Pamphylian Architectural Decoration
in the Second Century AD:
Purely Derivative or an Independent Tradition?

Simon YOUNG*

I. Pamphylian Sarcophagi

Pamphylian sarcophagi from the second century AD are a valuable source of information for the study of architectural ornament and of the workshops that produced them. S. Cormack summarises conveniently the type of sarcophagi that one can expect from Asia Minor, "garlands supported by erotes and bull’s heads, the labours of Hercules, and seated philosopher figures attended by Muses" or other mythical figures such as the Dioscori. The lids of these sarcophagi often supported reclining figures, which were meant to represent the deceased. The labours of Hercules and the seated philosopher type refer to the statuettes on the sides of the sarcophagus and these make the most use of architectural "framing" decoration. The "Medusa" type is also important as is the use of theatrical masks to decorate the sarcophagi, and these also make use of architectural elements for their decoration.

The craftsmen who created these sarcophagi may have been working from copy books of motifs from the classical era, but used them in new scenic compositions or in J. Marçadé’s words "les mêmes mots reparaissent-ils dans des phrases d’intention différentes." Another possibility is that they were copying scenes from Attic sarcophagi.

* Simon Young, 79 Tait St., Renown Park, South Australia.

This paper is an adoption of my honours thesis presented to the University of Adelaide in 2001. I am grateful for the help I received from Dr. M. O’Hea who was my supervisor and Dr. A. Geddes for her excellent suggestions and support. I also wish to thank K. Dörtlük, the director of Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Institute of Mediterranean Civilizations for letting me use their library in the course of research in 2001 and 2002 and also T. Kaliya for all his help.

1 Cormack 1997, 147.
2 Marçadé 1987, 219.
II. Export of Pamphylian Sarcophagi

Some examples of "Torre Nova" sarcophagi convincingly identified as Lyco-Pamphylia appear in Rome, Athens and Naples. Turcan asks why they were exported. He doubts that it was for economic reasons. It is possible that Pamphylian sarcophagi were a comparatively cheaper high quality product. This is a view raised and doubted by R. Turcan. Another possible explanation, according to Turcan, is that Pamphylian sarcophagi had an iconography which was sought after by a romanised clientele, an argument he counters by suggesting that this clientele could have simply commissioned a local craftsman to create a sarcophagus according to their needs. That ex-patriot Lyco-Pamphylians wished their children's mortal remains to rest in stone from Pamphylia is an argument that appears unlikely when considering that for the same cost or less they could have their remains transported to their native province. Surely that was preferable to having them buried in their native stone but in an alien land.

It is possible that the workshops in Pamphylia had given the marble a characteristic and attractive style of architectural decoration and that was the reason that some Roman residents used them for the burial of their children. For what other reason would the situation exist where quality marble decorated in Pamphylia was exported somewhere further afield. There was a market for sarcophagi, and among the masters in this field at middle of the second century were the Greeks of Asia Minor both for the quality and content of the decoration on their stonework.

Around the same period building projects in Rome displayed characteristic eastern architectural decoration so it is reasonable to suggest that the same kind of decoration on sarcophagi also made them popular. This in turn suggests that there existed a certain workshop or workshops in Pamphylia which produced architectural decoration and had a certain quality that was particularly popular. These second century local workshops were also probably involved in the decoration of building projects in Pamphylia as well as these exported sarcophagi.

III. Three Stages of Sarcophagus Decoration

The questions Ward-Perkins raises about second century sarcophagi are worth noting and may be equally applied to the architectural decoration of this period. He observes that literature on sarcophagi is "curiously stereotyped" and considers sarcophagi only as documents for the history of Roman art or as social documents "indicative of the status and beliefs of the persons buried in them."
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2. Although Turcan specifies the Torre Nova type of Pamphylian sarcophagus, in his article he does not only speak of this type but of highly decorated Pamphylian sarcophagi in general; ibid., 688.
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In reference to the architectural or sculptural decoration on sarcophagi, he asks us to consider whether the piece in question is a "school" piece, that is: if it is commissioned by a particular client and so was unique, or whether it was within a group of standardised products manufactured in quantity for sale in the open market.

It is interesting to note that the face portrait on the lids of the sarcophagi with a reclining figure is unfinished. In other cases the head has been replaced, suggesting that the sarcophagi was reused. The quality of workmanship of the lid portraits when compared to the treatment of the portraits on the body of the sarcophagus often seems inferior. This suggests that standardised sarcophagi were produced with no client in mind, sold and then finished by other workmen who individualised them.

So, if we consider the question whether the sarcophagi were individual pieces or a group of standardised products, the answer is that they seem to have been both. They were standardised in the sense that they did not vary from the basic forms; individual because the faces of the reclining figures on the lids were meant to be portraits of those entombed within.

The process of decorating a sarcophagus could be divided into three stages. The first stage was the initial "roughing out" of the template of the sarcophagus, at the quarry. Then a skilled workman was needed to apply designs to the sides and lid of the sarcophagus leaving the face of the lid portrait unfinished. The most outstanding feature of this design was the architectural decoration. Finally a rough likeness of the deceased was carved onto the head after a client had chosen to use a specific sarcophagus.

IV. The Identification of Local Workshops

In attempting to identify a workshop a variety of methods have been used. Many of them, in my opinion, are poor. A visual attempt may be made to determine the provenance of the marble of the sarcophagi. This method is fraught with inaccuracies. One only has to look at the arguments over the type of marble used in the "Torre Nova" sarcophagus in the National Museum of Athens where opinion is divided over whether it is Parian or Pentelic marble.  

Another method is to examine primary sources for clues about the source of the marble. There is a tendency to attribute most marble used in Asia Minor to Proconnesian quarries due mostly to Vitruvius (2.8, 10) and Pliny (XXXVI, 47).

The most accurate method to date is isotopic analysis. Isotopic analysis has shown that Vitruvius should not be trusted as the results of testing on fragments from the Mausoleum of Halicarnassos point to use of marble from Afyon. If this is the case it would bring the quarry closer to Halicarnassos, but more expensive to transport there. If we accept that
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its marble was used extensively on the Mausoleum, Afyon had an active marble quarry from the fourth century BC. The marble had to be transported overland to reach any major shipping routes. Pamphylia via Sagalassos would be one of the possibilities.

In the British Museum the marble of three Attic second century sarcophagi formerly identified as Pentelic have also been attributed to Afyon by means of isotopic analysis. That workshops in Pamphylia worked in imported marble is testified at least in Side where at the entrance of the city there is one “roughed out” sarcophagus. The same template was used as far away as Beirut. The closest sources of high quality marble for the Pamphylia region are the Phrygian quarries located around Afyon. It is probable that Pamphylion workshops made some use of this material rather than that from the quarries in Marmara. It would be enlightening to perform an isotopic analysis on the roughed-out example in Side to test further whether or not this marble is from Afyon.

It seems clear that simply to determine the provenance of marble used in second century sarcophagi is not at all useful for locating the workshop that finished it. Ward-Perkins proposes that skilled craftsmen accompanied partially prefabricated or “roughed out” material from the quarry and completed the finer decorative work at the final destination. Later, these craftsmen established “permanent or temporary workshops” there. The presumption that quality marble was exported and traded and that craftsmen worked in imported marble is acceptable, and by no means new. The corollary of Ward-Perkin’s argument is that if you determine the provenance of marble you also determine where the skilled workmen came from who finally fashioned it or at least established the school and “style” in the place where the marble was finished off. Ward-Perkins’ idea of craftsmen travelling with marble from its point of origin i.e. Proconnesus, conveniently ties in with D. Strong’s idea of a “Pergamene School” which led the “architectural revolution” of the second century. The Marmara quarries are not far removed from Pergamon. Nonetheless, in the case of three Attic sarcophagi it has been demonstrated that the marble comes from Afyon, which to my knowledge has no claim to creative genius. In light of isotopic analysis it seems to be a perilous conclusion to link the provenance of material to the origins of the skills needed to complete the final product.

Using architectural ornament to attempt to discover the provenance of decorative styles on sarcophagi is probably the most reliable method. With building decoration we can safely assume that the work was executed reasonably close to the building site. The
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earliest example of a decorated sarcophagus in imported marble still in its context is
the one in the tomb chamber of the Library of Celsus in Ephesus which is dated by an
inscription to 117 AD\textsuperscript{20}.

V. Links between Sarcophagus and Architectural Decoration.

It is likely that sarcophagus production and architectural ornament were closely related.
In the literature on the subject, although is seems reasonable to suggest the existence of
workshops that produced both sarcophagi and architectural ornament, to my knowledge,
this has been alluded to but not argued or clearly articulated. For Ward-Perkins the arrival
of imported marble to Tripolitania in bulk around the middle of the second century also
signals the arrival of skilled craftsmen. Here, until the importation of quality marble began,
the buildings were characteristically provincial but after the importation they displayed
elements that were alien to the previous architectural repertoire. As second century
sarcophagi from other regions including Pamphylia are executed in imported marble he
argues that both sarcophagi and architectural ornament, are strongly linked\textsuperscript{21}. Cormack
also observes the link between sarcophagus workshops and contemporary architectural
ornament “the architecture of the Roman columnar sarcophagi seems rather to reflect the
façades of contemporary elaborate public buildings (such as nymphaea, propylaea and the
scenaec frons of theatres”. However as to the origins of the teachers of the craftsmen who
created these sarcophagus and elaborate public buildings her commentary is not clear
as she suggests that they were trained in either the East or West through some type of
“fruitful dialogue”\textsuperscript{22}.

It seems likely that local workshops worked on local buildings. In the first quarter of
the second century AD with increased stability and prosperity in the eastern Empire, marble
began to be traded in higher quantity and quality\textsuperscript{23}. With its arrival, skilled craftsmen estab-
ished workshops who “finished off” the marble for a variety of purposes, primarily the
finer details of buildings such as renovations of theatres, nymphaea and monumental gate-
ways but also sarcophagi. The workshops were always guaranteed steady work, as sar-
cophagi were always in demand. There existed at the same time a growing demand for
the local élite wishing to fulfill their municipitalia who would commission larger pro-
jects\textsuperscript{24}. Sarcophagi not only provided a regular sideline but would have also provided
excellent practice for apprentices and assistant craftsmen. If workshops like this did exist
then craftsmen would have had no need to be itinerant, but could have made a comfort-
able living in one place. It is likely that workshops in Pamphylia already enjoyed an active
architectural tradition which quickly adapted to and excelled in working the new materi-
al. It is very likely that the innovative use of iconography and architectural ornament flour-
ished in Pamphylia. It seems that Pamphylian sarcophagi, probably because of their archi-
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tectural decoration and iconography, began to be sought in other major centres such as Rome where there was a revival of interest in Greek culture. By the first quarter of the second century AD the workshops in Pamphylia had developed their own particular style of decoration on sarcophagi at least. It is likely that the product that was desirable even in Rome was purely the decoration. Hadrian’s building project in Rome where he probably employed Greek architects for the final decoration is also evidence of this revived interest in the Greek world.

VI. Extent of Derivation and Exportation of Style

Hadrianic Baroque, which transformed Asia Minor including Pamphylia near the beginning of Hadrian’s principate, was an architectural revolution. In a relatively short period monumental building projects executed in this distinctive style were initiated over most of the eastern Empire. These buildings included new or renovated nymphaea, theatres, bathing complexes and temples. What was distinctive about this architecture was its extensive use of imported marble and its inventive decoration in the baroque manner taken from or derived from the classical and Hellenistic Greek repertoire. In this section I shall argue that Pamphylian craftsmen not only participated in the revolution but were among those who initiated it.

One of the functions of this article is to ask what Pamphylia owed to other sources when decorating its sarcophagi and buildings. According to Cormack the view that Asia Minor was an “important creative center for sarcophagi which were often exported to Rome and elsewhere” is “traditional.” A flaw in the suggestion that the exporters i.e. the Asia Minor craftsmen were also the creators of the new style is apparent when comparing sarcophagi with known provenance. The Smithsonian Institution sarcophagus from Beirut, for example, if compared with the Medusa sarcophagus in the Antalya museum is immediately recognizable as being different. It lacks the sculptural depth, which creates sharply defined shadow on the Antalya example, the realism and “architectural baroque” of the Antalya example and seems in comparison, less ornamental. If you compare the two sarcophagi, it is apparent that they were fashioned from the same basic roughed-out design. As we observed earlier, this was the form in which the material arrived; so, surely this is a testimony of the freedom of individual workshops to adapt their own skill or lack of it to this roughed-out form.

It has been the concern of some scholars to attempt to trace the origins and source of influence of Hadrianic Baroque architectural decoration. The conclusions of Strong have been significantly influential. Strong detected an Asia Minor style of decoration in three
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29 Ward-Perkins 1981, 463 Pl. I 1-2 Pl. II.
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buildings in Rome (in the mausoleum of Hadrian, the temple of Venus and the temple of Divus Hadrianus). He realised they differed significantly from that of preceding Flavian and Augustan buildings. He suggested that these three buildings displayed ornamentation directly derived from the Greek architectural decoration of Asia Minor. When he compared the ornamentation of the Trajanum in Pergamon and the Library of Celsus in Ephesus with that of these three buildings in Rome he was able to find many parallels. From these observations he suggests that the architect(s) or "craftsmen" responsible for the building project had been trained ultimately in a "Pergamene school". Strong's proposal was to be championed later as authoritative by many who followed him, such as Ward-Perkins and M. Lyttleton. The idea that a single school in Pergamon was responsible for the architecture of these three building in Rome, has perhaps coloured our thinking when we assess other architecture in Asia Minor.

The implications of Strong's idea of a pervasive Pergamene school and its influence in Asia Minor and in particular Pamphylia are evident even in his article. He argues that the smaller peristyle temple at Side displays ornamentation similar to the Trajanum and is therefore probably 'derived' from it although the date for this temple is not known. The structure of the argument could be simplified as follows. A building or buildings in Rome are similar to the Trajanum. This suggests there is a Pergamene school responsible for the Trajanum. In Side there is a temple which is also similar to the Trajanum and thus was constructed by Pergamene craftsmen. Is it not equally possible that as the Trajanum is similar to the temple in Side, then craftsmen from Pamphylia had a hand in its construction or were even among the architects who were called to Rome and responsible for the decoration of the buildings there? I am not aware of any literary evidence that architects from Pergamon were involved on the building project in Rome or that Pergamon was influential in the Hadrianic Baroque buildings there. The Greek architects who went to Rome could have come from anywhere, possibly even Pamphylia.

When comparing the temple at Side with Mansel's drawings of the architectural details, the drawings prove to be inaccurate and incomplete in key places such as the architrave (Fig. 3). He omits the palmette acroteria which crown both the raking and normal sima between the lion heads. These errors were transmitted to Strong's written description of the temple. They deserve to be corrected here. "The sima is divided from the corona by an egg-and-tongue and a bead-and-reel, and the rectangular consoles, crowned by a cyma reversa and divided into two fasciae by a bead-and-reel, are set well back from the face.
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of the corona. The frieze design almost repeats that of the Trajaneum; the architrave is crowned by a fillet, a cyma-reversa (type B), and it is divided into three fasciae by rows of bead-and-reel. The architrave of Temple N1 is crowned by a fillet and then followed by alternate open and closed palmettes and not cyma-reversa. It is followed by egg and dart and then divided into three fasciae.

However the architrave of the Trajaneum is divided into two fasciae while N1 is divided into three. The frieze in this description is the common element. Once the description is corrected the ornamentation of the crown of the architraves of these two temples is identical and the division of the architrave distinct. The ornamentation of the crown of the two architraves makes the connection between the two temples stronger. One can see why Strong was tempted to make a Pergamene architect responsible. It seems like a clear case. In Side, which was a “less important” city, the temple N1 was decorated bycopying the famous Trajaneum in Pergamon, as had been done in Rome with other buildings. “This building is probably two or three decades later than the Trajaneum, and it seems likely that an architect trained at Pergamon was responsible for its construction in the middle of the second century.” The only evidence for placing this temple two or three decades later is because Strong believes that it is derived from Pergamon. We find echoes of this conclusion in the most important recent study of the architectural decoration of this region; L. Vandeput’s The Architectural Decoration of Asia Minor. “The motif at Sagalassos (anthemia with Palmettos and lotus flowers) can thus be considered a simplified version of the anthemia on the cornices of the Trajaneum and of Temple N1 at Side.” “This new arrangement of the Corinthian capital seems to have spread very soon and was copied in most cities of Asia Minor. Corinthian capitals closely resembling those of the Trajaneum at Pergamon and most probably built with the help of or by the workmen from there.” There is no reason apart from Strong’s belief that Pergamon was responsible for the decorations in Rome to assume that the Side temple came two or three decades later.

On the question of derivation, it is useful to review Strong’s argument further. According to Strong, when speaking of the three Hadrianic Baroque buildings in Rome, “(i) if it can be shown that the profiling and decorative details of these entablatures, which we have found to be foreign to the Roman repertory of the first century AD, have their origin in a particular architectural tradition, we should have good reason for supposing that the architect who devised those forms was trained in that tradition even though we could not find (and indeed, we should not expect to find) exact parallels in an earlier period.”

Looking to Side, as Strong did to Rome, we find many of the distinctive architectural elements of temple N1 already recognisable in a less developed form on a first century fountain house at Side, the monument to Vespasianus. To my knowledge this is the only
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surviving monument from the first century AD, in Pamphylia and it is securely dated by an inscription to 71 AD. The sima of this fountain house also has alternate open and closed fan palmettes and lions' heads. In Strong’s article, open and closed fan palmettes on the sima are crucial for linking the architecture of Pergamon to that of Rome. The architrave of the Vespasianus monument is crowned by alternate open and closed palmettes and divided into three fasciae, like temple N1 but unlike the Trajanum (Fig. 1, 2 and 4). Strong’s argument suggests that as we find an exact parallel in an earlier period, in this case in Side, the architect in Side who devised the forms of the temple N1 was trained in the architectural tradition of Side.

These observations challenge the validity of seeking one school or single point of origin for a “style” of architecture. The Vespasianus monument at Side may or may not be the “precursor” to temple N1. However, there is no need to ascribe its origin to a foreign influence. The earlier monument is surely a testimony to an active architectural decorative tradition which displays elements alien to the Roman architectural repertoire in the first century and which employs the same architectural motifs and architrave schemes as would later Hadrianic Baroque buildings in Pamphylia. As Strong observes, the open and closed palmette motive was unknown in Rome until the Temple of Venus and Rome 121 AD but is present on this monument in Side in 71 AD. There is no justification for the easy and often repeated assumption that the origin of the Roman architectural decoration was Pergamum.

This monument also displays another feature which could give us reason to suspect that it is a precursor of times to come (albeit less specific). It employs two small, extended pediments and so exploits extended columnar decoration, a very early example and an important precursor to what is later to become such an important element in the great monumental nymphaeum of the region.

Ward-Perkins, following and expanding on Strong’s earlier observations, would like to derive the inspiration of Hadrianic Baroque in Pamphylia from the western coast of Asia Minor and/or Pergamon. Could a second century AD Pergamene style have been diffused to the Pamphylian plain via Ephesus? Securely dated buildings such as the Trajanum 112-129 AD, Library of Celsus, 119 AD, and the arch at Attleia 128/129 AD which is supposed to be derived from the Library of Celsus give the process of diffusion little time. One could argue that there was too much work for a group of itinerant craftsmen from Pergamum, travelling, working on monuments and then moving on. In addition there are arguments in the preceding discussion on sarcophagi to suggest that permanent “schools” were already operating in the region.
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Citing Strong, Ward-Perkins’ view is that Pamphylian architectural ornament is mainly derivative from Pergamum. He also observes the distinctive ‘Pergamene’ style in both the theatre and newer *nymphaeum* at Side. He sees more examples of this “Pergamene” style of ornament in Side in Pamphylia than in Pergamon itself. He states, as we have previously said, that the monument to Vespasianus is a precursor of the Hadrianic Baroque of the coast. Hadrian’s arch in Attaleia, is “(the earliest surviving arch to incorporate free standing columns (a feature of the arch at Petra)” He implies that the decoration of the arch is derived from western coast cities and cites the library of Celsus as an earlier example of Hadrianic Baroque. His argument then, is that a precursor to Hadrianic Baroque on the Western coast is found in the Vespasianus monument in Pamphylia in Side. It is then “diffused” to Ephesus and the Trajaneum and at a later time, back to Hadrian’s Arch in Attaleia. The history of architectural decoration in Asia Minor is more complex and not to be found in one school. It is a case of a complex interplay among many places in Asia Minor which all shared a Hellenistic architectural history.

There is no doubt that Pergamene influence was important in the Hellenistic era in Pamphylia. However, this influence and the flowering of the Hadrianic Baroque style are two periods separated by at least two centuries and more. M. Waalkens recognises the significance of early Hellenistic influence. “The foundation of Attaleia as a kind of Pergamon of the south was mostly populated by Pergamon people.” They would have brought with them all the artistic refinement of Pergamon (or at least a desire for it) to Pamphylia.

In considering the importance of the Hellenistic period in Pamphylia it is also important to remember that it was usual for Hellenistic rulers to sponsor public building programs and no doubt they did so in Pamphylia. Ward-Perkins says, “the principal architectural legacy from the past seems to have been the buildings erected in Pamphylia under Pergamene domination in the second century BC, possibly the two storeyed stoa beside the agora at Aspendos.”

This building activity presumes the establishment (or pre-existing of) workshops which carried out the construction and decoration of these buildings. Skill in decoration possibly by way of Pergamene influence and the existence of local workmen are also apparent in Sagalassos in the craftsmanship of the NW heroon where, according to Waalkens, “the Corinthian capitals of Sagalassos presumably the work of local craftsmen, are the best examples thus far known from Hellenistic Anatolia. The treatment of the acanthus leaves on both Corinthian capitals and in tendril friezes is characteristically vivid.” He also observes “three fragments 50m high limestone frieze, represents dancing girls holding each other’s hands, their stylistic movement of heavy robes and baroqueness place them in the tradition of the Pergamene Gigantomachy, 2nd century BC.”
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The implications are that a Hellenistic sculptural school was active in Sagalassos and presumably derived from the Pergamene colony of Attaleia which suggests that a high quality architectural decorative tradition was active in the region during the Hellenistic period. If one considers that Sagalassos more or less derived its quality workmanship from Pergamon via Pamphylia58, it would be reasonable to suggest that there was a continuity of tradition right through from the Hellenistic period to the Hadrianic Baroque movement in Pamphylia. In the same publication, however, the architectural historian Vandeput cites an “early Hadrianic Pergamene School” directly derived from Pergamon in the second century AD59 as being responsible for the Hadrianic architecture at Sagalassos and passes over the possibility of an independent tradition ultimately derived from the Hellenistic Pergamene colonists in Atteleia. She seems to be opting instead for Strong’s opinion of the Hadrianic Baroque in Pamphylia (and therefore perhaps also in Sagalassos) came to them directly from Pergamon.

It is possible that a Hellenistic Baroque school developed independently in Pamphylia ever since the arrival of Pergamene colonists in Atteleia. This is a view that has been suggested by Lyttleton. “Evolving from the traditions of the Hellenistic period, Asia Minor to a large extent developed an independent architectural [decorative] style”60. Farrington suggests the possibility that Pamphylia was innovative. “The architects of the western coastlands produce their own highly original version of the thermae of Rome, whilst a secluded corner of Pamphylia and Rough Cilicia produced its own unique plan”61. Furthermore, Pamphylia exhibits architectural decorative innovation which could be called “Pamphylian”.

The evidence cited by Vandeput shows Pamphylia emerging as an innovative and creative centre for architectural decoration. “Near the beginning of the evolution which led towards elongated beads, a ‘new’ type of bead-and-reel was developed in Pamphylia, a type which made it possible to avoid the elongation. In the cities along the south coast of Asia Minor, an extra reel was inserted, thus changing the rhythm of the motif. Instead of an alternation between pairs of rhomboidal reels and -elongated- bead, single reels and reels in pairs alternate with globular to oval beads62.”

58 “During the study of the architectural decoration of the nymphaeum on the upper agora at Sagalassos, numerous links with the large Pamphylian coastal cities are obvious. The bead-and-reel with pairs of reels alternating with single reels is clearly taken from Pamphylian examples, where it occurs from the Hadrianic period onward. All this makes it very clear that new ideas in the decoration of these large coastal sites seem to have been imitated at Sagalassos and that they influenced the masons there to a considerable extent, at least in the period when the nymphaeum on the upper agora was constructed” Vandeput 1997b, 402.

59 Vandeput 1993, 94.
60 Lyttleton 1987, 48.
61 Farrington 1995, 68.
62 Vandeput 1997a, 150.
Conclusion

The individuals who created Hadrianic Baroque architecture in Asia Minor were skilled craftsmen patronised by an ambitious local élite who were keen to further their political careers by embellishing the image of the city and in doing so glorifying their names. The traditions of Hellenistic rulership made for an easy transition of the cities in Pamphylia to the Roman political system. Several families in larger cities were actually required to construct something for the benefit of their fellow citizens, and if one considers that élite families had a tradition of patronage in order to further political careers\(^6\), there is a strong motive for local craftsmen to develop permanent workshops to cater for regular construction work. I have argued that benefiting from this regular work, the workshops had ample opportunity to develop independently. They proved to be not only innovative but also set the standard for their neighbours who would emulate them, such as the craftsmen in Sagalassos.

Due to the parallels between building ornamentation and sarcophagus decoration the two activities were located in the same workshop. The workshops catered for local needs and were exploited by the large-scale importation of marble in the first quarter of the second century AD. These local craftsmen were trained in the Hellenistic tradition. As the workshops developed, the workman infused the new material and techniques with their traditional knowledge, innovatively “recreating” the classical style by reusing old motifs and imagery in a new and creative way. The sarcophagi, which were being produced by at least the middle of the second century AD, began to be sought after in Rome where a revival of interest in all things Greek took place under Hadrian. At the same time, Hadrian undertook building projects in Rome for which he employed architectural decorative workmen from Asia Minor.

Attempts to trace the origins of Hadrianic Baroque decoration have identified certain “schools” which may have influenced and diffused Hadrianic Baroque throughout Asia Minor and other parts of the empire. One popular choice has been Pergamon because of similarities in decoration between buildings constructed there under the principate of Hadrian and others elsewhere, for example, in Rome. However, after closer inspection many of the decorative elements found in Rome, can also be found in Pamphylia, and Ephesus. To say that craftsmen in Ephesus and Pamphylia were influenced by a Pergamene School seems unlikely given the proximity of dates of key buildings and the geographical separation of these places. It seems more likely that each region developed more or less independently of each other and out of the preceding Hellenistic tradition, occasionally incorporating motifs from other places and at other times inventing new ones.

In attempting to trace the origins of the style, past scholarship has placed too much emphasis on linear derivation. The creative centre of Hadrianic Baroque is believed to be the cities of the western coast. Literature on the subject seems to place too much importance on places like Ephesus and Pergamon perhaps to support primary sources in which these places figure prominently as “capitals of provinces and empires”. We are now

\(^6\) Deijver 1996.
witnessing the disintegration of such stereotypes in Sagalassos in Pisidia which used to be called a “backwater”.

Pamphylia then, emerges not as a region slavishly dependent on others, but rather as the home of a flowering of the earlier Hellenistic architectural tradition fused with the innovations of both its own workmen and its neighbours. Rather than being ultimately derived from Pergamon, Pamphylia, it could be argued, in many ways led the field for Hadrianic Baroque decoration.
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Özet

İ.S. 2. yüzyılda Pamphylia Lâhitleri ve Mimari süsleme:
Mermer diş alımı - Biçem diş satımı


Hadrian Dönemi'nde “Hadrian Baroku” diye anılan yontu alanı hakkında diri liste “Bergama Okulu”na bağlı yontucuların öneminin ve Pamphylia'daki yontu biçiminin kaynağı olarak “Bergama Okulu” nın gösterilmesinin hem sağlam kanıtıdır, hem de geçerli nedenler yok olmaya, bu çalışmaların yazan tarafındandır ortaya konmaktadır.


Bu çalışmada vardır sonuçlar, hem geçmiş bilimsel araştırmalardan, hem de Pamphylia lâhitlerinde kullanılan mermerin olasılıkla elde edilme yerine ilişkin arkeolojik buluntularдан kaynaklanmıştır.
Fig. 1  Vespasianus Monument, from A. M. Mansel, Side (1978) 119.

Fig. 2  Detail of Sima, Open and closed fan palmettes, 71 AD, from from A. M. Mansel, Side (1978) Fig 126.
Fig. 3
Temple N1, from D. E. Strong, "Late Hadrianic Architectural Ornament in Rome" in PBRS (1953) 132.

Fig. 4
The Trajaneum, from D. E. Strong, "Late Hadrianic Architectural Ornament in Rome" in PBRS (1953) 132.