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Abstract

Although the sacrificial tables standing in the courtyards of the Great Altar at Pergamon and Artemis Altars at Ephesos and Magnesia are dated to the Hellenistic period, some features observed in the anthemion decorations of these tables indicate that these tables might belong to the Augustan period. This paper examines the stylistic features of the anthemion decorations with other comparable materials dated to the Augustan period from other cities.

Were the sacrificial tables of three big Hellenistic altars in Anatolia rebuilt during Augustan period? I will try to answer this question by examining the anthemion decorations of the sacrificial tables. However, solely stylistic comparative analysis of architectural decoration might not answer the question. Therefore, this paper will first focus on Augustan building propaganda in conjunction with the imperial cult, and on its impact and reflections on architectural activities in Anatolia.

As in other states, cities in the province Asia, exalted Augustus with a divine respect and consequently welcomed him as an emperor. Having been accepted as a rescuer divine power, Augustus permitted for building many temples and altars, and leaded for organization of festivals and sacrificial ceremonies in the name of him. The cities of Anatolia started to compete with each other to build temples in the name of divine Augustus.

Coins, inscriptions, ancient literatures and archaeological evidences show that plenty of temples were built in the name of emperor and Augustus’ priests were commissioned in the organization of the

---

1 This article is an expanded version of the paper delivered at the III **National Symposium of the Archaeological Researches** (2004-Ankara University. I am very grateful to Prof. Dr. Orhan Bingöl (University of Ankara, Turkey) for permitting me to work on the Magnesian examples and guiding me with his positive critiques. I also thank to archaeologist Kadir Baran (University of Ankara, Turkey) for helping to translate the text to English.

2 Permission for establishing imperial cults were applied to Rome and decided by Senate and the Emperor after the Augustan period. For example, the decision of Mytilene for establishing the imperial cult was presented with the envoys to the approval of the emperor. The specially commissioned people except the Senate and the emperor also played part in organizing the cult of Augustus in provinces. Augustus’ friend Vedius Pollio who governed Asia unofficially, made some arrangements about the imperial cult in Ephesos and his arrangements were also approved by Augustus. Another officer in Peleponnesos did not avoid devoting the costs of sacrificial animals and ceremonies for the emperor during the Imperial ceremonies. For detailed info see: Price 2004, 126-133

festivals and sacrificial ceremonies in 34 different cities in Anatolia.

The cities tried to show their respectfulness and the emperor’s divinity by issuing coins which were depicting him in his own temples as on mints of Teos and Pergamon. Some others coins were also depicting him like an Olympian god as on Mylasa mints. The depictions of the emperor were used not only on the coins which circulated frequently and intensively, but also on the gems which were basically for personal usages. On the Gemma Augustea, from about 10 B.C, the emperor Augustus appears as seated on a throne like Jupiter, together with the attributes of Jupiter: an eagle and a scepter.

The practices of the Augustan cult caused some other newness. The old Macedonia calendar used in the provinces was replaced in the year of 9 B.C. with the Julian calendar which begins with 23 September i.e. the birthday of Augustus. The beginning of the year which is also the birthday of Augustus was celebrated every year with the festivals in the name Augustus and moreover, this day went on being celebrated at the 23rd of every month. These festivals either for the cult or for the birthday of Augustus were proud of the cities and caused a competition between the cities for organizations.

The cultural, social and religious changes in the cities after this new cult which appears with Augustus show a parallelism with the architectural process that can also be observed in the sanctuaries of the traditionally worshipped gods and goddesses in Anatolia. For example, the sanctuary of Athena at Ilion had been destructed by the Roman commander Fimbria, on ally of Marius, in 85 B.C. and after this destruction the temple and other structures were restored and newly arranged during the reign of Augustus.

Lagina in Karia had also shared the same fate with Ilion. The Sanctuary of Hekate at Lagina was plundered by Parthians under the command of Labienus in 40 B.C. After this intensive destruction, the sanctuary was restored during the reign of Augustus. These restorations were immortalized by an inscription on the lintel block of the Propylon dated to Augustan period. Also it is thought after the recent studies that the stylistic features of the Corinthian capitals of Hekate Temple point to an Augustan date. If this assumption is correct, the temple should have some repairs during the Augustan period like Ilion Athena temple.

The sanctuary of Hera at Samos also had some important changes in Augustan

---

4 Price 2004, 114-115; Although the tradition of the imperial cult went on, none of the emperors had temples as many as Augustus and the extent of the imperial cult had not been as wide as Augustan period (Price 2004, 115-116).
5 Zanker 1988, Fig.231 b.
6 SNG, Myseim 1050-1438, 1957, Taf. 43, No. 1290
7 SNG, Kostasi 2334-3267, 1962, Taf.82, No.2624
8 Zanker 1988, 230-231, Fig.182.
11 Price 2004, 120.
12 Price 2004, 179, 217-219; For example, The city of Mytilene declared to all the famous cities that they established the imperial cult, and decided to give out the copies of the decree to all Mediterranean area, Pergamon, Actium, Brundisium, Tarraco, Massalia, Syrian Antioch and many cities whose names are lost.
13 For detailed information on the new arrangements occur after the Augustan cult in Rome and the other provinces, see: Zanker 1988, Price 2004.
14 Maggie 1950, 469-470, fn.9; Rumscheid 1994, 18-19 (text band), 23 (taf. band); Winter 1996, 75; Rose 2002, 39-40, fn.34.
15 Bean 1980, 75
16 Bean 1980, 73; Rumscheid 1994, 23 (text band); Winter 1996, 75-76
17 Bean 1980, 75; Alzinger 1974, 7.
18 Alzinger 1974, 42; Vandeven 1997, 36.
period. It is known that the Great Altar was renewed in the early imperial period\(^{19}\). Augustus visited Samos for three times and spent long time on the island\(^{20}\). The altar whose the architectural decorations imitate the Archaic ones\(^{21}\) must have been renewed during one of these visits. Not only the altar but also the temple is supposed to be renewed during this period\(^ {22}\). Samians thanked him for all these renovations and arrangements by erecting a temple in the name of Augustus\(^ {23}\).

The Priene example is more interesting one. The Propylon of the sanctuary was built during the Augustan period\(^ {24}\) and also it is started to be worshipped jointly to emperor and goddess in the sanctuary as it is understood by the architrave inscriptions of the Athena Polias temple\(^ {25}\). Furthermore, the inscriptions on the architrave block of the altar indicate that the altar was dedicated to Augustus\(^ {26}\). Besides, it is considered that the portico called as Sacred Stoa was partly arranged as Caesareum dedicated to Roma and Augustus\(^ {27}\).

During the Augustan period, the situation is quite similar in Magnesia ad Maeandrum, Pergamon and Ephesos as in the other cities.

Although no concrete finds for the cult of Augustus in the city of Magnesia ad Maeandrum could have been uncovered, it is known that the festivals in the name of goddess Rome were held in the Hellenistic period since 2\(^ {\text{nd}}\) – 1\(^ {\text{st}}\) Centuries B.C.\(^ {28}\). In addition, the Propylon which connects the Agora and the Artemis Sanctuary was proposed to be Augustan in date by the researchers since 19\(^ {\text{th}}\) century\(^ {29}\).

Our knowledge about the cult of Augustus is fairly much at Pergamon compared to Magnesia. As in Magnesia, the festivals for goddess Roma were celebrated at Pergamon after the bequeathing of the kingdom, and also a priest of the cult of Roma was commissioned in the 1\(^ {\text{st}}\) Century B.C.\(^ {30}\). During the Augustan period, a temple and temenos was built in the name of Augustus and Rome in 29 B.C.\(^ {31}\), and Augustan festivals were arranged in the name of Asian Province\(^ {32}\). Also, some other arrangements were made in the sanctuaries of the other gods and goddesses\(^ {33}\).

The festivals for goddess Roma were celebrated and the priests of the cult were commissioned also in Ephesos already in the Hellenistic period as at Magnesia and Pergamon\(^ {34}\). It is understood that great structural changes occurred in the city together with the cult of Augustus\(^ {35}\).

---

19 Schleif is the first who proposed that the altar was renewed during the early imperial period (Schleif 1933, 210) after his researches on the monument. Rumscheid also dated the monument with the help of ornamental criteria between 50-25 B.C. (Rumscheid 1994, 80-taf. band).

21 Schleif 1933, Taf. LIV-LVII; Kyrieleis 1981, 86.
23 Maggie 1950, 469.
25 Rumscheid 1998, 122, fig.105; Koenigs (1983, 147, 174, Taf.44, 2) dates the mason marks and an inscription on a column drum to Augustan period. These point to the continuation of building the temple till Augustan period, but he states that there is no stylistic indication on the temple for this period.
26 Wiegand-Schrader 1904, 126; Price 2004, 419.
27 Hänlein-Schäfer 1985, 6; Rumscheid 1998, 75 -77.
28 Maggie 1950, 1613.
29 R. Kekule, Wochenschrift für klass. Philologie, 1894, 9; Rumscheid 1994, 41 (taf. band); for the recent study on the dating see: Kökdemir 2003.
30 Maggie 1950, 1613.
31 Hänlein-Schäfer 1985, 6; Radt 1999, 44 etc.
33 Augustus made his own statue erected in Athena sanctuary and returned the things which were stolen from the city and the sanctuary by Antonius (Maggio 1950, 469; Radt 1999, 45,163, Abb.108).
34 Maggie 1950, 1613.
The Augustan Typological And Stylistic Features In Anthemion Decorations On Sacrificial Tables

temple of Julius Caesar and Roma, the temple of Augustus in the city centre, the monument which was erected for Augustus and his cousin and the sacred portico can be given as examples of these structural changes. It is also understood epigraphically that some measuring and repairing works have been achieved during the Augustan period in the sanctuary of Artemis. Some inscribed statue bases uncovered during the altar excavations, are dated to the 1st century B.C and point to new arrangements in the sanctuary. Besides these new arrangements in Artemision, it is believed that there was another Augusteion in the sanctuary. If this suggestion is correct then it may be proposed that Augustus and goddess were jointly worshipped and also sacrificed at the same altar in Artemision as in Priene.

There are some clues which point to some renewals like the previous examples at the altars in Ephesos, Magnesia and Pergamon. These will be examined in detailed.

It is supposed that the sacrificial tables in the courtyards of Pergamon Great Altar, Ephesos Artemis Altar and Magnesia Artemis Altar were used for votive and sacrificial rituals as seen in many other altars.

It is thought that there were a cult statue base which was used during the rituals, a loading ramp for sacrificing the animals and a sacrificial table which was used for burning the sacrificed just on the southern edge of the ramp, inside the courtyard of the altar of Artemis at Ephesos. The suggested reconstruction of the sacrificial table is based on the crown blocks which are supposed to belong to the table and the foundation remains which are on the southern edge of the ramp (Drawing 1.1).

Gerkan made the first detailed research on the hypothetical sacrificial table of the Artemis altar in Magnesia. Gerkan’s proposals on the possible form, size and location of the table are based on the hypothetical corner crown block and his altar reconstruction. Although Gerkan’s suggestion on the placement of the sacrificial table was accepted, the size and location of the table varied due to the different reconstruction proposals by the other scholars (Drawing 1.2).

It is suggested that there is also a sacrificial table in the center of the podium surrounded by the columns at Pergamon Great Altar which has same plan with Magnesia Altar. However the proposals on the size and location of the table which has few fragments are also hypothetical as Magnesia and Ephesos (Drawing 1.3).

---

36 Price 2004, 412-413; for the structures at Ephesos from the Augustan period, see: Alzinger 1974.
41 For the other examples of the usage of the sacrificial tables in the altars see: Şahin 1972.
42 The term “sacrificial table” in this paper is used for the part which was called as eschara in recent studies (Muss-Bammer 2001).
43 See fn.40.
45 For the comments of other scholars and final reconstruction proposal see: Bingöl 1998, 36-40; Çetin 2003.
46 See fn.40. It is proposed by the dowel holes on the upper surfaces of the sima blocks which functions as crown blocks that statues were employed on the sacrificial table.
The peculiarity of the sacrificial tables in various sizes and types which were supposed to be in these three altars is being arranged independently from the architecture of the altars. In other word, any possible future changes on the sacrificial tables do not necessarily affect or change the architecture of the altars.

Besides that peculiarity, it is also seen that the anthemion decorations of these three altars which are dated to Hellenistic period have some typological and stylistic features which point to different dates than the construction dates. These will be examined below in detailed.

ANTHEMION SCHEMES
Trio Scheme (Table 1)

The left corner crown block belonged to Magnesia Artemis Altar was uncovered during the Humann excavations (Fig.1). This block for the first time was commented by Gerkan as belonging to the sacrificial table in the courtyard of the altar. Two other blocks in the same size of the mentioned block which is now kept in the Berlin Museum were uncovered during the Bingöl excavations (Fig.2-3). It is examined that three blocks have similar profiles and similar decorations on these profiles. As well they have similar anthemion schemes which will be examined below in detailed. In spite of these similarities, one of these newly found blocks differs in workmanship of the anthemion decorations than the other blocks (Fig.4-6).

Although there are some workmanship differences between these three blocks, they will be accepted in this study as belonging to the sacrificial table’s crown because they have similar sizes, profiles and typological similarities of the anthemion schemes with the block which was already suggested by Gerkan as belonging to the table.

The corner block which is kept in Berlin carries an anthemion scheme consisting from “½ Closed Palmette –

---

47 In addition to this, the stylistic differences between the patterns used on the sacrificial table and on the exterior of the altar support our opinion (For the anthemion decoration on the exterior of the altar see: Rumscheid 1994, Taf.85.3). In the same way, different treatments are seen between exterior front and sacrificial table in Pergamon. While there is no decoration on the exterior front of the Pergamon altar, the sacrificial table is richly decorated. Also, while there is no frize on the exterior front, there is an anthemion frize on the sacrificial table (for the exterior front of Pergamon, see: Rumscheid 1994, Taf. 123.1; for the sacrificial table see: Kästner 1996, 68 ff.).

48 For the literature on dating the buildings and detailed info, see: fn. 37; although the crown block of the Ephesos sacrificial table was dated to the same period with the altar, Başaran is the first who dated the crown block and the anthemion decorations of meander decorated blocks which are supposed to be placed on altar podium (For the suggested reconstruction of altar, see: Mass-Bammer 2001, 126 ff., Abb. 488) to the Augustan period (Başaran 1995, 29, 152-153).

49 Humann 1904, 93, Abb. 89-91.

50 Gerkan 1929, 22 ff.
51 Gerkan, Taf.VI.Nr.28
52 Similar examples of the usage of different stylistic decorations on the same structure and even on the same structure member, as we determined on Magnesia example, are seen on the other cities. For example, the scroll decorations which show different stylistics are seen on the column base from Hadrian period at Didyma Apollon Temple. (Pülz 1989, Pl. 3.1-2). Pülz suggested that this difference caused by the two different workman working on the same base (Pülz 1989, 25-27). Vandeput on her short study on the dating criteria of the ornamentations mentioned this Didyma example and also other examples which show different stylistics caused by different hands on the same structure (Vandeput 1995). This stylistic difference seen on the Magnesia sacrificial table most probably is caused by two different masters’ workmanships who worked on the same member as the other examples. However, the reason of this difference must be examined comprehensively together with the other architectural problems about the altar in the further studies.
Open Palmette (Lotus?) – Open Palmette (Lotus?)-½ Closed Palmette” patterns (Drawing 4, Fig.4). One of the newly found blocks which have similar workmanship carries the same scheme with “½ Closed Palmette – Open Palmette (Lotus?) – Open Palmette (Lotus?)-½ Closed Palmette” patterns (Fig.5). This scheme which consists of three patterns or axes of three patterns will be called as Trio Scheme in this study. The other newly found block which is already mentioned about the workmanship differences has the similar Trio Scheme with three patterns or patterns axes as on the other two blocks. The scheme consists by using the “½ Closed Palmette – Lotus – Open Palmette – ½ Closed Palmette side by side (Fig.6).

The trio schemes similar to Magnesia examples were also used on the Propylon at Magnesia, and on some structures from Priene, Stratonikeia and Rome which are dated to the Augustan period53 and on a sarcophagus lid from Claudius period at Hierapolis54, on gesims of “Base” Structure from Nero period at Ephesus55 (Fig 7-13 Table 1).

It is seen that the common feature of the trio schemes used on the Magnesia Altar table and the other Roman examples is the usage of the open palmettes and lotuses between the closed palmettes. Lotuses and open palmettes are used side by side between closed palmettes with turns (Fig. 6, 7, 9) or with same types (Fig. 4, 5, 10, 13) or with same type but in different stylistics. These different stylistic features are seen on the central stems of the lotuses at Priene. The central stems of the lotuses used side by side are concave on one and plain on the other (Fig.11). In this way, the trio scheme consists from the lotuses in different stylistics used between closed palmettes. The open palmettes with different stylistics are used in the scheme on Magnesia Propylon (Fig.8) and Hierapolis example (Fig.12). The stylistic difference of the open palmettes occurs by the alternating usage of round ended leaves which turn outside on one and sharp ended leaves which turn outside on the other.

Sextet Scheme (Table 2)

There is an anthemion scheme similar to trio scheme on the upper moulding of the meander decorated podium block56 which was dated to the Augustan period by Başaran57. This scheme which occurs twice on the block indicates to the motivated usage. This scheme because of the patterns number is called as Sextet Scheme in this study and consists of “Closed Palmette – Lotus – Open Palmette – Lotus – Open Palmette – Lotus” patterns. (Drawing 5, Fig.14). This scheme is formed by inserting three similar patterns (lotus) between the other patterns used in the trio scheme and it can be defined as an extended version of the trio scheme. Similar examples of sextet scheme are seen on the Roman structures as trio scheme (Fig. 15-16 Table 2)58.

53 For Magnesia-Propylon, see fn. 29 (this paper); Priene Bouleuterion Altar, see: Rumscheid 1998, 58-59; Stratonikeia Emperors Temple, see: Tüpin 1998, 31, Çiz.14 A., Res.24 b.; Roma Aemilia Baslica, see: Strong-Perkins 1962, 22 ff., Pl.XIX b. 54 For the sarcophagus at Hierapolis, see: D’Andria 1987, 101. 55 Stroeka 1978, 909, Abb.21. 56 Seven of the meander decorated blocks which are supposed to be from the podium were uncovered during the excavations, but the anthemion decoration only on one of them is preserved. (Muss-Banner 2001) 57 see: fn. 48 58 On the dating of the column base from Didyma Apollon Temple, see: Pülz 1989, 130–131, Taf.2.2
The only difference between Ephesos, Magnesia and Didyma examples is seen on the open palmettes of the scheme. The open palmettes are used in the same type in the scheme on Ephesos example (Drawing 1.5; Fig.14). On the other hand, one of the open palmettes has round ended leaves which turn outside and the other has sharp ended leaves which turn outside in the schemes on Magnesia (Fig.15) and Didyma (Fig.16) examples, in a similar way to the trio scheme examples. By this way two different open palmettes which have different stylistics used in the scheme.

Octet Scheme (Table 3)

The crown blocks which are supposed to be belonged to the sacrificial table of the Artemis Altar in Ephesos, has an anthemion scheme which is formed by eight axes of patterns and this scheme repeats itself on the same block. The reason for forming eight axes of patterns is the usage of different types of open palmettes like in trio and sextet schemes. While the turning outwards leaves of the first open palmette have round ends, the turning outwards leaves of the second open palmette have sharp ends in the scheme. In this way, scheme consists from "½ Closed Palmette – Lotus – Open Palmette (Type a) – Lotus – Closed Palmette – Lotus – Open Palmette (Type b) – Lotus – ½ Closed Palmette" patterns (Drawing 1.6, Fig.17). Similar examples of this scheme which will be called Octet Scheme in this study are seen among the Roman structures, like the Trio and Sextet schemes (Fig. 18-20 Table 3).

It is understood that the Trio, Sextet and Octet schemes which are determined on the Roman structures were widely used especially during the Augustan Period.

When the 25 examples are examined from the Hellenistic period, it is seen that the schemes which are determined on the sacrificial tables of Magnesia and Ephesos Altars and on the podium of Ephesos were not used in the Hellenistic period that the altars dated, but three different main schemes commonly were used (Table 5). These schemes used in the Hellenistic period are:

Duet Scheme – Type A consists of alternating "½ Closed Palmette – Lotus – ½ Closed Palmette" patterns,

Duet Scheme – Type B consists of alternating "½ Open Palmette – Lotus – ½ Open Palmette" patterns,

Quartet Scheme consists of alternating "½ Closed Palmette – Lotus – Open Palmette – Lotus – ½ Closed Palmette" patterns (Table 1) (Figs.21-23).

---

59 Püüz mentioned the types of palmettes in different stylistics in the anthemion decoration of the base, Püüz 1989, 25.
60 On the dating of the Gate of M. Mithridates at Ephesos, see: Rumscheid 1994, 16-17 (Taf. band).
ANTHEMIUM-SCROLLS
RISING FROM PALMETTES

(Table 4)

The common feature of the anthemion decorations of the sacrificial tables at Magnesia, Ephesos and Pergamon is the rising of anthemion-scrolls from the palmettes. The anthemion-scrolls rise from acanthus formed calyces on Ephesos and Pergamon examples (Drawing 1.6), but rise from the central leaves on Magnesia examples (Drawing 1.4). When we examined the Roman structures it is understood that the anthemion-scrolls rising from the palmettes are used in the anthemion decorations in a similar way to the Pergamon, Ephesos and Magnesia examples (Fig. 24-38 Table 4).

Anthemion-Scrolls
Rising from Palmettes

It is seen that the anthemion-scroll patterns rise from the palmettes which are determined on the Roman examples were mostly used in Augustan period. But these patterns which are pointed to be used on the podium of Ephesian altar and on the sacrificial tables of the altars at Magnesia, Ephesos and Pergamon were not used in the Hellenistic period as trio, sextet and octet schemes. (Table 1) The anthemion-scrolls which are seen on the buildings dated to the Hellenistic period usually rise from the lotuses (Fig. 39-42). It is also seen on a few examples that the independently shaped anthemion-scroll patterns were also used between the ornaments in this period.

Table 5; Fig. 43.

BLOSSOMS USED WITHIN THE ANTHEMIUM-SCROLL PATTERNS

One of the shoots in the anthemion-scroll patterns which rise from acanthus formed calyces under palmette in the anthemion decorations on the sacrificial table of Pergamon Great altar curves upward and ends with a blossom pattern.

for Sagalassos, see: Vandepoot 1997, 46-49; for Priene, see n.53; for Ancyra, see: Rumscheid 1994, 3-4 (tafel. band) ; for the theater of Miletos, see: Başaran 1995, 200, Lev.32d.

64 It is understood that these patterns were commonly used from Archaic until Roman periods. For the independent anthemion-scrolls of archaic and classical periods, see: Schede 1909,Taf. III. 7 / Taf.III. 15,17,18,21 / Taf.IV.24; Paton – Stevens 1927, Pl. XXXVIII.1 ; for Roman examples, see: Başaran 1995, Lev.4d / Lev.6c / Lev.26c ; Vandepoot 1997, Pl.22.3 ; for the Hellenistic examples, see: Table 5.
The similar shoots in the anthemion-scroll patterns which curve upward and end with a blossom pattern are also seen in the anthemion decorations of the Classical buildings. The shoots in the anthemion-scroll patterns which were used on Erekhtheion, the famous classical building, curve upward and end with a rosette (Fig. 44). The shoots of Epidauros Tholos from the 4th Century B.C. curve upward and end with an open palmette in a similar way to Erekhtheion (Fig. 45). The blossom patterns which are used on endings of the shoots are all in the same type on both examples. The shoots which end with the patterns in the same type as Erekhtheion and Epidauros examples are used on a block from the Agora of Thasos which is dated to the 4th Century B.C. (Fig. 46). Although it seems very similar to the classical examples at the first sight, the endings of the shoots in the anthemion-scrolls of Pergamon example have been used in different types after each palmettes (Fig. 47). A similar example of the Pergamon example which differs from classical ones appears in the Augustan period. One of the anthemion-scrolls curves upward on the sloping sima blocks of southern corner of the east front of Magnesia Propylon which is dated to the Augustan period (Fig. 48). The ending patterns of the shoots are treated with different types as in Pergamon, so it differs from the classical examples (Fig. 49).

This practice in the anthemion decorations of the Pergamon Great Altar and Magnesia Propylon is also seen not only on the anthemion decorations but also in scroll decorations which are dated to the Augustan period. The filling and blossom patterns on the endings of the shoots which rise symmetrically from the central calyx are treated in different types as seen in the anthemion decorations. For example, the shoots rising from the central acanthus calyx continues symmetrically but end with different types of blossoms on the anta capitals of Magnesia Propylon (Fig. 49). Similarly, the shoots end with different types of the blossoms on the right and left sides of central acanthus calyx on the anta capital of Stratonikeia Emperor's Temple which is dated to the Augustan period (Fig. 50). Another example is seen on the scenae frons of the theater in Stratonikeia. The shoots rise from the acanthus formed central calyx and continue right and left symmetrically in the scroll decorations of aedicule pediment of the third floor which is dated to the Augustan period. However, the blossom patterns on the endings were treated in different types and this usage breaks the symmetry (Fig. 51).

decorations consists of (from right to left) ½ Closed Palmet - Lotus - Open Palmet - Lotus - Open Palmet - Lotus - Closed Palmet - Lotus patterns on the sloping sima front. On the contrary, the different patterns were noticed after examining of the block in Berlin. The block originally carries the patterns of (from right to left) ½ Closed Palmet - Lotus - Open Palmet - Lotus - Closed Palmet - Lotus - Acanthus - ½ Lotus. The anthemion-scrolls which rise from acanthus formed calyces between (from right to left) ½ Closed Palmet - Lotus - Open Palmet - Lotus are given correctly in the drawing of Humann. On the other hand, it is determined that the anthemion-scrolls which are similar to Pergamon table among the other patterns (Closed Palmet - Lotus - Acanthus - ½ Lotus) were used originally and are different than the Humann's drawing. For detailed information, see: Kökdemir 2003.

65 Paton – Stevens 1927, Pl. XXXVII.2
66 Voigtländer 1975, 48; Gruben 1986, s.138 ff.
67 Daux 1967, 98-99, Fig.43; Voigtländer 1975, 48.; The shoots in the anthemion-scrolls which end with the same blossom patterns are seen on an example from Syria. It is very similar to Greek mainland examples and dated to the 4th century B.C., see: Stucky 1990, 28, Abb.2.
68 see: fn.29
69 The drawing of north corner sloping sima block of eastern front of the propylon uncovered by Humann is published in Humann 1904, Abb.136. It is shown on this drawing that the anthemion
It is also seen in the examples from the other places else than Anatolia that small details differ in the symmetry as on Anatolia and Pergamon examples. Although the blossoms in the scroll decorations on a silver vase from the Augustan period seem symmetrical at the first sight, it can be determined that they are different in small details (Fig. 52). The endings of the shoots which advance symmetrically in the scroll decorations on a marble table from the Augustan period have different types like on Anatolian examples (Fig. 53).

It is seen that these different treatments were not used in the examples from the Hellenistic period. The blossoms and filling patterns of the scroll decorations in this period are used in the same type and keep the symmetry on the both sides of acanthus calyx (Fig. 54-56).

The different treatments which remind the practices of different endings of the shoots in anthemion and scroll decorations in the Augustan period are determined on the palmettes and lotuses of the crown of the sacrificial table of Ephesos Artemis Altar. The first difference is seen on the calyx leaves of lotuses used in decoration. Although it is not easy to notice at the first sight considering that these lotuses were used on a building, the master appears to have carved the calyx leaves of every lotus distinctly after each palmet. If it is checked carefully, it is seen that the calyx leaves of the first lotus shaped in acanthus form but the calyx of the second lotus shaped plain (Drawing 1.6, Fig. 17). Another difference is seen on the acanthus leaves which are used in the hearts of the palmettes. Although this is not easy to determine at the first glance, the third acanthus leaf which is stuck on the heart of the palmettes that rise from the acanthus shaped calyx with double leaves below palmettes is shaped straight on the heart of the closed palmettes but curves downwards on the heart of the open palmettes (Drawing 1.6, Fig. 17). These details on the calyx leaves and on the acanthus leaves below the palmettes are used without any changes in the schemes of all blocks. For this reason it is understood that these treatments were made by purpose.

These different details determined on the lotuses and palmettes in the anthemion decorations of the Ephesos sacrificial table, must have been used for enriching the appearance of the decoration and breaking the monotonous in the symmetry. It can be compared to the usage of the different types of the blossoms on the endings of the shoots in the anthemion and scroll decorations which are seen at Pergamon and the examples from the Augustan period.

72 Zanker 1988, 182 ff., Fig. 188
73 Zanker 1988, 269-270, Fig.211
74 These details were used on the other crown blocks of the sacrificial table. For the other blocks, see: Muss-Bammer 2001, Abb.427, 433, 434, 435.
75 The usage of the different blossoms on the endings of the shoots in the anthemion and scroll decorations and the usage of the small differences on the details of the patterns in the anthemion decorations are also determined in the scroll decorations of the Ara Pacis. The blossoms on the endings of the shoots which are used symmetrically on the both sides of the central calyx in the scroll decorations of the Ara Pacis seem as they were used in the same type in the first sight but it is determined after a close look that there are some differences between the details of the blossoms. (Zanker 1988, Fig.140.). In a similar way the real life-scenes as attacking of a snake to the baby birds and animals as snake, frog etc., occupy the small areas of the scroll decorations of Ara Pacis by breaking the symmetry. This also can be seen after a close look. (Zanker 1988, Fig. 141). These practices in the scroll decorations of the Ara Pacis most probably used for enriching the ornamentation and breaking monotonous in the symmetry and artificiality as in the examples from the Augustan period which are examined above. Zanker also mentioned these
As a conclusion, it was examined in detail the usage of:

1) The trio, sextet and octet schemes,

2) The anthemion-scrolls rise from palmettes,

3) The blossoms in different types on the endings of the shoots in the anthemion-scrolls.

These are the stylistic and typological features and peculiarities in anthemion decorations and when they are evaluated together with the similar examples from the Augustan period, they can answer the question of possibility of any renewals of the sacrificial tables of the mentioned buildings during the Augustan Period\textsuperscript{76}.

\textsuperscript{76} differentiations of the floral motives in the decorations of the Ara Pacis, but he mainly focused on the symbolic meaning of the ornaments. (Zanker 1988, 179-183).

With these results the anthemion decoration on the meander decorated podium block of the Ephesos Artemis altar should have been dated to the Augustan period because it shows similar stylistic and typological features which are determined on the examined sacrificial tables in this paper.

Although, the temple of Smintheus Apollon were dated to the Hellenistic period (H. Weber, "Zum Apollon Smintheus Tempel der Troas, IstMitt 16, 1966; Orhan Bingöl, "Der Aufbau des Smintheion in der Troas", Hermogenes und die hochkellenistische Architektur Ed. Hoepfner-Schwandner 1990, 45-50; for other literature see: Rumscheid 1994, 9-taf. band) it is suggested in the recent studies (Gökay 2002, fn.48) that might be connected with the Augustan period. The similar comments on the dating as Gökay were also proposed by the first scholars who worked on the temple (for the first scholars see: Rumscheid, 1994, 9-taf.band). In a parallel way to these scholars it is seen that the typological features of the anthemion decorations of the Augustan period (the usage of the trio scheme on the architrave blocks and the anthemion-scrolls which rise from the bottom of the palmettes on the sloping sima) can be determined on the architrave and the sloping sima blocks of the temple of Smintheus Apollon as the anthemion decorations of the sacrificial tables from Magnesia, Pergamon and Ephesos Altars and the above mentioned examples from the Augustan period (for the Smintheus examples, see: F. Rumscheid, "Die Ornamentik des Apollon-Smintheus-Tempels in der Troas", IstMitt 45 (1995), 25-55., Abb.7, Taf.23.5). Therefore, it became a necessity to make new researches on the architecture of the temple with the help of these typological features of the anthemion decorations. On the other hand, this kind of detailed research is out of the scope of this study, therefore the examples from the temple of Smintheus Apollon were not included in this paper.

\textsuperscript{77} See: fn.48.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KP / CP</td>
<td>Kapah Palmet / Closed Palmette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP / OP</td>
<td>Açık Palmet / Open Palmette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA / OPa</td>
<td>Açık Palmet (TipA) / Open Palmette (Type A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APb / OPb</td>
<td>Açık Palmet (TipB) / Open Palmette (Type B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lotus / Lotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Lotus (TipA) / Lotus (Type A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lb</td>
<td>Lotus (TipB) / Lotus (Type B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dn / fn.</td>
<td>dipnot / footnote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Augustus | Roma Basilica Aemilia | Geison | ⅓ CP – L – OP – ¼ CP |
| Augustus | Stratonicia Temple | Architrave | ⅓ CP – L – OP – ¼ CP |
| Augustus | Priene Bouleterion | Altar Base | ⅓ CP – La – ⅓bb – ⅓ CP |
| Augustus | Magnesia Propylon | Sima West Front | ⅓ CP – OP – OP – ⅓ CP |
| Augustus | Magnesia Propylon | Architrave East Front | ⅓ CP – OPa – OPb – ⅓ CP |
| Claudius | Hierapolis | Sarcophagus Lid | ⅓ CP – OPa – OPb – ⅓ CP |
| Nero | Ephesos | Geismo | ⅓ CP – OP – OP – ⅓ CP |
|        | "Socle" Structure (?) | Sacrificial Table | ⅓ CP – OP – OP – ⅓ CP |
|        | Magnesia Altar | Sacrificial Table | ⅓ CP – L – OP – ⅓ CP |

**Table 1: Trio Scheme Examples**


**Table 2: Sextet Scheme Examples**

| Hadrian | Gate of M. Mithridates | Base | ⅓ CP – L – OPa – L – OPb – L – ⅓ CP |
| Ephesos Altar | Sacrificial Table | ⅓ CP – L – OPa – L – OPb – L – ⅓ CP |

**Table 3: Octet Scheme Examples**

| Augustus | Magnesia Propylon | Sina East Front | Calyx |
| Augustus | Magnesia Propylon | Architrave East Front | Calyx |
| Hadrian | Didyma Temple | Architrave | Calyx |
| Ephesos Altar | Sacrificial Table | Calyx |
| Pergamon Altar | Sacrificial Table | Calyx |
| Augustus | Magnesia Propylon | Anta Capital | Palmette Heart |
| Augustus | Ephesos | Friere | Palmette Heart |
| Augustus | Monument of Memmius | Geison | Palmette Heart |
| Augustus | Ephesos | Gate of M. Mithridates | Palmette Heart |
| Augustus | Logana Propylon | Architrave | Palmette Heart |
| Augustus | Antiochita Temple | Architrave | Palmette Heart |
| Augustus | Sagalassos | Base | Palmette Heart |
| Augustus | Hayeio Bouleterion | Altar Base | Palmette Heart |
| Augustus | Ankyra Temple | Socle Profile | Palmette Heart |
| Flavians' | Miletos Theatre | Geison | Palmette Heart |
| Magnesia Altar | Sacrificial Table | Palmette Heart |
| Ephesos Altar | Podium Block | Palmette Heart |

**Table 4: Examples of Anthemion – Scrolls Rising From Palmettes**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Scrolls rise from</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HALIKARNASSOS</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>350 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 21 (Taf. Band), Taf.47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIDYMA</td>
<td>APOLLON TEMPLE NAIKOS</td>
<td>Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>300/250-225 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 13 (Taf. Band), Taf.31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELEVI</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>Frieze Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>290-270 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 8 (Taf. Band), Taf.14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILETOS</td>
<td>DIONYSOS TEMPLE</td>
<td>Frieze Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>300/250-225 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 13 (Taf. Band), Taf.31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARASOS</td>
<td>APOLLON SANCTUARY (?)</td>
<td>Anta Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>250 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 21 (Taf. Band) Taf.57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGNESIA</td>
<td>ARTEMIS ALTAR</td>
<td>Anta Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>220-205 B.C.</td>
<td>Kochan 1995, 110.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGNESIA</td>
<td>ARTEMIS ALTAR</td>
<td>Anta Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>220-205 B.C.</td>
<td>Kochan 1995, 110.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILETOS</td>
<td>BOULETERION</td>
<td>Anta Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>220-205 B.C.</td>
<td>Kochan 1995, 110.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILETOS</td>
<td>HELLENISTIC GYMNASION</td>
<td>Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>220-205 B.C.</td>
<td>Kochan 1995, 110.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILETOS</td>
<td>GYMNASION OF EUMENES</td>
<td>Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>159 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 16 (Taf. Band), Taf.103.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELGE</td>
<td>ZEUS TEMPLE</td>
<td>Sina Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>200-150 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 83 (Taf. Band), Taf.181.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEOS</td>
<td>DIONYSOS TEMPLE</td>
<td>Architrave Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>175-150 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 83 (Taf. Band), Taf.181.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIENE</td>
<td>ZEUS (?) TEMPLE</td>
<td>Anta Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>155-125 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 74 (Taf. Band), Taf.165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIENE</td>
<td>SACRED STOA</td>
<td>Anta Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>150-100 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 74 (Taf. Band), Taf.165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGINA</td>
<td>HEKATE TEMPLE</td>
<td>Frieze Duet Scheme Type B</td>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>150-100 B.C.</td>
<td>Runnidge 1994, 74 (Taf. Band), Taf.165.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Anthemion scheme types and anthemion scroll patterns in the Hellenistic Period
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