

ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE
TOME LIX

**LES GRECS HÉRITIERS
DES ROMAINS**

IV

EDMUND THOMAS

Translating Roman architecture into Greek regional identities

FONDATION HARDT
VANDŒUVRES – GENÈVE
27-31 AOÛT 2012

IV

EDMUND THOMAS

TRANSLATING ROMAN ARCHITECTURE INTO GREEK REGIONAL IDENTITIES

Inventing Roman imperial architecture in the Greek world

In the year 47 the Greek city of Miletus experienced a devastating earthquake.¹ Substantial financial assistance for the restoration was provided by a Roman equestrian official, Gnaeus Vergilius Capito, who had served as procurator of the emperor Claudius in Asia and would leave that year to be Prefect of Egypt.² The impact of his contribution was particularly visible in the civic theatre, which then received a new stage building,³ and three blocks of the city grid which lay between the Archaic sanctuary of Apollo Delphinios and the Hellenistic gymnasium of Eudemos, prominently sited off the east side of the processional road leading to the Delphinion from the vast South Agora of the late Hellenistic period (Fig. 1). The site was redeveloped afresh and in a way which would reshape the appearance of the old Greek city. A portico of the Ionic order fronting the building along the processional way struck a note of familiarity. But an inscription on the architrave announced

¹ For the date, see HABICHT (1960) 162-163.

² PFLAUM (1960) 32-33 no. 13bis; DEMOUGIN (1999) 605 no. 130. He is known to have been in Egypt by January 48 at the latest: *CIL* III 6024.6 = *ILS* 2282; BASTIANINI (1975) 272.

³ According to the inscription on the entablature over the central intercolumniation of the stage building, as restored by MCCABE (1986); cf. ALTENHÖFER (1986) and HERRMANN (1986).

a larger project. The portico fronted a row of shops behind the north end of which opened a colonnaded court, the Palaestra. Beyond that, and screened by a curvilinear colonnade behind an open-air swimming bath (*natatio*), extended a new bath building with cold and heated pools. It was built with construction techniques entirely unfamiliar in the old city: courses of rubble concrete, faced with small stone blocks, in the manner of Italian buildings, especially thermal structures. Particularly striking was a domed rotunda nine metres in diameter on the south side of the building (Fig. 2) which resembled round bathing halls constructed in Italy, using horizontal layers of rubble concrete.⁴

It used to be common to describe cases like this as an explicitly ‘Roman’ element in the architecture of formerly Greek cities and as material signs of the ‘Romanization’ of the province.⁵ But how this entered the provincial repertoire is a moot point. The term ‘Romanization’ was once used to denote the application to provincial urban space of an alien system of forms and techniques associated with the centre of power.⁶ But it is now generally accepted that using such a term imposes a rigid and unilateral model of the relationship between centre and periphery, with the former seen as an agent of far-reaching, ‘top-down’ cultural change and the latter as a passive recipient of unfamiliar ideas; and few today would mourn its absence from current critiques of provincial culture.⁷ Capito’s project should certainly be seen in connection with wider restoration activity

⁴ VON GERKAN / KRISCHEN (1928) 31; KLEINER (1968) 95-96. The room is usually interpreted as a *laconicum*; YEGÜL (1992) 386, however, suggests that this was a “heated pool room”.

⁵ E.g. WARD-PERKINS (1981) 274: “it was such buildings that were among the earliest and most distinctively Roman contributions to the established Hellenistic repertory”; NIELSEN (1990) I, 98 (Asia Minor, “one of the first provinces to be ‘romanized’”).

⁶ MACMULLEN (2000).

⁷ MATTINGLY (2011) 41. See notably the condemnation of the word by SYME (1983) 35 (“vulgar and ugly, worse than that, anachronistic and misleading”), and the more detailed discussions by HINGLEY (2005); LAURENCE / BERRY (1998); MILLETT (1990); and KEAY / TERRENATO (2001).

after the earthquake attributed to the Emperor Claudius at Miletus and in the area.⁸ Dedicated to the Emperor, his new baths would have been one of the principal flagships of the new “Caesarea Miletus”, as the city would briefly be known, like others in the province restored by imperial authority after an earthquake.⁹ It was Capito who, as high-priest, had established a cult of the Emperor Gaius (Caligula) at Miletus in 40-1.¹⁰ So his restoration of these central blocks of the civic centre appear to suggest a typical pattern of “natural disaster, petition and imperial response”, with private donors sharing in the cost of reconstruction led by the imperial government.¹¹

The particular circumstances of the case, however, suggest a much less clear-cut phenomenon. In the first place, the architectural forms imposed and the construction techniques are not so much Roman as typical of the region of Campania where Capito’s family had land and may have originated. The domed room not only replicates a Campanian tradition of domed *laconica* extending back over a century, but, now complete with modern underground heating system, mirrors current developments, as at the Central Baths at Pompeii, erected in the years immediately after the earthquake of 62.¹² The open-air *natatio* is also typical of contemporary planning in Campania, and its

⁸ Claudius’ restoration of the Temple of Dionysus with title of ‘New Founder’: *IGR* IV 1711; cf. HERRMANN (1960) 95 and 120; FREIS (1985). Restoration at Miletus, Ephesus and Smyrna: MALALAS *Chron.* 246D.

⁹ Dedication: *I.Milet* 328, with HERRMANN (1997) 211. Caesarea Miletus, known only from the ethnic of a Milesian buried at Athens (*IG* II² 9475, dated only to the first or second century CE): ROBERT (1977). For others, starting with Tralles under Augustus and several restored by Tiberius after the earthquake of 17 CE, see ROBERT (1949) 213-214.

¹⁰ *I.Didyma* 148; SHERK (1988) 81-82 no. 43. The date is given by DIO CASS. 59, 28. See further ROBERT (1949); HERRMANN (1994) 227-228. For the cult and its planned location in no less a building than the Temple of Apollo at Didyma, see BURRELL (2004) 55-56.

¹¹ MITCHELL (1987) 22.

¹² VON GERKAN / KRISCHEN (1928) 32; cf. MAU (1877) 220. The absence of a water outlet confirms the identification of the room at Miletus as a *laconicum*, *pace* YEGÜL (1992) 386, who suggests that it may have been a “heated pool room” on the supposed analogy of the later conversion of the first-century BCE

position at the rear of the palaestra closest to the bathing block is analogous to the example in the same Pompeian baths which was still unfinished at the time of the 79 eruption.¹³ Since it is likely that Capito would have commanded the labour and expertise of building workers and architects from that region, the introduction of such techniques represented assimilation not so much to “Roman” as to Campanian culture. Secondly, however, this was not the culture of a foreign power. Capito was a resident at Miletus, whose father had settled there around the turn of the era in the second wave of Italian immigration to Asia Minor and married into the Iulii, one of the most established of local families in the late Republic and early Empire.¹⁴ Acquiring some of the best agricultural land in the fertile Maeander Valley, the Vergilii were by Capito’s time among the wealthiest families in the area.¹⁵ Capito himself would arguably become the object of a hero cult, with games held in his honour, the *Capitoneia*, which continued to be celebrated until at least the end of the second century.¹⁶ The palaestra was restored

laconica in the Stabian Baths at Pompeii into a frigidarium (ESCHEBACH [1979] 60), as also happened at the Forum Baths in the same town.

¹³ MAU (1877) 217; KRENCKER (1929) 256-257 fig. 386; cf. NIELSEN (1990) I, 107 n. 82; II, C47 fig. 79.

¹⁴ For Italian immigration to Asia Minor, see KIRBIHLER (2007) 23-28. The main indication for his Milesian origin suggested by PFLAUM (1960) I, 33 — that, unlike other foreigners, no ethnic is given after his name in the inscription establishing the cult of Caligula at Miletus — is not in itself conclusive, since the list of ethnics for the following names is probably to be explained by the status of these men as delegates of the principal towns of the assizes, from whom he is to be regarded as separate: ROBERT (1949). Yet Capito was nephew of Julia the daughter of C. Iulius Epicrates, posthumously honoured with a statue in a gymnasium (*SEG* 44, 938), who was third in a line of eponymous *stephanephoroi* at Miletus, of whom the eldest was Julius Caesar’s friend Epicrates, who collected the ransom for Caesar at Miletus after his capture by pirates.

¹⁵ THONEMANN (2011) 252.

¹⁶ Cult: *I.Didyma* 149; games: *I.Didyma* 278.5-6; HABICHT (1960) 162-163. The connection with this Capito is not secure. EHRHARDT (1984) 391 suggests that the cult related to a descendant of the Hadrianic period (see next note). At any rate, this was not “the last attested cult of a Roman official of any kind other than the Emperor”, as claimed by BOWERSOCK (1965) 120; for the cults of Rufinus at Pergamon and Vedius Antoninus at Ephesus, see PONT

by a later member of the family, probably in the Hadrianic period;¹⁷ and the Ionic street-side colonnade extended to provide a unified frontage linking the new project to the earlier gymnasium.¹⁸

In the third place, the forms of the new buildings were not entirely alien, but moulded by indigenous practices and concepts. The most obvious sign of this is the Ionic portico, which faced onto and blended into the processional road, the principal axis of the Hellenistic city.¹⁹ Erected at the same time as the Palaestra,²⁰ the portico formed a prelude to it, offering a cultural statement by repeating the order of the Hellenistic gymnasium and its propylon, unifying the old with the new project by running along the whole length of both spaces, and announcing the dedication of the Italian *balaneion* behind. But this was combined with Italic features. Above the regionalist statement of the capitals is a frieze of acanthus tendrils, an ornament that had been given particular political significance under Augustus and the Julio-Claudians in Italy and beyond.²¹ A close parallel from the so-called 'Hellenistic villa' at Kastro Tigani, Samos, which should probably be dated rather to the early Empire, might also be the product of restorations after

(2010) 326, who, however, follows Ehrhardt in the suggestion that the cult at Miletus may have referred to a later member of the family.

¹⁷ Inscription on the architrave of the palaestra: *IMilet* 329. Although it has been suggested that the name Capito here is the same as the patron of the baths (McCABE [1986] 189), the letter forms suggest a second-century date, so the name (if it does not refer to the original donor) should perhaps rather be identified with a civic official of the Hadrianic period: EHRHARDT (1984) 390 n. 60; HERRMANN (1997) 211; PONT (2010) 141-142. The gentilicium Vergilius is written at the start of an architrave block, if not necessarily at the start of the line, but whether it followed the same form of dedicatory formula as the text on the Ionic portico is by no means clear.

¹⁸ VON GERKAN / KRISCHEN (1928) 36-47.

¹⁹ KLINKOTT (1996) 182-184.

²⁰ The architecture of the palaestra belongs to the same period as the rest of the complex: see KÖSTER (2004) 42 against alternative datings of the front portico either earlier or later.

²¹ KÖSTER (2004) 42-46, fig. 9, pls. 23.4, 24.5-7; for the symbolism of the acanthus more generally, see above all SAURON (2000).

the earthquake.²² Within the Palaestra the entablature also repeats the motif of the Hellenistic gymnasium, with lion's head water spouts, a balustrade adorned with plant imagery, Corinthian capitals, and a frieze of plant scrolls above. In front of the bath building, this was embellished with an upper gallery with central broken pediment (Fig. 3).²³ The latter distinctive and novel feature also occurs in the first theatre stage (Fig. 4), apparently dedicated to the Emperor Nero, which has likewise been attributed to Capito's restoration.²⁴ A precursor of this form can be seen at Nabataean Petra in the Khasneh and Deir (Fig. 5), dated to the late first century BCE and the first century CE respectively. But, perhaps more significantly, it was around the same time an innovative element of grotto architecture and domestic mural decoration in Campania.²⁵ One particular instance shows how this was visualized in a spatial setting: a small vignette of a stage-like painted 'vestibule' on the upper south wall of the triclinium of the "Casa del Porcellino", or "Casa di Sulpicius Rufus", at Pompeii (IX.9.c) (Fig. 6).²⁶ Resembling the stage-building of the theatre at Aphrodisias funded by Iulius Zoilus two generations earlier, the entry into the baths from the new palaestra, like the centre-

²² RUMSCHEID (1994) I, 292; II, 25, cat. 80.22, pl. 55.4-5: with spirally fluted caulicoli, as at Miletus, Delphinion: *Milet* 1.3. For Claudius' restoration of the Temple of Dionysus on Samos, see FREIS (1985).

²³ KÖSTER (2004) 33-42.

²⁴ *SEG* 36, 1057. A rasura before *Καίσαρι* and the amount of space available in the reconstruction of the block point to Nero as the dedicatee. The donor's name is not preserved in the fragmentary inscription, but Capito's name is restored by MCCABE (1986).

²⁵ Grotto: the 'Ninfeo Dorico' on the shore of Lake Albano at Castelgandolfo: CHIARUCCI (1981) 194. Murals: a wall painting on the north wall of Cubiculum 11 of the Villa at Oplontis (Torre Annunziata), omitting the left-hand pediment because of the doorway into the room: TYBOUT (1989) 242 pl. 39; MCKENZIE (1990) 40-50.

²⁶ Drawing in the DAI Rome: FÖRTSCH (1993) pl. 41.5. Photo of remains by BOB and JACKIE DUNN, <<http://www.pompeiiinpictures.com>>, IX.9.c, Part 4.

piece of the new theatre stage building, was modelled on a theatrical and quasi-palatial Roman domestic entrance.²⁷

When the baths were discovered in 1906-8, they were seen as “of especial architectural interest ... a type transitional between a Hellenistic gymnasium and a Roman bath”.²⁸ But it may be better to see the design as a representation of the latter in terms of the former: unlike the linear sequences of late Hellenistic bathing complexes or late Republican examples at Pompeii, its axial plan suggests an attempt to project a model derived from Campanian architecture onto a local Hellenistic design.²⁹ Although on the *Forma Urbis* the *πυριατῆριον Λακωνικόν* (Dio Cass. 53, 27, 1) of Agrippa’s Baths at Rome shows a more symmetrical arrangement than the row-type complexes of that name in Campanian bath architecture (such as the Stabian Baths at Pompeii, where a *laconicum* was dedicated in the 70s BCE³⁰), it lacks the axiality of Capito’s baths. At Miletus what was adopted was not so much a pre-conceived semi-symmetrical “block arrangement”³¹ as a Campanian bath design imposed upon a local East Greek axial and symmetrical scheme already evident in the Gymnasium of Eudemos, the Bouleuterion, and the North Agora (Fig. 1).³² The resulting composition has been regarded as possibly the earliest example of bilateral symmetry and axiality in ancient bath architecture, preceding the imperial *thermae* of Rome.³³ The result of such

²⁷ Aphrodisias: THEODORESCU (1996). Completed before 29 BCE, the theatre at Aphrodisias may have been the inspiration for the Theatre of Marcellus in Rome, which is reconstructed with a similar broken pediment above the regia and hospitalia entrances by MONTERROSO (2010) 49 fig. 17.

²⁸ DAWKINS (1910) 361.

²⁹ NIELSEN (1990) I, 102-103: a “transitional form” comparable to Campanian baths.

³⁰ Rome: *FUR*, fr. 38 Stanford. Pompeii: ESCHEBACH V-VI = NIELSEN VI-VII: NIELSEN (1990) II, C40 fig. 36.

³¹ FARRINGTON (1987) 53.

³² The design was “marked by symmetry and axiality and a certain monumentality before these features were found in the Roman *thermae*”: NIELSEN (1990) I, 103.

³³ NIELSEN (1990) I, 103; YEGÜL (1992) 254.

negotiation between local and 'imperial' practice would prove influential on the form of baths in both the province of Asia and the metropolis. Axial and symmetrical layouts were replicated in the later Hume-i Tepe Baths at Miletus and further afield, at Salamis in Cyprus and at Ephesus and Aphrodisias, while at Rome within a very few years the gymnasium of Nero produced a grander, axial and symmetrical version of the combination of baths and gymnasium which maintained an emphasis on the open palaestra court.³⁴

In the past the influence of Roman rule on the architecture of Greece and Asia Minor has been considered analogously to other transformations of the eastern Mediterranean like coinage, entertainments and the military presence or with particular attention to distinctive new forms like the temples of the imperial cult.³⁵ The question was studied closely at a seminar of the British Society of Antiquaries in 1985 and in its subsequent publication, now some twenty-five years ago, by Sarah Macready and F.H. Thompson.³⁶ Individual contributions to that volume investigated the 'impact' of Roman architectural design on Greek forms and spaces or searched for new Roman building types or techniques and local adaptations of metropolitan materials, or for features which might indicate Roman influence as opposed to an enduring "Hellenistic legacy".³⁷ Such an exercise was inevitably susceptible to the problems that attend larger considerations of 'Romanization', above all the assumption that the process in question involved a unilateral transformation of

³⁴ Hume-i Tepe Baths: YEGÜL (1986) 151. Harbour Baths, Ephesus, and Baths of Faustina: YEGÜL (1992) 256, and figs. 306-7. Salamis: YEGÜL (1992) 308-309 fig. 403. Rome: TAMM (1970); TUCHELT (1974) 168. As the name on the emperor is not preserved in the inscription, it is also possible that the baths at Miletus were dedicated to Nero, leaving an even shorter interval between the provincial project and the metropolitan one: MCCABE (1986); see further below.

³⁵ MILLAR (1987) ix-x; cf. CRAWFORD (1974); HÄNLEIN-SCHÄFER (1985).

³⁶ MACREADY / THOMPSON (1987).

³⁷ 'Impact': THOMPSON (1987); nymphaeum: WALKER (1987); building techniques: WÄLKENS (1987); materials: DODGE (1987); "Hellenistic legacy": LYTTTELTON (1987) 43.

the urban landscape from one kind of appearance to another. Moreover, behind such considerations of cultural influence lies the spectre of Josef Strzygowski's *Orient oder Rom*, to which John Ward-Perkins responded, arguing that to regard "the art or architecture of the empire as the product of two contrasting elements — whether it be Rome and the Orient, the Eastern and Western Empires ... [or] Romanism and Hellenism ... is to invite trouble".³⁸ But despite Ward-Perkins' alternative emphasis on the diversity of traditions and the peripheral and reciprocal influences on the architecture of the Roman East, his attention to form and structure have encouraged subsequent scholars and students to characterize the differences between East and West through a series of opposites: walls in ashlar or in concrete or mortared rubble; trabeated architecture or vaults and arches; linear plans or curvilinear design; horizontality or verticality; irregularity or axiality.³⁹

The phenomenon of "Roman architecture in the Greek world" should not, however, be seen as something imposed absolutely, nor in terms of cultural polarities, but as the result of a process of negotiation of cultural difference. It is a measure of how far perceptions of this process of cultural change have altered, that in a second conference on the theme held twenty years later, at the Institute of Classical Archaeology in Vienna in 2005, which was published also twenty years after the British publication, it was strongly emphasized that the architectural forms of Roman Asia Minor manifested a range of complex cultural processes, identified as persistence, accommodation, selection, adaptation, invention, acceptance, substitution, or assimilation.⁴⁰ Yet the applicability to architecture of these labels designed to categorize the wider relations between societies and cultures remains questionable. It is not quite adequate to describe the bath and palaestra complexes of imperial Roman

³⁸ WARD-PERKINS (1947) 181. For the influence of Strzygowski on later views of Roman art, see ELSNER (2002).

³⁹ YEGÜL (1991) 345. This is still partly evident in HUEBER (2007) 52.

⁴⁰ MEYER (2007) 11.

Asia Minor simply as an “instance of the fusion (*Verschmelzung*) of Greek and Roman culture”, as if there were two distinct cultural groupings which somehow collided and merged with the construction of a new spatial hybrid.⁴¹ Nor, at the other extreme, can it be correct to claim that material culture played “a very marginal role” in Greek self-definition in the light either of explicit statements of affiliation to the Parthenon and other buildings of Periclean Athens or of the abundant collections of sculpture in both civic and private contexts.⁴² In the baths of Capito at Miletus, which may be the first known instance of the bath-gymnasium form,⁴³ we see an architectural model deriving from Italian practice, yet emerging in the Greek East not in the same form but re-interpreted within the local language. The Campanian model of bathing suite around a *laconicum* is adapted into a civic layout based upon axial, symmetrical design. The entrance from the Palaestra with broken pediment is transferred from a Roman domestic or theatrical context to a Greek civic one. One can speak of these adjustments of Roman architectural practice when inserted into a Greek physical and cultural environment in linguistic terms, as the ‘translation’ of an Italic or Roman device into a manner comprehensible in the local region. What matters here is how the ‘translated’ concept is ‘read’ by the receiving population. As Egon Flaig has argued in an extreme form: “Das Rezipient eines kulturellen Produktes ist im Prozess der Aneignung ein ebenso wichtiger Faktor wie der Produzent. Wenn es um interkulturellen Austausch geht, dann ist der Rezipient noch wichtiger. Er bestimmt dann die Bedeutung, er allein und kein anderer”.⁴⁴

⁴¹ STESKAL (2007) 116.

⁴² WOOLF (1994) 128.

⁴³ At the very least, the building “occupies a key position in the formation of the bath-gymnasium type”, being the earliest example of axial bilateral symmetry in bathing architecture in Asia Minor and probably also in the West: YEGÜL (1992) 254.

⁴⁴ “The recipient of a cultural product is just as important a factor in the process of adoption as the producer. If it is a question of intercultural exchange,

Modern literary and cultural critics now apply theory on linguistic translation beyond the realm of language, referring more broadly to the ‘translatability of cultures’.⁴⁵ For antiquity too Greek and Roman patterns of cultural behaviour in the late Republic have been seen as deliberative stances, adopted at will like language and used interchangeably through a practice of ‘code switching’ so that one can speak to some extent of cultural bilingualism.⁴⁶ This applies to architecture as well as to dress and speech. Furthermore, it was practised by provincials, as well as by Romans. The erection by Herod the Great of a three-aisled basilica in Roman style on the Temple Mount at Jerusalem can be seen just as much as a form of ‘code switching’ as the building of a Corinthian *oecus* in a Roman house.⁴⁷ But this is to consider ‘Greek’ and ‘Roman’ architectural usages, of basilica versus stoa, atrium versus peristyle, or triclinium versus *oecus*, as the application of unchanging, absolute, and opposed categories and does not take account of efforts to mediate between the two cultures by translating a form from one language into the other.

Esra Akcan has lately studied the role of architecture as ‘translation’ in the practice of German-speaking architects designing cities in Turkey from the 1920s to the 1950s. In her recent book she writes:

“Bi- and multilateral international transportation of people, ideas, technology, information, and images generates processes of change that I am defining as *translations* — a term I particu-

then the recipient is even more important. It is what defines the meaning, it alone and no other.” FLAIG (1999) 94, supported with reference to bath gymnasium complexes in Asia Minor by STESKAL (2007) 121.

⁴⁵ BUDICK / ISER (1996).

⁴⁶ WALLACE-HADRILL (1998).

⁴⁷ For the basilica on the Temple Mount, see BALTU (1991) 289-290; HESBERG (2002). For the Corinthian *oecus* as an example of “code switching”, see WALLACE-HADRILL (1998) 90. In this particular case, the code switching becomes more complex, as the Corinthian *oecus* described by VITR. 6, 3, 8-9 was itself emulated in Herod’s third palace at Jericho and the very similar “palace complex” at Petra: KROPP (2009) 46.

larly find accessible since it is a common experience, whether one has translated between two languages, mediums, or places. Translation, as it is conceptualized in this book, takes place under any condition where there is a cultural flow from one place to another. It is the process of transformation during the act of transportation.”⁴⁸

In adopting such an approach Akcan is concerned not only with historical societies, but also with the potential of architecture as a contemporary discipline to promote in the future mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge between different geographic regions. The transmission of a work of architecture in translation is understood not as a second-hand copy where the original gets lost, but as a positive and creative force:

“it is through translations that a place opens itself to what was hitherto foreign, modifying and enriching its political institutions and cultural forms while simultaneously negotiating local norms with the other. ... Translations establish a contact zone that not only makes cultural exchanges possible, but also reveals the tensions and conflicts created by the perceived inequalities between places.”⁴⁹

Akcan’s work therefore develops a terminology for architecture based upon analyses of linguistic translation. It is possible, for example, to consider the transfer of alien architectural concepts to new contexts in terms of their “smooth translatability” or “untranslatability”, which lead respectively to the “appropriation” of translation — “the tendency to assimilate or absorb a foreign idea or artifact into the local norms” — or to its ‘foreignizing’, “the tendency to resist domestication, to expose the differences between two places, and to introduce a new idea, a discontinuity”; bearing in mind that “every actual translation exists somewhere between these two ends of the spectrum”.⁵⁰ Alternatively, one may speak of “translations for

⁴⁸ AKCAN (2012) 3-4.

⁴⁹ AKCAN (2012) 4.

⁵⁰ AKCAN (2012) 16.

the sake of hybridity and for the sake of a cosmopolitan ethic". In this way the model of translation offers "an alternative to indistinct concepts such as hybrid and transculturation, and to passive metaphors such as import, influence and transfer — all of which deny agency to the receiving location".⁵¹ Just as the postcolonial theories of Jacques Derrida and others have demystified the idea of linguistic translation as a neutral bridge between cultures,⁵² so considering the transfer of architectural ideas between cultures in this way can help to refine understanding of the processes of cultural influence upon the built environment. In particular, it encourages interpreters to avoid three over-simplifying narratives that are common in the study of colonial architecture or of any architecture that involves the interaction of western and eastern cultures: first, the perpetuation of "colonial terms of cultural criticism such as *civilized* and *backward*, *progressive international style* and *regressive regionalism*"; second, "the myth of problem-free modernization and the westernization of the world, which is predicated on the premise of smooth translatability"; and, third, "convictions of untranslatability that glorify traditional origins and closed borders".⁵³ It is not hard to see that these three perceptions of twentieth-century architecture are very similar to traditional ways of interpreting the emergence of Roman culture in the eastern Mediterranean.

Language is here treated not as a precise analogy for architecture, but as a conceptual metaphor, and there is no attempt to analyse buildings as artefacts that can be read with the same methods as applied to a linguistic text. In translation from a written text the source has a hierarchical status, prized for its 'untranslatability', and the translation is correspondingly measured by its ability to 'transport', or rewrite, the original in the receiving language despite the always contestable definitions of

⁵¹ AKCAN (2012) 5.

⁵² DERRIDA (2001); AKCAN (2012) 9-14.

⁵³ AKCAN (2012) 5.

what constitutes “fidelity”.⁵⁴ But, whereas “modern literary translation aims at the maximum possible closeness to the original, ... architectural translation more often than not aims at a distance, distortion, or transmutation”.⁵⁵ Architectural translation is not burdened by fidelity in the same way as literary translation. Instead, the architect faces a question of appropriation. Should he absorb the foreign into the local as much as possible “in order to maintain continuity in the existing context, or intentionally preserve its foreignness as much as possible to implement a radical discontinuity?”⁵⁶ Hence, while linguistic creolization is very rare, if an architectural hybrid is defined “as an artefact whose sources can be traced back to different places, there is hardly anything more common than an architectural hybrid”.⁵⁷ In fact, when architecture in a colonial environment is separated from the notion of imperialist intentions, it helps us to see that “translation is the process through which each place is opened to and enriched by its outside. ... Things do not get lost in translation, but they get multiplied through displacement and replacement.”⁵⁸

These issues concerning the translatability of colonial ideas are easily applicable to the introduction of ‘Roman architecture’ in the Greek East. We are well aware today that both private and public buildings in the ancient world had a communicative function.⁵⁹ But up to now the study of Roman provincial architecture has been overshadowed by assumptions on the one hand imperialist or on the other hand regionalist.⁶⁰ It

⁵⁴ AKCAN (2012) 11-12; DERRIDA (2001).

⁵⁵ AKCAN (2012) 8.

⁵⁶ AKCAN (2012) 16.

⁵⁷ AKCAN (2012) 22.

⁵⁸ AKCAN (2012) 25.

⁵⁹ This has been most prominently established for public architecture by HÖLSCHER (1984) and for private by WALLACE-HADRILL (1988). The principle is applied more extensively to both spheres by GROS (1996-2001).

⁶⁰ For the two assumptions together, leading to a distinction, in treating the architecture of Roman Greece, between “the conventional repetition of traditional lessons” and the forms introduced by “the new settlers”, see WARD-PERKINS (1981) 255.

is possible to understand the many varieties of provincial Roman architecture as determined by the ways in which a 'Roman' architectural discourse is presented in 'translated' form for residents of different regions. Certain basic typological forms used in the imperial East such as the podium temple with frontal stairway, the triumphal arch, the aqueduct with arcades, and, more rarely, the amphitheatre have clearly western origins, and their occurrence in eastern cities would have been obviously 'foreignizing', if not necessarily alienating.⁶¹ At a general level of perception, the translatability of Agrippa's baths is called into question for us by the variation in its naming: Agrippa's Campanian *laconicum* had by the end of the first century CE acquired for Frontinus the status of imperial Roman *thermae*, yet for the easterner Cassius Dio they were still a *gymnasion* over a century later.⁶² What was put in place in first-century Miletus involved the transportation of an Italian *laconicum* system to an axial Greek design and the translation of Italic symbolic ornamentation to a local decorative context. In terms of construction techniques a vaulting system executed with Italian pumice and mortar and faced with brick was not reproduced perfectly, but translated into a local medium of rubble concrete and a facing of small stones. At a smaller level of architectural detail the transfer of designs and motifs between Rome and Asia Minor in the first and second centuries is now better seen as a process of absorption of ideas, with decorative motifs from one region incorporated into a basic design format determined by the other; such new ideas were probably communicated through pattern books and solid models, transported from place to place, rather than executed through the physical movement of a migratory human work-

⁶¹ PLATTNER (2007) 125-126. Podium temples: e.g. Temple of Augustus, Pisidian Antioch; Traianeum, Pergamon; "Temple of Serapis", Ephesus; Temples of "Jupiter" and "Bacchus", Baalbek. Triumphal arch: e.g. South Gate of the Agora, Ephesus (dedicated by Mazaëus and Mithridates). Aqueducts: e.g. Ephesus, Aspendus. Amphitheatres: e.g. Pergamon.

⁶² TUCHELT (1974) 165; after KRAUSE.

force.⁶³ The alien architectural model thus resembled a foreign text requiring translation by local workmen to an indigenous context. Provincial architects implementing its inclusion into local environments had to decide how far to maintain links with existing building style and how far to emphasize discontinuities.

This approach to architecture as translation also helps to understand the other major building project attributed to Capito. The new stage building differed from the usual scheme in Asia Minor with a column display in front of a linear back wall. What occurs at Miletus, and differs from other theatres in Roman Asia Minor, is an attempt to translate to that rectilinear stage a practice of curvilinear design which had appeared in Italy a century earlier and, after a period of experimentation in the last years of the Republic and early Augustan era, starting perhaps with Pompey's Theatre at Rome, had by the late Augustan period become *de rigueur* in the Roman colonies of the western empire. The theatres at Gubbio in Umbria, Arles and Orange in Gallia Narbonensis, and Merida in Spain have a rounded niche at the centre of the stage; and the latter two examples show an orthodox pattern with a central semi-circular niche and two lateral rectangular niches which was widely followed in Italy, Spain and Africa and in the East at Herodian Caesarea Maritima.⁶⁴ But at Miletus the translation process is imperfect (Fig. 7). The single rounded niche at the centre of the stage is shallower and is preceded by four freestanding columns on podia.⁶⁵ The Italian model is reconciled with a Greek dramatic tradition of five

⁶³ PLATTNER (2004); contrast the earlier arguments of, in particular, STRONG (1953) and STROCKA (1988), who envisaged the influence of Trajan's Forum on civic architecture in Asia Minor as having been carried out through the large-scale migration of actual workmen and architects from Rome.

⁶⁴ SEAR (2006) 83-86, with Plans 63, 208-9, 230 and 280. In the Augustan period this curvilinear design was not, however, the only form practised in the West: for the rectilinear *scaenae frons* of the Theatre of Marcellus and the Augustan theatres at Ostia, Casinum and Tauromenium, see PENSABENE / DE NUCCIO (2010).

⁶⁵ ALTENHÖFER (1986).

entrances, rather than the three used in the Latin theatre, and at the same time with the linear Asiatic mode of column display as the four freestanding columns in front of the regia are aligned with the columns of the straight wings of the stage façade. The new form thus represents a translation of a Latin theatrical and architectural practice into a local idiom.

The Roman model was adapted in a similar way in the early second century, when the more voluminous, redeveloped scaena of the Theatre of Pompey (Fig. 8) with two lateral semicircular niches around the *hospitalia*, newly rebuilt after the fire of 80 CE, was translated to theatres in the Greek East. In several theatres in Italy, Spain and North Africa this was commuted to three semicircular niches, an adjustment which has been described as “a compromise between the old orthodox type and the more elaborate Theatre of Pompey type”.⁶⁶ In the Greek East the foreignness of the western feature was generally not directly imitated, but incorporated through the addition of indented podia with freestanding columns, instead of a continuous wall, so that the essential rectilinear stage wall was preserved behind (Figs. 9-10). At the Roman colony of Corinth, however, uniquely in Roman Greece, the Hadrianic stage building (Fig. 11) presented a complete sequence of three semicircular niches, complete even with basilicas on either side of the stage.⁶⁷ We can see here a clear distortion of the archetype, first in the West and at Corinth with the introduction of the central semicircular niche, and then elsewhere in the eastern provinces, with the manipulation of the visual effect through column displays instead of solid walls, which shows the essential untranslatability of the Roman model.

In architecture the process of translation is never a matter of mere reproduction of the original. It is also a creative process. The process of translation from metropolitan archetype to provincial building in baths and theatres alike encouraged a

⁶⁶ SEAR (2006) 88.

⁶⁷ STILLWELL (1952) pl. VII; SEAR (2006) 114-115 and 393, Plan 419.

cross-fertilization of ideas between the two, as the single curvilinear niche of the theatre at Miletus is replicated in the back wall of the Palaestra with a broken pediment straddling the entrance to the baths behind. The connection between the two buildings has implications for their relative dates. As Donald McCabe perceptively observed, the dedicatory inscription of the theatre is best restored by placing the name of Vergilius Capito in the architrave (Fig. 12) — making his role as dedicatory hierarchically subordinate to the dedicatees in the frieze (emperor, city divinity and people) — and, if the theatre which he funded was dedicated to Nero, it is no longer necessary to restore Claudius' name in the dedication of the bath gymnasium.⁶⁸ One might in any case expect that, after the earthquake, the restoration of the civic theatre, the largest and most important public building of the city, would have preceded the construction of a new thermal installation; and there would be more room for the Milesian Capito to dedicate the two buildings on his return from Egypt in 52 CE at the earliest than before his departure, in January 48 at the latest, when they can scarcely have been completed. In fact, if Nero was already on the throne by the time Capito dedicated the theatre to the new emperor, it is a reasonable inference that he dedicated the new bath-gymnasium after that. But there are additional architectural grounds. Although the evidence is limited, close parallels between the surviving architectural ornament of the Palaestra colonnade and the decoration of the theatre stage buildings strongly suggest that the two buildings were contemporary.⁶⁹ Capito's recent stay in Alexandria and experience of 'baroque' architecture there might also help to explain the appearance of a broken pediment feature a few years later in the upper (and later) levels of both these Milesian building commissions, although, as we have seen, Italian parallels provide a sufficient

⁶⁸ MCCABE (1986) 188.

⁶⁹ KÖSTER (2004) 55-56.

explanation.⁷⁰ Moreover, if the baths were in fact designed and dedicated *after* the theatre, it would better explain the channels of influence in the process of design: it is easier to see the introduction of a curved exedra and baroque broken pediment entrance first in the stage design of a theatre, from where they had been derived and where they would naturally enhance the theatrical setting, and subsequently experimentally deployed in the entrance behind the curvilinear end of the Palaestra, rather than the other way around. In the same way the introduction in the *caldarium* of the new baths of the unprecedented formula of a semi-circular niche between two rectangular ones might more naturally have occurred *after* its implementation in the new stage building in emulation of western *scaenae*.⁷¹

Thus the projects of Vergilius Capito at Miletus neither reflect a pattern of 'resistance' or 'regressive regionalism' on the part of local builders clinging fast to indigenous traditions nor indicate a scenario of imperialist 'westernization' or 'modernization' in imposing the forms or technologies of an alien culture. Instead, they illustrate a creative process of translation of one set of architectural forms, distorted and reconciled with another, but not without the input of others again, so that the home culture is enriched by 'foreign' elements from outside. But there is also a further implication for the relations between 'metropolitan' and 'colonial' architectural cultures which may seem counter-intuitive. Given that Capito's bath gymnasium was most likely dedicated *early* in Nero's reign, it may not be too bold to suggest that it was the model which influenced the axial symmetrical design of Nero's bath gymnasium at Rome, dedicated only in 60 or 62 CE,⁷² and so too that of the future imperial *thermae*, rather than the other way around.

⁷⁰ MCKENZIE (1990) 75 nos. 41-2, and (2007) 94.

⁷¹ On the novelty of this feature in a bathing context, see YEGÜL (1992) 419.

⁷² Dated to 62 according to TAC. *Ann.* 14, 47 and to 60 according to DIO CASS. 61, 21, 1.

The re-invention of Greek architecture under Rome and the incorporation of the Roman

Already a century before the works of Capito another architectural project by a Roman patron in 'old Greece' offers further cause for reflection on the notion of translation. In February 50 BCE Cicero learned that his colleague in the augural college at Rome, Appius Claudius Pulcher, was "building a *propylon* at Eleusis".⁷³ The Greek term he uses highlights that Appius' project was one of cross-cultural negotiation, the construction of a consciously Hellenic form. Indeed, nowhere more than here, at the entrance to an ancient Greek sacred site allegedly going back to the reign of King Erechtheus, would one expect the persistence of Hellenic forms.⁷⁴ Yet the new, so-called "Inner Propylaea", completed by his nephews after his death,⁷⁵ was no replication of traditional local religious architecture. It avoided the obvious and exalted paradigm of the "celebrated" Athenian Propylaea with its almost identical outer and inner faces, although, two centuries later, this would be adopted as a model for the outer gateway by the Antonine emperors.⁷⁶ Instead, it has been observed that the architecture with its narrow portal and open forecourt (Fig. 13) recalls the 'vestibule' of a Roman house, that "empty space" between the front door and the street, bordered by walls on each side, where, in the words of the later writer Aulus Gellius, "those who had come to greet the master of the house stopped before they were admitted, standing neither in the street nor within the house".⁷⁷ This enclosed space between projecting side walls in front of the house door is precisely that visualized in the

⁷³ Cic. *Att.* 6, 1, 26.

⁷⁴ MYLONAS (1972).

⁷⁵ *ILLRP* 401 = *CIL* 1² 775 = *ILS* 4041. Dated to 44 BCE by HESBERG (1994) 42.

⁷⁶ Cic. *Rep.* 3, 44; cf. SAURON (2000) 169-70. For the Antonine outer propylaea, see CLINTON (1989) 1526-1527.

⁷⁷ GELL. 16, 5, 2-3, 9; FÖRTSCH (1993) 129.

painting of the House of Sulpicius Rufus, which dates to around the same era, and where the idealized figures in the intercolumniations of the upper colonnade suggest the image of a dramatic palace (Fig. 6).

Yet there were further meanings to be read in the inner gateway at Eleusis. Its north-south orientation had ulterior significance for the Roman augur Appius as the axial framework of a Roman *templum*.⁷⁸ The distinctive architectural ornament — capitals without calathos, so that the monstrous creatures in place of the upper row of acanthus leaves appear to support a weightless superstructure with their wings, and helices taking the form of plant tendrils — has parallels in the work of neo-Attic sculptors in Italy inspired by models from Hellenistic Asia Minor, but is unknown in earlier Attic art.⁷⁹ Similarly, the very detailed iconography of the entablature expressed a complex of religious-political ideas prevalent at Rome through the matrix of a Hellenic style. The Doric frieze is converted into a symbol of Demeter with, remarkably, a *Latin* dedicatory inscription on the architrave below.⁸⁰ The mouldings of the Attic-Ionic column bases followed an idealizing form modelled on the most outstanding monument of Attica's classical heritage which encapsulated the sanctuary's own mythic origins, the Erechtheum. The neo-Attic caryatids on the inner face are a more obvious visual reference to the Erechtheum, but the details of their dress and coiffure are not direct copies of the latter, showing instead more similarity to the stylized urbanity of the Muses at the Theatre of Pompey.⁸¹ The form of the inner gateway at Eleusis can thus in several respects be understood in terms of a process of translation, its Italian layout, orientation and symbolic ornament adapted to the indigenous religious and cultural context and presented as a traditional Greek structure. To a Roman viewer like Cicero the structure

⁷⁸ For Appius' special distinction as augur, see *CIC. Div.* 1, 105.

⁷⁹ MASCHEK (2008) 187.

⁸⁰ *ILLRP* 401 = *CIL* 1² 775 = *ILS* 4041.

⁸¹ SAURON (2000) 170.

was described by a foreign word, *πρόπυλον*, in Greek characters; but on the building inscription this term was given in unfamiliar Latin letters, *propylum*. The building was presented as a revival of Classical Attic art, but instead of straightforwardly imitating genuine local works it moulded Roman replications of a cliché of Classical Greek architectural culture — the Erechtheum — and applied an Italian vestibule form to a local sanctuary entrance. It was not an exact repetition of authentic Attic culture, but a version intended to meet Roman expectations of how it should look and blended with alien features. Likewise, the incorporation of foreign elements in the building's plan was adapted to a local Greek environment. There was no exact displacement of Roman architectural forms to a Greek setting, since the specific elements introduced by Appius' patronage were neither perfectly translatable nor wholly untranslatable.

A different approach to the problem of translation was taken thirty years later with the construction of the Odeion of Agrippa, ca. 15 BCE, in the Athenian Agora.⁸² Here the 'normal' Corinthian capitals with kalathos and fleuron show the transportation from Rome to Greece of what was now becoming a standardized element of architectural vocabulary.⁸³ This too cannot be regarded as a straightforward transposition of a Roman model to a colonial ambit. The acanthus imagery already had iconic local significance in buildings like the Lysicrates Monument and, combined with classical forms of the Attic-Ionic base, as at Eleusis, and with classicizing images adorning the stage, it provided a stereotypical token of the city's classical past.⁸⁴ But what is most remarkable about the Odeion is its architectural form and urban context, which represent a mediated version of a

⁸² See, most recently, BALDASSARRI (1998) 115-142, with earlier bibliography.

⁸³ HEILMEYER (1970). For the capitals' resemblance to those of the Temple of Mars Ultor, see BALDASSARRI (1998) 137.

⁸⁴ For the herms decorating the *scaena* with female heads following models by Alcamenes and other Classical sculptors, see BALDASSARRI (1998) 122.

metropolitan model adjusted to its provincial setting. Its dominating position near the site of the ancient open-air orchestra and across what would henceforth become the Agora's principal axis has been recognised as an urban configuration jarring to Greek eyes; resembling a Roman temple with its raised octastyle Corinthian façade surrounded by side porticoes (Fig. 14), it was analogous in location to the Temple of Divus Julius at Rome, which straddled the Roman Forum facing the rostra, and to the new imperial fora of Caesar and Augustus.⁸⁵ But this grand temple front, comparable to the Temple of Mars Ultor then under construction in the capital, perhaps even by the same workmen, was translated to an ulterior context, masking a secular building for recitals.⁸⁶

Inside too, what was nominally a recreation of Classical Athens — Pericles' Odeion at the south-eastern foot of the Acropolis — was physically closer in conception to recent constructions in Italy. Of buildings that survive today the Covered Theatre at Pompeii is most similar;⁸⁷ but, as Agrippa's Odeion probably originated during or after his visit to Athens in the winter of 16/15 BCE,⁸⁸ it was more likely inspired by his new technological conceptions in Rome: the now lost Diribitorium, famous for its innovative roof supported by beams a hundred foot long, and, one may venture, perhaps even an Odeum in the Campus Martius, a predecessor of Domitian's.⁸⁹ How much these works owed to the recent restoration of Pericles' Odeion, under the Roman architect brothers Gaius and Marcus, sons of Stallius, and one

⁸⁵ THOMPSON (1987) 7-9.

⁸⁶ For the significance of Pericles' new Odeion in creating a forum for secular musical performances in the democratic city, see MOSCONI (2000) 295-297. The construction of Agrippa's Odeion at the site of the orchestra in the Agora completed this process.

⁸⁷ BALDASSARRI (1998) 131.

⁸⁸ For the date, see BALDASSARRI (1998) 139.

⁸⁹ Diribitorium: PLIN. *Nat.* 16, 201; 36, 102. There is, of course, no record of an earlier Odeum in the Campus Martius, but, for the Flavian emulation of Augustan building projects, see, e.g., HESLIN (2007) 17.

Melanippus, must remain a mystery until further excavation can reveal more about that building.⁹⁰ Agrippa's Odeion, with its roof supported by a giant Corinthian order and boldly spanning some twenty-five metres, would have towered over the Classical Bouleuterion on the west side of the agora.⁹¹ So in this case the translation was of new interior and exterior forms, executed in the medium of traditional local building techniques,⁹² and an alien urban layout, brought together in the central urban context of the city's ancient civic heart. Yet, however foreign this building might have appeared structurally and spatially, it soon became a new site for traditional values, coming to be used as a setting for rhetorical panegyrics of old Athens like the speech by Herodes Atticus, which, we are told, was "compared to an abridgement of a Panathenaic oration".⁹³ The transfer of a spatial configuration from Rome itself did not stop there. The cross-axis was dominated by the transposition, in this case literally a translation from its previous site outside the city, of the Classical temple of Ares, which in its spatial relationship to the Odeion mimicked the perpendicular relation of temples at Rome.⁹⁴ Formal and spatial principles were transferred from the capital to the provincial city, but this took the shape not of simple replication of metropolitan models, but of their adaptation to the existing formal and spatial language of the provincial town: the Classical Doric temple front, crowded with hackneyed images of past Hellenic culture, was placed in direct juxtaposition and con-

⁹⁰ *IG II²* 3426-3427; THOMPSON (1987) 4.

⁹¹ The eventual collapse of the Odeion's roof exposed the imperfection of the translation.

⁹² The use of T-shaped clamps resembles construction techniques of the fifth century and may even have imitated the method of the Classical Temple of Ares transferred during the same period to a site adjacent to the Odeion: BALDASSARRI (1998) 117.

⁹³ PHILOSTR. *VS* 2, 5, 4 (571K).

⁹⁴ THOMPSON (1987) 9. KORRES (1998) now argues that the former location of the temple was at Pallene, rather than Acharnae as usually thought, and that it had originally been dedicated to Athena.

frontation with the new Roman temple-like façade of the Odeion, itself blended with images from the Classical city.⁹⁵

The product of the architectural negotiations that took place in Roman Greece was not so much ‘biculturalism’ or ‘hybridization’ as a new synthesis which took both Greek architecture and Roman architecture forward in a different direction. In colonial architecture in general is materialized the transformation of indigenous architectural forms by the adoption of imperial ones. Yet the practice often described as ‘Romanization’ consists rather of two alternative and diametrically opposed strategies of introducing Roman forms into the local cityscape: ‘appropriation’ and ‘foreignizing’. Appropriation can be described as “the tendency to assimilate or absorb a foreign idea or artifact into the local norms”, a way of homogenizing the colonial built environment; by contrast, ‘foreignizing’ translation is “the tendency to resist domestication, to expose the differences between two places and to introduce a new idea, a discontinuity”.⁹⁶ The first strategy can be seen at Eleusis, the second in the Agora at Athens. Yet no single Roman colony follows either of these opposed strategies completely. Every actual colonial establishment is a translation that exists somewhere between these two ends of the spectrum. It may move the world one step towards what is now called ‘clonialism’ (sameness), brought under one hegemonic power, a state which among Roman colonies never completely existed;⁹⁷ or it may introduce a new and foreign idea to a given context or strengthen the local norms at that given moment if the imported object is assimilated. On the one hand, the premise of absolute translatability may trigger the total assimilation of one place in another and the recognition of a provincial city as ‘Roman’. On the other, the belief in *untranslatability* may

⁹⁵ For the various images in and around the temple, see PAUS. 1, 8, 4-5, and, for their nostalgic effect, see ALCOCK (2002) 56.

⁹⁶ AKCAN (2012) 16.

⁹⁷ BISPHAM (2000) and (2006).

draw sharp and fixed borders around places and encourage the persistence of local identity.

If the Roman transformation of the Athenian Agora points to the untranslatability of Roman architectural ideals, with the massive appearance of Agrippa's Odeion indicating a discontinuity in the Athenian city, the new Forum of the Roman colony at Corinth (Fig. 15) suggests the possibility of the smooth translation of architectural forms from one cultural context to another, hinting that buildings, like languages, "are not strangers to one another, but ... interrelated in what they want to express".⁹⁸ The realignment of this central civic space, extended over the site of the ancient agora of the Greek city-state, presents a translation of the Roman forum concept into a local dialect. On the south side the old South Stoa was rebuilt in a form identical to its Classical predecessor up to its roof, apart from minor repairs and the addition of a small bath and latrine and offices.⁹⁹ Extending 164 m alongside the agora, its orientation remained visibly determined by that of the Temple of Apollo above the agora to the north. The east side, however, was taken up entirely by the Augustan "Julian Basilica", in the manner of a western forum, and opposite were ranged a row of small prostyle temples of Etrusco-Italic design, the "Babbius Monument", and the Fountain of Poseidon, with an almost axial view to the larger peripteral Temple E behind, constructed in the Augustan era. Some have seen the latter as the Capitolium of the colony because of its high position and strong east-west axis over the plaza, while others remain more sceptical.¹⁰⁰

Two axes determined the layout of the north side: to the East, the Peirene spring, jutting into the agora; to the West, the more linear Lechaion Road, following the north-south orientation of the centuriation of Caesar's colony.¹⁰¹ The restoration of

⁹⁸ BENJAMIN (1996) 72.

⁹⁹ BRONEER (1954) 100-155; WISEMAN (1979) 515-516.

¹⁰⁰ Identification as Capitolium: WALBANK (1989), followed by STROCKA (2010) 39; but for reservations see HUTTON (2005) 168-169.

¹⁰¹ STROCKA (2010) 39.

the primeval Peirene spring adjacent to both the agora and the Lechaion Road was one of the first building projects of the new colony, showing its importance for the civic identity of the new colonists, preserved as an icon of the city's ancient identity and cult.¹⁰² Now, however, like other buildings of the colony, it followed Roman models. The ancient spring-fed tunnels were maintained behind a two-storey façade with arched openings framed by an engaged Doric order and an ornamental Ionic order above. This idiom of superimposed arcades with half-columns, dating to the early years of the Augustan era, represented a translation of an Italian concept seen in structures like the so-called "Tabularium" at Rome and now also the Theatre of Marcellus.¹⁰³ But here the concept took a local form, once again simulating the Classical archetypes of old Greece with Attic-Ionic bases like those of the Erechtheum;¹⁰⁴ and the superimposed orders of the poros court added in the Augustan period followed the formula of fourth-century BCE colonnaded temple interiors such as the Temple of Zeus at Nemea and the Temple of Athena Alea at Tegea, which had recently been echoed at Rome in the temples of Venus Genetrix, Apollo in Circo and Mars Ultor. These last models may also have inspired the addition of an apse on the long north side opposite the façade, reduplicating the apse of the Augustan Temple F, possibly a Temple of Venus Genetrix.¹⁰⁵

Across the Lechaion Road the first basilica established a clear cross-axis leading to the bema on the other side of the forum.¹⁰⁶ As we noted already in the case of King Herod, the introduction of the basilica into the Greek world in general is, of course, a further instance of the practice of architectural translation. At

¹⁰² ROBINSON (2011) 176.

¹⁰³ ROBINSON (2011) 190-191.

¹⁰⁴ ROBINSON (2011) 184; cf. the Inner Propylon at Eleusis and the Odeion of Agrippa in Athens.

¹⁰⁵ ROBINSON (2011) 193-194. Venus Genetrix: WILLIAMS (1989) 157-158, 162.

¹⁰⁶ FOWLER / STILLWELL (1932) 193-211; STROCKA (2010) 40.

one end of the spectrum the Roman form was almost perfectly reproduced in the Julian Basilica at Corinth or the basilica recently excavated at the Decapolis city of Hippos Sussita, where in the second half of the first century CE an Italian layout was imposed on an eastern city located on a narrow mountain overlooking the Sea of Galilee (Fig. 16).¹⁰⁷ But in neither case is the basilica a precise replication of an Italian form. At Corinth a basilica quadrangle of ten by five columns first built in local poros limestone in the first quarter of the first century CE was rebuilt in marble somewhat over a century later and given a monumental approach from the forum, in the form of a high central stairway at the top of which stood a tetrastyle porch with granite columns.¹⁰⁸ The stairway leading to the basilica located on the short side of the long forum made the building a striking visual focus at the end of the square. A tribunal situated in the centre of the south wall flanked by imperial statues can be reconstructed, developing the model of Vitruvius' basilica at Fanum.¹⁰⁹ But two small exedras added off the rear wall, to either side of an east porch, represent to our knowledge no precise reproduction of an Italian original; they were replicated in the South Basilica, an exact copy of the Julian Basilica built a generation later. The location of the South Basilica behind the South Stoa, instead of directly on the forum, also demonstrates the imperfect translatability of the basilica concept. At Hippos the layout with three entrances on the short side is very similar to that at the Apennine colony of Saepinum. However, the three doorways lead not to the forum, but to a principal thoroughfare (the *decumanus maximus*) which approaches the forum at its north-eastern corner, not unlike Pompeii, with a triumphal arch marking the shift to the larger open civic space. The translation into a local idiom may even be evident in the unusual spirally fluted stucco fluting of the

¹⁰⁷ SEGAL (2010) 24-42.

¹⁰⁸ For the west porch belonging to Phase IV of the building, see SCOTTON (1997) 196-204.

¹⁰⁹ SCOTTON (1997) 265-266.

columns (Fig. 17). In both these cases the transformation of the Italian civic basilica does not replicate a perfectly translatable form, but merges the Roman design with local factors.

At the opposite end of the spectrum, instances of the type from Asia Minor, with elongated nave and aisles and separate hall space at one end, show how the translation of the Roman basilica form was mediated through the traditions of the Greek stoa.¹¹⁰ At Ephesus the Augustan building erected along the north side of the State Agora in the final years of Augustus' reign was labelled in a bilingual dedicatory inscription which reveals a clear case of architectural 'code switching' between the term *Basilica Stoa* in the Greek part and the Latin *Basilica*.¹¹¹ Yet in appearance the building resembled neither a Greek stoa nor a Roman judiciary basilica. Changes in linguistic translation are paralleled by formal ones. Funded by the resident Roman C. Sextilius Pollio (perhaps a relative or heir of the great Augustan merchant and diplomat P. Vedius Pollio, whose freedmen settled in Asia Minor),¹¹² who also financed the city's new aqueduct with its distinctively western arcades, his wife Ofillia Bassa and stepson Ofillius Proculus, also from a high-standing Ephesian family,¹¹³ the building, which replaced a single-aisle stoa of Hellenistic date, mimicked the Roman form with a higher and wider central nave of two stories and two single-storey aisles and was raised five steps above the agora, but, like a Greek stoa, took an elongated form, one stadion in length, along the north side of the "State Agora", open on one side (Fig. 18).¹¹⁴ Like his aqueduct and the earlier, triumviral

¹¹⁰ Aphrodisias: STINSON (2008); Smyrna: NAUMANN / KANTAR (1950).

¹¹¹ Date: c. 11-14. ALZINGER (1974) 26-28. Inscription: *AE* 1993, 1498; ENGELMANN / İPLİKÇIOĞLU / KNIBBE (1993) 148-149 no. 80. Bilingualism: KEARSLEY (2001) 127-129 no. 154.

¹¹² KIRBIHLER (2007) 27-30.

¹¹³ SCHERRER (2007) 67-68. There is, however, no evidence either that the Sextilii and Ofillii held civic office at this time or of their relation to the *conuentus ciuium Romanorum*.

¹¹⁴ *IK 12-Ephesos* 404 with the additional fragment published by KNIBBE in ENGELMANN / İPLİKÇIOĞLU / KNIBBE (1993) 148-149 no. 80; ALZINGER (1974)

temple within the “State Agora”, the construction employed the unfamiliar method of laying mortared rubble within ashlar facing, an evident translation of western building techniques into locally available materials and indigenous architectural traditions.¹¹⁵ At the east end a separate hall, or *chalcidicum*, was distinguished which, unlike the Roman tribunal at, for example, Pompeii, was not concealed from the inner colonnades by a transverse ambulatory, but represented an enlargement of the spaces produced by returning side walls at some Hellenistic stoas in Asia Minor.¹¹⁶ In this east room were found large enthroned portraits of Augustus and Livia, but the development of this space can be seen as much as the continuation of an earlier trend towards the interiorization of Greek civic space, as well as the introduction of a specifically Roman idea.¹¹⁷ At Aphrodisias this new model was constructed on a larger scale to produce a form of embellished interior grandeur more in keeping with imperial Roman norms, but which also asserted the city’s own status and history with a remarkable series of reliefs illustrating the city’s legends;¹¹⁸ at Smyrna the high, wide nave of the Antonine basilica continued uninterruptedly to a tribunal at one end with no transverse columns.¹¹⁹ In Syro-Palestine contrasting solutions were adopted in the basilicas at Ascalon and Samaria Sebaste: the former followed the elongated, hierarchical layout of the basilicas of Asia Minor, while the latter, like Hippos, had a more compact, Italianate plan adjacent to the forum.¹²⁰ I have elsewhere shown the process of negotiation through which a two-aisled Hellenistic stoa at Thera, originally turned towards the forum through an open colonnade,

26-37.

¹¹⁵ ALZINGER (1974) 28-29; WAELEKENS (1987) 96.

¹¹⁶ E.g. Aegae, Assos, Magnesia: STINSON (2007) 94.

¹¹⁷ STINSON (2007) 94; cf. GROS (2005) 186-187. For ALZINGER (1989) 216, this represented an alternative version of the basilica unknown to Vitruvius.

¹¹⁸ STINSON (2008) 99-101; YILDIRIM (2008).

¹¹⁹ NAUMANN / KANTAR (1950); STINSON (2008) 104.

¹²⁰ Ascalon: FISCHER (1995); Samaria Sebaste: REISNER / FISHER / LYON (1924); CROWFOOT / KENYON / SUKENIK (1942).

could become labelled, like the Augustan building at Ephesus, as a *stoa basilikē*, still with two aisles, but closed off from the forum with an axial approach and a hall at one end, as at Ephesus but separated by spur walls and a central column.¹²¹ In this sense one could almost claim that the idea of a Roman *basilica* presented by the new name had become lost in the architectural translation to a Greek version.

Returning to Corinth, the Lechaion Road entered the agora by a monumental stairway at the top of which was a three-bay triumphal arch with gilded chariots carrying Phaethon and Helios which Pausanias called the Propylaea.¹²² Pausanias' choice of vocabulary is revealing. But it is not the Latin word for triumphal arch which raises issues of translatability — there was a common Greek term available, *hapsis* — but the architectural concept. The triple gateway with honorific meaning leading into the forum from a straight, axial street was a formula repeated in many western cities, but to Pausanias it resembled a gateway to a religious sanctuary. The architecture accordingly is a translation. Despite the reliefs with images of weaponry, captured Parthians, and an imperial sacrifice in the presence of divinities, the form of the rebuilt Neronian gateway diverges from the norm of imperial Roman arches in the substantial projection of the central section, which corresponds to the need for the gateway to serve as a formal precinct entrance rather than merely a triumphal archway.¹²³

Built beside the extended Propylaea, as part of a single project, the so-called Captives' Façade, erected along the north side of the agora of the colony, as a façade for the rebuilt first basilica, offers a good example of the negotiation of the translatability of particular built forms.¹²⁴ The display of long-haired, chained figures can on one level be seen to replicate the

¹²¹ THOMAS (2007) 135-139.

¹²² PAUS. 2, 3, 2. FOWLER / STILLWELL (1932) 159-192; STROCKA (2010) 74-78.

¹²³ STROCKA (2010) 74-75 fig. 119.

¹²⁴ FOWLER / STILLWELL (1932). For redating: STROCKA (2010) 39-42.

interior decoration of the Basilica Aemilia in Rome, where the row of statues of 'Phrygians' in pavonazetto along the attic was a visual demonstration of Roman dominion over eastern nations.¹²⁵ It could thus be considered as the kind of alien form which outside Rome would look particularly 'foreign'. But it is not reproduced identically. The concept of 'barbarians' expressed in the Roman basilica is reinterpreted, or 'translated', to correspond to Hellenic tradition both in the ethnic characterization of the figures and in their manner and location. The figures' iconography hinting at a Parthian ethnicity and their exterior position in fronting the upper storey of the basilica, without the conspicuous gesture of support seen in the Basilica Aemilia, follow the model of the Persian Stoa at Sparta.¹²⁶ The latter is described by Vitruvius in a passage directly following his account of the famous Caryatids:

"The Spartans too, after they overcame the infinitely large Persian army at the Battle of Plataea with a handful of soldiers under the leadership of Pausanias son of Agesilas [sic] [Gioc.: "Agesipolis"], celebrated a glorious triumph with the plunder and the spoils and set up a Persian portico from the proceeds (*ex manubiis*) as evidence of the renown and valour of their own citizens and as a victory trophy for posterity. There they arranged likenesses of their prisoners in lavish barbarian dress holding up the roof, their pride punished by well-deserved humiliations, so that their enemies would tremble with fear for what their bravery might achieve and their own citizens, looking at this model of courage, would hold their heads high in glory and be ready to defend their freedom. And so from that time many builders have placed in their works statues of Persians holding up architraves and their mouldings and have thus developed striking variations on that theme. There are other histories too of the same kind of which architects should take note."¹²⁷

¹²⁵ PLIN. *Nat.* 36, 102 with the emendation *columnis e[t] Phrygibus* of SCHNEIDER (1986) 64-67; cf. (1998) 104, with pl. 12.1-2. See now LIPPS (2011) 27 fig. 4, and 140-149.

¹²⁶ STROCKA (2010) 50. KUTTNER (1995) 83 suggested that the figures of Parthian captives in the Basilica Aemilia allude to the Persian Porch in Sparta and referred also to Persian caryatids at the Villa Farnesina.

¹²⁷ VITR. 1, 1, 6.

There have been various imaginings of what this structure looked like, of which the most striking is Joseph Gandy's painting of 1816.¹²⁸ Most plausibly, Hugh Plommer visualized "a two-storey stoa, perhaps with a wholly Doric exterior, and with columns on the ground floor separated by a continuous architrave from Persians on the first floor. A continuous Doric entablature could have provided a handsome crown for the whole work."¹²⁹ However, the new basilica façade at Corinth was not just a copy of the Classical structure, but a negotiation between Roman and Greek form and ideas (Fig. 19). The model of the Persian Stoa provided a convenient inspiration at the time of the Emperor Nero's Parthian campaign. The result was a translation of the imperialistic model of the Roman basilica with its images of Phrygian captives into a façade which played with the Hellenic tradition, from which the Spartan Pausanias' Persians had become Nero's Parthians (Fig. 20-21). It was not the only version introduced into the Roman provinces. In the western empire a very similar idea was presented in a different idiom at the forum basilica at Tarraco where a row of Parthians in relief on the basilica façade looked out onto the *chalcidicum* courtyard.¹³⁰

* * *

This paper has dealt with the processes by which a range of forms were introduced into the public architecture of the Greek East in the first generations of Roman rule. But in the early second century the transmission of Roman forms into the

¹²⁸ "The Persian Porch and place of consultation of the Lacedaemonians". Royal Academy Exhibition Catalogue 1816, no. 806, p. 36. Getty Research Institute, Research Library, 910072*. On the painting, see ELSNER (2001) and (2010) 249 no. 9, and, for Gandy's other paintings based on Pausanias, ELSNER (2010) 237-246.

¹²⁹ PLOMMER (1979) 100. For discussions of the location of the agora at Sparta, see STIBBE (1989) 77; MUSTI / TORELLI (1991) 192-193; and TORELLI (1991) 225-226.

¹³⁰ LAMUÀ et al. (2011) 870 fig. 5.

architecture of Asia Minor was still a matter of incorporating alien elements into a native tradition. Rather than the grand “Ephesian-Pergamene building workshop (*Bauhütte*)” which scholars formerly imagined as responsible for Trajanic and Hadrianic public buildings in western Asia Minor, it is now clear from the close adherence of the detailed execution of the leaves of Corinthian and composite capitals to local traditions that these were the work of much smaller, temporary workshops who adapted the formal syntax of western models to regional architectural language using pattern books and physical models.¹³¹ Some of these western capitals that might have accompanied the official *procurator* in charge of imperial projects like Domitian’s new temple at Ephesus have survived, showing very close resemblance to official projects in the capital such as Domitian’s new palace, and would have offered local stonemasons a model which was then translated into the local idiom. But the process of translation enabled the alien features to become absorbed into the urban environment. Western Roman decorative idioms presented in a building like the Library of Celsus, which had perhaps been transmitted through pattern books brought from Rome and accessible to the founder as erstwhile *curator operum publicorum*,¹³² became obscured in the local architectural language; new western building techniques of brick construction were concealed behind familiar marble cladding.¹³³ By contrast, explicitly Roman iconography like the eagles of the frieze and the fasces carved within the plant scrolls of the pilasters stood out all the more directly as ‘foreignizing’.¹³⁴

What followed after the introduction of western forms was a long creative process during which features that may once have

¹³¹ PLATTNER (2007) 128-129. For earlier views of an “ephesisch-pergame-nische Bauhütte”, see STROCKA (1988) and ROHMANN (1998) 109-110.

¹³² As suggested by STROCKA (1978) 900.

¹³³ This is identified by STROCKA (1988) 302 as the earliest use of fired brick masonry at Ephesus.

¹³⁴ PLATTNER (2007) 130.

been perceived as ‘Roman’, including basilicas, baths and the Latin stage, became more complex cultural markers, particularly on the Greek mainland where cities adopted hybrid forms of memory.¹³⁵ Architectural innovations resulted from intercultural exchanges across the Mediterranean as forms and designs were translated into new contexts.¹³⁶ The fertility and inventiveness of design in Roman Greece can be seen in the second- or third-century baths at Marathon, with two hexagonal *caldaria*, a circular sweating-room with two lobed ends, and an oval swimming pool.¹³⁷ In the fourth century the Peirene fountain at Corinth took a new form with three new arched semi-circular exedras, a “triconch” conception translated from western palatial architecture, itself based on the precocious architecture of Hadrian’s Villa.¹³⁸ The development of building techniques in the Greek East continued to carry forward Roman ideas, but Rome was not the only inspiration. Ideas and techniques from other traditions also found translation into new materials. Thus the pitched brick vaulting of a cult hall at Argos employs fired bricks set vertically on end in the manner of contemporary construction in Mesopotamia, a technique modified from earlier, pitched mud-brick prototypes and also adopted in hydraulic structures at Athens and Eleusis and in the substructures of the Antonine basilica at Smyrna and of a third-century basilica at Aspendus.¹³⁹ The introduc-

¹³⁵ STINSON (2007) 97; ALCOCK (2002) 65-95.

¹³⁶ On this theme see further PIRSON / WULF-RHEIDT (2008).

¹³⁷ NIELSEN (1990) C269, fig. 214; ARAPOGIANNI (1993) 139 fig. 8. For the geometric complexity, compare the Antonine Baths at Carthage and the baths at Thaeanae in Numidia: THOMAS (2007) with references.

¹³⁸ Pace HILL (1964) 93-99, who dated this phase to the second century. For the fourth-century date, based on closer consideration of the stratigraphic record, and for examples of other buildings of this form, see ROBINSON (2011) 252-265. For the triconch form at Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli, see MACDONALD / PINTO (1994) 103-107.

¹³⁹ DODGE (1984) 242-247, and (1987) 113-114, using the word “translation” to describe this adaptation. For the discussion, with references, of the use of vertically set brick in the so-called “Bath A” at Argos, elsewhere in Roman Greece and Asia Minor, and in the Parthian palace at Assur and a burial chamber

tion of western building types gave the impetus to explore old techniques in new ways, giving rise to successors in late antiquity which themselves would be of seminal importance for future architecture, including the Great Palace in Constantinople and the Church of Santa Sophia.¹⁴⁰ The latter, which lays the greatest claim of any building in the eastern empire to the legacy of Roman vaulting, was the work of two Ionians, the Milesian architect Isidorus and Anthemius of Tralles, who relied perhaps on the teachings of the Alexandrian engineer Heron, but also on the transmission of Roman practice.¹⁴¹ It was through these successive acts of architectural translation of western and eastern forms and ideas to renewed Greek contexts that Byzantine and later architecture emerged.

Works cited:

- AKCAN, E. (2012), *Architecture in Translation: Germany, Turkey, and the Modern House* (Durham-London).
- ALCOCK, S.E. (2002), *The Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscape, Monuments, and Memories* (Cambridge).
- ALTENHÖFER, E. (1986), "Das erste römische Bühnengebäude des Theaters von Milet", in W. MÜLLER-WIENER (Hrsg.), *Milet 1899-1980: Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung; Kolloquium, Frankfurt am Main 1980* (Tübingen), 165-173.
- ALZINGER, W. (1974), *Augusteische Architektur in Ephesos* (Wien).
- ALZINGER, W. (1989), "Vitruvs Basilika und der archäologische Befund", in H. GEERTMAN / J. J. DE JONG (ed.), *Munus non ingratum: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Vitruvius' De Architectura and the Hellenistic and Republican Architecture, Leiden, 20-23 January 1987* (Leiden), 212-216.

at Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, and the important distinction between such construction with bricks set vertically on end and the "pitched brick" technique of Egyptian and earlier Mesopotamian mud-brick architecture, see LANCASTER (2009).

¹⁴⁰ On building techniques in the eastern Mediterranean in the late Roman and early Byzantine periods, see WARD-PERKINS (1958); cf. also WARD-PERKINS (1947).

¹⁴¹ MAINSTONE (1988); SVENSHON (2009).

- ARAPOGIANNI, X. (1993), "Τὸ ῥωμαϊκὸ βαλκανεῖο στὴν Μπρεζίτσα τοῦ Μακραθῶνος", *AE* 132:133-186.
- BALDASSARRI, P. (1998), *ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΙ: Edilizia monumentale ad Atene durante il Saeculum Augustum* (Roma).
- BALTY, J.-Ch. (1991), *Curia ordinis: Recherches d'architecture et d'urbanisme antiques sur les curies provinciales du monde romain* (Bruxelles).
- BASTIANINI, G. (1975), "Lista dei prefetti d'Egitto dal 30^a al 299^p", *ZPE* 17:263-328.
- BENJAMIN, W. (1996), "The Concept of Criticism in German Romanticism" [1919], in M.P. BULLOCK / M.W. JENNINGS (ed.), *Walter Benjamin. Selected Writings*. 1, 1913-1926 (Cambridge MA), 116-200.
- BISPHAM, E. (2000), "Mimic?: A Case Study in Early Roman Colonisation", in E. HERRING / K. LOMAS (ed.), *The Emergence of State Identities in Italy in the First Millennium BC (Accordia Specialist Studies on Italy 8)*, London), 157-186.
- BISPHAM, E. (2006), "*Coloniā deducere*: How Roman was Roman Colonization during the Middle Republic", in G. BRADLEY / J.-P. WILSON (ed.), *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions* (Swansea), 74-160.
- BOWERSOCK, G.W. (1965), *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford).
- BRONEER, O. (1954), *Corinth: Results of Excavations*. I.4, *The South Stoa and its Roman Successors* (Princeton).
- BUDICK, S. / ISER, W. (1996) (ed.), *The Translatability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space Between* (Stanford).
- BURRELL, B. (2004), *Neokoroi: Greek Cities and Roman Emperors* (Leiden).
- CHIARUCCI, P. (1981), "Rinvenimenti presso il Lago Albano", in *Archeologia Laziale* 4 (*QuadAEI* 5, Roma), 191-197.
- CLINTON, K. (1989), "The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors, Second Century BC to AD 267", in *ANRW* II.18.2 (Berlin), 1499-1539.
- CRAWFORD, M.H. (1974), *Roman Republican Coinage* (London).
- CROWFOOT, J.W. / KENYON, K.M. / SUKENIK, E.L. (1942), *The Buildings at Samaria* (London).
- DAWKINS, R.M. (1910), "Archeology in Greece (1909-1910)", *JHS* 30:357-364.
- DEMOUGIN, S. (1999), "L'ordre équestre en Asie Mineure: Histoire d'une romanisation", in S. DEMOUGIN (éd.), *L'ordre équestre: Histoire d'une aristocratie (II^e siècle av. J.-C. - III^e siècle ap. J.-C.)*; *Actes du colloque international (Bruxelles-Leuven, 5-7 octobre 1995)* (Rome), 579-612.

- DERRIDA, J. (2001), "What is a 'relevant' translation?", transl. by L. VENUTI, *Critical Inquiry* 27,2:174-200.
- DODGE, H. (1984), *Building Materials and Techniques in the Eastern Mediterranean from the Hellenistic Period to the Fourth Century A.D.* PhD dissertation (Newcastle University).
- DODGE, H. (1987), "Brick Construction in Roman Greece and Asia Minor", in MACREADY / THOMPSON (1987), 106-116.
- EDWARDS, C.M. (1994), "The Arch over the Lechaion Road at Corinth and its Sculpture", *Hesperia* 63,3: 263-308.
- EHRHARDT, N. (1984), "Ein milesischer Festkalender aus severischer Zeit", *MDAI(I)* 34:371-404.
- ELSNER, J. (2001), "Coda: A Pictorial Postscript", in S.E. ALCOCK / J.F. CHERRY / J. ELSNER (ed.), *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford), 256-260.
- ELSNER, J. (2002), "The Birth of Late Antiquity: Riegl and Strzygowski in 1901", *Art History* 25:358-379.
- ELSNER, J. (2010), "Picturesque and Sublime: Impacts of Pausanias in Late-Eighteenth- and Early-Nineteenth-Century Britain", *Classical Receptions Journal* 2(2):219-253.
- ENGELMANN, H. / İPLİKÇIOĞLU, B. / KNIBBE, D. (1993), "Neue Inschriften aus Ephesos XII", *JÖAI* 62: 113-150.
- ESCHEBACH, H. (1979), *Die Stabianer Thermen in Pompeji* (Berlin).
- FARRINGTON, A. (1987), "Imperial Bath Buildings in South-West Asia Minor", in MACREADY / THOMPSON (1987), 50-59.
- FISCHER, M. (1995), "The Basilica at Ascalon: Marble, Imperial Art, and Architecture in Roman Palestine", in J.H. HUMPHREY (ed.), *The Roman and Byzantine Near East: Some Recent Archaeological Research*. I (*JRA* Supplementary Series 14, Portsmouth), 121-150.
- FLAIG, E. (1999), "Über die Grenzen der Akkulturation: Wider die Verdinglichung des Kulturbegriffs", in G. VOGT-SPIRA / B. ROMMEL (Hrsg.), *Rezeption und Identität: Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma* (Stuttgart), 81-112.
- FÖRTSCH, R. (1993), *Archäologischer Kommentar zu den Villenbriefen des jüngeren Plinius* (Mainz).
- FOWLER, H.N. / STILLWELL, R. (1932), *Corinth: Results of Excavations*. I.1, *Introduction, Topography, Architecture* (Cambridge MA).
- FREIS, H. (1985), "Eine Bauinschrift des Kaisers Claudius aus Samos", *ZPE* 58:189-193.
- GERKAN, A. VON / KRISCHEN, F. (1928), *Thermen und Palaestren (Milet I.9, Berlin)*.

- GROS, P. (1996-2001), *L'architecture romaine du début du III^e siècle av. J.-C. à la fin du Haut-Empire*. Vol. 1, *Les monuments publics*. Vol. 2, *Maisons, palais, villas et tombeaux* (Paris).
- GROS, P. (2005), "La ville comme symbole: le modèle central et ses limites", in H. INGEBERT (ed.), *Histoire de la civilisation romaine* (Paris), 155-232.
- HABICHT, Ch. (1960), Review of A. REHM (1958) (Hrsg.), *Didyma*. II, *Die Inschriften* (Berlin), *GGA* 213(1959):145-166.
- HABICHT, Ch. (1975), "New Evidence on the Province of Asia", *JRS* 65:64-91.
- HÄNLEIN-SCHÄFER, H. (1985), *Veneratio Augusti: Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers* (*Archaeologica* 39, Roma).
- HEILMEYER, W.-D. (1970), *Korinthische Normalkapitelle: Studien zur Geschichte der römischen Architekturdekoration* (Heidelberg).
- HERRMANN, P. (1960), "Die Inschriften römischer Zeit aus dem Heraion von Samos", *MDAI(A)* 75:68-183.
- HERRMANN, P. (1986), "Die Weihinschrift der ersten römischen Bühne in Milet", in W. MUELLER-WIENER (Hrsg.), *Milet 1899-1980: Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung; Kolloquium, Frankfurt am Main 1980* (Tübingen), 175-189.
- HERRMANN, P. (1994), "Milet unter Augustus: C. Iulius Epikrates und die Anfänge des Kaiserkults", *MDAI(I)* 44:203-236.
- HERRMANN, P. (1997), *Inschriften von Milet*. 1: B, *Nachträge und Übersetzungen zu den Inschriften N. 1-406* (Milet VI.1) (Berlin).
- HESBERG, H. VON (1994), *Formen privater Repräsentation in der Baukunst des 2. und 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Köln).
- HESBERG, H. VON (2002), "Die Basilika von Ephesos — Die kulturelle Kompetenz der neuen Stifter", in C. BERNS / H. VON HESBERG / L. VANDEPUT / M. WÄLKENS (Hrsg.), *Patris und Imperium: Kulturelle und politische Identität in den Städten der römischen Provinzen Kleinasiens in der frühen Kaiserzeit, Kolloquium Köln, November 1998* (*BABesch* Supplement 8, Leuven), 149-158.
- HESLIN, P.J. (2007), "Augustus, Domitian and the So-called *Horologium Augusti*", *JRS* 97:1-20.
- HILL, B.H. (1964), *Corinth: Results of Excavations*. I.6, *The Springs: Peirene, Sacred Springs*, Glauke (Princeton).
- HINGLEY, R. (2005), *Globalizing Roman Culture: Unity, Diversity and Empire* (London).
- HÖLSCHER, T. (1984), *Staatsdenkmal und Publikum vom Untergang der Republik bis zur Festigung des Kaisertums in Rom* (*Xenia* 9, Konstanz).

- HUEBER, F. (2007), "Römischer Einfluss auf die Bautechnik, Bauwirtschaft und Architekturkonzepte in Kleinasien", in MEYER (2007), 45-55.
- HUTTON, W. (2005), *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias* (Cambridge).
- KEARSLEY, R.A. (2001), *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia: Mixed Language Inscriptions and Linguistic Evidence for Cultural Interaction until the End of A.D. III (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 59, Bonn)*.
- KEAY, S.J. / TERRENATO, N. (2001) (ed.), *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization* (Oxford).
- KIRBIHLER, F. (2007), "Die Italiker in Kleinasien, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Ephesos (133 v. Chr. – 1. Jh. n. Chr.)", in MEYER (2007), 19-35.
- KLEINER, G. (1968), *Die Ruinen von Milet* (Berlin).
- KLINKOTT, M. (1996), "Raster, Raum und Sichtverbindungen im Stadtensemble von Milet", *MDAI(I)* 46:179-186.
- KORRES, M. (1998), "Ἀπό τον Σταυρό στην Αρχαία Αγορά", *Horos* 10-12:83-104.
- KÖSTER, R. (2004), *Die Bauornamentik von Milet. 1, Die Bauornamentik der frühen und mittleren Kaiserzeit (Milet VII.1, Berlin)*.
- KRENCKER, D.M. (1929), *Die Trierer Kaiserthermen. Abt. I, Ausgrabungsbericht und grundsätzliche Untersuchungen römischer Thermen* (Augsburg).
- KROPP, A.J.M. (2009), "Nabataean Petra: The Royal Palace and the Herod Connection", *Boreas* 32:43-59.
- KUTTNER, A.L. (1995), *Dynasty and Empire in the Age of Augustus: The Case of the Boscoreale Cups* (Berkeley-Oxford).
- LAMUA, M. / VIVÓ, D. / MAR, R. / RUIZ DE ARBULO, J. (2011), "La fachada oriental de la basílica forense de Tarraco: El monumento de los cautivos y el *chalcidicum* de culto imperial", in T. NOGALES / I. RODÀ (ed.), *Roma y las provincias: Modelo y difusión. II* (Roma), 863-872.
- LANCASTER, L.C. (2009), "Early Examples of So-Called Pitched Brick Barrel Vaulting in Roman Greece and Asia Minor: A Question of Origin and Intention", in M. BACHMANN (Hrsg.), *Bautechnik im antiken und vorantiken Kleinasien: Internationale Konferenz 13.-16. Juni 2007 in Istanbul (BYZAS 9, Istanbul)*, 371-391.
- LAURENCE, R. / BERRY, J. (1998) (ed.), *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire* (London).
- LIPPS, J. (2011), *Die Basilica Aemilia am Forum Romanum: Der kaiserzeitliche Bau und seine Ornamentik* (Wiesbaden).

- LYTTELTON, M. (1987), "The Design and Planning of Temples and Sanctuaries in Asia Minor in the Roman Imperial Period", in MACREADY / THOMPSON (1987), 38-49.
- MACDONALD, W.L. / PINTO, J.A. (1994), *Hadrian's Villa and its Legacy* (New Haven-London).
- MACMULLEN, R. (2000), *Romanization in the Time of Augustus* (New Haven).
- MACREADY, S. / THOMPSON, F.H. (1987) (ed.), *Roman Architecture in the Greek World (The Society of Antiquaries, Occasional Papers N.S. 10, London)*.
- MAINSTONE, R.J. (1988), *Hagia Sophia: Architecture, Structure and Liturgy of Justinian's Great Church* (London).
- MASCHEK, D. (2008), "Figur und Ornament: Das Tänzerinnenmonument von der Via Prenestina und die Produktion von Architekturdekor im römischen Suburbium des 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.", *JÖAI* 77:185-217.
- MATTINGLY, D.J. (2011), *Imperialism, Power and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire* (Princeton).
- MAU, A. (1877), "Le terme centrali di Pompei", *Bolletino dell'Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica* 214-223.
- MCCABE, D. (1986), "Die Weihinschrift der ersten römischen Bühne in Milet: Note", in W. MUELLER-WIENER (Hrsg.), *Milet 1899-1980: Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung; Kolloquium, Frankfurt am Main 1980* (Tübingen), 186-189.
- MCKENZIE, J. (1990), *The Architecture of Petra* (Oxford).
- MCKENZIE, J. (2007), *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt, c. 300 BC to AD 700* (New Haven-London).
- MEYER, M. (2007) (Hrsg.), *Neue Zeiten – Neue Sitten: Zu Rezeption und Integration römischen und italischen Kulturguts in Kleinasien* (Wien).
- MILLAR, F. (1987), "Introduction", in MACREADY / THOMPSON (1987), ix-xv.
- MILLET, M. (1990), *The Romanization of Britain: An Essay in Archaeological Interpretation* (Cambridge).
- MITCHELL, S. (1987), "Imperial Building in the Eastern Roman Provinces", in MACREADY / THOMPSON (1987), 18-25.
- MONTEROSO, A. (2010), "La scaenae frons en los teatros de Roma: Entre liturgia, formas y modelos", in S.F. RAMALLO ASENSIO / N. RÖRING (ed.), *La scaenae frons en la arquitectura teatral roman: Actas del Symposium Internacional celebrado en Cartagena los días 12 al 14 de marzo de 2009 en el Museo del Teatro Romano* (Murcia), 15-55.

- MOSCONI, G. (2000), "La democrazia ateniese e la nuova musica: L'Odeion di Pericle", in A.C. CASSIO / D. MUSTI / L.E. ROSSI (ed.), *Synaulia: Cultura musicale in Grecia e contatti mediterranei* (Napoli), 217-316.
- MUSTI, D. / TORELLI, M. (1991), *Pausania. Guida della Grecia: Libro III, la Laconia* (Roma-Milano).
- MYLONAS, G.E. (1972), *Eleusis: A Guide to its Ruins and its History* (Athens).
- NAUMANN, R. / KANTAR, S. (1950), "Die Agora von Smyrna: Bericht über die in den Jahren 1932-1941 auf dem Friedhof Namazgâh zu Izmir von der Museumsleitung in Verbindung mit der türkischen Geschichtskommission durchgeführten Ausgrabungen", in *Kleinasien und Byzanz: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Altertumskunde und Kunstgeschichte (Istanbuler Forschungen 17, Berlin)*, 69-114.
- NIELSEN, I. (1990), *Thermae et balnea: The Architecture and Cultural History of Roman Public Baths*. 2 vol. (Aarhus).
- NÜNNERICH-ASMUS, A. (1994), *Basilika und Portikus: Die Architektur der Säulenhallen als Ausdruck gewandelter Urbanität in später Republik und früher Kaiserzeit* (Köln).
- PENSABENE, P. / DE NUCCIO, M. (2010), "Frontescene rettilinee nei teatri: I case di Roma (Teatro Marcello), Ostia, Cassino e Taormina", in S.F. RAMALLO ASENSIO / N. RÖRING (ed.), *La scaenae frons en la arquitectura teatral roman: Actas del Symposium Internacional celebrado en Cartagena los días 12 al 14 de marzo de 2009 en el Museo del Teatro Romano* (Murcia), 57-100.
- PFLAUM, H.-G. (1960), *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*. Vol. 1 (Paris).
- PIRSON, F. / WULF-RHEIDT, U. (2008) (Hrsg.), *Austausch und Inspiration: Kulturkontakt als Impuls architektonischer Innovation (Diskussionen zur archäologischen Bauforschung 9, Mainz)*.
- PLATTNER, G.A. (2004), "Transfer von Architekturkonzepten und Ornamentformen zwischen Kleinasien und Rom in der Kaiserzeit", *RHM* 46:17-35.
- PLATTNER, G.A. (2007), "Elemente stadtrömischer Bautypen und Ornamentformen in der kleinasiatischen Architektur", in MEYER (2007), 125-132.
- PLOMMER, H. (1979), "Vitruvius and the Origin of Caryatids", *JHS* 99:97-102.
- PONT, A.-V. (2010), *Orner la cité: Enjeux culturels et politiques du paysage urbain dans l'Asie gréco-romaine* (Bordeaux-Paris).
- RATTÉ, Ch. / SMITH, R.R.R. (2008) (ed.), *Aphrodisias Papers*. 4, *New Research on the City and its Monuments (JRA Supplementary Series 70, Portsmouth)*.

- REISNER, G.A. / FISHER, C.S. / LYON, D.G. (1924), *Harvard Excavations at Samaria: 1908-1910* (Cambridge MA).
- ROBERT, L. (1949), "Le culte de Caligula à Milet et la province d'Asie", *Hellenica* 7:206-238.
- ROBERT, L. (1977), "Un Milésien à Athènes", *AE* 217-218.
- ROBINSON, B.A. (2011), *Histories of Peirene: A Corinthian Fountain in Three Millennia* (Princeton).
- ROHMANN, J. (1998), *Die Kapitellproduktion der römischen Kaiserzeit in Pergamon (Pergamenische Forschungen 10, Berlin)*.
- RUMSCHEID, F. (1994), *Untersuchungen zur kleinasiatischen Bauornamentik des Hellenismus* (Mainz).
- SAURON, G. (2000), *L'histoire végétalisée: Ornement et politique à Rome* (Paris).
- SCHERRER, P. (2007), "Der *conventus civium Romanorum* und kaiserliche Freigelassene als Bauherren in Ephesos in augusteischer Zeit", in MEYER (2007), 63-75.
- SCHNEIDER, R.M. (1986), *Bunte Barbaren: Orientalenstatuen aus farbigem Marmor in der römischen Repräsentationskunst* (Worms).
- SCHNEIDER, R.M. (1998), "Die Faszination des Feindes: Bilder der Parther und des Orients in Rom", in J. WIESEHÖFER (Hrsg.), *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse = The Arsacid Empire: Sources and Documentation; Beiträge des internationalen Colloquiums, Eutin (27.-30. Juni 1996)* (*Historia Einzelschriften* 122, Stuttgart), 95-146.
- SCOTTON, P.D. (1997), *The Julian Basilica at Corinth: An Architectural Investigation*. Diss. (Philadelphia).
- SEAR, F.B. (2006), *Roman Theatres: An Architectural Study* (Oxford-New York).
- SEGAL, A. (2010), *Hippos-Sussita: Eleventh Season of Excavations* (Haifa).
- SHERK, R.K. (1988), *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian (Translated Documents of Greece and Rome 6, Cambridge)*.
- STESKAL, M. (2007), "Griechische Gymnasien und römische Thermen: Rezeption römischer Lebensart im griechischen Osten, dargestellt am Beispiel der ephesischen Bad-Gymnasium-Komplexe", in MEYER (2007), 115-123.
- STIBBE, C.M. (1989), "Beobachtungen zur Topographie des antiken Sparta", *BABesch* 64:61-99.
- STILLWELL, R. (1952), *Corinth: Results of Excavations. II, The Theatre* (Princeton).
- STINSON, P. (2007), "Imitation and Adaptation in Architectural Design: Two Roman Basilicas at Ephesus and Aphrodisias", in MEYER (2007), 91-100.

- STINSON, P. (2008), "The Civil Basilica: Urban Context, Design, and Significance", in RATTÉ / SMITH (2008), 79-106.
- STROCKA, V.M. (1978), "Zur Datierung des Celsusbibliothek", in E. AKURGAL (ed.), *The Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Ankara-Izmir, 23-30/IX/1973*. II (Ankara), 893-900.
- STROCKA, V.M. (1988), "Wechselwirkungen der stadtrömischen und kleinasiatischen Architektur unter Trajan und Hadrian", *MDAI(I)* 38:291-307.
- STROCKA, V.M. (2010), *Die Gefangenenfassade an der Agora von Korinth: Ihr Ort in der römischen Kunstgeschichte* (Regensburg).
- STRONG, D.E. (1953), "Late Hadrianic Architectural Ornament in Rome", *PBSR* 21:118-151.
- SVENSHON, H. (2009), "Heron of Alexandria and the Dome of Hagia Sophia in Istanbul", in *Proceedings of the Third International Congress on Construction History, Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus, Germany, 20th-24th May 2009* (Cottbus), online at <<http://www.bma.arch.unige.it/>>.
- SYME, R. (1983), "Rome and the Nations", *Diogenes* 124:33-46 (= R. SYME, *Roman Papers*. 4 [Oxford 1988], 62-73).
- THEODORESCU, D. (1996), "La *frons scaenae* du théâtre: Innovations et particularités à l'époque de Zoilos", in Ch. ROUECHÉ / R.R.R. SMITH (ed.), *Aphrodisias Papers*. 3, *The Setting and Quarries, Mythological and Other Sculptural Decoration, Architectural Development, Portico of Tiberius, and Tetracylon* (JRA Supplementary Series 20, Ann Arbor), 127-148.
- THOMAS, E. (2007), *Monumentality and the Roman Empire: Architecture in the Antonine Age* (Oxford-New York).
- THOMPSON, H.A. (1987), "The Impact of Roman Architects and Architecture on Athens, 170 BC - AD 170", in MACREADY / THOMPSON (1987), 1-17.
- THONEMANN, P. (2011), *The Maeander Valley: A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium* (Cambridge-New York).
- TORELLI, M. (1991), "Da Sparta a Villa Adriana: Le terme dell'Arapissa, il ginnasio del *Platanistas* e il Teatro Marittimo", in M. GNADE (ed.), *Stips Votiva: Papers Presented to C.M. Stibbe* (Amsterdam), 225-232.
- TUCHELT, K. (1974), "Bemerkungen zu den Capito-Thermen in Milet", in *Mansel'e armağan: Mélanges Mansel* (Ankara), 147-169.
- TYBOUT, R.A. (1989), *Aedificiorum Figurae: Untersuchungen zu den Architekturdarstellungen des frühen zweiten Stils* (*Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology* 7, Amsterdam).

- WÆLKENS, M. (1987), "The Adoption of Roman Building Techniques in the Architecture of Asia Minor", in MACREADY / THOMPSON (1987), 94-105.
- WALBANK, M. (1989), "Pausanias, Octavia and Temple E at Corinth", *ABSA* 84:361-394.
- WALKER, S. (1987), "Roman Nymphaea in the Greek World", in MACREADY / THOMPSON (1987), 60-71.
- WALLACE-HADRILL, A. (1988), "The Social Structure of the Roman House", *PBSR* 56:43-97.
- WALLACE-HADRILL, A. (1998), "To Be Roman, Go Greek: Thoughts on Hellenization at Rome", in M.M. AUSTIN / J. HARRIES / C.J. SMITH (ed.), *Modus operandi: Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Rickman* (London), 79-91.
- WALTHEW, C.V. (1995), "Roman Basilicas: A Progress Report", *Classics Ireland* 2:133-149.
- WARD-PERKINS, J.B. (1947), "The Italian Element in Late Roman and Early Medieval Architecture", *PBA* 33:163-194.
- WARD-PERKINS, J.B. (1958), "Notes on the Structure and Building Methods of Early Byzantine Architecture", in D. TALBOT RICE (ed.), *The Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors, Second Report* (Edinburgh), 53-104.
- WARD-PERKINS, J.B. (1981), *Roman Imperial Architecture* (Harmondsworth).
- WILLIAMS, C.K. II (1989), "A Re-evaluation of Temple E and the West End of the Forum at Corinth", in S. WALKER / A. CAMERON (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* (*BICS* Suppl. 55, London), 156-162.
- WISEMAN, J. (1979), "Corinth and Rome I: 228 BC — AD 267", in *ANRW* II.7.1 (Berlin), 438-548.
- WOOLF, G. (1994), "Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East", *PCPhS* 40:116-143.
- YEGÜL, F.K. (1992), *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge MA-New York).
- YILDIRIM, B. (2008), "The Date of the Reliefs from the Colonnades of the Civil Basilica", in RATTÉ / SMITH (2008), 107-129.

DISCUSSION

A. Heller: J'ai été extrêmement intéressée par votre exposé et les problématiques que vous développez, qui rejoignent en grande partie mes propres préoccupations: pour l'histoire des institutions comme pour l'histoire de l'architecture, nous avons à revisiter l'ancien concept de romanisation, dont tout le monde s'accorde à penser qu'il a montré ses limites. Vous y substituez le concept de traduction, et j'ai été largement convaincue de sa pertinence à travers les exemples que vous avez étudiés. Je me demande toutefois si deux autres concepts, que vous évoquez pour les rejeter, ne méritent pas d'être davantage pris en considération. Le premier est celui d'hybridation: il me semble que, par exemple, le cas du complexe bathsgymnasium à Milet (et ailleurs) peut être interprété en ces termes; on a les thermes romains, on a le gymnase hellénistique, et ces deux formes se combinent pour produire un nouveau type de monument, que l'on peut à mon sens qualifier d'hybride. Le deuxième concept qui me paraît opératoire est celui de transfert culturel. Dans la théorie des transferts culturels telle qu'elle a été élaborée dans le champ littéraire, avant d'être transposée à d'autres disciplines, le milieu de réception n'est jamais perçu comme le récipient passif de l'objet transféré; au contraire, l'accent est mis sur les transformations et adaptations que subit cet objet dans son contexte de réception. De plus, cette théorie invite à mettre en valeur les agents du transfert, ce qui dans les cas qui nous occupent me paraît intéressant: il n'est pas inutile de souligner que Capito est citoyen milésien et qu'à côté de sa carrière dans l'administration romaine, il a rempli des fonctions civiques à Milet; il est Grec en même temps que Romain — même si la question des identités individuelles est complexe et ne se réduit pas à une simple alternative binaire; par contraste,

Appius à Éleusis est clairement un représentant du pouvoir romain, de passage et non pas installé depuis des générations dans la cité. L'identité et le statut des agents du transfert peuvent-ils influencer sur la nature et les modalités du transfert?

E. Thomas: Thank you for this intervention. You are quite right, of course, that the question of terminology to describe these complex processes of cultural change is always a difficult one and that it would be wrong to dismiss the validity of particular terms in different specific cases. The term 'hybridization' has seen some favour in recent archaeological discussions, especially as an alternative to the more restricted term 'Hellenization', in order to emphasize the extent to which the accretion of 'Greek' features in areas attached to other cultures was not a pure addition, but fused with other elements. It certainly seems tempting to employ the term to describe the baths gymnasia in Asia Minor where one finds clearly identifiable elements of separate cultures — the palaestra of the Greek gymnasium and the heated rooms of the western bath suite — presented in a new form, as if biologically grafted together. But to describe this as 'hybridization' in a precise biological sense risks underestimating the purpose of such a cultural transformation: was the fusion between 'Greek' and 'Roman' elements established on an equal basis without hierarchy, or was it not the case that the builders intended to transport a 'foreign' element to an indigenous realm, rather than to fuse the two together indiscriminately? At the same time, the term 'hybrid' is also too general since in architecture most buildings can be considered as 'architectural hybrids' in the sense that their sources are drawn from different places. The term 'translation', on the other hand, draws attention to the introduction of Roman or western culture to a local Greek environment without the problematic assumptions implicit in the traditional term 'Romanization'.

The term 'cultural transfer' certainly avoids the abstract and impersonal aspect of 'hybridization' and is a less objectionable

way of describing the process of cultural change in architecture, especially if it can be applied in a more active sense than it commonly has been in English. However, I have preferred instead the term ‘translation’ because of its ability to conceptualize the sometimes indistinct process of cultural flow between one region and another and because, unlike transfer, ‘translation’ is a creative process, which, as with the Baths of Capito or the “Captives’ Façade” at Corinth, does not simply reproduce a ‘foreign’ concept, but creates something new. It does not imply that a concept or practice has been transported perfectly, but that it may, and usually does, take the form of a distorted version of the original.

H.-G. Nesselrath: Der Bau des Odeion des Agrippa mitten auf der ‘klassischen’ athenischen Agora ist sicher ein gutes Beispiel für ein ‘foreignizing’ in Architektur. Hier wäre es interessant zu wissen, aus welchen Gründen Agrippa gerade hier ein solches Gebäude erbauen ließ: Wollte er damit unmissverständlich die römische Präsenz und Dominanz in Athen demonstrieren? Wollte er die Stoa des pergamenischen Königs Attalos, die ja damals schon seit einiger Zeit die Ostseite der Agora dominierte, ‘übertrumpfen’? Ebenso interessant zu wissen wäre, wie die Athener auf den Bau des Agrippa reagierten; gibt es dazu irgendwelche Zeugnisse? Pausanias erwähnt das Odeion nur einmal kurz und ganz nebenbei (1, 8, 6), und er sagt dabei auch nicht, dass es von Agrippa stammt.

E. Thomas: It is hard to know for certain the intention of M. Agrippa in building his Odeion at Athens, nor is there any evidence for how the Athenians might have reacted. At any rate, the recent restoration of Pericles’ Odeion suggests that the construction was not determined by functional need alone. I have speculated in my paper that part of the motive was to reorganize the Athenian Agora, which up until then had been aligned around the diagonal Panathenaic Way, in a manner more typical of Roman public space, with a raised temple

façade on a straight axis. But this transportation of a Roman idea of public space to the provincial Greek context, which I have called a ‘translation’, was distorted in that it involved not an actual temple building, but a temple-like front on a building for recitations. It would be a reasonable guess that at least some Athenians regarded the new Odeion as an aggressive and provocative gesture, not least because of its scale in overshadowing the transplanted Temple of Ares beside it. If this reaction is not attested explicitly in the always meagre evidence of ancient responses to architecture, it is not only made plausible by Cassius Dio’s (52, 30, 1-3) attribution to Maecenas of the intention of imperial architecture to intimidate its provincial subjects, but may even explain Herodes Atticus’ later use of the building to deliver nostalgic panegyrics of Athens’ independent past as a reaction to such feelings of alienation or an attempt to re-appropriate the building for sentiments of local pride.

T. Whitmarsh: Perhaps I could follow up Heinz-Günther with two observations and a question. The first observation is that Leslie Shear has argued precisely that the point of Roman intervention in the *agora* was to eat up democratic space: that the aim was not just to create an environment, but also to destroy one. Second observation: It must be right, yes, that Agrippa’s ‘foreignizing’ Odeion was in dialogue with Pericles’ predecessor. But if we are to trust Pausanias, that predecessor was already itself ‘foreignizing’, in that it was modeled on Xerxes’ tent. So the foreignizing tendency in Agrippa’s construction might be seen, actually, as rather domesticated? Finally, my question. All our images for cultural contact are metaphors: hybridity is from the field of biology, cultural transfer from trade, translation from language. They are all thus approximations rather than descriptions, and carry risks as well as advantages. I wonder whether ‘translation’ implies too much that every single architectural ‘speech act’ is a salient or emic vehicle for the articulation of identity. Sometimes differences may be due to local bricolage or improvisation (e.g. you

note that concrete is simply not available in Asia Minor). In such cases, transformations of architectural design would not be emic translations but rather etic features of pragmatic adaptation to the local geological, political and technological environment.

E. Thomas: Thank you, these observations are certainly valid and important. In the first case, I suspect that the distinction between creating and destroying space may be an artificial one. Every work of new architecture which is constructed on a fixed space is necessarily both a work of creation and one of destruction (in that it destroys what went before, whether that was an existing building, an empty space, or a virgin site). The important thing with Agrippa's transformation of the Athenian Agora is that it introduced a new idea of public space, one based on western urban design; even if that appeared to involve destroying the previous idea of the Agora, it is arguable whether it fully destroyed it, since earlier Athenian civic buildings remained in place along the edges of the square.

On your second point about Pericles' Odeion, I will only add that it is an inevitable consequence of architectural translation that, in time, the concepts translated become blurred and distorted. What once seems 'foreign' later becomes domesticated. But in the passage to which you refer Pausanias' point is arguably not so much to stress the alienness of the form of Pericles' Odeion as, on the contrary, to show how closely bound up it is, through its evocation of the Persian Wars, with Athens' historic identity.

The final question is a very fair one and difficult to answer. It is true, of course, that not every work of construction can be regarded as articulating identity. But undoubtedly many can. In this case, where I am considering buildings as deliberate attempts to transport an idea from an alien culture, they can *qua definitione* be understood in these emic terms. The fact that a particular building material is unavailable does not make the choice to improvise by using a close substitute purely inci-

dental. One should ask why the builders at Miletus felt it important to render as close as possible an approximation to Campanian rubble concrete, rather than, say, using traditional indigenous masonry techniques. In other words, their use of mortared rubble was not an accidental means to an end, but a significant part of their aim in transporting the Italian form to the West Asian regional context. Certainly, the metaphor of translation is intended as a conceptual one and might therefore in principle be vulnerable to the same risks of inequalities as other metaphors. However, it at least has the advantage of plausibility to the situation. So, while the transportation of architectural ideas is hardly a biological process or even a matter of concepts traded between partners, it can more realistically be considered as a form of expression.

H.-G. Nesselrath: Sie unterscheiden zwischen 'linguistic translation' und 'architectural translation', wobei Sie als Kennzeichen dieser letzteren nicht 'fidelity' (d.h. größtmögliche Genauigkeit in der Übertragung eines Textes aus einer fremden Sprache in die eigene) bezeichnen, sondern ihr die Freiheit zu 'distance, distortion, or transmutation' zubilligen. Handelt es sich dann aber noch um 'translation', oder sollte man eher von 'rewriting' oder 'remodelling' sprechen? Und liegt diese größere Freiheit in der künstlerischen Freiheit begründet, die ein Architekt für sich beansprucht?

E. Thomas: Yes, the greater freedom of architectural translation from its model is in part the result of the freedom of the artist, but it is also because, unlike an actual translation of a written or spoken text, the translation of a building is not designed primarily to serve the purpose of communicating a message. Nonetheless, 'translation' remains an appropriate term to describe this phenomenon, which is still defined by *an* intention to transport an ideal or a form to a new regional context. That cannot always be described instead as 'rewriting' or 'remodelling' because the aim is not to produce a distortion

of form, but to produce a version of the form which, because of the complexity of the process, usually becomes distorted, in some cases more so than in others. That does not mean that in some cases a more 'accurate' version cannot be produced, as for example the translation of the Latin stage to the theatre at Corinth or of the three-aisled basilica to Hippos Sussita.

P. Schubert: Ma question s'adresse aussi bien à vous qu'à Ursula Gärtner. Votre exposé montre de manière frappante que, entre les parties respectivement occidentale et orientale de l'Empire, une circulation s'opère: elle peut s'observer notamment au niveau de l'architecture. En comparaison avec le domaine relativement cloisonné de la poésie épique, le contraste est frappant. Comment expliquer une telle différence?

E. Thomas: First of all, there is a danger that this contrasting impression is a result of the reality that, whereas only a very small number of ancient books survive, we are much better served for architecture. It is therefore much easier to establish links between buildings in the East and West of the Empire than between books and readers of which we remain mostly unaware. Nonetheless, there may to some extent be a difference in the nature of the material. Because architecture was a medium which did not need to be passed through written texts, but could also circulate visually, it was therefore easier for interconnected buildings to be erected in different regions than to produce texts which cross-refer to one another, a process that can be communicated through text alone.

T. Whitmarsh: I would like to return to the question of the use of translation as an image for architectural adaptation. Translation implies a linear trajectory from one bounded field (a language) to another. What you describe, however, seems much more complex. As one would expect of the hub of a vast empire, Rome's architecture is an extraordinary blend of styles: you note, for example, the colonnaded interior and apse of the

temples of Mars Ultor and Venus Genetrix, which derive from buildings in Tegea and Nemea. Metropolitan architecture does not seem to have the coherent morphology and syntax of a language: it is more like a Babel, a collage of all the languages of the known world.

E. Thomas: There is certainly a very real danger here. Because buildings may always be the result of a variety of sources, it is hard to be sure that a particular building is 'translated' from one particular source. Indeed, in several cases there are good grounds to suspect that ideas from a number of different sources are being translated. How therefore can it be right to describe such a process as a translation from a language? It is true that language should have a regular and coherent morphological and syntactical structure, but architecture also needs to be bound by equivalent rules, not just the structural requirements that a building stand up, but also a specific 'grammar' of ornamental mouldings. The language metaphor seems more applicable in some cases, e.g. the use of the acanthus motif in Capito's palaestra; it is less obviously applicable in the case of spatial formations like Agrippa's changes to the Athenian Agora or the western forms of basilicas and theatres.

U. Gärtner: Auch ich möchte noch einmal das Konzept 'translation' aufgreifen. Sie haben betont, dass hierbei entscheidend ist, wie die aufnehmende Bevölkerung dieses Konzept 'las'. Bei den Beispielen lag der Schwerpunkt eher auf dem 'Translator'. Was lässt sich darüber sagen, wie die vorgestellten Projekte von der Bevölkerung tatsächlich 'gelesen' und aufgefasst wurden?

E. Thomas: In the absence of clear textual evidence the reading of a building by the recipient population is always hard to identify for certain. But in some cases we have evidence of just such a response, albeit through a distorted lens, as, for example, the buildings of Dio of Prusa, which Dio himself reports

were criticized (*Or.* 40.8, 47.16). As far as we can tell, the objections to the building plans were aesthetic. The most controversial issue seems to have been the greater height of the new buildings, a feature which, as we have seen, might also have been concerning in the case of Agrippa's Odeion. Dio himself explicitly responds that the city had an urgent need of taller public buildings to avoid embarrassment when the Roman governor visited the city. So here the literary sources here offer a clue, not only that Dio's planned buildings were intended to bring western ideals of architecture and urban space to this Bithynian city, but also that such a plan was read quite differently by those who adhered to rather different architectural and urban traditions.

LIST OF PLATES

Fig. 1. Miletus. Plan of the city centre in the Roman period. The arrow points to the three blocks of the grid occupied by the Palaestra and Baths of Capito. Drawing by B.F. Weber, Milet-Archiv Bochum, Stadtplan 2003 (B.F. Weber). After B.F. WEBER (2007), “Der Stadtplan von Milet: Einhundert Jahre Stadtforschung”, in J. COBET / V. v. GRAEVE / W.D. NIEMEIER / K. ZIMMERMANN (Hrsg.), *Frühes Ionien: Eine Bestandsaufnahme; Panionion-Symposium Güzelçamlı 26. September - 1. Oktober 1999 (Milesische Forschungen 5, Mainz)*, 327-362, Beilage 3.

Fig. 2. Miletus, Baths of Capito. Remains of the round, vaulted and heated chamber. Photo Scott Gilchrist, Archivision Inc.

Fig. 3. Miletus, Baths of Capito. Palaestra. Reconstruction of the two-storey colonnade in front of the bathing block. From KÖSTER (2004) 36, Abb. 7. After F. KRISCHEN, in GERKAN / KRISCHEN (1928).

Fig. 4. Miletus, Theatre. Reconstruction of the first Roman stage building. From ALTENHÖFER (1986) Taf. 22.

Fig. 5. Petra, the Deir. Photo author, 2010.

Fig. 6. Pompeii, ‘Casa del Porcellino’ or ‘Casa di Sulpicius Rufus’ (IX.9.c). Reconstruction of painting on the upper south wall of the triclinium. DAI Rome, inv. no. Pompeii 188.

Fig. 7. Miletus, Theatre. Reconstructed plan of the first Roman stage building. From ALTENHÖFER (1986) 168, Abb. 37.

Fig. 8. Rome, Theatre of Pompey. Reconstructed plan of the theatre in the Severan period, based on fragments of the *Forma Urbis Romae*. Drawing courtesy of A. Monterroso. From A. MONTERROSO (2010), *Theatrum Pompei: Forma y arquitectura de la génesis del modelo teatral de Roma* (Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas).

Fig. 9. Jerash (*Gerasa*), South Theatre. Detail showing the partially reconstructed stage building. Photo author, 2010.

Fig. 10. Amman (*Philadelphia*), Theatre. Detail showing the partially reconstructed stage building. Photo author, 2010.

Fig. 11. Corinth, Theatre. Reconstructed plan. From SEAR (2006) Plan 419. After STILLWELL (1952) Pl. VII.

Fig. 12a-b. Miletus, Theatre. Inscribed entablature from the central intercolumniation of the stage building. a) Reconstruction of surviving fragments. b) Reconstruction by D. McCabe and M. Waelkens. From HERRMANN (1986) 178, Abb. 39 and MCCABE (1986) 188, Abb. 40.

Fig. 13. Eleusis. Inner Propylaea. View of the present site from the north, exterior side. DAI Athens, Eleusis 562.

Fig. 14. Athens, Odeion of Agrippa. Restored view from the north. Dimitrios SALKANIS, <www.ancientathens3d.com>.

Fig. 15. Corinth, Forum of the Roman colony. Reconstructed plan. Drawing by J. Travlos (1955). From *Corinth* I.5 (1960), Plan X.

Fig. 16. Hippos Sussita, Basilica. Partially excavated plan. Drawing by T. Meltsen. From SEGAL (2010) Fig. 20.

Fig. 17. Hippos Sussita, Basilica. Column with spirally fluted stucco revetment. Photo author, 2010.

Fig. 18. Ephesus, “Staatsagora” with Basilica Stoa. Aerial view of the site. Photo © ÖAI.

Fig. 19. Ephesus, “Staatsagora”. Restored plan. The Basilica Stoa is situated along the north-east side of the agora. Drawing by L. Bier. From H. THÜR (1997) (ed.), “...*Und verschönerte die Stadt...*”: *Ein ephesischer Kaiserpriester des Kaiserkultes in seinem Umfeld* (*Sonder-schriften des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts*, 27, Wien), 95 Abb. 38. © ÖAI.

Fig. 20. Corinth, the “Captives Façade”. Reconstructed elevation indicating the position of preserved fragments proposed by V.M. Strocka. Drawing by W. Aulmann. From STROCKA (2010) Abb. 137.

Fig. 21a-b. Corinth Museum, Corinth. “Captive” piers from the first storey of the central section of the “Captives Façade” (shown on Fig. 20 as nos. 24 and 25). Photo author, 2011.