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Fig. 1. Schematic plan of Pisidian Antioch. Drawing by the author, after Cowell et al. unpublished and Taşlahan et al. 2003, fig. 2.
From 1923 to 1925, a University of Michigan fellowship allowed architect Frederick J. Woodbridge (1901–1974) to study classical Greek and Roman architecture at first hand. Woodbridge enrolled as a visiting student at the American Academy in Rome, at that time the premier American school for the study of classical and Renaissance architecture. During this time he also served as architect on two excavations sponsored by the University of Michigan, in 1924 at Pisidian Antioch in Turkey and in 1925 at Carthage in Tunisia. Today the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology houses substantial records of the Pisidian Antioch excavations, including journals, correspondences, and more than 1,600 photographs. The architectural drawings, however, were retained by Woodbridge and eventually found their way to the archives of the American Academy in Rome. In 2005 it was agreed that the two archives should be united, and the Academy graciously transferred the drawings to the Kelsey Museum that summer. This essay describes the contents of the Woodbridge archive, shows how the materials elucidate his process of architectural reconstruction, examines the influence of Woodbridge's education at the American Academy on his drafting style, and explains the significance of the newly available reconstruction drawings for the study of Pisidian Antioch.

Located in central Turkey, Antioch was one of several cities of that name founded by the Seleucid dynasty in the third century BCE. Because the city occupied a strategic position on the network of major roads in Asia Minor, in 25 BCE the emperor Augustus refounded Antioch as a Roman colony (dubbed Colonia Caesarea Antiocheia) in the province of Galatia. Roman rule brought with it substantial public building projects and infrastructural improvements. As recorded in the Acts of the Apostles (13:14ff.), St. Paul visited the city during his travels through Asia Minor. In the late Roman period Antioch was named capital of the newly formed province of Pisidia, and it became a Christian bishopric. Arab invaders destroyed the city in the eighth century CE.

The site of the ancient city, on a low hill overshadowed by the massive mountain of Sultan Dağ, is adjacent to the modern town of Yalvaç in the province of Isparta. Francis V. J. Arundell identified the site in 1833 and published a description of the visible ruins (1834, 268–275). Sir William Ramsay headed two seasons of excavations in 1913 and 1914, but his architectural discoveries went for the most part unpublished until the Michigan team, led by Francis W. Kelsey and David M. Robinson, partnered with Ramsay and undertook new excavations in 1924. A dispute between Ramsay and Robinson caused a rift

---

1 For an overview of Antioch's political history, see Mitchell and Waelkens 1998, 5–14; for a more detailed treatment, see Levick 1967.
that was not to be repaired, and excavations planned for subsequent seasons never took place.

The excavations of 1924 concentrated on major buildings, including a sanctuary of the imperial cult, a triple-arched city gate, and two Christian churches, all of which date to the Roman period or later (fig. 1). The imperial cult sanctuary consists of a long plaza, the so-called “Tiberia Platea,” that leads up to a monumental stairway. A triple-arched gate, which the Michigan team called the “propylaea,” stood atop this stairway and opened onto a larger colonnaded plaza. At the far end of this plaza, a broad semicircular colonnaded exedra framed a temple dedicated to the emperor Augustus. To the west of the imperial cult sanctuary, facing the entrance to the Tiberia Platea, stood the smaller of the two excavated churches, dubbed the “Byzantine church” by the Michigan team. The larger church, called the “basilica,” was located adjacent to the western wall of the city. Several hundred meters south of the basilica, the triple-arched city gate, usually called the “triumphal arch” by the Michigan team, pierced the city wall. The team also studied the aqueduct and traced its course to the presumed source deep in the mountains. More recent excavations have uncovered the city’s theater, a monumental fountain house or nymphaeum, sections of the city wall, a bath complex, parts of major roadways, and a third church.

**History of the Archive**

During the Michigan excavations, written and photographic documentation was kept by three individuals: David M. Robinson, the director of excavations; Enoch E. Peterson, who is listed as “in charge of records” in the journal of excavations; and George R. Swain, the primary photographer. Woodbridge and his assistant, Horace F. Colby, kept additional records in the form of architectural drawings. The photographic and textual archives came back to Michigan, eventually to be housed in the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology. Most of the architectural drawings, however, stayed with Woodbridge so that he could produce detailed reconstruction drawings of the major excavated monuments. He produced a few reconstructions, some of them preliminary, in time for inclusion in Robinson’s publication of the sculptures from the site (1926, figs. 1, 2, 3, 31, and 67).

After this publication Woodbridge’s professional attention turned to his architectural design pursuits as partner in the New York firms of Evans, Moore and Woodbridge (1929–1942) and Adams and Woodbridge (1945–1974). Colby,

2 Robinson seems to have retained some of the drawings, particularly those relating to the larger church, the so-called basilica. See below, “Contents of the Archive.”

Woodbridge’s assistant “especially for the study of architectural sculptures,” seems to have moved on to a career in sculpture, settling in Pasadena, California (Hughes 1986, 110). Besides studying the ancient sculpture at Antioch, Colby also had the opportunity to use his artistic skills when he performed minor plaster restorations of at least two sculptures on site.\(^5\)

It was many years before Woodbridge was able to complete final reconstruction drawings of some of the monuments. In the early 1970s, when he returned to the American Academy in Rome as a visiting scholar, Woodbridge was given the use of a drafting table in the workspace of the Cosa excavations, then under the direction of Frank E. Brown.\(^6\) At that time Woodbridge finally revisited the material from Antioch and produced a series of reconstruction drawings of the imperial cult sanctuary and its propylaea. Upon Woodbridge’s death in 1974, the archive passed into the possession of his widow, Catherine Baldwin Woodbridge. In 1984 she made the drawings available to Marc Waelkens, who was then working with Stephen Mitchell on a new architectural survey of Antioch (Mitchell and Waelkens 1998, xiv), and in 1998 several of the drawings were published for the first time in the resulting book (Mitchell and Waelkens 1998, figs. 25, 26, 30, 33, 35, 40, and 42). Mrs. Woodbridge subsequently donated the archive to the American Academy in Rome, where it resided until its transfer to the Kelsey Museum in June of 2005.

Contents of the Archive

The Woodbridge archive contains three notebooks and 71 loose drawings. These materials represent various stages in the process of archaeological documentation and architectural reconstruction. Although only one of the notebooks is dated, their worn condition suggests that all three were used on site during the 1924 excavations. One of the notebooks contains a textual inventory of architectural fragments, which Peterson compiled in the time before Woodbridge arrived in Yalvaç.\(^7\) The inventory’s contents primarily concern the Tiberia

---

\(^4\) Journal of excavations, preface.

\(^5\) Colby restored the head of the female figure of the central acroterion of the temple of Augustus (caption to KM 7.1667), and he restored the nose on the plaster cast of the portrait of Augustus (caption to KM 8.1532), which is housed in the Kelsey Museum. The original marble portrait, with unrestored nose, is in the Archaeological Museum in Istanbul.

\(^6\) Information provided by Russell T. Scott of Bryn Mawr College, the current director of the American Academy’s excavations at Cosa.

\(^7\) The text is attributable to Peterson, whose handwriting is well known to the staff of the Kelsey Museum, and the journal of excavations (preface) lists among its contents an “Architectural Inventory,
Platea and the propylaea, the first monuments to be excavated in 1924, as well as fragments uncovered in Ramsay’s earlier excavations. Each entry includes a unique identification number, measurements, and a description of the fragment; some entries also include a rough sketch of the block. This architectural inventory provides essential information about stones that are now missing—the residents of Yalvaç used many of the excavated blocks for building material after the Michigan expedition concluded.

The contents of the other two notebooks consist of measured graphic representations of excavated blocks, predominantly those with sculpted decoration. According to their covers, the contents of one notebook were drawn by Woodbridge alone, while Colby and Woodbridge collaborated in the other. The 50 drawn pages of the Woodbridge notebook primarily cover the city gate (20 pages) and the temple (21 pages), while the Colby/Woodbridge notebook’s 30 pages primarily cover the propylaea (19 pages). There is some overlap in coverage between the notebooks, and each contains a few miscellaneous drawings of fragments from other minor monuments. A significant number of pages has been excised from the end of these two notebooks. In addition, a series of ten loose sheets from an absent notebook has been inserted into the Colby/Woodbridge notebook. These ten sheets are the primary record of the excavated remains of the Byzantine church.

The 71 loose drawings in the Woodbridge archive show a wide variety of purpose and drafting technique. The subjects of the vast majority of these are the monuments of the imperial cult sanctuary—the temple of Augustus and its colonnaded plaza, the propylaea, and the Tiberia Platea. Of the other monuments, five drawings depict the city gate, one the Byzantine church, and one the overall city plan. In general, about half of the 71 sheets contain field drawings that act as primary documentation of the ancient structures as excavated. The other half falls into two groups: working drawings and final reconstructions. The working drawings depict the intermediary steps between the field drawings and the final reconstructions.

Certain notable materials are missing from the archive. During the excavations, several test trenches were opened in areas of the site away from major monuments. These were usually placed with the intention of identifying major roadways, although that goal was not always attained. Two trenches to the north of the city gate exposed the Roman street paving, as did a third trench at the presumed intersection of the Tiberia Platea and a major north-south street. Two other test trenches, one near the Byzantine church, the other halfway between that

Commenced by Mr. Peterson; continuation rendered unnecessary by the arrival of the architect, July 4.”
church and the so-called north city gate (now known to have been a nymphaeum), came down upon late antique houses. These houses seem to have been excavated with the same care as the major public monuments. The journal of excavations records their prominent finds each day, and they were documented photographically; however, the Woodbridge archive lacks any primary graphic record of these trenches. These trenches and the walls excavated within them are indicated on the city plan produced by Woodbridge and published by Robinson (1926, fig. 2). The Kelsey archive contains a photograph of this plan, but the whereabouts of the original drawing are currently unknown.

The archive is also missing materials concerning the larger of the two churches, the so-called basilica. Woodbridge drew a plan of the basilica with some indications of its mosaic floor decoration, as well as at least three large drawings of certain details of the mosaics. The Kelsey archive contains photographs of these four drawings. It is fortunate that these photographs exist, but, since the journal of excavations mentions that the drawings of the mosaics were done in “exact color reproductions,” the black-and-white photographs cannot replace the originals. According to an article by Ernst Kitzinger (1974, 385–387), all of these drawings were in Robinson’s possession in 1950, when Kitzinger examined them and photographed the plan of the basilica; however, their whereabouts as of 1974 were unknown. Given the complete absence of material pertaining to the basilica in the Woodbridge archive, we might surmise that Woodbridge handed over all such records to Robinson, possibly even to the point of cutting pages out of his notebooks (as mentioned above).

At least three people were involved with the graphic recording of excavated features during the summer of 1924: Enoch Peterson, Frederick Woodbridge, and Horace Colby. As reported in the excavation journal, from May 10 to July 4 Peterson recorded the architectural data. His work is represented in the archive by the architectural inventory notebook and, it seems, by the sheets that record the excavation of the Byzantine church, which the team undertook in the weeks just prior to Woodbridge’s arrival. In the inventory notebook, Peterson shows a penchant for recording the structural details of each stone, such as the presence of anathyrosis, a type of stonework

---

8 Journal of excavations, entry for July 11–August 10.

9 By the time Kitzinger published his photograph of the plan in 1974, individuals at the University of Mississippi, which houses Robinson’s papers, could locate only two photographs of the mosaic drawings in their archives and none of the originals. Robinson may have donated them to another institution.
that allowed each block to abut its neighbor closely, and the locations of holes and channels for dowels, clamps, and leading that once secured the stones together.

The ten loose sheets inserted into the Colby/Woodbridge notebook contain a measured plan of the foundations of the Byzantine church that spans three sheets, as well as several measured elevation drawings of standing walls. Peterson’s rigid drawing style and looping handwriting are evident on these sheets, just as in the architectural inventory. Together, these materials show Peterson’s careful recording of architectural features during the weeks before Woodbridge arrived. Also in the archive is a more formal rendering of the foundations of the Byzantine church, signed by Woodbridge (Mitchell and Waelkens 1998, fig. 40). The ten sheets show that, in the case of this drawing, much of the preliminary work was done by Peterson, and that Woodbridge used Peterson’s data to produce the final archival plan.

Woodbridge’s role in the production of the final reconstructions is clear from his signed drawings. His exact role during the course of excavations, however, is less obvious, especially considering his late arrival. The archive contains a series of drawings on heavy-stock paper that would hold up well under the working conditions on an archaeological site. The drawings include eight sketch plans that give detailed measurements of structures in situ (fig. 2), two long profile drawings of the imperial cult sanctuary, and seven large-scale (often 1:1) drawings of architectural molding profiles. Most of these can be attributed to Woodbridge based on the style of his handwriting. This attribution is verified by Woodbridge’s signature on one of the molding profile sheets and by the ornate FJW monogram sketched almost as a doodle rather than as a formal
signature in the corner of one of the plans. Another of these plans in the same hand has a series of male and female portraits sketched in the corners of the page, evidence of a creative mind passing the down time (fig. 3). In this series of drawings we see Woodbridge in his active role as archaeological architect, gathering precise data concerning the structures he later would be required to reconstruct.

Colby’s role in the process is more difficult to determine. It seems that he arrived in Yalvaç very late in the summer, on August 23. The preface to the journal of excavations reports that the final day of excavations was September 1 and that Robinson departed the next day. Meanwhile, “the other members of the staff remain[ed] for a week or more to finish the work of photographing and the accumulation of data for architectural drawings.”10 They seem to have stayed until about September 10.11 Taking final measurements of all the monuments that had been excavated would have been a major project, so Colby’s presence in the last few hectic weeks was probably essential. Some of the drawings in the Colby/Woodbridge notebook surely must have been executed by Colby, but his drawing style is difficult to distinguish from that of Woodbridge. The handwriting of the accompanying notes is of some help, but even here it is difficult to distinguish between the two. Perhaps the most likely candidates for attribution to the sculptor Colby are the sketches of freestanding sculptures, including an impressive rendering of the marble head of Augustus discovered in a late antique house near the Byzantine church (fig. 4).

10 Journal of excavations, preface.
11 The latest date recorded in the photograph captions.
In the course of excavations, Woodbridge appears to have continually reinterpreted the architectural evidence for each structure as new blocks came to light. His efforts to reconstruct the city gate illustrate this process well. In the two notebooks, Woodbridge created measured drawings of the excavated blocks that contain sculptural decoration, as well as sketches of these blocks in preliminary structural relationships. When drawing figure 5, Woodbridge had already determined the final placement of the lion-head cornice, vegetal frieze, and architrave; however, in his final reconstruction he placed the type of Corinthian capital illustrated here in a different location. Woodbridge also measured and drew undecorated blocks that provided essential information about the structure of the gate. He often depicted these structural blocks in an axonometric view, which helped him to visualize their relationships in three dimensions. In figure 6, Woodbridge illustrated the relationship between the blocks that delimit the tall arched niches present in each of the piers.

After testing the relationships between blocks graphically in the pages of the notebooks, Woodbridge next produced a preliminary reconstruction of the entire gate. Figure 7 is almost certainly his first attempt at such a reconstruction. Here he depicted the city gate with only one archway. This clearly indicates that excavations were still ongoing when the drawing was produced, because at the end of excavations, the exposed foundations of four piers showed that the gate actually had three archways. The third and fourth piers, however, were not uncovered until a few days before excavations ceased. Woodbridge, eager to visualize the known extent of the arch, put his first hypothetical reconstruction on paper when only two pier
bases had been uncovered. The journal of excavations reports that digging was suspended from July 11 to August 10, while some permit issues were resolved, and that in that time “Mr. Woodbridge devoted his time to drawing plans of the Basilica [sic], its mosaic in exact color reproductions, the triumphal arch, and the temple.” Thus, it was probably during this break in excavation that Woodbridge produced the preliminary, single-bayed manifestation of the gate. The single-bayed arch would have been a type well known to any student of Roman architecture; canonical examples include the Arch of Titus in Rome and the Arch of Trajan in Benevento, Italy. The decorative relief

12 Other details of the drawing indicate that Woodbridge’s study of the remains of the gate were incomplete: he placed the weapons frieze blocks at the tops of the two piers, and the pilasters that flank the niches in the piers do not have the elaborately molded bases present in the final reconstruction.

13 In his drawings Woodbridge sometimes used the term “triumphal arch” to refer to both the city gate and the gateway to the imperial cult sanctuary. The terminology in the journal of excavations, on the other hand, is clearer: the city gate on the western edge of the site is always called the “triumphal arch,” while the triple-arched gateway to the imperial cult sanctuary is referred to as the “propylaea.”
sculpture of the city gate, which included a frieze of weapons and two figures carrying military standards, depicted just the sort of imagery that Woodbridge would have expected on a single-bayed “triumphal” arch. The drawing is an imaginative reconstruction of a monument that never existed.

On August 28, the team discovered the third pier of the city gate, and the fourth came to light just a few days later. A small sketch of the arch in its triple-bayed form on a 3 × 5 inch note card might have been drawn the very day that the fourth pier was discovered (fig. 8). Similar note cards in the archive show that Woodbridge used them for a variety of purposes, including taking notes on architectural features, sketching and measuring fragments, and jotting down an itemized list of expenses. These cards may have been the closest thing to hand when he wanted to visualize the arch in its complete form for the first time.

The 3 × 5 sketch is also Woodbridge’s first attempt to place the arch into its urban context. The structure visible inside the central archway is a representation of the fountain excavated by the Michigan team in this position (fig. 9). Woodbridge also included the city wall on either side of the gate and, for scale, several people, including a guard posted in the central archway. This guard is a recurring element in Woodbridge’s drawings of the city gate; he is present on the single-arched version, in the 3 × 5 sketch, and in his first large elevation sketch (fig. 10). In this last drawing, Woodbridge expanded the gate’s urban context by including a number of hypothetical buildings visible through the archways—buildings located in areas that went unexcavated during the summer of 1924.14

In his final ink-and-wash reconstruction of the city gate, created in early 1925 after his return to Rome, Woodbridge omitted these contextual features and presented the monument

---

14 Recent excavations undertaken by Mehmet Taşlalan (2000) have shown a different arrangement of buildings in this area.
Fig. 9. Frederick J. Woodbridge, *Restored plan of the city gate and surrounding structures, including the semicircular fountain to the north*, 1924, ink on paper. Kelsey Museum Archives.

Fig. 10. Frederick J. Woodbridge, *Preliminary sketch of the city gate and surrounding structures*, 1924, pencil on paper. Kelsey Museum Archives.
The tenure of a full Fellow of the Academy was three years. In that time each Fellow was expected to complete several projects: to measure and draw an ancient building, a Renaissance building, and, in the third year, a larger group of buildings or complex dating to either of the two periods (Yegül 1991, 37–39). Fellows also took part in Collaborative Problems, yearly competitions that teamed an architect, a sculptor, and a painter in a contest to create an original design for an imaginary project assigned by the Academy. Since Woodbridge was a visiting student and not a full Fellow, participation in the Collaborative Problems was closed to him. Documents in the Records of the American Academy in Rome (RAAR), now housed in the Archives of American Art in Washington, D.C., show that the other aspects of the Academy’s curriculum were available to Woodbridge.
In the “Roster of the Students,” a set of forms completed by each student as a record of their activities, Woodbridge reported that in the spring of 1924 he undertook a project to measure and reconstruct the Horrea Epagathiana et Epaphroditiana, a storage building in Ostia, the port of Rome (RAAR, 5789.876). The Academy’s archive of photographs, still housed in Rome, contains photographs of the five drawings that comprised Woodbridge’s Horrea project. The drawings include an elevation (fig. 12), a plan, two sections, and a collection of architectural details. In the months required to complete this project, Woodbridge would have interacted with other students and received instruction from Academy faculty. In the process, he became familiar with the drafting style prevalent among the Academy’s students.

After Woodbridge completed the Horrea project, his course of study diverged from the Academy’s typical curriculum for Fellows. In the summer of 1924, Woodbridge traveled to Yalvaç to assist in recording the “unusually imposing” architectural discoveries in Antioch (RAAR, ITRO 13.524). The director of the Academy himself, Gorham Phillips Stevens, personally recommended Woodbridge to the Michigan team based on Woodbridge’s work in Ostia (RAAR, ITRO 13.536). Woodbridge “consequently took up his duties in Asia Minor with enthusiasm and intelligence” (RAAR, ITRO 13.524) and “sent back enthusiastic informal reports of the excitement from day to day in the Metropolis of Yalovach”’ (RAAR, ITRO 13.536).
Woodbridge served as architect not only for the Antioch excavations in the summer of 1924 but also for excavations in Carthage in the spring of 1925 (Kelsey 1926, 10–11). In the time between these excavations, he returned to Rome to work on his final reconstruction drawings for the Antioch excavations (RAAR, 5789.876). Working in the Academy’s studios and interacting daily with students and faculty again had an influence on Woodbridge’s drafting style. This influence is clearest in his restoration of the city gate, but many other drawings also reflect drafting and reconstruction styles that were prevalent at the Academy at the time.

Titled “Restored Elevation of a Triumphal Arch at Antioch of Pisidia,” the reconstruction of the city gate is by far the most elaborate and polished drawing in the Kelsey Museum’s Woodbridge archive, and, at 95 × 57 cm, it is also the largest (fig. 11). The drawing represents one façade of the triple-arched gate, removed from its urban context and set against a blank gray background that fades to a lighter tone toward the top of the frame. The arch appears to stand on a line that delimits an area below reserved for descriptive text. A black-and-white dashed border, doubling as a meter scale, enframes this text, which names the monument and lists its location, estimated date of construction (now known to be incorrect), date of excavation, and excavating institution. Woodbridge executed the architectural and sculptural details of the arch in ink as a line drawing with varying line weights (fig. 13). He used washes in varying tones to indicate shading and cast shadows, and to add variety to the tones of individual stone blocks. This ink-and-wash style lends a sense of solidity and depth that is absent in his simpler line drawings.

The city gate reconstruction is an impressive image, evocative of an era when the artistry of architectural reconstruction was emphasized. In addition to fellowships in architecture, the American Academy offered fellowships to students of other arts, especially painting and sculpture. During the Academy’s annual exhibitions, the reconstruction drawings produced by students in architecture were displayed alongside the sculptures and paintings of their fellow students. Woodbridge showed his reconstruction of Antioch’s city gate during the annual exhibition of 1925 (fig. 14). Because it helps us visualize the past, architectural reconstruction occupies an important place in the discipline of archaeology, and the process of creating a reconstruction can also raise new and unexpected questions. The discipline itself, however, sometimes uses reconstructions too trustingly, and an impressive, convincing image can become iconic, whether or not its details are correct. Woodbridge’s reconstruction of the city gate has been published at least four times (Robinson 1926, fig. 1; Mitchell and Waelkens 1998, fig.
Woodbridge’s *Restored elevation of a triumphal arch at Antioch of Pisidia* is displayed between the windows on the right wall. Photographic Archives of the American Academy in Rome, AAR.FW.Exh.1925.819.

At times, unfortunately, it has been taken as representative of the actual monument, creating a false sense that the monument is “known” and needs no further research. For example, when describing the gate, Mehmet Taşlıalan states that the eastern archway was flanked by victories and the western one by genii or erotes. Taşlıalan argues that the northern face of the gateway—the one not depicted by Woodbridge—was devoid of decorative reliefs (Taşlıalan 2000, 10).

My own research has shown that this is not the case; the two faces of the gate had congruent but differing decorative schemes (Ossi forthcoming). The southern face had standard-bearers over the central arch, genii or erotes over both side arches, and a frieze of weapons. The northern face had bound captives over the central arch, winged victories over the side arches, and a spiraling vegetal frieze. Even as he was drawing the image, Woodbridge may have known that he was misrepresenting the monument. A similar effect is present in one of the notebooks, where Woodbridge sketched the scroll of the city gate’s keystone bracket with two different decorative patterns (fig. 15). A note tells us that the two patterns represent alternative treatments of the two keystones found. In order to get the most information into his reconstruction of the city gate, Woodbridge partially conflated the two façades by placing victories over the left archway.

The depiction of multiple views of the same building in
one image is a trait commonly found in architectural reconstruction drawings produced at the American Academy in Rome (cf. Yegül 1991, pl. 78). In addition to this, Woodbridge’s reconstruction of Antioch’s city gate has other affinities with reconstruction drawings done by Academy Fellows in architecture at that time, particularly its ink-and-wash technique (cf. Yegül 1991, pl. 93) and the dashed border surrounding the text (cf. Yegül 1991, pls. 53–54.). As stated above, it was also common practice to remove monuments from their contexts and illustrate them as stand-alone objects. Woodbridge used this compositional device both in his Horrea project and in his final reconstruction of Antioch’s city gate. Several other drawings in the Woodbridge archive also reflect his Academy education. His final drawing of molding profiles, depicting seven separate profiles arranged together on one sheet (fig. 16), has at least one close parallel in the Academy’s archives (cf. Yegül 1991, pl. 56). Likewise, Woodbridge’s drawings of details of the mosaic pavement of the basilica (fig. 17) are similar to other floor pavement studies drawn by Academy Fellows at that time (cf. Yegül 1991, pls. 63 and 80).

Woodbridge returned to the Academy in 1971 in order to complete his reconstruction drawings of the imperial cult sanctuary (figs. 18–20). For these drawings, he chose not to employ the elaborate ink-and-wash technique that he had used for the city gate reconstruction and for his Horrea project. Instead, he used a simpler line-drawing technique, similar to that of his single-bayed version of the city gate. Perhaps a desire to finish a project that had been on his shelf for almost fifty years impelled Woodbridge to use this simpler, quicker technique. Because he had saved all of his working drawings, the length of time between excavation and reconstruction did not adversely affect the accuracy of the drawings. For example, Woodbridge had the working plan of the Tiberia Platea’s stairway (fig. 2) as a base for his final plan of the propylaea and steps (fig. 20). He could use the carefully recorded profiles wherever necessary in elevation drawings. And the Colby/Woodbridge notebook was full of measured drawings of the architectural and sculptural
Fig. 16. Frederick J. Woodbridge, *Full size profiles from Antioch of Pisidia*, 1924, ink on paper. Kelsey Museum Archives.

Fig. 17. Frederick J. Woodbridge, *Detail of the mosaic pavement of the basilica*, 1924, ink on paper. Kelsey Museum Archives.

Fig. 18. Frederick J. Woodbridge, *Restored elevation of the temple of Augustus and its surrounding colonnade*, 1971, pencil on paper. Kelsey Museum Archives.
Impact of the Woodbridge Archive

Even prior to their identification by Arundell in 1833, the Roman ruins of Pisidian Antioch had been a source of building materials for local residents (Arundell 1834, 275). Robinson (1924, 437) reports that during the course of excavations in 1924, “a half mile of macadam road was built of stones from the ancient site.” The site was left unprotected after the conclusion of the Michigan excavations, and the residents of Yalvaç could not resist using such a large amount of well-cut, good-quality stone. The Turkish masons’ gain, however, is the archaeologists’ loss. The area most affected by this salvage activity was the Tiberia Platea and its monumental stairway. One can easily grasp the appeal of the materials based on photographs from 1924 (fig. 21). The stairway, built of large squared limestone blocks, was largely intact, and flat paving stones covered the entire exposed area of the plaza. Today these structures are almost entirely gone.

Until now, scholars studying these structures had to rely on brief verbal descriptions published by Robinson (1924;
1926), supplemented by a few published photographs (Robinson 1924, fig. 2; Mitchell and Waelkens 1998, pls. 104–107) and Woodbridge’s lone published drawing of the propylaea and steps (Robinson 1926, fig. 31). If the Michigan team’s conclusions seemed unlikely to a modern scholar, a debate arose between accepting the team’s findings because they had studied the actual remains and dismissing their conclusions as inept, thereby allowing a scholar to supply his or her own conjectural hypothesis. The Woodbridge archive represents an untapped source of information about these structures that can provide authoritative answers to some lingering questions. For example, most plans of the imperial cult sanctuary published recently depict the stairway incorrectly (Tuchelt 1983, fig. 1; Taşhalan
1994, plan 1; Mitchell and Waelkens 1998, fig. 31). These plans all show the stairs continuing uninterrupted from one side of the Tiberia Platea to the other. In fact, four plinths, aligned with the piers of the triple-arched propylaea, punctuated the stairway (figs. 19–20). No trace of these plinths exists today for modern scholars to examine. Woodbridge’s drawings, supported by photographs in the Kelsey archive, are their only record.

These plinths represent an important architectural detail because of the ongoing debate about the location of the inscribed *Res Gestae*, a record of the emperor Augustus’s “Deeds Accomplished.” This long inscription was a primary element of the sanctuary’s political message to the local inhabitants, communicated via its architectural, sculptural, and epigraphic program (Mitchell and Waelkens 1998, 157–167; Rose 2005, 54–57; Rubin forthcoming). Woodbridge depicted the plinths as bearing the *Res Gestae* inscription (fig. 19), which would have been a much more visible and accessible location than the one proposed more recently, on the inside of the arches of the propylaea (Taşhahan 1994, 251–253; Mitchell and Waelkens 1998, 146). The find spots of the majority of these fragments support Woodbridge’s placement; the fragments were concentrated at the bottom of the stairway.

The dramatic destruction of the Tiberia Platea that occurred after the Michigan excavations makes the Woodbridge archive a primary source of information on these structures that is otherwise unavailable. Although the other monuments of Antioch did not fare as badly in the intervening years, it
is likely that some attrition has occurred. A detailed survey of their remains in conjunction with careful study of the Woodbridge archive would certainly yield additional information that has been lost or hidden since 1924. Together, the Woodbridge archive and the Kelsey Museum’s archive of photographs from the 1924 excavations represent an essential resource for future scholarship on the Roman colony of Pisidian Antioch.


