Appendix: The exedra of Demetrios, son of Python, at Labraunda

BY FREDRIK TOBIN

In front of the Temple of Zeus at Labraunda, there is an open area where a large number of small, free-standing monuments stood in antiquity. Today, mostly statue bases remain, but in the north-eastern corner of the Temple Terrace a relatively well-preserved exedra can be found (Fig. 43). Apart from the publication of its inscriptions it has received little scholarly attention. Parts of it were seen by Alfred Laumonier in 1933; it was later excavated by Swedish archaeologists and finally reassembled on 5 July 1948. During the 2013 field season, the exedra was cleaned of accumulated dirt and documented (Fig. 44).

The exedra itself is semi-circular in shape, c. 4 m wide and c. 2 m deep. It is built entirely of marble and stands on a rectangular foundation built of local gneiss. The floor of the exedra consists of 11 marble blocks which have all been preserved. The superstructure consists of a back wall and a bench, both of which have been partly preserved.

The back wall was originally made up of five blocks, one of which is missing (Fig. 45).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back wall block</th>
<th>Labraunda find ID</th>
<th>Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B 84</td>
<td>Labraunda 29 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B 4a</td>
<td>Labraunda 29 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>B 48 + B 83</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>B 4</td>
<td>Labraunda 29 a and 29 b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
Fig. 44. The exedra of Demetrios in its current state.

Fig. 45. Plan of the exedra (in black) and its foundation (in grey).
The original order of placement of the back wall blocks cannot be determined with complete certainty. Block A is the only block which has mouldings and an inscription on its right short side, meaning that it must have been the final block on the right side. Since none of the preserved blocks have mouldings on their left short side, this means that the missing block was the final block on the left side. Since block D has a small part of an inscription on the left end of the front of block (Labraunda 29 b), the block standing directly to the left of it must have contained the rest of the inscription. Neither block B nor C has any such inscriptions, suggesting that block D was positioned to the right of the missing block. Nothing certain can be said about the internal order of placement of blocks B and C.

The superstructure of the exedra was constructed using orthostate blocks for the back wall, combined with a completely separate bench (Fig. 46). On the Greek mainland, the bench is usually integrated into the back wall. In fact, exedrae with separate benches are found only on the Aegean islands and in Asia Minor. Mouldings run along the top of the back wall, both on the front side and on the back side. Although the back-side moulding is very damaged, it seems to have been identical to the front-side moulding (an observation made previously in the 1948 field journal B II, page 64). A third moulding runs along the back side of the exedra floor. For the reconstructed section, the front side of block D was used as the basis for both top mouldings, while the floor blocks under back wall blocks A and B were used for the floor moulding.

Three of the four known inscriptions on the exedra (Labraunda 29 a–c) were cut into the front side of the back wall and simply state the name of the dedicator of the monument: Demetrios, son of Python (Fig. 47). The fourth inscription (Labraunda 29 d) was cut into the short side of block A and seems to have been at least five lines long, although only a few single letters were readable when it was excavated. All of the inscriptions are almost completely destroyed today, but Jonas Crampa, who published the inscriptions, made squeezes of them which are now at the Uppsala University Library. Crampa dated the inscriptions to the 3rd century BC on account of the lettering.

Cuttings for bronze statues can be noted on the top of the back wall. They are easiest to interpret on block A, where two pairs of feet can be seen clearly. The cuttings on the other blocks are less obvious in shape, but it seems certain that statues were placed all along the top of the back wall, presumably also on the missing back wall block. Gunter has estimated that there were as many as nine statues.
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Clamps were used to hold blocks of the exedra floor together, and these were also used between back wall block D and the missing back wall block. Two of the clamp holes in the floor still contain remains of iron clamps. A clamp in the floor under back wall block D even preserves its lead cover, and according to the field journal, a second clamp (now covered by one of the bench blocks) also has a preserved cover. Even though many of the clamp cuttings are very worn, it is clear that at least some of the cuttings which would have been visible on the floor had dovetailed cuttings. The practice of giving visible clamps dovetailed cuttings and the non-visible ones plain cuttings is apparent also in the Temple of Zeus, for example.80

The exedra is placed only a few centimetres from the Stoa of Poleites (also known as the North Stoa). The construction of this stoa has been dated to somewhere between AD 102 and 114,81 but it also contains anta blocks from an earlier stoa dedicated by Maussollos (first half of the 4th century BC). The relationship between the Stoa of Poleites and the Stoa of Maussollos is still being debated. Peter Liljenstolpe and Patric von Schmalensee have suggested that the two stood on almost the same spot and that the Stoa of Poleites reused some materials and the back wall from the earlier stoa, but that it was largely a new building.82 The gneiss foundation of the exedra extends under the euthynteria of the stoa, so unless the exedra foundation was originally constructed for a different, earlier monument, this means that the construction of the stoa must post-date the construction of the exedra. And even though the exedra cannot be very precisely dated, a dating to the period of Maussollos can be ruled out since free-standing exedrae did not emerge until the period of the 4th century BC.83 It is of course possible that blocks in the stylobate and euthynteria of the Stoa of Poleites could come from the Stoa of Maussollos, but in that case they must have been moved to their current position sometime after the construction of the exedra.
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