

4. THE SCAENAE FRONS OF P. VEDIUS ANTONINUS

The changes wrought by P. Vadius in what was at earliest a Domitianic, and at latest a Trajanic building,¹³² involved an augmentation of the seating capacity by vaulting the *parodoi* to carry the upper *cavea* to the *scaenae* wall, and the addition of a *pulpitum* (plan 7; pl. 30, 3). But more central to his building program was the provision of a modern columnar façade with projecting *aediculae* suitable for the prominent display of statuary that was to present the reigning emperor and members of the imperial family, past and present, as guarantors of his civic status (plan 6). There is good reason to believe that the ensemble included images of the patron and his wife in accordance with contemporary practice, although they are unlikely to have occupied the *scaenae frons* itself.¹³³ Several letters from Antoninus Pius to the Ephesians praising Vadius for his efforts on behalf of the city were to be given monumental expression, however, by being inscribed on the thin marble slabs of the revetment along with two Hadrianic letters recopied from the original wall surface.¹³⁴

Before attempting a reconstruction of the *scaenae frons* it might be useful to reiterate briefly the importance of the entablature fragments mentioned in the introduction, as they not only recount the circumstances of the Antonine renovation but provide vital information about the architectural ornament, the proportional system used and ultimately about the design of the *scaenae frons* as a whole.

Central to both the architectural and epigraphic record is the block discovered in many pieces by R. Heberdey in 1908 and published in 1912 that bore the foundation inscription naming Papiane and (certainly) her husband Vadius Antoninus as donors (pls. 47, 1; 48, 1; 61).¹³⁵ A second block found in the debris bore a fragmentary inscription of formulaic content mentioning Artemis¹³⁶ (pls. 47, 2; 60). Both inscriptions were transcribed in the report but neither illustrated, although Heberdey did remark that they came from two different stories of a “Sockelarchitektur” and that the first was an architrave-frieze wall block, the second part of a freestanding architrave block that had been carved separately from its frieze.¹³⁷

Of much greater interest for our present purpose is J. Keil’s “Skizzenbuch” for 1908 in which appears, along with the fragments of the Papiane inscription drawn to scale, a dimension drawing of the restored block¹³⁸ (pl. 48, 1). Another drawing (pl. 47, 2) with the pieces of the second inscription includes one fragment of the architrave block preserving both top and bottom surfaces for which the height is given. In comparing the heights of both blocks it is clear that they were elements of the first and second story. The notebook also illustrated a third series of fragments found in the Bouleuterion belonging to the first story architrave which bore an inscription on its upper fascia¹³⁹ (pl. 48, 2).

Meanwhile, a recent search of the inscription depot beneath the Domitian terrace at Ephesos has turned up many (though not all) of the fragments recorded by Keil.¹⁴⁰ Matching these were additional pieces brought to light in the 1960’s during excavations in the Basilica Stoa which, judging from their size, style and technique of carving, belonged to each of the three groups. Taken together, this material provides a basis for reconstructing both the architecture of the *scaenae frons* and the inscribed texts it carried (pls. 60; 61).¹⁴¹

It is interesting to note that the only architectural elements to have survived and/or to have been recorded are those bearing inscriptions. It is to Keil’s credit that he viewed inscriptions as being integral with the build-

¹³² See below chap. 7.4.

¹³³ See below chap. 9.

¹³⁴ See below chap. 8.

¹³⁵ IvE 40; see below chap. 8.1.2. The text was published for the first time by HEBERDEY 1912, 172–173.

¹³⁶ IvE 460. In the “Skizzenbücher” the piece was recorded by J. KEIL (Skizzenbuch 1686 fragment D), including a drawing with the architectural decoration to scale.

¹³⁷ HEBERDEY 1912, 172 f.

¹³⁸ Skizzenbuch no. 1685 recto.

¹³⁹ IvE 477; Skizzenbuch no. 1687. 2403.

¹⁴⁰ This search was greatly facilitated by ENGELMANN 1993, 279–288. For a list of all the fragments see appendix 1.

¹⁴¹ See below chap. 8 and appendix 1.

ing on which they appeared, and drew all ten fragments of the Papiane wall block although only five bore letters. The cornices, in any case, and other elements such as the pediments which must have surmounted the second story *aediculae* were most likely uninscribed and were discarded.

4.1 The Pedestals

As described in the previous chapter, the Antonine renovation of the *scaenae frons* began with truncating the four central pillars which projected onto the stage, then broadening them to form pedestals (plan 4), each wide enough to accommodate a pair of columns with a statue in between. At the same time narrow pedestals of the same height were built at the sides flanking the lateral stage doors to carry single columns. The pillars they abutted retained their original form, but the tall pedestals which they carried were partially dismantled and used to support the south ends of arches spanning the *parodoi* (plan 5; 7).

The crown course of all six pedestals was 0.17 m thick and molded on the front and sides (pls. 36, 2–3; 37). The broader pedestals supported doubled slabs joined by pairs of clamps while the smaller corner pedestals carried single slabs. The second broad pedestal has preserved only a small portion of its stylobate which seems to be *in situ* but that of the third is missing entirely. All stylobates were clamped to shelves cut in the rear wall, the two corner ones to their abutting piers as well. These stylobate blocks were joined to tall base moldings by sheets of revetment 0.88 m high, fixed at top and bottom and to the surfaces they faced by iron pins, and the space behind filled in with pink hydraulic mortar. The revetment has not survived although its thickness (ca. 0.03 m) and (in some places) its precise position can be determined by examining the tops of the base moldings where they are preserved *in situ* as well as plaster lines where they joined the rear wall. The reconstructed width of the two central pedestals including their revetment is 2.52–2.54 m, that of the flanking broad pedestals 2.40–2.46 m, while the small corner pedestals were each 0.90 m wide (pls. 38, 1–2). The depth of the stylobate surfaces is more difficult to come by as there are no clues for the precise position of the wall revetment, a problem that will be dealt with later.

4.2 General Remarks on the Elevation of the Scaenae Frons (plan 6)

The number and relative size of the pedestals offer two common possibilities for the organization of a multi-storied Roman *scaenae frons* in addition to a number of variations. In the simplest, the single lateral columns in both stories carry ressauts – short sections of architrave projecting at right angles to the wall – that support corresponding projections of the cornice. The paired columns are connected by sections of entablature in both stories that turn back to join with the ends of the entablature wall blocks above the doorways. The pediments capping the upper story are above the pedestals. A well-known variation also has lateral ressauts but only in the first story. The projecting spaces in the second story are staggered so that the pediments are aligned with the doorways. To prove one or the other, it is necessary to have a complete block from the upper entablature that ran parallel to the stage wall as this can be matched with the spaces defined by the positions of the columns. In the second scheme, for example, a wall block would be somewhat wider than a free-standing one. Since none of the entablature blocks from the upper story of the Bouleuterion preserve their entire width, we cannot be certain which of these schemes the *scaenae frons* followed. The second model is chosen here simply because it fits what appears to have been the taste of the time; the last multistoried columnar façades at Ephesos to follow the first scheme were the Nymphaeum built by C. Laecanius Bassus in 79/80 A.D. (pl. 49, 1)¹⁴² and the so-called Street Fountain (pl. 49, 2).¹⁴³ This system was given up thereafter for the second scheme best known from the Celsus Library (pl. 50, 1) erected during the late reign of emperor Trajan.¹⁴⁴ Likewise, the Celsus Library utilized a well-known system of alternating segmental and triangular pediments to terminate the façade.¹⁴⁵ Since

¹⁴² FOSSEL – LANGMANN 1972–75, 301–310; JUNG 2006, 79–86.

¹⁴³ QUATEMBER 2008c, 219–264, esp. 244 fig. 38; for a summary cf. QUATEMBER 2008a and QUATEMBER 2008b.

¹⁴⁴ STROCKA 1978, 893 – 899.

¹⁴⁵ On the building in general s. WILBERG 1943; HUEBER 1985, 175 –200. For a summary s. HUEBER 1997, 77–83. Also the so-called Nymphaeum Traiani on the Curetes Street uses alternating round and triangular pediments, see QUATEMBER, FiE (forthcoming). For a compilation of earlier façades of this kind in Asia Minor see BERNIS 2002, 159–174.

we have nothing to suggest any of the possible variants on this scheme such as a broken pediment or triangular pediment incorporating an arch or vault, the simpler solution is adopted here.

4.3 Column Bases

Approximate positions for the column bases of the lower story can be determined by the location of pryholes cut for shifting them into place and by pairs of dowel holes used for securing the bases to the stylobates. There are no setting lines however, or significant changes in tooling in the upper surfaces to indicate their precise locations, which would remain unknown but for a pair of shallow holes made with a pointed tool in the eastern half of the crown course over the first broad pedestal (ped. 5; pls. 36, 3; 37; plan 4). These are spaced 0.83 m apart, and, as one of the pair is located on the axis of the pryholes, we can assume that their purpose was to help in positioning a base whose plinth was 0.83 m wide. A fragmentary column base (cat. 1.1; pl. 72) for which this width can be restored lay shifted slightly to the west at the beginning of this project. A pair of dowel holes in the underside on one of the main axis is spaced 0.455 m apart and corresponds precisely with the dowel holes in the stylobate.

The base belongs to a class that is rather unusual in the eastern half of the Roman Empire¹⁴⁶: Above a quadratic plinth is a convex *torus* followed by a concave *scotia* between fillets, a projecting astragal, a second *scotia* between fillets, and a badly preserved but easily restorable upper *torus*. The total height was 0.31 m and the bedding surface ca. 0.62 m. The bottom surface contains, in addition to the dowel holes, a small compass hole from which short masons' lines extend out on two sides to mark the main axes. Concentric with the compass hole are two roughly chiseled circles with radii of 0.369 m and 0.385 m. In the top of the base is a lewis hole that became a dowel hole in the construction phase when it was provided with a narrow pour channel. Workmanship is of high quality. Top and bottom surfaces were finished with fine point and toothed chisel. The sides were worked smooth with crisply cut profiles. Both *scotiae* dip slightly below the tops of their lower fillets to form shallow annular channels.

The small positioning holes in the crown course of the first broad pedestal are also important for the information they provide about the precise location of the other bases and thus of the columns they supported, at least along the east-west axis (plan 4). The easternmost hole is vertically aligned with the bearing surface of the base molding below and we can safely assume that this was also the case with the other bases whose original positions on their respective pedestals are given approximately by the dowel holes cut to secure them and more accurately by the pedestal base moldings, most of which are *in situ*. This arrangement must have been followed in positioning the bases on the north-south axis as well.

4.4 Column Shafts

Identification of the shafts that went with these bases is more difficult, depending as it does largely on the circumstantial evidence of size and present location. J. T. Wood reported finding column shafts made of "Egyptian syenite", the red granite quarried at Aswan, which he assumed "had fallen from the circular colonnade above."¹⁴⁷ A few small pieces of these shafts can still be seen in the *diazoma* near the east *vomitorium* (pl. 12, 1) while a series of longer lengths have been collected together in recent times in the "Staatsmarkt" near the southeast corner of the temple excavations and in the Basilica Stoa directly south of the Prytaneion (pls. 73, 1–2).

The fragments (cat. 2-1–2-10 in appendix 1), about two dozen in all, include the tops and bottoms of column shafts that seem to belong to a two-storied façade. Moldings consist of a flare that is too irregular in profile to be called a *torus*, and a fillet which sometimes tapers outwards from the bottom. The flares at the base of the larger shafts measure about 0.62 m in diameter and the lower shaft diameter is ca 0.60 m. This fits well with the Bouleuterion column base. Included among the fragments are some in gray limestone which share the same dimensions, technique and style, indicating a polychrome arrangement. The original shaft height cannot be given for either the first or second story.

¹⁴⁶ See below chap. 5.1.1.

¹⁴⁷ WOOD 1877, 51.

4.5 Capitals of the Lower Order

Neither J. T. Wood nor subsequent excavators reported finding capitals in the debris of the Bouleuterion, and attribution must again depend on factors like proximity of find-spot, appropriateness of scale and size, as well as approximate date of production. The upper bed surfaces of the larger column shafts described above measure between 0.52 and 0.54 m in diameter which fits well with a capital (cat. 3-1; pl. 74, 1–3) discovered in 1961 during excavations in the Basilica and displayed since then in the Basilica Stoa.¹⁴⁸ The capital, of which only two sides are reasonably well preserved, is 0.67 m high and has a lower diameter of 0.52 m which fits the top of the column shafts very well.¹⁴⁹

4.6 The Architrave-Frieze Course of the Lower Story

The fragments of an architrave-frieze wall block bearing a portion of the foundation inscription in letters 0.12 m high were recorded by J. Keil in his “Skizzenbuch” (pls. 47, 1; 48, 1)¹⁵⁰ for the 1908 campaign carefully drawn to a scale of 1 : 10 (cat. 4-6, 4-9, 4-10). They were found according to his notation scattered in the orchestra, in the entrance to the left of the central door in the debris on the floor, and on a wall of the western *parodos*. A reconstruction drawing gives the major dimensions (pl. 48, 1). The complete block was 2.55 m wide and 0.835 m high. The sides were chamfered to join the ends of the projecting blocks of the adjacent *aediculae* so that the actual length of frieze available for the inscription measured 2.09 m. Keil’s rounding off of the height to half a centimeter inspires confidence in his measurements, and this is fortunate as the present location of these fragments is unknown, if indeed they have survived. They allow us to place the block above the fourth stage door (SD 3) where the interval at the level of the frieze would have been about 2.10 m, judging from the positions of the column bases. Furthermore, as he took the trouble to record all the fragments, including those which did not bear letters, we have the full sequence of decorative elements. The crown of the convex frieze was an egg-and-dart molding surmounted by a fillet. Crowning the architrave was a cluster of three contiguous moldings comprising (from the top down) palmettes, egg-and-dart, and bead-and-reel. The three fascias of the architrave were separated by a leaf-and-dart cymation and a bead-and-reel respectively.

J. Keil also recorded a second series of inscribed fragments (pl. 48, 2) which certainly belonged to this course. The letters, measuring 6.5 cm high, were cut in the upper fascia between the bead-and-reel and leaf-and-dart moldings. The inscription must have been brief as it did not extend as far as the Papiane block, and assuming symmetrical spacing, could only have occupied the two central *aediculae* and the wall in between.¹⁵¹

The search of the Domitian Depot in 2001 and 2002 has produced some additional fragments of the dedicatory inscription (pl. 61), including one bearing ETA to fill a gap in J. Keil’s drawing, and nine fragments of the architrave inscription.¹⁵² All seem to have come to light between 1964 and 1966 during clearing of the Basilica Stoa.

The lower surfaces of this course are gone along with any soffit decoration they may have carried. Nor do any of our fragments preserve traces of the shelves which typically supported coffer blocks although, like the soffits, these must have existed. Finally, as mentioned above, the method used to join free-standing blocks with wall blocks is known from Keil’s drawing and its accompanying notation which indicate a simple chamfered join reinforced with clamps.

¹⁴⁸ The top surface of the abacus bears faintly scratched excavation number P61-59. According to the excavation diary it was found in the southern aisle of the Basilica.

¹⁴⁹ It is highly probable that parts of the *scaenae frons* fell southwards in the direction of the Basilica Stoa. Thus it seems likely that the capital found there by W. Alzinger was once part of the Bouleuterion. Recently, G. A. PLATTNER and A. SCHMIDT-COLINET have assigned the capital to the Basilica Stoa, cf. PLATTNER – SCHMIDT-COLINET 2005, 245 fig. 3. However, the fact that there are two different sizes of the same capital type rather indicates that they more probably come from the Bouleuterion than from a secondary repair in the Basilica Stoa. For a full discussion of the capitals see below chap. 5.1.2.

¹⁵⁰ Skizzenbuch 1685 recto and verso.

¹⁵¹ See below chap. 8.

¹⁵² See below chap. 8 and esp. appendix 1.

4.7 The Cornice of the First Story and the Height of the Order

That no blocks of the cornice can be identified today suggests that they were anepigraphic and were therefore discarded, left to their fate on discovery, rather than being set aside or at least recorded. The height of the column shafts and cornice height,¹⁵³ however, can be reconstructed with confidence on analogy with roughly contemporary monuments in Ephesos, such as the Celsus Library¹⁵⁴ and Hadrian's Gate¹⁵⁵. Both monuments also possess fully preserved columns.¹⁵⁶ On this basis we can restore shafts of 4.75 m and a cornice of 0.40 m.

The proportional relationships between the shaft and the complete column in the Corinthian order also coincides with the results of M. Wilson Jones.¹⁵⁷

4.8 The Upper Order

A hypothetical reconstruction of the upper story is more problematic as fewer elements can be confidently identified or even put forth as possible candidates. Neither the column bases nor their stylobate platforms have left identifiable traces while the frieze, carved separately from its architrave, has not survived. Thus, the proportions of the second story are reconstructed by analogy with roughly contemporary buildings¹⁵⁸ and the dimensions for our second order can only be approximate.

The capitals of the upper story (cat. 9-1. 9-2; pls. 83, 3; 84, 1-2) are displayed today in the Basilica Stoa. They are 0.58 m high, are identical in design and technique to the large capital assigned here to the first story and must belong to the upper order.

The entablature is represented only by its architrave of which J. Keil recorded six fragments (pl. 47, 2); our search of the depot has yielded eight more.¹⁵⁹ The group again provides valuable information of both a technical and epigraphic nature. The blocks, 0.40 m high, had three fascias increasing in size from the bottom in the normal manner and without intermediate moldings. They were crowned by a triple molding of which only the lower element, a bead-and-reel, is preserved in cat. 10-6 and 10-8 (pls. 87, 1; 89, 1). Above this were probably an egg and dart and an anthemion. In order to provide a surface for the inscription whose letters were 0.12 m high, the upper fascia was chiseled off, an operation which has left clear traces in the surface tooling. A single corner fragment, cat. 10-4 (pl. 86, 1), preserves its upper fascia on one side suggesting that the inscription may only have occupied the surfaces facing the *cavea*.

Adjoining blocks were joined in the same manner as those in the lower order. The chamfered surface was worked smooth with a fine toothed chisel and displays no *anathyrosis*. As only the bottom surface is preserved we have no clamp holes.

The method of lifting can be seen in cat. 10-6 (pl. 87, 1) which retains portions of a lewis hole. This device is seen only in the pedestals' stylobate slabs and does not appear to have been used in the building's original phase.

Small portions of soffit panels bearing acanthus ornament appear in cat. 10-7, 10-9 and obviously also 10-10 (pls. 87, 2; 88, 1-2; 89, 2). Fragment 10-7 contains a poorly preserved acanthus bush indicating that it belonged to the center of a free-standing block, a significant clue for the reconstruction of the inscription. Fragment 10-9 (pl. 89, 2) contains part of a scroll pattern or rinceaux (which grow from such bushes), containing a rosette enclosed within a main stem emerging from a bract with plain (unfluted) *cauliculus* and a backward-bending secondary stem. Block 10-9 also displays on its back side a roughly worked vertical surface which curves at the bottom to form a shelf for the support of a coffer.

¹⁵³ In the original manuscript, L. Bier used a nymphaeum excavated alongside the road to the Magnesian Gate as an analogy for comparative measurements of the height. Since latest research has established a divergent reconstruction, more reliable examples have been used for a reconstruction. For a new reconstruction of the so-called Street Fountain cf. QUATEMBER 2008c, 219-264.

¹⁵⁴ On the monument see WILBERG 1943; HUEBER 1985; HUEBER 1997, 77-83.

¹⁵⁵ On the building in general see THÜR 1989.

¹⁵⁶ See below the table in appendix 2.

¹⁵⁷ WILSON JONES 2000, passim, esp. 147-148.

¹⁵⁸ See below appendix 2.

¹⁵⁹ See below appendix 1.

The awkward expedient of removing the upper fascia of the architrave to provide space for the inscription must have been due to a reluctance to alter an existing frieze which most likely bore acanthus decoration. Ironically, this might have assured the preservation of some of the fragments.

(L. Bier)

4.9 The Fallen Arches and the Question of Windows

In 1908, W. Wilberg documented in three sketches a series of voussoirs as they had fallen and presented reconstructions (pls. 10, 1–2; 11, 1). As find-spot, he indicated “In Falllage vor der Mauer links (westl.) der Mittelthür” (“As it had fallen in front of the wall to the left, i.e. west of the central door”; pl. 10, 1). Five blocks of an arch (A) are documented in this sketch: the length of the chord of the intrados of four of these blocks measures 40 cm, the chord of the left springstone measures 27 + 10 cm. Both the left and the right springstone are broken. The voussoirs rested on a spring course of white marble and of 23 cm height. The arch abutted on spandrels and big square stones of various height (H. on the left side: 62 cm, on the right side 49 cm, 24.5 cm, 45 cm respectively). Below the spring course, a square block of 64 cm height and a smaller one of 23 cm height as well as a block of 90 cm height are documented. In the left margin of the sketch, Wilberg noted: “mit Ausnahme der einen Schicht aus w.[eisse]m M.[armor] sind alle Quadern aus blauem Kalkstein mit rauer Oberfläche” (“with the exception of one course of white marble, all the square blocks are made of blue limestone with a rough surface”). On the sketch, four blocks of the right side and two blocks of the left side are recorded as “glatt” or “gl.” (“smooth”). Above the list of measurements, left of the sketch, Wilberg noted: “Quaderhöhen der Mauer links der Mittelthür, nach der Falllage” (“height of the blocks left of the central door, as they had fallen”). The list of measurements, starting from the bottom: 65 – 21 – 30 – 33 – 23 (“weißer Marmor” = “white marble”) – 30 – 58.

In another drawing (pl. 10, 2), Wilberg presents the reconstruction of an arch (B) with a span of 1.20 m, consisting of five arch blocks whose chord length is 37 cm, 37 cm, 37 cm, 36 cm and 38 cm, respectively. On the right side, the arch rests on a profiled impost capital which is reworked according to Wilberg (“abgearbeitet”). On the right side of the arch there are two spandrel blocks (H. 67.5 cm and 22.5 cm). A recess is cut into the big lower spandrel (H. 27 cm. w. 32 cm), a thin inset is noted in the upper right corner. On the right side, the 23.5 cm high spring course consists of three blocks: the block with the impost capital (H. 56 cm), a block of 69 cm length and a block of 1.075 m length featuring a projecting pilaster or pillar (W. 42 cm, projecting 3 cm). The interval between this pillar and the jamb is 1.59 m. The height of this jamb is indicated as 1.515 m, but noted as “nach anderem Stück gemessen” (“the measurement is based on another piece”). The spandrels of the left side are preserved, too: a big block (H. 67.5 cm) rests on a broken block of the string course; this big block features a recess (H. 25 cm. w. 34 cm. d. 13 cm). Wilberg called this recess “Loch zum Einsatz einer Konsole” (“hole for the insertion of a console”). The bottom edge of this hole continues in a cutting towards the left. Resting on this big block, a spandrel block (H. 22.5 cm. l. 40 cm) and two other blocks (L. 64 cm and 43 cm) are preserved. A stone course of 45 cm height follows on top. A long keystone served as a relieving device above the arch. On the right side, two blocks of 56 cm and 47 cm length follow; the relevant blocks on the left side measure 52 cm. Above the holes for consoles dowel holes are cut into the blocks. Regarding the dowel hole on the left, Wilberg noted: “Eisenstange 205 lang, 3 cm breit, 2 cm dick” (“iron rod, l. 205, w. 3 cm, d. 2 cm”).

In a third sketch (pl. 11, 1), Wilberg presented a wall of square blocks featuring two arches. The left arch corresponds to arch B in pl. 10, 2, compare the big wedge-shaped keystone above the arch (l. 1.62 m), the hole for the console and the 43 cm wide pillar or pilaster on the right. As to the arch on the right, Wilberg only noted: “5 Bogenst[eine]”, i.e. “5 voussoirs”. He noted measurements of another long keystone (bottom l. 1.40 m, upper l. 1.51 m) and described it as “keilförmig, saß über dem Mittelbogen” (“wedge-shaped, rested above the middle arch”). A course of 24 cm height is preserved on the right side by a block of 72 cm length and on the left side by a block of 1.13 m length which is joined to a block of 65 cm length. On top, four blocks of a 45 cm high course are added to the wall. Based on the sketch alone, it is unclear whether the sequence of blocks between the left and the right arch is actually certain (the interval between the jambs is ca. 3.80 m). As the spandrels and square blocks adjoining the right arch are not identical with the relevant blocks of arch A (pl. 10, 1), the remains of a third arch (C) were obviously documented in the sketch’s right arch. Therefore, Wilberg obviously discovered and documented the blocks of three arches and the adjoining wall parts.

He noted the find-spot for arch A only, “west of the central door”. In the left lower corner of pl. 11, 1, a brick block is documented as “Ziegelmauerwerk, wahrsch.[einlich] spätere Füllung eines Fensters(?)”, i.e. “brickwork, probably secondary filling of a window (?)”. The block dimensions are 1.05 m height, 65 cm width and 1.00 m depth. In a sketch in the lower part of pl. 11, 1, its find-spot is indicated as “lag in der Halle vor dem Odeion zwischen der vorletzten und letzten Tür im Osten” (“found in the hall in front of the Odeion, between the two easternmost doors”), i.e. doors BD 4 and BD 5. According to its shape, the brick filling could belong to one of the arch openings. As the filling featured “dünner weißer Putz auf einer Unterlage von Sand und Kalk” (“thin white plaster on a bed of sand and limestone”) on its whole vertical side, only half of the opening was walled up, or a small slot was left open in a wide opening (as proposed by Wilberg’s small sketch above the location sketch in pl. 11,1).

In Wilberg’s drawings, the measurements of the depths of the arch blocks are missing. The material of the wall blocks is characterised by Wilberg as roughly worked limestone, i.e. the local bluish gray marble from Panayırdağ. Only for one course, the string course, white marble is recorded. In pl. 11, 1, Wilberg describes a huge block on top of the 45 cm high lintel as “großer bl.[auer] Kalkst.[ein]/ durchlaufende Schicht über dem Bogen” (“big blue limestone/ through course above the arch”), i.e. a course of binders.

The two long keystones above arches B and C, and the spandrel blocks show that the archways belonged to the original remains of a wall and were not inserted secondarily. The location where they had fallen confirms that these openings were *in situ* in the latest phase of the structure. In this phase, one of the openings could have been partially blocked by brickwork. According to their find-spot, the three arches could have belonged to the north wall of the Basilica Stoa; in this case, they were oriented towards north, i.e. towards the small corridor between Basilica and the back of the scene wall. A second possibility is the south wall of the Bouleuterion, i.e. the back of the scene wall. In this case, they were oriented towards the interior of the Bouleuterion.

E. Fossel’s¹⁶⁰ reconstruction of the Basilica Stoa does not include arched windows. Theoretically, archways or arched windows could have been inserted above the remains of the north wall. As these openings were oriented towards the 1.60–2.00 m wide corridor, an only roughly worked interspace, and the high scene wall, these openings could not have served as a source of light. As the Basilica Stoa was lighted and ventilated by openings in the upper story of the central aisle, windows in the north wall would make no sense.

The material of the wall with the arches is the local bluish gray marble of Panayırdağ (“blue limestone”) which corresponds to the material of the Bouleuterion’s scene wall, but not to the material of the Basilica Stoa’s north wall.¹⁶¹ The thickness of the scene wall (0.98 m) corresponds to the depth of a part of the arch blocks (96–100 cm), too. The uneven, only roughly worked south face of the scene wall also matches this evidence.

Before the analysis of the blocks as part of the scene wall, the blocks themselves have to be discussed. In spring 2009, 17 voussoirs plus several fragments were located in the northern aisle of the Basilica Stoa. 10 blocks are located east of the central door of the Basilica Stoa’s north wall, obviously near the find-spot documented by Wilberg. 7 blocks are lying west of this door. The depth of these voussoirs varies. On all these blocks, only the front of the arch is worked as the visible face and furnished with fascias and a crown molding. Due to the measurements of the depth, the blocks can be divided into two groups. The jambs of the longer blocks measures 94–100 cm. The back of these blocks is roughly worked and cannot have been visible. The jamb is worked as a visible face, only a small strip at the rear edge is worked less carefully and probably served as a support. The exposed, visible part of the jambs measured approximately 88 cm. The face of the arch is divided into two fascias (w. of the inner fascia 5 cm, of the outer 8 cm), a concave molding and a fillet. The fascias are worked very carefully with a seam. This group consists of 10 blocks; one of them features two dowels in the lateral joint.

The depth of the second group of voussoirs is only 64–66 cm, measured at the jamb. Several of the blocks are broken. The back of these blocks is roughly worked, like the blocks of the first group. Their visible face differs, it features also two fascias, but the crown molding is rendered more simply with an oblique and a straight fillet, and the seams on the fascias are lacking. There is no trace of a support at the rear edge of the jamb of these blocks. The voussoirs are worked of white marble. Contrary to the voussoirs, the wall blocks of

¹⁶⁰ FOSSEL 1982, 16 pl. 3.

¹⁶¹ The orthostates of this wall consist of carefully worked marble blocks whereas the upper part of the wall is made of quarry stones. It is unclear, though, whether this represents the original condition.

local gray Panayırdağ-marble are not located in their original find-spot any more. For their analysis, we have to rely only on Wilberg's notes.

Before the determination of the original position of the arch blocks we have to analyse the scene wall. As previously stated, the voussoirs belong to the original structure, i.e. to phase 1 of the building – unless the reconstruction in Phase 2 was so radical as to include the replacement of the roof and parts of the scene wall.¹⁶² As the first story of the north face of the scene wall in Phase 1 was built of marble blocks and the upper story featured marble veneer, the arches can only belong to the upper part of the wall. A position of the arches above the doors can be ruled out, as there are no doors with matching intervals of 1.20 m inside width in the Bouleuterion. Due to the traces of workmanship and of supports on the voussoirs, an exposed area of approximately 88 cm can be observed. The remaining area of 10 cm rested on a filling. The measurement of about 10 cm would fit well for a marble window-frame. Therefore, two of the arches, i.e. those measuring 96–100 cm (depth of the blocks), probably belonged to window openings. The blocks of the third arch with a depth of 64–66 cm, on the other hand, probably joined into a wall construction of 98 cm depth as upper part of a vaulted niche. In this niche, a statue could have been set up. According to the find-spot and the way the arch (A) had fallen, such a niche could originally have been positioned above the small door SD3 in the upper story, in the bay west of the central *aedicula*.

The two archways which had an approximate interval of 3.80 m, on the other hand, probably belonged to windows which were built into the back wall, in the upper story east of the façade. Their position is confirmed by the find-spot of the brick block. These windows lit the upper *cavea* and especially the seating above the *parodoi*. Half of one of the windows was obviously walled up secondarily by brickwork.

The interpretations of these archways proposed here are only hypothetical as it is not certain whether the blocks preserved today actually correspond to the blocks documented in Wilberg's sketches.

(H. Thür)

¹⁶² See above chap. 3.3.