5. ARCHITECTURAL DECORATION

Unlike many other buildings without an inscription, the Bouleuterion does not require an analysis of the architectural ornamentation of the *scaenae frons* to establish its dating. On the contrary, the dedicatory inscription of the renovated structure by P. Vedius Antoninus and his wife Fl. Papiane provides a reliable date that could never be superseded by means of stylistic analyses. Furthermore, the inscription provides an opportunity to ask questions that go beyond dating the *scaenae frons* and to assess the relationship between this building and other structures commissioned by the Vedii. The first part of this chapter will summarize the ornamentation of the preserved architectural fragments of the Bouleuterion's *scaenae frons* according to the compilation in appendix 1 (catalog of the architectural fragments). The second part will discuss the methodological basis for a comparison with other buildings commissioned by the Vedius family. Their dates, assignment and architectural ornamentation suggest suppositions about the relationship among benefactor, ornamentation and craftsmen or workshops.

5.1. Architectural Decoration of the Bouleuterion Scaenae Frons

5.1.1 Bases and Moldings

The pedestals forming the substructure for the *scaenae frons* display elaborate moldings (pl. 36, 2). The base consists of two vertical bands, the upper one set back slightly, a chamfer, an inverted *cyma recta* and two further chamfers. On the crown molding a cavetto is followed by an astragal, an ovolo and another cavetto concluded by a *taenia*. This kind of complex succession of different moldings is known from other contemporary buildings in Ephesos, including the Monopteros along the road to Magnesia (pl. 53), where the combination of forms is identical to the top of the pedestal.[163] Also the crown molding of the pedestals in the so-called "Marble Hall" in the Vedius Gymnasium displays an identical sequence. The base molding there nevertheless is different: instead of the chamfered zones, the Vedius Gymnasium shows an inverted *cyma recta*.[164]

Only one column base has been attributed to the *scaenae frons* by L. Bier (cat. 1-1). It displays two *scotiae* over the lower *torus* (pl. 72). The upper *torus* according to L. Bier's reconstruction protrudes well over the upper *scotia*. Therefore, this specimen clearly belongs to a kind known as the Roman version of the Ionic base. In this type, the top of the *scotia* is always set back from the greatest projection of the upper *torus*. Usually, there is only one *scotia*, but already from the Late Republican period onward we know examples where the *scotia* is doubled, sometimes with an astragal in between.[165] In and around Rome, bases with two *scotiae* are known both in ornate forms with elaborate decoration[166] and with simple moldings[167], similar to the Ephesian piece. Curiously, the Roman Ionic base is usually limited to the western half of the Roman Empire with a few exceptions where it has spread over from Italy into Greek territory.[168] In Corinth, the use of Roman Ionic bases during the early Imperial period goes back to the refounding of the city in 44 B.C. and the Italian origin of the colonists who rebuilt the city.[169] This is clearly an exception; normally, the Attic-Ionic base is preferred in Asia Minor.[170] For example, in the well-studied city of Sagalassos in Pisidia exclusively this type was found.[171] We

[163] See below chap. 5.2.2.3 and Koenigs – Radt 1979, insert 2.
[164] Steskal – La Torre 2008, pl. 69, 1. 3.
[165] Meritt 1969,191–195 fig. 3 f.
[166] For instance in the peristyle of Domitian's palace on the Palatine, now in the antiquarium, Wegner 1965, pl. 8 b. Other examples can be found in Hadrian's Villa in Tivoli, Wegner 1965, pl. 19 b.
[167] For example in the hippodrome of Domitian's palace on the Palatine, Meritt 1969, pl. 52 d.
[168] Meritt 1969, 197–198.
[169] Shoe 1964, 300–303.
[170] Meritt 1969, 195–196.
[171] Vandeput 1997, 175.

can only speculate, why such a peculiar form – at least for this region – might have been used for the Bouleuterion *scaenae frons* architecture in the middle of the 2nd century A.D.

From the first building phase of the *scaenae frons*, two pedestals and bases have been preserved in the south-east and south-west corner of the scene wall (pls. 32, 2–3; 33).[172] They belong to the regular Attic-Ionic type, which is very well known in the Eastern Roman Empire, especially in Asia Minor.[173] Above a square plinth follow a *torus*, a *scotia* and a *torus* again. The latter does not project beyond the upper edge of the *scotia*. Other examples for the use of this type include Ephesian buildings throughout the first and second century A.D., such as the so-called Street Fountain[174] from the first quarter of the 2nd century A.D. and the Vedius Gymnasium[175]. In aedicular façades an Attic-Ionic base is frequently combined with pedestals of varying heights, as seen in the Nymphaeum Traiani[176], the Celsus Library[177] and Hadrian's Gate[178].

5.1.2 Corinthian Capitals

Altogether three capitals, in two different sizes (cat. 3-1. 9-1. 9-2; pls. 74; 83, 3; 84, 1–2), are preserved from the *scaenae frons*.[179] Their characteristic features include leaves that are decidedly in the Asia Minor tradition. The display of the single lobes is fan-shaped, their ribs are carved with V-shaped section, and the eyelets are elongated. The calyx shows deep drillings.

All three capitals were found in the Basilica Stoa in 1961 by W. Alzinger. Lately G. A. Plattner and A. Schmidt-Colinet attributed them to a Late Antique (?) repair of the structure.[180] Their hypothesis is debatable because of the divergent sizes that seem less suitable for reuse in a building such as the basilica. Furthermore, the diameter of the capitals fits the columns assigned to the Bouleuterion's *scaenae frons*. L. Bier's attribution to the Bouleuterion therefore seems plausible.

All three capitals show the same characteristics and belong to a group of capitals that, according to G. A. Plattner, dominates Ephesian building activities in the first half of the 2nd century A.D.[181] or the late 1st and early 2nd century A.D.[182] G. A. Plattner more recently seems to favor the latter date.[183] P. Scherrer assumes a use of this particular group between the late 1st century A.D. and the Hadrianic or Early Antonine era.[184] This led L. Bier to the assumption that the capitals were re-used for the Vedius *scaenae frons* from an earlier building phase.

To clarify this question, the evidence for Ephesian capitals in the 2nd century A.D. will be reassessed. Plattner lists buildings with these capitals, which he calls the "Ephesos type".[185] Among them he considers the ones in the Harbor Gymnasium, the Varius baths and the temenos of the so-called Serapeion (pl. 52, 3) to come from the original building phase. The Serapeion temenos is best testified and the attribution of the capitals to the original structure is certain.[186] The chronology of the construction of the temple has been the subject of much scholarly debate.[187] For the porticos, P. Scherrer suggested a date between the late 1st century and the middle of the 2nd century A.D.[188] According to L. Rembart's recent study on the stratigraphy and the finds, the

---

172 See below chap. 2.3.1.
173 Meritt 1969, 186–204, esp. 195–197 on its distribution in Roman times.
174 Quatember 2008c, 229 fig. 12.
175 Steskal – La Torre 2008, pl. 79, 5.
176 Quatember, FiE (forthcoming).
177 Wilberg 1943, 4 fig. 6.
178 Thür 1989, 88–90.
179 See also above chap. 4.5.
180 Plattner – Schmidt-Colinet 2005, 245.
181 Plattner 2002, 247–248.
182 Plattner – Schmidt-Colinet 2005, 245.
183 Plattner 2002, 247–248 with further references; Plattner 2008, 276.
184 Scherrer 2005, 120–121.
185 Plattner 2002, 247–248; Plattner 2008, 276 note 1337.
186 Koller 2005, 139–141 fig. 4.5; Scherrer 2005, fig. 5.6.
187 Cf. for example Koenigs – Radt 1979, 346 (last quarter of the 2nd century A.D); Strocka 1988, 303–305 (Hadrianic); Scherrer 2005, 109–138, esp. 119–121. 129–130 (first half of the 2nd century A.D.); Plattner 2008, 276 note 1337 (early 2nd century A.D.).
188 Scherrer 2005, esp. 119.

Serapeion should be placed in the second half of the 2nd century.[189] The situations in the Harbor Gymnasium and the Varius baths are more ambiguous. The Harbor Gymnasium-Bath complex has been identified as the "Sebaston Gymnasion" with good reasons.[190] Its date nevertheless depends upon inscriptions on a group of bases from the Harbor Gymnasium, which can be dated to 92/93 A.D.[191] and has often been taken as proof for the building's completion during the late Flavian era. Yet, some problems with this date in my opinion are still unsolved: the donation of the so-called marble hall adjacent to the *palaestra* has been attributed to Ti. Claudius Aristion and therefore to the time of the emperor Domitian. The position of the respective inscription on the architrave, its attribution to the building in general and also its date are by no means certain.[192] In addition, the building ornamentation of the bath itself according to V. M. Strocka is Hadrianic.[193] Such a gap in between the erection of the *palaestra* under Domitian and the bath at least twenty years later seems curious. In contrast, W. Alzinger argues for an uninterrupted construction of the whole complex.[194] These contradictions clearly have to be resolved before we can judge the building's ornamentation on a grander scale. Nevertheless, the available evidence seems to point towards the construction of at least parts of the Harbor Gymnasium-Bath complex during the Hadrianic era. Also the building phases of the Varius baths have never been properly studied,[195] and the attribution of the "Ephesos type" to the original structure remains uncertain.[196]

From the evidence presented thus far, we can deduce the use of the "Ephesos type" from the middle of the 2nd century A.D. onward. Earlier dates remain uncertain. This fits quite well with another building adorned with capitals of the "Ephesos Type", the Monopteros along the road to Magnesia (pls. 52, 1–2).[197] As will be argued below, this building was probably erected during the third quarter of the 2nd century A.D.

Taking this evidence into consideration, the Corinthian capitals today displayed in the Basilica Stoa might well have been produced as building parts of the mid-second century Vedius *scaenae frons* in the Bouleuterion.

5.1.3 Architrave-Frieze of the Lower Story

The best preserved piece of this course is 4-9, the so-called "Papiane-block" due to its inscription (pls. 76, 2; 78, 1–2). It is therefore best suited for studying the architectural ornamentation of this level. Architrave and frieze are worked in one piece. The three fascias of the architrave are separated by moldings: a bead-and-reel between the lower one, a Lesbian kymation between the upper ones. The architrave's crown molding shows a bead-and-reel and an egg-and-dart. Above it there was a cavetto with palmettes preserved on one single fragment (fragment E; pl. 76, 2). This threefold combination is more or less standard in Asia Minor during the Roman period.[198] The axes of the bead-and-reel and the egg-and-dart do not correlate. The frieze zone is characterized by a convex frieze profile, and is crowned by an egg-and-dart. Both features are common in this region in Roman Imperial times.

---

189 Rembart 2009; I want to thank the author for sharing with me the results of her work.

190 Friesen 1993, 121–137; Scherrer, in: Thür 1997, esp. 112. 118.

191 Scherrer, in: Thür 1997, 117 f.

192 IvE 427; cf. Quatember 2007, 104 with further references. In addition, the copy of the inscription in the "Skizzenbücher" displays an angular lunar sigma which rarely occurs during the Flavian era, cf. Skizzenbücher Inv. 31–33. See also a remark on the inscription by R. Heberdey in the Archive of the ÖAI, Emil Reisch papers (III, Inschriften Ephesos): "Nach der Schrift (⊏!) nicht gut in flav. Zeit möglich. Da die gekrümmte Friesfläche nur roh behauen ist, ist denkbar, daß die Inschrift bei einer Reparatur eingetragen wurde, wobei der vielleicht mit Ranken verzierte Fries abgearbeitet wurde". I want to thank G. Wlach who informed me about this document in the archive of the ÖAI. – Indeed, according to M. Guarducci, the angular shaped lunar sigma occurs mainly in the 3rd century A.D., cf. Guarducci 1967, 377. However, in Ephesos the earliest example is known from the Hadrianic period: IvE 271a (Skizzenbuch no. 2695). I want to thank A. Sokolicek for information on this topic.

193 Strocka 1988, 302–303. Also Scherrer, in: Thür 1997, 112 note 168. 118 note 66 states that additional building activities took place in the Harbour Gymnasium during the first quarter of the 2nd century A.D., probably connected to the Hadrianic Neokoros-Temple.

194 Alzinger 1970, 1610: "Der Aufbau des gesamten Therme-Gymnasion-Komplexes wirkt trotz seiner additiven Struktur so einheitlich und ausgewogen, daß man nur ungern verschiedene Entstehungszeiten annehmen möchte".

195 Miltner 1955, 34–40; Miltner 1959a, 250–264; Alzinger 1970, 1619 f.; on the identification of the building and its name see Knibbe –Merkelbach 1978, 99; on the renovation by Scholastikia see Strocka 1985, 229–232.

196 Similar Scherrer 2005, 121.

197 See below chap. 5.2.2.3.

198 Köster 2004, 161.

In all egg-and-dart moldings the middle motif in between two eggs is arrow-shaped. The casing is wide and the structure is dominated by light and dark effects. As Köster has demonstrated, arrow-shaped darts occur as early as the Neronian period in Asia Minor.[199] In Ephesos this motif is attested at least from the reign of Domitian onwards.[200] It also appears, for example, on the Celsus Library,[201] where the wide casing and the light and dark effects are also evident. Nonetheless, its general layout there seems more fragile and less coarse than in the Bouleuterion egg-and-dart moldings, a feature that can also be observed on other buildings commissioned by the Vedii.[202]

The leaf-and-dart is of the type called stirrup-framed by L. Vandeput.[203] It clearly fits into the line of development as sketched by Köster, with a tendency to break up the motif into single elements by using deep drillings in between them.[204]

5.1.4 Architrave of the Upper Story

Unfortunately, only small fragments of the architrave zone are preserved. The crown molding is only represented by a bead-and-reel on cats. 10-6 and 10-8 (pls. 87, 1; 89, 1). As mentioned above, a crowning egg-and-dart and cavetto can be assumed based on various analogies.[205] According to the preserved corner piece cat. 10-4 (pl. 86, 1) and toolmarks on various other pieces (for example cat. 10-5; pl. 86, 2), the architrave originally had three fascias. The upper one was later removed, leaving more space for the inscription.[206] An architrave with three fascias in the upper story provides an exception to R. Köster's assumption that the choice was based on the size of the architectural elements.[207] The upper story architrave is considerably smaller than that of the lower story and it might therefore seem natural to use only two fascias. This issue has to remain unresolved, especially given the fact that a fascia was worked off for the inscription, maybe as an afterthought to provide more space for the letters of the inscription. Very little of the soffit panels has been preserved. From cats. 10-7 and 10-9 (pls. 88, 1–2; 89, 2) we can conclude that they were decorated with some vegetal motif. Vegetal ornamentation of soffit panels occurs in Ephesos from the 2nd century A.D. onwards, as seen in the Celsus Library.[208] Cat. 10-7 shows a central acanthus chalice from which the tendrils grow out. According to R. Köster, such a central ornament is first testified in the Celsus Library and originates from influence from the city of Rome.[209] Based on the scant remaining evidence, it is impossible to draw any further conclusions regarding the upper story. We can only assume that the frieze was adorned with some kind of ornament, either vegetal such as an acanthus scroll, or even figured.

5.2. The Bouleuterion Ornaments in Context: The Buildings of the Vedii

5.2.1 Methodology: Patterns and their Combination

In order to search for the characteristics in the architectural ornamentation of buildings commissioned by the Vedii, the basis of the material analyzed has to be established first. Only on definite grounds can we determine features that are inherent in that particular group.

---

199 Köster 2004, 143–144.

200 Pülz 1989, 15–16 and note 77.

201 Wilberg 1943, for example fig. 8. 10. 13. 14.;Vandeput 1997, 145 interprets this as proof for the import of this motif from Rome. This is clearly contradicted by the occurrence in earlier buildings in Asia Minor, see Köster 2004, 144.

202 See below 5.3.

203 Vandeput 1997, 29 and note 53.

204 Köster 2004, 145–147, esp. 146. On the development of stirrup-framed leaf-and-darts see also Vandeput 1997, 151–154, on the Antonine period 152–153. In Sagalassos, the mid-rib of the Lesbian kymation in contemporary buildings, such as the Temple of Antoninus Pius, is split into three parts, thus forming two side ribs. Cf. Vandeput 1997, pl. 28, 2. In this respect the examples from Sagalassos differ clearly from the Ephesian ones.

205 Köster 2004, 161.

206 See also above chap. 4.8.

207 Köster 2004, 160–161.

208 Plattner 2008, 280.

209 Köster 2004, 160.

In a second step, we need to identify a method of searching for patterns within this specific group. For the purpose of this study, this is achieved via a twofold approach: first, individual ornaments are considered. Both the ornamental patterns and their execution should be identical in order to link the production of the respective items. Second, the pattern of distribution of each ornament has to be considered: identical ornaments could still be a coincidence connected to one particular craftsman and/or pattern books.[210] This possibility has to be ruled out by defining combinations of these attributes. Unlike the definition of types,[211] not every combination of attributes has to be present in all members of the group. On the contrary, as the results below will show (see also table 1), none of the buildings commissioned by the Vedii shows exactly the same characteristics. But the distribution of distinctive features is so evenly spread that we can consider them as a group linked together not only by their donor, but also by their manufacture.

5.2.2 Buildings Commissioned by the Vedii and their Ornamentation

5.2.2.1 Vedius Gymnasium

The Structure

The so-called Vedius Gymnasium, a large bath-gymnasium-complex located at the northern edge of the city, was commissioned by the Vedii, hence its name.[212] According to the latest research, the construction can be securely dated to the years between 147 and 149 A.D., testified by the building inscription and the proconsul L. Antonius Albus.[213] While the majority of the building need not concern us here, the so-called Kaisersaal (pl. 50, 2) is important for this study: the hall adjacent to the *palaestra*, whose function is still the subject of scholarly debate,[214] was adorned with a two storied aedicular façade. Its architecture – and also ornamentation as we shall see – is very similar to the Bouleuterion.[215]

Description and Discussion of the Ornamentation (pl. 51, 1)

The lower story of the Vedius "Kaisersaal" displays Composite capitals with a characteristic rope molding on the astragal between the volutes. According to H. Thür and G. A. Plattner, this type "dominates" Ephesian building activities in the mid-2nd century A.D.,[216] among them also the East Gymnasium.[217] 22 specimens were found on the Tetragonos Agora.[218] The earliest examples for this type according to G. A. Plattner can be found in the Church of Mary,[219] which was built into the south colonnade of the temple precinct for the Emperor Hadrian. The pillars and the capitals that rest on them are part of the few original remnants from the Hadrianic period.[220] The duration of usage for these capitals is testified from the Vedius "Kaisersaal" at least until the middle of the 2nd century. This period probably has to be extended until the third quarter of the 2nd century, if we take the East Gymnasium[221] and the so-called St. Luke's Grave[222] into consideration.

---

[210] On general considerations concerning workshops and pattern books s. Plattner 2004, 17–35, esp. 29–35.

[211] On the definition of types in general s. Adams – Adams 1991, esp. 29–95.

[212] On the building in general see Steskal – La Torre 2008.

[213] IvE 431. 438; M. Steskal, in: Steskal – La Torre 2008, esp. 92 note 672 with further references.

[214] Most recently: Burell 2006, 437–469.

[215] On the development of aedicular fa ades in Asia Minor s. Quatember, FiE (forthcoming). On the earlier examples s. Berns 2002, 159–174.

[216] Thür 1989, 96–97; Plattner 2002, 248; Plattner 2008, 276.

[217] Keil 1932, 29–30 fig. 14 (capitals from the propylon); Plattner 2008, 277; Leung in: Auinger (in preparation).

[218] Scherrer, in: Scherrer – Trinkl 2006, 50, says, that there is no proof for them being in their original context. On the contrary, Plattner 2008, 277, seems to support their belonging to the agora.

[219] Plattner 2008, 277 pl. 379, 2. See also Knoll 1932, 21–22 fig. 11–12.

[220] Karwiese 1989, 13 fig. 10: "Was nun die innere Gestaltung der dreischiffigen Stoa anlangt, die damit als *Basilika* zu bezeichnen ist, so zeigte sich, daß der große Marmorpilaster vor dem südlichen Ort der Ostapsis *in situ stehend* in den Kirchenbau einbezogen wurde". On Hadrian's imperial cult temple in general see Scherrer 1999, 137–144.

[221] See below chap. 5.2.2.2. Cf. also Plattner 2008, 277–278. 281–282.

[222] The so-called St. Luke's Grave in its original building phase was a monopteros fountain on a square surrounded by colonnades on four sides. It can be dated to the second half of the 2nd century A.D. The columns of the colonnade carried composite capitals with

The entablature of the Vedius "Kaisersaal" includes an architrave-frieze worked in one piece.[223] The fascias are not separated, and the crown shows the usual combination of bead-and-reel, egg-and-dart and cavetto with terminating band. The forms of the first two are identical to the ones known from the Bouleuterion. The cavetto is adorned with palmettes. The convex frieze is crowned by an egg-and-dart and a band. On the cornice, the dentils are followed by a bead-and-reel and an egg-and-dart. The front of the corona displays a running spiral motif. Above another bead-and-reel, the steep sima is decorated with alternating open and closed palmettes. Conspicuously the axes of the motifs do not correspond in most cases.

5.2.2.2 East Gymnasium

The addition of a *palaestra* and a "Kaisersaal" to a pre-existing bath complex in the so-called East Gymnasium has often been connected to T. Flavius Damianus and his wife Vedia Phaedrina.[224] J. Keil supplemented the preserved fragment as "Antonina or "Antoniniana" and thus the whole name as "Vedia Phaedrina Antonina".[225] More recently, reasonable doubts have been expressed concerning Keil's interpretation: as testified so far by other inscriptions, the name of Vedia Phaedrina never includes "Antonina" or "Antoniniana".[226] Currently a project on this structure is underway[227] and new results on the inscription and the benefactor are to be expected. Despite their similarity, the building ornamentation will therefore be excluded from this study.[228]

5.2.2.3 Monopteros along the Road to Magnesia

The Monument

The so-called Round Tomb on the road to Magnesia was excavated in 1929 (pl. 51, 2). J. Keil mentioned it briefly in the excavation report and illustrated his text with a tentative reconstruction by M. Theuer (pl. 53).[229] As an important parallel to a similar building in Pergamon, the Ephesian Monopteros was dealt with extensively in a study by W. Koenigs and W. Radt (pl. 53).[230] A full publication based on a stone-by-stone reconstruction is nonetheless still lacking. Despite this desideratum the structure serves as an important parallel for the Bouleuterion *scaenae frons*.

Even though the inscription is only partially preserved, the reconstruction of the names of Flavius Damianus and Vedia Phaedrina[231] has been widely accepted.[232] Koenigs and Radt proposed a date towards the end of the 2nd century A.D. for the structure, based solely on stylistic criteria without considering the epigraphic evidence.[233] The similarity of the building ornamentation with the Bouleuterion and the Vedius Gymnasium, in combination with genealogical considerations, makes a date in the third quarter of the 2nd century more likely.

---

rope molding of the type discussed here: Plattner 2008, 277. Cf. also Pülz 2010, esp. 72–74 on the capitals. His recent results could not be incorporated in this study. However, due to the poorly preserved building inscription, the context of the erection of the fountain remains too unclear to draw conclusions on the questions posed here.

223 On the entablature see Plattner 2008, 280–282.

224 Keil 1932, 31–32 note 3; Alzinger 1970, 1613–1615; more recently for example Yegül 1992, 423.

225 Keil 1932, 31–32 note 3 and fig. 15.

226 Dillon 1996, 272 note 39; Steskal 2003, 232–233; Burrell 2006, 448 note 45.

227 Conducted by the Austrian Archaeological Institute, financed by the Austrian Science Fund (P18605) under the direction of M. Aurenhammer together with J. Auinger and A. Leung.

228 On the building ornamentation see Plattner 2008, 277–278. 281–282.

229 Keil 1930b, 45–48; s. also Keil 1964, 144 fig. 82.

230 Koenigs – Radt 1979, 317–354, esp. 345–348.

231 IvE 2100.

232 H. Thür in: Scherrer 2000, 228; Berns 2003, 162 and note 296.

233 Koenigs – Radt 1979, 345–348; followed by Plattner 2002, 248 note 50.

Description and Discussion of the Ornamentation (pl. 52, 1)

The documentation from the excavation allows us to attribute capitals of the so-called Ephesos Type[234] to the Round Tomb (pls. 51, 2; 52, 1–2). As has been discussed above, the latest research has shed new light on the date of this group,[235] which now fits very well into the overall context of the building's architectural decoration into the third quarter of the 2nd century A.D.

The architrave is worked separately from the frieze (pl. 53). It possesses three fascias without separating moldings, crowned by an astragal, egg-and-dart and cavetto. The egg-and-dart is the only molding where the ornaments are worked out. It displays eggs with very broad casing and pointed, arrow-shaped darts. The succession of the three crowning moldings is not only identical to the Vedius "Kaisersaal", but also very common in Asia Minor since Hellenistic times.[236]

The frieze is convex, as in the Bouleuterion and the Vedius Gymnasium (pl. 51, 1). It does not carry an inscription – which is rendered on the orthostats of the base – but is decorated with an elaborate acanthus frieze. This difference among the buildings under discussion is certainly due to practical reasons. In an aedicular façade such as the Bouleuterion or the "Kaisersäle", the most suitable place for at least the main portion of the inscription is the frieze zone. At the same time an acanthus frieze is a time-consuming – and thus probably costly – item. Its presence in the Monopteros is certainly connected to the function and small size of the monument.

The Monopteros along the road to Magnesia is the only single-story structure discussed here and displays a console cornice in its entablature. Above the dentils is an egg-and dart molding. The bottom of the consoles is decorated with an acanthus leaf, while the vertical area in between them shows scrolls of varying patterns. An egg-and-dart molding frames the consoles. The corona is decorated with a running spiral motif. Separated by a bead-and-reel, the sima is adorned with an anthemion.

5.3 Similarities and Dissimilarities of the Vedii Structures

According to the premises discussed above,[237] individual moldings will be discussed first. An egg-and-dart molding is present in all known buildings commissioned by the Vedii. They all share an arrow-shaped central motif in between two eggs and the dominance of light and dark effects (pls. 51, 1; 52, 1; 78, 2). The arrows are not decorated and their sides touch the casing in the upper third.

The bead-and-reel in the Bouleuterion is not preserved well enough to verify its precise design. The examples from the Vedius Gymnasium and the Monopteros along the road to Magnesia show identical proportions. The surface of the individual elements is not plastically molded, but rather flat. In the cases where bead-and-reel and egg-and-dart are combined, their axes are not lined up.

The running spiral in the Vedius Gymnasium (pl. 51, 1) and on the Monopteros (pl. 52, 1) is clearly identical – though mirrored – in every detail. A *cyma reversa* is only seen at the Bouleuterion, while alternating open and closed palmettes on the architrave cavetto only occur in the Vedius Gymnasium (pl. 51, 1); thus, both lack comparative examples. The last single motif to be compared is the anthemion on the sima. Here a different model was clearly chosen. The Vedius Gymnasium shows alternating open and closed palmettes (pl. 51, 1). The Monopteros modifies this pattern with closed palmettes and open ones turned upside down (pl. 52, 1). Also single elements differ, for example the scrolls at the bottom of the closed palmettes are turned in different ways.

As evident in this analysis, individual moldings are identical in many cases. This fact can be connected to workshops, single workmen or perhaps pattern books; in any case, it confirms that they must have been produced in the same context.

In a next step the combination of patterns has to be considered. As can also be seen in table 1, the distribution of some features is so evenly spread that this strongly suggests the same context for their manufacture: Corinthian capitals of the same type are attested for the Bouleuterion (pls. 74; 83, 3; 84, 1–2) and the Monopteros (pls. 52, 1–2), while the Vedius Gymnasium in the lower story posesses Composite capitals with rope

[234] Plattner 2002, 247 f.; Plattner – Schmidt-Colinet 2005, 245; Plattner 2008, 276.
[235] See above chap. 5.1.2.
[236] See above chap. 5.2.2.1. See also Quatember 2007, 107 with further references.
[237] See above chap. 5.2.1.

molding (pl. 51, 1). According to the new evidence presented above, this does not contradict the interconnection of these structures. Corinthian capitals of the "Ephesos Type" occur during the 2nd half of the 2nd century A.D., while the beginnings of this group might be a little bit earlier, perhaps Hadrianic.[238] Composite capitals with rope molding[239] commence during the Hadrianic era, and continue well into the third quarter of the 2nd century A.D. A new date for the Corinthian capitals is proposed following L. Rembart´s interpretation of the stratigraphic evidence in the Serapeion. This shows that they might not be predecessors to the Composite capitals with rope molding, as has been suggested by Plattner.[240] On the contrary, their usage overlaps for a certain period of time. Their concurrency is further supported by the design of the acanthus leaves, which are – also according to Plattner[241] – more or less identical. Therefore, in my opinion, the two groups do not necessarily represent two types that can be distinguished chronologically, but functionally. Corinthian capitals might represent the more "traditional" type that was applied for a more dignified context, such as a grave monument or the city's Bouleuterion. For a public building of a more functional nature, like a bath-gymnasium complex, the more "modern" Composite capital type was chosen.

The entablature of the three buildings shows striking similarities on the one hand, and also differences on the other. The fascias without separating moldings are present in the Vedius Gymnasium (pl. 51, 1) and the Monopteros (pl. 52, 1; 53). In the Bouleuterion, on the contrary, a bead-and-reel and a Lesbian kymation serve as a partition (pl. 78, 1). The crown moldings of the architraves are identical, as in most of the instances dating to the Roman Imperial period in Asia Minor. Their degree of elaboration varies: the Monopteros only shows an egg-and-dart, the Bouleuterion at least an additional bead-and-reel, and the Vedius Gymnasium has palmettes on the cavetto. The frieze profile is convex in all the examples. On the Monopteros it is further decorated with an anthemion frieze. The crown molding combination of egg-and-dart and vertical band appears to be identical again. The cornice can only be compared at the Vedius Gymnasium and the Monopteros, since this course is not preserved in the Bouleuterion. Here we can detect the most striking difference between the two buildings: the Vedius Gymnasium displays a cornice with simple dentils, whereas the one-storied Monopteros is adorned with consoles. Both the consoles and the coffers in between are richly decorated. Despite this divergence, the running spiral on the corona results in a very similar overall impression for the pieces. On the sima, the succession of bead-and-reel and anthemion are identical, while the single palmettes are rendered differently.

	Vedius Gymnasium	**Bouleuterion**	**Monopteros**
Crown molding of pedestal			
Cavetto, astragal, ovolo, cavetto, *taenia*	×	×	×
Capitals			
Corinthian Capitals ("Ephesos Type")		×	×
Capitals with rope/cable molding	×		
Architrave-Frieze	×	×	(two pieces)
Three fascias, no separating molding	×	× (upper story)	×
Crown molding of architrave: astragal, egg-and-dart, cavetto, *taenia*	×	×(?)	×
Convex frieze profile	×	×	×
Crown molding of frieze: egg-and-dart and *taenia*	×	×	×?
Cornice			
Cornice with dentil	×	?	
Cornice with consoles		?	×
Running spiral on corona	×		×
Sima: astragal and palmette frieze	×		×

Table 1: Distribution of features in the buildings commissioned by the Vedii

238 See above chap. 5.1.2.
239 See above chap. 5.2.2.1.
240 Plattner 2002, 248; Plattner 2008, 276.
241 Plattner 2002, 248; Plattner 2008, 276.

This distribution of pattern is almost too regular to be coincidental; in addition to the same context for their manufacture, I therefore suggest that it was intended by the employer or principal.[242] All the structures that were – according to their inscriptions – commissioned by the Vedii, display the same characteristics.[243] Yet, it is difficult to verify this hypothesis due to the lack of contemporary buildings that are proved *not* to be commissioned by the Vedii. Nevertheless, this well-defined group of structures sheds new light on the relationship between donor and donation. It might have been part of the building concept of the Vedii to create a certain pattern in the decoration that could visually connect buildings of different layout and purpose – a Bouleuterion as a civic institution, a bath-gymnasium-complex as a recreational, but also semi-public institution, and a family tomb monument. These patterns would have been recognized by the viewer. Stated differently, one might say that the Vedii used the architectural decoration to establish a visual trademark for the outsider. Further research will clarify if this was a common practice among Roman benefactors. A potential explanation model might be the personal connection between the Vedii and Emperor Antoninus Pius. Specialized workshops of the Roman emperor have been identified for the period from Domitian to Hadrian and for the Severans.[244] On a smaller scale, the Vedii might have tried to copy this model for their own building activities.

(U. Quatember)

[242] Similar thoughts concerning the capitals were also expressed by L. Bier, cf. Scherrer 2005, 135 note 55.

[243] The East Gymnasium, as far as can be said at present, will show no exception to this rule. Even though the particulars are not known, the sculpture found in the "Kaisersaal" points towards the Vedii, as does – according to my theory – the architectural decoration. On the evidence from the sculpture, see Dillon 1996, 261–274.

[244] Freyberger 1991, esp. 133–135.