Herodes and Regilla built a number of installations during their marriage, some of which represented their union in spatial terms. After Regilla died, Herodes reconfigured two of these structures, altering their meanings with inscriptions to represent the marriage retrospectively. This paper considers the implications of these commemorative installations for Herodes’ sense of cultural identity.
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Making Space for Bicultural Identity: Herodes Atticus Commemorates Regilla

Herodes’ friend Favorinus owned a human toy, a black Indian slave, ‘Who would entertain them when they drank together, mixing Atticisms with Indicisms as he jibbered broken Greek.’ The linguistic hybridity of this domestic slave contrasts with the linguistic purity of Herodes’ ‘Herakles’, a freeborn rustic strongman, clothed in wolf-skin, who spoke perfect Greek. The Attic hinterland was his teacher, or so he claimed; pure and healthy speech was hardly to be found in the city, where, by welcoming floods of paying students from barbarous parts, the Athenians had corrupted their own language.

These two mascots represented two approaches to Greek language and identity. Heracles from the hinterland represented an inward-looking model that emphasized Greek uniqueness and the historical particularity of Attic tradition. The Indian slave gestured toward a more outward-looking, cosmopolitan model of Greek paideia as a game men of any race could play. Listening to the hybrid babble of their slave permitted Herodes and Favorinus to enjoy the sophisticated frisson of recognizing the Attic self in the barbarian ‘other’. This Attic self, however, was a deliberate posture. Each sophist in his own way straddled the ambiguous border between Greek and Roman identities—hence their shared taste for cultural incongruity. This paper explores Herodes’ position between Greek and Roman identities by looking at how some of his building projects, undertaken during his marriage and modified after the death of his Roman wife, symbolized the symmetries and asymmetries of their marriage and social position. As we observe the grieving Herodes ‘at play with his marbles’ (his own expression), we see how he used built space and poetic inscriptions to express complex issues of gender and bicultural identity.

Herodes Atticus was one of a kind. His affluence, his eloquence, and his arrogance put him in a league of his own. He was therefore well-placed to test the limits of conventional behavior. As a Greek Herodes was very unusual in that he became a Roman consul. He was also exceptional in having a Roman wife. Alone of his Hellenic contemporaries, Herodes married a patrician from the upper reaches of the Roman aristocracy. What were the identity implications of this choice? I think it makes more sense to assume that Herodes’ identity contained both Greek and Roman elements, than to assume that he operated without any sense of cultural difference at all. Herodes’

---

1. This essay is dedicated to three unforgettable teachers whose scholarly work has illuminated various aspects of the subject under study: Glen Bowersock, Erich Gruen and Ron Stroud. Many colleagues and friends have humored my obsession with Herodes and tried to steer me straight: John Bodel, Riet van Bremen, my iurisconsult Judith Evans Grubbs, Elizabeth Holley, Phillip Horky, Christopher Jones, Tom McGinn, Joe Rife, Susan Stephens, Ron Stroud, Jennifer Trimble, Verity Platt, David Potter, Tim Whitmarsh, and Daniel Richter’s second sophistic seminar. This essay builds on the scholarly foundation laid by the monographs of Graindor, Ameling, Tobin, and Galli. Pomeroy 2007, which engages with the same cast of characters but asks different questions, appeared after this study was essentially completed. It has not fundamentally altered my views.

2. Philostratus VS 490; 552-3.

3. Whitmarsh 2001: 105-8 finds Herodes Atticus particularly associated with the cosmopolitan model.

4. For the paradoxes of Favorinus’ identity see Philostratus VS 489; Gleason 1995: 3-8; König 2001.

5. Philostratus VS 559.
Greece had long been incorporated into the Roman Empire, but retained its own language and cultural traditions. In Herodes’ world ‘Greek’ and ‘Roman’ did function as operative categories: they were used to sort and to label. When Herodes, rich as he was, appeared in a Roman courtroom, he still might hear himself denigrated as a ‘Greekeling’.

This is not to say that the labels ‘Greek’ and ‘Roman’ were applied in consistent ways, or that they defined any clear-cut essential difference. In this period, at the upper reaches of society, Greek and Roman identities interpenetrated, but were not fused. Complicating this picture was the fact that Romans played at being Greek: wealthy Romans had long affected a taste for Greek amenities in their private lives, while Roman emperors, particularly Hadrian, financed extensive monumental building in Greece and actively supported its cultural institutions. Long before Roman emperors began fostering Greekness, however, Herodes’ ancestors had been busily pursuing ties with Rome.

Situated as he was within multiple taxonomies, Herodes’ identity contained both Greek and Roman elements that never completely integrated, but remained in tension. His notorious arrogance expressed his sense of uniqueness, as if he constituted a micro-identity of one. But we have to wonder how he conceived of his place in the Roman world, in terms of both history and contemporary reality. Did he conceive of his own Greekness as a mark of distinction from Roman ‘others’? And how did he conceive of being Roman, a category that definitely included his wife, but also in some ways himself? Herodes’ Greekness is easy to see. If ethnic identity requires ‘a subscription to a myth of common descent and kinship, an association with a specific territory, and a sense of shared history’, Herodes’ identity was markedly Greek. He traced his descent from the Greek god Hermes and Kekrops, the autochthonous hero of Attica. He also claimed descent from the great Athenian general Miltiades. The dramatic lectures he gave as a sophist reinforced the Hellenic pride of his audience and reanimated the shared history of Classical Greece.

Yet when we look behind his self-conscious Hellenism to the actualities of his ‘common descent and kinship’, Herodes begins to look a lot more Roman. His mother’s family came from the Roman colony of Corinth and bore a Hellenized Latin name. His father’s family had cultivated ties with Rome for many generations. Herodes’ great great grandfather traveled all the way to Gaul to ask Julius Caesar to underwrite

---

6 *Graeculus*: Fronto Ad. M. Caes. 3. 3.
7 This interest took the form of monumental building, support for cults and festivals, and re-organization of Athens’ city government. For details see Geagan 1979.
8 On the question of how Roman Greeks saw their own identities see Swain 1996: 70 and *passim*; Alcock 2002: 86.
10 Kekrops: *IG* XIV 1389 (Ameling 1983 II: 146); Miltiades: Philostratus *VS* 546. Naming his daughter Elpinike was Herodes’ way of emphasizing this connection, since Miltiades’ sister bore that name.
11 Topics from Greek history in the classical period were popular with second-century audiences. Herodes declaimed, for example, on whether the Athenians should remove trophies set up for victories over other Greeks, and moved himself to tears as he impersonated wounded Athenians imploring their retreating comrades in the fifth-century debacle of the Sicilian Expedition (Philostratus *VS* 539, 574).
12 Herodes’ family tree: Ameling 1983 I: 170-1; on inscriptions, mostly in Latin, attesting to Vibullii in Corinth, see Robert *Hellenica* II (1946) 9-10; Spawforth 1978: 258 n. 68 with stemma p. 261; 1980: 208 n. 33. The late republican senator L. Vibullius Rufus would not have married a non-citizen Greek girl; the Vibullii of Corinth were probably descended from one of that senator’s freedmen operating in the area as a businessman. On the mixed identity of Corinth see Alcock 1993: 166-9; König 2001.
some Athenian public works projects. This same ancestor mentored Cicero’s son during his studies in Athens. Herodes’ great-grandfather served as priest of Nero, and was rewarded with Roman citizenship when it was still rare among natives of old Greece. Herodes’ grandfather and father continued to serve as priests of the Roman imperial cult. Her father entered the senate at an unknown date. About 132, when Herodes’ career was already well under way, his father was appointed suffect consul, the first native of old Greece to attain this honor.

After the males of Herodes’ family gained Roman citizenship, their matrimonial choices were constrained. Since citizenship could pass only through the female line, they had to marry women who were already Roman citizens. This explains the family’s intertwined relationship with the Vibullii, citizens of Italian origin from the Roman colony of Corinth. Herodes’ father chose a wife from this family, into which his aunt had already married: his wife, Vibullia Alkia, was his niece. This marriage illustrates the ‘marked tendency towards endogamy’ characteristic of aristocratic marriages in Roman Greece. This tendency produced, in the case of Herodes’ parents, a marriage between Roman citizens that was not actually legitimate according to Roman law. Once Herodes’ father became consul, the matrimonial choices of his son were further constrained. Senators in this period, both Italian and Greek-speaking, adhered in practice to a policy of marrying women from their region of origin whose families were of equal rank. Herodes presumably aspired to follow his father’s footsteps into the consulate. Whom should he marry? Herodes was stuck: there were no other consular families from Achaea, unless one were to count Philopappus, displaced descendant of the kings of Commagene. There was only one other senatorial family from Achaea: a Spartan Vibullius, a relative of Herodes’ mother, had entered the senate. It would be interesting to know whether these families had daughters whom

13 He came home with 50 talents: Cicero Att. VI. 1. 25; Ameling 1983 I: 7-8.
15 He was the first of the family to bear the names Tiberius Claudius: Ameling 1983 I: 13; Tobin 1997: 14.
16 A great-uncle was priest of Tiberius; his great-grandfather was priest of Nero and gained Roman citizenship; his grandfather Hipparchos was likewise an imperial priest. Possibly executed, Hipparchus lost his property under Domitian. Herodes’ father was also adlected to one of Rome’s major priestly colleges (XVviri) (IO 359+492+622; Ameling 1983 II: 133 # 124). On Herodes’ own priesthoods see below n. 28.
17 Or at least peregrines with the right of conubium (Woloch 1973: 254, 260-1).
18 She was the daughter of his sister and (L.) Vibullius Rufus. Herodes’ own daughter Elpinike married into the same family: Lucius Vibullius Hipparchos, whose brother Herodes eventually adopted (Ameling 1983: II: #129, 136, 141, 142).
19 Spawforth 1985: 192, citing a comment of Plutarch which implies that Greeks preferred sons-in-law who were already relatives (Mor. 772a).
20 Roman law forbade marriage between a man and his sister’s daughter (Gaius, Inst. I. 62; Grubbs 2002: 137-8). The Digest records the case of a woman married to her uncle who had to petition Marcus Aurelius to establish the legitimacy of her children (23.2.57a; Grubbs 2002: 140; Frier and McGinn 2004: 37). It is interesting that the social prominence of Herodes’ father seems to have been sufficient to pull off such a marriage without any challenge to the legitimacy of the children. Woloch 1973: 164 wonders why Herodes’ Athenian political enemies did not do so. Perhaps their own families contained similar marriages. Birley 1997: 227 n. 134 suggests that Herodes may have been adopted by his mother’s brother, L. Vibullius Hipparchus (Herodes’ full name was L. Vibullius Hipparchus Ti. Claudius Ti. F. Quir. Atticus Herodes).
21 Rémy 1990. It is not clear whether Herodes’ father married before or after he entered the senate.
22 Philopappus, cos. suff. 109 PIR2 I 151; Spawforth 1978.
23 C. Iulius Euryycles Herculanus L. Vibullius Pius PIR2 I 302; Spawforth 1978; Halfmann 1979: 1256. He may never have married. At any rate, the name was continued only by testamentary adoption (Birley 1977: 211, 243-4).
Herodes overlooked in order to reach for Regilla, or whether his choice of an Italian patrician was prompted by a dearth of eligible Greek women.

This situation may explain why Herodes married late: he wanted a bride from a consular family, and in order to achieve the alliance he had to wait until his own consulship was within sight. By the time he became consul ordinarius in 143, Herodes had married a Roman from a patrician family, Appia Annia Atilia Regilla Caecidius Tertulla.24 Her father, both her grandfathers, and her paternal great-grandfather had all been consuls. Herodes knew her maternal grandfather well: they were both founding members of the imperial college of priests dedicated to the cult of the deified Hadrian.25 At the time of her marriage, Regilla was in her mid-teens; Herodes was about 40, a few years older than her father.26 We cannot tell at this distance precisely why either family chose exogamy, but the choice was highly unusual. Aristocratic Greeks and Italians may have interacted as equals in politics and intellectual life, as houseguests and drinking-companions, but in this period they did not intermarry.27

Like his marriage and family, Herodes’ career and education had both Roman and Greek dimensions.28 In his Roman career he followed the cursus honorum to the very top. He served as quaestor (distinguished even then by his close relationship to Hadrian), as tribunus plebis, and then as praetor in his early thirties, after which he was sent to supervise the free cities of Asia. He received the rare honor of three major Roman priesthoods. And he attained the consulate—not, like his father, as an elderly consul suffect, but at the youngest possible age, as one of the consuls who gave his name to the year 143 A.D. In his parallel Athenian career, Herodes served as agoranomos and became eponymous archon in his mid-twenties. In his mid-thirties he superintended (and subsidized) the games of the Panhellenion, an association of Greek cities invented by the Emperor Hadrian. After his father’s death, he refused to forgive the Athenians’ debts to the estate, and as a conciliatory gesture undertook to build a stadium and fund the next Panathenaea.29 In Greece, Herodes’ education had been pan-Hellenic. At Sparta he took part in the rich boys’ ephebeia;30 at Athens he underwent the grueling rhetorical training that made him a grandmaster of Attic speech. But Herodes had also—quite atypically—received some of his education in Rome. He had

24 PIR² A 720; Ameling 1983 I: 78-9; II 16; Raepsaet-Charlier 66.
25 Schumacher 1999: 434-5. Herodes had been an amicus of Hadrian as early as his quaestorship (Syll.³ 863 no. 1; Ameling 1983 II: 105-6 # 76).
26 Regilla’s father seems to have died not long after their marriage. At any rate, he never became consul ordinarius.
27 Woloch 1973: 169. The only other examples I know of are from a generation later: two daughters of Marcus Aurelius who were married to senators whose families came from the eastern empire, and another possible example cited by Millar 1964: 12-3. Fronto, Herodes’ fellow-consul from North Africa did the reverse: he married a woman from a Greek family prominent in Ephesus (was she named Gratia or Kratia? See Champlin 1980: 26 with Raepsaet-Charlier 1987 nos. 300 and 233).
28 On Herodes’ career see Woloch 1973: 171-6; Ameling 1983 I: 48-83, II: 1-15 and catalogue nos. 101-5 (Athens), 105-8 (Rome). Surveys of Herodes’ life and quarrels: Philostratus, VS 545-567; Tobin 1997: 22-67. On his Roman priesthoods (XXvir sacris faciundis, sodalis Augustalis, sodalis Hadrianalis) see Schumacher 1999, who aptly quotes Seneca de Ira 3. 31. 2 to show that cooptation into multiple priestly colleges was the summit of senatorial ambition. Herodes did not immediately succeed his father as provincial high priest of the imperial cult, perhaps because he was already sodalis Augustalis, but succeeded to that post at the end of his life. Philostratus VS 549.
29 Ameling 1983 II: #70. Herodes’ father had done this too. The family’s connection with Sparta goes back to the days of Herodes’ grandfather’s exile from Athens under Domitian. In the imperial period the Spartan ephebeia was an organization for the social elite.
lived as a child in the patrician household of Marcus Aurelius’ grandparents. Thanks to this experience, Herodes came to know the future emperor’s mother. (Presumably it was she who, years later, engaged him to tutor Marcus in Greek rhetoric). And thanks to this experience, Herodes would have been better versed in Latin language and Roman domestic mores than most provincial Greeks.

From this biographical summary, Herodes’ identity appears to have comprised both Greek and Roman elements. Whatever vestiges of cultural difference between ‘Greeks’ and ‘Romans’ remained in his world, anthropology suggests that we look for them in marriage and funerary practices. Herodes and Regilla, a bi-cultural couple, built a number of installations together, some of which represented their union in spatial terms. After Regilla died, Herodes added inscriptions to some of these structures, altering their meanings to represent the marriage retrospectively. We can read those installations as sites of negotiation between multiple identities, as bounded spaces designed to hold multiple meanings and carry out complex symbolic work.

THE NYMPHAEUM

The Nymphaeum was a fountain that Herodes and Regilla built at Olympia. Its array of statues celebrated both the Greek and Roman sides of their family, and shows how they presented the composite to the public. Privately-financed construction in public space are always, implicitly, acts of self-presentation on the part of the donor. The Nymphaeum made this dynamic explicit. Its statues, symmetrically arranged above statues of the imperial family, physically represented the family of Herodes and Regilla as it was in the early 150’s. This was the high tide of their personal good fortune. Herodes had already tutored the emperor, married Regilla, and served as consul ordinarius. Although the couple had early lost an infant son (and Herodes did not take the loss very well), they now had four living children. Regilla was serving as priestess of Demeter at Olympia, an honor that simultaneously included her, though a Roman patrician, in the definitive festival of Hellenic identity, and set her apart from Greek women, who were not allowed to watch the games. The nymphaeum monument made her uniqueness permanent. On their way to the stadium, athletes, spectators, and off-season tourists would pause, as they walked past the two-tiered fountain with its refreshing spray, to read the simple Greek inscription incised on the flanks of a marble

---

31 P. Calvisius Tullus Russo and Domitia Lucilla the elder were Marcus’ maternal grandparents. Marcus says of Herodes in a letter to Fronto: *et scio illum guïdem in avi mei P. Calvisii domo educatum* (ad M. Caes. 3. 2). Possibly this period began during Herodes’ father’s suffect consulship under Trajan, with Herodes staying on in Rome like the son of a client king. Herodes’ experience was not normative: the sons of many provincial senators were brought up in their families’ home province far from Rome (Eck 1980: 284).

32 Bol 1984; Smith 1998. The purpose of this monument was not primarily commemorative, although some of the family members whose statues were included in the monumental display were no longer among the living.

33 For the date see Tobin 1997: 321.

34 Marcus Aurelius wrote to Fronto: *Herodi filius natus <hodi>e mortuus est. Id Herodes non aequo animo fert.* Ad M. Caes. I. 6 (10 van der Hout I 154 Haines). Fronto admonished Herodes in Greek to hope for other children *Epist. Graec.* 3.

35 For the statue base inscriptions and dates of Herodes’ children see Bol 1984: 132-9. Tobin suggest that at least one more child was born to Herodes (Regilla was eight months pregnant when she died) and that this child is commemorated by Herodes’ poem for a dead infant, an inscription that probably comes from the family tomb at Kephisia (Tobin 1997: 224-8; Ameling 1983 II: 143 # 140.)
bull poised above the waters: ‘Regilla, priestess of Demeter, dedicated the water and the fixtures to Zeus.’

As reconstructed by Renate Bol, the Nymphaeum featured two layers of eleven niches arrayed in a semi-circle. The lower niches contained sculptures of the imperial family, while the upper contained (slightly smaller) sculptures of Herodes’ family: Regilla and her parents and grandfather to the viewer’s left, Herodes, his parents and his eldest son to the right. As outliers at the far ends of the ensemble are Herodes’ eldest daughter on the left, and two younger children on the right, matching up with children from the imperial family in the niches below. At the midpoint of each semi-circle was a statue of Zeus (draped and unarmored to match the civilians above, nude and heroic to accompany the imperial warriors below). Each adult male of the imperial family wears Roman military dress. Upstairs, to the viewer’s left, Regilla’s father and grandfather wear Roman civilian togas, while on the right Herodes’ sons wear the

Illustration #1 –Nymphaeum reconstruction by Bol

Regilla also dedicated a statue in the sanctuary to Hygieia with a no-frills inscription that assumes public recognition and asserts her uniqueness: ‘Ῥήγιλλα Ὑγείαι’ (no patronymic or husband’s name needed) (IvO 288).

Bol 1984 Beilag 4 shows her reconstruction of the sculptural arrangement and Beilag 5 shows the whole structure. My discussion is very much indebted to Smith 1998.

36 Ῥήγιλλα, ἱερεία Δήμητρος, τῷ ὕδωρ καὶ τῷ περὶ τῷ ὕδωρ τῷ Δίῳ IvO 610 = Ameling 1983 II: 127-8 #112. Regilla also dedicated a statue in the sanctuary to Hygieia with a no-frills inscription that assumes public recognition and asserts her uniqueness: ‘Ῥήγιλλα Ὑγείαι’ (no patronymic or husband’s name needed) (IvO 288).

37 Bol 1984 Beilag 4 shows her reconstruction of the sculptural arrangement and Beilag 5 shows the whole structure. My discussion is very much indebted to Smith 1998.
The two adult males on Herodes’ side of the family are headless; one wears a toga, the other a himation. Which one is Herodes? Rowland Smith proposes that Herodes’ father wears the toga, as the senior male and representative of the forebear who secured the citizenship. Then it would be Herodes himself who wears the himation. In so doing he would be making a statement that his Greek civic dress is on a par with the togas of his father and father-in-law.

The inscription on the marble bull indicated that the Nymphaeum as a whole was dedicated in Regilla’s name as Priestess of Demeter. But the sculptures of the individual imperial family that occupied the lower niches were dedicated in Herodes’ name alone. We have no way to know how costs and design ideas were apportioned between husband and wife, but we cannot rule out an extended process of family discussion. As an architectural instrument of familial self-positioning the Nymphaeum encodes patterns of identity and difference. The monument presents Herodes as like the emperor in that he bestows aqueducts and expensive nymphae on the public. The sculptural ensemble also contrasts Herodes’ and Regilla’s family with the emperor’s family: they are aristocratic as opposed to imperial, civilian as opposed to military. Yet at the same time, the logic of the whole, with one dynastic group arranged above another along a horizontal axis of symmetry, implies similarity, if not parity, between the donor’s family and the imperial family. A vertical axis of symmetry also guides the arrangement. The right and left sides of the sculptural ensemble symmetrically celebrate the Greek and the Roman halves of Herodes’ and Regilla’s family, with the implication that they are equal in status: Herodes the Greek and his Roman wife on either side of Zeus, flanked by their respective parents and framed by their children. One cannot simply say of this monument that it boils down to Greek as opposed to Roman; though elements of cultural contrast are there, they are muted by the less differentiated costumes of the women and the other contrasts in play. The Nymphaeum’s symmetries are elegant but not stark; they seem designed to convey the decorum of a harmonious but not homogenized world.

What did contemporary observers think of this monument? While it was standard procedure for wealthy aristocrats to erect statues of the imperial family, it was unusual, without the invitation of an honorific decree, for living individuals to erect

---

38 We can tell that Herodes’ son Atticus Bradua wore a himation though only bits of his foot survive: he is wearing sandals (Bol 1984, Tafel 56), which were never worn with a toga. Regilla resembles the adult women of the imperial family (‘large Herculaneum woman’ type), while her mother is a ‘Palliata’ (Bol 1984: 177) and Herodes’ mother is still another type (modest and voluminous too), with the hairstyle of an older generation (Bol 1984: 176). In portrait sculpture of this period female dress is not as markedly differentiated Greek from Roman as male costume. Certainly none of the women are dressed definitively à la greque (in peplos or chiton-and-himation).

39 Smith 1998: 77. Strictly speaking, however, it was not Herodes’ father but his great-grandfather, imperial priest of Nero, who secured Roman citizenship (Ameling I p. 13). Herodes father was the family’s first consul.

40 Should Herodes’ head turn up, I would be very surprised if it sported the neatly curled hair and styled beard made fashionable by Hadrian and his Antonine successors. These were unknown in Classical and Hellenistic Greek portraiture. Herodes’ extant portraits recall the beards of Lysias and Aischines, and projects an ‘emphatic Hellenic identity’ (Smith 1998: 79).

41 IvO 614-7.

42 Hadrian, for example, gave a nymphaeum to Athens (Geagan ‘Roman Athens’ ANRW II. 7.1: 397). In 134/5, when Herodes was corrector of the free cities of Asia, he lobbied Hadrian for money to improve the water-supply of Alexandria Troas. He vastly overspent his budget, however, and his father had to make up the difference (Philostratus VS 548).
public statues of themselves. Did Herodes’ presentation of his own family in parallel formation to the imperial family violate some sort of unwritten rule against this type of self-display? We do know that at least one Hellenic rigorist was displeased with the Nymphaeum: Peregrinus the Cynic philosopher. According to Lucian, Peregrinus was a self-promoting rabble-rouser who railed against the emperor and encouraged the Greeks to take up arms against Roman rule. Perhaps he read the dynastic symmetries of Herodes’ monument as indicating too much complaisance with Roman political domination. Or perhaps he was offended by Herodes’ attempt to graft the luxury of Roman water engineering onto a Greek sanctuary central to the construction of Hellenic identity. At any rate, in his diatribes Peregrinus associated the enterprise with the dangers posed to Hellenic manhood by Roman rule. He publicly attacked Herodes for bringing water to Olympia, on the grounds that he was ‘feminizing the Hellenes’. Real Greeks, evidently, ought to tough out their thirst. It seems that Peregrinus’ model of how Greeks should comport themselves vis a vis Rome was not happy marriage, but manly resistance.

The Nymphaeum at Olympia shows us how Herodes and his wife represented themselves and their prospering family to the international crowds visiting the sanctuary. Their family, however, did not prosper long. Regilla died a few years after the monument was built. Herodes himself lived to a ripe old age, but this meant that he lived long enough to lose, besides his wife, most of their sons and daughters, and at least five foster-children. The intensity with which he dramatized his grief was often remarked. When Regilla died, Herodes signaled loud and clear that he was not going to take it like a Roman and pull himself together to serve the Roman state: he refused to cast lots for his proconsulship.

To commemorate Regilla, Herodes built a huge auditorium at the foot of the Acropolis. This construction was a quasi-royal gesture, Herodes’ answer to Hadrian’s make-over of the theater of Dionysus. It imposed on the central feature of the Athenian landscape a lieu de mémoire that no one could ignore. Few people, however, saw the memorial installations that Herodes created on private land. We will look at one in Attica, and one near Rome. Each went through two phases. Originally, during Regilla’s lifetime, they bore one set of meanings. After Regilla’s death, Herodes had them retrofitted with additional inscriptions. These inscriptions shifted the meaning of the whole ensemble so as to represent the post-mortem state of Herodes’ bicultural marriage. Like the Nymphaeum at Olympia, these structures play with symmetries and oppositions between Greek and Roman, private and imperial. The rest of this paper considers the implications of these commemorative installations.

---

43 Stewart 2003: 84. When a city awarded a statue to someone by honorific decree, the recipient often paid for it himself, an arrangement that preserved the proprieties.
45 On the date of Regilla’s death see below n. 121.
46 Philostratus VS 556-461, Lucian Demonax 24, 33.
47 Philostratus VS 556. Fronto cast lots, but did not serve, presumably because of ill health.
48 At this time the Theater of Dionysus contained 13 statues of Hadrian. Hadrian had donated a scaenae frons whose sculptural decoration may have depicted the marriage of himself as New Dionysus to Sabina/Ariadne (Karivieri 2002: 42-3). Building an odeion in Athens as a royal gesture: the theater of Pericles, sacked by Sulla, was restored by Ariarathes of Cappodocia. Agrippa donated an odeion in the Athenian agora. When its roof collapsed, it was reconstructed under Antoninus Pius (Geagan, ‘Roman Athens I’ ANRW II. 7. 1 371-436, pp. 382, 380, 399). The cost of Herodes’ auditorium may be gauged from the fact that it was roofed in statue-grade cedar: Philostratus VS 551, 556.
for Herodes’ sense of cultural identity. I think it makes sense to read commemorative installations as identity statements because the person commemorated is both ‘other’ and connected to the self. Since we define ourselves both through connection and through otherness, bereavement and commemoration bring issues of self-definition to the fore.

THE ARCH AT MARATHON

Illustration # 2 Herodes’ arch at Marathon (reconstruction by Mallwitz 1964)

The first of these memorial installations is an arch that Herodes constructed on his estate at Marathon. In its initial phase, before Regilla’s death, this arch appears to have served as a gateway into a walled enclave within the estate. The architectural symmetry of this arch involves the vertical plane, with paired inscriptions on the keystones that were integral to the original design. ‘The Gate of Immortal Concord. You are entering Regilla’s area’, reads the arch from one side; ‘Gate of Immortal Concord. You are entering Herodes’ area’, reads it from the other. The arch is clearly honorific, but in its transposition of a medium of public honor into a private context it is highly unusual. Even Roman emperors did not put up honorific arches to themselves.

50 The practical function of this enclave remains a mystery: the topography of the site does not suggest it ever was a garden or locus amoenus (R. Stroud, personal communication, which accords with the photographs in Tobin 1997: fig. 80).
51 Ὅμοιοις ἀθανάτου, πύλη, Ἡρώδου ὁ χώρος εἰς ὅν εἰσέρχει[1] (IG II² 5189); πύλη, Ἡργίλλης ὁ χώρος εἰς ὅν εἰσέρχεται (IG II² 5190); SEG XXIII 131; Ameling 1983 II: 117 #97-8.
52 Wallace-Hadrill 1990: 146.
In its shape and proportions, Herodes’ arch at Marathon resembled the arch built by the Athenians to honor Hadrian.\textsuperscript{53} Like Herodes’ arch at Marathon, Hadrian’s arch at Athens bore symmetrically phrased, but significantly different inscriptions on each side. Travelers heading out from the agora through Hadrian’s arch would read, ‘This is Athens, formerly the city of Theseus’. Heading back to the agora, having viewed Hadrian’s splendid restoration of the Temple of Olympian Zeus, they would read, ‘This is the city of Hadrian, not of Theseus’. The inscriptions on Hadrian’s arch, alluded to by Herodes, themselves allude to an intertext. The paired inscriptions on Hadrian’s arch (which mention Theseus) resemble the paired inscriptions put up by Theseus to mark the territorial boundary of the isthmus: ‘This is not the Peloponnesus, but Ionia’ read the one facing east. ‘This is not the Peloponnesus, but Ionia’ read the other side.\textsuperscript{54} Herodes’ arch clearly alludes to Hadrian’s, but equivocates about its mimetic relationship to its prototype. Was Herodes imitating Hadrian, or imitating Hadrian-imitating-Theseus, or (as an Athenian whose ancestry extends back into the mythic past) just imitating Theseus? There is also more than one way to look at what the arch at Marathon says about Herodes and Regilla. In general, Roman arches mark boundaries.\textsuperscript{55} The Hadrian/Theseus antithesis of the arch at Athens is, on one level, an antithesis between Roman and Greek identities. The arch at Marathon can also be read as emphasizing the antithesis between the Roman and Greek identities of Regilla and Herodes. But to see both inscriptions the viewer must pass through the arch--in other

\textsuperscript{53} Hadrian’s arch in Athens spanned the processional route from the agora to the Temple of Olympian Zeus. At Eleusis a similarly-shaped pair of arches with twin inscriptions was dedicated to Hadrian by the Panhellenion (\textit{IG II} \textsuperscript{2} 3386; Jones 1996: 36). The idea that the Athenian arch honors Hadrian as the city’s new κτίστης derives from an unpublished paper by C.P. Jones cited by Adams 1989. Like Herodes himself, an honorary arch is, both conceptually and architecturally, a hybrid of Roman and Greek elements (Wallace-Hadrill 1990; Adams 1989:12-13). On Herodes’ presentation of himself in the Marathon inscriptions as a sort of city-founder in the private domain, see Galli 2003: 134-8.

\textsuperscript{54} Strabo III.5.5; IX.1.6-7; Plutarch \textit{Theseus} 25.4: \textit{Προσκτησάµενος δὲ τῇ Ἀττικῇ τὴν Μεγαρικὴν βεβαιῶς, τὴν ὀρθογραµµένην ἐν Ἰσθµῷ στῆλην ἐστήσεν, ἐπὶ γράψας τὸ διορίζον ἐπὶγράµµα τὴν χώραν δυσὶ τριµὲ τροις, ὃν ἐστίν ἐπὶ τὸ μὲν πρὸς ἑως Ἡαδ᾿ Ιονία, τὸ δὲ πρὸς ἐστὶν Πελοπόννησος, ἀλλὰ Ἰονία, τὸ δὲ πρὸς ἐστὶν Ηαδ᾿ ἐστὶ Πελοπόννησος, οὐχ Ἰονία.\textsuperscript{55} Gregory and Mills (1984) 427.
words, must make the transition from one side to the other, must see things from both sides, and thus experience, however briefly, the kind of shift between cultural registers that Herodes and Regilla had to make all the time. Like ‘His’ and ‘Hers’ towels on opposite ends of the towel bar, the arch at Marathon figures dissimilium concordia.

Illustration # 4 Coin of Antoninus and Faustina

OMONOIA ΑΘΑΝΑΤΟΣ (‘Immortal Concord’), the slogan that appears on both sides of Herodes’ arch at Marathon, is the Greek equivalent of the Latin phrase concordia aeterna used in imperial public relations. As Geagan pointed out, Herodes’ inscription echoes the matrimonial propaganda of Antoninus Pius and Faustina. On coins issued shortly after Faustina’s death, which was around the time that Herodes and Regilla were married, we see Antoninus and Faustina clasping hands above a smaller couple who are themselves clasping hands above an altar. The two pairs of figures, one nested inside the other, suggest an infinite series of mimetic miniaturizations. The coins’ legend: CONCORDIA. Read this way, Herodes’ arch does not so much contrast Greek and Roman identities as proclaim that the marital harmony of Herodes and Regilla is congruent with the values of the imperial family. Thus the first phase of Herodes’ arch at Marathon represents, in its relationship with imperial monuments and coinage, shifting perspectives on identity and difference. Herodes is both like and not like Hadrian, both like and unlike Regilla. Because an arch may have two faces, but remains one monument, the arch at Marathon was a structure well suited to represent the paradoxes of bi-cultural identity.

When Regilla died, the image of a harmonious bi-cultural family, so carefully represented in the Nymphaeum at Olympia and on the arch at Marathon, suffered a jolt. She had been pregnant. Perhaps she died giving birth, but some said that Herodes

56 Compare the entrance inscription to the Triopion sanctuary that Herodes built on the Appian Way: the inscription on each pillar wraps around 90 degrees towards the inside so that to read the whole thing one would have been forced to enter (as noted by Tobin 1997: 358-9) (IG XIV 1390 = Ameling #143).
57 Geagan 1964:152 n. 11. Of course marital ὀμονοία was not exclusive to the imperial family, but also an encomiastic generality (Ameling 1983 II: 118-19), and the leading families of Greek cities made ample use of marital motifs in public contexts Bremen (1996: 184-90).
58 Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, Volume 4 # 1236 p. 198 with Plate 28 #8. The symmetry that the coins suggest between the Concordia of the imperial couple and that of their married subjects became concrete during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, when statues of the imperial couple were set up in the temple of Venus and Roma. All couples in Rome were supposed to offer pre-nuptial sacrifice at the altar in front of these images (Dio 71 [72] 31, cited by Geagan).
had ordered her beaten. Regilla’s brother accused Herodes of murder. In these circumstances Herodes’ public grief-gestures were suspect as self-exculpation.

Some claimed that Herodes was trying to avert suspicion when he spent so lavishly building an auditorium in Regilla’s memory. Others pointed out that he must have been innocent, since he had dedicated his wife’s clothing at Eleusis: a murderer would not tempt fate by attracting the Goddesses’ attention. At home Herodes also mourned his wife extravagantly, redecorating his town house all in black, for example, and ordering meals prepared for the departed. These gestures only made history because they were deemed excessive by his peers.

In addition to his more widely-noted commemorative gestures, Herodes made a change to the arch at Marathon that adjusted its meaning for him, but seems not to have attracted the attention of contemporaries. He composed a verse inscription and had it carved, in small letters, at eye level on the eastern pillar of the gate. One can tell that this inscription is a later addition because the surface of the stone has been dug away and smoothed slightly to accommodate it. This inscription was found by Geagan and published in 1964. It consists of three elegiac couplets.

```
Α μάκαρ Ὠστίς ἔδειμε νέην πόλιν, οὐν[ο]μα δ’ αὐτήν
‘Ῥηγίλλης καλέων, ζωεὶ ἀγαλλόμενος.
Ζώω δ’ ἄλυμνος τὸ μοι οἰκία τέτυκται
νόσφ[ι]τι φιλῆς ἀλόγου καὶ δόμος ἡμιτελῆς.
ός ἄρα τοί θνητοὶς θεοὶ βιοτήν {ε}κεράσαντ[ες],
χάρ[ρ]ιματα τ’ ἠδ’ ἀνίας γείτονας ἀμφις ἔχο[νν].
```

Ah, blessed is he who has built a new city, calling it

---

59 What was scandalous, apparently, was not that he might have ordered his freedman to beat her, but that the provocation was trivial (Philostratus VS 555). Whether truth of slander, the story of this attack assimilated Herodes to tyrants like Periander, Nero, and King Herod(es) of Judaea, who occasioned similar comment by his extravagant grieving for his wife Mariamene, executed on his orders. A husband’s kick to the womb also sets in motion the plot of an early imperial novel (Chariton 4). These high-profile cases aside, wife-beating was unremarkable in the Roman world (e.g. Augustine Confessions 9. 9, 19), and epitaphs celebrated marriages that were not violent (Shaw 1987: 31-2). We cannot assume that women of rank were ipso facto immune. The premise of Pomeroy 2007, however, that Regilla was a victim of domestic violence, goes beyond the evidence.

60 το ὑπερπενθήσει... διεβάλλετο μὲν γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα ὃς πλάσμα (Philostratus VS 566). Compare Polybius’ remarks on hostile response to the display of intense emotion in people of another culture (XV 17. 1-2). Judged by Stoic standards, Herodes’ grieving was quite over the top. He, in his turn, was unrepentantly critical of the Stoic ideal of apatheia (Gellius N.A. 19. 12).

61 Philostratus VS 551, 555-7; Lucian Demonax 33, which may be a derogatory reference to the Roman practice of feasting at the graveside.


63 ‘The third letter may be read as an omicron, a theta, a lunate epsilon or sigma’ (Geagan 1964: 152). Geagan restored κεράσαντ[ες]...ἔχο[νν], translating, ‘For, in truth, the gods, when they have mixed the cup of life for mortals, pour out joys and griefs side by side’. This has the advantage of preserving the mixing imagery derived from the ‘two urns’ passage in the Iliad (24. 524-30) which Herodes clearly had in mind (note how he echoes the phrase ζωεὶ ἀγαλλόμενος of Iliad 24. 526). Vox 2003: 216-17 proposes κεράσαντ[ο]...ἔζε.[νν] and translates, ‘Così, in realtà, gli dei hanno mescolato per i mortali la coppa della vita, si che abbiano gioie e dolori per vicini, da un lato e dall’altro’. The first person ἔχο seems to me a less desirable reading since it lessens the gnomic impact of the final couplet.
by Regilla’s name; he lives in exultation. But I live in grief because my dwelling has been built without my beloved wife, and my home is half-complete. For the gods, in truth, when they have mixed the cup of human life, pour out joys and griefs as neighbors side by side.

This inscription transforms the arch into a commemorative structure. Initially, it represented a boundary or limen between male and female spaces, and between Greek and Roman identities. With the addition of Herodes’ poem, the arch became a structure that represents another boundary: the limen between life and death. All three couplets allude self-referentially to the idea of architectural structure: ἐδείκνυε ἡ πόλιν... οἰκία τέτυκται... δόμος ἡμιτελής... γείτονας. The poem conveys the fractures in Herodes’ experience. In temporal terms, the couplets divide up into past, present, and eternity. In logical terms, the couplets take the form of a thesis/antithesis/synthesis. In emotional terms, the couplets move from joy to grief to Homeric resignation. The first couplet refers to Herodes in the third person. It may not be necessary to postulate an anonymous passer-by who speaks these lines. Rather the change of person between ‘Happy is he’ and ‘I live in grief’ conveys how vast a gulf has opened up between the Herodes of yesterday and the Herodes of today—so vast a gulf that the former self feels like a different person.

Geagan has called attention to the play of Homeric allusions in this poem. I would like to focus in on one of them. In the Iliad’s Catalogue of Ships, we are told that Protesilaus, the leader of a contingent from Phylake, has already died, leaving behind his wife, and his ‘house half-complete’. In its multi-layered presentation of time, compressing the ante- and post-mortem phases of Protesilaus’ existence, this Homeric passage bears some general resemblance to Herodes’ poem. Specific verbal echoes confirm the relationship:

Iliad 2. 699-701

Marathon epigram 3-4

The Homeric phrase δόμος ἡμιτελής was a crux—the sort of things that sophists debated over their wine. Herodes may have found that this phrase spoke to his sense of splitting, division, and incompleteness that characterized his life in bereavement. This sense of splitting may indeed have pre-existed his bereavement, in that he was both an

---

64 Here Herodes presents himself as a city-founder (like Hadrian on the arch at Athens), only his ‘city’ is a construct of domestic, not public, space (cf. Galli 2002: 134-8).

65 As suggested to me by Verity Platt.

66 The Iliad scholia on line 701 offer a variety of interpretations of the phrase δόμος ἡμιτελής, showing that its meaning was disputed in antiquity. In Heroikos 12 we learn that Protesilaus, as a revenant, disputed Homer’s use of ἡμιτελής as well as his use of the hapax ἀμφιδρύφης. Second Sophistic writers enjoyed using Protesilaus to re-write and elaborate Homer (Lucian Dialogues of the Dead 27-8; Philostratus Heroikos 2 et passim).
ur-Greek and a bi-cultural person. The marriage tie that was supposed to knit those contradictions together has been disconnected. The Homeric allusion also suggests a poetic reversal of gender identification. Herodes’ use of Homeric allusion shows that as a bereaved survivor he figured himself (consciously or unconsciously) as Protesilaus’ wife. He could also be betraying a familiarity with later elaborations of the Homeric story. The precedent for this cross-gender identification comes from Latin literature: in Catullus 68 it is Catullus’ devotion, not Lesbia’s, that is compared to the devotion of Protesilaus’ wife. It is not inconceivable that Herodes, who passed part of his boyhood in the house of a Roman aristocrat, knew Catullus’ poem.

The boundary marker that Theseus set up at the Isthmus marked a division of space: on the one side Ionia, on the other, the Peloponnese. Hadrian’s arch marked a division in time: this used to be the city of Theseus, now it is the city of Hadrian. Herodes’ arch initially marked a division of space and a division of gender, in that it formed an entrance to an enclave for Regilla nested within the larger enclave of Herodes’ estate. After her death, however, the arch came to represent other divisions also. Herodes’ epigram marks a discontinuity of time (before and after Regilla’s death), a reversal of gender roles through the feminizing experience of grief, and a rupture of the two halves of the self that the arch had at one time brought together.

THE TRIOPION

The Triopion was a complex of buildings and gardens three miles from Rome, on an estate fronting the Appian Way. Most scholars assume that this estate originally belonged to Regilla’s family. The name ‘Triopion’, however, is hardly Roman: it

---

68 It is possibly relevant to Herodes’ interest in boundaries and self-definition that he cherished an ambition to immortalize himself by cutting a canal through the Isthmus (Philostratus VS 551-2).
69 Pisani and Calza 1976: 132-141, 210-13; Ameling 1983 II: 148-59; Tobin 1997: 355-62; Galli 2002: 109-27. The boundaries of the precinct are not known. The reconciliation of the crucial inscriptions with the surviving architectural remains problematic: the inscriptions are no longer in situ; their purported find-spots and the various remaining structures are diagrammed in Pisani and Calza 1976 132, although I am not sure how their plan fits with what Piranesi and Ligorio have to say about where the caryatids and the twin columns were found (see below and n. 73). The church of San Urbano, 600 meters east of the Via Appia, is often taken to be the site of the main Demeter temple, but the most elaborate second-century sculptural remains were found on the Appian Way itself (the ‘caryatid structure’). Piranesi located the caryatids ‘about half a mile’ past the tomb of Caecilia Metella ‘in the Strozzi vineyard’ (quoted in Galli 2002: 123). If Piranesi was measuring distances on the Appian Way out from Rome, as they were measured in antiquity, then the caryatid structure was further south than is indicated on most modern maps. The Marcellus inscription announcing the precinct’s re-dedication to Regilla was found closer to Rome, near the basilica of San Sebastiano. Perhaps the Triopion’s original center of gravity was at the southern end of the property, and after Regilla’s death Herodes’ extended it northward to include a larger chunk of the estate.
70 This estate, whose villa was extensively remodeled in the mid second century, is often assumed to have been part of Regilla’s dowry. In fact we know nothing specific about the property arrangements attendant on her marriage. The estate on the Appian Way could have been part of her dowry, or it could have been her personal property (peculium), to which, as a Roman citizen marrying a Roman citizen, she kept title. Or she could have inherited it during the marriage; it was not uncommon for fathers to bequeath dotal property to their daughters. Ameling 1983 I: 78-9 floats the idea that the property could even have been acquired by Herodes’ father. But this hypothesis does not explain the bilingual inscription attesting Regilla’s ownership: Ἀννία Ῥηγίλλα Ηρόδου uxor lumen domus cuius haec praedia fuerunt (Ameling 1983 I: #144. The word praedia could mean, but does not prove, that the property was a fundus dotalis). After Regilla died, Herodes gained possession, though it is not clear whether he did so by testament, dotal pact, or fideicommissum for their children still in his potestas (on these modalities of property transmission
recalls the sanctuary of Demeter on Knidos. The complex that came to be known as the Triopion seems to have been designed during Regilla’s lifetime as a shrine to Demeter and the deified Faustina. Twin columns inscribed to ‘Demeter, Kore, and the Chthonic deities’ guarded a round building at the third milestone of the Appian Way. The columns’ grim warning against vandalism suggests that this structure marked the entrance. The Triopion seems to have developed in two phases. From an inscribed dedicatory poem we know that it originally contained a bicultural shrine: a temple with statues of Demeter and the deified Faustina (‘Old and New Demeter’). After Regilla’s death, Herodes retrofitted the Triopion to commemorate her also, and Regilla’s image was added to the ensemble.

Conceptually, this precinct on the Appian Way seems at first like Regilla’s precinct at Marathon turned inside out. Instead of an enclosed space for a Roman woman surrounded by the estate of her Greek husband, we have an enclosed space for a Greek Goddess on the estate of a Roman wife. But Demeter, in this instance, has a double identity. She was not paired with Kore, her usual Greek twin, but with a deified Roman empress. In the original Triopion precinct, then, Greek and Roman identities were layered in concentric symmetry with an element of hybridity at the symbolic center. A layering of cultural elements can be also detected in the series of caryatids that adorned one of the Triopion’s buildings.

see Saller 1994). The primary evidence for Herodes’ claim to ownership are the inscribed columns from the entrance (IG XIV 1390; Ameling 1983 II: 149 #143) that refer to the property as belonging to Herodes (there is no other indication of their date).

71 Triopion: RE VI A, 1 (1939) 175f. (W. Ruge). For the original Triopion’s foundation stories see Callimachus Hymn to Demeter; Diodorus Siculus 5. 61; Ovid Metamorphoses 8. 738-878.

72 I believe the Triopion developed in two stages for the following reasons. Marcellus’ dedicatory poem implies that Regilla’s image is being added to a pre-existing shrine (IG XIV 1389 lines 5-8: θεαὶ δὲ μιν οὐρανίωναι/ τίοςιν, Δηώ τε νέη Δηώ τε παλαιὴ/ τῆσι περ ιερὸν εἴδος ἐνζώνοι γυναικός/ ἀγκεῖται) Faustina died in 141 AD, and the most natural time to commemorate the empress was in the years immediately after her death when her husband was also engaged in founding cults in her honor. Herodes and Regilla married in the late 130’s or early 140’s and lived in Italy until 146.

73 IG XIV 1390; Ameling II 1983: 148-50 #143: ‘And these columns are an offering to Demeter, Kore, and the chthonic deity; no one is permitted to remove anything from the Triopion which is at the third [milestone] of the Appian Way in the land of Herodes. No good will come to him who moves it: Euhodia the [underworld] daimon is witness.’ Presumably this inscription dates to the second phase of the Triopion, since it refers to the property as Herodes’ and sounds the menacing note he favored in his other commemorations. The columns, incised with archaizing letters, were found on the Appian Way ‘about a bowshot from the tomb of Caecilia Metella [capo di bove] on the right going towards Albano’ (so wrote Ligorio in the 16th century—original text quoted in Galli 2002: 126). The columns were removed from the site in Ligorio’s day; they now reside in the Naples Museum. For Ligorio’s drawings of the columns and round building see Galli 2002: 127-32. I have not seen anyone remark on the fact that, according to Ligorio, this structure was on the west side of the Appian Way, which makes it hard to imagine how it could have served as an entrance to a precinct on the other side of the street.

74 The Marcellus poem (IG XIV 1389: 5-8) refers to Regilla’s statue.
It must have struck the eye right away that some caryatids were dressed as Greek ladies, and some as Romans. They all bore Demeter’s trade-mark basket on their heads. We do not know how they were lined up; Piranesi reconstructed them in a mirror-image arrangement. The caryatid ensemble constituted a complex architectural allusion to both Greek and Roman models—the Erechtheum at Athens, and Hadrian’s estate at Tivoli (which itself enjoyed a recursive relationship to its Greek prototype). This layering of Greek and Roman elements seems well suited to memorialize a bi-cultural marriage.

Why would Herodes and Regilla have decided to construct a shrine to Faustina and Demeter? By celebrating the empress’ apotheosis, the couple were celebrating a genealogical connection, since both Regilla and Faustina were Annii. Beyond genealogy, mythology and cult provided a further rationale for this bicultural shrine. Demeter, and her Roman counterpart Ceres, had long been a fruitful point of contact between Greek and Roman religion. In the early Republic, the mythology and iconography of Demeter became attached to Ceres; the association of women in the imperial family with Ceres and Demeter began with Livia. The empress Faustina was associated with Demeter on coins, both during her lifetime and after her death. Herodes and Regilla were both active in the Demeter cults of old Greece. They built the Nymphaeum to celebrate Regilla as priestess of Demeter at Olympia. Herodes, for his part, had continued his family’s tradition of involvement in Demeter’s sanctuary at Eleusis. Greek noblemen normally supported established cults. But

---

75 The recursive relationship between Herodes, Hadrian, and classical Athens that these caryatids set up resembles the relationship between Herodes’ arch at Marathon and its various models. The caryatids were found on the Appian Way near the tomb of Caecilia Metella and the round temple containing IG XIV 1390 sketched by Ligorio. Galli 2002 123-7 reproduces Piranesi’s imaginative reconstruction, with photographs of the five surviving caryatids in Tafel 9-10; photos also in Pisani and Calza (1976) part II Tavola XXXIII.

76 Graindor 1938: 83; Tobin 1997: 32 assume kinship. However, I have not been able to confirm that the Annii Galli had any recent connections with the Annii Veri.

77 Spaeth 1996: 8-9; 169-81; Alexandridis 2004: 83-4; 88-91.


79 IO 610 = Ameling 1983 II: 127-8 #112.

80 Two aunts served as παιδες ἅττης, as did two of his children. Herodes donated white cloaks for the ephebes to wear in the Eleusinian procession, and dedicated statues of Regilla, Marcus Aurelius and Luciua Verus at Eleusis (Tobin 1997: 200-9; Ameling 1983 II: # 28, 30, 69, 92, 95, 132). Herodes must have been an Eleusinian
starting up new a Demeter sanctuary in Italy was unusual—more like something emperors would do. Claudius had tried to move the Eleusinian mysteries to Rome, while Hadrian established a mystery along Eleusinian lines in the capitol.

When Regilla died, there are various considerations that may have inspired Herodes to add her statue to the Old and New Demeter ensemble in the Triopion. In the first place, Regilla was connected to Old Demeter as her priestess and to New Demeter as her kin. In general, mythology and cult had always provided a symbolic language for representing equivalences and similarities between matters Greek and matters Roman. The mythology and cult of Demeter-Ceres in particular was well-suited to represent Regilla’s identity because of the goddess’ traditional connection with liminality, particularly the liminality of marriage and the liminality between the world of the living and the world of the dead.

Although Regilla was buried in Athens, Herodes decided that she should be commemorated in Italy as well. This may indeed have been her preference: aristocratic Romans liked to have themselves commemorated on their country estates, where proximity to a villa facilitated memorial rituals, even in the absence of the actual grave. The Triopion estate was particularly suitable for commemoration because it fronted the Via Appia, where there were many tombs, including in the immediate neighborhood some striking memorials of aristocratic women. From Herodes’ and Regillas’ villa, the southern view was dominated by the tomb of Caecilia Metella; even closer stood the sumptuous mausoleum where Claudia Semne was represented by her husband as quasi-divine. In re-fashioning the Triopion as a commemorative structure for Regilla, Herodes may have been inspired by Claudia Semne’s memorial: it featured statues of the departed wife in the guise of various goddesses, set in a shrine. This shrine, like Regilla’s, was set within a funerary garden containing a vineyard; the ensemble was enclosed by a wall.

initiate of high standing, since Marcus Aurelius invited him to be his mystagogue for his own initiation (Philostratus VS 563).

81 Suetonius Claud. 26 sacra Eleusinia etiam transferre ex Attica Romam conatus est. Augustus did not bring new cults into Italy. He restored the temple of Ceres, Liber, and Libera in Rome (Tacitus Annales 2. 49), was himself initiated at Eleusis (Suetonius Augustus 93; Dio 54. 9.10), and apparently put up a temple to Demeter in the Athenian agora (Geagan 1979: 381).

82 Aurelius Victor De Caes. 14. 4 initia Cereris Liberaeque, quae Eleusinia dicitur, Atheniensium modo Roma percoleret.

83 Faustina (‘New Demeter’) and Regilla were both Annii, though from different branches of the family.

84 Spaeth 1996: 44-7, 57 (weddings); 63-5 (the dead).

85 IG XIV 1392; IGR I 196; Ameling II 145: ἐστιν δὲ οὐ τάφος· τὸ γὰρ σῶµα ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ νῦν παρὰ τῷ ἀνδρί ἐστιν.

86 Bodel 1997: 23.

87 The second-century villa on Regilla’s estate is currently under excavation (preliminary report Conlin 2006). The mausoleum of Claudia Semne, constructed by a wealthy freedman of Trajan, is no longer extant, but was found by Corbet in the eighteenth century on the Appian Way adjacent to San Sebastiano, about 200 meters from Herodes’ and Regilla’s villa. In this mausoleum Claudia Semne was sculpturally represented as Fortuna, Spes, and Venus (CIL VI.15594; ILS 8063b; Wrede 1971:125).

An elaborate mythological poem shows how Herodes reconceptualized the Triopion after Regilla’s death.\(^9\) It was inscribed in archaizing letters on two marble stelai found on the Appian Way.\(^0\) The first stone bears the heading ‘Markellou’ (‘By Marcellus’). Whether or not this Marcellus was Marcellus of Side,\(^1\) I will assume that the poem was composed to Herodes’ specifications and submitted to his approval. This poem is a generic hybrid: part hymn, part epitaph, part funerary imprecation.

The poem’s opening lines invite ‘the daughters of Tibur’ to approach Regilla’s temple-abode with offerings of incense: Δεῦρ’ ἵτε Θυβριάδες νηὸν ποτὶ τόνδε γυναῖκες.

These ‘daughters of Tibur’ may have been depicted in a bas relief found in the vicinity that shows three ladies with laurel wreaths and mural crowns carrying offerings in a graceful procession.\(^2\) The poem’s hymnic invocation sets up an allusion to Callimachus’ *Hymn to Demeter*, which also begins by enjoining a group of women to attend to a ritual procession, and also ends with the cautionary tale of Triopas, punished for violating a sanctuary of Demeter.\(^3\)

The ‘daughters of Tibur’ (presumably Roman ladies, addressed in Greek) are invited to honor Regilla. The poem presents Regilla’s genealogy in a peculiar way. First it locates her ancestry in the mythic past. Regilla is descended from Aeneas, Anchises and Aphrodite. Then, without skipping a beat, it localizes Regilla in an Attic deme: ‘she married into Marathon.’ In this abrupt transition from Troy to Marathon, the entire Roman phase of her family history is completely eclipsed—no mention made here of all those consular ancestors and the family’s connection with Faustina. In keeping with this subsuming of things Roman into Greek, Faustina’s name does not appear until line 48. Here, at the beginning of the poem, Faustina is referred to only as

---

\(^9\) *IG* XIV 1389. (*IGUR* III 1155) Ameling 1983 II # 146 (with German translation in volume I 105-7). The Greek text incorporating Peek’s emendations is available at: http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main. From this page go to: Regions: Sicily, Italy, and the West; then go to: Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae I-IV [IGUR]; then go to IGUR III 1155. See also editions by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1928, Moretti 1968, Skenteri 2005. Peek 1979 offers some improvements to the text summarized in SEG XXIX. 999. Skenteri 2005 now prints a text with an English translation and a commentary that connects the poem to the tropes of various epideictic speech-types in Menander Rhetor (epitaphios logos for stele A; cletic hymn for the opening of stele B).

\(^0\) The stelai were found across from the Basilica of San Sebastiano, perhaps 500m from where the columns of *IG* XIV 1390 and the caryatid structure stood, but not far from the westernmost corner of the second-century villa (whose entrance, however, was oriented toward the present-day Via Appia Pignatelli). Does this mean that at one point the Triopion had another entrance near San Sebastiano? Perhaps, but we cannot be certain that the inscription was found in its original location—a column twice as tall inscribed to Regilla was moved several miles away in the fourth century: *IG* XIV 1391, *CIL* X 6886.

\(^1\) Bowie 1990: 66-9 accepts the identification.

\(^2\) Galli 2002: 124-5 with Tafel 10.3.

\(^3\) *Hymn to Demeter* 1, in the same meter and ending with the same word: Τῶ καλάθω κατιόντος ἐπιφθέγξασθε, γυναῖκες. For another echo of Callimachus in a poem attributed to Herodes see Bowie 1989: 233.
‘New Demeter’, and her only function is to honor Regilla, who now apparently has a statue in the Demeter shrine. Regilla bears the Homeric epithet ‘lovely-girded woman’ (εὐζώνοιο γυναικός line 8). This phrase appears only in Iliad I. 429, where Achilles is mourning the loss of Briseis. If Regilla bears Briseis’ epithet, then Herodes is by implication Achilles, prostrate with grief. He appears, prostrate with grief, a few lines latter.

She herself, however, dwells with the heroines
In the Isles of the Blessed where Kronos is King.
She has received this as reward for her virtuous mind,
Since Zeus pitied her mourning mate,
Lying in withered age in a widowed bed,
Since the snatching black Fates carried off
More than half his children from his blameless halls.
Two children still were left him, very young and pure, innocent of all wrong,
From whom pitiless fate snatched such a mother
Before she had attained the old woman’s spindle.94

The Triopion poem portrays Regilla’s promotion to heroine status as a benefaction bestowed by the king of the gods on the grief-stricken Herodes. ‘Zeus pitied her mourning mate, lying in withered age in a widowed bed’:

ож οι Ζεύς ὄργευεν ὀδυρόμενον παρακοίτην
γήραι ἐν ἀζαλέωι χήρηι περικείμενον εὐνή...

The terminology of widowhood (χήρη), and its association with orphaned children and an empty house, recalls the funerary imprecations of Anatolia (a genre which Herodes imitated elsewhere).95 These Anatolian inscriptions menace anyone who disturbs a grave with an early death, ‘leaving orphan children, a widowed life, and an empty house’: όρφανά τέκνα λίποιτο, χήρον βίον, οἶκον ἔρημον.96 Widowhood is not a man’s, but a woman’s condition.97 In a technique that recalls the gender-reversed similes in the Odyssey,98 the first part of the Triopion poem presents Herodes as an accursed and widowed victim groveling in his blighted bed. The passivity of this situation will be reversed at the end of the poem, when Herodes vigorously curses anyone who would destroy the commemorative precinct he has created for his wife.

Grim and lonesome though Herodes’ predicament may be, there are compensations.

Zeus gave him [Herodes] a gift in his unceasing grief,

94 Following the reading of Peek 1979: 80.
95 Twenty five inscriptions have been found in Greece with formulaic curse inscriptions protecting commemorative herms to Herodes’ foster-sons and an altar (?) to Regilla. The find spots of most are uncertain, though they seem to have come from Herodes’ estates (texts in Ameling II 1983: # 147-70; Tobin 1997: 113-60).
96 CIG 3862 (2) cited with numerous other examples by Robert 1978: 253.
97 I follow L. Robert (1978) 256 in interpreting χήρον βίον as referring to the life of a widow, although Strubbe (1991) 42 with n. 87 prefers ‘childless life’.
98 Foley 1978.
And [so did] the Emperor (βασιλεύς), like to Zeus in his nature and mind.

Zeus brought his blooming wife to Ocean with Elysian breezes of Zephyr;

While he [the Emperor] gave Herodes’ son the starry footgear
To wear about his ankles, which they say Hermes also wore
When he led Aeneas out of battle with the Greeks
Through shadowy night. And on his feet, the shining savior,
Was a [broad] circle like the moon.

And this circle the descendents of Aeneas once upon a time sewed onto their shoes
To be the privilege of well-born Ausonians.

Do not begrudge him, descendant of Kekrops though he be,

The ancient ankle-insignia of the Tyrian [Etruscan] men, [he is]
Descendant of Herse and Hermes, if true it is
That Keryx is the ancestor of Thesean Herodes.
For this reason he is honored and eponymous [consul ordinarius],
Enrolled, on the one hand, in the ruling Senate,
where are the front-row [consular] seats,
And in Greece, on the other hand, there is no one
more regal (βασιλεύτερος) in birth or speech
Than Herodes; they call him ‘the tongue of Athens.’

Zeus has promoted Herodes’ wife to heroine status; the Emperor, in a parallel benefaction, has promoted their son to patrician status. ‘Starry footgear’ (23) refers to the lunate medallion worn by Roman patricians on their shoes. Herodes’ poem invents a Hellenizing origin story for this exclusive mark of Roman status (24-9).99 This etiology is quasi-Homeric, alluding to an incident at Troy that does not actually happen in the Iliad. When Hermes was rescuing Aeneas from battle with the Greeks, he (supposedly) put lunate reflectors on his feet to light his way! This story seems to be just a bombastic way of saying that Emperor has permitted Herodes’ son to inherit Regilla’s Roman rank and wear patrician footgear. But we know that Herodes was touchy about the status claims of patrician shoe insignia: when Regilla’s brother had brought him to trial and was dissertating at length on the distinction of his ancestry, Herodes retorted, ‘You wear your good birth on your ankle-joints.’100 And since this poem explicitly says that Herodes and his son are the descendents of Hermes (32), and that Regilla is descended from Aeneas (38), Herodes could be staking an oblique claim to Hellenic superiority: my ancestor rescued her ancestor from the victorious Greeks.101

It is interesting to watch how this poem transitions from celebrating the patrician status of Herodes’ son to trumpeting Herodes’ own honors and ancestry. In a

---

99 Talbert 1984: 219 claims, despite the evidence of Plutarch and Statius, that under the Principate the lunate insignia was worn by both patrician and plebeian senators (cf. Moralia 470C and Silvae 5. 2. 27-8). Marcellus’ poem shows that, whatever contemporary practice may have been, the lunate insignia was still associated with patrician status, if only in an antiquarian way.

100 Philostratus VS 555. Herodes was nonetheless interested in patrician lore: Gellius NA IX.2 preserves an explicit comparison that he drew between Greek and Roman naming practice—subtly to the advantage of the former, in that Athenian tyrants are set up to contrast with Patrician traitors.

101 Herodes disparagingly referred to the brothers Quintilii as ‘Trojans’ (they came from the Roman colony of Alexandria Troas). On the role of Troy in cultural negotiation between Greece and Rome see Erskine 2001.
µὲν...δὲ antithesis that balances between his Roman and Greek identities, Herodes describes on the one hand his own entitlement, as a consular, to a front-row seat in the Roman Senate, while insisting that ‘in Greece there is no one βασιλεύτερος in birth or speech, than he’. From a Greek perspective, βασιλεύτερος is just a florid superlative (‘prince’), but βασιλεύς was also the word Greeks used for the Roman emperor. Thus Herodes seems to emphasize his parity with, more than his subordination to, the emperor (referred to as βασιλεύς in line 20), although he presents Regilla’s heroine-status as clearly subordinate to Faustina’s divinity. Overall, in the Triopion the balance between Greek and Roman identities seems less even-handed, and the analogies between Herodes’ family and the imperial family seem less equilibrated, than they appeared in the stately and symmetrical Nymphaeum of twenty years before.

Regilla is now semi-divine:

She herself, the fair-ankled descendant of Aeneas
and of Ganymede, was also of the Dardanian race
Of Tros, son of Erichthonios. But you, if you will, make offerings
And sacrifices. But sacrifices are not needed from the unwilling;
It is good, though, for the pious to pay heed also to the heroes.
She is not a mortal, but neither was she made a goddess.
Wherefore she received neither a sacred temple nor a tomb,
Not honors due to mortals, nor those due to the gods.
There is a temple-like monument for her in the city of Athena,
But her soul tends the scepter of Radamanthes.
This statue [of Regilla] stands as a gift in honor of Faustina
In the Triopion, where there were formerly her broad fields,
A choir of vineyards, and olive orchards.
The goddess would not dishonor her, queen of women,
To be the handmaid of her honors and attendant nymph.
For Artemis, arrow-pourer of the lovely throne, scorned not Iphigenia,
Nor did Gorgon-faced Athena scorn Herse,
Nor will the corn-bearing mother of mighty Caesar,
Guardian-goddess for the nymphs of old, overlook her as she
Enters the dance of the earlier demi-goddesses,
For it is her [Faustina’s] prerogative to superintend the dances of Elysium
With blessed Alcmene and Kadmos’ daughter.

This inscription’s careful equivocation, as it situates the heroized Regilla between temple and tomb, recalls a memorial shrine that Herodes had built for his father at Marathon. A recently published inscription shows that Herodes dedicated a statue of his father that described as both a divine image (ἀγάλμα δαιμόνος 13) and a portrait (μορφήν πατρώαν 14), in a temple (νηῶ 9) built for this purpose at Marathon.

102 For Herodes as βασιλεύς τῶν λόγων and ‘tongue of the Hellenes’ see Philostratus VS 586, 598; Whitmarsh 2001 105.
103 IG XIV.1392 (Ameling II 1983: # 145), which appears to have come from the Triopion area, states more clearly that Regilla is buried in Greece: ἐστιν δὲ οὐ τάφος· τὸ γάρ σῶμα ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ νῦν παρὰ τῷ ἀνδρί ἐστιν.
His father’s shrine, like Regilla’s Triopion, is embedded in a landscape context that Herodes’ intensive cultivation has transformed into a commemorative *locus amoenus*.\(^\text{104}\)

In the Triopion poem the conundrum of Herodes’ bicultural marriage has been ‘solved’ by locating Regilla’s ancestry in the Homeric past and then by locating her post-mortem existence in multiple places. Her body is buried in Athens, her statue receives cult in Italy, and her heroized shade has relocated to Elysium, a bi-cultural space where ‘Caesar’s corn-bearing mother’ superintends the dances of the nymphs of old alongside Alcmene and Semele (55-6). In this space, where Herodes’ ancestor Herse also dances, Regilla is neither mortal nor goddess but a heroine, a *tertium quid* (43-5).\(^\text{105}\) The fact that she has a parallel heroon in Athens (perhaps adorned with another copy of the same poem)\(^\text{106}\) makes her cult, like that of Demeter, Athena and Nemesis, localize itself simultaneously in Greece and Italy, so that in the imaginative world of the poem her spectral presence shimmers between both.

The second stele of the Triopion poem begins with a hymnic invocation to two Attic goddesses, Athena and Nemesis, who are invited to take up residence in the Italian Triopion, just as they once descended from Olympus to take up residence in Athens and Rhamnous.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lady Tritogeneia, sovereign of the Athenians,} & \quad 60 \\
\text{And you who oversee the works of men, Rhamnousian Nemesis,} & \\
\text{Next-door neighbors of hundred-gated Rome,} & \\
\text{Honor this rich land also, Goddess,} & \\
\text{The home friendly to strangers of Triopian Demeter} & \quad 65 \\
\text{As long as the Triopeiai are counted among the immortals.} & \\
\text{As once you came to Rhamnous and Athens of the broad dancing floors,} & \\
\text{Leaving the house of your father the thunderer,} & \\
\text{So strengthen likewise this vineyard rich in clusters,} & \\
\text{Visiting the standing corn, the trees heavy with vines,} & \\
\text{And the luxuriant tresses of the meadows.} & \quad 70 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Athena and Rhamnousian Nemesis, invited by Herodes to become protectors of the Triopion precinct, are described as ‘next-door neighbors of hundred-gated Rome’ (62). This is the first time Rome is mentioned in the poem. But the Attic goddesses are *not* normally localized as ‘neighbors’ of Rome, and in Greek poetry it is usually Egyptian Thebes, not Rome, that is ‘hundred-gated’. The effect of these inconcinnities is to evoke a locality that grounded neither in Attica, nor in Italy. The effect is deracinated and slightly surreal. On this reading, the Triopion is a purpose-built bi-cultural theme park.

This enclosed idyllic space is under threat, and requires fierce protection:

\[
\text{Herodes released this land to be sacred for you,}
\]

\(^{104}\) Petrukos 2002. The inscription was found by a church in the village of Kato Souli, and thus has no relation to Regilla’s enclave west of Mt. Kotroni.

\(^{105}\) Cicero was likewise seeking to suggest apotheosis when he insisted on Tullia’s memorial being a shrine and not a tomb (*ad Att. 12. 36*).

\(^{106}\) Bowie 1989: 236-8 (the poet Glaucus was more likely to have seen the poem in Attica than in Italy); Galli 2002: 117.
An extent crowned by a smoothly-running wall,  
To remain unmoved and sacrosanct for generations  
To come. Athena granted, shaking her helmet-crest  
Terribly from her immortal head,  
That [no one can] move one clod or rock  
Without penalty, since the dooms of the Fates  
Are to be reckoned with if anyone do mischief to the seats of the gods.  
Listen, neighboring landowners and laborers,  
The ground is sacred, and the Goddesses,  
Immovable, and honored, are ready to lend an ear.  
Let no one take a mattock, servant of dark Hades,  
To the rows of vines or groves of trees  
Or verdant meadows luxuriant with fodder,  
To build a new tomb here or plunder the old one.  
For it is sacrilege to bury a body here with hallowed soil  
Except for relatives and future descendants of the family.  
For them it is not improper, since the founder is the avenger.  
For even Athena herself, you see, once put King Erichthonios  
In her temple to be partner in her cult.  
If someone fails to heed these warnings and does not obey them,  
But dishonors [the sanctuary], let this not go unavenged—  
But dire Nemesis and an avenging whirlwind  
Will pay him back and roll him in abominable evil.  
For the strength of Triopas son of Aeolis  
Availed him little when he sacked Demeter’s temple.  
Shun the punishment and the story that explains the place’s name,  
Lest the Triopian Fury catch up with you!

This half of the poem combines *locus amoenus* description with funerary imprecation. Lines 80ff indicate that Herodes is consecrating a walled funerary garden (κηπόταφον) for the exclusive use of his family. The physical layout of this sacro-idyllic landscape is not clear from the inscription, which is no longer in situ, or from archeological remains. Conceptually the funerary garden of the Triopion bears some resemblance to the memorial shrine that Herodes built for his father at Marathon. Both installations honor the departed in a way that blurs the Roman categories of sacer (consecrated to a deity) and religiosus (consecrated to the dead). But only Regilla’s memorial space is protected by curses. More vehement than the guardian columns’

---

107 The general sense is clear, but the language awkward; Skenteri 2005: 50-1 proposes reading ΕΚΓΟΝΟΣ.
108 The creation of a new family burial ground on the Appian Way seems otiose, since Regilla was actually buried in Attica, along with their dead children, and Herodes himself planned to be buried at Marathon. On the children’s burials on Herodes’ property in Kephisia see Tobin 1997: 211-39. This property contained a funerary garden (Galli 2002: 154-7). For the burial of Herodes himself see Rife 2008. On funerary gardens see Toynbee 1971: 94-100; Purcell 1987: 32-6. On the nearby funerary garden of Claudia Semne as a possible model see above nn. 87-88 above. For architectural remains of Herodes’ Triopion, particularly a round building whose foundations and columns were seen by Ligorio see Galli 2002: 110-33.
109 Recent excavations of the villa suggest that it contained a second-century peristyle garden (Gianni Ponti, site visit May 2008), but this need not have been the only walled garden on the estate.
110 See above n. 104.
warning against temple theft, these curses suggest that, in Herodes’ mind, once the Triopion became Regilla’s memorial, the space required additional protection. His lineup of protective deities looks like over-insurance. The inscription concludes with an origin story that amounts to an imprecation, warning visitors to beware the fate of Triopas, who by violating Demeter’s sanctuary came to a sticky end.

Herodes’ decision to fortify this commemorative space with curses was definitely unusual. All along the Appian Way, no other tombs had curses like these. Burials were often protected with curses in Greek-speaking Anatolia, but funerary imprecations were not customary in Italy or in Greece. A full understanding of Herodes’ purposes is beyond our reach, but it is worth noting that in his other commemorations he also made a practice of inscribing curses and combining cultural forms. For example, Herodes set up outdoor commemorative statues for his foster-sons on his rural estates in Attica and inscribed them too with protective curse formulae. These installations grafted the Roman tradition of portrait busts onto Greek herm to create idiosyncratic hybrids in spaces that played with the Roman esthetic of the hyper-real.

Curses suggest a need to protect boundaries. I have been arguing that Herodes’ commemorative installations perform symbolic work, adjusting and balancing the Greek and Roman sides of his marriage, as well as the Greek and Roman components of his own identity. The more delicate and idiosyncratic the identity adjustments being worked out in such a space, the more vociferously we might expect its creator to protect its physical boundaries. Thus we might understand the curses as protecting the symbolic work of the Triopion. But the curses may also have served a practical purpose. Perhaps Herodes posted the Triopion as a highly literate KEEP OFF sign in a property-rights dispute with Regilla’s family. Commemorative inscriptions in which the commemorator named himself were a characteristically Roman practice, and they often constituted a claim that the commemorator was heir to the deceased. Did Herodes reinscribe the land to his divinized wife, establishing on it a burial ground exclusively for their descendants, in order to keep her family from reclaiming the property?

We do not know whether Regilla made a will, nor do we know the terms of her marriage contract. But there are various ways in which the estate on the Appian Way could have become, after her death, a bone of contention between her husband and her agnate kin. If the estate was part of her personal property, Regilla could have left it to Herodes in her will. If her will (as was common) instituted her children as heirs,
Herodes would still have controlled the property as long as the children remained in his potestas. If, as is more likely, Regilla died intestate, her agnate kin would have been first in line to inherit her estate.\textsuperscript{117} If the property had been part of her dowry, it would normally go back to her father when she died. If he were no longer living, her agnates might still have hoped to get it back: marriage contracts often stipulated that the dowry given by a woman’s deceased father be returned to her brother.\textsuperscript{118} Although we do not know exactly what happened to the Via Appia estate, we can infer that Herodes retained control of much of Regilla’s property, because in his own will he bequeathed to their surviving son, Bradua Regillus Atticus, a substantial amount of maternal property.\textsuperscript{119} Alleging his son’s intellectual and moral deficiencies, Herodes left him bona materna, but nothing from his own estate. This posthumous gesture may have been a calculated insult to Regilla’s relatives. It is not possible, at this distance, to disentangle the moves and counter-moves in a long-forgotten family quarrel, but it could be that Regilla’s brother brought the charge of murder as a move in a property dispute.\textsuperscript{120} After all, he waited to bring charges until he attained the consulate, several years after Regilla’s death.\textsuperscript{121} If his case had been strong, and there was a clear-cut homicide to be avenged, he would not have needed to wait. But all he may have hoped to prove was that Herodes was unfit to inherit. Under Roman law, a legacy could be taken away on grounds of unfitness—and a beneficiary who had caused the death of the testator was definitely considered unfit. Antoninus Pius, for example, decreed that ‘a man appointed heir by his wife, who is clearly proved to have caused her death by his own fault and negligence, should not inherit’.\textsuperscript{122}

CREATING SPACE FOR BI-CULTURAL IDENTITY

To recapitulate: Herodes and his wife monumentalized their bi-cultural family at Olympia by building the Nymphaeum. This structure balanced Regilla’s Roman

\textsuperscript{117} The right of children to inherit from a mother who died intestate was not established until 178 AD (Grubbs 2002: 219-20).

\textsuperscript{118} Saller 1994: 208-10; Grubbs 2002: 97-8. A dotal instrument might specify that a dowry be returned to her brother after a married woman’s death if her father were no longer living. Ulpian states that a dead woman’s husband could keep her paternal dowry if her father was no longer living (Tituli ex Corpore Ulpiani 6. 4; Frier and McGinn 2004: 170-1).

\textsuperscript{119} Thus we learn that Bradua was never emancipated during his lifetime, but remained in potestate, with Herodes controlling all of the family property. Bradua became consul ordinarius in 185: PIR\textsuperscript{2} C785. Since he had inherited none of his father’s property, his maternal inheritance must have been very substantial indeed. On Bradua’s shortcomings and Herodes’ will, see Philostratus VS 558. The phrase τελευτῶν δὲ τὰ µὲν µητρὸς αὐτῷ ἀπέδωκεν refers to the Roman legal concept of bona materna. Since Roman custom strongly favored the right of children to inherit, one might think that Bradua might have successfully contested his father’s will, but there is no evidence that he did so. (On the scarcity of examples of punitive disinheritance of children and on the legal action appealing an undutiful will see Champlin 1991: 14-5, 107-11).

\textsuperscript{120} On the murder accusation: Philostratus VS 555.

\textsuperscript{121} It seems that Regilla died around 157, shortly before Herodes was to cast lots for his proconsulship (Philostratus VS 556). Herodes, who had been consul ordinarius in 143, would have been in line for a proconsulship the same year as Fronto, who had been suffect consul that year. Fronto was designated proconsul for 157-8 (Ameling 1983 II: 7-9; Champlin 1980: 82). Bradua was consul in 160.

\textsuperscript{122} Digest 34.9.3. See also 24.3.10.1, where Pomponius, citing a first-century jurist, writes: ‘If a man has killed his wife, Proculus says that the wife’s heirs should be granted an action to recover her dowry—and rightly so, since it is not fair that a man expect to make a profit for himself on the dowry thanks to his own crime.’
relatives with Herodes’ Greek ones, and expressed symmetry between their joint offspring and those of the imperial family. Within a few years this picture was out of date: his wife and at least two of their children were no longer living. Herodes built a huge theater at Athens as a very public commemorative gesture for his wife. But he also registered her departure in more private ways. Two monuments show how he did this, the enclosure with an arch on his estate at Marathon, and the Demeter/Triopion sanctuary on the Appian Way. Both of these spaces contained purpose-built micro-localities, originally designed by or for Regilla. These spaces acquired new meanings after Regilla’s death when Herodes retrofitted them with poetic inscriptions that refashioned their environment into commemorative spaces.

It is worth pausing to consider the question of whether grieving and commemorative practices were themselves at this time an area of contestation between cultural identities. Traditionally, a Roman aristocrat, when bereaved, was supposed to lead the funeral procession and pronounce the laudatio funebris. He was expected to return to the world of civic engagement promptly—or, in hyper-masculine mode, continue civic duties without interruption. Extended mourning and emotional display were for women. Were expectations different for Greeks? Although Greek philosophical tradition deprecated weeping, Greek heroic tradition afforded powerful examples of alpha males who gave vent to grief. While the Roman laudatio was supposed to stay focused on the deceased’s family and accomplishments, Greek funerary speeches of the imperial period were designed to encourage the expression of emotion: Menander Rhetor instructs Greek orators how to stir an audience (men as well as women) to fresh floods of tears. In the imperial period, there may in fact have been a shift in Roman norms. Imperial bereavements opened up new possibilities. We see this especially with the death of Germanicus. Expressions of grief once considered too feminine, too extravagant and off-limits to Roman men, became open to them: by making a public display of emotion (traditionally feminine) they could express their loyalty to the state (traditionally masculine). Expressions of grief by the emperor himself reached unprecedented intensity in the case of Hadrian. Without other examples, we cannot assess how unusual were Hadrian’s expressions of emotional distress in the laudatio he delivered for his mother in-law, but the extravagance of his mourning for Antinous clearly set a new benchmark.

123 On Roman norms for paternal grieving see Prescendi (1995).
124 Seneca to Lucilius 63. 13: annum feminis ad lugendum constituere maiores, non ut tam diu lugerent, se ne diutius: viris nullum legitimum tempus est, quia nullum honestum.
125 A long tradition of philosophical consolation extended from Crantor to both Cicero and Plutarch (if Plutarch wrote the Letter to Apollonios that is attributed to him: Mor. 101 F-122 A). But there is no easy way to translate the platitudes of consolation literature into the norms of everyday behavior.
126 It is hard to imagine Cato or Seneca giving such advice. Menander Rhetor: ἐπὶ τοῦτοις πάλιν κεφάλαιον θήσεις τὸν θρόνον, ὅτι διὰ ταῦτα τούτον ὀδύρωμεν, ἐργασίαν δοὺς ἰδιάζουσαν, καθορεύουσαν λοιπὸν ἐγκωμίων, οίκτους κινῶν, εἰς δέκαρα συγχέων τοὺς ἀκουόντας (421. 13–4); αὐξέων δὲ καὶ τὸν θρήνον (420. 5–6). The effective speaker will dramatize his own emotion: ὦ πόσος συνοδώρωμε τῷ γέγονε τό πάθος, ὦ τὴν ἐνίβολην τοῦ θρήνου πάθην ποιήσομει (419. 16). A developed example of these techniques is Aristides’ lament for his pupil Eteonius: Or. 31, esp. section 12 (=11. 78 Dindorf): ὦ κύκλοι μὲν οὐθαλκοί γέκειν τὸν ἄπαντα ἴδη χρόνον, κεφαλὴ δὲ ἡ πρότερον χαριεστὴτ ἐν κόνει χεῖρες δὲ ἀφόνεις, ὦ πόδες οίνον φέροντες τὸν δεσποτὴν ὑπεδώκατε.
128 Hadrian’s speech (Jones 2004) line 15: si non ita victus esse praesenti confusione and 18–20: Nam adhuc] est imago tristissima socrus optimae labentis/[ante oculos, aure]is etiammum strepunt luctuosis conclamatio/[nibus
Hadrian was an ostentatious philhellene and Antinoos, a Bithynian, was culturally Greek. Achilles and Alexander, after all, were known for extravagant homoerotic mourning. Yet imperial intellectuals continued to debate the propriety of Alexander’s behavior, and among first-century senators we see evidence of concern over the acceptable limits of male grieving.\(^{129}\)

What were the rules that applied to Herodes? Senators disliked Hadrian, and were unlikely to look with favor on his imitator. We can compare the behavior of Herodes’ contemporary Fronto, who also suffered multiple bereavements. Coming from North Africa, he was more aligned with Latin language and thus with traditional Roman norms. As far as we know, Fronto did noting outré. Though he wrote movingly of his own bereavements, he distanced himself from excessive emotion. Describing the experience of grieving for own his dead sons, he used a military metaphor, comparing the struggle to single combat. In mourning for his grandson, however, he confessed to a sense of utter dissolution. He saved face by attributing this sensation, which might imply an unbecoming erosion of male boundaries, to manly solidarity: empathy with the grief of his bereaved son-in-law.\(^{130}\)

In the social circle of Fronto and Herodes, it was acceptable that a man should grieve for his teachers. Herodes wept when he delivered a funeral oration for his old teacher Secundus.\(^{131}\) This was noted, but not condemned. Antoninus Pius permitted Marcus Aurelius to weep for his pedagogue, when palace functionaries were discouraging this display.\(^{132}\) But when the sophist Philagrus inserted a lament for his wife into an encomium of Athens, he was judged ‘immature’.\(^{133}\) Herodes’ grieving for Regilla was doubly suspect --insincere pretense in the view of some, unmanly self-indulgence in the view of others.\(^{134}\) His grieving for his foster-sons, which included private games, may have taken Hadrian’s homoerotic commemoration of Antinoos as its model. Herodes’ outdoor statuary installations for his boys were nonetheless

---

**Notes:**
129. Aelian *VH* 7. 8 shows that second-century intellectuals continued to debate the proper limits of ‘Hellenic’ mourning. Proper grieving among Romans: Tacitus *Annales* 4. 1; *Agricola* 29. 1. Pliny’s deplored the extravagance with which his nemesis Regulus mourned his son. Regulus commissioned portraits of his son in all sorts of expensive media; Herodes commissioned so many portraits of his *trophimos* Polydeukion that more of them survive than for any other private person under the empire (Gazda 1980). (Herodes’ relationship with his foster-sons was of course open to homoerotic interpretation in a way that Regulus’ purely paternal grief was not). Pliny *Ep.* 4. 7. 1: *Placuit ei lugere filium: luget ut nemo. Placuit statuas eius et imagines quam plurimas facere: hoc omnibus officinis agit, illum coloribus illum cera illum aere illum argento illum abore marmore effingit.* Regulus also slaughtered his son’s ponies and expensive pets on the pyre, as if the departed were a Homeric hero or a Skythian prince. This practice earned the comment from Pliny, *luget insane* (*Ep.* 4. 2). When another bereaved father lost his philosophic grip, Pliny found his behavior acceptable, presumably because Fundanus was a friend, and because his extravagance was conventional (*tus et unguenta*) (*Ep.* 5. 16. 7-11). Fundanus did not try to rope others into dramatizing his loss, as Regulus did by arranging for scripted eulogies to be declaimed in towns all over Italy.
130. *Namque meus animus meomet dolore obnixus, oppositus quasi solitario certamine, unus uni par pari resistebat....Victorini mei lacrimis tabesco, conlituesco* (*De nepote amioso* 2: 235 Van der Hout; 2, 222 Haines).
131. At Herodes’ own funeral, the orator provoked the Athenians to tears (Philostratus *VS* 544, 586).
133. *µειρωκιοδης* (Philostratus *VS* 579).
134. Philostratus *VS* 556; Lucian *Demonax* 33, cf. 24. On Herodes’ display of emotion in mourning his daughters and foster-daughters, see Philostratus *VS* 558; 560-1.
criticized as excessive. When a Stoic complained that he mourned them *minus sapienter et parum viriliter*, Herodes did not take this insult to his manhood lying down; he responded with vigorous diatribe against the ‘enervating torpor’ that descends (so he claims) upon those who go too far in extirpating the passions. Although what counts as culturally acceptable display of emotion is always a complicated question, it is fair to say that Herodes’ multiple bereavements, his high profile, and the scale of his commemorative gestures drew censorious attention to his personal choices in an area where cultural norms were in flux.

I have put my focus on Herodes’ bereavement and commemorative practices to see what they might reveal about how Herodes saw his own position in the borderland between Greek and Roman culture. One of the things that made his position unique was the fact that he actually married a Roman aristocrat. For a Greek aristocrat to marry a Roman patrician was, at this point in time, practically without parallel. Herodes’ wife was ‘good to think with’ about identity in various ways. She was ‘other’ in that she was Roman, ‘other’ in that she was female, and yet she was also an extension of Herodes’ self as his wife and the mother of his children. Most of the children died, eroding the bridge their birth had built between their parents’ identities. When Regilla died, her family became an enemy ‘other’, threatening Herodes’ social status with a capital accusation. And to the extent that grief put Herodes into a feminized and helpless position, groveling ‘in withered age on his widowed bed,’ his bereavement forced him to undergo a sort of ultimate othering, to experience himself as ‘other’.

Bereavement, with its cross-gender identification, opened up expressive possibilities. In bereavement, Herodes permitted himself more latitude of emotional expression than was enjoyed by any other elite male of his era, Greek or Roman, with the possible exception of Hadrian. Like the emperor, Herodes was rich, and allowed himself to live large. How did this unusual man construct his own identity? Clearly there was no single identity paradigm in which he could seamlessly immerse himself, achieving, in Stuart Hall’s phrase, a ‘fantasy of incorporation,’ a merger that erases difference. To the extent that identification ‘operates across difference, it entails discursive work,’ particularly the making and marking of symbolic boundaries. It is the premise of this essay that Herodes was actively engaged in identity-negotiation, and that his multiple cross-cultural foci of identification entailed a huge amount of discursive work. We can observe him sometimes quite literally making and marking symbolic boundaries on his own property.

Herodes’ identity, then, was fluid, his self-fashioning a work-in-progress. In this process, did Roman power function as an alien ‘other’ against which he defined himself? This could not be true in any straightforward way: Herodes’ family enjoyed Roman citizenship; by education, marriage and office he was more connected to the Roman aristocracy than any of his Athenian peers. In fact ‘Roman’ couldn’t function
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135 Philostratus VS 559.
136 Gellius N.A. 19. 12. Herodes manages to imply that the pursuit *apatheia* both erodes one’s manly rigor and makes one boorish *Langueret animus et torperet* (3); *in torpore ignavae et quasi enervatae vitae consenescunt* (10). Those who pursue *apatheia* to excess are compared to a boorish Thracian who cuts down all his vines because he stupidly thinks they are weeds (7-9).
137 Hall 1996: 3.
138 Ibid.
like ‘barbarian’ as a polar-opposite ‘other’ for any cultivated Hellene of this period. For centuries now Roman culture had been forming itself recursively in relationship to Greek culture, a relationship that combined assimilative desire with awareness of otherness.\(^{139}\) Greek culture was part of every elite Roman’s self-formation in varying degrees, so when an educated Greek looked at a Roman he saw some refraction of himself.\(^{140}\) Susan Alcock describes prominent individuals like Plutarch and Philopappus as shifting frequently, even polyphonically, between identities. Did this oscillation ever speed up to the point that such persons experienced their multiple identities as synchronous?\(^{141}\) Symbolically rich spaces would facilitate this—indeed, were designed to do so.

When Herodes created, and then refashioned, multi-layered symbolic spaces in honor of his wife, he was representing the complexities of their union, and of his own identity, in spatial terms. It is the thesis of this paper that when Herodes assembled these installations of poetry and marble, he was not engaged in pure self-advertisement, nor in purely disinterested retrospection, but in a form of meditation about his bicultural marriage and, ultimately, about his own bicultural identity. Such an identity was not fixed but fluid: who Herodes was at any one moment depended on the context and the angle from which one looked. Its Greek component was many-layered. Sometimes he seemed to self-identify as a hyper-local Marathonian, insisting that he be buried in his deme.\(^{142}\) At other times he posed as an ur-Athenian, descended from Theseus. He often seemed to operate as if his local identity were coterminous with a universalizing Greekness. This is not surprising, since Athenian identity had long been the least regional form of Greekness, and the most open to appropriation by outsiders like Hadrian and Philopappus. But notwithstanding Herodes’ posture of Greekness, he had lived in Rome as a child and his mother’s ancestors came from Italy. To look at him through a Roman lens is to see a Roman senator with a patrician wife and son. He held Roman priesthoods coveted by the senatorial class: at Olympia he was honored as sodalis Augustalis and sodalis Hadrianalis. The only inscription that records those titles describes him, intriguingly, not as ‘Herodes’, but as ‘Regilla’s husband’.\(^{143}\) Since Herodes acknowledged no superiors, he preferred to make his own rules. He was most comfortable in spaces of his own design. On the arch of his estate at Marathon he described himself as a New Theseus, founder of his own ‘new city’, a bi-cultural enclave named for his Roman wife. On the Appian Way he founded a private religious sanctuary and laid down the ground-rules in no uncertain terms. His idiosyncratic monuments served many purposes, one of which was to create spaces that could be read simultaneously according to Greek and Roman cultural codes, spaces where seeing double made sense.\(^{144}\)
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139 From the large bibliography on this subject I have been particularly influenced by Feeney 1988 and Wallace-Hadrill 1998.
140 Cf. Taussig 1993: 252: ‘For now the self is inscribed in the Alter that the self needs to define itself against’.
141 Alcock 2002: 86. Monuments and rituals that engaged simultaneously with the Greek past and the Roman present sometimes created hybridity as a tertium quid, an effect permitting the play of difference without commitment to hierarchy (95-6).
142 Philostratus VS 565-6.
143 Schumacher 1999. The inscription was erected by the Elians, apparently many years after Regilla’s death.
144 On the interplay of Greek and Egyptian culture in Ptolemaic Alexandria as ‘seeing double’, see Stephens 2003.
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