Palaces and elite residences in the Hellenistic East, late fourth to early first century BC: formation and purpose

VOLUME I: TEXT AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Maria Kopsacheili

Wolfson College

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Archaeology

(79000 words)

Michaelmas Term 2012

Table of Contents

Volume I

Volume II

ABSTRACT

Palaces and elite residences in the Hellenistic East, late fourth to early first century BC: formation and purpose

Maria Kopsacheili
Wolfson College, DPhil Archaeology
Submitted Michaelmas Term 2012

This thesis investigates the morphology and the purpose of palaces in major and minor kingdoms of the Hellenistic World. Elements of architecture, spatial organisation and decoration are analysed in the attempt to clarify issues of chronology and in order to identify function. The analysis places the material into its social and ideological context by taking into consideration the role of kingship ideologies in the formation of space used by royal courts. Comparison with residences of the elite demonstrates the reception of palaces not only as architectural models, but also as mechanisms of power manifestation.

Macedonia is the starting point of the discussion as the homeland of the first Hellenistic kings. In the light of evidence recovered in the last twenty years and not comparatively studied before, the chapter brings together various chronological phases of the buildings. Questions of definition and on sources of inspiration are clarified further in the following chapters. The third chapter uses textual evidence and finds from the royal district of Alexandria to understand the meaning of palace architecture for the Ptolemies, while the seat of a local official in Transjordania reveals mechanisms of emulation. In chapter four the case of Pergamene palaces and their relationship with residences in the city demonstrates that formation of these royal seats corresponded to ideals of Attalid kingship. Seats of officials in the Seleukid Empire and palaces in Bactria and Kommagene, the subject of the fifth chapter, provide an insight into the position of palace architecture in processes of hybridisation in material culture. The last chapter is a synthesis of patterns of form and function and unifies the conclusions for each separate region. It emerges that shifts in power relations and the structure of the royal court, especially towards the end of the third century BC, were a crucial factor in shaping palace forms. The concluding chapter also provides a view from the West: examples from the late Roman Republic indicate that the role of Hellenistic palaces as models for power display went beyond the limits of royal courts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost my deepest thanks go to my supervisor, Professor Bert Smith. I have immensely benefited not only from his expertise, but also from his constant encouragement and patience that kept me going during the four years of doctoral research. The prompt and stimulating feedback on the numerous drafts since day one have always been valuable for shaping blurry ideas and thoughts and I could not have wished for better supervision. I am also very grateful to Dr. Janet Delaine, who acted as my supervisor during Bert's sabbatical year in 2010-11. Her contribution has been crucial both to the progress of the thesis and to the growth of my confidence as a researcher. Her persistence and attention to detail helped me improve the quality of my work both in paper and in presentations.

Of the scholars I had the luck to meet in Oxford I offer my warmest thanks to Dr. Maria Stamatopoulou for her appreciation, scholarly advice and for facilitating my field trips in Greece by bringing me in contact with the right people. I am also grateful to Dr. Susan Walker for feedback, Prof. Angelos Chaniotis for his trust in the publication potentials of my work, and Dr. Charlotte Potts, Dr. Roberto Rossi, Ms. Anna Kouremenos and Ms. Sujatha Chandrasekaran for opportunities they offered me to present my research in public. Recalling my studies before the doctorate, I also owe credit to Dr. Will Wootton (KCL) for his support and enthusiasm that encouraged my application to Oxford and for reading chapter drafts in their very initial stages. Dr. Ruth Westgate (Cardiff) welcomed me in Cardiff when as an MA student in UCL I had just started to put down ideas on the topic.

I am also indebted to Mr. Pavlos Chrysostomou, Ms. Anthi Batziou-Efstathiou and Ms. Peggy Triantafyllopoulou (all three in the Greek Archaeological Service) who were kind and patient enough to welcome me in Pella and Demetrias, reply my numerous questions and help me better understand the sites. For the same reasons I owe thanks to the team of the Jebel Khalid excavation project in Syria and especially to Dr. Heather Jackson (Melbourne), as well as to Prof. Marc Lebeau (Brussels, director of Tell Beydar project). Thanks also to Dr. Fatma Marii for her help during my stay in Jordan, to the British Archaeological Institute in Amman and the German Archaeological Institute in Damascus for their hospitality.

The thesis has only been possible with the financial support of the following institutions: Wolfson College (travel, conference grants and bursaries), School of Archaeology in Oxford (Meyerstein Fund), Faculty of Classics (Craven Committee) and the University of Oxford (Vice Chancellors' Fund). I am deeply indebted to the Greek Archaeological Committee and its chair, Mrs. Matti Egon, for generously granting me

scholarships from the second year of the doctorate onwards. For her constant support in this direction and appraisal I would also like to thanks Prof. Irene Lemos (Merton).

My friends in Oxford have always cared for my well-being and made my stay even more enjoyable. In particular, Drs. Ilektra-Georgia Apostolidou, Despoina Mavridou, Tatsiana Senina and Mr. Morgan DiRodi have been continuously offering their love and support. I owe many thanks to Morgan and Dr. Rachel Wood for the arduous task of proof-reading the final draft, to Mr. Efthymis Kakavoyiannis for his assistance with bibliographical material from Athens and Berlin, while Dr. Foteini Spingou helped immensely with last-minute laptop crisis.

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Vaso and Nikos, who have always showed me trust and shared my slightly 'unconventional'—for a family of scientists—academic choices. Without their support in all levels not a single word of this study would have been written.

ABBREVIATIONS

Journals and series are abbreviated according to the system of the *American Journal of Archaeology*. The abbreviation *AEMTh* stands for the journal *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και τη Θράκη* (Greek Ministry of Culture and University of Thessaloniki).

All translations of ancient authors are from the *Loeb Classical Library* unless said otherwise. Abbreviations of names of ancient authors and their works, as well as of epigraphic texts, follow the system in Hornblower, S. and A. Spawforth (eds.) 2003 (3rd edition). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford, New York, xxx–liv.

LIST OF DIAGRAMS AND FIGURES

Diagrams (Volume II)

Figures (Volume II)

Figure 2.7. The eastern façade of the palace in Aegae, reconstruction (Kottaridi 2011b, Fig.34a).

Figure 2.8. Restored ground plan of the palace in Aegae by Heuzey and Daumet (1876, Plate 7).

Figure 2.9. Fragment of a Corinthian capital found in the Tholos, palace in Aegae (Heuzey and Daumet 1876, Plate 13.5).

Figure 2.10. Upper part of a stela with inscription to Heracles Patroos found in the Tholos of the palace in Aegae (Hatzopoulos 1996, p.50).

Figure 2.11. Relief fragment from the Tholos (Heuzey and Daumet 1876, Plate 13.3).

Figure 2.12a. The mosaic floor in room E, palace of Aegae (Kottaridi 2011a, Fig.182).

Figure 2.12b. Reconstruction of the mosaic in room E (Salzmann 1982, Plate 39.1).

Figure 2.13. The prop-and-lintel roofing system (Klein 1998, Fig.2).

Figure 2.14. The roof-truss system (Klein 1998, Fig.3).

Figure 2.15. Ground plan of the excavated remains of the southwestern peristyle, palace in Aegae (labeling of spaces by author, after Andronikos 1970, Plan 1).

Figure 2.16. The profile of the capitals in Doric order in the palace in Aegae. Junction between echinus and abacus in red (after Rhomaios 1953/4, Fig. 6).

Figure 2.17. The profile of the Doric capital from the limestone temple of Athena Pronaia in Delphi. Junction between echinus and abacus in red (after Michaud, J.P. 1977. *Fouilles De Delphes. Tome II. Topographie et architecture. Le sanctuaire d'Athéna Pronaia. Le temple en calcaire.* Paris, Plate 82a).

Figure 2.18a. Relief palmette antefixes from the palace in Aegae (Kottaridi 2011 Figs.176 and 177).

Figure 2.18b. Relief palmette antefixes from the House of Dionysus in Pella, photo and reconstruction (Makaronas and Giouri 1989, Figs.105 and 120).

Figure 2.19. Plan of the first construction phase of the palace in Aegae indicating the different types of pavement (by author, after Kottaridi 2011b, Fig.32b).

Figure 2.20a. Reconstruction of the Tholos by Miller as a dining room (Stephen Miller 1972, Fig.1).

Figure 2.20b. Plan of the excavated remains at the part of the Tholos (Heuzey and Daumet 1876, Plate 7).

Figure 2.21. Fragments found in the Tholos and their reconstruction as a pillar (Heuzey and Daumet 1876, Plate 13.5).

Figure 2.22. Space B from the west, palace in Aegae (Andronikos 1961/2, Plate 271β).

Figure 2.23. Plan of the city of Pella. The palace is located at the far north (Siganidou 1987, Fig.8).

Figure 2.24. Plan of the excavated remains of the palace in Pella (labeling by author, after Chrysostomou 2004, Fig.25).

Figure 2.25. The gate of the wall to the northeast of the palace complex in Pella (Chrysostomou 2002, Fig.1.2).

Figure 2.26. Building I-II of the palace in Pella (labeling by author, detail of figure 2.24).

Figure 2.27. Profile of the Doric capital of the façade colonnade (Chrysostomou 1996, Plan 4).

Figure 2.28. The excavated remains of the northern part of Building I in the palace of Pella (Siganidou 1996, Fig.1).

Figure 2.29. Reconstruction of the northern part of Section I-II.A in the palace of Pella by Lauter, based on Heermann's plan (Lauter 1986, Abb.45b).

Figure 2.30. Reconstruction of the northern part of Section I-II.A in the palace of Pella after Hoepfner (Hoepfner 1996, Fig.25).

Figure 2.31. Fragments of Ionic capitals of half pillar-columns (Hoepfner 1996, Fig.28).

Figure 2.32. Reconstruction of the decoration of the northern wall in the large hall in Section I-II.A, palace of Pella (Hoepfner 1996, Fig.35).

Figure 2.33. Restored ground plan (top left) of the bathhouse complex between Sections IV-V.A and IV.V.B in the palace of Pella (Misailidou Despotidou 1988, Plan 2).

Figure 2.34. Section of the pool and room E of Building IV-V (Misailidou Despotidou 1988, Plan 4).

Figure 2.35. Plan of the remains of Section IV-V.B of the palace in Pella (Chrysostomou 2001, Plan 2).

Figure 2.36. Plan of the city of Demetrias with the palace indicated (Marzolff 1996a, Fig.1).

Figure 2.37a. Plan of the of the palace in Demetrias with the remains of all periods that have been discovered (Marzolff 1996b, Plan 3).

Figure 2.37b. Plan of the palace of Demetrias in the late 3rd- early 2nd century BC (Batziou Efstathiou 2001, Fig.19).

Figure 2.38. Reconstruction of the 'Protero-Anaktoron' and 'Antianaktoron' phases (Marzolff 1996, Fig.6).

Figure 2.39. Drawing that depicts the elevation difference between the terraces of Sections A and B (Marzolff 1976, Taf.2).

Figure 2.40. Beam sockets at the northern wall of the corridor, Section B, palace of Demetrias (Marzolff 1996a, Fig.3; photo on the right by author).

Figure 2.41. View from the south of the colonnaded hall in Section B, palace of Demetrias (by author).

Figure 2.42. View of the northern wall of courtyard 3 at the southwestern part of Section B, palace in Demetrias (by author).

Figure 2.43. Reconstruction of the peristyle courtyard of Section A in the palace of Demetrias (Marzolff 1996a, Fig.15).

Figure 2.44. Groups of spaces of similar arrangement in the governor's palace in Jebel Khalid (on top: after Clarke 2001, Fig.3) and the royal palace in Demetrias. I indicate the groups in red (by author).

Figure 2.45. Part of the wall of the southern portico that preserves white plaster, Section A, palace of Demetrias (by author).

Figure 2.46. Reconstruction of the northern section of the palace in Iraq al Amir (Will 1996 in Hoepfner and Brands 1996, Fig.3).

Figure 2.47. Marble base in the shape of the prow of a ship, groove in the middle, palace in Demetrias (Batziou Efstathiou 2000, Fig.14).

Figure 2.48a. Fragment of Ionic double-sided pillar column from the palace in Aegae, side and frontal view (Kottaridi 2011a, 183-184).

Figure 2.48b. Fragment of Ionic half pillar-column from the House of Dionysus in Pella, side and frontal view (Makaronas and Giouri 1989, Figs.76, 77).

Figure 2.49a. The mosaic floor from room 4 in the House of Dionysus in Pella (M. Lilimpaki Akamati 2003. Η Πέλλα. In M. Lilimpaki Akamati and I.M. Akamatis (eds.) *Πέλλα και η περιοχή της*. Thessaloniki, Fig.15).

Figure 2.49b. Mosaic floor of room 3 in the House of Dionysus (on top) and mosaic floor from room Δ of the House of Helen in Pella (in M. Lilimpaki Akamati 2003. Η Πέλλα. In M. Lilimpaki Akamati, I.M. Akamatis (eds.*) Πέλλα και η περιοχή της*. Thessaloniki, Figs.14, 17).

Figure 2.50. Architectural plans of the buildings examined in Chapter 2 shown at the same scale (by author).

Figure 2.51. Plan of the city of Seuthopolis (Dimitrov 1961, Fig.1).

Figure 2.52. Restored plan of the palace in Seuthopolis (http://sevtopolis.suhranibulgarskoto.org/sevtopolis-img-obekt-img04.jpg).

Figure 2.53. Schematic chronological development of the architectural plan of the case studies (by author).

Figure 3.1. Map of northern Egypt (McKenzie 2007, Map 1).

Figure 3.2. Reconstructed plan of the Ptolemaic city of Alexandria (McKenzie 2007, Fig.22).

Figure 3.3. Map indicating the submerged parts of the eastern harbour of Alexandria and the ancient coastline in yellow (McKenzie 2007, Fig.31).

Figure 3.4. The Warriors mosaic from the speculated area of the *basileia* in Alexandria (Daszewski 1985, Plate 1).

Figure 3.5. Reconstructed architectural ground plan of houses excavated in the speculated area of the *basileia*. The rosette mosaic is depicted on the bottom left in House III (Empereur 1998, page 29).

Figure 3.6. Mosaic depicting a Stag Hunt from the Shatby area of Alexandria (McKenzie 2007, Fig.98).

Figure 3.7. Fragment of mosaic floor from the speculated area of the *basileia* in Alexandria depicting a running centaur (Daszewski 1985, Plate 13).

Figure 3.8. Mosaic floor from the Shatby area of Alexandria. Found next to the mosaic in Figure 9 (Guimier Sorbets 1998, Fig.4).

Figure 3.9. Fragment of a mosaic floor from the Shatby area of Alexandria, found next to the mosaic in figure 8 (Guimier Sorbets 1998, Fig.8).

Figure 3.10. A column acanthus base found in the speculated area of the basileia in Alexandria (McKenzie 2007, Fig.113g).

Figure 3.11a. Reconstruction of the pavilion of Ptolemy II by Studniczka (1914, Plate 3).

Figure 3.11b. Reconstruction of the pavilion with proposed arrangement of dining couches (Calandra 2009, Fig.22).

Figure 3.12. Reconstruction of Ptolemy II's pavilion by Studniczka (Nielsen 1994, Fig.70).

Figure 3.13a. Reconstruction of the Thalamegos of Ptolemy IV (Caspari 1916, Plate 22).

Figure 3.13b. Reconstruction of the Thalamegos on the basis of Macedonian palace architecture (Pfrommer 1996, Fig.1).

Figure 3.14. Reconstruction of the plan of the two floors of the Thalamegos (lower level above, upper level below; Caspari 1916, Plate 25).

Figure 3.15. Map indicating the location of Iraq al Amir (Étienne and Salles eds. 2010, Fig.1).

Figure 3.16. Map of the site of Iraq al-Amir: 2-Qasr, 4-lake, 10-Monumental Gate, 11 and 12-possible gates, 14 and15-terraces to the north of the Qasr, 17-caves (Étienne ed. 2010, Fig.13).

Figure 3.17. Photograph of the Qasr (on the right) from the northeast. The Wadi el Sir continues on the left (by author).

Figure 3.18. Plan of the caves to the northeast of the Qasr. Upper level on top, lower level below (Borel 2006, Figs.21 and 22).

Figure 3.19. Plan of the monumental gate to the east of the Qasr (Dentzer, Villeneuve and Larché 1983, Fig.60).

Figure 3.20. Reconstruction of the façade of the monumental gate (Dentzer 2010, Fig.29).

Figure 3.21. Plan of the Plaster Building (Lapp 1983, Plan 4).

Figure 3.22. Reconstruction of the area of Iraq al-Amir as a *paradeisos* (Étiénne ed. 2010, Fig.14).

Figure 3.23. View of the Qasr-el-Abd from the southwest and below its terrace (by author).

Figure 3.24. View of the north and west sides of the Qasr-el-Abd (by author).

Figure 3.25a. Reconstruction of the northern façade of the Qasr (Will et al. 1991, Plate 36).

Figure 3.25b. Reconstruction of the southern façade of the Qasr (Will et al. 1991, Plate 37).

Figure 3.26. View of the western side of the Qasr (by author).

Figure 3.27. Axonometric reconstruction of the Qasr, northeast view (Larché 2005, Fig.26).

Figure 3.28. The leopard on the eastern side of the Qasr (by author).

Figure 3.29a. Reconstructed plan of the ground floor of the Qasr at the level of the windows of the central part (Larché 2005, Plate 5a).

Figure 3.29b. Reconstructed plan of the upper floor of the Qasr (Larché 2005, Plate 4).

Figure 3.30. View of the northeastern staircase on the level of the lower floor with the four rooms (by author).

Figure 3.31. The Mausolea at Belevi, Knidos and Halikarnassos, reconstructions (Rosenberg 2006, Fig.60).

Figure 3.32. Reconstruction of the palace of the Hasmoneans in Jericho in the late 2nd –early 1st century B.C. The palace is adjacent to an area of gardens with pools and a pavilion (Evyasaf 2008, Fig.5).

Figure 3.33. Axonometric reconstruction of the Palazzo delle Colonne in Ptolemais. The *aedicula* whose upper floor has capitals of Alexandrian type is indicated by the arrow (McKenzie 2007, Fig.258).

Figure 4.1. General plan of the city of Pergamon. The palaces are located at the eastern side of the acropolis (Radt, W. 1983. Pergamon. Vorbericht über die Kampagne 1982. *AA* 1983, map of page 456).

Figure 4.2. Plan of the acropolis of Pergamon after W. Radt (Radt 1999, Fig.15). The early phase of Building I (Building Ia) is indicated in gray. Building II is labeled as a 'water-tower'.

Figure 4.3. 3D model of the excavated remains of the acropolis (Pirson 2008, Fig.3). I indicate the location of the buildings under discussion.

Figure 4.4. Chronological relations between the palaces in Macedonia (various phases) and Pergamon, contemporary buildings highlighted in the same colour (by author).

Figure.4.5. Plan of the excavated remains of Buildings I and II. The foundations in dark blue belong to the first phase (Building Ia) and in brown to the second phase (Building 1b-Barracks). A series of spaces to the south beneath the Trajaneum in light blue (after Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Tafel II).

Figure 4.6. Plan of the area of Building I and the Trajaneum (Raeck 1999, Plate 1). In red I indicate how Building Ia is related to the northern remains under the Trajaneum.

Figure 4.7. Reconstruction of Building Ia by W. Hoepfner (Hoepfner 1990, Fig.4).

Figure 4.8. Reconstruction of Building II, Acropolis of Pergamon by W. Hoepfner (1996/7, Fig.2a-b). The outline of the area of Building III is depicted to the east. The temple to the south dates in the Roman era.

Figure. 4.9. Plan of the excavated remains of Building III. I indicate with numbers the spaces of the original construction phase (after Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Tafel III).

Figure. 4.10. The palace complex in Larisa on Hermos with the *megaron* in red (after Boehlau and Schefold 1940, Fig.6).

Figure 4.11. Plan of the excavated remains of Building VI. The storage rooms of the barracks are located to the south (Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Tafel VI).

Figure 4.12. Plan of the excavated remains of palace IV (below), after Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Tafel IV.

Figure 4.13. Plan of the excavated remains of Palace V, remains of earlier structure in blue (after Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Tafel V).

Figure 4.14a. Reconstruction of Palace IV (Pinkwart and Stammnitz 1984, Fig.15a).

Figure 4.14b. Reconstruction of Palace V (Pinkwart and Stammnitz 1984, Fig.15b).

Figure 4.15. Reconstruction of Palaces IV and V (Hoepfner 1996, Fig.16).

Figure 4.16a. Reconstruction of Palace IV (Wulf 1999, Abb.74.7).

Figure 4.16b. Reconstruction of Palace V (Wulf 1999, Abb.74.8).

Figure 4.17. Plan of the foundations of the palace (Kutbay 1998, Figs.3 and 4).

Figure 4.18. Reconstruction of Palace IV, same scale as 4.19 (by author).

Figure 4.19. The House of Dionysus, Pella, at the same scale as Figure 4.18, reconstructed plan (after Lauter 1986, Fig.45a).

Figure 4.20. Fragments of the mosaic floor from room A, Palace IV (Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Plate VIII and R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner and A. Scholl (eds.) 2012, *Pergamon, Panorama der Antiken Metropole*. Berlin, Kat. 5.41).

Figure 4.21. Detail of the 'Asarotos Oikos' mosaic floor (Salzmann 2012, Fig.3).

Figure 4.22. Painted frieze with griffins, room A, palace IV (restoration in Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Plate VII).

Figure 4.23. Fragments of the mosaic from room D, Palace IV (Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Plate X).

Figure 4.24. Fragments of miniature architectural elements found in room D, palace IV (Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Figs. 63 and 65).

Figure 4.25. Terracotta figurine from room D, palace IV (Zimmer 2010, 5a and 5b).

Figure 4.26. Mould found at the Hellenistic phase of the 'Haus mit dem Podiensaal' in Pergamon (reproduction to the right) (Schwarzer 2008, ZG 14).

Figure 4.27. Block of the stylobate of the peristyle courtyard, Palace V, drawing of its upper surface (Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, Abb.49).

Figure 4.28. Mosaic floor from room H, Palace V, R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner and A. Scholl (eds.) 2012, Pergamon, Panorama der Antiken Metropole. Berlin, Kat. 5.42.

Figure 4.29. Reconstruction of the mosaic floor from room K, palace V (by Salzmann, in Radt 1999, Fig.22).

Figure 4.30. Fragment of the mosaic floor in room K, palace V (Radt 1999, Fig.21).

Figure 4.31. Statue of a female figure, found in room K, palace V (R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner and A. Scholl (eds.) 2012, *Pergamon, Panorama der Antiken Metropole.* Berlin, Kat. 5.24).

Figure 4.32. Relief panels depicting Athena and Telephos (?), the Trojan Horse and Gigantomachy, found on the acropolis of Pergamon (Hoepfner 1996, Fig.17).

Figure 4.33. Three-dimensional reconstruction of Palace V depicting the relief frieze on the top floor of the peristyle (Hoepfner 1996, Fig.20).

Figure 4.34. The House of Attalos, groundplan. Hellenistic walls in black, the foundations and the securely reconstructed walls in crossing lines, and the exterior part of supportive walls also in black (Dörpfeld 1907, Taf.XIV).

Figure 4.35. Reconstructed plan of the House of Attalos (Pinkwart and Stammnitz 1984, Fig.15c).

Figure 5.13. Space 1 from the west, Jebel Khalid. Its southern wall survives partially in two courses (by author).

Figure 5.14. Two column bases found in space 12. The one to the right has been found in situ (by author).

Figure 5.15. Ground plan of the temple in Jebel Khalid (in Clarke 2006/7, Fig.2).

Figure 5.16. Ground plan of the domestic quarter in Jebel Khalid with the House of the Painted Frieze highlighted in light blue (after Jackson 2009, Fig.2). The Erotes frieze decorated the northern wall of space 19.

Figure 5.17. Two of the fragments of the frieze with Erotes as chariots from space 19, House of the Painted Frieze, Jebel Khalid (Jackson 2009, Figs.8a and d).

Figure 5.18. Reconstruction of the decorated wall of room 19, House of the Painted Frieze, Jebel Khalid (Jackson 2009, Fig.16).

Figure 5.19. General view from the South of Mount Karasis and its surrounding area.

Figure 5.20. Reconstructed plan of the site on Mount Karasis (Radt 2011, Fig.4).

Figure 5.21. Reconstructed plan of the Lower Castle in Karasis (Hoffmann and Sayar 2007, Abb.5a).

Figure 5.22. The interior façade of tower 4 with relief decoration depicting an elephant, Lower Castle, Karasis (Radt 2011, Fig.6).

Figure 5.23. Reconstructed plan of the Upper Castle, Mount Karasis (Radt 2011, Fig.7).

Figure 5.24. Reconstructed plan of the palace-like buildings on the Upper Castle, Mount Karasis (Radt 2011, Fig.9).

Figure 5.25. Reconstruction of the Upper Castle, Mount Karasis. The Banquet Building is located on a lower level than the Residence building (Radt 2011, Fig.7).

Figure 5.26. The acropolis of Pergamon to the left (area of the palaces indicated in blue) and the Upper Castle on Karasis at the same scale.

Figure 5.27. The site of Dura-Europos (Google Earth). I indicate the location of the palaces in blue.

Figure 5.28. Reconstructed plan of the city of Dura-Europos (without distinguishing occupation phases). I indicate the palaces in red (after P. Leriche and M. Gelin (eds.) 1997. *Doura-Europos, Études IV 1991-1993*. Beirut, page 1).

Figure 5.29. The ‘Palace on the Acropolis’, view from the Citadel Palace (by author).

Figure 5.30. Ground plan of the ‘Palace on the Acropolis’, Dura-Europos (Leriche et al. 1997, Fig.1).

Figure 5.31. The northern façade of the Palace on the Acropolis (by author).

Figure 5.32. Reconstructed ground plan of the Palace on the Acropolis by W. Hoepfner (W. Hoepfner, J. Boessneck, S. Dakaris, E.L. Schwandner eds. 1994, Fig.216).

Figure 5.33. Four columns to the south of the Palace on the Acropolis, that have been interpreted as belonging to a forecourt (by author).

Figure 5.34. The southeast corner of the courtyard, Palace on the Acropolis. The remains of the two columns belong to the vestibule of the east side that led to a hall with three openings. These openings can be seen in the background (by author).

Figure 5.35. Ground plan of the Citadel Palace II in Dura-Europos. Remains of the first phase on the top left (Pillet 1931, Plate IV).

Figure 5.36. The western part of the corridor that separates the two sections of the Citadel Palace II (by author).

Figure 5.37. The ground plan of the Hellenistic building in Tell Beydar (Martin Galán and Olivares Pantoja 2007, Fig.4).

Figure 5.38. The site of Ai Khanoum (Google Earth).

Figure 5.39. View of the site of Ai Khanoum from the Southwest. The *basileion* in the Lower City is indicated (Google Earth).

Figure 5.40. Plan of the city of Ai Khanoum: 1. Propylon from the street 2. Palace 3. Pool 4. Gymnasium 5. Houses (after Held 2002, Abb.9).

Figure 5.41. Reconstructed ground plan of the palace in Ai Khanoum (Bernard 1982, page 133).

Figure 5.42. Three-dimensional reconstruction of the palace (Lecuyot 2007, plate 3).

Figure 5.43. Sections b and c of the palace (detail of Figure 5.41).

Figure 5.44. Space 6 of Section c (after Bernard 1973, Pl.3).

Figure 5.45. Space 9 of Section c, at the same scale as room 6 above (after Bernard 1973, Pl.3).

Figure 5.46. Pebble mosaic floor, room 74, Section g, Ai Khanoum palace (Bernard 1975, Fig.6).

Figure 5.47. The mosaic floor in space 98, section f (Bernard 1976, Fig.4).

Figure 5.48. Plan of the city of Samosata. The palace is located on the acropolis to the East (Zoroglu 2000), Fig.101).

Figure 5.49. Ground plan of the palace in Samosata (after Zoroğlu 2000, Fig.106).

Figure 5.50. Three-dimensional ground-plan of the palace in Samosata with indicated mosaic pavements (Zoroğlu 2000, Fig.107).

Figure 5.51. The mosaic pavement of space I (Zoroğlu 2000, Fig.114).

Figure 5.52. Fragments of the central panel of the mosaic pavement of room VI in the palace of Samosata (Zoroğlu 2000, Fig.116).

Figure 5.53. Portrait head of a Seleukid ruler found in the palace of Samosata (Zoroğlu 2000, Fig.109).

Figure 6.1. Table with the four groups of patterns of form according to Pattern Language as it was formulated in Watts 1987 (by author).

Figure 6.2. Table showing percentages of courtyard to total surface of each peristyle section (by author, data for entries 10-13 from Pinkwart and Stammnitz 1984, page 37, for entry 7 from Wulf 2009).

Figure 6.3. Nielsen's categorisation of palace functions (Nielsen 1994, Fig.1).

Figure 6.4. Details from the banquet scene in the frieze from the façade of the Tomb of Aghios Athanasios (Tsimpidou Avloniti 2005, Plate 33).

Figure 6.5. Crater from Cumae, Archaeological Museum of Naples, CA 85873 (Richter, G.M.A. 1986. *Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*. London. Fig.368).

Figure 6.6. Restored ground plan of the House of the Masks, Delos (Kreeb 1988, Fig.2.9).

Figure 6.7. Mosaic from room e in the House of the Masks, Delos (Christensen 2006, Fig.3.56).

Figure 6.8. Mosaic from room i, House of the Masks (Christensen 2006, Fig.3.59).

Figure 6.9. Plan of the House of the Faun (after Dwyer 2001, in Christensen 2006, Fig.1.2).

Figure 6.10. Mosaic panel, *triclinium* 34, House of the Faun, Pompeii (Christensen 2006, Fig.1.10).

Figure 6.11. Threshold band mosaic between *fauces* 53 and *atrium* 27 in the House of the Faun at Pompeii (Christensen 2006, Fig.1.12).

CHAPTER 1. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PALACE AS ARCHITECTURAL TYPE AND AS CULTURAL EXPRESSION

Subject matter and objectives

This thesis analyses the form of palaces used either by kings or administrators in the major and minor kingdoms of the Hellenistic World. It also investigates the processes that resulted in the choice of specific morphological patterns, as well as the reception of palaces both by higher and lower echelons of society. Processes (in the sense of the reasons behind practices) and reception (the way practices are experienced, accepted or denied and potentially altered) are the two principal mechanisms for interpreting the purposes of material expressions of culture, including the erection of monumental architecture. By drawing on methodological tools and interpretative frameworks developed for the study of form and purpose in built space, architecture and art I intend to re-evaluate the dominant views concerning the formation of Hellenistic palaces and explore their role in the societies that surrounded them.

On a primary level, my intention is to demonstrate particular remaining problems of architectural typology, chronology, spatial arrangement and function. The old view of the palace merely as a large luxurious residence is rejected and replaced by the acknowledgement of the palace as a setting with multiple functions.[1] In addition,

[1] In the third edition of his work on ancient Greek architecture W.B. Dinsmoor treats the palaces in Aegae and Pergamon as residences. In the case of Aegae he mentions the presence of a reception room and entertainment spaces, but emphasizes the 'private quarters of the king', while

different needs in specific kingdoms, either practical or ideological, led to the creation of a variety of features among Hellenistic palaces. The procedure by which this happened has not yet been clarified. Hence the aim of this study on a second level is to interpret typological observations by examining the palatial construction as a whole, set into its social and cultural context; this means not only the palace as a building in itself, but also its surroundings and the palace as a concept within its historical framework. Comparison with elite residences aims to clarify the way palaces impacted on and were affected by the upper social strata. It demonstrates the potential not only of the royal palace as a model, but also of the built space of the elite to transform royal space. It will be shown that palatial architecture bears a meaning relevant to the ideological and social circumstances in each era and region. This is a dual relationship, as palaces are defined by their context and simultaneously they have the potential to transmit specific messages to maintain or change certain conditions. Legitimisation of governance, implementation of the royal political agenda, and the attempt to acquire elite social status, are factors that defined spatial organisation.

The examined material comprises primarily the available archaeological evidence, namely the building remains of excavated palaces and residences *(Figure 1.1)*. The geographical specification 'Hellenistic East' denotes the Greek mainland, Egypt, and the territories of western and central Asia. This definition is a broad one, but excludes for reasons of space the western part of the Hellenistic world, the Italian

---

the Pergamene palaces are presented as 'rather luxurious peristyle houses' (Dinsmoor 1950, 326). A.W. Lawrence was the first to challenge this view and even though he includes the palace of Aegae in his chapter on Hellenistic residential buildings, he acknowledges 'it is not simply an enlarged house' (Lawrence 1996 [1957], 186). For a discussion about functions in more recent scholarship see Nielsen 1994, 18–26 and also below in the following section of the present chapter.

peninsula and Sicily in the time of the Republic. In addition, textual evidence is used in order to shed light not only on the form of and activities in specific buildings, but also, and more importantly, on general attitudes towards palace space. Particular aspects I focus on in the study of the written sources are royal administration and banqueting, since these appear to have been cardinal functions served by palaces. The information provided by ancient authors needs to be evaluated and interpreted before deciding which elements can be used for the analysis of the case studies. Literary references to palaces tend to be generic and usually concern particular events that took place in the palace quarters and not on architectural or spatial features. In this category belong Polybios' *Histories*, where he presents the rise of Rome (220–146 BCE) and the situation of Macedonia in this process. Even though Polybios was contemporary with the palaces of the second century BC, he does not provide any detailed descriptions. The same is observed in Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander*. In Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, especially of Alexander and Demetrios, the palace often appears to be the setting of the narrative, but again is never treated as the subject of discussion.

The aims of the thesis require a primary definition: What is a palace? And in particular, how can we identify a Hellenistic one? Scholarship uses the term to describe buildings that come from an extremely wide chronological framework, from Bronze Age Mesopotamia up to our times. The palace is a facet of monumental architecture for the development of which social ranking, even of low complexity, has been acknowledged as the principal prerequisite.[2] As a building type it is one of the main spatial

[2] For the relationship between monumentality and social hierarchies see Trigger 1990, 119–122. Trigger defines monumentality in architecture as excess in scale and elaboration; excess that is not essential when the only purpose of a building is to perform its intended practical functions.

manifestations of power that derives from social discrepancies and as such we find it in societies both before and after the Hellenistic Age. Thus the element that makes it a standard, universal and diachronic type is its relationship with sovereignty. While the definition of the social aspect of the palace seems to be straightforward and widely applicable, a definition in architectural and functional terms proves to be a far more complicated task. There is little in common both in form and way of use between a Minoan building complex and a medieval castle, or the governmental and military headquarters of a Roman emperor and the luxurious house of a modern head of state in a democratic political system, all of which may be described by the term 'palace'.

Contemporary perception of the 'palace' in the Western World derives from early Modern history and particularly from the seventeenth and eighteenth century courts in Europe. From Versailles and the Whitehall Palace of the Tudors, to the Charlottenburg, the royal residence of the Hohenzollern dynasty in Berlin, and the Royal Palace in Madrid, all these complexes aimed to serve a great variety of public and private functions. Scale, complexity of design and luxury of materials intended to demonstrate the monarch's wealth and power. In the time of Louis XIV (rule 1634–1715) two sets of gates, a forecourt, inner courtyards, gardens with pavilions, banquet halls, rooms for court reception, chapels and ancillary sections were found in Versailles. Special care had been taken for the construction of lodges for the approximately three thousand members

This definition succeeds, in my view, as a universal one in identifying monumentality. Due to its strongly utilitarian perspective, however, it requires caution in the way we quantify 'practical needs' and identify 'excess' in antique cultural frameworks. With respect to power and monumentality in architecture and its relationship with social mobility with a focus on the Bronze Age Aegean see Wright 2006 and Cunningham 2007, 23–28.

of the royal court, a feature that likens the complex to a town.[3] The palace functioned as a model for the construction of Charlottenburg during Friedrich I's reign (1701–1713) and the Royal Alcàzar of Philip V (rule 1700–1724) in the Spanish capital, where similar types of spaces were present.

In our century a 'palace' refers mostly to a building associated with supreme power, especially of a secular sovereign, such as a king in constitutional monarchy, or a dictator. By contrast to the Early Modern palaces, which served an array of functions, the principal element nowadays to classify a building as a palace seems to be its use as a residence. We recently became familiar with the luxurious houses named 'palaces' by media coverage of expelled presidents of countries in the Middle East during the 2011–12 Arab Spring.[4] In Europe, for example in England and Spain, constitutional monarchs still have the privilege of residing in palaces their ancestors used, even though they have not retained the same powers of state.

Non-monarchical political systems have also used the term 'palace'. After the authorities of the German Democratic Republic demolished the Imperial Palace in East Berlin, a partly destroyed building by the Second World War bombing, they constructed a new building at the site.[5] Even though it accommodated the government of the Republic and was intended to serve the needs of all people, the term 'palace' was preserved (*Palace of the People*). In other cases where the abolishment of monarchy

[3] For a recent study on the everyday life in the palace of Versailles see Spawforth 2008, especially 6–17 for the number of courtiers and palace functions.
[4] With the most famous example being the compound that Muammar Gadaffi used as his base in the Libyan capital (see Andelman 2011 and also Goldstone 2011).
[5] For the history of the 'Palace of the People' as a case that shows the relationship between architecture and manifestation of political power see La 2010.

directed the change in the way a (former) royal residence was used, the term 'palace' was completely dismissed possibly because of its negative connotations with totalitarian regimes: after the final elimination of monarchy in Greece in 1974, the 'New Palace' in Athens, which until then accommodated the royal family, became the seat of the President of the Hellenic Republic and was renamed as 'Presidential Mansion'.[6] Finally, the term is also used in a non-literal way to denote luxury, pleasure, and privilege in social status. In its most extreme metaphoric meaning the word is used in names of hotels or even hostels for the elderly in order to indicate grandeur, a high level of comfort and high quality service. Were palaces in the Hellenistic states the place of residence of the whole court and the ultimate set of elaborate morphological elements in a Versailles fashion? And did they hold any symbolic value similar to their modern-day counterparts?

The dangers by our modern perception in interpreting palaces of the Hellenistic World and strategies to minimise their impact, are explained in the section on methodology in the present chapter. A question that has already emerged, however, is to what degree ancient perceptions of the palaces placed the residential and recreational function at the top of the list that we could arbitrarily call 'essential functions in identifying a building as a palace'. A look at the current scholarship on Hellenistic palaces and other 'palace civilisations' provides an insight into this question.

Towards a definition of the Hellenistic palace

[6] For the original use of the Presidential Mansion see Kardamitsi Adami 2009, 191–207.

I have focused so far on determining the 'palace' from aspects of function rather than form. This is the approach that dominates the most recent monograph about palaces of the Hellenistic World, Inge Nielsen's *Hellenistic palaces: tradition and renewal*.[7] In the introductory chapter of this study the author compiles a list of nine functions on the basis of references to Hellenistic royal courts in ancient literary sources. According to this model, it is expected a number or all of the functions existed in a palace.[8] These are official, social, religious, defensive, administrative, service, residential for king, royal family and guests, public and recreational. Certain types of rooms would have been constructed in order to cater to these functions. Nielsen also provides a table that indicates which of these functions and types of spaces were present in the palaces she analyses *(Figure 1.2).* It covers a wide chronological span from Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid to early Roman Imperial examples. The striking feature of this table is that, by contrast to buildings before or after the Hellenistic Age, most of the entries for palaces of the third to early first century BC remain blank or are uncertain. Even though this approach results in inadequate classification, it is according to these categories the author organises the catalogue of the buildings.

The reason for the unsatisfactory results of functional categorisation is the state of preservation of the surviving buildings and the small number of finds that facilitate the identification of specific types of spaces. Even in the case of other 'palace civilisations', where a more solid record of finds is available, the functional complexity and frequently a multifunctional character have been acknowledged, while identifying a primary function to a palace complex only rarely lacks apprehension: For example, in the case of

[7] Nielsen 1994.
[8] Ibid. 18–25. See also section *Patterns of function* in chapter 6.

Bronze Age palaces in the Middle East, it remains unclear whether the buildings were used principally as administrative or religious centres.[9] As for Minoan Crete, due to the variety of functions the buildings identified as palaces served, even the validity of the term 'palace' itself has been criticised and the purpose-free term 'mega-structure' has been suggested.[10] Finally, the immediate forerunners of the Hellenistic palaces in Egypt and the Seleukid Empire were the royal seats of the Achaemenid kings. These accommodated a variety of functions and are regarded as an expression of the political power of the king, his control of resources and as manifestation of pomp and glory. Even though unique architectural forms and the significance of gardens and parks have been recognised, the exact function of the spatial sections in these palaces remains unknown.[11]

Unexpectedly, a definition by a scholar not of Hellenistic, but of Minoan architecture, proves to be useful for the present study. In defining the Minoan palace, John McEnroe follows an approach that relies on form rather than function and regards the term as applicable to a building category of monumental scale with specific sets of rooms and distinctive structural and material elements.[12] Even though the starting point in my evaluation of the Hellenistic cases is the material record itself and not a specific model in favour of functional or morphological analysis, McEnroe's approach facilitates

[9] An example for this ambiguity between sacred and profane is Building E in Uruk (see Margueron 1987 and Bretschneider 2007, 11–13).

[10] For a recent discussion on the multiple functions of Minoan palaces that uses the term 'megastructure' see Panagiotopoulos 2006. See also Driessen 2007, 89–92. For similar problems in scholarship about Mycenaean palaces see the papers by Chadwick, Godard and Carlier in Lévy (ed.) 1987, which suggest different activities as the principal purpose of the palaces, such as industrial production and trade, distribution of arms or religious control.

[11] For a general overview of the design, function and significance for the cities of Achaemenid palaces see Amandry 1987 and Brosius 2007, 46–53. See also Stronach 2001 for the relationship between the palaces in Pasargadae and Susa with the dwellings of the inhabitants in these cities and Huff 2010 for a discussion on the form and purpose of the Apadana (Throne Hall), one of the most characteristic types of buildings in Achaemenid palace complexes.

[12] McEnroe 2010, 54.

distinguishing a palace on a local level in a specific site and therefore it is worth taking into consideration. On a wider level, a general definition of the 'Hellenistic palace' requires a comparative approach between different regions and comparison not only of buildings, but also of whole sites as settings of the palaces.

In the case of Minoan palace complexes, the survival of exclusively archival records in clay tablets and the lack of narrative literary sources is one extra difficulty in the attempt to understand the way they were used and perceived by their contemporary society. By contrast, textual evidence that refers to Hellenistic examples is available and does provide an insight into the use of space. It appears that the palace was the principal spatial setting for a wide range of activities from the most formal to the everyday ones, which occurred during the presence of the king in the capital or in major cities of his kingdom. We are informed, for example, that Ptolemy II organised a seven-day banquet in the palace of Alexandria for the translators of the Old Testament, and also that Attalos III grew herbs and used to sow them himself in the palace gardens in Pergamon.[13] The written accounts that refer to the various Hellenistic courts are the reason we can attempt to understand function, but on their own they are inadequate to define a palace.

What we can clarify at this point is the relevant to the palace nomenclature used in the textual evidence. Linguistically the word 'palace' originates in the Latin *palatium.* The word *anaktoron,* which is still in use in Modern Greek as a synonym for 'palace', has its origins in Mycenaean texts.[14] Nevertheless, in literary evidence it is completely absent in relation to palaces of the Hellenistic era and refers only to examples of later

[13] Letter of Aristeas 173–293; Plut. Vit. *Demetr*. 20.2.
[14] Carlier 1984, 40–134.

periods or to buildings in religious context.[15] Authors who wrote during or about the Hellenistic Age use primarily the word *basileion*.[16] Apart from the main administrative and residential building, the *basileion* may stand for the whole royal area of a city with the group of constructions related to the palace, such as sanctuaries, theatre, gymnasium and gardens. In Polybios we also find the word *aule*. The author uses it both with respect to the palace as a building and to the royal court as an institution.[17]

In this study I use the ancient term *basileion* and the modern 'palace' as identical when I refer to palace complexes or the whole area they covered, but only the term 'palace' in the analysis of individual buildings. I avoid the terminology that Nielsen applies distinguishing between 'royal' and 'governor's palace', because it relies on function and the identity of the user, which in most cases cannot be confirmed. Analysis of the case studies will demonstrate instead the value of a distinction based on the context of the buildings, where palaces belong to urban or to non-urban contexts and to royal capitals or peripheral cities. Moreover, the terms *andron* and *oikos* that Wolfram Hoepfner has assigned to Hellenistic palaces as denoting rooms of reception and banqueting function and private character respectively are in reality not as clear-cut when we look at the textual evidence.[18] As a consequence, the discussion of the spatial

[15] Plut. Vit. *Num.* 13; Ath. 4.64 and 5.51.

[16] The word in Ancient Greek is τὸ βασίλειον (pl. τὰ βασίλεια). Some examples for its use that may refer not only to Hellenistic but also to Persian palaces in texts of the fourth to the first century B.C. are the following: Xen. *An.* 1.2.7, 1.4.10, 4.1.15–16; Arist. *[Oec]*. 2.1352; Polyb. 10.10.9, 10.27.7, 10.31.5; Diod. Sic. 11.57.3–4, 11.67, 14.31.2, 17.52.4, 17.59.4, 17.71.3. See also Funck 1996, 50–55 for an overview of the terms used in connection with royal space by Xenophon, Herodotos and Polybios.

[17] Polyb. 12.8.4, 15.25.4, 15.28.4, 15.30.4, 16.21.8.

[18] Hoepfner 1996, 1. The view that these terms can be used in such sharply defined way has been challenged by Hellmann on the basis of epigraphic evidence. The scholar demonstrated that the *andron* simply denotes space used by men, while an *oikos* was used in the sense of 'house'

configuration of the case studies in the following chapters rejects this terminology and focuses instead on morphological features and the relevant finds in order to describe the various rooms.

The state of research and methodology

Form and function

The first published work that analysed palaces of the Hellenistic Age was an article by Giovanna Tosi from 1959.[19] The author was interested not only in morphological observations, but also in questions of identity, cross-cultural interaction and continuity in material culture and the impact of court ceremonial on the architectural forms of the palaces. Nevertheless, even though Tosi set out compelling questions, only the palaces in Pergamon and an elite residence in Ptolemais of Cyrenaica had been at the time excavated and so the available evidence was inadequate in order to understand the greater picture with respect to Hellenistic palaces. As we will see in the following chapters, archaeological investigations over the last five decades have yielded a more substantial body of evidence, which now allows a more complete reconstruction of the processes that surrounded the production of palace space and the nature of palaces themselves.

without necessarily referring to a more private section than other parts of the house (Hellmann 1994, 135 and 142).

[19] Tosi 1959.

Later scholarship on Hellenistic palaces has focused on matters of architectural typology and origin of forms but has shown little interest in the purpose of the palace.[20] Vera Heermann's book on Macedonian palaces is a meticulous analysis of the architectural forms used in the region and focuses on matters of continuity with mainland Greece.[21] Bonnie Lea Kutbay's study also concerns the typology of Hellenistic palaces in the Aegean, based primarily on the archaeological evidence from Aegae and Pergamon.[22] Kutbay is interested in defining the origins of the peristyle and *pastas*, architectural elements found in palatial buildings, and suggests continuity with *gymnasia* or *katagogeia* and the *megaron* buildings of the fourth century B.C.[23] The significance of her contribution lies in the connection between palace and both public and domestic space. She moves towards viewing the palace as a symbol of a ruler cult, but the study does not extend further than the typological aspect towards understanding the meaning of chosen forms.

Inge Nielsen describes the architecture of Hellenistic and earlier palaces in the Ancient Near East and also includes early Roman Imperial palatial buildings, raising the subject of the interaction with the Hellenistic examples. In a fashion that follows the structure in Tosi's article, she also investigates the presence of Neo-Babylonian and Persian features and presents the older Achaemenid palaces. Even though she does not demonstrate the differences in form between different construction phases of the

[20] For this dichotomy see Grassigli 2007, 43.
[21] Heermann 1986.
[22] Kutbay 1998.
[23] Kutbay's study is not a complete monograph on Hellenistic palaces, since no case studies from the eastern Hellenistic world are examined, while bibliographical references after 1989 and Nielsen's 1994 study are absent. With regard to the palace of Pella for instance, only a short paragraph is to be found (Kutbay 1998, 40). This is justified by the intention of the author to create an introductory handbook for students of ancient architecture, as she states in the Preface of the book.

buildings and relies on reconstructions and not architectural plans that illustrate the actual finds, she suggests identification of the function of specific rooms or sectors.

Nielsen accentuates the approach of identifying function on the basis of morphological features by quoting the dictum 'form follows function'.[24] This idea was established in the beginning of the twentieth century and supported by modernists in architecture and design.[25] Its meaning is that humans' practical needs are the factor according to which they give specific forms to space. These needs give birth to essential functions, which are reflected in form. The application of this approach might be suitable for modern history, where textual evidence and archival material are available and we are able to know exactly what the constructors aimed to create. In such cases we can begin with the needs and consequently identify form. In the case of Hellenistic palaces, however, this approach is condemned to fail for two reasons: firstly, the exact needs of the commissioner are usually unknown and, secondly, utilitarian models for the interpretation of modern-day practices do not necessarily correspond to antiquity. We need, therefore, to start from the analysis of the form.

Criticism by built space and environmental psychology studies towards the precedence of function over form has supported the opposite view 'function follows form': the form of built space makes us use it in a specific way that is not essentially the intended function (its purpose).[26] This actual function depends not only on the form, but also on our own experience, cultural background and relationship with built space.

[24] Nielsen 1994, 13.
[25] The American architect Louis Sullivan first stated this view in 1896 (see Michl 1995 for the history of the approach and criticism).
[26] For the view 'function follows form' see Nasar et al. 2005.

Scholarship has concluded, therefore, that form and function are in fact separate but interdependent and we need to study them as such.[27] The interpretation requires a far more complex procedure than determining which one comes first, and following these theoretical advances in the present study I analyse the form of Hellenistic palaces separately in each kingdom. I set the results into their cultural framework, compare on a local and universal level and draw conclusions regarding their meaning.

I consider form a concept comprising of five elements: general features of setting (location, orientation, and size), architectural features, material and technique, decoration and iconographic program, and, finally, spatial organisation. The latter consists of circulation and accessibility patterns, entrance formation, visibility and linking axes. The catalogue accompanying this thesis is structured according to these parameters. I am interested in demonstrating the changes that occurred in time by following each different construction phase of the buildings. Form needs to be evaluated both on a local level in relation to other buildings and the site as a whole, and on a broad level in comparison to other cases.

The function of space, both in the sense of purpose (intended function) and in the sense of actual way of use, is a product of physical, social and ideological processes. Physical processes relate to conditions that are naturally present, such as climate, physical landscape and resources. The ideological processes coincide with the symbolic meaning of material culture as this has been defined in scholarship and they relate to ideas on royal power, philosophy, religion and cosmology at the time of creation and use

[27] Markus 1993, 9.

of Hellenistic palaces.[28] The building scientist and architecture historian Thomas Markus has aptly characterised the ideological factors as creators of 'bond relations'.[29] In the case of the topic of this thesis, they bring together the audience the Hellenistic palace addressed and create links between this audience and the commissioner of the palace. Individuals or groups may unconsciously and under the influence of these processes prescribe purpose to space, but they may also intentionally give meaning to spatial organisation, what Locock calls 'contrived meaning'.[30]

The conference volume *Basileia: Die Paläste der Hellenistischen Könige* takes into account ideological and physical processes and examines various aspects of Hellenistic palatial buildings by setting the examples into their historical context; the studies often go further than a simple typological presentation by following an interdisciplinary approach with reference to other kinds of material evidence, such as tombs.[31] The combination with historical data is a fruitful perspective, which leads to contextual interpretation. Another focus of this volume is the interpretation of Hellenistic palaces in connection with social processes. Förtsch, for example, argues that the interaction between Hellenistic palaces and Roman residences is not confined to typological features and the public character of a residence proves to be a useful criterion for indicating the degree of influence of the Hellenistic examples.[32]

---

[28] For the concept of symbolic meaning as regards space see Steadman 1996, 64–66 and Bandmann 2005, 18–38. For the meaning of material culture in the sense of culturally determined choices see Hodder 1989, Parker Pearson and Richards 1994, Locock 1994, Rapoport 1994, 473.
[29] Markus 1993, 25.
[30] Locock 1994, 5.
[31] Hoepfner and Brands (eds.) 1996 (see especially the contributions by Brands, Förtsch, Funck, von Hesberg, Gossel-Raeck, Walter-Karydi and Zimmer).
[32] Förtsch 1996, 248–249.

Studies on space as social formation have been influential on the fields of archaeology and material culture. As a consequence a major contribution of theoretical advances in archaeology in the 1970s and 1980s was the acknowledgement that spatial variability and social circumstances are related.[33] Even though it has been expanded and modified, the sociological study that has been a hallmark in the examination of royal court diachronically is Norbert Elias' *The Court Society.*[34] By taking eighteenth-century France as an example, Elias investigated how the changes in the relationship between society and the court aristocracy are reflected in the ceremonial practices. His work demonstrated the importance of the court as an institution, its potential to define the balance of power relationships, and most importantly that the emergence of the court is a social phenomenon rather than a product of historical circumstances.

By exposing the similarities of the Hellenistic with early modern European courts, the historian Gabriel Herman showed that Elias' approach and methodology may legitimately be used for the study of the Hellenistic court.[35] In this respect, my goal is to examine the case studies not only as buildings, but also as social formations, namely as means of adaptation of the living space in the social hierarchies dominant in each region and era. Since the formation of space depends on the social context it is necessary to examine the features of the Hellenistic court society and the hierarchies within the elite. Emphasis will be put on the members of the court, because they functioned both as an

[33] For an overview of the advances in the study of space and society since its emergence as a distinct archaeological branch see Ashmore 2004.
[34] Elias 1983 [1969], followed by Duindam (1994). Specialized in antiquity, the volume *The court and court society in ancient monarchies* (Spawforth ed. 2007) has these studies as a starting point.
[35] Herman 1997, 203–206.

influential factor on the decisions taken by the king and as the stage linking the king and his people. We need to keep in mind that we ought to understand this system from its highest to its lowest level, namely from the royal family and the friends of the king, to courtiers with lower proximity to the king, ancillary staff and slaves.[36]

The ceremonial practices that secured the concentration of power exercised by the king and his immediate entourage also need to be understood, since their physical space was the palace. In this sense the court is not regarded simply as the spatial framework of the exercise of royal power, but as a dominant social and cultural system.[37] The different patterns of governance and social hierarchies in the earlier Achaemenid court and in the later Roman Republican era are expected to have affected the formation of space in different ways, since they served different needs than in the Hellenistic kingdoms. However, answers to the same kinds of questions are required in all cases; by what means the *philoi* communicated with the king, how approachable he was, and how space contributed in this procedure; what the exact role of the members of the royal court or the family of the king was; how decoration was chosen to serve display purposes and to maintain power, and whether certain criteria of social ranking, such as gender, age and proximity to the court can be detected at the palatial buildings.

Power emerges as the defining element of social processes. Despite the variety of factors that affected the form and purpose of the palaces in 'palace civilisations', there has been a primary motivation in all cases: it is the concern to determine and distinguish specific space for the needs of the ruler that has made the creation of palaces a

[36] Ibid. 214.
[37] Spawforth 2007.

diachronic phenomenon. The relationship between built space and power is a topic that has drawn little attention among specialists of Hellenistic material culture. Theorists of modern history and architecture, however, have developed an interpretative model for the study of space and power.[38] The formation of space has been found to depend on specific strategies for the establishment and maintenance of power: segregation and in its extreme form marginalisation, and destruction are strategies that eliminate power for those who do not control space, while preservation and openness of space indicate participation of a larger group in power. This is participation only in certain levels of power that are determined by the top of the hierarchy, which in the case of this study is the Hellenistic king. Another strategy of power applied on space is scale, an element that in Hellenistic palaces is reflected to monumentality, size of rooms and decoration.

The Hellenistic was a historical period with continuous power shifts and political transformations. The kings needed to retain the balance of power in their court in order to maintain their rule and to compete with the rulers of other regions over control of land and resources. Since the palace was the spatial setting of the court, it is very likely that power strategies determined function and form. For this reason, I use the described theoretical framework in order to evaluate the significance of royal power for the nature of the palaces and clarify its manifestations. An example of spatial control by destruction is the palace of the last tyrant in Sicyon, the only building intentionally destroyed during the revolt of 251 B.C.[39] In another case Demetrios I Soter spatially marginalises himself in a remote palace in order to secure his protection and eliminate the impact of those in

[38] Markus 1993; Findley 2005.
[39] Plut. Vit. *Arat.* 9.1–2.

power.[40] The present thesis will demonstrate whether and in what ways such strategies enjoyed wide application in the palaces of the late fourth to the first decades of the first century B.C.

An analytical tool relevant to the control of power is the permeability diagrams developed by Hillier and Hanson in their seminal study about analysing space.[41] These are maps that illustrate the spatial configuration of a building according to how accessible or unapproachable a room is and to what degree it communicates with other spaces or is isolated. Applying this method depends, of course, to the state of preservation of the buildings; therefore I make only limited use here in cases whose condition allows the reconstruction of a complete permeability diagram *(Diagrams 1–7).* In our attempt to understand function, examining accessibility and the position of a room in the building is an approach that complements the analysis of the morphological features as well as of artefacts and installations found in these spaces.[42]

Reception

I have so far discussed the significance for the interpretation of the Hellenistic palaces of the processes that determine the choices of the controller of space, namely the possible reasons why Hellenistic kings built their palaces in the way they did. The agency of

[40] Joseph. *AJ* 13.2.1.

[41] Hillier and Hanson (1984) developed a system in order to read space in architectural constructions and settlements and to understand its relationship with social conditions, which is based on patterns of accessibility. See Grahame 2000 and DeLaine 2004 as examples of applying Hillier and Hanson's methodology in the study of Roman buildings.

[42] The possible pitfalls of focusing on one type of evidence in order to identify function are discussed by Ruth Westgate in her article about the role of decoration as an indicator of room function in Late Hellenistic houses (Westgate 2007).

material culture, however, is successfully transmitted only if there is a receptor. This is why the way the palace was perceived is a factor that also formulated their actual function. Firstly, perception of palatial space must be examined on a local level: It is subject to cultural beliefs of people about kingship, religion, relation of social status with space, and their own spatial experiences. The role of the analysis of luxurious residences comparable to the palaces is to elucidate this aspect of perception. It will also demonstrate whether the function of palaces, their agency as objects of material culture, was simply transmitted in a top-down fashion from the king to his court and the subjects of the kingdom, with the palaces functioning as models, or whether it was a binary procedure that also worked bottom-up from groups of lower to groups of higher status. The second level of perception is the universal. The Hellenistic World was a vast area separated in several kingdoms, major and minor, which were ruled by authorities with different power premises. Nevertheless, the origins of these authorities stemmed from a common basis, the Empire of Alexander. In what ways were the palaces perceived among different regions and what is their position in the processes of cultural interchange?

Scholarship on this period has applied different methodological approaches in order to interpret the diversity of material culture in the Hellenistic World and especially in its part to the east of Asia Minor. Until the 1950s the concept that dominated was that of 'Hellenisation'.[43] According to this interpretative framework, Greek elements in the

[43] Characteristic examples of this approach are Droysen 1836 (were the terms 'Hellenism' and 'Hellenistic' were introduced), Bouché-Leclercq 1913–14, Jouguet 1926 and Tarn 1938. For a recent compelling discussion about 'Hellenisation' see Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 17–28. A succinct overview of the history of interpretative models in the scholarship about Hellenistic history and material culture is provided in Rossi 2011.

culture of the newly acquired lands were introduced by the successors of Alexander and the Macedonian elite that dominated the system of administration in their attempt to consolidate their power. The only way for a local to gain social status and reach the uppermost echelons of society was to adopt these elements. Later a new interpretative approach emerged, which took distance from colonialist models of acculturation and emphasised the maintenance of regional and 'oriental' elements, while after the 1970s it was acknowledged that a binary model of competition between eastern and western elements was inadequate for interpreting the complex processes of cross-cultural interaction and formulation of identity.[44]

The contribution of Nielsen's monograph lies in the fact that she is interested in understanding the position of the Hellenistic palace within a series of palace cultures from the Neo-Babylonian to the early Imperial Roman; therefore she brings the building type of the palace into the discussion about continuity and disruption of Hellenistic culture. The author, however, seems to rely on a predefined interpretative agenda, which accentuates Achaemenid origins for architectural and spatial features and which possibly draws on advances in the field of Seleukid studies that appeared in scholarship during the two decades before she published her study.[45] The result is the constraint of the potential to determine other sources of inspiration and the study gives an impression of ignoring the complexity of cross-cultural interaction. Nielsen demonstrates the lower frequency of oriental features in the western part of the Hellenistic world, and attributes this lack to geographical reasons as well as to the strong Macedonian kingship tradition.[46] However,

[44] These advances are discussed below in the first section of Chapter 5.
[45] Briant 1982; Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1987.
[46] Nielsen 1996, 212.

the connection of palatial space with certain social and ideological processes according to the context in each case and perception is not investigated in a methodical way. In addition, there is no examination of the interaction with local and previous traditions in specific regions.

Thesis structure

The present thesis follows a different approach by letting the analysis of the archaeological evidence demonstrate the position of palace construction within cross-cultural interaction. In the following chapters I examine the remains of palaces in capital and peripheral cities separately in each kingdom in order to accentuate the particular circumstances that determined their construction in different regions. To follow a chronological sequence is essential in order to comprehend the transformation of palatial building activity during the Hellenistic era. For this reason I begin with the kingdom of Macedonia in Chapter 2, an area that provides evidence not only for the three last centuries BC, but also for the few decades before the formation of the Hellenistic states. The third chapter focuses on the Ptolemaic kingdom: the surviving governors' seats, finds out of context from the royal district of Alexandria, recent underwater survey in the city, and descriptions by ancient authors provide a view of the palatial architecture of the time and its significance for the Ptolemies.

The analysis of the palaces of the Attalids on the acropolis of Pergamon in Chapter 4 contributes crucially to the reconstruction of the situation in the second century B.C. due to the relatively well-known historical context and the preservation of

high quality decoration. It follows the sections about Macedonia and Egypt not only due to chronological sequence, but also due to the connections of Attalid material culture with the Greek mainland and Egypt. The Seleukid Empire comes last in an attempt to evaluate the view that the *basileion* in Alexandria played a dramatic role in the formation of palaces in the East and to detect any other possible paths of interaction. The surviving examples from the territory of the Seleukids cover the third and second centuries B.C. Material data are available, though only for seats of administrators, since the Seleukid royal palaces are known exclusively from the literary sources. In this chapter I include the palaces in the minor kingdoms of Bactria and Kommagene, former regions of the Seleukid Empire, which demonstrate how palatial architecture corresponded to the needs of the late Hellenistic period. The palace in Ai Khanoum, the capital city of Bactria, provides an insight into the meaning of the palace in the furthest eastern borders of the Hellenistic world. The palace in Samosata, the capital of Kommagene, is an example that stems from a period when the merging of different cultural trends was stronger, but it also demonstrates the role of regionalism. Due to the differentiation in origins of cultural and religious practices, the seats of the Hasmonean dynasty (140–37 BC) in Judaea have been excluded from the case studies that are discussed in detail.

Each one of these chapters closes with a discussion that brings together the observations on form and function according to the methodological framework that I apply focusing on the spatial manifestation of power. Finally, the sixth chapter juxtaposes the conclusions for each region, summarises patterns of function and form and views the palace as the spatial setting of Hellenistic courts. It is also relevant to the reception of palaces by their contemporary societies. Examples from the late Roman

Republic indicate that the role of Hellenistic royal seats as models for power display went beyond the limits of royal courts. The catalogue that accompanies the thesis lists in a methodical and consistent manner the features and the finds from the excavation of the buildings under discussion taking into account the modifications that took place in different phases of construction.

CHAPTER 2. MACEDONIA

Although kingship in ancient Macedonia goes back to the seventh century BC and we know of reception of artists, poets and scientists in the courts of Perdikkas II and Archelaos, the remains of buildings that can be identified as palaces in Macedonia date from a later era.[47] These are located in three sites: Aegae, the first capital of the Macedonian kingdom, Pella, which became the administrative centre in place of Aegae in the early fourth century BC, and Demetrias, founded by Demetrios I Poliorcetes (294–288 BC) *(Figure 2.1).* Von Hesberg, Hammond and Walbank maintain the view that palaces also existed in other cities, something that is supposed to be evident in literary sources.[48] In reality, such references are absent from the literary sources. Mieza is called 'a royal city',[49] appellation that makes likely the presence of a palace in the city, and we would also expect Cassander to have commissioned the construction of palaces in the cities he founded, Thessaloniki and Kassandreia. Relying on the currently available evidence, however, we cannot archaeologically confirm these assumptions.

[47] Hammond and Griffiths 1979, 149. It is unclear whether the famous passage about Archelaos (413–399 BC) hiring the painter Zeuxis refers to a palace with administrative functions or to an exclusively residential building (Ael. *VH* 14.17). Aelian uses the word *οἰκία* and not *βασίλειον*, which is the term used in written sources for palaces of the Hellenistic rulers.

[48] von Hesberg 1996, 89; Hammond and Walbank 1988, 477. Neither von Hesberg, nor Hammond and Walbank give any actual references to primary evidence.

[49] See Müller 1989, 392 for the literary evidence about Mieza. A monumental building at Kopanos in the area was initially identified as a palace, but as excavation progressed, identification as the *hestiatorion* of a sanctuary became more likely (Allamani and Koukouvou 1998; Allamani, Koukouvou and Psarra 2002).

In this chapter my aim is twofold; first I seek to analyse and understand the architectural form and spatial arrangement of the surviving palaces. I focus on aspects that have been disputable and remain unclear in previous studies, and on morphological elements that need to be clarified and contextualised within the general architectural framework of the era. A specific view that I wish to challenge here, is Inge Nielsen's emphasis on the use of models from the Orient as a basic source of inspiration, even for palaces in Macedonia;[50] a view which risks, I believe, ignoring the contribution of local traditions. I argue for the development of the type of palace in this region based primarily on earlier local tradition of monumental architecture and the Greek mainland, and less on the Orient.

Chronological problems are not absent, since in all cases excavation is still in progress and the stratigraphic relationships between different construction phases are not entirely clear.[51] However, scholarship has already shown the existence of standard patterns in the palatial architecture of Macedonia, such as the emphasis on the façade, and the formation of groups of three rooms with the central one functioning as a vestibule for the other two.[52] Based on these observations and my own reevaluation of the form of palaces, my second aim is to investigate the functional problems of the buildings. It is in the sixth chapter of this study that I bring the conclusions on form and function of the Macedonian and other Hellenistic palaces together with political institutions and the court system in order to shed light on the meaning of palaces, meaning in the sense of socially and culturally determined choices. However, functional

[50] Nielsen 1996.
[51] An obstacle in the comparative examination of the case studies from Macedonia is the absence of publications with final results.
[52] Heermann 1986, 256, 305–312; Hoepfner 1996, 9–17, 26–43.

analysis will spark the discussion on the purpose of palaces and their role as a means to impose government and foster the image of the powerful king already in the current chapter.

Aegae

The city of Aegae is located on the plain to the north of the Pieria Mountains close to the river Haliakmon in the area of the modern village of Vergina.[53] A French mission first undertook excavation at the palace in the mid-nineteenth century, and the results were published in 1876.[54] Systematic research by the University of Thessaloniki revealed a much larger part of the building than the first mission.[55] Since 2007 archaeological research in Aegae has focused again on the palace as a part of the project for the restoration of the site by the 17th Ephorate of Classical Antiquities. Preliminary results of this study, which change significantly our knowledge of the building, were recently published.[56]

Before the establishment of the identification of Vergina with Aegae, a number of scholars raised doubts about its function as a palace and suggested that it was a banquet house possibly of religious character.[57] To rely on the identification of the site of Vergina

[53] Nowadays scholars accept the identification of the site of Vergina with Aegae almost unanimously. For an alternative suggestion, which did not find much approval, see Faklaris 1994, and also the criticism in Saatsoglou Paliadeli 1996.
[54] Heuzey and Daumet 1876.
[55] Rhomaios, 1953–4; Andronikos 1960, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1984; Andronikos, et al. 1961; Bakalakis and Andronikos 1969.
[56] Kottaridi 2011[a] and 2011[b]. Vel sim. Kottaridi 2009 (the volume, which came out in 2012, presents the results of the 2007–2009 project and contains an extension of Kottaridi 2011[b] with new reconstructions of specific parts and rooms of the palace).
[57] Miller 1972, 11; Tomlinson 1970, 313–315.

as Aegae in order to interpret the function of the monumental building as a royal palace results in a circular argument of little value, because the existence of the palace is also an argument for the identification of the site as the royal city of Aegae. Therefore, whether the building that I examine in this chapter can legitimately be called a palace, must rely on criteria of morphological and functional nature **(Cat. M1).**

The palace is located in the southwestern part of the city on a low hill and next to western section of the fortification wall *(Figure 2.2).* Its prominent position is enhanced by construction on a platform, supported by a 7 to 13 m high retaining wall to the north.[58] The open terrace on the northern side permitted view to the theatre, the level of which is sixteen metres lower, and the Agora.[59] The theatre must have formed a unity with the palace, as it is constructed at a distance of only fifty metres from its northern part.

Architectural form and spatial arrangement

The palace covers more than 12500 m^2 and consists of two peristyle courtyards arranged east-west *(Figure 2.3).* Individual or groups of spaces surround these two courtyards. The eastern section (104.60 x 90 m) has rooms on all sides, whereas the southwestern (41.40 x 41.40 m) only to the west and north. Scholarship has so far followed Travlos's and Hoepfner's reconstructions, which do not distinguish any

[58] Kottaridi 2011[b], 307; Pandermalis 1976, 394.
[59] The terrace is a long open space created by the retaining wall of the platform (Hoepfner 1996, 16; Kottaridi 2011[b], 308). Therefore, the term 'veranda' that has previously been used (Andronikos 1984, 39, 44) and implies a roofed space should be avoided.

construction phases *(Figures 2.4a–b).* Research during the last decade, however, which included the systematic excavation of the foundation trenches, has produced a new more accurate plan *(Figure 2.4c).* It restores the original construction phase and clarifies ambiguities of the previous versions especially in the form of the entrance and the eastern façade. This is the plan that I follow here in the discussion of the building.

The ten-meter wide monumental propylon to the East provided access to the palace. It is divided in three consecutive sections, propyla 1–3 (Pr1–Pr3). Two Ionic double-sided pillar-columns stood at the entrance of Pr1 and between Pr1 and Pr2.[60] Ionic capitals indicate an upper floor at the propylon. They were found together with fragments of false-windows and a pediment by the entrance and spaces V and X and this material allows the reconstruction of the façade. It was similar to the façade of the Tomb of Judgment in Lefkadia, where the false windows were set between the intercolumnia of the upper floor *(Figures 2.5, 2.6).*[61] In addition, the most recent survey showed that there was a long Doric colonnade of equal length to the north and south of the propylon with the optical correction of one extra intercolumnium to the north.[62] According to Travlos the façade of the upper floor had an Ionic colonnade that extended the whole length of the eastern side.[63] The investigations of the 17th Ephorate confirm this and also suggest the presence of an upper storey above the spaces of all porticoes *(Figure 2.7).*[64]

[60] Kottaridi 2011[b], 318.
[61] Pandermalis 1976, 391.
[62] Kottaridi 2011[b], 317. Andronikos found it unlikely that a stoa extended the whole length of the eastern side of the building (Andronikos 1964, 6).
[63] Andronikos 1984, 39.
[64] Kottaridi 2011[b], 327. Hoepfner reconstructs only one floor at the entrance (Pr1) and at the colonnaded eastern façade and an upper floor at the east and west portico. The only difference with regard to the upper storey in the reconstructions by Pandermalis and Brands is that the first part of the propylon (Pr1) also has an upper floor.

Eastern wing

The excavation of the foundations in the spaces behind the façade showed that there were slabs for the support of heavy benches along the south and west sides of room X *(Figure 2.4c)*.[65] Similar foundations have been found by the walls to the north and south in Pr2 and Pr3, and also to the west and north in space T. Pr2 provided access to the long rectangular rooms V and T, while Pr3 (10 x 10 m) is larger than the other two (10 x 6 m). Pr2 and Pr3 communicated via a large single door instead of three openings as they appear in the reconstructions by Travlos and Hoepfner.[66] After the last anteroom and through openings formed by two double-sided Ionic pillar-columns one entered the peristyle court, which functioned as the core of the complex that defined and unified space. S and R were undoubtedly used as banquet rooms, function indicated by an off centre door opening to the peristyle and a raised border for couches.[67] The unit of rooms A and A1–2 resembles in arrangement units P–Q1–Q2, with a rectangular vestibule providing access to two smaller square spaces.

The Tholos

The first room to the left of the entrance is the so-called Tholos (Th), an internally circular room (d: 11.1 m) inscribed in a square. Stone material found in this room was robbed in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and this has caused multiple

[65] Andronikos 1984, 39.
[66] Kottaridi 2011[b], 318. The reason is the presence of the benches, which does not leave enough space for the formation of three openings with supports at the sides.
[67] For these typical features that allow identification of a room as space for banqueting see Westgate 1997–1998, 94.

problems in our understanding of its function and form. The first is the rectangular projections depicted in the first plan of the palace by Heuzey, which do not survive anymore *(Figure 2.8).* They were attached to the wall of the room at regular intervals of about 2 m and measured approximately 80 x 40 cm.[68] Miller interprets them as supports for dining couches, Heermann as supports of a structure for the decoration of the wall, and Kottaridi as socles for the support of engaged Corinthian half-columns, because a fragment of a Corinthian capital has been found in this space *(Figure 2.9).*[69] The first interpretation implies the function of the room as a banquet-hall, a suggestion that is difficult to prove, as I will further analyse below. In addition, similar projections in the plan of the first excavators are reconstructed in Pr3, an element that has not been discussed in scholarship so far. If we interpret these as supports for dining couches, the result will be an odd arrangement with *klinai* in the vestibule, a space of high traffic right before the courtyard. For this reason this interpretation seems to be unlikely.

There are two problems with Kottaridi's interpretation: first, the projections are too long (0.80 m) to have supported half-columns. We would expect a shorter length and a more square shape if they were used for the bases of Corinthian half-columns. The length, for example, of the plinth that supports the base of the Ionic double-sided pillar-columns between the spaces of the propylon measures approximately 1.40 m and the lower diameter of the Doric columns of the façade is approximately 0.95 m.[70] In addition, neither the Philippeion in Olympia, nor the Tholos in Delphi, which Roux

[68] Their height is not recorded.
[69] Stephen Miller 1972, 79; Heermann 1986, 252; Kottaridi 2011[b] 326.
[70] Heuzey and Daumet 1876, 196–197 and Plate 10.

mentions as parallels for engaged Corinthian order, present this type of projections.[71] For these reasons, I find it doubtful that the capital fragment relates to the projections. It might have crowned a votive stele, something that Miller suggested,[72] or a votive pillar. As for the projections, they can have indeed been part of a wall decoration, something that Heermann suggests, but its type remains unknown and this interpretation cannot go much further.[73] If we recall again the projections that Heuzey and Daumet reported at Pr3 and the conclusion by Kottaridi that this space had benches on the sides, I find it likely that the projections were supports for a similar type of benches used for seating and not reclining.

The other finds from the Tholos are fragments of reliefs, a two-stepped block, and marble slabs.[74] The votive character of these artefacts encourages the interpretation of the Corinthian fragment as a part of a votive stele or pillar: one of the slabs preserves a votive inscription to Herakles Patroos, and indicates his worship in the room *(Figure 2.10).*[75] The best preserved of the relief panels depicts a seated female figure, who holds a snake with her left hand *(Figure 2.11).* The first excavators identified her either with Hygieia-Athena or with Olympias, based on the reference by Plutarch that a snake was once seen by her side while she was asleep.[76] The snake matches as an attribute the

[71] Roux 1961, 365.
[72] Stella Miller 1972, 32–33.
[73] Heermann 1986, 253. Heermann also regards the reconstruction of this space with an architectural wall decoration of Corinthian order as lacking firm evidence.
[74] Bakalakis and Andronikos 1970, 394. The first excavators mention the presence in situ of a marble threshold and a two-stepped block adjacent to the wall on the northeast (2.50 x 2.40 x 0.47 m). Both had disappeared already in the beginning of the twentieth century and only the foundation of the block survives (Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 2001, 203–204). It seems that the same happened with the pavement of the room (Drougou and Paliadeli 2000, 20).
[75] On the inscription, its date and the function of the room here the section *Spatial patterns and functional problems.*
[76] Heuzey and Daumet 1876, 217. Plut. Vit. *Alex.* 2.4.

representation of Hygieia and this must be the correct identification, as the type was common in the Hellenistic Era and copied in Roman sculptures.[77]

Southern wing

Rooms E and G (81 m^2, *Figure 2.4c*) form a unit with vestibule F; even though they are different in size, this arrangement resembles units M1–M2–M3 and N1–N2–N3 with a vestibule open to the peristyle flanked by two square side rooms of equal size. Heermann first demonstrated the significance of this arrangement, which is a typical feature of palace space in Macedonia, found also in the houses of Pella and adopted by later Hellenistic palaces.[78] In her study such units are called 'Flügeldreiraumgruppe', for which an equivalent term in English can well be 'group of vestibule with two side rooms'.

Three Ionic double-sided pillar-columns defined the entrance of room F, as the bases in situ indicate.[79] This type of supports has been also found in Building I–II in the palace in Pella, and seems to be a distinctive feature of Macedonian palace architecture.[80] F provided access to room E, which is paved with a mosaic floor. It depicts a rosette in the centre surrounded by eight pairs of interlacing tendrils. Female figures wearing a *polos* with the lower torso ending to a floral ornament are set in the spandrels *(Figures*

[77] The relief resembles Roman sculptures of Hygieia that copy Hellenistic prototypes, such as a statue in New York and a statuette in the Hermitage (*LIMC* vol. 5.1 p. 557). The relief was transferred in the Museum of Louvre and the catalogue of the Greek sculptures of the museum identifies it indeed as Hygieia (Hamiaux 1998, 180, fig. 199).
[78] Heermann 1986, 259–266.
[79] Andronikos 1961, 22.
[80] Hoepfner 1996, 11–12, 29.

2.12a–b).[81] Finally, traces of a mosaic floor with Tritons or Erotes riding dolphins and a complex meander around the central—not preserved—panel are mentioned in the excavation report to have survived in room G. The recent reexamination of the room with 3-D laser scanning has revealed the outline of the feet of a bull. Thus, the most possible subject illustrated here is the Abduction of Europa.[82] Spaces D and H have the same dimensions as E and G; all these rooms had a raised border for the couches, something that indicates their use for dining, but D and H are of less private character, because they were directly accessible from the courtyard.

Western wing

Rooms M1–M3 are the largest in the building (284.75 m^2). The floor of M2 is on a slightly lower level than the other two. Andronikos assumed that this was a vestibule leading to M1 and M3 and this view has now proved to be correct.[83] The large quantity of tiles that has been found confirms that these spaces were roofed.[84] At the same time, finds indicating internal columns to support the roof are absent. How these vast spaces with a clear span of 17 m, the largest in ancient Greek architecture, were roofed without internal supports is a problem that—with one exception[85]—has not been so far discussed and deserves more attention.[86] The typical system of roofing in Greek architecture was the prop-and-lintel, according to which the timbers that span the space are supported

[81] Andronikos 1961, 20.
[82] Kottaridi 2011[b], 324.
[83] Andronikos 1964, 7; Heermann 1986, 262–5. The state of preservation at this part initially hindered the identification of the thresholds location.
[84] Andronikos 1962, 212.
[85] Winter 2006, 164–5.
[86] The span at the Arsinoeion in Samothrace (285 BC) is very close (16.80 m) to these rooms, but as it is a round building, a different system of roofing was applied (Coulton 1977, 158). The same problem emerges for the palace of Pella, see below.

from below at regular intervals *(Figure 2.13)*. It is generally accepted that this system is suitable for clear spans of up to 11 m, unless a ridge beam of vast thickness is used.[87] The system that allows roofing larger spans is the roof-truss, which is a triangular frame of beams joined on their edges. The beams support each other without the need of supports from below *(Figure 2.14)*. The first confirmed case for the use of the roof-truss comes from a much later era, the third century AD. It is believed, however, that the system developed from the second century BC onwards.[88]

This leaves us with three options: The first is that the roof was of the prop-and-lintel type and one vast ridge beam or many beams joined together were used. As large spaces without supports are found in Sicily already in the fifth century BC, and in Macedonia and Samothrace in the fourth–third century BC, and because all these areas were well known for timber of excellent quality in abundance, Coulton justifies the roofing of such large spans by the quality of the available material.[89] The problem with this interpretation is the apparent lack of such examples in Greece. Since timber imported from Macedonia was used for ships and siege machinery in Greece, why did they not use it for architectural purposes as well?

The second option is that spaces M1–M3 had a roof-truss. If we accept the current excavator's chronology, that the palace was constructed during the reign of Philip II, we will need to revise the date for the development of this technology. But again one

[87] Klein 1998, 338; Ulrich 2007, 125.
[88] The Ekkleseasterion in Priene (ca. 200 BC) and the Bouleuterion in Miletus (around 175 BC) with clear spans of 15.60 m and 12.12 m respectively are possible examples of a roof truss system (Izenour 1992, 46–53; Ulrich 2007, 124).
[89] Coulton 1977, 158. See also Hodge 1960.

wonders why the Greeks did not adopt this system in the fourth–third centuries BC. Winter assumes that a roof-truss was used indeed, something that indicates a later date for the palace than the late third century BC.

To conclude, for the reasons that I analysed, this technical issue is not as simple as Winter presents it, and as a dating criterion it is inadequate on its own. We cannot tell with certainty which kind of roofing was used. As large spans are not found in Greece, I believe that the architect in Aegae was experimenting, like in Samothrace, at a stage where the system had imperfections or was not well understood. The stamps on the roof-tiles (though it is not clear if the stamped tiles come from the western part of the palace) indicate a date in the late fourth century.[90] It is not unlikely that the technological knowledge still in an experimental stage had been imported in Macedonia from Sicily, as interaction with Italy is evident in other aspects of Macedonian material culture as well.[91]

A recent view that attributes the origin of the architectural type of the basilica to large halls of audience of the Hellenistic palaces might be relevant to this issue.[92] This encourages the possibility of experimentation in roofing, because a typical feature of the basilica, at least in the AD era is the clear span with a roof-truss. Ulrich justifies the absence of basilicas in Greece by the lack of knowledge of the roof-truss and attributes its usage in second century BC Asia Minor to influence from the West.[93] A more complex procedure of two-way interaction and experimentation, in which Hellenistic

[90] Pandermalis 1987. See also the discussion below about the chronology of the palace.
[91] For example, Pfrommer (1982) has pointed out the affinities between Macedonia and Sicily of decorative vegetal motifs found in pottery.
[92] Welch 2003. See also chapter 6 for the significance of this theory with respect to cross-cultural interaction in the sphere of monumental architecture between the Hellenistic East and West.
[93] Ulrich 2007, 144.

palaces might have also played a role, rather than a single-step West-to-East influence is also possible. In any case it becomes apparent that this is an open question that one needs to take into consideration both for the chronology of the building and for the cultural interaction between Macedonia and the western part of the Hellenistic world.

Northern wing

Due to the poor state of preservation of the northern wing, the reconstruction of its plan has been problematic and most scholars have reconstructed individual rooms that open to the peristyle *(Figures 2.4a–c).* Excavation of the foundation trenches confirmed Heermann's reconstruction and indicated that there was a tripartite group of banquet halls and vestibule (N1–N2–N3) corresponding to the arrangement in the southern wing.[94] Finally, corridor N4 leads to the terrace.[95]

The southwestern peristyle

The foundations of a smaller peristyle to the southwest have been also excavated and initially dated in the early third century BC on the basis of pottery finds *(Figure 2.15).*[96] Kottaridi has proven that it is contemporary to the main one because of the same type of foundation of the southern wall with its continuation onto the main section.[97] The surviving rectangular stone bases indicate that its peristyle was formed by 9 x 9 wooden

[94] Kottaridi 2011[b], 324, footnote 101. It is not clear why on the new plan of the palace space N5 is separated in three parts, but it must be for reasons of symmetry.
[95] Andronikos 1984, 44.
[96] Bakalakis and Andronikos 1969, 1970; Andronikos 1984, 46.
[97] Kottaridi 2011[b], 304.

columns.[98] Only the rooms to the north and west date to the initial phase, and the semicircular bath is a later addition. To the west a mosaic floor made of black pebbles paved room 1969γ_2, and of red and black pebbles room 1969β. The latter seems to have been one of the most important spaces, because apart from the mosaic, fragments of plaster indicate decorated walls. In addition, iron gilded fragments have been found, something that, I assume, may come from furniture. The narrow shape of 1969$\gamma_{1–2}$ indicates that this is possibly a staircase with a vestibule. The most prominent spaces of the peristyle were located on the northern side. These are 1969a and 1969στ. According to the excavation report, the first was paved with a mosaic made of black pebbles, which was surrounded by a border of yellow/grey colour. It seems to me that this description shows a dining-room of the same type that we find at the main peristyle. Space 1969στ also yielded finds that indicate some degree of elaboration, these are the left hand of a marble statue and red and yellow plaster fragments. It is not clear, however, whether these finds belong to the original construction phase.

Problems of chronology

Andronikos initially dated the palace in the early third century during the reign of Antigonos Gonatas (277–239 BC) based on architectural features and coins. In particular a coin of Lysimachos (305–281 BC) from the foundation on the east part of the palace was seen as a *terminus post quem*.[99] The most recent research has disconnected this specific coin from any foundation layers.[100] Later Andronikos suggested the late fourth

[98] Andronikos 1970, 338.
[99] Andronikos 1961/2, 228.
[100] Kottaridi 2011[b], 301.

century, because the study of the roof tiles showed that they date to this period.[101] Touratsoglou and Heermann have also supported this view and connected the palace with the government of Cassander.[102] Hoepfner and Kottaridi, however, argue for an earlier date in the time of Philip II.[103] Kottaridi suggests that the construction of the palace started in the beginning of the second half of the fourth century BC and finished in 336 BC. Let us examine these two options separately.

A date during the rule of Philip II is based on the affinities of the Doric order with the temples of Athena Alea in Tegea, the limestone temple of Athena Pronaia in Delphi and with the Tholos in Epidauros, all constructed in the first half of the fourth century BC. In addition, the Ionic double sided pillar-column capitals of the ground floor recall the column capitals of the Mausoleion in Halikarnassos, constructed 353–350 BC. A further argument is that the floral patterns and the female figures of the mosaic in room E resemble representations on artefacts found in the main chamber of Tomb II in Vergina, attributed by some scholars to Philip II. Nevertheless, this chronology encounters specific problems. First, as Roux and Miller have shown, affinities with the region of the Peloponnese existed indeed, but the comparison with temples from the area, one of Kottaridi's arguments, leads to a date in the last third of the fourth century the earliest.[104] The profile of the Doric capitals of the palace seems to be much later than the capitals of the Temple of Athena Pronaia in Delphi (ca. 360 BC), because the junction between the echinus and the abacus is sharper in the Temple of Delphi with the upper part of echinus turning inwards *(Figures 2.16–2.17).* In the capitals of Aegae this

[101] Andronikos 1984, 39; Pandermalis 1987, 602.
[102] Touratsoglou 1975; Heermann 1986, 314–315.
[103] Hoepfner 1996, 9–17; Kottaridi 2011[b], 301–303.
[104] Roux 1961, 336–8 and 348–9; Stella Miller 1972, 20–32 and 95–98.

junction is straighter, and is closer to the capitals of the Temple of Zeus in Nemea (340–320 BC). As for the parallelism with artefacts from the so-called Tomb of Philip II, this can be used as a positive argument only if one accepts the attribution of the tomb to Philip, a highly disputable matter that does not seem to have found a final answer yet.[105] An additional argument against Hoepfner and Kottaridi's chronology is the date of the Corinthian roof-tiles of the palace, something that Kottaridi does not mention in her latest articles about the palace.[106] Some of the roof-tiles bear stamp impressions made with the same seal as stamped roof-tiles from the Houses of Dionysus and Helen in Pella.[107] Furthermore, the front of the eaves cover tiles ended in painted relief palmette antefixes and cornices, which are stylistically very close to the Types A and B of architectural decoration from the same houses *(Figure 2.18a–b).*[108] The date of the Houses of Dionysus and Helen rely on stratified pottery and numismatic evidence from the sublayer of the mosaics found in these buildings.[109] The material indicates the last quarter of the fourth century BC, hence the likely connection of Cassander with the palace in Aegae.

The construction of the palace by Cassander would have indeed been a strong means to legitimise and impose his power. The main argument for this, as we already

[105] For an overview of the problems of date of the tomb and a history of scholarly views on this matter see Franks 2012, 22, 116-126.
[106] Around 20.000 fragments of Corinthian roof tiles have been found, some of which bear stamps with figurative scenes of seven different themes in total (Pandermalis 1987, 591).
[107] Pandermalis 1987, 597.
[108] Makaronas and Giouri 1989, 95–96 and 108–110; Pandermalis 1987, 585.
[109] Touratsoglou 1975, 181–182. Hoepfner accepts that the palace and the house of Dionysus are contemporary, but claims that the house was built in the mid-fourth century, whereas the mosaics were constructed later during Alexander's rule (Hoepfner 2002, 94). This is an assumption that lacks archaeological evidence and should be, therefore, rejected.

saw, is the affinities with the houses of Pella. On the other hand, it seems unlikely for Cassander who was officially in power as a king for only eight years (305–297 BC) to have commissioned this palace, as his focus were the new cities of Thessaloniki and Kassandreia, as well as the expansion of Pella. In addition, there is a question of adequate finances, since his reign followed the Wars of the Successors.

Philip II's long reign must have encouraged the construction of monumental buildings, since the expansion of the Macedonian state during his government secured the availability of resources. In addition to the buildings that Kottaridi mentions as parallels, we need also to take into consideration the similarity of the propylon façade with the Tomb of Judgment in Lefkadia, which dates in the last quarter of the fourth century BC. Since a burial mound covered the tomb, it is more likely that the palace was constructed before the tomb and had an impact on the formation of the façade than the opposite. The depiction of Europa in the mosaic from room E could relate to Philip and Cleopatra's daughter Europa, as well as to Theopompos's reference to Philip as 'ruler of Europe'.[110] However, Antipater is also connected in the sources with Europe, as he was appointed a general in control of Europe (mainland Greece) after the beginning of the Alexander campaign.[111] The palace must not have been an urgent need, because the administrative centre had been transferred to Pella already in the early fourth century BC, and also the older palace in Aegae could still have been in use during the construction of the new palace. It might have taken several years to finish the building project. For these reasons I suggest that construction started during the reign of Philip II,

[110] For the relevant fragment from Theopompos' *Philippica* see Jacoby 1940–1958. Diodoros also refers to Philip as 'the greatest of the kings in Europe in his time' (Diod. Sic. 16.95).
[111] Diod. Sic. 17.118.

most likely a few years before his assassination in 336 and after a military success, such as the wars in Thrace (342–339), or the Battle in Chaeroneia (338).[112] The construction must have continued during Alexander's rule in a slower pace, or even temporarily interrupted because of the needs of the campaign. Finally, the date of the roof-tiles shows that the building must have been finished during the reign of Cassander.

Spatial patterns and functional problems

The only explicitly confirmed type of activity that the palace served is banqueting. Rooms S, R, D, E, G, H, M1, M3, are undoubtedly identified as banquet halls, a function indicated by the off centre-doors and the raised border for the couches. It is likely that N1, N3, Q1–2 and N5 were also dining rooms *(Figure 2.4c).*[113] The spaces of this type present similar decorative schemes and choice in materials. Mosaic floors often together with fragments of coloured wall plaster have been found in most of these rooms. Irregular pieces made of marble, a prestigious material, joined together with red plaster were used for the large M1–3 rooms *(Figure 2.19).*[114] The second largest banquet rooms, R and S (10.6 x 10.5 m, maximum 19 couches) had a polychrome non-figural mosaic. Of the smallest, D and H had the same type of polychrome pavement, whereas the most elaborate mosaic floors have been discovered in E and G (9 x 9,

[112] Europa was born in 338/7, therefore a possible relation of the mosaic with her indicates its construction after this date.
[113] Since M2 was a vestibule leading to M1 and M3, its function as an banquet hall is less certain. Kottaridi suggests that it was used as a throne hall something probable, but not possible to confirm (Kottaridi 2011[b], 325).
[114] Andronikos 1961, 24–25. Drougou and Paliadeli (2000, 20) use the term *opus sectile* to describe the type of pavements in M1–3. The technique includes the intentional cutting of material such as marble in pieces in order to assemble elements of a specific decorative pattern (Dunbabin 1999, 343). This does not happen in M1–3, hence *opus sectile* is a term that does not suit the palace in Aegae. In contrast, the marble fragments in M1–3 are of irregular shape and randomly scattered in the floor.

maximum 15 couches), which belong to the group of vestibule with two side rooms. Due to the decoration and the distinctive formation of the entrance with a vestibule defined by double-sided pillar-columns, it is obvious that these groups were the reception halls of the greatest importance.[115] Simpler decoration is found in other spaces, such as a plain mosaic floor made of white pebbles at C, V, A1 and A2.[116] Thus it seems that the smallest banquet rooms had the most elaborate decoration.

A look at the permeability diagram of the palace reveals that not only the size, but also the accessibility of the decorated rooms corresponds to the cost and elaboration of the decoration *(Diagram 1)*. The most remote reception rooms M1, M3 and E, G have the most expensive types of pavement. D, H, S, R, which are more accessible, have simpler polychrome non-figural mosaics. C and V are located closer to the entrance and have plain pebble mosaics. The variability in size, decoration and accessibility implies a hierarchical differentiation among the diners based on their social status and it seems that those who were in close connection with the king frequented the smallest most elaborately decorated banquet rooms. In spite of their remote position, the size of M1–3 indicates that these were rooms available for the circulation of large numbers of people possibly of various social statuses. If we accept that M1 and M3 each had 31 dining couches, and since two diners reclined on one couch, these halls accommodated a total of 124 diners. In group E–G less than half of the guests of M1 and M3 could be accommodated (a total of 60, 15 couches in each room). The mechanisms of displaying

[115] On the grounds of the powerful status women could obtain in the Macedonian court Hoepfner and Kose suggest that the arrangement of two banquet rooms of the same size flanking a vestibule indicates use by the king and by the queen. This is a mere assumption that does not rely on solid ground (Hoepfner and Kose 2002, 426).
[116] Andronikos 1964, 367; Kutbay 1998, 22.

wealth in this case comprised providing spaces with capacity for large amounts of guests, using costly material for the pavement. A possible reason for dismissing the pattern of figural decoration in the floor is the size of the rooms: a mosaic with composition similar to the mosaics in rooms E and G would not have as easily been viewed in such large surface. The differentiation of banquet rooms implies that the building was much more than a banquet house and possibly reflected the relations of courtiers and guests with the ruler. Spatial hierarchy in connection with banquets of the Macedonian court also recalls a reference in Diodoros Sikeliotes about a banquet organised for the army in Persepolis in around 317 BC.[117] Peucestes, the governor of Persis, who had also been one of the generals of Alexander III, had the diners arranged in four circuits according to their status from mercenaries in the outermost circuit to military commanders of the highest rank in the centre.

With respect to the function of the core of the palace, the peristyle courtyard, this is debatable. Nielsen suggests that a garden was located in that part with the argument that no pavement traces have been found.[118] The gutter that runs around the peristyle would have facilitated drainage of any excess water in case there was a garden, but it may well have been used just in order to drain the rainwater that fell from the roof of the porticoes. I believe that other features that contradict the existence of a garden-peristyle are the absence of cisterns and the location of the palace within a rich forest, something that would have diminished the need for a garden. The literary sources refer to gardens in Pergamon and Alexandria, but it is not clear if they were located in peristyle

[117] Diod. Sic. 19.22.1–3.
[118] Nielsen 1994, 84 and 2001, 177–8. See also Sonne 1996, 141.

courtyards;[119] this seems to be a view affected by the common presence of a garden-peristyle in Roman houses. For the Hellenistic era there is no firm archaeological evidence for the existence of gardens in the peristyle courtyard of palaces.[120] The courtyard may have instead been used for festivities and public banquets, in which case the gutter would have facilitated draining water from cleaning.[121]

Another space in the palace of Aegae whose function has been interpreted in several different ways is the Tholos. Miller justifies its round shape as a specialised room for the *kottabos* game during the symposion *(Figures 2.20a–b).*[122] As for the stone projections we discussed above, Hoepfner believes they were too short to have supported couches.[123] He gives a length of 0.50 m, but in the excavation plan by Heuzey and Daumet they seem to be about 0.80 m. The usual width of the couches has been estimated between 0.75 and 1 m, which means that the projections may have indeed been suitable for dining couches.[124] However, due to the existence of so many other spaces used for banqueting, I find it unlikely that this space was simply one more dining room. It also seems unreasonable to restrict the game of *kottabos* to only one space. The Tholos has also been interpreted as a bath, but in the absence of any relevant installations this is very unlikely.[125]

---

[119] Just. *Epit.* 36.4.4; Plut. Vit. *Demetr*. 20.2; Strabo 17.1.8–10.
[120] For this matter see also Carroll Spillecke 1989, who is also hesitant in relating garden-peristyles to Hellenistic palaces. The problem of the existence of gardens in peristyles of palaces will be also discussed in later chapters, and especially in Chapter 5 in relation to Seleukid palatial architecture.
[121] According to Arrian, Alexander sometimes held large banquets in peristyle courtyards (Arr. *Anab.* 7.11.8; see also Murray 1996).
[122] Miller 1972, 79.
[123] Hoepfner 1996, 15.
[124] Tomlison 1970, 309.
[125] Lawrence 1957, 306. Lawrence regarded the whole building as a *gymnasion*.

The only kind of function that the finds from this room indicate is religious. Except for the votive inscription to Herakles (*Figure 2.10)* and the block used either as an altar or a statue base, ash and organic material have been found on the floor possibly indicating ritual activity.[126] This is certain, however, only for the second building phase of the palace. Miltiades Hatzopoulos has managed by comparative analysis to restore the two first lines in the inscription of Herakles, which were erased in a later era:

[Φίλ]ι[ππος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρο]ς
[τον π]α[τέρα β]ασ[ι]λ[έα Περσέα]
Ἡρακλεῖ Πατρώιωι.

Philip and Alexander
(are dedicating a statue of) their father Perseus
to Herakles Patroos.[127]

The names are obviously the sons of king Perseus (179–168 BC). This shows that the inscription does not belong to the initial construction phase of the palace, and reveals the cult purpose of the room in the time of the last king of the Antigonids. The block of the inscription is decorated with a bead-and-reel band, an Ionic cymatium and a palmette. It resembles a similarly decorated fragment that Heuzey and Daumet discovered in the Tholos and for this reason I believe that they belong to the same artefact. The French excavators restored these fragments as a votive stele; therefore it is very likely that the inscribed block belongs to the same stele *(Figure 2.21).*[128] The decoration does not reveal whether the whole stele, or just the inscription, date to the time of Perseus, and the date of the other relief fragments from the Tholos is also unclear. As a result we cannot

[126] Kutbay 1998, 23.
[127] Hatzopoulos 1996, 50. The date of the inscription is also based on the shape of the letters, and especially of the letter A; its angular middle line indicates the third–second centuries BC and is also found in stamps of roof tiles (Kaltsas 1988, 105).
[128] A second fragment with a slightly different type of dart in the egg-and-dart pattern of the Ionic cymatium has been interpreted as the base of the pillar.

tell with certainty that the initial function of this space was religious. Since there is a possibility that benches for seating were set by the wall, the Tholos might relate to administrative purposes for the Macedonian assembly, a view also stated by the excavator in the 1950s, G. Rhomaios.[129]

Directly to the south of the Tholos A–A1–A2 form a group of rooms. Heermann interprets A1 and A2 as private bedrooms for the king and his family, but evidence to support this view is absent.[130] Moreover, a position so close to the entrance and large banquet rooms does not seem to be suitable for sleeping quarters. Hoepfner suggests a different identification and regards A1 as a library on the argument that it is located to the east, an element that accords to what Vitruvius reports for this particular type of space in the Greek house.[131] Nevertheless, by relying on a much later literary source than the Macedonian palaces we run the risk of false functional identification. Besides, in the Hellenistic palaces of Alexandria and Pergamon libraries were separate large buildings that belonged to the *basileia*. I consider it possible that this tradition originates in Macedonia, since this was the starting point for the creation of the later palaces and due to the support of philosophy and arts at least since the time of Archelaos in the Macedonian court. Therefore, a room of small size like A1 would have been inadequate for such an important function. Finally, Kottaridi's interpretation is that A1–2 were used as dining rooms.[132] In this case these would be the smallest in the palace, available only to diners of the highest social status. For this reason, we would expect a more elaborate type of pavement than plain white pebble mosaic floor, at least equal to the complexity

[129] Rhomaios 1953–4, 144.
[130] Heermann 1987, 254–5.
[131] Hoepfner 2002, 95.
[132] Kottaridi 2011[b], 327.

of the mosaics in rooms G and E. In addition, standard installations that would indicate banquet halls have not been found in these rooms. I would suggest that an alternative function for these spaces is ancillary catering the banquet halls to the southeast and the Tholos.

Vestibule A opens to the south onto room B. Kottaridi's suggestion that this was an archive is highly possible; the main reason encouraging this view is the presence of three square stone bases for wooden pillars or columns that she interpreted as elements of niches that supported shelves *(Figure 2.22)*.[133] She mistakenly characterises, however, this space as 'the most closed and isolated area of the palace' as thirteen more spaces in the palace are on the same level of accessibility and another five are in a deeper level *(Diagram 1)*; therefore its position should not be used as an argument for its interpretation. Andronikos identified the bases in space B as supports of a stair, but no such element exists in cases that bases for a stair have been found, such as the houses of Pella.[134] Moreover, room C is more likely to have been a staircase due to its narrow shape and the fragments of white and red plaster, which show that its walls were decorated, an element suitable to a room of high circulation that connected the ground with the upper floor.

As for spaces T and V, Hoepfner's view that they were used for the lodging of the guard and weaponry should be rejected, as there is no firm evidence for such function.[135] In particular, space T has now proved to have had a colonnade and not a wall

[133] Andronikos 1964, 6; Kottaridi ibid.
[134] Makaronas and Gioure 1989, 22.
[135] Hoepfner 1996, 16.

to the east, an element that does not match with a function as weaponry, for which we would expect a more closed space. In fact T is a double stoa, and it would have made more sense if it was used for displaying trophies, and works of art, function that would also justify the foundations for benches along the walls.

The part of the palace whose purpose has been discussed least in scholarship is the southwestern peristyle *(Figures 2.4c, 2.15).* Hoepfner suggested that it was used for residential purposes, whereas Kottaridi believes that it served ancillary needs with storage spaces, kitchens and stables.[136] The first view relates to the problem of identifying residential function and spaces of private character in interpreting domestic architecture. Scholars have relied on textual evidence that refers to the spatial arrangement in Athenian houses and implies that the upper floor was used for more private purposes and by the women of the household.[137] In this context Heermann suggests that the residential part of the palace was the upper floor, but further material evidence is required to confirm this view.[138] As Hoepfner suggested, I believe that we are justified to attribute residential purpose to the secondary peristyle. This part of the palace is the furthest from the propylon and not easily accessible, as it communicates with the main peristyle only via corridor Z. In addition, we already saw that some of its rooms were paved with mosaic floors, their walls were decorated and at least one seems to have been a banquet-room. These features hardly correspond to ancillary purposes. This view finds further support in the construction of a bath on the western side, even if this does not belong to the initial construction phase.

[136] Hoepfner 1996, 17; Kottaridi 2011[a], 233.
[137] On this problem see Nevett 1999, 12–20.
[138] Heermann 1986, 255 and 273–4.

Ancillary spaces, of the type that Kottaridi suggests, would indeed have been essential in a building of such scale, especially for the needs of the banquets. A group that may well have been used for this purpose is I–L, and, as Kottaridi remarks, these spaces were suitable for storage.[139] The low accessibility of I and K corresponds to use by ancillary staff. The final publication with the excavation results of the southwestern peristyle with a detailed presentation of its architecture is expected to provide more accurate answers as regards its function, but there is already adequate evidence to recognise residential function, at least partially.

The examination of the form of the palace in Aegae shows that the building consisted of the following types of spaces:

a) Individual rooms of square shape, which were used for reception and especially for banquets.

b) Rooms in a group of intercommunicating spaces; the group comprises either one vestibule in the middle and flanking rooms, or a vestibule on one side and two rooms on the other. In the first case the spaces were undoubtedly banquet rooms; in the second similar function is possible, but cannot be confirmed, and other purposes such as ancillary are to be considered.

c) The Tholos, possibly used for administrative and—at least by the last Antigonids—for cult purposes.

d) Large long spaces (T, U, V, X) that served purposes of display.

[139] Kottaridi 2011[b], 328.

e) Ancillary spaces, such as I–L, and a series of rectangular rooms possibly of residential character and a round bath constructed in the second century in the southwestern peristyle.

f) A propylon that consisted of three consecutive halls.

As a consequence, we can suggest that the main purpose of the palace was reception and entertainment by offering banquets; the residential function is very likely to have existed, an administrative function is possible, but cannot be confirmed. Together with Pella this is the oldest surviving example of Macedonian palace building tradition. Its form implies social differentiation within the royal court, namely among the users of the palace, and among those who frequented the palace as visitors. These implications and its connection with the ideology of Macedonian kingship are analysed together with the other case studies from the area in the conclusions of this chapter.

Pella

Pella became the new capital and administration centre of the Macedonian kingdom in the first half of the fourth century BC.[140] The city developed during the reign of Philip II and was re-organised during the reign of Cassander *(Figure 2.23)*.[141] The palace was

[140] The most widely accepted view is that Pella became the capital during the reign of king Archelaos (413–399 BC). Due to the lack, however, of explicit literary evidence, which would encourage this statement (Thukydides in *2.100.2* refers to the building activity and introduction of regular city planning by Archelaos, but it is not clear if he transferred the capital), Hatzopoulos (1996, 174–9) attributes this change to Amyntas III (392–370 BC). In an inscription with the list of *theorodokoi* in Epidauros from 360 BC, king Perdikkas III appears to be residing at Pella (Hatzopoulos 2001, 190 and *IG* V 1.94). This suggests that Pella had become the capital before 360 BC.

[141] Akamati 2003, 13.

excavated in 1957–1963 and mainly after 1980 **(Cat. M2)**.[142] The *basileion* is located on the middle of the three hills at the northern part of the city and is adjacent to the city wall on the north, which dates in the reign of Cassander. Both in Aegae and Demetrias the theatre has been found in proximity to the palace, therefore the theatre in Pella may have been located nearby to the southwest or southeast of the palace hill. In Pella the complex consists of many separate sections with or without a peristyle *(Figure 2.24)*, which belong to more than one phase of construction *(Figure 2.53).* A tripartite gate of unique form (18 x 14 m) that permitted direct access to the palace complex, has been found to the northeast of peristyle V *(Figure 2.25)*.[143] It is positioned across the fortification wall and was formed like a tower on three storeys: the external gate, the middle or guard lodge, and the inner gate, each one of which had a separate entrance and communicated with each other.[144] The gate is contemporary to the wall and a coin of Alexander IV from the foundation trench indicates a date to the end of the fourth century BC the earliest.

Architectural form and problems of function

The palace complex covers an area of more than 70000 m² and consists of six sections *(Figure 2.24).* Each one of these sections has conventionally been called 'Building' by the excavators, despite the fact that some of the sections were parts of the same building. These sections are four peristyle courtyards with surrounding rooms ('Buildings' I, II, IV and V) and two large groups of spaces without a peristyle to the west ('Buildings' III and VI). I analyse them below in chronological order and in slightly different labeling than

[142] Makaronas 1960; Siganidou 1981 to 1984, 1987, 1989 and 1996; Chrysostomou 1996, 1999, 2001 to 2003.
[143] Chrysostomou 2001, 445 and 2002.
[144] The height was about 14 m (Chrysostomou 2002, 452).

the excavation reports in order to demonstrate which parts belonged to the same building.

Peristyle Building I–II

I treat ‘Buildings’ I and II as a unit and analyse them together, since they were constructed on the same terrace, they shared a common propylon and communicated from openings in the rooms of the propylon and were also connected by a common wall that ran north-south *(Figure 2.26).* In addition, the colonnaded façade to the south extended the length of both ‘buildings’. They have by all likelihood been contemporary; hence they belonged to a single building with two peristyle courtyards. I call this part of the palace Building I–II. It consists of Section I–II.A to the east and Section I–II.B to the west. This is the oldest part of the complex with remains that date to three different building phases analysed below.

Phase 1

The propylon and its flanking stoas belong to the first phase for reasons that I will clarify below. The southern façade of Building I–II was viewable from the city and formed as an 160 m Doric stoa (8.60 m wide including its stylobate), that consisted of twenty-five columns. A monumental propylon (16 m wide) between the south-east and south-west corners of sections II and I respectively interrupted the colonnade (Pr1–Pr3). The retaining wall of the stoa and the propylon was 2.50 m high and the colonnade was further elevated, as it stood on a 2 m high podium; therefore access from the ground-

level was possible via a ramp constructed in front of the propylon.[145] The propylon consisted of three parts, but it is not identical to the propylon of the palace in Aegae. The first part (Pr1) projected about 3 m from the façade and was defined by the four Doric columns of the entrance and a wall between the flanking colonnades of the façade. As for the propylon façade, the aforementioned Doric columns stood on the lower floor of the entrance, while windows and Ionic half pillar-columns with a pediment formed the façade of the second floor.[146] The next part of the propylon was a large hall (Pr2, 150 m^2) and in a fashion that we saw in Aegae, it communicated through openings created by columns or posts with the side stoas. A wide door led to the third hall (Pr3, 90 m^2) of the propylon. Through five openings this allowed access to the space (8) between the southern part of the courtyards of the two sections.[147] Consequently, access to the peristyles of sections I and II was not direct to the courtyards, in contrast to the arrangement found in Vergina. Due to the ground inclination, the floor level of the propylon and the stoas is 0.70 m lower than the floors in sections I–II.A and I–II.B, and they must have communicated with stairs.[148]

This part of Building I–II dates to the third quarter of the fourth century BC. The evidence suggesting this date is the form of the Doric capitals of the façade colonnade, which is close to the temples of Athena Alea in Tegea (ca. 360 BC) and of Zeus in Nemea (340–320 BC) *(Figure 2.27; compare with Figures 2.16 and 2.17).* In combination with Corinthian roof-tiles from Section I–II.B that resemble the roof-tiles from the Tholos in Epidauros (third quarter of fourth century), the excavator concludes

[145] Siganidou 1989, 60; Chrysostomou 1988, 114 and 2003, 33.
[146] Chrysostomou 1996, 121.
[147] Siganidou 1989, 61.
[148] Siganidou 1989, 62.

that the first building phase of the palace dates to the third quarter of the fourth century BC, where the Doric capitals should also date to. At this point it is interesting to note that he regards them as earlier than the capitals of the Doric colonnade from the palace of Aegae.[149] It is also important to remind here that Kottaridi uses the same parallels (the Tholos in Epidauros and the Temple of Athena in Tegea) as an argument in order to date the capitals of the façade colonnade in Aegae in the mid-fourth century. Only one of the two excavators can be correct, and for the reasons I presented earlier in this chapter, I believe that this is Chrysostomou, namely the capitals of Pella are earlier than those of Aegae. Indeed if we compare the profiles *(Figures 2.16, 2.27),* we will see that the clearly curved line at the joining of the abacus and echinus has almost disappeared from the example in Aegae. The chronological difference of the Doric capitals is a further reason for not dating the palace of Aegae in the mid-fourth century BC, but later.

Substantial material evidence from the same phase (350–325 BC) has been unearthed in the northern part of Section I–IIB. This is the foundation of a wall on the northern side, the Corinthian tiles that we already mentioned, a lion-head sima, coins with the earliest being of Amyntas III, and stamped Laconian tiles. It seems that the architectural plan of Building I–II did not change much in the course of the Hellenistic Age, but it is not entirely clear which other parts of the Building come from this first phase, or from the second (late fourth–early third century BC). Therefore I will discuss these parts as belonging to a phase defined as 1–2.

Phase 1–2

[149] Chrysostomou 1996, p.128, ftn.72 and 1988, 114.

From Section I–II.A (7500 m²) the northern half is better known.[150] The rooms are arranged around a Doric peristyle courtyard (31 x 35.5 m including porticoes, 11 x 13 columns) with 6.5 m deep porticoes apart from the northern, which is 9.5 m deep.[151] The northern wing of Section I–II.A seems to have been the most prominent due to the presence of a large hall (space 1). In the excavation plans by Siganidou and the reconstruction by Heermann this hall measures about 17.70 x 21.80 m *(Figures 2.28, 2.29).* Chrysostomou also notes the exceptionally large dimensions of this hall, but does not clarify whether the space in this state dates to an early phase of construction or is a result of modification. If this was indeed the original size of the hall, the same problem we encountered with spaces M1–3 in the palace of Aegae concerning the roofing system would emerge here.[152] At least from the point of construction technique, such a large roofed space without internal supports may well have existed, as the example of Aegae proves; therefore it is possible that the hall in its maximum size existed already in the original phase.

Another disputable point as regards this hall is the form of its southern end (area 2 in Figure 2.26). The foundation that defined the northern portico to the south of the large hall has an impressive thickness of 2.20 m; therefore Hoepfner believes that this was the foundation of a colonnade of double-sided Ionic column-pillars, something that

[150] Hoepfner 1996, 27; Siganidou 1981, 1982[a]; Chrysostomou 1996 and 2003.
[151] This feature is also present at section A of the palace in Demetrias that we will examine below.
[152] However, the foundation of a wall 12 m to the south of the northern wall of this hall indicates that a wall separated it in two parts. Chrysostomou attributes this arrangement to the first phase of construction, for reasons that are unclear (Chrysostomou 1996, 125) and Hoepfner follows this in his reconstruction of the room.

Chrysostomou accepts *(Figure 2.30).*[153] Heermann reconstructs the large hall in its maximum possible dimensions, namely without an internal wall, and suggests that the foundation supported a series of half pillar-columns at the entrance of the large hall, and ordinary walls at the side rooms. As a result, this part of Section I–II.A becomes a group of vestibule with two side rooms familiar from the palace in Aegae.

Even though in Pella the central hall is longer than the side ones, I regard Heermann's restoration as more possible than Hoepfner's for the original phase of construction. The thickness of the foundation as a reason for suggesting double-sided column-pillars is inadequate on its own, since the foundations of the peristyle of Section I–II.B are of approximately the same thickness but supported a Doric colonnade. Moreover, the entrance form of the three-spaced groups in Aegae is a further argument for reconstruction with Ionic half-column pillars at the entrance of the vestibule. Finally, a find that is likely to have been related to the form of the hall to the south are fragments of capitals of Ionic half pillar-columns.[154] Hoepfner interprets these as architectural decoration of the northern wall with a two-storey pseudo-façade in Ionic order *(Figure 2.31, 2.32).* He reports that the capitals were of three different sizes with the diameter of the smallest being 0.25 m. Such size corresponds to a column suitable for decoration and not structural support. However, neither the dimensions of the other two capitals, nor any detailed description nor the exact find spot have been reported; therefore it remains unclear whether the other capitals belonged to a decorative scheme or were structural elements of the building that possibly stood at the entrance of this space, as Heermann reconstructs it.

[153] Hoepfner 1996, 29.
[154] Chrysostomou 1996, 126; Hoepfner 1996, 33-34.

The narrow passageways on the northern corners of the broad room resemble spaces found in second century BC palace buildings in the Orient, such as Ai Khanoum that I will analyse in chapter 5, and together with the wall that separates the large hall may have not belonged to the original phase of construction *(Figure 2.30).* These passageways led to two secondary courtyards in the west and east parts of the section. The western courtyard was connected with the main peristyle courtyard by a corridor, which also provided access to smaller rooms.[155] Siganidou suggested the function of the western peristyle (5) as a light well.[156] However, the reception character of the large hall and its flanking rooms make it more likely that the small courtyard and its related rooms were of ancillary function and catered for festivities and banquets. The connection of courtyard 5 with the large hall via small consecutive spaces to the northeast encourages this view. Finally, spaces 6 and 7 were set opposite each other in the northwest and northeast corners of the courtyard. Both were formed as an apse inscribed in a rectangular room and opened to the portico with two Ionic columns in antis: fragments of two Ionic half columns and Ionic antae capitals come from the stylobate at the opening of space 7 (one Ionic base in situ), while a platform along the apsidal wall was also found.[157] In space 6 two Ionic three-quarter columns stood at the entrance.

[155] The spaces to the south of this courtyard are reconstructed differently in the plans by Heermann and Hoepfner. The first scholar seems to follow more precisely the openings of the rooms as they appear in the excavation plan.

[156] Siganidou 1996, 144.

[157] Makaronas 1963, 205–206 and fig. 33; Mylonas 1981, 23. Postholes on the floor of space 7 indicate that four wooden columns supported the roof (Chrysostomou 1996, 124). Akamatis proposes that the apse to the east (d: 7.5 m) was initially a circular space resembling the Tholos in Aegae, but evidence for this is lacking (Akamatis 2011, 400).

Section I–II.B is located to the west of I–II.A and is larger with a Doric colonnade (16 x 16). The courtyard (excluding porticoes) measures approximately 50 x 50 m. The width of the porticoes is 6.35 m and they are paved with pisé and fragments of tiles.[158] Its southern façade is the continuation of the façade of peristyle I and together they form the 160 m long stoa. Remains of rooms have been found on all sides around the courtyard with the exception of the western. Building I–II is more likely than any other parts in the palace complex to have served the official-representational needs in the *basileia* from the beginning to the end of its habitation, due to the capacity of the spaces and the decoration.

Later elements of Building I–II (second century BC)

The foundations of an altar (3.22 x 3.66 m) survive in the centre of the courtyard of Section I–II.A *(Figure 2.26)*, as well as the foundations of three apsidal platforms, one in each of the southern, western and eastern sides.[159] The material of construction (grey local stone) and the symmetrical arrangement show that these installations relate to each other. They are also contemporary to the foundation of a podium (30.5 x 1.30 m) found between the southern wall of the large hall and the stylobate of the colonnade in the northern portico. Associated finds are fragments of four bases and statue plinths, also made of grey local stone, as well as fragments of marble statues.[160] Therefore, it is

[158] Siganidou 1984, 81; Chrysostomou 1996, 127.
[159] Siganidou 1984, 78; Chrysostomou 1999, 492. The platform to the west is present in the 1982 excavation plan (Siganidou 1982[a], Fig.1) but strangely not depicted in the most recent excavation plan that I follow in this chapter, even though the excavator reports it.The platform to the east is larger than the other two.
[160] Makaronas 1960, 81.

possible that the podium supported dedicatory statues, tripods or herms.[161] This group of installations belongs most likely to the last phase of the palace, as the foundations are made of material in secondary use. The position of the podium between the two apsidal spaces (6 and 7), the arrangement of these rooms on the same visual axis as well as the monumental formation of their entrances make it likely that they catered ceremonial purposes, at least in the second century BC.

As in the case of Aegae, Nielsen believes that a garden was located in the peristyle due to the 'presence of water installations including what probably accounts to a fountain or the like' and the absence of evidence for a paved courtyard.[162] Nielsen interprets the western apsidal platform in the peristyle courtyard as a fountain. There is no evidence, however, for such identification, neither for the western platform, nor for the other two. On the contrary, the presence of the platforms and the altar in the peristyle can be used as an argument against the existence of a garden-peristyle. Another element that belongs to the second phase is the apsidal wall (9) (d: 13 m) in the middle of the eastern wing in Section I–II.B that is inscribed in a square similarly to Section I–II.A. Ionic half pillar-columns must have been set at the stylobate of the entrance. The excavator dates these remains in about 168 BC.

Building IIIa (Phase 2, 297–276 BC)

Building III (85 x 50 m) is located to the west of I–II, but it is not clear whether and how the two were connected *(Figure 2.24).* The first phase of construction at this part of the

[161] Chrysostomou 1996, 124.
[162] Nielsen 2001, 178. For this view see also Étienne 2006, 110–111.

palace complex, what I call Building IIIa, consisted of colonnaded stoas that remained unfinished.[163] On the basis of coins and pottery it dates to the first quarter of the third century BC.

Building IV–V (Phase 2)

'Buildings' IV and V are contemporary, located on the same terrace and communicate via stairs; therefore I discuss them as an entity under the name of Building IV–V consisting of Sections IV–V.A and IV–V.B. The structure is located to the north of Building I–II on a separate terrace. In Section IV–V.A rooms of various sizes have been excavated mainly in its western part. Space E (9.50 x 13 m) had at least eight stone pillars to the east arranged in two rows of four *(Figure 2.33).*[164] It was a sunken space in a depth of 0.50 to 1.30 m *(Figure 2.34),* which supported a wooden floor on ground level. A part of the floor of space E is preserved and is made of beaten earth and a rubble sub-layer similar to the one found in the upper exterior surface of the bathing pool (K) of Section IV–V.B;[165] this element suggests that the two spaces are contemporary. An underground water reservoir has also been found to the north of space E, and as the latter is an underground space it seems that it forms an entity with the reservoir and the swimming pool forming an organised bathhouse. Under corridor Z a drain led the water from space E to a small courtyard to the east of Z. The excavator also suggests the

[163] Chrysostomou 1996, 108. On the significance of these remains for the interpretation of the development of the complex chapter 6, section *Social processes*.
[164] Misailidou Despotidou 1988. Room E and its neigbouring spaces are not clearly depicted in the most recent general plan of the excavation, possibly because of the incomplete excavation at this part.
[165] The bathing pool also has stairs on the northwest corner (Chrysostomou 1988, 117).

presence of a mint in Section IV–V.A judging from the coin blanks that have been discovered.

According to the excavators this part of the palace dates to the late fourth–early third century BC, namely to the second building phase of the palace overall. This is based on coins of the reign of Cassander, but since coins offer only a *terminus post quem*, the date might be even later. Space E seems to be a type of forerunner of the hypocausts (there are grooves in spaces A and Z that may have been used for the circulation of air), whose form was established in the Late Hellenistic and Roman Age. Thus we should reconsider the possibility that this part of the palace dates later, especially because the earliest examples in Greece that has been identified as hypocausts date to the mid third century or the second century BC.[166] Of course we cannot exclude the possibility of experimentation that I suggested also for the roofing system both in this and in the palace of Aegae. Besides, the fact that the pillars were set in a distance of about 2 m, makes the efficiency of the space for the heating of water doubtful. Another element that I regard as an argument for a later date of this part is the thickness of the walls, which resembles the walls of Buildings III and VI that date to the reign of Antigonos Gonatas (Phase 3).

It is likely that the bathhouse relates to the function of Section IV–V.B. This section measures 70 x 63.5 m (4445 m^2) and has a courtyard (50 x 38 m) defined by a

[166] These are the hypocausts in the *gymnasion* of Olympia (possibly third century BC) and in Gortyna in Arkadia (second century BC). See Ginouvès 1959, 56–77; Rook 1978, 270; Winter 2006, 132–133.

wooden peristyle *(Figures 2.24, 2.35).*[167] It has four entrances, one close to each corner; therefore large numbers of people on a regular basis must have frequented this part of the palace and it does not relate to private quarters of the king. Three stone pedestals have been found along the northern portico and were probably used for statues, a feature that resembles Section I–II.A. A row of rooms along the northern wing ends with the pool to the northeast.

Chrysostomou regards this section as a *gymnasion* for training and education of the royal pages, and identifies the function of the rooms of the northern wing according to Vitruvius's description of the gymnasion.[168] The large open space in the middle of the northern wing would be the *ephebeion*, where teaching took place, while a changing room and a training space with sand were adjacent to the swimming pool.[169] This approach can facilitate the understanding of the purpose of space, but one has to be cautious and take into account the possible inaccuracies by using a first century BC text to identify spatial patterns of the fourth and third centuries as well as the context of creation of this work. A recent article that analyses the description of Vitruvius concludes that the author does not describe the ideal Greek gymnasion, but a specific Roman building.[170] The only gymnasion that has been unearthed in Macedonia is the one in Amphipolis, which was possibly constructed in the mid fourth century BC.[171] This also has a bath complex as a separate building next to the gymnasion, an altar and a

[167] Chrysostomou 2002, 444.
[168] Vitr. *De arch.* 5.12.
[169] Chrysostomou 1999, 494.
[170] Wacker 2004.
[171] Lazaridi 1989.

xystos.[172] These elements are missing from Section IV–V.B in Pella, and if future research confirms their presence, we will be more certain about its identification as a gymnasion for the training of royal pages.

Building IIIb (Phase 3)

This is formed by groups of consecutive spaces in two terraces to the north and south. According to the excavation reports, corridors connect the two parts and the southern garden-courtyard with a courtyard to the north.[173] The finds, which consist of tools, vases and loom weights, as well as the simple material of construction, indicate that the building was used as a residential space and workshops for the ancillary staff of the court.[174] At the northern parts of sections VI and III small rooms of simple construction, possibly of residential character were built, while the southern part of section III seems to have been empty of buildings.[175] Coins, pottery and stamped Laconian tiles indicate its date to the reign of Antigonos Gonatas.[176]

Building VI (phase 3)

At the northwestern part of the palace complex Building VI consists of rooms, corridors and stoas. Section VIa is the small courtyard to the east with a Doric peristyle (9 x 9

[172] Chrysostomou identifies the space at the western part of the section as a *xystos*, because it is a long roofed space. But it is not clear how this is different than similar spaces at the eastern part of the complex and why it has the particular function of a *xystos.*
[173] Chrysostomou 1996, 111. It is not clear though on what evidence the excavator is based on in order to identify the southern part as a garden-courtyard.
[174] Chrysostomou 2001, 445.
[175] Siganidou 1996, 147.
[176] Chrysostomou 1996, 110.

columns) and rooms to the north, south and west, while section VIb is the part of the building to the west.[177] Fragments of red, white and grey plaster survive from the walls. The building was roofed with Laconian roof-tiles and the floor was made of beaten earth. Four of its rooms between the fortification wall and the northern part of the building formed a bathhouse and its floor was made of hydraulic lime plaster. The finds include a bath-tub integrated in the floor, a triangular base for the support of furniture used for the utensils of bathing, and a space with a hearth that provided steam in one of the rooms and was also used for fuel storage. Coins and pottery point to the reign of Antigonos Gonatas. Finally, in Building VII, which is located to the west of III, two rows of spaces have been excavated and they were possibly used as storerooms and workshops.[178]

Due to the state of preservation and the available evidence, we are unable to reconstruct the accessibility and circulation patterns in the palace of Pella. The *basileion* in its final state must have served multiple functions, facilitated by the presence of many peristyles with different types of spaces. In its initial construction phase it presents many similarities with the palace in Demetrias. Specific features of the palace, such as the presence of bathhouses in groups of spaces of residential character, the great length of the main hall in Building I, the presence of a mint and the large open courtyard to the south of Building III are forerunners of spatial arrangements that are found in the second century BC palace in Ai Khanoum, the capital of the Bactrian kingdom.[179]

[177] Chrysostomou 2003, 34.
[178] Chrysostomou 1996, 113. Lead weights and storage vessels indicate the purpose of this section.
[179] For the palace in Ai Khanoum and its relationship with Macedonian prototypes see chapter 5.

Demetrias

Thessaly became a part of the Macedonian kingdom after the success of Philip II in the Battle of the Crocus Field in 352 BC. In order to effectively control Magnesia and the cities of central Greece, Demetrios I (294–288 BC) founded the city of Demetrias as a naval centre in around 294–290 BC by *synoikism* of fourteen or fifteen settlements.[180] Demetrias remained under Macedonian control until the end of the Third Macedonian War (171–168 BC) with the exception of the years from 197/196–194 BC, during which a Roman garrison was stationed in the city, and another three years of independence until 191 BC. As we will see in the chronological problems for this palace, most of the remains do not belong to the period of the foundation of the city **(Cat. M3).**

The investigation began in 1906, but it was only about fifty years later that the building was first identified as a palace.[181] The main excavation project took place in the 1970s by the German Archaeological Institute and nowadays continues under the direction of the 13th Ephorate of Classical Antiquities.[182] The palace in Demetrias was constructed later than the first phases of the palaces in Aegae and Pella *(Figure 2.53).* For this reason, its significance lies in the way it reveals the utilisation of the type of palace in the period after the Hellenistic kingdoms had established their power. Vera Heermann has challenged its function as a political centre of the Antigonids and the

[180] On the historical background and the foundation of the city see Marzolff 1976, 5; Batziou Efstathiou 1996[a], 11–13 and Intzesiloglou 1996. For the settlements and older cities that comprised Demetrias see especially Intzesiloglou ibid. 91–101.
[181] Arvanitopoulos 1906; Papachatzis 1958. Arvanitopoulos mistakenly interpreted the building as a temple of Serapis.
[182] Marzolff 1976; Beyer, von Graeve and Sinn 1976; Beyer et al. 1976. From 1991 onwards the Greek Archaeological Service has been running small-scale excavations in order to resolve remaining morphological problems and to facilitate its restoration (Batziou Efstathiou 1991, 1996, 1997, 2001, and 2008).

validity of the term palace for this building, something that I intend to examine in the end of this chapter.[183]

Architectural form and problems of function

The palace is located on a 33 m hill in the centre of the eastern section of the city to the north of the Agora and the sanctuary of Artemis Iolkia, and is partially integrated in the Hippodameian urban plan *(Figure 2.36).*[184] It has the form of a building complex consisting of three sections on separate terraces oriented East-West *(Figures 2.37a–b).* In many respects the arrangement of Sections A and B resembles the sections of Building I–II of the Palace in Pella: in both cases a large open courtyard is located to the west of the sections (the area to the south of Building III in Pella and Section C in Demetrias, compare also in *Figure 2.50).* Sections A and B are connected at least to the north, while the long space between them must have been roofed.[185] It is very likely that the main entrance was common for and located between them to the south in a fashion similar to the palace of the capital.[186] Nevertheless, the arrangement found in Aegae and Pella with a tripartite propylon that leads with side openings to stoas and long spaces does not seem to be present in Demetrias, since no material evidence indicating a colonnaded façade has been found. A wall with external supports projected to the south of the southwestern tower and defined the street that led to the Agora.[187]

[183] Heermann 1986, 328–329.
[184] The city was fortified with an 8.5 wall in the time of the erection of the palace and an internal wall separated Demetrias in a western and an eastern section (Marzolff 1996[b], 51).
[185] The element that reveals that this space was roofed is the remains of grey and white plaster on the western side of the external wall of the western wing (Batziou Efstathiou 1997, 461).
[186] Besides, the entrance is expected to have been located in the southern part, because the city extended to the south of the palace, while the northern wing had a view to the sea.
[187] Batziou Efstathiou 2001, 22.

Before discussing the architecture and function of these sections, it is first necessary to clarify the construction phases; the oldest architectural remains in the area of the palace have been found mainly under the eastern portico of section A, but do not permit a reconstruction of the plan.[188] These are fragments of column bases, Doric capitals, and palmette antefixes, which present affinities with the palace and elite residences in Aegae and Pella. This phase is what Marzolff names 'Protero-Anaktoron' *(Figure 2.38 and Figure 2.53).*[189]

Section B dates in the first half of the third century BC (Marzolff's 'Anti-Anaktoron') while the first phase of Section A was contemporary, which means that during this period the two sections became an entity.[190] The 'Protero-Anaktoron' cannot have been much earlier than the first phase of Sections A–B, since Demetrios founded the city between 294 and 288 BC.

The third and last construction phase is placed in the end of the third–early second century BC, possibly in the reign of Philip V, but the palace was deserted in the mid-second century and presents unfinished elements from the last phase.[191] According to numismatic and pottery finds, the current remains of Section A and the towers belong to this phase. Furthermore, a part of the surviving remains of Section B also belongs to this era. This is the group of spaces to the south (2 and 3). The different chronology of

[188] Marzolff 1976, 27-28 and 1996[a], 152–154.
[189] Marzolff 1996[a], 154–155.
[190] Batziou Efstathiou 2008, 260.
[191] Beyer at al. 1976, 80–81; Batziou Efstathiou 2001. The dating is based on coins and pottery finds.

the surviving remains of the two sections is evident also in the type of masonry. Section B follows the isodomic system, whereas the walls in Section A follow the pseudo-isodomic with large blocks of gray marble slate on the exterior surface and small stones with mud filling at the interior.[192] In addition, the terrace level of Section A is about 2.70 m higher than the terrace level of Section B *(Figure 2.39).* At least during this phase the hill of the palace complex was connected with the internal fortification wall that divided the city in two sections. The complex is found on the margin of what seems to have been a distinct fortified enclosure to the east of the internal wall, but its exact relationship with this enclosure remains unclear.[193]

Section B (Phase 2: first half of third century BC)

Section B is the courtyard with surrounding spaces in the middle of the complex *(Figure 2.37b).* A long corridor (1) has been unearthed to the south (43 x 4 m). Fragments of Ionic half-columns made of white stucco from the decoration of the walls have been found in this space, and beam holes at its northern wall indicate the presence of a second floor *(Figure 2.40).*[194] An apsidal space was located in the eastern end of this corridor recalling rooms 6 and 7 of Section I–II.A in Pella. The entrance to the corridor is located at its western end. The fact that this space was elaborately decorated shows that it was not simply a means to separate the northern from the southern part of Section B (if any spaces existed at all during this time to the south). In combination with the apsidal room I find it possible that this space was used for religious/ceremonial purposes.

[192] Batziou Efstathiou 2001; Marzolff 1976, 22-23; Beyer et al. 1976, 78.
[193] Marzolff 1976, 8–10.
[194] Batziou Efstathiou 2001, 21 and 2008, 262.

As regards the groups of spaces 2–3 to the South, the eastern has installations and features that indicate its function as a bathhouse.[195] These are a space with six stone pillars *(Figure 2.41)*, walls covered with tiles for heating purposes and a drain that ends at the long corridor. The western has a small courtyard with a Rhodian peristyle (Doric half-columns), plastered portico walls and a staircase to the upper floor on its northeast corner.[196] The thick mud-brick northern wall of this group is decorated with bands of grey and red plaster *(Figure 2.42)*. The excavator dates this part in around 200 BC, but a similar chronological problem as in the case of the bathhouse in Section IV–V.A in Pella emerges: the 'hypostyle hall' seems to be in fact a hypocaust of a more advanced type than the (possible) one found at Building IV–V in the Palace in Pella, because according to the excavation reports the walls were covered with tiles in order to maintain a specific temperature. And as the earliest hypocausts from Greece most likely date later, it becomes very likely that this part of the palace belongs to the very last decades of its habitation in the second quarter of the second century BC.

The spatial arrangement on the northern side of Section B is unclear. In the excavation plan it appears that space N3 to the north was open to the courtyard via two columns *(Figure 2.37a)*.[197] We should indeed regard this as one of the most significant spaces that surround the peristyle, because it is located in the centre of the northern row of rooms, and the most significant rooms in Section A, W5 and E6, are also located in

[195] Batziou Efstathiou 2008, 262.
[196] Beyer et al. 1976, 75–76.
[197] Marzolff 1996[b]. This element is absent from the plan of the palace in Batziou Efstathiou 2001.

the centre of the sides they belong to. As for Section C, only a small part of it has been excavated, the evidence not permitting any interpretive conclusions about its function.

Section A (Phase 3: late third–early second century BC)

Section A (approximately 3666 m², 59.80 x 61.30 m) is a courtyard with a peristyle in Doric order (27 x 27 m, 10 columns in each side with the exception of the north), whose northern portico is wider (6.85 m) than the other three (5–5.5 m), a feature found also in the northern portico of Section I–II.A in Pella *(Figure 2.37b, 2.43)*.[198] The peristyle is of the Rhodian type, as the northern colonnade, which is formed by six half pillar-columns, is taller than the columns in the other three sides.[199] A distinctive feature of this palace, which stresses its military and defensive character, is the construction of an almost square tower on each corner (approximately 12.60–12.80 m each side) of section A. Two rectangular narrow spaces to the Southwest were possibly used as the staircase to the second floor of the portico.[200] The towers to the south are integrated in the plan of the building, whereas to the north they are placed at the extensions of the wall to the West and East.

Twelve spaces have been excavated in the eastern wing, the width of which is double than that of the other wings. It is formed by two rows of rooms and the western

[198] Beyer et al. 1976, 79. In the corners of the peristyle colonnade each column is in fact two joint half-columns that form an angle.
[199] Beyer et al. 1976, 76, 84. Marzolff 1996[a], 158. In the meanwhile during this phase the northern portico of Section B was modified in the same way and resembled Section A.
[200] Batziou Efstathiou 1996, 333.

ones communicate with the peristyle.[201] These rooms do not seem to me to have been banquet halls, because their doors are not off-centre, they have more than one opening and communicate with each other. The arrangement of a series of nine rooms of similar size that communicate (E2–E10) surrounding a central larger space (E6) resembles the arrangement in the northern part of the Seleukid governor's palace in Jebel Khalid (spaces 4–12), which is about fifty years older than the remains of Section A *(Figure 2.44).*[202] In that case the group of spaces has been interpreted as a large hall used for reception accompanied by ancillary rooms for the preparation of ceremonies, banquets and storage. These groups extend over a similarly (in analogy) large part of the eastern side. Therefore the same interpretation seems reasonable for Demetrias too. A similarity with Building I–II of Pella is also observed; this is space W5 in the western wing, which follows the pattern of a three-spaces group with a broad vestibule and flanking rooms; it communicates with the peristyle in the familiar from Pella and Aegae way, namely via two half pillar-columns in antis (Doric in this case) made of limestone and covered with white lime plaster. Fragments of First Style wall painting decoration in white and Pompeian red have been recovered from rooms of the south wing and rooms W2–6 to the west, as well as from the southern and eastern porticoes *(Figure 2.45).*[203] The state of preservation of the northern wing does not permit its complete reconstruction, but it seems that it corresponded to the southern wing.

Palace or garrison seat?

[201] Marzolff 1976, 20; Batziou Efstathiou 1997, 461.
[202] Clarke 2001. See also chapter 5, section *Seats of Seleukid local administrators and the palace-fortress*.
[203] Marzolff 1976, 27, 81; Batziou Efstathiou 1991, 207.

Papachatzis first identified the building with a royal palace, based on its location in proximity to the Agora and the temple of Artemis Iolkia.[204] The excavators in the following decades accepted this identification. In contrast, Heermann considers this complex the military centre and seat of the Macedonian garrison in Thessaly, and in consequent suggests that the royal palace was located elsewhere in the city of Demetrias.[205] Her arguments concern the existence of the towers, the size of the spaces, the dominance of the Doric order even on the upper floor, and the character of the city of Demetrias as a defensive centre. In what follows I explain why I consider the initial identification of the building complex as a palace better justified.

The exact function of the corner towers in Demetrias is not known and their interpretation requires examining parallels of the same era. Towers are found in other palatial buildings and not only in Demetrias, such as in the palaces of the Hasmoneans about one half century later and in a simplified form in the palace in Iraq Al Amir also in the mid-second century BC *(Figures 2.46, 3.29a–b).*[206] While in countryside houses in Attica and on islands in the fifth and fourth century towers were a defensive element, in the Hellenistic era they also expressed luxury, especially when they were open on the upper floor.[207] Indeed in Iraq al Amir the four tower-like corner rooms that exceeded in height the other spaces and had a loggia on the top indicate that they were used rather in order to enhance the lavish character of the building than for reasons of defense. The

[204] Papachatzis (1958, 22) also gives a reference in Xenophon (*Cyr.*1.2.3) on the location of the *basileion* in the agora, but this cannot be used as an argument for the identification of the building in Demetrias, as Xenophon refers to the Persian palaces.
[205] Heermann 1986, 328.
[206] Netzer 2001; Will 1991 et al.
[207] Lauter 1986, 225. Lauter suggests that a tower existed at the northwestern corner of Peristyle I in the palace of Pella, but there is no such reference in the excavation reports and in fact a small courtyard is found at this part.

reason is that these spaces were open on the top and their walls were not thicker than the rest of the building.[208] Lauter calls this type of space *tower-loggia*. As for the Hasmonean palaces, it is clear that their purpose was not exclusively military, but a significant part served recreation, residential needs and possibly administration.

Another case known from literary sources is the palace with four towers that Demetrios I Soter (161–150 BC) built close to Antioch in order to isolate and protect himself in the building.[209] The central location in the city, its size and the reception spaces exclude such purpose in the case of the palace in Demetrias. The walls of the four towers in the Demetrias palace are 1.65 m thick, the exterior walls 1.37 m on average, and the interior walls 0.82 m.[210] This means that they are significantly thicker than the walls of the other palaces examined in this study, but not than those of Building I–II in Pella. For this reason, I believe that the wall thickness does not necessarily relate to a defensive function, but can have simply served to support one or more upper floors. Of course we cannot ignore the fact that the palace was erected in close association with the citadel and that the projected position of the towers accentuate their significance in the spatial configuration. The term 'tower-loggias', for instance, is not applicable in this case. However, they cannot be used on their own as an argument for function of the whole building as a garrison station.

With respect to the size of spaces, in Demetrias the largest rooms (E6, W5 and presumably N4) are indeed smaller than the largest rooms at Section I–II.A in the Pella

[208] On the palace in Iraq al Amir, which is associated with the Jewish faction of Tobiads, see here Chapter 3.
[209] Marzolff 1976, 42. The reference is made in Joseph. *AJ* 13.2.1.
[210] Marzolff 1976, 22–24.

palace and in Aegae *(Figure 2.50).* However, Demetrias presents many affinities in terms of form with the other palaces, whose purpose obviously was not exclusively defensive. Both in Pella and Demetrias, for example, the middle hall in the units of three rooms is broader than the other two and communicates with the courtyard through half column-posts, while there are also long corridor-like and apsidal spaces. It is not exclusively the dimensions that give a palace character to a building, but a combination of architectural, spatial and functional features. As for the predominance of the Doric order on the upper floor, there is no evidence that this element contradicts the function of a building as a palace. It seems that for reasons we are not aware of, there was a preference for the Doric order not only on the upper floor, but also for the supports of the vestibules, whereas in Pella and Aegae these were of the Ionic order.

The city of Demetrias was indeed a military and defensive naval centre of the kingdom and it must have had a garrison seat.[211] Hill 49 is approximately 200 m further to the southwest of the palace and far from the sea. It seems to be more suitable for the defense from the land, and is also enclosed by a projecting part of the fortification wall; therefore the seat of the garrison should probably be sought in that area. The character of the city justifies a greater concern for defense in monumental architecture as it is expressed in the palace and also the connection of the building with the main citadel to the South.

[211] According to Strabo (9.5.15) Demetrias was the naval seat of the Macedonian kingdom. See also Papachatzis 1958, 16.

A further element that indicates functional variability in the building and the justification of the term palace in this case is the location.[212] The excavated complex in Demetrias is located directly to the north of the Agora of the city and the Temple of Artemis, a feature that is found also in the palaces of Vergina and Pella. In a city that was high in the administrative hierarchy in the Antigonid kingdom and a building of such form, we should expect a combination of residential, administrative and defensive function covering the needs of government, and not only usage as a garrison seat.[213] Finally, a sculptural find from Section A indicates the role this building played for display and representation of royal power, something that corresponds to function as a seat of the king's government rather than a military station. This is a marble podium in the shape of a bow of a ship found in the northern part of the palace that must relate to a naval victory *(Figure 2.47).*[214] Its worked under surface indicates that it was set at a height, possibly in a niche. No information about the exact location of the find is given, but it recalls the practice in the palace of Pella, where a podium for statues was set in Building I–II.

Discussion: The meaning of the palace in Macedonia and its sources of inspiration

Scholars have detected various influences on the form of the palaces of Macedonia. In particular, Heermann has pointed out typological affinities of the architectural Orders with the Peloponnese and Asia Minor, while Nielsen accepted that local traditions in

[212] For the definition of the word palace and the terms *aule* and *basileia* that are found in literary sources, as well as for the essential prerequisites in order to legitimately regard a building as a palace see Chapter 1, section *Towards a definition of the Hellenistic palace*.
[213] This is also Marzolff's view of the palace (Marzolff 1996[a], 163).
[214] Batziou Efstathiou 2000, 300 and 2001, 28.

monumental architecture might have played a role, but exaggerated the importance of Oriental models for Macedonian palaces. Referring to the palace of Pella she remarks:

> This stress on the façade was not new, being already present in Vergina, but it is certainly enhanced here, and an inspiration from the Orient either directly, or more probably, mediated through the personal kingdoms of the Hellenistic kings, might well be envisaged.[215]

In the light of the recent evidence from Pella that we saw above in this chapter, this statement is mistaken, because the façade of the palace in Pella proved to be much earlier than the Hellenistic palaces of the East. Consequently these cannot have been a mediator of influence from the Orient in the case of Pella. But of course as the issue does not only apply to Pella, I maintain, in contrast, that local traits and elements from mainland Greece played a more important role in forming the royal palaces.

Construction of public monumental architecture with *stoai* and courtyards was available in mainland Greece already before the construction of palaces by the Hellenistic rulers. The kings and Macedonian nobles must have been aware of those buildings since they visited the Pan-Hellenic sanctuaries and also because artists and architects had frequented the court already in the fifth century. For instance, Pandermalis and Heermann demonstrate that the palace in Aegae and the houses from Pella point to the existence of a local idiom that included and adapted archaizing elements from Attica.[216] In addition, local prototypes did exist, so there was no need for relying on Oriental models: it is true that there is not much evidence confirming a tradition of monumental architecture in Macedonia that starts early, before the time of Archelaos;

[215] Nielsen 1996, 211. See also Heermann 1986, 415–422.
[216] Heermann 1987; Pandermalis 1987, 598.

however this image is starting to change with the most recent research in western Macedonia, for example the stoic buildings unearthed in the city of Aiani.[217]

Besides, the Macedonian kings before the first attested case, that of Archelaos, must have had palaces, which were used as models for the later ones. Relations with the Persians did exist especially under the reign of Alexander I (498–454 BC), but if their impact on monumental architecture was strong in the fifth century, a greater amount and more explicit elements stemming from the Achaemenid repertoire would have been present, such as hypostyle halls, complex corridor systems and courtyards without peristyle colonnades.[218] In chapter 5 we will see that this is observed more in the Eastern part of the Hellenistic world. An element of construction that also contradicts the adoption of Achaemenid elements is the exceptionally large halls without internal supports that I analysed earlier in Aegae and Section I–II.A in Pella. Oriental elements, especially after Alexander's campaign, are likely to have been adopted, but they are very scarce in the three royal palaces in Macedonia. Previous local architecture seems to have played a greater role in the spatial patterns of Macedonian palaces.

The detailed examination of Macedonian palaces clarifies which are the elements that make a royal palace something more than the house of the ruler, and sheds light on the fundamental problem of 'palace or residence' in the examination of elite peristyle buildings of the Hellenistic Age. As Henner von Hesberg has demonstrated, an essential

[217] Karamitrou Mentessidi 2008, 34.
[218] A very common feature in the Achaemenid and Neo-Babylonian palaces is the use of many internal supports, often in an exaggerated way that has possibly also symbolic connotations to a different kind of kingship than in Macedonia. On Achaemenid palaces see Boehlau and Schefold 1948, Boucharlat 2001 and Perrot 2010.

factor the rulers needed to have clearly defined in the spatial setting of their court is the public character of the palace.[219] The examples analysed in Macedonia present features that emphasise this character, which suggest that these buildings can legitimately be called palaces. In the attempt to distinguish between private residences and royal buildings, Étienne points out the monumental formation of the access achieved by the façade.[220] Such further elements are the crucial role of peristyle courtyards and the creation of spaces with specific functions. To these as features that accentuate the public element in the palaces I would add the multipart gates, the agreement between decorative design and routes of access, as well as the preeminent role of the large banquet rooms. The examination of palaces in the eastern part of the Hellenistic world will show that although the public element is always present, its degree and attitudes towards it vary, creating different types of palaces.

At this point it is too early to decide whether one can talk about 'the archetypal Hellenistic palace' and how it is defined. We can nevertheless assemble the features of the Macedonian palaces in terms of spatial organisation and function in addition to the above mentioned. First, there is the prominent location on a low hill with direct access and view to the agora and the major sanctuaries of the city. Furthermore, the dimensions are considerably larger than the other buildings in the city, the peristyle courtyard is the core of the building, and often the most significant rooms are clustered in distinctive units of three spaces. Ancillary rooms are also arranged in separate sections. Other types of spaces found in all palaces are: rectangular rooms open on one side, interpreted as throne halls or reception rooms, which serve administrative needs; bathhouses; spaces of

[219] von Hesberg 1996.
[220] Étienne 2006, 106.

cult to heroic ancestors or patron deities and most probably residential sections, which are the most difficult to identify. Finally, accessibility is reflected in decoration, with the most elaborate decorative patterns in the least accessible rooms. And when we examine the decoration in terms of material and complexity, the hierarchy that is observed in combination with the various sizes of banquet rooms makes it clear that relations of social status contributed in the way the palace was formed

Macedonia is also the case that first raises the question of the relationship between elite residences and palaces. As Siganidou noted:

The houses unearthed in Pella are large and wealthy, but they are not palaces.[221]

Houses that present grandeur in spatial layout and decoration that recalls the palaces were not necessarily associated with the royal court. This is the reason why I avoid the term 'palatial residence' in this study and refer to then as 'elite residences'. It is still likely, however, that some of these houses related indeed to courtiers; we learn for example from Livy that the sons of King Philip V resided in their own houses in the city of Pella and not in the palace.[222] What the available evidence attests is that in terms of architecture the main differences compared with the royal seats are the absence of monumentality in the façade or the entrance, of sections of spaces for one function and ancillary-secondary constructions.[223] At the same time the houses in Pella indicate the use of royal palaces as models and as a source of spatial patterns.[224] The excavators of

[221] Siganidou 1982, 34.
[222] Livy 40.7.1 - 16.3; Hatzopoulos 2001, 193.
[223] As Walter Karydi stresses (1996, 59), the interior in the houses is still where the *luxus* is expressed rather than the exterior, where the openings are few and small.
[224] Since certain sections of the *basileion* in Pella precede the construction of the Hellenistic city, it is highly possible that the form of the houses adopted features from the palace.

the so-called Houses of Dionysus and of the Rape of Helen have pointed the resemblance of the peristyles of these houses not to private residences from other cities, but to royal palaces.[225] For instance, in Priene or Delos the rooms are set asymmetrically around the courtyard, whereas symmetry is a characteristic of the houses in Pella. In the House of the Rape of Helen the analogies of the dimensions of the Doric capitals are similar to the palace in Aegae.

The so-called House of Dionysus in Pella (3160 m^2) is a case that deserves closer attention here due to its well understood spatial layout and the surviving decoration **(Cat. M4)** (*Figures 2.50, 4.19, Diagram 5).* It consists of two sections arranged north-south, each of which contains a peristyle courtyard (P1–P2) with surrounding rooms. In terms of size each section is close to the southwestern peristyle in the palace of Aegae. P1 is defined by a Doric and P2 by an Ionic peristyle colonnade.[226] An entrance to the east between rooms 23 and 7 provided access to both peristyles via vestibule 1. A group of vestibule with flanking rooms (Rooms 4–6) occupies the western side of P1, while room 2 was open to the courtyard with pillars to the south. In P2 a long vestibule (20) and three small rooms comprise a *pastas* group. Evidence for a second storey above the northern wing of this court is the stone base of a stair in Room 19. Fragments of the coloured red and blue decoration of the Ionian peristyle with painted cymatia on white plaster are preserved. A similarity specifically between the House of Dionysus and the palace in Vergina are the capitals of the Ionic half pillar-columns that both buildings had

[225] Makaronas and Giouri 1989. For the symbolic value of the peristyle and the elements of palace architecture applied on houses see also Raeder 1988, who focuses on residences from Delos.
[226] The third courtyard to the south of the two sections does not seem to have belonged to the house.

on their upper storey *(Figures 2.48a–b).* The similarity of the capitals of limestone pilasters with Ionic semi-columns on either end is also striking.

As in the case of the palace in Aegae, the presence of mosaic pavements coincides with a deep position in the building in terms of access analysis (*Diagram 1*). Plain pebble mosaic floors have been found in rooms 21–23, which were of the most isolated. The same principle applies to the spaces with figural mosaic floors. The well-known mosaic depicting a lion hunt scene paved room 3. Access to it was emphasised by a threshold mosaic depicting a pair of centaurs, with the male one to the left holding a drinking vessel.[227] Vestibule 2 stresses the significance of this room and is paved with a black-and-white geometric mosaic with diamond patterns. The reception room in the northwestern corner is decorated with a pebble mosaic that represents Dionysus riding a panther, while a griffin attacking a deer is illustrated in the threshold mosaic *(Figure 2.49a).* In addition, a geometric mosaic has been found in its anteroom (5) to the south.

These observations about the residences in Pella indicate use of similar technical and design principles between residences and palaces and possibly some kind of relationship between the owner with the royal court. A connection of the form of private houses with the palaces is also found in the case of Pergamon. In order to clarify whether the royal palaces were used as prototypes only in the cities they belonged to and not in other areas, intensive research in private houses form Vergina and Demetrias would be necessary.[228]

[227] Salzmann 1982, 10.

[228] Three houses of the Hellenistic period have been so far located and partially excavated in Demetrias. One of the houses is organised around a peristyle courtyard with Doric columns that

Ideological implications of the form shed light on the importance of the palace as a concept in the Hellenistic Age. The palace functions as a symbol of city-protection, since it is constructed in proximity to the fortification wall (in Aegae and Pella) and not in the city centre, or in connection to the citadel like in Demetrias.[229] Livy refers to the construction by the Macedonians of a palace in Demetrias after the conquest of Magnesia, which must be identified with the excavated building. He reports that the Macedonians not only installed a garrison in the city, but also a palace:

Illa tantum commemorata, cum totam Graeciam beneficio libertatis obnoxiam Romanis esse tum eam civitatem praecipue: ibi enim non praesidium modo Macedonum fuisse, sed regiam exaedificatam, ut praesens semper in oculis habendus esset dominus.

The main facts were merely mentioned, that not only all Greece was indebted to the Romans for the blessing of liberty, but this state especially; for not only had there been a Macedonian garrison there, but a royal palace had been built, that their master in person might always be held before their eyes.[230]

The palace in this case functions as a symbol of the dominance of the king. Close relationship between palace and protection of the city is observed in the late fourth century royal seat of the Odrysian kings in Seuthopolis; the palace, whose form resembles a portico with rooms at the back from the Macedonian palaces, is located in a fortified enclosure separate from the rest of the city *(Figure 2.51)*.[231] It also seems to have had a strong religious function. This aspect in Macedonia is evident in the Tholos of Aegae and possibly in the apsidal exedrae Building I–II from Pella. By incorporating

supported a wooden epistyle, but it is highly likely that this building was the Metroon of the city and not simply a private residence (Batziou Efstathiou 1989, 227; Batziou Efstathiou and Triantafyllopoulou 2000; Triantafyllopoulou 2000).

[229] Lauter 1986, 88.

[230] Livy 35.31.9.

[231] Dimitrov 1961; Dimitrov and Čičikova 1978.

spaces for worship in the palace the king and his court become protectors of the patron deities.

The mosaics reveal which iconographical themes were significant in a royal context. We already mentioned that the representation of the Abduction of Europa in Aegae might have implied the Macedonian ruler's dominance over the other states of his time. The activity of hunting, depicted in the Houses of Dionysus and Helen *(Figures 2.49a-b)*, is a theme that corresponds to the function of spaces as banquet rooms, since it stems from the royal iconography. It is also found in the façade wall painting of Tomb II from Vergina and the so-called 'Alexander sarcophagus', which relates to king Abdalonymus of Babylon and bears a hunt scene of a lion and a stag on one of its long sides. Hunting was a typical activity of the members of the royal court and in Macedonian symposia diners were not allowed to recline but had to remain seated, unless they had killed a boar without using nets.[232] In addition epigraphic evidence attests the existence of parks for hunting that belonged to the royal court, the worship of Herakles Kynagidas as patron deity of hunting and the institution of royal *kynegoi.* These were most likely priests in the sanctuaries of Herakles Kynagidas, guards of the king's hunting forests and members of the royal court.[233] An edict of Philip V discovered in the theatre of Demetrias provides information about the dress of the *kynegoi*: it commands a change in the colour in the clothes they were required to wear from polychrome to grey.[234] We cannot be certain about the identity of the hunters depicted in the mosaics of Pella and whether they are associated with the *kynegoi,* since evidence about this custom

[232] Reference by Hegesander in Ath. 1.18a; see also Murray 1996, 16. For a recent discussion on hunting as a symbol of prowess in Macedonia see Cohen 2010, 72–78.
[233] Hatzopoulos 1994, 102–111 and Intzesiloglou 2006, 72.
[234] *IG* IX 625; Intzesiloglou 2006.

in Pella is lacking. Nevertheless, the decoration of the Houses in Pella is a case that indicates the possible role of iconographic themes in elite residences as not simple metaphors of royal ideals, but as reflections of actual practices by courtiers and royal officials.

When we think of the three excavated Macedonian palaces as a group of centres of the royal authority, we can understand better what their purpose was. The palace in Aegae, possibly erected during the last years of the reign of Philip II and completed in the late fourth century, is located in a city that had fallen to second place in the Macedonian kingdom at the beginning of the fourth century BC; therefore the building cannot have been the political and administrative centre of the Macedonian kingdom. Besides, if the palace was still used as a political centre in a later era, we would have expected extensions and significant alterations of the spatial arrangement, but this is not observed.[235] The dominance of the banquet room in this building makes possible its use mainly for royal feasts of political, recreational or religious character. As for Demetrias, the palace served the needs of the military centre of Macedonia after the age of Demetrios I. It appears to combine the administrative and reception functions found in Vergina and Pella with a greater emphasis on the military role of the king. In Pella the archaeological evidence indicates that the vast complex was indeed the seat of administration and the royal court, and possibly the site where education and training of the royal pages took place, at least from the mid-third century BC onwards. It is interesting to note that in its first phase of construction, which included only Building I–II with its propylon and façade, the architectural form of the palace was very close to

[235] In the royal palace of Pella, for instance, whole new buildings with or without peristyles are added in the course of the life of the building.

Aegae and Demetrias *(Figure 2.53).* The fact that in the course of the Hellenistic Age the palace in Pella gradually evolved into an immense complex of several buildings resembling the *basileia* in the Ptolemaic and Seleukid kingdoms indicates a change in the nature of kingship or the court structure. Building I–II was the only one on the palace hill until the reign of Antigonos Gonatas and this is a further element that implies a simpler system of hierarchical relations in the Early Hellenistic era than the Late. As Hatzopoulos has remarked, the city of Pella was much larger than the city of Aegae in the beginning of the Hellenistic Age, therefore in analogy the palace in the capital was quite small.[236]

The comparative analysis of examples from the other Hellenistic kingdoms will facilitate our understanding of the Hellenistic palaces as built space and institution, since in the case of Macedonia the identification is based on architecture and decoration and less on artefacts. Examining the palace structures in the rest of the Hellenistic world will elucidate the reasons for their morphological variety. In order to achieve an interpretation related to variation in royal ideology and social circumstances, one has to focus on the role of the pre-existing patterns in the exercise of royal power in the eastern part of the Hellenistic world, and also on the use of palaces as 'symbols of their type of arbitrary exercise of power and justice'.[237] The relationship between these patterns and the palace-symbol is going to be tested in the course of this study.

[236] Hatzopoulos 2001, 192.
[237] Von Hesberg 1996, 84.

CHAPTER 3: EGYPT

One of the major kingdoms that emerged after Alexander's death was that under the rule of Ptolemy I Soter. Ptolemy had been one of Alexander's generals and satrap of Egypt from 323 to 306 BC and he adopted the title of the king between 306 and 304 BC.[238] Unlike the Antigonid kingdom, the population in Ptolemaic Egypt was of mixed background and this is an element that the rulers had to take into account in order to stabilise their governing. On the one hand, the Ptolemies did not discard the pre-Hellenistic patterns of Pharaonic rule: etiquette, aulic titulature, legislation, the support of Egyptian cults and priesthood, the nature of kingship with the epithets of the monarchs and their queens implying divine nature, are all aspects of institutions that were partially based on the Egyptian pharaohs.[239]

On the other hand, the cardinal role as administration and commercial centres of new cities founded by Alexander and the first Ptolemies (e.g. Alexandria and Ptolemais Hermeiou in Upper Egypt) and the placement of Macedonians in the highest administrative positions of the state as governors of specific regions, relate to the Macedonian origins of this kingdom *(Figure 3.1).*[240] Such practices remind us that a new

[238] For the rule of Ptolemy I and his relations with Alexander see Hölbl 2001, 9–34. A general historical overview of Ptolemaic Egypt is given by Thompson (2003).
[239] On the relation of the Ptolemaic king with the pharaonic image see Mooren 1975.
[240] The demographics of the Ptolemaic administration system are analysed in Thompson 2001 and O'Neil 2006. Questions on the formation of this system and the participation of Macedonians and Egyptians are also investigated in Samuel 1993, Rowlandson 2007 and Moyer 2011. The topic of the foundation of cities as an element of the Ptolemaic political strategy has been investigated substantially in a recent monograph (Mueller 2006). See also Manning 2010,

social system of relations and ideological background had been introduced. The first Ptolemies, however, did not need to invent new architectural forms and stylistic patterns in order to construct their palaces. An influential palace architectural tradition must have been the Macedonian, especially since the founder of the dynasty, Ptolemy I, had as a royal page direct experience of the palace in Pella during the reigns of Philip II and Alexander. The second point of reference was Egyptian monumental secular and especially religious architecture. The first question examined in this chapter is whether the dual character of Ptolemaic royal policies is detected also in the form of palaces, while the second is the question about the purpose that they served for the monarch and the kingdom.

The approach in the study of palace architecture in Hellenistic Egypt has been determined by the nature of the available evidence. Neither in the capital, Alexandria, nor in other important cities, any building remains clearly designated as a palace have been located and the practice of reusing the palaces of the Pharaohs and the Achaemenids remains an open question. Strootman maintains that Naukratis, Siwah and Pelousion were cities with palaces.[241] This is reasonable to expect if the kings spent time in these cities for their affairs and appointed local administrators, but neither the textual evidence nor the archaeological evidence is sufficient in order validate this view.

---

as a study that emphasizes the continuities between the Egyptian and Persian past on the one hand, and Ptolemaic rule on the other.

[241] Strootman 2007, 55. The scholar does not provide any references that support this view. His assumption about Pelousion possibly derives by a passage in Jerome's *Commentary on Daniel* (11.6), where Ptolemy II Philadelphos conducts his daughter to Pelousion, after the agreement about her marriage to Antiochos II.

In Memphis the archaeological evidence is slightly more revealing about the Ptolemaic practices. The city was the capital of the Old Kingdom, became the administration centre of the satrapy of Egypt under the Achaemenids, and was briefly used as a royal seat by Ptolemy I Soter until Alexandria became the capital in 320/19 BC.[242] Since this is where Ptolemy initially resided, it is reasonable to assume that the existing palace of Apries, built in the sixth century BC, was reused. The lack of finds from the Ptolemaic period indicates, however, that the Ptolemies did not extensively use this building, but possibly preferred to construct a new palace. We know that the coronation of the kings had been taking place in Memphis at least since 197 BC, but the spatial setting of the ceremony is unknown and may have been the old palace.[243] Strabo reported palaces that were located near a lake and a grove.[244] The fact that he uses the plural form *τῶν βασιλείων* might be a further element indicating the presence of palace buildings constructed in different periods.

With respect to Alexandria scholarship has focused on the textual evidence, and more specifically on references to the palace made in the narration of historical events. Since in such cases the palace was simply the spatial setting and no details are provided, complementary archaeological evidence has been used in order to understand the form and nature of Ptolemaic royal palaces. These are other types of constructions and late Hellenistic buildings such as the tombs in the area of Alexandria and the Palazzo delle Colonne in Ptolemais of Cyrenaica. The result is usually a compilation that simply

[242] Fraser 1972, 7. Alexander also stayed in Memphis and appointed Cleomenes as the satrap of Egypt, who obviously resided in Memphis too.
[243] The excavator of the palace of Apries reports that no pottery of the time of the Ptolemies was found (Petrie 1909, 11). See also Nielsen 1994, 27–31 and Thompson 1988, 16. Thompson refers to remains of a building to the west of the Apries palace as Ptolemaic, but she does not provide any references and it remains unclear what this claim relies on.
[244] Strabo 17.1.31–32.

presents the ancient authors' accounts and describes the architectural form of the surviving monuments.[245] Revealing of the somewhat bewildering situation that scholars have encountered is Kutbay's conclusion: 'In trying to determine the appearance of the Alexandrian palaces, only general statements can be made'.[246] Her listing of 'standard' Alexandrian palatial features derives from written descriptions and buildings in other sites rather than from material evidence in the city.

Nevertheless, and even though our image about the *basileia* in Alexandria remains obscure and fragmentary, the Alexandrian palace complex has been bountifully cited as a model for *basileia* in other regions. Held, for example, regards its size and development as a prototype for the development of the palatial complex in Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris, for which hardly any material evidence survives.[247] In a similar fashion according to Nielsen 'royal heroa in connection with later palaces, for example in Pergamon, were undoubtedly inspired by Alexandria', a statement that points to the royal burial monument in the city, the Sema, and the heroon on the acropolis of Pergamon.[248] It is not certain, however whether the Sema was indeed located within the *basileia*. Even though such statements might be correct, they suffer the lack of material evidence that would allow a comparative examination and inevitably fail to convince. This approach risks creating circular arguments biased by the expectations we have from such a significant city as Alexandria. Therefore, before reaching any conclusions about the connections with other areas of the Hellenistic World we need to examine to what degree we can

[245] Nowicka 1969, 154–161; Nielsen 1994, 130–133; Kutbay 1998, 46–57; Strootman 2007, 73–80.
[246] Kutbay 1998, 57.
[247] Held 2002, 236.
[248] Nielsen 1996, 211.

achieve an understanding of Ptolemaic palatial forms based primarily on archaeological evidence. Using the textual descriptions as a source that reveals the attitude of the Ptolemies towards the concept of the *basileion* rather than as the starting point for the quest of corresponding surviving building fragments diminishes the obstacle of lacking substantial remains.

The potential of this approach in the process of reconstructing the layout of ancient Alexandria became evident with McKenzie's recent seminal work about the architecture of the city.[249] Considering the arduousness of the task that the scholar undertook in this study, it is perhaps not surprising, that this approach was not intensively applied for the *basileion* with the excavation results that possibly relate to it only briefly presented.[250] A crucial observation, however, in the relevant section, is the caution with which we need to handle textual evidence of the first century BC or later in order to reconstruct the early Ptolemaic city *(Figure 3.2).* This is a fundamental methodological element for understanding the *basileion,* because scholarship has so far relied on Strabo and Diodoros's passages, which were written in the late first century BC.[251]

The second methodological feature of the present chapter is the analysis of the evidence in reverse order: instead of starting from topography and form, and moving to

[249] McKenzie 2007. This study was preceded by a short article on the significance of the archaeological investigations on land including the early eighteenth and nineteenth century records (McKenzie 2003).
[250] McKenzie 2007, 68–71. Her analysis includes exhaustive bibliographical references to the results of the excavation projects in the city up to 2006.
[251] Strabo 17.1–10, Diod. Sic. 17.54. Fraser's phrase in his study on Alexandria is indicative of this practice: 'the account of Strabo provides the framework for what follows, and an attempt is made to associate the archaeological evidence with this account.' (Fraser 1972, 8).

dating and purpose of the palace, the purpose here becomes the analytical base and it is in this respect that the literary sources prove useful. This irregularity that contradicts the structure of the chapters on the archaeological evidence from other kingdoms is necessary evil that results from this scarcity of material remains. It is also useful to examine in detail and in conjunction to Alexandrian palatial tradition a building that was not located in Egypt, the so-called Qasr-el-Abd near modern-day Amman. The region was under Ptolemaic control until the early second century BC and the building reveals the ambitions of a local ruler and his attitude to Ptolemaic forms.

The royal palaces: archaeological and textual evidence

The functional aspect

When it comes to the palace as the spatial setting for the activity of the king and courtiers, the textual evidence for the Ptolemies is richer than for any other kingdom of the Hellenistic World. The palace is firstly the setting for events that include the wider public, and these are the festivals organised by the court. Theokritos, who writes in the third century BC, presents two countrywomen as going to the annual festival of Adonis during the reign of Ptolemy II.[252] Despite their low social status, the women enter the palace, where the festival takes place. The poet might be exaggerating about the presence of an immense crowd of people even of the lowest background; besides, the praising nature of some of his poems, with the most explicit being his *Hymn to Ptolemy*

[252] Theoc. *Id.* 15.

Philadelphos, is beyond doubt.[253] But even if this is the case, Idyll 15 indicates that providing access to the wider public in this type of events was a practice not only approved, but also expected from a virtuous king. In which part of the palace such festivals took place is unknown, but a large forecourt before the main buildings of the palace complex, or a spacious courtyard in the *basileion* would have been the type of spaces suitable for this function. Polybios refers to a *megiston peristylon*, the largest peristyle courtyard in the palace of Alexandria: such courtyards are also known from the palace in Pella and the later example of the palace in Ai Khanoum.[254] In the latter a forecourt of immense dimensions is located between the gate of the complex and a large space that was possibly used as the main audience hall.

This openness seems to have been an exception in certain events, since the restrictions set upon accessibility in the buildings of the palace are evident in Polybios's Histories. The author gives an account of the events that followed King Ptolemy IV's death and the intrigues in the court, the protagonists of which were the regents of the new boy-king Ptolemy V, Sosibios and Agathokles.[255] When the city revolts against Agathokles, he seeks refuge together with his family, the king and other members of the court in the third part of the passageway of the palace that led to the theatre. This passageway had two other parts closed off with metal doors that the mob and the Macedonian soldiers had to break down in order to reach Agathokles.

In addition, the palace appears to be the setting of incidents that included only the

[253] Griffiths 1979; Barbantani 2010, especially 231–245.
[254] Polyb. 15.25.
[255] Polyb. 15.31.2.

courtiers and foreign officials or ambassadors. Polybios mentions the "largest peristyle" in the context of the lamentation for the deceased king Ptolemy IV and the ceremony for the proclamation of the new king.[256] The regents made their announcements from a tribune that had been set for this purpose at the peristyle. The audience consisted of military and court officers, and the bodyguard. Furthermore, in the so-called *Letter of Aristeas* the royal pages and other courtiers are present as diners at the seven-day banquet that Ptolemy II offered in order to welcome the seventy-two translators of the Hebrew Bible in Greek.[257] Once more, despite the dubious historical credibility of this narration, it illustrates the spectrum of participation in royal dining in the time of Ptolemy II.

The activities we examined so far in the palace of the Ptolemies can be separated in two categories according to the groups of people they involved: public, and semi-public. Feasting and court ceremonies are semi-public activities of official character. In the semi-public function we can also place spaces that were accessible to specific groups of people for non-official purposes. Such is the *skene* of the Macedonians that Polybios mentions as being located near the palace, a construction that might well have been barracks and not a temporary military tent.[258] In the course of this study we will see that indeed barracks were constructed next to the palace in sites located both in the kingdom of the Seleukids and the Attalids. Another example of semi-public function of non-official character is evident in the narration of Polybios a few paragraphs earlier. Moiragenes, who was brought to "some remote part of the palace" for torturing and

[256] Polyb. 15.25.3–4.
[257] Joseph. *AJ* 12.2.
[258] Polyb. 15.28.4, 15.29.1. Walbank (1999, 489) regards the date of these events as late enough in order to legitimately talk about barracks, and not simply about huts or tents.

execution on the accusation of conspiracy against Agathokles, sought refuge to the barracks.[259] This incident demonstrates the possibility that certain spaces in the palace were used for detention. Moiragenes was released by coincidence and the fact that he managed to cross the palace half-naked without being noticed and to reach the barracks indicates that the space where he was brought into was at a part of the palace frequented only by very few courtiers. Finally, another type of space that falls into the category of semi-public is the gardens. Apart from recreational, the purpose in this case might also have been scientific: Ptolemy II Philadelphos is reported to have established a zoological garden in the premises of the *basileia*.[260]

The third level of functions is restricted to the king and his family that lived in the court, and this is the residential space. Judging from Polybios's account, this function seems to have been well defined: when Ptolemy IV was on a military expedition, he had two separate pavilions, one that was 'public and official', and one that he used for sleeping.[261] His successor, the under-age Ptolemy V, resides in his own house near the stadium, where he goes for attention after the revolt against Agathokles. The latter retires with his sister to his own house. The king and the regent's houses would have been separate buildings within the limits of the palace-complex.

Date and topography

The textual evidence

[259] Polyb.15.28.
[260] Ath. 14.654c.
[261] Polyb. 5.81.5.

Theokritos' Idyll about the festival of Adonis, written in the third century BC, provides an image of this type of events in the palace. The narration of Polybios dates to later, in the second half of the second century BC, but provides the most substantial information about functional aspects of palace space up to the early years of Ptolemy V's reign (204–181 BC). Consequently, both authors refer to events that were either contemporary, or a few decades older than the era in which they lived.

Similarly, the text that has most often been used for the reconstruction of the topography of the royal quarters in Alexandria, the passage in Strabo's seventeenth book of the Geography, is a description of the city in the author's time, namely in the early first century AD.[262] The Museum and its adjacent dining hall, an exedra with seats, a public promenade and the Sema, an enclosure with royal burials, were all parts of the *basileia.* The author also remarks that the royal quarters extended to one fourth or one third of the city and refers to three different locations of palaces:

Ἔστι δ᾽ ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ λιμένι κατὰ μὲν τὸν εἴσπλουν ἐν δεξιᾷ ἡ νῆσος καὶ ὁ πύργος ὁ Φάρος, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἑτέραν χεῖρα αἵ τε χοιράδες καὶ ἡ Λοχιὰς ἄκρα ἔχουσα βασίλειον. εἰσπλεύσαντι δ᾽ ἐν ἀριστερᾷ ἐστι συνεχῆ τοῖς ἐν τῇ Λοχιάδι τὰ ἐνδοτέρω βασίλεια, πολλὰς καὶ ποικίλας ἔχοντα διαίτας καὶ ἄλση: τούτοις δ᾽ ὑπόκειται ὅ τε ὀρυκτὸς λιμὴν καὶ κλειστός, ἴδιος τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ ἡ Ἀντίρροδος νησίον προκείμενον τοῦ ὀρυκτοῦ λιμένος, βασίλειον ἅμα καὶ λιμένιον ἔχον: ἐκάλεσαν δ᾽ οὕτως ὡς ἂν τῇ Ῥόδῳ ἐνάμιλλον.

In the great harbour at the entrance, on the right hand, are the island and the tower Pharos, and on the other hand the reefs and also the promontory Lochias, with a royal palace upon it; and on sailing into the harbour one comes, on the left, to the inner royal palaces, which are continuous with those on Lochias and have groves and numerous lodges painted in various colours. Below these lies the harbour that was dug by the hand of a man and is hidden from view, the private property of the kings, as also Antirrhodos, an isle lying off the artificial harbour, which was both a royal palace and a small harbour. They so called it as being a rival of Rhodes.[263]

[262] Strabo 17.1.6–10.
[263] Strabo 17.1.9.

It is not clear how the distinction between 'inner palaces' (*τὰ ἐνδοτέρω βασίλεια*) and 'palace' (*βασίλειον*) is to be interpreted and whether it implies a functional differentiation with the "inner" palaces being used for residential purposes and the buildings on the Lochias for public-administration purposes.[264] It is possible that this distinction is simply topographical and indicates the existence of royal buildings both by the sea on the promontory and further inland.

Strabo's account indicates that by the end of the Ptolemaic rule there was a group of buildings that formed a palace complex with a political, administration, cultural and residential character. Such an image would correspond and even surpass the complex of Pella in its last phase of occupation. Ancient authors also inform us that the *basileion* in Alexandria was a result of gradual expansion, since each one of the kings after Alexander added residential buildings.[265] Its development with the addition of sections with or without peristyle courtyards is a practice that we already examined in the case of Macedonia and will also become apparent in the next chapter that focuses on the Pergamene *basileia.* Is it possible for us to understand this procedure of expansion from the first decades of Ptolemaic rule to the first century BC? Such an attempt requires investigation in conjunction to the topography of the *basileia*.

The archaeological evidence

[264] Strootman adopts this view by accepting that the *basileia* in Strabo's passage were the 'semi-public and ceremonial area with temples, tombs and other monuments' and that the inner palaces were the residential part (Strootman 2007, 77–78). However, he locates the semi-public area in the centre of the city and the inner palaces on the Lochias near the theatre and the stadium, a conclusion for which there is no evidence. In reality we are not in a position to know what type of buildings comprised the *basileion* and the inner palaces.
[265] Strabo 17.1.8. Diod. Sic. 17.52.4.

The archaeological investigation in the city consists of underwater and on-land survey. The underwater excavation in the eastern harbour proved crucial for the reconstruction of the coastline during the Hellenistic and Roman period *(Figure 3.3).*[266] The Lochias promontory extended more than 450 m to the northwest of the modern Silsileh cape and it was wide enough to have accommodated palace structures. Nevertheless, no architectural finds that could be associated with a palace complex have been recorded in the part of Lochias that has been investigated and further research is essential for a firmer conclusion as to whether and on which part palatial buildings existed on the promontory.[267] In Antirrhodos the pavement of a spacious esplanade (approximately 6000 m^2) in the central part of the main branch of the island dates to the third century BC and indicates the presence of monumental buildings at the time.[268] The movable finds recovered in the underwater survey do not contribute to the topography of the *basileia* because their exact provenance is unknown and may have been objects of trade and not necessarily originating in Alexandria.

It is beyond doubt that the palace was no less important for the Ptolemies than it was for their contemporary Antigonid kings. And since the Ptolemaic dynasty was the longest lived one of the Hellenistic Age, the area occupied by the complex might well have surpassed the equivalent area in the other kingdoms. If the formation of the *basileia* was a gradual procedure, following the pattern of the Macedonian royal cities, it is very

[266] Goddio 1998, Goddio and Bernard 2004.
[267] Building remains might be located under the central part of the promontory, which is covered by the modern cape.
[268] Goddio and Bernard 2004, 88. Due to their date these remains cannot be identified with the palatial construction from the time of Cleopatra VII that Strabo reports.

likely that in the early years of Ptolemaic rule there was an initial core, possibly a small number of peristyle buildings like in Pella and Demetrias.[269] In the Macedonian cities the palaces were prominently located on a natural elevation overlooking the agora and the rest of the city. Even though the role of its two ports was of primary significance for Demetrias, the palace was not situated on the coast, and the same can be said for the palace of Pella and the proximity of the city to its river harbour.[270] Therefore, and despite the importance of the harbour for Alexandria, it is not essential that in the Ptolemaic capital the situation was any different. If Strabo's account about Lochias had not survived, the scholars would have very likely attempted to locate the palace on a high ground further inland.[271]

This possibility requires an answer to the matter of physical landscape of the city in the late fourth and third centuries BC, and particularly as to whether high grounds existed. McKenzie has emphasised the caution needed in investigating high grounds in the landscape of ancient Alexandria, because the Kom el Dikka hill proved to be man-made.[272] In addition, a fourth century AD text refers to Alexander's choice of the 'only naturally occurring high ground' in the city as the acropolis, where he had the citadel and

[269] Tkaczow assumes that the palace in Alexandria in the early third century BC would have resembled Pella or Aegae, a view that I accept for the reasons I describe in this section (Tkaczow 2008, 50).

[270] If we accept that the entrance of the palace of Demetrias was on the south, it is located on a distance of about 430 m from the northern main harbour of the city.

[271] McKenzie uses the following translation of the passage in the Satrap Stele of 311 BC: '(Ptolemy) made his residence [the palace], whose name is the Fort of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, son of Re [Alexander], on the shore of the Sea of the Ionians [the Mediterranean Sea], Raqote was its former name.' (McKenzie 2007, 40). There is no reason, however, to identify the 'residence' with the 'palace', because here it stands for the city as a royal seat and not for the buildings of the *basileia*, and it does not imply a location of the palace by the sea.

[272] On these grounds McKenzie criticizes a topographical map published in 1872 by H. Kiepert (McKenzie 2007, 16, with figure 15 and bibliographical references).

the temple of Serapis constructed.[273] The author uses the word *akra,* which in the written sources relevant to the Classical and Hellenistic period designates an elevation within an urban landscape. Indeed the remains of the sanctuary of Serapis have been unearthed on a twenty-two meter-high hill in the southwestern part of the city.[274] But was this indeed the only natural high ground in Alexandria?

The same word, *akra*, also means peninsula, and this is the case in Strabo's account. Without the distinction between peninsula and high ground being certain, the term *akra* appears in three more cases in connection with the *basileia*: the pavilion of Ptolemy II was located in an enclosure on the *akra,* while the translators of the Septuagint during his reign are said to have been hosted in the best quarters near the *akra*.[275] And the third reference is to an *akra* with a prison.[276] With respect to the pavilion the *akra* has been interpreted as an elevated citadel in the palace area.[277] In the case of the Jewish translators the *akra* is very likely to have also been located within the *basileia*, because the seven-day banquet took place in a dining hall in the palace. If we take a look at Macedonia, we can refer to the Phakos *akra* with a prison in Pella that Strabo refers to.[278] The Phakos combines the two meanings, because it was a promontory in the Lake Loudias and a fortified stronghold with a prison, and hosted the royal treasury.[279] The palace in Pella was not located on the peninsula, but to the north of the

[273] Aphth. *Prog*. 12; McKenzie 2007, 16, 39, 53–55.
[274] The remains of the Sarapeion that have been discovered date to the reign of Ptolemy III, while an older phase from the time of Ptolemy II has been ascertained. For the Sarapeion see most recently Sabottka 2008. Also McKenzie 2003, 50–56 and Tkaczow 1993, Site 15, p. 69–70.
[275] Joseph. *AJ* 181.
[276] Polyb. 5.39.4; Plut. Vit. *Cleom.* 37.5; Ath. 196a. See also McKenzie 2007, 66.
[277] Rice 1983, 32-34.
[278] Strabo Fragment 7.20.
[279] Akamati 2000.

city on a low elevation.[280]

Furthermore, if the only *akra* in the city was the Sarapeion hill, it should be identified with the citadel of the royal quarters where the pavilion was located. The Serapeion hill, however, is in the Egyptian part of the city and far from the eastern harbour and the main streets, in an area that cannot have belonged to the *basileia*.[281] Furthermore, rescue excavations between the jetty opposite Antirrhodos and the first promontory to the east *(Figure 3.3)* have shown that this was a hilly area, which became flat in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century after "enormous quantities of earth" were removed.[282] Even in the time of Strabo, it seems that buildings of the third or second centuries were no longer visible, or had been rebuilt, something that caused alterations in the city landscape, while remains of buildings oriented according to the cardinal points, and not to the street grid have also been discovered.[283] The discrepancies of the streets of the Hippodamean plan with remains of structures that follow a different orientation and even enter the street space have shown that an urban reorganisation took place in the late second or the early first century BC.[284] Whether

[280] The location of the palace of Mausolos, the king of Karia from 377 to 353 BC, is a matter of dispute with two likely locations being the peninsula Zephyrion and the part of the port to the north of the peninsula further inland. For the problems of the identification of the peninsula as the location of Mausolos' palace see Bean and Cook 1955, 89. Nielsen accepts this identification and refers to the remains of a platform on the peninsula (Nielsen 1994, 63). This element, however, has not been further associated with the palace.

[281] For the view that the akra of the literary sources is not necessarily identified with the hill of the Serapeion, or the Lochias see also Adriani 1966.

[282] Rodziewicz and Fatah 1991, 131.

[283] An example of a second century construction that had been leveled in the first century, is the unfinished monumental building with a Doric and an Ionic colonnade in the city block defined by streets R3, R4 and L3, possibly a temenos with a sanctuary (Hoepfner 1971, Rodziewicz and Fatah 1991). This is the 'Monumental Doric and Ionic Building' in McKenzie's plan of the street grid of the city *(Figure 3.2)*.

[284] An example of such irregularity is the wall to the north of the crossroad of streets R1 and L4 that enters the space of R1 in geographical orientation. The foundations of a gate at the same

other high grounds than the Serapeion hill existed in the city of the first Ptolemies is a matter that requires geological investigation, which is still lacking, and until there are firmer conclusions about the city landscape during the Ptolemaic rule, we cannot exclude the possibility of the first palatial buildings having been constructed on high ground following the pattern in Macedonia.[285]

Material evidence from the city excavations does not give a definite answer to topographical issues as regards the palaces, but is a source of information that we need to take into account. Due to the dense occupation in modern Alexandria, only small sections have been investigated primarily in rescue digs and the form of the buildings remains fragmentary. Finds of the late fourth and the first half of the third century BC, which may have been associated with buildings of the *basileia*, have been recovered from the blocks defined by streets L2, L3, R2 and R4 *(Figure 3.2)*. The oldest is a mosaic that dates to 320–300 BC and depicts a warrior who holds a shield and is about to throw his spear against his opponent to the right *(Figure 3.4)*. It was found in a room that belonged to a group of small spaces.[286] They are regarded either as a private residence, or the annex of a public building.[287] A group of houses that dates to the first half of the third century has been unearthed approximately two hundred metres to the northwest of the

crossroad on R1 have also been discovered, but the gate either remained unfinished, or it was demolished in the Ptolemaic period (Rodziewicz 1995, 229–231).

[285] About the need for a geological survey in Alexandria see Sabbotka 2008, 31, note 31.

[286] Adriani 1932–33, 69; Daszewski 1985, 101–103; Breccia 1907-17; Brown 1957, 69; Tkaczow 1993, site 116. Since the mosaic combines pebbles and tesserae it is possibly later than the mosaics of Pella, which date in the late fourth-early third century BC on the basis of numismatic evidence, therefore, I regard a date closer to 300 BC as more likely than to 320 BC. It was found accidentally in 1906 during sewage works on Champollion Street. Its exact position in the group of spaces has not been recorded and an architectural plan is lacking. This chronology is not only based on stylistic, iconographical and technical grounds, but also on the date of the walls of the building, which were on the same level as nearby Hellenistic walls.

[287] Daszewski ibid.

Warrior Mosaic and one of the rooms was paved with a mosaic decorated with a rosette in the centre *(Figure 3.5)*.[288] In addition, a small part of the stylobate of a Doric stoic building has been unearthed at the corner of the block between streets L1 and R4.[289] An early mosaic floor (290–260 BC) from a banquet room has been also discovered in the block to the east of the central north-south street R1 and between L3 and L4.[290] It depicts three Erotes hunting a stag in composition very similar to the Stag Hunt in the House of Helen in Pella *(Figures 3.6, 2.49b)*.[291] Due to the strong possibility that the *basileion* of the first Ptolemies was not situated on the Lochias promontory, and on the basis of the excavation finds, I would suggest that the royal district developed from the centre of the city eastwards and at some point in the second or first century residential buildings were added on the Lochias. This is of course only a working hypothesis; therefore any future excavation projects that attempt to understand more about the development of the Alexandrian *basileia* need to take as a starting point the areas in the city that have yielded the earliest finds. This is especially the area to the north of the 'Doric Stoa', the main east-west street (L1) and between streets R2 and R4.

Understanding the Ptolemaic palace form

The fragmentary character of the finds from the area to the south and southeast of the eastern port does not allow identification with structures of the palace complex.

[288] Empereur 1998, 29; Grimal 1998, 545–546.
[289] Tkaczow 1993, site 54, 107–8 with bibliography.
[290] Daszewski 1985, no. 2–4; Tkaczow 1993, Site 128; McKenzie 2007, 69. The mosaic floor measures 5.25 x 3.95 m (frame 1.40 m wide) and it has been recorded as coming from a banquet hall with an off-centre door and a raised border with white tesserae around it. It belongs to a group of rooms that possibly are a section of a large residence, but no excavation plans of the remains have been published.
[291] Two smaller mosaic floors made of white pebbles and marble pieces were found to the south and the northwest of the *Erotes* mosaic.

Nevertheless, since this is where the royal district was by all likelihood located, they reveal the type of architectural and decorative elements that were preferred. Apart from the early third century BC mosaics already mentioned between streets R2 and R4, and the Stag Hunt in the Shatby neighbourhood, three later mosaic floors have been also excavated. These are made of tesserae without pebbles, by contrast to the earlier mosaics that combine the two techniques. The first dates in 250–225 BC and comes from the *Chantier Finney* site between streets R3 and R4.[292] The mosaic fragments come from a frieze and depict a running centaur, a stag, and geometric motifs *(Figure 3.7).* Similarly to the *Erotes* mosaic and the mosaics in Pella, lead strips have been used for details and contours. The other two mosaics paved two adjacent rooms (early to mid-second century BC) in the Shatby area and they were made in the *vermiculatum* technique with very small fine tesserae.[293] The first shows a dog sitting next to an overturned *askos* in a round panel *(Figure 3.8).* The other pavement depicts two youths wrestling; one has white and the other black skin, while a water basin nearby indicates the spatial setting as a gymnasium or public bath *(Figure 3.9)*. The discovery of these floors about four hundred metres to the northwest of the Erotes mosaic makes the latter look less isolated than initially thought.[294] Due to its location at the southeast of the Lochias promontory far from the Warrior and the Chantier Finney mosaics, Daszewski suggested that it comes from a pavilion in the area of the gardens in the *basileia.*

The mosaic floors reveal a connection between the decorative forms chosen in the royal district of Alexandria with the forms found in Pella. The iconographical theme

[292] Daszewski 1985, 111–113. The fragments were unearthed in the debris near foundations of a Hellenistic wall and a row of pillars and are regarded as elements of an upper floor.
[293] Said 1994; Guimier Sorbets 1998 and 2004.
[294] Daszewski 1985, 106.

of stag hunting is repeated in the mosaic from Shatby with a high resemblance in composition with the equivalent mosaic in the House of Helen, as the posture of the hands and legs of the figures in the two mosaics are similar *(Figure 3.6).* The same parallelism can be made between the figure of the warrior from the earliest mosaic of Alexandria and the hunter to the left in the Lion Hunt mosaic from the House of Dionysus. A more playful note, however, is observed in the Alexandrian pavements. The hunters have been replaced by Erotes and their cloaks have been transformed to wings raised in a similar fashion by the intense motion of the scene. This is an example of adoption and adaptation of an iconographical theme according to the function of space and the fashion in a different era and region, where possibly the Macedonian institution of *kynegoi* lacked an equivalent. The other two mosaics from Shatby will find parallels in the Pergamene *basileia* in the second century BC, which is examined in the next chapter.

A further element that connects the Ptolemaic *basileion* with Macedonian/Greek tradition is the roof-tiles that have been found in the same blocks as the Centaur and the Warrior mosaics and indicate pitched roofs.[295] We cannot talk, however, about an exclusive adoption of Greek forms, as the architectural fragments indicate a multitude of sources of inspiration. Monumental architecture in Alexandria has been found to follow primarily classical forms, with buildings constructed in Doric and Ionic order, but elements of an indigenous style also played an important role. These drew on Egyptian forms, but had been transformed into a distinctive Ptolemaic repertoire that included completely new types of Corinthian capitals, pediments and entablature.[296] This so-called

[295] Rodziewicz 1995, 230.
[296] About this development see McKenzie 1990, 74–76 and 2007, 80–112. Building material from Egyptian buildings had been reused in the Roman times, both by and without being recut,

'Alexandrian style' has been also viewed as the model for cities under the influence of the Ptolemaic capital, such as Petra, and for the buildings depicted in wall paintings of the Second Style in Pompeii.[297] Due to the lack of substantial material evidence from Ptolemaic Alexandria, however, we cannot be certain about the scale of impact the city exercised in other areas, therefore this theory has been criticised as over-ambitious.[298] Nevertheless, in any processes of emulation of architectural forms in other areas the *basileia* would have been in the front line, since it comprised the most important governmental buildings. The fragments from the Chantier Finney, for example, include second century capitals of Alexandrian Corinthian type, and a column base that combines an acanthus base above an Attic base, a hybridised type possibly inspired by papyrus leaves depicted in the lower part of Egyptian column bases *(Figure 3.10)*.[299]

The material evidence either lacks precise chronology and spatial context, or even when dated with some certainty, such as in the case of the mosaic floors, the architectural context remains unknown. For this reason it is necessary to delve into the written sources if we want to acquire an image of the spatial organisation and decoration of palace space. The evidence refers to the time of two kings, Ptolemy II Philadelphos (283–246 BC) and Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–205 BC). Thus we learn that the entrance of the palace complex, where the festival of Adonis took place during Ptolemy II's reign,

---

but it is not certain whether this was a practice already applied during Ptolemaic rule (McKenzie 2003, 47).

[297] This view was supported mainly in McKenzie 1990.

[298] For the criticism against 'Alexandrian Style' as a distinctive genre originating in the city of Alexandria see Stewart 1996.

[299] McKenzie 2007, 87. The Corinthian capitals of Alexandrian style from the Chantier Finney belong to Types I, II, and III, as these have been defined in scholarship (McKenzie 2007, 86). By contrast to type IV, the helices in these types spread directly from the acanthus leaves.

was decorated with lavish embroideries.[300] There were also a "gate of audience" and a passageway between the gymnasium and the Meander, possibly a water channel, which connected the palace with the theatre.[301] Finally, the propylon in which Agathokles, the *epitropos* of king Ptolemy V, sought refuge when the people revolted against him is reported to have had three parts, and a side-door. This arrangement is familiar from the palaces in Vergina and Aegae. These are the only passages that provide some information with respect to the form of the Alexandrian *basileia*. Much more detailed is the description of constructions commissioned and used by Ptolemaic kings that can be regarded as *basileia*-inspired examined below.

There are two such descriptions, both preserved in Athenaios's work *The Deipnosophists*, which cite passages from an older treatise about Alexandria written by Kallixeinos: a pavilion set on the occasion of the Great Procession in honour of Dionysus-Serapis during Ptolemy II's reign and the leisure boat of Ptolemy IV.[302] The first reveals the form and lavishness of decoration in public or semi-public space relevant to the king's activities, while the second contributes in our understanding of the way different functional sections were arranged. Both structures have been studied thoroughly through Kallixeinos's passage and there have been numerous suggestions for the reconstruction of their form.[303] For this reason I do not intend to present here the literary

[300] Theoc. *Id.* 15

[301] Polyb. 15.31.2 and 15.32.3–4. Nielsen must be right in interpreting the Maeander as a water channel (Nielsen 1994, 131); Xenophon (*An.*1.2.7–9) reports that the river Maeander flowed through the garden of Xerxes at the city of Kelenai in Caria. It is therefore likely that the name of the river became the standard name of the type of water channels that ran through royal gardens (see also Evyasaf 2008, 28). Nielsen's assumption, however, that it was used for swimming does not rely on any evidence.

[302] Ath. 5.196a–197c and 5.204d–206c.

[303] Studniczka 1914; Caspari 1916; Winter and Christie 1985; Salza Prina Ricotti 1989; Pfrommer 1996 and 1999, 69–75, 93–115; Calandra 2008 and 2009.

account in detail, but to focus on those elements that are common with or can be juxtaposed to features found in the surviving palatial buildings.

The date of the procession is estimated to 275/4 BC.[304] According to the passage in the *Deipnosophists*, it was located in the enclosure of the *akra* (more likely a citadel rather than the promontory Lochias for the reasons I analysed earlier) near the feast that soldiers, artisans and visitors attended. Five columns on the long sides and four columns on the short sides defined the main central part of the pavilion as a peristyle, the main spatial component found in most Hellenistic palaces *(Figures 3.11a–b).* These supported an epistyle and a coffered roof with a canopy. The four corner columns were crowned with capitals in the shape of palm-trees, while the rest were formed as *thyrsoi (Figure 3.12).* The preference to these shapes and not to the Greek classical capitals seems to have been an element affected by the Egyptian tradition.[305] The peristyle was large enough to accommodate one hundred and thirty dining couches, but as one of the sides remained open, the actual number of the couches in the pavilion was one hundred. This means that there were two hundred diners, and this number corresponds to the capacity of the largest banquet halls at the western wing of the palace in Vergina (rooms M1–M3).

A peristyle portico with a vaulted roof, called *syrinx* in the passage, surrounded the central peristyle on three sides and was used as a waiting space for the entourage of

[304] For the procession see Rice 1983 and Thompson 2000. Rice (ibid. 182) discusses the problem of the date.
[305] For the classification of column capitals in traditional Egyptian style with specific examples in temples used in the Ptolemaic period see McKenzie 2007, 120–136.

the diners.[306] This reveals the need for such ancillary spaces in proximity to the banquet halls of the Hellenistic palaces and makes us conclude that this can have been the function of some of the rooms that flank banquet halls. The two parts, central peristyle and portico, were separated by decorated curtains.

Marble statues of animals made by the most prominent sculptors and paintings of the famous Sikyonian School decorated the pavilion between the columns of the central hall. Golden and silver doors and niches above them belonged to the decoration in the upper part. The niches illustrated symposion scenes, while statues of Nymphs and golden Delphic tripods were set between them.

The emphasis given in Kallixeinos's passage on the flowers that were strewn on the floor of the pavilion as decoration, an element that would impress the foreigners as the procession took place in the winter, implies the significance of gardens for the Ptolemies and the existence of peristyle gardens. The possibility of setting a garden in the peristyle of palatial buildings, in addition to *paradeisoi* in open areas of the *basileia* that Strabo mentions, is greater here than in Macedonia or other Hellenistic kingdoms, because of the long-term Egyptian tradition of royal gardens and parks.[307] The presence of an element of surprise like the flowers would have accentuated the theatrical aspect of the pavilion, an aspect created by the decoration, the separation of space by curtains, and the fact that one of the sides of the pavilion was open and visible to the majority of

[306] Polybios uses the word *syrinx* when he refers to the passageway that led from the palace in Alexandria to the theatre, and the *syrinx* as described in the pavilion must be the reason why Nielsen suggests that the passageway was vaulted (Nielsen 1994, 131).
[307] Strabo 17.1.9. For the Egyptian tradition of royal gardens see Wilkinson 1998 and Nielsen 2001, 172.

attendants of the procession, who did not have the privilege of dining with the king. A theatrical tone is also found later in the setting of Ptolemy V's proclamation, for which the two regents had a podium set in the palace.

Conclusions about the models on which the construction of the tent relied have been contradictory, with scholars attributing its form to Persian prototypes on the one hand, and supporting the predominance of Greek classical features on the other. Nielsen maintains that not only the pavilion, but also the *basileion* in Alexandria was extensively based on the palaces of the Achaemenids.[308] She justifies this view by drawing attention to Ptolemy I, who, as a follower of Alexander in his campaign, was aware of the appearance of Persian and Babylonian palaces, and constructed the greatest part of the royal quarters in Alexandria. She also suggests affinities of the plan of the main hall of the pavilion with the Persian apadana and the Hall of 100 columns in the Palace of Persepolis.[309] It seems rather surprising though to correlate these cases, since the Persian examples are spaces with multiple rows of similar columns set at the same distance and extending the whole surface of the room. Besides, there is no evidence for the size of the *basileia* in the reign of Ptolemy I, and due to the practice of gradual expansion it is likely that in his time the royal quarters comprised fewer buildings than in the second or first centuries BC. On the contrary, Rice accepts Studniczka's conclusion that the appearance of the pavilion was primarily Greek and interprets the Egyptianising elements as an attempt for innovation.[310]

[308] Nielsen 1994, 134–135.
[309] 'The relatively few columns in the pavilion's main hall remind one especially of the apadana; the same applies to the unusual tallness of the columns' (Nielsen 1994, 134).
[310] Rice 1983, 149.

Pfrommer, finally, supports both views by attributing the features of the pavilion to tradition in the Orient and to buildings in Macedonia. This mixture of elements is indeed very likely to have relied on multiple sources of inspiration; the scholar, nevertheless, excludes the presence of any Egyptian elements and rejects the idea that the pavilion reflects elements of the Ptolemaic *basileia*.[311] These statements cannot be valid, because the pavilion was ordered and used by Ptolemy II and for this reason it is reasonable to expect similarities with the palaces, while the capitals of the columns recall Egyptian types. The palace in Iraq al Amir, an area between the Ptolemaic and the Seleukid kingdom presents affinities to the pavilion in terms of decoration, as I will discuss below.

The attempt to distinguish the origins of the features of the pavilion is only the first of the two aspects of its contribution in understanding the forms used by royalty in the spatial setting for their activities. The second is its role in indicating the impact of royal space on forms used outside the context of the Ptolemaic court. This is evident in a recent find of the late third century BC from the Fayum area: a papyrus that was used by a tutor and contains the language exercises he taught.[312] A painted architectural frame surrounds different parts of the text and as R.R.R. Smith has demonstrated, specific types of wooden columns depicted find parallels in the slender columns of the pavilion described in Athenaios's passage. This applies particularly to the type of column

[311] Pfrommer 1999, 75. Calandra's approach is similar with reference both to Persian and Egyptian elements and especially to the Persian custom of using tents. She emphasizes, however, that similarities in form do not necessarily indicate a resemblance of spatial function (Calandra 2008, 45, 55).
[312] Smith 2010.

decorated with a band that presents a cross-hatching pattern, an element that possibly draws on the palm-tree type of columns attested for the pavilion.[313]

If the pavilion offers an image of the decoration in the buildings of the Ptolemaic *basileia* in the first half of the second century BC, the Thalamegos contributes in understanding the organisation of palace space in the second half.[314] The Thalamegos, whose name means cabin-carrier, was only one of the leisure boats of Ptolemy IV Philopator that navigated the Nile and was formed as a catamaran. Its length of 91.4 m is comparable to the length of the eastern façade of the palace in Vergina (approximately 80 m) and Section I–II of the *basileia* in Pella (approximately 150 m). It was approximately 13.70 m wide at its broadest part, and about 18.80 m high including a raised pavilion on it *(Figures 3.13a–b).*

Since the boat served recreational and representational purposes, the spatial arrangement indicates which were the essential functions in such context. According to Kallixeinos's description halls for dining, sleeping, 'and all necessary installations for living' were present, while double promenades ran on three sides *(Figure 3.14).*[315] Hence, it is very likely that residential and banqueting were two primary functions found in semi-public or private sections of the *basileia*.

[313] Ibid. 216–218.
[314] Caspari's study of the Thalamegos (Caspari 1916) is now outdated and his emphasis on connections with Minoan palaces was reasonable in the time he was writing when none of the Hellenistic palaces had been investigated (with the exception of the nineteenth century research in Vergina, which, however, did not identify the building as a palace).
[315] Ath. 5.204f.

The spaces of the pavilion in Ptolemy's boat were organised on two levels. The lower level was surrounded by a colonnade on three sides and was accessible through a propylon and a vestibule on the fourth side. This level corresponds to the ground level in the palaces of Macedonia, whose entrances were also formed as gateways with vestibules. After the second vestibule and a courtyard, the main dining hall was furnished with twenty couches. The capitals of the colonnade that defined this space did not follow Egyptian patterns, but the Corinthian order. A bedroom with seven berths was located next to the dining hall and a *syrinx*, a narrow corridor that crossed the long sides of the structure, separated this sleeping space from the women's hall. Attached to it was a second smaller sleeping space and stairs that led to the upper level. The presence of an exclusively female section in this case raises questions about the formation of similar sections in the palaces. And it seems that contrary to the prevailing view that the women's quarters were isolated and located on the upper floor of palatial buildings together with sleeping spaces,[316] the queen's dining and sleeping rooms can have also been arranged on the ground floor and next to primary banquet halls. Whether this is a unique case found in Egypt because of the more active role Ptolemaic queens played in governing, is a possibility that cannot be confirmed.[317]

The upper level was closed-off with walls and windows and had a strong worship character. A circular temple dedicated to Aphrodite housed the marble statue of the goddess and was located between a dining room with space for five couches and a second dining room that was adjacent to rooms with berths. The largest dining hall on

[316] An example of this approach is found in Raeder's article about the typical Greek house according to Vitruvius (Raeder 1988, 322).
[317] Macurdy 1932, 229–230; van Bremen 1996, 223–4.

this level was dedicated to Dionysus and a colonnade surrounded the couches. The courtyard of the upper level matched the courtyard on the lower level, and was arranged between two dining halls. The one closest to the stern was covered with curtains instead of a roof, while the colonnade in the other room was decorated with column capitals in Egyptian style. Royal cult in the time of Ptolemy IV was closely associated with Bacchic cult and justifies the Dionysiac character of the banquet hall.[318] A recess with statues of the members of the royal family in this hall accentuated this connection. Both in the pavilion and the leisure boat, the dining halls had internal supports in the form of a peristyle and the couches were arranged along the colonnades. This is an element that is absent from Macedonia, or the Pergamene palaces of the second century BC, and might have been distinctive for the banquet halls in the palaces of the Ptolemies.

Reception of Ptolemaic royal buildings: Qasr el Abd in Iraq al Amir

The setting

The Qasr el Abd palace belongs to an area that depended on Ptolemaic Egypt and, therefore, contributes in understanding the nature of the Alexandrian *basileia* **(Cat. E1).** It is located to the east of the Jordan river, about twenty kilometres to the west of Amman and close to the modern town Iraq al Amir *(Figure 3.15).*[319] It was constructed

[318] In his 1996 paper Pfrommer emphasizes the aspect of Dionysiac cult in the Thalamegos and associated this spatial arrangement with the patronage of the cult of Dionysus by Ptolemy IV (Pfrommer 1996, 99–100).

[319] The name of the building, which is Arabic, means 'Castle of the Slave' (or 'Castle of the Servant') and possibly relates to a local legend according to which the slave of a prince constructed it for the prince's daughter (Rosenberg 2006, 115–116).

after the Seleukids conquered the region in 198 BC.[320] Its character, however, presents many affinities with Egyptian monumental architecture, probably because its commissioner was associated, as we shall see, with the Ptolemaic court. For this reason it is examined here in the context of Ptolemaic palace tradition.

In its Hellenistic phase the site was a large agricultural estate with the Qasr very likely being the most prominent element. It comprised a fortified residential district (the Village) on a mound on the eastern side of the Wadi as-Sir ravine, and a cliff with seventeen rock-cut caves on two levels. These were located approximately 600 m to the northeast of the Qasr and accessed via stairs and a ramp *(Figures 3.16, 3.17).*[321] Efficient water management with an irrigation system that started from a spring above the caves facilitated agricultural production.[322] The caves were used at least since the third century BC, which is the date of the Aramaic inscriptions with the name *Tobiah* by the entrance of two of these, while a hoard of coins of the first three Ptolemaic kings has been discovered in one of the caves *(Figure 3.18).*[323]

The Qasr was surrounded by two parallel walls, which seem to have supported the soil that accumulated under the pressure of the artificial lake or moat around the

[320] Will et al. 1991, 14–15 and Gera 1998 for the historical background and the Seleukid presence in the region.
[321] See the articles in AASOR 1983 about the research project in Iraq al Amir that begun in the 1960s. Also Lapp 1962, 1963. The main publication of the Qasr is Will et al. 1991, while the architectural reconstruction was published updated in 2005 (Larché 2005). For the Qasr and other installations in the area of Iraq al Amir see also Rosenberg 2006; Borel 2006; Borel 2010[a]. The purpose of at least some of the caves relates to herding (Borel 2006).
[322] The remains of a fountainhead basin that was connected with this spring and blocks of a Doric entablature and column fragments have been also discovered about fifteen metres to the southwest of the spring. It has been reconstructed by Borel (2006, fig.19, 25, and 2010[b]). Five out of a total of seventeen caves have cisterns, some of which seem to have played a role in cleaning the water as it came from the spring above the caves (Borel 2006, 300).
[323] Zayadine 2005; Augé 2010.

building and created a terrace. A strip of land connected the Qasr with the road that led to the Village creating the impression that it was situated on a small promontory. The foundations of a structure about 200 m to the north of the Qasr, the so called Square Building, have also been excavated. This is very likely to have functioned as a basin since a water channel connected it with either the terrace of the Qasr or the *lake (Figure 3.16).*[324] A similar structure has been found nearby on its east, and both are located on terraces.[325] Finally, the remains of a gate to the east of the Qasr survive with decoration similar to it *(Figures 3.19, 3.20).*[326] The gate reached a height of more than nine metres and was set on the path that ran around the retaining walls. Two other gates to the south and west of the terrace possibly existed and their purpose would have been to control the route from Jericho to Philadelphia, the ancient city on the site of modern-day Amman.

Among other interpretations, the Qasr has been regarded as the palace of the local ruler that served residential and storage purposes.[327] Is it, however, correct to talk about a palace in a site whose major activity was agriculture and was neither a royal city, nor a military settlement with palaces of local administrators appointed by the central authorities, of the type that existed in the Seleukid kingdom at the time? I intend to demonstrate that the overall character of the site and the features of this particular building are factors that play a crucial role in any attempt to define the purpose of the Qasr. Its identification as a palace and its association with the Ptolemaic capital will prove to be justified.

[324] Lapp 1963, 21.
[325] Will et al. for function of the Square Building; Braun 2010, 67.
[326] Dentzer, Villeneuve and Larché 1983; Dentzer 2010.
[327] Will et al. 1991, 255–259.

A passage in Josephus's *Antiquities of the Jews* led to the identification of the site of Iraq al Amir with ancient Tyros, a city of the Jewish Tobiads.[328] Due to the striking similarities in material and decoration, the Qasr is identified with the building Josephus names *baris (βάρις),* a word usually translated as fortress.[329] The historian reports:

ὁ δὲ Ὑρκανὸς […] ἐπολέμει τοὺς Ἄραβας, ὡς πολλοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ λαβεῖν αἰχμαλώτους. ᾠκοδόμησεν δὲ βᾶριν ἰσχυρὰν ἐκ λίθου λευκοῦ κατασκευάσας πᾶσαν μέχρι καὶ τῆς στέγης ἐγγλύψας ζῷα παμμεγεθέστατα, περιήγαγεν δ᾽ αὐτῇ εὔριπον μέγαν καὶ βαθύν.

(Hyrkanos)…was fighting the Arabs, many of whom he killed and caught as slaves. And he constructed a strong fortress made entirely of white stone, even for the large animal sculptures of the roof, and he surrounded it with a large and deep moat.

He also refers to the caves on the cliff opposite the *baris* as having residential and banqueting function.[330] Other constructions he mentions, such as courtyards *(aulai)* of various sizes and parks (*paradeisoi),* cannot be located with certainty. The courtyards may refer to buildings in the village, such as the Plaster Building (22 x 19 m) that had a central courtyard surrounded by a corridor with painted wall plaster *(Figure 3.21).*[331] Parks may well have been formed on the various terraces that were a part of the irrigation system of the estate *(Figure 3.22).* We also learn that Hyrkanos continued the policy of his father, who was in good terms with the Ptolemies, by collecting tax revenue from the area that his faction controlled as well as caravan tolls, and for this reason was

[328] Joseph. *AJ* 12.6.11. For the Jewish faction of the Tobiads before the Ptolemaic period see Ji 1998 and for the period under discussion here Rosenberg 2006, 39–41 and Zayadine 2010.
[329] Will et al. 1991, 31–34.
[330] Ji 1998, 419–425.
[331] Lapp 1963, 17; Groot 1983, 77; Villeneuve 2010, 75. Incised lines decorated the white plaster of the walls and fragments in Pompeian red (possibly come from a red dado) have been also found.

received in the Alexandrian court.[332] In what way was the Qasr, Josephus's *baris,* connected with his activities and was it indeed a fortress?

Morphological features

The excavation projects that took place in the 1960s and 1970s allowed the thorough study of the architectural form and the construction techniques, which resulted in an accurate reconstruction of the exterior and interior. The Qasr has been restored accordingly, since most of the ground floor and a significant amount of the upper floor blocks survived on site after their collapse. The study of the recovered material also revealed that the Qasr remained unfinished and it was never used.[333] It is located on a terrace, which was supported by a rectangular wall, and measures 37.50 x 19 m, dimensions that coincide with 72 x 36 Egyptian cubits, the unit according to which the building was designed *(Figure 3.23).*[334] The height is estimated to 14.70 m. It consists of two floors constructed in ashlars made of local limestone. Some of the ashlars are monoliths of immense dimensions and reach up to a weight of twenty-eight tons and justify the definition of the construction as megalithic.[335] The building stood on a 0.80 m-high three-step *crepis*.

[332] Business letters from the archives of the Zenon papyri (*P.Cairo Zeno* 1. 59003 and 59076) reveal that in the mid-third century BC Hyrkanos's ancestors were allies and trade partners of the Ptolemies, as they were local tax collectors, supplied the court with slaves and tamed exotic animals, and secured order in Palestine, an area that was threatened by the Seleukids in the Second and Third Syrian Wars. For the connection of these papyri with the Tobiads see Rosenberg 2006, 19–20. For the activities of Hyrkanos see also Will et al. 1991, 14–22; Rosenberg 2006, 194–196; Zayadine 2010, 24–25.
[333] Wiil et al. 1991, 93–96, for the evidence that proves that it was never used.
[334] Will et al. 1991, 135–137; Braun 2010, 63–64.
[335] The monoliths of the lowest part of the northern façade, for instance, are 6.30 m long.

The northern façade consisted of three zones *(Figures 3.24, 3.25a).* In the lowest two columns in Corinthian order in antis separated the entranceway in three parts. An Ionic cornice and a frieze with alternating bovine heads and discs crowned this zone.[336] Right above the cornice the second zone started with two pairs of lions to the east and west in symmetrical arrangement. A lion stood back to back with a lioness, whose suckling cub is also sculpted. The heads of all the lions were turned so as to face the visitor, as he would be approaching the Qasr. The lion pairs stood on either side of the loggia of the upper floor that was defined by columns (their Corinthian capitals remained unfinished). Above each pair double-sided pilasters with Corinthian capitals formed three windows. On top of the cornice of these pilasters two eagles in high relief on each side were sculpted back to back and the part of the wall between the head and the wings was carved as a Corinthian capital. In addition to the eagles, a Doric entablature crowned the third zone and this element continued on all sides of the building. The parts that flank the loggia projected in height and one pediment was constructed on each.

The southern façade was similarly arranged and decorated, but the loggia on this side was smaller and did not exceed in height the window pilasters on the sides *(Figure 3.25b).* The entablature was continuous and a Doric frieze and a pediment crowned the highest zone. Elements that draw on architectural tradition from Alexandria are the capitals of the columns of the entrance and the loggia, that belong to Type III of Alexandrian Corinthian capitals, the bases of the loggia columns, which are decorated with acanthus leaves, and the combination of Corinthian capitals with a Doric frieze.[337]

[336] The carving of the decorative elements of the frieze is unfinished.
[337] McKenzie 2007, 95.

Seven rectangular windows opened on the exterior surface of the eastern and the western sides *(Figures 3.26, 3.27).* Furthermore, one sculpted leopard right above the stepped platform on each side functioned as a fountain: a pipe inside the mouth of each was connected with a cistern inside the building *(Figure 3.28).*[338] A continuous series of double-sided pilasters identical to the northern and southern sides flanked the windows and beneath it one pair of lions on each corner was sculpted in high relief.

The building was accessible through the door of the vestibule that was formed behind the columns of the northern façade *(Figure 3.29a).* A second vestibule followed, behind which the main hall was located. It is not clear, however, if and in what way the hall and the second vestibule communicated, because the wall of the latter had been modified in the early Byzantine phase of the building.[339] A relatively small space to the west of the first vestibule was possibly used to control the entranceway, while its equivalent space to the east was a staircase that provided access to the upper floor *(Figure 3.30).* The two cisterns that were connected with the leopard fountains flanked the second vestibule. On the southern side there was only one vestibule, but without a door that would permit further access to the building. Its flanking spaces communicated only with the central large hall. The reconstruction of this part is the most problematic in the building, because of alterations that took place in the Byzantine period. Larché's study proved that the level of this part was two meters higher than the level of the vestibules to the north and south, and that it was accessible only from the two staircases

[338] Hill 1983; Larché 2005, 36–37. The identification of the felines at the lower part of the western and eastern sides is based less on the features of the animal, which are not particularly realistic, and more to the material of construction, a mineral with red and light yellow patches, which gives the impression of the leopard pelt.

[339] For the problem of identifying the level of the floor in Hyrkanos's time due to the Byzantine alterations see Étienne and Larché 2010, 105–106.

via service doors.[340] The walls that survive and form four spaces date to this later period, but it is certain that they have been built on stub walls of the original phase. Therefore, the arrangement of the four rooms was the same in the time of Hyrkanos. The space around these four spaces was left free forming a four-meter wide Π-shaped corridor to the south, east and west. The corridor, the rooms it surrounded and the second vestibule after the entrance had a vaulted ceiling that supported the floor of the upper storey.[341]

The reconstruction of the upper floor is less certain than the lower floor, but the thorough study of the material led to a credible suggestion by F. Larché *(Figure 3.29b).*[342] A loggia with two side rooms was formed on the south, but the construction of the stairs that was meant to connect the two floors on this part was not completed. The loggia and its side rooms on the northern side were wider than the spaces on the south. It opened onto a vestibule, which led via two columns in antis to the central space of the floor. A corridor equivalent to the one on the ground floor is likely to have surrounded a hall or courtyard. Engaged semi-columns and three-quarter Corinthian columns decorated the wall surface of this space, which was the largest in the building. The surviving material evidence has not permitted the reconstruction of the design of the roof, but there is a possibility that this space was unroofed.[343]

[340] Larché 2005, 91–92.
[341] Voussoirs of the arches were found in second use in the Byzantine stratum (Will et al. 1991, 79).
[342] Larché 2005.
[343] Étienne and Larché 2010, 102.

The Qasr dates with certainty to the first quarter of the second century BC and most likely in the last years of Seleukos's IV reign (187–175 BC).[344] Its construction is believed to have ceased due to Hyrkanos's death (either in 175 or in 169/8 BC) and the lack of interest in the estate by the Seleukids.[345] Insufficient financial resources, however, may have also been the reason for unfinished elements, especially in decoration.

The function

Any attempt to understand the function of the Qasr needs to pay attention to the fact that it was never used. Therefore, in contrast to palaces in Macedonia and other Hellenistic kingdoms, in this case objects that would indicate the way the various spaces were used are lacking. The archaeological record for the Hellenistic phase is not associated with habitation, but with the procedure of construction in progress, and we can only rely on the design and talk about how the commissioner intended to use the building.

The prevailing view until the 1980s was that the Qasr functioned as a temple.[346] This identification is now dismissed mainly due to the results of the French excavations that proved the existence of the four rooms in the central part of the lower floor instead of colonnades. Will and Larché interpreted the building as the palace *(Château)* of Hyrkanos and concluded that the ground floor was used for storage. The second

[344] The date relies on pottery finds, architectural and construction features and the textual evidence (Lapp 1963, 24; Lapp 1983, 63–66; Will 1991 et al.; Rosenberg 2006, 84).
[345] For the historical problems with respect to the date of Hyrkanos's death see Will et al. 1991, 25–36; Rosenberg 2006, 49–52.
[346] Lapp 1963, 30 (with references to studies before the start of the first excavation project); Lauter 1986, 279.

vestibule and the space opposite the staircase at the northern part would have served reception and control of the entranceway respectively. According to this view the upper storey was designed as the residential part with spaces for sleeping and banqueting. The French team believed that the primary purpose of the Qasr was recreation in the *paradeisos* that Hyrkanos had created, while the administration centre would have been located in the fortified Village. A more recent study suggests that the Qasr was designed as a Mausoleion; in this case the four rooms of the lower level would have been used as burial chambers of Hyrkanos's ancestors, and the upper floor as space for funerary banquets in honour of the deceased.[347]

Finally, the possibility that it was a fortress, which occurred from the translation of the word *baris* as 'fortress,' is unanimously dismissed due to the abundance of openings in the exterior surface, and the unsuitable for defence location of the building.[348] Besides, the two surrounding walls have proved to be supportive and not strong enough for defence.[349] The word *baris* did not necessarily mean fortress in this case, but even if this is the correct translation, Josephus possibly relied on misleading sources that described the corner spaces of the building as towers connecting the building with *tetrapyrgia*.[350]

---

[347] Rosenberg 2006, 137–138.

[348] In the translation of the passage in the Loeb edition the word *baris* stands for fortress. Will remarks that the word is a transliteration from Aramaic to Greek and of Persian origin. It also means acropolis or temple in Persian contexts, and fortified residence (Will et al. 1991, 20, 31–35). In the Antiquities of the Jews Josephus uses the word without consistency to refer to different types of constructions (for example AJ 10.11.7 and 11.4.6).

[349] Villeneuve 1986; Rosenberg 2006, 163–164. The only scholar who sees a defensive function in the building is Nielsen (1994, 139) who also mistakenly mentions that it was "placed high up on a large terrace". The archaeological evidence does not validate an elevated position.

[350] Will suggests a connection of the four corner spaces of the Qasr with Parthian fortified residences in the form of tetrapyrgia, but this does not mean that the defensive function had been maintained in the Hyrkanos' building.

Rosenberg's comparative study sets the building within the broader framework of monumental architecture in the late third and the second centuries BC and discusses the textual evidence for the Tobiads. Even though this is an approach that takes into account several aspects of the building, not only architectural and decorative, but also technical and possibly symbolic,[351] Rosenberg's arguments for identifying the Qasr with a monumental tomb are based on indirect evidence and can be contradicted.

The scholar believes that the Qasr is comparable to funerary monuments of Asia Minor, such as the tomb of Mausolos in Halikarnassos, the Nereids Monument in Xanthos and the Mausoleion in Knidos *(Figure 3.31)*. His main arguments are the interior form of the ground-floor with vaulted rooms, the sculpted decoration of the façades and the more solid megalithic appearance of the lower than the upper floor, which is lighter with many openings. The structures he regards as parallels, however, present a significant difference in their podium, which is multi-stepped and several meters high, whereas in the Qasr the columns stand on a 0.80 m high podium. In addition, their ground plan is closer to a square shape than the elongated rectangular shape of the Qasr. As for the animals (lions, leopards and eagles), these are symbols of royal power and they were not adopted in burial context only. Earlier in this chapter we discussed this kind of iconography in the Pavilion and the Thalamegos of the Ptolemies; besides the eagle is found both in Ptolemaic and Seleukid coins. Even though Rosenberg refers to the theme of lionesses with cubs as a 'unique linking', he provides no possible

[351] The author, for instance, acknowledges the problem of who would have been the audience of this monument that would participate in the ritual meals in honour of the deceased in the upper floor of the building (Rosenberg 2006, 218).

reason for this peculiarity.[352] In my view, this is possibly an element that emphasises breeding of wild animals, which was one of the main activities and sources of income at least for Hyrkanos' ancestors, if not for himself.

Furthermore, Rosenberg criticises the identification of the ground level rooms as a storage area, because the limited access from the staircases would have hindered the transportation of large items. It would have been easier, however, to transfer commodities in these rooms via the approximately one meter-wide doorway on the northern side of the corridor, than to place monumental sarcophagi via these doorways. As a further argument the scholar refers to the high number of windows that would have made the upper floor unsuitable for permanent habitation. Nevertheless, this observation does not contradict the French Team's theory, where they interpret the Qasr as a recreational palace where Hyrkanos would retreat from the administration affairs. Dubious also is Rosenberg's interpretation of the surrounding lake or moat as a symbol of the world of the dead, because evidence for its utilitarian role to the overall irrigation system of the estate does exist: it was possibly used as a main reservoir for agricultural activities and the needs of the troops Hyrkanos had assembled.[353] Rosenberg finally overlooks the contrasting to his theory use of the term *baris* by Josephus. Even though the historian clearly speaks about a *baris* that was made of white stone and was decorated with sculpture, Rosenberg maintains that it does not refer to the Qasr, but to the overall estate. The only strong argument that could support the theory of the monumental tomb, something that the scholar does not evaluate, is the location of the

[352] Rosenberg 2006, 98.
[353] Will et al. 1991, 37. The Qasr was situated 8.30 m below the course of water that crosses the site (Gentelle 1981, 82).

building outside the fortified residential district and on the route from Jericho to Philadelphia. Yet in the absence of direct evidence from the building itself that would reveal its use as a burial site, it is difficult to accept identification with a funerary monument.

The Qasr is not, of course, a palace of the type we find in Macedonia, or in the city of Pergamon, the capital of the Attalids, that I will discuss in the following chapter. The reason is the lack of the ground-floor peristyle courtyard, which is the core element of Hellenistic palaces. Nevertheless, I suggest that the monumental building in Iraq al Amir is interpreted more effectively in the framework of the Hellenistic *basileia* than of sacral or funerary monuments. The case of Macedonia showed that royal palaces and elite residences were located within the limits of the cities, but their primary function was not necessarily the same, especially if we recall the example of Aegae. Following possibly the palaces of Alexandria and Antioch, the Qasr was in fact located on a small promontory. A connection with Memphis is also likely, because, at least according to Strabo, lakes were located in front of the palaces.[354] In addition, Netzer and Evyasaf have correctly pointed out the affinities with the palaces of the Hasmoneans in their estate in Jericho *(Figure 3.32).*[355] The combination of these buildings with water channels in a *paradeisos* is the most striking feature of the site.

As Pfrommer has noted, there are also affinities with the description of the Thalamegos of Ptolemy IV.[356] These concern particularly the exterior of the upper floor

[354] Strabo 17.1.32.
[355] Netzer 2001; Evyasaf 2008.
[356] Pfrommer 1996.

with a series of windows between columns and the spatial arrangement with a central colonnaded hall. Pfrommer draws attention to the form of the entranceways of the boat and the Qasr. The entranceway in the Thalamegos was an open colonnaded vestibule, an element that Alexandrian palace buildings may well have featured. In the Qasr the entrance is formed as a closed vestibule, but since this concept would not have developed in Hyrkanos' estate, it must also originate from the *basileia (Figures 3.14, 3.29a).* We can also add the relationship of both with water: the Thalamegos navigated the Nile, while the Qasr was surrounded by a lake, which gave the impression of an island. Traditional elements of monumental architecture were present, such as the Ionic cornice and the Doric frieze. The combination of the latter with Corinthian capitals, the use of quarter columns for decoration in the central space of the upper floor, and the column bases with acanthus leaves in the facade columns of the upper floor are Alexandrian practices. Moreover, the capitals belong to types II and III that developed in Alexandria.[357] It is very likely, therefore, that the Qasr was designed as a luxurious pavilion within the gardens that Hyrkanos and possibly his predecessors had created. In combination with the historical evidence about him, this recreation lodge may have satisfied a variety of needs, as we often observe in palatial buildings: entertainment and accommodation for Hyrkanos and his guests, control of the nearby gates that indicate a system of tolls on the route to Jericho, supervision of the installation for water management, advertising of the trading activities of the Tobiads in demand for tamed animals, and storage of commodities in the ground floor. As a consequence, Étiénne's view that this floor might have been a treasury becomes highly likely and this would

[357] McKenzie 2007, 86–91, 93.

justify the difficulty of access to the four rooms and the highly placed windows.[358] In this respect it is legitimate to identify the Qasr as a palace, and more precisely a kind of royal countryside lodge, and this does not contradict the possibility of Hyrkanos exercising his power from another palace located in the city on the mound.[359]

The finds in Iraq al Amir, and especially the Qasr, suggest that Hyrkanos aimed to create a distinct estate that would explicitly display his wealth and power. And it was the repertoire of Ptolemaic palatial forms that he extensively drew upon, in order to express this meaning. Even though his ideals of royalty originated in Alexandria, at the same time the desire to maintain the local Jewish identity is evident in the form of his palace. The megalithic masonry, for instance, and the assemblage technique of the blocks is an element that can only be justified as an intentional adoption of a local Syrian/Phoenician practice. The technical obstacles with transferring and setting these immense blocks could have been avoided with blocks of smaller size. Whether Hyrkanos wished to oppose himself and the Tobiads to rival Jewish factions by choosing this type of palace in an attempt to declare himself an independent local ruler is an open issue that we could possibly understand with further research in the fortified district on the mount.[360]

Discussion

[358] Etiénne 2010, 121–122. The only known treasury in a palace of the Hellenistic age is the one that has been excavated in Ai Khanoum (Rapin 1992). It is contemporary to the Qasr and the size of its spaces to the west and east resemble that of the four rooms in Hyrkanos' palace.
[359] Rosenberg (2006, 217) claims that Hyrkanos' palace was located in the Village.
[360] The plans of the French team included research in the area of the village, but were cancelled due to difficulties associated with property issues in the modern dwellings.

The combination of archaeological finds and textual evidence from the Ptolemaic capital manages to reduce the restrictions in understanding the space in which Ptolemaic court activities took place. It shows first that we cannot regard the Alexandrian *basileion* as a static building complex during the two and a half-centuries of Ptolemaic kingship and that any future investigations need to focus separately on different phases of its development.

Second, even if it is legitimate to determine a distinctive 'Alexandrian Style', at least in the case of the palaces this seems to apply only to elements of architectural decoration, and particularly to column capitals in the combination of the traditional Greek Orders. The way these elements were used was not a novelty; on the contrary, it resembled the Macedonian royal courts by creating the same types of spaces that served similar functions and in this respect the palaces of both areas belong first and foremost to Hellenistic material culture, rather than Antigonid or Ptolemaic.

Moreover, even if the innovations created in Alexandria spread to other cities or regions under the influence of the capital, we cannot simply refer to a phenomenon of copying these innovations, but to a phenomenon of merging and creating hybrid forms. Even the so-called 'Alexandrian Style' itself is in fact the product of hybridisation that derives primarily from Greek and Egyptian forms, and this hybridisation was not necessarily an intentional strategy of propagating the dominance of the court. The Qasr in Iraq al Amir is an example that demonstrates how adopted forms could be further hybridised in an environment of intense interaction of different traditions. It is essential to note at this point that I use the term 'hybridisation' in this study without implying a

necessarily intentional process of mixing elements from different cultural contexts, but more in the sense of co-existence, which may lead to choices of morphology that combine the different contexts. In addition, the result of such mixture in no case should can regarded as sterile.[361]

In Ptolemaic Egypt elements from both the Greek and the Egyptian tradition could be present in the same column, for example, when a Corinthian capital was combined with an Egyptian-style base. In a more advanced stage of hybridisation, completely new types of decorative patterns emerged and such were the column capitals of Egyptian style with added details originating from Corinthian capitals, patterns that were used in temples outside the capital.[362] The finds from the area of the royal district in Alexandria point to the first less advanced stage of hybridisation. Whether this implies a differentiation between secular and religious buildings with respect to the appearance intended, is an issue whose clarification requires a greater amount of evidence from cities other than the capital. For the moment, we can rely only on Kallixeinos' descriptions and on the palace of Hyrkanos as reliable examples indicative of the nature of Ptolemaic court space. The impact of the Alexandrian royal seat to the spatial formation of the elite is possibly verified by another case outside the capital, the so-called Palazzo delle Colonne in Ptolemais *(Figure 3.33)*.[363] Elements of architectural decoration undoubtedly draw on Alexandrian models, but since it has not been possible to determine which parts of the building date to the original phase of the early first century BC, we cannot evaluate with certainty its position in the reception of the

[361] On the limitations in using exclusively a specific interpretative model for processes of cultural interaction, such as hybridisation, see Mairs 2011, 177–179.
[362] McKenzie 2007, 125–136.
[363] Pesce 1950; Hoepfner 1971.

Alexandrian *basileia*. In the course of this study we will return to the role of the Ptolemaic palaces in formulating royal space in other regions of the Hellenistic World, from their relationship with the Dionysian and theatrical element observed in the case of Pergamon, to the topography of the royal seats in the capital cities of the Seleukids.

CHAPTER 4. THE ATTALID KINGDOM

In the present study the analysis of Attalid palaces precedes their counterparts in the Seleukid kingdom, even though this was created before Philetairos established his rule in the city of Pergamon (283 BC) and founded the Attalid dynasty.[364] The reason for this chronological disruption is the sources of inspiration of Pergamene palaces; scholarship has emphasised the role of Macedonia and Egypt as the two major areas that provided models for the Attalids.[365] Indeed in the course of this chapter a connection both with Macedonian and Ptolemaic palaces will become apparent.

Affinities with the Macedonian examples seem to be present in terms of architecture and spatial organisation, while the decoration and particularly the mosaic floors echo developments that took place in Alexandria under the first Ptolemies. Nevertheless, elements that are unique in Pergamene palaces and differentiate them from the other two Hellenistic kingdoms are also present. This non-Macedonian and non-Ptolemaic aspect of the Attalid case studies is also examined here and the purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate and interpret the multi-faceted nature of Attalid palace structures. The first section focuses on the buildings of different date and state of

[364] The Ptolemaic kingdom was founded in 323 and the Seleukid in 312 BC. Philetairos became the ruler of the city of Pergamon after the defeat of Lysimachos in the battle of Kouropedion by Seleukos I and the death of the latter soon afterwards (for the historical background of the early years of the dynasty see Hansen 1947, 17–18; Radt 1999, 27). For the date of Philetairos's reign see also Allen 1983, 9–11.

[365] Hoepfner 1996, 42. For Nielsen, the proximity of the Pergamene palaces to the temple of Athena, the major cult of the city, the location on the acropolis and the arrangement of the buildings on different terraces are elements that originate from 'local western Anatolian' palaces, but specific examples are not mentioned (Nielsen 1994, 110–111).

preservation that have been excavated on the acropolis of Pergamon. It is followed by a comparative examination of edifices located in the lower part of the city, which were most likely used as private residences *(Figures 4.1, 4.2).*

However, the capital of the Attalids was not the only city with palaces in the kingdom: Vitruvius and Pliny refer to the city of Tralleis as a royal seat with a palace made of sun-dried bricks.[366] In particular, Vitruvius mentions:

Trallibus domus regibus Attalicis facta, quae ad habitandum semper datur ei, qui civitatis gerit sacerdotium.

Residence in Tralleis made for the Attalid kings, which is always given for habitation to the person who holds the city priesthood.

According to Hansen this was the function of the palace in the time of the Attalids.[367] Since the author however, uses the present tense *datur*, I find it possible that it was during the time of Vitruvius that the priest used the palace, while during the Attalid rule it served residential and administrative purposes. Archaeological evidence confirming this is entirely absent, but the existence of a royal palace in Tralleis would be reasonable, judging from the role of the city as a royal mint of complementary character to the main one in Pergamon.[368] The palace would have been constructed after the treaty of Apameia in 188 BC, when the area was annexed to the Attalid kingdom. It was primarily after this date and the expansion of the Attalid kingdom that the political institution of the *epistates* was established. The *epistates* were local governors appointed by the king to cities under Attalid control and existed under the same title already in fourth century BC

[366] Vitr. *De arch.* 2.8.9; Plin. *HN* 35.49. See also Allen 1983, 101 and Hansen 1947, 199.
[367] Hansen 1947, 419. Priesthood was a civic institution associated with dynastic cult (Müller 2000).
[368] On the mint in Tralleis see Allen 1983, 135.

Macedonia.[369] Their residential and governmental seats may well have presented morphological features that drew on royal palaces and the reference by Vitruvius could relate to such a building.

The existence of a palace in Teos is also possible, because of a decree found in the city that refers to an Attaleion, a shrine, located close to the palace.[370] Nevertheless, it is not clear whether it refers to an Attaleion in Teos or in Pergamon, and we lack any relevant archaeological evidence. In contrast to Tralleis and Teos, the archaeological investigation confirms the existence of *a basileion* on the acropolis of Pergamon, and permits an analysis of form and function of its palaces.

The *basileia* of Pergamon

As in Alexandria, the *basileia* of Pergamon were composed of several building complexes. The palaces were located at the eastern part of the fortified acropolis to the northeast of the sanctuary of Athena and the acropolis propylon next to the main street *(Figures 4.2, 4.3).* The identification of the area with the seat of Attalid royalty is confirmed by stamps on roof-tiles that read either *βασιλείων* or *βασιλέων*.[371] They were excavated in the 1880s, but the results were published only in 1930.[372] In the 1990s

[369] For the role of the *epistates*, also called *strategoi*, in the Attalid kingdom on the basis of epigraphic evidence see Allen 1983 chapter 4 and especially page 105 with relevant bibliography. An analysis of the institution in Macedonia is found in Hammond 1999.

[370] …δι ὃν τό τε Ἀττάλλειον τὸ πρὸς τῶι θεάτρωι, ὃ καὶ | ζῶν καθιερώκει, τοῖς Ἀτταλισταῖς ἀνατίθησιν κα τὴν συν|οικίαν τὴν πρὸς τῶι βασιλείωι, τὴν πρότερον οὖσαν Μικ[κά]|ρου. (*OGI* 326, 20-21). See also Allen 1983, 153 and Schwarzer 2012, 115.

[371] Zimmer 2012, 144.

[372] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930. A preliminary report was published by Hummann and Bohn (1888) in *Jahrbuch der Königlichen preußischen Kunstsammlungen* IX.

Salzmann undertook a new study of the mosaics of palaces IV and V, a project that included a small-scale excavation.[373] The current research project of Pergamon is being directed by the German Archaeological Institute (Istanbul Department). It has included the opening of two small excavation trenches in palaces IV and V as a first step in order to better understand their form and date. The architecture of Pergamene palaces is the topic of a doctoral dissertation currently in progress and hopefully updated plans and a clearer view about their building phases will emerge soon.[374]

The excavators of the nineteenth century labeled the architectural groups they unearthed as 'Building Complexes' I–VI (*Baugruppen* I–VI). What survive from these structures are primarily parts of their foundations, and only the best preserved, IV and V, permit a comparative detailed analysis of their form. Due to the disputable function of the poorly preserved complexes, for each one of them, I use the simple term 'Building'. The date of Buildings I–III is very unclear and for most construction-phases only the relative chronology is certain *(Figure 4.4).* Kawerau and Wiegand's 1930 monograph, which still remains the fundamental work and starting point for the study of the Pergamene palaces, does not always distinguish between different phases, especially when the authors attempt functional interpretation.[375]

[373] Salzmann 1991, 1993 and 1995.
[374] The dissertation is in preparation by Mr. T. Zimmer, University of Cologne. See Zimmer 2010 and 2012.
[375] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930. In pages 42–43, for example, where the authors describe Building VI, it is not clear whether the spaces identified as shops in the south continued to be used as shops in a later phase, when rooms for the gate guard were built on top of one of the old shops. Another case of this problem is found in pages 11–12: Building I is identified as the oldest residence of the king on the acropolis, but the same is mentioned for Building II. This seems to imply that these two buildings had a similar function in different time periods, but the chronological problem is not demonstrated.

As regards Building I **(Cat. P1)** it seems that we can discern two main chronological phases, which I designate as Building Ia and Building Ib *(Figures 4.2, 4.5).* The remains of Ia comprise excavated sections of the foundations of a peristyle courtyard with 30 m long sides and small surrounding rooms to the east and north. It is unclear whether the row of rooms on the southern side of the courtyard belonged to Ia. These spaces opened to the street that runs along the acropolis from the northwest to the south-southeast. Hansen and Radt suggest they were used as storerooms, but since they were accessible from the street, we can perhaps identify them as shops.[376]

Moreover, it has been suggested that the series of rooms on the opposite side of the street and beneath the later Trajaneum relate to Building Ia *(Figure 4.6).*[377] Hoepfner takes this view one step further by interpreting these rooms as a part of the residential section of the earliest palace from the time of Attalos I (241–197 BC), in which case Building Ia would have been the official section *(Figure 4.7).*[378] However, investigation of these remains after Hoepfner's interpretation, demonstrated that the distinction in two functional sections is highly unlikely: with the exception of these rooms no other remains under the Trajaneum date earlier than the late second century BC, which means that material evidence that would have formed a residential section is absent *(Figure 4.6).*[379] Radt maintains that the series of spaces beneath the Trajaneum were of financial character, something that I find possible, especially if the series of the rooms to the north

[376] Hansen 1947, 223; Radt 1999, 65.
[377] This is what Raeck calls 'Building IV' in his survey of the remains beneath the Trajaneum (Raeck et al. 1999; Hoepfner 1990, 281).
[378] Hoepfner 1990, 280 and 1996, 19.
[379] Radt 1999 and 2000.

were indeed shops along the street.[380] What may have been the palace of Attalos I is Building Ia on its own with the courtyard and the spaces to the north and east. Its peristyle form corresponds to the standard type for Hellenistic palace architecture found in the palaces of Macedonia and Alexandria.

In the second architectural phase later in the second century BC modifications took place to the north and east: larger spaces, whose walls partially used the masonry of the first phase, expanded the building on these two sides (*Figure 4.5*). The modification in form and metal fragments of weapons found in these spaces suggest that Building Ib was used as barracks.[381] The existence of a large hall in the north side with a span of about 13 m and three pillars supporting the ceiling is a peculiar feature for this time period, because the technical knowledge of constructing large halls without supports did exist, and this tradition supposedly originates in Asia Minor.[382] The reason may be functional, as in Macedonia such halls were used for representative and ceremonial purposes and required unified space, whereas in barracks this kind of space was not essential. Technical difficulties are also to be estimated, as the hall is located right on the eastern edge of the acropolis. Such difficulties are also evident in the use of vertical support foundation walls (labeled as 3–5 in the plan) and the particularly strong exterior walls to the north and south.

[380] Radt 1999, 63.
[381] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 11. It is not specified in which spaces exactly these objects were found. For the same identification see also Hansen 1947, 213; Hoepfner 1996, 19 and Radt 1999, 64.
[382] See also footnote 88.

The available evidence is even scantier for Building II *(Figure 4.5).* Traces of the foundations of an almost square structure with about 18 m long sides survive and a room on the southeastern corner is discernible.[383] The reconstruction by Hoepfner is accurate at least for this side *(Figure 4.8).* It is not clear how the four steps of a stair to its southwest and two more steps to the northwest relate to the building, even though they all present the same orientation. If we take into consideration its location on the highest spot of the area of Buildings I–VI *(Figure 4.3),* we would expect a significant building, such as a palace, or a watchtower. Kawerau considers the rectangular building a palace independent from and older than Building I, whereas scholars before him identified it as an altar, a defensive tower, or barracks.[384] Using as an argument the thickness of the walls, Hoepfner suggests that it was a residential palace tower of the Gongylids, the local dynasty that preceded the Attalids.[385] Nevertheless, the thickness of the wall foundations resembles most parts of the foundations in Building Ia and is not an exceptional feature, while the scholar gives an exaggerated possible height of 20–30 m.[386] In reality neither the absolute, nor the relative dating of this building is clear, and consequently we cannot be certain about its character. I suggest that future excavation research should examine the possibility of this construction being connected to Philetairos as his own residence. We know that he was appointed by king Lysimachos to guard booty of nine thousand

[383] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 7.
[384] Ibid. 11 (with references to earlier interpretations).
[385] Hoepfner 1996/7, 23–24.
[386] In the reconstructed plan of the acropolis by Radt this location is labeled as a 'Water-tower' in connection with the nearby cisterns and Building Ib (Radt 1999, 66).

talents in Pergamon and for this purpose an adequately protected space would have been essential.[387]

Building III is located further to the southeast next to II *(Figure 4.9).* The first construction phase includes the oldest fortification wall at this part of the acropolis, a part of which was used as the exterior wall of Building III to the east (section B–D belongs to its foundation).[388] The building does not seem to have had a peristyle courtyard. It consisted of three sections with the largest spaces in the middle. This section is formed by a large space (approximately 8 x 5.50 m) and a second one with smaller width (1 and 2 respectively in the plan). At the sides two narrow corridors (6 and 8) approximately one meter-wide are arranged symmetrically. 7 is an L-shaped long space running northeast to southwest, whereas its equivalent space to the north is separated in smaller rooms (3, 4 and 5). Hoepfner assumes that Building III was the centre of royal administration on the basis of it not having a peristyle.[389] However, as the palaces in the previous chapters showed, there is no proven connection between the absence of a peristyle and an administrative function in the architecture of the era.

Radt sees a connection of the architectural plan with houses from Priene and the palace of Larisa on Hermos, especially with its Achaemenid fifth century BC phase.[390] Therefore, he believes that Building III is a pre-Hellenistic palace associated with the

[387] The *peristasis* between Ib and II shows that at some point the two buildings coexisted Spaces A-C to the south of Building II, possibly an extension of Ib, were constructed later and incorporated the four-step stair.

[388] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 17–18. A new wall (marked as A in the plan) was constructed in a later phase using a part of the old one. Remains to the south and north (E, F) are later additions.

[389] Hoepfner 1996, 19.

[390] Radt 1999, 66. For the palace in Larisa see Boehlau and Schefold 1940, Lauter 1975 and Nielsen 1994, 102. The building was used until the early third century BC.

dynasty of the Gongylids.[391] The arrangement of rooms 1 and 2 might indeed be reminiscent of the *megaron* unit in Larisa *(Figure 4.10*).[392] A further link of Building III with Achaemenid royal architecture and the Gongylids might be, in my view, the presence of approximately one metre-wide corridors (6 and 8) surrounding the central space. Such spaces played a cardinal role in the palaces of Persepolis and Susa by separating the numerous sections of the complexes *(Figure 5.2).* Nevertheless, in order to understand whether Building III had colonnaded spaces like the halls in Achaemenid palaces or whether this building is a result of interaction between Larisa and Pergamon in the time of Philetairos an intensive survey of the area of Building III, would be necessary.

Buildings IV and V will be examined in detail below in comparison with the palaces of the other kingdoms. Contemporary to them was Building VI, located in the lowest level of the eastern part of the acropolis. The structure is adjacent to the southeastern part of the acropolis fortification wall and consists of several small buildings that form an irregular architectural plan in two parts: a row of rooms of almost equal size is found to the north, and a group of three large rooms and smaller spaces is located to the south *(Figure 4.11).* Large *pithoi* of one thousand-litre capacity have been found in these spaces.[393] Other finds from this building are iron spearheads, metal joints and fragments, possibly of missile weapons.[394] These elements and the location of the spaces right to the east of the acropolis gate justify Radt's interpretation of Building VI

[391] A Gongylus was appointed as governor in Pergamon by the Achaemenids (Hansen 1947, 10 and on Pergamon in the first half of the fourth century with emphasis on numismatic evidence see Marcellesi 2012, 23–42).
[392] For the type of *megaron* see Kutbay 1998, 81–82.
[393] Radt 1999, 76.
[394] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 47. For the finds see also Conze 1913, 328–329, fig.125.

as barracks for the guard of the gate. Judging from the finds these spaces can have also been arsenals complementing a series of arsenals and possibly granaries in the northernmost part of the acropolis.[395] Hence it seems that enough space for the storage of weaponry and military equipment was already available.

Palace IV

Problems of spatial configuration

The situation is clearer in the case of Palaces IV (1050 m²) and V (2420 m^2) to the south of Building III *(Figures 4.12, 4.13).* Each consists of a peristyle courtyard surrounded by porticoes **(Cat. P2 and P3).** Rooms of various sizes are present on all sides except the western, due to the lack of space caused by the central street of the acropolis. Three suggested reconstructions of the architectural plan of these palaces are available in current scholarship and they present significant differences *(Figures 4.14a–b, 4.15, 4.16a–b).* As I will demonstrate below, the reconstruction by Ulrike Wulf is the most accurate for palace V. Kutbay also gives a useful and reliable plan of the foundations of both buildings in their main phases *(Figure 4.17)* without attempting a reconstruction. In order to understand their form and the various reconstructions, we need to start from the original excavation plans *(Figures 4.12, 4.13).* In this section after analysing the current restored plans I suggest a different version for palace IV.

[395] For these structures see Boehringer and Szalay 1937. The earliest ones were constructed in the time of Philetairos.

The major debatable point as regards Palace IV is the form of its courtyard. The excavators unearthed a partially preserved wall that defined the courtyard on all four sides together with its foundations, as well as two door thresholds that interrupted the wall. In their architectural analysis of the building Kawerau and Wiegand treated this wall as an element of the original construction phase. For this reason Pinkwart and Stammnitz reconstructed the palace courtyard as a space closed by the wall and accessed through doorways *(Figure 4.14a).* An argument supporting this view may be found in a building complex discovered recently on Mount Karasis in the region of Kilikia to the east of Pergamon, which presents features found in palace architecture: the courtyard of the so-called Banquet Building and possibly also of the Residential Building did not have colonnades, but walls with windows *(Figure 5.24).*[396] The complex dates in the second century BC at a time when eastern Kilikia was under the control of the Seleukids. This date makes it roughly contemporary to the Pergamene palaces, and as the excavators have demonstrated, a strong connection with Pergamon in terms of architectural form is present.[397]

Another contemporary example of a closed courtyard comes from Pergamon itself; this is found in the so-called House of Attalos in the Lower Agora of the city.[398] In this case columns defined the courtyard, but a two meter-high stone barrier between the columns closed the space off. Nevertheless, these two examples do not truly resemble the courtyard of Palace IV, because the Attalos House does have a colonnade, and the presence of windows, an element found in Karasis, is unconfirmed in Palace IV. In

[396] A detailed analysis of the palatial complex on Mount Karasis will follow in chapter 5, where it is examined together with other evidence from the Seleukid Empire.
[397] Hoffmann and Sayar 2007. See also Radt 2010 and 2011.
[398] For a detailed analysis of this house see below in the section *The houses of the elite.*

addition, exactly because the peristyle was used so frequently in Hellenistic palatial buildings, we would expect to find it in IV as well. Most scholars support this view and—without providing a justification—consider the wall a later modification.[399] In my view, an additional argument for the existence of a peristyle in Palace IV is one column base with a drum preserved in a height of 0.34 m and one column drum found in the palace.[400] The excavators do not identify them with a specific architectural Order, but it must have belonged to a Doric column, as it is similar to the bases of the Doric columns of the Temple of Zeus at the Upper Agora of the city. Even though we cannot be certain about their original location, their dimensions would fit in a peristyle colonnade of the courtyard. The diameter of the drums is recorded as 0.57–0.58 m and is close to the diameter of the column trace on a block of the stylobate from Palace V (0.66 m).[401]

Finally, the construction material and the masonry of this wall may be further indicators of a later date; no marble was used for the door thresholds, whereas the thresholds of the rooms on the eastern side were made of marble. In addition, according to the excavators the masonry is more irregular in comparison to the spaces on the three sides of the building.[402] Besides, traces of a later modification in Palace IV are also evident in two vertical walls in the northern portico, and especially in the southern part of room A, which was divided by a wall, while the altar in the same room is also a later addition *(Figures 4.12, 4.17).* For these reasons the peristyle courtyard is a more plausible reconstruction than a closed off courtyard. Hoepfner notes that none of the sides have

[399] Radt 1999, 67; Zimmer 2011, 156. Nielsen mentions that the evidence proving that Palace IV had a peristyle is 'sockets cut in the underlying rock', but no such reference exists in the excavation report by Kawerau and Wiegand (Nielsen 1994, 105).
[400] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, pages 29–30. The exact location of these finds is not reported.
[401] As I will discuss below, this trace is the only evidence for the form of the columns in Palace V, because no fragments have been found.
[402] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 25–26.

exactly the same length. The difference between the northern and western sides and the southern and eastern sides is 1.75 m, a number that divides the sides in 7 and 8 interaxial spaces, namely in 8 x 9 columns *(Figure 4.15).*[403]

The second element that has been reconstructed in different ways is the entranceways. The remains do not reveal the position of the entranceways to Palace IV, but they may have been located at the poorly preserved south or west sides. Wulf indicates only one entrance to the northwest *(Figure 4.16a).* This is possible, but does not exclude the presence of an entrance to the south, something that would facilitate movement between Palaces IV and V. Thus, in the plan by Pinkwart and Stammnitz two entrances are placed to the south, while Hoepfner depicts entrances both on the south and northwest and seems therefore to be most valid.

Differences are also observed in the arrangement of rooms, especially of the southeastern part of the palace. Only Pinkwart and Stammnitz and Kutbay indicate correctly the southern original wall of room A. Furthermore, the eastern colonnade—if we accept the presence of a peristyle—seems to have been connected with the walls of spaces F and 1 *(Figures 4.12, 4.18).* This results in the formation of a pastas group that Pinkwart and Stammnitz illustrate. But in contrast to their reconstruction, room C was probably a closed space as the foundation remains of its western wall indicate. I summarise these observations in a new plan of the palace *(Figure 4.18).* A pastas group is, in my view, likely to have existed also to the north, formed by the projection of the western wall of space E. Finally, the most striking difference between the architectural

[403] Hoepfner 1996, 22.

reconstructions is the presence of a large room at the southwestern corner in Wulf's architectural plan. The actual remains do not justify the existence of such space. It is likely that rooms were indeed present on that side, but we lack any evidence about their arrangement and size.

Despite these differences, it is clear that rooms E, D and F form the northern wing, while the eastern portico is the widest and contains the largest rooms A, B and C. Similarly to the Macedonian Palaces, the peristyle courtyard is the main node of the building and communicates with almost all the rooms. If pastas groups existed indeed, this would be an element connecting the building with elite residences from Pella (early third century BC) and with the Seleukid palace in Jebel Khalid (mid-third century BC). In this case the resemblance with the pastas group from the northern peristyle of the house of Dionysus would be striking *(Figure 4.19).* The accessibility patterns are simpler in comparison to the Palaces of Vergina and Pella; vestibules do not seem to have existed and the rooms open directly to the porticoes (or the portico-pastas) *(Diagram 7).*

The decoration

Elements of decoration that reveal the lavishness of the building have also been recovered. Remains of a polychrome *vermiculatum* mosaic survived between a hearth and the eastern wall of room A.[404] Decorative ornaments such as a garland and a meander that form friezes are preserved, while an *emblema* (a pre-fabricated mosaic panel) depicted a fish (*Figure 4.20).* The reconstruction of the mosaic is not possible, but it must have

[404] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 54–56.

contained *emblemata* surrounded by the friezes. This room is the largest (44.60 m^2) and was identified by the excavators as a cult space, because it contained a marble hearth or altar on top of a rubble layer.[405] However, it is doubtful that this feature belongs to the original construction phase of the room, besides the asymmetrically set door and a drain are elements that designate an banquet room. The hearth may have been a later addition contemporary to the modification of the southern part of the room.[406] Salzmann has estimated the dimensions of the mosaic and showed that it left enough space for *klinai*.[407] Raised borders for the couches were absent, but at that period this was not an essential element in banquet rooms.[408] The depiction of the fish is possibly associated with the use of the room for banquets, and could have informed the visitor about this function. Still life emblemata with sea animals and consumption products were not a rare theme in floors of kitchens and dining rooms in Hellenistic buildings. For instance, according to Pliny, Sosos made the *Asarotos oikos* in Pergamon, a mosaic well-known from Roman copies, which depicts the remains of a meal scattered on the floor *(Figure 4.21)*.[409] The patrons used such themes in order to display their prosperity and means to supply expensive or exotic food for their guests. Fragments of stucco decoration were also found in this room. Between the rows of painted ashlar pattern decoration of the wall a painted frieze was formed by bands of griffins, an egg-shaped cymatium, marble imitation, a perspective meander and braid pattern *(Figure 4.22)*.[410] A yellow socle and red orthostates were set in the lower part of the walls in the other sides of the room.

[405] Ibid. 29.
[406] Ibid. 29; Nielsen 1994, 105; Zimmer 2010, 156.
[407] Salzmann 1995, 103.
[408] For the shape and form of Hellenistic dining rooms see Westgate 2007, 316 and also Bergquist 1990.
[409] Plin. *HN* 36.184; Dunbabin 1999, 26.
[410] Bingöl 1997, 97; Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 48–49.

Fragments of a mosaic with ornamental plant motifs were also found in room D. They depict tendrils, parts of flowers and possibly an acanthus against black background,while white tesserae belong to the border for dining couches *(Figure 4.23).*[411] In a fashion known from the mosaic in Room E in the Palace of Aegae it is possible that the rosette was set in the centre of the floor. The excavators also reported plaster fragments of blue and yellow bands, while blue orthostates were set at the lower part of the walls.[412] Miniature architectural fragments made of white stucco, such as half-columns (diameter: 7 cm) and a Corinthian capital, come from the same room and are likely to have been decorative elements of the upper part of the wall in a fashion similar to the large hall in Peristyle I of the Palace in Pella *(Figure 4.24).* A fragment of a small frieze (height: 3.5 cm) with figures (possibly Erotes) has been also found. Furthermore, an artefact found recently in this room is the head of a bull made of terracotta *(Figure 4.25).*[413] It is not the first object of this type found in Pergamon: a mould for the head of a bull very similar to the one from palace IV was found in the cistern of a space identified as a kitchen next to shops, which comes from the Hellenistic phase of the so-called 'Haus mit dem Podiensaal' ('House of the hall with the platform') at the residential part of the city *(Figure 4.26).*[414] What these finds indicate is first the close connection between *basileia* and residential area in terms of production and consumption of objects of luxury. Second and most importantly, the excavator of the house has proved that it was used by the *Boukoloi*, a *thiasos* of Dionysus Kathegemon, the patron deity of the Attalids. On these grounds, the use of space D for cultic or worship activities becomes highly likely.

[411] Salzmann 1995, 104; Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 57–58.
[412] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 50.
[413] Zimmer 2010; Pirson 2008, 105.
[414] Schwarzer 2008, 79 and 92–98.

This would make the space an equivalent of the Tholos in the Aegae palace, where there also was some kind of sculptural decoration on the wall.

Palace V

Palace V is located between the sanctuary of Athena and the fortification wall of the acropolis. A *peristasis* separates the building from Palace IV *(Figure 4.13)*.[415] A block of the stylobate over the northeastern corner of the foundation of the courtyard proves the existence of a peristyle, as it preserves the round trace of a Doric column and two holes for the cramps *(Figures 4.13 and 4.27).* The peristyle was incomplete at its southwestern corner, because the walls of the western and southern porticoes met at that point *(Figures 4.14b and 4.15).* The entrance does not survive, but it must have been formed on the western side, possibly at its northern or southern end. The restored plans by Wulf *(Figure 4.16b)* and Pinkwart and Stammnitz depict an entrance to the southeast. This would be, however, an inconvenient position to enter the building, as the area was enclosed by a projection of the city wall. Did this building contain a propylon with a monumental façade of the type used in Macedonia and Egypt? Although this element would have indeed been suitable for such a building, any remains pointing to its presence are lacking.[416] Wulf's reconstruction depicts a type of 'dog-legged' entrance on the northwestern corner, which would have required a turn to the right at the end of the entrance corridor in order to access the peristyle. I find this unlikely because, according to

[415] The *peristasis* is a narrow covered passage left intentionally between two buildings on different ground level. Its purpose was to protect the building on a lower level from dampness and is a very common element in Pergamene residential architecture. About the significance of the *peristasis* in Pergamon and the inscription of the *Astynomoi*, which includes detailed information about its construction and maintenance see Dörfpeld 1902 and also Hoepfner 1996–7, 26–27.

[416] The monumental propylon is suggested by Hoepfner (1996, 25).

the excavators, the relevant remains that Wulf interprets as an entrance are located on a higher level than the palace. They enclose a low hill and possibly belong to a separate construction.[417] Another problematic point of the form of this palace is the arrangement of rooms on the southern side: the existence of a row of relatively small rooms, in the way they are reconstructed by Pinkwart-Stammnitz and Wulf is more likely than Hoepfner's reconstruction, as there is not enough space for a room as large as B.[418]

The architectural plan is better known for the northern and eastern sections. The courtyard is again the main node of the building. The largest room, with a marble threshold set slightly off-centre, is I in the north. Second in dimensions comes room F in the east. The threshold is clearly off-centre in this case, an element that indicates banquet halls. Strangely enough, only Wulf's reconstruction depicts the entrance of F in the right position. Nielsen suggests the existence of a garden in the peristyle of Palace V due to the lack of evidence for a pavement and the presence of cisterns.[419] While this is a possibility it also encounters problems: this is the foundation of a rectangular structure (6.70 x 2.60 m) to the west in the courtyard, probably a votive monument or an altar. How such a structure would have been arranged in the garden is unclear *(Figures 4.13, 4.14b)*.[420] Gardens in the area of the *basileion* must have existed at least in the last decades of Attalid rule, as ancient sources report that king Attalos III had a strong interest in

[417] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 34.
[418] Kawerau and Wiegand report 'It seems that further to the west [of room D] there were no spaces that belonged to the building', but in their plan there are traces of wall foundations to the west (ibid. 33).
[419] Nielsen 1994, 107.
[420] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 35

gardening and cultivated poisonous plants for use in court intrigues.[421] Nevertheless, there is no proof connecting gardens with the palace courtyards.

Similarly to Palace IV, mosaic pavements and painted walls comprised the decoration. The polychrome mosaic in the small room H to the east (10.89 m^2) consisted of four sections *(Figure 4.28)*. Two rectangular *emblemata* depicted theatre masks and flanked a socle adjacent to the east wall.[422] Moving towards the entrance, fragments of a garland with ribbons, flowers, foliage fruits and birds formed the second section. A similar garland is depicted directly in front of the entrance. Between the garlands two *emblemata* were set on the edges and one non-prefabricated mosaic in the middle. Only the northern one survives and illustrates in *opus vermiculatum* a parrot in profile against a dark ground. It was made of stone and glass tesserae to achieve green, blue, red and yellow hues.[423] The socle was used as an altar or a statue base. The second is more likely, because the threshold of the room occupied the whole western side and the cuttings show that it was closed off with a fence instead of a door. This element would facilitate viewing the statue from outside the room. Judging from the iconography of the mosaics, especially the garlands and the masks, worship in this room relates to Dionysus. In the northwestern wing room I was the largest banquet room of the palace with space for twenty-two couches according to Hoepfner's estimations. Fragments of the orthostates are made of white-blue marble like in Room H.[424] By contrast to I, fragments of the mosaic floor do survive in room K (72.25 m^2), which was also used for symposia. The mosaic occupied the whole surface of the room. The concentric composition was chosen

[421] Plut. *Vit.* Dem. 20.2, Just. *Epit.* 36.4.4.
[422] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 61; Salzmann 1995, 108–109.
[423] Salzmann 1995, 109.
[424] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 31.

with monochrome stripes and ornamental bands surrounding a central panel that carried three square *emblemata* at its northern part *(Figure 4.29)*.[425] One of the bands depicts tendrils, Erotes and flowers on a black ground. The signature of the mosaicist, 'ΗΦΑΙΣΤΙΩΝ ΕΠΟΙΕΙ', survives on the southern edge of the central mosaic *(Figure 4.30)*. It is depicted as being written on a piece of parchment, one corner of which is raised, because the wax that stuck it on the surface is broken. This optical illusion is effective only when viewed from some distance. For this reason, it is suitable in a room where the guests were reclining on couches beside the walls.

Statuary is not absent from this palace. A statue of a female figure (height: 1.10 m) was found in the same room *(Figure 4.31)*. She holds her *chiton* with the left hand, turns her head to the right, and brings her right hand to the front.[426] The figure is usually interpreted as a dancer and the object she held with her raised hand as a garland.[427] This interpretation corresponds to the function of the room as space used for symposia, but it is not clear whether the statue comes from the ground or an upper floor and where exactly it was originally on display.[428] A second statue of a female figure found out of context in a mosque in the modern city of Bergama is considered to be a counterpart in terms of style and dimensions of the statue from palace V. She brings both hands to the front, a posture

[425] Salzmann 1995, 104 and 2012, 104–105. For the choice of concentric composition in mosaic floors and particularly their suitability for dining rooms see Westgate 1997–1998, 102 and 2000, 255.
[426] The roughly formed back of the statue indicates that it was set against the wall or possibly in a niche. The diagonal wrapping of the *himation* under the left breast is an archaizing element (Winter 1908, 65).
[427] Zagdoun 1989, 174; Kunze 1996, 117. Other views are that the object was a servant's tray, a lamp or a torch (Bulle 1918, 21). There are no exact parallels of her posture. See also Vorster 2012, who suggests that the figure may have also held a wreath, decoration that would match the function of the room as a banquet hall and the wreaths the symposiasts wore.
[428] Kunze 1996, 117–118.

suitable for holding a garland, a band, or a tray.[429] The statue could be, in my view, a combination of a religious dancer connected with the customs of the symposion and at the same time with the cult of Dionysus.

Another set of sculptural finds are the panels of a frieze relief. Initially the panels were attributed to the sanctuary of Athena, as some fragments were found at the terrace of the sanctuary and others integrated in walls of the Byzantine era.[430] Their association with Palace V has been suggested by Hoepfner.[431] In his view, the frieze panels would have fitted the intercolumnia of the upper floor of the peristyle colonnade. The preserved panels depict a Homeric scene with Greek warriors coming out of the Trojan horse, Telephos and Athena, and a Gigantomachy *(Figures 4.32, 4.33).* Hoepfner's theory is intriguing, but in lack of further evidence remains speculative.

A clue for the date of the palaces is the reconstruction and adaptation of the wall in the southeast part of Palace IV to the Plan of Palace V. This element indicates that the latter was built later, though the chronological distance must be insignificant. A block of the coffered ceiling of the Great Altar was found in second use as a door threshold in room F of Palace V; therefore both buildings most likely date to the reign of Eumenes II (197-159 BC).[432] The block has been identifed as a faulty piece that was never used in the Altar. This means that the construction of Palace V began during or shortly after the

[429] Ibid. 118.
[430] Winter 1908, 283–285; Schober 1940.
[431] Hoepfner 1996, 24.
[432] Hoepfner 1996, 25; Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 32.

construction of the altar roof. All three buildings must stand chronologically close and belong to the extensive building activity during the reign of Eumenes II.[433]

Problems of function

The state of preservation of the palaces makes their functional interpretation far from an easy task and it is not surprising that there has not been much discussion about this issue. Most scholars accept Hoepfner's view, who maintains that Palace IV served residential needs of the royal family and hosted banquets for the king's companions, whereas Palace V was the official-administrative section for large-scale banquets and reception, namely the public element was stronger than in palace IV.[434] This theory presents two problematic points: first, the room that could be a parallel of the Tholos in functional terms (space D) is located in palace IV and not V, which means in the residential or private building and not in the official-public building if we accept Hoepfner's view. Second, the attempt to define the meaning of these buildings resembles the problem of coexistence and function of the main and the secondary peristyle in the palace of Aegae. Palaces IV and V, however, do not differ in size as much as the two sections in the Macedonian palace. How can we interpret these features and is there an alternative?

In order to justify the official function of Palace V that contrasted Palace IV, Nielsen presents as an argument that the decoration was finer and more elaborate in

[433] For an analysis of the building projects of Eumenes II and the expansion of the city see Hansen 1947, 228–274 and Radt 1999.
[434] Hoepfner 1996, 22–25.

Palace V.[435] In reality and as we saw above, the fragments of mosaic floors that survive in both edifices reveal similar quality of material and execution, while interior architectural decoration in stucco was also present. Hoepfner and Nielsen's observations require further discussion in order to test their validity and a useful approach is, in my view, to evaluate the buildings together and their area as a part of the whole city.

There are two possibilities as regards their role: they were either the two parts of a unit and each catered for different but clearly distinct and complementary needs, or they were independent buildings satisfying similar needs. What we can be certain of is that due to its size Palace IV accommodated fewer people than V. In addition, it did not contain a monumental entrance or banquet rooms with own vestibules, and it was erected in less privileged location than V. The main entrance of palace V viewed the open space defined by the propylon of the acropolis to the south and the Athena sanctuary to the west. Based on these features V seems more likely to have served official purposes, and in this case the proximity of the southern entrance of Palace IV to the secondary entrance of V would have been convenient for the movement of servants required for the banquets in rooms K and I.[436] On the other hand, it is worth reminding that the this distinction in a residential and an official section originates from the interpretation of the so-called House of Dionysus in Pella. In that case, the peristyles belong to one single building with a common entrance and a direct passageway from the north to the south section. By contrast, IV and V in Pergamon are separate buildings with a *peristasis* between them and different access. Before we dismiss one or the other option, additional comparative

[435] Nielsen 1994, 105.

[436] In the following chapter we will discuss similar distinction of sections in the case of the structures on Mount Karasis, but as their interpretation is largely based on the Pergamene palaces they cannot be used as an independent comparative case.

material coming from Pergamon itself proves useful and this is the residences outside the fortified acropolis that I will present below.

The houses of the elite

In Chapter 2 I discussed the relationship between palaces and elite residences in Macedonia and demonstrated the role of the royal seats as building models. A strong possibility emerged that these residences were associated with members of the court, such as the *philoi* or possibly with the *kynegoi*. Since the Attalid palaces present elements in common with Macedonian palace architecture, we would expect a similar relationship to feature the palaces and elite houses in Pergamon. The analysis of the houses will demonstrate, however, that we cannot simply draw a parallel between Pergamon and Macedonia, and that the situation in the Attalid kingdom presents its own distinctive features. In particular, I argue against the top-down procedure observed in Macedonia, namely patterns borrowed from royal palaces and applied to residences of the elite, and demonstrate the potential of Macedonian elite residences as the source of spatial patterns for the Pergamene palaces.

Peristyle houses constructed after the reign of Attalos I have been excavated to the west of the Lower Agora and near the main gate of the city wall from the time of Eumenes II (*Figure 4.1*). They were still used in the Roman period and therefore present alterations and extensions. Another group of houses, most of which do not have a peristyle courtyard and date either in the third or after the mid first century BC are

located in the Upper City.[437] I chose to discuss only the houses of the Lower Agora in this section because their date and the presence of the peristyle courtyard make them comparable to the acropolis palaces. Pinkwart and Stammnitz separated them in two categories according to the number of sides around the courtyard with spaces that communicated with the porticoes. Thus, the first category is U-shaped houses with rooms on three sides and the second is L-shaped houses with rooms on only two sides.[438] Wulf takes as a criterion the presence and arrangement of particular types of spaces, defined by her as the 'main reception hall', 'three-spaced groups', and 'other principal rooms'. This approach is more flexible and suitable to an assemblage of such great variety as the Pergamene houses present. Nevertheless, it is often difficult to determine and distinguish these types of spaces and at times Wulf's groupings appear arbitrary.[439] In addition, the spatial configuration in the houses is highly determined by the terrain of the city, the sloping ground that necessitated construction of the houses on terraces of various sizes. Due to the non-standardised and highly various form of the Pergamene peristyle houses, and also because the distinction in typological categories does not contribute in interpreting their social and symbolic meaning, I do not intend to follow these systems here. The contribution of the works by Wulf and Pinkwart and Stamnitz lays primarily in clarifying the construction phases and the architectural form of these buildings and less in their contextual interpretation.

[437] The peristyle houses are presented in Pinkwart and Stammnitz 1984. For the houses of the Upper City see Wulf 1999.
[438] Pinkwart and Stammnitz 1984, 36–42.
[439] Wulf 1999, especially 182–190. In particular Wulf's classification of spaces in 'main' and 'secondary' is an approach that is not based on clearly defined criteria and in both categories we find rooms of similar size and form.

The first peristyle house at the Lower Agora that is comparable to the acropolis palaces is the so-called House of Attalos (1465 m^2) **(Cat. P4).**[440] It is located to the north of the Lower Agora along the street that led from the Agora to the Gymnasion. Two main construction phases have been ascertained with the first dating approximately in the first quarter of the first century BC and the second in the second century AD.[441] The plan of the Hellenistic phase cannot be reconstructed in its entirety, because the interior walls were extensively altered in the Trajan-Antonine phase.[442] It is certain nevertheless, that originally the house had a peristyle courtyard defined by 5 x 8 Doric columns on the ground floor and marble Ionic Order on the upper floor *(Figures 4.34 and 4.35).*[443] This peristyle was by one column narrower than in the second phase. Rooms were formed on all sides apart possibly from the southern portico. The main entrance (46) was located to the southwest and formed as a long corridor-vestibule with side rooms. A smaller entrance (41–43) can be reconstructed on the northern corner. It is assumed that an entrance was located near room 30.

The main reception hall seems to have been *exedra* 45 which opened onto the courtyard with columns in antis. Space 30 is the second largest room and possibly played an important role in formal activities. 45 and 30 were set symmetrically on the long axis of the peristyle. This visual link between the two reception rooms emphasises their

[440] Dörpfeld 1907. Dörpfeld's article is a preliminary report that presents the excavation results and a complete publication of the building is still lacking. See also Wulf 1999, 168–169 and Radt 1999, 98–99 for brief descriptions of the house.
[441] Dörpfeld suggested a second century BC date for the first construction phase, but in a later survey pottery finds under mosaic floors in rooms 38 and 39 indicated the first century BC (Wulf 1999, 168, footnote 766).
[442] An inscription found in the house reveals that the consul Attalos Paterklianos from Pergamon was its owner in the late Roman era.
[443] Dörpfeld 1907, 176. Dörpfeld implies that space 39 was a later reconstruction, but describes its mosaic floor together with rooms 37 and 38. Pinkwart and Stammnitz regard it as of later date than the first building phase and for this reason restore the plan without this corridor.

significance and is a common feature among Roman houses from the second–first century BC onwards. This element together with the Roman date of the interior walls in spaces 30–32 makes it likely that 30 was initially wider and not in alignment with 45. Wulf classifies spaces 36–38 on the northern side in the category of 'three-spaced group', but as 36 and 37 do not communicate with each other this term is rather inaccurate. In any case, the Macedonian type of three-spaced groups is absent from the Attalos house, while its existence in the acropolis palaces is doubtful. Mosaics of the first construction phase survive in rooms 37, 38 and 39 (it is unclear whether the latter is a room that was constructed in the second phase of the building). The mosaic in 39 is made of very small tesserae and depicts black, red and green triangles framed by a black and white wave-pattern band.[444] Similarly to the corridors from the houses of Pella that have already been examined, the design corresponds to the movement in that space. Rooms 37 and 38 were also paved with geometric mosaics. The surviving fragments depict black, white and blue lozenges framed by a red stripe, a polychrome wave-pattern band and a perspective meander band resembling the mosaics of the Pergamene palaces.

The examination of its form indicates that this house presents similarities with the palaces in the arrangement of spaces and decoration with mosaics. An unexpected element is the presence of the exedra (45), a space closed off only by two columns and accessible from the peristyle. This type of monumental entrance formation is completely absent from Palaces IV and V. A further feature that raises questions as regards the function of the elite Pergamene residences and the purpose of the palaces is the size of the house, which is not much smaller than Palace IV. If in Pergamon the palaces used as

[444] Dörpfeld 1907, 184.

models their Macedonian counterparts, why do they lack some of the monumental features found in Macedonia and why do they not differ significantly in grandeur from the Pergamene residences? The comparative analysis of three more houses below will elucidate this problem.

Another house with a peristyle is House III (690 m^2), which is located to the southwest of the Attalos House and House I *(Figures 4.36–4.38)* **(Cat. P7).** There seems to have been only one construction phase during the Hellenistic time in the second half of the second century BC, or in the early first century BC.[445] The entrance was located between spaces 1 and 11 to the East, and a secondary entrance existed to the north. It resembles the house of Attalos in its architectural plan, because it has two large halls open to the courtyard onto the narrow sides to the northwest and southeast (rooms 1 and 10). Both of them, however, were accessible from the peristyle through doors and not through columns in antis, and these doors were not in alignment. The northern side is formed by five smaller spaces of almost equal size, which all have access to the courtyard. For the same reason as in the previously examined house, I find it questionable that spaces 4–6 in House III can be called a 'three-spaced group';[446] these rooms do not communicate with each other and have their own doorway to the peristyle.

By contrast, a group of vestibule with two side-rooms of the type featuring Macedonian palace buildings was certainly present in House I (1030 m^2). This is the first

[445] Hence the likelihood that House III existed at the same time as palaces IV and V and when Attalid kings were still on power. Despite its irregular plan, the same material, a combination of andesite and limestone, has been used in all parts. This element is telling of the contemporaneity of the rooms. The material, the finds, and similarities of construction technique with House II are the dating elements for House III (Pinkwart and Stammnitz 1984, 19).
[446] This term is used by Wulf (1999, 183).

example of this type of spaces found in Pergamon **(Cat. P5).** It is located at the northern portico (spaces 6–8), where the walls are preserved in a maximum height of 6–7 m *(Figures 4.36 and 4.39)*.[447] Only the northern part of the house survives and can be studied. Its construction history seems to be similar to the House of Attalos and House II with one Hellenistic (second century BC) and one Roman phase. The main entrance (13) permitted access from street H to the east. In this part the arrangement of spaces was somewhat peculiar with a group standing separate from the peristyle courtyard. The columns of the vestibule entrance belong to the first construction phase, but the interior walls of these rooms are a later Roman addition and the exact form of this part in its first phase is unknown.[448] Pinkwart and Stammnitz reconstruct it with a similar vestibule to the south that leads into a side room suggesting that the initial form was a courtyard with four columns.[449] The large space formed between the two vestibules was a courtyard open to the peristyle. Radt accepts this reconstruction and maintains that this secondary courtyard with the surrounding spaces indicates the wealth of the owner and is associated with commercial needs and the market, which was located in a short distance to the east.[450] This space does assign monumentality in the entrance, but it is unknown whether it relates to activities in the Agora and any interpretation of its purpose should be tentative.

An element that deserves attention is the Ionic order of the peristyle. Ionic bases and capitals have been recovered from the courtyard and the apertures for their

[447] Dörpfeld 1902 and 1904.
[448] Dörpfeld 1904, 117.
[449] Pinkwart and Stammnitz 1984, 38.
[450] Radt 1999, 102.

connection to the stylobate are preserved.[451] The type of this peristyle contrasts the examples we have examined so far, as the peristyle of the ground floor is usually Doric.[452] Apart from its size, the lavishness of this house may not have been inferior either from that of the palaces. Marble slabs in second use for the pavements during the Roman phase indicate that the house was possibly decorated with marble already in the Hellenistic era.

In House II (675 m^2) elements of monumentality are also present *(Figure 4.38)* **(Cat. P6).** The first is the vestibule with two side rooms (rooms 1–3) to the north with space 2 being an exedra with two columns in antis.[453] The latter gives access to room 3 but not to 1, therefore the group here has a simpler form than in House I. Second, a special treatment of the entrance with a vestibule (space 5) before the peristyle courtyard resembles House I. The rooms are arranged around the Doric peristyle at the northern and western porticoes. The main reception room is located to the southwest (room 6). In room 9 (12 m^2) the purpose of the pillar is unknown. It measures 0.50 x 0.50 m and is partially preserved in a height of 1.68 m. A possible explanation for the presence of the pillar in the centre of this space would be extra support for the roof. Yet due to the small size of the room this would not have been necessary. This element possibly implies that another floor existed above this part of the house and that there was a heavy installation such as a stair over room 9. Fragments of mosaics, which date from the mid-second century to the third quarter of the first century BC, have been found in this space but their arrangement

[451] Dörpfeld 1904, 118.
[452] The spatial configuration in the largest residences of the city with two-storeyed peristyles and Ionic order on the upper floor makes it likely that this element was also present in the palaces. Hoepfner (1996, 25) mentions as evidence for an upper floor the remains of a stair in room G, palace V, but this is not mentioned in the original publication. What the excavators report is a marble socle on a trachyte block, which could come from the marble *orthostates* of the walls.
[453] Pinkwart and Stammnitz 1984, 3.

in relation to the pillar is unknown (*Figure 4.41).* They depict ornamental bands with geometric motifs, present stylistic similarities with the mosaics from palaces IV and V, and also with the mosaics in spaces 38 and 39 in the House of Attalos. Due to their common orientation, the alignment of their walls on the east to west axis and the sharing of a *peristasis* between them, Houses I and II are most likely contemporary.

The analysis of the form of elite residences shows that palaces IV and V present similarities with the residences. They are close in size, spatial arrangement, decoration, and in both cases the buildings are separated by a peristasis.[454] Houses I and II were two distinct buildings and present strong affinities with Palaces IV and V *(Figure 4.42).* It is striking that the percentage of the courtyard surface to the whole building surface is identical between Palace IV and House II and between Palace V and House I *(Figure 4.43).* The palaces may have also been two separate buildings like Houses I and II with the same type of functions performed on a different scale. The peristyle courtyard of palace V and its halls are larger than in any other peristyle buildings excavated in the city. Hence it clearly presents the public element that suits a royal palace in a Hellenistic capital. Did its neighbouring Palace IV share any of this public character by being used for administrative and reception purposes, or was it simply the *oikos*, the residential section of the palace and possibly the section where banquets of small-scale for the closest to the king court members took place? Hoepfner makes a statement that contradicts the separation into public and private sections:

[454] Wulf classifies palaces IV–V and Houses I–II into the same category, which is peristyle houses with one hall, a group of three spaces and more main rooms (Wulf 1999, 186).

‘Houses II and III in Pergamon could have been in their original form parts of an ensemble, where the lower [in level] House III was the private section. It is, however, more possible that the houses in Delos and also in Pergamon did not present a horizontal, but a vertical division’.[455]

The scholar continues by referring to the upper floor as the section of private character and by concluding that only peristyle houses of the late fourth–early third century BC in Eretria were undoubtedly separated in a private and a public section. But if palaces IV and V are not merely the residential and the official section of one palace, there should be an explanation for constructing two buildings of palace form on the acropolis instead of a single large one.

The second interpretive problem as regards the Pergamene palaces is the relative lack of monumentality in comparison to the local residences and to royal palaces of the other major Hellenistic kingdoms. The Pergamene houses present morphological patterns found in the elite residences of Pella, such as the open on one side spaces that communicate through columns in antis with the porticoes, the groups of vestibule and two side-rooms and the mosaics. It is also likely that the formation of the entrances was better formulated than in palaces IV and V, by using vestibules. The Pergamene houses, therefore, appear as a link between the acropolis palaces and the elite residences of Pella. Palaces IV and V consequently adopt patterns found in elite houses and not in royal palaces. This phenomenon is not observed in the Antigonid or the Seleukid kingdoms, it is a distinctive feature of Attalid palaces and its interpretation requires good understanding of the development of peristyle buildings in Pergamon and an insight into the nature of the Attalid royal ideology.

[455] Hoepfner 1996–7, 37.

Discussion: The palace and the nature of Attalid government

Pfrommer has noted the more modest appearance of Palaces IV and V in comparison to Macedonia.[456] Nevertheless, his conclusion that these were not palaces in the real sense, but lavish residences, overlooks the criterion of administrative function and relies only on the degree of luxury. Even though there is a stronger connection in form between the Pergamene palaces and the Macedonian houses of the elite, rather than with the royal palaces, the purpose of IV and V as the royal seat of the kingdom is reflected in their decoration. The development of the manufacture of *emblemata* and the use of tesserae instead of pebbles, allowed a more sophisticated means of division of the floor in comparison to the Macedonian examples and recalls the mosaic floors from Shatby in Alexandria. Moreover, the iconography reflects the ideology of Attalid royal power: first, the masks and the garlands depicted in the mosaic of room H, Palace V, relate to worship of Dionysus, the patron deity of the Attalids.[457] Second, in case Hoepfner's theory about the context of the frieze is correct, the themes in the decoration of the intercolumnia in Palace V, and in particular the presence of Telephos, would be justified by the status of the mythical hero as the founder of Pergamon. His presence would emphasise the heroic past, since he had participated in the Trojan War protecting Mysia, the region around Pergamon, from Greek ambitions. However, as a son of Herakles and an Arkadian princess, he was of Greek origin. Hence his myth would facilitate the attempt of the Attalids to show their connection with the Greek Hellenistic cities and legitimise their

[456] Pfrommer 2004, 165.
[457] Agelidis 2012, 182. Schwarzer 2008, 92–93.

power in a region inhabited mainly by the indigenous population before the Hellenistic Age.[458]

In our evaluation of the relation to Macedonia and in order to interpret the purpose of Pergamene palaces, we must take into consideration that the different buildings of the *basileia* and their various phases were contemporary to different phases of the Macedonian palaces. The palace buildings in Pergamon can be chronologically divided into two main phases: the first covers the third century BC and finishes with the end of the reign of Attalos I (197 BC). In the end of his reign the eastern part of the fortified acropolis contained most likely Palace I, two arsenals and granaries to the far north and Buildings II and III. An additional structure that preceded the palaces of the time of Eumenes II was located under the eastern part of Palace V; it has been interpreted as barracks, but also slits for ventilation among the remains of the walls indicate that it functioned for the storage of grain.[459] The fortification wall of the city included the Upper Agora and small residences without a peristyle courtyard to the southeast of and very close to the main gate of the acropolis.[460] Therefore, it seems that until the early second century, the royal seat (Building Ia) was clearly distinct and preeminent. Building III on the acropolis possibly precedes Building Ia and presents a different form.

During this phase the royal seats in Macedonia were fully developed and very close to their final form. The palaces in Aegae and Pella included all the excavated peristyles with their modifications, while the palace in Demetrias consisted of Section B

[458] Scheer 2003, 223; Kosmetatou 2003, 167.
[459] Radt 1999, 74.
[460] The excavated examples, however, are too inadequate to reconstruct their exact form. For these houses see Wulf 1999, 153–157.

and the initial Section A *(Figure 4.4)*. It is important to note that if this was a pre-Hellenistic structure, then for their palaces the Attalids rejected the type of space used by their local predecessors in terms of spatial arrangement. They adopted the popular type of the peristyle building known from Macedonia in order to represent royal power, and this is an element of cultural continuation with their place of origin.

The second phase starts with the reign of Eumenes II and its limit is 133 BC, when the Attalid kingdom passed under Roman control. During that time the buildings on the eastern part of the acropolis were the six arsenals (and possibly granaries) to the north, barracks built over the former Building Ia, Palaces IV and V, and Building VI, which possibly functioned as magazines and barracks. It is not known whether Buildings II and III were still in use. Eumenes II constructed a new wall to fortify the city, which expanded to the south during his reign. The Lower Agora and the peristyle houses that I analysed above belong to this phase. The buildings located at the western part of the acropolis were the Sanctuary of Athena with a library in the temenos, the theatre and possibly gardens. Together with the palaces they formed the Pergamene *basileia*. Palaces IV and V must coincide chronologically with the last phase of the palace in Demetrias, this is the tetrapyrgion (Section A), Sections B and C.

Although the Antigonid royal seats were readily available as sources of spatial patterns for the Attalid palaces, the analysis of the latter shows that they did not simply copy the Macedonian examples. On the one hand, the existence of a peristyle and the direct access of the majority of spaces to it recall the palaces in Macedonia. On the other hand, the arrangement of space is adapted to the landscape, especially to the limited

available space between the fortification and the central street. The Attalids chose to convert Building Ia into barracks and construct a new palace further to the southeast, instead of expanding the old one. The second option would have produced a larger structure than the complex IV–V, as there was more space available in that part of the acropolis, as it becomes evident later with the construction of the Trajaneum.[461] Moreover, the accessibility patterns in palaces IV and V are simpler than in the Macedonian examples *(Diagrams 7, 8).* A first reason for choosing a relatively modest form for their royal palaces, possibly relates to a priority in defense installations than residential and administrative, especially after the expansion of the kingdom by Eumenes II. For this reason by the mid second century BC the acropolis had a strong military character with arsenals and barracks from its southern side to its northernmost edge. This might be an explanation for choosing to construct barracks with large spaces for hosting soldiers in the area of the former palace (Building Ia) and not constructing a new large palace in that location. This need may well also be the reason for having two separate peristyle buildings forming the palace (IV and V) and not a larger one: The plan to modify Building Ia into barracks created the need to construct a new palace. However, if IV and V had been constructed together, this would have meant that the old barracks under V could have no longer been used and no space to house soldiers would be available. It is therefore likely, that IV was constructed first and used initially as a palace serving the whole set of essential residential and administrative functions, while its neighbouring barracks remained in use until Building Ib was completed, and then the additional section of the palace (V) was built. By comparison with the site of Karasis we

[461] The excavation of the remains under the later Trajaneum has shown that they date later than Palaces IV and V, something that proves that there was indeed empty space to the south of Palace I for an extension (Raeck et al. 2002 and Raeck 2004).

can gain an idea about numbers of soldiers on the Pergamene acropolis. It has been estimated that just the lower section of the fortification of the site on Karasis could house about 200–240 soldiers in its small lodgings.[462] The site is much smaller and of different purpose than the city of Pergamon, but the strong military element is present in both cases. In Pergamon the garrison would have been much larger; according to Hansen the widest of the five arsenals on the northern tip of the acropolis had space to store enough food supplies for about one thousand men for one year.[463] A large number of soldiers would have necessitated sufficient lodgings; it would have been reasonable, therefore, to construct Building Ib, Palaces IV and V in stages until the erection of Ib ended. A strict functional distinction of IV and V in a later stage is likely, but remains unconfirmed.

Apart from the military character of the Attalid state and the need for defense, another explanation for its type of palaces might be the ideas that formulated the image of the powerful king and the maintenance of his government. After the victories against the Galatians during the reign of Attalos I, the Attalids expressed their power in monumental constructions such as the Athena sanctuary with the votive monuments commemorating their military achievements and the Great Altar. These building projects reflected the message of the kings in their exterior form and were located very close to the palaces. For this reason, monumentality in the exterior of Palaces IV and V may not have been essential. Moreover, scholarship has demonstrated that a fundamental element of the Attalid royal political agenda was to designate the image of the king as benefactor and of

[462] Radt 2011, 53.
[463] Hansen 1947, 214.

the royal family as a protector of the Pergamene society.[464] Such attitude and especially a subtle way of imposing royal authority more by accentuating the benefits for the people than the material preeminence of the rulers may have led to the adoption of simple forms for the palaces, forms that were also found in the houses at the lower part of the city. This possibly indicates smaller social discrepancies than in other kingdoms between the king and the members of the elite as well as among the elite, and encourages the suggestion that the social position of nobles was higher, or at least was allowed to appear higher. The form of royal seats and residences shows that this was a feature primarily of the second century BC, because earlier the palace on the acropolis (Building Ia) was clearly the most imposing residential/administrative building in the city. At this point, however, one cannot tell with certainty why this relationship between king and elite might have changed and it could be attributed to wealth emerging from trade or from a structural change in the organisation of the court. The next chapter deals with similar interpretive issues in the empire of the Seleukids and contributes in clarifying whether there was indeed greater equality between king, courtiers and subjects under the Attalids in comparison to Macedonia and the Seleukids. Cases like second century Pergamon, where there is no explicit attempt to distinguish the palace of the ruler from the residences of the elite by means of dimensions, accentuate the importance of evaluating the purpose of palatial architecture in connection with the local ideals on royal power and concepts for its establishment and maintenance.

[464] Kosmetatou 2003, 169. Kosmetatou, in particular, suggests that the Attalids, who were deified only posthumously, retained their power upon the citizens by stressing their role as benevolent providers for the 'common man'.

CHAPTER 5: HELLENISTIC PALACES IN ASIA BEYOND THE TAURUS MOUNTAINS

Seleukid royal palaces: reuse, innovation and interpretive approaches

Directions of scholarship

Despite the fluctuation of its boundaries over time, the Seleukid Empire was spatially much larger than the Pergamene kingdom. The Seleukid Empire emerged from the beginning of the rivalry of the Successors, unlike Attalid rule, and lasted longer.[465] In contrast to Macedonia and Pergamon, the king was not based in a capital city, but exercised his governance accompanied by his court in whichever major city he resided at a specific time.[466] The royal palaces in these cities are known from written sources, but material evidence revealing their form has in most cases not been recovered. The surviving remains of buildings comparable with the palaces examined in the previous chapters are located in sites that did not function as capital cities for the empire. It is likely the local administrators of these cities used these buildings as their seats. The duties of these officials were to control the civic and the military organisation in the most important cities of each Seleukid province. Their seats were a material reflection of the

[465] Already in the last quarter of the second century the Seleukid kingdom was a client-state of the Romans and in 63 BC Seleukid rule came to an end with the foundation of the Roman province of Syria. Recent studies on the history of Seleukid rule with previous bibliography are Capdetrey 2007 and Ehling 2008.

[466] Due to this practice the Seleukid court is regarded as a 'moving court' (Capdetrey 2007, 374; Strootman 2011, 71).

administrative organisation of the Empire: the officials were expected to control the area, implement the royal agenda and at the same time protect the interests of the city. In some cases the autonomous power grew to the point of rebellion.[467] Although a clear picture of the palaces of the kings is lacking, these secondary seats offer an insight into the gradual change in the utilisation of palace architecture by the ruling elite and connected with their political agenda, and the legitimisation and maintenance of power. This change is expected to have occurred in the course of the long period from the conflicts between the Diadochs and the establishment of their government to the increased Roman pressure and final subjugation.

The nature of the cultural identity of the Seleukid Empire, an identity strongly bound with the ideology of monarchical power, is an issue that scholarship has attempted to clarify since the earliest specialised studies on Seleukid history.[468] In the first half of the twentieth century the trend that dominated the study of the eastern part of the Hellenistic World was 'Hellenisation', an interpretive concept that accentuated the Hellenic character of Seleukid rule.[469] This approach regarded the intentional introduction of Greek/Macedonian political institutions and cultural elements by the ruling authorities in the East as the means of establishment of the new government after the Age of Alexander. In its extreme form it expressed the idea of transmission of elements from the culturally developed West to the less progressed East, a view fostered by colonialist and imperialist ideologies prevalent in the time these early historical

[467] Strootman 2011, 83–85 and Ramsey 2011. On the overall system of Seleukid administration see Bickermann 1938 and Capdetrey 2007, 112–130 and 229–283.
[468] Bevan 1966 [1902]; Bouché Leclercq 1913–14.
[469] For the problem of Hellenisation and imperialist theories in the study of Seleukid history see Sherwin White 1987, 3–5; Sherwin White and Kuhrt 1993, 141–149.

studies emerged. The influential work of Sherwin White and Kuhrt in the 1980s and 90s, and a series of articles earlier by other scholars criticised the role of 'Hellenisation' as a phenomenon that determined the nature of the Seleukid Empire.[470]

The two scholars demonstrated that cultural continuity in Asia from the Achaemenids to the Seleukids did exist: the latter did not only accept cultural elements of the East, which included old Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid traits, but also patronised local traditions, especially in the religious sphere, in order to strengthen their political position.[471] Even though this alternative interpretive approach correctly demonstrated the role of the East in the creation of cultural identity of the Seleukid Empire and sparked new interpretive perspectives, it has also led to somewhat extreme conclusions that risk ignoring the significance of the Hellenic aspect of Seleukid rule.[472] Other scholars have suggested the co-existence of agents of the Hellenic culture, primarily administrators, mercenaries and the ruling elite, with local peoples who continued practicing their own traditions without the two groups inhibiting each other.[473]

The study of palatial space could not have remained unaffected by the above standpoints. In her 1994 book Nielsen emphasised the eastern elements in the morphology of the Hellenistic palaces, while in her article 'Oriental Models for

[470] Oelsner 1978; Kuhrt and Sherwin-White 1987 (eds); Briant 1990; Sherwin White and Kuhrt 1993.
[471] For an example of the stance of the Seleukids on local religious traditions see Kuhrt, A. and S. Sherwin White 1991.
[472] For instance, in the beginning of their seminal study Sherwin White and Kuhrt refer to the Seleukid Empire as an 'eastern empire', something that is their 'firmly held view' (Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993, 1).
[473] Fowler 1998, 137; Strootman 2007, 291.

Hellenistic Palaces?' she made this view more explicit.[474] This brings her approach close to the model developed by Sherwin White and Kuhrt. According to Nielsen, a basic element that indicates a connection of Hellenistic palaces with their Neo-Babylonian, Egyptian and Achaemenid counterparts is the presence of parks in the area of the *basileia* and gardens in the peristyle courtyards.[475] As we have already seen in the present study, however, the existence of peristyle gardens in Macedonia and Pergamon is in most cases unlikely. As regards the Seleukid palaces in particular, a recent paper by Winfried Held aimed to shed more light on their form.[476] The scholar focused on royal palaces in the capital cities, namely the cases that are known from textual evidence. Based on this information he placed the palaces into their urban context and examined the *basileia* together with the layout of major Seleukid cities such as Babylon, Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris, Antioch-on-the-Orontes and Seleukeia-Pieria, and of Ai Khanoum, the Bactrian capital. Held accentuated the eastern character of the Seleukid *basileia*, whose form relied on architectural patterns in the same way the Achaemenids followed specific patterns for their own palaces. Held clearly stated his conclusion:

'The Seleukid kings consciously legitimised themselves as rulers in Mesopotamian and Persian tradition'.[477]

Nevertheless, if we take into account other categories of Seleukid material culture, the procedures of fostering the royal public image seem to have been far more complex than using a single source, whether we regard this source as Hellenic or

[474] Nielsen 1994, 112–129 and 1996.
[475] Nielsen 2001.
[476] Held 2002.
[477] Ibid. 2002, 247 (translation from German by author).

Eastern. Fowler's study demonstrated that in coinage the Seleukids chose to distance themselves from the Achaemenids; on the other hand, Seleukid patronage of Babylonian cults was strong and Persian kingly titulature was used (even if scarcely).[478] The multifaceted nature of Seleukid institutions justifies Fowler's view of the debate 'Hellenisation vs. Babylonian' as a simplistic one.[479] Recent historical work on the Hellenistic court society has also demonstrated that persistence in the Greek-Macedonian or Eastern aspect of the Seleukid royal ideology is an approach of limited interpretive potential; restrictions and perhaps compromises in the Hellenic character of the court to balance royal power with local elites did not mean the court structure was closer to the Neo-Babylonian or Achaemenid system than to the Greek/Macedonian. Centralised control was a political institution brought from Macedonia and applied to the existing satrapal administration system, and as the ancient historian Rolf Strootman has noted, 'limited' Hellenism was a prime element that secured the stability of the Empire.[480] Power legitimisation and maintenance require strategies that use many visual media and the palaces were only one of them.[481]

Former Achaemenid centres

[478] Kuhrt and Sherwin White 1991; Fowler 1998; Erickson 2011. Fowler and Hekster note that only the title 'Great King' was used by some of the Seleukids, but the title 'King of Kings' is completely absent from the record (Fowler and Hekster 2005, 141–143).
[479] Fowler 1998, 139.
[480] Strootman 2011, 66 and also McKenzie 1994, 64. Kuhrt and Sherwin-White have also demonstrated that the type of monarchy in Seleukid and other Hellenistic kingdoms cannot be regarded with certainty as more absolute than in Macedonia (Sherwin White and Kuhrt 1993, 119).
[481] For the variety of these possible sources, their categorisation and significance see Kropp 2008, 7.

The origins of Seleukid palace architecture is not the only aspect I intend to discuss in this section. Understanding the manner in which palaces were used and the purposes they served is as important as defining possible paths of cultural interaction and is in fact a prerequisite for this definition. Indeed, the Seleukids resided in and governed from both newly founded cities and former Achaemenid centres. In literary evidence, kings appear to be reusing the palaces of their Persian predecessors and in some cases this comes into agreement with the archaeological record. The extent of modification in these buildings cannot be determined, however, with certainty. The Achaemenids used as their bases the cities of Susa, Ekbatana, Persepolis, Pasargadae and Babylon *(Figure 1.1)*. The latter was also the place of death of Alexander and in an account of the first century AD it is reported that his body was placed in the palace, where mourning took place:

> Nobiles pueri corporis eius adsueti nec doloris magnitudinem capere nec se ipsos intra vestibulum regiae tenere potuerunt.
>
> The high-born boys who were his regular guard could neither contain the greatness of their grief nor keep themselves within the vestibule of the royal quarters.[482]

This indicates that there was possibly a vestibule in the entrance either of the *basileia*, if there was a complex of buildings, or at the entrance of a specific building where Alexander's body laid. It might also simply refer to a space functioning as a vestibule to this room.

Seleukos I also resided in Babylon, which was the only major administration seat until he founded Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris, while many of his successors stayed there for

[482] Curt. 10.5.8.

certain periods of time.[483] Reuse of the Neo-Babylonian palaces of the city is confirmed by the archaeological evidence as well as by cuneiform texts. The excavations in the Neo-Babylonian 'Summer Palace' at the northern part of the city revealed fragments of stucco decorated with painted vegetal motifs and possibly human figures, pavements, roof-tiles, and palmette antefixes that may date to the Seleukid era.[484] The building was located on a very high terrace of about 18 m and may have functioned as a citadel *(Figure 5.1).* The addition of a peristyle during the Hellenistic era is very likely judging from the roof-tiles found in the courtyard and a similar modification that undoubtedly took place in House I in the city during its Seleukid phase of construction.[485] It seems therefore, that alterations towards a more familiar Macedonian-Hellenic form did occur and these were applied in decoration, pavements, and the form of courtyards. The cuneiform sources, and more specifically astronomical diaries, indicate that the palace in Babylon was used until at least 125/124 BC and its primary function was defense and storage of valuable commodities.[486] The texts do not clarify whether they refer to the Summer Palace or the so-called Südburg, the second building that may have been re-used. They do give, however, an insight into the role of the palace as the architectural setting of conspiracies and rivals for power: a revolt against the Seleukid king appears to have taken place in 235 BC organised by the elite that resided in the palace. This incident is indicative of the power a local administrator and his entourage could obtain.

[483] About the history of Babylon under the rule of Alexander and the Seleukids see Oelsner 1986 and Boiy 2004.
[484] Wetzel 1957, 24; Schimdt 1941, 820-829. Similar fragments of wall plaster and pavements have also been recovered in the so-called Persian Building in the Main Palace to the south-west of the Summer Palace (Koldewey 1931, 120).
[485] In the house it was found that the unplastered parts of the courtyard floor corresponded to the space that was covered by the roof of the peristyle, whose columns might have been wooden (Reuther 1926, 92).
[486] These sources are astronomical diaries, cited in detail in Boiy 2004, 93.

Susa is another former Achaemenid centre used by the Seleukids, but it is less clear whether its significance was equal to Babylon. Strabo reports its importance as a city with a treasury in the time of Alexander and the preference of the king to reside not there, but in Babylon.[487] In addition, literary evidence and the results of the excavations at the site indicate that the city was not used as a major administrative centre by the Seleukids and also the lack of systematic occupation at least in the third century BC.[488] On the other hand, there is both archaeological and textual evidence indicating that the Seleukids re-founded the city as Seleukeia-on-the-Eulaios and re-used the Achaemenid palaces. Flat tiles, palmette antefixes, and battens have been recovered in the so-called Donjon palace in the southeastern part of the 'Ville royale' and the Chaour palace (so-called after the Chaour river, constructed under the rule of Artaxerxes II) in the western part of the city *(Figure 5.2).*[489] The strongest piece of evidence is the inscription of a honorific statue of the late third century BC found in the Donjon palace:

Λέων καὶ οἱ ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἡγεμόνες καὶ | στρατιῶται Ἀρήτην Τίμωνος τοῦ | ἐπὶ τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ Ἀθηνοῦς θυγατέρα.

Leon and the officers of the troops under his command and the soldiers (dedicate) Arete, the daughter of Timon, who was an officer in the king's court, and of Atheno.[490]

[487] Strabo 15.3.3–9.
[488] Martinez Sève 2002, 49–51.
[489] Boucharlat 2001, 120; Martinez Sève 2002, 37 (in favour of the reuse of the Chaour palace); Boucharlat 2010, 380–383.
[490] Translation by author. The inscription was published in Cumont 1932, 272–274. It is found on the abacus of a capital, which possibly crowned the base of the statue of Arete. The fragment was in second use as building material during the Sassanian period. See also Canali de Rossi 2004, 101 no. 183 and for the grammar and translation of this type of inscriptions Ma 2006, 207–209. Cumont mistakenly translates the accusative Ἀρήτην as 'to Arete', while the correct is 'Arete' denoting a statue of her. It is not known whether the context of the statue was funerary or it was set up on a different occasion.

The title of Arete's father indicates the presence in Susa of court personnel. Even if the city played a secondary role in royal administration, the Persian palaces may have been used primarily not by the king and his court, but by the chief magistrate of the city.[491] It is possible the significance of the city as a royal centre decreased after the late third century (the date of the inscription) and that after a point only the local governor used the palaces.

When Strabo refers in the same passage to the Persian palaces in Persepolis, and Pasargadae he states:

> These were the palaces in the time of the empire of the Persians, but the kings of later times used others, naturally less sumptuous, since Persis had been weakened, not only by the Macedonians, but still more so by the Parthians.[492]

For this reason Strootman has with certainty rejected the existence of a Seleukid palace in these two cities.[493] Indeed Alexander had burnt down the palace in Persepolis, therefore we would not expect to find any evidence for Seleukid occupation, something that archaeological evidence confirms.[494] The archaeological record in Pasargadae has not so far indicated Seleukid presence in the old palaces of the Achaemenids. Nevertheless, the fact that Strabo mentions the Parthians makes unclear whether the 'later kings' refers to the Seleukids or only to the Arsacid kings. Moreover, the evidence from Susa contradicts Strabo's statement and makes the conclusion against re-occupation of the royal seat in Pasargadae less certain.

[491] For these reasons Boucharlat's assumption that the Seleukid governor in Susiana resided in these palaces is highly likely (Boucharlat 2010, 383).
[492] Strabo 15.3.3.
[493] Stootman 2007, 71 and footnote 79.
[494] For the archaeological and textual evidence about the destruction of the palace and the city of Persepolis see Hammond 1992.

In case of Ekbatana the ancient authors present inconsistent information. Polybios on the one hand states that the Macedonians simply pillaged the precious metal from the Persian palace.[495] Strabo, however, reports that both the Achaemenids and the Macedonians used the palace as a winter residence.[496] The author may refer only to the period of the campaign of Alexander and not to the Seleukids, but in the absence of material evidence we are unable to clarify the situation. Other cities of the former Achaemenid Empire with palaces that according to textual evidence were reused by Seleukid governors were Sardis, Tambrax in the province of Hyrkania, and Opis.[497]

The new settlements

The examination of the nature of palaces in the newly-founded capital cities, to the degree that this is possible and on the basis of literary evidence, sheds more light on the attitude of the Seleukids towards Hellenic and eastern models for the formation of palatial buildings. For Antioch it seems that most scholars have adopted the view first expressed in the nineteenth century that a palace existed on an island in the river Orontes *(Figure 5.3).*[498] This piece of information functions as a major argument in Held's study to support his view that in Antioch and Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris the rulers chose an

[495] Polyb.10.27.7–13.
[496] Strabo 11.13.5. For the problems of research in Ekbatana see Boucharlat 1998. The scholar claims that a Seleukid governor's palace may have existed in the city (ibid. 184).
[497] For the Hellenistic period in Sardis see Hanfmann, Robert, and Mierse 1983, 109–139. Polybios (10.31.5) mentions that a royal palace existed in Tambrax, which at the time of Antiochos III's besieging was used by the Parthians. As regards Opis, at least Alexander appears to have resided in the city palace *(Arr. Anab.* 7.5.7–7.10.11*).*
[498] Nielsen 1994, 112–115; Held 2002, 242–243; Hoepfner 2004, 6–7. Criticism of this theory and references to 19th century commentaries on Strabo's passage are found in Downey 1961, 641.

eastern type of royal seat. It relies on a passage by Libanius that refers to the island as having its own fortification wall and accommodating 'the new palace'. This is interpreted as the palace the Seleukids built after the construction of their first palace in Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris. In reality, what Strabo reports in his account is that four parts constructed in different phases during the Hellenistic Age formed the city of Antioch. The palace was equal in scale to those in Alexandreia and Seleukeia, but the author does not provide any information about its location or fortification, if there was any.[499] Other sources earlier than the first century AD mention that a palace existed but without specifying its location.[500] Josephus describes the rebellion of the Antiochenes against Demetrios II and in his account it seems there were wooden houses around the palace.[501] In particular, the Jews who assisted Demetrios fought from the roofs of the royal quarters and by throwing missiles on the Antiochenes they managed to 'drive them out of the adjoining houses', which were densely arranged and quickly caught fire.[502] In contrast to Held's suggestion, this element makes it more likely the palace in the second century BC was located in a more central area in the city than on an island defined by the Orontes and artificial water channels. The effectiveness of the Jews can also have been a result of the palace being located on a higher level than the houses, such as on a low hill. In addition, the houses appear to have been adjoined to the palace, a feature that does not match a reconstruction with the *basileion* being separated by the water channels. As Glanville Downey's meticulous study of the literary evidence about the city of Antioch has demonstrated, the only sources that refer to a palace on an island come from a much

[499] Lib. *Orationes* 11.206. Held mentions (without providing a reference) that Strabo refers to a palace on an island, but this is absent in the author's account about Antioch. Strabo simply reports that there was a palace in the city, but does not talk about its location (Strabo 16.2.4–5).
[500] Diod. Sic. 33.4, Joseph. *AJ* 13.129–142, *I Maccabees* 11.45.
[501] Joseph. *AJ* 13.137–139.
[502] Ibid. 13.138.

later era than the Hellenistic and the earliest possible date for a palace located on an island is Trajan's rule in the second century AD.[503] Moreover, this location is possible only if we accept its proximity to the hippodrome, the only building that undoubtedly existed on this island.

Strootman and Nielsen regard the existence of a palace in Daphne, a small city about forty stadia (or 8 km) outside Antioch as highly likely.[504] According to Strabo and Polybios, the city had a large forest with water springs, where a temple of Apollo and Artemis was located, and a theatre.[505] This sanctuary was a centre of public festivals for the population in the area of Antioch. Even though we do not know anything about the location or form of a palace in Daphne, this is a case that raises questions about the relationship of a capital city, Antioch in this case, with a neighbouring town that possibly had monumental buildings. It is reported that during a cult festival of Adonis and Artemis which included athletic games, Antiochos IV organised a banquet for 9000 people.[506] It is expected the palace would have provided space for a part of the attendants, at least for the entourage of the king. We cannot exclude of course that a temporary pavilion near the sanctuary or tents would have catered for dining. The case of Daphne further raises questions about the relationship between Pella and Aegae in Macedonia, with Pella possibly being the capital and Aegae the religious and ceremonial centre of the kingdom.

[503] Downey 1961, 644.
[504] Nielsen 1994, 115 and also see Strootman 2007, 64 with references to textual evidence about Daphne.
[505] Strabo 16.2.6; Pol. 30.25–26.
[506] Polyb. 30.25–26. Also Nielsen 1994, 115 and Strootman 2007, 308.

We would also expect that there was a palace complex in Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris, since the city was one of the most important in the Empire and Seleukos I founded and used it as his governing centre. It is likely the royal quarters used the palaces of Babylon and Alexandreia as models, a view that Held maintains.[507] Both are possible sources of inspiration simply because they were constructed before Seleukeia. The palace might have been located at the northeastern part of the city by the river, because it would have followed the layout of Babylon and the presumed palace on the island in Antioch *(Figure 5.4).*[508] Another argument according to Held for the use of Babylonian tradition as the primary source of inspiration is that the Seleukid palaces followed a pattern that characterises their Babylonian and Achaemenid predecessors: construction on the riverbank and channels surrounding the royal quarters. Due to the extremely scanty nature of the available evidence on the location and form of the new royal Seleukid palaces, however, we need to be more cautious before drawing definite conclusions. Even if this was indeed the practice, the separation of palace and city does not feature only in the palaces of the East; as I demonstrated in chapters 2 and 4, in Macedonia and Pergamon the palace was constructed on the acropolis or a hill, a location that elevated the palace in a dominant position within the city.[509] The choice of isolating the palace by water channels may have been a solution serving a similar purpose in cities whose landscape is flat, such as Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris. Moreover, the architectural fragments discovered in the northwestern area of Seleukeia present a hybridised form

[507] Held 2002, 228.
[508] Held 2002, 228–236.
[509] In an article that clearly attributes Seleukid palaces to Oriental models, Held surprisingly regards the separation of the palace from the rest of the city as a practice that was alien to Macedonians (Held 2004, 24).

between Hellenic and Achaemenid models.[510] Besides, in case of Babylon archaeological evidence is telling of the use of the Summer Palace by the Seleukids, which was located on much higher level than the city; therefore the practice of occupying the highest available terrain had not been abandoned. In consequence, the use of Hellenic elements in the newly constructed palaces must not be underestimated, something we also observed in the cases where they reused old Neo-Babylonian and Persian palaces.

In the following sections I investigate the position of the surviving palaces within the system of Seleukid administration and the complex framework of royal display without taking the prevalence of Greek or Achaemenid character as a given. Even if the layout of the cities and the position of the palaces corresponded to older local practices in the region, the question of architectural form and function is a factor that also needs to be addressed. This is possible only by studying seats of Seleukid officials in the Empire and kings in minor kingdoms, which emerged in peripheral territories. Their research value lays in their territorial and chronological variety. The earliest case study, the 'Governor's Palace' in Jebel Khalid, dates to the first half of the third century BC, whereas the latest, the royal palace of Samosata in the minor kingdom of Kommagene, to the early first century BC. In addition, the study of Seleukid palatial buildings reveals how the type of the palace was used in an area with high diversity of population, but with rulers whose ideology of kingship originated from the same source, namely the monarchical institutions of Macedonia.

[510] Held 2002, 228–231.

Seats of Seleukid local administrators and the palace-fortress

Jebel Khalid

The site of Jebel Khalid **(Cat. S1)** is located on the west bank of the Euphrates in North Syria about 180 km east of ancient Antioch *(Figures 5.5–5.6).* It is one of several Seleukid cities on the Euphrates that have been investigated, the closest others being Seleukeia Zeugma-Apameia about 80 km to the northwest and Dura-Europos about 250 km to the southeast. The excavation project began in the 1980s and is in progress.[511] It has revealed residential and public sectors of a city that sits on an oblong rock formation with a palatial building on the acropolis (approximately 20000 m^2) to the south. Jebel Khalid is a fortress with the acropolis as its stronghold. The city is fortified with a 2.7 km long circuit wall, while a second wall (0.7 km in perimeter) encloses the acropolis. An impressive number of about 30 towers facilitated control and defense of the area. The gate of the city at the western section of the circuit wall, a temple (area B) that combines Greek and Mesopotamian elements, a building identified as possibly a gymnasium (area C), and a residential block have also been excavated. Construction features together with the recovered pottery and numismatic evidence indicate the first building phase in all cases was the first half of the third century. The fortification and the temple date to the first quarter of the third century and this is when the city was founded as a military settlement.[512]

[511] The excavation reports are found in the issues of *Mediterranean Archaeology* from 1994 to 2010. See also Clarke 2001; Clarke and Conor 2002; Jackson 2006, 2009[a], 2009[b]; Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011.

[512] For the fortifications see Connor and Clarke 1996/7, 166–71 and Clarke and Conor 2002, 1–15. For the temple Clarke 2003 and 2006/7, and also Clarke et al 2005, 128–135, 2008 and 2009/10. No earlier deposits have been found under the foundations of the Hellenistic buildings

Due to its location in the centre and on the highest point of the acropolis, its size (approximately 2920 m^2 in its final phase), monumental architectural features, and the accommodated functions, the building on the acropolis has correctly been identified a palace, as I will further support below *(Figure 5.7).*[513] Its resident would have been the Seleukid administrator of the city. The acropolis hill is about 100 m high; a feature that would allow effective control of the river and the surrounding area *(Figures 5.8–5.9).* The layout is familiar from the palatial buildings in Macedonia and Pergamon: the principal structural element is a peristyle courtyard (650 m^2) with 10 x 10 columns in the Doric order. Surviving fragments of triglyphs and metopes from the entablature preserve traces of red and blue paint *(Figures 5.10–5.12).*[514] Two clusters of spaces to the north and south and individual rooms of various sizes on the east and west surround the courtyard.

The exterior wall foundation in spaces 16–18 of the eastern side does not survive, and since the opening of the entrance to the palace has not been discovered in any of the other parts, this is its most likely location. In the restored plan of the palace, space 16 functions as the entrance vestibule. To the west it provided access to the peristyle

---

of the settlement, something that shows that there was no previous occupation at the site (Clarke 1994, 71–72). The earliest coins from Jebel Khalid are coins of Alexander that were issued in Antioch on the Orontes soon after his death, while the latest reach the two first centuries AD. The oldest stamped amphora handles that have been discovered in the site date in the beginning of the same century (Clarke and Conor 2002, 288; Clarke 2005). The majority of amphoras is of Rhodian origin, and reveals the commercial relations of the city.

[513] Total size calculated by author based on the dimensions of spaces given in the ground plan of the palace in Clarke 2001, Fig. 3.

[514] Clarke 2001, 219. A bell-shaped and approximately 6.6 m deep cistern in the southern part of the courtyard in proximity to the stylobate remains filled with debris that contains architectural fragments. It was partly excavated in 2006 and, as further research and the transfer of the material takes place, more evidence about the form and the purpose of the building is expected to become available (Clarke et al. 2008, 72–73).

courtyard via a step with a centrally placed column. Clarke refers to space 18 as an alternative but less likely position for the entrance.[515] This is a possibility, however, that deserves some more attention. The identification of space 16 as the entrance presents the following two problems: by entering the palace from 16 the column between the room and the courtyard would have interrupted the axial view towards the courtyard. Such visual restriction from the entrance is not found in any of the Macedonian or Pergamene palaces, cases whose form presents affinities with Jebel Khalid, as we will see below. A space associated with the entrance is, according to the excavator, room 15, presumably a guard lodge in charge of controlling the entranceway.[516] Nevertheless, the interpretation of equivalent spaces in the palaces of Aegae and Pergamon as guard lodges, as I discussed in the relevant chapters, is far from certain. By contrast, the alternative view that suggests function of 18 as the entrance corresponds to Pergamene palatial architecture, where monumental access does not seem to have been an essential element. In this case spaces 15–17 could have been a three-spaced group consisting of a vestibule and two side rooms in the arrangement that we find in the Macedonian and possibly the Pergamene palaces. As a consequence, space 16 can be interpreted as the vestibule providing access to this group, and the column on its entrance threshold would have indicated the significance of this spatial cluster. The significance of the room is also apparent in fragments of plaster in red, blue, black, green and white, which indicate wall decoration in Masonry Style. Other spaces on the eastern side are (13) and (14). The installations discovered show that they were used as a latrine and a washroom

[515] Clarke 2001, 238.
[516] Clarke ibid.

respectively. Their presence is an additional feature that shows the prominent character of the building and corresponds to its identification as the administrator's seat.[517]

The function of the rooms in the western part of the palace is not clear. Two Seleukid seal impressions were found at the lowest level of the floor in space 22. One depicts an anchor, which was an emblem of the royal treasury, and the other the god Zeus with sceptre and Nike.[518] The excavator interprets 22 as an administration space or an armoury. There is no evidence for the latter, while the seal impressions make it likely that 22 was used as an archive or treasury. 25 is a large open space, possibly a courtyard used for recreational purposes or exercise. Coins of Antiochos III found immediately above the foundations indicate this space was constructed later than the original phase of the building. To the west of room 22 the foundations for a series of spaces were set, but these remained incomplete.

The southern and northern clusters of spaces are separated from the courtyard by long vestibules 23 and 1 respectively. 23 extends over the full length of the courtyard and via two columns in antis permits access to a large room (20) *(Figure 5.13)*. The form of the entrance, the size (129 m^2), the fragments of flagstones from its pavement, and fragments of green and blue wall plaster that imitate coloured marble indicate space 20 was the main reception hall of the palace. The existence of two flanking rooms (19, 21) are reminiscent of the arrangement of large spaces in the palaces of Vergina (M1–3) and

[517] These finds are a latrine channel, walls dressed in lime mortar, fireplaces made of stone and mud that were used to heat water, and rubble partition walls.
[518] Clarke 2001, 242 and 2002. Clarke believes that they come either from sealed bags of coins, or from official documents. About writing on papyrus instead of clay in Seleukid Mesopotamia and the anchor as an emblem of Seleukid administration on seals see Invernizzi 2006.

Pella (Building I, northern section). 19 and 21 have been identified as spaces for food preparation: a storage pit, a raised hearth and a pit oven were found in 19 and two hearths in 21. It is not clear from the reports whether these installations come from the domestic reoccupation in the late Hellenistic era reported in other parts of the building.[519]

A second reception space is room 12 to the north, which is accessible from a long vestibule (1) as well as from rooms 5 and 10. The base of a tapering column that supported the ceiling has been found in situ in the centre of the floor *(Figure 5.14)*. The need for extra support in a space with a roof span of 11.36 m can be justified either by the lack of forests in the area that would provide suitable timber beams, a practice possibly followed in Macedonia for roofing large spans, or by the existence of an upper storey. The latter is more likely, because a second similar base has been found in this room and possibly comes from an upper floor.[520] Besides, space 20, whose span is larger, was roofed without an internal support, possibly due to the absence of an upper floor on that side. Coloured plaster fragments, some with vegetal motifs, indicate decoration in Masonry Style. Fragments of Ionic engaged columns have been found near the passageway between spaces 5 and 12 and in space 8 and may come from the upper floor. If these fragments, however, belonged to the entranceways between rooms 12 and 5, and 12 and 10, we would need to re-examine the possibility that originally 5 and 10 were not food preparation areas, but dining rooms that symmetrically flanked hall 12. The

[519] For example, the pit oven and storage installations in room 15 are identified as a later modification. A partition wall made of rubble has been reported for the northern part of room 21 running east-west (Clarke 2001, 240), but it is not depicted in the ground plan. The fragment of gold leaf found in this room is regarded as originating from space 20.

[520] Roof-tiles, nails in abundance and beams have been found all spaces of the palace except for space 3.

pavement in space 5 was made of black pebbles mixed with limestone chippings, while in 10 it is assumed that it was made of flagstones.[521]

It seems that apart from reception halls, coloured plaster also decorated the walls of service rooms; fragments of red, yellow and black bands come from room 6, which formed a storage and kitchen unit with spaces 4 and 5.[522] Even though rooms 8 and 10 were used for storage, as large pithoi and large amounts of pottery indicate, fragments of painted plaster are not absent.[523] The permeability map of the ground plan of the building demonstrates an image similar to the examples from Macedonia: the levels of permeability are seven, and the rooms that preserve elements of decoration are found in the fourth and the fifth level *(Diagram 6).* The upper storey was accessible from a stair in space 2. Room 3, located to the west of the reception hall complex, was an unroofed space. Its function was religious, as indicated by an altar found in situ to the southwest and ashy soil with bones.

Even though the original construction phase dates in the first half of the third century BC and the building presents evidence that confirms late Hellenistic residential reoccupation, the excavation reports do not clearly attribute the installations found in the various spaces of the palace to the original or the later phase. No possible architectural modifications after the third century have been reported either, except for courtyard 25 and a group of unfinished spaces on the southwest corner, and this ambiguity hinders the functional interpretation of the spaces.

[521] Clarke 2001, 227, 232.
[522] An oven has been found in room 6 (Clarke 2001, 227).
[523] Clarke 2001, 232.

Clarke concludes that the palace in Jebel Khalid combines Greek-Macedonian and eastern features; indeed vestibules 1 and 23 resemble the *pastas* in Greek houses with an example already examined here being the House of Dionysus in Pella (space 20) and possibly Palace IV in Pergamon. In addition, the outdoor space 3 with the altar is an easily accessible cult space integrated in the palace similarly to the palaces of Vergina (Tholos) and Pergamon (room H, Palace V) *(Figures 2.4c, 4.13).* By contrast, elements originating from the East are difficult to detect. Such an element is, according to Clarke, a garden that possibly existed in the peristyle courtyard because the foundation trench of the stylobate was filled with nitrogenous soil instead of stones or chips.[524] As we saw, however, in chapter 2, this trench has been now re-interpreted as an initial mistaken attempt to open the foundation trench of the stylobate; moreover, the excavator reports that there is evidence to conclude that the floor of the courtyard and the porticoes was paved with flagstones on an underlay made of clay mixed with limestone.[525] Thus, a peristyle garden that would indicate affinities with the East becomes even less likely.

Another argument for the use of eastern models is the off-centre openings from the peristyle to the long antechambers 1 and 23, which Clarke calls 'bent entrances' based on the terminology used by Nielsen.[526] This term, however, refers in Nielsen's study to the passageway from the entrance of the building to the peristyle and not to the way the peristyle communicated with other spaces. This passageway is called 'bent-entrance' when it does not connect directly the entrance of the building with the

[524] Clarke 2001, 217–218.
[525] Clarke 2002, 27. For the trench: B. Rowney, personal communication, May 15, 2010.
[526] Clarke 2002, 46; Nielsen 1994.

peristyle, but one had to turn or to pass through more spaces before reaching the courtyard.[527] Such an element is not observed in the palace of Jebel Khalid, whether the entrance was found in space 16 or 18.

The term 'broad-room' that Clarke uses for spaces 20 and 12 in order to demonstrate eastern patterns, is also problematic. The rectangular and not square shape of 20 and 12 is not an adequate feature in order to classify them as 'broad-rooms' of an eastern type, because large spaces of rectangular shape were also present in Pella and Pergamon.[528] In Jebel Khalid the building that clearly presents oriental elements in spatial layout and proportions is the temple. Even though it is amphiprostyle with six columns on the west and east facades, and despite the Doric elements of the colonnades, the ground plan is almost square and the interior is separated in a vestibule and a tripartite *adyton (Figure 5.15).*[529] In addition, traditional Doric elements are absent from the entablature. These features bring the building close to Mesopotamian temple tradition. This differentiation from the generally Hellenic character of the city implies the Seleukids chose eastern elements primarily for religious buildings and less for secular buildings. The same differentiation between religious and administrative buildings is a phenomenon that we will also see in Dura-Europos and Ai Khanoum in the present chapter.

[527] The terms 'bent entrance' and 'broad-room' come from scholarship on Babylonian temple architecture (Bietak 2003 with relevant references).
[528] Besides, the term 'broad-room' is somewhat ambiguous. Nielsen uses it for spaces that differ significantly in size and position than the other spaces in the building. As 'broad-rooms' she describes, for instance, both the long rectangular rooms that are flanked by much smaller spaces in the palace of Lachish and the largest space in the palace of Seuthopolis of the late fourth century BC (Nielsen 1994, 52 and 100); however, the two cases are completely different in terms of spatial design and it remains unclear what exactly a 'broad-room' in palace architecture is.
[529] Clarke 2006/7; Wright 2011.

The palace was not the only building on the acropolis. A structure with long narrow spaces is also being excavated to the northeast of the palace and is adjacent to the wall circuit; therefore, it is likely that it functioned as barracks/arsenal, or store-rooms in an arrangement that would resemble Palace Ia and Building Ib, or Palace V and Building VI on the acropolis of Pergamon.[530] Clarke considers the possibility that this was the residential section of the palace, but as the case of Palaces IV and V in Pergamon showed, this kind of distinction requires more substantial evidence. The palace in Jebel Khalid is contemporary or slightly older than the first structure that was possibly used as a palace on the Pergamene acropolis, Building Ia. In addition, it presents similarities in location and design with the later palaces in Pergamon. This indicates that the building in the Seleukid stronghold might have reflected the form of Building I from Pergamon.[531] Further investigation and especially the recovery and study of the architectural material from the cistern of the courtyard will lead to firmer conclusions about any affinities between the two cases.

The relationship of palace and houses in Pergamon becomes clear only in the second century BC, while in Pella it is evident also for the third century. Excavations at Jebel Khalid indicate the phenomenon of using the palace of the local authorities as a model for private residences occurred not only in the royal capitals, but also in cities ruled by appointed administrators. The houses in the residential block excavated to the north of the acropolis provide evidence that indicates the high social status of their

[530] Clarke at al. 2008, 70–72 and 2009/10, 215–218. The second building phase of this structure has been determined and it dates in the late third century.

[531] An element that is reminiscent of Pergamon is also found in the residential block that has been excavated in Jebel Khalid: the narrow channel (45 cm) formed between two walls on the northern side is a structural element similar to the *peristasis* of the Pergamene houses with the same function of insulation and additional support on sloping ground (Jackson 2009[a], 233).

occupants ('housing insula' in *Figure 5.6).*[532] They are organised around courtyards without a peristyle. The decoration, however, seems to follow elaborate decorative patterns found in Macedonia and possibly reflecting the painted walls of the palace on the acropolis. One of these houses, the House of the Painted Frieze, owes its name to the polychrome frieze that was part of its masonry-style painted decoration.[533] The surviving fragments come from the northern wall of its principal hall (space 19) *(Figure 5.16).* This space is flanked symmetrically to the east and west by four rooms arranged in groups of two and communicates with a *pastas* to the south. This section is very similar to the two *pastas* clusters organised around rooms 12 and 20 in the palace of the acropolis. The frieze dates to the second century BC and depicts erotes with goat-drawn chariots. The wall was also decorated with monochrome bands and panels of stucco in red, yellow and black *(Figures 5.17–18).* This house is the largest in the block in its second phase (second century BC), measuring 772 m^2, while in its first phase in the mid-third century it was smaller. By contrast to second century BC Pergamon, the palace here is considerably larger than this elite residence, something that implies a clear distinction of status. We should note, however, that there are more residential blocks in the city, which have not been excavated and their future investigation could change this image.

Mount Karasis

Mount Karasis is a steep ridge on the western part of the Taurus Mountains in the area of eastern Kilikia *(Figures 5.19–5.20).* Seleukid rule in the region, linking Anatolia and Northern Syria, was established in the early second century BC after long periods of

[532] Jackson 2009a, 231. The residential block has been studied by Heather Jackson and the final publication of the evidence is under preparation.
[533] Jackson 2009[a] and 2009[b].

Ptolemaic control that the Seleukids briefly interrupted during the first five Syrian Wars.[534] Karasis is located about 150 km to the northwest of Antioch and is accessible only from the south. The site, situated on the top of the mount with its highest point on 1056 m, had gone unnoticed until the mid-1990s **(Cat. S4).** The remains of a military settlement fortified by a 2.4 km long wall circuit was investigated and documented in a field survey project directed by the German Archaeological Institute (Istanbul Department) from 2003 to 2005.[535] Parts of the wall and its towers survive in a height of up to 16 m. The settlement consists of two parts, named the Lower and the Upper Castle, which are connected through a ramp, the area of which is called Middle Castle and is almost empty of buildings. Both the Lower and the Upper Castle contain large artillery towers, long casemated walls, simple small rectangular dwellings and cisterns. The Lower Castle includes a proteichisma at the southern part, while the wall continues to the north in a single line *(Figure 5.21).* Small dwellings and a water cistern served the needs of soldiers. Reliefs carved on blocks of the façade of Tower 4 on the side that faces the dwellings depict symbols of Seleukid military power, such as an elephant and a shield *(Figure 5.22).*

A building complex that covered a surface of about 4000 m^2 was the major construction of the Upper Castle *(Figure 5.23).* It consisted of two parts, both of which were defined by an inner courtyard. Each was accessible via a corridor at the northern side, while a large hall possibly for reception purposes was located to the east of the entrance *(Figure 5.24).* The building to the south was formed around a trapezoidal

[534] For the historical background of the region see Sayar 1999. Seleukid control lasted until about the death of Antiochos IV in 164 BC.
[535] Sayar 1995; Hoffmann and Sayar 2007; T. Radt 2009, 2010 and 2011.

courtyard, which was defined by spaces to the north and west. It owes its name, Banquet Building, to a series of rooms that had off-centre doors and may have been used for banquets. They varied in size and were arranged in groups (R0 and R1, R3 and K3, K1–4). K2–4 was a three-spaced group with K3 functioning as the vestibule of the type known from Macedonia. Fragments of coloured plaster from the middle room are indicative of its significance. The western wall of these rooms had a series of windows. The four-spaced group to the south has been interpreted as a kitchen and a similar construction standing as a separate building is located to the southwest of the Residence Building. The courtyard did not have a peristyle, but it was closed-off by a wall to the north and west with regularly set windows and doors.

The courtyard of the Residence Building, whose total size is approximately 1900 m^2, was either closed off on all sides in a similar fashion to the Banquet Building, or it had a peristyle of simple pillars that did not follow any of the Greek Orders. The state of preservation has not allowed the reconstruction of the arrangement of spaces in the southern and eastern sides. It is clear, however, that apart from the large hall, two more spacious rooms existed to the north, and a secondary corridor led to ancillary spaces to the South of the building. Due to the position of the main entrance far from the gate of the Upper Castle and its higher level compared to the Banquet Building, the Residence Building would have provided greater privacy *(Figure 5.25).* For this reason it is regarded as the residential section of the complex. Any finds or installations that would reveal more about the function of the complex are not available from the buildings, as excavation has not taken place and the results are based on field survey and documentation by aerial photography. Nevertheless, comparison with the buildings on

the acropolis of Pergamon, with which the site may be contemporary, and with the House of Dionysus in Pella indicates spatial configuration and architectural elements close to palaces. The affinities encourage the interpretation of the complex as consisting of two distinct sections with different function.[536] We cannot be certain, however, to what degree this functional division corresponds to the functional patterns found in the House of Dionysus, a connection that T. Radt has accentuated. Thr spatial context of the two cases is different, because the House of Dionysus is an urban elite residence, whereas the complex on Karasis is an isolated palace complex. Besides, there is a chronological distance of more than one century between them.

A large granary with an estimated capacity of one thousand tons of grain is found at the northernmost part of the Upper Castle.[537] This element together with the available space for a garrison of about 200–240 soldiers in the dwellings of the Lower Castle, and the buildings of the Upper Castle indicate that there would have been enough supplies for the inhabitants to reside at the site for years.[538] The design of the palace complex with two buildings that possibly served a different purpose, the presence of the granary, and the adjacent fortification resemble the arrangement of the Pergamene acropolis and in Jebel Khalid *(Figure 5.26).*[539] Nevertheless, despite the complex in Karasis presenting all the essential features that justify its definition as a palace, it does not protect a particular city, but stands isolated as a strongly fortified residence. It may have been used temporarily as a shelter for an important person or a group with their entourage and soldiers, or as a secure location for the protection of a treasure. We already referred in

[536] Radt 2011, 56-57.
[537] Hoffmann and Sayar 2007, 373; Radt 2010, 218.
[538] Hoffmann and Sayar 2007, 428. For the size of the garrison see Radt 2011, 53.
[539] It is yet to be seen how close Jebel Khalid is to this picture.

Chapter 2 to the case of Demetrios I Soter who sought refuge in a fortified palace with four towers near Antioch during his conflict over rule with Alexander Balas in about 160–150 BC; such buildings did exist and the complex in Karasis can well have belonged to this category.

The date of the complex in the second century BC relies on surface pottery and the construction technique of the masonry.[540] Karasis presents the residential and reception functions of a royal palace together with monumental elements detected in form, such as the prominent location, possibly the decoration, and the arrangement of dining rooms. It reveals the way urban palaces could be used as models for country estates and a point of reference both for form and function. A comparison with forts from western Kilikia has demonstrated the strong presence of local elements in the form of the fortification and the construction technique of the buildings, but the existence of a complex of such scale and functions is a concept that goes back to the palaces of third century Macedonia and the other Hellenistic kingdoms. [541]

Dura-Europos

The city of Dura-Europos is located on the western bank of the Euphrates to the southeast of Jebel Khalid *(Figures 5.27–5.28)*. Its position in the middle of the route between the capital cities of Babylonia, Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris and Babylon, and Antioch-on-the-Orontis encouraged the role of Dura as a major commercial station. The site also enjoyed natural defenses by ravines to the east, north and south and it became a

[540] Radt 2011, 51.
[541] Radt 2009.

stronghold with the construction of a fortification wall with its longest and main side to the west. Due to the continuous occupation from the early third century BC to late Antiquity, the surviving evidence for the Hellenistic plan of the city is very fragmentary.[542] The central street ran from west to east linking the western gate, the so-called Palmyrene, with the citadel. Apart from the wall in its original construction phase, a temple dedicated to Apollo and Artemis, and two buildings identifiable as palaces belong to this early period. During that time some of the elements of a typical Greek city, such as the theatre and the gymnasium, do not seem to have been present.

The first building (1387 m² in its final phase) is situated on the acropolis, which is formed between the eastern wadi and two smaller internal ones *(Figure 5.29,* **Cat. S2***).*[543] It is called the Redoubt or Strategeion, because it is considered to be the seat of the *strategos,* the military governor of the city. In order to avoid a pre-defined association of the building to a specific rank of royal officer, I adopt here the name 'Palace on the Acropolis' that Rostovtzeff used in his monograph *Dura-Europos and its art.*[544] In its first building phase (Palace on the Acropolis I) the palace consisted of a courtyard that was surrounded by spaces to the east, west and south *(Figure 5.30).* It dates to the mid-third century BC soon after the foundation of the city as a garrison settlement that is placed in the reign of Seleukos I.[545] In a second construction phase in the first half of the second century (Palace on the Acropolis II), when the re-planning of the city took place, a series of spaces on the northern side were added *(Figure 5.31).*

[542] Baur and Rostovtzeff 1931; Baur, Rostovtzeff, and Bellinger 1933; Downey 1985; Kosmin 2011.
[543] Pillet 1933, 21–27. Rostovtzeff 1938, 33-56; Nielsen 1994, 116–117, and especially for the problem of building phases see Leriche et al. 1997, 62–76.
[544] Rostovtzeff 1938.
[545] Downey 2003, 3. On the foundation of Dura by Seleukos see Kosmin 2011, 96–97.

Hoepfner and Schwandner reconstruct a peristyle forecourt to the south *(Figure 5.32–5.33).*[546] A row of four columns were indeed found to the southwest of the palace, but they seem to belong to a late extension of the building when dwelling installations were also added to the east and south and there is no evidence indicating that the columns belong to a large forecourt.[547] The main entrance was found to the south-west, while access was allowed also from the secondary entrances to the south and east. The rooms were organised around a courtyard, but in contrast to the pattern found in Macedonia, there was no peristyle. The largest rooms of the palace were located on the western, southern and northern wings. They were accompanied by adjacent spaces, which communicated with the courtyard via long vestibules *(Figure 5.34).* In the case of the western and southern vestibules a step with two columns led to the courtyard. The lack of symmetry in the arrangement and the size of rooms finds a parallel in the design of contemporary houses from Babylon and Dura.[548] At the same time, the groups of the largest rooms recall the formation of reception rooms and service spaces reached via long vestibules in the palace of Jebel Khalid. The building further expanded after the city came under Parthian control in 113 BC.

The second building relevant to this study is located on a fortified hill in the eastern side of the city just above the Euphrates *(Figure 5.28),* **(Cat. S3).** The remains on this crest date to two different phases.[549] The older building (Citadel Palace I), possibly

[546] Hoepfner et al. 1994, 272.
[547] The initial excavation report describes the palace and the annexes, or dwellings around it without discerning the building phases (Pillet 1933, 21–27). Only the ground plan in Leriche et al. 1997 (Table 3) depicts an opening with two columns in antis in a space of the eastern side, but it is unknown what this reconstruction is based on.
[548] Nielsen 1994, 117.
[549] Downey 1985 and 1986, 28; Nielsen 1994, 119.

contemporary with the first palace on the Acropolis, survives in very fragmentary state that does not allow any conclusions about its function *(Figure 5.35).* It is oriented according to the fortification wall of the citadel and runs parallel to it. Five spaces, two of which are only partially preserved, comprise its remains, while the masonry is of very good quality with square-cut stone blocks assembled very closely together.[550] Kosmin is correct to note that the palace in Jebel Khalid might reflect the form and functions of Citadel Palace I, since the topography of the two buildings is similar, they were both enclosed by their own fortification wall in addition to the circuit wall of the cities, and the sites were both founded as military settlements.[551]

The form of the later building on the citadel hill (Citadel Palace II) is better known. It consists of two sections aligned to the cardinal points and therefore in different orientation than the earlier building. The masonry is simpler and weaker than the first building with small, unsquared blocks. The southern section is organised around a peristyle courtyard (1269 m²) with 9 x 9 Doric columns, whose stylobate is preserved.[552] Rooms are formed on all sides excluding the north. The spaces of the eastern wing are not preserved, while the reconstruction of the southern wing is problematic. Four spaces have been located there with the main one being a hall (64.46 m^2) that opened to the peristyle (*Figure 5.36).* Three columns stood in the opening of this room, while five rectangular pillars supported the ceiling. Five more spaces that communicated with each other by many openings were found to the west and fragments of coloured stucco from the decoration of the walls have been recovered in this part. From the northern section

[550] Pillet 1931, 12–14; Hopkins 1931.
[551] Kosmin 2011, 100.
[552] Only one column drum has been discovered.

only the southwestern corner survives. It is formed by a wall with regular openings parallel to the northern wall of the peristyle, an arrangement which creates a corridor (2.12 m wide) between the southern and the northern sections. The western wall together with a parallel wall forms a narrower corridor (1.05 m wide, 0.75 between the pilasters) with consecutive doorways. The prominent role of the corridors as axes of circulation, which link spatial elements between different sections, is a feature that derives from Neo-Babylonian prototypes.[553] The entrance of the building must have been located to the north, since there are no openings at the rooms to the south.[554]

In Citadel Palace II the co-existence of Hellenic-Macedonian and oriental elements is more explicit than in the Palace on the Acropolis and reflected in the form of the two sections, the southern with a peristyle courtyard and Greek-style architectural decoration and the northern section stemming from eastern models. Initially in Dura-Europos the two palatial buildings were the Citadel Palace I and the Palace on the Acropolis I, which were contemporary to the palace of Jebel Khalid and the first building on the acropolis of Pergamon. Citadel Palace II and the Palace on the Acropolis II date to the second quarter of the second century BC, which means that they are contemporary to palaces IV and V, the new barracks (Building Ib) in Pergamon and the ruins on Mount Karasis. As the main purpose of the Citadel Palace was military, it is not surprising that thirty-five stone balls used as missiles have been discovered to the southeast of its

[553] We will also discuss this feature later in this chapter in the royal palace of Ai Khanoum in Bactria, where corridors define the different sections that form the palace complex.
[554] Downey 1986, 30, 33. Nielsen suggests that the entrance of the building would have been set in the same axis as the opening of the main representation hall to the south, but evidence to support this assumption is lacking (Nielsen 1994, 120).

remains.[555] Similar were the finds in the area of Building VI in Pergamon, which is interpreted as an arsenal or barracks.[556] The palaces in Karasis, Jebel Khalid, and Dura-Europos reveal that royal palatial architecture was a solid model re-interpreted and used in secondary sites of primarily military character.[557] Even though their location in a fortified enclosure accentuated this character, spatial arrangement and the function stay close to the patterns applied in the seats of the kings. In addition, Jebel Khalid and Dura indicate a preference for eastern prototypes not for palaces, but for temples. This very likely relates to the religious policy of the Seleukids. The easternmost case of a royal palace that stems from Seleukid architectural framework, the palace in Ai Khanoum, seems to confirm this distinction, as we will see below.

At this point we need to take notice of a case in the Seleukid kingdom that has been identified as a palace without adequate justification. This is the building excavated in Tell Beydar in Northeast Syria.[558] The excavated section measures about 800 m^2 and a courtyard without a peristyle seems to have been the core of the building *(Figure 5.37)*. The series of rooms that has been revealed communicates with the courtyard via a long vestibule that runs East-West and the spaces are arranged symmetrically flanking a central hall. The masonry is made of mud-brick and basalt is used in the foundations and

[555] Pillet 1931, 14.
[556] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 48.
[557] A building excavated in Nippur appears in bibliography as a 'palace', but due to its uncertain date and form, it is not discussed in this study. Nielsen includes it in her monograph on Hellenistic palaces (Nielsen 1994, 121–123) and follows the date given in Colledge 1987. It is possible that the building had a Seleukid phase, but any remains that would allow the reconstruction of its ground-plan are lacking. The majority of scholars support a Parthian date for the surviving remains (for the problems as regards its date see Oelsner 1986, 101–102 and footnotes 351–353).
[558] Martín Galán 2007; Martín Galán and Olivares Pantoja 2007.

the base of walls, something that corresponds to Neo-Babylonian construction techniques. The remains date to the mid-second century BC with an earlier phase of unknown form.

The site is located near a tributary of the Euphrates, but in contrast to Jebel Khalid or Dura, it is about 20 km from the river. The main phase of occupation in Tell Beydar goes back to the Bronze Age, and Hellenistic dwellings and workshops, reported as 'light installations', were built on top of ruins of that period.[559] The evidence is still too fragmentary to understand the relationship of the large building with the dwellings, but the site does not seem to have been a city of the scale of those along the Euphrates. It is regarded as a rural settlement, whose population was engaged in agricultural activities and especially in the production of wheat.[560] Similar sites in the area are being excavated, and it seems that they follow the Mesopotamian architectural traditions and construction methods. For these reasons and although monumental features are present, the 'palace' in this case is rather an isolated estate of commercial and agricultural character, and no connections with royal administration can be detected.

The royal palaces of Bactria and Kommagene

The empire of the Seleukids was the largest Hellenistic kingdom with the highest diversity of population and therefore the most susceptible to fragmentation. Conflicts at the boundaries of the empire and internal political instability frequently caused territorial

[559] Lebeau and Suleiman 2008, 3, 21.
[560] Martin Galán 2002, 39; Martín Galán and Olivares Pantoja 2007. I am thankful to Prof. Marc Lebau, the director of the project, for a tour in the site during my visit to Tell Beydar in May 2010, and for information about the 'palace' and especially the agricultural character of the site.

fluctuation from the early years of the empire. A consequence of this phenomenon was the foundation of independent small kingdoms in formerly Seleukid areas. Such was the kingdom of Bactria, which was the easternmost Seleukid province until about 245 BC.[561] By contrast, in times of military success Seleukid control expanded to areas that had long-term local ruling authorities, such as Kommagene when the Seleukids annexed North Syria in the late third–early second century BC. In 163/162 BC the local satrap declared independence from the Seleukids, but it was only in 80 BC that Kommagene officially received the status of a kingdom.[562] Even though these areas were only briefly governed by the Hellenistic dynasty, it is clear that Seleukid traditions had a major impact on their material culture. Therefore, the palaces that survive in the cities of Ai Khanoum in Bactria and Samosata in Kommagene reveal the way Seleukid patterns in palatial architecture in the major capitals of the empire were perceived and applied (or rejected) within the cultural framework of these marginal areas.

Ai Khanoum

Ai Khanoum is located on the confluence of the Oxus and the Kokcha rivers in modern-day northeastern Afghanistan *(Figure 5.38).* It consists of the Upper City, which is located on a plateau with steep slopes, and a citadel on its southern tip, and the Lower City to the west of the plateau *(Figures 5.39–5.40).*[563] Fortification walls ran across the

[561] About the secession of Bactria from the Seleukid kingdom see Sherwin White and Kuhrt 1993, 103–113.
[562] Facella 2006, 199–205 with literary and epigraphic evidence. The end of the dynasty of Kommagene dates ca. AD 70.
[563] See Schulmberger and Bernard 1965 and the excavation reports in CRAI (Bernard from 1966 to 1980). Also Bernard 1973, 1994, 2011 and Rapin 1992. Excavations at the site began in 1964 and the political conditions in the region put an end in the project in 1979.

parts to the north not naturally protected by the rivers. The palace is located in the centre of the Lower City by the Oxus.[564] This is a *basileion*, a palace complex, of the type known from Pella, Alexandria and in all likelihood the Seleukid royal cities *(Figure 5.41,* **Cat. S5***).* The palace together with the gymnasium, the heroon of the city-founder, a temple and mausoleum, monumental propylaea, and possibly gardens comprise the royal sector of the city. Large houses have been excavated to the south and north of this sector and indicate the location of residential areas.

Excluding the aforementioned structures, the palace covers an immense area of 87500 m^2, a size that makes it comparable and possibly larger than the palace in the Macedonian royal capital. It consists of a propylon to the north that leads to a large peristyle forecourt (labeled as (a) in the ground plan, 136.80 x 108.10 m) and separate sections that communicate with each other to the south and west of the courtyard (Sections b–g). An L-shaped pathway starting from a gate that faced the main street of the city led to the monumental two-part propylon of the forecourt. The southern vestibule of the propylon had two Corinthian columns in antis while the forecourt had a peristyle of 34 x 27 Corinthian columns. Due to the style of the capitals, the columns of the propylon and the peristyle (with the exception of its southern portico) have been determined as 'Pseudo-Corinthian', even though their position in the development of Corinthian order is unclear.[565] In addition, the stepped torus bases of these columns

[564] Bernard 1973; 1974, 301–310; 1975, 168–180; 1976, 288–293; 1978, 445–460; 1980, 437–457. Also Rapin 1992, Lecuyot 2007, and Bernard 2011. The excavators used the term 'Administration Quarter' in order to avoid the meaning-laden word 'palace'. It will become evident, however, in this chapter that its identification as the seat of Bactrian royalty is justified.
[565] Bernard 1973, pl. 37; pl. 23. The capitals lack inner helices, a standard feature of Corinthian capitals.

associate them with Iranian buildings of the third and second centuries BC.[566] Similarly to Section A in the palace of Demetrias, the peristyle courtyard is of the Rhodian type, since the southern portico is wider with columns of larger diameter and height than in the other three sides and set on a higher level *(Figure 5.42).*[567] In Section b a hypostyle hall (2) opened to a vestibule (3), which provided access to the other spaces of Section b and to section c. The hypostyle hall had three rows of six Corinthian columns that supported the roof. The bases of its columns, as well as of the colonnade of the southern portico, belong to the 'Attico-asiatic' type and resemble examples in the Greek mainland and the eastern Mediterranean. On the other hand, hypostyle spaces like (2) have their roots in the columned halls of the Achaemenid palaces.[568] Space 3 was unroofed and its walls were decorated with wooden semi-columns, painted panels with geometric motifs, clay relief sculpture and moulding made of stucco.[569] The roof-tiles that have been discovered in this area in small quantity are interpreted as coming from a partial coverage of the interior edges of the hall, essential to protect the decorative elements.[570]

The first phase of construction dates in the first half of the third century BC when Bactria still belonged to the Seleukid kingdom. The palace contained only the court and hall 2 without the colonnades, the adjacent spaces to the East and West, and space 3 in its original phase.[571] The building would be associated with the Seleukid governor in the area. After the independence of the Bactrian kingdom the palace expanded with the addition of the residential and administrative sections. The masonry of the early parts of

[566] Litvinskij and Pičiklan 2002, 75–83.
[567] Bernard 1967, 306–308. For the exact dimensions and proportions of the columns and the porticoes see Rapin 1992, 371-374.
[568] For the development of the hypostyle hall see Boucharlat 2010.
[569] Bernard 1973, 116.
[570] Bernard 1973, 54–55.
[571] About dating and architectural phases see Bernard 1968, 271 and 1973, 8–10.

the palace was made entirely of mud-bricks, whereas in the second phase the walls often had a few rows of fired bricks at the lower part. Hall 2 in the second phase became hypostyle, while the walls in 3 were renovated with fired bricks and the moulded decoration.[572]

The primary function of Section c can well have been representational and official (*Figure 5.43)*. Due to their size and decoration, at least halls 6 and 9 (207 m^2 and 161 m^2 respectively) and their surrounding spaces seem to have had this function. Pilasters with sofa capitals were set on all four sides of room 9 and on two sides of 6 *(Figures 5.44–5.45)*. Fragments of statues made of stucco and clay have been preserved. Those recovered in space 9 are parts of an arm, a human face and a lion, an animal traditionally associated with royal power. The fragments from Room 6 belong to at least 15 statues of various sizes, not higher than natural, which were possibly set in niches.[573] The walls in these rooms were also decorated with red plaster.

Sections f and g are interpreted as residential, because their design resembles the houses excavated in the northern and southern parts of the city. The excavation of Section e yielded a great variety of finds in considerable quantity from inscribed pottery and imprints of philosophical texts, to ingots of gold and silver, silver coins, and a decorative disc imported from India.[574] For this reason it is identified as the treasury and

[572] Two types of palmette antefixes have been found in courtyards and the entrance and they correspond to two different chronological phases, with the earliest type dating to the third century (Bernard 2011, 123). A simple mosaic made of black pebbles set in red mortar has also been found at the north part of the floor of Room 11 and belongs to the first phase.
[573] Bernard 1968, 268–269. Bernard 1973, pl. 104.
[574] For a catalogue of the finds from the treasury see Rapin 1992, 303–368. Also Bernard 2011, 107–123.

library of the palace. The Doric peristyle courtyard, formed by 16 x 16 columns to the south of the treasury, separates it from the residential section f.

In Section g room 74 (32.49 m^2) is paved with a polychrome pebble mosaic floor in concentric composition with vegetal and geometric motifs *(Figure 5.46).* The central panel is framed by a frieze that depicts dolphins, a black crab, sea-horses and is surrounded by a wave-band. Rooms 98 (20.25 m^2) and 95 (12.37 m^2) in Section f belong to a group of four consecutive small spaces (93, 95, 98, 99) and are also paved with mosaic floors with motifs similar to 74 *(Figure 5.47).* The groups of spaces that contain the rooms with the mosaics are identified as bath complexes. 74 was used as a changing room, 98 as an ablution room and 95 for the preparation of water.[575] It is, thus, not surprising that the iconography of the mosaic in 74 relates to water. The choice to pave the floor with pebble mosaics is also explained by the durability of the material. The available evidence is inadequate for any conclusions about the kind of groups that used these suites of baths, that appear to exist both in administrative and in residential sections, and about any social differentiation of their users.

Morphological features that do not appear in the Macedonian palaces are, apart from the hypostyle hall, the corridors that surround the different sections in a fashion already seen here in Citadel Palace II in Dura. The corridors separate the sections from each other and at the same time provide access to them. Additional narrower corridors define the design within each section and organise movement between the various spaces. Furthermore, the groups of two to three consecutive rooms of approximately the

[575] Bernard 1973, 175.

same size are an element absent from the palaces in Macedonia and Asia Minor. This is found primarily in Sections c, f, and g. In Macedonia or Pergamon groups of spaces would either share a common vestibule, or surround a main hall. By contrast, in Ai Khanoum only the first room communicates with the rest of the building and provides the only access to the other two rooms that follow. An element that further distances the palace in Ai Khanoum from the examples discussed in chapters 2 and 4 is the pool to the northwest of the complex. Held has pointed out, convincingly in my view, that the pool belonged to the palace and was not associated with the Gymnasium. It is likely, but more difficult to prove that the pool was in fact a water tank and that the area between the pool and the palace can be identified as a garden.[576]

These features in the architectural design indicate a strong link with Neo-Babylonian, Achaemenid palace architecture and contemporary Iranian buildings. The modification of space 2 into a hypostyle hall in the second phase must have been a conscious change in the design, possibly as a differentiation from former Seleukid patterns after the secession of Bactria. As Bernard has emphasised, however, the Macedonian-Hellenic building tradition is also present but reflected in different aspects.[577] This is the architectural decoration of the palace with palmette antefixes, the Corinthian order, even if of a local variation, the 'Attico-asiatic' column bases, and the decorative schemes. Even though the statues are made of stucco following a local technique, the repertoire and style originate from contemporary eastern Mediterranean.[578] The pavements reveal connections not with contemporary mosaic floors in Alexandria

[576] Held 2002, 239. It has not been possible to identify the drainage system of the pool.
[577] Bernard 2011.
[578] Frames made of wood and lead sticks were used as the core on which the statues would be modeled in clay or stucco (Bernard 2011, 101).

and Pergamon, but with older examples of the fourth century in the Greek mainland, such as Olynthos and Eretria.[579] This is evident in the material of construction (large pebbles) the simple design with vegetal motifs and the restricted range of colours. For these reasons Bernard's suggestion that they indicate an element of material culture brought together with the first Macedonians that inhabited the city and did not develop as much as in the West is based on solid ground.[580] This also raises the question up to what degree the palace in Ai Khanoum reflects the Seleukid royal palaces and can be used as a point of reference to understand their form; if there was indeed a disruption in the procedure of assimilation to models stemming from Macedonia and the other Hellenistic kingdoms, interaction between the Seleukid palaces and Ai Khanoum should be perceived as moving from the central Seleukid provinces to Bactria and not the other way around.

Samosata

Samosata was the capital of the kingdom of Kommagene and it was located on the western bank of the Euphrates to the north of Jebel Khalid. The site is nowadays submerged in the lake created in the 1980s by a dam near the modern city Samsat in Southeast Turkey **(Cat. S6)**. The partially excavated palace relates to the rulers of the independent kingdom of Kommagene in the early first century BC. It was built on the 50 m high acropolis of the city and its total size is estimated to approximately 3400 m^2 *(Figure 5.48).*

[579] Salzmann 1982, 40.
[580] Bernard 2011, 98-99.

The rescue excavations revealed only the northwestern part of the palace, where rooms of various sizes have been recovered *(Figures 5.49–5.50)*.[581] A corridor (1) ran along the external wall of the western side and must have extended to the north and surrounded the whole building. A second narrower corridor (2) parallel to 1 ran inside the excavated section separating two large spaces to the east from two groups of small rooms to the west. The largest space was found to the east. It measured 280 m^2 and is regarded by the excavators as a courtyard. It was connected via corridor 5 with room I and a group of three consecutive rooms (IIa–c). Spaces IV–V were a second group of consecutive rooms located to the south and accessible from corridor 2. This corridor also leads to the partially excavated room VI (121 m^2) next to the courtyard. A broader corridor seems to separate this room from another space to the south (VII), only a small section of which has been investigated. At the northern side corridor 2 bends to the east in front of room X and is connected with spaces VIII and XI.

The identification of the largest room as a courtyard makes this palace the only one with its core space paved with a mosaic floor and closed up by walls on all sides but the western, which is in fact a part of corridor 2. Similarly to the Palace on the Acropolis from Dura and space 3 (a courtyard) in the Palace of Ai Khanoum a peristyle colonnade was absent. However, those courtyards communicated via doorways or colonnaded passageways with their neighbouring spaces, something that is missing from the room in the palace of Samosata. For this reason, and due to its elaborate mosaic pavement, I find it more likely that this was not a movement but a gathering space, and may be identified

[581] Özgüç 1985 and 1986; Zoroğlu 2000, 79.

as one of the main reception rooms of the Palace. Together with rooms I and IIa–c it would have formed a group that presented the same layout as the group of spaces VI, II–V. Thus, its function must have served similar purposes with room VI. When all these rooms are examined as a group, they resemble architecturally the part of Section g in the Palace of Ai Khanoum identified as a bath (rooms 72–73, 63, 69–70). In addition, room I (15.75 m^2) was paved with a mosaic floor that depicted marine animals around a Rhodian amphora, while the number and dimensions of the rooms of each group correspond to the four room-scheme of the bath sections in Ai Khanoum: kitchen, changing-room, and two ablution rooms (*Figure 5.51)*.

The form of the palace is associated rather with oriental models than early Hellenistic Macedonian ones with corridors playing an important role as passageways between the different rooms, in a fashion familiar from the palace of Ai Khanoum. However, the decorative elements stem from the Hellenistic tradition. Tessellated mosaic floors, fragments of painted plaster from the walls and statuary are the types of decoration preserved. The walls are preserved up to two metres in height and sections of frescoes survive in different parts of the building, such as the western wall of the 'courtyard'. Its floor is paved with polychrome geometric mosaic bands with meander, wave and pyramid motifs. Ten bands with similar motifs formed the mosaic floor of room VI. A partly preserved medallion in the centre illustrates the head of a male figure with an ivy-wreath, identified either as a satyr, or a comic mask of the type of

pornoboskos (Figure 5.52).[582] Corridor 5 is paved with a non-figural black and white mosaic.

In the wall-painting fragments from space IIa a pomegranate is discernible, while a geometric mosaic paved room IIb. Zoroğlu regards the latter as a staircase due to its small width.[583] Installations found in IIc comprise a socle, a basis to the south, and a stepped block with a drain hole set in the centre of the floor. Furthermore, a limestone head representing the portrait of a young ruler was among the artefacts found in this room *(Figure 5.53)*. It was set in second use in the palace, as it is inscribed with the name Antiochos under the left eye and this is a later addition to the original object. Since Antiochos I of Kommagene received divine worship during his lifetime, it is very likely that this portrait represents him.[584] Finally, in room IV (30 m^2) the frame of the mosaic floor, formed as bands with geometric patterns, is also preserved. Fragments of painted plaster depict a rosette-frieze and an Ionic cymatium. The character of the corridor between rooms III–IV and VI as an area of high traffic and movement is stressed by its paving with a mosaic floor forming a grid of black squares against a white background.

The palace dates to the first half of the first century BC, a chronology that is based on late Hellenistic pottery, the style of the acanthus leaves in a fragment of a Corinthian capital from moulded interior wall decoration, a coin of Mithridates I

[582] The *pornoboskos* is a character of the New Comedy described by Pollux as bold or with shaved head and raised eyebrows, features that correspond to the figure of the mosaic (*Onomasticon* 4.145).
[583] Zoroğlu 2000, 81 and Bingöl 1997, 111. The existence of an upper storey cannot be confirmed, but the thickness of the walls (1.80 m) would indeed be adequate to support it.
[584] Dörrie 1964.

Kallinikos (109–70 BC), and the style of the mosaics.[585] The construction was commissioned either by Mithridates, or by his son Antiochos I (70–38 BC). Due to the partial recovery of the plan of this palace it is not possible to examine the accessibility patterns in connection with the type of decoration. It is certain, however, that the mosaic floors of the corridors accentuated the access to elaborately decorated spaces.

It becomes evident that, at least the excavated part of the Palace in Samosata was organised according to eastern prototypes, retaining, though, elements of the decorative concepts of the western part of the Hellenistic World. The blending of elements is not surprising considering that Antiochos 1's policy was to emphasise the (in reality distant) kinship relation of his ancestors with the Achaemenid dynasty and his mother's Seleukid ancestry.[586] The incomplete investigation of the building does not permit certain conclusions on the social hierarchies among the king's guests. The hierarchy of decoration in this case is a product of division between movement and gathering spaces; simple plain or geometric mosaics set in corridors and at thresholds, and figural iconography in gathering rooms. At the same time, due to the excavation of sanctuaries in the region, a lot more is known for the religious institutions than for the social conditions of the kingdom of Kommagene during the reign of Antiochos. The iconography of the mosaic in room VI is associated with cult, since the satyr or a comic mask relates to Dionysus and theatre. Evidence for the cult of the god comes also from the decoration of an architrave and frieze block of a small building found in the lower

[585] Zoroğlu 2000, 83.
[586] Messerschmidt 2000, 37.

city in Samosata. The fragment is contemporary to Antiochos's I reign and decorated with grapes and vine, namely attributes of Dionysus.[587]

Discussion: The hybridised nature of palaces in the eastern Hellenistic world and the problem of 'Hellenisation'

In his recent study on the Seleukid Empire, Capdetrey correctly refers to a 'network of palaces', in the sense that the numerous major cities where the king would reside had each their own *basileion*.[588] Does this palace-network have anything in common with the palaces in the other Hellenistic kingdoms and did it serve the same purpose? For example, when Antiochos the Great together with Philip V of Macedonia attempted to take advantage of the political instability in Egypt in around 200 BC, they both had more than one palace available to use.[589] The complexes in Pella, Aegae, and Demetrias at the least were available for Philip and his court. At the same time in the Attalid kingdom, the authorities of which informed Rome about Antiochos and Philip's treaty, it is highly likely that palaces existed in other cities than Pergamon for the local administrators.

The analysis of the case studies in the Seleukid Empire in this chapter shows that we can distinguish four categories of palaces according to their purpose: first, royal palaces used by the king and his entourage, or in the absence of the king by the local administrator. These were located in the capital cities of the kingdom and were either

[587] Hoepfner 2000, 57. It is known that groups of musicians participated in the cult festivals organised under the reign of Antiochos I, while theatre performances are also likely to have taken place (Millar 1987, 121–122).
[588] Capdetrey 2007, 375.
[589] The events that followed the treaty of the two rulers are known as the Fifth Syrian War (202–195 BC), which resulted in the annexation of Coele Syria to the Seleukids.

renovated building complexes of the Achaemenid kings, or newly constructed buildings. These palaces would have accommodated a variety of activities, from administrative and representational, to worship and recreation. Held maintains that standard features of the royal palaces were the riverside location in the lower part of the city and not on the acropolis, and surrounding water-channels. In reality, the only confirmed case of a palace in the lower part of the city is Ai Khanoum. Its form, however, during its original Seleukid construction phase is not well understood. Therefore, its reliability as a point of reference for generalisation on the features of Seleukid palaces is problematic. In addition, the Hellenistic kings reused the Summer Palace in Babylon, which overlooked the city, while the palace in Samosata, a royal capital, was located on the acropolis. The choice of location may well have been directed by the landscape and not by an attempt to imitate the Persian predecessors, and such may have been the case in the *basileion* of Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris. Besides, Sherwin White and Kuhrt have shown that the cities of Babylonia enjoyed a special framework of relations with the royal authorities, which allowed them to negotiate their rights in return of acknowledging the ruler's legitimacy.[590] As a consequence, it is possible that the reused palaces in Babylon did not reflect accurately the situation in other cities of the Empire and in contrast to Held's approach, the city cannot be regarded as the archetypal Seleukid royal seat.

The second category of Seleukid palaces encourages this theory. These are seats of either military or administrative magistrates, which were located in secondary cities of the kingdom. The cities had been often founded as garrison settlements, hence the prominent role of defenses, the location of the palace on the acropolis enclosed in its

[590] Sherwin White 1993; Kuhrt 1996, 42.

own fortification wall and its function as a fortress. Other functions, however, found in the palaces of the capital cities, are also present. Jebel Khalid and Dura-Europos were such sites and their significance was strategic and commercial. The Macedonian and Pergamene palaces might at first glance present stronger defensive elements than Seleukid royal palaces by incorporating towers and being adjacent to the fortification wall. The Seleukid administrators' seats, however, also present these features and indicate that palace architecture did not differ so much as Nielsen and Held have suggested from their counterparts in the western part of the Hellenistic World. Jebel Khalid, in particular, is an example of a settlement founded in a site without any previous occupation by Macedonians, who would not be limited by traditions supported by the local population in the forms they chose for their private and public buildings. Nevertheless, the palace and the elite houses followed the Hellenic architectural tradition without any major alterations in time, whereas the temple presents strong eastern features. There is no reason for excluding the possibility that such differentiation between administrative and worship architecture also existed in the new capital cities of the Seleukids. Therefore, it is far from certain that the formation of the *basileia* in cities such as Antioch, Seleukeia-Pieria, or even Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris relied exclusively on eastern models.

Third, the buildings on Mount Karasis and textual evidence about Demetrios's I *tetrapyrgion* confirm that palatial buildings were constructed in isolated locations and disconnected from any urban centres. Their primary purpose was to protect either a specific ruler or member of his court, or possibly valuable supplies. Finally, we could suggest that the palace in Daphne near Antioch, is an example of a purely recreational

and ceremonial building of large scale associated with the royal authorities, a kind of 'satellite' palace of the main one in Antioch.

The case studies examined in this chapter demonstrate that palatial buildings were a distinctive aspect of Seleukid monumental architecture formed by mechanisms operating only in this part of the Hellenistic world. Even though in cases where elements of form are closer to Hellenic or earlier eastern tradition, the merging of elements from both sources is always present. A combination with local traits is also observed, such as in the case of Mount Karasis. The architectural form and decoration of the palace and residences in Jebel Khalid are closer to the western tradition, but the temple in this city is clearly a hybrid. Further south along the Euphrates in Dura, the mixing of traditions becomes stronger. In a later era the royal palaces in Ai Khanoum and Samosata are cases that also clearly present hybridised forms in architectural layout, types of columns, roofing, and decoration. Geographical proximity, something that Nielsen regards as fundamental, is only one of the factors that defined palace form.[591] The cases in particular of Jebel Khalid, Dura, and Samosata, cannot be justified simply by their location.

Hybridisation is a key interpretive concept for Hellenistic palaces in the East and in this perspective palatial space becomes a distinctive aspect of Seleukid material culture. The division in the use of models for religious and administrative buildings implies that the application of hybridised forms in palaces has also been at least partly intentional. There is no doubt that Antiochos I of Kommagene claimed origin both from

[591] Nielsen 1996. According to this approach, moving westwards the Greek elements are more intense and the contrary happens moving towards the eastern territories of the Seleukid kingdom.

Seleukid and Achaemenid rulers, but without neglecting the local dynasty of the Orontids. The most explicit declaration of this policy is the monuments of imperial cult and the accompanying inscriptions that he set up in his *hierothesion* on Nemrud Dağ. The dual character of the colossal statues is emphasised, as they were made 'according to both the Greek and Persian tradition'.[592] The hybridised character of the palace in Samosata corresponds to Antiochos or his father's policy, which favoured conglomeration of all the traditions that existed in the region. It is very likely that the Seleukids had followed this tactic with their own palaces in order to legitimise and maintain their power and as a consequence palace form should be regarded as closely associated with political institutions and ambitions.

The kings in Hellenistic central Asia were undoubtedly concerned with their image as legitimate heirs of Mesopotamian and Persian monarchic traditions, something that is evident in palace form. At the same time equally present was the Hellenic heritage of palatial spatial design. The palaces reflect the compound character of Seleukid kingship that was and had to be more versatile in comparison to the other Hellenistic kingdoms. They would have also been expressions of competition for power; the second architectural phases of the building in Jebel Khalid and Dura date in the first half of the second century BC. This was an era of modifications in the administration system, especially due to Antiochos III, who replaced in many cases local administrators with vassal kings.[593] By relying exclusively on the remains of these palaces we cannot be certain about the exact ways and the intensity by which the governors used the material

[592] *OGI* 1, 383. The sculptural project set at the *hierothesion* consisted of groups of seated figures of the king and the syncretic gods whose cult he had introduced. The blending of elements is observed in the style of the sculptures (Dörrie 1964, 189–192; Smith 1988, 104; Wagner 2000).
[593] Strootman 2011, 81–85.

aspect of their seats, controlled or modified space, in order to obtain support from the local community. These are considerations, however, worth keeping in mind in our evaluation of the buildings and in combination with the examples from the other kingdoms elucidate the purpose of the palace for the Hellenistic royal elite.

CHAPTER 6. SYNTHESIS AND INTERPRETATION

In chapters 2 to 5 I analyzed palaces used by kings and officials in the major and minor Hellenistic kingdoms region by region, focusing on morphological, functional and chronological aspects. The present and last chapter is a synthesis of form, spatial configuration and function patterns. In order to obtain a unified view of organisation and use of space by the Hellenistic royal courts, I lay emphasis on their progression from the late fourth to the early first century. In addition, the comparative examination of the buildings together with their surroundings has exhibited patterns of continuity and change, whose interpretation requires viewing the evidence as a whole. For this reason, questions relevant to the users and their intent are examined here in a more systematic way.

Interpreting the development of Hellenistic palaces on the basis of design, construction and use, namely of processes determined by the commissioners, would bring us only halfway into understanding their purpose. By following the methodological principles presented in the introductory chapter of this study, there will be an examination of the way the audience in and outside the court perceived palaces, which complements our perspective about purpose. The social processes that determined reception were the hierarchical dynamics of the royal court and the relationship between court and subjects. These factors, in combination with particular ideological beliefs about kingship and self-representation, comprised the receptive mechanisms. Reception becomes particularly evident not only in contemporary but also in later contexts such as architectural evidence and literary accounts from the late Roman Republic.

Morphological patterning

One of the methodological premises throughout the present study has been to open the analysis from the available archaeological evidence by combining morphological features and finds. This combination has been used as the basis for assessing the validity of identifying a building as a Hellenistic palace. In this respect a standard repertoire consisting of specific types of spaces and structural characteristics present in the buildings under examination has emerged. A systematic analytical method for categorizing patterns of form is the so-called *Pattern Language* applied in the case of Roman domestic space with case studies from Pompeii, Herculaneum and Ostia.[594] This method categorises patterns in four levels depending on whether they refer to the building as a whole, to groups of spaces, individual spaces, or walls, floors and ceilings. Further sub-groups emerge within these categories, only a few of which apply to Hellenistic palaces for reasons of preservation *(Figure 6.1)*. As a consequence, only the four general pattern levels—from the macro-level of the whole building to the micro-level of elements in one specific room—are applied in this chapter. I use the categorisation of Pattern Language not as a given set of morphological features, but as a tool to navigate the synthesis through the centuries of construction and form.

Patterns of the whole building

[594] The principles of this method were introduced in a multi-authored volume in the 1970s which is organised more like a list of rules for ideal architectural formation and less as a monograph analyzing the methodological principles (Alexander et al. 1974). Watts formulated and refined the method by creating the four categories (Watts 1987) and applied the system in houses from Pompeii, Herculaneum and Ostia. For an additional application in Roman context see Muntasser 2003.

The primary categorisation criterion of Hellenistic palaces is their location in an urban or non-urban context. Buildings belonging to an urban context are located either in a capital city of the kingdom comprising the principal administrative seat of the king, or in secondary cities governed by state officials. In the first case these are usually formed as *basileia*, namely as building complexes in direct association with other monumental religious and secular buildings. By contrast, the seats of officials are single buildings. In particular, the mid-third century palaces in Jebel Khalid and Dura, present a stronger military character than the buildings in royal capitals due to the significance of military command for the maintenance of power in these sites. The palace of Philip V in Demetrias seems to have been a case that fostered this type of palaces for the second century: the *basileia* of Eumenes II in Pergamon is the utmost example of the combination of royal palace and fortress, while the complex on Mount Karasis certainly draws on this aspect of early Hellenistic palaces. In close proximity to such palaces we usually find granaries, an additional feature that reveals their primary role as retreats and mechanisms to safeguard the city. Finally, with the exception of Ai Khanoum and the Qasr, the location chosen for the construction of the palace was an area on high ground that would surpass in height the private houses of the city.

Only two of the buildings examined in this study belong to the second category and indicate that by the early second century BC other types of palaces had emerged, types that were not necessarily associated with official state administration. The complex on Mount Karasis is not related to any city, while Hyrkanos' recreational building in Iraq al Amir was constructed in a distance from public buildings or private houses. Despite

the location and character of these buildings, they are legitimately regarded as palaces since they present morphological features that match the repertoire for the Hellenistic royal palaces.

With respect to patterns of spatial configuration in the palace as a whole, the sub-group of *Axial order* according to Pattern Language does apply to the Hellenistic era. The seats of the kings in the royal capitals always present a special formation of the entrance with consecutive spaces set axially on one side of the courtyard. This feature is found in Pella, Aegae, possibly in Demetrias and according to written accounts also in Alexandria. In Ai Khanoum it is further accentuated by the construction of the pathway that linked the gate of the forecourt to the gate that opened to the main street of the city. This element survived into the second phase of the complex (second century BC) and is a case that verifies the axial propylon as a diachronic element applied throughout the Hellenistic period. In Ai Khanoum strong axial structuring is achieved not only by the formation of the entrance, but also by the long corridors in the individual sections that form the palace complex. The meaning of this axiality in entering the ground-floor level becomes symbolic as it creates anticipation and turns entering the special setting of the royal court into a literally step-by-step procedure.

In contrast to the multi-part formation in royal palaces, the entrances of the local officials' seats comprised a single vestibule or a corridor. Palace IV in Pergamon is an exception to this scheme; even though it is found in a royal capital, the northwest entrance was a simple opening to the western peristyle porticos. As I suggested in the relevant chapter, social hierarchies in the court and the relationship between kings and

the elite are likely to have been responsible for the discrepancies observed in Pergamon in terms of scale and monumentality in comparison to Macedonia and Egypt.

Kutbay has associated the axial position of the propylon on one side of the courtyard with Achaemenid and pre-Hellenistic Egyptian practices in administrational buildings and temples respectively.[595] As a consequence, she suggested that this morphological feature emphasised the role of the palaces as ceremonial centres. The structural element of combining the multipart propylon with stoas in Pella and Aegae is indeed a practice that not only denotes ceremonial significance, but also opens out to the public the space created for the royal court. Nevertheless, the analysis of the technical aspects of this combination by Gunnar Brands has proved that Egypt and Persia were not necessarily the only source of inspiration; entranceways in stoas of sanctuaries in mainland Greece and Sicily must have also played their part in the result we find in Macedonia, which can well have been a local innovation.[596] The emphasis on façades and entranceways indicates a strong interest in the visual effect not only of the interior, but also of the exterior of the royal palaces. The lavishness of interior decoration is reflected in the surfaces that everyone was able to see from outside the palace regardless of social status and accessibility and this is a fundamental difference in comparison to residences of the elite.

Pattern language defines circulation nodes, connectors and static spaces as a distinct sub-group in the patterns found in the whole building. Such patterns are

[595] Kutbay 1998, 97–98. Kutbay also sees parallels for the tripartite propylon in three-part entrance ways into reception halls in Assyrian palaces of the eighth and seventh centuries BC, but as the author herself admits, it is difficult to ascertain a direct connection.
[596] Brands 1996, 67–69.

applicable in the Hellenistic palaces and demonstrate how space was controlled. Apart from the courtyard, the principal circulation node, corridors and vestibules connected separate sections and different rooms respectively, and their role seems to have been more prominent in the Seleukid kingdom and in the latest examples of Ai Khanoum and Samosata. As spaces for movement, corridors are usually paved with mosaic floors with simple geometric patterns or without any decoration (space C in Aegae and corridors in the palace in Samosata). By contrast, rooms with only one entrance, found in various sizes, were static spaces. In the previous chapters I referred to a measurable quality, the permeability of space, which indicates the scale of control. To sum up, the relevant diagrams of the buildings in Aegae and Jebel Khalid indicate that the early Hellenistic palaces presented a greater number of permeability levels than the surviving examples of the second century *(Diagrams 1, 5–8).* Instead of six or seven permeability levels in the late fourth and third centuries, the deepest room in palace V in Pergamon was accessible from only two consecutive rooms when entering the building, while possibly in IV it was only the courtyard that linked the entrance with the various rooms of the building. The buildings in Karasis and Iraq al Amir feature a low number of levels as well. While in these examples control of space has become less strict, further east, in the capital of Bactria, the number of permeability levels was closer to the old Macedonian palaces than to contemporary ones in other parts of the Hellenistic world. Unless they are ancillary, rooms in the deepest levels tend to be the most lavishly decorated, something that denotes high position in terms of hierarchy among all the spaces of the palace *(Diagrams 2-4).*

The principal component of spatial configuration and circulation node, the peristyle, deserves further discussion. The position of the Hellenistic palaces in the context of domestic architecture has been an approach widely used to interpret their establishment as a building type.[597] Kutbay explores this issue through the peristyle courtyard.[598] Whether the peristyle draws primarily on courtyards of Classical houses, particularly in Olynthos and Eretria, where extensive sets of examples have been preserved, or on courtyards of earlier public buildings is a question that remains unclear.[599] The lack of a precise date for the Macedonian palaces, however, hinders any definite conclusions about the conditions that established the peristyle courtyard as a standard structural element and Kutbay correctly acknowledges the contribution of multiple sources to this procedure.

The fact is that at least until the late second century BC the pattern for the formation of courtyards in the ground floor of the palaces was a peristyle in Doric order. This functioned as the centre of the structure that linked the various rooms and permitted circulation between them. It also created a vertical axis because it was an unroofed space. Accentuated by the columns this axis would have been a visual and conceptual link with the world outside the palace. The only exception is Qasr el Abd, where a peristyle courtyard is lacking, an irregularity compensated by the open spaces of the upper floor and justified by the role of the building as a lodge in a *paradeisos* and not as a palace used for purposes of administration by large numbers of people. Ionic order is

[597] Kutbay 1998, 59–93. Lawrence 1996 [1957], 186; Winter 2006, 164–165.
[598] Kutbay 1998, 59–70.
[599] Such public buildings are banquet-houses of the fourth century BC that served the needs of sanctuaries and the guest-houses (*katagogeia*) in Kassope, Epidauros and Olympia all dating in the second half of the fourth century BC (ibid. 76–80).

typically found in upper floors, even though in the House of Dionysus and possibly in Palace IV in Pergamon it is present in the ground level. After the mid-second century the Corinthian order certainly has a place in the colonnades of the courtyards, as the palace in Ai Khanoum indicates, while Corinthian capitals from the royal quarters in Alexandria are a further indication for its use. Decorative elements of the epistyle of the colonnades were painted, as the traces on finds from Aegae, the Houses in Pella and Jebel Khalid indicate.

The peristyle seems to have remained significant throughout the Hellenistic period for the palaces in capitals of the kingdoms judging from the similar proportions of its surface to the total surface of the building *(Figure 6.2)*. Only in the two sections of the palace in Aegae the percentage of courtyard without porticoes is slightly higher, something that shows greater capacity and implies heavier use of the courtyard than in other palaces, which provide more space for the porticoes (e.g. Section I–II.A in Pella, Section A in Demetrias and the palaces in Pergamon). In contrast to the seats of kings, the smaller palaces in the secondary cities of Jebel Khalid and Dura-Europos (Palace on the Acropolis), present a lower percentage of courtyard with or without porticoes to total surface and indicate a greater interest in the construction of spacious room sections around the peristyle. This implies that ceremonial and functions that accommodated large numbers of participants were not as an important part of the activities in these buildings as in the palaces in capital cities. Ai Khanoum, the Citadel Palace and the second phase of the Acropolis palace in Dura indicate that in the second century BC the forecourt has been added in the repertoire of open types of spaces.

Patterns of groups of spaces

Rooms around the peristyle courtyards are found on all sides unless the topography of the site does not provide adequate space on a particular side. In the second century BC there is a slight preference for locating the largest halls to the North following the example of Section I–II.A in Pella. With the possible exception of the Pergamene palaces, they are usually accompanied by vestibules or side-rooms forming suites of rooms, whose origins can be traced to the same sources as the tripartite entrances, while the three-room complex with a vestibule open to the courtyard and to two side rooms is typically found in Macedonia.

A further means to effectively control space were the marked boundaries between sections or rooms, which comprise a separate category of patterns, and create hierarchical relations. The multipart form of entrances served such purpose, as we have already seen. In addition, the thresholds found in the palace of Aegae and the houses in Pella indicate that double leafed doors with bronze decorative elements marked the entranceways, corridors and halls and comprised the most evident set of boundaries. Three openings defined by columns set on the entrance of a hall substituted the wooden doors, but invited rather than discouraged access to these spaces and in this way decreased spatial boundaries. The metal fence in room D in Palace V of Pergamon is the only surviving example of a particularly explicit desire to spatially segregate a room of worship and at the same time to make it visually accessible. As for boundaries with outside space, since the courtyard was the source of light and ventilation and in agreement to the rules of privacy in domestic architecture, the palaces had only a few

and small windows on the exterior. The series of windows on the western wall of the Banquet Building on Karasis is an exception, while in Qasr el Abd they are possibly related to Ptolemaic trends evident in the structures on luxurious boats as we saw in the relevant chapter.

Patterns of walls and floors

The masonry in all cases was made of local stone in the lower part of the walls and continued in sun-dried brick above the orthostate. White plaster covered the surfaces and hydraulic lime-plaster the floors and walls of bathrooms. The walls were always decorated with coloured stucco and fragments from Macedonia, Jebel Khalid and Dura indicate patterns that imitated masonry and coloured marble. Hierarchy of material is clearly observed in Aegae, where better quality stone that resembled marble was used for the capitals of columns and pillars, the stylobates and the bases, as well as elements of the entablature. Actual marble was used only for the thresholds by all likelihood due to the higher durability of the material in comparison to limestone and the availability of resources for its supply. Apart from constructing door and window frames and roofing, the use of wood for decorative elements has been confirmed in the case of Ai Khanoum, a building that was entirely made of mud-bricks in its initial phase. Terracotta and clay were used in this palace not only for tiles, but also for statues. In addition to figural floor mosaics, in cases where the pavements of the rooms are preserved, they are made of beaten earth, mortar mixed with pebbles or cut pieces of stone, and paved with flagstones. The palaces in Aegae, Jebel Khalid, Pergamon and Samosata have

demonstrated the relationship between type of pavement and hierarchy of space in terms of prestige in its function.

To sum up, the elements that distinguish a Hellenistic palace are location on high grounds near the fortification or within a separate circuit, the principal role of large open spaces and halls that accommodated groups of people, effective and in some cases elaborate means for the control of space, decorative, structural and technical innovations, and lavishness of interior decoration anticipated in some cases by the exterior surfaces. Contrary to private residences, the palaces feature elements that open outwards and these are the colonnades and propyla in Macedonia and the forecourts of Ai Khanoum and possibly the Acropolis palace in Dura in its latest phase. In addition, the Qasr was clearly meant to impress by the decoration on its exterior surfaces and the megalithic masonry. Taking this aspect of palaces, lavishness of exterior surfaces, to this extreme might have been an impact Ptolemaic or former Egyptian architecture had on the building activity of the Tobiads. Combining morphological elements of private residences and monumental public buildings was a strategy that served the intention of the ruler to display his power and status.

Patterns of function

The analysis of the functional problems of the case studies in the previous chapters showed that identification of the way a space was used is a procedure that requires evaluation of artefacts, installations, architectural elements and its position in the spatial configuration. Taking textual evidence into consideration Nielsen distinguished nine

types of function.[600] *(Figure 6.3)* Her system, however, is somewhat constrained leaving little space for ascribing multiple functions to a single room. In addition, types such as 'offices' and 'harem' reveal that it is affected by modern preconceptions about palaces, since there is no archaeological evidence to confirm that specific rooms were designated for such functions. For these reasons I suggest that a more effective way to group functional patterns in Hellenistic palaces is to define three general categories: reception-entertainment, administration, and ancillary. This system relies on the archaeological evidence without ignoring literary accounts, avoids biased views, and leaves room for multiple functions in the same area.

Reception and display

Due to the decoration and the political significance of receiving companions and envoys in the court the primary function of dining rooms lies between purposes of display and administration. Finds indicative for the use of a room for banquets are the raised borders for couches along the walls, an element preserved in the palace of Aegae, sections of white tesserae in rooms with figural mosaic floors when raised borders are absent, the off-centre position of doors, proximity to areas of food preparation, and arrangement in suites of rooms. Public banquets provided in peristyle courtyards is a possibility, but remains an open issue, since it is neither archaeologically confirmed, nor reported in literary sources in the spatial setting of the palaces.

[600] Nielsen 1994, 18–25, and for criticism on this system see also here the Introduction (section *The state of research*).

It is indeed likely that the peristyle courtyard was used for banquets and it became this way another type of space in the palace that emphasised the king's role as a provider. The arrangement of the banquet in the pavilion of Ptolemy II as described by Kallixeinos is the strongest evidence for the validity of this view. Further supportive evidence comes from the banquet scene in the façade frieze of the Tomb of Aghios Athanasios, which dates in the last quarter of the fourth century *(Figure 6.4).*[601] The finds and the iconographic program indicate that the deceased was one of the *hetairoi* of the king; therefore the symposion scene is associated with feasting in a residence whose owner belonged to the inner court of the time. The excavator suggests that the banquet is taking place in the peristyle courtyard of the house.[602] The iconographic element that denotes interior space is the wooden furniture where utensils for eating and drinking are kept, while the foliage has been interpreted as an element of plantation in the courtyard. As an additional argument the excavator refers to a fourth century BC crater from Cumae that depicts a symposion scene *(Figure 6.5).*[603] The architectural setting of the scene encourages the view that one of the function of peristyle courtyards was to accommodate banquets. The frame consists of two columns that support an architrave, an indication of a colonnade. I would also add that the decoration in the background with hanging objects reveals that either a wall or the sides of a tent closed off the area. In the first case this area could be a portico of a peristyle courtyard and in the second a movable tent or a pavilion.

[601] Tsimpidou Avloniti 2005.
[602] Ibid. 134 with footnote 442.
[603] About the interpretation of the architectural scene on the vase as a peristyle see Dentzer 1982, 137.

Elements of display are found not only in dining rooms, but also in most types of spaces in the palaces. As a primary function it is found in parts of peristyles and porticoes where monuments for veneration or commemoration were set. The record of finds indicates that this practice was common particularly in the second century BC, since it comprises the pedestals from the last phase of Buildings I–IIa and V in Pella, from the northern portico of Palace IV in Pergamon and also the podium for a sculptural monument in Section A in Demetrias. It is likely that this function draws on practices that were common in Macedonia already in the fourth century BC with spaces designated specifically for the display of art. Such seem to have been the stoas in the façade of the palace in Aegae.

Administration

As regards administration, we learn from textual evidence that audience and councils were court institutions widely applied in the Hellenistic states.[604] On the basis of the currently available archaeological evidence, however, it is not possible to identify with certainty rooms of such purpose. We would expect rooms of outstanding scale in decoration, architectural elements and dimensions to have played this role, such as the Tholos in the palace of Aegae, the hall in the northern part of Section I–II.A in Pella, and room D from Palace IV in Pergamon. In addition, spaces that facilitated administration were the vestibules of entrances, suites of rooms and large halls, because they functioned

[604] About audience in the court of Alexander the Great see Spawforth 2007[b], 97–99. For an overview about reception and audience with references to literary sources see Strootman 2007, 332–337.

as preparatory spaces for audience or reception and this practice is a feature of all the buildings under discussion.

Two additional types of function relate to administration, and these are the maintenance of archives and the storage of prestigious objects and products. The room identified as an archive on the basis of seal impressions in Jebel Khalid is a mid-third century case, while the section that functioned as a treasury in Ai Khanoum comes from the early second century.[605] Since Jebel Khalid presents strong connections with the palaces and the residences of the elite in Macedonia, it is highly likely that archive rooms were present in Macedonian palaces: we have already discussed the suitability of room B in Aegae for such function.[606]

Worship rooms identifiable by an altar, a socle for the statue of the tutelary deity and relevant decoration also fall into the general category of administration due to the role of the king as the patron of religion and ancestral divine cult. The circular shape of the temple in the Thalamegos of Ptolemy IV encourages the view that the Tholos in Aegae served purposes of cult in addition to audience. Finally, display of monuments was only a part of the purpose of courtyards; as we saw in the third chapter of the present study, textual evidence shows that they accommodated court ceremonies and public festivals.[607]

Ancillary

[605] Rapin 1992.
[606] See chapter 2, section *Spatial patterns and functional problems.*
[607] See chapter 3, section *The royal palaces*.

The last functional category comprises spaces that served ancillary purposes and is represented by bathrooms, latrines, storage rooms and pools. These tend to be designed in clusters of rooms without symmetrical arrangement and be the smallest rooms in the palace. Large amounts of pottery and especially pithoi indicate storage space, while the presence of a water reservoir, a system of water heating, and lime plaster as waterproofing material for the floor indicate suites of baths. The latter are present in all three palaces of Macedonia in the phases from the reign of Antigonos Gonatas onwards and also in Ai Khanoum and Samosata, while a latrine has been excavated in Jebel Khalid.

Residential was an additional general functional category in Hellenistic palaces, but as we saw in the analysis of the case studies, there is no firm archaeological evidence in order to identify sleeping spaces either in the ground or the upper floor. These are only reported in the Thalamegos of Ptolemy IV. The significance and extent of these functional categories for each case should be evaluated in relation to the urban or non-urban context of the palace and its location in a capital or secondary city.

Whether the palaces achieved through their patterns of form and function to establish and manifest royal institutions in the court societies of the Hellenistic kingdoms depended on the manner they were perceived. The social and ideological processes that defined reception will be summarised according to the conclusions drawn in each of the previous chapters and further discussed in the following section on the basis of material evidence both contemporary with and later than the Hellenistic palaces.

Social processes: The palace and the Hellenistic court society

In an article after the publication of her book on palaces Inge Nielsen brought into discussion the question of whether we can view the palaces as a mirror of the royal institutions that were characteristic of each region.[608] The scholar concluded that the distinction in two types of monarchy, personal and national, was responsible for different approaches towards the construction of palaces. Nielsen used Macedonia as a case study and she justified the difference in scale between the palaces of Aegae in the early third century and the *basileion* in Pella in the time of Philip V by transition from a national to a more absolute type of monarchy. The first problem with this theory is that Section I–II in Pella dates in the fourth century and not in the late third, as I discussed in chapter 2.[609] Moreover, the progresses of historical research on the courts of the Hellenistic Age in the past fifteen years have shown that in Macedonia a tendency towards more absolute monarchy existed already since the time of Philip II. It dramatically increased during the reign of Alexander and the first generation of early Hellenistic kings pursued equally authoritarian exercise of power, while the conditions were not different in the time of Philip V.[610]

In his construction of a model about the relationship between the city and Hellenistic palaces, Miltiades Hatzopoulos accepted the validity of relating the palaces to

[608] Nielsen 1997.
[609] Expansion did take place, but it was sections to the west that were added under the rule of Philip V.
[610] Walbank 1984, 65; Hatzopoulos 2001, 192. See also Weber 1997, 29–30, who notes that modern perspectives about absolutism that rely on the French court might not be suitable for evaluating the Hellenistic courts.

their contemporary type of monarchy.[611] He emphasised, however, regional rather than chronological reasons for the changes in the type of palaces by suing a different example: According to his view, there is an opposition between the palaces in Aegae and Pella on the one hand, and Alexandria, Antioch and Pergamon on the other. He regards the first group as expressing a national type of kingship and justifies his view by observing that these palaces were integrated in the urban layout. By contrast, the palaces of the second group were separate from the city. The archaeological evidence, however, sets this interpretation open to criticism. In the case of Antioch Hatzopoulos follows the ambiguous theory that the Hellenistic palace was located on an island, while he sees Alexandria and Pergamon as distinct areas isolated from the rest of the city. In reality there is no difference when it comes to location between these two palaces and their counterparts in Macedonia: the royal district in Alexandria is presented as a city within the city in the textual evidence, while the *basileion* in Pergamon is located on the acropolis. In a similar fashion the palace in Pella was situated on high grounds at the northern part of the city. As a consequence, an alternative explanation as to what was the motivation for modifications in the palace that formulated its development as a building type from the late fourth to the early first century becomes essential. I suggest that this was the development of the Hellenistic court, and more specifically of its hierarchical structure.

We saw that the material evidence examined in the present study implies a gradual change in the form of palaces towards the last decades of the third century BC. A phenomenon not only restricted in Macedonia, as Nielsen has already suggested, but

[611] Hatzopoulos 2001, 194.

extended to all major Hellenistic kingdoms with spatially complex groups and *basileia* being more common than single buildings in the second century and modifications taking place in the existing palaces. Certain spaces in the palace of Aegae were modified; sections were added to the palace complexes in Pella and Demetrias, and Palace I in Pergamon fell out of use and was replaced by Palaces IV and V. At the same time, the royal seat in Ai Khanoum turned into a *basileion* approximately as large as the one in Pella, the Ptolemaic kings did not cease to add new palaces to the royal district, a local estate ruler in Iraq al Amir made extensive use of decorative and architectural elements from royal palaces, while a palace complex appeared for reasons we are not certain about on the top of Mount Karasis in Kilikia. First we need to assess whether this is a valid observation or merely a coincidence due to the availability of the surviving material most of which dates in the second century BC. The answer lies in the link between the palace and the Hellenistic society: The common ground that created standardised morphological and functional patterns and legitimises our view of the palaces in different kingdoms as a group is their role as the spatial setting of the Hellenistic royal court. Can changes in the courts justify the changes that took place in the course of the late third century?

The most influential work for the study of the court as an institution has been Norbert Elias's *The Court Society*.[612] By focusing on the court of Louis XIV Elias proved that the royal court is a system of social relations, the maintenance of which requires application of specific strategies. One of these strategies is keeping the courtiers under surveillance by applying spatial control, the principal means for which is the

[612] Elias 1983.

palace.[613] Relying on the advances that the work of Elias and scholars that followed him brought, the historian Gabriel Herman demonstrated that the Hellenistic court was a system consisting of three elements, which interacted with each other.[614] On the top of the hierarchy was the king, followed by his court, and finally by his subjects. The royal family and the king's *philoi,* personnel with specialised duties and servants comprised the inner court, while governors in other cities or envoys were officials that did not frequent the royal residence regularly.[615] Balance in the social relations and rank among the courtiers, required its organisation in a certain way based on the self-interest of king and courtiers and on rules of conduct. The object of the present study, the Hellenistic palace, was connected with two aspects of court structure as Herman defines these: specialisation of courtly functions and the lavish consumption and display.[616] The analysis of form and function of the case studies showed that they indeed reflected these aspects. As a consequence, the Hellenistic palaces contributed in maintaining the balance in the relations between king, court and subjects, so that the king retained his power and the court its privileges.[617]

A point that strikes the reader of Elias's study who specialises in the material culture of the Hellenistic world is his desciption of the typical *hôtel* or *palais* of the

[613] Elias discusses Louis XIV's palace under this perspective (ibid. 80–88).
[614] Herman 1997, 200.
[615] Walbank 1984, 68–70; Weber 1995, 290. On the institution of the *philoi* in the Antigonid and the Seleukid courts see Le Bohec 1985 and Savalli Lestrade 1998. LeBohec, 1985; Savalli Lestrade 1998.
[616] Herman 1997, 204. For the Hellenistic court as social space of exercise of power by the elite and the palace as its setting see also Moyer 2011, 18.
[617] Scholarship on Elias's model has also demonstrated that the court can be beneficial not only for the king, but also for the nobility since it was the institution that provided them social status (Duindam 1994; Spawforth 2007[a], 5).

eighteenth century as shown in the *Encyclopédie* by Diderot and D'Alembert.[618] The account of architectural and functional elements is similar to the morphological and functional patterns found in the Hellenistic palaces. The large central courtyard with a colonnade, the multi-part entrance, rooms for administration and reception, private apartments, gardens, bathhouses, storerooms, ancillary spaces and servants' quarters are elements that feature the palaces of the Hellenistic kings and officials as well. How are these similarities justified, especially if we take into consideration that in contrast to the courtiers of Louis XIV, the *philoi* of the Hellenistic kings did not reside in the palace? The coincidence is not a result of modern preconceptions about palaces, since the morphological analysis in combination with the record of finds from the buildings examined in the present study reveals similar features. The reason is the role of the palace as one of the mechanisms by which the ruler in a monarchic system controls courtiers and subjects, which is a diachronic feature and applicable in the Hellenistic age.

This study suggests that modifications in the balance of the court affected changes in the palaces. Apart from advances in the field of sociology, additional support comes from the results of historical research on the Hellenistic courts. The development of the court as an institution went through two distinct periods with a turning point the last decades of the third century.[619] Court structure became more formalised with specific levels of rank and corresponding titles, while the influence of courtiers on the king increased.[620] Since the development of the Hellenistic palaces cannot have been irrelevant to developments of the court as an institution, it emerges that Nielsen was only

[618] Elias 1983, 44.
[619] Weber 1997, 69–70.
[620] In the Ptolemaic and Seleukid kingdoms this change was stronger that in Macedonia and the Attalids (ibid. 55–56).

partially right: the change in the type of palaces cannot be justified by the type of monarchy and the reason is not only the lack of definite boundaries between national and personal monarchy in the course of the Hellenistic age; the reason lies in the Hellenistic court society. Expansion, increase in scale and elaboration of forms in the palaces does not indicate a stronger or more absolute ruler than his predecessors, but a stronger and hierarchically more complex court. As the threat of disruption in the court balance increases, the palace becomes more significant, because the surveillance of the court requires more effective spatial control and a sophisticated system of power manifestation.

This section demonstrated how the development of Hellenistic palaces was a result not only of the kings' ability to use more elaborate means of display, but also of a change in the audience the palaces addressed to and especially of the courtiers. A factor that we also need to take into consideration is the relationship between palace and subjects, namely the body of citizens.

The similarities as regards spatial organisation and decoration between residences from Pella, Jebel Khalid and Pergamon and the palaces in these sites indicates, as we discussed in previous chapters, a harmonious and beneficial interaction between royal and domestic space. The palaces provided patterns for the manifestation of power that were adopted by the elite, while we cannot exclude a down to top direction with the forms in the palace adapting to fashion and trends followed by the subjects. In cities without tradition of monarchic institutions, however, this harmony would have been more difficult to achieve. The reconciliation between monarchy and such cities is a

matter that has drawn attention among historians, who concluded that adoption in the court of institutions originating in the Classical Greek city facilitated smooth relations between court and city.[621] In this respect, since Hellenistic palaces incorporated morphological elements from public monumental architecture and private houses, they can be seen as a material expression of this procedure. Moreover, the integration of gymnasia and libraries in the *basileion* (Alexandria, Pergamon, Pella) was one of the most explicit methods in accord with traditional city institutions. The presence of a palace in the landscape of the cities not only progressed to become natural, but also impacted on the spatial manifestation of power in domestic space that belonged to different political frameworks. This became possible via ideological processes and examples of the phenomenon will be discussed in the following section.

Ideological conventions and reception

Ideologies

The way by which social hierarchies affected form and function is the first aspect of the purpose of Hellenistic palaces. The second relates to the effect of the palace on its audience and especially on the way the subjects viewed the authority of king and court on the basis of the spatial setting of their activities.[622] In their morphological and

[621] For an overview about strategies of introducing and establishing Hellenistic kingship in the Greek cities see Ma 2003, 180–181.

[622] It is known from references in literary works that treatises defining the ideals of kingship existed and they put emphasis on the ethical and divine qualities of the king (Walbank 1984, 76–77; Smith 1988, 49–52). Isocrates stresses the importance of education for a king (Usher 1994). The role of palace space as a means for education, especially for the royal pages in Macedonia, is an aspect that needs further investigation; for example, decoration can have served such purpose.

functional patterns the palaces are found to encapsulate those ideals about power that determined the reception of monumental buildings. These are ideological conventions of kingship, power and self-representation, which can vary among the kingdoms. I aim here to provide an insight into the ideological aspect of reception by summarizing the observations discussed individually for each kingdom and by using examples from textual evidence. Success of palace forms in conveying ideological meanings and maintaining social hierarchies becomes evident in their impact on later monumental space.

Plutarch reports that when Seleukos I forced Demetrios Poliorketes to confinement, he provided Demetrios not only banquet halls, but also parks with wild game.[623] This is telling about the attitude towards the institution of the king, who is expected to practice and excel in hunting. Hunting was regarded as preparation for military accomplishment and for this reason it was associated with the basis of Hellenistic kingship, success in warfare.[624] Indeed Demetrios stopped hunting only after he had started to lose interest in ambitions of government. This monarchic ideal was stronger in Antigonid Macedonia and the Seleukids than the Ptolemies.[625] Accordingly the iconographic themes of hunt in the mosaics from the Houses of Dionysus and the Rape of Helen in Pella would have been familiar to the viewer by responding to the prevailing ideals about royalty.

[623] Plut. Vit. *Dem.* 50.5.
[624] Lane Fox 1996, 122, 137–143.
[625] We already referred to Cassander's exclusion from reclining in banquets because he had not proven his mastery in hunting (see the *Discussion* in chapter 2).

In addition to the attribute of the king as the supreme military commander, palaces advanced his image by demonstrating royal patronage of the major cults of the city and by claiming ancestry from particular gods. Spaces that served cult and reflected this aspect of kingship were present in buildings in all kingdoms. In Ptolemaic Egypt there was a strong tendency to assimilate the rulers with deities,[626] but the available archaeological evidence, however, does not suffice to confirm whether the royal palaces at the time communicated the divinity of the rulers by means that were absent from the palaces in other regions.

When it comes to the sphere of jurisdiction and administration, the ideological conventions coincided with the image of a generous and accessible monarch. The custom of audience started early in the morning in the presence of the *philoi* and took place in specifically determined space.[627] Display, differentiation in accessibility according to social status and the use of waiting rooms, features present in the Hellenistic palaces, reminded that the king was approachable, but still in charge of handling the procedure of audience. An example from the Early Hellenistic period indicates that even when the court was peripatetic for military purposes, the etiquette as regards suitable space for audience was not abandoned: two oppositional assemblies of Athenians request audience from king Antipater, who had established his control over Phokis and Athens after the Lamian Wars (322–320 BC).[628] The audience takes place only after Antipater's general and appointed successor, Poylperchon, makes sure that Antipater and his *hetairoi* sit

[626] Walbank 1984, 85–86.
[627] Polyb. 5.56.10; 8.21.1. Denial of audience to specific *philoi* and selective audience of foreign envoys were exceptions and usually required an excuse (see Polyb. 5.56.2, 5.56.7, 21.6.2–6).
[628] Plut. *Vit. Phoc.* 33.5–7.

under a golden canopy, a measure that reflects equivalent designation of space in palaces.

Finally, providing banquets to small groups of attendants and public feasts was a function that fostered the image of the generous king. This is particularly evident in the preserved palaces from Macedonia and Pergamon, where the banquet halls seem to have played a primary role, and also in textual evidence about the pavilion of Ptolemy II and the seven-day banquet for the translators of the Septuagint. Abundance of material resources was not the only element of the banquet that revealed a generous king. This image became powerful also in a conceptual level. It was achieved by sympotic poetry, whose audience was the members of the court. Accentuating the virtues of the court in contrast to high social strata outside this royal circle cultivated bonds between the courtiers.[629] Without the king's patronage, sympotic poetry could not have had developed and had this effect. As a consequence, the banquet room as its architectural setting reminded that it was due to the king's generosity that the court was able to maintain its structure and power.

Heritage

It appears that ideology about kingship became a part of prevailing views about power that derived from other sources than royalty. A case that reflects persistence and spread of ideals about self-representation are the houses from Delos. The iconographical programs in the houses do not essentially show that their owners drew directly on

[629] Strootman 2007, 207. For the royal court as the setting of sympotic poetry see Cameron 1995 and Hunter 1996.

elements found in Hellenistic palaces. They are indicative, however, of the fact that Hellenistic palaces contributed in consolidating strategies of power manifestation. Delos increased its power after 166 BC when the Romans declared the island a free port and it became an international trade centre between the Aegean and the ports of Italy.[630] The continuation of iconographic themes denotes that the ideals on monarchic power evolved into ideals of power derived by wealth, which was now acquired by trade.

The most revealing example is the iconography of the mosaics in the House of the Masks *(Figure 6.6).* It contains together most of the themes that we find in the Hellenistic palaces from Aegae to Samosata: In a fashion familiar from Pella, the central mosaic scene in room e depicts Dionysus riding a panther, while two panels with centaurs flank the image of the god (*Figure 6.7*).[631] In room g the mosaic recalls the decoration in the palaces of Pergamon, as a band with masks surrounds perspective cubes. Furthermore, the mosaic in room h depicts a seated piper and a dancing Silenos, and in Room i it shows an amphora flanked by two rosettes, an element found later in the palace in Samosata (*Figure 6.8*).[632]

The same source of power, trade, was responsible for the development of the cities in the Bay of Naples. Houses constructed during the last two centuries of the Roman Republic demonstrate how manifesting the king's power over his subjects in the Hellenistic court was transformed into manifestation of the wealthy patron's power over his *clientela*. In a fashion equivalent to the Hellenistic court system, the relationship

[630] Rauh 1993.
[631] Bruneau 1972, 240–245.
[632] Bruneau 1972, 256–260.

between the patron and his *clientes* was vital for the maintenance of the structure of the Roman Republican Society, since it was the means of elevation of the social status and related to senatorial rank. The clients increased the social prestige of the patrons by offering support in the jury, in elections, especially in Rome so that they could get in the Senate, and provided their loyalty and help when they were asked.[633] In reward, they received the patron's protection, legal assistance, support in obtaining the Roman citizenship and financial or material rewards.

Even though in the second century BC and after the Roman conquest of Macedonia the respect to Hellenistic kings had started to decrease, the persistence of ideals that had their roots in the ideology of royal power in the Hellenistic East is evident in Roman residences of the time, a matter that I will discuss below.[634] But first it is worth noting that the correlation between prestige in spatial configuration and Hellenistic palace architecture in the eyes of the Romans must have been established earlier. In this respect, the latest theory about the origins of the Roman architectural type of basilica is elucidating.[635] This theory sees a connection of the first basilica in Rome constructed between 270 and 210 BC, the so called Atrium Regium, with halls for audience and banquets in the palaces of Hellenistic kings.[636] The type of space in the palaces that is

[633] Wallace Hadrill 1990, 65; Deniaux 2006; Rosenstein 2006, 369. The group of the non-strangers, who had access to the residential spaces of the house, comprises the patron, his family and the servants (Wallace Hadrill 1994, 38; Zanker 1998, 12–13). The patron's friends and clientes were the strangers in terms of accessibility, and were confined to the more official parts of the house and guided in its spaces.

[634] For the Hellenistic king as a symbol of power, luxury and wealth from a Roman perspective see Erskine 1991, 112, 120.

[635] Welch 2003.

[636] Ibid. especially page 12 and footnotes 29 and 31 with previous bibliography that related basilicas to Hellenistic palaces. The scholar's argument relies on historical, archaeological and topographical evidence.

most likely to be associated with the basilica is the Egyptian *oecus* due to the clerestory and aisles, a type that was present in the tent of Ptolemy II and the Palazzo delle Colonne in Ptolemais, an elite residence possibly used by an official of the city.[637] Welch suggested that the first basilica was used for reception and dining of ambassadors both Roman and foreign. Its association with palaces in the East would have impressed envoys of the Hellenistic kings. This is an attractive theory that reveals the survival of strategies to manifest power with origins in the realm of Hellenistic palaces and their reception by the Romans.

The same phenomenon is also reflected in the residences of the late Roman Republic. Affinities with Hellenistic palaces are observed primarily in the design around multiple courtyards and the elements of decoration. The House of the Faun in Pompeii has been characterised as a 'palace' due to its size (2940 m^2), which is comparable to elite houses of the late fourth century BC in Pella and the Palaces of Pergamon (*Figure 6.9).*[638] The iconography of the mosaics in the *triclinia* between atrium 27 and peristyle 54 is associated with the preparation of the symposion and Dionysus. The panels depict a fish (35) and a tiger rider (34) and are oriented towards the visitor coming from the entrance and atrium 27 *(Figure 6.10).* Similarly to palaces, decoration is set hierarchically. The well-known Alexander mosaic, the most splendid floor of the building, is set in one of the most remote rooms, exedra 37, ranked at the fifth level of depth from the entrance. The mosaic, which illustrates a battle scene between Alexander and Darius, is considered to be a copy of a painting of the second half of the fourth

[637] Pesce 1950.
[638] Hoffmann 2009.

century BC.[639] Moreover, the threshold mosaic between the *fauces* and the *atrium* and the frame of the Tiger Rider panel depict garlands that consist of tragic masks, foliage, ribbons and fruits *(Figure 6.11).* This motif also appears in the House of the Mosaic Doves in Pompeii in the frame of a mosaic floor that depicts doves drinking water from a cauldron. The garlands are familiar from the mosaics in palaces IV and V of Pergamon, while the scene with the doves must be a version of the mosaic that according to Pliny was executed by Sosos for the same palaces.[640]

A final source that possibly reveals the view of Hellenistic palaces from the West is Vitruvius' passage about the Greek house.[641] The author not only describes the parts that comprised the typical Greek residence, but also emphasised which of these parts and in what ways were different in Roman houses. We need to rely on two interpretative theories with respect to Vitruvius's treatise in order to understand its role in revealing a stance towards the royal seats.

The first is a recent theory that has found wide acceptance about the general aim of Vitruvius's work.[642] Wallace Hadrill characterises Vitruvius' treatise as 'the rebuilding of Roman identity through architecture', an aim as important as defining the identity of the architect at the time.[643] This means that Vitruvius stresses the differences

[639] Zanker 1998, 40; DeCaro 2001.
[640] Plin. *HN* 36.184.
[641] Vitr. *De arch.* 6.7.1–7.
[642] Wallace Hadrill 2008, 149.
[643] This second aim is seen as one of self-definition. The status of the architect in the late Republic was variable, from a slave or an amateur noble to a senatorial magistrate. Vitruvius presents his own ideal view of the architect (*De arch.* 1.1), the professional who specializes in construction and design and is also broadly educated in liberal arts like himself (Howe and Rowland 1999, 13–14).

between the Greek and the Roman and attempts to adapt Hellenistic elements in a Roman framework in order to create a specific and distinct ideological context of the architecture of the era of Augustus.[644] In the beginning of the Imperial era, during Augustus' reign, the architectural projects were associated with the emperor and the imperial family, therefore Vitruvius seeks to provide the emperor with the principles of Architecture.[645]

Wallace Hadrill's interpretation encourages the second theory, which is more specific since it focuses on the sources of Vitruvius's description and takes us back to the sphere of royal residences. This is a reappraisal of the models on which Vitruvius's account on the Greek house relied.[646] Raeder remarks that the design of the house as described with two peristyles, rich interior furnishing, representation and guest rooms, a library and a gallery for the display of paintings, matches elements found in *basileia* and not private residences. We cannot be certain that palaces were indeed the prototypes that Vitruvius had in mind. It is certain, however, that juxtaposing Roman buildings with palaces of Hellenistic rulers, renowned for their luxury, would be a strong comparative strategy that aimed to demonstrate the superiority of his contemporary architecture and in essence to foster the image of Augustus as a patron of such virtuous projects. Vitruvius's audience was Roman nobles, who would have been able to receive the message of comparison with older points of reference as regards representation of power.

[644] McEwen 2003, 48. Wallace Hadrill 2008, 144–148.
[645] McEwen 2003, 70.
[646] Raeder 1988, 347. See also Étienne 2006, 112-114.

It is this framework of the attempt to create a new Augustan identity that is revealing of the impact of Hellenistic palace architecture on Roman contexts.[647]

Conclusion

The present study investigated the seats of kings and officials in the Hellenistic East from a morphological and functional aspect. The aim has been to reconstruct the meaning of palaces in the societies that produced these buildings. For this reason it has also been essential to discuss the particular sociological and ideological processes that orchestrated the phenomenon of palace construction in each Hellenistic state and determined their reception. The investigation on reception comprised two levels: the local coincided with attitudes towards palaces from courtiers and subjects outside the court in the kingdoms. The second level has been more extensive and defined as the view of Hellenistic palaces from the West; a view reconstructed both through archaeological and textual evidence. It has been found that organizing space in the palaces revolved around four general aims: Reception and administration were associated with representation of the king, maintenance of his government and his court. The construction of palaces also aimed to facilitate residential needs for the ruler and provide the essential ancillary sections.

The analysis of the surviving material remains by region relied on the results of primary archaeological research and combined architectural, spatial and decorative parameters with the record of attested objects and installations from the buildings and

[647] For the creation of identity in Vitruvius's work see also McEwen 2003, 79.

also took their political and cultural context into consideration. This procedure offered an insight into the specific issues that apply in each one of the major and minor Hellenistic kingdoms involved in the study. It did not only reevaluate existing theories, but also demonstrated new ways of reading the material by avoiding preconceptions rooted in our knowledge of palaces in Modern History and suggested new interpretations.

By distinguishing the construction phases of the palaces in Macedonia I demonstrated that their form has been the result of gradual expansion from the mid-fourth to the early second century. This is a factor that we need to take into consideration in any interpretative attempt. The buildings in Pella and Demetrias reflect the type of space that the courts of the kings required possibly already since the time of Philip II and up to the reign of Philip V and Perseus. Emphasis on banqueting was stronger in the building in Aegae than in the other two Macedonian palaces and its purpose should be evaluated in the context of the ceremonial character of the site. Moreover, Macedonia functioned as a first point of reference in this study in the process of defining the standard elements of Hellenistic palaces and justifying its distinction from the study of domestic space.

The chapter on Egypt shed more light on the boundaries between palaces and houses: the textual evidence revealed the role of the *basileia*, the whole area of the palace complex together with its associated buildings, in the public life of a Hellenistic city and enriched our understanding of interior furnishing. On the basis of topographical and historical observations as well as by comparison to the other case studies the prevailing view about the location of the *basileia* in Alexandria was set open to criticism.

Comparative investigation of the case studies in the kingdom of the Attalids with private houses and Macedonia brought into discussion the matter of social processes as a parameter present in the interaction between the palaces and their audience. From an overall evaluation of the body of evidence in time course the present thesis concluded that the cardinal element of social circumstances that affected this interactive relationship was the complexity of the hierarchical structure in the court as well as its power in relation to the power of the king. In this respect it was suggested that modifications towards larger scale and sophistication of features in palace forms depended on an increase in the power of the courtiers. As Court Societies, the Hellenistic states constructed palaces that partially relied on diachronic behavioural patterns as regards the social dynamics in the court, power and self-representation. The distinctive elements from other palace civilisations touch upon ideas on the exercise of administration and government, recreation and banqueting, and values associated with royalty and particularly with the maintenance and legitimation of power.

With respect to origins of architectural and spatial forms, an issue that was the primary focus of previous studies on Hellenistic royal seats, the results of the present work reconcile views that see Achaemenid traditions as the main determinant of Hellenistic palace forms with the compound cultural character of the Hellenistic World. It draws attention on the variability in the sources of inspiration that provided strategies for the manifestation of royal power. And more specifically it places emphasis on the importance of understanding features by comparison and defining continuities, disruption and innovation bypassing one-way models of influence. The most suitable

case for clarifying procedures of cross-cultural interaction has been the Seleukid Empire due to its need to consolidate power in an extensively variable audience.

The conclusions of this thesis have also raised new questions for further exploration. What was the role of marginal regions in the interaction between the Hellenistic East and the West in the sphere of monumental space and especially in the formation of space for the representation of royalty? Macedonian palaces, for instance, have already indicated connections with Italy and ascertaining the pathway of interaction would help us better understand the features we find in both areas. And what was the architectural framework that determined such space in the easternmost provinces of the Seleukid Empire? Future results of studies on the pottery of the late fourth and early third century might lead to more accurate dating of the buildings in the beginning of the Hellenistic Age and reconstruct with greater precision their emergence and development. Necessary for attempting to understand these matters, however, is not only to obtain a greater amount of archaeological data, but also interpretative approaches that leave space for placing the buildings into their social and ideological framework as well as the diachronic aspects of their character.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adriani, A. 1932–33. *Annuario del Museo greco-romano*, vol. 1. Alexandria.

Adriani, A. 1933–35. *Annuaire du musée Greco-Romain d'Alexandrie.* Alexandria.

Adriani, A. 1966. Repertorio d'arte dell'Egitto greco-romano, Series C, vol. 1-2. Palermo.

Agelidis, S. 2012. 'Kulte und Heiligtümer in Pergamon'. In R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner and A. Scholl (eds.) *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole.* Berlin, 175–183.

Akamati, M. 2000. Νέες ανασκαφικές έρευνες στην Πέλλα. *AEMTh* 14, 407–420.

Akamati, M. 2003. 'Η Πέλλα'. In M. Lilimpaki Akamati and I.M. Akamatis (eds.) *Πέλλα και η περιοχή της. Pella and its Environs.* Thessaloniki.

Akamatis, I.M. 2011. 'Pella' in R.J. Lane Fox (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon.* Leiden-Boston, 393–408.

Alexander et al. 1977 (Alexander, Ch., S. Ishikawa and M. Silverstein 1977). *A pattern language: towns, buildings, construction.* New York.

Allamani, V. and A. Koukouvou 1998. Μίεζα: Ανασκαφικές έρευνες. *AEMTh* 12, 371–380.

Allamani, V., A. Koukouvou and E. Psarra 2002. Το κτηριακό συγκρότημα της Μίεζας. Ερμηνευτικές προσεγγίσεις και προοπτικές της έρευνας. *AEMTh* 16, 571–580.

Allen, R.E. 1983. *The Attalid Kingdom. A Constitutional History.* Oxford.

Amandry, P. 1987. 'Le système palatial dans la Perse Achéménide'. In E. Lévy (ed.) *Le système palatial en Orient, en Grèce et à Rome: actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 19–22 juin 1985*. Strasbourg.

Andelman, D. A. 2011. ...To the Shores of Tripoli. *World Policy Journal* 28, 124–132.

Andronikos et al. 1961 (Andronikos, M. - Ch. Makaronas - N. Moutsopoulos - G. Bakalakis 1961). *Το ανάκτορο της Βεργίνας*. Athens.

Andronikos, M. 1960. Ανασκαφή του αρχαίου ανακτόρου Βεργίνης. *ArchDelt* 16 (B2), 212–214.

Andronikos, M. 1964[a]. *Vergina, the prehistoric necropolis and the Hellenistic palace.* Lund.

Andronikos, M. 1964[b]. Ανασκαφαί Βεργίνας. *ArchDelt* 19 (B2), 366–367.

Andronikos, M. 1966. Ανασκαφή εις ανάκτορον Βεργίνης. *ArchDelt* 21 (B2), 357–358.

Andronikos, M. 1984. *Vergina, the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City*. Athens.

Arvanitopoulos, A.S. 1906. Ανασκαφαί και έρευναι εν Θεσσαλία. *Prakt* 1906, 123–130.

Ashmore, W. 2004. Decisions and Dispositions: Socializing Spatial Archaeology. *American Anthropologist*, 104, 1172–1183.

Augé, C. 2010. 'L'histoire par les monnaies'. In R. Étiénne and J.F Salles (eds). *Iraq al-Amir: guide historique et archéologique du domaine des Tobiades.* Beirut, 33–42.

Bakalakis, G. and M. Andronikos (1961-1962). Ανασκαφή ανακτόρου Βεργίνης. *ArchDelt* 17 (B2), 226–330

Bakalakis, G. and M. Andronikos 1969. Ανασκαφή Βεργίνης. *ArchDelt* 24 (B2), 336–339

Bakalakis, G. and M. Andronikos 1970. Ανασκαφή Βεργίνης. *ArchDelt* 25 (B2), 390–395.

Bakalakis, G. and M. Andronikos 1973. Ανασκαφή Βεργίνης. *ArchDelt* 28 (B2), 390–396.

Bandmann, G. 2005. *Early medieval architecture as bearer of meaning.* New York.

Barbantani, S. 2010. 'Idéologie royale et littérature de cour dans l' Égypte lagide'. In I. Savalli Lestrade and I. Cogitore (eds.) *Des rois au prince. Pratiques du pouvoir monarchique dans l'orient hellénistique et romain (IVe siécle avant J.-C. – IIe siécle après J.-C.)* Grenoble, 227–251.

Batziou Efstathiou, A 1997, Δημητριάδα, Ανάκτορο. *ArchDelt* 52, 461–463.

Batziou Efstathiou, A. 1989. Δημητριάδα. *ArchDelt* 44, B2, 227–228.

Batziou Efstathiou, A. 1991. Δημητριάδα. *ArchDelt* 46, B2, 207–208.

Batziou Efstathiou, A. 1996[a]. 'Δημητριάδα'. In E.I. Kontaksi (ed.) *Αρχαία Δημητριάδα. Η διαδρομή της στο χρόνο. Volos*, 11–46.

Batziou Efstathiou, A. 1996[b]. Αρχαία Δημητριάδα. *ArchDelt* 51, 333–335.

Batziou Efstathiou, A. 2000. 'Εργασίες στο ανάκτορο Δημητριάδος 1991-1997' *Το Έργο των Εφορειών Αρχαιοτήτων και Νεωτέρων Μνημείων του ΥΠ.ΠΟ στη Θεσσαλία και την ευρύτερη περιοχή της 1990-1998.* Volos, 293–300.

Batziou Efstathiou, A. 2001. *Δημητριάς.* Athens.

Batziou Efstathiou, A. 2008. 'Το ανάκτορο της Δημητριάδος'. In *1st International Congress on the History and Culture of Thessaly. Congress Proceedings, 1–11 November 2006,* 259–265.

Batziou Efstathiou, A. and P. Triantafyllopoulou 2000. 'Νεότερα δεδομένα από τον αρχαιολογικό χώρο Δημητριάδος'. *Το έργο των Εφορειών Αρχαιοτήτων και Νεωτέρων Μνημείων του ΥΠ.ΠΟ. στη Θεσσαλία και την ευρύτερη περιοχή της.* Volos, 301–307.

Baur, P. and M. Rostovtzeff (eds.) 1931. *The excavations at Dura-Europos, Preliminary Report of the Second Season, 1928–1929.* Yale and New Haven.

Baur, P., M. Rostovtzeff and A. Bellinger (eds.) 1933. *The excavations at Dura-Europos, Preliminary Report of the Fourth Season, 1930–1931*. Yale and New Haven.

Bean, G.E. and J.M. Cook 1955. The Halicarnassus Peninsula. *BSA* 50, 85–171.

Bergquist, B 1990. 'Sympotic Space: A Functional Aspect of Greek Dining-Rooms'. In O. Murray (ed.) *Sympotica: a symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford, 37–65.

Bernard, P. 1967. Deuxième campagne de fouilles d'Aï Khanoum en Bactriane. *CRAI* 111, 306–324.

Bernard, P. 1968. Troisième campagne de fouilles à Aï Khanoum en Bactriane. *CRAI* 112, 263–279.

Bernard, P. 1973. *Fouilles d'Ai Khanoum I (Campagnes 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968).* Paris.

Bernard, P. 1974. Fouilles d'Ai Khanoum. Campagnes de 1972 et 1973. *CRAI* 118, 280–308.

Bernard, P. 1975. Campagne de fouilles 1974 à Aï Khanoum (Afghanistan). *CRAI* 119, 167–197.

Bernard, P. 1976. Campagne de Fouilles 1975 à Ai Khanoum. *CRAI 120*, 287–322.

Bernard, P. 1978. Campagne de fouilles 1976-1977 à Aï Khanoum (Afghanistan). *CRAI 122*, 421–463.

Bernard, P. 1980. Campagne de fouilles 1978 à Aï Khanoum (Afghanistan). *CRAI* 124, 435–459.

Bernard, P. 1994. An ancient Greek city in Central Asia. *Scientific American* January 1982, 148–159.

Bernard, P. 2011 [2008]. 'The Greek Colony at Aï Khanoum and Hellenism in Central Asia.' In F. Hiebert and P. Cambon (eds.) *Afghanistan. Crossroads of the Ancient World.* London, 81–129.

Bevan, E.R. 1902. *The House of Seleucus*. London.

Beyer et al. 1976. (Beyer, I., V. von Graeve and U. Sinn in collaboration with B. Gossel, F. Henninger, D. Hertel 1976) 'Bericht über die Grabung am Palast 1971'. In V. Milojčić and D. Theocharis (eds.) *Demetrias* I. Bonn, 75–141.

Beyer, I., V. von Graeve and U. Sinn 1976. 'Grabung am Anaktoron von Demetrias 1970'. In V. Milojčić and D. Theocharis (eds.) *Demetrias* I. Bonn, 59–62.

Bickermann, E.J. 1938. *Institutions des Séleucides*. Paris.

Bietak, M. 2003. Two Ancient Near Eastern Temples with Bent Axis in the Eastern Nile Delta. *Ägypten und Levante* 13, 13–38.

Bingöl, O. 1997. *Malerei und Mosaik der Antike in der Türkei.* Mainz.

Boehlau, J. and K. Schefold (eds.) 1948. *Larisa am Hermos, die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen, 1902–1934. Die Bauten.* Berlin.

Boehlau, J. and K. Schefold 1940. *Die Bauten (Larisa am Hermos I)*. Berlin.

Boehringer, E. and A. Szalay 1937. *Die Hellenistischen Arsenale: Garten der Königin*. Berlin.

Boiy, T. 2004. *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*. Leuven.

Borel, L. 2006. Recherches récentes sur le domaine d'Iraq al Amir: nouveaux elements sur lé paysage construit. *Topoi* 14, 291–330.

Borel, L. 2010[a]. 'Le complexe troglodytique'. In R. Étiénne and J.F Salles (eds.) *Iraq al-Amir: guide historique et archéologique du domaine des Tobiades.* Beirut, 77–82.

Borel, L. 2010[b]. 'Le bassin de la falaise'. In R. Étiénne and J.F Salles (eds.) *Iraq al-Amir: guide historique et archéologique du domaine des Tobiades.* Beirut, 83–86.

Boucharlat, R. 1998. À la recherché d'Ecbatane sur Tepe Hagmataneh. *IrAnt* 33, 173–186.

Boucharlat, R. 2001. 'The Palace and the Royal Achaemenid City: two case Studies-Pasargadae and Susa'. In I. Nielsen (ed.) *The royal palace institution in the first millennium BC.* Athens, 113–122.

Boucharlat, R. 2010. 'Suse dans l'architecture iranienne et orientale'. In J. Perrot (ed.) *Le palais de Darius à Suse : une résidence royale sur la route de Persépolis à Babylone.* Paris, 380–385.

Bouché Leclercq, A. 1913–14. *Histoire des Séleucides (232–64 avant J.-C.).* Paris.

Brands, G. 1996. 'Halle, Propylon und Peristyl - Elemente hellenistischer Palastfassaden in Makedonien'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.), *Basileia. Die Paläste der Hellenistischen Könige*. Mainz, 62–72.

Braun, J.P. 2010. 'L'organisation au centre du domaine'. In R. Étiénne and J.F Salles (eds.) *Iraq al-Amir: guide historique et archéologique du domaine des Tobiades. Beirut,* 63–70.

Breccia, E. 1907-17. *Rapport sur la marche du service du musée Greco-Romain d'Alexandrie, 1906–16.* Alexandria.

Bretschneider, J. 2007. 'The 'reception palace' of Uruk and its architectural origin'. In J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen and K.V. Lerberghe (eds.) *Power and architecture: monumental public architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean.* Leuven, 11-22.

Briant, P. 1982. *Rois, tributs et paysans.* Paris.

Briant, P. 1990. 'The Seleucid Kingdom, the Achaemenid Empire and the History of the Near East in the First Millennium BC' in P. Bilde (ed.), *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom.* Aarhus, 40–65.

Brosius, M. 2007. 'New out of old? Court and court ceremonies in Achaemenid Persia'. In A. J. S. Spawforth (ed.) 2007. *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies.* Cambridge, 17–57.

Brown, B.R. 1957. *Ptolemaic Paintings and Mosaics and the Alexandrian Style.* Cambridge, Mass.

Bruneau, P. 1972. *Les mosaïques*. Paris.

Bulle, H. 1918. *Archaisierende Griechische Rundplastik.* Munich.

Calandra, E. 2008. L'occasione e l'eterno: la tenda di Tolomeo Filadelfo nei palazzi di Alessandria. Parte prima. Materiali per la ricostruzione. *LANX* 1, 26–74.

Calandra, E. 2009. L'occasione e l'eterno: la tenda di Tolomeo Filadelfo nei palazzi di Alessandria. Parte seconda. Una proposta di ricostruzione. *LANX* 2, 1–77.

Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and his critics*. Princeton.

Canali de Rossi, F. 2004. *Iscrizioni dello estremo oriente greco: un repertorio*. Bonn.

Capdetrey, L. 2007. *Le pouvoir séleucide*: *territoire, administration, finances d'un royaume hellénistique, 312–129 avant J.-C.* Rennes.

Carlier, P 1984. *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*. Strasbourg.

Carroll Spillecke, M. 1989. *ΚΗΠΟΣ. Der antike griechische Garten.* Munich.

Caspari, F. 1916. Das Nilschiff Ptolemaios IV. *JdI* 31, 1–74.

Christensen, A. 2006. From Palaces to Pompeii: The Architectural and Social Context of Hellenistic Floor Mosaics in the House of the Faun. PhD Thesis, The Florida State University. Accessed: http://etd.lib.fsu.edu/theses/available/etd-07272006-130323.

Chrysostomou, P. 1988, Λουτρά στο ανάκτορο της Πέλλας. *AEMTh* 2, 113–26.

Chrysostomou, P. 1996. Το ανάκτορο της Πέλλας. *AEMTh* 10, 105–142.

Chrysostomou, P. 1999. Ανάκτορο Πέλλας και Πελλαία χώρα κατά το 1999. *AEMTh* 13, 491–495.

Chrysostomou, P. 2001. Ανάκτορο Πέλλας 2001: «Βασίλειος κάραβος». *AEMTh* 15, 441–449.

Chrysostomou, P. 2002. Ανάκτορο Πέλλας 2002: «Βασίλειος κάραβος». *AEMTh* 16, 447–456.

Chrysostomou, P. 2003. 'Το ανάκτορο της Πέλλας'. In M. Lilimpaki Akamati and I.M. Akamatis (eds.) *Pella and its environs.* Athens, 31–39.

Clarke et al. 2005. (G.W. Clarke, A. Al-Azm, L. Coogle, H. Jackson, M. McConchie, W. Reade, J. Tidmarsh and R. Thornley 2005). Jebel Khalid: the 2004 and 2005 seasons. *MeditArch* 18, 119–60.

Clarke et al. 2008 (G. Clarke, H. Jackson, T. Nixon, W. Reade, J. Tidmarsh, and R. Thornley 2008). Jebel Khalid Fieldwork Report: 2006 Season. Area B. *MeditArch* 21, 59–78.

Clarke et al. 2009/10 (G. Clarke, H. Jackson, J. Tidmarsh, T. Nixon 2009/10). Jebel Khalid: the 2008 Season. Area B. *MeditArch* 22, *2*07–219.

Clarke, G.W. 1994. Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates: the Acropolis Building. *MeditArch* 7, 69–75.

Clarke, G.W. 2001. 'The Governor's palace, Acropolis, Jebel Khalid'. In I. Nielsen (ed.) *The Royal palace Institution in the First Millennium BC.* Athens, 215–247.

Clarke, G.W. 2002. 'Four Hellenistic Seal Impressions'. In Clarke, G.W. and P.J. Connor 2002. *Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates: report on excavations 1986-1996.* Sydney, 201–203.

Clarke, G.W. 2003. Jebel Khalid: The 2002 Season. Area B. *MeditArch* 16, 171–175.

Clarke, G.W. 2005. Jebel Khalid: Stamped Amphora Handles, 2000–2005. *MeditArch* 18, 175–191.

Clarke, G.W. 2006–2007. The Jebel Khalid Temple. *MeditArch* 19/20, 133–39.

Clarke, G.W. and P.J. Connor 2002. *Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates: report on excavations 1986–1996.* Sydney.

Cohen, A. 2010. *Art in the era of Alexander the Great: paradigms of manhood and their cultural traditions.* Cambridge.

Colledge, M 1987. 'Greek and non-Greek interaction in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East'. In A. Kuhrt (ed.) *Hellenism in the East: the interaction of Greek and non-Greek civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander*. London, 134–162.

Connor, P.J. 1990. 'A Fortified Macedonian Military Settlement at Jebel Khalid, North Syria: Excavations 1986-87'. In A. M. Tamis (ed.), *Macedonian Hellenism*. Melbourne, 12–26.

Connor, P.J. and G.W. Clarke 1996/7. 'Jebel Khalid in North Syria: The First Campaigns' *MeditArch* 9/10, 151–183.

Conze, A. 1913. *Altertümer von Pergamon I.2. Stadt und Landschaft.* Berlin.

Coulton, J.J. 1977. *Greek architects at work: Problems of structure and design*. London.

Cumont, F. 1934. Nouvelles inscriptions grecques de Suse. *CRAI* 1932.3, 271–286.

Cunningham, T. 2007. 'The destruction of power and the power of destruction in Minoan Crete'. In J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen, K.V. Lerberghs (eds.) *Power and architecture: monumental public architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean.* Leuven, 23-43.

Daszewski, M. 1985. *Corpus of Mosaics from Egypt I. Hellenistic and early Roman period.* Mainz.

DeCaro, S. 2001. *I mosaici: la casa del fauno*. Naples.

DeLaine, J. 2004. Designing for a market: medianum apartments at Ostia. *JRA* 17, 146–176.

Deniaux, E. 2006. 'Patronage', in N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein-Marx (eds.), *A Companion to the Roman Republic.* Oxford, 401–20.

Dentzer, J.M. 1982. *Le motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.* Rome.

Dentzer, J.M. 2010. 'La porte du domaine'. In R. Étiénne and J.F Salles (eds.) *Iraq al-Amir: guide historique et archéologique du domaine des Tobiades.* Beirut, 87–94.

Dentzer, J.M., F. Villeneuve and F. Larché 1983. The Main Gateway and the Princely Estate of Araq el-Emir. *AASOR* 171, 133–148.

Dimitrov, D.P. 1961. Seuthopolis. *Antiquity* 35.2, 91–102.

Dimitrov, D.P. and Čičikova, M. 1978. *The Thracian city of Seuthopolis.* Oxford.

Dinsmoor, W. B. 1950. *The architecture of ancient Greece: an account of its historic development.* London.

Dörpfeld, W. 1902. Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon. Die Bauwerke. *AM* 27, 10–43.

Dörpfeld, W. 1904. Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon. Die Bauwerke. *AM* 29, 114–151.

Dörpfeld, W. 1907. Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1904-1905. Die Bauwerke. *AM* 32, 163–240.

Dörrie, H. 1964. *Der Königskult des Antiochos von Kommagene im Lichte neuer Inschriften-Funde.* Göttingen.

Downey, G. 1961. *A history of Antioch in Syria: from Seleucus to the Arab conquest.* Princeton.

Downey, S.B. 1985. Two buildings at Dura-Europos and the early history of the Iwan. *Mesopotamia* 20, 111–129.

Downey, S.B. 1986. The Citadel Palace at Dura-Europos. *Syria* 63, 27–37.

Downey, S.B. 2003. *Terracotta Figurines and Plaques from Dura-Europos.* Ann Arbor.

Driessen, J. 2007. 'IIB or not IIB: On the beginnings of Minoan monumental building'. In J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen, K.V. Lerberghe (eds.) *Power and architecture: monumental public architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean.* Leuven, 73-92.

Drougou, S. and Ch. Saatsoglou Paliadeli 2000. *Vergina: wandering through the archaeological site.* Athens.

Droysen, J.G. 1836. *Geschichte des Hellenismus*. Hamburg.

Duindam, J.F.J. 1994. *Myths of power: Norbert Elias and the early modern European court*. Amsterdam.

Dunbabin, K.M.D. 1999. *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman world.* Cambridge.

Ehling, K. 2008. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der späten Seleukiden (164–63 v. Chr.): vom Tode des Antiochos IV. bis zur Einrichtung der Provinz Syria unter Pompeius.* Stuttgart.

Elias, N. 1983. *The court society*. Oxford.

Empereur, J.Y. 1998. Sous le sol d'Alexandrie. *Archéologia* 345 May 1998, 28–37.

Erskine, A. 1991. Monarchy and Roman Political Invective, *CQ* 41.1, 106–120.

Étiénne, R. 2006. 'Architecture palatiale et architecture privée en Macédoine, IV^{e}–II^{e} s. av. J.-C.' In A.M. Guimier-Sorbets, M.B. Hatzopoulos and Y. Morizot (eds.) *Rois, cites, necropoles. Institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine.* Athens, 105–115.

Étiénne, R. 2010. 'Fonctions du pavillon'. In R. Étiénne and J.F Salles (eds.) *Iraq al-Amir: guide historique et archéologique du domaine des Tobiades.* Beirut, 119–122.

Étiénne, R. and F. Larché 2010. 'Visite et description du pavillon'. In R. Étiénne and J.F Salles (eds.) *Iraq al-Amir: guide historique et archéologique du domaine des Tobiades.* Beirut, 95–108.

Evyasaf, R.S. 2008. Gardens at a Crossroads: The Influence of Persian and Egyptian Gardens on the Hellenistic Royal Gardens of Judea. *Bollettino di Archeologia Online* 2008 (Rome), 27–37.

Facella, M. 2006. *La dinastia degli Orontidi nella Kommagene ellenistico-romana.* Pisa.

Faklaris, P.B. 1994. Aegae: Determining the Site of the First Capital of the Macedonians. *AJA* 98.4, 609–616.

Findley, L. 2005. *Building change: architecture, politics, and cultural agency.* London.

Förtsch, R. 1996. 'Die Herstellung von Öffentlichkeit in der spätrepublikanischen Wohnarchitektur als Rezeption hellenistischer Basileia'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige.* Mainz, 240–249.

Fowler, R. 1998. *Ethnicity and power: Studies in the royal ideology of the Hellenistic Fertile crescent.* DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford.

Fowler, R. and Hekster, O. 2005. 'Imagining kings: From Persia to Rome'. In O. Hekster and R. Fowler (eds.) *Imaginary kings: royal images in the ancient Near East, Greece and Rome.* Stuttgart, 9–38.

Franks, H.M. 2012. *Hunters, Heroes, Kings: The Frieze of Tomb II at Vergina.* Athens.

Fraser, P.M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Oxford.

Funck, B. 1996. 'Beobachtungen zum Begriff des Herrscherpalastes und seiner machtpolitischen Funktion im hellenistischen Raum. Prolegomena zur Typologie der hellenistischen

Herrschaftspaläste.' In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) *Basileia, Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige*. Mainz, 44–45.

Gentelle, P. 1981. Un 'paradis' hellenistique en Jordanie. *Hérodote* 20, 70–101.

Gera, D. 1998. *Judaea and Mediterranean politics, 219 to 161 B.C.E.* Leiden.

Ginouvès, R. 1959. *L'établissement thermal de Gortys d'Arcadie.* Paris.

Goddio, F. 1998. *Alexandria: The submerged royal quarters.* London.

Goddio, F. and A. Bernard 2004. *Sunken Egypt: Alexandria.* London.

Goldstone, J. A. 2011. Cross-class Coalitions and the Making of the Arab Revolts of 2011. *Swiss Political Science Review* 17, 457–462.

Grahame, M. 2000. *Reading space: social interaction and identity in the houses of Roman Pompeii: a syntactical approach to the analysis and interpretation of built space*. Oxford.

Grassigli, G. L. 2007. 'La città e il palazzo reale, la funzione pubblica di uno spazio privata'. In D. Calabi, C.G. Malacrino and E. Sorbo (eds.) *Architetti, architettura e città nel Mediterraneo antico.* Milan.

Griffiths, F.T. 1979. *Theocritus at Court.* Leiden.

Grimal, N. 1998. Travaux de l'IFAO – Centre des études alexandrines. *BIFAO 98*, 543–550.

Groot, J. 1983. Wall Decoration. *AASOR* 47, 75–86.

Guimier Sorbets, A. M. 1998. Alexandrie: Les mosaiques hellénistiques découvertes sur le terrain de la nouvelle Biblioteca Alexandrina. *RA* 1998, 263–290.

Guimier Sorbets, A.M. 2004. 'Mosaics of Alexandria'. In A. Hirst and M. Silk (eds.), *Alexandria, Real and Imagined.* Aldershot.

Hamiaux, M. 1998. *Les sculptures grecques. II. La période hellénistique (IIIe-Ier siècles avant J.-C.). Musée du Louvre.* Paris.

Hammond, N. 1992. The Archaeological and Literary Evidence for the Burning of the Persepolis Palace. *CQ 42.2*, 358–364.

Hammond, N.G.L and F.W. Walbank 1988. *A history of Macedonia, vol. III.* Oxford.

Hammond, N.G.L and T. Griffiths 1979. *A History of Macedonia, vol. II*. Oxford.

Hammond, N.G.L. 1999. The Roles of the Epistates in Macedonian Contexts. *BSA* 94, 369–375.

Hanfmann, G.M.A., L. Robert, W.E. Mierse 1983. 'The Hellenistic Period'. In G.M.A. Hanfmann (ed.) *Sardis: From Prehistoric to Roman Times. Results of the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis 1958-1975*. Cambridge, Mass. and London, 109–39.

Hansen, E.V. 1947. *The Attalids of Pergamon.* Ithaca.

Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1994. *Cultes et rites de passage en Macédoine.* Athens.

Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1996. *Macedonian institutions under the kings. Vol.2 Epigraphic Appendix.* Athens.

Hatzopoulos, M.B. 2001. 'Macedonian Palaces: Where King and City meet.' In I. Nielsen (ed.) *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC.* Athens, 189–198.

Heermann, V. 1986. *Studien zur Makedonischen Palastarchitektur*. Berlin.

Held, W. 2002. Die Residenzstädte der Seleukiden. *JdI* 117, 217–249.

Held, W. 2004. Königsstädte in babylonischer Tradition. Die Residenzstädte der Seleukiden, *AntW* 2004.2, 23–26.

Hellmann, M.C. 1994. La maison grecque: les sources épigraphiques. *Topoi* 4.2, 131–146.

Herman, G. 1997. 'The court society in the Hellenistic Age'. In P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey and E. Green (eds.) *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History and Historiography*. Berkeley, 199-224.

Heuzey, L.A. and Daumet, H. 1876. *Mission archéologique de Macédoine.* Paris.

Hill, D.K. 1963. The Animal Fountain of Araq el Emir. *BASOR* 171, Oct 1963, 45–55.

Hillier, B. and J. Hanson 1984. *The social logic of space*. Cambridge.

Hodder, I. 1989. *The meanings of things: material culture and symbolic expression*. London.

Hodge, A.T. 1960. *The woodwork of Greek roofs.* Cambridge.

Hoepfner et al. 1994 (W. Hoepfner, J. Boessneck, S. Dakares, E.L. Schwandner 1994). *Haus und Stadt im klassischen Griechenland*. Munich.

Hoepfner, W. 1971. *Zwei Ptolemäerbauten: das Ptolemaierweihgeschenk in Olympia und ein Bauvorhaben in Alexandria.* Berlin.

Hoepfner, W. 1990. 'Von Alexandria über Pergamon nach Nikopolis. Städtebau und Stadtbilder hellenistischer Zeit'. In *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für klassische Archäologie Berlin 1988*. Mainz, 275–285.

Hoepfner, W. 1996. 'Zum Typus der Basileia und der königlichen Andrones'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige*. Mainz, 1–43.

Hoepfner, W. 1996–7. 'The architecture of Pergamon'. In R. Dreyfus et al (eds.) *Pergamon: the Telephos frieze form the Great Altar* (vol. 2). San Fransisco, 23–58.

Hoepfner, W. 2000. ‘Arsameia am Nymphaios und der Allgötterkult Antiochos’ I’. In J. Wagner (ed.), *Gottkönige am Euphrat: neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in Kommagene.* Munich, 57–73.

Hoepfner, W. 2002. ‘Bibliotheken in Wohnhäusern und Palästen.’ In W. Hoepfner (ed.) *Antike Bibliotheken.* Mainz, 86–96.

Hoepfner, W. 2004. «Antiocheia die Große». Geschichte einer antiken Stadt. *AntW* 35.2, 3–10.

Hoepfner, W. and A. Kose 2002. ‘Bauordnung und Weltwunder’. In F. Zimmer and J.C. Eule (eds.) *Die griechische Klassik: Idee oder Wirklichkeit: eine Ausstellung im Martin-Gropius-Bau.* Mainz, 399–432.

Hoffmann, A. 2009. *Die Casa del Fauno in Pompeji (VI 12)*. Wiesbaden.

Hoffmann, A. and Sayar, M.H. (eds.) 2007. Vorbericht zu den in den Jahren 2003 bis 2005 auf dem Berg Karasis (bei Kozan/Adana) und in seiner Umgebung durchgeführten Untersuchungen. *IstMitt* 57, 365–468.

Hölbl, G. 2001. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. London.

Hopkins, C. 1931. ‘Report on the finds’. In P.V.C. Baur and M.I. Rostovtzeff (eds.) *The excavations at Dura-Europos, Preliminary report of second season of work 1931*. New Haven and London, 20–113.

Howe, T. N. and I.D. Rowland 1999. *Ten books on architecture*. Cambridge.

Hunter, R. L. 1996. *Theocritus and the archaeology of Greek poetry.* Cambridge.

Intzesiloglou, B. G. 1996. ‘Ο συνοικισμός και η πολιτική οργάνωση της Δημητριάδας και του Κοινού των Μαγνήτων κατά την Ελληνιστική περίοδο’. In E.I. Kontaksi (ed.) *Αρχαία Δημητριάδα. Η διαδρομή της στο χρόνο.*Volos, 91–111.

Intzesiloglou, B.G. 2006. ‘The inscription of the Kynegoi of Herakles from the ancient theatre of Demetrias’. In Y.A. Pikoulas (ed.) *Inscriptions and history of Thessaly; new evidence. Proceedings of the International Symposium in honor of Professor Christian Habicht.* Volos, 67–77.

Invernizzi, A. 2006. ‘They did not write on clay. Non-cuneiform documents and archives in Seleucid Mesopotamia’. In M. Brosius (ed.) *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions.* Oxford, 302–321.

Izenour, G.C. 1992. *Roofed theaters of classical antiquity.* New Haven and London.

Jackson, H. 2006. *Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates, Volume Two: the Terracotta Figurines.* Sydney.

Jackson, H. 2009[a]. Erotes on the Euphrates. A Figured Frieze in a Private House at Hellenistic Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates. *AJA* 113, 231–253.

Jackson, H. 2009[b]. Catalogue of Significant Stucco Fragments from a Private House from Hellenistic Jebel Khalid. An Appendix to "Erotes on the Euphrates" (Jackson 2009a). Accessed online: http://www.ajaonline.org/sites/default/files/AJA1132_Jackson_appx.pdf.

Jackson, H., and J. Tidmarsh 2011. *Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates. Vol. 3, The Pottery.* Wiesbaden.

Jacoby, F. 1940-1958. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Leiden.

Ji, C.C. 1998. A new look at the Tobiads in Iraq al Amir. *Liber Annus* 48, 417–440.

Jouguet, P. 1926. *L'impérialisme macédonien et l'hellénisation de l'Orient.* Paris.

Kaltsas, N.E. 1988. *Πήλινες διακοσμημένες κεραμώσεις από τη Μακεδονία.* Athens.

Karamitrou Mentesidi, G. 2008. *Aiani: a guide to the archaeological site and the museum.* Archaeological Museum of Aiani.

Kardamitsi Adami, M. 2009. *Ανάκτορα στην Ελλάδα.* Athens.

Kawerau G. and T. Wiegand 1930. *Die Paläste der Hochburg, Altertümer von Pergamon, V.1*. Berlin.

Klein, N.L. 1998. Evidence for West Greek Influence on Mainland Greek Roof Construction and the Creation of the Truss in the Archaic Period. *Hesperia* 67.4, 335–374.

Koldewey, R. 1931. *Die Königsburgen von Babylon*. Leipzig.

Kosmetatou, E. 2003. 'The Attalids of Pergamon'. In A. Erskine, ed., *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford, 159–174.

Kosmin, P.J. 2011. 'The foundation and early life of Dura-Europos'. In L.R. Brody and G.L. Hoffman (eds.) *Dura Europos. Crossroads of Antiquity.* Boston, 95–109.

Kottaridi, A. 2009. *The Palace of Aegae 2007 - 2009: the commencement of a major project.* Thessaloniki.

Kottaridi, A. 2011[a]. 'The palace of Philip II in Aegae'. In A. Kottaridi and S. Walker (eds.) *Heracles to Alexander the Great: Treasures from the Royal Capital of Macedon, a Hellenistic Kingdom in the Age of Democracy*. Oxford, 233–236.

Kottaridi, A. 2011[b]. 'The palace of Aegae'. In R. Lane Fox (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon.* Leiden, Boston, 297–333.

Kropp, A.J.M. 2008. *Images and monuments of local rulers in the Roman Near East, 100 BC–AD 100.* DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford.

Kuhrt, A. 1996. 'The Seleucid kings and Babylonia: new perspectives on the Seleucid realm in the East'. In P. Bilde et al. (eds.) *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*. Aarhus, 41–54.

Kuhrt, A. 2001. 'The Palace(s) of Babylon'. In I. Nielsen (ed.) *The royal palace institution in the first millennium BC: regional development and cultural interchange between East and West.* Athens, 77–93.

Kuhrt, A. and S. Sherwin White 1991. Aspects of Seleucid Royal Ideology: The Cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa. *JHS* 111, 71–86.

Kunze, C. 1996. 'Die Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Paläste'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige.* Mainz, 109–129.

Kutbay, B. L. 1998. *Palaces and large residences of the Hellenistic Age.* Lewiston, N.Y.

La, K. C. 2010. The very mark of repression. The demolition theatre of the Palast der Republik and the New Schloss Berlin. *Architectural Design* 80, 116–123.

Lane Fox, R. 1996. 'Ancient hunting: from Homer to Polybios'. In G. Shipley, J. Salmon (eds). *Human landscapes in Classical Antiquity*. London, 119–153.

Lapp, N. 1983. Hellenistic Pottery from the Qasr and Square Building. *AASOR* 47, 63–74.

Lapp, P.W. 1962. Soundings at Araq el-Emir (Jordan). *BASOR* 165, Feb 1962, 16–34.

Lapp, P.W. 1963. The Second and the Third Campaigns at Araq el-Emir. *BASOR* 171, Oct 1963, 8–38.

Larché, F. 2005. *'Iraq al Amir: Le château de Tobiad Hyrcan. Vol. II Restitution et reconstruction.* Paris.

Lauter, H. 1971. Ptolemais in Libyen. Ein Beitrag zur Baukunst Alexandrias. *JdI* 46, 149–178.

Lauter, H. 1975. Die beiden anderen Tyrannenpaläste in Larissa am Hermos. *BJb* 175, 1975, 33–57.

Lauter, H. 1986. *Die Architektur des Hellenismus.* Darmstadt.

Lawrence, A. W. 1996 [1957]. *Greek architecture.* New Haven and London.

Lazaridi, K. 1989. Ανασκαφή Γυμνασίου αρχαίας Αμφιπόλεως. *Prakt* 1989, 205–215.

Le Bohec, S. 1985. Les philoi des rois antigonides. *REG* 98, 93–124.

Lebeau, M. and A. Suleiman 2008. Report on the 15th Season of excavations and the 6th season of architectural restoration at Tell Beydar (2008). Accessed online: http://www.beydar.com/pdf/Beydar_2008-en.pdf.

Lecuyot, G. 2007. Ai Khanoum reconstructed. *ProcBritAc* 133, 155–162.

Leriche et al. 1997 (Leriche, P., M. Gelin. M. Gharbi, J.B. Yon 1997). 'Le palais du stratège à Doura-Europos'. In P. Leriche and M. Gelin (eds.) *Doura-Europos Études IV 1991–1993.* Beyrouth, 55-80.

LIMC= Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae, vol.5.1 p. 557.

Litvinskij, B. and I.R. Pičiklan 2002. *Taxt-i-Sangīn. Der Oxus Tempel. Grabungsbefund, Stratigraphie und Architektur*. Mainz.

Locock, M. 1994. 'Meaningful architecture'. In M. Locock (ed.) *Meaningful architecture: Social interpretations of buildings.* Adelshot, Avebury, 1-13.

Ma, J. 2006. 'Hellenistic honorific statues and their inscriptions'. In Z. Newton and R.E. Leader Newby (eds.*) Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, 203–220.

Macurdy, G.H. 1932. *Hellenistic Queens; a study of woman-power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt.* Baltimore, Maryland.

Mairs, R. 2011. 'The places in between: model and metaphor in the archaeology of Hellenistic Arachosia'. In A. Kouremenos, S. Chandrasekaran and R. Rossi (eds.), *From Pella to Gandhara. Hybridisation and Identity in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East.* Oxford, 177–189.

Makaronas, Ch. 1960. Ανασκαφαί Πέλλης 1957-1960. *ArchDelt* 16 (B2), 72–83.

Makaronas, Ch. 1963. Ανασκαφαί Πέλλης. *ArchDelt* 18 (B2), 200–206.

Makaronas, Ch. I. and E. Giouri 1989. *Οι οικίες αρπαγής της Ελένης και Διονύσου της Πέλλας.* Athens.

Manning, J.G. 2010. *The last Pharaohs. Egypt under the Ptolemies, 305–50 BC*. Princeton.

Marcellesi, M.Ch. 2012. *Pergame de la fin du Ve au début du Ier siècle avant J.-C. Pratiques monétaires et histoire.* Pisa and Rome.

Margueron, J. 1987. 'Apparition du palais au Proche-Orient'. In E. Lévy (ed.) *Le système palatial en Orient, en Grèce et à Rome: actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 19–22 juin 1985*. Strasbourg, 9-38.

Markus, T. A. 1993. *Buildings and power: freedom and control in the origin of modern building types.* London.

Martín Galán, R. 2002. 'The Seleucid-Parthian Settlement at Tell Beydar and its Importance in the Context of Hellenistic Upper Mesopotamia'. In M. Lebeau and A. Suleiman (eds.) *Tell Beydar/Nabada. An Early Bronze Age City in the Syrian Jezirah: 10 Years of Research (1992–2002).* Accessed online: http://www.beydar.com/pdf/bey_10_en.pdf, 38–42.

Martín Galán, R. 2007. Structural and functional analysis. *Subartu* XV, 243–254.

Martín Galán, R. and E.d.C. Olivares Pantoja 2007. The Hellenistic palace of Tell Beydar. *Subartu* XV, 211–225.

Martinez Sève, L. 2002. La ville de Suse à l'époque Hellénistique. *RA* 33.1, 31–53.

Marzolff, P. 1976. 'Untersuchungen auf Höhe 33 ("Anaktoron" - Hügel)'. In V. Milojčić and D. Theocharis (eds.) *Demetrias* I. Bonn, 17–58.

Marzolff, P. 1996[a]. 'Der Palast von Demetrias'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) 1996. *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige.* Mainz, 148–163.

Marzolff, P. 1996[b]. 'Η πολεοδομική εξέλιξη και τα κυριότερα αρχιτεκτονικά έργα της περιοχής της Δημητριάδας'. In E. Kontaksi (ed.) *Αρχαία Δημητριάδα. Η διαδρομή της στο χρόνο.* Volos, 47–73.

McEnroe, J. C. 2010. *Architecture of Minoan Crete: constructing identity in the Aegean Bronze Age.* Austin.

McEwen, I. K. 2003. *Vitruvius: writing the body of architecture.* Cambridge, Mass. and London.

McKenzie, J. 1990. *The architecture of Petra.* Oxford.

McKenzie, J. 2003. Glimpsing Alexandria from Archaeological Evidence. *JRA* 16, 35–63.

McKenzie, J. 2007. *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt.* London, Yale University Press.

McKenzie, L. 1994. Patterns in Seleucid Administration. *MeditArch* 7, 61–68.

Messerschmidt, W. 2000. 'Die Ahnengalerie des Antiochos I. von Kommagene'. In J. Wagner (ed.), *Gottkönige am Euphrat: neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in Kommagene.* Munich, 37–49.

Michl, J. 1995. Form follows what? The modernist notion of function as a carte blanche. *1:50 - Magazine of the Faculty of Architecture & Town Planning (Technion, Israel Institute of Technology)* 10, 31–20 [sic].

Millar, F. 1987. 'The Problem of Hellenistic Syria'. In A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds.) *Hellenism in the East*. London, 110–133.

Miller, Stella 1972. *Hellenistic Macedonian Architecture: Its style and painted ornamentation.* Bryn Mawr College, PhD, 1971. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Miller, Stephen 1972. Round pegs in square holes. *AJA* 76.1, 78–9.

Misailidou Despotidou, V. 1989. Ανασκαφή στο ανάκτορο της Πέλλας. *AEMTh* 3, 67–74.

Mitropoulou, E. 1984. *Η τυπολογία της θεάς Υγείας με φίδι.* Athens.

Mooren, L. 1975. 'Die angebliche Verwandschaft zwischen ptolemäischen und pharaonischen Hofrangtiteln.' In P. J. Parsons et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists*. London, 233–240.

Moyer, I.S. 2011. Court, *chora*, and culture in Late Ptolemaic Egypt. *AJP* 132, 15–44.

Mueller, K. 2006. *Settlements of the Ptolemies: city foundations and new settlement in the Hellenistic world.* Leuven

Müller 1989. ‘Levkadia’. In S. Lauffer (ed.) *Griechenland: Lexikon der historischen Stätten von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart.* Munich, 392.

Müller, H. 2000. Der hellenistische Archiereus. *Chiron* 30, 519–542.

Muntasser, N.K. 2003. *The Late Antique Domus in Ostia: Patterns of Diversity and Transformation* (PhD Thesis, University of Texas at Austin).

Murray, O. 1996. ‘Hellenistic Royal Symposia’. In Bilde et al (eds.) *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship.* Aarhus, 15–27.

Mylonas, G.E, ed. (1981). Πέλλα, *Ergon* 20, 20–23.

Nasar et al. 2005 (Nasar, J. L., A.E. Stamps and K. Hanyu 2005). Form and function in public buildings. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 25, 159–165.

Netzer, E. 2001. *Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho, Vol. I.* Israel Exploration Society.

Nevett, L. C. 1999. *Home and Society in the Ancient Greek World.* Cambridge.

Nielsen , I. 1994. *Hellenistic palaces; tradition and renewal*. Aarhus.

Nielsen, I. 1996. ‘Oriental Models for Hellenistic Palaces?’ In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) Basileia: *die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige.* Mainz, 209–212.

Nielsen, I. 1997. Royal Palaces and Type of Monarchy: do the Hellenistic Palaces reflect the Status of the King? *Hephaistos* 15, 137–161.

Nielsen, I. 2001. ‘The Gardens of the Hellenistic Palaces’. In I. Nielsen (ed.) *The royal palace institution in the first millennium BC.* Athens, 165–187.

Nowicka, M. 1969. *La maison privée dans l’Égypte ptolemaïque.* Wroclaw.

Oelsner, J. 1978. Kontinuität und Wandel im Gesellschaft und Kultur Babyloniens in hellenistischer Zeit. *Klio* 60, 101–116.

Oelsner, J. 1986. *Materialien zur babylonischen Gesellschaft und Kultur in hellenistischer Zeit.* Budapest.

O'Neil, J. L. 2006. Places and Origin of the Officials of Ptolemaic Egypt. *Historia* 55, 16–25.

Özgüç, N. 1985. Samsat 1984 yılı Kazıları, *VII. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı*, 221–227.

Özgüç, N. 1986. 1985 Yilinda yapilmis olan Samsat kazilarinin sonuclari. *VIII. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı*, 297–304.

Panagiotopoulos, D. 2006. ‘Der minoische 'Hof' als Kulisse zeremonieller Handlung’. In J. Maran, C. Juwig, H. Schwengel and U. Thaler (eds.) *Constructing Power. Architecture and social practice.* Hamburg, 31-48.

Pandermalis, D. 1976. 'Beobachtungen zur Fassadenarchitektur und Aussichtsveranda in hellenistischen Macedonien'. In P. Zanker (ed.) *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien.* Göttingen, 387–395.

Pandermalis, D. 1987. 'Η κεράμωση του ανακτόρου της Βεργίνας'. In *ΑΜΗΤΟΣ: τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Μανόλη Ανδρόνικο (vol.II).* Thessaloniki, 579–614.

Papachatzis, N. 1958. Το μακεδονικό ανάκτορο της Δημητριάδας. *Thessalika* A1, 16–26.

Parker Pearson, M. and C. Richards 1994. 'Ordering the world: perceptions of architecture, space and time'. In M. Parker Pearson, C. Richards (eds.) *Architecture and Order. Approaches to the social space.* London, 1-37.

Perrot, J.F. 2010. *Le palais de Darius à Suse: une résidence royale sur la route de Persépolis à Babylone*. Paris.

Pesce, G. 1950. *Il Palazzo delle Colonne in Tolemaide di Cirenaica.* Rome.

Petrie, W.M.F. 1909. *The palace of Apries (Memphis II).* London.

Pfrommer, M. 1982. Rankenornamentik frühhellenistischer Zeit. *JdI* 92 (1982), 119–190.

Pfrommer, M. 1996. 'Fassade und Heiligtum. Betrachtungen zur architektonischen Repräsentation des vierten Ptolemäers'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) *Basileia. Die Paläste der Hellenistischen Könige.* Mainz, 97–108.

Pfrommer, M. 1999. *Alexandria. Im Schatten der Pyramiden.* Mainz.

Pfrommer, M. 2004. Die Basileia von Pergamon, Alexandria und das Haus des Augustus. *IstMitt* 54, 161–172.

Pillet, M. 1931. 'General report on the campaign'. In P.V.C. Baur and M.I. Rostovtzeff (eds. Second season) *The excavations at Dura-Europos, Preliminary report of second season of work 1931*, 1–19.

Pillet, M. 1933. 'General report on the campaign of 1930-31'. In Baur, Rostovtzeff, and Bellinger (eds.) *The excavations at Dura-Europos, Preliminary report of fourth season of work 1933*, 1–41.

Pinkwart, D. and W. Stammnitz 1984. *Peristylhäuser westlich der unteren Agora. (Altertümer von Pergamon XIV).* Berlin.

Pirson, F. 2008. Pergamon-Bericht über die Arbeiten in der Kampagne 2007. *AA* 2008.2, 104–106.

Pitschikjan, I. 1996. 'Die Entwicklung des Baktrischen Palast-Tempels'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) *Basileia. Die Paläste der Hellenistischen Könige. Internationales Symposion in Berlin.* Mainz, 226–233.

Radt, T. 2009. 'Bautechnische Eigenheiten im hellenistischen Wehrbau Kilikiens'. In M. Bachmann (ed.) *Bautechnik im antiken und vorantiken Kleinasien.* Istanbul, 269–294.

Radt, T. 2010. 'Fliehburg, Festung, Residenz? – Die Ruinen auf dem Karasis'. In F. Pirson (ed.) *Aktuelle Forschungen zur Konstruktion, Funktion und Semantik antiker Stadtbefestigungen.* Istanbul, 195–218.

Radt, T. 2011. 'The ruins on Mount Karasis in Cilicia'. In A. Kouremenos, R. Rossi, S. Chandrasekaran (eds.) *From Pella to Gandhara: Hybridisation and Identity in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East.* Oxford, 49–64.

Radt, W. 1999. *Pergamon: Geschichte und Bauten einer antiken Metropole.* Darmstadt.

Raeck et al. 1999 (Raeck, W., A. Gorys and B. Gossel Raeck 1999). Untersuchungen zur Vorgängerbebauung des Trajaneums von Pergamon, 1. Überblick. Obere Hangstufe. *IstMitt* 49, 333–361.

Raeck et al. 2000 (Raeck, W., A. Gorys and B. Gossel Raeck 2000). Untersuchungen zur Vorgängerbebauung des Trajaneums von Pergamon, 2. Der Bereich westlich des Tempels, untere Hangstufe. *IstMitt* 50, 307–364.

Raeck, W. 2004. Das hellenistische Pergamon als Residenzstadt und Polis. Kenntnisstand und offene Fragen. *IstMitt* 54, 23–34.

Raeder, J. 1988. Vitruv, de architectura VI 7 *(aedificia Grecorum)* und die Hellenistische Wohnhaus- und Palastarchitektur. *Gymnasium* 95, 316–68.

Ramsey, G. 2011. 'Seleucid administration: effectiveness and dysfunction among officials'. In K. Erickson and G. Ramsey (eds.) *Seleucid dissolution: the sinking of the anchor*. Wiesbaden, 37–50.

Rapin, C. 1992. *Fouilles d'Ai Khanoum 8, La Trésorerie du palais hellénistique d'Ai Khanoum.* Paris.

Rapoport, A. 1994. 'Spatial organization and the built environment'. In T. Ingold (ed.) *The Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology.* London, 460-502.

Rauh, N.K. 1993. *The sacred bonds of commerce: religion, economy, and trade society at Hellenistic Roman Delos, 166–87 B.C.* Amsterdam.

Reuther, O. 1926. *Die Innenstadt von Babylon (Merkes).* Leipzig.

Rhomaios, K.A. 1955. Το ανάκτορο της Παλατίτσας. *ArchEph* 1953–4 I, 141–150.

Rice, E. 1983. *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus.* Oxford.

Rodziewicz, M. 1995. 'Ptolemaic Street Directions in Basileia (Alexandria)'. In *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico-romano. Congresso Alessandria 1992.* Rome, 227–235.

Rodziewicz, M. and A.A. Fatah 1991. Recent discoveries in the Royal Quarter of Alexandria. *Bulletin de Société Archéologique d'Alexandrie* 44, 131–150.

Rook, T. 1978. The Development and Operation of Roman Hypocausted Baths. *JAS* 5, 269–282.

Rosenberg, S.G. 2006. *Airaq al-Amir. The Architecture of the Tobiads.* Oxford.

Rosenstein, N. 2006. 'Aristocratic Values'. In N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein Marx (eds.), *A Companion to the Roman Republic.* Oxford, 365–382.

Rossi, R. 2011. 'Introduction: from Pella to Gandhara'. In A. Kouremenos, R. Rossi, and S. Chandrasekaran (eds.) *From Pella to Gandhara: Hybridisation and Identity in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East.* Oxford.

Rostovtzeff, M.I. 1938. *Dura-Europos and its Art.* Oxford.

Roux, G. 1961. *L'architecture de l'Argolide aux IVe et IIIe siècles avant J.-C.* Paris.

Roux, G. 1973. Salles de banquets à Délos, *BCH* Supplément 1.1, 525–54.

Rowlandson, J. 2007. 'The character of Ptolemaic aristocracy: problems of definition and evidence'. In T. Rajak, S. Pearce, J. Aitken and J. Dines (eds.) *Jewish perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, 29–49.

Saatsoglou Paliadeli, Chr. 1996. Aegae. A reconsideration, *AM* 111, 225–236.

Saatsoglou Paliadeli, Chr. 1999. Βεργίνα 1998-1999. Ανασκαφή στο ιερό της Εύκλειας και στη θόλο του ανακτόρου. *AEMTh* 13, 541–551.

Saatsoglou Paliadeli, Chr. 2001. 'The Palace of Vergina-Aegae and its Surroundings'. In I. Nielsen (ed.) *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC.* Athens and Aarhus, 201–213.

Sabbotka, M. 2008. *Das Serapeum in Alexandria.* Cairo.

Said, D. 1994. Deux mosaiques hellenistiques recemment decouvertes a Alexandrie. *BIFAO 94*, 377–80.

Salza Prina Ricotti, E. 1989. 'Le tende conviviale e la tenda di Tolomeo Filadelfo'. In M.I. Curtis (ed.) *Studia Pompeiana and Classica in Honour of Wilhelmina Jashemski*, vol. 2. New Rochelle, NY, 199–239.

Salzmann, D. 1982. *Untersuchungen zu den antiken Kieselmosaiken: von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Tesseratechnik.* Berlin.

Salzmann, D. 1991. Mosaiken und Pavimente in Pergamon. Vorbericht der Kampagnen 1989 und 1990. *AA* 1991, 433–456.

Salzmann, D. 1993. Mosaiken und Pavimente in Pergamon. Vorbericht der Kampagne 1991 und 1992. *AA* 1993, 389–400.

Salzmann, D. 1995. Zu den Mosaiken in den Palästen IV und V von Pergamon, *Asia Minor Studien* 16, 101–112.

Salzmann, D. 2012. ‘Hellenistische und Frühkaiserzeitliche Mosaiken und Pavimente in Pergamon‘. In R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner and A. Scholl (eds.) *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole*. Berlin, 101–107.

Samuel, A.E. 1993. ‘The Ptolemies and the Ideology of Kingship’. In P. Green (ed.) *Hellenistic History and Culture*. Berkeley, chapter 6.

Savalli Lestrade, I. 1998. *Les philoi royaux dans l’Asie hellénistique*. Geneva.

Sayar, M.H. 1995. Eine neuentdeckte seleukidische Bergfestung im ostkilikischen Taurus. *AntW* 26, 279–282.

Sayar, M.H. 1999. ‘Kilikien und die Seleukiden’. *Studien zum antiken Kleinasien V*, 125–136.

Scheer, T.S. 2003. ‘The Past in the Hellenistic Present’. In A. Erskine (ed.) *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford, 217–231.

Schefold, K. 1978. Die Residenz von Larisa am Hermos im Licht neuer Forschungen. In *The Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology*. Ankara, 549–564.

Schenkar, M. 2011. ‘Temple Architecture in the Iranian World in the Hellenistic Period’. In A. Kouremenos et al (eds.) *From Pella to Gandhara. Hybridisation and Identity in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East.* Oxford, 117–140.

Schlumberger, D. and P. Bernard 1965. Aï Khanoum. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, 89.2, 590–657.

Schmidt, M.W. 1941. Die Griechen in Babylon und das Weiterleben ihrer Kultur. *AA* 56, 786–843.

Schober, A. 1940. Zur Datierung eumenischer Bauten, *ÖJh* 32, 1940, 151–168.

Schrwarzer, H. 2008. *Das Gebäude mit dem Podiensaal in der Stadtgrabung von Pergamon (Altertümer von Pergamon XV.4).* Berlin.

Schwarzer, H. 2012. ‘Der Herrscherkult der Attaliden’. In R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner and A. Scholl (eds.) *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole.* Berlin,110–117.

Sherwin White, S. 1987. ‘Babylonia: a case study for the installation and development of Greek rule’. In A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin White (eds.) *Hellenism in the East.* London, 1–31.

Sherwin White, S. and A. Kuhrt 1993. *From Samarkhand to Sardis. A new approach to the Seleucid Empire.* London.

Siganidou, M. 1981. Ανασκαφή Πέλλας υπό Μ. Σιγανίδου. *Prakt* 137 (1981), 42–54.

Siganidou, M. 1982[a]. Ανασκαφή Πέλλας υπό Μ. Σιγανίδου. *Prakt* 138 (1982), 57–62.

Siganidou, M. 1982[b]. Η ιδιωτική κατοικία στην αρχαία Πέλλα. *Αρχαιολογία* 2, 31–36.

Siganidou, M. 1984. Ανασκαφές Πέλλας υπό Μ. Σιγανίδου. *Prakt* 140 (1984) 75–94.

Siganidou, M. 1987. Το ανακτορικό συγκρότημα της Πέλλας. *AEMTh* 1, 119–124.

Siganidou, M. 1989. Το μνημειακό πρόπυλο του ανακτόρου της Πέλλας. *AEMTh* 3, 59–66.

Siganidou, M. 1996. 'Die Basileia von Pella' in W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.). *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige*. Mainz, 144–147.

Smith, R. R. R. 1988. *Hellenistic royal portraits*. Oxford.

Smith, R.R.R. 2010. 'A Fayum teacher's manual, Alexandrian pavilion architecture, and Augustan wall-painting'. In O. Palagia and B.D. Wescoat (eds.) *Samothracian connections. Essays in honour of James R. McCredie.* Oxford and Oakville, 211–220.

Sonne, W. 1996. 'Hellenistische Herrschaftsgärten'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) 1996. *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige*. Mainz, 136–143.

Spawforth, A.J.S. (ed.) 2007. *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies*. Cambridge.

Spawforth, A.J.S. 2007[a]. 'Introduction', in A.J.S Spawforth (ed.), *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies*. Cambridge, 1–16.

Spawforth, A.J.S. 2007[b]. 'The court of Alexander the Great between Europe and Asia' In A.J.S Spawforth (ed.), *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies*. Cambridge, 82–120.

Spawforth, A.J.S. 2008. *Versailles: a biography of a palace*. New York.

Steadman, S. R. 1996. Recent research in the Archaeology of Architecture: Beyond the foundations. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 4, 51–93.

Stewart, A. 1996. 'The Alexandrian Style: A Mirage?'. In *Alexandria and Alexandrianism, papers delivered at a symposium organized by the J. Paul Getty Museum and the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities and held at the Museum, April 22–25, 1993.* Malibu, 231–246.

Stronach, D. 2001. 'From Cyrus to Darius: Notes on Art and Architecture in Early Achaemenid palaces'. In I. Nielsen (ed.) *The Royal Palace Institution in the first Millennium B.C. Regional development and cultural interchange between East and West.* Aarhus.

Strootman, R. 2007. *The Hellenistic Royal Court. Court Culture, Ceremonial and Ideology in Greece, Egypt and the Near East, 336–30 BCE* (PhD Thesis, Utrecht University). Accessed online.

Strootman, R. 2011. 'Hellenistic court society: The Seleukid imperial court under Antiochos the Great, 223-187 BCE'. In J. Duindam, T. Artan, M. Kunt (eds.) *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires: A Global Perspective*. Leiden, 63–89.

Studniczka, F. 1914. *Das Symposion Ptolemaios II: nach der Beschreibung des Kallixeinos.* Leipzig.

Tarn, W.W. 1938. *The Greeks in Bactria and India.* Cambridge.

Thompson, D.J. 1988. *Memphis under the Ptolemies.* Princeton.

Thompson, D. J. 2000. 'Philadelphus' Procession. Dynastic Power in a Mediterranean Context'. In L. Mooren (ed.) *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Bertinoro 19–24 July 1997.* Leuven, 365–388.

Thompson, D. J. 2001. 'Ethne, Taxes and Administrative Geography in Early Ptolemaic Egypt'. In I. Andorlini, G. Bastianini, M. Manfredi, G. Menci (eds.) *Atti del XXII congresso internazionale di papirologia, Firenze, 23–29 agosto 1998*. Florence, 1255–1263.

Thompson, D. J. 2003. 'The Ptolemies and Egypt'. In A. Erskine (ed.) *A Companion to the Hellenistic World.* Oxford, 105–120.

Tkaczow, B. 1993. *Topography of ancient Alexandria. An archaeological map.* Warsaw.

Tkaczow, B. 2008. *Architectural Styles of Ancient Alexandria. Elements of architectural decoration from Polish excavations at Kom el-Dikka.* Warsaw.

Tomlison, R.A. 1970. 'Ancient Macedonian Symposia'. In V. Laourdas and Ch. Makaronas (eds.) *Αρχαία Μακεδονία: ανακοινώσεις κατά το πρώτον Διεθνές Συμπόσιον εν Θεσσαλονίκη.* Thessaloniki, 308–315.

Tosi, G. 1959. Il palazzo principesco dall'arcaismo greco alla Domus Flavia. *Arte Antica e Moderna* 7, 241–260.

Touratsoglou, I. 1975. Μεταλεξάνδρεια Πέλλα. *ArchDelt* 30 (A), 169–171.

Triantafyllopoulou, P. 2000. Αρχαία Δημητριάς. Συνοικία Αϊβαλιώτικα, οδός Παλατίου. *ArchDelt* 2000, 467–468.

Trigger, B. G. 1990. Monumental Architecture: A Thermodynamic Explanation of Symbolic Behaviour. *World Archaeology* 22, 119–132.

Tsimpidou Avloniti, M. 2005. *Μακεδονικοί τάφοι στον Φοίνικα και στον Άγιο Αθανάσιο Θεσσαλονίκης: συμβολή στη μελέτη της εικονογραφίας των ταφικών μνημείων της Μακεδονίας*. Athens.

Ulrich, R.B. 2007. *Roman Woodworking.* New Haven, London.

Usher, S. 1994. 'Isocrates: Paideia, Kingship and the Barbarians. In The Birth of the European Identity'. In H.A. Khan (ed.) *The Europe-Asia Contrast in Greek Thought 490–322 B.C.* Nottingham, 131–145.

van Bremen, R. 1996. *The limits of participation; Women and civic life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.* Amsterdam.

Villeneuve, F. 1986. 'Recherches en cours sur les systèmes défensifs d'un petit site d'époque hellénistique en Transjordanie: Iraq al Amir'. In P. Leriche and H. Tréziny (eds.) *La*

fortification dans l'histoire du monde grec: actes du Colloque international La Fortification et sa place dans l'histoire politique, culturelle et sociale du monde grec, Valbonne, décembre 1982. Paris, 157–165.

Villeneuve, F. 2010. 'Le village de Iraq al-Amir, aujourd'hui et dans les temps anciens'. In R. Étienne and J.F. Salles (eds.) *Iraq al-Amir: guide historique et archéologique du domaine des Tobiades.* Beirut, 71–76.

von Hesberg, H. 1996. 'Privatheit und Öffentlichkeit der frühhellenistischen Hofarchitektur'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) 1996. *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige*. Mainz, 84-96.

Vorster, C. 2012. 'Die ''Tänzerin'' aus Palast V in Pergamon'. In R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner and A. Scholl (eds.) *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole.* Berlin, 149–151.

Wacker, Ch. 2004. 'Die bauhistorische Entwicklung der Gymnasien. Von der Parkanlage zum 'Ideal gymnasion' des Vitruv'. In D. Kah and P. Scholz (eds.) Das hellenistische Gymnasion. Berlin, 349–362.

Wagner, J. 2000. 'Die Könige der Kommagene und ihrer Herrscherkult'. In J. Wagner (ed.) *Gottkönige am Euphrat: neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in Kommagene.* München, 11–25.

Walbank, F. W. 1984. 'Monarchies and monarchic Ideas'. In F.W. Walbank (ed). *The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume 7. Part 1, The Hellenistic World*. Cambridge, 62–100.

Walbank, F. W. 1999. *A historical commentary on Polybius.* Oxford (3rd edition).

Wallace Hadrill, A. 1990. 'Patronage in Roman society: from republic to empire', in A. Wallace Hadrill (ed.) *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London and New York, 63–87.

Wallace Hadrill, A. 1994. *Houses and society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Princeton.

Wallace Hadrill, A. 2008. *Rome's cultural revolution*. Cambridge.

Walter Karydi, E. 1996. 'Die Nobilitierung des griechischen Wohnhauses in der spätklassischen Zeit'. In W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.) *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige*. Mainz, 56–61.

Watts, C. 1987. *A pattern language for houses at Pompeii, Herculaneum and Ostia* (PhD Thesis, University of Texas at Austin).

Weber, G. 1995. Herrscher, Hof und Dichter. Aspekte der Legitimierung und Repräsentation hellenistischer Könige am Beispiel der ersten drei Antigoniden, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 44.3, 283–316.

Weber, G. 1997. 'Interaktion, Repräsentation und Heerschaft. Der Königshof im Hellenismus', in A. Winterling (ed.), *Zwischen 'Haus' und 'Staat': antike Höfe im Vergleich*. Berlin, 27–72.

Welch, K. 2003. A new view on the origins of the basilica, *JRA* 16, 16–34.

Westgate, R. 1997-1998. Greek mosaics in their architectural and social context. *BICS* 42, 93–115.

Westgate, R. 2000. Pavimenta atque emblemata vermiculata: Regional Styles in Hellenistic Mosaics and the First Mosaics at Pompeii. *AJA* 104.2, 255–275.

Westgate, R. 2007. 'Life's Rich Pattern: Decoration as evidence for room function in Hellenistic houses'. In R. Westgate, N.R.E. Fisher and J. Whitley (eds.) *Building Communities: House, Settlement and Society in the Aegean and Beyond.* London, 313–321.

Wetzel, F., E. F. Schmidt and A. Mallwitz 1957. *Das Babylon der Spätzeit.* Berlin.

Wilkinson A., 1998. *The Garden in Ancient Egypt*. London.

Will, E. 1983. Recent French work at Araq el Emir: The Qasr el-Abd rediscovered. *AASOR* 47, 149–154.

Will, E. et al. 1991. (Will, E. and F. Larché with contributions by F. Zayadine, J. Dentzer-Feydy, F. Queyrel 1991). *'Iraq-al-Amir: le château du Tobiade Hyrcan.* Paris.

Winter, F. 1908. *Die Skulpturen mit Ausnahme der Altarreliefs.* Berlin.

Winter, F.E. 2006. *Studies in Hellenistic architecture.* Toronto, Buffalo and London.

Winter, F.E. and A. Christie 1985. The Symposium-Tent of Ptolemy II: a New Proposal. *EchCl* 29, 289–308.

Wright, J. C. 2006. 'The social production of space and the architectural reproduction of society in the Bronze Age Aegean during the 2nd Millennium B.C.E.' In J. Maran, C. Juwig, H. Schwengel and U. Thaler (eds.) *Constructing power. Architecture, Ideology and Social Practice*. Hamburg, 49-74.

Wright, N.L. 2011. 'The Last Days of a Seleucid City: Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates and its Temple'. In K. Erickson and G. Ramsey (eds.) *Seleucid dissolution: the sinking of the anchor.* Wiesbaden, 117–132.

Wulf, U. 1999. *Die Stadtgrabung, Teil 3. Die Hellenistischen und Römischen Wohnhäuser von Pergamon (Altertümer von Pergamon XV$_3$).* Berlin.

Zagdoun, M.A. 1989. *La sculpture archaïsante dans l'art hellénistique et dans l'art romain du Haut-Empire.* Athens.

Zanker, P. 1998. *Pompeii: public and private life*. Cambridge, Mass. and London.

Zayadine, F. 2005. 'Le grand domaine des Tobiades en Jordanie et la politique économique des Lagides et des Séleucides'. In V. Chankovski and F. Duyrat (eds.) Le *Roi et l'économie. Autonomies locales et structures royales dans l'économie de l'empire séleucide. Topoi Suppl. 6*, 267–290.

Zayadine, F. 2010. ‘L’histoire des Tobiades’. In R. Étienne and J.F. Salles (eds.) *Iraq al-Amir: guide historique et archéologique du domaine des Tobiades.* Beirut, 13–29.

Zimmer, T. 2010. ‘Repräsentatives Wohnen am Beispiel der Palastanlagen von Pergamon’. In S. Ladstätter, V. Scheibelreiter (eds.) *Städtisches Wohnen im östlichen Mittelmeerraum 4. Jh. v. Chr. – 1. Jh. n. Chr., Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums vom 24.–27. Oktober 2007 an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Archäologische Forschungen 18*. Wien, 155–166.

Zimmer, T. 2012. ‘Die Basileia – Der Palastbezirk von Pergamon’. In R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner and A. Scholl (eds.) *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole*. Berlin, 144–147

Zoroğlu, L., 2000. ‘Samosata. Ausgrabungen in der kommagenischen Hauptstadt’. In J. Wagner (ed.), *Gottkönige am Euphrat: neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in Kommagene.* München, 75–83.