R. R. R. SMITH

A PORTRAIT MONUMENT FOR JULIAN AND THEODOSIUS AT APHRODISIAS*

The archaeological record of Aphrodisias in Caria has preserved an unusual number of cases from the Roman and late Roman periods in which marble statues can be re-combined with the inscribed bases on which the statues originally stood. Reconstructions of two complete statue monuments of the early Severan period, of L. Antonius Diogenes Dometeinus and his niece Antonia Tatiana, have recently been published[1]. The present paper, part of a project studying the late antique portrait statuary from Aphrodisias[2], argues for a

[1] JRS 1998, 66–68, figs. 1–2.

[2] Further on this project: JRS 1999, 155–189. This work is part of a program of archaeological research at Aphrodisias undertaken by the Institute of Fine Arts and the Faculty of Arts and Science of New York University since 1991. A principal aim is to document the excavations and finds made by the late Professor K. Erim at the site between

reconstruction of a late Roman imperial monument set up in the colonnaded square in front of the theatre.

1. Context and historical background

First, the archaeological and architectural context. The square in front of the theatre at Aphrodisias was excavated in the early 1970's (Pl. 31, 1. 2) and revealed a considerable number of items from late antique statue monuments: inscribed bases, cuttings for bases in the pavement, statue plinths, statues, and portrait heads. These elements of late antique statuary are shown on the schematic find plan, Fig. 33. Some were found along the line of the colonnade running obliquely behind the stage building of the theatre (a kind of porticus post scaenam), which was really the west stoa of the Tetrastoon, a porticoed square that dates in its present form to the mid-fourth century AD. Other elements, chiefly some inscribed bases, were found built into the later (probably seventh-century) defensive wall constructed mainly of spolia blocks along the outer line of the scaena building. These pieces were recovered when the spolia wall was demolished by excavators in the later 1970's. This wall can be seen still intact in old excavation photographs (Pl. 31, 2)[3].

The west stoa of the Tetrastoon clearly functioned as an important site for honorific statuary from the time of its (re)construction in the 360's to the sixth century. There is evidence for at least seven statue monuments

1961 and 1990. Preliminary reports: R. R. R. Smith – C. Ratté, Archaeological Research at Aphrodisias in Caria, 1993, AJA 99, 1995, 33–58; Archaeological Research at Aphrodisias in Caria, 1994, AJA 100, 1996, 5–33; Archaeological Research at Aphrodisias in Caria, 1995, AJA 101, 1997, 1–22; Archaeological Research at Aphrodisias in Caria, 1996, AJA 102, 1998, 225–250; Archaeological Research at Aphrodisias in Caria, 1997 and 1998, AJA 104, 2000, 221-253.

[3] For the seventh-century spolia wall and discussion of its date: R. Cormack, The Wall Painting of St. Michael in the Theatre, in: K. T. Erim – R. R. R. Smith (eds.), Aphrodisias Papers 2, JRA Suppl. 2 (1991) 109–122, esp. 120; ALA pp. 150–151.

that were posted on the square in front of the columns of the west stoa. This study concerns itself with the earliest, an honorific statue monument first set up for Julian and later re-used for Theodosius I or II. The latest in this honorific gallery was the statue of a governor and acting vicar, Flavius Palmatus (ca. AD 500), which was found with its head fallen directly in front of its *in situ* inscribed base (the base composed of two re-used elements can be seen *in situ* in Pl. 31, 2)[4]. The elements of this base and statue complex for Palmatus are marked 'F' on the plan, Fig. 33. It is this kind of archaeological conjunction of statues fallen near their bases, repeated several times at Aphrodisias, that is the chief argument for the reconstruction of the statue proposed here.

Some historical background to the monument under discussion can be deduced from its inscribed text and that of another base (to Valens) from the same context. The statue monument for Julian was set up by a governor, Antonius Tatianus, who was also, the inscription on the base tells us (Pl. 32, 1. 3), responsible for the construction of the Tetrastoon (surely in reality its reconstruction)[5]. It is this inscription that supplies the name and precise date for the Tetrastoon, and it was clearly part of the purpose of the statue to mark and advertise this major architectural work undertaken by the governor. The same governor was still in office at Aphrodisias both at the time of Julian's death in June 363 and, after the brief eight-month reign of Jovian, at the accession of Valens as Augustus for the eastern empire in March 364 – for he also promptly honoured Valens with a statue also set up at the west stoa of his Tetrastoon. The (rectangular) base for this monument was also recovered from the seventh-century spolia wall behind[6]. Julian's cognomen ('Ioulianon') was later erased from the inscription on the first (cylindrical) base and that of Theodosius written in large crude letters over it ('Theodosion': Pl. 32, 3). Although Julian's name was erased locally elsewhere (for example, at Pergamon: ILS 751), he did not suffer any official or widespread damning of his memory. The Theodosian appropriation of the monument could therefore have taken place either some years later when a monument for Theodosius I or II was needed, or alternatively, soon after Julian's death

at the time the new statue to Valens was set up by the governor, keen to demonstrate his loyalty to the new regime[7]. The governor's haste is revealed on the second (rectangular) base where he gives the new emperor the previous dynasty's *nomina* – Flavius Claudius Valens, instead of simply Flavius Valens. Julian's (bearded) portrait (and possibly the statue too) would surely have been removed at the same time as the erasing of the name. If this had been carried out soon after Julian's death, the base would then have stood 'empty' continuing to advertise only the governor's building work[8].

2. The surviving elements: Base, statue, and head

We are concerned with five diverse re-used elements, all of local marble, all found in fairly close proximity and which may have formed a single late antique statue monument. These elements are as follows (from bottom to top): (A) a plinth, made from an Ionic column base; (B) an inscribed cylindrical base, also a re-used element; (C) an inscribed crowning element, also made from an Ionic column base, used upside down to correspond to A; (D) a youthful headless togate statue of the middle imperial period; and (E) a youthful, diademed portrait head of the fourth-fifth century, skilfully re-carved from a Julio-Claudian portrait.

The find places of the five elements are marked A–E on the plan, Fig. 33. The three elements, A–C, making up the inscribed base, though found dispersed, surely belong together. They connect less well, judged in terms of marble jointing practice of the middle empire, better in terms of epigraphy and context. The two elements of the statue, head and body, D–E, probably belonged together in the late antique period, again not because they fit well but because they were found close to each other and could plausibly be fitted together. The connection of the statue with the base is again not founded on any physical or technical connection – far from it – but on

[4] Base: ALA no. 62. Statue: IR II no. 208. Reconstruction of monument: R. R. R. Smith – C. Ratté, AJA 102, 1998, 242–244 fig. 21; JRS 1999, 169 fig. 9.

[5] ALA no. 20. Text and translation are given below.

[6] ALA no. 21.

[7] The latter alternative is favoured by Roueché in her commentary on ALA nos. 20–21.

[8] Unless of course the base had been used in the intervening time for another honorand and the present name was cut over a double erasure. One candidate whom the governor Antonius Tatianus might have honoured in the place of Julian would be the short-lived emperor Jovian (Jun. 353– Feb. 354), who immediately preceded Valentinian and Valens on the throne. The city might later have felt able to appropriate his monument to honour Theodosius I or II – with as few qualms or risks as appropriating Julian's. This hypothesis may however be said to lack economy.

the archaeological and historical context. We may describe the pieces individually and then discuss more fully their possible association.

(A) Re-carved plinth (visible in Pl. 31, 2)

Found in situ in front of the fourth column (from the north) of the west stoa of the Tetrastoon, sunk into the paving of the square.

No inv. H: 25; D: 74.5; Upper D: 54.5 cm.

The plinth has a thin square base, damaged at the front right corner, a plain torus, and a short columnar shaft. The front right corner had already been damaged at the time of its re-use in the paving of the Tetrastoon, which is cut neatly in a curve at this point to follow the line of the break. The plinth was made out of a re-used Attic-Ionic base of standard type, from which the scotia and upper torus have been carved down to form a simple apophyge and shaft in a second use.

(B) Inscribed cylindrical base (Pl. 32, 1. 3)

Found built into the seventh-century spolia wall.

Inv. 77–136. H: 115.5; D: 53.5 cm.

The disfigured part of the upper moulding at the front is due to erosion in the marble block not to damage. The base is fully preserved and seems to have been used at least twice, before serving as a statue support in the fourth century. It was used first with the mouldings above and below carved half way around its circumference, with the carved half presumably facing to the front. It was then turned ninety degrees clockwise and used as a dividing element for screens abutting on either side, for which there are shallow cuttings down both sides of the base. It was then used later as the base for the monument under discussion, with the same orientation, so that above and below the front of the base presents half carved and half uncarved mouldings. In either the second or this third and last use, the top of the base was cut back further on either side, where the screen cuttings are, to the depth of the projection of the upper moulding, that is, ca. 5 cm on each side. Cuttings for vertical clamps in the sides of the base were set in these channels. The side cuttings for the screens and the clamps give the orientation of the base and show that the inscription was laid out slightly to the right of centre.

Published: ALA no. 20 pl. VII.

(C) Inscribed crowning element (Pl. 32, 4)

Found built into the seventh-century spolia wall.

Inv. 76–112. H: 30; W: 69.5; D: 69; Lower D: 54 cm.

Fully preserved, with only some chips out of the abacus. Below a tall, well-finished square abacus is a plain round torus and short shaft, which has been shaped with a claw

chisel and left with a slightly rough clawed surface. The square abacus has two 'feet' cuttings for a probably draped bronze figure. The sides of the shaft have vertical clamp cuttings for its attachment to a lower member, and the inscription Ἀγαθῆι Τύχηι is centred on the front of the shaft, engraved in neat light letters similiar in scale and character to those of the cylindrical base (B).

Like the plinth (A), this element is a re-used Attic-Ionic base (deployed upside down), from which the upper torus and the scotia were carved down to form a short shaft. This is proved by the dowel hole and pour channel in the member's u n d e r -side. Although the clamp cuttings do not align well, in the horizontal plane, with those of the cylindrical base, the lettering of the inscription and the identical lower diameter to that of the upper diameter of the cylindrical base show nevertheless that they very likely belong. The clamps align in the vertical plane between the two elements, but in the horizontal plane they would have to be bent inwards or pass through open air in the side slots of the cylindrical base before meeting its cuttings, which are set further in. This would reduce the efficiency of the clamps, but far from rules out that they were used in this way in the fourth century.

The combined text of B and C is as follows:

Ἀγαθῆι Τύχηι
Φλ(άβιον) Κλ(αύδιον) Θεοδόσιον
V. τὸν αἰώνιον
καὶ εὐσεβέστατον
5   V. Αὔγουστον
Ἀντώνιος Τατιανὸς
ὁ λαμπρ(ότατος) ἡγεμὼν
πᾶν τὸ ὁρώμενον
ἔργον τοῦ τετραστώου
10 ἐκ θεμελίων καὶ τὸν
περικείμενον σύμπαν-
τα κόσμον τῇ μητροπόλι
V. κατασκευάσας leaf

»To Good Fortune. Antonius Tatianus, *clarissimus praeses*, having built all the work of the tetrastoon that can be seen from the foundations, and all the surrounding decoration, for the metropolis, (set up this statue) of Flavius Claudius Iulianus (l a t e r   e m e n d e d   to Theodosius), the eternal and most pious Augustus«.

(Text and translation: ALA no. 20).

(D) Togate statue (Pl. 32, 2; 33, 1-4)

Preserved in two pieces: (1) the statue with plinth, (2) left hand broken through wrist and re-attached.

Inv. 72–131. H: 132; W: 54; D: 45 cm. Dimensions of plinth: H: 6; W: 45; D: 38 cm.

Found fallen in front of the west colonnade of the Tetrastoon, in front of the intercolumniation between the fourth and the fifth columns (counting from the north), on its back, face up, lying approximately on an east-west orientation, the base towards the east. The preserved left hand was found a few metres further to the east, marked 'd' on the find plan, Fig. 33.

The following were dowelled separately onto the statue and are now missing: (1) the right hand and wrist, (2) the left forefinger, (3) and (4) the upper and lower ends of the scroll held in the left hand. The following are broken off: the third and fourth fingers of the left hand, pieces from the fall of drapery below the left wrist, and a large piece from the lowest curve of the toga's sinus. Otherwise the surface is remarkably well preserved. The statue is finely finished to a near polish, with no visible traces of tools on the main surface. It is possible that a higher polish has weathered off. The back of the statue is also fully finished. There is no trace of any re-working on the statue – except in the deep and roughly worked neck cavity into which the head was set separately and secured with a large squarish dowel hole at the base of the cavity. The dowel hole narrows towards its bottom. The generous width of the dowel hole allowed plenty of play in setting the head in position on the statue.

Preliminary notice: K. T. Erim – R. R. R. Smith, Aphrodisias Papers 2 (1991) 95–96 no. 38 fig. 34.

The statue represents a youth wearing a tunic and toga with senatorial shoes. The figure steps forward on a rounded moulded plinth, with its weight on the right leg, the left leg bent at the knee and the foot trailing. The left foot is turned outwards, the heel raised, and only the front part is in contact with the base. The heel is supported behind by a carefully worked 'tenon' of marble.

The left hand is held out in front, supporting the end of the toga over the bent forearm, and held a vertical narrow scroll, separately attached above and below. The lowered right hand was held out from the body – the missing hand and broken forearm seem to have been in the usual position for holding a *patera/phiale*.

The figure is braced on its proper right side by a marble support carved in the form of a set of writing tablets that stand vertically on their own 'base' on the plinth. The set is represented as composed of ten rectangular tablets stacked vertically front to back, the divisions marked clearly on top. On the outer side of the set there is a convex, hinge-like feature running vertically, and on top the stacked tablets have, as often, a

rounded handle-like element that would normally be pierced for a string to be passed through it[9].

The plinth traces an irregular three-quarter circle in plan towards the front and a straight, slightly convex line across the back. It is plain across the back and has a finely moulded profile towards the front – a torus above and below framing a scotia between. Clamp cuttings were carved carefully into the figure's supports, above the level of the plinth, on both sides for use in attaching the figure to its original base – on the proper left into the support under the left heel, and on the proper right into the lower part of the tabula support. The same, outer side of the tabula support has also at mid-height a large roughly carved lead-filled hole, of uncertain function.

The tunic and toga are richly carved in a realistic virtuoso manner with a complex, highly varied play of light folds and deep channels. The thinner lighter tunic traces an asymmetrical course around the line of the bust socket that left part of the upper chest visible, and covers the right arm to near the wrist. The lower part of the tunic is seen over the left leg and between the lower legs and feet spilling onto the plinth.

The toga is bulky and impressive, giving the figure great width at mid-height. The bundled roll of one edge of the garment that crosses the upper body from right hip to left shoulder (*balteus*) hangs low on the right hip, leaving a lot of tunic visible, and has a full pouch of fabric (*umbo*) pulled out over the *balteus* at the middle of the stomach, before it rises like a thick plaid to the left shoulder in a thick, bunched swathe of folds. It is here thrown over the left shoulder, and the upper edge emerging from the swathe is carried in a raised line behind the right shoulder and continues down behind the outer edge of the right arm. The garment falls free of the body below the right elbow as far as the knee, where the fall of cloth is worked in the round, as it were, in its own thickness, and is then taken up in a deep loop (*sinus*) in front of the right knee to the left shoulder again. This swathe of cloth is then thrown over the shoulder again where it falls down the back. At the left shoulder it passes under and is to be distinguished from the bundled 'plaid' of cloth next to the neck. The lower hem of the garment emerges from behind the right ankle, and is carried up in a sharp diagonal line over the left thigh to the right

---

[9] For the form of the tablets: Daremberg – Saglio, s. v. tabella; and most recently E. Lalou (ed.), Les tablettes à écrire de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne (1992), a reference I owe to the kindness of P. Parsons.

arm where the 'excess' cloth is draped over the projecting left forearm. With the toga costume, the left arm had always to hold or otherwise dispose of the long end of the garment, leaving only the right arm free for gesture and movement.

The way the toga is worn and draped is standard for early and middle imperial statues. Within the well-studied, broad evolution of toga design and the slow-changing disposition of its various elements, the figure is a developed example. The *balteus* is still low on the hip, but the *umbo* is relatively pronounced, and the *sinus* is at mid-level in its possible range. On such conventional criteria the original statue should belong in the mid-second century[10].

The soft boots have thin soles and are very finely and sensitively worked with delicate narrow feet and toes modelled 'through' the soft leather. Flat straps attached to the soles at the broader part of the feet on both sides cross on top of the feet and are wrapped tightly around the ankles in several neat horizontal tiers to be tied at the front in a bow or reef knot, with the free ends left to hang loose over the front of the ankle. Short passages of bare ankle and leg are visible beneath the clothing and the top of the horizontal straps. The combination of a decidely youthful figure and senatorial boots indicates most likely that the statue was made to represent an imperial prince[11].

(E) Portrait head (Pl. 34, 1-4)

Preserved in two pieces, with neck worked as a tenon for insertion into a statue.
Inv. 72–203. H: 30; W: 18; D: 22 cm.
Found inside the colonnade of the west stoa of the Tetrastoon, behind the intercolumniation between the fifth and sixth columns (counting from the north).

The head is recomposed of two pieces broken dia-gonally through the head in its vertical axis. The break runs diagonally across the top of the head, down the proper right cheek, under the chin, and down the neck to the (viewer's) right of the throat. The two parts then are: (1) most of the face, brow, front of the hair, left ear, and left side of the neck, (2) the back right cheek, the right ear, and most of the back of the head and of the neck. Part of the lower left nostril is missing, and there is damage to the ear rims and the proper left side of the brow hair. There is also some light damage to the face and neck behind. Otherwise the

surface is very well preserved, with a lot of visible tool marks, chiefly fine rasp lines over the surface of the face, and some claw chisel over the back and top of the head. Both kinds of tooling go back to the re-working of the head in the late period, when the face was slimmed down and the Julio-Claudian hair pattern removed on top and behind. There is a large squarish dowel hole in the bottom of the neck tenon for attachment to the statue.
Published: K. T. Erim, in IR II no. 80.

The head represents a youthful-looking beardless male, and wore a separately added jewelled imperial diadem over a short plain hairstyle brushed forward onto the brow. Cuttings for the elements of the diadem have been sunk directly into the hair of the head which was not originally designed to wear a diadem. It was obviously, therefore, re-worked from an earlier portrait. The adaptation was far-reaching and skilful, keeping what was needed from the earlier portrait (the plain fringe of forehead hair, classical brows and eyelids, and the sensitively carved ears, mouth, and neck) and re-carving other elements in order to re-orient the physiognomy to different expressive norms (the hair on top of the head and the face and nose).

In its first use the head clearly represented a young Julio-Claudian male – it had a youthful, classical styling and a plain comma-lock hair pattern on the brow. The head turns slightly to its left on the neck, and the tight, regular contour of the neck tenon, if original to the first use, would indicate it came from an armoured figure – rather than from a togate or himation figure, for both of which a larger and asymmetrical part of the upper chest is normally left visible. It is possible however that the neck tenon was carved for its later use – for example, if the head had been removed from a bust or statue made in one piece with the head.

The most readily visible secondary carving is in the hair above the diadem, in the eye-markings, and in the re-shaping of the face and nose. The bridge of the nose seems to have been considerably thinned, and the face and cheeks slimmed to form a tall oval face.

The cuttings for the diadem, countersunk into the hair, continue to the level of the ears, after which the line of the diadem is continued by roughly carved grooves marking the upper and lower borders. The two ends of the diadem meet in an abbreviated knot at the back. Towards the front there are thirteen individual cuttings: a larger oval cutting over the centre of the brow, and six cuttings to each side, in alternating squares and ovals. The head clearly then wore a 'jewel' diadem of a type in use from the mid-fourth century

---

[10] Goette, Togadarstellungen 136 Liste B b 116 ('Antoninische Statuen').

[11] On senatorial shoes: H. R. Goette, Mulleus-Embas-Calceus, JdI 103, 1988, 401–464.

onwards – a more sumptuous alternative to the more common 'pearl' diadem (a plain band edged with small 'pearls', with a single central jewel or medallion over the centre of the brow)[12]. The jewel diadem was made of interlinked cut stones, precious or semi-precious, and fastened behind on the nape. In the marble head, it is unlikely that stones were simply attached on their own into the cuttings. Rather a complete interlinked diadem was surely placed on the head and fastened behind. The cuttings then were not so much to affix the stones as to bed them down into the marble hair – that is, to give a better illusion that the subject was actually wearing an attribute whose elements pressed into his hair.

Below the diadem, the hair falls on the brow in flat plain comma- and lightly S-shaped locks. On each side, the locks curve inwards, meeting off-centre, over the inner corner of the right eye, where they form a distinctive Julio-Claudian style 'claw' motif. This is not sufficient to identify the subject of the portrait in its first use. The asymmetry in the rectangle formed by the brow and hairline – taller on the viewer's left than the right, indicates that the forehead hair was probably also gone over by the later sculptor, to make it simpler and more 'Constantinian' in form and style[13]. The earlier Julio-Claudian portrait here provided both the basis for a contemporary late antique imperial hairstyle and the possibility of adjusting it. Probably a thicker and more varied Julio-Claudian hairstyle has been reduced to a plainer arrangement that minimises the defining off-centre claw-motif of the first portrait.

There are remains of sideburns in front of the right ear, but not in front of the left ear – it too was perhaps taken down by the late sculptor. At the back, the hair is more roughly finished. Above the diadem and on top of the head, the original hair has been almost completely removed, taken down with a flat chisel to an uneven surface which has then been partly gone over with a claw chisel. (There is one passage, over the proper right ear above the diadem, where the longer overlaid locks of the first portrait can still be seen). The purpose of this reduction of the hair may have been to maintain the overall proportions of the re-worked head and perhaps also again to bring this part of the hairstyle more into line with plain fourth-fifth century imperial norms. The claw-chisel work may be seen as an attempt to imitate the very fine claw work used on the top of Constantinopolitan imperial portrait heads where it represents finely combed flat hair brushed neatly forward in thread-like parallel strands[14].

The face and features of the portrait are extremely well preserved (only the tip of the nose is slightly damaged), and they have a fresh rasp-finished surface. The plain forehead, sharp brows, and classical eye-lids are features transferred from the first portrait as being appropriate with little adjustment to the new portrait. With a plain, beardless face, they were part of antiquity's visual language for handsome youthfulness. The narrow, naturally-sized eyes have been given incised iris lines of usual shape and drilled pupils in the form of a rounded and flattened half-moon. The iris lines are rather heavier and the pupil markings deeper and less sophisticated than was normal in the middle empire.

In its overall proportions, the face has a tall slender oval form, a low brow and a small, 'shallow' chin. Probably the broader, classically-formed Julio-Claudian physiognomy has been extensively remodelled. The cheeks have been considerably thinned, though asymmetrically – the proper right cheek is fuller, the left cheek flat, almost sunken. The line and width of the nose have been adjusted. In profile it makes a curved portrait-like dip at the bridge, and it has been thinned and remodelled to produce a sharp-looking narrow nose with lightly flaring nostrils and carefully modulated contour. Finally, in the recarving of the lower part of the face, the late sculptor has introduced a lot of quite sophisticated physiognomical modelling – in the light swelling at the outer corners of the mouth that casts a modelling shadow below, in the modelled dip below the lower lip, and in the light 'squaring' and indentation in the end of the chin itself. These

---

[12] On the forms and varieties of the late Roman diadem: Delbrueck 46–66. Also: A. Alföldi, Die monarchische Repräsentation im Römischen Kaiserreiche (1970) 263–268, and index s. v. diadem; P. Bastien, Le buste monétaire des empereurs romains 1 (1992) 143–167.

[13] Constantine's basic hairstyle was like that of Augustus and the Julio-Claudians in having plain locks falling on the brow, but it had a more austerely simple and axial arrangement in which the comma-shaped locks simply curved inwards on each side to meet exactly in the centre. Examples: H. P. L'Orange, Diokletian bis zu den Konstantin-Söhnen, Das römische Herrscherbild III 4 (1984) 50–57 pls. 32–39. Further on the Constantinian image, below n. 15.

[14] Seen for example on the 'Arcadius' head from Beyazit in Istanbul: IR II no. 82.

features were introduced by the late sculptor over a model that was probably plainer and harder in physiognomical treatment.

As in the hairstyle, the basic purpose of remodelling the face was surely to re-orient it to the norms of late Roman imperial physiognomy. The imperial image of Constantine and his successors generally favoured a tall, narrow, refined, sometimes rather mannered, even 'abstracted' physiognomical style[15]. The Aphrodisian head is true to the Hellenistic-based tradition of the local marble workshops in avoiding the exaggeration and abstraction of eyes and physiognomy that were fashionable in other late antique sculpture centres. It maintains a realist language, even introducing subtly modelled 'portrait' features – for example, around the mouth and chin and in the nose. Generally its aim is to use a traditional vocabulary to express the changed physiognomical priorities of its late Roman imperial subject.

The head cannot be dated independently either by style or by identification. Given the clearly documented local preference for traditional forms through the fourth century and later at Aphrodisias, it is difficult to date this head on conventional criteria of formal development. And, since after Constantine, only very rarely were imperial portraits made as replicas or versions of defined central types, it is not possible to identify the head by the method of an observable adherence to a named portrait type. Both the diadem and the ageless ideal portrait identified the image as that of an emperor in the following of Constantine without further need of distinguishing features.

Nor does the type of diadem help with the dating. The linked jewel diadem worn by the head is found on coins and sculpture from Constantine onwards. The alternative, the pearl diadem, a plain band edged with pearls was more common on both coins and sculptures[16]. K. Erim placed the head in the immediate following of Constantine, and saw in it one of Constantine's sons (such as Constantine II or Constantius II)[17]. This interpretation is of course possible, but the arguments used to support it – apparent youth of the subject and apparent resemblance to coins – are not good ones. Most late Roman emperors are shown as youthful or at least beardless, and ageless, and the coins, like the sculptures, take little or no interest in defining individual portrait features. In terms of age and physiognomy, surviving late imperial portraits tend to resemble many emperor's portraits on coins. Most are versions and local reformulations of a single broad image type, varying more according to scale, material, local ideas, and workshop preferences, than according to defined portrait features. The greater apparent youth of the Aphrodisian head may then simply be something transferred from the first version of the portrait.

One aspect of the re-working of the portrait may point to a later date. That is the mannered thinning of the nose, which, together with the thinning of the cheeks, is the most careful and striking adjustment and remodelling of the earlier image. This feature is not found on portraits of the earlier and mid-fourth century, but is very common on both imperial and non-imperial images of the Theodosian period and later, in the later fourth and fifth century when it is seen on a wide range of portrait images in both the eastern and western parts of the empire. It was used in its most mannered form to express the refined, tall, thin-faced elegance and beauty of aristocratic youth – that of young late Roman aristocrats, as seen for example in a group of portraits from Rome, as well as that of the perpetual youth of Theodosian-style emperors (and empresses) [18]. It may be noted also that the one closely dated late imperial portrait – a statue from Aphrodisias of AD 388–392, representing either the young Valentinian II or the young Arcadius – does not have this feature[19]. This feature together with the technical mannerism of the clawed 'forward-brushed' hair (also best paralleled later)[20] might

[15] Image of Constantine and successors: Delbrueck; L'Orange (above n. 13); R. H. W. Stichel, Die römische Kaiserstatue am Ausgang der Antike (1982); Fittschen – Zanker I (1985) nos. 120–127; JRS 1997, 185–187, with further lit.

[16] Diadem forms: above n. 12.

[17] K. T. Erim, in: IR II no. 80.

[18] Group from Rome: H. P. L'Orange, Studien zur Geschichte des spätantiken Porträts (1933) cat. nos. 101 (Munich). 102 (Terme). 103 (Capitoline) figs. 192–198. Emperors: IR II nos. 82 (Istanbul). 83 (Detroit); Stichel pl. 19 (Cabinet des Médailles, statuette of empress, from Cyprus); Delbrueck pl. 93 (Budapest, small bronze bust). pls. 94–8 (Madrid missorium; cf. below, n. 29). pl. 114 (Louvre 'Eugenius'). Others, frequently in fifth century – for example: IR I no. 194 (Eutropius); IR II no. 204 (Brussels head, from Aphrodisias).

[19] IR I no. 66.

[20] Finely clawed hair, for example: IR II nos. 82 (Istanbul

suggest a later date, that is, at the end of the fourth or into the fifth century, rather than the earlier or mid-fourth century. (In this case, the portrait would go better with a portrait monument put together for Theodosius II rather than Theodosius I.) Other arguments, we will see later, might favour this later date.

3. The monument

We may now investigate in more detail how the elements described above may be connected. There is no unequivocal or technical connection between them, but there is some good circumstantial reason for thinking they may all have belonged together to form one spolia portrait monument – even though that re-constructed monument may have for us a jarring visual effect compared to the base and statue designs of the high empire (Fig. 34).

The cylindrical inscribed base (B) was found re-used in the northern stretch of the seventh-century wall behind the colonnade. Its lower diameter fits the upper diameter of the plinth (A) found in situ in front of the fourth column of the colonnade, and the base should therefore probably be placed on the plinth. The upper element (C) was also found in the seventh-century wall, not with (D), but further to the north and in the previous year. Its lower diameter matches the top of the cylindrical base, but the clamp cuttings, though well aligned vertically, would not work well together. On the top of the cylindrical base, its moulding is cut back so that the clamps were attached into the cylinder shaft (D: 44 cm) and rise 'through' the moulding to their upper member. This means there was a 5 cm difference on each side in the horizontal alignment. These two elements could however have been placed together with such clumsy vertical clamping; the clamps would simply need to be bent inwards.

The base of the monument should be restored then with the three re-used elements. The connection of the statue to this base is more circumstantial. By the norms of earlier statue monuments, the statue is too small in scale for the base, but perhaps not in the spolia-oriented practice of late antiquity. The strongest argument for the connection is simply the find position of the statue close to the plinth for the inscribed round base. The statue, it seems, was simply discarded when the monument was finally dismantled,

while the base was taken as building material for the wall nearby. In no less than five other cases at Aphrodisias, statues found fallen in front of bases can be shown with very high degrees of probability to have belonged on those bases[21]. One example was close by: the statue, base, and head of Flavius Palmatus[22]. That is, the peculiar, relatively undisturbed character of the archaeological preservation of the monuments of late antiquity at Aphrodisias leads to an expectation that whole well-preserved statues should belong to bases that they are found near.

A good indication that the statue did not move far from the site of its monument is given by the broken left hand of the figure which was also found close by. Small broken pieces can move easily and far from their original context. The presence of the hand nearby indicates that the statue was probably left where it fell after the base was taken for re-use in the wall behind – rather than coming from some other context altogether.

In spite therefore of the unusual proportions, there is a *prima facie* archaeological connection between the statue and the base. In terms of the other surviving evidence of late antique monuments from the same setting, the statue with its rounded plinth also matches best the cylindrical base for Julian and Theodosius. Further to the south was a plinth and the inscribed base for the emperor Valens (mentioned earlier), which was considerably larger[23]. And to the north is the monument for Fl. Palmatus ('F' on Fig. 33), and beyond that an inscribed columnar base for another governor (?), which is also very much larger[24]. The statue (D) could be fitted to the base without the upper element (C)[25], but find context, lettering, and dimensions suggest clearly this upper element should belong – whatever the technical difficulties. With the upper element the base gains symmetry. The upper surface of the plinth, as noted earlier, has cuttings for a bronze figure in its upper surface, which might argue against placing the surviving marble figure on top. The cuttings for a bronze, however, may well

[21] Dometeinus, Tatiana: above n. 1. Others in late period: JRS 1999.

[22] Palmatus: above n. 4.

[23] Valens base: above n. 6.

[24] Inscribed columnar base: ALA no. 64. This monument had an even more technically and aesthetically awkward base: it was composed of part of a re-used column shaft set on an ill-fitting up-turned Doric capital as its plinth.

[25] As shown in a preliminary reconstruction: R. R. R. Smith – C. Ratté, AJA 102, 1998, 243 fig. 20.

'Arcadius'). 200 (Aphrodisias, re-worked). 204 (Brussels, from Aphrodisias).

belong to an earlier use of this crowning element or conceivably to a bronze statue for Julian that was removed when his name was erased. The base certainly carried a bronze statue at some point – but it was also re-used at least once before finally supporting a Theodosian image. One might argue that *prima facie*, since this base carried a bronze statue, a reconstruction with a marble statue should be ruled out. But in the larger context of statue-use at Aphrodisias in late antiquity, it seems preferable to give more weight to the archaeological find context which suggests that the round-plinthed marble statue should be associated with the round base beside and in front of which it was found.

The statue's plinth and the crowning element do not form a smooth, level join, and if they were placed together, as suggested here, the statue would need to have been set onto a bed of mortar. The two clamp cuttings on the statue's plinth – one on its right side sunk into the support, another on its left side sunk into the marble under the left hand heel – were for its first use and could not have been used effectively with the late crowning element.

4. The portrait and the date

The diademed imperial head (E) was found in two pieces a few metres from the statue, on the other side of the in-situ plinth (A), just inside the colonnade. Again the find context of the head fragments close together indicates that it had not moved far from where it was discarded after the fall or dismantling of the monument to which it belonged.

The head clearly did not belong to this statue in its first use. Firstly, although it is a youthful head, it is still slightly too large in relative scale to go with the boyish figure of the togatus – at least within the naturalising norms of early and middle imperial statuary. Secondly, the head was originally of the Julio-Claudian period, while the statue belongs more easily, in terms both of technique and the form of the toga, in the mid-second century[26]. And thirdly, as remarked earlier, the short regular cut of the neckline is more appropriate for connection to the neckline of a cuirassed statue than that of a toga statue. In its later form, however, the head was most likely attached to the statue. The neck tenon does not fit the wide and deep shoulder socket in the statue, which corresponds, as often, to the full extent of the exposed upper chest and neck visible above the tunic,

but both neck tenon and shoulder socket do have large rectangular dowel holes of a similar, rather rough, approximate character – that is, they are much larger than they need to be and have rough sloping or tapering interiors. Such dowel holes allowed a lot of play in setting the position of two elements before fixing. The neck tenon would need to be supported in the socket and the empty volume bulked out by a packing in another material – such as plaster, stucco, or mortar (as in a temporary trial reconstruction mounted on the statue with a plaster packing and a cast of the head, carried out in 1997: Pl. 33, 1).

Most surviving fourth-fifth century imperial portrait heads are parts of a range of local receptions and modulations of the de-individualized youthful Augustan-style image introduced by Constantine[27]. It is difficult to correlate most of the variations in the surviving examples with either chronological evolution or specific emperors' image types. As we saw above, the evidence of the diademed head in itself cannot provide a secure date but that some features (thin nose and finely 'clawed' hair) suggest it should belong considerably later than the mid-fourth century date originally proposed.

In terms of the broad evolution of the late Roman imperial image, it also seems to belong better in a late context. The tall-profiled, ageless, majestic Augustan image of Constantine and his dynasty was adjusted on much of the coinage of Valentinian and Valens in favour of a somewhat heavier, more square-jawed portrait[28]. Then on the coinage and dated monuments of the Theodosian dynasty (for example, on the frontal court portraits on the silver missorium of ca. 390), the tall-profiled Constantinian image is revised and intensified[29]. We find a slim, narrow, oval, imperial face, with delicate, sensitive, rather mannered features. Boyish youth and vapid beauty make the

---

[26] Above n. 10.

[27] Lit. above n. 15.

[28] Delbrueck 27–28. 89–90 pl. 13; J. P. C. Kent – M. and A. Hirmer, Roman Coins (1978) 697–698. 702. 705–706.

[29] Useful collection of Theodosian material: B. Kiilerich, Late fourth century classicism in the plastic arts. Studies in the so-called Theodosian renaissance (1993). Theodosian missorium in Madrid, best illustrations: A. Grabar, Byzantium: From the Death of Theodosius to the Rise of Islam (1966) 303 figs. 348–351; and most recently, J. Meischner, Das Missorium des Theodosius in Madrid, JdI 111, 1996, 389–432 (proposing to change date); W. Raeck, *Doctissimus Imperator.* Ein Aspekt des Herrscherideals in der spätantiken Kunst, AA 1998, 509–522, at 520–522 (contra new date).

portraits appear almost effeminate to modern eyes, but their goal was the elevated quality that made the term *sacer* appropriate to everything to do with the emperor. The Theodosian imperial portrait norm was truly the expression of the late Roman emperor's *sacer vultus*. In this perspective, the Aphrodisian head could be comfortably read as informed by Theodosian norms. The choice of the boyish Julio-Claudian raw material, the refined, narrow oval face with its carefully thinned, rather mannered and pointed nose and its artificial youthfulness could be taken as a local reception of the main externals of the Theodosian imperial portrait. In Constantinople, that portrait was treated in a highly mannered, 'abstracted'-symbolic formal manner, which the Aphrodisian portrait could be seen as bypassing in favour of treatment in the local naturalising vocabulary[30].

Such an argument is worth making, but given the variety of local receptions of the late Roman imperial image that was possible once the discipline of the need to achieve recognisable likenesses through conformity to given identifying models had been removed, it should perhaps not be pressed. Such an argument of course becomes relevant in the local archaeological context when we observe simply that no inscribed bases are preserved at Aphrodisias for figures such as Constantinus II and Constantius II (originally proposed as identifications: above n. 17), and that the head was found near an inscribed monument for a Theodosius, and the next closest imperial base was for a statue of Valens, at some distance. The head can be taken then as a typically Aphrodisian 'naturalising' reception and handling of the austere, mannered, tall oval face of Theodosian imperial portraits, carefully worked out of a 'stronger' head of a Julio-Claudian prince. It could be attached to the togatus in a way that would not jar the eyes of the late fourth or earlier fifth century, accustomed as they were to much greater infractions of old aesthetic norms. The way that the head joins the statue is certainly no more clumsy than the way 'Theodosion' was written on the erasure of Julian's name (Pl. 32, 3). The resulting reconstruction (Fig. 34) is of course open to question on both technical and aesthetic grounds. It looks ill-proportioned and few of the elements have a satisfactory, provable technical connection. To judge by statue norms of the middle empire, few of the elements should belong together.

The cylindrical base (B) already has projecting mouldings above and below, and the plinth and capital (A and C) create a very unusual profile for a statue base, for which the statue seems too small. The question is to judge when the quite different statue-monument aesthetic and technical standards that are attested so well at Aphrodisias from the later fourth and fifth centuries became the norm in the city. The technical characteristics are well within the norms of fourth-century spolia building practices, which can take great liberties. The West City Gate of the mid-fourth century, for example, re-used parts of a colossal middle imperial door frame for both its lintel and its tympanum – the latter levelled off with a filling of rough stones and pebbles[31]. The aesthetic of the late statue monuments of the city sought in general to achieve a tall slender effect. The cylindrical base gains greatly in height and imposing effect by the addition of the plinth and capital, and maintains in cylindrical form the basic earlier profile of a shaft with strongly projecting upper and lower mouldings. The curious design of the base, made of three re-used elements, can be seen as a way of achieving with minimal reworking of some available elements the effect of a tall Severan-style base with strongly projecting upper and lower moulded members[32]. Later some statues at Aphrodisias, such as that of Oecumenius, in their search for height and elegance, seem to have done away entirely with the projecting elements, in favour of a modern-style rectangular shaft alone[33].

As for the re-used second-century statue, though old-fashioned and homely in dress style compared to the tighter, more elaborate senatorial togas of the period, it still spoke a current language. It remained suitable principally for two reasons: its senatorial rank represented very clearly in the shoes, and its extraordinary lifelike quality and technical virtuosity. In the later fourth and fifth centuries a toga of this form was no doubt old-fashioned compared to the new 'ranking' togas of senators and consuls but was probably still worn in certain contexts[34] – and if the

[30] The 'Arcadius' head in Istanbul is the classic Constantinopolitan example: IR II no. 82.

[31] On the use of spolia in the West Gate: C. Ratté – R. R. R. Smith, Archaeological Research at Aphrodisias in Caria, 1997 and 1998, AJA 104, 2000, 238-240.

[32] See for example the bases of the monuments of Dometeinus and Tatiana: above, n. 1.

[33] Oecumenius: JRS 1999, 166 fig. 6.

[34] See the use of both old and new togas on, for example, the later third-century 'Brothers Sarcophagus' in Naples: Goette, Togadarstellungen 51–58. 161 S 32 pl. 74, 2. An example of a later fourth-century figure wearing an old toga

statue, as seems likely, had originally been part of a statue of an imperial prince, it could have been felt appropriate for re-use as a contemporary imperial portrait. One of the first concerns of the late antique statue monument was for high technical quality and refinement of finish. This quality the available and brilliantly worked second-century togatus could provide at little or no cost, and it was something that was more important than any slight disparity of scale between figure and base or any possible unsuitability of the costume. The disparity that strikes us between the slight body and the head (Pl. 33, 1) may be simply the result of our classically conditioned aesthetic. In contemporary late antique terms, the slight figure of the togatus could be seen as giving Theodosius' statue both an appearance of youth and the tall slender body form that came to be favoured in this period. To the original significance of the statue's body form (youth) had been added something different in contemporary eyes (height, elegance).

5. Conclusion

We may then tentatively propose the reconstruction of a spolia monument and its history as follows. The monument was first set up for Julian in the early 360s by the governor Antonius Tatianus and was composed of a tall cylindrical base made up of three re-used and adapted elements. This base, made for Julian, may have carried the bronze statue whose foot cuttings are preserved on top of the plinth, or alternatively these cuttings could have belonged to an earlier use of the plinth. At some point after his death in 363, Julian's monument was locally 'condemned' – his cognomen was erased, and the image perhaps taken down too. There are two occasions at which this might have happened. It could have been carried out soon after Julian's death, by the same governor who was still in office at Aphrodisias and who set up a statue to Valens on another base further to the west in front of the same colonnade. The first base would then have been left empty (or, might conceivably have been used in the interim to honour someone else – for example, the ephemeral Jovian, 353-354) until it was later re-inscribed to honour Theodosius I or II. Alternatively, Julian's monument remained standing longer, and was condemned only when it was decided to honour Theodosius. Since Julian's main imperial portrait type was bearded, it was necessary to equip the monument to Theodosius with a new portrait.

is a statue from Ostia: Goette op. cit. 140 Bb 182 pl. 27, 5–6.

The new portrait consisted of a fine re-worked Julio-Claudian head and perhaps too of the re-used second-century togate statue which supported it. The statue was re-used without any re-modelling, except at the neck to make a socket for the head, while the head was carved down to a narrow-faced Theodosian portrait ideal, with shallow indentations carved into the hair for the addition of a jewel diadem.

The style and character of the slender, thin-nosed portrait and the emphatic youth of both head and statue (as well perhaps as the rough carving of 'Theodosion' over the erasure in the text?) might favour the young Theodosius II (402–450) over Theodosius I (379–395) as the monument's final honorand[35]. If so, this would be the last recorded imperial honorific statue set up in the city[36]. The imperial statues that would immediately precede it would be those set up to the early Theodosian emperors in AD 388–392, which were freshly carved statues[37]. The use of spolia now for the emperor's image and the lack of subsequent imperial statues might then have been the result of the legislation controlling expensive statue honours that seems to have come into force around this time[38].

The kind of statuary redeployment and spolia monument studied in this paper was not unusual in the late Roman period. There are other attested examples, both at Aphrodisias[39] and elsewhere[40]. The

[35] Above, n. 18.

[36] The only possible honorific inscription for a later emperor, an inscribed plaque for Justinian (?) (ALA no. 81), is doubtfully from a statue monument.

[37] Bases: ALA nos. 25-27. Statues: IR I no. 66; JRS 1999, 162 at n. 29; 164 figs. 3–4 pl. I 1.

[38] On which, see ALA p. 62, with further references. The price of the new honorific statues that continued to be erected through the fifth century to non-imperial figures in significant numbers, especially governors, may have been paid or promised by the honorands themselves; cf. JRS 1999, 173 at nn. 54–56.

[39] At Aphrodisias, for example, the statue monument of the governor Alexander: JRS 1999, 166 fig. 5.

[40] Elsewhere, for example, (1) the statue of C. Caelius Saturninus Dogmatius from Rome: A. Giuliano, Catalogo dei ritratti romani del Museo Profano Lateranense (1957) no. 99; and (2) the statue of Scholasticia in the baths she restored at Ephesus: V. M. Strocka, Zuviel Ehre für Scholastikia, in: M. Kandler – S. Karwiese – R. Pillinger (eds.), Lebendige Altertumswissenschaft: Festgabe zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres von Hermann Vetters (1985) 229–232, demonstrating that the statue is a recycled figure of the second century AD.

level of rough craftsmanship and the unusual (from a classical, middle imperial perspective) aesthetic of the proposed monument are closely paralleled in the rough and ready re-deployment of ancient architecture in this period. It is not that the classical aesthetic was dead, just that it was no longer normative regardless of cost, when economic solutions were to hand. The classical aesthetic was simply widened to accommodate those solutions. For public portrait statues at Aphrodisias in the late antique period, it was routine to re-use old bases, but for the statues themselves such re-use was less common than the fresh carving of the statue from new marble. The reason was simple: re-used middle imperial toga and himation statues wore the wrong clothes, and could not easily be refashioned (without a great reduction of scale) into statues wearing the right clothes – the late forms of the chlamys and the toga – that marked the governors and men of senatorial rank honoured in these statues. Exceptions could clearly be made according to circumstance and need – more easily perhaps for an imperial figure which wore other clear signs of its elevated rank, such as the imperial diadem.

The photographs are by M. Ali Dögenci, courtesy New York University Excavations at Aphrodisias.