Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections

The Şekerhane Köşkü at Selinus (Cilicia): The Temple of the Deified Trajan

Michael Hoff
University of Nebraska

Abstract

In 117 CE the emperor Trajan died at Selinus (modern Gazipaşa, Turkey) while returning to Italy from the East. A building preserved among the ruins of the ancient city has been historically labeled as a cenotaph associated with the emperor's death in the city. This structure has been identified as temple-like by the recent excavators, but continues to be called a cenotaph. This paper addresses the notion of this identification as a body-less mausoleum, and suggests that the structure served not only as a cult temple to the Deified Trajan, but also may mark the location of the ustrinum for Trajan's funerary pyre.

In spring 1812 Francis Beaufort, commanding the HMS *Frederikssteen*, was under orders from the British Admiralty to chart the southern coast of Turkey for potential harborages. While surveying the coastline Beaufort, an amateur classicist, seized the opportunity to match architectural remains he encountered with ancient historical and geographical texts, so as to put city names to these ruined sites. The antiquities along the south coast were unknown to virtually all European travelers up to this point. Upon return to London, Beaufort published the results of his *periegesis* that became the first western description of the archaeological sites of the south Mediterranean coast of Turkey.[1] The methodology he employed was straightforward: simply to observe the more prominent remains that he encountered and to record his descriptions of the structures and significant inscriptions.

After Beaufort anchored the ship along the coast near the town of Selinti (known today as Gazipaşa, Antalya province), he and the antiquarian Charles Cockerell, who had recently joined Beaufort and his crew, disembarked and spent some time exploring the remains of the ancient city that Beaufort recognized to be Selinus.[2] At Selinus he recorded several bath buildings and a structure he called "a small theatre," which most likely was the civic bouleuterion/odeion.[3] Beaufort also encountered an unusual structure that he described, relative to other structures at this or other sites along the coast, at great length:

> The most remarkable of these [viz. ancient buildings] is a low massy edifice of seventy feet by fifty, composed of large well cut blocks of stone, and containing a single vault. A flight of narrow steps, parallel to the wall, leads to the flat top, on which nothing now remains, though there is every reason to suppose that this building was formerly the basement story of some splendid superstructure; but the columns, which either surmounted or surrounded it, have disappeared, except a few fragments of some large fluted pilasters of fine workmanship… The edifice stands in the centre of a quadrangle, along each side of which there was a single row of thirty small columns; but they have been all broken off close to the ground, and carried away: this peristyle is about 240 feet in diameter, and extends nearly to the bank of the river.
>
> There is no doubt that Selinty was the ancient Selinus, which, upon the death of Trajan, assumed the name of Trajanopolis. I cannot find what honours were paid to his memory by the Cilicians; but it seems highly probable that a mausoleum should have been erected in the city where the decease of so accomplished and so popular an emperor took place; and if so, it is equally probably that this

> building was designed for that purpose.[4]

Cockerell was much less verbose than the loquacious commander in his own description: "We found here a small theatre, much ruined, and the remains of a grand senate-house, or perhaps a mausoleum to Trajan, also very much injured."[5] Both visitors agreed that the structure possibly served the funerary needs of Trajan; one assumes that that agreement was mutually decided upon at the time of their visit. They are both of the opinion that the structure was constructed as a "mausoleum," but neither offers reasons why it served as a tomb other than, according to Beaufort, it seemed "highly probable" that s structure honoring Trajan, who died in Selinus in 117 CE would have been built in his honor. But the term "mausoleum" Beaufort and Cockerell use is curious. The term connotes a freestanding tomb structure. But in this case, Beaufort and Cockerell would have been aware that Trajan's remains were removed to Rome. Therefore, it must be inferred that they regarded the structure as a *cenotaph*, or sepulchral monument without the actual body interred within.

This structure survives today in much the state as when Beaufort and Cockerell visited the ancient site (Figs. 1 and 2). The structure is located on a flat but narrow river plain, between the slopes of the ancient acropolis and the Hacımusa River. Until recently local farmers cultivated the fields surrounding the structure; indeed, even until the early 2000s the top of the structure, flat and still covered with a soil blanket, had cultivable wheat growing on top. The structure is situated off-center within an enclosed courtyard, 84 x 84 m, that included deep porticos that largely survived into the early 20th century, but now have largely disappeared.

The structure is known locally as the Şekerhane Köşkü, a term that refers to its post-Classical use during the Seljuk period as a hunting platform. Indeed, its outward appearance is in fact due to the Seljuks who transformed the Roman-era structure into a flat-topped platform for hunting wild animals during the medieval period. Early archaeologists who visited the site in the late 19th and early 20th centuries attributed various functions to the building. Rudolf Heberdey and Adolf Wilhelm, who visited in 1891, disagreed with Beaufort, believing instead that the structure served as a medieval "khan," and the Italians Roberto Peribeni and Pietro Romanelli, who published the first plans of the structure and courtyard in 1914, saw the court as the city's agora and the Şekerhane Köşkü as a cistern.[6] In the 1960s Gerhard Huber, the architect for the earliest survey of western Rough Cilicia under the direction of Elizabeth Rosenbaum, described



Figure 1: Selinus (Gazipaşa, Turkey). The so-called Şekerhane Köşkü, north facade (photograph by the author).



Figure 2: Selinus (Gazipaşa, Turkey). The so-called Şekerhane Köşkü, west facade (photograph by the author).

and provided a floor plan of the building and the courtyard, but he believed the structure to be generally medieval, reusing ancient material that once stood on the spot.[7] Huber opted moreover not to interpret the structure's purpose.

Scott Redford's analysis published in 2000 was the most thorough study up to that date.[8] Redford recognized the structure served as a Seljuk-era hunting lodge yet observed that its core was likely Roman with an exterior that had been cladded during the medieval period using ancient material. He concluded his study by observing the structure to be unlike other funerary monuments of Rough Cilicia, yet he nevertheless agreed with Beaufort's identification of the monument as sepulchral.[9]

Between 2001 and 2003 the Alanya Museum cleared the earthen mantle atop the structure, revealing the platform of a temple-like building, complete with an emplacement for a cult statue at the rear of the newly revealed cella, leaving no doubt of the structure's ancient origin. Subsequently the structure was studied by a team from the German Archaeological Institute under the direction of Seher Türkmen, director of the Alanya Museum, and Adolf Hoffman. The lead researcher and architect of the project, Claudia Winterstein, published a preliminary report in 2013.[10] A full report by Winterstein is currently in preparation.

The German team concluded that the structure once served as a five-meter-high cement podium for a tetrastyle prostyle "temple-like building," measuring roughly 14 x 22 m.[11] The original walls of the upper structure, composed of ashlar marble blocks, had been removed by the 13th century Seljuks who subsequently used the marble blocks to clad the cement podium. No trace of the columns that once stood on the north façade of the structure survive. The result achieved by the Seljuk builders was a flat-topped pavilion that could serve the recreational hunting needs of the local Seljuk nobility. Within the core of the podium is a two-chambered, barrel-vaulted crypt that originally was entered solely from the cella by means of a narrow stairway (Fig. 3). There had been a broad exterior stairway on the north façade that provided access to the porch, but this too was removed by the medieval Seljuks so as to interdict the hunter's prey from climbing. In addition to the staircase removal, an opening was punched through the north wall of the podium to allow access into the vaulted chambers. This new opening was plastered and painted decoration in the form of still-visible geometric motifs was applied.

Winterstein does not rule out the interpretation of the "temple-like" structure as a cenotaph, regarding the attribution as "conceivable."[12] She suggests that even though the structure is in the form of a temple, it could



Figure 3: Selinus (Gazipaşa, Turkey). The so-called Şekerhane Köşkü, interior north crypt (photograph by the author).

nevertheless be considered a cenotaph, simply because it commemorates the demise of Trajan. Considering the region of Rough Cilicia, where monumental tomb architecture is indeed prevalent, this proposed attribution is understandable.[13]

During the Hellenistic period and continuing throughout the Roman era, we see the development of large tomb construction in the form of *heroa*, particularly in southwestern Asia Minor, perhaps through influence from the Persians.[14] In its origin the heroön as a type served as the burial structure for kings, dynasts, and other elites throughout Asia Minor, usually awarded by urban cities and towns in recognition of their contributions, e.g., euergetistic, military, athletic.[15] The most well-known example of this type is the 4th-century BCE Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, and other similar-type heroa include the so-called Lycian-Type tombs (e.g., the Nereid Monument at Xanthos). These early heroa are often built within the city walls as a mark of prestige awarded to the deceased. By the late Roman period, especially in Cilicia, tombs of all sorts, including the most basic and simple, are attested epigraphically as heroa. It should be noted that, at least for Rough Cilicia, these Roman-era heroa are also often intramural.

Among the more prevalent *heroa* in western Rough Cilicia is the tomb type constructed in the form of a temple, in which the deceased members of the elite are provided with architecture connoting cult honors. Winterstein suggests that the Şekerhane Köşkü served as a temple-tomb, but since there is no body associated, it would be considered a cenotaph.[16] At Side and Pergamon, examples Winterstein cites as comparanda for the Şekerhane Köşkü, there are temple-tombs that are associated with the architectural elements one would expect for a temple: a high podium, a columned façade accessed by an exterior stairway, and often an enclosed temenos.[17] However, in a study co-conducted by this author and R. Townsend, we showed that temple-tombs within western Rough Cilicia, although designed to emulate the small Classical or Hellenistic temple in form, are generally not associated with a temenos enclosure, nor are they usually outfitted with accessible stairways.[18] Instead these tombs are often

difficult to access, likely because they were private structures in which the public were generally not meant to freely enter, an aspect apparently opposite of the Selinus Şekerhane Köşkü with its broad frontal stairway. Also, the Pergamon and Side tombs Winterstein cites are constructed using ashlar masonry, with mortar used sparingly. Our study on Rough Cilicia temple-tombs, however, demonstrated that ashlar masonry was generally not utilized. This does not mean to suggest that the structures at Side and Pergamon cited by Winterstein were temples rather than tombs. Instead our study was localized in western Rough Cilicia, where Selinus is located. Based on our study, the Şekerhane Köşkü does not conform to the typical temple tomb within the study area, and at least for western Rough Cilicia, there are no tombs so elaborately appointed as the Şekerhane Köşkü.

If one accepts that the Şekerhane Köşkü does not conform to the temple-tomb type prevalent in western Rough Cilicia, should it still be considered a "mausoleum" as Beaufort first proposed? The Romans demonstrated great respect towards their dead by conducting deeply rooted funerary rituals and utilizing a variety of tomb types throughout their empire.[19] The wealthy elite would often construct elaborate tombs or mausolea in honor of their illustrative deceased; the temple-tomb was only one such type. Not all funerary architecture involved tombs. Although rare, there are examples of funerary architecture that were commemorative memorials without actual burials—or cenotaphs—of generally elite members of society. The actual body might be buried elsewhere. Probably the most appropriate prominent example of a memorial without a body in Asia Minor is the monument constructed for Augustus' grandson and heir, Gaius Caesar, in Limyra (Lycia) after his death in 4 CE. The monument is considered a commemorative cenotaph because the body of Gaius Caesar was brought back to Rome and interred in Augustus' mausoleum. As with the Şekerhane Köşkü purportedly serving as a memorial to Trajan, the cenotaph of Gaius memorializes a member of the imperial family. But the structure is not at all in the form of a temple, however, as is the Şekerhane Köşkü; instead, the Limyra cenotaph resembles more a pyramidal-tower construction type that can be found in Asia Minor and elsewhere, whose funerary origins go back to the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus.[20] This type of monument, perhaps best labeled as an aedicular monument based on its form, is somewhat ubiquitous in the Roman world. Among examples of this type is the well-known monument known as the Mausoleum of the Iulii in Glanum (Gaul). And similar to the Limyra monument, the Glanum mausoleum is also generally referred to as a cenotaph, as it did not serve as a tomb.[21] It appears to have been constructed as a commemorative marker in the mid-1st century BCE for deceased family members, so it is perhaps appropriate to refer to it as a cenotaph. At Ephesus the monument to Androklos, the mythical founder of Ephesus, is described as a cenotaph.[22] This structure dates to the late Hellenistic period, and with a colonnade atop a rectangular socle it more closely resembles the Great Altar of Zeus and Athena in Pergamon than it does a temple.[23]

Another example of a supposed cenotaph, and one that again commemorates a member of Augustus' family, is the so-called Drususstein in Mainz, which was constructed as a memorial to Augustus' stepson and younger son of Livia, Nero Claudius Drusus, following his death in 9 BCE. Although Drusus' ashes were deposited inside of Augustus' mausoleum, the veterans in his command constructed the tall, non-temple-like, columnar monument to serve as a memorial to their fallen commander where commemorative rites apparently occurred on an annual basis.[24] Although it has yet to be identified, there was also a sepulchral monument constructed in Antioch to commemorate the death of Germanicus in 19 CE.[25]

But does the fact that the Şekerhane Köşkü does not resemble the form of other imperial cenotaphs preclude the possibility that it was indeed a cenotaph? Could it have been an empty temple-tomb as Winterstein posits? Or, since it was built in the form of a temple, could it instead have functioned as a cult temple without the overtones of a cenotaph or sepulchral monument? The structure as now revealed contains all the basic elements one would expect of a cult temple: a tetrastyle prostyle plan with Corinthian columns, a high podium approached by frontal stairway, and a cella containing an emplacement for a cult statue.

In the absence of any other known temple at Selinus, it seems quite likely that the Şekerhane Köşkü is the structure depicted on the reverse of coins struck in Selinus as early as Marcus Aurelius (161–180 CE) and continued to appear on imperial issues through Trajan Decius (247–249 CE).[26] These coins show a tetrastyle temple with a seated statue within the cella, presumably of Trajan, in the manner of an enthroned Zeus/Jupiter carrying a scepter and thunderbolt (**Fig. 4**).[27] Trajan was closely associated with Zeus/Jupiter, as seen in Pliny's *Panegyric* (1.4–5; 5.2–4), in which Jupiter reveals to the Roman people that he had chosen Trajan to be their ruler. In the pediment of the temple is an inscription: ΘΕΟΥ ΤΡΑΙ(ΑΝΟΥ), confirming that the temple on the coins was consecrated to the divine Trajan.



Figure 4: Bronze coin from Selinus (BM 1863,0706.32). Obv.: Head of Severus Alexander. Rev.: ΤΡΑΙ ΑΙΝ CEΛ ΙΝΟ, and in exergue, ΤΗCΙΕ. Tetrastyle temple façade with seated statue of Zeus (?), facing left. In pediment: ΘΕ ΤΡΑΙ. Image courtesy of the British Museum.

Reverse types on provincial coinage often include prominent buildings within the community that celebrate special significance.[28] The longevity of this temple reverse type of nearly a century is testimony to the significance of Trajan's death in the city the citizenry held.

A temple constructed under similar circumstances may be recognized in the Forum Romanum: the Temple of the Deified Julius Caesar.[29] Ancient sources document that the temple's construction was begun by the Triumvirs in 42 BCE on the location where Caesar's body was cremated by a mob two years earlier (Fig. 5).[30] Upon its dedication there was a celebration of games, and the temple had the right of asylum.[31] The temple is certainly that shown on an aureus of Octavian minted in 36 BCE as a tetrastyle temple with an inscription "Divo Iul(io)," indicating by the use of the dative case that it was dedicated to the newly divine Caesar (Fig. 6).[32] Yet Cassius Dio specifically refers to the temple as a heroön (47.18.4), suggesting that the term can be applied to a structure that both is temple and has funerary associations as the place where the hero's body was cremated. But the temple is not a tomb, nor has there been any reference to it as a cenotaph. Caesar's ashes were deposited within the tumulus of his daughter Julia in the Campus Martius.[33] Unlike the Şekerhane Köşkü, there is no crypt within the podium of the temple.

Temples outfitted with barrel-vaulted crypts, however, while not unknown are infrequently observed, and those



Figure 6: Aureus, 36 BCE, BM 1896,0608.5. Obv.: Head of Octavian. Rev.: Tetrastyle façade of Temple of Deified Julius Caesar. Inscription in pediment: DIVO IVL. Image courtesy of the British Museum.

Figure 5: Rome, Forum Romanum. General View of the Temple of the Deified Julius Caesar.



that are attested belong principally to Asia Minor and Syria. The closest parallel to the Selinus temple is the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi in which, similar to the Şekerhane Köşkü, there is a single sub-floor crypt accessible from the cella by means of a stairway.[34] The octostyle Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus was provided with multiple underground chambers, instead of a single crypt. Both underground complexes were likely associated with cult activities.[35] A temple at Elaiussa Sebaste in Cilicia purportedly was outfitted with a barrel-vaulted crypt.[36] There are also two interconnected, barrel-vaulted crypts under the east end of the Temple of Bacchus at Baalbek; a staircase provided access from the cella.[37] A Roman-era temple at Magnesia also contains a small vaulted chamber under the cella, although how it communicated with the cella is unknown.[38] A slightly different arrangement of sub-platform crypts can be observed at the Temple of Artemis at Jerash dated to the Antonine period in which interconnected passageways and chambers were constructed under the cella. These passageways were barrel-vaulted and were accessed from the cella by means of a staircase.[39] A greater concentration of temples with crypts are known from Roman Syria, presumably all with cultic functions.[40] In Greece there is one known example of a vaulted crypt within a temple. The Cult Complex at Argos includes a large vaulted room with an apse that had been attributed to a cult of Serapis. Under the apse is a barrel-vaulted crypt; means of communication between apse and crypt is unknown. The attribution as a Serapeion has been recently questioned and instead a cult to Asklepios that dates to the Hadrianic period has been put forward.[41] A commonality many of these temples, outfitted with sub-floor, barrel-vaulted crypts, share is that they date to the Hadrianic period or shortly thereafter.

It is now apparent that the Şekerhane Köşkü should not be considered as a mausoleum, as first posited by Beaufort and maintained by others, but as a temple constructed to commemorate the death of Trajan within the city. It may be possible that there is more than memorializing the death of the emperor in Selinus. Since the Temple of the Deified Julius Caesar in the Forum Romanum was constructed as a marker commemorating the location of the dictator's funerary pyre, perhaps the Selinus temple localizes the emplacement of the *ustrinum* where Trajan's body was cremated.

Although other emperors died outside of Rome, such as Augustus (Nola) and Tiberius (Misenum), no emperor until Trajan had died outside of Italy. In all previous cases, however, imperial funerals took place in Rome. Suetonius (*Aug*. 100) informs us that the body of Augustus was carried to Rome by Roman dignitaries, a distance of approximately 225 kilometers. Suetonius also says that the entourage travelled only by night because of the heat. Once in Rome, the funeral occurred and the body was cremated upon the pyre. In the case of Tiberius, Suetonius, again our only source for these early cremations (*Tib*. 75), merely states that the body was carried to Rome by soldiers, probably to keep the emperor's body safe from an angry mob. Safely brought to the city, the body was properly cremated with appropriate rites.[42]

Although Suetonius did not provide details of Tiberius' funeral, an imperial funeral was an elaborate affair. According to Herodian (*Hist*. 4.2), it generally involved a procession to the Rostra where the body was placed in a baldacchino-like shrine. In many instances the bodies were represented in wax images. After the orations, the body was brought to the *ustrinum* or pyre in the Campus Martius where it would be cremated, a ritual that was required for the apotheosis to occur.[43]

Trajan died far from Italy, however, and our sources are silent regarding the circumstances of not so much of his death in Selinus but the subsequent funeral and cremation. There are two main sources regarding these events: Cassius Dio and the *Historia Augusta*.[44] Dio's accounts of Trajan's death at Selinus and aftermath (68.33.2–3; 69.1–2.3) are the most complete regarding his death. Also, Dio mentions significantly that his source for these events was his father, who had served as governor of Cilicia and, as related to specifically by Dio, was privy to information about Trajan's death that was not widely distributed through official channels. Dio records that Trajan had departed Antioch in early August 117 for Italy already feeling ill. The emperor had previously experienced a stroke that had left him partially paralyzed, and he was suffering from severe diarrhea and edema (dropsy), possibly from chronic heart failure.[45] Trajan attributed his symptoms, also according to Dio, to having been poisoned. As the emperor's condition worsened, the decision was made to put into the nearest port or harborage, which was Selinus. Shortly after Trajan and his entourage arrived at Selinus, the emperor died.[46] Dio does not say how long Trajan remained alive after disembarking, only that he suddenly expired.

No source informs us what happened immediately after Trajan died, nor does any source reveal specifically where his body was cremated. Dio states that the emperor's death was purposely not revealed for several days so that Hadrian's adoption might be announced first, which would therefore aid in the plans for succession; it is possible that Trajan made this intention clear just before he died.[47] But eventually the ship that brought Trajan to Selinus departed back to Syria where, according to the *Historia Augusta*, it was met by Hadrian, probably at Antioch's port of Seleucia Pieria, who "inspected Trajan's remains" and then sent them to Rome by ship.[48] Julian Bennett, in his recent biography of Trajan, surmises that Trajan's funeral and cremation occurred at Seleucia, as he takes the Latin term *reliquiae* to refer to a complete body and only assumes that the cremation occurred in Syria.[49] But *reliquiae* is often used to indicate specifically "incinerated ashes," and not just the more generic "remains."[50] The possibility, if not fact, that Trajan's body was cremated in Selinus before it departed for Syria, is strong, especially as Dio mentions that the announcement of Trajan's demise was purposely delayed and therefore it seems apparent that the body remained in Selinus for an

indeterminate period. Cremation at Selinus therefore seems likely. Then the ship returned to Syria to bring the succession documents, among other personal effects to Hadrian—as well as the already cremated remains—in order to solidify Hadrian's dynastic claims, before dispatching the *reliquiae* to Rome for deposition in the Column within the Forum Trajan had constructed.

There is precedence for an imperial cremation outside of Rome prior to Trajan. Germanicus, the nephew of Tiberius, died in Antioch of mysterious circumstances in 19 CE. Tacitus reports (*Ann*. 2.73) that Germanicus' body was prominently displayed within the Agora at Antioch, then the body was cremated, and his ashes were brought back to Rome and interred inside the Mausoleum of Augustus. Although the place of cremation for Gaius Caesar, whose sepulchral monument is described above, is unknown, it is certainly possible that his body was cremated in Limyra where he died and his ashes were returned to Rome for the funeral. In the case of Drusus, however, the body was carried back to Rome from Germany intact for cremation and funeral (Suet. *Claud*. 1; *Tib*. 7). It is unclear if distance is a deciding factor whether the body is to be cremated or not: Germanicus was cremated in Antioch, as was Trajan (either at Selinus or near Antioch), although Drusus in Germany was not.

Trajan's elaborate funeral, undoubtedly similar to the other imperial funerals, would still have likely taken place in Rome within the Campus Martius, regardless of where the actual cremation occurred.[51] Then the golden urn carrying the ashes would have been deposited within the Column in Trajan's Forum as described by Eutropius (*Breviarum ab urbe condita* 8.5.2).[52]

The tetrastyle temple at Selinus was seemingly then consecrated to the cult of Trajan, but its construction would have been allowed to occur only after the Senate's unanimous vote to commemorate the deceased emperor with divine honors, probably by the end of 117.[53] There is no mention of the temple in the ancient sources—the coins appear to be its only record—but one may assume that permission to build the temple, as well as the granting the funds necessary for its construction, would have occurred quickly after the events of 117 and possibly in conjunction with the renaming of the city as Trajanopolis.[54]

As for the actual place where the funerary pyre would have been erected, the most feasible location would have been away from the domestic and public areas of the city, and within a sufficient terrain to handle both pyre and public viewing. The most feasible area was surely the river plain east of the agora and between the river and acropolis, right where the Şekerhane Köşkü would be constructed. The emplacement of the funerary pyre seems to be a logical and desirable location to construct a temple in commemoration of the deified emperor, in much the same way that the Temple of the Deified Julius Caesar in the Forum Romanum commemorated Caesar's apotheosis.

From the temple platform, the still-existing narrow stairway that originally provided access to the crypt below allowed visitors the opportunity to become close to the very spot of cremation. Winterstein refers to a pre-temple installation under the current floor in the temple's crypt in which she describes "roughly hewn stone blocks in a rectangular layout" and also in the south part of the west wall of the back chamber is a relieving arch that she believes was constructed to relieve pressure upon the installation below (Fig. 7).[55] If the Şekerhane Köşkü served as the location for the funerary pyre or *ustrinum*, it may be that this pre-temple installation is associated with the emplacement for the pyre. The relieving arch constructed within the crypt's west wall suggests that it was meant to protect and therefore allow the pre-temple construction to be viewed. That installation must have had a special significance, possibly the remnants of the funerary pyre. On the south wall of the crypt there are three small openings that allowed in antiquity narrow beams of sunlight to be cast on the floor of the southern crypt chamber, potentially upon the very spot of the *ustrinum*.[56]

Archaeologically the identification of an *ustrinum*, particularly of a single-use pyre, is difficult, primarily because there have been few studies made and heavily burned material found within was judged difficult to analyze or to be unsuitable. However, recent research has begun to make inroads in our knowledge of *ustrina* in urban and rural cemeteries in the northern Roman Empire.[57] Michel Polfer has distinguished two primary types of *ustrina* found in archaeological contexts and in urban landscapes: one, permanent *ustrina* built using durable materials such as stone or brick; and two, non-permanent cremation areas for single or additional cremations. Permanent *ustrina* are generally constructed with stone walls in either circular or, more common, quadrangular form.[58] Strabo describes (5.3.8) the *ustrinum* of Augustus within the Campus Martius as a sacred precinct, enclosed by a white marble wall. But no example of a single-use pyre of the grandiose type used for an imperial *ustrinum* as described by the ancient sources is preserved.[59]

The pyres in the Campus Martius that were used for most of the imperial cremations over time increased in scale and pomp. Originally the concept of gargantuan and elaborate funerary pyres may be traced back to Alexander the Great and other Hellenistic dynasts.[60] Coin depictions and eyewitness accounts attest to the tower-like pyres of the imperial cremations, sometimes many stories tall, decreasing in size upwards like a lighthouse and adorned with statues, paintings and furniture. Often the timbered flanks would be covered by colorful woven tapestries to hide the plain wooden structure. Attendees would throw all sorts of items into the pyre, such as perfumes, oils, fruits, and incense, before it was lit to give the deceased an aromatic sendoff. Sometimes even an eagle within the pyre would be let loose at an appropriate moment to symbolically represent the moment of apotheosis. In addition, an apparent ritualistic requirement for the cremation of important people, according to the ancient sources, was ample space around the pyre to allow for circumambulatory parades of priests and military



Figure 7: Selinus (Gazipaşa, Turkey). The so-called Şekerhane Köşkü, interior south crypt, view towards the southwest corner, showing interior wall arch and square installation (photograph by the author).

personnel.[61] Scholars generally believe that most imperial funerals used separate *ustrina*, to provide distinction among them, but generally they would have been sequestered in the area near Augustus' Mausoleum in the Campus Martius.[62] Although none has been positively identified, the *ustrinum* installations must have been provided with stone foundations—Strabo mentions a walled enclosure—to create a stable platform for such loads as described above, even if they were intended for a single-use cremation or at most only infrequently used. The "roughly hewn stone blocks in a rectangular layout" as observed by Winterstein in the crypt of the Selinus Şekerhane Köşkü could have served as a foundation platform for an *ustrinum*.

We must assume that, if Trajan's body was indeed cremated in Selinus, the event would not have been as extravagant as previous imperial funerals held in Rome. Probably the intent was to conduct a small affair, involving the local population and dignitaries, along with the members of the imperial entourage accompanying Trajan aboard ship that included Trajan's wife, Plotina (*HA Hadrian* 5.9). There was also ample space around the proposed pyre for any circumambulatory rituals, if they occurred.[63] Once the cremated remains were back in Rome, a proper and large funeral, with the appropriate lavish displays, likely occurred.[64]

In conclusion, the Şekerhane Köşkü should be identified as the Temple of the Deified Trajan at Selinus that was constructed to commemorate the emperor's death that occurred within the city in 117. The structure was indeed a temple, endowed with the necessary elements for cult, that was consecrated to the emperor, regardless if his cremation took place elsewhere. It is significant that the temple's facade was depicted on the coinage struck at Selinus for nearly a century, from Marcus Aurelius through Trajan Decius, indicating a long-standing importance to the city. Perhaps one could view the structure as a pendent temple to the great temple to the emperor in Rome: The Temple of Deified Trajan erected in the Forum of Trajan. This temple, apparently an octostyle

podium temple, according to coin depictions, appears to have been also constructed by Hadrian, although it was designed during Trajan's lifetime by Apollodorus as an integral part of his overall plan of the Forum.[65] These two temples then are connected by purpose: the commemoration of the Divine Trajan. Paul Zanker suggested that the complex of Column, where the remains are kept, and Temple in the Forum in Rome should be considered as a heroön in the Hellenistic manner.[66] That the Column/Sepulcher, extraordinary in that the burial was allowed within the pomerium of the city, and its commemorative temple are testimonia to the honors paid to the emperor by the Senate and the People. Perhaps then the Şekerhane Köşkü at Selinus, the other Temple of the Deified Trajan, should be seem in a similar light. That the Temple was also considered as a heroön, like that of the Deified Caesar within the Roman Forum, dedicated by the citizens of Selinus, to commemorate the death of the emperor—and perhaps his cremation—within the city. But a cenotaph it is not.

Acknowledgements: I am delighted to have been asked to contribute to this collection of papers dedicated to my first teacher of Roman archaeology, David Soren, when I was a student at the University of Missouri. My interest in the archaeology of the Roman Empire was first fueled by David's lectures and, whether in general Roman archaeology, Roman painting, or Roman numismatics, I have tried to model myself to be like David, who was the consummate teacher. I count myself fortunate to have had David as my early guide in academia. I want to thank my friends and colleagues, Rhys Townsend and Molly Richardson, for reading and commenting on an early draft of this paper. I would also like to thank the anonymous readers of this paper for their helpful comments.

---

1 Francis Beaufort, *Karamania, or a Brief Description of the South Coast of Asia Minor and of the Remains of Antiquity* (London: R. Hunter, 1817); also, cf. Léonce Alishan, *Sissouan, ou L'Arméno-Cilicie: description géographique et historique* (Venice: S. Lazare, 1899), 376.

2 For Cockerell's account, see his memoir published by his son nearly a century later: Charles R. Cockerell, *Travels in Southern Europe and the Levant, 1810–1817: The Journal of C.R. Cockerell* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903).

3 On Selinus and its remains, see Friedrich Hild and Hansgerd Hellenkemper, *Kilikien and Isaurien* (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990), 407–408; and Nicholas Rauh, Rhys F. Townsend, Michael C. Hoff, Matthew Dillon, and Martin W. Doyle, "Life in the Truck Lane: Urban Development in Western Rough Cilicia," *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien* 78 (2009): 253–312.

4 Beaufort 1817, 180–181.

5 Cockerell 1903, 180.

6 Rudolf Heberdey and Adolf Wilhelm, *Reisen in Kilikien. Ausgeführt 1891 und 1892 im Auftrage der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna: C. Gerold Sohne), 149–151; Roberto Paribeni and Pietro Romanelli, "Studii e ricerche archeologiche nell'Anatolia meridionale," *Monumenti Antichi* 23 (1914): 5–274; cf. Winterstein 2013, 157.

7 Gerhard Huber, "The Sites and Their Principal Buildings," in Elizabeth Rosenbaum, Gerhard Huber, and Somay Onurkan (eds.), *A Survey of Coastal Cities in Western Cilicia: Preliminary Report* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayılarından 6.8, 1967), 29–31: "The Corinthian capital and the fragment of a fluted pilaster suggest that originally, a building of the Corinthian order stood in the square, which at a later date was replaced by the present structure which made use of the old material and is probably of Islamic origin."

8 Scott Redford, *Landscape and the State in Medieval Anatolia: Seljuk Gardens and Pavilions of Alanya, Turkey* (Oxford: Archeopress, 2000), 156–160.

9 Redford 2000, 40, 156–160.

10 Claudia Winterstein, "The Şekerhane Köşkü in Selinus: The Alleged Cenotaph for the Roman Emperor Trajan: Preliminary Report on Current Architectural Research," in Michael C. Hoff and Rhys F. Townsend (eds.), *Rough Cilicia: New Historical and Archaeological Approaches* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2013), 157–175.

11 Winterstein 2013, 170.

12 Winterstein 2013, 171.

13 Marcello Spanu, "Burial in Asia Minor during the Imperial Period, with a Particular Reference to Cilicia and Cappadocia," in John Pearce, Martin Millett, and Manuela Struck (eds.), *Burial, Society and Context in the Roman World* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2000), 169–177.

14 Sarah Cormack, "Funerary Monuments and Mortuary Practice in Roman Asia Minor," in Susan E. Alcock (ed.), *The Early Roman Empire in the East* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1997), 138–139.

15 Cormack 1994, 139.

16 Winterstein 2013, 171–172.

17 Winterstein 2013, 172. Side: Cormack 1997, 145; Pergamon: Şehrazad Karagöz, Wolfgang Radt and Klaus Rheidt, "Ein römischer Grabbau auf dem Niyazitepe bei Pergamon," *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 36 (1986): 109–146; also, for temple-tombs in general, see Henner von Hesberg, *Römische Grabbauten* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992), 182–201.

18 For temple-tombs with restricted access due to false

or inaccessible stairways in southwestern Asia Minor, such as Arycanda in Lycia, Termessos in Pisidia, Gelchik in Pamphylia, and Elaiussa Sebaste in Cilicia, see Rhys F. Townsend and Michael C. Hoff, "Monumental Tomb Architecture in Western Rough Cilicia," *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien* 73 (2004): 276–277.

19 For recent discussion of funerary monuments in Asia Minor, see Sarah Cormack, *The Space of Death in Roman Asia Minor* (Vienna: Phoibos Verlag, 2004).

20 For the Gaius cenotaph see Joachim Ganzert, *Das Kenotaph für Gaius Caesar in Limyra* (Tübingen: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth, 1984); P. Gros, *L'architecture romaine*, Vol. 2, *Maisons, palais, villas et tombeaux* (Paris: Picard, 2001), 457–461. Winterstein (2013, 171) recognizes the parallelism between the Gaius cenotaph and the Şekerhane Köşkü in the similar use of figural reliefs as architectural ornamentation but points out that the overall architectural plan and layout is dissimilar.

21 For the Mausoleum of the Iulii at Glanum, see James C. Anderson, Jr., *Roman Architecture in Provence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 224–233; Gros 2001, 412–413.

22 Hilke Thür, "Der ephesische Ktistes Androkles und (s)ein Heroon am Embolos," *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien* 64 (1995): 63–103; cf. Cormack 2004, 223–225.

23 At Aphrodisias, it is unclear whether the Monument of C. Julius Zoilos functioned as a tomb or a cenotaph; its type is similar to the Limyra and Glanum types: a squared structure atop a stepped platform with a stepped, pyramidal roof; see R. R. R. Smith, *The Monument of C. Julius Zoilos: Aphrodisias I: Results of the Excavations at Aphrodisias in Caria Conducted by NYU* (Mainz: Von Zabern, 1993). Also, at Pergamon excavators suggest that a 14-meter-tall tholos served as a cenotaph; cf. Cormack 2004, 271.

24 Suet. *Claud*. 1.3. For the monument, see Andreas Panter, *Der Drususstein in Mainz und dessen Einordnung in die römische Grabarchitektur seiner Erbauungszeit* (Mainz: Archäologische Denkmalpflege Amt Mainz, 2007).

25 Tac. *Ann*. 2.83: sepulchrum Antiochiae ubi cremates.

26 The site of Selinus was carefully surveyed by the Rough Cilicia Survey Project during the 1997–2000 seasons; for a preliminary report of the project, see Nicholas Rauh et al. 2009, 253–312. The final report of the architecture from the Rough Cilicia survey is currently under preparation by Rhys Townsend and this author.

27 *BMC Cilicia* xxxvii–xxxviii, 143 nos. 1 and 2; Edoardo Levante, "The Coinage of Selinus in Cilicia," *Numismatic Chronicle* 150 (1990): 226–233. Cf. Simon R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 273–274.

Nathan T. Elkins, *Monuments in Miniature: Architecture on Roman Coinage* (New York: The American Numismatic Society, 2015), 144.

Lawrence Richardson, Jr., *A New Topographical Dictionary and Ancient Rome* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 213–214; Eva M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon topographicum urbis romae*, Vol. 3 (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1996), 116–119.

Pliny *HN* 18.16; Suet. *Iul*. 84.84.34; App. *BCiv*. 2.148.615-16; Dio 44.50.2; Cic. *Phil*. 2.91, *Att*. 14.101; cf. Stefan Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 355, 393; Penelope J. E. Davies, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 9. Before the temple was constructed, an altar and column were first set up as markers dedicated to Caesar's memory.

Suet. *Iul*. 85; App. *BCiv.* 2.148.

BMC 1896,0608.5. Eleanor Ghey, Ian Leins, and Michael Crawford (eds.), *A Catalogue of the Roman Republic Coins in the British Museum* (London: The British Museum, 2010), 540.1.1.

Dio 44.51; cf. Davies 2004, 9.

34 The latest discussion of the Temple suggests its date to be Domitianic; see Kai Jes, Richard Posamentir, and Michael Woerrle, "Der Tempel des Zeus in Aizanoi und seine Datierung," in Klaus Rheidt (ed.), *Aizanoi und Anatolien*, (Mainz am Rhein: Von Zabern, 2010), 58–87; also see Rudolf Naumann (ed.), *Der Zeustempel zu* Aizanoi (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1979), 14–15.

35 On Cyzicus see Andrea Barattolo, "The Temple of Hadrian-Zeus at Cyzicus," *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 45 (1995): 89. For cult activity within the crypts at Aizanoi and Cyzicus, see Price 1984, 155.

36 Emanuela Borgia, "Notes on the Architecture of the Roman Temple at Elaiussa Sebaste," *Olba* 16 (2008): 249–276.

37 Theodor Wiegand (ed.), *Baalbek. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in den Jahren 1989 bis 1905*, Vol. 2 (Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1923), 31.

38 Carl Humann, *Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin: Reimer, 1904), 30.

39 Carl H. Kraeling (ed.), *Gerasa: City of the Decapolis* (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1938), 134–135. The authors describe the function of the passageways as cisterns.

40 Syrian temples with crypts: Ayn Harsha (Daniel Krencker and Willy Zschietzschmann, *Römische Tempel in Syrien* [Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1938], 245–255; Lévon Nordiguian, *Temples de l'époque romaine au Liban* [Beirut: Presses de l'Université Saint-

Joseph, 2005], 108–119); Bakka (Krencker and Zschietzschmann 1938, 177; Nordiguian 2005, 103); Hibbariyya (Krencker and Zschietzschmann 1938, 213–221; Nordiguian 2005, 120–121); Hosn Sfire (Krencker and Zschietzschmann 1938, 34; Nordiguian 2005, 206–211); Maqam Rabb (Nordiguian 2005, 220–222); Nebi Safi (Krencker and Zschietzschmann 1938, 205–211; Nordiguian 2005, 122–123); and Great Temple A at Niha (Krencker and Zschietzschmann 1938, 106–115; Nordiguian 2005, 53–54).

41 For a discussion of the Argive cult complex see Lynne Lancaster, "Parthian Influence on Vaulting in Roman Greece? An Inquiry into Technological Exchange Under Hadrian," *American Journal of Archaeology* 114 (2010): 455–459.

42 Suet. *Tib*. 75: Romam per milites deportatum est crematumque publico funere.

43 For descriptions of imperial funerals, see Davies 2004, 9–11.

44 Additional sources: Eutr. *Breviarum ab urbe condita* 8.5.2–3; Aur. Vict. *Epit*. 13.11.

45 Eutr. *Breviarum ab urbe condita* 8.5; on medical diagnoses, see Julian Bennett, *Trajan: Optimus Princeps* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997), 202.

46 Cf. Eutr. *Breviarum ab urbe condita* 8.5.2; the text is corrupt, as it replaces Selinus for Isaurian Seleucia. The illness was clearly severe, as the ship carrying the stricken Trajan must have moored in the mouth of the Hacımusa River because at Selinus there was no harbor per se. Apparently the harbor at nearby Syedra served the port needs of Selinus, according to Lucan (8.260).

47 Bennett 1997, 202.

48 *HA Hadrian* 5.9–10: Post haec Antiochia digressus est ad inspiciendas reliquias Traiani, quas Attianus, Plotina et Matidia deferebant. Quibus exceptis et navi Romam dimissis ipse Antiochiam regressus praepositoque Syriae Catilio Severo per Illyricum Romam venit.

49 Bennett 1997, 204. Bennett is followed by Amanda Claridge, "Hadrian's Succession and the Monuments of Trajan," in Thorsten Opper (ed.), *Hadrian: Art, Politics and Economy* (London: The British Museum, 2013), 5.

50 On the use of *reliquiae* to refer to burnt remains, see Cic. *Fam*. 12.4.1; Sen. *Ep*. 92.35; Suet. *Otho* 10; Tac. *Ann*. 2.75; Verg. *A*. 6.227.

51 See Davies 2004, 32.

52 For the ancient sources noting the deposition of Trajan's ashes within the base of the Column, see Eva M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon topographicum urbis romae*, Vol. 2 (Rome: Edizione Quasar, 1995), 357.

53 HA *Hadrian* 6.1; Bennett 1997, 204.

54 Dio 68.3.3; see *BMC Cilicia,* xxxvii–xxxviii; W. Ruge, "Traianopolis," A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll (eds.), *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Band VIA, Halbband 12, *Timon-Tribus* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1937), 2787–2788; cf. Hild and Hellenkemper 1990, 407–408.

55 Winterstein 2013, 163–165.

56 It should be noted that the niche within the base of the Column of Trajan where an altar and the golden urn containing the cremated remains of the emperor was located included a window that allowed sunlight to shine on the altar and urn; see Giuseppi Lugli, "La tomba di Traiano," in *Omagiu lui Constantin Daicoviciu* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine, 1960), 337–338; Davies 2004, 32.

57 Michel Polfer, "Reconstructing Funerary Rituals: The Evidence of *Ustrina* and Related Archaeological Structures," in John Pearce, Martin Millett, and Manuela Struck (eds.), *Burial, Society and Context in the Roman World* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2000), 30–37.

58 Polfer 2000, 31.

59 Eighteenth century excavations just east of the Mausoleum of Augustus revealed several travertine funerary *cippi* inscribed with the names of members of the Julio-Claudians, possibly localizing the *Ustrinum Domus Augustae* as nearby; see Richardson, Jr. 1992, 404; Eva M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon topographicum urbis romae*, Vol. 5 (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1993), 97. For the most recent discussion of Augustus' *ustrinum*, see Paul Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos. Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 33–35.

60 Davies 2004, 10.

61 For discussions of funerary rites during cremations, see Mary T. Boatwright, "The 'Ara Ditus–Ustrinum of Hadrian' in the Western Campus Martius and Other Problematic Roman Ustrina," *American Journal of Archaeology* 89 (1985): 494–495; Lise Vogel, *The Column of Antoninus Pius* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 57–60; Jocelyn M.C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971), 56–61.

62 Vincent Jolivet, "Les cendres d'Auguste. Note sur la topographie monumentale du Champ de Mars septentrionale," *Archeologia Laziale* 9 (1988): 90–96; for imperial *ustrina* see Boatwright 1985, 495; and Davies 2004, 167–168.

63 For rites associated with cremations and funerals, see John Scheid, "Contraria Facere: Renversements et déplacements dans les rites funéraires," *Annali dell'instituto Orientale di Napoli* 6 (1984): 117–139; Penelope J.E. Davies, "The Politics of Perpetuation:

Trajan's Column and the Art of Commemoration," *American Journal of Archaeology* 101 (1997): 52–58.

64 Jean-Claude Richard, "Les funérailles de Trajan et le triomphe sur les Parthes," *Revue des Études Latines* 44 (1966): 351–362.

65 The situation regarding the Trajan temple is somewhat controversial; see now James E. Packer, *The Forum of Trajan in Rome: A Study of the Monuments*, Vol. 1 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 134–135, and John W. Stamper, *The Architecture of Roman Temples: The Republic to the Middle Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 181–182; cf. Eva M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon topographicum urbis romae*, Vol. 2 (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1995), 354–356.

66 Paul Zanker, "Das Traiansforum in Rom," *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1970): 539.