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Introduction

This dissertation presents a synoptic study of five colossal temples built or appropriated by the Romans in the province of Asia from the late 1st to the middle 2nd century AD: the Wadi B Temple at Sardis, the Vetters Temple at Ephesus, the Red Hall at Pergamon, the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, and the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis.¹ These temples - which I will term “spotlight temples” for convenience - truly stand out from the corpora of Roman Imperial temples. Immediately evident is their size, which places them in the exclusive group of monumental Roman temples. Second, they are all located in the province of Asia, a region known for monumental Hellenistic temples. This is significant because no other Roman province could boast as many monumental temples, from pre-Roman or imperial eras. In contrast to their predecessors, however, the spotlight temples were erected within city limits, making them among the most noticeable urban landmarks in their respective cities. Third, the spotlight temples can all be linked to the Roman emperor, and by extension, the Roman Imperial Cult, an intriguing blend of religious and political agendas. On their own, each of the spotlight temples is a curiosity, but their agreements of date, imperial association, cultic affiliation, size, and location suggest deeper social and political connections. Viewed as a group, these temples can be seen as the monumental architectural product of an attempt to promote regional acculturation within the Roman

¹ Identities of each temple are uncertain, but the names given above are used as a means to discuss them in this dissertation. The reasons and accuracy of these designations and other possibilities are addressed later in the text. My use of these identifications is a choice made with a mind toward convenience and consistency with earlier scholarly publications and official excavation reports.
Empire. This dissertation takes an inclusive approach to the shared features of the monumental temples in order to identify what their construction achieved and the ways that they underscored the profound cultural changes of Roman Asia during the period spanned by the late 1st to middle 2nd century AD.

In the first chapter I introduce the spotlight temples, the social and historical contexts of the Roman province of Asia during the 2nd century AD, and the concept of monumentality. Following this, I present a summary of the excavation reports and publications of each of the temples to establish the history of their study. Next, I discuss the problems that obscure our understanding of the spotlight temples, including issues related to historical testimony, identification, and function. This leads to a discussion of their shared monumentality and its potential significance. Finally, I introduce my methodology and the theoretical models that aid in the collective study of the temples.

Chapter 2 is a compendium of the material evidence for the spotlight temples, focusing on their plans, adornment, and material. By commenting only on the physical data, this section sets aside religious function and instead supplies a full architectural study of the structures as a means to identify Greek and Roman architectural precedents and influences. A synthesis of previous comparative scholarship highlights the ways they have been compared to other similar structures, and demonstrates the need for a collective analysis of the buildings. I conclude this chapter by outlining how the spotlight temples can be seen as broad emulations of the local practice of building monumental temples in Asia, and how the Romans were able to improve upon that tradition.
Chapter 3 focuses on the cult affiliations of the temples. First, I outline what other scholars have proposed about the possible sacred functions of the spotlight temples. Because the emperor appears to have played a prominent role in the function of each temple, I also include a concise summary of the Imperial Cult and its role in Asia. Next, I examine the epigraphical, numismatic, historical, and architectural evidence that seems to link the spotlight temples in order to reach my own conclusions about their cult affiliations. Setting peculiarities aside, the universal natures of Imperial and other cults associated with the spotlight temples suggests that they may have more in common with one another than is immediately evident. By balancing the details known about the intersection of religion and politics in each of the temple sites, and applying that information to the temples, this chapter outlines how broad cult identification was another contributing element to the monumentality of the spotlight temples.

The fourth and final chapter looks beyond particulars of design and social capacities to assess the importance of size and setting. Here the sizes of the temples and their locations are judged in relation to their original historical and physical contexts. The distinct features of each building seem to represent the realization of a deliberate, but adaptable, approach to city planning and temple placement. Above all, the choices made in the size and topographical setting of the spotlight temples clearly indicate an interest in visibility. Consequently, I use this chapter to discuss whether a broader view of the spotlight temples and their common effect on their local topographies can provide a better understanding of their imperial purposes than specialized studies based on physical and functional specifics.
Following Chapter 4, a brief conclusion brings together the findings of the first four chapters. Each chapter focused on a component of monumentality. Together those components were absorbed into the overarching monumentality of the temples, which honored and harnessed an ancient and familiar tradition as a means to advertise the province’s place in the Empire and the corresponding glory that brought for that time and for the future.

Finally, to aid the reader, there are three appendices attached to this dissertation. The first (Appendix 1: Testimonia) is a collection of ancient testimonia, primarily epigraphical and historical sources, that mention the spotlight temples. Not all ancient texts cited in the dissertation are included in this appendix, but only those that directly mention the spotlight temples. This appendix is intended to be the complete collection of non-archaeological sources related to the temples. Testimonia are ordered as they appear in the dissertation and are labelled T1, T2, T3, and so on. Appendix entries include a citation, a brief explanation, the original (or edited) text, and a full translation. In the case of epigraphical and numismatic testimony, find locations and material detail are provided when available. For epigraphical entries, the most commonly available publications of the cited text are provided in lieu of a complete list of concordances, which can be found at referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/supplementum-epigraphicum-graecum.

The second appendix (Appendix 2: Architecture) is a compilation of architectural comparanda for the spotlight temples. The comparanda are temples from the Greek and Roman eras that have been, or can be, compared to the spotlight temples according to design, decoration, cult affiliation, size, and location. This appendix will primarily serve
the reader as a quick reference guide to all of the essential comparable temples and structures that are mentioned in the dissertation. Like the testimonia, not every temple or example of architecture mentioned in the dissertation is included in this appendix. Only those that require more than a brief description are included. Entries are ordered as they appear in the text and are labelled A1, A2, A3, and so on. Each entry is approximately 2 to 4 pages in length, including basic information on the structure, a summary of scholarly analysis as it relates to the spotlight temples, a short bibliography, and images.

The final appendix (Appendix 3: Images) is a file of the images referred to in the text, including identifications and source for the images. Most of the images are separated into groups corresponding with the spotlight temples and are ordered as they appear in the text. The ordering of images corresponding to the spotlight temples is as follows: Site image, site map, site plan, plan, excavation finds (including foundations and architectural varia), isometric projection, and isometric projections set on the landscape. In the text the figures are labeled I1, I2, I3, and so on, corresponding to the same notes found in the appendix.
1. A Monumental Province

The province of Asia flourished throughout the Roman principate, especially in the 2nd century AD (I1). During this period, Asia became a social and political force, substantially contributing to the multicultural and polyethnic composition of the Empire.\(^2\) By the 2nd century AD, the introduction of specifically Roman institutions and practices to Asia included an official Imperial Cult, oversight by a centralized political administration, a permanent military presence, and religions imported from other parts of the Empire.\(^3\) As a prominent province, Asia received special attention from the Imperial administration, often in the form of honorific titles, celebratory games, and funding for building projects. Yet the lasting financial impact of imperial honors is uncertain. Individual cities and the province occasionally petitioned for and funded some of the titles and temples that were granted by the Empire, but at other times gifts came unsolicited.\(^4\) Moreover, the burden of maintaining the continued cost of games and buildings might have fallen on the Empire, province, or city, making the financial benefits unclear. The prevalence of some public undertakings, like the construction of large religious sanctuaries, suggests that they were desirable enough to outweigh the potential cost. Coincidentally, the construction of monumental temples in Asia reached its apex in this period, making the temples on which this thesis focuses a conspicuous group worthy of synoptic examination.

\(^2\) For a collection of essays on the variety of issues that resulted from being culturally Greek in the Roman Empire, see Goldhill 2001. Most of the articles focus on the lived Greek experience and cultural modes of thought.

\(^3\) Mitchell 2008, 191.

\(^4\) For more on the administrative communications of the Roman Imperial period, see Eich 2012, especially pages 87-92, which address the system of provincial petitions and imperial responses.
Province and Empire

A province can be defined as a designated region of the Roman Empire placed under the administrative control of a Roman citizen serving as proconsul, or governor. Of the fifty-three established provinces in the 2nd century AD, all but two were outside the Italian peninsula. No matter what level of Romanization provinces achieved, they were generally considered to be composed of an ethnically and culturally mixed population. Accordingly, management of the provinces varied throughout the Empire and depended upon the attitudes of both the local population and the Roman administrators. Some provinces, like Asia, engaged in a form of limited self-governance through a regional council called a concilium in Latin or a koinon in Greek. The koinon usually consisted of upper class citizens of the cities of the province, who cooperated with the governor and other Roman administrators to support the imperial agenda. Because positions in the koinon put the local elite in direct contact with Roman officials, the office could be a step toward Roman citizenship, or even senatorial rank. In turn, the governor and emperor could rely on the members of the koinon to advance Roman interests in the province, making the relationship mutually beneficial.

5 For the basics on Roman provinces, see Mommsen 1906 and Lintott 1993. Mommsen’s attitude carried some historical European bias, but the text is nevertheless one of the foundational studies of the subject. Lintott’s book is more comprehensive, but concentrates on the Roman point of view, not that of subjugated peoples. For management of the provinces and their relationship with central Roman authority see Abbott and Johnson 1926 and Burton 1975.

6 In simplest terms, koinon (See LSJ s.v. Κοινός 2) refers to something common to the public.

7 Sometimes koina had disputes with the Roman governors, in which case the emperor acted as arbitrator. Nevertheless, whomever the koinon worked with, the ultimate goal was to support the Empire.
By far the most significant responsibility of the koinon was the promotion and oversight of the Roman Imperial Cult. Generally speaking, this cult was a component of official Roman religion that endowed or recognized the emperor with divine qualities or the status of a god. It was widely practiced in both Asia and Rome, but in different ways. While the emperor was honored with deification after death in Rome, the Asian population recognized the emperor’s divinity during his life. The popular views of preceding rulers in each region probably led to this divergence of practices.

Roman Imperial Cult customs may be rooted in the foundation story of Rome, according to which the mythical founder Romulus eventually experienced apotheosis. Julius Caesar (r. 49-44 BC) was the first historical Roman leader granted deification at Rome, but he received the honor posthumously. Subsequently, many emperors were deified after their deaths, but the worship of living emperors was rare in the capital. Some exceptions existed, but emperors who actively aspired to divine station in Rome were often reminded of their corporeal mortality by way of assassination. Several emperors, like Augustus (r. 27 BC-14 AD), were able to sidestep this danger by declaring themselves *divi filius*, or son of a god.

---

8 Bowersock 1972, 181. The Roman Imperial Cult has long been the subject of intense study and controversy. See Nock 1928, Bowersock 1972, Price 1984b, Fishwick 1987, and Burrell 2004. Nock and Bowersock both outlined the generalities and problems of the cult. Price wrote the most comprehensive book on the topic in the province of Asia, while Fishwick focused on the Roman west. Burrell delved a bit into architectural analysis with her book on Imperial Cult titles, but only included plans and elevations (via coins and sketches), offering limited architectural analysis.

9 Deification was an official process that required a vote of the Roman Senate.

10 Caligula (r. 37-41 AD) is a famous example. Cassius Dio (59.26-28) wrote about Caligula’s extravagance, which included dressing as a god, and naming himself Jupiter in public documents. As a result of this and other offenses, Caligula was murdered by his own guards.

11 In Augustus’s case, the god to whom he referred was his adopted father, Julius Caesar (r. 49-44 BC).
In the provinces, and especially in those that spoke Greek, the emperor was considered to be a sort of living god and the subject of official worship, as established and regulated by the koina. Asia seems to have had a particular zeal for the Imperial Cult, possibly because of the long tradition of ruler worship in the region. Alexander the Great (356-323 BC) was posthumously deified and two regional dynasties, the Commagenes (163 BC-72 AD) and the Attalids (282-133 BC), also deified their kings after death. In Roman times, ruler worship generally consisted of the dedication of temples, statues, altars, shrines, sacrifices and games to an emperor. Apart from these basic elements, the precise nature of the cult remains enigmatic. For now, let it suffice to say that the Imperial Cult was a meaningful political and religious apparatus in Asia that underscored allegiance to the Empire and inspired the creation of a number of temples and locally held social and civic offices.

In comparison to other Roman provinces, Asia was conspicuous in several ways. First, while most provinces were acquired through military conquest, the majority of Asia was inherited from Attalus III (r. 138-133 BC) of Pergamon, who bequeathed his kingdom to the Romans in 133 BC. Second, Asia was quite wealthy in its own right due to natural resources, industry and trade. Trade was conducted through the major ports of the province, especially Ephesus and Cyzicus. Ports not only encouraged trade, but also fostered a multicultural environment, making the province more cosmopolitan than some of its peers.

The system of Roman governance in Asia was complex. Like most provinces, Asia was governed by an annually appointed proconsul, but each city was responsible

---

12 For more on Asia as a Roman province, see Jones 1937, Magie 1950, and Habicht 1975.
for its own administration, law enforcement, finances, taxes, and public building programs. In cooperation with the cities, the proconsul traveled to and heard cases at the twelve assize cities of the province, which included Ephesus, Pergamon, and Cyzicus. By the 2nd century AD, the Roman Imperial Cult was managed by the local koinon, which met in the provincial cities (I1) of Ephesus, Pergamon, Smyrna, Cyzicus, and Sardis on a yearly rotation. Significantly, four of the five cities are the sites of the spotlight temples. In Asia, the core of the koinon was composed of two types of officials: the Asiarch and archiereis. Both were probably assigned administrative and religious duties, but the relationship between the two and their precise responsibilities within the Imperial Cult and provincial organization remain unclear. Overall, control of the province, both political and religious, seems to have been a collaborative effort between Roman and local agencies. It was inevitable, then, that the status of Asia depended on the attention of Roman authorities and the effort of cities to encourage and preserve provincial unity.

Building Activity in Asia

Pursuant to its elevated status within the Empire, an extraordinary building campaign took place in Asia from the late 1st to the middle 2nd century AD. Some

13 For more on the assize cities of the Roman period see Habicht 1975.

14 There is no record of the total number of persons who served on the koinon at any one time. In addition to the titles asiarch and archiereus, there were other auxiliary offices that varied at each site. Burrell (2004, 347-349) argued that since the asiarch was a priest of the Imperial Cult in the province of Asia (see LSJ s.v. Ἀσιάρχης), it would stand to reason that only one asiarch existed at each provincial city at one time, making the total priestly membership of the koinon five. However, the issue is complicated because the title archiereus translates as arch-priest or chief-priest (see LSJ s.v. ἀρχιερεύς), meaning that there was either more than one type of chief priest, or that titulature was inconsistent. Whatever the titulature, the chief priests and priestesses of Asia presided at the temples of only five cities: Pergamon, Smyrna, Ephesus, Sardis, and Cyzicus. For more on the terms asiarch and archiereus, see Rossner 1974 and Kearsley 1988.

15 Duncan-Jones 1990, 60.
emperors, most notably Hadrian (r. 117-138 AD), spent significant time traveling within the province, personally contributing financial and political support to specific cities and sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{16} Public and private donations from external and local sources allowed cities to improve civic infrastructure (public meeting locations, porticoes, aqueducts), recreational and leisure centers (baths, gymnasias, and theaters), and decorative architectural attractions (fountains and arches). Many of these improvements adopted Roman forms and construction methods and can accordingly be viewed both as projects geared toward the public good, and as proponents of Roman culture.

One field of the 2\textsuperscript{nd}-century construction boom that has received little scholarly attention is the flourishing of sacred structures, especially monumental temples. This is particularly relevant in the case of the provincial cities of Asia. Except for Smyrna, each of the cities where the koinon met is known to have had an example of monumental temple architecture constructed or rebuilt around the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD: the Vetters Temple at Ephesus, the Red Hall at Pergamon, the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, and the Wadi B Temple and Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16} Boatwright (2000) provided a complete narrative of Hadrian’s relationship to provincial cities, focusing on his travels and munificence.

\textsuperscript{17} There may have once been a monumental temple in Smyrna, but it is no longer extant. Apparently Anton Prokesh von Osten (1829) saw the remains of a large temple of comparable dimensions to the Olympieion at Athens (A2) on Degirmen-tepe near Izmir in the mid-nineteenth century. By the middle of the twentieth century, however, only a fragment of a column drum remained. For a bibliography on this missing temple, see Burrell 2004, 45-46. Complicating the issue further, almost nothing is known of the ancient urban layout of Smyrna. Because of the uncertainty of this temple’s dimensions and location, therefore, Smyrna has been omitted from consideration in this dissertation.
Religion

Because ancient and modern concepts of religion differ, any discussion of sacred space must include a brief introduction to ancient religious practice.\textsuperscript{18} In contrast to modern notions of personal prayer and individual faith, religious life and social life were intertwined in the Roman period.\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, there was no direct relationship between ethical behavior and religious practice. In fact, there is no clear Greek term that approximates the modern concept of religious faith.\textsuperscript{20} The Romans had the word \textit{religio}, which was used to describe the ritual fulfillment of obligations to the gods.\textsuperscript{21} Religious activity of the Roman Imperial Cult was largely an orthopraxic affair of social activity often involving scheduled public festivals and sacrifices.

Another significant feature of ancient Greek and Roman religion is that there was no exclusivity in the pantheon of public gods. Deities linked to particular cities, like Artemis at Ephesus or Athena at Athens, were also universally recognized throughout the ancient Mediterranean. Furthermore, new gods were regularly introduced into the pantheon from foreign cultures or through deliberate invention.\textsuperscript{22} In effect, the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} The topic of Greek and Roman religion is vast and only a general summary is provided here. For more information and bibliography on Greek religion, see Burkert 1985; for Roman religion, see Beard, North, and Price 1998 and Ando 2003.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Fears 1981, 740.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Perhaps the closest term in Greek is dogma (see \textit{LSJ} s.v. δόγμα) which in the Roman era could be used to describe a decision, a public decree, or an opinion. This term is not totally separate from religious belief or practice, but does not really express the spirit of belief or faith.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Herz 2007, 304. Religio was basically a term used to describe showing proper reverence or fear toward the gods (see \textit{OLD} s.v. Religio I).
\item \textsuperscript{22} Deities like Cybele, also called Magna Mater, who was imported from ancient Anatolia, eventually came to be worshipped alongside more traditional Greek and Roman gods. Sarapis is the best known hybrid god, in this case, of Osiris and Apis, promoted by Ptolemy I (r. 323-283 BC) in an effort to unify Greeks and Egyptians. Worship of Sarapis expanded throughout the Roman empire in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD.
\end{itemize}
organization of religion in the Roman world appears to have been fluid enough to expand as necessary, while still maintaining widespread legitimacy.

**Greek and Roman Temple Design and Use**

Greek and Roman temples were of similar utility; each functioned as a house for a god and that god's image.\(^{23}\) They also frequently served as repositories for the property of the god and storehouses for regional wealth. Temples were usually not intended for daily or weekly congregational use, except during festivals, sacrifices, or games dedicated to the god. While Greeks and Romans adhered to similar religious practices, their native approaches to the design of religious buildings were slightly different. Greek temples were usually oriented eastward and built on a standardized plan raised a few meters above the ground by a stepped platform called a *crepidoma* or *stereobate* (I2 and I3).\(^{24}\) The central room of a temple, *cella*\(^{25}\) in Latin or *naos*\(^{26}\) in Greek, served as the protected location of the divine image, usually a statue. Admission into the cella was usually reserved for priests or temple officials, but this rule may have been inconsistently applied. The cella was flanked by porches on each end, a *pronaos* in front and *opisthodomos* in back, and was surrounded by one or two rows of columns, called the *peristyle*. Greek temples were also usually situated within a demarcated area

\(^{23}\) Here I mean to discuss only larger temples consistently supported by priests and administrators, not small sanctuaries often found in cities. For an introduction to Greek and Roman temples, see Straun 1929, Dinsmoor 1950, and Ward-Perkins 1981.

\(^{24}\) For these and all other architectural terms, a brief definition of the term will be given in the text or as a footnote. For more, see the glossary in Dinsmoor (1950, 387-397) and the general introduction to temple architecture in Robertson (1929, 37-50). For a complete description of the development of Greek temple architecture, see Dinsmoor 1950, Lawrence 1957, Gruben 1961b, and Spawforth 2006.

\(^{25}\) *Cella* is the Latin term for the innermost portion of a temple.

\(^{26}\) In Greek, the term *naos* was used to refer to an entire temple or the innermost room of a temple.
called a *temenos*, which was considered a sacred space and was sometimes enclosed by a wall. Because of this need for space, many large Greek temples were built outside of cities.

Roman temples often adopted the decorative features of Greek temples, but conformed to a different type and were customarily raised on high podia and frontally oriented with a deep *prostyle*27 porch and staircase extending forward (I4 and I5).28 Religious activities were similar to those at Greek temples, but unlike Greek temples, the Roman temple type made more efficient use of space in an urban environment. Built within cities, they were forced to make the most of their established environment, which may help to explain the evident interest in height and frontality, two features that maximize visibility and space in a confined area. This may have also led Roman temples to be more integrated topographical participants, rather than isolated freestanding structures.

In Asia, the Romans encountered an established Greek architectural tradition of stylistic preferences, excellently represented by the Hellenistic Temple of Athena Polias at Priene (I6).29 It was located near the center of ancient Priene, a small and historically modest city dynamically set on a terrace below the peak of Mount Mycale and above the Aegean Sea.30 A lack of space prevented a large temenos, but the temple was fronted by a courtyard and altar. It was built between 340 and 150 BC, and an

27 *Prostyle* is an architectural term that refers to a temple possessing columns projecting out immediately in front of the temple antae, not between them.

28 For a complete account of Roman temple architecture, see Ward-Perkins 1981, in which temples are included among imperial architecture. Studies dedicated to Roman temples include Stambaugh 1972a, which examines the function of Roman temples, and Stamper 2005, which focused on architecture.


30 The coast has since receded to a greater distance.
inscription on the temple notes that it was dedicated by Alexander the Great.\textsuperscript{31} It is an Ionic hexastyle peripteral temple with distyle in antis pronaos and opisthodomos (I7). The approximate stylobate dimensions of the temple are 19.55 \times 37.20 meters and it probably had a total height of about 18 meters. By the Roman period the structure was so well known that it was mentioned by the architect Vitruvius in his discussions of proper temple proportions.\textsuperscript{32} Although it does not share the remarkable history or size of some of the major temples of Asia, like the Didymaion (A4) or the Artemision (A5), the Temple of Athena Polias at Priene was typical of the established architectural tradition that influenced Roman builders of the Imperial era. During the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD, the influence of architectural traditions appears to have been reciprocal as architecture leaned toward either Greek or Roman styles, both in Asia and at Rome.\textsuperscript{33} Although some of the Roman temples of Asia conformed to Greek conventions of design and location, the use of concrete, brick, and revetment were materials more commonly associated with Roman builders.

Roman socio-political dominance in Asia also availed itself of the advantageous features of Roman temples. When not in use as the site of public cult activity, temples retained their physical presence and mark on the local topography. Simply by existing as a physical object, a temple could be a permanent testament of Roman presence in

\textsuperscript{31} Von Gaertringen, et al 1906, no. 156. Perhaps not coincidentally, the temple was rededicated in the Roman Imperial period to include the cult of Augustus.

\textsuperscript{32} Vitruvius (1.1.12 and 7.introduction.12). According to Vitruvius, the temple was the subject of a treatise written by its architect, Pythius. In Chapter 4 I discuss Vitruvius’s recommendations for proportion in temple architecture.

\textsuperscript{33} Lyttelton (1987) touched on this theme of reciprocal influence. See especially pages 47-48, in which she proposed the exchange of craftsmen between Rome and Asia. Ward-Perkins (1981, 122-123) has also suggested the same.
the city. That presence could be viewed in different ways, but the temples likely acted as
reminders of Roman authority and, because that authority was founded in the power of
the emperor, they possessed the capacity to communicate imperial ideology. But not all
temples are equal in this regard. Instead of examining the entire catalogue of 2nd-
century temples, this study is confined to those that best embody the qualities of other
large-scale Roman building projects in Asia. Because of their size, monumental temples
are best suited to engage a large portion of the public, either through daily interaction or
topographical prominence.

Monumentality

The terms “monumental” and “monumentality” point to those combined attributes
of a physical structure that create a noteworthy visual impact. Attributes that made a
structure noteworthy could include size, design, decoration, and location. As a
theoretical approach, a focus on architectural “monumentality” is closely related to
phenomenology, a philosophical perspective that studies the ways people experience
the physical world. Roman architectural historian Edmund Thomas wrote that
“monumentality” denotes something “visionary” about a structure that is recognized
when seen, but difficult to predict or describe.34 The concept has been the object of
recent scholarly discussion. Monumentality in the Roman context was broadly explored
at a 1987 conference organized by the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, which
focused on the urban development of Roman Spain and considered monumentality as

34 Thomas 2007, 3.
an aspect of city planning, rather than of individual buildings or monuments. Monumentality was attained when a Roman city exhibited “adornment with buildings and memorials intended for show.” Since then, use of the term has shifted slightly to include discussion of individual monuments and structures. Most recently, participants at a 2012 conference at the State University of New York at Buffalo titled “Approaching Monumentality in the Archaeological Record” examined the diversity of the concept and included presentations on sculpture, architecture, text, and fashion from the perspectives of various cultures across many time periods. By endeavoring to clarify the various uses of “monumental” and “monumentality,” this conference highlighted the universality of the terms as expressions of a basic human desire to create something visionary and impressive.

Thomas summarized the active features of monumentality as both the quality of an edifice as well as its presence in the life of a community. According to these criteria, several building types can potentially engender monumental examples: structures for public meeting, walls, aqueducts, baths, gymnasia, theaters, fountains, arches, and temples. Constructed public spaces such as these could achieve monumentality through unprecedented size, magnificent decoration, or placement in notable locations maximizing contact with the local population. These criteria are not mutually exclusive,


36 Thomas 2007, 2.

37 Approaching Monumentality in the Archaeological Record was sponsored by The Institute for European and Mediterranean Archaeology and was held on 12-13 May 2012, in Buffalo, NY. The program for the event is available at: http://e-a-a.org/docs/IEMA_Conference_Program.pdf.

38 Thomas 2007, 11.
and the most effectively monumental structures often fulfilled more than one. Most importantly, Thomas proposed that the goal of such monumentality was to establish an architectural unity of the urban topography or to define the Empire, region, and city in a particular way.

Sacred architecture responds to a unique community need, and consequently possesses different functional and practical restrictions in comparison to other public buildings. This provides temples with an even greater capacity for monumentality. As houses of the gods, temples were regularly constructed out of expensive materials and extravagantly adorned. This is not to say that other types of structures could not be built in this manner, only that the quality of a temple’s material was encouraged by religious support and was less limited by political concerns. For example, a project like an aqueduct would be built in response to physical needs, and expedience guided the construction schedule and cost. There was no pressing need to seek out rare or valuable materials, but every pressing concern to complete the project quickly. Fulfilling a need less tangibly immediate, a temple could be built over a longer period of time at a greater cost with a reduced concern for civil backlash.\(^39\) Availability of funds and appropriate site are therefore the only major obstacles to the construction of a monumental temple in terms of material and size.

Following Thomas, in this work I use the term “monumental” to indicate the size and physical distinction of a building. Temple height can be approximated with podium or stylobate dimensions and column diameters. Since few ancient temples survive to

---

\(^39\) Some temples, like the Parthenon at Athens, are obvious exceptions to this statement. Nevertheless, the political concerns of 5\(^{th}\) century BC Athens and its personalities were somewhat different from those during the high Roman Empire.
their original heights, I use the structural footprints and remaining column drums to calculate an approximate original elevation of the temples. Temples were built in a bewildering variety of forms, so it is also important to draw some basic guidelines to what made a temple “monumental” in terms of size. Most Roman temples conform to three standard categories of width: < 10 meters wide, 10-25 meters wide, and > 30 meters wide. Because the latter category includes the largest known Roman temples, it serves as the definitive benchmark width (and corresponding size) for monumentality. This rule is not excessively firm, however, as a slightly smaller temple could also qualify based on other features. For example, a temple measuring 28 x 50 meters could be housed in a 100 x 200 meter temenos, making the physical space occupied by the temple extraordinarily large.

A temple can also be categorized as monumental compared to its immediate surroundings, making the architectural form unique in comparison to other public building types. Examples of infrastructure, like walls or aqueducts, cover large portions of land out of practical necessity, extending through and around different neighborhoods. Recreational centers, like baths and gymnasia, are almost always built in the most populated neighborhoods of a city, ensuring the maximum accessibility for patrons. Finally, examples of decorative architecture, like fountains and arches, are usually built near high traffic areas, at the entrance to the city or adjacent to other

40 Ward-Perkins (1981) provided the best English-language survey of Roman imperial architecture. Most major temples were included in this survey and my three categories of dimensions are based on the range of temples that he examined.

41 Surprisingly few temples achieve this dimension and most that do are included in Appendix 2 of this dissertation.

42 For example, the cella walls of the Red Hall at Pergamon (which has no stylobate or peristasis) are 26 x 60 m. located within a walled sacred area measuring 270 x 100 m.
frequented buildings. Temples are singular in that they are a self-contained attraction and require no proximity relationship or decorative cooperation with other structures. They can be placed anywhere, inside or outside a city, without regard for neighborhood or even accessibility. Temples are thus able to create their own neighborhoods and surroundings and have no resulting locative requirements similar to those possessed by examples of monumental infrastructure.

On the other hand, the placement of a temple makes up a substantial component of its monumentality. Plainly, a monumental building should be built in a monumental setting. Thomas described two types of location that would contribute to monumentality: a dynamic natural feature or a place of high traffic where other important civic monuments, such as commemorative or religious statues, are located. Both types of location have the capacity to emphasize special features of each city and increase the visibility of the monument in question. In antiquity, Ephesus had examples of both types of location in its harbor and the Kuretes street (also called the Embolos). The former was a dynamic feature and focus of commerce at Ephesus. Many people entered and exited the city from this outlet, making it a highly visible and well-trafficked location. The Kuretes street connected the upper Roman agora to the lower Greek agora and was lined with statues and inscriptions highlighting the achievements of famous Ephesians. Both locations could enhance monumentality according to Thomas’s criteria. All the spotlight temples are located in dynamic settings that provide visual accessibility and connections to naturally and historically significant locations.

---

43 Thomas 2007, 108 and 117.
To sum up, a monumental temple is conspicuous: the natural focus of attention as the largest, and most prominently or dynamically situated building in its immediate environment. By virtue of their physical features, societal role, and surroundings, the spotlight temples achieved monumentality and were conspicuous in doing so. The challenge going forward is to understand the incentives to create monumentality with the spotlight temples.

Ancient Greek and Roman critics were certainly able to recognize monumentality and generally used common terms to discuss exceptionally noteworthy works of art. Common nouns used to note the size of a work of art include magnificentia, magnitudo, maiestas, and megethos. Related adjectives are grandis and megaloprepes. A few other terms, like thaumastos and mirabilis, could be used to

44 Jerome Pollitt has written extensively on ancient art criticism and commentary, focusing especially on the terminology used by ancient Greek writers. See Pollitt 1974, which focuses on vocabulary and Pollitt 1990, which is a sourcebook (chapter 11, 181-205, deals specifically with architecture.).
45 Magnificentia could mean artistic greatness (see OLD s.v. magnificentia 1) or splendor and magnificence (See OLD s.v. magnificentia 2). Also see Pollitt 1974, 400-401.
46 Magnitudo referred to the quality or degree of magnitude, size, or extent (see OLD s.v. magnitudo).
47 Maiestas means grandeur or majesty (see OLD s.v. maiestas 4 and Pollitt 1974, 401-402).
48 Megethos means greatness or magnitude (see LSJ s.v. μέγεθος) and Pollitt 1974, 198-201).
49 Grandis can refer to something of considerable size or simply mean large (see OLD s.v. grandis 2 and Pollitt 1974, 379).
50 Megaloprepes (μεγαλοπρεπῆς) could mean magnificent or befitting a great man (see LSJ s.v. μεγαλοπρεπῆς and Pollitt 1974, 196-198).
51 Thaumastos (θαυμαστός) could mean wonderful or marvelous (see LSJ s.v. θαυμασμός and Pollitt 1974, 189-191).
52 Mirabilis means wonderful or marvelous (see OLD s.v mirabilis). Mirabilis is the equivalent of thaumastos, and seems to have been used in the same way, but could refer to works great and small (Pollitt 1974, 402-406).
observe that a work of art was a marvel or marvelous. Finally, the Latin word *pondus*\(^{53}\) was sometimes used to describe weighty significance.\(^{54}\) These terms are usually found in commentaries that mention some of the most famous works of art produced by the ancient world.\(^{55}\) Rarely, however, were these terms used in the discussion of architecture.

When the terms were used, the application is not always consistent with the theoretical meaning of monumentality used in this dissertation. Many well-known ancient temples that conform to my definition of monumentality are treated with terms of practical description in the sources. For example, the gigantic Heraion at Samos is blandly described by Herodotus as the largest known temple, with no further comment on the significance of that fact.\(^{56}\) Plutarch wrote about the famous Periklean building program at Athens and acknowledged the grandeur of the buildings, but focused more on the astonishing speed at which those buildings were erected.\(^{57}\) Even the Roman architect Vitruvius mentioned size only as a means to underscore the functional benefit

\(^{53}\) Pondus is a term that sometimes refers to the importance, weight, value, or influence of a thing (see *OLD* s.v. pondus 6 and Pollitt 1974, 422-423).

\(^{54}\) For example, Pollitt (1974, 422), noted that Quintillian (12.10.7-8) remarked that pondus was a quality possessed by the work of Phidias, but which Polykleitos’s work lacked. This would seem to suggest that pondus went beyond the meaning of maiestas, magnificentia, and megethos.

\(^{55}\) For example, Pausanias (8.42.7) used a form of thaumastos to observe that the bronze Apollo by Onatas at Pergamon was a marvel for its size and workmanship. Dio Chrysostom (*Orationes* 12.77) used megaloprepes to describe Phideas’ Olympian Zeus, and Quintillian (12.10.9) described the maiestas of that same statue.

\(^{56}\) Herodotus (3.60.4): τρίτον δὲ σφι ἑξέργασαι νηὸς μέγιστος πάντων νηῶν τῶν ἡμεῖς ἱδον· τοῦ ἀρχιτέκτων πρῶτος ἐγένετο Ῥοῖκος Φιλέω ἐπιχώριος; τούτων εἶνεκεν μᾶλλον τι περὶ Σαμίων ἔμηκνα.

\(^{57}\) Plutarch (*Perikles* 13.1): ἄναβαινόντων δὲ τῶν ἔργων ύπερηφάνων μὲν μεγέθει, μορφὴ δ’ ἀμιμητῶν καὶ χάριτι, τῶν δημιουργῶν ἀμιλλωμένων ύπερβάλλεσθαι τὴν δημιουργίαν τῇ καλλιτεχνίᾳ, μάλιστα θαυμάσιον ἦν τὸ τάχος. ὃν γὰρ ἐκαστὸν ὕφοντο πολλαῖς διάδοχαις καὶ ἕλεκτοι μόλις ἐπὶ τέλος ἀφίέσθαι, ταῦτα πάντα μᾶς ἀκμῆ πολιτείας ἐλάμβανε τὴν συντέλειαν.
it brought in noting the magnitude sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis.⁵⁸

Amazingly, in the preceding sentence Vitruvius mentioned both the Didymaion (A4) and the Artemision (A5), but observed only their excellent workmanship, leaving aside issues of size, despite the fact that those were two of the largest temples ever built. Strabo also wrote about the Didymaion (A4) but only casually named it the largest of all temples.⁵⁹ Even when buildings known for their size were discussed, therefore, the significance of their monumentality was never considered to any meaningful degree.

Several possibilities could explain this odd situation. First, perhaps the Greeks and Romans had no interest in monumentality and therefore declined to discuss its merits. There can be no truth to this possibility, however, because the corpus of ancient monumental temples speaks to a large and widespread phenomenon. A second possibility is that the texts that discuss monumentality have not survived to the present day. Although it is true that many Classical texts did not survive the medieval period, Vitruvius’s books on architecture are largely intact and have sections devoted to the virtues of proportion and the design of temples. If monumentality was an issue that needed to be discussed, Vitruvius would have written more about the great temples of his time. This leads to the third possibility, that the concept of monumentality was so obvious in the ancient world that it was not seen as a subject worth exploring by ancient authors. That is not to say that monumentality was meaningless, rather, that it was so apparent to viewers that it needed little, or no, explanation.

---

⁵⁸ Vitruvius, (7.introduction.16): *Eleusine Cereris et Proserpinae cellam inmani magnitudine Ictinos dorico more sine exterioribus columnis ad laxamentum usus sacrificiorum pertexit.*

⁵⁹ Strabo (14.1.5): *ὑστερον δ’ οἱ Μιλήσιοι μέγιστον νεών τῶν πάντων κατεσκεύασαν, διέμεινε δὲ χωρὶς όροφῆς διὰ τὸ μέγεθος.*
History of Scholarship

The spotlight temples have been the subject of earlier studies, mostly in historical accounts from antiquity and the medieval period, reports published by archaeological excavations, and articles and monographs. Historical sources are generally ancient to early modern travelogues and vary in quality of detail. Excavation reports on the spotlight temples generally present a detailed record of the material remains found at the temple sites, making them invaluable contributions to the understanding of the temples. They provide the primary data on which all subsequent studies base their arguments. When the temples considered in this study have been discussed as the focus of articles or within monographs, they are usually viewed from the perspective of imperial affiliation, construction techniques, design and decoration, and identification.

The Wadi B Temple at Sardis

The Wadi B Temple at Sardis was found on an artificial terrace in the topographical center of Sardis (I10-I12) in 1981 by the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis sponsored by the Harvard Art Museums and Cornell University at Sardis (AES). Crawford Greenewalt, Donald Sullivan, Christopher Ratté, and Thomas Howe published a detailed record of the 1981 and 1982 seasons, during which only one corner of the building (I14) was unearthed. According to this report, only the stylobate, foundations, foundations,

60 In this bibliographic essay portion of the chapter, excavation reports and articles that focus on the spotlight temples are cited without page numbers, unless specifically warranted. For analysis coming from broader studies, the relevant page numbers are provided. Most of these sources will be discussed in great detail in subsequent chapters, and at that point full citations will be provided.


and a few architectural fragments of the Wadi B temple survive, but from what remains
the archaeologists were able to establish an approximate date of construction in the 1st
century AD and to estimate the dimensions of the building. Two other discoveries were
noted: First, a tympanum block with a partial Greek inscription reading, “ΑΔΡΑΜΥ/
THON” (I15), and second, a cluster of coins dating from the reign of Antoninus Pius (r.
138-161 AD).

The initial report of the Wadi B Temple’s discovery was followed by a substantial
and informative article by Ratté, Howe, and Clive Foss. Based on one corner of the
foundation and six fragmented columns, the authors concluded that the temple must
have been of pseudodipteral plan (I13). This conclusion was based on a comparison
with the remains of all other known pseudodipteral temples of the region. The authors
also reaffirmed the 1st-century AD date of the structure and suggested that the
“AΔPAMY/THON” inscription linked the temple with the provincial Imperial Cult. Finally,
Ratté, Howe, and Foss oriented the temple on axis with other structures of the city,
which partially formed the basis for their proposal for the size of the temple. A later
evacuation report on the 1996-1998 seasons quotes site architect Philip Stinson’s

63 The full publication of this inscription is pending.
64 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986. This is the only major publication on the Wadi B temple, which includes a
summary of the excavation notes, a reconstruction of the architecture, and discussion of the identity and
political role of the temple.
65 Pseudodipteral means that the temple appeared to be, but was not, fully dipteral (i.e., surrounded by
two rows of columns). Such temples have only one row of columns along the sides, though there is space
left for two. Sometimes an illusion of a second row of columns is achieved by a porch several columns
deep, or by a row of engaged columns along the flanks of the cella.
hypothesis that the Wadi B Temple fit within a system of urban design, along with the theater and stadium.\textsuperscript{66}

Beginning in the early 2000s, the use of global positioning systems (GPS) allowed researchers to view ancient Sardis from a new perspective, shedding the limitations of total station surveys of large areas. An excavation report from 2002 by Greenewalt demonstrated how GPS was used to look at the topographical features of the terrace on which the Wadi B Temple was built.\textsuperscript{67} Excavations the following year found no new information or pre-Roman material, suggesting that the site was in use for only a short time during the Roman period.\textsuperscript{68} In 2004, the combined contributions of GPS and fieldwork showed that the Wadi B Temple was not oriented with the theater and stadium but rather at 90 degrees to that axis, implying that the temple was larger than originally believed and stood alone on the artificial terrace (I12).\textsuperscript{69} In 2005 and 2006, Greenewalt also reported that the Wadi B temple was intimately related to the artificial terrace on which it was built, perhaps even as the centerpiece.\textsuperscript{70} During the 2006 season, more architectural and sculptural fragments were found that suggested the Corinthian order (I16 and I17). Finally, twelve imperial inscriptions were found at the

\textsuperscript{66} Greenewalt and Rautman 2000, 677. At that time, the Wadi B temple was believed to have been aligned with the theatre on an east-west axis, based on the earlier conclusions of Ratté, Howe, and Foss, 46.

\textsuperscript{67} Greenewalt 2002. The goal was to identify subsurface features in the terrace.

\textsuperscript{68} Greenewalt 2003.

\textsuperscript{69} Greenewalt 2005. Discovery of another corner of the temple caused the reconstruction of the temple to be shifted 90 degrees on the plan. Oddly, the reconstruction and dimensions Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986 proposed were not affected by this discovery. Only the orientation of the temple was changed.

\textsuperscript{70} Greenewalt 2005, 176 and 2006, 744.
Despite the short publication history of the Wadi B temple, we can summarize a few basic theories about the structure. First, it was a Roman-era construction built on an artificial terrace in the geographical center of Sardis. Second, the temple was probably linked to the Imperial Cult or the activities of the provincial koinon. Finally, the temple itself may have been in use for only a brief period before being abandoned or destroyed.\textsuperscript{72}

\textit{The Vetters Temple at Ephesus}

A 1972 excavation led by Hermann Vetters of the Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut (OeAI) found an artificial plateau (I21) just within the northern city boundaries (I22) of Ephesus and later excavations led to the discovery of the foundations of an exceptionally large temple (I27 and I28).\textsuperscript{73} Vetters quickly identified the temple as the Ephesian Olympieion mentioned by Pausanias and a \textit{neokorate}\textsuperscript{74} temple of the Emperor Hadrian (T1). Subsequent excavation results indicated that the Church of Mary had been built from the remains of the south \textit{stoa}\textsuperscript{75} of the larger

\textsuperscript{71} Greenewalt 2006. The full publication of these inscriptions is pending.

\textsuperscript{72} I will explore an alternative theory to this conclusion in Chapter 2, 64-65, and Chapter 3, 128.

\textsuperscript{73} Vetters 1983. The artificial plateau was a conspicuously vacant area just north of the Church of Mary, near the Koressian gate. Discovery of the temple was made in the following 1983 season.

\textsuperscript{74} A \textit{neokorate} is a temple built in conjunction with the bestowing of the title of \textit{neokoros}, (see \textit{LSJ} [s.v. \textit{νεοκόρος}, II]) which in its most basic sense may be translated as temple warden. In the Imperial era, it was often used as a title that accompanied a special award of the Imperial Cult. See Chapter 3, 139-140.

\textsuperscript{75} A \textit{stoa} was a roofed colonnade or portico. These were sometimes used to mark the boundaries of a temenos.
In 1987 Vetters and Karwiese published a summary of the 1984 and 1985 excavations that provided approximate dimensions for the temple’s peristyle, images and measurements of Corinthian capital fragments found, and a proposal for two separate destruction dates in the 4th and 5th centuries AD.\textsuperscript{77}

The excavation of the Vetters Temple continued during the 1980s and 1990s. Stefan Karwiese published a short book in 1989, summarizing the excavations to that point and proposing a \textit{dodecastyle dipteral}\textsuperscript{78} plan for the temple.\textsuperscript{79} In a 1992 excavation campaign at the Church of Mary, Gerhard Langmann used ceramic evidence to suggest that the land on which the church was built, and consequently that of the Vetters Temple, was first occupied in the 1st century AD.\textsuperscript{80} In 1993, Karwiese published results of the 1992 season, which revealed a 4th-century AD ash stratum and the fact that a lime kiln had been installed in the area sometime in the 5th century AD.\textsuperscript{81} This supported the hypothesis of two destructions, the first perhaps politically and religiously motivated by the rise of Christianity, and a later practical dismantling of the temple. The 1993 report also stated that no remains earlier than the 1st century AD were found below the

\textsuperscript{76} Vetters 1986. The Church of Mary was then identified as a large early 4th-century Christian church. Subsequent studies have indicated that the structure was built later. Its footprint is strikingly long compared to its narrow width, making it plausible that the church was built according to the dimensions of the preceding stoa.

\textsuperscript{77} Vetters and Karwiese 1987.

\textsuperscript{78} Dodecastyle dipteral describes a temple with twelve columns across the facade that is completely surrounded by two rows of columns.

\textsuperscript{79} Karwiese 1989. The dodecastyle dipteral plan is tentative and based primarily on the extraordinary size of the structure. In 1995, Peter Scherrer identified the temple as having a pseudodipteral plan. In his most recent observations about the temple, Scherrer (1999) acknowledged that it may have been dipteral or pseudodipteral. Burrell (2004, 307) has convincingly argued that the temple could not have exceeded a decastyle plan.

\textsuperscript{80} Langmann 1992.

\textsuperscript{81} Karwiese 1993.
construction layer of the Vetters Temple. Furthermore, Karwiese later claimed that his findings indicated that sea level in the temple area at that time would have been at least one meter above the excavated foundations, making the temple site a marshland up until the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD, meaning that it must date later than that time.\textsuperscript{82} Subsequent reports by Karwiese and Danica Beyll in 1994 and 1995 revealed even more of the Vetters Temple’s history. In 1994 they reported that the building was likely constructed at the beginning of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD and that the marble floor of the temple was spoliated in the late 4\textsuperscript{th} century AD.\textsuperscript{83} The next year, however, a trench at the junction of the east and south stoa foundations of the temple indicated a somewhat later construction date, sometime between the reigns of Hadrian and Caracalla (r. 198-217 AD).\textsuperscript{84} In another article, Karwiese suggested that the extended period of construction may have been the result of the major expense of constructing the main temple.\textsuperscript{85} Finally, a 1996 geological survey of the northern section of Ephesus confirmed the earlier belief that the area of the temple was swampland until the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD.\textsuperscript{86}

Although the Vetters Temple was initially thought to be the Olympieion mentioned by the 2\textsuperscript{nd}-century AD Greek traveler and geographer Pausanias (T1), that identification

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{82} Karwiese 1995a, 312.
\item \textsuperscript{83} Karwiese and Beyll 1994. The spoliation date was established by coins that were found near the removed sections of the marble flooring.
\item \textsuperscript{84} Karwiese and Beyll 1995. At the junction of the stoa supports, there was a normal ashlar wall and a wall made from reused materials. Apparently, these were both in place at the time in which the marble floor was installed, prompting the excavators to date these foundations between the reigns of Hadrian and Caracalla.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Karwiese 1995a, 314. This conclusion has merit, especially as the date of the temple is fairly certain and it would have been the first part of the structure completed. The elaborate temenos boundaries would probably have been the last element of the complex to be completed.
\item \textsuperscript{86} Brückner and Jungmann 1996.
\end{itemize}
has been the source of contention. In 1993, C.P. Jones pointed out the discrepancy between the description Pausanias gave of the site verses the location of known landmarks, concluding that the foundations found by Vetters in 1983 could not be the Olympieion mentioned by the ancient author. Karwiese countered this argument, claiming that Pausanias’s account must include errors, as the only route he could have described entered the city on its north side, near the ruins of the Vetters Temple. Helmut Engelmann joined the debate in 1996, arguing that the temple must have been misidentified and that the ruins of the Vetters Temple were more probably a Hadrianieion. Scherrer proposed that a new translation of Pausanias could clear up some of the inconsistencies, but that no matter the translation, the text can be interpreted as mentioning the structure found by Vetters. In 2002, Dieter Knibbe responded by suggesting that scholars reevaluate the ways Pausanias could have understood routes between the city and the Artemision. Burrell did just that, and concluded that the description of Pausanias corresponds with a reliable ancient source.

87 This topic is thoroughly discussed in Chapter 3, 133-136. What follows in this chapter is a brief summary.

88 Jones 1993.

89 Karwiese 1995a, 313.

90 Engelmann 1996. Engelmann’s argument is somewhat difficult to follow because his essential point is that Pausanias saw a temple that he named the Olympieion, but it was not the same temple as the archaeological remains of a temple commonly identified as the Olympieion. Furthermore, Engelmann believed that those remains are more accurately called a Hadrianieion, a slightly different variant of the common name Olympieion, which is generally accepted to have been a temple dedicated to Hadrian Olympios, and could just as easily have been named a Hadrianieion.

91 Scherrer 1999, 142. According to Scherrer, Pausanias may not have referred to the Olympieion as “on the way”, but rather, “at some point past.” This is difficult to prove, but could explain the odd mention of the Magnesian gate. Scherrer translated the final clause of the Pausanias line as “leading from the sanctuary towards the Olympieion and towards the Magnesian Gate.” To achieve this, Scherrer noted that the use of τοιχα + accusative can mean either “on the way” or “towards”.

92 Knibbe 2002. There are a few major routes between the Artemision and the Vetters Temple, but Pausanias could have arrived from almost any direction except the sea.
for the city’s landmarks, making it unlikely that the Olympieion was named in error, and therefore making it unlikely that the Vetters temple is the Olympieion.\textsuperscript{93}

The two most recent publications on the Vetters Temple refer directly to its religious significance. In 2004, Barbara Burrell identified the structure as a sanctuary of the Imperial Cult in her lexicon of the neokorate temples in the Roman world.\textsuperscript{94} Based on epigraphic and numismatic evidence, Burrell asserted that the temple was constructed for Hadrian between 130 and 132 AD.\textsuperscript{95} Burrell also contributed to the debate over the building’s identity, writing that it should be called a “Temple to Lord Hadrian Caesar” or “Temple of the God Hadrian.”\textsuperscript{96} Most recently, Peter Scherrer has also sought to link the building with the Imperial Cult.\textsuperscript{97} He argued that Roman Ephesus was planned, or at least developed, as a stage for civic and religious festivals. Therefore the building, along with other imperial structures, substantially affected the urban layout of Ephesus, shaping the way citizens viewed the topography of the city.

In sum, the Vetters Temple was only recently discovered and since that time has experienced a crisis of identification. None doubt that the building was founded in the Roman Imperial period, but the precise nature of its religious affiliation is undetermined.

\textsuperscript{93} Burrell 2004, 68. Burrell’s conclusion is based on the "Endowment of Salutaris," which is an inscription describing a processional route through the city and to the Artemision. The inscription detailing Salutaris’s endowment of a procession was first discovered and published by J.T. Wood (1877) and was subsequently published as \textit{IvE} 27.

\textsuperscript{94} Burrell 2004. Many earlier scholars skirted discussion of the building’s religious affiliation, using Olympieion as a vague label. Burrell sought to clarify that the temple was not dedicated to Zeus, but to the Emperor Hadrian.

\textsuperscript{95} Burrell 2004, 315.

\textsuperscript{96} Burrell 2004, 68-69.

\textsuperscript{97} Scherrer 2008. He believed that buildings associated with the Imperial Cult at Ephesus were meant to affect the layout and flow of the city.
However, due to its date and material, it appears that the temple was in some way connected to the Empire, most likely through the Imperial Cult.

**The Red Hall at Pergamon**

In contrast to the ruinous Vetters Temple, the Red Hall at Pergamon (I35) was never allowed to fall completely into ruin and is perhaps the best preserved ancient building in Asia Minor. It spanned the Selinus River at the foot of the acropolis in the lower city (I36). No known ancient sources refer to the structure. Descriptions of the building appear only in the late medieval and early modern periods. The first of these is a letter written by the future Byzantine Emperor Theodoros II Laskaris (r. 1254-1258) to the historian Georgios Akropolites, in which he described a visit to the Red Hall in 1250. In the letter, Laskaris mentioned the Red Hall in passing and described the arched vaults that were built to conceal the Selinus River in the building’s original temenos (I37).

Most early modern accounts of Pergamon from the 17th through the early 20th century are travel accounts providing limited cultural and archaeological information about the city. Thomas Smith (1638-1710 AD) was the first author to write about this temple in his 17th-century book on the seven biblical churches of Asia, in which he called the building a church dedicated to St. John. Approximately one century later, French traveler M. Gabriel Choiseul-Gouffier (1752-1817 AD) identified the Red Hall as a temple to Asklepios rededicated as a church of St. John the Evangelist, and James

---

98 It owes part of its durability to having been converted into a Christian church in the 5th century AD.

99 For the text of Laskaris’s letter, see Gelzer 1903, 89.

100 Smith 1678.
Dallaway (1763-1834 AD) and Charles Texier (1802-1871 AD) each described ancient parts of the structure and temenos. The final description of the Red Hall prior to systematic archaeological investigation was published in 1900 by the French authors Maxime Collignon and Emmanuel Pontremoli, who detailed the vastness of the Red Hall and its history as the Church of Hagios Antipas and later a bathhouse. On the whole, these early travelers indicate the confusion over the identity of the Red Hall and mention a few architectural features, but offer little in the way of archaeological details.

Archaeological excavations at Pergamon began in 1878 under the direction of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (DAI). Alexander Conze mentioned the Red Hall in the first volume of *Altertümer von Pergamon*, in which he described the building’s design, location, and possibilities for its identification, including a bathhouse, temple of Asklepios, basilica, and library. Between 1934 and 1938, Oskar Ziegenaus and Otfried Deubner excavated parts of the Red Hall, but most of the records of this campaign were destroyed during the Second World War (1939-1944). Deubner did publish an abstract of a 1939 conference paper, asserting that the Red Hall was a Roman temple to Alexandrian Egyptian Deities, based largely on Roman construction techniques and the discovery of Egyptianizing atlantes and caryatids on the site.

---

101 Choiseul-Gouffier 1782, Dallaway 1797, and Texier 1833.
102 Collignon and Pontremoli 1900.
103 Conze 1912.
104 Nohlen 1998, 78.
105 Atlantes are male figural sculptures that also support larger architectural elements.
106 Caryatids are the female version of atlantes.
(I42 and I43).\textsuperscript{107} He continued to work on the Red Hall for the next several decades, and his 1977 site report, the most complete record of the excavations to that point, featured images of sculptural elements, marble revetment, and reconstructions of the Red Hall and its surrounding complex.\textsuperscript{108} Ward-Perkins included the Red Hall in his 1981 survey of Roman imperial architecture, and generally agreed with Deubner’s ideas about the structure.\textsuperscript{109} Ward-Perkins also believed the Red Hall to be an Egyptian sanctuary and noted its distinctly “unclassical” design and use of materials. In 1984, Deubner published two new reconstructions of the entrance and the interior of the hall, complete with a highly conjectural cult statue.\textsuperscript{110} Finally, in 1995, Deubner wrote a short article about the courtyard figures and the different types of overhangs they could have supported.\textsuperscript{111}

In the same year, Helmut Koester wrote on the function of the Red Hall, suggesting that it could be profitably analyzed in juxtaposition with such contemporaries as the Vetters Temple at Ephesus. He observed that the 2\textsuperscript{nd}-century AD religious evolution in Asia Minor prompted a movement away from locally established cults towards imported religions, with their associated major sanctuaries meant to dominate

\textsuperscript{107}Deubner 1940.
\textsuperscript{108}Deubner 1977. This publication was quite complete for the time and was only recently surpassed by Ulrich Mania’s monograph (2011a).
\textsuperscript{109}Ward-Perkins 1981, 283. That is to say Ward-Perkins also concluded that the Red Hall must have been dedicated to Egyptian deities.
\textsuperscript{110}Deubner 1984. As his career progressed, many of Deubner’s essays, including this one, offered increasing degrees of speculation, based on a long professional familiarity with the building.
\textsuperscript{111}Deubner 1995.
urban topography and impress viewers.\footnote{Koester 1995b. This was published in a collection of essays concerning the social world of early Christians. The primary thrust of the article was to discuss the cult processes that can be recognized in the design of the hall.} In a second essay published in a book focused specifically on Pergamon, Koester stated his firm belief that the Red Hall served Egyptian deities, citing the atlantes and a small sculpture of Isis, as well as limited epigraphic and paleographic evidence.\footnote{Koester 1998. The epigraphic and paleographic evidence are discussed in Chapter 3,142-144.} Also in that collection, Klaus Nohlen wrote a detailed essay on the architectural features of the Red Hall, with a full bibliography, and supported its identity as a Roman temple to Egyptian gods.\footnote{Nohlen 1998.} In 1999, Wolfgang Radt included a chapter on the Red Hall in his comprehensive archaeological guide to Pergamon, in which he synthesized previous scholarship and discussed the significance of the hall’s proximity to the Selinus River, arguing that it may have allowed builders to avoid demolishing existing houses and structures.\footnote{Radt 1999.} Next, the publication of a 2003 DAI colloquium on Egyptian cults and sanctuaries in the Roman East included six essays related to the Red Hall.\footnote{Hoffmann 2005. The number of essays is clearly an indication of the importance of the Red Hall in the DAI’s recent activity in Pergamon and the popularity of the building among experienced and emerging scholars.} First, Adolf Hoffmann wrote a historiographical essay on the complicated history of research and excavations at the site.\footnote{Hoffmann 2005. This essay touched on many of the issues Nohlen 1998 described, including lost records and pauses in work at the site.} This was followed by essays by Ulrich Mania and Corinna Brückener on sculptural fragments recently excavated there.\footnote{Mania 2005 and Brückener 2005.} Katja Lembke briefly discussed the monumental qualities of
the Red Hall, commenting especially on the expansiveness of the complex in the urban environment of the lower city.\footnote{Lembke 2005.} Radt traced the presence and history of Egyptian gods in Pergamon, following Koester’s earlier work closely, and Ana-Katharina Rieger discussed the urban significance of the temple.\footnote{Radt 2005 and Rieger 2005.}

In 2007, Mania wrote a second essay in which he used the sculptural fragments from the Red Hall to support the argument that the temple was dedicated to an Egyptian deity.\footnote{Mania 2011b. More than any previous scholar, Mania sought out possible comparisons for the Egyptianizing sculptural features. Although he pointed out the Egyptian flair of the building, he also noted the uniqueness of the sculptural themes and style.} Finally, in 2011 he published a monograph featuring the results of several seasons of excavation and research in the 2000s.\footnote{Mania 2011a. This book constitutes the current last word on the Red Hall and no comprehensive future projects are expected. Brückener, an advanced doctoral student, continues to work on the urban context of the Red Hall complex, but focuses only on its integration into the social fabric of the lower city.} Ceramic evidence, according to Mania, indicates a construction date between the mid-1\textsuperscript{st} and the mid-2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD, but certain peculiarities of the structure are Hadrianic, perhaps even indicating the direct influence of the emperor.\footnote{This conclusion is founded on an analysis of the sculptural furnishings and material features of the Red Hall. In short, Mania felt that too many features can be tied to Hadrian for the structure to have been built without the emperor’s input.}

Overall, the Red Hall has received considerable attention in the modern era, but no ancient source survives to attest to its original purpose and reception. While early writers offered various opinions on its purpose and identity, scholars of the past sixty years have overwhelmingly claimed it to be a temple to Egyptian gods. Those same scholars have also confirmed that the temple was almost certainly built by Romans,
which should temper the significance of any theories based on the Egyptian character of the temple.

The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus

Of the spotlight temples, the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus (I48) is the subject of the most extensive ancient and early modern testimony. The famous orator Aelius Aristides (117-181 AD) wrote a panegyric (T2, T3, and T4) about a huge Cyzicene temple in 167 AD, but never identified the building as dedicated or belonging to Hadrian. He marveled at the size of the structure, noting that it was three stories high and visible from the sea. Because the temple was the subject of Aristides’s speech, we can surmise that he delivered the panegyric on the occasion of a special event at the temple, perhaps at the dedication of its rebuilding.\(^\text{124}\) Whatever the occasion, Aristides must have seen the temple during the late stages of construction or shortly after its completion. Cassius Dio recorded (T17) that the temple was destroyed during an earthquake in 161 AD and provided dimensions of the columns.\(^\text{125}\)

No other extant ancient source acknowledges the temple until John Malalas (ca. 491-578 AD), who identified the edifice as dedicated to Hadrian and built from funds given by the emperor after an earthquake devastated Cyzicus in the mid-2\(^{\text{nd}}\) century AD (T5). Malalas described the temple as very large and featuring a huge bust of the emperor on the roof. Another 6\(^{\text{th}}\)-century source, a commentary on Lucian’s (ca.

\(^{124}\) Cassius Dio (T17) recorded that the “greatest and most beautiful temple” at Cyzicus was damaged from the earthquake of 161 AD. Therefore, Aristides cannot have spoken about the original structure, but probably the rededication of its renovation.

\(^{125}\) Dio never explicitly named the temple, but referred instead to “the temple there [Cyzicus] that was the greatest and most beautiful of all temples was thrown down.”
125-180 AD) *Icaromenippus* (T6), compared the temple to the Olympieion at Athens (A2), claiming that neither sanctuary would have been built without the aid of Hadrian. About a century later, *The Paschal Chronicle* (c. 600-680 AD) noted that Hadrian did indeed set up a temple at Cyzicus and at the same time he paved a marketplace with marble (T7). Later, a passage of the *Greek Anthology*\(^{126}\) placed the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus among the great wonders of the world, indicating the level of fame that Byzantine historians accorded the temple (T8). In the 11th century, Byzantine historian Georgius Cedrenus (ca. 1010-1100 AD) again asserted that Hadrian built the temple in Cyzicus, but curiously cited it among other cities that Hadrian founded, not other temples (T9). Maximus Planudes (ca. 1260-1305 AD) mentioned the temple in a 13th-century letter, especially noting its underground passages.\(^{127}\) Finally, the 14th-century author George Kodinos claimed that the Byzantine Emperor Justinian (r. 527-565 AD) spoliated cities from all over the empire to construct Hagia Sophia, listing Cyzicus among the robbed sites.\(^{128}\)

Cyriacus of Ancona (1391-1453 AD) was the first early modern writer to provide a description of the temple, from observations gathered during his 1431 and 1444 visits to the site (T10 and T11).\(^{129}\) Cyriacus’s detailed narrative and measurements were coupled with sketches of architectural and sculptural details, copies of which have

\(^{126}\) The *Greek Anthology* is a collection of classical and Byzantine poems and epigrams. Most of the text is a combination of two manuscripts, the 10th-century *Palatine Anthology* and the 14th-century *Planudean Anthology*, assembled by Maximus Planudes.

\(^{127}\) Maximus Planudes (*Epistole* 55.5-15).


\(^{129}\) For more on Cyriacus and his travels, see MacKendrick 1951 and Scalamonti, Mitchell, and Bodnar 1996.
Cyriacus also complained that Ottoman Turks were actively dismantling the temple to reuse material for new construction in the capital at Bursa. Five years later, more Italian travelers, Bonsignore Bonsignori and Bernardo Michelozzi, described a slightly more modest site, confirming the spoliation observed by Cyriacus. In the 18th and 19th centuries, Richard Pococke (1704-1765 AD), Domenico Sestini (1750-1832 AD), William Leake (1777-1860 AD), and William Hamilton (1777-1859 AD) all wrote about the state of the temple, commented on the extraordinary size of the ruins, and described the subterranean vaults.

During the middle of the 19th century, the temple became the focus of individual studies that aimed at linking ruins and historical sources within a greater scholarly discourse. In 1836, Joachim Marquardt (1812-1882 AD) published a book on Cyzicus that compiled primary sources and early historical accounts of the temple in an attempt to reconstruct a plan. An 1864 archaeological guide to Galatia written by Georges Perrot (1832-1914 AD) featured the subterranean vaults of the temple and a partial map. In 1890, Theodore Reinach (1860-1928 AD) attempted to develop another plan of the building based on literary sources and the description of Georges Perrot. Bruno Keil (1859-1916 AD) followed in 1897, trying in a short article to reconcile the

130 The only copy of Cyriacus’s description of Cyzicus that includes images is the Codex Ashmolensis, which is discussed on the following page.

131 Bonsignori and Michelozzi 1497-1498 (See Schulz 1995).

132 Pococke 1745, Sestini 1779, Leake 1824, and Hamilton 1842.

133 Marquardt 1836. Marquardt is to my knowledge the first to attempt a reconstructed plan.

134 Perrot 1864.

135 Reinach 1890.
chronology of the temple with Aristides’s panegyric. This was succeeded by F.W. Hasluck’s (1878-1920 AD) 1910 book, *Cyzicus*, the first book-length study of the site with a comprehensive bibliography and proposed plan.

Bernard Ashmole shed new light on the temple with the 1956 publication of a new Cyriacus codex (*Codex Ashmolensis*) that apparently includes copies of the author’s travel sketches (I76-I80). In this article, Ashmole proposed a progressive series of reconstructed plans of the temple according to Cyriacus’s notes on the site. Around ten years later it was followed by a paper by Hans Peter Laubscher, who wrote about a now lost frieze panel allegedly found at the temple site. Although the panel itself was lost during WWII, Laubscher’s article made use of partial photos and a reconstructed sketch to propose a subject of Parthian battle (I69 and I70).

No more research on the temple was published until 1990, when Armin Schulz and Engelbert Winter produced another reconstructed plan, maintaining that the design was somewhat reserved and probably based on earlier Greek temples in Asia Minor. In 1995, Schulz examined Bonsignore Bonsignori’s (c. 1468-1530 AD) account of a visit
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136 Keil 1897.

137 Hasluck 1910. Marquardt 1836, Perrot 1864, Reinach 1890, Keil 1897 and Hasluck all offered a reconstructed plan and measurements. Most were hypothetical and based on some element of the archaeological evidence found at the site.

138 Ashmole 1956.

139 Ashmole’s reconstructions are very basic and offer a close following of Cyriacus’s description of the temple. Ashmole began with a single colonnade, making it peripteral, then filling in the front and rear columns, eventually settling on a octastyle temple with a quatrastyle in antis pronaos and opisthodomos.

140 Laubscher 1967.

141 Schulz and Winter 1990.
to the temple site, concluding that the accounts of Bonsignori and Cyriacus are so similar that they must be regarded as reliable.\textsuperscript{142}

The middle 1990s also saw the publication of Andrea Barattolo’s lengthy article that sought to consolidate all the available epigraphical and historical data on the temple.\textsuperscript{143} Barattolo contended that the temple was dedicated to both Zeus and Hadrian, based on evidence that games and festivals dedicated to each may have been celebrated at the temple. He also advanced a series of hypothetical reconstructions of the temple’s plan and a hypothetical three-story elevation (I52-I54 and I56). Around the same time, Mary Boatwright argued that the temple was likely dedicated to Hadrian and certainly fit within the mold of monumental buildings in Asia, as well as Hadrian’s other architectural benefactions throughout the Empire.\textsuperscript{144} Burrell supported Boatwright’s claim for the dedication to Hadrian alone, citing ancient sources to contradict Barattolo’s argument.\textsuperscript{145} Burrell also included the Cyzicene temple in her book on neokoroi, pointing out that many of Hadrian’s temples in Asia seem to have been enormous and visible from the sea.\textsuperscript{146} The most novel approach to the temple came from Janet DeLaine in 2002, who used ancient testimony to highlight the Hadrian Temple as a

\textsuperscript{142} Schulz 1995.

\textsuperscript{143} Barattolo’s 1995 article is exceptionally dense and attempts to establish a date of construction using epigraphical mentions of games, festivals, and honors. He also produced three reconstructed plans that consolidate the variations proposed by others.

\textsuperscript{144} Boatwright 1997, 119, 129-130. Boatwright observed that Hadrian was frequently assimilated with Zeus in the Greek world.

\textsuperscript{145} Burrell 2002. Burrell’s argument resembles her assertion that the Vetters Temple at Ephesus was also dedicated to Hadrian, not Zeus.

\textsuperscript{146} Burrell 2004. This is only one of Burrell’s many contributions to the study of the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus. The rest will be discussed throughout my dissertation.
manifestation of the Roman fascination with “exceptional construction.”¹⁴⁷ In 2007, Edmund Thomas offered the most recent hypothetical reconstruction of the temple, proposing that the temple had a prostyle plan (I55).¹⁴⁸

Archaeological research at the temple site has a much shorter history. First came Resit Ertüzün, a Turkish archaeologist who published a short pamphlet in 1953 about the ruins of ancient Cyzicus.¹⁴⁹ Erzurum Atatürk Üniversitesi (EAU) eventually took control of the site and has conducted excavations from 1990 to 1997 and from 2007 to the present. Excavation results have been summarized in the Kazı Sonuçları Toplantıları, the annual publication of the Turkish General Directorate, which contains brief yearly reports from all excavations in Turkey.¹⁵⁰ Over a combined two decades of work, EAU excavators have found many architectural fragments (I58-I63), lime kilns, and the remains of two friezes (I66 and I67). Unfortunately, because of illicit looting and rapid decay, the excavators have been forced to spend part of every season documenting evidence of illegal activities and clearing debris. Yet even the clearing of rubble has proven beneficial, as the most recent report published in Kazı Sonuçları...
Toplantıları announced that it is possible to ascertain a more accurate measurement of the temple’s stylobate.\(^{151}\)

In sum, the temple at Cyzicus has long been associated with Hadrian, but the exact nature of the relationship to temple function remains enigmatic. It has been the subject of much archaeological inquiry that has regularly produced new proposals for the plan. Despite these efforts, there is still no consensus on the layout of the temple. Finally, some sculpture has been unearthed that may be helpful in identifying a decorative and narrative scheme.

The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis

Outside the city walls, the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius (I85) was among the first structures investigated at Sardis. The temple and cult of Artemis predate the Roman Empire by several hundred years. Although no ancient testimony refers directly to the temple, Pausanias (T14), Strabo (64 BC-24 AD, T15), and Xenophon (431-355 BC, T16) mention the cult of Artemis at Sardis as an ancient and respected institution. Several antiquarians mentioned the temple between the early modern and modern periods, including the aforementioned Thomas Smith and Edmund Chishull (1671-1773 AD).\(^{152}\) In 1750, Robert Wood (1717-1771 AD) was the first to excavate, but his work was never published.\(^{153}\) Between 1750 and 1838, Charles de Peyssonel (1727-1790 AD), Richard Chandler (1738-1810 AD), Anton von Prokesch (1795-1876

\(^{151}\) Koçan and Meral 2011.

\(^{152}\) Smith 1678 and Chishull 1747.

\(^{153}\) Butler 1922, 5.
AD), and Leon de Laborde (1807-1869 AD) visited the site, producing sketches and site plans.\textsuperscript{154}

Semi-official excavations were conducted in 1882 and 1904, but nothing was released until Howard Butler’s book was published in 1922.\textsuperscript{155} This text covered Butler’s 1910-1914 efforts, during which he cleared the debris around the temple. In 1925, Butler produced a second monograph, focused on the Temple of Artemis, outlining the general history, use, and shifting dedication of the temple. Here Butler published inscriptions establishing that the building was in use during the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries AD. He also unearthed a colossal head (I89) of Faustina (100-141 AD), possibly represented as Artemis Cybele, that he took as evidence of a new dedication dated to the time of Faustina’s death in AD 141.\textsuperscript{156}

In 1961, Gottfried Gruben proposed that the temple was originally dedicated to Artemis, but also took on an imperial role during the Antonine era.\textsuperscript{157} After the discovery of several more colossal portrait heads (I90) in the early 1980s, George Hanfmann, William Mierse, and Clive Foss hypothesized that the Romans completed the Artemis temple as a neokorate temple around AD 140.\textsuperscript{158}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{154} Butler 1922, 5, de Peyssonel 1765, Chandler 1776, von Prokesch 1831, de Laborde 1838. These early studies of the Temple of Artemis resemble the early modern accounts written about the Temple of Hadrian.
\item \textsuperscript{155} George Dennis, the British Consul at Smyrna, led the 1882 excavations that discovered one of the colossal Antonine heads. In 1904, the Director of the Imperial Ottoman Museums commissioned Gustave Mendell to conduct preliminary excavations, which were eventually cancelled due to expense. Most of Butler’s 1922 book focuses on the Lydian and Hellenistic layers of the city.
\item \textsuperscript{156} Butler 1925, 143.
\item \textsuperscript{157} Gruben 1961a. Gruben’s conclusion was founded on Butler’s discovery of the colossal head of Faustina.
\item \textsuperscript{158} Hanfmann, Mierse, and Foss 1983. The temple was never completed during the Hellenistic age, even though it was in use. It may not even have been fully completed by the Romans, but the authors took the Roman statues as evidence of a possible rededication or co-dedication.
\end{itemize}
The AES excavations in the 1990s and 2000s looked at the technical evidence for the temple’s development. In the campaigns of 1996-1998, Fikret Yegül observed that many of its columns and capitals are mismatched, possibly due to ancient reconstructions.\footnote{Greenewalt and Rautman 2000.} He also excavated around the foundations, aiming to determine the precise columnar arrangement. During excavation of the pronaos, another colossal bearded portrait head (I91) was found, making a total of six portraits found at the temple. Yegül identified all the portraits as members of the Antonine family, supporting the imperial character of the temple first proposed by Butler. In 2002, the AES tried to establish the chronology of the inner east porch, concluding that the porch columns postdate the temple walls, based on pottery fill dating to the 3rd century AD.\footnote{Greenewalt 2003, 482.}

Burrell also believed the temple was repurposed for the Imperial Cult of Antoninus Pius and went on to claim that Artemis was housed in the western half of the cella, with Antoninus Pius and Faustina in the eastern portion.\footnote{Burrell 2004, 308.} Burrell considered this a sign that as temples of the Imperial Cult increased in number and popularity in Asia, it became necessary to use existing local temples rather than build new ones at great expense.

Nicholas Cahill released the 2010 AES campaign report in 2011, in which he emphasized that the irregularities of the temple were less a matter of preference than necessity. Because of the temple’s antiquity, Cahill suggested that some important parts of the complex, namely the altar and original cella, were immovable, forcing the
Romans to work around the permanent fixtures of the preceding cult. Lastly, Yegül has been working on an ambitious project focused on the Temple of Artemis since 1987, attempting to provide a complete record of the temple’s finished and unfinished remains, giving the same attention to decorative and structural elements alike.

In sum, the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius has the longest history of excavation among the spotlight temples. Most analysis has focused on its architectural features, particularly those that demonstrate the continual construction at the site. That construction history has also confirmed that the temple was at some point altered to accommodate a second cult dedication related to the Antonine family.

Problems of Approach and Method

Although only the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus and the Vetters Temple at Ephesus can boast ancient testimony, we can draw a few general conclusions from those accounts, or the lack thereof. First, neither Pausanias nor Aristides discussed the temples at Ephesus and Cyzicus in detail (T1-T4). Compared to other commentaries by these authors, such as Aristides’s thorough description of the Asklepieion at Pergamon and Pausanias’s report on the Athenian Olympieion, their accounts of the spotlight temples are cursory. While it is possible that neither author observed his subject in person, it is highly unlikely that Aristides would write a speech in praise of a temple he had never seen. On the other hand, perhaps the authors spent little time describing the visual and functional aspects of each temple because those features were all too
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162 Cahill 2011. This position suggests that some cult furniture and structures are so vital that they cannot be altered or moved, but must be worked around as a site expands and changes.

163 Greenewalt, Cahill, Stinson, and Yegül 2003, 47.
obvious. In turn, this could help explain the absence of any narration for the Red Hall, Wadi B temple, and the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius. There was no need to advertise or explain buildings already familiar to the population.

Summarized analysis of the buildings demonstrates that the temples have been studied according to specific trajectories. Almost all analysis of the Vetters Temple has focused on its identification based on historical sources. Similarly, most studies of the Red Hall use architectural features to support its role as a temple to Egyptian gods, but they lack corroborating ancient narratives. Some have studied the function of the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, but most of the modern literature has focused on the subterranean vaults and constructing an accurate plan. Finally, the two temples at Sardis have also received an exhaustive architectural dissection with the purpose of determining their designs.

Another common assumption in the modern literature is the claim that the temples are connected with the Roman Imperial Cult.\textsuperscript{164} Although it is not unusual for insufficiently attested buildings to be associated with that cult, it is unusual that imperial associations have been assumed by so many authors with relatively little attention paid to the reasons for and consequences of that cultic identity. Few modern scholars have considered how the temples’ size and association with the Imperial Cult affected their reception. Cultic function and material function can take different meanings. While the cult can function in a ritualistic manner, the way that the temples function as part of the topography and civic identity are different, and elevate them as prominent symbols and

\textsuperscript{164} Only the Red Hall at Pergamon has not been directly identified with the Imperial Cult, but the putative belief is that the Emperor Hadrian was directly involved in its construction, giving the temple a clear connection to the supreme earthly deity of the Empire.
carriers of civic and cultural meaning. Despite the propensity for grandiosity in Roman engineering, there are few Roman temples that can compare with the monumentality of the spotlight temples. There are several reasons for this situation. First, buildings are often designed to fit available space. If cost or existing structures limit land acquisition, then a building’s size is naturally restricted.\footnote{Augustus’s Temple of Mars Ultor (A1) is a perfect example of this; the rear end of the temple is oddly truncated due to the proximity of other structures directly behind the temple site.} Funding can also affect the size and quality of a structure. For example, a temple funded by a private individual at the apex of the Roman Empire is likely to be smaller than one publicly or imperially funded.\footnote{The complexity of this issue varies depending on the region and city. Plenty of private donors during the high empire had the financial capacity to fund the building of extraordinary structures. If, however, imperial funds were attainable, the motivations for private donorship can be reduced to two factors: a desire to do public good or a desire to elevate personal reputation. A further complication is that all public works projects required continued maintenance. Finally, excepting the emperor and his close associates, we have little evidence that private donors built enormous religious structures. In contrast, private donors almost always seem to have preferred funding entertainment and leisure complexes, like baths, theaters, and gymnasia.} Finally, since the engineering priorities of Empire and city are commonly guided by practical public need, temple funding may have suffered in favor of infrastructure, like aqueducts and baths. As a result, most temples took the form of smaller sanctuaries, no matter how prestigious their location or lavish their decoration.

The spotlight temples are then outliers in the field of sacred Roman architecture, as well as in the field of Roman engineering marvels. Rarity does not necessarily signify that they were exceptions to a rule. Instead, monumental temples may embody a different rule - one that is not yet fully recognized. Architectural history is often characterized by the study and analysis of material data, inspecting physical minutiae rather than considering the sum of a temple’s features. Usually this approach first focuses on small details and builds outward through comparative analysis. For example,
the Wadi B temple in Sardis has been examined just so, with the most comprehensive publication comparing a single corner of the foundation to twenty-three other buildings, religious and otherwise.\textsuperscript{167} Analysis and classification of sculptural style, material composition, and construction method can be useful for establishing architectural chronology and regional preferences. On the other hand, granting disproportionate attention to architectural minutiae can distract from a holistic understanding of a building. As Simon Price aptly noted, “There should be more to architectural history than the counting of columns and the measuring of stylobates.”\textsuperscript{168}

The examination and comparative analysis of minor architectural details parallels the process of construction - beginning with nothing and building outward. This contrasts with the design process, which begins with an idea of a building followed by the more restrictive physical creation. The former approach to architecture cannot fully illuminate the appeal of monumental temples and the incentive to build them, though it is a necessary first step towards such a goal. A focus on comprehensive architectural features highlights the temple as a whole, looking at broad characteristics of the structure and its context, such as design, dedication, size, and location. Typological and chronological approaches benefit architectural history by establishing dates, providing insight into construction methods, and revealing how building practices spread throughout the empire. Comprehensive studies necessarily rely on the results of detail-oriented surveys but also work toward broader understandings of architecture based on bold architectural features. Since there are so many evident similarities among the

\textsuperscript{167} Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986.

\textsuperscript{168} Price 1982, 197.
spotlight temples, their shared dominant features can be viewed as expressions of their functions.

Likewise, investigations of cult associations are limited in their potential to deepen our understanding of Roman temples. First, a cult-centered focus can lead to disengagement with the physical properties of a temple, and instead privileges historical and epigraphic evidence. An overemphasis on written testimony at the expense of physical data can easily lead to interpreting two sanctuaries sharing a single cult association in the same way, even though they may possess different physical attributes. This is a particular problem for buildings allegedly dedicated to the Imperial Cult. For example, the Temple of Domitian at Ephesus (A3), the Temple of Hadrian at Ephesus, and the Vetters Temple are all profoundly different in terms of size and topographical setting. Framed only by their common association with the Imperial Cult, however, they can easily be treated without consideration of their differentiating attributes. On a related note, scholars of the Imperial Cult often emphasize regional differences of ideology and administration without regarding how those variations are manifest in the architectural expression of the cult.

A second problem related to ancient sanctuaries is that the cult affiliation of temples is unknown or uncertain. For example, the identification of the Vetters Temple at Ephesus as the Olympieion can be traced to the first discovery of the building, but there is little direct evidence to support it. Despite impressive challenges to the title, the building has continued to assume the label of “Olympieion” in excavation reports and
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169 For an example of this, see Wild’s 1984 book on Roman-era sanctuaries of Isis and Sarapis. While the book is a useful lexicon of Isis-Sarapis sanctuaries, it makes no real attempt to explain the extreme diversity of architectural forms.

170 Vetters 1983.
most academic writing. The only alternative to this is to provide a generic name for a temple based on location or the name of the archaeologist who unearthed it. Although more accurate such labels would atomize the field rather than lead to greater understanding.

Finally, even when cult association is relatively certain, the significance of that fact can be debased by an incomplete knowledge of the cult. One spotlight temple, the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, has maintained a broadly consistent cult affiliation since antiquity. No one has yet disputed that the temple was somehow dedicated to or by the Emperor Hadrian, but unknown factors persist, especially whether Hadrian was the sole dedicatee, if the dedication was shared with Zeus, if Zeus and the emperor were assimilated, or whether Hadrian’s precise divine nature demanded a specialized system of religious ritual. Thus, even known dedications can support only a partial picture of the social and religious meaning of a sacred building, limiting how it can be understood as a cultural or civic symbol.

Despite an array of such uncertainties, it is likely that each temple is connected to the Imperial Cult by means of dedication, ritual function, or relationship with a particular emperor. Yet any attempt to identify a sure connection is a dangerous gambit because the cult itself and its related architecture are not securely defined. Most confounding of all, the ritual spaces and sanctuaries identified as serving the Imperial Cult exhibit a wide variety of forms and inconsistent influence across the provinces and at Rome. Concerning the spotlight temples, unless new data that can elaborate on the
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171 Jones 1993 and Englemann 1996.

172 As noted above, Burrell looked into this issue in her 2004 publication on neokoroi, but did not go beyond the scope of her project to examine the architecture of these temples in detail.
many variants of cult practice linked to the emperor and Empire becomes known, the term “Imperial Cult” remains too vague and inconclusive to contribute to a substantial explanation of these massive structures. Therefore, we should acknowledge the imperial nature of the spotlight temples, but not imprudently accept their role as belonging to and representative of the Imperial Cult. Instead the temples can first be viewed through the lens of their monumentality and then studied from a perspective of cultic affiliation, observing how monumentality could have served a religiously supported agenda in each case.

Theoretical Approaches to Monumental Architecture

Several theoretical approaches are relevant to this study, beginning with Richard Krautheimer’s notion of an “iconography of architecture.” Krautheimer outlined the concept of the “content” of symbolism for buildings, which he initially developed for medieval architecture, but later applied to late Roman structures.\(^ {173}\) According to Krautheimer, buildings could be symbolic forms based on prototypes that carried with them certain cultural significance.\(^ {174}\) Moreover, he espoused the notion that architecture could work on parallel fronts of communication at different levels of society, especially when building prototypes were broken down into recognizable elements.\(^ {175}\) One of Krautheimer’s more compelling examples is the 4\(^{th}\)-century Constantinian Basilica of

\(^{173}\) Krautheimer first published on this topic in a 1942 article that focused on Abbot Suger, the designer of the Saint Denis Monastery. Krautheimer also made use of this approach in books published in 1980 and 1983.

\(^{174}\) Krautheimer 1942, 9.

\(^{175}\) Krautheimer 1942, 14.
John Lateran, the first public Christian church in Rome. In terms of design, it repurposed the basilica type, traditionally a civic building for the practice of law, into a religious building supported by the emperor himself. This lent Christianity legitimacy, and ultimately affected the course of western Christian architecture. Because of an uneasy relationship between the newly legitimate Christians and the largely pagan ruling classes, Constantine cleverly built the huge basilica on private land in the suburbs of Rome, away from other cult centers. In part because the structure was massive, opulent, and built by the emperor, it managed to attract worshippers, while not overtly antagonizing the traditional cults of the city or infringing on their territory. Because several of the spotlight temples possess the same carefully considered topographical placement, imperial character, and monumental scale that Krautheimer highlighted in his study of late Roman and medieval architecture, his theoretical approach can inform an analysis of the spotlight temples.

Recent publications reveal Krautheimer’s lasting influence on the interpretation of a range of buildings and periods. In a response to Krautheimer’s theory of building imitation, Mario Carpo suggested that the communication of structural models in the medieval period was primarily non-visual, causing vague architectural imitations. In essence, the significance of a prototype came not from its precise design details, but from the general visual impression that it offered. Therefore, although the designs of the spotlight temples may be diverse, they all follow a common prototype with the result of giving a shared impression.
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177 Carpo 2001, 36-41.
178 This is addressed in Chapter 2, 116-119.
of interpretation, Catherine McCurrach observed that while we cannot know if viewers and architects shared an understanding of design significance, it is certain that religious structures had the capacity to perform many functions in an urban environment, from the devotional to the secular.\textsuperscript{179} This is certainly true of the spotlight temples and the way they connected secular and devotional service.\textsuperscript{180} Brought to bear on the spotlight temples, these commentaries support the notion that in terms of emulation, function, and visibility, monumental temples had the potential to reach different audiences through a single form.

Most relevant to this thesis is the recent work of architectural historian Edmund Thomas, who focuses on monumentality in the imperial Roman period.\textsuperscript{181} First, in his book \textit{Monumentality and the Roman Empire: Architecture in the Antonine Age}, Thomas described how buildings expressed a relationship between the citizenry and the emperor and Empire. Unlike Krautheimer, Thomas saw architectural symbolism as a necessity, not just a design choice. Because most of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire were likely illiterate, ideology was frequently communicated visually.\textsuperscript{182} Therefore, this theoretical model emphasizes the significance of size, design, and material as a means to construct and fortify identity. By building on a monumental scale, the Empire could highlight the power of the patron city and simultaneously challenge a rival. This is especially important for Asia, where honorific titles like the neokoria, are often thought to be signs of inter-urban competition. On the other hand, Thomas

\textsuperscript{179} McCurrach 2011, 43.

\textsuperscript{180} This is addressed in Chapter 3, 166-173.

\textsuperscript{181} See Thomas 2007 and 2010.

\textsuperscript{182} Thomas 2007, 53.
proposes that perhaps the monumental architecture of the provinces was the direct
result of the emperor attempting to promote unity through architectural style.¹⁸³

Thomas also advocated an updating of architectural history, stressing the social
meanings of buildings and how those meanings can be examined through new
polarities of study, such as architecture versus construction process, the relationship
between designer and patron, original audiences, and the effects of ephemeral features
on permanent buildings.¹⁸⁴ Notions like these are important for establishing the
complexity of intent and historical context, and must be considered as elements of
monumentality.

Considerations raised by Krautheimer and Thomas will ultimately serve to
support further inquiry into the initial proposals made by Janet DeLaine in her article on
exceptional Roman building.¹⁸⁵ As noted above, DeLaine recently assessed the Temple
of Hadrian at Cyzicus from a perspective of reception. DeLaine contended that temples
like Hadrian’s at Cyzicus were too large and powerful to be neutral players in the urban
environment, arguing instead that Roman construction strove for exceptional size and
adornment to communicate the civilizing force of an empire that commanded resources
and changed natural topography in a seemingly unbelievable way.¹⁸⁶ DeLaine is among
the first scholars to have interpreted monumental temples as outstanding achievements.
By first accepting the spotlight temples as exceptional constructions, this study seeks to
identify and examine the essential qualities that contribute to their monumentality:

¹⁸³ Thomas 2007, 127.
emulation, construction techniques, decoration, dedications, size, and topographical prominence.

**Untangling Monumentality**

It is daunting to search for patterns in ancient material in the hopes of discovering meaning. Available data is often too fragmentary and ambiguous to allow one to develop conclusions with any degree of certainty. Moreover, what we now perceive as deliberate organization may have never occurred to those who formed the evidence. That said, some approaches provide the opportunity for fruitful exercises that make use of broad data groupings. Because of these challenges, I adopt an approach to the spotlight temples built on their shared architectural attributes and presumed cult affiliations. By minding these broad features while reviewing and synthesizing the architectural and cultic details, I will develop a list of incentives that may have inspired the construction of these buildings in the hopes of identifying their overall social function beyond any definitive cult alliance or single civic purpose. Ultimately, the spotlight temples are considered in their own terms as examples of architectural iconography. An investigation of how the temples came into being and how they continued to serve a role, as well as what motives and incentives contributed to their creation and eventual deterioration, reveals their social meaning.
2. Emulation and Innovation

One key to Romanization was the Empire’s ability to integrate local heritage and traditions with Roman identity, making the new political and cultural environment seem natural, rather than imposed.\textsuperscript{187} Prior to Roman dominance, Asia possessed an unmistakable architectural heritage of monumental religious sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{188} When viewed alongside these predecessors, the spotlight temples appear to be attempts at harnessing a distinctive local architectural tradition. In this chapter, I examine the archaeological record to determine the degree to which the spotlight temples were allusions to the Asian tradition of monumental temple building, and in what ways they deviated from precedent.\textsuperscript{189} Through a unified examination of the archaeological data, I intend to demonstrate that the spotlight temples were general emulations of earlier

\textsuperscript{187} Yegül 2000, 138.

\textsuperscript{188} Several famous sanctuaries existed in Hellenistic Asia, including the Temple of Apollo at Didyma (A4), the Temple of Artemis at Sardis, and the legendary Temple of Artemis in Ephesus (A5). These three carry special significance because they were enormous in size and reputation, making them popular regional destinations. Although they were located outside city boundaries, each was intimately related to its nearby host city and acted as a source of and symbol for civic identity. By the Roman Imperial period, the traditional Asian sanctuaries were internationally known as the chief examples of monumental Hellenistic sacred architecture in Asia. Perhaps not coincidentally, these three also share sites with the spotlight temples. Based on their fame and proximity, the case for their influence on the spotlight temples is strong. Greek and Roman authors from the Hellenistic through the Roman periods mentioned the temples, usually focusing on the antiquity or widespread fame of the temples. Strabo (14.1.5), Pausanias (7.5.4), and Pliny (\textit{Natural History} 6.18) discussed the Didymaion, Pausanias (T14), Strabo (T15), and Xenophon (T16) mentioned the Temple of Artemis at Sardis, and Pausanias (7.2.6) and Antipater (\textit{Greek Anthology} 9.58) commented on the Ephesian Artemision.

\textsuperscript{189} The archaeological record in this case is found in excavation reports, field surveys, and museum collections, as well as my own site visits.
Asian temples, but that they were altered to highlight Roman contributions to the regional tradition.\(^{190}\)

Jonathan Ward-Perkins asserted that the imperial architecture of Asia Minor was significant for two reasons: First, it took the techniques and interests of Western architecture and adapted them to the different conditions of the Eastern Mediterranean, and second, it kept an Asiatic tradition by respecting classical elements of design but also altered the ways in which those elements were used.\(^{191}\) If we accept his assessment, then the spotlight temples can be viewed as emulations, appropriations, or innovations of the monumental temple tradition of the region, as well as instruments of Romanization. By incorporating some of the visual and functional characteristics of earlier monumental temples, the builders of the spotlight temples effectively harnessed and redirected the local building tradition toward a different end.

**Plan and Appearance**

Models of classical architectural design were fairly rigid and often signaled the function of a building to the public, whether secular or sacred. For example, a temple looks like a temple, a gymnasium\(^ {192}\) like a gymnasium, and a *bouleuterion*\(^ {193}\) like a

\(^{190}\) As I use it in this thesis, the term “emulation” implies neither overt imitation nor appropriation, but rather an effort to recreate the aesthetic elements of a work of art or architecture to promote a different purpose or social function. Emulation is a major topic in Roman studies, but aside from Krautheimer’s work on the iconography of architecture (see Chapter 1, 52-54), most studies have focused on sculpture. Major works on the topic of ancient emulation include Bartmann 1992, Gazda 2002, Koorbojian 2002, Hölscher 2004, Perry 2002 and 2005, Strocka 2005, Marvin 2008, and Anguissola 2011.


\(^{192}\) A gymnasium was a public building that served as a venue for athletic training and education.

\(^{193}\) A bouleuterion was a public council chamber.
Local traditions and precedents could affect form but usually inspired only minor deviation from standard types. To the modern eye, some design variants seem connected to cultural stylistic preferences, broadly linking them to either the Greeks or the Romans. Given the typical Greek and Roman conventions for temple plan (I2-I5) outlined in the first chapter, it seems reasonable to conclude that the architects of the Roman period were aware of the culturally associated architectural differences. In addition, the differences between Greek and Roman architecture are consistently mentioned in the writing by the Roman architect Vitruvius.\(^{195}\)

Regionally based plan divergence is especially important for an examination of the spotlight temples, which were built in a Greek cultural sphere, but housed within the Roman political world. In terms of size, the spotlight temples were massive (I8 and I9) and seem to fit more within the Greek architectural tradition than the Roman. They were huge complexes, built on a scale that, at that time, was known only in the city of Rome, Asia Minor, and parts of the eastern Empire.\(^{196}\) As noted above, appearance often broadcasts intended use, and the ambitions of the builders also could have been expressed through the inclusion of exceptional features and architectural references in the design. Comparing the architecture of the spotlight temples and juxtaposing them with other Greek and Roman monumental temples allows modern viewers to pinpoint

\(^{194}\) In the ancient Greek and Roman world, a gymnasium was a public complex where citizens could engage in athletic, social, and scholarly pursuits.

\(^{195}\) Books 3, 4, and 5 of *De Architectura* are especially relevant in this regard. Books 3 and 4 describe the architectural orders and temples, and Book 5 covers civic buildings. In this books Vitruvius often points to Greek and Roman preferences as a means to describe the possibilities for how buildings can be designed.

\(^{196}\) The construction, by Romans, of monumental religious complexes in Rome and elsewhere was primarily a recent development of the Imperial period. In contrast, monumental sanctuaries, like the Heraion of Samos, were being built in the Greek-speaking world in the 6th century BC.
the elements of monumentality they share with each other and those that they borrow from other temples outside the group. Using this approach it is possible to discern how the spotlight temples were architecturally coded to signal cultural and religious relationships and deliberately evoke responses from viewers.

Decoration, like plan, also affirms the character of a structure, as well as its cultural and religious character. Ulrike Egelhaaf-Gaiser has written that ornament can represent the link between a space and history, and that decoration affirms and reminds viewers about a community’s traditions, ultimately establishing a history and communicating power that is repeated through rituals.\textsuperscript{197} Even when the plan and material of a temple were adjusted, a familiar decorative scheme could serve to promote a sense of environmental consistency. The ornamentation of the spotlight temples demonstrates a decorative program consistent with that found on most Greek and Roman temples, establishing the continuity described by Egelhaaf-Gaiser. In addition, the ornament of the spotlight temples displays a high level of finish and quality that came only at great expense. Finally, this high quality demonstrates a willingness to match, or at least maintain the level of excellence found at the famous Hellenistic sanctuaries of the region.

Jaś Elsner has observed that Roman art evokes the grandeur of the past and advertises the glory of the present, while at the same time supporting the continuing status of institutions.\textsuperscript{198} The same thought could be applied to Roman imperial architecture, especially if we consider aesthetic and functional emulation as means of


\textsuperscript{198} Elsner 1998, 28.
expressing cultural reference. In Asia, the local monumental temples served as models, and architects of the Roman Imperial period were thus able to use a Hellenistic architectural language as dressing for the spotlight temples. Yet the spotlight temples also contributed some new architectural vocabulary that reshaped the appearances and construction methods of monumental temples. In a sense, the spotlight temples emphasized a shared heritage of temple construction, but cleverly altered it to further an imperial agenda.

Architecturally speaking, the spotlight temples can be securely known according to three major categories: plan, ornament, and building material. Together, these categories compose the overall physical character of a building. In the following pages, the physical characteristics of the spotlight temples are isolated and examined to establish the ways in which the spotlight temples imitated and deviated from preceding Asian and contemporary Roman monumental temples. I discuss the temples chronologically, based on their use in the Roman period, beginning with the Wadi B Temple, and ending with the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius. This ordering is

199 In a recent essay, Emanuel Mayer observed (2010, 114-116) that portraits of Roman emperors in the Greek east often relied on Hellenic modes of depiction, even though the portraits were often commissioned by benefactors with imperial ties who were presumably aware of the Roman Imperial portraiture fashions (or guidelines). This idea of flexibility in imperial representation can, I think, be carried over into architectural patronage, where the imperial office sought to advance its agenda and reputation within the visual language of the region.

200 Varied states of preservation and excavation progress have made the available data for the spotlight temples inconsistent. In this chapter, the degree of attention given to features of the temples changes according to the breadth of available data and scholarship. Consequently, aspects some of the spotlight temples will be discussed at greater length than others.

201 Although chronologically first, the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius was the last to accommodate a cult motivated by Roman interests. The precise chronological ordering of the Vetters Temple, the Red Hall, and the Temple of Hadrian, has not been determined, but all are usually identified as Hadrianic, falling within a few decades of one another.
used with the aim of highlighting some developments of style and material that may help point to some interests and initiatives of the builders.

*The Wadi B Temple*

Very little of the Wadi B Temple at Sardis is visible above grade (I10) and the results of excavations are insufficient for a complete reconstruction of the temple plan and its setting. The earliest work at the site exposed one corner of the building preserved to the stylobate level (I14), including two Ionic marble column bases on a plinth, the base and lower shaft of a column, fragments of five other columns, and a block of marble thought to be part of the pediment (I15). Later excavations west of the temple uncovered a dump of several architectural and sculptural fragments, including parts of an architrave, soffit panels, column drums, and one capital decorated with four male torsos emerging out of acanthus foliage (I16 and I17). Although it is unclear whether the building was Ionic, Corinthian, or a combination, the acanthus foliage of the torso capital increases the likelihood that the temple was Corinthian or a closely related variant. The capitals could also represent an Ionic derivation called Aeolic (or Pergamene) capitals, which feature palmettes springing vertically out of a lower register of acanthus leaves. Although the male torsos are reminiscent of the

202 Greenewalt, Sullivan, Ratté, and Howe 1985, 60.

203 Greenewalt 2006, 743-744.


205 I am grateful to Prof. Paul Scotton for mentioning this possibility after reading an early draft of this chapter.
palmette shoots of the Aeolic capitals, they appear to represent a more refined sculptural scheme.

Based on an analysis of ornamental style, Wadi B has been dated to the 1st century AD. The column shafts and ornament were finished and a marble pediment block had apparently been installed, indicating that the structure was nearly complete. A layer of ash found immediately above the remains of the temple has been interpreted as the secondary level of destruction. Six coins of the mid-2nd century, the latest depicting Faustina the Elder (Empress 138-140 AD), were also found during the initial excavation of the temple. If the coins were related to the ash layer, as the excavators believed, then the building may have been in use only for about one century.

206 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 57-58. They observed that the style of Wadi B ornament predates the “marble style,” which had become the most popular fashion by the 2nd century AD and featured deeply carved ornament with bold contrasts of light and dark. The marble style was also characterized by an increase in marble diversity (Dodge 1990, 109). In contrast, the sculpture of the Wadi B Temple was carved in lower relief and resembled earlier Hellenistic styles which are flatter in appearance.

207 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 55. The contention that the building was near completion was supported by the additional sculptural discoveries from the 2005 and 2006 seasons, which featured finished architectural sculpture. Burrell (2004, 101) has observed that some of the decorative features were roughly finished. This could indicate that the final touches were in process when the temple was destroyed. I believe that the temple was practically finished and that some of the rough features may have been the result of later adjustments to the building based on cult affiliation (see Chapter 3, 145-148).

208 Ratté, Howe, and Foss (1986, 48) believed that the initial destruction of the temple was the result of a collapse and that the ash layer represents intentional dismantling.

209 Greenewalt, Sullivan, Ratté, and Howe 1985, 64. Ratté, Howe, and Foss (1986, 48) implied that these coins were related to the ash layer above the remains of the temple. One of the coins is associated with Hadrian, four with Marcus Aurelius, and one with Faustina the Elder. Although the initial reports claimed the latter coin depicted Faustina the Younger (Empress 161-175), Burrell (2004, 102) concluded that the coin portrayed the Elder thea (goddess). Because Faustina the Elder was called Sebaste (Empress) prior to her death, Burrell concluded that the title thea indicated that the coin was a posthumous release and therefore dated the destruction of the temple to 140-150 AD. The coins depicting Marcus Aurelius (r. 161-180 AD) were apparently ignored due to the assumption that the installation of the Antonine cult in the nearby Temple of Artemis was motivated by the destruction of the Wadi B Temple.
In a recent lecture to the American Philological Association, Jane Evans pointed out that three of the coins were apparently found in a stack against the stylobate. She observed that this possibly deliberate and undisturbed arrangement of the coins could represent a votive offering, indicating that they are not useful for establishing the date of the ash layer. On the other hand, the apparently stacked coins could have been what remained after a lost change purse disintegrated. More importantly, Evans also remarked that the mid-2nd century destruction proposed by Ratté, Howe, and Foss falls precisely during the time of Sardis’s greatest affluence. She therefore found it curious that the temple would remain in ruins for the remainder of the life of the city, and suggested that the temple may have continued to function until the Late Roman period. I would also add that leaving an important temple to ruin is incongruous with the meaning of the neokoros title. Evans’s hypothesis is supported by the 2005 discovery of at least one inscription naming Sardis “twice neokoros”. The inscription is on a statue pedestal found among architectural and sculptural fragments on the west side of the

---

210 According to Jane Evans (See http://apaclassics.org/index.php/annual_meeting/144th_annual_meeting_abstracts/67.3.evans/), there is some discontinuity between the article by Ratté et al, and the field notes regarding the relationship between the coins and the supposed destruction layer. In the article, it is said that the coins were related to the ash layer, but nothing is said of their arrangement. In her abstract, Evans noted that three or four of the coins were found “stacked beside the stylobate.” Yet in her paper, she quotes the field notes, which are unavailable to me, as saying that the coins were “all found together…right up against the west side of the plinth.” Evans argued that the coins may have been votive offerings separate from the ash “destruction” layer. All the coins are large bronzes, one of which has a 34mm diameter and weighs about 23 grams. This would suggest that they were too large, as Evans said, “to slip out of pocket.” One of them, a Hadrianic coin from Bithynia, had its obverse side carefully rubbed off, so that only the reverse image of an octastyle temple remained. To support this hypothesis, Evans noted a few other sites where coins were left as votive offerings for the gods, such as Bath (Walker and Sellwood 1988), the River Liri (Frier and Parker 1970), the Sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone at Cyrene (White 1984), and the Grove of the Feroniae (Livy 26.11). Furthermore, she noted that no ash layer was found at the other corner of the temple excavated in 2004. Finally, Evans underscored that even if the temple had been destroyed in the 2nd century AD, its location was too prominent for the Sardians to have let it sit in a destroyed state during the apex of the city’s economic might.

211 Greenewalt 2006, 745. Twelve inscriptions were found in total, mostly on statue pedestals. The report is vague, but clearly states that the title "twice neokoros" was found on at least one statue base.
terrace, and believed to have been part of the Wadi B Temple (I16 and I17). If the statue base was originally set up at the Wadi B site, it would indicate that the temple site was active after the dedication of the second neokorate, which occurred during the reign of Antoninus Pius and is thought to be associated with the Temple of Artemis. This discovery therefore adds weight to Evans’s hypothesis that the Wadi B temple remained active throughout the Roman Imperial era.

Regardless of when the temple was destroyed, it is likely to have been demolished after a natural collapse. Since a dry riverbed runs through the terrace, it is possible that a mudslide or avalanche destroyed the structure, but an earthquake could have also been the cause. If a natural disaster indeed struck, the site might have been abandoned due to the natural drainage path running through the terrace. No certain evidence exists attesting the reuse of the building, making a natural destruction the most likely scenario.

---

212 Burrell (2004 102-103) suggested that the temple may have been built for Antoninus's cult, but destroyed by an earthquake. She speculated that, rather than rebuilding the temple, the Sardians moved the cult from the Wadi B temple to the Temple of Artemis. Yet the ornamental style of the Wadi B Temple dates to a century before the reign of Antoninus Pius. In Chapter 3 (162-164), I discuss cult affiliation at greater length and propose that the Cult of Antoninus Pius was meant to be installed in the Temple of Artemis, not moved there due to dramatic circumstances.

213 The excavators’ date for the Wadi B Temple’s destruction makes a religiously or politically motivated destruction unlikely. Burrell (2004, 102) concluded that the site was intentionally dismantled after a naturally caused collapse. Therefore, the ash layer may be best explained as having been produced by lime kilns that post-date the destruction.

214 Greenewalt, Sullivan, Ratté, and Howe 1985, 64. If some natural feature of the site, like a wadi, meant that continued use would be a problem, the terrace may have simply been abandoned.
The scale and arrangement of the six known columns could only conform to a temple with a prostyle porch and a pseudodipteral colonnade. In their reconstructed plan (I13), Ratté, Howe, and Foss drew the temple with a distyle in antis opisthodomos, although there is no archaeological data from the site to support the decision. The authors believed the columnar arrangement to have been 8 x 13 columns with peristyle dimensions of at least 20 x 32 or 20 x 38 meters. The temple was oriented on a north-south axis and originally built on a five-acre artificial terrace immediately under the slopes of the acropolis (I12). Excavations have confirmed that the terrace was likely built for the temple, which was reached via a 15-meter-wide staircase.

Ratté, Howe and Foss established their reconstructed plan based on comparison with other Roman temples in the area. Prostyle porches and porches several column bays deep usually existed only in very large temples, like the Temple of Domitian at

215 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 54, 59-62. The diameter of the most complete column is 0.886 m, which makes it an unusually close match for Vitruvian standards for a systyle arrangement of columns. The systyle arrangement is achieved with two column thicknesses for each intercolumnation in a facade. The proposal of a pseudodipteral plan was based on the scale of the order and several comparisons. It could be only three-quarters peripteral or a fully peripteral podium temple with stairs only at the front, but the authors think that details place the temple in the tradition of the pseudodipteral temples of later Hellenistic and early Roman Asia, where the colonnade usually sat on a high stepped platform.

216 Distyle in antis refers to two columns between the antae or piers extending out from the cella of a temple.

217 Ratté, Howe, and Foss (1986, 59-62) made the choice of distyle in antis based on comparative Hellenistic and Roman plans, especially the Temple of Apollo Smintheus at Chryse, the Temple of Aphroditte at Messa, the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi (A9), and the Temple of Augustus and Roma at Ancyra (A7).

218 Greenewalt, Sullivan, Ratté, and Howe 1985, 62-63. The columnar arrangement could provide for the temple to be oriented in either of two directions. Early on, excavators believed that the temple was set on axis with the nearby theatre. More recent excavations (Greenewalt 2005, 176 and Greenewalt 2006, 744) unearthed a second corner of the building, which established that the Wadi B temple was actually set at a north-south orientation, perpendicular to the theatre facade. Nevertheless, the dimensions originally proposed remain valid.

Ephesus (A3), the Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias (A8), the Temple of Mars Ulter (A1) and the Temple of Augustus and Rome at Ancyra (A7). Assuming that the Wadi B Temple was as large as it appears to have been and fully peripteral, they concluded that it too must have had a prostyle porch.

Ratté, Howe, and Foss’s work was anticipated by Ward-Perkins’s analysis of the Temple of Augustus and Roma at Ancyra (A7), in which he observed that it shared what he called a “conservative” Greek design with the Temple of Domitian at Ephesus (A3), the Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias (A8), and the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi (A9). Ratté et al also believed that in use of material and manipulation of space the Wadi B temple represents the persistence of the conservative tradition of architectural design in Asia Minor at a time of architectural innovations. The conservatism noted by Ward-Perkins and Ratté et al conforms to the fashions of pre-Hadrianic architecture. Hadrian’s reign saw a rise in the prevalence of a new style of experimental architecture and dynamic decoration, sometimes called the “Baroque Style.” This style manifested itself in the inventive shapes of buildings coupled with a loose adherence to earlier standards of appearance. The Pantheon (A10) and the Temple of Venus and Roma (A11), both at Rome, are examples of how temple architecture of the Hadrianic era stretched the limits of temple standardization. In the Pantheon, the typical Roman cella

220 The term “prostyle porch” describes a row of columns in front of the cella, but behind and parallel to the facade.

221 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 59.

222 Ward-Perkins 1981, 281. Ward-Perkins used the term “conservative” to describe the Ancyra temple, by which I believe he meant more traditionally Greek than Roman and definitely pre-Hadrianic.

223 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 46, 58, and 62.

224 For a full explanation of the Baroque Style in Classical antiquity, see Lyttelton 1974.
was reshaped into a circle covered with a rotunda, but the temple retained the Roman features of a deep porch and frontal orientation. The Temple of Venus and Roma expanded on the Greek peripteral temple type, only barely fit within its urban temenos, and had two back-to-back cellae to accommodate two cults. Yet each of these examples postdates the Wadi B Temple by several decades. The suggestion that the Wadi B Temple was conservative may mean either that it was representative of its time or a deliberate call-back to earlier architectural modes.

Since it and the comparanda cited by Ratté, Howe, and Foss and Ward-Perkins can mostly be dated to the 1st century AD, I believe it is accurate to say that the Wadi B Temple was built according to the style of the time. In this early period of monumental Roman construction in Asia, the emphasis seems to have focused on attaining the scale of Hellenistic monumental temples, with only minor changes to decoration and efficient alterations of construction method and material. If Ratté, Howe and Foss are correct in their conclusion that the Wadi B temple had a prostyle plan with a distyle in antis opisthodomos, that would give it the most traditionally Greek layout of the spotlight temples. Without a more complete excavation, however, it is impossible to establish the full plan of the Wadi B Temple.

---

225 Although there was a tradition of the round cella in both Greek and Roman architecture, before the Pantheon it had been used only in much smaller structures.

226 The temples at Aizanoi (A9) and Ancyra (A7) are both peripteral with distyle in antis opisthodomoi and prostyle front porches. Yet the Aizanoi temple was built on a high podium with a single set of stairs on its eastern end. The Temple of Domitian (A3) and the Temple of Aphrodite (A8) are prostyle temples lacking rear porches, which emphasized their frontal orientation. Because of its terrace and setting, the Temple of Domitian is visible only from the east. Stylobate dimensions make the Temples of Zeus at Aizanoi, Domitian at Ephesus, and Aphrodite at Aphrodisias the closest approximations for the space occupied by the Wadi B temple. Depending on the type of porch plan it possessed, and if we consider height and frontal orientation to be inherently Roman design preferences, the Wadi B Temple could have demonstrably favored a Greek or Roman plan.
The Vetters Temple

Today, the 2nd-century AD Vetters Temple at Ephesus is poorly preserved and covered in dense underbrush (I21). Only the western one-third of the temple foundation has been unearthed. In the excavated portion, three distinct segments of the foundation are visible: a central concrete and rubble mass under the original location of the cella, and two concentric squares composed of larger stones and concrete (I27 and I28). Remnants of foundation still exist between these squares, but the material must have been insubstantial, because the elements have washed away in the areas between the rings and the cella foundation. Finally, there are a few slabs of the original marble paving (I29). Very little of the ornament from the Vetters Temple at Ephesus has been unearthed. A large Corinthian capital (I30a) was found in early excavations and one fragment of a fluted column drum (I30b) can also now be seen on the temple foundations.227 A fragment of molding was also found that features bead and reel, egg and dart, and palmette designs (I31). These match the pattern and size of those on a doorway in the nearby 5th-century Church of Mary, evidence that parts of the Vetters Temple were reused in the nearby church.228 As with the Wadi B Temple, ornamental finish and column fluting at the Vetters Temple suggest that it was completed. Unlike the ornament of the Wadi B Temple, the moldings at the Vetters Temple are deeply carved examples of the 2nd century AD “marble style” ornament. The 2nd-century date is confirmed by pottery found in the temenos area and the belief that the land was only

227 Vetters and Karwiese 1987, 84. The capital found at the site has a diameter of 1.5 meters and an original height of 1.7 meters.

228 The Church of Mary is generally believed to have been built into the southern stoa of the Vetters Temple temenos. Consequently, some of the material used likely came from the temple complex.
beginning to be prepared for habitation and construction in the 1st century AD. Later geological drilling proved that the land itself was uninhabited swamp up until about 100 AD, suggesting that fill had been brought in specifically to make space for the construction of this temple.

A vast man-made precinct measuring approximately 225 x 350 meters would have surrounded the Vetters Temple (I22 and I23). The dimensions of the entire stereobate are 57 x 85 meters, with a stylobate and peristasis of 33 x 60 meters, and a column height between 20 and 22 meters. Unfortunately, it has never been determined whether the temple was dipteros or pseudodipteros, or if it had a prostyle plan, columns in antis, front and rear antae or a deep porch. Because the two foundation squares appear to have been constructed to support the weight of columns, they therefore most likely supported a dipteral plan, with an external column scheme of 12 x 21 or 10 x 21. To date, there is no agreement on the number of columns across

229 Langmann 1992, 8-9
231 Scherrer 1999, 137 and Scherrer 2008, 54. Measurements for the temenos are speculative and partly based on the distance between the Vetters Temple and the Church of Mary, which once served as the southern section of the bordering stoa. Overlaying the reconstructed boundaries over the site, the Church of Mary extends a bit further to the west than the temenos would have extended if the temple was centrally placed in the precinct. Therefore, it appears that the temenos boundaries may have been a bit larger than the estimated 225 x 350 meters or that the Church of Mary extended slightly further west than the temenos. For the man-made qualities of the temenos area, see Langmann 1992, 8-9, Karwiese 1995, 312, Scherrer 1999, 137, and Kraft, et al 2000, 176.
232 Vetters and Karwiese 1987, 84, Scherrer 1995, Scherrer 1999, 137 and 184 and Scherrer 2008, 54. It is unclear whether the “floorplan” mentioned by Scherrer (2008) refers to the stylobate or the stereobate. Because the most commonly cited dimensions are for a peristasis of 33 x 60 meters, I believe that this refers to the stylobate dimensions if the temple was dipteral. Karwiese proposed an earlier set of dimensions in 1982, but those were found to be erroneous in subsequent excavations. The Corinthian capital provided the basis for the proposed height.
233 Wiplinger and Wlach 1996, 114. Also included in this publication is a state plan that includes odd notations that could be interpreted to mean that the temple had nine columns in its facade.
the facade, but the general consensus is that the temple must have been massive, either deca or dodeca.²³⁴ Susanne Schorndorfer published a hypothetical plan for the deca dipteral arrangement (I24) and Karwiese’s hypothetical elevation depicts a deca dipteral temple (I26), while Burrell proposed a deca pseudodipteral plan (I25).²³⁵ Any of these plans is possible depending on the spacing of the columns and whether the peristyle was pushed to the edge of the stylobate.

Due to uncertainty about the plan, it is difficult to identify helpful architectural parallels for the Vetters Temple. Although almost certainly peripteral, it could have been built according to a number of different plans. The number of columns on the facade, either ten or twelve, places the Vetters Temple in the rarest class of temples. Moreover, its size would have made the Wadi B temple and its comparanda seem modest. This disparity in size can be most easily observed by comparing the Vetters Temple to the Temple of Domitian (A3), only one kilometer away. Given its exclusive features, the most obvious comparandum for the Vetters Temple is the nearby Artemision, or Temple of Artemis, at Ephesus (A5). Listed among the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, the Artemision was a legendary building long before the Romans assumed control of Asia. Reconstructions of the Artemision vary, but most depict it with a four bay-deep distyle in antis pronaos, a closed room behind the cella, and no opisthodomos. Although its precise dimensions and plan are unknown during the Roman period, the temple had a large temenos, was octastyle, measured about 60 meters wide, and had columns

²³⁴ Karwiese 1989, Scherrer 1999, 137 and Burrell 2004, 307. Scherrer has proposed an arrangement of 12 x 21 columns, while Burrell stated that the temple could not have exceeded 10 columns in width.

²³⁵ Schorndorfer’s 1997 dipteral plan places the peristasis at the edge of the stylobate. Burrell’s 2004 plan provides an unspecified space between the edge of the peristasis and the edge of the stylobate, which appears to be several meters.
between 20 and 22 meters in height. These features and measurements are remarkably close to those of the Vetters Temple, making it possible that the Roman structure was modeled after the nearby Artemision. The Temple of Apollo at Didyma is also a good parallel in terms of size (A4). It is decastyle and dipteral, with a stylobate measurement of 118.34 x 60.13 meters, making it slightly longer than the Vetters Temple but close to it in width. Inside, the Didymaion was hypaethral, but that would not have been visible from the exterior. Whatever the particulars of the Vetters Temple’s plan, it would seem that its designers dreamed big, aspiring to match the size of two famous Hellenistic temples and outshine its nearby Roman forbear, the Temple of Domitian.

The Red Hall

The 2nd-century AD Red Hall is remarkably well preserved, providing a more complete architectural picture than the other spotlight temples (I35). Unusual for temples in Greek lands, the Red Hall was set facing west at the far eastern edge of its temenos, instead of at the center. The temenos (I37) measured 100 x 270 meters and

---

236 Vitruvius (3.2.7) suggested that the Artemision was an octastyle dipteros and built with diastyle intercolumnations (equal to 3 column diameters). According to Scherrer (1995, 51-52), the columns were 18.4 meter high. Capitals and bases would increase the total height by approximately 1.5 to 3.5 meters.

237 The number of facade columns is obviously quite different, but that is a result of column size and intercolumnation. In his description of the Artemision, Vitruvius noted that the diastyle arrangement of columns could lead to falling architraves. By the Roman imperial period, few, if any temples were built with diastyle intercolumnations.

238 Hypaethral is a term used to designate buildings without closed roofs.

239 The Red Hall’s date has been established by sculptural analysis. Heilmeyer (1970, 92), Koenigs and Radt (1979, 342), Rohmann (1998, 100-102), and Mania (2011b, 350-353 and 356) all dated the architectural adornment to the era spanning the Trajanic-Antonine periods (98- 192 AD).
was bordered by a stone wall at least 13 meters high. Instead of adhering to a typical Roman or Greek temple plan, the building was a vast hall, with no interior supporting columns or peristasis. This central hall is flanked by two rotundas and a portico that extended across the front of all three (I38).

Constructed almost entirely of brick, the central hall measures 26 x 60 meters. The walls currently reach 19 meters, but they may have been higher in their original state. The walls and floors were originally faced with revetment made of marble and granite imported from as far away as Egypt, Greece, and North Africa. The types of marble and granite found in the building include Phrygian marble, Numidian marble, Carystian Marble, Lacadaemonian Marble, Porphyry, and red, violet, and gray granite, a clear indication that the structure was built in the 2nd-century “marble style.” The main entrance (I39) was on the west and the doorway to the building was a vast 7 x 14 meters. The door sill (I40), made from a solid piece of marble weighing over sixty tons, shows no signs of wear, which may indicate that the main door was rarely closed. Instead, a metal grill with a smaller door was installed on the outside, which allowed for the building to be closed when necessary. Windows measuring about 2.5 x 6.0

---

240 Nohlen (1998, 85) mentioned that the entire Red Hall complex is 266 meters long. Most publications do not include the hall itself in the measurements of the temenos.

241 Surprisingly, no brick stamps have been found to date the structure.

242 Nohlen 1998, 92 and Mania 2011a, 37. Most of the floor marble is gone, but the mortar substratum and some remains show that there were rectangular and square slabs, some decorated with rosettes and framed by strips of lapis lacedaemonius. The water channel on the floor was sheathed with alabaster slabs, also imported from Egypt.

243 Mania 2011a, 102. The Phrygian marble came from west-central Turkey, the Numidian marbly from Tunisia, the lapis lacedaemonius and cipollino from Greece, and the porphyry, red, violet, and gray granite from Egypt.

244 Nohlen 1998, 89-90.
meters were built into the upper part of the south wall (I41), but may not have been installed on the opposite wall.\textsuperscript{245} If so, the interior of the hall would have featured a dramatic cascade of natural light that may have been related to, or enhanced, the rituals practiced at the hall. Twelve arched niches of the same size were also embedded on a lower level of the walls, five lining both the north and south walls and another two flanking the door on the west wall. A water channel originally ran across the floor (I38), separating the eastern and western halves. Three rectangular alabaster tubs, presumably used in rituals, sat in front of the channel (I38). A podium (I38) measuring 4.8 x 4.8 x 0.7 meters stood at the rear of the hall, with an opening in the center that led into a subterranean chamber connected to a system of passages underneath the complex.\textsuperscript{246}

The two rotundas (I35 and I39) on either side of the main hall are also largely intact and composed of the same brick as the central hall. Each rotunda is about 19 meters high and has a diameter of 12 meters. Both were fronted by courtyards, measuring 27 x 28 meters, in which have been found fragments of atlantes and caryatids (I42-I44).\textsuperscript{247} The great portico separated the hall and rotundas from the temenos, which resembled a gigantic forecourt. Running diagonally under the temenos, the Selinus River was diverted into two tunnels spanned by a continuous underground

\textsuperscript{245} Radt 1999, 234.

\textsuperscript{246} Nohlen (1998, 92 and 98) proposed that the podium may have been used for a cult statue. Moreover, he suggested that the underground passage could have allowed a priest to speak through the statue. Koester (1995b, 273-274) believed that the underground passages may have been used as a means for initiates of the cult to surreptitiously move about.

\textsuperscript{247} Atlantes and caryatids are columnar supports sculpted in the shape of men and women, respectively. Those found in the Red Hall’s courtyards were likely used to support the stoas preceding the rotundas.
Since the modern city of Bergama surrounds the Red Hall and rotundas, excavation of the temenos area is impossible. Only its approximate dimensions can be known; its contents of cult furniture and structures remain unavailable.

The site is littered with atypical figural structural adornment unparalleled in Roman architecture. The unusual figures in question are known from a group of 107 fragments of Egyptianizing atlantes and caryatids sculpted of white, gray, and black marble (I42-I44). Most are from the two courtyards that flanked the hall and all are janiform with back-to-back standing figures (I43b). All the figures bear signs of Egyptian influence in their attire and postures. Three figural types exist: two female and one male (I44). The first female type wears a single garment with a vertical fold down the center of the front. The other female figure wears a mantle diagonally draped over a chiton. The male type wears a kilt and a combined Egyptian waistcoat and cuirass. The male figures have the heads of jackals, crocodiles and ibises. A few of the female figures have lion heads, but most are fully human. Atlantes and caryatids are not unknown in Roman or Greek architecture, but those at the Red Hall have no clear parallel. Some have proposed that they copy Egyptian prototypes, but again no similar

---

248 Parts of this are visible today, and used as bridges for traffic to cross the Selinus River.

249 Mania 2011, 347.


251 See Lloyd-Morgan (1990) for a summary of the use of figural supporters in Rome and their Greek predecessors.
examples have been identified. The most similar Roman-era sculptural comparisons are found at Herodes Atticus’s Sanctuary of Egyptian Gods on his estate at Brexiza, near Marathon. The figures at Herodes Atticus’s estate may have been free-standing, but flanked an entryway and have similar Egyptianized appearance and drapery to the Red Hall figures. The contemporary examples from Brexiza are the best evidence for the Red Hall figures being Roman creations based on Egyptian visual tropes.

Because of the brick walls, most of the ornament at the Red Hall was attached by means of dowels and mortar, rather than as structural component. Almost none remains affixed to the structure today, but much has been found during excavations. A substantial amount of architectural varia and ornament has been found at the site (I45). Typical patterns and motifs populate these remains, including bead-and-reel, egg-and-dart, palmettes, rosettes, and acanthus leaves. More unusual are relief fragments depicting clusters of feathers (I46). Although it is unknown whether the relief comes from a continuous frieze or sculpted vignettes, Mania identified the subject as a sphinx.

An eagle or Nike is also a possibility for the feathered subject. Like the ornament of the

---

252 Mania (2011b, 347-348 and 356) considered the Egyptian ‘Hathor Pillars’ to be a useful comparison. He warned, however, that the Hathor columns depicted only the heads of divinities, not the whole body, so that they must only be the inspiration of the Red Hall columns. Although the “Hathor Pillars” commonly represent Egyptian deities, they more closely resemble herms because the only figural representation included is a head in place of a capital. In that sense, they are significantly different from the atlantes at the Red Hall. He also mentions the Osiris pillars from the second court of the Temple of Ramses at Thebes, also known as the Temple of Amun at Karnak. These, however, are much larger than the Red Hall atlantes, are one sided, and provide no structural support. Finally, one other example not mentioned by Mania are the Pillars inside the Temple of Ramses II at Abu Simbel, which resemble the Osiris pillars at Karnak and are also poor comparisons for the Red Hall figures. Overall, Mania believed that the atlantes and caryatids reveal Egyptian-influenced figures that were altered according to Roman taste. In fact, no other comparable caryatids exist. Those in the Forum of Augustus in Rome and at Hadrian’s Villa in Tivoli are modeled after Greek caryatids, those of the Erechtheion in Athens.

253 The sanctuary, which may have been dedicated to Isis, includes freestanding Egyptianizing figures at its entrances. Although not identical, the figures are similarly styled contemporaries of those at the Red Hall, demonstrating a common interest in Egyptianizing imagery. Compared to the Red Hall figures, those at Brexiza are of obviously inferior craftsmanship, due to their variances in scale and rough finishes. For more on the sanctuary at Brexiza, see Tobin 1991, 123-131 and Albersmeier 1994.
Vetters Temple and the Temple of Hadrian, the deeply carved sculpture here also exemplifies the popular 2nd-century “marble style.”

The complex is strikingly well designed and crafted, a sign of attention to detail that would be inspired by an imperial presence. One example of this extraordinary craftsmanship can be observed in the metal screen that was used in place of a monumental door. This is not a later addition to allow for the convenient closing of the hall; rather the builders originally planned for this feature and installed perfectly dovetailed joints between the screen and threshold to ensure that the weight of the metal screen never damaged the entrance. Another example can be found in the windows and niches inside the hall. Although they appear to be the same size, the windows are 20cm narrower than the niches. Nohlen considered that the optics of light passing through would make the windows seem larger, and so the architects scaled them down slightly. These are two signs of a superior engineering process that could indicate that the funding and supervision came from outside the local community. Finally, Mania has observed that since Hadrian visited Egypt in 130 and returned to Greece via Asia Minor, he may have stopped in Pergamon, which would explain the odd and unparalleled design choices.

Despite its remarkable condition, its unusual plan leaves the Red Hall without obvious architectural comparanda. Ward-Perkins remarked on the unconventional

---

254 Rieger 2005, 91-92. Mania (2011a, 102-103) also mentioned that the variety of stones used in the Red Hall also suggests imperial support.


257 Mania 2011a, 350-351. For a complete chronological record of Hadrian's journeys, see Syme 1988.
design of the building, considering it to be “unclassical”. While this sentiment is quite accurate, it likely gives too much credence to the Egyptianizing courtyard figures. Katja Lembke argued that the structure was really a demonstration of Hadrianic building policy, rather than a derivative of Egyptian or Asian precedents. The plan of the “cella”, an enormous central hall with high solid walls, and the absence of the typical peripteral colonnade is far beyond the norm for temples of the region, as is the placement of the central structure and rotundas at the far end of a temenos. Yet it is unmistakably Roman in design, with parallels in great Roman complexes of the 1st and 2nd centuries like the Temple of Mars Ultor (A1), the Templum Pacis (A13), and the Pantheon (A10) at Rome. All of these precincts display the monumentality of the great Hellenistic temples of the East, but placed the main structure at the end of the temenos. Each of these was enormous and the locations of the central structures indicate that they were meant to be approached from a particular direction. However, the enormous size of the Red Hall’s temenos almost doubled that of the comparanda in the city of Rome. In terms of size, then, it made a more dominant impact on its immediate environment.

The Temple of Hadrian

At the present time, the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus presents to the visitor only a poorly preserved stylobate covered in brush and surrounded by marble rubble (I50).

Approximately one third of the structure has been excavated, making visible the southern side of the temple, and parts of the eastern and western ends. Arches punctuate the upper level of the foundation and originally would have been covered, probably supporting the stylobate (I57). Cassius Dio wrote that the columns of the temple were monolithic, with a diameter of 2.356 meters and a height of about 23.1 meters (T17).\footnote{Andrea Barattolo (1995, 79) converted Dio’s measurements into meters.} The earliest documented dimensions of the temple were recorded by Cyriacus of Ancona as approximately 48.84 x 106.56 meters and the cella as 20.72 x 41.44 meters, with a height of 20.72 meters (T10).\footnote{Cyriacus measured the stylobate in cubits and the cella in Roman feet, both of which I have converted into meters (1 cubit = 0.444 meters, 1 Roman foot = 0.296 meters). Koçan and Meral (2011, 258-259) also calculated the precise conversion of Cyriacus’s measurements as 48.84 x 106.56 meters. Reinach (1890), Hasluck (1910, 10), and Schulz and Winter (1990, 58-63, 74-81), have all offered slightly different estimates, but the difference is negligible. Barattolo (1995, 90 and 104) tested Cyriacus’s estimate of height using column fragments that he found on the site, which measured 2.14 meters in diameter. He compared this to a now-lost fragment measured by Guillaume and Perrot (1862, 79), which measured 2.135 meters at the base of the shaft and 1.83 meters at the top.} Finally, in the most recent excavation reports, Nureddin Koçan established the length of the crepidoma as 116.23 meters and the length of the stylobate as 107 meters, although he cautioned that no dimensions of width can be determined until the entire site is cleared.\footnote{Koçan and Meral 2011, 258-259. Because excavation goals do not seem to include ascertaining precise dimensions, it is unlikely that the site will be cleared any time soon. The term crepidoma refers to the multi-level platform on which a temple is built. The stylobate is the uppermost level of the crepidoma. Since Koçan stated a difference of length between the crepidoma and the stylobate, it is reasonable to conclude that he used the lowermost level of the crepidoma to establish its dimensions.} No monolithic columns have yet been found, but the diameter of the columns found on site is 2.135
meters, which would make them a close match for those whose measurements were
given by Cyriacus.264

Excavations at the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus have yielded more sculpture
and architectural elements than at any of the other spotlight temples. Most of the finds
come from the upper registers of the temple and include parts of the architrave,
columns and Corinthian capitals, and fragments of frieze and pedimental sculpture (I58-
I62, I65-I68).265 Most of the sculpture represents the refined “marble style” of carving,
placing the temple in the 2nd century AD.266 Many exceptionally large and detailed lion-
head spouts (I62a) have been discovered, as has a relief sculpture of a lion pelt
(I62b).267 A sculpted cluster of feathers at the site (I63) could point to a large Nike,
sphinx, or eagle, but the block on which it is carved is half buried, preventing any useful
hypothesis concerning its original placement. Whether either this or the lion pelt was
part of a frieze or some other element of relief is unknown, but remnants of sculpture
more certainly belonging to figural friezes have also been found (I66 and I67).268 Finally,

264 Koçan and Meral 2010, 13. We have no way of knowing whether Cyriacus’s measurements included
the column bases and capitals. At 2.13 meters in diameter, the columns shafts would have reached about
21 meters, very close to the cella height of 20.72 meters provided by Cyriacus. There are no published
heights of the capitals, but they appear to be at least 1.5 meters in height, and would have had a base of
about 0.75 meters. Adding these elements to the height of the columns brings the total to 22.97, a near
match for Cassius’ Dio’s measurement of 23.1 meters.

265 Koçan and Meral 2007, 14.


267 Yaylali and Özkaya 1995, 315. Yaylali and Özkaya stressed that this lion was rendered differently than
the lion head spouts. They specifically referred to the lifeless eyes and shallow representation, leading
them to conclude that it was a lion pelt and possible attribute of Herakles.

268 Yaylali 1990, 174-175, Yaylali 1992, 226, Yaylali and Özkaya 1996, 414, Koçan and Meral 2007, 14,
and Koçan and Meral 2009, 52-53.
four sculpted human heads (I68) have been found near the eastern end of the temple, although their original location and relationship to the temple is unknown.  

Because the site plan of ancient Cyzicus (I51) around the Temple of Hadrian is not known in detail, it is currently impossible to estimate the size of its temenos, if one existed.  Nevertheless, several scholars have proposed that the temple was adjacent to a large plaza to its north, measuring 100 x 400 or 450 meters.  No one knows whether this was a sacred precinct belonging to the temple or an open public area. Even without the advantage of being set in the midst of open space, the approximate dimensions of the Temple of Hadrian make it one of the largest temples ever built.

There has been considerable speculation about the plan of the Temple of Hadrian. Because so little of the superstructure is in place, most theories rely on numismatic evidence and Cyriacus’s drawings (I76-I80) to establish a temple layout. Hasluck, Ashmole, Barattolo, Burrell, Thomas, and Koçan have used a local coin type (T21) dating from the reign of Antoninus Pius to estimate the appearance of the

---

269 Yaylali and Özkaya 1994, 111. In this report, it is speculated that these heads may come from the temple’s pediment. Unfortunately, the report provides no indication of the size of the sculpted heads, making further speculation on the material unwise. The authors tentatively identified one of the heads as Zeus and another as either Apollo or Dionysus. The condition of the images is too unclear for any productive analysis.

270 The temple is now surrounded by massive piles of marble debris and is situated in the midst of several privately owned farms, making any future determination of the temple’s boundaries unlikely.

271 Hasluck 1910, 14, Ashmole 1956 180, and Schulz and Winter 1990, 58-63, 74-81. I have not found any evidence to support these claims in archaeological reports or site visits. The area immediately surrounding the temple may have been more visible before excavators began depositing rubble on the site.

272 For an outline of the attempts to reconstruct a plan made by early travelers Marquardt (1836), Perrot (1864), Reinach (1890), and Hasluck (1910), See Chapter 1, 39. Modern scholars, including Ashmole (1956), Barattolo (1995), Burrell (2004), and Thomas (2007) have also sought to reconstruct the plan.
Delaine and Burrell were convinced that the coin preserves the first known numismatic representation of the Temple of Hadrian, and that even if the temple was not yet complete at the moment of this coin’s minting, it must have been sufficiently finished for depiction. This conclusion assumes that depictions of buildings on coins are reliable, when the exact opposite could be argued. There are two basic reasons for representing temples on coins: to advertise the building activity of the moneyer or the emperor, and to commemorate a religious or political imperial event. The existence of the temple’s image attests to the fact that it was an important building for Cyzicus. On the coin, the temple appears to be octastyle and of the Corinthian order. It is important to note, however, that while Roman die-cutters may have used actual temples as models, only the essential features of decoration and architecture are usually depicted. Several fragments of large Corinthian capitals (I59 and I60) can be found around the temple, corroborating the order illustrated on the coin (T21), which is

273 Hasluck 1910, 12, Ashmole 1956, 183, Barattolo 1995 97-100, Burrell 2004, 89, and Koçan and Meral 2011, 259-260. It is important to note that this coin probably represents the reconstruction of the temple. According to Burrell (2003, 34), Dio’s commentary on the destruction of the temple (T16) was written before Antoninus Pius’s death in 161 AD. Since Aristides panegyric to the temple (T2-T4) was delivered around 166-167 AD, it is reasonable to conclude that Antoninus probably aided the reconstruction of the temple. Within such a short timeframe, I would suggest that the temple was rebuilt according to the original plan.


275 Burnett (1999, 138) characterized the utility of ancient coins representing buildings as either wholly reliable, or so unreliable as to be useless to ancient architectural history.

276 Brown 1940, 10-13.

277 Burnett (1999 154-158) observed that illustrating monuments and buildings on coins is an exclusively Roman practice among ancient cultures. Consequently, he suggested that images buildings and monuments were an important part of the Roman visual vocabulary. Furthermore, he argued that temples of the Imperial Cult dominate the imperial coinage of the Roman East. On the basis of this observation, he suggested (158) that “the Roman preoccupation with buildings and temples was spread to the eastern provinces of the empire by the mechanism of the establishment of the imperial cult.”

278 Brown 1940, 19.
also supported by Cyriacus’s sketches (I76 and I77a). Although the condition of the stylobate precludes ascertaining the number of columns, Hasluck noted that the longitudinal subterranean vaults of the temple number seven and were probably designed to support eight columns, an observation later echoed by Barattolo.\(^{279}\) Further support for this came from a page in an unusual codex of Renaissance drawings of ancient architecture known as the Destailleur Codex.\(^{280}\) One of its illustrations is a partial sketch of an octastyle temple facade (I81) attributed to Cyriacus that may represent the Cyzicene temple.\(^{281}\) Based on material found at the site, coins, and Cyriacus’s sketches, Barattolo and Thomas produced several hypothetical plans (I52-I55) and three hypothetical facade elevations (I56).\(^{282}\) According to these two authors, the temple was almost certainly dipteral, but whether it had a pronaos, opisthodomos, distyle in antis, or prostyle plan remains a mystery.\(^{283}\)

Much scholarly research on the appearance of the temple has focused on the *Codex Ashmolensis*, which was drawn by a copyist of Cyriacus named Bartolomeo

\(^{279}\) Hasluck 1910, 12 and Barattolo 1995, 97-100.

\(^{280}\) Sometimes called the *Destailleur Manuscript*, the codex is named after its former owner, Hippolyte Destailleur, a 19\(^{th}\)-century French architect. Almost the entire codex is composed of architectural drawings. Unfortunately, the provenance of the codex prior to Destailleur’s ownership is unknown.

\(^{281}\) Ashmole 1956, 184-185 and Burrell 2004, 91 have noted the uncertainty of the subject in the image. It was included next to an image of the Parthenon and images of other structures in Italy and the connection to the Temple of Hadrian in Cyzicus is therefore uncertain. However, the image features a hazy sketch of a statue within a medallion on the pediment that may accord with Malalas’s description of the temple pediment (T5).


\(^{283}\) Because the stylobate was so large, the temple must have been dipteral. Schulz and Winter (1990, 76-77) are the only scholars to have suggested a pseudodipteral plan.
Frontius. Frontius devoted nine pages of his manuscript to the images (I76-I80). Although most of these images include a bit of descriptive text and measurements, none specify exactly what part of the temple complex is portrayed. The first two pages appear to be connected and portray a portico with arched lintels and vine wrapped pilasters (I76). Above, and perhaps behind, these porticoes are larger fluted Corinthian columns that seem to support a faintly drawn architrave. The columns are not depicted as centered on the arches, suggesting that these were independent elements of the complex. The third sketch (I77a) shows a wall and doorway, along with background columns, of the same proportions as those in the first two sketches. In this image there are no signs of the arched lintels, and the background columns are certainly supporting an architrave. Curiously, a few steps are faintly drawn in the dark interior of the doorway, but there is no indication of where they lead. Together, the first three pages (I76 and I77a) seem to represent an exterior view of the temple complex. However, the exterior borders of the three images depict the end of the walls and its molding, suggesting either that these are the corners of the structure or that this was a page-ending convention of the artist. Whatever the cause for this feature, the large background columns seem to rise from behind the walls and porticoes, indicating that

---

284 See Ashmole 1956.

285 Cyriacus’s ninth and final drawing (I80) is a full page sketch of an elaborate Corinthian capital surmounted by a gorgon head, which he measured at 9 feet high, with an abacus width of 13 feet. This capital does not match any of the decoration of those in the other sketches, and Ashmole (1956, 190) hypothesized that it may be from a special position in the temple. It may also have been mistakenly included by Frontius. Because this unusual sketch has no architectural or decorative bearing on the focus of my dissertation, I will omit it from any detailed discussion of Cyriacus’s drawings.

286 In some images, broken architectural components are labeled and drawn near standing parts of the temple. This may represent the actual state of the ruins or they may be composite sketches. It is important to note that at the time Cyriacus visited the Temple of Hadrian, it was already in ruins and being quarried by the Ottomans. Therefore, Cyriacus’s record and illustrations should be viewed as possible reconstructions.
this view must be from outside the temenos wall or nearby structure. In a subscript on
the first two pages of his drawings (I76), Cyriacus wrote, “In front of the facade of the
temple of Cyzicus, on each side a proporticus or pronaos having five columns
connected on each side to the walls and highly ornamented in superb style with
tendrilled vines and bunches of grapes” (T11).\footnote{Translation by Ashmole (1956). The original reads, “Cyzici ante templi frontispicium hinc inde
proporticum vel pronaon habentes quinas hinc inde parietibus annexas et eximia arte pampineis vitibus &
 uvis ornatissimas columnas.”} Ashmole observed that Cyriacus gave
no precise indication of what structure or part of the temple was being described.\footnote{Ashmole 1956, 185-186.} It
could have been the porticoes, the main building, a propylon, a structure in the adjoining
plaza, or an access to the lower vaults. In his exploration of the underground vaults,
Hasluck mentioned a “contrived” stairway that opened at a right angle to the “nave” of
the temple and another on the opposite side that led to a corresponding domed well
chamber.\footnote{Hasluck 1910, 11.} Hasluck’s description sounds as if the steps were later modifications,
making it unlikely that they are the same as those sketched by Cyriacus (I77a).

The next five pages from Cyriacus’s text represent walls built in ashlar masonry,
articulated by vine wrapped columns and topped by decorative moldings and a figural
frieze (I77b-I79). None of these images depict larger background columns, making it
possible that they represent the interior or exterior walls of the cella. Margaret Lyttelton
has argued these pages may represent the interior order of the cella because Cyriacus
wrote that the cella featured ten highly decorated columns (T10).\footnote{Lyttelton 1974, 262-263 and Lyttelton 1987, 45.} Lyttelton noted that

The Temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassae, a late 5th-century BC temple, was

\footnote{Lyttelton 1974, 262-263 and Lyttelton 1987, 45.}
distinguished by an unusual internal cella frieze. Moreover, it also had ten columns on the cella interior. Because the Bassae temple was in an isolated location, its level of familiarity at Roman Cyzicus is unknowable. However, the temple was designed by Iktinos, one of the famous architects of the Parthenon at Athens. An architectural quotation of the temple at Bassae in the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus would have endowed it with an element of historical significance.

On closer inspection, the columns and frieze on Cyriacus’s fourth page (I77b) of images are of different proportions and the ashlar blocks are different in pattern and number from those represented on pages five (I78a), six (I78b), seven (I79a), and eight (I79b). Cyriacus gave no explanation for this difference, and provided measurements only on pages seven and eight (I79). Using Cyriacus’s measurement of the architrave on page seven (I79a), the entire image can be scaled (assuming reasonably correct proportions) to give a column height of approximately 8.9 meters, far shorter than the 21 meter height of the exterior columns. Cyriacus’s fourth page (I77b) depicts more slender columns and a different block pattern than the following pages (I78 and I79). Furthermore, the wall is distinguished by a large gorgon head (I77b). What a comparison of the drawings makes clear is that Cyriacus may have illustrated separate areas of the temple: either the cella and surrounding porticoes or two levels of the cella.

291 Lyttelton 1974, 263. For more on the temple at Bassae, see Dinsmoor 1933.
292 Pausanias (8.41.7-9).
293 During Cyriacus’s first trip to Cyzicus, he observed that the temple was being dismantled for the building of mosques in Mudanya and Bursa. Ashmole (1956, 181) suggested that a study of those mosques may be rewarding. After personally visiting all of the 14th and 15th-century buildings in Mudanya and Bursa (many of which have been destroyed and rebuilt), I believe that some of the mosques in those cities must include blocks from the Cyzicus temple. In particular, the Yildirim Bayezit Mosque at Bursa and the Grand Mosque at Bursa are built from blocks of Proconessian marble cut into shapes and sizes that would fit the scale of the Temple of Hadrian and also closely resemble the patterns drawn by Cyriacus.
In his panegyric of the temple, Aelius Aristides observed that it was built in three levels (T2). Barattolo took that to mean that the cella had two levels, with the podium acting as the third (I56a). Barattolo 1995, 97-100. Pages five through eight (I78 and I79) all show architectural debris on the ground, while sketch four (I77b) has none. Based on this, it is not inconceivable that Cyriacus represented two levels of the interior columns and friezes. According to this scheme, the columns, wall and frieze of sketch four (I77b) could have surmounted the differently proportioned columns, wall and, frieze of pages five through eight (I78 and I79).

Searching for columns to match the distinctive vine-wrapped supports of Cyriacus’s drawings, Ashmole found two candidates. The first is a slender engaged column attached to an anta in the courtyard of the Istanbul Archaeology Museum (I64). Ashmole 1956, 184. According to the museum files, the column was found in 1911 near the “house of Justinian” in Constantinople. Curatorial files, Istanbul Archaeology Museum. The so-called house of Justinian was reportedly in the vicinity of the Hippodrome, and could refer to the imperial Byzantine palaces. In the 14th century AD, Byzantine historian George Kodinos recorded that the Emperor Justinian looted Cyzicus to build Constantinople, making it possible that pieces of the temple would ultimately end up in Istanbul. Like the columns in the drawing, the fragment in the museum is decorated with a meandering vine pattern, and it is made of Proconnesian marble, like the elements of the temple still preserved on the site. The pilaster is 4.78 meters high and its reconstructed height from

294 Barattolo 1995, 97-100.

295 Ashmole 1956, 184.

296 Curatorial files, Istanbul Archaeology Museum. The so-called house of Justinian was reportedly in the vicinity of the Hippodrome, and could refer to the imperial Byzantine palaces.

297 Kodinos (De Structura temple Sancta Sophiae, 157).
the base of the column to the top of the architrave was 6.82 meters. The attached anta suggests that the Istanbul pilaster framed a bay, meaning that if it was a part of the temple, it most likely came from the structure represented in Cyriacus’s first sketch (I76).

Ashmole also spotted a second column fragment (I65a) with similar decoration now located at an open-air museum at the harbor in Erdek, some 8 kilometers from the temple site. Subsequently, a similar column fragment (I65b) has been recovered from the temple site, confirming that both belong to the temple. These fragments (I65) are larger and thicker than the Istanbul pilaster (I64), with diameters of 1.45 meters, which would have provided for a height of 10 or 11 meters. Neither is completely round, meaning that these too could have been engaged columns. Ashmole posited that these fragments could have been internal or perhaps supported a balcony or second story. Applying the same method he used on the Istanbul column, Barattolo proposed that the Erdek fragments reached a total height of 15.4 meters. Using his reconstructions, Barattolo contended that the Erdek column fragments and the Istanbul pilaster reached about 22.5 meters, or just higher than the 70-foot height Cyriacus provided for the cella.

---

298 Barattolo 1995, 87-88. This conclusion is technically accurate, but conjectural. Barattolo claimed that the capital would have been one module high, making the total column height 5.78 meters, and that the architrave would have been one thirteenth of the column total (0.444 meters), the frieze would have been one quarter smaller than this smaller than the architrave (0.333 meters), that the cornice would have been as high as the median height of the architrave (0.126 meters), and that the cyma would have been one-eighth higher (0.142 meters), giving a grand total of 6.826 meters. This is assuming that the Istanbul column originally supported all of these elements.

299 Ashmole (1956, 184) claimed that the column would have been appropriate for a portico and could have supported a larger superstructure.

300 Ashmole 1956, 188.

301 Ashmole 1956, 189.

302 Barattolo 1995, 88. Again, this hypothetical height relies on the assumed presence of an architrave, cyma, and frieze.
walls. Aristides’s description, Cyriacus’s sketches, and Barattolo’s reconstruction of the column fragments make a convincing case that the interior of the cella featured two levels. Since the Istanbul pilaster most likely framed a portico bay, however, it is unlikely that it was part of the cella. Nevertheless, Baratollo’s hypothesis for a two storied cella has merit, but simply lacks appropriate architectural remains for confirmation.

Excavators have discovered the remains of two different friezes at the temple site (I66 and I67). The first group of fragments is at a larger scale (1.52 meters estimated figural height) and featured a battle scene (I66). A second set of fragments comes from a smaller frieze (estimated 0.7 meters figural height) that depicted a chariot scene with winged figures (I67). Evident size difference prohibits the fragments from belonging to the same frieze, yet they were recovered from the same area. Excavators have hypothesized that they come from different architectural elements in the building or from two different structures. Due to the fragmentary state of the newly discovered material, little can be discerned of the subject. Allowing for some flexibility in the size of Barattolo’s hypothetical friezes for the columns at Istanbul and Erdek, these fragments could be more proof of friezes on two levels of the cella interior.

303 Barattolo (1995, 88) wrote “Clearly this can be no coincidence,” but does not fully account for the lack of material needed to confirm his reconstruction, nor the 1.5 meter difference between his reconstructed height and Cyriacus’s estimation.

304 Yaylali 1990, 174-175 and Koçan and Meral 2007, 14. These are the only two excavation reports which specifically mention the difference of scale in the frieze fragments.

305 Yaylali 1990, 174-175, Yaylali 1992, 226, Yaylali and Özkaya 1996, 414, Koçan and Meral 2007, 14, and Koçan and Meral 2009, 52-53. Only minor fragmented components have been found at the site representing wings, clothed female torsos, and pieces of chariots. Many pieces are so badly damaged as to prevent any identification.

306 Yaylali 1990, 174-175 and Yaylali and Özkaya 1994, 112. In 1990, Yaylali (1990) proposed that one of the friezes may have been inside the cella.
Barattolo proposed that two fragments of a figural frieze in the courtyard of the Istanbul Archaeological Museum might have come from the temple at Cyzicus based on size, material, and style (I69). He identified the subjects as a Nereid and Triton (I69a) and Silenus and a maenad (I69b). Although there are no similar Dionysiac characters in Cyriacus’s drawings, the marine figures (I69a) on one fragment represent a similar subject as that portrayed on Cyriacus’s fifth sketch (I78a). Prior to the possible identification of these pieces, however, Ashmole cautioned that Cyriacus may not have accurately recorded the subjects on the frieze and that perhaps the frieze drawing was meant to state the existence of sculpture too high or damaged to be seen accurately. A closer examination of Cyriacus’s frieze illustrations shows that he represented a hodgepodge of common and identifiable subjects, like the Three Graces, and Cybele riding a lion. Perhaps Cyriacus or his copyist simply drew familiar themes in order to represent the presence of sculpture. Another alternative sees Cyriacus copying subjects he saw during his travels.

More evidence of the friezes exists elsewhere. In 1967, Hans Peter Laubscher published a short article on a frieze panel found at the temple site (I70 and I71) with figures that match the dimensions of the newly discovered large frieze fragments

---


308 There are major differences between the two, including the orientation of the figures and that the nereid rides a hippocamp in Cyriacus's sketch and a triton on the Istanbul panel.

309 Ashmole 1956, 188-189.

310 For example, a grave stele at the archaeological museum at Bandirma, near Cyzicus, is decorated with a relief of the Three Graces that closely resembles a component of Cyriacus’s sketched frieze (I78b). The stele was found at a village far north of Cyzicus (Ormanli) and there is no way that it could have been part of the frieze and chances are slim that Cyriacus copied it. The prevalence of this theme and others may have allowed them to work their way into Cyriacus’s illustrations of the frieze as substitutes for the actual subject.
Laubscher determined that the subject was a battle scene involving Parthians or generalized Easterners. This would seem to accord with the Turkish excavator’s proposal that the large frieze depicted a battle scene. A set of smaller frieze panels (I72-I75) from the Bandirma museum yard may also match the chariot frieze fragments found in the excavation (I67). Allegedly recovered by police during the arrest of smugglers who robbed the temple site, the Bandirma panels match the size of the smaller frieze and depict nearly complete Nike figures on chariots. Although the role of these two different friezes in the temples is unknown, Cyriacus’s drawings lend themselves to at least one proposal. As noted earlier, the columnar pieces identified by Ashmole could belong to two different levels of the structure, in accordance with an interpretation of Aristides’s description of the temple. If so, then these two friezes may also have come from two levels of the cella. Alternatively, one frieze may have been on the cella’s interior wall, with the other on the exterior of the cella walls.

311 Laubscher 1967. The frieze panel was housed in Berlin and lost during World War II. Now only a sketch and partial photographs exist.

312 Bandirma is approximately 15 kilometers from the site of the Temple of Hadrian. After identifying the panels in the yard, museum director Dr. Tulin Tan graciously communicated what information she had about them. According to Dr. Tan, in 2004 police arrested a group of thieves that had been robbing the temple site at Cyzicus. According to custom, the police deposited the archaeological materials at the local museum, which maintains possession, but not control, of the sculptures. The temple site is under the authority of the excavation director, who operates independently of the local museum and has declined all requests for permission to publish on the panels.

313 In his efforts to place Cyriacus’s sketches, Barattolo (1995, 80-89 especially 89), concluded that I69a depicted the exterior of the cella, while I69b, I70, and I71 all represented its interior. He did not, however, clarify whether he believed the frieze represented in I69b was the same as that in I70 and I71.
Because of its extraordinary size, there are only a few adequate comparanda for the Temple of Hadrian. The Temple of Bacchus at Baalbek (A14) and the Olympieion at Athens (A2) have been cited as comparable in size. Setting the Roman era parallels aside, Lyttelton expressed the opinion that the Temple of Hadrian was Hellenistic in plan with Roman decoration, a sentiment later echoed by Schulz and Winter, who suggested that it was modeled after the monumental temples in Asia Minor. In a more pointed comparison, Laubscher hypothesized that the Temple of Hadrian imitated the design, and perhaps surpassed the size of the Didymaion (A4) and the Artemision of Ephesus (A5). With comparable size and material, the Temple of Hadrian certainly met the mark set by its famous predecessors. By matching the profile of earlier temples, the Temple of Hadrian effectively put Cyzicus on the map of monumental temples in Asia Minor as a representative of the Roman era of imperial splendor.

The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius

Owing to its original dedication as a Hellenistic temple later repurposed in the Roman era, the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius (I85) is an excellent example of

---

314 For example, Hasluck (1910, 12-13), Ashmole (1956, 183), and Barattolo (1995, 89) all compared elements of the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi (A9) to the Temple of Hadrian, but also acknowledged the significant size disparity. Moreover, these three scholars tried to use the intact cella of the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi as a model, despite the size difference and the fact that the layout of the Cyzicene temple is entirely hypothetical.

315 Ashmole (1956, 183 and 191) and Laubscher (1967, 217) raised the comparison of Baalbek. Ashmole also promoted the Olympieion at Athens as a good comparison to “gain an idea of the grandeur of the lost temple”, but the plan of the Olympieion is much narrower than the temple at Cyzicus could have been (A2).

316 Lyttelton 1987, 45 and Schulz and Winter 1990, 76-77.

317 Laubscher 1967, 217.
the enduring importance of temple designs in Asia. It effectively represents the type of monumental temple emulated by the other spotlight temples, and also shows that 2nd-century Roman builders were willing to repurpose existing structures when necessary. Although the temple was never completed, it was probably in continual use from the 3rd century BC to the 3rd century AD. The Roman additions to the temple have frequently been assigned to the 2nd century AD, but in a forthcoming article Nicholas Cahill will suggest that Roman-era remodeling may have occurred as part of the 1st-century AD repairs made after a devastating earthquake of 17 AD. Because it was almost completely uncovered in the early 20th century, most of the temple layout is visible, supporting the development of a reconstructed plan (I87). Unfortunately, establishing the developmental chronology of the temple has proven difficult, so some peculiarities of design are without explanation.

The temple is Ionic, octastyle (8 x 20 columns), pseudodipteral, with stylobate dimensions of 45.51 x 97.94 meters, and column height of 17.81 meters. The cella measures 22.5 x 67.5 meters and was divided to create two opposite facing

---

318 There is more evidence of emperors attempting to complete unfinished temples. For example, Suetonius (Gaius 21) claimed that Caligula wanted to finish the Didymaion and Cassius Dio (69.16.1-2) discussed Hadrian’s role in completing the Athenian Olympieion. Neither of these accounts unequivocally states that the emperors amended the temple affiliations to include their cults. However, Caligula’s divine aspirations are well known and Dio recorded that a statue of Hadrian was placed inside the Athenian Olympieion and that the temple district was renamed Hadrianopolis.

319 Butler 1925, 142 and Hanfmann and Waldbaum 1975, 56. As noted in Chapter 1 (45), Fikret Yegül continues to work on a project that will offer a complete record of the temple’s finished and unfinished sculptural and ornamental elements, which may have an impact on our understanding of the temple’s chronology.

320 My gratitude goes to Prof. Cahill for sharing an early draft of his article.

321 Butler 1925, 16-26, 41 and Burrell 2004, 103.
sanctuaries. The eastern end never had columns or stairs, an irregularity that Cahill attributed to the presence of two preexisting monuments: the Lydian altar and a square structure in the cella that may have been a statue base. Any alterations to the plan of the temple had to contend with the boundaries set by those two monuments. Therefore, the latest stage of the temple is the largest structure that could be built without disturbing the preexisting monuments.

The building’s decorative scheme evidently included no figural sculpture. Instead of a figural frieze, the temple most likely had a decorative frieze. Lion-head water spouts are the only remaining feature of this architrave order (I88). Such spouts are relatively common in Greek architecture and are also present at the Temple of Hadrian in Cyzicus. Yet the “Assyrian” style of the spouts found at Sardis is totally unlike those found elsewhere in Greek architecture, indicating that the temple had an unusual decorative scheme. Several colossal portrait heads of members of the Imperial Antonine family (I89-I91) were found at the temple site, and were perhaps included in the eastern section of the cella. Strangely, the temple was never completed, making the presence of finished adornment and the colossal portraits somewhat perplexing.

---

322 Butler 1925, 16-26. This was presumably done to accommodate the later introduction of the Antonine cult to the temple, a topic covered in Chapter 3 (161). However, as noted above, Cahill considered that the cella division took place much earlier.

323 Cahill 2011, 210. For the date of the altar, see Greenewalt (2007, 372).

324 For more on the precinct of Artemis, see Hanfmann and Waldbaum (1975), who recorded the excavations at Sardis from 1958-1973.

325 Butler (1925, 6, 26, and 51) concluded that the standard figural frieze must have been replaced by what he termed an “architrave order,” but this was most likely his way of describing a non-figural frieze.

326 Only the face of the lion is depicted, without the mane or ears and Butler (1925, 26, 73-74) called them “Assyrian” in character, suggesting an eastern origin for the type.
Its Hellenistic origin and continuous remodeling makes it impossible to view the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius as the Roman emulation of a Greek shrine. Instead, it was appropriated and its dedication and layout altered. The split cella was the only major structural change introduced in the Roman era, but it was significant. Burrell has noted that this feature caused it to resemble the cella of the Temple of Venus and Roma in Rome (A11), but there seems to be little significance to the similarity.\textsuperscript{327} The split cella at the Temple of Venus and Roma was part of the original design, while at the Artemis temple at Sardis it was a product of remodeling. Cahill has recently noted that perhaps a more appropriate comparandum can be found in the Temple of Apollo at Corinth, which may have also undergone a cella division in the Roman era.\textsuperscript{328} In any event, the divided cella demonstrates more appropriation than emulation, and underscores the Roman interest in the tradition of Asian monumental temples.

Summary

Few Roman temples match the overall appearance and geographical context of the spotlight temples. A few unifying features shine through their diversity of plans. The first is their enormous sizes (I8 and I9). The widths of the spotlight temples each exceed 20 meters, with the Wadi B temple as possibly the smallest, measuring only a bit over

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{327} Burrell (2004, 104) attributed this suggestion to Crawford Greenewalt Jr., and acknowledged that this double cella arrangement likely was introduced during Antoninus Pius’s reign.
\item \textsuperscript{328} Cahill’s comments on the matter will be included in a forthcoming report on excavations at the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius from 2002-2012, in which he will argue that the temple must have been constructed by many generations of builders, none of whom were able to realize the full plan, if such a plan even existed. The temple of Apollo at Corinth did possess a split cella, but the function of that feature is unknown. Pausanias (2.3.6) recorded that the temple housed a bronze statue of Apollo, but offered no clues about the purpose of the split cella.
\end{enumerate}
20 meters and the Temple of Hadrian as the widest at about 50 meters. More importantly, each of the temples is octastyle or greater, a clear hallmark of monumentality. Finally, visibility and elevation were evidently major concerns in the placement and construction of the spotlight temples. The Wadi B Temple (I12), the Vetters Temple (I22 and I23), and the Red Hall (I37) were situated within gigantic temenoi built on man-made plateaus that provided uninterrupted sight lines to the structure from great distances. The Temple of Hadrian (I51) and the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius (I86) developed in more cramped environments, but their arresting size and adjacent unoccupied space ensured their visibility.

Viewed as a unit, the spotlight temples and their Hellenistic predecessors make it clear that Roman Asia was a point of concentration for monumental temple building. No place other than Rome itself can boast so many extraordinarily large temple complexes. More importantly, nowhere else presents the array of Hellenistic predecessors like the models that the spotlight temples emulated. Yet the material composition of the spotlight temples is a different story altogether, and points to a desire to improve upon the monumental works of the past.

---

329 To put these measurements in a global Roman perspective, compare the following widths: that of the Temple of Mars Ultor (A1) was about 36 meters, that of the Temple of Augustus and Roma at Ancyra (A7) was about 36.5 meters, that of the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi (A9) was about 21.5 meters, and the width of the Temple of Venus and Roma (A11) was about 66 meters.

330 Because it does not have a traditional temple facade, the Red Hall is not octastyle in the same sense as the others. However, the colonnade that originally stretched across the front of the Red Hall and the flanking rotundas numbered 18 columns across, 8 of which covered the width of the Red Hall.
Material

Material can be evaluated according to chronology, quality, and cultural association. In this study the chronological order of the temples can be ascertained through the technological development of material. A qualitative approach to materials looks at the connotations of prestige associated with a particular material, highlighting expense, availability, and means of acquisition and production. Finally, materials often have embedded cultural associations, which in the case of the spotlight temples can point to Roman practices and preferences or established Greek building traditions. By assembling and comparing the material attributes of the temples, we can situate them in a chronological, economic, and cultural context.

Some scholars have commented that architecture in Asia can be diametrically characterized as Greek or Roman according to building methods and materials; they see things in terms of opposites, contrasting Roman imposition with Greek tradition. In my view, the spotlight temples were carefully assembled hybrids, rather than the passive products of polar influences. Most importantly, the choices of what elements were used were the result of practical and strategic decisions rather than simple cultural preferences. Because of its readily available sources of marble, Asia is a unique location for the study of the Roman building materials that were frequently used in monumental construction. Traditionally, Asia relied on ashlar masonry and local marble and limestone, but the wholesale introduction of concrete in the Roman Imperial period changed building techniques. Although cement and concrete in foundations eventually

---

331 See Brown 1964, Lyttelton 1987, and Yegül 2000. These authors are interested in parsing the cultural influences that acted on buildings rather than exploring the fluidity of imperial Roman construction in Asia. Sometimes buildings fit into one cultural mode or the other.
replaced the ashlar masonry during the 1st century AD, marble continued to be used in the superstructure of monumental temples.\textsuperscript{332} Both marble and concrete were exploited by Roman builders, evolving into a new construction method of combined building materials that became a hallmark of imperial architecture in Asia.\textsuperscript{333} The spotlight temples provide a telling illustration of this evolution.

Construction of the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis began several centuries before the Romans assumed control of Asia and the bulk of the completed substructure was built during the Hellenistic age. Instead of concrete, the building is founded on marble blocks set deep into the ground.\textsuperscript{334} The superstructure is also marble, as are most of the sculptural elements found at the site (I85). In short, the material composition of the Artemis and Antoninus temple is a wholly Greek example of monumental Hellenistic architecture. In contrast, concrete and rubble were used in the foundations of the Wadi B Temple (I14), the Vetters Temple (I27 and I28), and the Temple of Hadrian (I57), with marble found only in the superstructures. Unique in the group, the Red Hall was constructed almost entirely of mortared bricks (I39-I41). Although the superstructure is largely intact, the applied marble surfaces that sheathed it are now missing.

\textsuperscript{332} There are some instances in which cement was used as a structural component to walls, but they were always faced with marble revetment.

\textsuperscript{333} Ward-Perkins 1981, 300-306 and Waelkens 1987, 102. Waelkens believed that Asia was an active participant in the development of architectural methods, sometimes absorbing, sometimes rejecting Roman influences. The former, he wrote, contributed a new blend of Greek and Roman practices that was used in the Asian province to redefine the urban landscape. Ward-Perkins has noted that while Asia was influenced by the Roman use of concrete, the province also influenced the composition of architecture throughout the Empire, as Asian craftsmen were exported along with shipments of marble.

\textsuperscript{334} Butler 1925, 27.
Earliest of the spotlight temples, the Wadi B Temple exhibits the "combined technique" of construction, featuring a blend of Hellenistic ashlar masonry and mortared rubble. Although not unknown in the Greek speaking world, the expert use of mortared rubble is generally known to be a Roman building technique. Value engineering seems to have ruled the construction process; the builders obviously strove to economize, using cheaper materials where they would not negatively affect the appearance or stability of the structure. The uppermost level of the stylobate is composed of alternating marble and limestone slabs (I14). Under columns, the slabs cover deep limestone piers that serve as column supports. In the areas not supporting columns, the stylobate blocks are thin marble slabs that rest on a foundation of hard mortar and rubble. Although the combined technique appears somewhat haphazard, it is in fact an economically efficient use of stone and concrete. Fragmentary remains (I15-I17) indicate that the superstructure consisted primarily of white marble, along with some bronze additions to the ornament. In sum, the Wadi B Temple represents a careful use of materials, enclosing the inexpensive components within those that were more valuable.

Of the spotlight temples, the foundation of the Vetters Temple is today the most visible (I27 and I29). The central portion is a mass of concrete surrounded by rubble and encased in outer ring of concrete. The rings are punctuated by large limestone

335 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 50, 56.
336 Greenewalt, Sullivan, Ratté, and Howe 1985, 60. The marble stylobate blocks between the ashlar columns are packed in a finer, harder mortar than the mass of the rubble podium.
blocks that were packed with mortared rubble for stability.\textsuperscript{338} This expert use of a large concrete mass is one of the indications that this building post-dates the Wadi B Temple. Furthermore, this approach to foundation construction was far more efficient and expedient than traditional Greek ashlar foundations. Of the superstructure, only floor slabs (I29), a marble column capital (I30), and an architrave fragment (I31) remain. Assuming that the entire floor and columns were made of the same marble, the building must have been constructed at extraordinary expense. Overall, the Vetters Temple’s extensive use of concrete beneath so much marble points to an efficiently built but expensive structure that may have been constructed with the aid of Roman engineers or architects.\textsuperscript{339}

At Cyzicus, the foundation of the Hadrian temple is notable for the many subterranean concrete and rubble arches (I57). Clearly visible today, these would have originally been hidden underneath the stylobate. These arched supports visually resemble those used in the Traianeum at Pergamon (A6) and the Temple of Venus and Roma at Rome (A11), both Hadrianic buildings. Therefore, we should also consider this use of concrete vaults to be Roman. Most of the marble debris littering the temple site (I58-I61) is beyond reassembly. On the one hand, this makes a reconstruction difficult, but on the other, such large pieces of undecorated marble underscore the considerable cost of such a structure. The marble is from the nearby island of Proconnesus.\textsuperscript{340} In antiquity, Cyzicus controlled the Proconnesian quarries and the material was common

\textsuperscript{338} Scherrer 1995, 184.

\textsuperscript{339} To my knowledge, there is no earlier temple in Roman Asia which benefitted from such an extensive use of concrete in its foundations.

\textsuperscript{340} Hasluck 1910, 30 and Ashmole 1956, 180.
during the Hadrianic-Antonine era, used especially in buildings like the Temple of Venus and Roma (A11) and the Hadrianeion at Rome (A15). Although the primary motive for using Proconnesian marble at the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus was certainly the proximity of the Proconnesian quarries, its prestigious reputation cannot be ignored.

In contrast with the other spotlight temples, the Red Hall was built primarily of brick (I37-I39). Brick-faced concrete walls were common in Roman architecture but the walls of the Red Hall are brick throughout. No other pre-Byzantine building in the province of Asia matches this unique composition, nor comes close to the scale of the Red Hall’s walls. In the Roman East, bricks were used as a “concrete substitute” for vaulting materials because the concrete outside Rome was of a weaker consistency. Concrete was an important part of the Roman architectural revolution, and it is possible that the comprehensive use of bricks in the Red Hall is a result of the industrialization of a substitute for concrete. Nohlen speculated that bricks may have been used because most of the stone masons were engaged in work at the

---

341 Boatwright 1997, 129-130. Boatwright has suggested that Cyzicus became a wealthy city as imperial demand for Proconnesian marble increased.

342 Ward-Perkins (1951, 103) offered a brief history of Proconnesian marble. Vitruvius (2.8.10) and Pliny (36.6.47) noted that the house of Mausolus was decorated with Proconnesian marble, and Strabo (8.1.16) mentioned that the marble was held in high esteem.

343 For this reason, Waelkens (1987, 95), referred to the Red Hall as among the most important brick buildings in Asia Minor.

344 Ward-Perkins 1981, 276 and Dodge 1990,114-116. Several buildings in Asia had bricks in their vaulting, like the Temple of Asklepiion at Pergamon (see AvP XI and Radt 1999, 220-241), the Gymnasium complex at Sardis (see Yegül 1976, 127), and the Harbor Baths (see Wiplinger and Wlach 1995, 18-20) and the Library at Ephesus (see Wiplinger and Wlach 1995, 31-35).

345 MacDonald (1982, 3-19 and 41-46) wrote a summary of the Roman architectural revolution, which he characterized by the dramatic use of arches, vaults, and domes that were made possible by the development of opus caementicium.
contemporary Traianeion (A6) and Asklepieion. Brick production required substantial firing facilities, and the abundance needed for the Red Hall would likely require a nearby production site. In the absence of stonemasons, the builders of the Red Hall could have instigated the development of a local brickmaking industry and employed locals as bricklayers. Therefore, the cost of brickworks may have been absorbed locally, ensuring that the construction of the Red Hall directly contributed to the local economy. Yet the brick walls and the floor of the Red Hall were sheathed in marble and granite. This was expensive and required access to suppliers in different parts of the Empire, including Egypt, Greece, and North Africa. Although the use of fine stone was not uncommon in Asia, the extensive use of it at the Red Hall was more diverse and lavish by the standards of the Greek speaking world.

**Agents of Construction**

For this thesis, an agent of construction can be defined as any person, group, or institution that was involved in the construction of the spotlight temples. The processes of building such large public edifices must have been complex and the endeavors were costly; size alone dictates that the spotlight temples were produced by means of the united effort of many people. There are four central players in any process of

---


347 Nohlen 1998, 88. Nohlen also notes that these bricks were of exceptional quality and that their use in the Red Hall (especially the window niches) indicates a high level of technical expertise. Yet there were so many, they must have been locally made. For more on brick construction in Roman Asia, see Dodge 1987. Overall, Dodge held that the use of brick was used mostly in the metropolitan context, suggesting an imperial connection.

348 This idea is supported by Lancaster (2008, 264), who proposed that the invention of bricks and their prevalence was a technological advance based on organization rather than innovation.
construction - the primary donor, the founder, the architect, and the manual laborers. Sometimes the role of primary donor and founder can be played by the same entity, but that was not always the case in Roman construction processes. Although human dynamics make it impossible to predict the working relationships among these individuals or groups in any individual situation, these roles are generally hierarchical; The laborers are subordinate to the architect, who is subordinate to the founder who initiates the project. If the developer is not the primary donor, then the developer may also be subordinate to that donor. Although the identities of those who funded, designed, and built the spotlight temples must once have been well known, they are now a matter of serious uncertainty.

Epigraphical documentation concerning project development exists for only one of the spotlight temples - the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus. It comes from an inscription (Τ12) recorded by Cyriacus that reads:

ΕΚΔΑΠΕΔΟΥ ΜΩΡΘΩΣ ΕΝΟΛΛΗΣΑΙΣ [...] Ι ΑΦΘΟΝΙΗ ΧΕΙΡΩΝ ΔΙΟΣ · ΑΡΙΣΤΕΝΟΤΟΣ

Several attempts to restore the missing text and to correct the name ΑΡΙΣΤΕΝΟΤΟΣ have been made, but Reinach’s version has been the most generally accepted. It reads: ‘Εκ δαπέδου μ’ ὑψώσειν ὅλης Ἀσίας [δαπάνησιν] ἀφθονίῃ χειρῶν δῖος Ἀριστέν(ε)
τος. Burrell translated the text as, “From level earth, with [wealth] of all Asia (and) no lack of hands, godlike Aristenetos erected me.”

On the surface, this inscription seems to indicate that the province and its municipalities either supported the cost of construction or supplied the workers and that someone named Aristenetos was credited. Herrmann believed that the emphasis of the inscription should be placed on the workers of Asia, rather than the wealth as suggested by Reinach. Burrell mostly agreed with Herrmann, but also asserted that the reference to Asia implied the koinon, rather than the province. If Burrell is correct, then the people comprising the quasi-independent koinon of the Asian Imperial Cult built the temple. Since Burrell argued that the emphasis should be on the workers, she would seem to be suggesting that either the priests of the koinon, or the workers sent by the priests of the koinon completed the work. Whether province or koinon, the inscription seems to make clear that Asian workers helped to build the temple, a point that should be emphasized because the mention of wealth is a restoration. Provincial manpower was probably used at all the spotlight temples because the importation of manual laborers from elsewhere would have been inefficient.

349 IGR IV, 140. Ashmole (1956, 187-188) mentioned three restorations of the inscription and settled on Reinach’s version as the most convincing. The other translations are found in Preger 1889, 47: ‘Ἔκ δαπέδου μ’ ὄρθωσεν ὅλης Ἀσίας [μέγα χαῦρα] ἀφθονίῃ χαιρῶν Δίος Ἀριστένετου, and Anthologie Didot 1890: Εκ δαπέδου μ’ ὄρθωσεν ὅλης Ἀσίας [ἐυτέχνων] ἀφθονίῃ χειρῶν δῖος Ἀριστένετος.

350 Burrell (2004, 90) questioned the accuracy of all published restorations but believed that the emphasis of the inscription should be on the workers of Asia, rather than the wealth. Furthermore, the restored word δαπάνησιν more accurately means cost or expenditure.


353 Here I mean to refer only to the laborers who performed the brute tasks like digging foundations and hauling material. Skilled laborers, like sculptors may have come from elsewhere.
the contrary, it seems likely that the construction of the temples could have provided ample opportunity for local employment.

Next, there is the issue of funding. If the inscription can be restored to include a mention of wealth or expenditure, then it implies that the koinon or province provided some funds toward the founding of the temple. Yet the revenues of the province (and koinon) and the Empire were mutually dependent.\textsuperscript{354} Even if the province acquired revenue by imposing new taxes or by receiving imperial tax relief, the Empire should receive some credit for the attainment of funds for consenting to the province’s actions. Private donors could have contributed, but the inscription implies that Aristenetos could have been the architect or the superintendent of the structure. Whether by tradition or chance, architects and builders are rarely named in ancient testimonia, but several exceptions do exist, supporting the possibility that Aristenetos might have served in a technical role.\textsuperscript{355}

Even if the source of funding could be ascertained, there are a few lingering problems. First, the inscription may refer to only one part of the temple rather than to the...
whole project.\textsuperscript{356} It is known only from one of Cyriacus’s illustrations (I75a), which may represent either a portion of the exterior of the complex or the cella of the temple. If the temple complex was funded by several donors, it is not inconceivable that each of them would claim credit for the individual products of his or her own efforts. The second issue concerns the reliability of the inscription itself, which may be an invention. Cyriacus’s sketch is the only record, and despite the author’s reliability in general, the text could have been copied from some other source, or could even be a complete fabrication.\textsuperscript{357}

There is only so much that the hypothetical restoration of a missing inscription can reliably communicate.

Since the Cyriacus inscription is the only text naming the agency behind any of the spotlight temples, the identity of their primary donors and founders must be sought through a general inquiry into architectural funding in the Imperial era. When attempting to determine the agency behind a structure, one should first recognize the distinction separating private from public buildings. Private buildings include homes, commercial property, and tombs. Public buildings, on the other hand, take the form of infrastructure and governmental edifices. Religious buildings belong to either category, but the larger

\textsuperscript{356} A contemporary example of this can be observed at the complex known as the Gymnasium of Vedius in Ephesus, which has yielded two dedicatory inscriptions. The first, \textit{IvE} 438, was found inside the main building of the complex and states that Vedius and his wife built and dedicated the gymnasium from its foundation with all its decoration in honor of the Emperor Antoninus Pius. A second inscription also recording the contributions of Vedius and his wife was also found. This inscription, \textit{IvE} 431, was found on an architrave that originally surmounted a portico on the far (west) side of the courtyard of the gymnasium (for more on the context of the find, see \textit{ÖJh} XXIV, 28). However, \textit{IvE} 431, is missing the section that would have specified the item dedicated. Given that it was found outside the gymnasium on a different element of the complex, it may have only referred to the dedication of part of the courtyard. Burrell (2006, 441) wrote that \textit{IvE} 431 referred to Vedius’s funding of “the portico of the palaestra”. These two 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD inscriptions at the Gymnasium of Vedius complex at Ephesus suggest that partial dedications were possible, and proves that donors did claim credit for specific contributions.

\textsuperscript{357} Ashmole (1956, 187) questioned the credibility of the inscription, suggesting that Cyriacus may have copied this inscription not from the building but from “some Byzantine anthology.”
the building, the more likely it is that it was intended for public use. Therefore, most major temples should be seen as public buildings. In the following section, only the evidence for public buildings is considered as a means to determine the agency behind the founding of the spotlight temples.

During the Imperial era, initiative to build most likely came from the Emperor, province, and city, not private groups or individuals. The potential benefits that major structures brought to each party are undeniable and are explored throughout this thesis. One role that cannot be overstated in the process of ancient building is that of the initial founder; buildings required too much expenditure and effort to have been created without substantial support from a very affluent entity.\footnote{Funding for the initial construction of the spotlight temples must have been acquired locally or from the Empire. Locally, the first major investor in the temples could have been the province, koinon, city or individual benefactors. Imperially, the source of funding must have been the emperor himself, directly as a gift, through a close associate or family member, in the form of disaster relief, as restoration aid, or as part of a special tax program.}

Consensus Opinions

There seems to be no inarguable position regarding the funding of Imperial buildings in the provinces during the first three centuries of the Principate.\footnote{There seems to be no inarguable position regarding the funding of Imperial buildings in the provinces during the first three centuries of the Principate.} One traditional belief holds that the emperor, via the mechanisms of Empire, was able to fund whatever he desired at any time. From Augustus to the Antonines, most emperors

\footnote{Taylor 2003, 11.}

\footnote{Taylor (2003, 13), for example, has observed that the organization of Roman building projects across time and the Empire was quite diverse, and he argued that as the emperor gained more control over public building, the historical documentation decreased.}
were unimaginably rich and their finances were more or less inseparable from the public coffers.\textsuperscript{360} Provincial and municipal finances were also affected by the emperor, even if he did not overtly control them\textsuperscript{361}. For example, provincial and municipal revenues could rise if the emperor chose to lower imperial levies or allow the province to collect more taxes.\textsuperscript{362} Alternatively, the emperor could simply give money to the provinces, either unbidden or in response to a request. Tacitus recorded that Tiberius gave funds and tax relief to Asia following the devastating earthquakes during his reign.\textsuperscript{363} Significantly, there is almost no evidence for regular or recurring payments made from imperial revenues for the public good.\textsuperscript{364} Instead, the crown seems to have responded only to the needs of any given moment. Although the emperor could allocate money to the provinces of almost any amount and for any length of time, but he usually only did so in lump sums for immediate purposes, not as an endowment.

\textit{Cost of Building}

Unfortunately, we don’t know how much a structure as large as one of the spotlight temple would have cost in the Imperial era. Recorded prices fluctuate wildly

\textsuperscript{360} Fergus Millar (1977, 189-201) touched on this topic while writing on the relationship between imperial and public finances. Although there is no clear understanding of the balance between the emperor’s personal wealth and the wealth that the emperor appropriated or took on from the public funds, Millar gave several examples of the emperor himself doling out money for social welfare, games, and especially building.

\textsuperscript{361} Millar (1983, 76) has argued that the early Empire was based on a network of cities that had the capacity to finance public buildings and festivals, as well as pay for the function of government, although he was careful not to specify that these cities did in fact shoulder the financial burden.

\textsuperscript{362} MacMullen 1959, 210

\textsuperscript{363} Tacitus (\textit{Annals} 2.47).

\textsuperscript{364} Millar 1977, 200.
over time and space. For example, although most statues cost between 3,000 and 8,000 sestertii, at least one silver statue of Hadrian in Benevento is said to have cost 1,000,000 sestertii, putting it at a higher value than that of any building in Africa, according to the preserved data. Using epigraphically attested building expenses, Ramsay MacMullen deduced that at least 3,000,000 sestertii would have been needed to outfit a city the size of Pompeii with basic public buildings and infrastructure. According to MacMullen, the cost of a “large temple” was set at 100,000 sestercii. Yet because he also calculated that a typical honorific arch would cost approximately 75,000 sestercii, we can conclude that the cost of the spotlight temples would have far exceeded the financial commitment for a typical “large temple.” Other structures, like theaters and baths, are listed at 400,000 sestercii each. These estimates did not include the adornment and elaboration of public buildings, such as sculpture and connective architecture, or budgets for repair. Rabun Taylor cautioned that the costs attested epigraphically are usually round numbers that often fail to account for overruns or building decoration. Amenities in a building could constituted a substantial cost, perhaps even rivaling the initial investment. Therefore, actual cost of a building could

---

365 A sestertius was a common unit of Roman currency often used to quantify large expenses. As today, ancient currency was affected by inflation so it is difficult to put a value on the sestertius over the course of several centuries. To provide an idea of value and inflation, the average Roman legionary made 900 sestertii per annum during the reign of Augustus, but by the reign of Septimius Severus at the end of the 2nd century, that annual salary had increased to 2,400 sestertii (see Speidel 1992, table 1).

366 Taylor 2003, 18. See also Duncan-Jones 1974, 126 and 164.

367 Macmullen 1974, 142-145. For the cost of different types of buildings, he calculated median figures based on epigraphical data from Africa and Italy, which provide a great range. Müller-Wiener (1988, 33-39) wrote a similar summary for architectural financing in Classical and Hellenistic Greek cities.

368 Taylor 2003, 18.
have greatly exceeded the promised contribution of a patron. In sum, the true costs of
construction are unknown, owing to the nature of our documentary evidence.

The Emperor as Primary Donor

Roman emperors frequently funded and founded public building projects,
especially in the capital city. From the beginning of the Empire, Julius and Augustus
Caesar engaged in a comprehensive building program in Rome. Although many of
Augustus’s building projects were directed at improving the infrastructure of Rome,
others, like the Temple of Mars Ultor (A1) or the Temple of Julius Caesar, were
obviously intended to emphasize the divinity of his predecessor and his implied
connection to the divine. For several centuries after Augustus, almost every Roman
emperor carried on this tradition of public building through the continued development of
the Imperial Fora. Many also followed Augustus’s lead by establishing and restoring
temples all over the Empire, either in response to specific needs or adhering to a
personally motivated theme of religious euergeticism.

Augustus also instituted a public works administration of Rome that over time
evolved into the *Opera Caesaris*, the major bureaucratic arm of the emperor focused on
building throughout the Empire. Augustus’s son-in-law and close friend Marcus

369 See Suetonius (*Augustus* 29). Dignas (2002, 120) observed that Augustus claimed responsibility for
restoring votive offerings at temples in Asia in his *Res Gestae* (24.1), and inscriptions record his aid in
rebuilding temples at Ephesus (IV E 1522), Pergamon (OGIS 328c), Ilium (Iliion 84), and Laguna
(Stratonikeia 1 511). See Winter (1996, 168-177) for more specific examples and references.


371 Called the *cura operum publicorum*. See Robinson 1992, 54-56.

372 Anderson (1997, 69) and Robinson (1992, 21) concluded that the Opera Caesaris was instituted under
Domitian. I believe that a version of the office may actually have existed in practice as early as Tiberius’s
reign (see Tacitus [*Annals* 4.55-56] and pages 121-122.
Agrippa was the first to take permanent control of this institution, which should indicate its level of significance to the Emperor.\textsuperscript{373} Although the Opera Caesaris did not replace all privately funded building activities, it nevertheless dominated public works in the city of Rome, and eventually in other parts of the Empire. Robinson and Anderson have argued that the function of the institution shifted according to the agenda and interests of each emperor\textsuperscript{374}; Domitian preferred monumental building, Trajan focused on infrastructure, and Antoninus Pius worked on restoration projects.

The dynamics of public construction in the provinces were somewhat different than they were at Rome. Major public building campaigns were a frequent means of response to natural disasters like earthquakes.\textsuperscript{375} MacMullen observed that the initial funding of such projects emerged in one of two ways: a direct appeal to the throne from the province, or the spontaneous generosity to the province from the emperor.\textsuperscript{376} Requests from outside of Italy often came to the emperor through a patron, a wealthy citizen who acted as an advocate for others. Claude Eilers has written extensively on the subject of Roman patrons in the Greek-speaking portions of the Empire, arguing that it was possible for an individual to act as the patron for an entire city.\textsuperscript{377} Such patrons could be wealthy private citizens, groups of individuals dedicated to a particular

\begin{enumerate}
\item See Frontinus (\textit{De aquaeductu urbis Romae}, 98).
\item See Mitchell 1987, 350-352.
\item MacMullen 1959, 207.
\item See Eilers 2002.
\end{enumerate}
cause, or public officials. Eilers concluded that a person could become a city patron in three ways: at the request of a city, by conquest, or as a responsibility of official imperial office. On the basis of the documentary evidence, Eilers concluded that the primary responsibility of a patron was to serve as an advocate. This could involve financial contributions, but the evidence appears to indicate that cities more frequently prevailed upon their patrons for influence with Rome. Ancient historians preserve the names of several city patrons, including Pliny, Polemon, Herodes Atticus, and Aelius Aristides. Patrons could be very persuasive with their requests, sometimes downplaying the value of the money needed or even appealing to the emperor’s desire for a good reputation. The emperor himself then took on the role of the traditional patron who was able to aid or deny a city any request that was made by its individual patron. Therefore, even when funding was acquired by a local individual, the revenue can often be traced to the emperor, since the patrons were often relatives or close

378 Pliny the Younger is an example of such a public official and his correspondence with the Emperor Trajan (Epistolae) represents the process of requests for funding between Roman provincial officials and the crown.

379 For example, if a general conquered a city as part of imperial expansion and then took on responsibility for that city.


382 Pliny (Epistolae) Philostratus (Lives of the Sophists 1.25, 2.1, and 2.9).

383 For example, Philostratus (Lives of the Sophists 2.1) recounted that Herodes Atticus once asked the Emperor Hadrian for a sum that was too great for the province to bear, but only a pittance to the emperor, while Pliny requested (Epistolae 10.41) funds from Trajan by suggesting the benefit it would provide to the emperor’s lasting legacy.

384 Eilers 186-189.
associates of the throne.\textsuperscript{385} Overall, there is ample evidence that emperors were willing to disperse capital for the construction of major public buildings when asked.

For the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century in particular, there seems to have been a trend of several emperors initiating massive imperial building projects.\textsuperscript{386} Hadrian is chief among these great builders and his role is clearly described in the \textit{Historia Augusta}, which claims that he built something in almost every city and that he aided communities devastated by earthquakes, pestilence, and famine.\textsuperscript{387} Even the dearth of epigraphical evidence related to Hadrian’s euergetism is accounted for by the \textit{Historia Augusta}, which explains that, with the exception of Temple of Trajan at Rome, he avoided inscribing his names on buildings.\textsuperscript{388} Boatwright has also written extensively on Hadrian’s building activities throughout the Empire, concluding that the Emperor can be credited with completing dozens of major projects.\textsuperscript{389}

On the other hand, the lack of inscriptional evidence could also cause modern scholars to assign Imperial responsibility where there was none. Often times a building is linked to the emperor by the timing of imperial visits. Dignas even commented that Hadrian’s religious euergetism was so great as to appear to be the motivation and

\textsuperscript{385} Mitchell 1987, 348. As an example, Mitchell noted that major building activity at Pisidian Antioch took place when three members of the imperial family and two of Augustus’s generals were honorary officials of the colony.

\textsuperscript{386} Anderson 1997, 50. Arjan Zuiderhoek (2009, 23-24 and 110-112.) has also written about munificence in imperial Asia and concluded that, although 2\textsuperscript{nd}-century Asia marks the height of personal euergetism, imperial support was the dominant economic force behind building.

\textsuperscript{387} \textit{Historia Augusta} (Hadrian 19.9 and 21.5).

\textsuperscript{388} \textit{Historia Augusta} (Hadrian 20.4).

\textsuperscript{389} See Boatwright 2000, tables 6.1 and 6.2 (pages 109-111) for a comprehensive list of building projects credited to Hadrian.
occupation of his extensive travels, which included four trips through Asia. Proximity of visits and construction could be a coincidence, but it could also very well be causal. If causal, the procedure could have happened in a few ways. First, an emperor could visit a city, and then decide to fund several public buildings. Second, a construction project could be completed in anticipation of an imperial visit. No matter what the ordering of visit and construction was, there is still uncertainty regarding funding. An emperor could visit a city to inspect a monument that he had himself ordered to be built. Even if the structure itself was dedicated by locals to the emperor, it may have been as thanks for his generosity in funding the project. Alternatively, monuments may also have been built by locals in anticipation of imperial visits.

Local Patronage

If major imperial buildings were built with local funding, the how and why are still debatable. In the Hellenistic era, several Asian cities demonstrated themselves capable of erecting monumental temples. Asia continued to be in generally good financial health during the imperial period, and cities would have been able to cover basic operating costs, like municipal salaries, maintenance of public properties, as well as


391 Revell 2009, 41-42 and 101. Revell raised this possibility in her discussion of scholarly interpretations of the dedication (RIB 228) at the forum at Wroxeter. The dedication is from the community to Hadrian, but it is generally assumed that Hadrian funded the forum.


393 For example, both Ephesus and Sardis had apparently self funded initial construction for their temples to Artemis. However, each building was renovated or enlarged at some point by Roman authorities.
some major expenditures like festivals and games. Yet there is little clear evidence for the degree to which cities were responsible for public works and whether provinces or municipalities were responsible for temple construction. Furthermore, even if a city or province took credit for founding a structure, there is still the question of whether the funds could have come from the emperor via gift or creative accounting. There is far more evidence for local individuals supporting construction costs.

Mitchell argued that public buildings were the primary means used by the aristocratic class to express their generosity in the classical world and that the munificence of the emperors and locals complemented each other. Revell took this even further and concluded that the local elites should be credited for paying for public construction in provincial cities, and therefore, those elites are active agents in the process of Romanization through architecture. Yet the evidence Revell offered sometimes goes against her general conclusion. For example, she noted that the city of Clunia (in modern Spain), was mostly built up during the 2nd century by the efforts of

394 For city expenses and budget capacity, see Zuiderhoek 2009, 37-49, in which the author used historical and epigraphic evidence to contradict a prevalent assumption that provincial cities had financial problems in the 2nd century AD. Although cities were well funded, little is known about how funds were allotted or made available for building. Zuiderhoek noted (2009, 42) that Pliny recorded (Epistulae 10.37 and 10.39) that several cities in Bithynia spent enormous sums on public works. For example, Nicaea spent 10 million sestertii on a theater (10.39) and Nicomedia spent almost 4 million sestertii on water systems (10.37). Yet Zuiderhoek emphasized that none of these works projects were fully completed with that money, leading Pliny to surmise that corruption prevented funds from being properly used. John Stambaugh (1972a, 565 and 574) also held that the construction and rebuilding of public temples in Rome was almost always sponsored by the emperor and that the maintenance expenses of public temples was usually assumed by the public treasury or the temple itself. In Asia, these funds would have been controlled by the provincial or municipal governments.


397 Revell 2009, 56.
local patrons. Yet Italica was at the same time architecturally transformed mostly due to the direct patronage of the Emperor Hadrian, who had a personal connection to the city. So it would seem that context and the emperor’s relationship with a city (whether personal or through the work of a city patron) was an important factor in determining who paid for public buildings.

A recent study of Roman era theaters by Mary Sturgeon is perhaps the best collection of evidence for the sources of imperial funding for building in the provinces. Dedicatory inscriptions naming donors is common in Roman theaters and they form the bulk of Sturgeon’s evidence. Of course theaters are different from temples, especially in terms of function. Consequently, the procedure for their funding and continuing operational costs may have been quite different. On the other hand, theaters are similar to the spotlight temples in that they are very large and costly buildings, usually located within a city’s walls. Since there is little epigraphical evidence for temples in general, theaters offer good comparative epigraphical evidence for the funding of public buildings during the Roman Imperial era.

Overall, Sturgeon concluded that about a third of the theaters surveyed from the Roman East were built entirely by emperors, while two thirds were funded by private donations. According to Sturgeon, private patronage for the construction of theaters in ancient Greece and Anatolia dates back to the 3rd century BC, although Hellenistic kings also played a role. In the Imperial era, Roman emperors frequently financed

---

399 Sturgeon 2004, 424. Sturgeon did acknowledge that inscriptions can only inform part of the story of patronage, and that chance determines which inscriptions have survived. Nevertheless, there are so many inscriptions available that Sturgeon had plenty of compelling evidence for her conclusions.
theaters, but more often client kings and provincial aristocrats contributed funds, sometimes to display their loyalty toward Rome.\footnote{Sturgeon 2004, 417-418.} Sturgeon offered the theater at Corinth as a case study. Several dedicatory inscriptions exist there, and many even state what a private donor contributed and why.\footnote{Sturgeon 2004, 412-413. In many cases the reason for the donation was as an exchange for public office.} The theater at Ephesus is another example, where there are six inscriptions that detail the building history of the theater and the role of private donors.\footnote{Sturgeon 2004, 419.} These inscriptions, it is important to note, cover the 1\textsuperscript{st} through the 4\textsuperscript{th} or 5\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD, and therefore suggest that the role of private patronage there was directed at renovation costs, not initial financing. Overall, it seems that the Corinthian and Ephesian theaters were built in several stages over time, perhaps as funds became available. This may put them at odds with the speed with which the spotlight temples were more likely erected.

In general, the accounts of private benefactions cited by Sturgeon almost exclusively credit the individual for remodeling or renovation.\footnote{Sturgeon 2004, 422-423.} In only a few instances are private donors credited for the original construction of a theater, and those theaters fall into two categories: those built in the city of Rome in the later Republican and early Imperial era\footnote{The theatre of Pompey in Rome is an example of this.}, and theaters built in smaller cities in the east, like Limyra, Xanthus, and Tlos.\footnote{For the former category, see Sturgeon 2004, 414-415. For the latter category, see Sturgeon 2004, 423-424.} Sturgeon’s article on theater funding proves that individuals (and through their
efforts, cities) were fully capable of providing the revenue needed to complete renovations or building phases of existing theaters, but there is little documented evidence for *ex nihlo* constructions funded by local sources.

Sturgeon’s article brings to light the difficulty in interpreting inscriptions. Mitchell has argued that scholars should approach inscriptions concerning building credit cautiously, as they can usually be interpreted in many ways.\(^4^0^7\) In particular, studies focused on identifying the resources used to fund imperial building projects should strive to make distinctions among the levels of possible donorship. Not every patron or donor can be credited with building an entire monument. According to Arjan Zuiderhoek, who surveyed over five hundred epigraphically attested gifts in Asia, architectural donations were the largest category of private benefactions, but were mostly made up of small-scale gifts for single architectural elements or for the continued maintenance of a building.\(^4^0^8\) Only those who were able to provide sufficient funds to initiate construction can be reliably called primary donors. Most private donors supplied relatively modest amounts focused on alleviating a specific need in an already existing building. These individual donors should not be considered on the same level as primary donors.

---

\(^4^0^7\) Mitchell 1987, 344. The example Mitchell provided related to the neokorate temple at Philadelphia. *IGR* 4.1619 names Caracalla as a founder of the temple, but there is debate on whether he contributed any financial support (see Burrell 2004, 126-127 for the debate).

\(^4^0^8\) Zuiderhoek 2009, 23-24 and 76-80. Some examples of these gifts are the supply of a column, stoa, or statues, or the funding of games, restorations, and embellishment. Of the donations Zuiderhoek studied that included specific sums, the mean was 300,000 sestertii and the average 64,000 sestertii. The bulk of the gifts were in the 40,000 to 140,000 sestertii range. The highest was 8,000,000 and the lowest 200 sestertii, both of which were extreme outliers. See especially table 2.1
Funding for Temples

No uniform procedure existed for the funding of secular public buildings, and the same is true for those dedicated to a religious function. Emperors and private individuals were both capable of acting as donors. In the Hellenistic era, donors and builders required local government approval, but the funding of temples may also have come from organized groups of devotees.\textsuperscript{409} For initial construction, Dignas held that it was the responsibility of a polis to “secure the means for the construction of sacred buildings.”\textsuperscript{410} Whether “the means” refers to funds, materials, or space is unclear.

The cult of the emperor was quite different from traditional cults. First, it may not have inspired the same degree of religious devotion that traditional cults did. Failure of an emperor to support the Imperial Cult could cause it to become diminished. In general, the extraordinary size of most Imperial Cult temples indicates that they must have been intended to promote the cult and establish a system for demonstrating loyalty, rather than to serve a pre-established preexisting group. Dignas characterized the process of temple funding in the Roman Imperial era as a mutual display of diplomatic loyalty between the emperor and the city usually initiated by the latter and funded by the former.\textsuperscript{411} Although cities and provinces may have been financially able to begin construction on a major temple, the conditions of the 2\textsuperscript{nd}-century Empire were such that the provinces were aware of the potential for imperial largesse and availed themselves of this source of revenue.

\textsuperscript{409} Lauter 1986, 12-13. Lauter also generally discussed the relationship between Hellenistic patrons and builders (12-27).

\textsuperscript{410} Dignas 2002, 24.

\textsuperscript{411} Dignas 2002, 132-134.
In the provinces, and especially in the case of temples dedicated to the Imperial Cult, conventional wisdom points to private individuals as the primary source of funds.\textsuperscript{412} There are two reasons for this belief. First, there was a strong tradition in the provinces of including a dedicatory inscription for the funding of a building or an element of that building. Second, provinces and municipalities requested the honor of serving as a neokoros for the Imperial Cult and building a temple dedicated to the emperor. One must keep in mind, however, that dedicatory inscriptions can be easily misinterpreted, and that asking for permission to build a temple is not the same as committing to fund it. The disposition of the title-granting emperor could make a difference in how the means for construction were secured. This is especially relevant because for all their prosperity, the eastern provinces, and especially Asia, were known to have suffered several calamities throughout the 1\textsuperscript{st} through 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries AD.

In her thorough monograph on neokoroi, Burrell concluded that most neokoros Imperial Cult Temples were built with funds contributed by local groups and individuals, such as wealthy donors, priests, the koinon, municipalities, or the province itself. \textsuperscript{413} This conclusion is partly based on the epigraphical evidence that relates to some of the temples and partly on the precedent apparently set by the first neokorate temple awarded. It was at Pergamon and dedicated to Augustus. The establishment of the temple is recorded by Dio Cassius, who stated that Augustus gave permission to the Asians in Pergamon and the Bithynians in Nikomedia to consecrate temples to

\textsuperscript{412} For a summary of the complexity of the funding of monumental temples, see Sear 1983, 113-123. For the funding of temples related to neokoroi, see Burrell 2004, 312-314.

\textsuperscript{413} Burrell 2004, 313.
himself. Burrell took this as proof that Rome did not impose the Imperial Cult on the provinces, but that the provinces took the initiative of requesting it. She also concluded that the construction of the nearly contemporary Temple of Augustus and Roma at Ancyra (A7) was also funded by local people. In this case, however, the evidence is ambiguous. There is no record of the temple’s founding, but a lengthy inscription on its interior records the donations made by the priests of the temple over time. Most concern funding provided for games and feasts. One records that a certain Pylaianne donated, “the places where the Sebasteion is, and where the festival takes place, and the racecourse.” None address the question of who paid for the initial construction of the temple.

A slightly later neokorate temple, built in Smyrna during the reign of Tiberius, provides much information about the competition for neokorate temples in Asia, as well as the Roman response. Tacitus wrote about the award of the neokoria, describing how eleven cities in Asia petitioned for a temple and how the senate debated the issue, eventually choosing Smyrna. The Senate then dispatched a supernumerary legate, or commissioner, to Asia to oversee the temple’s construction. Burrell argued that the commissioner’s role was purely supervisory and that the action by the Senate did not

414 Dio Cassius (51.20.6-9).
416 Bosch 1967, no. 51.
417 Bosch 1967, no. 51. Translation by Burrell 2004, 167. Burrell also outlines the various interpretations of the inscription and what “Sebasteion,” which could mean a temple or other structures related to the operation of the complex.
418 Tacitus (Annals 4.55-56).
419 The phrase used by Tacitus to describe the commissioner is “super numerum legaretur.”
indicate Roman financial contribution. Since M. Lepidus, the sitting governor, declined “out of modesty” to choose this commissioner himself, a certain Valerius Naso, identified as an ex-Praetor, was chosen by lot and dispatched to the province. Since, as Tacitus recorded, those in power at Rome were concerned so much with the location of the temple, it stands to reason that efforts would be made to construct a temple of substantial note. Those efforts certainly included a Roman commissioner, but may also have included other assistance. An incomplete or insufficient temple would have been an embarrassment and the emperor would likely have wanted to ensure the success of the project.

Later constructions at Smyrna were imperially funded; Philostratus reported that Hadrian provided ten million drachmae for the construction of a market, a gymnasium, and a monumental temple. Based on an inscription at that gymnasium, Burrell identified this temple as a “thanks-offering temple” associated with the award of a Hadrianic neokoria. At Smyrna, then, Hadrian awarded the city the neokoros title and provided a sum of money for general use. From those funds the city constructed several buildings, including a monumental neokorate temple. This alone proves beyond a doubt that, by the Hadrianic period, it was possible for imperial funds awarded by the emperor to be used towards the construction of Imperial Cult temples, even if the funds provided were not overtly given for the temple, but for a variety of projects.

Burrell’s overarching claim that the provincial organizations, like the koinon of Asia, paid for the construction of Imperial Cult temples is based partly on the fact that

---

420 Burrell 2004, 39 and 312.
421 Philostratus (Lives of the Sophists 1.25.2).
422 Burrell 2004, 45. For the inscription, see IvS 697
the cities applied for the honor of a neokoria and that at least some sources refer to the koinon members contributing to the sanctuaries of Asia.\textsuperscript{423} Again, it is unclear when these contributions were made and for what purpose. They could have been directed toward the construction of the temple or for operating expenses. No unambiguous sources confirm that the koinon or province undertook initial construction on its own. Certainly the province, koinon, or city supplied some revenue, but the level and purpose of those funds are unclear. More evidence exists for priests and wealthy locals contributing to the operating costs of Imperial Cult temples. First there is the example of Ancyra listed above.\textsuperscript{424} Stephen Mitchell also examined inscriptions recording local benefactions made by priests of the Imperial Cult in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD in Galatia.\textsuperscript{425} Almost all of the benefactions were related to the operational costs of the cult, such as oil, banquets, games, and sacrificial animals. Very few had anything to do with the construction of buildings, and when they did, the funding went to structures used for entertainment.

Imperial support for temples seems to be more on the level of initial founding and financing. The first two neokoroi of Smyrna perhaps provide the best evidence. In the first, Tiberius and the Senate appointed a senior Roman official to serve as an Imperial representative overseeing the project. For the second neokoria, historical sources record that the Emperor Hadrian awarded the city a neokoria, and later supplied an enormous sum of money in earthquake relief, some of which was applied to the

\textsuperscript{423} Burrell (2004, 313) points to Dio Chrysostomos (Oration 35.14, 17) as evidence for these assessments.

\textsuperscript{424} See page 121.

\textsuperscript{425} Mitchell 1993, 107-109. See especially table 8.1, which provides a list of donations.
rebuilding of the Imperial Cult temple. The epigraphical testimony suggests that this temple was originally built in thanks to the emperor. In any event, Hadrian clearly gave money to Smyrna and, although the sources do not explicitly say so, it probably funded the erection of his Imperial Cult temple there.

All told, Burrell concluded that in the early Empire all of a province’s cities bore the initial cost of construction, appointed overseers and contributed workmen, but that Hadrian’s reign introduced a paradigmatic shift in which the emperor could and did directly fund temple construction.\(^{426}\) Boatwright even concluded that the Emperor paid for the refurbishment, renovation, or construction of as many as eleven buildings that housed or have been linked to the Imperial Cult: the Traianeion at Italica, the Library of Hadrian at Athens, the Olympieion at Athens (A2), the Temple of Zeus Panhellenius at Athens, the “Pantheon” of Athens, the Temple of the Nymphs at Antioch, the Imperial Cult temple at Smyrna\(^{427}\), a sanctuary of Hermes at Trapezus, the Temple of Augustus at Tarraco, the Basilica of Plotina at Nemausus, and the “Temple of Zeus” at Cyzicus.\(^{428}\)

In contrast to the apparent commitment on the part of at least Hadrian, documented evidence of private donations to the building of major Imperial Cult sites is slim. When evidence does exist, the associated building is far different than the

\(^{426}\) Burrell 2004, 312-314. Burrell admitted that there is limited evidence that can be used to determine funding sources. However, the evidence seems to suggest that in the early development of the provincial Imperial Cult, the koina and province offered the funds for the temples, while later emperors were more willing to contribute to the construction of temples.

\(^{427}\) See note 17.

\(^{428}\) Boatwright 2000, 136. Regarding the temples listed above, Boatwright did concede that only some of these buildings directly honored the emperor or his family, sometimes the imperial connection was more nuanced. Boatwright also discussed the primary evidence linking the buildings with Hadrian and the Imperial Cult throughout Chapters 6 and 7 of her book. She (2000, 110 [table 6.2]) also developed a useful table recording the known benefactions made to cities by Hadrian for non-utilitarian public works. The clear majority are temples, many of which can be tied to the worship of Zeus or the emperor.
enormous spotlight temples. Revell provided a comparative example in her studies of Italica and Clunia. At Italica, Hadrian is credited with building the enormous Traianeum. The Imperial Cult temple at Clunia, on the other hand, was presumably built with local funds. In contrast to its counterpart in Italica, the Clunia temple was really a small shrine built within a larger plaza made up of small shops. This not only shows the variety of Imperial Cult structures, but also underscores the difference in scale and singular function of imperially funded Imperial Cult temples. To conclude, it seems clear that private donations to major Imperial Cult temples mirrored those of other structures; They were gifts for operational costs or renovations, modest in comparison to the sum that would have been spent for an initial construction of a structure the size of the spotlight temples.

Building Materials

Structural and decorative building materials can also point to the source of construction. With the exception of the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius, the spotlight temples were all constructed according to Roman building techniques, especially with the use of concrete. Several major earthquakes during the 1st and 2nd centuries AD might have motivated builders to adopt concrete construction to increase

429 Revell 2009, 91.

430 Burrell (2004, 101) cited Waelkens' (1987, 96-97) comment that Sardis had some habit of using rubble mortared walls, but that the use of concrete truly prevailed after a 17 AD earthquake, and then only under Roman supervision. Since Waelkens's thesis stresses that Romans prompted the use of cemented walls to replace ashlar masonry, I believe that the 1st-century AD use of concrete at the Wadi B Temple should be considered a Roman building technique.
building stability.\textsuperscript{431} In addition to the structural benefits of concrete, the medium also increased the speed with which the temples could be erected. While many ancient temples took centuries to build,\textsuperscript{432} concrete could accelerate the building process via the reduction of costs and availability of materials. In light of the common occurrence of incomplete temples, such a rapid pace of construction must have been impressive. Within a few decades, the spotlight temples would have dramatically altered the local topography of Sardis, Ephesus, Pergamon, and Cyzicus. This would have been especially evident at Sardis, where contemporaneity of the ornament and foundations shows that the Wadi B Temple was completed within the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD, while its neighbor, the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius, was never fully finished. The builders of the spotlight temples, therefore, asserted their ability to apply technological innovation to traditional problems associated with monumental sanctuaries.

The visible materials used in some of the spotlight temples also provide clues to who was responsible for their construction. Most of the stone was of high quality or diverse origin. For example, the Temple of Hadrian was almost entirely built of Proconnesian marble and the varieties of stone used in the Red Hall were a clear demonstration of economic might and political reach.\textsuperscript{433} Another example, the sixty-ton monolithic door sill (I40) at the Red Hall has even been suggested to be a symbol of the

\textsuperscript{431} In contrast to those made with blocks, concrete and concrete-supported foundations constitute a seamless unit that decreases the chance of structural shifting. Lancaster 2008, 259 has noted that as structures were built on a larger scale, perhaps foundations became a focus for technological improvement, especially in locations prone to earthquakes.

\textsuperscript{432} The Olympieion at Athens (A2), the Didymaion (A4), and the Temple of Artemis at Sardis are all examples of a monumental temple that took many centuries to build due to the waxing and waning of funding.

\textsuperscript{433} Proximity to Proconnessus could have made the marble from its quarries the cheapest available material for Cyzicus. Nevertheless, the amount of marble used in the temple is staggering, as is the detail with which it was sculpted.
community’s power.\textsuperscript{434} Unfortunately, the meager remains of the Wadi B Temple and the Vetters Temple preclude the approach of material analysis, although both of their superstructures were built of fine white marble. The issue is even more complicated for the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius due to the length of its construction process and its inception as a Greek building. Nevertheless, all the temples include marble quarried during the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries AD\textsuperscript{435}, and must have been completed with the help of the emperor, who by that time had claimed ownership of the majority of marble quarries in the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{436} In general, raw materials for building were almost certainly acquired with the help of the emperor.\textsuperscript{437}

The ornamental and sculptural decoration of the spotlight temples could also communicate the identity of the agents of construction. Cornelius Vermeule asserted that the cities of Roman Asia preferred colored marble and distinct architectural carving over sculpture in their large public structures.\textsuperscript{438} So the modest amounts of sculpture found at some of the temples could be a result of regional preference, or an outsider’s

\textsuperscript{434} Nohlen 1998, 89. Nohlen did not specify the community to which he referred. Rieger (2005, 86-88) also noted that few ancient buildings possessing anything comparable to the enormous door sill have the imperial connections of the Red Hall, causing her to identify Hadrian as a major donor of construction.

\textsuperscript{435} New marble at the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius is most notable present in the colossal cult statues, which were most likely not re-sculpted.

\textsuperscript{436} MacMullen 1959, 212 and Dodge 1988, 69-70. Dodge (1988, 76) even proposed that the system of imperially-owned marble quarries was specifically set up to provide the emperor with the material for his use. Dodge (1990, 108-109) has also argued that the Empire was a major factor in the emergence and organization of a sophisticated marble trading system in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD. She argued that participation in the Roman social and economic framework was the root cause of the use of marble and granite in the eastern provinces. So while the use of various marbles and granites was not unknown in Asia in earlier centuries, the Empire made available a greater variety and amount of imported stones. For more on the trade and use of ancient marble, see Ward-Perkins 1971 and 1980 and Dodge 1988 and 1991.

\textsuperscript{437} Mitchell 1987, 344. He provided examples, including many sources that mention Hadrian providing materials. For example, Hadrian sent columns from various quarries to Smyrna (\textit{IGR} 4.1431) and Athens (Pausanias 1.18.9).

\textsuperscript{438} Vermeule 1977, 87-88.
adherence to that local preference. Most of the spotlight temples utilize the standard decorative schemes of Greek architecture. Some sculpted features, however, represent distinct Roman styles: the torso capitals of the Wadi B Temple (I15), the grapevine-wrapped columns at the Temple of Hadrian (I63), and the Egyptianizing figural columns at the Red Hall (I40-I42) differ from Greek and Egyptian precedents and may be viewed as expressions of Roman or imperial taste. We can thus understand the decoration and adornment of the temples as an expression of a variant of Egelhaaf-Gaiser’s theory that ornament represents the link between a building and the history of the community. Mirroring the mixed composition of the plans and materials, the ornament and decorative materials can be seen as a considerate nod to local interests with the inclusion of Roman sculpture as appropriate.

Considering building techniques and adornment, it seems clear that imperial powers had a hand, or at least a voice of authority, in the construction of the spotlight temples. Concrete arches, brick walls, and manipulated landscapes were not unknown.

---

439 Capitals depicting human figures are not uncommon in ancient architecture, especially in Roman buildings. For an overview of ancient figured capitals, see Von Mercklin 1962, especially 147-186 for full and half-figure Roman capitals most similar to what was found at the Wadi B Temple site; and Ridgway 1999, 49, especially note 35, which includes a summary and bibliography for figured capitals in Greek architecture. Although figural additions to column capitals were common in Roman architecture, there are in fact few examples that include identifiable characters.

440 Entwined columns, pilasters, and pillars appear on Roman monuments from the Republican period (Basilica Aemilia), through the early Principate (the Ara Pacis), and into the High Empire (Hadrian’s Villa). See Mathea-Förtsch 1999 for a comprehensive catalogue, many of which resemble the Cyzicene fragments. A strikingly similar comparison for the vine-wrapped columns at Cyzicus can be found on the “Tomb-Crane Relief” from the 1st-century AD Tomb of the Haterii in Rome (see Jensen 1978). On this relief panel, a Roman prostyle temple is depicted, the columns of which were sculpted with the same grape vine motif as that of the Cyzicus columns.

441 See note 252. For more on the popularity of Egyptian styles in 2nd-century AD Rome, see Chapter 3, 160-161.

442 The figural sculpture, especially as it relates to cult status, is be considered in much more detail in Chapter 3.
in Asia, but they carried with them an undeniable association with Roman construction methods. Visually pleasing materials and eclectic decoration were also not totally foreign to the architecture associated with the Greek speaking world, but the overabundance of these elements in the spotlight temples nonetheless demonstrates a deviation from the norm, a hallmark of Roman taste. Yet the overall plan and size of the temples obviously drew influence from the preexisting local monumental temples.

**Beneficiaries**

Rather than exclusively examining the finances or the decorative programs as a means to establish the agents of construction, an alternative approach could consider the beneficiaries of the spotlight temples. According to the simplest view, the city and province benefited from a continued source of income and an enhanced reputation

---

443 It is the inventive uses of these construction techniques that give them their Roman character. Arches have long been used by humans, but the Romans were the first to use arches supported by or composed of concrete as stand-alone or subterranean supports. Likewise, brick production was nothing new in the ancient world, but Romans standardized the industry and were the first to use bricks on a large scale. Furthermore, there is no pre-Byzantine (c. 5th-6th century AD) building in Asia that is fully constructed of bricks. Finally, it is interesting that all of the temples but the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius exhibit a dramatic manipulation of the landscape, not unlike the way systematically planned Roman colonies, like Ostia (see Meiggs 1973) or Thamagudi (see Watkins 2002), exhibit an interest in order over natural landscape. In contrast, the Greek temple par excellence, the Parthenon, was built deliberately to appear as if it organically sprouted from the Athenian acropolis, adapting to the natural contours of the space (even though in reality it was made from marble quarried a short distance away and made use of artificial terracing).

444 Roman taste is also evident in other types of civic architecture of 2nd-century Asia, but with slightly different circumstances. Public fountains, for example, were a major type of public benefaction in the Hadrianic era. In a book focusing on the topics of civic patronage and Roman imperialism demonstrated by Roman fountains, Longfellow has argued (2011, 140-162) that the public fountains of Asia display a variety of forms and settings. Most pay homage or draw on local architectural traditions, but also demonstrate the flair of Hadrianic architecture. This is not dissimilar to the design and decoration of the spotlight temples. Yet, unlike the patrons of the spotlight temples, the benefactors of these fountains can be identified as the emperor, imperial administrators, or wealthy locals, which seems to indicate that Roman taste had simply become the popular taste of the era. Looking at the locations where fountains were funded by local elites, however, Longfellow noted (161) that none was built in a city visited by the emperor and noted the possibility that these fountains may have been inspired by those built by the emperor or imperial administrators. Even more telling, these locally funded fountains also tend to emphasize local deities and situations, while those built by the emperor do not.
created by the temples. On the other hand, the Empire and emperor would gain local
prestige from having helped to create such awe-inspiring structures. In addition, the
temples served to elevate the visible Roman presence in the region and consequently
make an imprint on daily life.\textsuperscript{445} Individuals surely participated in the development of the
temples, most likely as workers, or by vacating land.\textsuperscript{446} Only one individual, the
emperor, certainly possessed the financial ability, and perhaps political incentive, to
finance an entire structure of the scale and quality of the spotlight temples. Yet, the
public agenda of the emperor was indivisible from that of the Empire itself. By the
Roman Imperial period, buildings the size of the spotlight temples were likely too large,
too expensive, and the benefits too comprehensive for them to have been the
achievement of one person, or even one political entity. Therefore, the benefit of each
temple was, to an extent, shared between the Empire and the municipality or
province.\textsuperscript{447}

\textsuperscript{445} Although the Temple of Artemis at Sardis was no more physically prominent after the introduction of
the Antonine cult, it did elevate the emperor’s visible presence, as he became a part of the local cult.

\textsuperscript{446} The latter is most plausible for the Red Hall, which was built in the lower city of Pergamon near the
river, and away from known public buildings. People almost certainly lived in the area of the temenos. The
centrality of the Wadi B Temple at Sardis and the location of the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus near the
sea would make both logical places for preexisting settlements. At the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus
Pius, the building predated Roman construction, and at Ephesus the Vetters Temple was built on former
swampland. Therefore, neither would have displaced people.

\textsuperscript{447} Monumental temples were built by municipalities of Asia prior to Roman control of the province. Yet
most of those predate the Roman Empire by several hundreds of years. I propose that the arrival of
Rome as an overwhelming political force so changed the political and cultural makeup of the province that
cities no longer built monumental temples on their own. Furthermore, many of the preceding monumental
temples of the region had established their foundations to autochthonous myths of the gods they served
(the Heraion at Samos) or understood themselves to have a special connection with the deity (the
Didymaion [A4] and the Artemision [A5]).
Conclusion

According to Lynne Lancaster, engineering skill was seen as an indicator of cultural superiority during the Roman era.\textsuperscript{448} She also noted that during the second half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD, imperial building declined in Rome in part because effort was shifted to areas of need in the provinces.\textsuperscript{449} Aside from the vanities of showmanship and a desire to please the emperor, there was no obvious local need for the monumental temples, so the initiative must have belonged to Rome.\textsuperscript{450} If the spotlight temples were purely the creations of Romans, then they could be seen as an affirmation of cultural power over the province and its cities. Yet the designs of the spotlight temples act in many ways to highlight the local architectural tradition, which preceded Roman influence by centuries. Accordingly, we can view the spotlight temples as the conceptual products of the entire Roman Empire, including the emperor, the province, the cities, Roman administrators and engineers, and the local elites, working classes, and slaves. In terms of likely sources of revenue, style and initiative to build, however, I conclude that the emperors were the most significant players in the construction of the spotlight temples. Without the initiative set and financial support given by the imperial office, only the Temple of Artemis would have been built.

\textsuperscript{448} Lancaster 2008, 278. Specifically, Lancaster was writing about engineering innovations like concrete.

\textsuperscript{449} Lancaster 2008, 272.

\textsuperscript{450} In this case, the Wadi B Temple and Temple of Artemis and Antoninus require a more nuanced view, especially if the Wadi B Temple was a reconstructed temple of Zeus.
Emulation, Appropriation, and Innovation

Given their architecture, material, and decoration, the outward appearance of the spotlight temples and their precincts can be understood as emulations or appropriations of, or improvements upon, the traditional Hellenistic temples of Asia. In terms of building techniques and internal composition, however, they display Roman engineering skill. None of the spotlight temples is an outright copy of a Greek predecessor, so they must be viewed as attempts to harness the spirit of Hellenistic predecessors. By combining the size and appearance of local monumental Greek sanctuaries with new materials, the spotlight temples represent altered versions of the monumental temple type. Alterations in outward appearance were subtle, especially in the cases of the Wadi B Temple and the Vetters Temple, and to a lesser extent the Temple of Hadrian. In this respect, the unique design of the Red Hall makes it an obvious outlier. In terms of their supporting structure, with the exception of the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius, the modifications to the building process were dramatic.

Like the structures they emulated, the spotlight temples were cult centers, but the contextual impact of the Roman Empire altered the terms of their reception. Roman images and buildings certainly recalled Greek models, but the models could be manipulated according to the needs of a situation. The Greek-based designs and ornament of the spotlight temples illustrate this idea. Yet each temple offered distinct deviations from the Greek norms in form and material. The Wadi B temple and the Vetters Temple mimicked the size and setting of large Hellenistic temples, but were constructed using new building techniques and required an extreme manipulation of the

landscape. The Temple of Hadrian and the Red Hall both emulated aspects of monumental temple complexes, but featured eclectic decorative programs paired with traditional ornament. Finally, the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius is a superb sign of Roman emulative desire, a wholesale appropriation that included significant physical alterations and the installation of a new cult.

Michael Grant observed that Roman temples in the provinces tended to combine Roman influences with regional styles, which he argued was done to encourage conquered and subjugated peoples to accept, and perhaps support, Roman control. That some of the spotlight temples combine Greek forms with Roman building techniques may support this theory. Yet according to Richard Krautheimer, symbolic significance simply accompanied form, but was not tied to any specific interpretations. That is, many viewers could agree that a particular building meant something, but no consensus could be reached concerning what that meaning was. Other factors, like cultural or political orientation of viewers, inspired the majority of specific interpretations. Accordingly, Krautheimer claimed that copies of a building often demonstrate the ‘disintegration’ of the prototype into single elements for which viewers provide the interpretive framework. In the case of the spotlight temples, the designers isolated features of Greek temple architecture and integrated them into a new mode of

---

452 Strabo (5.3.8) observed that the Greeks were skilled at building cities that took advantage of natural features, whereas the Romans were more willing to overcome natural features to benefit their projects.

453 Again, the choice to appropriate the Temple of Artemis may have been financially motivated, as it potentially saved the Sardians or the Empire the cost of erecting a new temple.

454 Grant 1995, 34.

455 Krautheimer 1942, 9.

456 Krautheimer 1942, 14.
construction. The comprehensive result was neither wholly revolutionary nor traditional.\textsuperscript{457} Rather than supporting Roman control, then, perhaps the combination of emulation and innovation encouraged active provincial participation in the makeup of the Empire.

As mentioned above, some have expressed the opinion that architecture in Asia can be characterized in terms of Roman imposition verses Greek tradition.\textsuperscript{458} Except for the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus, the foundations of the spotlight temples are thoroughly Roman in material and technique, making them products of Roman-era dominance. In their design, however, any suspicion of overt imposition is tempered by the incorporation of traditional features of monumental temple complexes. Perhaps the builders of the spotlight temples attempted to emulate preceding Asian shrines in order to demonstrate that the Roman Empire, including the Asian province, was capable of matching without diminishing the achievements of the past.

Yegül has opined that the cities of Asia held onto the memories of a mythical and historical past and used those memories as a metaphor for the present.\textsuperscript{459} Although not all the spotlight temples were built of old stones, as the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius was, they relied on a traditional model, injecting new materials, techniques, and an evolving visual vocabulary. In doing so they harnessed the significance of tradition within a new Roman package. This could have activated pride in the regional past, but it also confirmed the power of the Empire and its ability to elevate

\textsuperscript{457} The basis for this conclusion came from Brown (1964, 58), who called the architecture of Hadrian “neither eclectic nor traditional”, but a product of skill and creative design. Here, I have amended his conclusion and applied it to the periods preceding and succeeding Hadrian’s reign as well.

\textsuperscript{458} See Brown 1964, Lyttelton 1987, and Yegül 2000 for a full expression of this diametrical view.

\textsuperscript{459} Yegül 2000, 150-151.
the region in a number of ways, including temple architecture. Given their complexity, the spotlight temples could achieve these monumental goals through clever construction and design.

Architectural and artistic impact is only one avenue through which a temple’s monumentality can be interpreted. Function is an entirely different matter. As the builders of the Roman period adopted Greek temple types and tailored them to meet their specific needs, the characters of the cults housed in those temples also required attention. The next chapter will examine the function of the spotlight temples via their cult affiliations and explore the ways in which newly formed cults and modified traditional cults could establish and promote monumentality.
3. The Question of Cult

Cultural significance and religious affiliation must have been substantial reasons for the size and lavish decoration of the spotlight temples. Although the personal beliefs of cult participants will forever be unknown, the physical monumentality of the temples establishes that they served well-funded cults and active worshippers. In this chapter, I outline the possible religious identities of the spotlight temples and suggest ways in which these identities could have affected their societal function. After summarizing the prevailing theories that identify the spotlight temples as places of emperor worship, I follow with a brief discussion about the Imperial Cult. Next, I compile, review, and analyze all the available evidence for the religious affiliation of the temples, which I believe shows that the temples can also be linked to traditional deities through the identity of the emperor. To conclude, I describe the ways in which a fluid association between the Imperial Cult and traditional deities at the spotlight temples positioned them as divinely inflected symbols of local and Imperial identity that encouraged imperial unity.

Accepted Affiliations

Scholars have overwhelmingly recognized a strong link between the spotlight temples and the Roman emperor. The Wadi B Temple at Sardis is believed to have been a provincial temple of Asia, perhaps even a neokorate temple of the Imperial

---

460 There is no question that the spotlight temples were all built as religious structures. As noted in the preceding chapter, all but the Red Hall conform to standard Greek temple design. For that reason, the Red Hall’s religious function is less clear, but because it was situated inside a clearly demarcated temenos and possessed interior ritual architecture, it is certainly a religious structure.
Cult. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus and the Vetters Temple at Ephesus are also candidates for neokorate temples, and with some effort can also be associated with Zeus and the Emperor Hadrian. While the Red Hall is almost certainly related to an Egyptian deity or deities, a close connection with Hadrian has also been argued.

Finally, the remnants of colossal statues depicting the Antonine family found at the Temple of Artemis at Sardis are considered proof that the temple was rededicated as an Imperial Cult temple, perhaps for the second Sardian neokorate. From this brief summary, it is clear that prevailing theories identify a relationship between the temples and the office of the Roman emperor, and consequently, the Imperial Cult.

The Imperial Cult was a sacred institution focused on the divine properties of the person and office of the Roman emperor. Augustus initiated it as a cult to Rome and Caesar, but the practice continued for all emperors prior to the ascendance of Christianity. It was an adaptable institution, both in terms of how it was religiously constituted and of how it was applied across various geographic zones and cultures. Consequently, there is great diversity in the ways in which the cult was implemented through architecture and practice. Any temple, from a small shrine to a monumental

---

461 Ratté, Howe, and Foss (1986, 63-68) made the case for a provincial temple, which Burrell (2004, 100-103) suggested may have been the temple for Sardis’s first neokorate.

462 Mania (2011a, 350-351) suggested this based on the peculiar design of the Red Hall and the likelihood that Hadrian visited Pergamon during its construction.


464 Cassius Dio (51.20.6-7) recorded the beginnings of the Imperial Cult. A decree of the League of Asian Cities hailing Augustus as a divinity and savior given to mankind for its benefit and for the restoration of peace (SEG IV 490, dated to 9 BC by Fears [1977, 215]) offers early epigraphic confirmation for the establishment of the cult. There seems to have been no clear end to the practice, as pagan cult activities continued alongside imperially approved Christianity for some time after the public conversion of the Emperor Constantine in 312 AD. Constantine’s conversion to Christianity was in fact a gradual process, similar to that of the Empire as a whole. It is quite possible that practices associated with the Imperial Cult continued on in some form throughout the first several centuries of Christianity before being expropriated into codified Christian worship.
structure built with private or public funds, could house the cult. In practice, a Roman emperor could be worshipped through rituals, sacrifices, personal devotions, festivals, or any combination thereof. In the provinces, emperors could be worshipped while living, but in Rome an emperor became fully divinized only after his death.465

Natural mortality bound the identity of the current emperor with those emperors of past and future in the continuation of the Imperial Cult. Two Roman concepts that facilitate the development of the Imperial Cult as an institution are *genius* and *numen*. In Roman culture, *genius* was almost a synonym of “self.”466 It was not exclusive to an emperor, but individuals, families, institutions, and Roman society were also endowed with a *genius*. *Numen* was a term that can be understood as “spirit,” or the will of something endowed with divinity.467 Accordingly, normal people were not understood to have *numen*, which was instead the exclusive property of the gods, emperors, and the entity of Rome and the Roman people. In an early study of institutionalized emperor worship, Lily Ross Taylor asserted that the eternal *genius* of the emperor was the subject of worship, while the living emperor and his family were its tangible objects.468 In this context, *genius* can be defined as an external force accompanying and helping an emperor during his lifetime. Duncan Fishwick argued that *genius* was like a spiritual companion to the living emperor.469 Fishwick also stressed the distinction between

465 There are exceptions to this, but in general, the living emperor was rarely the object of worship in Italy.

466 *Genius* (See OLD s.v. *Genius*) was the divine nature or spirit innate in all things. See also Kunckel 1974.

467 *Numen* (See OLD s.v. *Numen*) could be the divine will of the gods or divinity itself.

468 Taylor 1931, 207. Taylor seems to conflate the term *genius* with *numen*, but her main point that the eternal aspects of the emperor were the focus and the living emperor was the conduit are unaffected by the choice of vocabulary.

469 Fishwick 1969, 360-361.
*genius* and *numen*, maintaining that the latter referred to the divine quality of all emperors, living and dead.⁴⁷⁰ Although this is a much debated issue, the Imperial Cult can be understood as an official apparatus for the celebration of the *genius* of the living emperor and the eternal imperial *numen*. No matter what worshippers believed about the supernatural qualities of the emperor, his cult was based on the concept that all emperors occupied a position endowed with divinity that existed before and extended beyond mortal life. In theory, a temple dedicated to a particular emperor existed to honor only that specific emperor until his death, at which point he became a part of the collective imperial *numen*.⁴⁷¹ So even though a temple may have continued to be associated with and named for a specific emperor, like the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, it nevertheless functioned as a temple of the Imperial Cult. This is all to underscore that at its heart the Imperial Cult was understood to be an enduring religious institution.

Often, a temple of the Imperial Cult was accompanied by the honorific *neokoros*,⁴⁷² a Greek word meaning “temple warden” that was often used as a title of

---

⁴⁷⁰ Fishwick 1969, 359-360. A person could not be a *numen*, but could be endowed with the divine quality of a *numen*. In simplest terms, Fishwick argued that the *numen* of the emperors was the divine endowment that came with the office. He did caution (365) that the distinction between *genius* and *numen* was perhaps too difficult for much of the population to grasp, but that it nevertheless formed the base of the early development of the Imperial Cult.

⁴⁷¹ Some individual emperors surely continued to be celebrated on designated days, especially if festivals were endowed in their name. Regularly practiced rituals that took place at the temples must have been performed for the benefit of the current emperor. Consider also that although the construction of a temple may have begun during one emperor’s reign, it would very likely be completed by his successor. The Traianeion at Pergamon (A6), for example, was dedicated to Trajan, but built by Hadrian. Cult statues of both emperors were found in the temple, suggesting that both were honored in the temple: Trajan after his death, Hadrian while still alive. Another example is the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus in Sardis, where Antoninus Pius’s two successors, Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius (along with their wives), were also honored with statues.

⁴⁷² See note 74.
prestige in parts of the Greek-speaking world, and especially in Asia. Some cities used the term to advertise a significant relationship with traditional deities; Ephesus, for example, called itself a neokoros of Artemis.\textsuperscript{473} By the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD, however, the title was used exclusively in reference to temples of the Roman Imperial Cult.\textsuperscript{474} Since the very term neokoros includes the word for temple, it is assumed that a temple must have existed in connection with the designation, and such a temple is called a neokorate temple.\textsuperscript{475} Not every temple dedicated to the worship of an emperor or other Roman ruler earned its city the title neokoros,\textsuperscript{476} but any city in Asia that included neokoros in its titulature from the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD onward is assumed to have possessed a temple of the Roman Imperial Cult.

\textsuperscript{473} This was an inconsistent practice. Burrell (2004, 328-329) noted that only Ephesus, Aizanoi, and Magnesia called themselves neokoroi for traditional gods because of their large shrines to Artemis and Zeus. However, Burrell also observed that not all cities with major temples self-identified themselves as holders of a neokorate. Didyma, for example, did not claim a neokorate for Apollo, despite the massive Didymaion dedicated to that god. So the reason for adopting this title for traditional gods is unknown. Unless otherwise specified, the title neokoros refers to the Imperial Cult.

\textsuperscript{474} Price 1984b, 64-65. See especially footnote 47.

\textsuperscript{475} The word neokoros may also support my conclusions regarding the agents of construction. Wardenship refers to keeping guard over an entity that one has been given. If the cities were the primary agents of construction for the spotlight temples serving the Imperial Cult, then a title more suggestive of ownership would be appropriate. Instead, however, it is known that cities applied to the emperor to attain neokoros status, and the emperor either fulfilled or denied that request, which implies that the emperor had the ability to grant cities and provinces with a temple to ward.

\textsuperscript{476} For example, the Temple of Augustus and Roma at Ancyra (A7) was built before Augustus began awarding the title neokoros. Furthermore, in a letter to his brother Quintus (Letters to his Brother Quintus 1.1.26), Cicero insisted that, although he rejected an Asian offer to build a temple or monument in his honor, it would not have been unlawful for him to accept. This implies that such honors had been offered before, and that temples dedicated to individual Roman rulers could exist outside the stable of neokorate temples. As competition for neokirates increased, the title was awarded more frequently, but temples to the Imperial Cult were still regularly built without the honorific being attached.
Evidence for Identification

Although there are several unanswered questions concerning their individual dedications, the spotlight temples are thematically united by connections with the emperor. The following sections present all the evidence for the cults hosted in the spotlight temples. Where available, archaeological material found on the sites and ancient testimony that unquestionably relates to the temples is highlighted. Ancient testimony on an unspecified subject that may apply to the temples, such as coins, historical accounts, and off-site inscriptions, is also significant and is included when appropriate.

The Wadi B Temple

In the preceding chapter, the high quality of the Wadi B temple’s structure and adornment was emphasized. It was one of the characteristics that Ratté, Howe, and Foss took as affirmation that the temple served as a provincial center of the Imperial Cult.\textsuperscript{477} They also noted that many conservative pseudodipteral temples have been associated with emperor worship.\textsuperscript{478} Correlation between pseudodipteral plans and temples of the Imperial Cult is an interesting idea, but far from universal. Expensive material, innovative engineering, and quality craftsmanship are unmistakeable signs that the temple received sufficient, if not abundant, funding from external sources. That

\textsuperscript{477} Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 46.

\textsuperscript{478} Ratté, Howe, and Foss (1986, 62) mentioned as comparanda the Temple of Domitian at Ephesus (A3), the Temple of Augustus and Roma at Ancyra (A7), and the Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias (A8). Although dedicated to Aphrodite, the temple at Aphrodisias may have highlighted a relationship with the emperors of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, who traced their ancestry to the goddess.
would seem to be a strong indicator of imperial attention or support, which in turn suggests an affiliation with the Imperial Cult.

Of the published epigraphical material, only a single tympanum block (I15) can contribute to arguments for the temple’s identity. The block was found during the excavations of 1981-1982 and includes the word “ΑΔΡΑΜΥ/THON,” as well as molding and damaged traces of relief sculpture. Roughly hewn, the inscription and ornament almost appear as afterthoughts when compared to the more finished appearance of the temple’s other known sculptural fragments (I16 and I17). It is possible that the block came from another structure, but because there are no other known structures nearby it is more likely that it was a part of the Wadi B Temple. Clive Foss concluded that the text refers to the city of Adramyteion in Mysia. Since Adramyteion was among the conventi of Asia, Foss and his coauthors concluded that the pediment must have also included the names of the other cities that bore that title. If true, that makes the temple a candidate for one of the meeting points of the koinon that supervised the Asian Imperial Cult. Burrell accepted this hypothesis and suggested that Sardis and the other

---

479 Greenewalt, Sullivan, Ratté, and Howe 1985, 63.

480 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 63. Foss took primary responsibility for the section of the article on temple identification. In the article, he used the Latin spelling of the name, Adramyteion. The spelling on the pediment block is, “Ἀδραμύτηον,” which Foss considered to be a “novel” spelling of the name, more usually spelled, “Ἀδραμύτειον.” The city was located on the northwest coast of Turkey, eventually becoming the modern village of Ören, near the modern city of Edremit.

481 See Chapter 1, 5.

482 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 63-68. Recall that the conventi constituted a group of cities where the Roman provincial governor held court. However, those same cities also served as meeting places for the koinon, which administered the Imperial Cult. Thus, the conventi were linked with the provincial administration of the Roman Imperial Cult.
conventi could have been commemorated in the Wadi B temple’s decorative scheme. Although no evidence that other cities were listed has yet been found, Adramyteion is out of place on its own and was unlikely to have been included as such.

Some sculptural fragments have been found at the Wadi B temple, but none comes from a cult statue. Of the sculpture found at Wadi B, the bronze fragments of a lion and the column capital decorated with torsos (I17) illustrate the extravagant decoration at the temple. The bronze fragments likely formed part of an over life-size lion that may have been either a part of the sculptural program or a votive offering. In either scenario, the prominent presence of a large lion sculpture evokes the notions of power and authority associated with the imperial office. Regarding the torso capitals, Greenewalt has suggested that the figure could represent Herakles, a Greek hero who embodied strength and power. Figured capitals are not uncommon in Greek or Roman art, but the depiction of Herakles on a capital is found elsewhere only at the

---

483 Burrell 2004, 101. She also noted that the personifications of cities on the frieze of the Temple of Hekate at Lagina or the people represented on the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias are precedents for this, although the entities depicted in those examples are unlabeled.

484 Burrell hypothesized that personification of the cities was a possibility. I agree that this is an attractive suggestion, but I think that it is more likely that the names of the cities were simply inscribed on the tympanum, which would explain the unrefined appearance of the existing Adramyteion inscription.

485 This is may soon change, as the Sardis excavation team plans to dig in the Wadi B sector during the 2013 season.


487 Greenewalt 2006, 743-744.
Baths of Caracalla.\textsuperscript{488} Several emperors throughout the Imperial period incorporated the persona and attributes of Herakles into their public imagery, as a means to assert their power and connections with divinity.\textsuperscript{489} Thus these fragments could indicate some support for an imperial character, but the association is uncertain.

Several statue bases inscribed with honorifics were recently found at the Wadi B site, supporting an association with the Imperial Cult.\textsuperscript{490} Although they await full publication, Greenewalt summarized their contents as listing conventional city titles of Sardis, including, “autochthonous and sacred to the gods, metropolis of Asia and all Lydia, metropolis of Asia and all Lydia and Greece, twice neokoros, and friend and ally of the Romans.”\textsuperscript{491} These inscribed bases would then support two general conclusions: first, that the partnership between the Empire and Sardis was advertised at the Wadi B site and second, that the Wadi B Temple was active at the time of the second neokorate.

\textsuperscript{488} At the Baths of Caracalla, not all of the figured capitals represent Herakles. Those that do, however, are easy to identify as their design imitates that of the Farnese Herakles, a famous sculpture on display in the baths. For the Baths of Caracalla, see DeLaine 1997, 72-73 and 81-83. For more on figured capitals see note 441.

\textsuperscript{489} Herakles was the son of Zeus and a lion pelt was one of his attributes. For more on the use of Herakles in Roman imperial imagery, see Hekster 2005.

\textsuperscript{490} Greenewalt 2006, 744-745. According to Greenewalt’s summary, twelve inscriptions were found, most of which were cut into statue bases. These inscribed bases were found among a larger collection of sculptural and architectural fragments at what Greenewalt considered to be a dump site. Their proximity to the Wadi B Temple and the uniformity of sculptural style support the contention that they are associated with the temple, and that they may have been dumped after the destruction of the temple.

\textsuperscript{491} Greenewalt 2006, 745. Eight previously unattested individuals are named in these inscriptions (six men and two women) and their titles include: councilor, agonothete, priest of Zeus Polieus, panegyriarchon, strategos, and priestess of Artemis. These titles are discussed below, where they appear in fully published inscriptions.
According to Tacitus, Sardis initially attempted, but failed, to win neokoros status in the reign of Tiberius.\(^{492}\) Sardis probably first received the honor of an Imperial Cult neokorate later in the 1\(^{st}\) century AD. A lost honorific inscription (T18) mentioned a high priest of the Augusti, as well as the Emperors Vespasian and Titus, suggesting that the initial neokoros status had been bestowed on Sardis by the time of the Flavian dynasty.\(^{493}\) Therefore, the emperor ultimately responsible for the first Sardian neokorate could have been Claudius, Nero, Vespasian, or Titus. Given its 1\(^{st}\)-century AD date, substantial size, and possible link to the conventi, the Wadi B Temple is likely to have been the first neokoros temple of the Imperial Cult awarded to Sardis.

Due to its location and at least one historical source, the Wadi B Temple could also be identified as a temple of Zeus. The temple was originally bounded on the south and west by steep walls surmounted by exclusive properties that may have formed part or all of the Lydian palace.\(^{494}\) According to Arrian, Alexander the Great gave instructions to build a Temple to Zeus *Polieus*\(^{495}\) at Sardis on or near the acropolis, in close proximity to the site of the Lydian palace.\(^{496}\) No ancient remains have been identified as an ancient temple to Zeus at the Wadi B site, but if one existed, it could have easily

\(^{492}\) Tacitus (*Annals* 4.55-56). The neokorate was given to Smyrna instead.

\(^{493}\) Burrell 2004, 100.

\(^{494}\) In personal correspondence, Nicholas Cahill has suggested that the remains of housing and high-quality portable goods make this a plausible site for the Lydian palace.

\(^{495}\) Polieus (See *LSJ* s.v. Πολιεῦς) is a divine epithet meaning guardian of the city.

\(^{496}\) Arrian (1.17.5-6). Arrian’s text is a little unclear on the relationship between the acropolis and the Lydian palace. He wrote that Alexander wanted to build a temple to Zeus on the acropolis, but that thunder and rain poured on the spot of the Lydian palace. Alexander interpreted this as a sign and ordered the temple to be built there. Although not explicit, the Lydian palace seems to have stood on or very near to the acropolis.
been leveled by the 17 AD earthquake that damaged the city, or it may be concealed by the 1st century construction of the Wadi B terrace.

Although Tiberius rejected the Sardian request for a neokorate, he was actually viewed as one of the great benefactors of the city. Dio Cassius, Strabo, Tacitus, and Suetonius all recorded Tiberius’ uncharacteristic generosity in giving money to the cities of Asia after the earthquake of 17 AD.\(^{497}\) Tacitus specifically records that Sardis was hard hit by the disaster and was the beneficiary of a great deal of the emperor’s sympathy. A few inscriptions found in Sardis also honor Tiberius, perhaps acknowledging his support of the city after the earthquake.\(^{498}\) If Tiberius had funded the reconstruction of the city, the Temple of Zeus very well could have been included in the rebuilding effort. An association with Zeus could also help to explain the presence of Heraklean imagery at the temple, such as the torso capitals, and perhaps the bronze lion.\(^{499}\)

At least two inscriptions (T18 and T19),\(^{500}\) confirm that Sardis had a cult of Zeus Polieus, a provincial Imperial Cult priesthood, and a priesthood of Tiberius’s cult. One (T19) is incomplete but cites the priesthood of the thirteen cities, refers to the “council loyal to the emperor,” and has been restored to include the priesthood of Zeus Polieus. The priesthoods of the thirteen cities of Asia and of Zeus are emphasized, and the

---

\(^{497}\) See Dio Cassius (57.17.7-9), Strabo (12.8.18), Suetonius (Tiberius 48.2), and Tacitus (Annals 2.47).

\(^{498}\) Buckler and Robinson 1932, nos. 34 and 39 name Tiberius. Buckler and Robinson 1932, no. 38 uses the title “Caesarian” Sardis, which was adopted by the city during Tiberius’s reign. Finally Buckler and Robinson 1932, no. 9 records a vote of the twelve cities of Asia, which may be part of a resolution of thanks to the Emperor Tiberius for his aid.

\(^{499}\) See note 491.

\(^{500}\) Greenewalt (2006, 745) recorded that at least one other inscription mentioning Zeus Polieus was found on the west side of the Wadi B terrace.
reference to the council loyal to the emperor can only convey a deep respect for the imperial office. The other inscription (T18) is now lost, but it honored a wealthy Sardian and listed his titles as “high priest of Asia of the temples of the Sardians in Lydia and priest for two terms of the most mighty Zeus Polieus, high priest of the Thirteen Cities, stephanephoros\textsuperscript{501}, priest of Tiberius Caesar, chief strategos\textsuperscript{502} for two terms and agonothete\textsuperscript{503} for life.” This list of titles would seem to prove that Sardis possessed at least two major provincial temples, probably neokorate temples, as well as two other temples dedicated to Zeus Polieus and Tiberius. It is surprising that the inscription does not mention the Temple of Artemis, but Buckler and Robinson dated this inscription to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century A.D.,\textsuperscript{504} at which point the temple had probably already been converted to a neokorate temple of Antoninus Pius. Consequently, the Artemis temple can be inferred as one of the Asian temples mentioned. If we assume that the temples in which the high priest of Asia performed his duties are neokorate temples, the mention of the Tiberius cult demonstrates that it was distinct and important enough to warrant individual mention. The same can be said for the cult of the “most mighty Zeus Poleius,” whose founding dates to the time of Alexander the Great.

\textsuperscript{501} A stephanephoros (See LSJ s.v. Στεφανηφόρος) literally refers to one who wears a wreath, but it was also a priestly office whose responsibilities varied according to local customs.

\textsuperscript{502} Although strategos (See LSJ s.v. στρατηγός) is a title meaning military general, in Roman Asia it was also used for the chief magistrates of the cities of Asia Minor.

\textsuperscript{503} An agonothete (See LSJ s.v. ἀγωνοθήτης) was an executive of sacred games. It was one of the highest honors a city could give a citizen, and the Roman Imperial Period office was responsible for games associated with the Imperial Cult.

\textsuperscript{504} Buckler and Robinson (1932, no. 47 [T18]) concluded that the honoree of the inscription, L. Julius Libonianus, served as strategos under Trajan. Burrell (2004, 102), noted that Libonianus could have served for 25-30 years, which would date this inscription to the early part of Antoninus Pius’s reign.
It would seem, therefore, that there were more major Sardian cults than there are known temples. This could simply mean that the other temples have not yet been discovered, a strong possibility due to the size of the ancient city and the limits of the excavations. On the other hand, there was nothing to prevent a single temple from hosting more than one cult. The cults of Zeus and Tiberius, as well as the neokoros title, could each be logically placed at the Wadi B Temple. Given what can be known about the site and the sequence of events, I believe that the Wadi B Temple could have served the cults of Zeus Poleius, Tiberius, and the first neokorate. Although it may be the simplest explanation to ascribe the construction of the Wadi B Temple to whichever emperor granted the first neokorate, the evidence suggests otherwise. After an unsuccessful attempt to acquire a neokorate, the city or province could have resolved to honor the Imperial Cult of Tiberius with a place in the rebuilt temple of Zeus. Later, Claudius, Nero, or the Flavians had the opportunity to convert the temple by awarding Sardis its first neokorate. An appropriation of an existing temple associated with the Imperial Cult could also explain why there is no record of the city’s first neokorate. Such a scenario is complicated, but certainly possible, especially since the hypothesis offers one of the few options that can reconcile all the limited textual and material evidence.

---

505 There is even an instance of this happening at Sardis; less than one century after the construction of the Wadi B Temple, the Temple of Artemis at Sardis was altered to accommodate the Imperial Cult.

506 It is worth noting that the motivation for a decree to thank Tiberius (Buckler and Robinson 1932, no. 9) is unknown, but assumed to be his assistance after the earthquake.

507 Burrell (2004, 102) remarked that it could have been a temple to Claudius, in part because no temple of his has yet been found in Asia. I acknowledge that it may have been the neokorate temple awarded by Claudius. However, there is no record of Claudius financially assisting the city of Sardis, as there is for Tiberius, making the latter the most likely imperial donor. Burrell (2004, 314) also noted that the Imperial Cult could be moved into a preexisting temple as a means to save funds. This could also explain rough-hewn appearance of the Adramyteion inscription, which may have been a late addition to the temple and never completed finished.
The Vetters Temple

No inscriptive or sculptural evidence exists at the Vetters Temple to help establish its identity, but the dates of construction and destruction provide some suggestive evidence. Geophysical surveys show that the site of the temple and its temenos was already being prepared for construction in the 1st century AD.\textsuperscript{508} The composition of the foundation and stylistic analysis of the ornament, however, supports a date in the 2nd century AD for the construction of the building.\textsuperscript{509} This alone proves that the temple was erected during the high Empire, even though the Ephesians began preparing the land some decades earlier.

Pausanias is the only historical source considered by some to mention the Vetters Temple, but he never specifies that he visited Ephesus or saw the temple himself. Instead, in an account of the burial of the hero Androklos, he implies that the Ephesian Olympieion was located on the road from the sanctuary of Artemis to the Magnesian Gate (T1).\textsuperscript{510} The passage reads:

\textit{The Ephesians carried off his body and buried it in their own land, at the spot where his tomb is pointed out at the present day, on the road leading from the sanctuary past the Olympieum to the Magnesian gate.} (Translation by W.H.S. Jones)


\textsuperscript{509} Karwiese 1993, 16 and Karwiese and Beyll 1994, 15. Based on date and style, Hueber (1997, 260-261, 264) was prompted to suggest that the Parthian monument of Lucius Verus was part of the Vetters Temple complex, perhaps its altar.

\textsuperscript{510} Vetters (1984, 11-12) was the first to make this connection to Pausanias in his initial report on the temple. Although he mentioned Pausanias’s account, he offered no other corroborating evidence to link the Olympieion of Pausanias to the temple foundations that he had discovered.
The name Olympieion could refer to a Temple of Olympian Zeus, of the Olympian gods, a Temple of Hadrianos Olympios, or some related variant. Given Pausanias’s use of the Olympieion as a landmark, readers are led to assume that it must have been a noteworthy structure of the local topography. In fact, the identification of the impressive foundations of the Vetters Temple as those of the Olympieion was made based on their size and little else. Jones argued against this identification, observing that the Magnesian Gate was actually located on the southeastern side of Ephesus, on the opposite side of the city from the foundations in question, a glaring inconsistency in the literary-archaeological connection Vetters proposed. Karwiese countered by suggesting that the ancient author must have meant to describe the Koressian gate rather than the Magnesian gate. This could have happened if Pausanias had relied on the stories of others to write about Ephesus. Yet Jones has noted that the road from the Magnesian Gate to the Artemision was a main route between the city and the Temple of Artemis, attested by the fact that Damianus built a portico in the 2nd century.

511 Jones 1993, 152. Jones suggested some these options based on the associations of the title Olympios, an epithet originally used for Zeus, but taken by Hadrian around the time of his 129 AD visit to Ephesus, which Metcalf (1974, 64) observed may have had some relationship to his founding of the Panhellenion and completion of the Athenian Olympieion.

512 Vetters (1983) identified the temple as the Olympieion, but Burrell (2004, 67-68) noted that this was a hasty conclusion based on insufficient support.

513 Jones (1993) was the first to point out this discrepancy and was also the most vocal opponent of the identification. Minding the fact that Pausanias was not describing his travel route, but rather the location of the tomb of Androklos, Jones maintained that the text is unambiguous about the relationship between the Artemision, the Olympieion, and the Magnesian Gate, making it impossible that the Olympieion was anywhere other than the eastern side of Panayir Dag.

514 Karwiese 1995a, 313. The Koressian Gate was located on the opposite side of Ephesus, very close to the foundations of the Vetters Temple. Karwiese’s argument was partially based on the fact that there are no known major monuments near the Magnesian gate. This conclusion also supports the assumption that the temple mentioned by Pausanias must have been huge, but this also relies on an absence of evidence as proof of nonexistence. Most importantly, Karwiese wrote under the assumption that Pausanias had personally travelled to Ephesus, something that the ancient author most likely did not do.
AD to allow people to visit the sanctuary conveniently when it was raining.\textsuperscript{515} Scherrer and Knibbe argued that scholars should reevaluate the way Pausanias conceived of movement around the city.\textsuperscript{516} Engelmann acknowledged that although there were probably a number of ways to reach the Magnesian Gate from the Artemision, there was only one route that led to the grave of Androklos.\textsuperscript{517} Finally, Burrell noted that the topography described by Pausanias matches the processional way featured in C. Vibius Salutaris’s early 2\textsuperscript{nd}-century processional endowment, and therefore leaves little chance that he misnamed the gate.\textsuperscript{518} Therefore, the Vetters Temple cannot have been the Olympieion mentioned by Pausanias, although, as we shall see, it may nonetheless have had an association with Zeus.

Other evidence supports this conclusion. First, the cult of Zeus Olympios was already long established at Ephesus by the Roman Imperial period, with Strabo alluding to its existence.\textsuperscript{519} Jones also found that several 5\textsuperscript{th}-century BC dedications to Zeus were inscribed at a rustic cult place belonging to the “Mother of the Gods,” on the north-

\textsuperscript{515} Jones 1993, 193.
\textsuperscript{516} Scherrer (1999, 142) advocated a different translation of Pausanias’s text: the Olympieion was “on the way to” rather than “to” or “toward” the tomb of Androklos. To achieve this translation, he notes that the use of \textit{παρα}+accusative can have both meanings of “on the way” and “towards”. Knibbe (2002, 213) suggested replacing the assumed clockwise manner with a counterclockwise approach from the Artemision to the Olympieion.

\textsuperscript{517} Engelmann 1996, 133.

\textsuperscript{518} Burrell 2004, 68. The inscription detailing Salutaris’s endowment of a procession was first discovered and published by Wood (1877) and was subsequently published as \textit{IvE} 27.

\textsuperscript{519} Strabo (14.1.4). This passage includes a quotation from a prayer of the 7\textsuperscript{th}-century BC poet Kallinos. Burrell 2004, 326 and Jones 1993, 150.
east slope of Panayirdag. During Domitian’s reign in the 1st century AD, a coin was minted with the obverse inscribed “Zeus Olympios”. Given the apparent antiquity of the cult, it is impossible to maintain that there was no temple to Zeus predating the Vettres Temple. Furthermore, the land on which those ruins lie was reclaimed for the purpose of building the temple, making it a new foundation without a predecessor in that space.

More evidence exists for the Vettres Temple to be identified as a neokorate temple dating to Hadrian’s reign. Ephesus was initially awarded an Imperial Cult neokorate in the 1st century under Nero or Domitian, but it was later associated with Vespasian. It is probably because Domitian received the damnatio memoriae that most inscriptions refer to the Asian Temple of the emperors in vague terms. No matter

---

520 Jones 1993, 150 and IvE, 101-104. Here the identity for Zeus is Ζεὺς Πατρόιος, which represents a different cult. Panayirdag is the mountain around whose base the central city of Ephesus was built. The findspot of IvE 101-104 is somewhere on the opposite side of the mountain, in the area of the Cave of the Seven Sleepers marked #8 on the map (I22).

521 SNGvA 1879.

522 There was also a festival called the Olympia that may have been instituted by Domitian (see Beaujeu 1955, 182 and Jones 1993, 150). Engelmann (1998, 305-311) clarified the relationship between the cult of Zeus Olympios, the festival of the Olympia, and honors given to Domitian at Ephesus. He concluded that the Olympia festival was separate from the Agon festival and that Ephesus had two temples: one new Imperial temple and an older temple to Zeus administered by the Agonothete or in coordination with the Agon festival.

523 Of course, this line of thinking precludes a change of venues, which was certainly possible.

524 See IvE 232-242 and Jones 1993, 151. The temple associated with the neokorate is thought to be the Temple of Domitian (A3). Burrell (2004, 63) argued that the temple in Ephesus’ upper agora was always called a temple of the Augusti, not a temple of Domitian.

525 The damnatio memoriae was a process by which the memory of a person was condemned. This included defacement or destruction of public inscriptions and sculptures.

526 For example, IvE 236, 415-416 presumably refers to a temple as, “[τ]ὸν νεω[κό]ρον καὶ φιλοσέβαστον καὶ κοιμούντα τὴν Ἀσίαν,” while IvE 232-235 and IvE 237-241 all refer instead to the “ναῶι τῶι ἐν Ἐφέσωι τῶι Σεβαστῶι κοινῶι τῆς Ἀσίας,” or some variant. I consider this flexibility of title to be evidence that the title was in a process of evolution, even if the meaning of the neokorate remained constant. For more on the ambiguous and changing titles asiarch and archiereus see Rossner 1974 and Kearsley 1988. Also see note 14.
the conditions of the first imperial neokorate, a second neokorate was awarded during Hadrian’s reign, between 130 and 132 AD.\textsuperscript{527} Dozens of Ephesian inscriptions refer to the city as “twice neokoros of the emperors”, whose officials were sometimes named as “high priests of the temples of Asia in Ephesus.”\textsuperscript{528} It would seem, then, that the provincial priests of Asia served in the Imperial Cult of the province. Whether the priests or Imperial Cult temple are named together or separately, they almost never accompany the name of any specific emperor.

The likelihood is quite high that the temple discovered by Vetters was a temple of the Imperial Cult, and because of its date, dedicated to Hadrian. Yet because the Vetters Temple seems to have been built during the reign of Hadrian, it may have also been associated with Zeus through co-dedication or as an aspect of Hadrian’s divinity. Hadrian had likely assumed the title “Olympios” in 128 or 129 AD at Athens and was again given the title during his visit to Ephesus in 129 AD.\textsuperscript{529} Magie suggested that a plan was made for the construction of a temple for the worship of Zeus Olympios during Hadrian’s 129 visit to Ephesus, but that after its completion Ephesus obtained the title of twice neokoros and combined the worship of Zeus and Hadrian, perhaps culminating

\textsuperscript{527} Burrell 2004, 66-67 and 315.

\textsuperscript{528} The most common phrasing of the city title was “δὶς νεωκόρος τῶν Σεβαστῶν Ἐφεσίων πόλις,” and the title for the priesthood was “ἀρχιερέα τῆς Ἀσίας ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἔφεσῳ.”

\textsuperscript{529} Metcalf 1974, 62 and Jones 1993, 151.
with the festival of the Hadrianeia Olympia. Although combined worship is a difficult practice to prove, several inscriptions at Ephesus attest to Hadrian’s close relationship or assimilation to Zeus. At no point, however, do these inscriptions mention a temple of Hadrian Olympios. One known coin type (T20), however, bears the legend “Hadrian Caesar Olympios” on the obverse and “Ephesus Twice Neokoros” on the reverse; this is the clearest connection between Hadrian Olympios and the second neokorate. Other inscriptions mention only a “temple of Lord Hadrian Caesar,” or the “temple of the god Hadrian”. Therefore, the best that the evidence can establish is that the Vetters Temple was in fact a Temple of Hadrian, who was officially called Hadrian Olympios.

The terminal fate of the Vetters Temple also supports the claim that the temple housed the Imperial Cult. According to Karwiese, the marble floor of the temple was

---

530 Magie 1950, 619 and 1479. Jones (1993,151) criticized Magie’s conclusions, especially concerning the synthesis of the Olympia and Hadrianeia festivals, based on the fact that most inscriptions referring to the contests refer to both as distinct games (for example, IvE 1132), and only one mentions both together (CIG 2810 and perhaps IvE 1083). Furthermore, he argued that Hadrianeia is an adjective for Olympia, not a dual dedication. Complicating the matter, Burrell (2004, 69 and 326), has argued that the festival of Hadrianeia Olympia is not yet firmly tied to any one cult, and furthermore that festivals are not always reliable proof of the existence of temples. Whatever the details of the festivals, construction began on a large imperial temple sometime after Hadrian’s 129 trip to Ephesus, which also corresponds to his adoption of the title Olympios and the institution of festivals called the Olympia and Hadrianeia. Whether the two festivals constitute evidence of synthesized worship is not as relevant to the identification of the temple as is Hadrian’s relationship and how he was addressed through Ephesian inscriptions.

531 IvE 267-274, 277, 280b, 430, and 1501. Most of the inscriptions name him “Ἁδριανῷ Καίσαρι Διὶ Ὄλυμπιῶι”, “Ἄδριανῷ Σεβαστῶι Διὶ Ὄλυμπιῶι”, or similar variations.

532 SNGParis 684. Obverse: Laureate covered cuirassed portrait of Hadrian. ΑΔΡΙ[ΑΝΟΣ] ΚΑΙΚΑΡ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΩC. Reverse: Two distyle temples turned toward each other, a figure in each. [ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ] ΔΙC [ΝΕ]ΩΚΟΡΩΝ.

533 IvE 291, 428, 814, 921, and 9742 all name the temple of the god or Lord Hadrian. Engelmann (1996, 131-133) considered these to be support that the temple found by Vetters was not the Olympieion described by Pausanias.

534 Although Burrell (2004, 69) rejected the identification of the Vetters Temple with the Olympieion, she accepted it as the temple of Hadrian and wrote, “Any Olympieion of Hadrian is a purely modern agglomeration for what the Ephesians called the temple of Lord Hadrian Caesar or the temple of the god Hadrian.”
spoliated late in the 4th century AD, and 5th-century lime kilns attest to its destruction by that time.\textsuperscript{535} The concurrent 5th-century conversion of the south stoa of the temenos into the Church of Mary also announces the end of the original use of the temple, and represents the only significant continued use of the site. Dismantling, destruction, and eventual reuse are common fates of ancient buildings. The circumstance that the actual temple of this complex was not reused may have been culturally motivated. By the late 4th century AD, Christianity was the officially endorsed religion of the Empire. In the 5th century, the \textit{Codex Theodosianus} set laws regarding which pagan buildings should be destroyed and how others could be preserved.\textsuperscript{536} According to one legend, John Chrysostomos, the archbishop of Constantinople, personally oversaw the dismantling of the Artemision at Ephesus in the 4th century.\textsuperscript{537} In reality, The Artemision was first looted by Goths in the mid-3rd century, and although it was partially repaired, it was extensively spoliated during the 4th century AD.\textsuperscript{538} The concurrent looting of the Vetters Temple and Artemision implies that the two may have occupied the same share of public consciousness. Alternatively, the Vetters Temple may simply have been too large for the

\textsuperscript{535} Karwiese 1993, 15-16. Karwiese’s dating was based on coins and ceramics from the levels of the slabs and kilns.

\textsuperscript{536} The codex was a compilation of laws instituted by Christian emperors of the Roman Empire. Although it was not imposed on the East until the middle of the 5th century AD, many of the laws really date to the early 4th century AD. Book XVI.10 of the codex covers the issue of pagan temples. There seems to have been considerable flexibility in the permissible responses to such buildings. In many cases, they were closed or destroyed, but if the statues and altars were removed, they could be repurposed.

\textsuperscript{537} The legend has its roots in the 20th \textit{Oration} of the 5th-century AD writer Proclus of Constantinople. According to Ladstätter and Pülz (2007, 414-416), there is no overwhelming evidence for the comprehensive destruction of temples by Christians at Ephesus. They observed that only two temples in the city were converted to churches, while the remainder were left to decay on their own. Although they noted no certain evidence that the Vetters Temple was destroyed by Christians, the temple was intentionally dismantled and not left to fall into ruin naturally.

\textsuperscript{538} For a summary of the later archaeological and legendary history of the Artemision, see Foss 1979. Large lime kilns have been found at the site, and blocks from the building may have been used in the Construction of the Church of St. John.
local community to maintain. Yet Ephesus was instrumental in the development of imperially advocated Christianity and was the site of the ecumenical Church council of 431 AD. Only one century later, the enormous Basilica of John was built in the city. While the municipality may have been able to support large structures like the Vetters Temple, it evidently chose not to do so. Given the abbreviated lifespan of the temple, it stands to reason that it was dismantled deliberately. From the Christian perspective, a cult of particular idolatry, such as the Imperial Cult, may have restricted possible reuses and even inspired a complete demolition. Aside from the cult of Artemis, only the Imperial neokorate temples of Ephesus were so ingrained in the identity of the city. Therefore, given the timing of its construction and destruction, and the lack of substantial conflicting information, the Vetters Temple bears the signs of an Imperial Cult founded in Hadrian’s name.

**The Red Hall**

The brick construction, extensive use of revetment, and ornamental style of the Red Hall designate it as a product of the 2nd century, and most likely of Hadrian’s reign.\(^539\) Due to the Egyptian attributes and identities of the courtyard atlantes and caryatids (I42-I44), the Red Hall is generally considered to be a temple to the Egyptian gods.\(^540\) The arrangement of the central hall and flanking rotundas and courtyards (I37

---

\(^539\) Heilmeyer (1970, 92), Koenigs and Radt (1979, 342) and Rohmann (1998, 100-102), have all dated the architectural adornment to Trajanic-Antonine periods. Mania (2011a, 98-100 and 350-351), dated the Red Hall to about 170-180 AD based on sculpture and decoration, but gave a date of 131 AD for the beginning of construction. Presumably the design phase predated construction, which would put the planning and initial labor of the Red Hall squarely in Hadrian’s reign.

\(^540\) Deubner (1970, 235-237), Ward-Perkins (1981, 283), Nohlen (1998, 98), and Mania (2011a, 96) have all supported this designation.
and I38) have also prompted some to suggest that the Red Hall was dedicated to a triad of Egyptian deities.\textsuperscript{541} Sarapis and Isis are possibilities because of the popularity of their cults during Hadrian’s time.\textsuperscript{542} Water played a part in the rituals of Sarapis and Isis,\textsuperscript{543} and the water-related cult furniture in the central hall (I37 and I38) could point to one of those deities as the focus of worship. No cult objects have been found in the immediate vicinity of the Red Hall. Only one potential cult object, a small terra cotta head thought to be a representation of Isis, has been recovered in the lower city.\textsuperscript{544}

No cult statues have been found, but Mania has argued that the courtyard figures are important for ascertaining the identity of the Red Hall, even though they are outside of the temple’s naos.\textsuperscript{545} It is impossible to dispute that they are significant to the overall appearance of the Red Hall, but whether they are direct evidence of an Egyptian cult is less certain.\textsuperscript{546} The gods scholars have most frequently associated with the Red Hall

\textsuperscript{541} Nohlen (1998, 98) noted that deity triads were prominent in Egyptian religion.

\textsuperscript{542} For an introduction to the Roman-era worship of Sarapis and Isis, see Takàcs 1995.

\textsuperscript{543} See Wild 1981.

\textsuperscript{544} Salditt-Trappman (1972, 13-14) published the discovery of this small sculpture and asserted that it came from within the temenos area. Radt (2005, 61-69) assembled and discussed other possible remains of Sarapis-Isis worship at Pergamon, some two dozen small terra cotta heads and sculptures. Almost all of these date to the Hellenistic period and were found around the acropolis. None of the sculptures are obviously Egyptian or Egyptianizing in style, but can be interpreted as such with some effort. Most notably, there are six small male busts that may depict Sarapis. Söğüt (2011, 295-296) observed that relatively few sculptures of Sarapis exist compared to the number of inscriptions mentioning the god. When he is represented, it is with a thick beard and curly hair, usually with three separate locks hanging down his forehead. All of the small sculptures identified by Radt depict a bearded male, but none include the attribute of three curls falling across his forehead. See Hornbostel 1973 for more on the iconography of Sarapis.

\textsuperscript{545} Mania 2011, 96. Price (2007, 266) also observed that sanctuaries and temples dedicated to Isis are almost always “Egyptian” in appearance, lending credence to the notion that the courtyard figures support an Egyptian cult relationship. On the contrary, Wild’s 1984 study on the known Isis and Sarapis sanctuaries of the Roman period demonstrates the diversity of their appearances.

\textsuperscript{546} Mary Beard, John North and Simon Price (1998, 282), have observed that Egyptianizing images usually encourage more assumptions than they should. In comparison, they note that statues of Hermes and Venus found in sanctuaries never inspire immediate identification of a temple.
are Sarapis and Isis, yet neither is represented among the courtyard figures (I42-I44). Instead, the animal heads of some of the figures seem to represent several Egyptian deities, including Anubis, Sobek, Thoth, and Sekhmet. Other than their Egyptian identity, there is no evident unifying theme among these characters. Furthermore, their positions outside the flanking rotundas may attest to their secondary role in the complex. A few other features of the Red Hall courtyard figures mark them as irregular in comparison to traditional Egyptian cult art. First, Mania identified one of the human-headed female figure types (I42) as devotees of Isis, but admitted that the vertical fold running down the center of their garments does not terminate with a knot, something always present in other known representations.\footnote{Mania (2011, 349) noted that the figures may have worn necklaces, eliminating the need to depict the knots. Nevertheless, the inconsistency is evident.} Second, the nemes headress\footnote{The nemes was the headdress associated with ancient Egyptian Pharaohs.} was used only for male figures in Egyptian art, but the caryatids of the Red Hall wear it.\footnote{Mania 2011, 349. The only woman regularly depicted wearing the nemes in Egyptian art was Hatshepsut (r. 1479-1468 BC).} Thus the figures represent a break with two conventions of Egyptian religious sculpture. That should call into question the reliability of these sculptures as sure evidence of Egyptian religious activity at the site.

Only one inscription, \textit{IvP} 338, has been found in the Red Hall itself. It is a marble plaque dating to the 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD and mentions worshippers, but the name of the deity or deities being worshipped is missing.\footnote{Koester (1999, 317) and Nohlen (1998, 81) claimed that the inscription dates 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD and that the name of Sarapis “would fit the lacuna on the stone”, and the inscription (\textit{IvP} 338) has been restored thusly: Τίτος, [— { τοῦ δείνος} υἱός Αφαρεύς [αύτός τοῖς ἄλλοις] θεραπευταίς Σαράπιδι (?)} ἀνέθηκε, ἵ γραμματεῦο[ντος τὸ β (?)] Π(λ)αβίου — — ].} Out of the many hundreds of
inscriptions recovered at Pergamon, only two refer to Egyptian deities. The first of these, *IvP* 336, dates to the 1st century AD and was found near a church in the lower city of Pergamon, not far from the Red Hall. It lists the names of two individuals called the bearers of holy objects who, under the command of the “goddess,” dedicated statues of “Sarapis, Isis, Harpokrates, Osiris, Apis, Helios on a horse and the suppliant beside the horse, Ares, and the Dioskouri”. A second inscription, *IvP* 337, dates to the 2nd or 3rd century BC. It is from a small altar found at an unspecified location in the city and briefly names a devotee who set the altar up for Sarapis. Both inscriptions significantly preceded the erection of the Red Hall, but nevertheless textually substantiate the existence of Egyptian cults at Pergamon. Outside of these meager offerings, the only Roman-era confirmation of Egyptian deities at Pergamon comes from a text published in the *Oxyryncchus Papyri*, which calls Isis the “mistress” of Pergamon. The papyrus also mentions other cities and seems to focus on lauding the far-reaching worship of Isis, rather than the goddess’s primacy at Pergamon. There is no doubt that Egyptian deities were worshipped at Pergamon, even if just privately. Yet considering the physical dominance of the Red Hall, the dearth of textual and

---

551 *IvP* 336 and 337.

552 *IvP* 336 was found near the “Armenian Church”, which Mania (2011a, 98-99) considered close enough to be within the Red Hall’s temenos. It reads: Εὔφημος καὶ Τυλία Σπένδουσα, οἱ ἱεραφόροι, καθιέρωσαν τοὺς θεούς, οὓς ἡ θεὸς ἐκέλευσε· Σάραπιν, Εἰσιν, Ἄνουβιν, Ἀρφοὶ κράτην, Ὄσειριν, Ἀπις, Ἡλιον ῞ἵππῳ καὶ ἱκέτην παρὰ τῶι ἵππω, Ἀρη, Διοσὶ κόρους.

553 Koester (1998, 112) provided the date for the inscription and asserted that it was the earliest evidence of Egyptian cults at Pergamon, but he does not associate it with the sculptures identified by Radt (2005).

554 *IvP* 337 reads: Σαράπει [— — —] Ὡρκάνος ἰν[έθηκεν].

555 *Oxyryncchus Papyrus* 11 (1380.108): ...ἡ ἐν Περγάμῳ δεσπότις...
material evidence at the site is surprising, and should cast doubt on the common assumption that the courtyard figures denote an Egyptian cult.

A few other options for the religious affiliation of the Red Hall exist. Koester speculated that the twelve niches (I41) of the inner walls of the hall may have housed statues of the twelve gods of the Zodiac.\textsuperscript{556} Another possibility is that the niches displayed images of the twelve Olympian gods. Unfortunately, the number of the niches alone is not enough to establish a relationship with either divine group. Another theory identifies the Red Hall as the site of a mystery cult because of the large interior kept private by high walls and small windows.\textsuperscript{557} The enormous temenos and the grounds of the Red Hall, however, were clearly visible from many vantage points on the acropolis, including the ancient approach to the summit. Any ritual activity requiring secrecy must have taken place inside hall itself, calling into question the efficacy of the high walls to prevent the uninitiated from viewing activities in the temenos.

Perhaps, then, the Egyptianizing figures are only meant to provide an exotic atmosphere for the temple complex.\textsuperscript{558} A precedent for this can be found at Hadrian’s villa at Tivoli, parts of which are widely considered to be aimed at establishing an Egyptian ambiance.\textsuperscript{559} The Egyptianizing figures from Herodes Atticus’s Sanctuary of Egyptian Gods at Brexiza may also be aimed at establishing a specific atmosphere, but

\textsuperscript{556} Koester 1995b, 273. Koester’s assertion on this possibility is made without any explanation. Koester may have intended to tie the Red Hall to the 2nd-century Alexandrian scholar, Claudius Ptolemy, who wrote about the Zodiac in his \textit{Tetrabiblos}. Certainly it would provide yet another connection to Egypt.

\textsuperscript{557} Radt 1999, 234 and Koester 1995b, 273-274.

\textsuperscript{558} Mania (2011a, 90-92) has also suggested this possibility and included the comparison of Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli.

\textsuperscript{559} Several architectural and sculptural elements of the complex are evocative of Egyptian precedents, especially the so-called Canopus and Sarapeion. For more on Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli, see MacDonald and Pinto 1995.
they are most likely tied to the cult of the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{560} Egyptian styles were popular at imperial Rome, and especially in Hadrian’s time due in part to the emperor’s travels and his support of a monumental Temple to Sarapis in Rome.\textsuperscript{561} This Egyptian-styled art in Rome may have been more evocative than representative of the actual religious art of the inspiring region. Anne Roullet has characterized objects imported to Rome from Egypt as suggestive of the Roman idea of the country instead of an accurate presentation and maintains that most imports were decorative, rather than religious.\textsuperscript{562} At Rome, the majority of Egyptian or Egyptianizing art seems to have been inspired or expropriated as a result of what Ellen Perry called “Roman eclecticism,” which she defined as the synthesis of many artistic prototypes.\textsuperscript{563} This notion of eclecticism is evident in the decoration of the Red Hall, especially considering that the atlantes of the courtyard have no prototype in Egyptian art, but instead seem to have represented a Roman interpretation of Egyptian art.\textsuperscript{564} This should not, however, completely disqualify their potential religious import. Whether or not they were authentically Egyptian, the courtyard figures were installed in an environment explicitly designed to facilitate worship, and they were therefore inflected with religious significance.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item All the figures from Brexiza can be tied to the worship of Isis, making it fairly certain that the sanctuary served the goddesses cult. See Tobin 1991, 123-131 and Albersmeier 1994.
\item Hadrian’s Temple of Sarapis is now lost, but Taylor’s 2004 article has a summary of the known information about the structure.
\item Roullet 1972, 13 and 18-22. In short, she reduced the significance of Egyptianizing art and architecture to popular taste, which may have been the case. On the latter point, she noted that obelisks, sphinxes, lions, and animal-headed gods featured prominently, but decorative statues outnumbered religious statues by far.
\item Perry 2002, 168-171.
\item For more on the lack of Egyptian parallels in Egypt, see note 252.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Pergamon was awarded multiple neokorates, but it is impossible that the Red Hall was related to any of them. While several inscriptions mention the first neokorate of Pergamon, none name the emperor who bestowed the honor. Luckily, several historical sources record that Augustus founded the Imperial Cult at the city, which may have been a neokorate temple co-dedicated to Rome. No temple associated with this first neokorate has been found. A second was awarded during Trajan’s reign, which was the first time such an honor had been awarded twice to one city. The temple for this unprecedented honor is the Traianeion (A6), which was a co-dedication to Zeus Philios and Trajan. Pergamon received a third neokorate during the latter years of Caracalla’s (r. 198-217) reign. Because the Red Hall was built sometime in the mid-2nd century AD, there is no chance that it was a neokorate temple.

The possibility nonetheless exists that the Red Hall was a monumental Imperial Cult temple, though not a neokorate one. Mania has suggested that the Egyptianizing

565 *IdA (IvP III) 157, IvP 438, IvP 441, IvP 461, IGR 4:453, 4:459, IGR 4:1689, IGR 4:1293, and Hepding 1907, 331-335 all give Pergamon the title of neokoros.*

566 *Dio Cassius (51.20. 6-9) described the founding of the Imperial Cult and related games in Pergamon by Augustus, but did not mention a temple. Tacitus (*Annals*, 4.37.3) noted that Augustus did not forbid that a temple be dedicated to both himself and Rome at Pergamon. Later in his work (59.28.1), Dio Cassius recorded that Nero declined to award a neokorate to Pergamon because it had already been awarded a temple. No inscriptions exist to confirm this.*

567 *This resulted in Pergamon adopting the somewhat confusing titles, δὶς νεωκόρος πρώτης ορ δὶς νεωκόρου πρώτης τῶν Σεβαστῶν, to describe the city as “first twice neokoros.” Inscriptions mentioning the second neokorate are *IvP 324, IvP 395, IvP 397, IvP 520, Habicht 1959/1960, 126-127, IGR 4:426, IGR 4:908 (from Kibyra), IGR 4:480, IGR 4:1687, IGR 4:1688, IdA 10, IdA 11, IdA 20, IdA 23, IdA 24, IdA 28, IdA 30, IdA 32, IdA 34, IdA 35, IdA 37, IdA 38, IdA 42, and IdA 54. These inscriptions began to appear during the rule of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Strangely, no inscriptions mention the first neokorate on its own.*

568 *Burrell (2004, 23) held that the dual dedication of the second neokorate temple under Trajan was probably modeled on the preceding cult of Augustus and Rome.*

569 *Burrell (2004, 30-31) noted that a 209 AD Pergamene coin depicting Geta used the title of “twice neokoros”. Therefore, the third neokorate must have been given after Geta’s assassination in 211 AD.*
figures, the odd design of the building, and Hadrian’s travel itinerary may point to the emperor’s direct involvement in the design of the temple. On the basis that Hadrian contributed to the construction of the complex, Rieger suggested that one or both of the rotundas may have housed the Imperial Cult. Mania raised the point that the Red Hall might be the Pergamene Temple of Hadrian, or Hadrianeion, mentioned by Aristides in his Sacred Tales. In that passage, Aristides described a dream in which he was instructed to go to the Hadrianeion in order to engage in ritual ablution. At the time of the dream, Aristides was residing at the Asklepion, approximately 2 kilometers away from the Pergamene acropolis and 1 kilometer from the Red Hall. Aristides’s account suggests that the Hadrianeion was outside of the Asklepieion, but within walking distance. Mania and Müller entertained the possibility that Aristides may have referred to the Traianeion (A6), but a recently discovered inscription records that Hadrian denied Pergamon a neokorate in his name. Burrell dismissed the notion that the Hadrianeion mentioned by Aristides and the Traianeion were the same, noting that there were no facilities for ritual bathing at Trajan’s temple. The Red Hall, however, has ample water features that could have been used for ritual bathing, including the courtyard fountains and the interior water channel and basins. Date of construction, a Hadrianic decorative

570 Mania 2011a, 350-351. Rieger (2005, 91-92) has also supported this argument.
571 Rieger 2005, 91-93.
572 Mania 2011a, 109-110 and Aristides (Hieroi Logoi 1.29 [also cited as Orationes 47.29]).
573 Müller 2009, 391-392 and Mania 2011a, 110. This is also based on the discovery of two statues at the Traianeion, one of Trajan and one of Hadrian, which suggests that both had roles in the cult of the temple. In his book, Mania raised this possibility, but did not conclude that the Traianeion was the same as Aristides’s Hadrianeion.
574 Burrell 2004, 28. Surprisingly, Burrell did not mention the Red Hall as a candidate for the Hadrianeion mentioned by Aristides.
scheme, and the presence of fountains and water basins make the Red Hall the most viable option to be identified as the Hadrianeion.

Even though the Egyptianizing features of the Red Hall may not prove the exclusive presence of Egyptian cults, perhaps Egyptian religion was a component of the Imperial Cult at Pergamon. Sarapis, the god most frequently associated with the Red Hall, was a hybrid deity promoted by the Ptolemies in the 3rd century BC with the aim of bolstering Greek and Egyptian unity.\(^{575}\) His identity was quite flexible and he was often associated with other deities, like Zeus and Asklepios, who were universally worshipped throughout the ancient Mediterranean.\(^{576}\) Furthermore, the Ptolemies supported the notion that Sarapis was a protector of royal authority, a theme encouraged by some Roman emperors, especially Vespasian, Hadrian, and Septimius Severus.\(^{577}\) If Sarapis was an object of cult in the Red Hall, then it is possible that he was worshipped in some capacity alongside Hadrian.\(^{578}\) Hadrian’s interest in Egypt, as well as his promotion of Sarapis at Rome, could suggest that the emperor had an interest in associating himself

---

\(^{575}\) The deity Sarapis evolved from a synthesis of the Egyptian gods Osiris and Apis. When depicted in art, he usually wears Greek clothing. For more on the cult of Sarapis, see Tacitus (\textit{Histories} 4.83-84), Stambaugh 1967 and 1972b, Hornbostel 1973, and Merkelbach 2001.

\(^{576}\) Tacitus’s (\textit{Histories} 4.83-84) account of the 3rd-century BC development of the god also discusses the Sarapis’s assimilation with Asclepius and Zeus.

\(^{577}\) Sarapis was frequently depicted on imperial coinage alongside emperors, and some, like Septimius Severus, were occasionally depicted as Sarapis.

\(^{578}\) Presumably Hadrian denied Pergamon a neokorate temple to himself (see Müller 2009, 391-392) because that would give the city the unprecedented title of first thrice neokoros. Since Pergamon was awarded the first twice neokoros for the Traianeion, such a step might have angered other cities. Therefore, a co-dedication of a major temple to an Egyptian god associated with the emperor could sidestep that potential problem. Intriguingly, the two neokorate temples at Pergamon were also co-dedications - The Temple of Augustus and Roma, and the Traianeion, which was dedicated to Zeus Philios and Trajan. According to Beard, North, and Price (1998, 279-281), Egyptian cults did not preclude the worship of traditional Greek and Roman deities. They even noted that the myth of Isis makes her responsible for the development of the traditional Mediterranean cults.
with Sarapis as much as Zeus, depending on the context. At Pergamon, the cult of Zeus was of great antiquity, and the god was already honored by the Great Altar and the dynamic Temple of Trajan and Zeus Philios. At each of these sanctuaries one inscription has been found that names Hadrian Olympios. Yet many other references to Hadrian Olympios were found in the lower city of Pergamon. Almost all of the Pergamene texts that name Hadrian as Olympios are inscribed on altars or blocks of marble that could have served as altars.

Mania contended that epigraphic proof is necessary to equate the Red Hall with the Hadrianeion mentioned by Aristides. Such epigraphic proof may exist; two inscriptions naming Hadrian as Olympios were found in the immediate vicinity of the Red Hall. Die Inschriften von Pergamon II records that IvP 364 was found on an altar built into the wall of a house next to the north rotunda of the Basilica of John, the name applied to the Red Hall by the early travelers John Smith and M. Gabriel Choiseul-Gouffier. Another, IvP 374, was found at the site of the modern marketplace, at most 

579 Nock (1930, 19) noted another instance in which Hadrian and Serapis may have shared a temple; his suggestion was based on an Alexandrian coin (BMC no. 875 f, pl. 29) depicting Hadrian touching a shrine labeled ΔΑΠΙΑΝΝΩΝ with Serapis depicted on the other side of the shrine.

580 IvP 371 was found on an altar near the Great Altar of Zeus and IvP 372 was found on an altar near the Traianeion. Another inscription, IvP 370, was also found on the acropolis, near the Temple of Athena.

581 IvP 364-369 and IdA 7 all include Olympios among Hadrian’s titles and were found either at the lowest levels of the upper city (i.e. not the acropolis), in the lower city, or at the Asklepieion.

582 IvP 364, 367, 368, 369, 371, 372 possess the characteristics of altars, but have not been conclusively identified as such.

583 Mania 2011a, 110.

584 IvP 364. Carved into an altar approximately 0.44 meters high, the inscription reads: Αὐτοκράτορι Ἅδριανωί ὁ Ολυμπίωι σωτήρι καὶ κτίστῃ Γαῖως Ἀντιοκ Ἀλέξανδρος.

585 See Smith 1678 and Choiseul-Gouffier 1782. IvP was published in 1895, before the DAI began commonly using the name “Die Rote Halle”. This may have caused other scholars to miss this potentially important piece of epigraphical evidence.
only a few hundred meters from the Red Hall. Other inscriptions of the lower city may also have been found nearby, but their find spots were recorded as private homes impossible to identify today. While these altars may have been appropriated from another place during the Christian renovation of the building, their locations could be proof of Hadrian’s involvement with the Red Hall. Most importantly, the prevalence of the title Hadrian Olympios on altars found predominantly in the lower city is evidence of an active cult dedicated to the emperor near to the Red Hall. Due to the existence of the Great Altar and the Traianeion at Pergamon, Hadrian may have been dissuaded from building yet another structure related to Zeus and imperial worship. Accordingly, Hadrian could have chosen a similar universal god with whom he was linked, like Sarapis, in order to underscore his authority and ability to bring together the disparate cultures of the Empire. Lacking any other potential sites, the Red Hall bears the best evidence for the site of such a cult.

The Temple of Hadrian

Ornament and sculpture from the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus show that the temple was decorated according to Roman imperial style. The two friezes illustrating a battle scene and chariot-riding Nikes (I66, I67, and I70-I75) elucidate the decorative

\[586\] In fact, the style of the elaborate carving of the vine-wrapped columns (I65) and detail of the lion head spouts (I62a) place the decoration of the temple in or around the reign of Hadrian.
theme, which may have a bearing on the temple’s cult affiliation. Although the friezes differ in size and subject, thematic elements link the two. The battle with foreigners of the larger frieze (I66, I70, and I71) is a common theme in Roman art. Having been carved in the 2nd century, this frieze may have alluded to or commemorated the victorious campaigns of Trajan against the Parthians. In a more general sense, however, such a theme would have identified Greeks or Romans as champions over savagery. This in turn may have suggested a continuity of purpose linking the new Roman and local Greek cultures in Asia.

The Nike figures on the smaller frieze (I67, I72-I75) portray victory in symbolic form. The frieze panels from the Bandirma museum yard (I72-I75), show that the Nikes are rendered in different styles and with different accoutrements; two (I72 and I73) in a classicizing style and two in a dramatically rendered rich style (I74 and I75). There are several possible reasons for these variations. First, the Nikes may simply be the work of

---

587 Although only parts of these friezes have been recovered at the temple site, I am convinced that they match the panel identified by Laubscher (1967) and the panels in the Bandirma museum yard. Reports published by Koçan and Meral (2007) and Yaylali (1990) leave no ambiguity that parts of two friezes of different scale and subject were found during the 2006 season. The larger was identified as a battle scene, based on the presence of helmets, armor, and hilts, while smaller chariot wheels have been discovered as evidence of the smaller frieze. To my knowledge, the current excavation director, Nureddin Koçan, has not yet made a connection between the chariot wheels and the Nike charioteers in the Bandirma museum.

588 Laubscher (1967, 215-216) argued that the subject of riders in battle was a common decorative motif for the Hadrianic period and noted the similarity of the decorative program of the Parthian Monument of Lucius Verus at Ephesus. Boatwright (1997, 129) noted that the barbarian battle frieze linked Hadrian with the tradition of temple decoration in Asia. Burrell (2003b, 38-39) suggested that the depiction of a battle between Romans and Easterners would have been an appropriate for an imperial apotheosis or a Parthian theme.

589 There is also a chance that the frieze refers to Lucius Verus’s Parthian exploits, but that would make the temple decoration several decades removed from Hadrian. It is a possibility, however, since the temple was probably re-erected during the reign of Antoninus Pius.
different sculptors. Yet this diversity of styles is not evident elsewhere in the otherwise consistent adornment of the temple, an indication that craftsmen were not free to produce according to their own stylistic preferences. A second possibility is that the Nikes are sculptural quotations of well-known representations of Nike. Artistic reference was a common practice in the Roman era, especially in painting and freestanding sculpture, but there is scant evidence of this in the permanent fixtures of temples. Furthermore, depictions of Nike are so ubiquitous in the Roman period that it may be impossible to identify a prototype convincingly. The small scale of the frieze compared to the overall size of the structure makes it likely that there were at least dozens of figures on the frieze, if not hundreds. Therefore, unless there were dozens of Nikes worth copying, the variation in the figures is more likely to be based on the associations of the various styles.

Although this variety could have been chosen simply for visual entertainment, the two different styles of Nikes may also have contained embedded cultural meanings with the classicizing Nikes representing classical Greek culture and the more dynamic Nikes

---

590 It could also be the result of sculptors working at different times. However, this would require the temple to have been decorated over the period of many years, an unlikely scenario considering the consistency of the other sculpture and ornament at the temple.

591 Hölscher (2004, 58-59) cited one example involving Nikes: the Augustan Altar in Arezzo. He noted that the images of two Nikes on the monument are quite different - both “neo-Attic,” but one archaizing and the other of the “Rich Style.” This, according to Hölscher, indicated that these two images represent different forms for different functions, not the actions of two workshops or the taste of the client.

592 A thorough search of LIMC disclosed no unmistakably similar types.

593 Richter (1958,15) observed that Roman artists copied and adapted motifs from all the previous epochs, beginning with the 5th century B.C. Furthermore, she concluded that in the Roman Imperial period art truly became international, drawing from all corners of the Empire and all past styles. Similarly, Perry (2002, 158-160) argued that a distinction existed between superficial imitation and natural imitation through experience. The former was mechanical, the latter artistic. In essence, she advocated the view that the Romans avoided direct copies in favor of appropriating forms, themes, and images into Roman contexts.
representing Rome. By depicting the victory of the Greek-speaking world and Rome over barbarism, the Nike frieze served as a thematic companion to the larger battle frieze. Together, the two friezes express the theme of victory, a common subject in Roman art that emphasized the glory of the emperor and the Empire. Both subjects would be at home on a civic monument, such as an honorific arch, or on a monument associated with the Imperial Cult. A good comparison for these reliefs can be found in the Antonine Altar at Ephesus, also known as the Parthian Monument of Lucius Verus. The frieze included combat scenes depicting barbarians fleeing and dying in the face of overwhelming Roman strength. Representations of Nike are also included on the altar as adjuncts to the apotheoses of Trajan and the Empress Sabina. In his major study on Roman Imperial art in Greece and Asia Minor, Vermeule discussed the Antonine Altar at Ephesus, concluding that the reliefs advertised the continued glory of the imperial family, from Trajan to Lucius Verus. At Cyzicus, the two friezes illustrate the same theme of imperial victory. There was an active provincial Imperial Cult at

---

594 Toynbee (1954) wrote extensively about visual vocabulary in the Roman era. Overall, she observed that Roman visual language had a specific grammar that ruled the interpretation of the images, and that Roman viewers were taught or instinctively knew how to read images that may baffle us today. More recently, Hölscher (2004, 20-21) has argued that Roman art chose visual models not on the basis of style or taste, but according to subject and content. Accordingly, he concluded that the Romans used different periods, styles, and models of Greek art depending on situation, not depending on stylistic development or taste.

595 For more on the meaning and popularity of triumphal themes in Roman imperial art, see Strong 1961.

596 Laubscher (1967, 215-216) first made this comparison.

597 Vermeule 1968, 95-123.

598 Although they are too fragmentary to identify, the massive wing relief (163) at Cyzicus could have been another Nike, but significantly larger.
Cyzicus, and the decorative theme of the friezes supports the idea that the temple served emperor worship.\textsuperscript{599}

Burrell has been the strongest advocate of the position that the temple served only Hadrian’s cult.\textsuperscript{600} She maintained that none of the evidence, material or written, supports the conclusion that the temple was dedicated to anyone or anything other than the emperor. The \textit{Chronicon Paschale} (T7) and Georgius Cedrenus (T9) recorded that Hadrian built a temple, and Aristides (T2) noted that the name of the “best emperor up to that time,” was inscribed on the temple, but neither of these sources mentioned the precise cult that the temple served. Other sources that specifically mention the temple provide additional proof that it was dedicated to Hadrian; The \textit{Greek Anthology} (T8) names it a “Temple of Hadrian,” and Malalas (T5) claimed that the emperor set up a large bust of himself on the roof of the temple. Burrell also pointed to the Cyzicene coin (T21) depicting a temple, which includes the legend neokoros. She observed that since Cyzicus was not known to call itself a neokoros of Zeus, the title must refer to the Imperial Cult.\textsuperscript{601} Finally, Burrell wrote that “the survival of the identity of Hadrian’s temple down to the wonder lists of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century [T8] and beyond indicates that the emperor to whom a cult was dedicated was not necessarily subsumed into a cult of the Augusti or

\textsuperscript{599} For detailed accounts of the imperial priesthoods, festivals, and honors at Cyzicus see Marquardt 1836, Halfmann 1990, and Barattolo 1995, 59-73.

\textsuperscript{600} See Burrell’s 2003 article titled, “Temples of Hadrian, Not Zeus,” in which she argues that there is no ancient testimony that supports the claim that Hadrian and Zeus were co-dedicatees of any of his three neokorate temples in Asia.

\textsuperscript{601} Burrell 2004, 93.
of a god who shared the temple, but could stand independently to the end of the cult and beyond.”

Despite Burrell’s strong argument that the temple was dedicated primarily to Hadrian, there is still support for the theory that Zeus was involved with the emperor’s cult at Cyzicus. Depictions of an octastyle temple thought to represent the Temple of Hadrian can be seen in the Destailleur Codex (I81) and on a Cyzicene coin of Antoninus Pius (T21). Both depict a medallion installed in the central position of the pediment. The Destailleur Codex depicts a statue within the medallion. Although far less clear, the image on the coin’s medallion could also represent a statue; Burrell thought that it could be numismatic convention to represent a bust of Hadrian. Boatwright concluded that the central marble sculpture on the pediment may have represented Zeus in the guise of Hadrian, because it would accord with the accounts of Malalas (T5) and Cyriacus (T13). Their testimony is contradictory, however, with Malalas (T5) recording that Hadrian set up a bust of himself on the roof of the temple, and Cyriacus (T13) seemingly implying that a statue of Zeus stood in the pediment.

Burrell 2004, 94. Although this is a plausible argument, it nevertheless gives far too much credence to the power of a name mentioned in a few late antique and medieval texts. It could just as easily mean that it was a temple famously built by Hadrian, rather than dedicated to his worship, like saying Hadrian’s Pantheon. It also discounts the possibility that temples could function as a part of one cult, but be named after their founder or another figure, like many Christian churches. One only need look at the Imperial Fora, usually named for specific emperors, but including temples and structures dedicated to a variety of deities and functions.

Brown (1940, 17-19) contended that Roman die-cutters used actual temples as the models for temples on coins, but only approximated the essential features of decoration or architecture. Vermeule (1977, 103) noted that numismatic representation provides a good approximation of where statues and sculpture were displayed in ancient temples. The significance of numismatic evidence should be viewed cautiously because, as Fears (1977, 199-202) noted, no ancient author mentioned the importance of images on coins.

Boatwright 1997, 129.
Four marble heads recently found on the eastern end of the temple may throw light on this issue (168). The excavators speculated that these may have been part of a pedimental program representing the twelve Olympian gods, with Zeus presumably in the center.\footnote{Yaylali and Özkaya 1994, 112.} Although the sculptures were almost certainly affixed to the temple, the published report provides only murky images without dimensions, making it impossible to tell if the sculpture is of a size appropriate to the pediment.\footnote{The backs of the heads are apparently crudely carved, as if they were meant to be attached permanently to a wall.} For their identification of these heads, the excavators pointed to Cyriacus’s account of his 1444 visit to the site, in which he mentioned that marble statues of gods remained on the facade with “Jove himself as their guardian” (T13). Price took this to mean that Jove, or Zeus, was the true dedicatee of the temple.\footnote{Price 1984b, 153-155. Price’s conclusion that Zeus was the central cult figure draws on other supporting evidence, but Cyriacus’s comment is his only evidence that can be tied to the physical temple.} Burrell disagreed, observing that Cyriacus often referred to the Christian God as Jove, and therefore that he was simply interpreting the survival of the pedimental sculptures until 1444 as a miracle of God.\footnote{Burrell 2003a, 197 and Burrell 2003b, 39. She also noted that Cyriacus believed that the temple was dedicated to Persephone.} Therefore, Cyriacus’s commentary should be discounted in any conclusion that the temple was dedicated to Zeus.

Nevertheless, several scholars have concluded that the temple at Cyzicus was affiliated with Zeus or a hybrid of Zeus and the emperor. Hasluck named it the Temple of Jupiter, noting that inscriptions naming Hadrian as Olympian, savior, and founder implied only that the emperor somehow aided the construction of the temple.\footnote{Hasluck 1910, 10, 187.}
argued that Hadrian certainly had a place in what he called the “Olympieum at Cyzicus” but acknowledged that it is unknown whether Hadrian was worshiped there with Zeus or as Zeus.\textsuperscript{610} Price provided yet another alternative, suggesting that Hadrian was honored at the temple, but not as the chief deity.\textsuperscript{611}

Several inscriptions have also been found that name Hadrian as Olympios, emperor, founder, and savior of Cyzicus.\textsuperscript{612} In the 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD, Socrates also wrote that the Cyzicenes had declared Hadrian to be the thirteenth god, an obvious nod to the emperor’s well-used title of Olympios.\textsuperscript{613} Other inscriptions mention a festival called \textit{Olympia Hadrianeia}, which may have been a festival or games dedicated to Zeus and Hadrian, or to Hadrian as Zeus.\textsuperscript{614} A festival would have been granted along with a temple and title, which supports the theory that the temple was affiliated with Hadrian and Zeus.\textsuperscript{615} Another possible allusion to this connection can be found in a scholion to

\textsuperscript{610} Nock 1930, 34.

\textsuperscript{611} Price 1984b, 153-155.

\textsuperscript{612} \textit{IGR} IV 128, \textit{IGR} IV 138, \textit{IGR} IV 139, \textit{IvK} II 27c, \textit{IvK} II 27d, Lolling 1884, 20, Wiegand 1904, 309-310, and \textit{CIG} 338. Many of the inscriptions do not use the terms founder and savior, but each calls Hadrian emperor and Olympios (Αὐτοκράτορ Ἀδριανῷ Ὀλυμπίῳ).

\textsuperscript{613} Socrates (\textit{Historia Ecclesiastica} III.23.59): Κυζιχηνοὶ δὲ τρισκαιδέκατον θεὸν Ἀδριανὸν ἀνηγόρευσαν...

\textsuperscript{614} \textit{IGR} I 802, \textit{IGR} IV 154, \textit{IGR} IV 162, and Ziebarth 1897, no. 26, mention the Olympia Hadrianeia. Price (1984b, 154-155) has noted that the position of Hadrian’s name in the title means that the emperor may have been the secondary dedicatee after Zeus. \textit{IGV} IV 160 mentions the Olympia and the Hadrianeia as if they were two separate festivals. A few other inscriptions, \textit{CIG} 2810, \textit{CIG} 3672, \textit{IGII} 3169, \textit{IGII2} 3170, \textit{IGR} IV 161, \textit{IGR} IV 1645, Mortmann 1882, no. 26, mention only the Olympia and Bey (1904), no. 7, mentions only the Hadrianeia. This could indicate that there were two festivals, that Cyzicenes abbreviated the name, or that the inscriptions are incomplete. Nevertheless, there are too many inscriptions that name a combined festival for its existence to be dismissed. See Behr (19981, 266) for more on the possible distinction between these two festivals.

\textsuperscript{615} Burrell (2004, 92) argued against this stating the opposite: “…the name Hadrianeia Olympia cannot be taken to indicate that Hadrian shared his temple at Kyzikos with another deity, Zeus Olympios”. Barattolo’s 1995 article includes a lengthy discussion of the evidence for a festival named after Hadrian and Zeus.
Lucian’s *Icaromenippus* (T6), which claims neither the Athenian Olympieion (A2) nor the temple at Cyzicus would have been completed without Hadrian’s financial support. It not only supports Hadrian’s relationship with the temple, but also leaves open the possibility that the two temples could have some cultic connection.

I believe, with Burrell, that the Temple of Hadrian first served the Imperial Cult, but I also accept that Zeus had an important role in cult there as an element of Hadrian’s identity. At Cyzicus and elsewhere, Hadrian’s Olympian epithet shows that the emperor accepted and encouraged the perception that he held a special relationship with Zeus. Providing Zeus with a share of the emperor’s identity aided the legitimization of the divine claims of the Imperial Cult. Still called the Temple of Hadrian long after his death, the temple was more likely the site of provincial Imperial Cult activities for his successors.

*The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius*

Evidence from the site itself confirming the Roman-era cult affiliation of the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius is composed of the colossal portrait heads found there (I89-I91) and by the temple’s split cella (I87). The heads have been identified as portraits of Antonine family members, most likely Antoninus Pius (I90b), Lucius Verus

---

616 The Antonines were an imperial dynasty who ruled from 138 to 192 AD. The emperors of this dynasty were Antoninus Pius (r. 138-161 AD), Marcus Aurelius (r. 161–80 AD), Lucius Verus (r. 161–69 AD), and Commodus (r. 177–92 AD).
Marcus Aurelius (I90c) and their respective wives Faustina the Elder (I89), Lucilla (I90a), and Faustina the Younger (I90d). Aside from the heads, only unclothed parts of bodies have been found, leading the excavators to conclude that most of the statues were acrolithic. They vary between three and four times life-size, with Antoninus Pius the largest. If their proposed identifications are correct, the temple almost certainly served in part as a shrine of the Imperial Cult.

In its complete state, the statue of Antoninus Pius (I90b) was fully nude and seated, possibly depicting the emperor in the guise of Zeus. Burrell noted that the portrait of Faustina the Elder (I89) may have had a veil attached to the rear of her head, indicating that she was paired with her husband as Hera. Whatever extra identities the other portraits may have expressed, they are all certainly members of Antoninus Pius’s immediate family, including his wife, his adopted sons, and their wives. Although

---

617 After its discovery in 1996, Greenewalt and Rautman (2000, 675-676) communicated R.R.R. Smith’s identification of this bust as Commodus. Burrell (2004, 105-106) contended that this is unlikely, based on the damnatio memoriae levied on Commodus after his death. Had this been a portrait of Commodus, then it would have stood in place for three years between his condemnation and later redemption by Septimius Severus. Burrell further concluded that this portrait group must have included an image of Lucius Verus, because the statues were installed at the time of the Parthian War, when Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus were frequently in Asia.

618 The portrait of Lucilla (I90a) was also identified by Hanfmann (1978, 166-167) as a possible head of Artemis. However, the portrait dates to the Roman period and the later discovery of the Lucius Verus head (I91) casts doubt on Hanfmann’s earlier identification.

619 Greenewalt and Rautman 2000, 675-676. Acrolithic sculptures were sculptures that combined marble and wood, with the marble used to represent human flesh. R.R.R. Smith concluded that the statues were acrolithic based on the neckline borders of the Lucius Verus (I91) portrait.

620 Unfortunately, there is no evidence of Artemis’s cult statue to compare it with those of the Antonines.

621 Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, 98. A fragment representing a portion of Antoninus’s thigh joined to his abdomen at a ninety-degree angle proves that the statue was nude and seated.

they may not have had central roles in cult activities, the family members would have been included in the cult of Antoninus.\textsuperscript{623}

There is no obvious place where the statues could have been installed;\textsuperscript{624} possibly they stood against or between the columns inside the cella or elsewhere in the temple precinct. Regardless of their position in the temple, these statues are far too large to have been mere decorative or honorific statues. Although they may have been placed outside of the temple, as Hadrian’s colossus was at the Athenian Olympieion, they were most probably placed in their own section of the cella. First, since the lack of space around the temple prohibited the completion of even the facade, it is unlikely that room could have been found for these six colossi. Second, the split cella clearly indicates that two cults were present: one in which worship of Artemis presumably continued, and a second where Antoninus, possibly as Zeus, and his family were the focus. Available space dictates that the Antonine family must have occupied the preferred eastern portion of the cella; the imperial statues were simply too large and numerous to have been contained in the smaller western portion.\textsuperscript{625}

The origin of the temple’s split cella and its meaning were initially misunderstood. Because he believed that the statue now identified as Marcus Aurelius represented Zeus, Hanfmann argued that the cella was originally split during the Hellenistic period to

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{623} Beard, North, and Price (1998, 318) have noted that it was not unusual for members of the imperial family to be included in the Imperial Cult.
  \item \textsuperscript{624} Greenewalt and Rautman 2000, 675-676 and Burrell 2004, 320-321.
  \item \textsuperscript{625} Burrell (2004, 308) suggested that Artemis presided over the west-facing portion of the cella and Antoninus Plus and Faustina over the east. Because the western portion of the cella (I87) includes a partial partition, it would have been difficult to accommodate the Antonine statues in that area, making Burrell’s hypothesis likely. Incidentally, the cella of Artemis at the Ephesian Artemision also faces west. This does not relate to particular practices of her cult as the temples of Artemis in Aulideia, Brauron, Agrotera, and Tauropolos all faced east.
\end{itemize}
accommodate a cult statue of Zeus and that it was converted to the emperor’s cult after the earthquake of 17 AD, first for Tiberius, and later for Antoninus Pius and Faustina.626 One honorific inscription, Buckler and Robinson 1932 no. 22, found about 35 meters northeast of the temple, does mention the “worshippers of Zeus” but also records the consecration of one individual as the “chief man of the city”.627 Buckler and Robinson suggested that the title, “chief man of the city,” refers to a priesthood of Rome628 and therefore cannot be used to identify a pre-Roman cult of Zeus at the site. Hanfmann’s suggestion concerning Tiberius was plausible, but was made before the discovery of the Wadi B Temple, which certainly predates the Antonine presence at the Temple of Artemis. If Sardis had honored Tiberius, then it would have done so with the Wadi B Temple, not the Temple of Artemis. That leaves the colossi of Antoninus and his family as the only substantial proof of the need to split the cella.

Sardis almost certainly received its second neokorate during the reign of Antoninus Pius.629 The earliest known reference to the second neokorate comes from an inscription on a marble base of a statue dedicated to Antoninus’s successor, Lucius Verus. The inscription calls Sardis “twice neokoros,” and was probably set up during the

626 Hanfmann 1983, 120. Hanfmann’s contention that the cella was split for a statue of Zeus was based on an early identification of the statue known now as Marcus Aurelius as a Hellenistic statue of Zeus.

627 Buckler and Robinson 1932, no. 22. The inscription reads: οἱ τοῦ Διὸς θεραπευταὶ τῶν εἰ[...] | τὸ ἁδύτων εἰσπορευομένων καθι- | ερόσαντες ἐστεφάνωσαν | Σωκράτην Πολεμαίου Παρδαλαν | τὸν πρῶτον τῆς πόλεως, διακει- | μένον ἐκ προγόνων πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβῶς.

628 Buckler and Robinson 1932, 47-48.

629 Several inscriptions call Sardis twice neokoros, including SEG 36, nos. 1093-1096, Buckler and Robinson 1932, no. 63, and the unpublished Sardis IN 74.7 (see Burrell 2004, 114). A few others (Buckler and Robinson 1932, nos. 64, 67, 69, and 70) mention multiple neokorates, but their preservation prevents a clear reading of the number. Most have been restored to specify two neokorates. Finally, at least one unpublished inscription mentioned by Greenewalt (2006, 745) calls the city “twice neokoros.” Significantly, the last inscription is on a statue base found among architectural and sculptural fragments on the west side of the Wadi B temple’s terrace.
166 AD visit Verus made to the city following his Parthian campaign; it provides a terminus ante quem for the award of the title. The colossal Antonine heads and the split cella at the Temple of Artemis corroborate the textual evidence and establish the temple as the site of the second neokorate.

One lingering problem related to the cult of the Antonines is why the Sardians allowed it to occupy the Temple of Artemis. Burrell posited that the Antonine cult was originally installed in the Wadi B Temple at Sardis and moved when that structure was destroyed. This proposal requires one to accept the contention of Ratté, Howe, and Foss that the Wadi B Temple was destroyed in the 2nd century AD and never rebuilt. Evans has recently questioned that argument, suggesting that the archaeological evidence does not support the conclusion that the temple was destroyed early in its existence and never rebuilt. Furthermore, one of the unpublished inscriptions found alongside fragments of the Wadi B temple (I16 and I17) mentions “twice neokoros.” If associated with the Wadi B Temple, the inscription would imply that the temple was functioning during the second neokorate, and not in a state of ruin that would necessitate the transfer of the Antonine neokorate into the Artemis Temple.

---

630 SEG 36 1986,1093. Burrell (2004, 103) also mentioned Buckler and Robinson 1932 no. 47, which states that L Julius Libonianus was a chief priest of Asia in the Sardian temples. Libonianus also acted as strategos during Trajan’s reign. Burrell concluded that his career could not have lasted much more than 25 years, he must have served as chief priest of Asia during Antoninus’s reign, meaning that the second neokorate can be attributed to Antoninus.

631 In an aside, Pausanias (7.6.6) referred to the sanctuary of Artemis at Sardis, but made no mention of its relation to the Imperial Cult. This should not be assumed to carry great significance, however, as the reference is in a part of his text recording interactions between Lydians and Greeks. Furthermore, it is possible that the cella of the Temple of Artemis had not yet been split to include the Emperor Antoninus and his wife Faustina at the time Pausanias wrote.

632 See note 210.

633 See Greenewalt 2006, 745.
Instead, the Temple of Artemis was apparently considered to be a space that could be made available during the 2nd century AD. The temple certainly received extensive Roman-era renovation related to the Antonine cult, and perhaps the accommodation of that cult was a condition of that remodeling effort. Although a new neokorate temple was an honor for the city and emperor, equal prominence in a famous regional shrine was certainly an attractive alternative.634 Such a move would have offered a level of prestige that extended beyond a simple co-dedication in a newly built temple. We have no clear information about what happened if an emperor’s cult was installed in an older temple. Hanfmann opined that most dedicatory inscriptions suggest an equitable partnership between the emperor and the local divinity.635 Price has written that in instances where he shared a temple with a god, the emperor was always in the subordinate position.636 Burrell concluded the opposite and wrote that worship in dual-dedication provincial temples focused on the emperor at the expense of gods sharing the cult space.637 Physically, the installation of the Antonine statues in the preferred eastern portion of the cella could either be an indication that they were honored above Artemis, or simply that they required the larger space. Whatever the precise arrangement at the grand temple in Sardis, Antoninus Pius and the Imperial Cult seem to have had a special position alongside Artemis.

634 This would not be without precedent. Burrell (2004, 56-57 and 316) has reported that the cult of Caligula was included in the Didymaion, perhaps transforming it into a neokorate temple.

635 Hanfmann 1975, 73.

636 Price 1984b, 155-156.

637 Burrell 2003a, 195.
The status of the emperor's cult may also have been augmented by his relationship with Zeus. Antoninus's colossus probably depicted the emperor and his wife as Zeus and Hera. Moreover, if the interpretation of Buckler and Robinson 1932, no. 22 is correct, the inscription links a priesthood of Rome with worshippers of Zeus, perhaps a sign of the relationship between the Imperial Cult and Zeus at the temple. Finally, an inscription found near the gymnasiun complex during the 1970 season gives Antoninus the title Olympios.\textsuperscript{638} The evidence therefore suggests that Antoninus Pius was identified with Zeus at Sardis, and specifically at the Temple of Artemis.

Summary

The spotlight temples were the products of extraordinary effort, and consequently, their related cults must have represented significant value to a major segment of the local community, and in turn, to the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{639} Ancient sources testify that the cities in which the temples were built all hosted several temples dedicated to the Imperial Cult. On the whole, the materials, construction methods, and the decoration of the spotlight temples bear the hallmark of a Roman hand at work. Only the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius has surviving cult statues, the surest sign of a dedication to the Imperial Cult; a similar affiliation for the other temples relies on evidence based on their archaeological remains and primary textual data.\textsuperscript{640}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{638} Hanfmann and Thomas 1970, 14. According to the report, the inscription is catalogued as IN 70.4.
\item \textsuperscript{639} Duncan-Jones (1990, 60) argued that the local building activities of cities were vital contributions to the overall economic health of the Empire.
\item \textsuperscript{640} The relationship between quality of material and imperial assistance was discussed in Chapter 2, 110-111.
\end{itemize}
responsible for the construction of all of the spotlight temples. Because the cult of the emperors was ubiquitous in the provinces, it is reasonable to conclude that any temple touched by the imperial office was also inflected with the Imperial Cult. Decorative schemes are more difficult to tie to emperor worship, with any association relying on imperial stylistic habit. The Wadi B Temple and Vetters Temple have yielded nothing beyond typical temple ornament and the Red Hall has a clear relationship to Egyptian styles. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus is more identifiably Roman in its ornament, and the remains of friezes express a victorious theme, which would be appropriate for an imperial monument. Historical context can also suggest an imperial connection. Most of the temples were built with imperial support during the Empire’s apex. Several of the temples, especially the Vetters Temple, also seem to have been demolished or left to decay shortly after the official rise of Christendom, at most two centuries after their creations. Christian responses to pagan architecture varied wildly, however, from zealous destruction to appropriation, so without conclusive testimony of Christian responses to each building, the reasons for their abandonment and ruin are uncertain. What can be adduced from the archaeological remains is that the spotlight temples were functionally tied to the pre-Christian Roman Empire, and were of limited public use after the 4th century.

On the other hand, the temples can also be linked to traditional deities. Through sculpture, the Red Hall can be linked to Egyptian gods, and the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius may have incorporated Zeus. Furthermore, the identities of the most

641 Appropriation could involve the complete or partial takeover of a pagan structure, depending on the needs of the community. For example, the southern stoa of the Vetters Temple was taken over presumably because the temple was too large to maintain. In contrast, the Red Hall and its rotundas were totally taken over, but its temenos was apparently not.
likely founding emperors of the temples seem to be inflected by an association with Zeus. Coins, inscriptions, and historical accounts support a shared affiliation with the Imperial Cult, but also articulate a blending of that cult with traditional deities. The traditional gods associated with the spotlight temples, Zeus and Sarapis, are not local deities, but were universally recognized in the religious environment of the Roman Imperial period. As it bears on temple dedication, neither the Imperial Cult nor traditional cults need to be understood as exclusive. Given the available data, I suggest that the spotlight temples’ cult associations echoed the hybridity of their plans. The emperor and a traditional god both seem to have had a role in the cult of each temple. The inquiry, then, should not focus on the dynamics of the dedications, but rather on the reason for the amalgamations of the cults.

Emperors and Gods

The ostensible goal of the Imperial Cult was to place the emperor on a level above other humans as a means to confirm the primacy of the Empire and its ruler. In practice, this required the participation of the Roman administrative hierarchy and of those provinces under Roman authority, but there was no single set of practices or beliefs associated with the Imperial Cult. For Burrell, worship is characterized by the offering of sacrifices to the emperor in a context that confirms his divinity. Price maintained that the Imperial Cult did not provide the emperor with full divinity, but instead elevated him above mortals into a position that was god-like, but also in need of

---

642 According to Beard, North, and Price (1998, 318), there was no one Imperial Cult, but several cults that shared a focus on the emperor and his family. Environment, ritual, and Roman involvement varied greatly across the Empire.

divine support. More recently, Ted Kaizer has argued that in Rome the emperor was the mortal head of the college of pontiffs, and was made divine only on the occasion of his death, while in the eastern provinces he was the subject of a cult, in which the level of belief in his divinity is unknowable. These viewpoints concerning the emperor's divinity and the apparent inconsistency in the ways he was worshipped indicate that the Imperial Cult was an adaptable institution. Consequently, an instance of imperial worship should be approached according to its environment. The versions of the Imperial Cult existing at the spotlight temples seem to share a common feature beyond their province and size; the cults integrated the deity of the emperor with that of a traditional universal god, and in turn provided the monumental temples with a monumental cult personality.

William Ramsay and John Anderson considered that the greatness of Rome was embodied by the "god-emperor," and that the Imperial Cult was the basis and keystone of religious imperial architecture. Fears echoed this view by arguing that the cult of emperors was an appropriation of the concept of Genius Populi Romani, itself a combination of the Hellenistic cults of Tyche and the demos of a city. The Imperial Cult simply offered an added element of divinity by combining the concepts of the

644 Price 1984a, 94.
645 Kaizer 2007, 447.
646 Ramsay and Anderson 1941, 5. Writing with a certain prejudice, Ramsay and Anderson went on to state that the Imperial Cult "was a sham by which the subjects expressed their devoted loyalty in religious forms," and eventually humanity demanded a "real religion". Despite their personal opinions on pagan worship, I believe their point that the Imperial Cult embodied the greatness of the Empire has merit.
647 Fears 1978, 286. According to Fears, the male Genius Populi Romani was distinct from the goddess Roma, represented as a female. Consequently, the Genius Populi Romani was the perfect precursor for the emperor's role as a corporeal symbol of the Empire.
Roman _genius_ with the emperor. In effect, the cult made the emperor the tangible and spiritual symbol of the Empire throughout the world.

The Greek East proved to be especially fertile ground for the Roman Imperial Cult.\(^648\) By linking the Roman emperor to various traditional gods, the Imperial Cult bolstered his celestial significance for the Greek-speaking world. According to A.D. Nock, emperors could share in the cults of individual deities, and assimilation to a deity was aimed at association or comparison.\(^649\) Price argued that the Greeks collated the names of emperors with specific deities, as they associated Hadrian with Zeus through the epithet Olympios, in the same way that they used the term _theos_ as an adjective.\(^650\) Accordingly, an emperor could be associated with the characteristics of a particular god, but could not truly be that god. Beard, North, and Price questioned if there was even significance to rituals treating the emperor as a god or if he was simply under the gods’ protection through alliance or assimilation. Instead, they argued that the true purpose of the Imperial Cult was to preserve social order and stability.\(^651\)

Roman imperialism forced a reinterpretation of culture and religion.\(^652\) This is particularly important during and after Hadrian’s reign, when colonization and conquest

\(^{648}\) See Chapter 1, 9.

\(^{649}\) Nock 1930, 18, 40-43. Nock discussed (32) Hadrian’s divine epithets, Olympios, Panhellenios, and Eleutheros, and noted that it is difficult to determine whether temples related to these titles featured statues of Hadrian and Zeus side by side, or a single cult statue of Zeus with Hadrian’s features.

\(^{650}\) Price 1984a, 86. Price noted that the Greek term _theos_ (see _LSJ_ s.v. ἐός) differs from the Latin _divus_ in that it refers to living persons as well as dead. Similarly the thrust of Imperial Cult practice in the Greek world was towards the figure of the reigning emperor. The predication of _theos_ placed the emperor within the traditional religious system in a position higher than mortals but not fully equal to the gods.

\(^{651}\) Beard, North and Price 1998, 361. Gordon (2011, 44) even questioned if receiving worship was a simple precondition for imperial power.

\(^{652}\) Beard, North and Price 1998, 313. In terms of religion, Kaizer (2007, 446-447) contended that in order to provide Roman religion in the East, a colony was supplied with an essential “religious export package” that included a set of Roman gods, the Capitoline Triad, and several priesthoods.
were replaced by diplomacy. In Asia, the Imperial Cult was a foreign institution that could not immediately assume the same function as the worship of local deities.

Theodore Mommsen observed, however, that by the Roman Imperial period, the traditional gods were not supported by strong faith, but by “the habits of home and the memory of the past.” By linking the emperor to the familiar models of divine rulership, the version of the Imperial Cult present at the spotlight temples emphasized the emperor’s natural place within the local religious landscape. In effect, the emperor harnessed the comforting qualities of the traditional gods, but had a much more perceptible impact on everyday life.

Whether he was a partner, subordinate, or was assimilated with a traditional god, the emperor was the supreme power on earth. As king of the gods, Zeus Olympios logically became the most common imperial companion. The term “Olympios” originated as an epithet of Zeus and was used to describe his supremacy as the head of the Olympian gods, therefore making him a universal deity. With the epithet Olympios, several emperors, like Alexander before them, became the chief of the world of men in parallel with Zeus as the head of the gods. Although Zeus was the most common association, the emperor or his family could also be linked with other gods.

---

653 Mommsen 1906, 296.

654 For example, Hadrian most famously adopted the epithet of Olympios, Antoninus Pius was represented as Zeus at the Temple of Artemis at Sardis, and the Traianeion at Pergamon was dedication to Trajan and Zeus Philios.

655 Metcalf 1974, 60.

656 For example, a coin, BMC no. 875 placed Hadrian alongside Sarapis. In another example, Aristides (Orationes 23.78) called Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus the friends of gods and compared them to the “savior” gods Asclepius and Sarapis.
All of the spotlight temples can be linked with Zeus except the Red Hall, which was more likely affiliated with Sarapis, who himself was sometimes equated with Zeus. Although some scholars have held that worship at some of the spotlight temples focused on one subject,\textsuperscript{657} I believe that the reality was more complex. The precise relationship between the emperors and Zeus may be forever unknown, but the evidence of that association should not be dismissed. Religion and ritual was an ever-present element of Roman life, and temple dedications could remind people of the emperor’s beneficence and establish a link between religious ritual and the emperor himself, thereby integrating gods and emperors.\textsuperscript{658} Rather than situating the emperor in an enigmatic place in the divine hierarchy, his association with universal deities, like Zeus and Sarapis, would have placed him in an easily recognizable class of divinity.

**Imperialism and the Imperial Cult**

Epigraphical and architectural evidence shows that the cult of Roman emperors reached a high mark of popularity in Asia during the 2\textsuperscript{nd} AD. Unfortunately, there is no way to know how many people participated in the cult, or if it was aimed at a religious or socio-political end.\textsuperscript{659} Simon Price argued that competition to build an Imperial Cult neokorate temple was fierce and required that a city or province petition to the emperor.

\textsuperscript{657} See especially Burrell 2003b.

\textsuperscript{658} Boatwright 2000, 127-129.

\textsuperscript{659} See Price 1984b. Price concluded that the religious structure of the Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor was wildly varied and that the level to which the local populations of Asia Minor participated is unknown. He suggested that it may have functioned like any traditional cult, but may have also been a marker of civic identity and accomplishment. Moreover, the architecture related to the imperial cult may have been built as thanks for, or in anticipation of, favors from the emperor.
for the honor.\textsuperscript{660} He characterized this process as one of complex gift exchange, in which the provinces and Empire engaged in diplomatic negotiations that ultimately benefitted both parties.\textsuperscript{661} Burrell has advocated a broader view, stating that the significance of the neokoros title is not straightforward and could change according to circumstances and the requirements of the Empire, emperor, province, and cities.\textsuperscript{662}

This uncertainty about the significance of neokorate titles is played out by the spotlight temples. All of the spotlight temples were built around the time when their cities competed for neokorates. Three - the Vetters Temple, the Temple of Hadrian, and the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus - were almost certainly neokorate temples of the Imperial Cult. Two - the Wadi B Temple and the Red Hall, were built around the same time that Sardis and Pergamon were denied neokorates.\textsuperscript{663} Neither of these was a neokorate temple (although Wadi B may have received that title later), but their imposing physicality and relationship to the emperor nevertheless emphasized the relationship between their cities and the emperor who probably funded them. If a neokorate temple had the capacity to enhance the profile of any one of the entities with

\textsuperscript{660} Price (1984b, 64-77) wrote a historical overview of how the process of awarding provincial Imperial Cult titles began, as well as how they could be perceived as political and religious benefits to both Empire and provincial cities.

\textsuperscript{661} Ostensibly the domain of the province, it is still unclear whether the resulting temples were cared for by a municipality or the entire province. Burrell (2004, 305) has characterized the neokorate temples as “settings where dramas of loyalty [between the emperor and province] were enacted.”

\textsuperscript{662} Burrell 2004, 372. She also wrote (2004, 359) that we should consider the Imperial Cult as a product that happened over a long period of time, and its meaning must have been tailored to each situation.

\textsuperscript{663} It is important to note that Sardis and Pergamon were likely refused neokorates for practical reasons. At the time the Wadi B temple was built, Smyrna was awarded Tiberius’s single neokorate. Although multiple neokorates were eventually allowed, Hadrian denied Pergamon because he had just completed the official temple dedicated to his predecessor Trajan.
which it was related, surely the same could be said for non-neokorate temples of such monumental stature.

According to Burrell, the impetus for emperor worship came from the provincials at the periphery, not from any imposed propaganda or religious apparatus.\textsuperscript{664} Correct though it might be, that argument does not discount the possibility that the imperial center quickly realized the benefits of a formalized Imperial Cult and was aware of the ways in which temples could be used as vehicles for advancing the imperial agenda.\textsuperscript{665} It may be beneficial to consider how the spotlight temples may also have been related to imperial or local administration and identity. In his essay on the function of Roman temples, Stambaugh noted that because temples were deeply integrated into the political processes of the Empire, they naturally became weighty political gestures.\textsuperscript{666} The existence of an Imperial Cult temple expressed a link between a city and Rome, but the size and quality of the spotlight temples speaks to a more substantial relationship. At the local level, Yegül observed that the new institutions and architecture of the Imperial Cult were a part of the daily life of citizens.\textsuperscript{667} By joining imperial worship with traditional cults at the spotlight temples, the province and Empire were bound by common interests that encouraged municipal and regional loyalty built on shared convictions.

\textsuperscript{664} Burrell 2006, 449.

\textsuperscript{665} For example, Mattingly (1947, 56) asserted that the Imperial Cult was a substitute for the universal religion of the Empire.

\textsuperscript{666} Stambaugh 1972a, 583.

\textsuperscript{667} Yegül 2000, 134. In a related topic, Mattingly (1947, 50) observed that the worship of the emperor was a natural bridge between the individual citizen and his political surroundings. Bowersock (1972, 182) held that elite participation in the Imperial Cult suggests that social and political roles were at the center. In other words, the provincial priesthoods were a political and social honor that one could earn for self and family.
The development of the Imperial Cult was both variously imposed\(^{668}\) and spontaneous, and this flexibility facilitated a peaceful acculturation process. Despite the absence of an intentional pattern, the divine emperor was probably placed alongside traditional universal gods in the spotlight temples. Although based on limited evidence, the general chronology of the temples may point to an evolution of the process by which the emperors were identified with major gods.\(^{669}\) If my suggestion is correct, chance allowed the cults of Tiberius and Zeus to share worship, or at least a space, in Sardis. The three Hadrianic temples, the Vettters Temple, the Temple of Hadrian, and the Red Hall, all appear to portray universal divinity as a familiar aspect of the Imperial Cult through epithets. Finally, with the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus, the Imperial Cult not only appropriated a major temple dedicated to a traditional deity, but may also have installed the religious image of the emperor as Zeus, overtly depicting assimilation. Certainly there was nothing particularly new about depicting the emperor as a god, but to depict him as a god with a cult statue in a well-established temple represents a major departure from accepted practice. The simple discovery of all the cult statues in the other spotlight temples could easily dismiss this hypothesis, but the currently available support suggests an increasing boldness in the manner in which the emperors were assimilated with, or at least identified with, universal deities. Consequently, I would argue that in the same way that the spotlight temples emulated the major sanctuaries of

\(^{668}\) Lozano 2011, 512-513. In Asia, it would seem that the cities actively sought the Imperial Cult. Sacrifice to the emperor, which was an important aspect of imperial worship, was mandated in some places, and was one cause of the Jewish revolt of Jerusalem in the 1\(^{st}\) century AD (see Josephus [The Jewish War]). Therefore, though imposition of the Imperial Cult cannot be proven in Asia, emperor worship was certainly an expected requirement of the provinces.

\(^{669}\) This is a phenomenon that also occurred in the Greek-speaking province of Achaea (which includes Athens). Here, as in Asia, Hadrian and the Antonines may also have been placed alongside or synthesized with major deities. For more, see Camia 2011, 25-82.
Asia, they also emulated traditional religion, in order to temper the intrusion of new additions to the local religious and architectural landscape and to make them more familiar. This was an ambitious undertaking, and one that monumentalized the role of the emperor and the Empire in local religious rituals.

In design and religious affiliation the spotlight temples are delicate emulations of and innovations on the traditional temples and religions of Asia. Yet they were obviously major structures that towered over their surroundings, collectively a permanent testament to Roman presence. In the following chapter, I look at the placements of the spotlight temples in their urban contexts and examine how their monumentality reached its full effect and changed the topography of sacred architecture in Asia.
4. Monumental Size and Placement

Design and cult affiliation are important ingredients of monumentality, especially as they affect the appearances and characters of the spotlight temples. A third ingredient, visibility, is the focus of this final chapter. Visibility was a major concern for Roman temple builders, and so significant that William MacDonald called it a Roman specialty and passion.\(^{670}\) Two major components affect the visibility of the spotlight temples: volume and location. These two aspects of monumentality must have impressed, perhaps even awed, ancient viewers. Today it is difficult to see the spotlight temples as anything but isolated ruins. In antiquity, however, they were enormous landmarks in a living urban landscape, experienced by pedestrians from near and far. In this chapter I use reconstructed models to provide an estimate of how the temples were physically experienced in antiquity. First, I determine the minimum possible sizes of the spotlight temples. Next, I provide a summary of the characteristics of Roman urban environments with special attention to the typical placement of temples. Following this, I describe the settings of the spotlight temples and how the temples fit in conceptually or culturally with their surroundings. My goal in this chapter is to demonstrate how size and location played a role in emphasizing the visibility and monumentality of the spotlight temples.

Size

The term monumentality naturally evokes a notion of exceptional size. Monumentality establishes the physical presence of the temples on a grand scale and

\(^{670}\) MacDonald 1986, 133.
suggests the financial and human effort expended in the construction process. Edmund Thomas considered that physical grandeur was a direct means to communicate the historical significance of Roman buildings in their own time. More recently, Augusta McMahon commented that scale in monumental architecture is a fundamental term in the visual vocabulary for communicating power over space and people. From this point of view, size certainly helps to determine the purpose and meaning of a building. Size and height also ensured visibility, an essential characteristic of Roman temples that emphasized their importance and allowed them to dominate their surroundings and tower over viewers.

In the following section, I present perspective models, based on the measurements provided by excavators, which offer an estimate of each temple’s height and volume. Of the spotlight temples, only the Red Hall offers today standing evidence of its effect on the skyline and topography. The other temples are known only by their structural footprints and their fragmentary architectural varia. Because poor preservation has eliminated most visible evidence for their heights, stylobate dimensions and column diameters are the only reliable items of data that can be used to determine their original heights. Capital height and column diameter are the basic measurements from which I have calculated the approximate heights of the temples.

---

671 Thomas 2007, 170. Writing on the subject of private homes, Egelhaaf-Gaiser (2007, 208) also suggested that space, height, and monumentality were intended to impress viewers in public spaces whereas the less spectacular spaces were for specific functions.

672 McMahon 2013, 163. McMahon’s article focused on ancient Mesopotamian architecture, but the point is relevant for Roman imperial architecture as well.

673 Richard Brilliant (1984, 96) claimed that the Romans favored buildings with emphasized verticality because it projected a sense of honor or importance. William MacDonald (1986, 133-139) discussed the notion of domination and considered elevation, axial authority, and visibility to be consistent architectural features of Roman temples throughout the Empire.
Most were built in the Corinthian order, for which Vitruvius preserved a canon that can be used to calculate the height of the temples from stylobate to horizontal cornice in a uniform manner. The recommendations for proportion provided by Vitruvius can be found throughout the third and fourth books of his *de Architectura*. For the sake of convenience, I have assembled the relevant formulae in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Passage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ionic Column Base</td>
<td>1/2 Lower Column Diameter (LCD)</td>
<td>3.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinthian Column base</td>
<td>Same as Ionic</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionic Shaft Height</td>
<td>8.5 x LCD</td>
<td>4.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinthian Shaft height</td>
<td>Same as Ionic</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionic Capital</td>
<td>½ LCD</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinthian Capital</td>
<td>1 LCD</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionic Architrave Height (AH)</td>
<td>Varies, but generally between 1/8 and 1/12 of the column shaft height</td>
<td>3.5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinthian AH</td>
<td>Same as Ionic AH</td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieze Height without Figures</td>
<td>3/4 AH</td>
<td>3.5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieze Height with Figures</td>
<td>1.25 x AH</td>
<td>3.5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice (with Dentils)</td>
<td>4/7 AH</td>
<td>3.5.9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediment</td>
<td>Tympanum Height = 1/9 Tympanum Width</td>
<td>3.5.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The formula for architrave height, which affects the heights of the frieze and cornice, requires some additional explanation. According to Vitruvius, architrave height depends on a variable fraction of the column shaft height (3.5.8). Vitruvius also advised that if columns are between 15 and 20 feet in height, then the architrave should be 1/13 of the column height, if they are between 20 and 25 feet high, then the architrave should be 1/12.5 of column height, and if they are 35 to 30 feet high, then the architrave should be 1/12 of column height. For columns higher than 30 feet (approximately 10 meters), Vitruvius stated that the formula of proportion should be continued. Therefore, for every five-foot increment, the division of the column should be reduced by 0.5. This formula applies only to the Wadi B Temple, the Vetters Temple, and the Temple of Hadrian. Using the standard equivalent for a Roman foot (0.296 meters), the variable formulae for architrave heights of these spotlight temples is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temple</th>
<th>Shaft Height (Roman Feet)</th>
<th>Shaft Height (Meters)</th>
<th>Vitruvian Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wadi B Temple</td>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>7.4 - 8.88</td>
<td>1/12 Shaft Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetters Temple</td>
<td>45 - 50</td>
<td>13.32 - 14.8</td>
<td>1/10 Shaft Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of Hadrian</td>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>17.76 - 19.24</td>
<td>1/8.5 Shaft Height</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is significant diversity among Roman Corinthian buildings, especially in the variety of the ways in which bases, shafts, and capitals could be proportioned.

---

674 The Red Hall was a totally unique structure, for which Vitruvian recommendations do not apply. The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius was also exception because of the range of column sizes. Fortunately, the total column height and architrave have been measured at the site.

675 Jones 2000, 143 and MacDonald 1986, 186-188. MacDonald (186-187) even suggested that in parts of the Empire "the Vitruvian canon was often ignored, perhaps unknown".
Consequently no set of rules can offer an entirely accurate formula to reconstruct lost buildings. Nevertheless, Vitruvius was known for his conservatism and his formulae for proportion provide a range that would have fit within the sizes of the spotlight temples.\textsuperscript{676} While the imperial architects of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century may have attempted heights beyond his imagination, the application of Vitruvius’ formulae for determining order height should give us the approximate sizes that the spotlight temples would have originally reached. Although using this Vitruvian method for calculating height may preclude the option of drawing the temples to their largest possible sizes, it provides control over the reconstruction process.

Despite the importance of physical presence, Roman temple architecture is not always considered from a perspective that emphasizes a building’s visual impact on urban environments and viewers.\textsuperscript{677} Instead, as the previous chapters have shown, most scholars have paid attention to the design details, the affiliations, and the practical functions of temples. My models approximate the space occupied by the spotlight temples, but not their precise appearances. Because the columnar arrangements and cella layouts of several of the temples are uncertain, the reconstructions will not include

\textsuperscript{676} MacDonald (1986, 248) and Jones (1989, 59-65) have discussed the challenges presented by Vitruvius’s recommendations for proportion verses the material evidence from extant buildings. Over the centuries, scholars have applied his formulae to known structures. Sometimes they match, other times not. Usually the Vitruvian dimensions are not drastically different from the architectural remains. All things considered, the ancient author provides a guide for temple design, and one which was surely known by the architects of the High Empire. Consequently, the Vitruvian guidelines are used in this chapter as a practical guide to be uniformly imposed on the spotlight temple remains.

\textsuperscript{677} MacDonald 1982, 192.
any of those details. In their completed states, then, the models take the appearance of large three-dimensional blocks. Finally, to provide a sense of scale, each model is accompanied by a small (approximately 1.65 meters tall) human figure. With these models, I hope to provide a basic sense of the physical presences of the spotlight temples within the larger local landscapes. In essence, the models depict them according to the broad strokes of their appearances in order to demonstrate the ways in which they dominated their environments.

The Wadi B Temple

The Wadi B Temple is the smallest of the spotlight temples. Based on the arrangement and diameter of the columns, it probably measured 20 x 32 or 20 x 38 meters. My reconstruction reflects the larger set of dimensions. The stylobate is 2.2 meters above the lowest level of the stereobate, which extends the footprint of the building by approximately 4.4 meters. Because excavations unearthed a corner of the building, it seems most likely that a flight of steps wrapped around the entire stylobate. According to the excavators, the rise of the step blocks is 0.22 meters and the tread

678 Chapters 1 and 2 include information concerning the competing hypothetical plans for the temples. Vitruvian guidelines for intercolumnar distance based on column diameter may support a method for determining columnar configurations. The variety of columnar spacing in the 2nd century, however, is significant and makes any configurations based on Vitruvian recommendations just as uncertain as the hypothetical drawings made by earlier scholars. Furthermore, in the scope of this chapter the precise configuration of columns is not as significant as their presence on the landscape.


680 In choosing between these two options, I have considered the fact that the exceptional size of the temple’s precinct easily allowed for the larger dimensions.

681 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 53.
ranges between 0.4 and 0.44 meters, making it likely that there were ten steps. The peristasis appears to have extended to the edge of the stylobate, meaning that the volume occupied by the temple was set by the stylobate dimensions. Ratté, Howe, and Foss estimated that the order height was between 8 and 10 meters high. To arrive at a more specific estimate for height, I applied the Vitruvian formula, multiplying the column diameter of 0.886 meters by 10, for a combined base, shaft, and capital height of 8.86 meters. Because the column shaft fits within the Vitruvian range of 25 to 30 Roman feet, the architrave should be 1/12 of the column shaft height, or 0.627 meters. If the refined sculpted features of the torso capitals (I17) carried over onto the rest of the structure, it most likely possessed a figural frieze, which would have been 0.748 meters high. Continuing this scheme, the cornice would have been 0.358 meters high, making the entire entablature height 1.769 meters. Finally, at 1/9 the stylobate width, the apex of the roof would have been an additional 2.222 meters higher, bringing the total approximate height of the Wadi B Temple to 15.051 meters (I18).

In tabular form, the height of the Wadi B Temple is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wadi B Temple</th>
<th>Measurement (Meters)</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column Diameter</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereobate Height</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

682 Ibid.

683 Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 55. The authors reached this conclusion based on the scale of a fragment of egg-and-tongue molding from the pediment block with the Adramyteion inscription.

684 Although there are no published dimensions for the torso capitals (I17), I have applied the Vitruvian advice that they should equal the lower column diameter in height. It's worth noting that the lower diameter of the column is almost equal to 3 Roman feet (1 Roman foot equaled approximately 0.296 m.), making the full column height 30 Roman feet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wadi B Temple</th>
<th>Measurement (Meters)</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column Base</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>1/2 LCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaft Height</td>
<td>7.531</td>
<td>8.5 x LCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Height</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>1 LCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architrave Height</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>1/12 Shaft Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieze Height</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>1.25 x AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice Height</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>4/7 AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediment Height</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>1/9 Stylobate Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Approximate Height</td>
<td>15.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Vetters Temple*

Scherrer proposed that the original height of the Vetters Temple was approximately 25 meters, but he did not specify how he arrived at that estimate or whether the pediment was included in the estimate. It is likely that the outermost peristasis of the Vetters Temple (like that of the Wadi B Temple) matched its stylobate dimensions, which are 33 x 60 meters. The full stereobate measures approximately 57 x 85 meters, but the height of the crepidoma has not yet been ascertained. For the Doric and Ionic Greek orders there are formulas that can be used to calculate crepidoma height, but these are not appropriate to the Roman Corinthian order, in which crepidoma height, but these are not appropriate to the Roman Corinthian order, in which

---

685 Scherrer 1995, 184; 2008, 54. His column height is based on a capital found at the site, which he included in the dimensions. Earlier, Karwiese (1995a, 313) estimated the height of the structure at about 23 meters. Neither of these estimates specified which elements are included in the estimate, so it is impossible to tell if they include the crepidoma or roof heights.

686 Vetters and Karwiese 1987, 84 and Scherrer 1999, 137. Karwiese proposed an earlier set of dimensions in 1982, but those were found to be erroneous in subsequent excavations. The height of the stereobate is unpublished.
Roman architects sometimes sought greater verticality. In my reconstruction, I have raised the crepidoma to a very conservative height of 2.0 meters, simply to give an impression of the crepidoma.\textsuperscript{687} Considering the crepidoma heights of contemporary temples of similar sizes, two meters is surely lower than the actual height,\textsuperscript{688} and so can therefore be accepted as a minimum height. A Corinthian capital found during the 1984 season has a diameter\textsuperscript{689} of 1.5 meters and an estimated original height of 1.7 meters, the latter of which will serve as my lower column diameter (I30a).\textsuperscript{690} Using the Vitruvian formula, the combined height of the base, shaft, and capital would be about 17 meters, and the height of the entablature at least 4.076 meters. Finally, at its highest point, the pediment would have reached at least an additional 3.666 meters, giving the entire superstructure a total minimum height of 26.742 meters (I32). With the original height of the crepidoma and precise pitch of the roof, the height of the Vetters Temple could have been several meters higher.

\textsuperscript{687} The nine steps on the reconstruction are based on this height and a standard step rise of 0.2 meters. Applying these figures to the footprint of the crepidoma, the treads of the steps on the north and south facades of the temple measure 1.39 meters and the treads on the east and west sides measure 1.33 meters.

\textsuperscript{688} For comparison, the Temple of Artemis at Gerasa (A12) and the Temple of Bacchus at Baalbek (A14) had crepidoma heights are 4.32 and 5.1 meters, respectively (MacDonald 1986, 137).

\textsuperscript{689} Entasis would have made the capital diameter slimmer than the lower column diameter used in the Vitruvian formulae, but the height of the capital should represent lower column diameter.

\textsuperscript{690} Vetters and Karwiese 1987, 84. The capital is somewhat damaged, and Karwiese determined the original capital height based on Vitruvius (4.1.1). Vitruvius recorded that Corinthian capitals are the same height as the diameter of the column’s base. Since the diameter of the lower portion of the capital is 1.5 meters, Karwiese simply added 0.2 meters to account for \textit{entasis}, giving a lower column diameter of 1.7 meters.
In tabular form, the height of the Vetters Temple is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vetter's Temple</th>
<th>Measurement (Meters)</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column Diameter</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereobate Height</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Minimum Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Base</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1/2 LCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaft Height</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>8.5 x LCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Height</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1 LCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architrave Height</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>1/10 Shaft Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieze Height</td>
<td>1.806</td>
<td>1.25 x AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice Height</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>4/7 AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediment Height</td>
<td>3.666</td>
<td>1/9 Stylobate Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Approximate Height</td>
<td>26.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Red Hall

Since it is largely intact today, the size of the Red Hall is easy to appreciate (I35). The central portion of the hall itself is in remarkable condition, missing only the eastern wall and roof. It measures 26 x 60 meters and the standing portions of the walls reach a height of 19 meters, making that the minimum original height. Unlike the other spotlight temples, the Red Hall possessed no peristasis. Instead, it was bordered by its own massive walls, as well as two flanking rotundas and a portico in front, extending across the width of the temenos. Because of this unique design, there is no way to estimate the original height of the building reliably. Finally, the walls provide no evidence

---

691 Unlike the other spotlight temples, the Red Hall was not raised above the ground on a podium or crepidoma.
for the original design of the roof. It could have been flat, pitched, or open. Therefore, the model (I47) does not include a hypothetical level representing the roof, even though the Red Hall was certainly taller than its current height.

The Temple of Hadrian

The Temple of Hadrian is the largest of the spotlight temples, and one of the largest temples built in the ancient world. Recent excavation reports list the dimensions of the stylobate as 48.84 x 106.56 meters and the full length of the stereobate as 116.23 meters. If these measurements are correct, that would mean that the steps extend 4.835 meters beyond the east and west ends of the temple. Although the width of the stereobate is uncertain, excavators have observed that the steps on the south side of the temple extended between 6.3 and 6.6 meters beyond the stylobate. Assuming that the steps on both the north and south flanks extended about 6.6 meters, the full dimensions of the stereobate would be 62.04 x 116.23 meters. Foundation elevations from the excavation reports give the height of the crepidoma as 3.0 meters. Column diameters measure 2.135 meters, which projects for a base, shaft, and capital height of 21.35 meters - slightly shorter than Cassius Dio’s estimates for the height of the columns (T17), but a closer match for Cyriacus’s estimate (T10). The entablature would have been at least 6.023 meters and the apex of the pediment another 3.666 meters.

---


693 Koçan and Meral 2011, 258-259.

694 Koçan and Meral 2010, 13.

695 Koçan and Meral 2011, 258-259. The fifteen steps on the reconstruction are based on this height and a standard step rise of 0.2 meters. Applying these figures to the footprint of the crepidoma, the treads of the steps on the north and south side of the temple measure 0.471 meters and the treads on the east and west facades measure 0.345 meters.
Using the Vitruvian formulae, the total height from ground to the top of the roof was at least 34.725 meters (I82). As with the other temples, it is almost certain that the Temple of Hadrian was a bit higher in its original state.

In tabular form, the height of the Temple of Hadrian is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temple of Hadrian</th>
<th>Measurement (Meters)</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column Diameter</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereobate Height</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Base</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1/2 LCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaft Height</td>
<td>18.147</td>
<td>8.5 x LCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Height</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td>1 LCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architrave Height</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td>1/8.5 Shaft Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieze Height</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>1.25 x AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice Height</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4/7 AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediment Height</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1/9 Stylobate Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Approximate Height</td>
<td>35.792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius*

The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius retains an intact stylobate measuring 45.51 x 97.94 meters, and the split cella occupies a space of 22.5 x 67.5 meters.\(^{696}\)

\(^{696}\) Butler 1925, 16-26. This was presumably done to accommodate the later introduction of the Antonine cult to the temple, a topic that will be discussed in Chapter 3. Again, Cahill considered that the cella division took place much earlier.
Because the temple was built over the course of many centuries, there are many obvious irregularities of the plan.\textsuperscript{697} One is the variable height of the stereobate throughout the building.\textsuperscript{698} On the whole, though, the crepidoma rises about 1.65 meters above the ground and the steps extend out 2.5 meters.\textsuperscript{699} A second irregularity can be found in column dimensions. Some columns stood atop high plinths, while others were set closer to the ground. Their diameters range from 1.98 to 2.10 meters and Butler recorded that they ranged proportionally from 8.75 to 9.25 diameters in height, a clear departure from Vitruvian ideals.\textsuperscript{700} Fortunately, two complete Ionic columns (including bases, shafts, and capitals) still stand at the site and reach a height of 17.31 meters.\textsuperscript{701} A fragment of the architrave was also found and measures 1.54 meters high.\textsuperscript{702} Butler concluded that the temple had only an architrave and a cornice,\textsuperscript{703} but it almost certainly also had a non-figural frieze course. Since Vitruvius provided a formula for establishing the height of non-figural friezes, one will be included in the total temple height projection. Given the dimensions of the architrave, therefore, the theoretical corresponding heights of the non-figural frieze and cornice would be a total of 2.035

\textsuperscript{697} See Chapter 2, 92-93.

\textsuperscript{698} See Gruben 1961a, 155-196, Hanfmann 1975, chapters 4-7, Hanfmann 1983, 119-120 and 164. All of these detail the precise measurements of the different parts of the temple.

\textsuperscript{699} Gruben 1961a, 177. The steps on the reconstruction are based on this height and a standard step rise of 0.2 meters. Applying these figures to the footprint of the crepidoma, the treads of the steps are 0.357 meters.

\textsuperscript{700} Butler 1925, 113.

\textsuperscript{701} Butler 1925, 16-26, 41 and Burrell 2004, 103.

\textsuperscript{702} Butler 1925, 49.

\textsuperscript{703} Butler 1925, 26.
meters. Finally, the pediment should have added another 5.056 meters, bringing the total minimum height to 27.591 meters (I92).

In tabular form, the height of the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stereobate Height</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base, Shaft, and Capital Height</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architrave Height</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice Height</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4/7 AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-figural Frieze Height</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>3/4 AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediment Height</td>
<td>5.056</td>
<td>1/9 Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Approximate Height</td>
<td>27.591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Even these basic models clearly illustrate the monumentality of the spotlight temples (I8 and I9). In chapter 2, I outlined the similarity of design shared by the spotlight temples and several nearby traditional temples. Their size makes those comparisons even more apparent. Butler compared the size of the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus to the great Artemision at Ephesus (A5), and Koçan and Burrell noted the similarity between the scale of the Hadrian temple at Cyzicus to the Temple of Apollo at Didyma (A4). Both the Artemision and Didyma temples were of considerable reputation, as was the Temple of Artemis at Sardis (due to its history). It would therefore

---

704 Butler 1910, 26, Koçan and Meral 2011, 259, and Burrell 2003, 34.
be attractive for Roman builders to base newer temple designs on the ambitious scale of Classical and Hellenistic temples, whose marvelous size seems to have gone hand in hand with the reputation they afforded their cities and the province. Although the Wadi B Temple and the Red Hall were smaller than the other three, they possessed the added benefit of their own enormous temenoi, which only enhanced the impression of their sizes. Moreover, they were monumental in their own right, as few other Roman-era temples matched or exceeded their dimensions.

Physical monumentality seems to have been a motivation for several other Roman temples built in the 2nd century AD, many of which have also been compared to the spotlight temples in size. Ashmole compared the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus to the Olympieion at Athens (A2) and the large temple at Baalbek, as a means to “gain an idea of the grandeur of the lost temple.” Mania mentioned the similarity of the Red Hall’s temenos to other large Roman complexes, especially the Templum Pacis (A13), the Forum of Trajan (240 x 123 meters), and the Library of Hadrian in Athens (121 x 75 meters). Greenewalt compared the Wadi B temple to the Temple of Zeus at Aezani (A9) and the Temple of Augustus and Roma at Ancyra (A7) in terms of size and scale. Meanwhile, Boatwright observed that the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus fits with others associated with Hadrian and the Imperial Cult, like the Olympieion at Athens (A2) and the Temple of Venus and Roma at Rome (A11), as being extraordinarily large.

_____________________

705 Ashmole 1956, 191.
706 Mania 2011a, 100.
708 Boatwright 1997, 128-129.
the exception of the Temple of Venus and Roma, all of these comparanda are located in the Roman East and in close proximity to older monumental temple complexes. This suggests a deliberate effort to build monumental temples in the East, an important region for the Roman Empire and one that also had an undeniable tradition of monumental construction. In size, as in design, the spotlight temples may have resulted from a Roman desire to construct at an enormous scale in order to inflect the new cult spaces with the majesty of older, more traditionally dedicated temples.

Beyond emulation, there are other reasons why overwhelming size was such an important factor in the construction of the spotlight temples. William MacDonald stressed the importance of visibility to the Romans.\(^{709}\) He concluded that many architectural conventions, like height and spatial independence, support the idea that Roman temples were built to dominate their surroundings and tower over people. According to MacDonald, the repeated combination of elevation, visibility, and axial authority throughout the Roman world demonstrates a perceived need for highly visible religious buildings within dense urban settings. The cities in which the spotlight temples were built were indeed dense urban environments. Their street plans, major landmarks, and topography were established centuries before the arrival of Roman administrative authority and the cultural shifts that accompanied it. DeLaine contended that temples like that of Hadrian at Cyzicus were too large and powerful to be neutral elements of the urban environment.\(^{710}\) Accordingly, she claimed that Roman construction strove for exceptional size and adornment in order to communicate the civilizing force of an

\(^{709}\) MacDonald 1986, 133-140.

empire that commanded resources and changed natural topography in an unprecedented way. Yet there is no obvious uniformity in the ways in which the spotlight temples achieved this result. Instead, their placements seem to demonstrate a willingness on the part of Roman builders to adopt different strategies in negotiating new construction within mature urban environments. Some temples were built on new ground, while others were installed in or adjacent to long established neighborhoods. In the following section, I explore how the spotlight temples functioned in their urban environments, paying special attention to the ways in which their visual impact emphasized their importance without diminishing the established cityscapes around them.

**City Patterns**

A number of cultural and practical standards guided the organization of ancient Greek and Roman cities. Strabo wrote that the Greeks were skilled at founding visually pleasing and strategic cities that took advantage of natural features, whereas the Romans were pragmatists concerned with infrastructure. 711 Once the Roman Empire assumed control of Asia and began to imprint itself architecturally on the cities of the region, these competing cultural preferences for urban organization became integrated. To maintain or alter their city centers and notable buildings, Greek cities were

---

711 Strabo 5.3.8.
essentially coerced into supporting the needs of the Empire. Consequently, the architecture of Asian cities during the Roman Imperial era sometimes appears to be culturally bipolar, with ancient Greek roads conforming to the natural topography leading past massive, and comparatively newer, man-made Roman terraces.

The process by which established cities were remodeled, as well as the identities of those responsible for those renovations is somewhat unclear. On the one hand, it has been argued that there is little evidence that Roman civic or provincial officials had any interest in or uniform procedure for controlling urban growth in terms of what we would call zoning. Therefore wealthy private citizens could probably contribute to urban growth as they were financially able. On the other hand, the emperor had general rights to all the property of the Empire and was capable of doing as he pleased. Furthermore, there cannot have been many private individuals wealthy enough to fund major projects who were not also provincial officials or major imperial clients. Individuals such as those benefitted personally through their support for the emperor and could be considered imperial surrogates. Accordingly, it is most likely that agents of the Empire were responsible for the Roman-era alterations to city plans. The Imperial

---

712 Several of the cities of Asia received Roman assistance to renovate major temples. For example, Augustus and Antony both expanded the Ephesian Artemision and Hadrian renovated the Asklepieion at Pergamon. Yegül (2000, 148) has taken a more philosophical view of the issue, arguing that the Greek cities were caught between desires for loyalty and for independence. In order to ensure that they possessed beautiful cities, the Greeks of Asia needed to solicit the help of and work within the confines of the Empire. Therefore, according to Yegül, the architecture of Asian cities served as both a reference to the city’s past, as well as its future.

713 Kaiser 2011, 17. There is no documentation that suggests that there were legal building restrictions in Asia that would limit an individual’s ability to build in any part of town, provided that they owned rights to the land.

714 Herodes Atticus (ca. 101-177 AD) is an example of such an individual. He was a well-known Greek aristocrat who also served as a Roman Senator. He was a significant 2nd-century builder and benefactor, but his close ties to Rome inflect his projects with a flavor of imperial agenda.
government was certainly a great influence on the architectural development of the provinces through financial and human resources.\textsuperscript{715}

Roman builders tended to alter natural topography when possible, but they could also be situationally motivated. When circumstances prevented them from changing the environment to fit their needs, they simply adapted their street networks and buildings to the landscape.\textsuperscript{716} Thomas asserted that Roman imperial builders sought to improve the natural landscape through architecture, building structures to stand out within an already dramatic landscape in order to emphasize mankind’s dominance over nature.\textsuperscript{717}

In established urban environments, perhaps the expression of dominance could be extended over onto the pre-existing man-made landscape.

Lyttelton has suggested that axial planning was especially important in Roman Asia as a means to unify cities and link buildings with colonnades, steps, and organized approaches.\textsuperscript{718} This hypothesis is difficult to support for two reasons: First, it fails to consider temporary architecture, which must have been a significant element of the topography of any ancient city. Second, evidence from the city of Rome shows that axially could be deliberately interrupted in favor of drawing attention to new or

---

\textsuperscript{715} MacDonald 1986, 182. MacDonald also made an important suggestion that many architects and builders were trained during military service, which would count as another government-sponsored contribution to provincial building.

\textsuperscript{716} Kaiser 2011, 49. This view is perhaps based on the thought that the Romans wanted cities to be built in the manner of military encampments, with the major thoroughfares of cardo and decumanus forming the city center, and all else being built around that intersection. This may be true of colonies, which were originally primarily populated by retired soldiers, but the same approach would have been inefficient or impossible if imposed on established cities like those where the spotlight temples were built. A consequence of this can be seen in the artificial terraces present at all of the cities with spotlight temples.

\textsuperscript{717} Thomas 2007, 240.

\textsuperscript{718} Lyttelton 1987, 47. This is based on site observations and Vitruvius’s statements concerning the alignment of temples with streets and rivers.
noteworthy structures. In established cities like those in Asia, the refiguring and development of cities seems to have been more organic. MacDonald first brought this idea forth with his discussion of urban armatures. Like Lyttelton, he considered armatures to be made up of connective architecture such as colonnades and stoas. In contrast to Lyttelton, he considered these armatures to be more naturally developed from a desire to link community gathering points, like marketplaces or public buildings. Thomas further articulated this theory by suggesting that the webbed appearance of cities indicated their organic nature. In Thomas’ view, buildings were city landmarks and also served as the anchors of development. Accordingly, buildings were the most important step of city planning, while the connective architecture and axial approaches were improvements of secondary concern. American college campuses are a modern example of this phenomenon. Larger projects, like dormitories, recreational centers, and classroom buildings, are the focus of major donations, spending, and initial construction. After those are planned and built, smaller projects, like plazas, fountains, porticoes, and even seating, are developed to fill out the remaining space.

---

719 Amanda Claridge (2007) recently called into question the idea that the Romans deliberately favored axial city planning in her article on the actual positioning of Trajan’s temple within his forum at Rome.

720 MacDonald 1986, 30.

721 Thomas 2007, 120.
Temple Locations

The spotlight temples were certainly a type of anchor architecture around which cities developed in the Roman era. Unlike many Greek temples, the standard Roman temple type was tailored to an urban environment where verticality and frontal orientation helped to maximize visibility and make the most of cramped environments. Locations like the city center or hilltops were natural sites for temples, but practical interests like space limitations often trumped tradition. Placement could also enhance the monumentality of a temple. When located within municipalities, temples were a more active presence in the everyday lives of city inhabitants. First, temples could serve as landmarks in an otherwise disorganized urban environment, encouraging the growth of neighborhoods and neighborhood identification. Second, they could be used for many different functions involving civic business, like senate meetings, speeches, 

722 In Asia, monumental temples were often built within large temenoi located outside of cities. Smaller temples or shrines were frequently built in or near city centers. Exceptionally large temples, however, were usually located some distance from the city. This could have arisen from a simple need for space that was unavailable in the city center or for a symbolic purpose. Just how firm the division of sacred and secular space was in the ancient Greek-speaking world is unclear. On the one hand, cities like Athens featured ancient monumental temples in the city center. Yet according to Aristotle, secular and sacred space could be considered separate. He recorded (Politics II.VIII) that a 5th-century BC city planner, Hippodamus of Miletus, planned for city land to be in three parts: public, private, and sacred (for more on the history of Hippodamus, see Burns 1976). As houses of the gods, temples were neither civilized in a human sense, nor completely wild in a natural sense. Instead, they bridged the opposing positions of nature and civilization. McINerney (2006) argued that the expanse of a sacred space was vital to religious importance (34-35), and that sacred spaces outside the city "modulated" conflict at the edge of "cultivated territory" (56). Being placed outside of a city, but not too far outside, allowed a temple to straddle the boundary of civilized safety and natural danger and provide the geographical neutral ground to facilitate the meetings between gods and mankind. 

723 Stambaugh (1972a, 562) remarked that one need only look at the temples of the Imperial fora and those that surmount the legendary hills of Rome for evidence. Stambaugh lists the Templum Pacis, the Temple of Venus and Roma on the Velian Hill, the Temple of Claudius on the Caelian hill, and the Temples of Sarapis and Sol on the Quirinal Hill as examples of this practice. 


725 James Anderson’s (1997, 243-247) book on the relationship between architecture and Roman society covers many of the ways in which temples were active in an everyday sense. It is important to note, however, that Anderson limited his study to temples in the city of Rome.
and trials. In both situations, temples could function as loci for community attention, and therefore they could be useful as vehicles of influence, especially when associated with an emperor. When these other functions of temples were combined with visibility, their ability to communicate messages was potent.

Clifford Ando wrote that the positioning of temples in public spaces is one aspect in which Roman theory and practice are in harmony and argued that this directly contributed to the gradual re-development of ancient Greek cities in the East. The spotlight temples provide excellent support for this argument. None of the spotlight temples were designed in the Roman style of temple building, and most resembled Hellenistic predecessors. Yet one significant way in which the spotlight temples differed from regional precedent was in their locations. Although the Roman-era spotlight temples emulated traditional monumental temples in appearance, in terms of placement they were purely Roman.

The spotlight temples required vast space, a need that undoubtedly influenced the choice of location. Most of them seem to have been built on previously unoccupied sites or on sites that could be made available. None of them, however, was built on

---

726 Stambaugh (1972, 587) suggested that the multifunctional nature of temples meant that they were a vital part of the urban fabric, where people interacted, completed business, and were influenced by their surroundings.

727 Anderson (1997, 245-247) argued that the temples of the Imperial Fora in Rome were particularly propagandistic, especially the Temple of Mars Ultor (A1) and the Templum Pacis (A13).

728 Ando 2007, 434.

729 The Red Hall is obviously an anomaly that has both Roman and Greek characteristics.

730 The Hellenistic Temple of Artemis is an exception to the otherwise evident pattern. The Wadi B Temple could also be an exception, but its terrace - a major element of its monumental placement - was created by Roman-era builders.

731 Only sites with active permanent public architecture seem to have been off-limits. The only exception being the Temple of Artemis at Sardis, which retained its function under a new dedication.
truly neutral ground. Instead they existed in relation to their surrounding neighborhoods and monuments that, consciously or not, affected the lived experience of viewers. In this section, I describe the locations of the spotlight temples and insert the reconstructed models and temenoi boundaries (where available), into the modern landscapes using Google Earth. The purpose of this exercise is to demonstrate the size and scale of the temples in relation to their immediate environments. There are significant challenges involved in this approach. First, the living fabric of the ancient cities is missing. All that can be known about the immediate environment and urban surroundings of the spotlight temples comes from the skeletal remains of permanent architecture. Second, only modest sections of each site have been fully excavated. Unexcavated sections of the cities could someday reveal other examples of monumental architecture, or cause excavators to reevaluate the organization of the cities. Fortunately, most of the known major architecture of the spotlight temple cities is physically accounted for. Therefore, by observing the location of the spotlight temples in relation to the other major known structures in their cities, we can form an idea of how they may have been perceived physically and socially. Despite the many unknowns, the space occupied by the spotlight temples certainly made them exceptional features in the landscape, and the reconstructions can help us understand their impact within the urban fabric.

Inserting reconstructed models onto the local terrain using Google Earth presents a second set of challenges. Because Google Earth can show the terrain only as it

---

732 McMahon’s 2013 article focuses on this subject with regard to neo-Assyrian buildings.

733 Google Earth is a free internet-based program that provides a 3D virtual map of the globe using satellite imagery, aerial images, and GIS technology.
currently exists, the landscape in the images will be different from the landscape of the 2nd century AD. Consequently, many of the once-level terraces that supported and surrounded the spotlight temples have eroded to the point that the temples are partially buried today. To account for this, some of the reconstructions are set slightly above (at most 1 meter) ground level to adjust for this natural change in terrain and ensure that they are above ground. Site plans, excavation reports, and visible archaeological material ensure that the reconstructions have been plotted accurately to within a few meters. In cases where the foundations of the temple are no longer visible (like the Wadi B Temple), the location was determined by overlaying the excavator’s site plans onto the satellite views. Finally, to distinguish them from their surrounding landscapes, the spotlight temples have been colored white.

*The Wadi B Temple*

Only portions of Sardis have been excavated, and there are large gaps in the city map. A partial outline of the city walls is known (I11 and I12) and it presumably surrounds the ancient city center. A cluster of Roman-era buildings, including the Wadi B Temple, a stadium, and a theater, are located in the approximate geographical center of the land bounded by these city walls (I12). Just south of the buildings, and also in the center of the walled area, the land rises significantly and was occupied by several more buildings that probably date as far back as the Lydian period. Although their role was uncertain, archaeological finds from this area are of high quality, inviting speculation that these were part of the ancient Lydian palace complex, or at least an exclusive district of

---

734 This is visible only from close views of the spots where the temples meet the landscape. The slight change is indiscernible in the images included in the appendix.
the city. This hypothesis also finds support in the fact that this location overlooks the lower city of Sardis, as well as the tumuloi of the Lydian kings far in the distance (I19). A few other buildings are scattered throughout the walled area, but few have been conclusively identified.

Two major complexes were located outside of the walls. First was the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius, which was located some two kilometers southwest of the Wadi B Temple, and about one kilometer from the presumed boundary of the city wall (I11). A second complex was located on a lower elevation and to the northwest of the Wadi B Temple, just outside the city walls. The building’s precise identification is unknown, although it was probably a bath and gymnasion complex (I11). The gymnasion complex was opulently decorated and has been dated to the 2nd century AD. Several smaller structures of a later date surround it, including a synagogue and many 5th- and 6th-century shops. These surrounding buildings, along with the size and quality of the bath-gymnasion complex, suggest that this must have been a central part of the lower city of Sardis beginning in the Roman imperial era.

The Wadi B temple itself was built in the center of a five-acre artificial terrace (I12). No other structures have been found at the site, suggesting that the temple must have been its focal point. Due to its spatial independence, the Wadi B Temple was extraordinarily visible, with nothing around high enough to block sight lines from most

---

735 This information comes from conversations and email exchanges with Dr. Nicholas Cahill, the Director of the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis.

736 See Yegül 1976. For many years the gymnasion complex was called a Kaisersaal, and was thought to be some sort of building related to the emperor or Imperial Cult. See Yegül 1982 for more on the idea of a Kaisersaal and the gymnasion complex at Sardis.

737 See Crawford 1990.

738 Greenewalt 2005, 176.
perspectives (I19 and I20). Ratté, et. al compared this use of a temenos on an artificial
terrace to the Traianieion at Pergamon (A6) and the Temple of Domitian (A3) at
Ephesus,\footnote{Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 62. Ratté’s contribution to this portion of the article leaves much analysis
unsaid, relying on the viewer to recognize the similarities evident in the site plans. Because the purpose
of the article was the initial publication of the temple, the comparisons are more for the readers
edification, rather than an effort to contextualize the temple for further analysis.} to which Burrell responded that the Wadi B temple lacked the “grandiosity”
of the complexes at Ephesus and Pergamon.\footnote{Burrell 2004, 307-308.} I would counter, however, that the Wadi
B Temple had a dynamic position above the Roman section of the city that is quite
comparable to the other examples (I20). The Temple of Domitian at Ephesus (A3) was
raised above the street level and overlooked the upper agora of Ephesus. Already on
high ground, the Traianeion at Pergamon (A6) was built onto the side of the acropolis
and required an extended terrace to support its precinct. At an even greater height than
the Temple of Domitian at Ephesus, the terrace at Pergamon endowed Trajan’s temple
with a commanding vantage over the lower city. At Sardis, the topographical location of
the Wadi B Temple was notably central, but its terrace was surrounded by steep terrain.
The Wadi B temple was elevated over its neighbors to the north and its place on the
terrace afforded it a commanding view over the lower city (I19). Behind the temple to its
south the terrain rises, culminating in the acropolis. This position ensured that anyone
looking toward the acropolis would have had her or his attention drawn to the Wadi B
Temple, a massive monument sitting within a huge temenos and situated near Sardis’s
ancient center (I20). Seen from this perspective, the Wadi B Temple was perhaps even
more dynamic than the aforementioned comparanda. Its location would have provided
the added advantage of being easily identifiable, but tucked within the dramatic natural

\footnotetext{Ratté, Howe, and Foss 1986, 62. Ratté’s contribution to this portion of the article leaves much analysis
unsaid, relying on the viewer to recognize the similarities evident in the site plans. Because the purpose
of the article was the initial publication of the temple, the comparisons are more for the readers
edification, rather than an effort to contextualize the temple for further analysis.}

\footnotetext{Burrell 2004, 307-308.}
landscape and just below the exclusive neighborhood of ancient Sardis. One more intriguing aspect of the Wadi B Temple’s placement is its distance from the Temple of Artemis. Although it was visually accessible from the Roman and ancient sections of the city, it was located far the Artemis Temple, with a mountain separating the two.

*The Vetters Temple*

Ephesus has been the focus of excavations for well over a century, making it among the most fully explored ancient sites in the world (I22). The city was bounded by its harbor to the west, by Bulbuldag Mountain to the south, and by Panayirdag Mountain to the east. A wall encircled the city, running along the tops of these surrounding mountains. There were three main access points into Ephesus: the Magnesian gate on the southeast, the Koressian Gate at the north, and the harbor on the west. The city was built in two sections that were connected by the Kuretes Street (also called the Embolos). The older section was on a lower level bordering the harbor; this had been the center of the Greek city. It features several baths, the agora, and the theatre. The newer section of the city was located on an upper level at the southern end of the city and included many Roman-era administrative buildings and the Temple of Domitian (A3). Finally, approximately two kilometers northeast of the city walls was the Artemision (A5).

The Vetters Temple was physically associated with neither the upper nor lower neighborhoods. Instead, it was independently situated on an enormous section of reclaimed marshland on the northern border of the city. By the early second century AD, the marshland had been converted into a vast area, measuring approximately 225 x 350
meters, which became the temenos of the Vetters Temple.\textsuperscript{741} This particular location is intriguing for a number of reasons. First, the fact that the temple was built on new land means that it did not displace any preceding structures, whether public buildings or private housing. Yet while avoiding displacing anything else, land reclamation could only have been accomplished by an extraordinarily committed effort.\textsuperscript{742} Perhaps the most striking aspect of the Vetters Temple site was its visibility from almost every part of the city. The only positions from which the temple was not clearly visible were at the extreme eastern limits of the upper city, by the Magnesian Gate. Entering the city via the harbor (I33) or the Koressian Gate, or gazing northward from the Temple of Domitian’s terrace (I34) just past the Magnesian Gate, a visitor would have had an excellent view of the Vetters Temple. Like the Wadi B Temple, although the Vetters Temple was visually accessible from most sections of the city, it was far removed from the city’s older monumental temple. A mountain stood between the Vetters Temple and the Artemision, perhaps to avoid visual competition or comparison. Such positioning is a clear sign that the Vetters Temple was not only built on its site for convenience, but also to highlight the individual importance of the building.

\textit{The Red Hall}

Pergamon also had an upper city and a lower city (I36). The walled upper city, the acropolis, was the traditional center of Pergamon. It featured many major monuments, like the theatre, the Temple of Athena, a palace complex, an agora, the

\textsuperscript{741} See Chapter 2, 69-70.

\textsuperscript{742} There is no way to know for certain how this was accomplished, but it must have involved draining the swampland and manually dumping rock and dirt onto the site. Without the aid of modern machinery, this must have been a substantial manual undertaking, no matter the source of human labor.
Altar of Zeus, a gymnasium, and the Traianeion (A6). The lower city was located south of the base of the acropolis hill near the Selinus River and has largely been built over by the contemporary city of Bergama. Buildings at the lower city level seem to have been spread out, and include the Red Hall, a stadium, a second theatre, an amphitheater, a bath complex, and perhaps a forum. Finally, the Asklepieion was located about one kilometer southwest of the Red Hall.

The lower city of Pergamon is believed to have been extensive, but very little of it has been fully mapped.743 Rieger concluded that the Red Hall was prominently positioned in the center of a forum, bath complex, and the lower agora, similar in setting to some of the Imperial Fora in Rome.744 Distances between these structures were significant, affording each some spatial independence. Situated several hundred meters from any other major building, the Red Hall may simply have been built on the largest portion of land available. The precinct was built over the Selinus River, an inconvenience that involved an extra engineering effort to overcome.745 The prominence of a water channel and basins inside the hall, as well as the fountains of the courtyards, suggests that spanning the river was a design choice based on a need for flowing water perhaps mandated by the cult of the temple.746 Yet the Red Hall was also located at a critical point of connection for the city. According to the most recently published DAI

743 See Wulf 1994 and Rieger 2005 for a full summary of the current state of research on the lower city of Pergamon. There appear to have been several major public structures, but the modern city of Bergama precludes excavation.

744 Rieger 2005, 82-84 and 90-91. Mania (2011a, 68) has also made this connection with the imperial fora, and also observed that the Fora of Augustus, Vespasian, and Hadrian were all built away from the Palatine and Capitoline hills, in much the same way that the Red Hall is separate from the acropolis.

745 The river was vaulted and covered where it intersected with the Red Hall and its temenos. Parts of the original vaulting still cover the river today.

746 See Chapter 3, 156-157.
maps, the main road from the Asklepieion to the acropolis led directly past the Red Hall. Accordingly, there must have been a significant number of homes and businesses along this road, some of which might have been displaced by construction of the Red Hall. Any displacement of people or businesses could lead to dissension, even if compensation was offered. Spanning the river may have been a practical decision to disrupt as little of the city as possible. Therefore, the choice of site probably both fulfilled the needs of cult and also maintained the municipal peace.

Today the Red Hall towers over modern Bergama and there is no reason to suppose it was any less prominent in antiquity. Built on the road connecting the upper and lower cities, it was a major landmark on a prominent urban passage. No other buildings or natural features obscured the view of the Red Hall from the road leading from the Asklepieion to the acropolis (I48), and to this day the building remains visible for the majority of the ancient approach to the city (I49). Yet the steep slopes separating the terraces of the upper city make it impossible to see the Red Hall from the apex of the acropolis.

Pergamon is peculiar in that all three sections of the city were the beneficiaries of Imperial assistance during the 2nd century AD. Hadrian was responsible for the renovation of the Asklepieion, the construction of the Traianeion, and the Red Hall. In the first volume of Al tertüber von Pergamon, Conze noted that the size and position of the Red Hall allowed it to dominate the lower city in the same manner in which the Traianeion dominated the acropolis. This observation could be further emphasized by

---

747 See Chapter 1, 35.

748 Conze 1912, 284.
arguing that the three Hadrianic projects at Pergamon represent the axis of a building initiative. With the Asklepieion and Traianieion, Hadrian dynamically remodeled the ancient parts of the city. Connecting these two, the Red Hall was even more dramatic an architectural addition, ensuring that the emperor and the Empire left a lasting mark on the city.

*The Temple of Hadrian*

The map of ancient Cyzicus (1851) has not been updated as recently as those of the other sites, and very little other than the Temple of Hadrian has been excavated. What is certain is that the city was set on a peninsula between two shores of the Sea of Marmara and was bordered by harbors on its east (Trakikos Limani), west (Hytos Limani), and south (Panoramos Limani). The Hytos and Panoramos harbors have since been filled or silted up. An acropolis is located near the midpoint of the eastern and western shores. Not much is known about the architecture of the acropolis, but there was an amphitheater to its north. South of the acropolis and built along the Panoramos harbor is what appears to have been the central part of the ancient Greek city, including a theatre, an agora, the treasury, the bouleuterion, and the prytaneion. The Temple of Hadrian was located very close to the shore on the Hytos harbor, approximately one kilometer west of the acropolis and the Panoramos harbor.

---

749 The site plan of Cyzicus has hardly been updated from the original drawings made by Perrot and Guillaume (1862) and de Rustafjaeli (1902). de Rustafjaeli noted (1902, 175) that both were sketched on the spot within a matter of days, making them less accurate than the site plans for Sardis, Ephesus, and Pergamon, which were created using modern surveying methods and have been drafted and updated throughout the years.
Almost nothing is known of the Temple of Hadrian’s immediate architectural surroundings. There may have been an adjacent plaza, but that is speculation based on the large empty spaces to the east and north of the temple. Compared to the other clusters of architecture at Cyzicus, the temple appears to have been some distance from both the acropolis and the Greek city, but it would have been visible from both (I83). At first glance, this once again looks like a practical measure of building a gigantic temple in an available space. Yet the temple was also built within one or two hundred meters of the Hytos harbor. Most Mediterranean sea traffic would have approached from the west\(^{750}\), making this a popular and highly visible harbor. Due to its size, the temple would have been the largest visible monument on the Cyzicene skyline for those approaching from the west, a dramatic visual introduction for most visitors to the city (I84).

*The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius*

As described above, the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius was about two kilometers from the apparent center of Sardis (I11). Its distance from the central city is typical of major sanctuaries of the Hellenistic period, and in that regard the temple is comparable to the Asklepieion at Pergamon and the Artemision at Ephesus. The temple was erected in a valley southwest of the acropolis. Bordered by the Pactoclus River immediately to the west, the temple is surrounded by hills on all other sides and appears to have occupied the largest section of level land in its immediate environment. Several other structures were placed nearby, but they are of a much smaller scale

\(^{750}\) The western harbor was the most easily accessible for any ship coming from the Mediterranean and Aegean seas.
Many date to the 3rd century AD or later, and they include a church, tombs, and homes. Most of these buildings are clustered along the north side of the temple, built onto terraces that overlooked the sanctuary. Given their proximity, they may have once had some function related to the temple, perhaps as administrative or guard buildings. Of the buildings in the precinct, none are large or prominent enough to have diminished the monumentality of the temple.

Because it was located at least one kilometer away from the lower city and the acropolis, the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius is an excellent example of Greek temple placement. It was certainly the dominant structure in its immediate environment. Yet the surrounding topography would have made it impossible to appreciate the temple fully from a distance. On the one hand, this makes it an outlier among the spotlight temples, each of which could be seen from many kilometers away. On the other hand, because of its secluded location, the Temple of Artemis would have towered over viewers who ventured close enough to see it fully.

Setting and Visibility

The spotlight temples are larger by far than any other structures in their immediate vicinities. Only traditional extramural sanctuaries, like the Asklepieion and the Artemision, approach their sizes. Those extramural complexes, however, are physically separated from the municipal centers, existing as solitary entities (even though they

751 For a comprehensive account of the secondary buildings in the Artemis precinct, see Hanfmann and Waldbaum 1975, 53-73.

752 Only an approach from the west would have allowed a full view of the temple from a distance of several hundred meters. However, there appear to have been no roads coming from that direction, nor were there any major ancient settlements directly to the west, other than Smyrna, a great distance away.
were closely tied to the identities of their cities). In contrast, the spotlight temples located within city boundaries have undeniable connections and visual relationships with both the Roman-era and earlier city centers.

Large temenoi or adjacent empty space afforded the temples spatial independence that made them even more visible and emphasized their extraordinary sizes. Yet all the Roman-era spotlight temples were undoubtedly set within city boundaries, and so had the appearance of being isolated in a crowd. Their placement in large temenoi was clearly intentional, since all but the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius and perhaps the Temple of Hadrian occupied dedicated artificial terraces set within urban environments. Several of them, like the Wadi B Temple, the Vetters Temple, and the Red Hall, were built on plots of land that far exceeded the space needed to house them. The Wadi B Temple may have occupied the site of an earlier temple\textsuperscript{753}, but the artificial terrace on which it was built was leveled so thoroughly that it eliminated any physical remains of previous structures that may have existed. The Vetters Temple was built on previously unoccupied land, which was perhaps reclaimed specifically for the temple.\textsuperscript{754} The size of the Red Hall and its precinct and its location along the main thoroughfare must have required that some people and businesses be persuaded (financially or otherwise) to vacate that land. Although the Temple of Hadrian was evidently without a huge temenos, it still occupied a prime location that was bound only

\textsuperscript{753} See Chapter 2, pages 10-13.

\textsuperscript{754} This is impossible to know for certain because the process of land reclamation began in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century. The Ephesians may have planned that far in advance for a major Imperial temple, especially if there was an interest in attracting Imperial favor in order to compete with Pergamon, the city that earned the first neokorate under Augustus (Burrell 2004, 17-22).
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by the sea on two sides, an arrangement that functioned visually in the same way as a large temenos.

Substantial earthmoving would have been required in order to remove any earlier buildings and level the building sites. The Vetters Temple, the Temple of Hadrian, and the Red Hall possessed the additional construction of subterranean vaulting. With or without the artificial terracing, the ground would have to be leveled. Because land within the city walls was finite, the space occupied by the temples should be seen as a major commitment by their builders and the cities. Consequently, the spatial independence of the spotlight temples, and the related increase in monumentality, must have been envisioned as a major element of the completed product by the builders and a source of wonderment for viewers.

All the temples were built in prime locations, and all but the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius were built within the active city limits. Most were strategically placed so that pedestrians enjoyed clear views of the temples while approaching the cities. The Wadi B Temple was located in the geographical heart of Sardis. The Vetters Temple occupied the area adjacent to the stadium and the bath complexes of Ephesus, as well as the northern and harbor entrances into the city. On the main thoroughfare and at the juncture between the new and old cities of Pergamon, the Red Hall was perhaps the

---

755 In the case of the Red Hall, the vaulting was a necessary measure to span the Selinus River. For the Vetters Temple and the Temple of Hadrian, the use of subterranean vaulting was a choice. See MacDonald (1986, 135-136) for additional comments on Roman terrace building.

756 Conspicuous placement of the temples seems to have been a concern, a topic addressed by a few scholars. Koester (1998, 133) compared the placements of the Vetters Temple and the Traianieion at Pergamon, arguing that they were designed to impress those who approached the city. Burrell (2003, 50 and 2004, 317) has also observed that Hadrianic temples in Asia tend to be visible from the sea. Yegül (Yegül 2000, 148) expanded on the ideas of Koester and Burrell, noting that the public buildings of Ephesus and Sardis make use of the dramatic and historical settings of the cities.
most prominent structure in the lower city. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus was built up against the sea at the important harbor city of Cyzicus. Finally, the Temple of Artemis, although separate from the city, was a long-established prominent site at Sardis. Without a doubt, the spotlight temples took advantage of the best and most dynamic places that could be made available at the sites.

Reconstructing the urban experience of individuals in the ancient world is nearly impossible, especially since almost all of the textual evidence related to how people perceived the urban street environment in the Roman imperial period comes from Rome itself. Kaiser argued, however, that from the 1st century BC to the 4th century AD there was a “common urban culture” in the Mediterranean that united the urban experience of those living in the Roman Empire. According to Kaiser, the development of the street system had an impact on the placement of buildings. From a study of four sites, Kaiser concluded that streets can be divided into two types: those that integrate the city and those that segregate it. The first category is composed of primary thoroughfares and fora used by both pedestrians and wheeled traffic, while the latter group consists exclusively of narrow pedestrian routes. I would also add a third type: approaches to a city. This category includes major land and sea routes leading into or around a city. For non-residents, these would have provided the initial and perhaps most memorable view of the city. Residents would have used the major approaches to their city in processions related to religious festivals. With these three categories of “streets,” primary

---

757 Kaiser 2011, 16.

758 Kaiser 2011, 199-200.
thoroughfares, minor roads, and approaches, one can attempt to reconstruct the ways in which a person in the Roman Imperial era would have experienced the cities of Asia.

Jürgen Süss has observed a number of traits shared by the locations of buildings associated with emperor worship. Most were placed in highly visible locations, often on main roads. Some were centrally located near an agora. If not, they tended to be built on plots that could highlight the natural topographies of the cities. Both situations provided substantial visibility, either from the close proximity of daily traffic or from a distance. It is significant that the Roman-built spotlight temples can be perceived from both perspectives. All were located on main thoroughfares, and most were near marketplaces. Yet the cities were large enough to have more than one urban center, and the spotlight temples also dominated the urban skylines from those distant loci. Finally, all were built where they appeared prominent to viewers outside of the city. Consequently, the spotlight temples demonstrate the Roman use of monumental buildings not only as anchors for urban development, but also as visual anchors within the cityscape. In some cases, as at Sardis, the temples (or just the Roman cults) were installed in locations that were already significant in the city pattern. At Ephesus, Pergamon, and Cyzicus, the temples were built in spaces that could support new urban development and also provide maximum visibility.

Thomas observed that ancient cities could be distinguished by their terrains, which he considered contributing factors to its inhabitants sense of their city’s identity. In light of this, it is likely that the spotlight temples were deliberately placed in such a way to capture the attention of both inhabitants and outsiders.

---

759 Süss 2003, 251-262.
760 Thomas 2007, 108.
way as to take advantage of the natural and built features each city had to offer. Access to the sea was vital to Ephesus and Cyzicus, and the spotlight temples there emphasized that fact. Sardis and Pergamon were notable for their acropoleis. The Wadi B Temple was in a central location close to the Sardian acropolis. Although the Red Hall was not on the Pergamene acropolis, where there was no available space, it was positioned in a vital section of the city, much like the Ephesian and Cyzicene spotlight temples. Finally, the Temple of Artemis had been a significant cult space for Sardis long before the addition of the Imperial Cult there.

In a sense, the spotlight temples can be seen as occupying the most monumental places available in their respective cities. Only the Sardian temples were on plots plausibly endowed with civic repute; the Wadi B Temple near the acropolis and the Artemis temple a center in its own right. At Ephesus, Pergamon, and Cyzicus, the temples were built on new plots, none of which were undeniable centerpieces of their cities. Of all the spotlight temples, only the Wadi B temple is anywhere close to an acropolis, the most obviously monumental setting an ancient city of the Greek-speaking world could offer. Instead, the spotlight temples were built to be seen by those traveling to or within the cities. Thomas argued that important civic monuments, like inscriptions and statues, were not always placed in locations that were important as destinations, but rather along passageways. Unlike the traditional sanctuaries of Asia, including the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius, the Roman-era spotlight temples all seem to occupy positions that could attract the attention of viewers on the move. Rather than

---

761 It is worth noting that the decline of Ephesus can be attributed to the silting of its harbor. The communities near Cyzicus, including Bandirma, are still regional hubs for sea trade and shipping.

762 Thomas 2000, 117.
pilgrimage destinations, their positions dictate that they were meant to be consistently seen by city inhabitants and travelers alike. Like the individual agents of the Roman Empire, the spotlight temples may not have always been sought out, but they were always looming over the population and being watched in return.
Conclusion

Viewed as a unit, the spotlight temples and their Hellenistic predecessors demonstrate that 1st and 2nd-century Roman Asia was a point of concentration for monumental temple building. Although each temple was built according to a different plan, a few unifying features transcend their diversity: synthesis of Roman and Greek design, ambitious cult affiliations, strategic placements, and monumental sizes. What we may now perceive as a purposeful agenda, however, could have been a set of standard responses to the needs of a moment. There is no way to know if the responses that resulted in the spotlight temples were intended to be so standardized, but the buildings’ similarity of form and function suggests that there was an overarching political or cultural organization behind the development of the provincial Asian cities, a development that was achieved in part by the spotlight temples.

In terms of architecture the temples are reminiscent of the traditional Hellenistic temples of Asia. Yet none is an outright copy of a Greek predecessor, and many of the features familiar from Greek temple architecture were built with materials and adornment more closely identified with Roman culture. We must then view the spotlight temples as attempts to harness the spirit of Hellenistic predecessors to support an imperial agenda. Functionally, the spotlight temples were similar to their predecessors in that they served as religious buildings. Yet the spotlight temples served the Imperial Cult instead of traditional deities, a clear shift from the precedents set by the existing monumental temples in the region.

763 Much in the same way that Roman imperial portraiture adopted Greek forms of representation to depict the emperors as they wanted to be understood.
In design and religious affiliation the spotlight temples are careful emulations of and innovations based on the traditional temples and religions of Asia. Yet they were obviously major buildings that towered over their surroundings as permanent testaments to Roman presence. Thus the temples provide an undeniable example of the Empire making a physical mark on the province. Furthermore, it is no stretch to suggest that the temples also had a noteworthy psychological impact on viewers. In a recently published essay, Paul Zanker examined imperially funded secular public buildings (promenades, baths, and buildings for games) in Rome, most of which were of monumental size and centrally located. Zanker pointed out that monumentality and centrality would be natural attributes for Imperial palaces or temples to the official cult of the Empire. Yet in Rome, the historical aversion to monarchy and support for a republican government for the people seems to be reflected by centrally located monumental civic architecture. In Asia, this situation was somewhat reversed. In particular, the spotlight temples do occupy the most monumental places in their municipalities, dominating those locations so much as to eclipse any potential competition. In fact, the spotlight temples matched or surpassed the architectural achievements of most earlier temples in the region. In the Roman provinces, temples were a central part of the municipal landscape and culture, and therefore represented civic infrastructure just as much as an aqueduct or bath complex. Major temples to the Imperial Cult could promote in provincial populations the feeling of being an important part of the architectural culture of the Empire. After all, while bath complexes were native to Rome, monumental temples were an undeniable tradition of Asia and the East.

---

764 Zanker 2010, 75-78.
The spotlight temples both accommodate and appropriate that tradition and therefore were crucial to the incorporation of the provinces into the social fabric of the Empire.

Whether or not the impetus and funding for their construction came, as I have argued, from the emperor himself, it is clear that the spotlight temples were built as a consequence of the Empire and imperial control. Because so much evidence points to Roman hands, minds, and funding at work, I suggest that the temples were intended to impose an architectural, religious, and visual unity onto the province. Viewed as products of their time, they represent no universal narrative, but rather a set of perspectives that confirmed the authority of the Roman Empire and affirmed the place of the province (and provincial cities) within it.

One aspect of the spotlight temples that most likely commanded the attention of their planners and builders is the continued occupation of the sites. As I discussed in Chapter 4, planners and builders were certainly aware of the importance of location. Part of their awareness must have included an attention to consequences of long-term occupations of the cities, which generally shaped the daily rituals and practices of inhabitants. Although the temples were grand monuments set apart by their exceptional sizes, they could never, in a basic sense, stand alone. Instead, the spotlight temples wove together the traditions and initiatives of Rome and the province and worked within the living topographies of the cities. No matter how layered their physical

---

765 Thomas (2007, 127) has proposed that perhaps the architecture of the provinces was the direct result of the emperor attempting to promote unity, at least in terms of architectural appearance. Furthermore, Thomas (2007, 153) suggested that Roman emperors were deeply interested in the architecture of the provinces because of their need to inspire loyalty in their allies and fear in their enemies. Monumental architecture could accomplish both of these by means of splendor and intimidating size.

766 Yegül (2000 152-153) has written on this subject, arguing that the Romans must have been aware that over time buildings were endowed with myths and enhanced meanings.
surroundings became or how elaborate the ceremony of the Imperial Cult became, the spotlight temples were so large and made such an impact on the landscape that they outshone most competition. What was important was way they harnessed Asian traditions of monumentality, linked the emperor with transcendent divinities, and secured the most monumental locations of their respective municipalities - the factors that made them daily-experienced and lasting markers of Roman civilization, physically imprinted upon an entire province. With the spectacle of the spotlight temples, the Romans were able to evoke the memory of a celebrated past and promote a unified Roman vision for the future.

As permanent features of the topography, the temples would eventually evolve from awe-inspiring monuments to constant and seemingly natural physical and psychological reminders of the power and presence of the Roman Empire. Pressed on the populations as familiarly traditional forms in a new location, dedicated to a physical associate of transcendent divinity, and ceaselessly visible from all corners of the cities, the spotlight temples would initially have been sensational. As the Romans were surely aware, however, thrill eventually gives way to familiarity and familiarity to acceptance, whether contemptuous or appreciative. Through a clever package that captured the familiar expressed anew, the Romans built onto Asia the architectural imprint of the greatest empire of that time, and in doing so moved toward unity with the province.
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Appendix 1: Testimonia

T1. Pausanias (Description of Greece 7.2.9): Description of the funeral of Androklos and the route the procession would have taken, using modern landmarks, including the Olympieion at Ephesus.

Ἐφέσιοι δὲ ἄνελόμενοι τοῦ Ἀνδρόκλου τὸν νεκρὸν ἔθαψαν τῆς σφετέρας ἐνθά δείκνυται καὶ ἐς ἑμὲ ἔτι τὸ μνήμα κατὰ τὴν ὀδὸν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ παρά τὸ Ὀλυμπειον καὶ ἐπὶ πύλας τὰς Μαγνήτιδας:

The Ephesians carried off his body and buried it in their own land, at the spot where his tomb is pointed out at the present day, on the road leading from the sanctuary past the Olympieum to the Magnesian gate. (Translation by Jones 1918)

T2. Aelius Aristides (Orations 27, 16-22): From the panegyric to Cyzicus in which Aristides described the Temple of Hadrian in hyperbolic terms. Here he mentioned the position of the temple, it grandiosity, and its appearance. Most of the description is sweeping and general, but Aristides made an effort to note that the temple had three levels.

Πρὸς αὐτὸ γε ἤκω τὸ κλυδώνιον, πῶς ἂν εἴποιμι ὅσον βούλομαι; ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον ἂν εἴποιμι ὅσον εἰπών συγγνοιν ἐμαυτῷ. πάντας γάρ μικροῦ δὲ ἔστε, λέγειν ὅσοι τοῖς ὀμοίοις ἐνεχείρησαν ὑπὸ τῆς συμφῆσαι τοιτερομένους πλέοντες. Κύζικος ήδη, Προκόννησος αὖ γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ἡμῶν ἢ ἵδι τις ἂν τῶν ὧν δὲ εἰπώς ἄντι τῶν ὀρῶν ἀρκεῖ, καὶ μόνοις υἱῶν συγγνοίν ἄρα υἱῶν πάρεν τῶν παρασκευάζων τῆς τῆς τὴν συμφῆσαι ἐνταυθοῖς, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἡμῶν ἄρα τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπίπεδης τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ τρυφῆς ἐκ τῆς ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τῶν ὑμῖν ἡμῖν ἄλλων ἀντὶ τῶν ὃν βυθοῦ τῆς τῆς εἰκὸς τοῦ τρωικοῦ μυθολόγιμα μεταθέντες, ὡς ἢ ἀντὶ τῶν ἠρώματος ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἀρκέσαι τὴν φύσιν. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τῶν νήσων ταῖς κορυφαῖς ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἡμῶν ἄλλων ἔδοξεν τὴν τῆς ἔργον τοῦ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ τῆς δεῖκνυται ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν τῆς ἔργον τὰς πολλὰς παρασκευάζων ἀναμένουσαν ἄλλων ἐν τῆς τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἐκ τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς ἔργον τῆς.
I have come to the tempest itself. How should I say all that I wish? But I should say as much as, when said, would satisfy my obligation. I am close to declaring that you have shown all men who have attempted similar works to be like children, by having erected a work so great that it would have seemed to be an act of madness to have conceived it and beyond the power of man to accomplish it. One would be uncertain as to whether most of the island has been transferred here or remains in its place. But I think that all would agree that this would be the offering of no other city or quarry than your own. For their nature would not suffice. Formerly sailors used to judge their position by the peaks of the islands, ‘Here is Cyzicus’, ‘This is Proconnesus’, and whatever other island one beheld. But now the temple is equal to the mountains, and you alone have no need of beacons, signal fires, and towers for those putting into port. But the temple fills every vista, and at the same time reveals the city and the magnanimity of its inhabitants. And although it is so great, its beauty exceeds its size. If Homer and Hesiod had happened to be alive, I think that they would have readily transferred to here the tale about the Trojan wall and would have told how Poseidon and Apollo jointly designed and fashioned this work for the city, the former by providing rock from the depths of the sea and at the same time making it possible for it to be brought here, and the latter through his desire to adorn his city with such a great addition, as it is likely that a founder would do. You would say that each of the stones was meant to be the whole temple, and the temple the whole precinct, and again that the temple precinct was big enough to be a city. If you wish to consider the comfort and luxury which it provides, it is possible to view this very great temple like three-storied houses or like three-decked ships, many times greater than other temples, and itself of a threefold nature. For part of the spectacle is subterranean, part on an upper story, and part in between the usual position. There are walks which traverse it all about, underground and hanging, as it were made not as an additional adornment, but actually to be walked. There is no need to praise these things in speech, but they can be left to the surveyors and technical experts, at least to as many of these as are fully trained and capable of measuring so great a work, since I fear that not even all of those may be able to attain to accuracy in this matter. If someone should forgo speaking about the temple itself, it is enough to express admiration for the engineering equipment and the transport, whose invention was prompted by the requirements of the temple, since they formerly did not exist among mankind. You should also be congratulated for your good fortune. For while you have inscribed upon it the name of the best emperor up to that time, your work has
been completed in these times, whose lot again has been the fairest of the fair and for which most justly would so great a thank offering be erected to the gods, since it is not easy to find a greater. (Translation by Behr 1981)

T3. Aelius Aristides (Orations 27, 39): From Aristides’s panegyric on the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus in which he compared the Emperors to the “savior” gods Sarapis and Asklepios.

εἰσέρχεται δὲ ἐμοί γε καὶ τὰ τῶν δύο τῶν σωτήρων θεῶν, οἳ τὴν γῆν ἀπασαν κατειλήφθες σῶξουσι κοινῇ καὶ συνεργάζονται, παρ’ ἄλληλους τε πέμποντες καὶ τὰς εὐεργεσίας τὰς παρ’ ἑαυτῶν καὶ τὰς παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐχαριστίας κοινὰς ποιούμενοι: παρ’ οἷς τίνας μᾶλλον τὸ πλεῖον τῆς σωτηρίας εἶναι λόγος, οἵτινες ἐν τῇ σωτηρίᾳ πολύν μεγαλείωσι, τῇ καλλίστῃ πετάλιαν ἐπὶ ὕψοσι τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνεργοῦσιν·

I am even reminded of the relationship of the two Savior gods [Sarapis and Asklepios],767 who encompass the whole earth and save in common and work together, sending to one another and bestowing benefits in common and sharing the gratitude which they receive from mankind. In the eyes of those two gods who more is likely to win approval than these men or whose safety is likely to be of greater account, since they have become, as it were, prophets and a representation of the resolve of those gods by forming the fairest kind of friendship for the benefit of the whole human race. (Translation by Behr 1981)

We should be grateful to the gods, but we should congratulate the emperors and join in prayer for them. These adornments of construction are fair and exercise a remarkable

767 Behr 1981, 105 note 54.
persuasion over the masses. But what is perfect and truly the gift of some god occurs whenever both adornments are in harmony, that in the soul and that in construction. For just as we praise the harmony in the latter and the fact that each element preserves its proper relationship, so it is also fitting to think that a well lived life takes place whenever harmony and order prevail throughout. This adornment is truly proper to cities. This preserves both individual man and city. This need not be bought at the cost of money, or the expenditure of time, nor must you set up engineering equipment and be concerned with public works. But each man need only persuade himself to choose the better course. (Translation by Behr 1981)

T5. John Malalas (Chronicle 11.16): Reference to Hadrian’s aid to Cyzicus as part of earthquake recovery and called the temple “one of the wonders” and “very large.” Also notes that Hadrian, “set up a marble portrait, a large bust of himself, there in the roof of the temple, on which he wrote, ‘of the god Hadrian’.

During the reign of the most sacred Hadrian, Kyzikos, which is the great metropolis of the province of Hellespont, suffered an earthquake from the wrath of God on the night of 10th November. He gave generously to the city and restored it. He bestowed money and ranks on he surviving citizens. Hadrian built a very large temple in Kyzikos, one of the wonders, and he placed there on the roof of the temple a marble statue, a very large bust of himself, on which he inscribed, “Of the Sacred Hadrian”, which remains to the present day. (Translation by Jeffreys, Jeffreys, and Scott 1986)

T6. Scholion on Lucian’s Icaromenippus (Rabe 1906, 107): This text claims that the Olympieion in Athens and the temple in Cyzicus were incomplete for many years due to lack of funds, and that neither would have been finished without Hadrian taking up the work with public funds.

The construction of the Olympieion, which is the temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens, stretched over many years, for the Athenians were at a loss for money for its completion...
because of the enormity of the project. The temple in Cyzicus is similar, and if the Roman Emperor Hadrian had not taken on the work with public funds, neither would have been completed. (Translation by Susan Rotroff and Andrew Findley)

T7. *Chronicon Paschale* I 475.10: The chronicle records that Hadrian built a temple and paved a street with marble in Cyzicus.

"Ετι γε μην χαι έν Κυζίχω ναὸν έχτισεν χαι την ϛ αυτη πλατειαν έστρωσε μαρμάροις.

And he both built a temple in Cyzicus and paved a street with marble. (Translation by Susan Rotroff)

T8. *Greek Anthology* 9.656: Describes the Temple of Cyzicus as among the great wonders of the world, including the Capitoline Temple at Rome, the grounds of the Asklepeion at Pergamon, the Colossus of Rhodes and

εἰς τὸν οἰκον τὸν ἐπιλεγόμενον Χαλκην ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ, ὁ έκτισε Άναστάσιος βασιλεύς


On the house called the Chalke, in the palace built by Emperor Anastasius: I am the house of Anastasius, the emperor, slayer of tyrants, and I alone far excel all cities of the Earth. I am a cause of wonder to all, since the architects, seeing my height, length, and vast breadth, were minded to leave the huge pile unroofed; but skilled Aetherius, the most eminent master of that laborious art, devised my shape, laying the first-fruits of his toil before our stainless emperor. Therefore, stretching on all sides my vast bulk, I surpass the celebrated wonders of the Italian land. Beauty of the Capitoline hall, give place to thy betters, even though thy golden roof dazzles the eye. Hide, Pergamus, thy splendid ornament, the grove of Rufinus, narrow now beside the halls of this limitless
palace; and thou, Cyzicus, no longer sing of thy noble temple of Hadrian standing fast on the long cliff. The pyramids are not capable of vying with me, or the colossus, or the Pharos; I alone surpass a great legion of buildings. My prince himself, after his victory over the Isaurians, completed me, the house of the Dawn, shining with gold, on all sides exposed to the breezes of the four winds. (Translation by Paton 1916)


οὗτος ἐν Μυσίᾳ θηράσας ψυχοδόμησε πόλιν, καὶ μετωνόμασεν αὐτὴν Ἀδριανοῦ θήρας ἐν τοῖς μιτάτοις, ὑσαύτως καὶ ἐτέραν πόλιν ἐν Ἐράκη, προσαγορεύσας αὐτὴν Ἀδριανούπολιν, καὶ ναόν ἐν Κυζίκῳ.

After hunting in Mysia he set up a city, and named it the hunting ground of Hadrian, Hadrian, among the Mitatois. Just as he also founded another city in Thrace, calling it Adrianople, and a temple in Cyzicus. (Translation by Susan Rotroff and Andrew Findley)


Cum vero templi hujusce mirifici magnitudinem habilius considerassem, metique certius maluissem, comperimus parietes hinc inde pro templi latere CXL p. longitudinis, latitudinis vero p. LXX constare; totidem altitudine parietes constant. Columnae vero ab utroque latere XXX numero, ejusdem parietum altitudinis, XIII p. invicem distantes, totidem pedum ab ipsis parietibus distant; et ingenti lapidum magnitudine, inter columnas ipsas et conspicuas parietes, nobile pavimentum hinc inde lata euntibus deambulatoria praebet; praeterea ante faciem templi, pronaonis decore, inter quae pro lateribus exstant columnae; quino ordine quaternae, viginti numero, exstitisse videntur, ornatissimis epistiliis, laquearibus protectae. Sed a posteriore parte delubri, praeter quas pro lateribus exstabant, quaternas trino ordine XII habuisse columnas cognovimus. Ex quo omnes ingentis delubri columnae LXII numero fuisse videntur, praeter X quae intus ornatisimae minores, quino ordine, hinc inde parietibus annexae permanent.

When I had reflected on the size of this marvelous temple more closely, and had decided to measure it, we found that the walls, in each direction, in proportion to the side of the temple, were a hundred and forty feet long and seventy feet wide; the walls are of the same height [i.e. seventy feet]. The columns, on each side, are thirty in number, of the same height as the walls; and a noble pavement with stones of huge size, between the columns and the splendid walls, offers wide promenades for passengers. Moreover, before the front of the temple, as a decoration for the pronaos, columns seem to have stood between those that stand in front of the side-walls-four in five rows, twenty in number, with most ornate architraves, covered with coffers. But at
the back of the shrine, we ascertained that it had twelve columns in three rows of four, in addition to those that stood in front of the side walls. Hence all the columns of the vast shrine are seen to have been sixty-two in number, excluding ten highly decorated smaller ones which still remain, inside the building, in rows of five, engaged on each side to the walls. (Translation by Ashmole 1956)

T11. Text included as subscript in one of Cyriacus’ drawings (I76).

"Cyzici ante templi frontispicium hinc inde proporticum vel pronaon habentes quinas hinc inde parietibus annexas et eximia arte pampineis vitibus & uvis ornatissimas columnas."

"In front of the facade of the temple of Cyzicus, on each side a proporticus or pronaos having five columns connected on each side to the walls and highly ornamented in superb style with tendrilled vines and bunches of grapes. (Translation by Ashmole 1956)

T12. IGR IV 140: Originally recorded by Cyriac of Ancona (I77), the inscription mentions a monument built at the expense of Asia. Burrell attributed this inscription to the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, but also admits that the phrasing is awkward and somewhat unsatisfactory. Herrmann believed that the emphasis of the inscription should be on the workers of Asia, rather than the wealth. Ashmole argued that Cyriac may have copied this inscription not from the building but from “some Byzantine anthology.”

ΕΚΔΑΠΕΔΟΥ ΜΩΡΘΩΣ ΕΝΟΛΛΗΣΑΣΙΑΣ Ι ΑΦΘΟΝΙΗ ΧΕΙΡΩΝ ΔΙΟΣ · ΑΡΙΣΤΕΝΟΤΟΣ

Ἐκ δαπέδου μ᾽ ὄρθωσεν ὅλης Ἀσίας [δαπάνησιν] ἀφθονὴ χειρῶν δίος Ἀριστέν(ε)τος.

“From level earth, with [wealth] of all Asia (and) no lack of hands, godlike Aristenetos erected me.” (Translation by Burrell 2004)


Sed emin insigni eius et mirabili in frontispicio eximia deum et praeclarissima illa de marmore simulacra love ipso optimo protectore suaque eximiae celsitudinis patrocinio inlaesa tutantur et intacta suo fere prisco splendore manent.

768 Burrell 2004, 90.
770 Ashmole 1956, 187.
But indeed those splendid and very beautiful statues of the gods in its noble and wonderful facade, preserved unharmed, with the best jove himself as their guardian and with the protection of their lofty height. (Translation by Burrell 2004)

T14. Pausanias (Description of Greece 7.6.6): Mentions the sanctuary of Persian Artemis at Sardis, but makes no mention of its relation to any Roman cult. This should not be assumed to carry great significance, as it is possible that the cella of the Temple of Artemis had not yet been split to include the Emperor Antoninus and his wife Faustina.

I myself know that, Adrastus, a Lydian, helped the Greeks as a private individual, although the Lydian commonwealth held aloof. A likeness of this Adrastus in bronze was dedicated in front of the sanctuary of Persian Artemis by the Lydians, who wrote an inscription to the effect that Adrastus died fighting for the Greeks against Leonnatus. (Translation by Jones 1918)

T15. Strabo (Geography 13.4.5): Discusses the geography, topography, and cultural context of Sardis. Specifically describes the cult of Artemis and the wealth of the city.

ai δὲ Σάρδεις πόλις ἐστὶ μεγάλη, νεωτέρα μὲν τῶν Τρωικῶν ἀρχαία δ᾽ ὃμως, ἀκραν ἔχουσα εὔερκή: βασιλεῖον δ᾽ ὑπῆρξε τῶν Λυδῶν, οὐς ὁ ποιητής καλεῖ Μῆνας οἱ δ᾽ ὕστερον Μαίονας, οἰμέν τοὺς αὐτούς τοῖς Λυδοῖς οἱ δ᾽ ἐτέρους ἀποφαίνοντες: τοὺς δ᾽ αὐτούς ἀμείναν ἐστὶ λέγειν. ὑπέρκειται δὲ τῶν Σάρδεων ὁ Τμώλος, εὐδαιμόν ὅρος, ἐν τῇ ἀκραφείᾳ σκοτήρι ἔχον, ἐξεδράν λευκοῦ λίθου, Περσῶν ἔργον, ἀφ᾽ οὗ καταπετέεται τὰ κύκλω πεδία καὶ μάλιστα τὸ Καυστριανόν: περιοικοῦσι δὲ Λυδοὶ καὶ Μυσοὶ καὶ Μακεδόνες. ἤει δ᾽ ὁ Πακτωλὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Τμώλου, καταφέρων τὸ παλαιὸν ψῆμα χρυσοῦ πολὺ, ἀφ᾽ οὗ τὸν Κροίσον λεγόμενον πλοῦτον καὶ τῶν προγόνων αὐτοῦ διονυσοθηνὰ φαι: νῦν δ᾽ ἐκλέλοπτο τὸ ψῆμα, ὡς εἰρήνη. καταφέρεται δ᾽ ὁ Πακτωλὸς εἰς τὸν Ἐρμον, εἰς ὅν καὶ ὁ "Υλλος ἐμβάλλει, Φρύγιος νυνι καλούμενος: συμπεσόντες δ᾽ οἱ τρεῖς καὶ ἄλλοι ἀσμότεροι σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν κατὰ Φώκαιαν ἐκδιδάσθη θάλατταν, ἡς Ἡρόδοτός φησιν. ἄρχεται δ᾽ ἐκ Μυσίας ὁ "Ερμος, ἕξ ὁροὺς ἵππου τῆς Δινδυμῆνης, καὶ διὰ τῆς Κατακεκαυμένης εἰς τὴν Σαρδιανὴν φέρεται καὶ τὰ συνεχῆ πεδία μέχρι τῆς θαλάττης. ὑπόκειται δὲ τῇ πόλει τὸ τε Σαρδιανὸν πεδίον καὶ τὸ τοῦ Κύρου καὶ τοῦ Ἐρμου καὶ τὸ Καυστριανόν, συνεχή τε ὄντα καὶ πάντων ἄριστα πεδίων. ἐν δὲ σταδίοις τετταράκοντα ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐστὶν ἡ Πυγαία μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ λεγομένη λίμνη, Κολόνα δ᾽ ὑστερον μετονομαθείσα, ὅπου τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Κολονίης Αρτέμιδος μεγάλη ἀγιστεῖαν ἔχον. φασὶ δ᾽ ἐνταῦθα χορεύειντος καλάθους κατὰ τὰς ἑορτὰς, οὐκ οἶδ᾽ ὅπως ποτὲ παραδοξολογούντες μάλλον ἢ ἀληθεύοντες.
Sardeis is a great city, and, though of later date than the Trojan time, is nevertheless old, and has a strong citadel. It was the royal city of the Lydians, whom the poet calls Meionians; and later writers call them Maeonians too, some identifying them with the Lydians and others representing them as different, but it is better to call them the same people. Above Sardeis is situated Mt. Tmolus, a blest mountain, with a look-out on its summit, an arcade of white marble, a work of the Persians, whence there is a view of the plains below all around, particularly the Cayster plain. And round it dwell Lydians and Mysians and Macedonians. The Pactolus River flows from Mt. Tmolus; in early times a large quantity of gold-dust was brought down in it, whence, it is said, arose the fame of the riches of Croesus and his forefathers. But the gold dust has given out. The Pactolus runs down into the Hermus, into which also the Hyllus, now called the Phrygius, empties. These three, and other less significant rivers with them, meet and empty into the sea near Phocaea, as Herodotus says. The Hermus rises in Mysia, in the sacred mountain Dindymene, and flows through the Catacecaumene country into the territory of Sardeis and the contiguous plains, as I have already said, to the sea. Below the city lie the plain of Sardeis and that of the Cyrus, and that of the Hermus, and that of the Cayster, which are contiguous to one another and are the best of all plains. Within forty stadia from the city one comes to Gygaea, which is mentioned by the poet, the name of which was later changed to Coloe, where is the temple of Coloenian Artemis, which is characterised by great holiness. They say that at the festivals here the baskets dance, though I do not know why in the world they talk marvels rather than tell the truth. (Translation by Jones 1929)

T16. Xenophon (Anabasis 1.6.6-7): Mentions the altar of Artemis at Sardis existing during the time of Cyrus, indicating the antiquity of the cult.

τοῦτον γὰρ πρῶτον μὲν ὁ ἐμὸς πατήρ ἔδωκεν ὑπῆκοον εἶναι ἐμοί: ἐπεὶ δὲ ταχθεὶς, ὡς ἔφη αὐτὸς, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἀδελφοῦ οὗτος ἐπολέμησεν ἐμοὶ ἔχων τὴν ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἀκρόπολιν, καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸν προσπολεμῶν ἐποίησα ὡστε δόξαι τούτῳ τοῦ πρὸς ἐμέ πολέμου παύσασθαι, καὶ δεξιὰν ἔλαβον καὶ ἔδωκα, μετὰ ταῦτα, ἔφη, Ὀρόντα, ἐστίν ὁ τι ἡδίκησα; ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι οὔ. οὐκοῦν, ὡς ἄρε, ὡς ἀδικούμενος ἀποστὰς εἰς Μυσοὺς κακῶς ἐποίεις τὴν ἐμὴν χώραν ὃ τι ἐδύνων; ἔφη Ὀρόντας. οὐκοῦν, ἔφη ὁ Κῦρος, ὁπότ᾽ αὐτὸς ἐνυπηρετήσατο τὴν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος βωμὸν μεταμέλειν καὶ πείσας ἐμὲ πιστὰ πάλιν ἔδωκάς μοι καὶ ἔλαβες παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ; καὶ ταῦθ᾽ ὑμολόγησε Ὀρόντας.

“This man was given me at first by my father, to be my subject; then, at the bidding, as he himself said, of my brother, this man levied war upon me, holding the citadel of Sardis, and I, by the war I waged against him, made him count it best to cease from warring upon me, and I received and gave the hand-clasp of friendship. Since that,” he said, “Orontas, have I done you any wrong?” “No,” Orontas answered. Cyrus went on questioning him: “Did you not afterwards, although, as you yourself admit, you had suffered no wrong at my hands, desert me for the Mysians, and do all the harm you could to my territory?” “Yes,” said Orontas. “Did you not,” Cyrus said, “when once more
you had learned the slightness of your own power, go to the altar of Artemis and say
you were sorry, and did you not, after prevailing upon me to pardon you, again give me
pledges and receive pledges from me?” (Translation by Brownson and Dillery 1922)

T17. Dio Cassius (70.4.1-2): Discusses the earthquake that occurred during the reign of
Marcus Aurelius (ca. 161 AD) and the severe damage it did to Cyzicus and the “greatest
and most beautiful” temple there.

In the days of Antoninus it is said, also, that a most frightful earthquake occurred in the
region of Bithynia and the Hellespont. Various cities were severely damaged or fell into
utter ruin, and in particular Cyzicus; and the temple there that was the greatest and
most beautiful of all temples was thrown down. Its columns were four cubits in
thickness and fifty cubits in height, each consisting of a single block of marble; and in
general the details of the edifice were more to be wondered at than praised. And in the
interior of the country, they say, a mountain peak burst asunder and a flood of sea-water
poured forth, and the spray from it whipped by the wind, was driven to a great distance
over the land - a spray of pure, transparent sea-water. (Translation by Cary 1914)

T18. Buckler and Robinson 1932, no. 47: A now lost honorific inscription that lists a
wealthy Sardian’s donations. It was seen by Cyriac of Ancona and copied by Pickering
and printed by J. Spon in 1685. The donor mentioned in the text was apparently a high
profile priest of the Imperial Cult, Zeus, Asia, and the Thirteen Cities. This inscription
seems to indicate that these were all separate offices.

Lucius Iulius Libonianus, a man eminent by birth and lover of his city high priest of Asia
of the temples of the Sardians in Lydia and priest for two terms of the most mighty Zeus
Polieus, high priest of the Thirteen Cities, stephanephorus, priest of Tiberius Caesar,
chief strategus for two terms and agonothete for life; when want came among the
people, he nobly contributed toward its alleviation out of his private means a modius for
each citizen, and he munificently discharged all the public offices for his native city.  
(Translation by Buckler and Robinson 1932)

Т19. Buckler and Robinson 1932, no. 48: This incomplete marble slab inscription refers to the priesthood of the Thirteen Cities, and the “council loyal to the emperor.”

[..]ν, ἄρχιερεὰ τῶν τρισκαίδεκα | [πολεων καὶ ἀγωνοθέτην διὰ | [βίου καὶ ἱερέα 
Πολιέως Διός] | [καὶ δις στρατηγόν πρώτον, καὶ] | [τὸν δήμου γενόμενον τρίς] | 
(?) | [γραμματέα καὶ δίς (?) γυμνασίου Αργυρο-] | [τα] 
μίαν τῆς φιλοσεβάστου γε]- | [ρομποδίας, [— — c.15 — —] | [δὲκατος [— — —] | [τε] 
ἀργυροφυιον [— — — — επι]- | [φαγεστα[τα — — —] | [ἀρχὴ εἰς [— — —] | [..] 
τα δέκα [— — —] | [..]ς ἐπὶ τὸ [— — —] | [χορηγεῖν ἐν[— — —] | [προγεγογον[τα — — —] | [..] 
τε τῶν [— — —] | [..] προσθέντα [— — —] | [..] (δην.) αφοε'[— — —] | [..] ἄλλα (δην. [— — —] | [— — —] | [— — —] | 

…, high priest of the Thirteen Cities, and [agonothete for] life and priest [of Zeus Polieus] and for two terms [chief] strategos; and he was for three (?) terms clerk of the people and for two (?) gymnasiarch and for [several (?) treasurer] to the [emperor-loving] elders… (Translation by Buckler and Robinson 1932)
T20. Ephesian Coin: SNG PARIS 684

Obverse: Laureate covered cuirassed portrait of Hadrian, ΑΔΡΙΑΝΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΡΙΩΛΟΥ. Reverse: Two distyle temples turned toward each other, a figure in each, [ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ] ΔΙΟΝΟΜΕΩΝ.

Obverse: Draped bust of Antoninus Pius, ΑΥΤ ΚΑΙ ΑΔΡΙ ΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟC
Reverse: Eight-columned Corinthian temple on podium, ΕΠΙ ΕΤΙΑΙΟΥ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟ - ΑΡ ΕΚΤΙΑΙΟΥ ΚΥΖΙ(ΚΗΩΝ...) ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ.
Appendix 2: Architecture

A1. The Temple of Mars Ultor at Rome
Compared to: The Wadi B Temple at Sardis

Summary:

Vowed by Augustus in 42 B.C., but not completed and dedicated until 2 B.C, the temple was the centerpiece of the Forum of Augustus and was situated at the end of a long open space flanked by colonnades and two semi-circular apses. It was built to provide additional room for the courts and other needs of a growing population. With the forum, the temple provided a platform to celebrate Augustus's achievements in war and diplomacy and to portray him and his family as belonging to a long list of great Roman men. Standards recovered from the Parthians were housed in the temple, and later spoils recovered from enemies may also have been dedicated there. Some social functions took place in the forum, including the taking up of the *toga virilis* by youths, the formal departure of new provincial governors, and the reception of governors. Only three columns are currently visible.

Physical Characteristics:
- Octastyle (8 x 8 columns), Corinthian, peripteral sine postico.
- Stylobate measures ca. 36 x 50 m.
- Columns 15.3 m. high with 1.76 m. diameter. Arranged pycnostyle.
- Sacred precinct was ca. 85 x 125 m.
- Built and decorated with a variety of stones including tufa, concrete, peperino, Gabine stone, travertine, and marbles from Carrara, Numidia, Phrygia, Teos, Chios, and Euboea.
- Backed by a 35 m. wall meant to isolate the temple from its surroundings and to protect from fire.
- High, deep porch.
- Entablature had a triple fascia architrave and a plain frieze topped by an astragal, ovuli, and dentils and a cornice with modillions. Corona on the sides had carved lion heads and antefixes with palmettes and acanthus leaves.
- Temple pediment had a statue of Mars flanked by Venus, Fortuna, and Romulus and Roma and Augustus’s name in the entablature. Reclining in the corners of the gable are personifications of the Palatine Hill and the Tiber.
- Cella was divided into a nave and two aisles articulated by internal columns.
- Capitals of the cella interior were ornately carved and featured volutes carved to represent winged horses.
- Statues of Mars, Venus, and Julius Caesar stood in the cella.

Testimonia:
- Epigraphical:
  - *CIL* 6.8709: Mars Ultoris.

• Literary:
  • Cassius Dio (54.8) recorded that the temple was built to house the standards recovered by the Parthians.
  • Emperors Claudius and Trajan sat in judgment here (Cassius Dio 68.10; Suetonius *Claudius* 13).
  • Augustus installed bronze statues of major Roman figures in the porticoes and apses, including Aeneas and Romulus (Cassius Dio 4.10.3; Suetonius *Augustus* 31.1).
  • Some social functions took place in the forum, including the taking up of the *toga virilis* by youths, the formal departure of new provincial governors, and the reception of governors (Cassius Dio 55 10.3-5; Suetonius *Augustus* 29.2).
  • Pliny (*Natural History* 36.102) considered it one of the most beautiful buildings in the world.

Analysis:

• Ward-Perkins (1981, 32-33) considered the temple to be an interesting hybridization of Roman and Greek artistic influences, comparing aspects of the masonry to Late Republican and Greek styles, specifically mentioning the Temple of Augustus at Ankara and the Inner Propylaeae at Eleusis.
• Ratte, Howe and Foss (1986, 59) used the Temple of Mars Ultor as an example of a deep porch plan that exists only in very large temples, almost all of which are pseudodipteral. Moreover, they mentioned the Temple of Mars Ultor (along with the Temples of Trajan and the Temple of Venus Genetrix in Rome) to illustrate the consistent difference between Roman and Hellenistic pseudodipteral plans - that Hellenistic examples all have distyle-in-antis porches, while Roman examples emphasize the frontality of the cella with a prostyle porch.

The Temple of Mars Ultor: restored site plan.
A2. The Olympieion at Athens (Temple of Olympian Zeus)  
Compared to: The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus and The Wadi B Temple at Sardis

Summary:

The temple is located in the area southeast of the Athenian Acropolis. Although construction began in the 6th century B.C., it was not finished until 131-132 A.D. The Emperor Hadrian is often credited with the completion, and he was subsequently given the title of Olympios. Its completion was also associated with the Panhellenion, a collection of Greek cities founded by Hadrian. The temple is in a good state of preservation, with many columns still standing.

Physical Characteristics:
• Octastyle (8 x 21), Corinthian and Ionic, dipteral.
• Stylobate measures ca. 41 x 108 m.
• A paved court was constructed around the temple and its precinct wall, which was used as a meeting place for the Panhellenion.
• Temple and surrounding precinct featured statues depicting Hadrian, the gods, and personifications of Roman provinces.
• A colossal statue of Hadrian was behind the building and a colossal chryselaphantine statue of Zeus occupied the cella of the temple.

Testimonia:
• Epigraphical:
  • IG II2 5185: αἵδ’ εἴσ’ Ἀθῆναι Θησέως ἡ πρὶν πόλις / αἵδ’ εἴσ’ Ἡadroνοῦ καὶ σύχι Θησέως πόλις (This is Athens, the ancient city of Theseus /This is Athens, the ancient city of Theseus). This was written on the gate that served as the entrance to the new deme, Hadrianopolis, which was founded in conjunction with the dedication of the Olympieion.

• Literary:
  • Cassius Dio (69.16.1-2) described the statue of Hadrian, the function of the sacred precinct, and the history of the temple.
  • Pausanias (1.18.6-9) discussed the history of the Olympieion and its construction under Hadrian. He also described the cult statues in terms of historical significance and skill of execution.

Analysis:
• Barattolo (1995, 72) referred to a source from the 6th century, the scholion on Lucian’s *Icaromenippos*, which says that at Cyzicus Hadrian completed an older building that without him would have remained unfinished (just like the Olympieion at Athens), which suggests a possible connection between the two temples.
• Barattolo (1995, 100) also compared the Cyzicus temple to the Olympieion at Athens and the Temple of Venus and Roma at Rome, concluding that the three temples
constituted an international second-century AD axis of architecture, tied together by grandeur and an ideological connection to Augustus.

- Ashmole (1956, 91) suggested the Olympieion at Athens as a comparison to “gain an idea of the grandeur of [The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus].”

**Bibliography:** Wycherley 1964; Abramson 1974; Tölle-Kastenbein 1994.

a. The Olympieion at Athens: restored site plan.
b. The Olympieion at Athens.
A3. The Temple of Domitian (Temple of the Augusti), Ephesus
Compared to: The Wadi B Temple at Sardis and the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus

Summary:

Located in the upper agora of Ephesus, the so-called Temple of Domitian likely dates from the 1st century AD and was built in a prominent position in the Roman administrative center of Ephesus. Attributed to Domitian based on fragments of a monumental sculpture of the Emperor found at the site, and evidence that permission to build an imperial temple was given to Ephesus during Domitian’s rule. Dedication of the temple to Domitian remains uncertain, as the damnatio memoriae was imposed on the Emperor after his assassination. After demolition in the 5th century AD, the site was repurposed several times, leaving scant remains of the original structure.

Physical Characteristics:
- Octastyle (8 x 13), Ionic, pseudodipteral with prostyle porch.
- Stylobate measures ca. 24 x 34 m.
- Precinct measures ca. 50 x 100 m., composed of an artificial terrace on vaulted foundations. The north side of the terrace was originally two stories high.
- A “U” shaped altar with a frieze depicting scenes of sacrifice and weaponry was found at the eastern end of the temple terrace.
- A monumental statue, perhaps representing Domitian, was found in the substructures of the site.

Analysis:
- Ward-Perkins (1981, 281) noted the similarity of masonry and design between the Temple of Domitian at Ephesus, the Temple of Augustus and Rome at Ancyra, the Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias, and the Temple of Zeus at Aezani. He also saw an evident relationship between the Temple of Zeus at Aezani and the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, presumably based on geography and size.
- Ratté, Howe and Foss (1986, 90) mentioned this temple in comparison to the Wadi B Temple at Sardis as one of the 11 known pseudodipteral temples from the late Hellenistic and Roman periods in Asia Minor, many of which are associated with the Imperial Cult and demonstrate a conservative plan with exceptional attention to detail. Ratté, Howe, and Foss viewed these temples through the lens of Hadrianic classical revival, which they saw as a conservative contemporaneous counterbalance to the more innovative architectural developments of the middle 2nd century AD.

a. The Temple of Domitian at Ephesus: restored site plan.

b. The Temple of Domitian at Ephesus.
A4. The Temple of Apollo at Didyma (Didymaion) 
Compared to: Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus

Summary:

The Didymaion is a huge temple and sanctuary located in the region of Miletus, and home to an oracle of Apollo. Preceding structures on the site date to at least the beginning of the first millennium BC. The existing temple was built throughout the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods (ca. 300 BC - 200 AD). The temple is very well preserved, with many partial columns still standing and architectural varia surrounding the site.

Physical Characteristics:
- Decastyle (10 x 21), Ionic and Corinthian, dipteral.
- Stylobate measures 118.34 x 60.13 m.
- Columns at least ca. 19.71 m. high.
- Cella is hypaethral and has no opisthodomos.
- On the right and left sides of the west wall of the pronaos are two barrel vault passageways which end at a wide staircase leading down to the hypaethral cella.
- Column bases of the east facade are adorned with meander patterns and laurel leaves, which also date to the Trajanic or Hadrianic period.
- Decorative features of exterior include a frieze of gorgon heads and foliage dating to the Trajanic or Hadrianic period.

Testimonia:
- Literary:
  - Pausanias (7.2.6) mentioned the temple of Apollo at Didyma and claimed that the sanctuary predates the migration of the Ionians.
  - Pliny (Natural History 6.18) referred to sanctuaries dedicated to “Apollo Didymaeus.”
  - Suetonius (Gaius 21) claimed that Caligula intended to complete the temple.

Analysis:
- Burrel (2004, 55) proposed that the Didymaion may have been a provincial temple of the Imperial cult based on Pliny (Natural History 6.18).
- Laubscher (1967, 214) compared the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus to the Didymaion based on their similar mass and size.

Bibliography: Haselberger 1985; Parke 1986; Fontenrose 1988, 28-44.
a. The Temple of Apollo at Didyma: restored plan.

b. The Temple of Apollo at Didyma.
A5. The Temple of Artemis at Ephesus (The Artemision)
Compared to: The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus and the Olympieion at Ephesus.

Summary:

The Artemision was famous in antiquity and was included in the list of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. The original temple predated the reign of Croesus in the 6th century BC and went through at least two additional rebuilding stages. The identity of Ephesus was intimately linked with the Artemision, and the temple was prominently featured on Ephesian coins and named in inscriptions mentioning Ephesus. The temple was almost completely destroyed in the 4th century AD and only a single re-erected column survives to the present day.

Physical Characteristics:
- Octastyle (8 x 21 columns), Ionic, dipteral.
- Stylobate measures ca. 55 x 117 m.
- Column height was ca.18.4 m.
- Possibly hypaethral.

Testimonia:
- Literary:
  - Antipater (Greek Anthology IX.58) recorded that the Artemision was among the grandest buildings of the world.
  - Pausanias (7.2.6.) discussed the antiquity of the temple.
  - Pliny (Natural History 16.79.213-216) described the decoration of the columns and the cult image of Artemis. He also explained that the temple was built on marshland in order to protect it against earthquakes.

Analysis:
- Laubscher (1967, 217) proposed that the Temple of Hadrian competed with, and perhaps surpassed, the huge sanctuaries of the Didymaion and the Artemision of Ephesus.

a. The Temple of Artemis at Ephesus: restored site plan.

b. The Temple of Artemis at Ephesus.
A6. The Temple of Trajan, Pergamon (Trajaneum or Traianieion)
Compared to: The Wadi B Temple at Sardis and the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus

Summary:

Built as an Imperial Cult temple to the Emperor Trajan, the temple sits on an artificial plaza on the acropolis of Pergamon above the hillside theatre. Owing to its dominant position, the temple is visible from a great distance. Likely built after Trajan’s death, the temple was most probably commissioned by Hadrian. Several columns remain and have been re-erected.

Physical Characteristics:
• Hexastyle (6 x 9 columns), Corinthian, distyle in antis, peripteral.
• Sacred precinct measures ca. 60 x 70 m. and was surrounded on three sides by stoas, with the fourth overlooking the plain below the acropolis.
• Built entirely of white marble.
• Raised on a podium with a frontal staircase, making it approximately 18 m. high.
• Had a system of arches under podium and precinct.
• Ornately decorated with openwork akroteria, gorgon heads on the frieze.
• Pieces of colossal statues of Trajan and Hadrian found on site.

Analysis:
• Ward-Perkins (1981, 123) suggested that the architect of Hadrian’s temple of Venus and Roma in Rome also worked at the Trajaneum.
• Ratté, Howe and Foss (1986, 90) mentioned this temple in comparison to the Wadi B Temple at Sardis as one of the 11 known pseudodipteral temples from the late Hellenistic and Roman periods in Asia Minor, many of which are associated with the Imperial Cult and demonstrate a conservative plan with exceptional attention to detail.
• Ashmole (1956, 180) mentioned the vault-system in comparison to the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus but notes that the vaulting of the Traianeum was necessitated by the steepness of the site.

a. The Temple of Trajan at Pergamon: restored site plan.

b. The Temple of Trajan at Pergamon.
A7. The Temple of Augustus and Roma at Ancyra (Monumentum Ancyranum)
Compared to: The Wadi B Temple at Sardis

Summary:

Built between 25 and 20 B.C., the Temple of Augustus and Rome includes the most complete Greek and Latin inscriptions detailing the Res Gestae of Augustus carved into the walls of the pronaos and cella, which are mostly still intact. Epigraphical evidence suggests that the temple had a functional link to the Imperial Cult, possibly extending beyond the time of Augustus.

Physical Characteristics:
- Octastyle, Corinthian, pseudodipteral.
- Stylobate measures ca. 36.0 x 54.82 m.
- 2 m. high podium.
- Interior pronaos wall features the Latin text of the *Res Gestae* engraved in six columns measuring ca. 4.0 x 2.7 m.
- Outer wall of the cella features the Greek text of the *Res Gestae*, engraved in 19 columns measuring ca. 1.0 x 1.25 m.
- Another inscription, dating to the reign of Tiberius, is carved on the left anta of the temple and lists Galatian priests of the Imperial Cult.

Testimonia:
- Epigraphical:
  - The *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*: 35 paragraphs of text that name and describe the highlights of the political, public, and military accomplishments of the Augustus.

Analysis:
- Ward-Perkins (1981, 279) believed that the temple is conservative in design and decoration in a similar mold to The Temple of Mars Ultor in Rome. He also compared the masonry and design to those of the Temple of Domitian at Ephesus, the Temple of Augustus and Rome at Ancyra, the Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias, and the Temple of Zeus at Alazanoi.
- As they did with the Traianeum, Ratté, Howe and Foss (1986, 90) compared this to the Wadi B Temple at Sardis because it was one of the 11 known pseudodipteral temples from the late Hellenistic and Roman periods in Asia Minor, and was associated with the Imperial Cult.


b. The Temple of Augustus and Rome.
A8. The Temple of Aphrodite, Aphrodisias
Compared to: The Wadi B Temple at Sardis

Summary:

The temple was built during the 1st centuries BC and AD, and the precinct may have been completed in the 2nd century AD during the reign of Hadrian. Located in the northern section of the city, the temple appears to have been a focal point of the city. Because Aphrodite was the patron goddess of Aphrodisias and the divine ancestor of the Julio-Claudian line of Roman Emperors, the temple may also have served to emphasize and strengthen ties between the city of Aphrodisias and the seat of imperial power. The temple has been re-erected on the site using the 14 remaining columns.

Physical Characteristics:
• Octastyle (8 x 13), Ionic, pseudodipteral.
• Stylobate measures ca. 20 x 32 m.
• Precinct was elaborate, with a two-story aedicular facade on the east and porticos on the north, south, and west.
• Some columns and door moldings are inscribed with records of the names and donations of some prominent citizens.
• Marble of the temple was elaborately carved, and some Corinthian pilasters have been found that depict human and animal figures incorporated in acanthus leaves.
• A cult statue of Aphrodite has been found at the site.

Analysis:
• Ward-Perkins (1981, 281) noted the similarity of masonry and design between the Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias to the Temple of Domitian at Ephesus, the Temple of Augustus and Rome at Ancyra, and the Temple of Zeus at Aezani.
• The Temple of Aphrodite was also among the 11 pseudodipteral Asian temples with ties to the Imperial Cult that Ratté, Howe, and Foss (1986, 90) compared to the Wadi B Temple.

Bibliography: Erim 1986; Reynolds 1990.
a. The Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias: restored site plan.

b. The Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias.
A9. The Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi (Aezani)
Compared to: The Wadi B Temple at Sardis and the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus

Summary:

Construction of the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi is generally believed to have taken place during the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. The temple is Hellenistic in style and set in a colonnaded court, elevated above the surrounding landscape. The interior features an inscription zone that includes several documents dating to the reign of Hadrian. Some aspects of the temple are unusual, including a vaulted underground chamber, which remains intact. Much of the superstructure of the temple has been re-erected.

Physical Characteristics:
• Octastyle (8 x 15), Ionic, pseudodipteral.
• Stylobate measures ca. 33 x 37 m.
• Precinct measures ca. 112 x 130 m. and was surrounded by double-aisled porticoes and an axial propylon.
• Marble was the primary building material.
• Pronaos had 4 prostyle columns; 2 columns in antis in the opisthodomos; behind the opisthodomos is a flight of steps down to the subterranean vaulted chamber.
• Upper zones of the column flutes have small vases in relief.
• Podium was 2.86 m. high and approached by stairways of 11 and 7 steps.
• A large central akroterion shows a bust of Zeus on the east end and on the west a female bust, perhaps to be identified as Cybele.

Ancient Sources:
• Epigraphical:
  • The cella walls have an inscription zone, framed by molding. The inscriptions describe a lawsuit over the possession of the temple and honorary decrees from the year AD. 157 for M. Ulpius Apuleius Eurykles, a famous citizen of Aizanoi.

Analysis:
• Lyttelton (1974, 271) claimed that the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus and the Temple of Zeus Aizanoi demonstrate that a homogenized local style existed in Asia Minor during the 2nd century, which she describes as Hellenistic in appearance, but Roman in setting and planning.
• Hasluck (1910, 11) and Barattolo (1995, 84) mentioned that the use of amphorae to decorate capital fluting is also found at the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus.
• Barattolo (1995, 89) also commented on the similar cella decoration of the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi, the Temple N2 at Termessos, the Roman Temple at Magnesia on the Maeander, the Temple of Artemis at Jerash, and the Temple of Bacchus at Baalbek to the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus. Specifically, he claimed they had a richly decorated and gigantic main doorway, underground vaults in partial communication with one another, and interior stairways.
• Ratté, Howe, and Foss (1986, 58) highlighted the sculpture at the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi as an example of “classicistic sense of plasticity” and a comparison for the Wadi B Temple at Sardis. They also (1986, 63) used it as an example of a large scale pseudodipteral temple within a colonnaded precinct.

• Ward-Perkins (1981, 281) noted how the masonry and design of the Temple of Domitian at Ephesus, the Temple of Augustus and Rome at Ancyra, the Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias, and the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi resemble one another. He saw this as evidence of a relationship between the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi and the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus.

• Hasluck (1910, 12-13) compared the Temple of Zeus to the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, noting the formal similarity and general contemporaneity of the two structures, but acknowledging the obvious difference in scale. Hasluck also proposed that the temple at Aizanoi needed only one vault to support the cella, but that it had the same arrangements for ventilation and the same communication by staircase as the Cyzicus temple.

• Ashmole (1956, 183) claimed that the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi was built 12 years before the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus and may have been designed by the same architect. More specifically, Ashmole thought that the temple at Aizanoi could be used to reconstruct the facade and cella walls of the temple at Cyzicus. According to Ashmole, the width of the Cyzicus temple forbids the pseudodipteral plan of Aizanoi, so that the walls of the Cyzicus cella may have been closer to the peripteros.

a. The Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi: restored plan.

b. The Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi.
A10. Pantheon, Rome
Compared to: The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus and the Red Hall at Pergamon

Summary:

Built between 118 and 128 AD, this structure commissioned by the Emperors Trajan and Hadrian to replace the original Pantheon built by Marcus Agrippa in the 1st century BC. The temple is composed of three main elements: the pronaos, an intermediate block resembling a foyer, and the domed rotunda. Neither the function nor dedication of the Pantheon are known for certain. Potential meanings include a temple to planetary deities, a symbol of the heavens, a celebration of the family of Augustus, an exercise in geometric forms, a temple to Romanism, an audience hall, or an exercise in aesthetics. Shortly after the decline of paganism, the Pantheon was rededicated as a church, to which it owes its remarkable state of preservation.

Physical Characteristics:
- Octastyle, Corinthian, prostyle with a rotunda.
- Temple rotunda is based on a 43.3 m. sphere, with 9 m. oculus centered on the roof.
- Pronaos was 8 columns across and three deep, with a width of 34.2 m. and depth of 15.62 m.
- Columns on the pronaos are monolithic 14.2 m. high and spaced a bit wide (at 2 to 1, rather than 1.5 to 1 of the pycnostyle).
- Precinct measured ca. 60 x 150 m. and the porticoes surrounding the forum were 4.6 to 6 m. deep and raised on 1.8 meter platforms.
- The dome is concrete and the columns are grey granite from Mons Claudianus in the front, but red granite from Aswan in the back. All have Pentellic bases and capitals.
- Podium was low at 1.32 meters, with 7 steps.
- 7 niches around the floor, 7 rings on the vault.
- Each zone of the interior is subdivided according to a different scheme. None of the zones line up, drawing attention to the center of the dome itself.

Testimonia:
- Epigraphical:
  - CIL 6.896, 2041: M. AGRIPPA. L. F. COSTERTIUM. FECIT (Marcus Agrippa, son of Lucius, consul for three times, made it.)

- Literary:
  - Cassius Dio (69.7.1) claimed that Hadrian used the Pantheon as an audience hall and further speculated that the name of the structure came either from the statues of so many gods placed around this building, or else from the resemblance of the dome to the heavens.
  - Pliny (Natural History 9.58) mentioned a statue of Venus in the Pantheon.
  - Historia Augusta (Hadrian 19.10) stated that Hadrian restored the Pantheon.
Analysis:
- Baratollo (1995, 87) made the point that the column diameters of the Pantheon (as well as the Temple of Apollo Sosianus, the Temple of Zeus Aezani, and the Temple of Hadrian at Rome) are similar to those of Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus.
- The enigmatic function of the Pantheon should caution any assumptions about similarly anomalous buildings like the Red Hall at Pergamon.

b. The Pantheon at Rome: restored site plan.

c. The Pantheon at Rome.
A11. The Temple of Venus and Roma, Rome
Compared to: The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus

Summary:

Consecrated by Hadrian in 135 A.D., the temple was built on the former site of Nero’s Domus Aurea near the Velia. It may have been modeled on the Temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens, but altered for size and setting. Set on a low podium and accessible from the east and west ends of the precinct, the temple sat on an important thoroughfare between the Flavian Amphitheater and the Roman Forum. Significantly, this is the first time Roma was given her own temple, marking a new religious development. Today, the substructure and rear sections of the cellae are intact and visible.

Physical Characteristics:

- Decastyle, peripteral.
- Stylobate measured ca. 145 x 100 m.
- Temple measured ca. 66 x 136 m., and was ca. 31 m. high.
- Constructed of lavish materials, including Egyptian granite, blue-veined Proconessian marble, Pentelic marble, cipollino, peperino, and gold-plated bronze tiles.
- Cella was divided into 2 opposite facing chambers, one dedicated to Venus (facing the Flavian Amphitheater) and one to Roma (facing the Roman Forum). Apses of each portion of the cella roofed with coffered domes.
- Frieze was plain and the cornice was ornamented by consoles, palmettes, and lion heads. Coins from the time show the standing figure of Roma in the pediment.

Analysis:

- Ward-Perkins (1981, 123) and Lyttelton (1987, 47-48) were certain that workmen from Asia Minor were imported for the work because the carving of the moldings is very similar to that of the Traianieion at Pergamon.

Bibliography:
Richardson 1992, 409-411; Steinby 1999, 121-123.
a. The Temple of Venus and Roma at Rome: restored site plan.

b. The Temple of Venus and Roma at Rome.
A12. Temple of Artemis, Jerash (Gerasa)
Compared to: The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus

Summary:

Built during the reign of Antoninus Pius, the Temple of Artemis at Jerash surmounts a high terrace above the city. The temple is at the terminus of a set of approaches that were visible from all quarters of the city. Each level of the approach provided vistas over the city, but the entire complex was fully visible only once inside the sacred precinct. Despite the grand scale of the structure and the sculptural program, it was made of local material and featured relatively modest adornment.

Physical Characteristics:
• Hexastyle, Corinthian, peripteral.
• Stylobate measures ca. 22.6 x 40.1 m.
• Precinct measured ca. 232 x 161 m., enclosed by three porticoes and a propylon.
• Building material was local sandstone.
• Deep porch on a very tall podium (ca. 4.32 m. high).
• Steps leading up to the propylon were ca. 100 m. wide.

Analysis:
• Barattolo (1995, 89) argued that the Temple of Artemis at Jerash is a typological parallel for the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, based primarily on the gigantic main doorway, interior stairways, and underground vaults in partial communication with one another.

Bibliography: Kraeling 1938, 125-138; Segal 1981.
a. The Temple of Artemis at Jerash: restored site plan.

b. The Temple of Artemis at Jerash.
A13. Templum Pacis at Rome (Forum of Vespasian or Forum of Peace)
Compared to: The Red Hall at Pergamon

Summary:

The Templum Pacis was a large square and building complex nestled among the other imperial fora. Built by Vespasian between 71 and 75 AD, the sanctuary was a monument to the suppression of the Jewish revolt. It was destroyed by fire in 192 AD and later rebuilt by Septimius Severus. Although its full function is uncertain, proposals for its use include a religious sanctuary, a public garden, a venue for Imperial propaganda, an open air museum, and a municipal administrative building. Almost nothing remains of the structure, but it is the discovery site of the Forma Urbis.

Physical Characteristics:
- The central hall measured ca. 34 x 22 m., had a hexastyle pronaos, an apse, and was at the southeastern end of the complex
- The temenos was unusual and consisted of two main elements: a large, colonnaded square (ca. 134 x 137 m.), and a set of rectangular rooms along the southeastern end of the square.
- Lavishly decorated: Fragments of marble, including giallo antico, peperino, red Egyptian granite, Africano marble and pavonazzetto have been found.
- Built entirely on street level, neither the hall or precinct were raised.
- Adorned with trophies of the Jewish war including the menorah, and possibly the Ark of the Covenant, as well as significant works of Greek painting and sculpture.

Testimonia:

Literary:
- Pliny (Natural History) recorded that Vespasian was the first person to dedicate a Temple of Peace (12.94) and that several Greek sculptures which were installed within its complex. Pliny also called it one of the most beautiful buildings in Rome (14.2-3).
- Suetonius (Vespasian 9.1) said that the Temple of Peace was among Vespasian’s public work projects.

Analysis:
- Schorndorfer (1997, 63) notes that the Red Hall seems to mix several different styles and compares its layout to that of the Templum Pacis in Rome.
- Similar to the Red Hall in its enigmatic function, as well as plan.

a. The Templum Pacis at Rome: restored site plan.
A14. Temple of Bacchus, Baalbek
Compared to: The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, the Red Hall at Pergamon

Summary:

The Temple of Bacchus is one of the three main temples at Baalbek and was commissioned by Antoninus Pius in 150 AD. It is one of the best preserved temples of the ancient world, partially due to being protected by the ruins of the nearby massive Temple of Jupiter Heliopolis.

Physical Characteristics:

- Octastyle, Corinthian, prostyle peripteral.
- Stylobate measured ca. 35 x 66 m and ca. 31 m. high.
- Had no temenos of its own, but appears to have been part of the larger Baalbek temple complex.
- Built from local limestone.
- Very large cella was heavily ornamented and featured receding planes of wall surface.
- Cella interior was decorated with Corinthian half-columns, flanking two-story niches that featured scenes from the life of Bacchus.
- An adyton at the rear of the cella was raised by a few steps and had a screen wall carved with Bacchic scenes.

Analysis:

- Ashmole (1956, 183) contended that the Temple of Bacchus provides a good example of how we may reconstruct the facade and entrance portico of the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus. He also reasoned that the two temples had the same number of columns on the front and sides, and if the Cyzicus pronaos were filled with columns that it would accommodate 5 rows of 4 columns. According to this scenario, the total number of columns at Cyzicus would equal 62, the exact number mentioned by Cyriacus of Ancona. However, the Temple of Bacchus lacked the rear portico of the temple at Cyzicus, making this possibility moot. He also concluded that the measurements of the doorway claimed by Cyriac of Ancona to match the those at the entrance to the Bacchus temple.
- Baratollo (1995, 187) claimed the Bacchus temple is a typological parallel for the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus. He also noted the similarity between the cella decoration of the Bacchus Temple to the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus. Specifically, he asserted that they had richly decorated and gigantic main doorways, underground vaults in partial communication with one another, and interior stairways.
- Laubscher (1967, 217) compared the size of the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus and its decoration to the Bacchus Temple at Baalbek, but concluded that the Hadrian temple was not so “Syrian in character”.

The Temple of Bacchus at Baalbek.
A15. The Temple of Hadrian at Rome (Hadrianeion)
Compared to: The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus

Summary:

Built by Antoninus Pius in 145 AD as a temple to the divinized Hadrian, the temple was in the Campus Martius, situated between the column of Marcus Aurelius and the Baths of Nero. Temple is partially preserved and currently repurposed as the Roman stock exchange building. One wall of the cella remains, along with 11 columns.

Physical Characteristics:
- Octastyle (8x13), Corinthian, peripteral.
- Stylobate measured ca. 20 x 40 m.
- Columns ca. 14.8 m. high with a 1.44 m. diameter.
- Situated in a large precinct surrounded by columns made of *giallo antico* marble.
- Precinct opened through a honorific arch, sometimes called the “Arch of Claudius” or the modern “Arch of the Tosetti.”
- 4 m.-high podium was made of peperino, most of the superstructure was Proconessian marble.
- A series of reliefs depicting the provinces and *spolia optima* decorated the stylobate, the interior of the cella, or both.
- Cella was non-apsidal, but included a barrel vaulted ceiling.

Testimonia:
- Literary:
  - The *Historia Augusta* (*Antoninus Pius 8*) mentions the Temple of Hadrian as one of the public works of Antoninus Pius.
  - Later, the *Historia Augusta* (*Lucius Verus 3*) mentions that Lucius Verus received the toga virilis on the same day that Antoninus Pius dedicated a “temple to his father.”

Analysis:
- Ward-Perkins (1981, 124) and Boatwright (2010, 171-174) noted that the surviving sculpture exhibits a mix of Asiatic and Italian styles and motifs, which he saw this as evidence of Hadrian’s Asian craftsmen contributing to the local Roman architectural styles. Some of the spotlight temples also exhibit this mixed style.
- Baratollo observed that the column diameters of the Temple of Apollo Sosianus, the Pantheon, the Temple of Zeus Aezani, and the Hadrianeum at Rome and the Temple of Zeus, Aizanoi are similar to those found at the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus.\(^{771}\)


---

\(^{771}\) Barattolo 1995, 87.

b. The Temple of Hadrian at Rome.
Appendix 3: Images

I1. Map of Roman Asia (Sardis, Ephesus, Pergamon, and Cyzicus highlighted).

I2. Greek temple profile.
III. Standard Greek temple plan.

IV. Roman temple profile (Temple of Jupiter Capitoline).
15. Roman temple plan (Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus).

17. The Temple of Athena Polias at Priene: restored plan.

I9. Spotlight Temple perspective drawings: a. frontal view, b. angled view. Temples ordered from left to right: the Wadi B Temple, the Vetters Temple, the Red Hall, the Temple of Hadrian, and the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus.

II.1. Sardis site plan (the Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Plus circled in blue, the Bath/Gymnasium complex circled in green, and the Wadi B Temple circled in red).

II.2. Sardis walled city site plan (Wadi B Temple circled in red).


118. The Wadi B Temple at Sardis: perspective drawing
119. The Wadi B Temple at Sardis: geo-located perspective drawing viewed from the South (distance of 650 meters).

120. The Wadi B Temple at Sardis: geo-located perspective drawing viewed from the Bath/Gymnasium complex (distance of 640 meters).
I21. The Vettres Temple at Ephesus: view from the Church of Mary (temple site circled).

I22. Ephesus site plan (the Vettres Temple circled in red, the Artemision circled in blue).
I23. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: hypothetical temenos plan.

I24. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: hypothetical plan, dodecastyle dipteral.
I26. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: hypothetical elevation.
I27. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: view of north corner from the stylobate.

I28. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: foundation viewed from the north.
I29. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: marble paving.

I30. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: a. capital, b. column drum fragment.
I31. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: architectural fragment.

I32. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: perspective drawing.
I33. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: geo-located perspective drawing viewed from the harbor (distance of 1 kilometer).

I34. The Vetters Temple at Ephesus: geo-located perspective drawing viewed from the Temple of Domitian (distance of 1.7 kilometers).
135. The Red Hall at Pergamon: view of left rotunda and hall From the northwest.

136. Pergamon restored site plan (the Red Hall circled in red, the Asklepieion circled in blue, and the acropolis circled in green).
I37. The Red Hall at Pergamon: restored plan of hall and temenos.

I38. The Red Hall at Pergamon: restored plan.

I40. The Red Hall at Pergamon: marble sill.
I41. The Red Hall at Pergamon: south wall with windows and niches.

I42. The Red Hall at Pergamon: (a) atlantid bust, (b) caryatid lower half.
I43. The Red Hall at Pergamon: a. atlantid bust, b. caryatid bust.

I44. The Red Hall at Pergamon: reconstruction of atlantes and caryatids.
I45. The Red Hall at Pergamon: a. coffer with egg and dart moulding, b. moulding with egg and dart and palmettes, c. bead and reel, egg and dart moulding, d. acanthus leaf moulding, and e. marble fragment with egg and dart and running spiral.

I46. The Red Hall at Pergamon: feather reliefs.
I47. The Red Hall at Pergamon: perspective drawing.

I48. The Red Hall at Pergamon: geo-located perspective drawing viewed from the road leading from the Asklepieion to the acropolis (distance of 1 kilometer).
149. The Red Hall at Pergamon: viewed from the "Antik Yol" or road leading up the acropolis.

150. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: view from the South.
I51. Cyzicus Site Plan (the Temple of Hadrian circled in red, the three harbors circled in blue, and the acropolis circled in green).

I52. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: hypothetical plan, dipteral.
I53. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: hypothetical plan, distyle in antis.

I54. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: hypothetical plan, distyle in antistyle pronaos and opisthodomos.
I55. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: hypothetical plan, prostyle.

I56. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: hypothetical elevations.

158. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: surrounding farms and rubble.
I59. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: architectural varia.

I60. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: Corinthian capital.
161. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: amphora column.

162. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: a. lion head spout, b. lion pelt frieze fragment.
163. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: feather cluster (circled in red).


I66. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: a. fragment of warrior from warrior frieze, b. torso of warrior from warrior frieze, c. head and hands of warriors from warrior frieze.

168. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: a. unidentified head (identified by Yaylali and Özkaya as Zeus), b. unidentified head (identified by Yaylali and Özkaya as Apollo or Dionysus), c. unidentified head, d. unidentified head.
169. Istanbul Archaeology Museum: a. fragment of frieze featuring a nereid on a triton, b. fragment of a frieze featuring Silenus and a maenad.

170. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: sketch of warrior frieze panel.
I71. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: a. detail of horse head from warrior frieze panel, b. detail of warrior on horse from warrior frieze panel, c. detail of warrior on horse and warrior on ground from warrior frieze panel.


175. Bandırma Archaeological Museum: rich style Nike frieze panel.


I78. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: a. Cyriacus of Ancona drawing 5 (Ms. Lat. Misc. d 85, f. 134v), b. Cyriacus of Ancona drawing 6 (Ms. Lat. Misc. d 85, f. 135r). Frieze subjects include Helios on his chariot (far left) and the Three Graces (far right).
I79. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: a. Cyriacus of Ancona drawing 7 (Ms. Lat. Misc. d 85, f. 135v), b. Cyriacus of Ancona drawing 8 (Ms. Lat. Misc. d 85, f. 136v). Frieze subjects include Artemis and the Hind (left of center) and Cybele riding a lion (right of center). Lower portion of image includes a fallen architrave (measured at 22 feet long), 6 feet high and 6 feet wide) and an fragment of an arch (measured at 13 feet long).

I81. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: Destailleur Manuscript drawing.

I82. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: perspective drawing.
183. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: geo-located perspective drawing viewed from the acropolis (distance of 1.8 kilometers).

184. The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus: geo-located perspective drawing viewed from the Hytos Limani (distance of 500 meters).
185. The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis: view from the Southeast.

186. The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis: site plan.
III7. The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis: restored plan.

III8. The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis: lion head spout.
189. The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis: portrait of Faustina.

I91. The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis: portrait of Lucius Verus.

I92. The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis: perspective drawing.
I93. The Temple of Artemis and Antoninus Pius at Sardis: geo-located perspective drawing viewed from the West (distance of 450 meters).