The portraits of a civic benefactor of 2nd-c. Ephesos

Sheila Dillon

Introduction

The large number of vacant statue bases that line the agoras and streets of a city such as Ephesos are eloquent testimony to both the ubiquity of portrait statues in antiquity and the important rôle they played in the visual landscape of an ancient city.¹ While images of the emperor and his family were certainly prominent among these, many of the portrait statues represented local elites, members of wealthy families who had contributed to the prosperity of their cities — and enhanced their own power and prestige — through benefactions and public service. These portrait statues and their inscribed bases recorded and celebrated the generosity and good works of these civic benefactors to their fellow citizens. The portraits of one such civic notable of 2nd-c. Ephesos are the focus of this paper. It is both unusual and noteworthy that at least three marble portraits of him are preserved, two of which were found by the Austrian excavations at Ephesos and so come from known archaeological contexts. Within the large corpus of Roman marble portraits that survive from antiquity, multiple examples of the portrait of a private individual based on a common model are exceedingly rare, those that have a secure archaeological provenance even more so. In addition to the exceptional number, these portraits present the subject in two different guises — in two he is represented as an imperial priest, and in one he is shown in everyday dress of *himation* and *chiton*. While we know from literary and epigraphic sources that it was not uncommon for a person to be honored with a number of portrait statues in various guises,² few of these portraits survive.

The three portraits based on the same model are:

1. statue with bust-crown in Izmir, Archaeological Museum no. 648,³ total H 2.32 m; HdH 35 cm

* The following abbreviations are used: H = height; HdH = head height from chin to crown

Inan-Rosenbaum 1 J. Inan and E. Rosenbaum, *Roman and Early Byzantine portrait sculpture in Asia Minor* (London 1966).

Inan-Rosenbaum 2 J. Inan and E. Alföldi-Rosenbaum, *Römische und frühbyzantinische Porträtplastik aus der Türkei: Neue Funde* (Mainz 1979).

IvE *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*: vols. Ia-VIII,2 (Bonn 1979-84).

Keil, *Vedius Gymnasium* 1 J. Keil, "XIII. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Ephesos," *ÖJhBeibl* 24 (1929) cols. 20-45.

Keil, *Vedius Gymnasium* 2 J. Keil, "XIV. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Ephesos," *ÖJhBeibl* 25 (1929) cols. 21-33.

Keil, *East Gymnasium* 1 J. Keil, "XVI. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Ephesos," *ÖJhBeibl* 27 (1932) cols. 25-51.

Keil, *East Gymnasium* 2 J. Keil, "XVII. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Ephesos," *ÖJhBeibl* 28 (1933) cols. 6-12.

Manderscheid H. Manderscheid, *Die Skulpturenausstattung der kaiserzeitlichen Thermenanlagen* (Berlin 1981).

Miltner, *Ephesos* F. Miltner, *Ephesos: Stadt der Artemis und des Johannes* (Vienna 1958).

Yegül F. K. Yegül, *Baths and bathing in classical antiquity* (New York 1992).

1 See, for example, the contribution by G. Zimmer in *Die römische Stadt im 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.: Die Funktionswandel des öffentlichen Raumes* (Xantener Berichte Bd. 2, 1992) 301-13, for graphic reconstructions of the statues set up in the fora of Timgad and Cuicul.

2 See, for example, the statues of Volusius Saturninus set up in Rome: W. Eck, *Hermes* 100 (1972) 461-84; and the statues of Diodoros Paspáros in Pergamon: C. P. Jones, *Chiron* 4 (1974) 183-205.

3 Keil, *East Gymnasium* 1 cols. 40-43, no. 6, figs. 23, 25; Inan-Rosenbaum 1, 128, no. 151, pls. 83.4, 88.1-2; Manderscheid, 92, no. 200, pl. 29; J. Dedeoğlu, *Izmir Archaeological Museum* (Istanbul 1993) 75.

Fig.1. Izmir Archaeological Museum inv. no. 648

Fig.2. Louvre inv. no. MND 012 (Louvre head)

Fig.3. Izmir Archaeological Museum inv. no. 570

(figs. 1, 5, 8, 13);

2. head with bust-crown in the Louvre, no. MND 012,⁴ HdH 38 cm (figs. 2, 6, 9);

3. statue in Izmir, Archaeological Museum no. 570,⁵ total H 1.16 m; HdH 31 cm (figs. 3, 7, 10-12). For convenience, they will be referred to respectively as (1) Izmir 648, (2) the Louvre head, and (3) Izmir 570. All three portraits are of the highest quality — the statues in Izmir are among the finest portraits from Ephesos. Izmir 570 (figs. 11-12) is lifesize, carved from a single piece of marble, and extremely refined in its details and surface treatment. Izmir 648 (fig. 13) is well over lifesize, carved mostly from a single piece of marble, and preserves a superb surface finish. This imposing figure wears full Greek civic dress — *chiton*, *himation*, and Greek-type sandals — and is identified as a priest by the double fillet and crown which carries 15 imperial and/or divine busts.⁶ These miniature busts, all now headless, seem to be primarily of two types: those wearing the *paludamentum* and those in *chiton* and *himation*. One bust wears an undecorated cuirass. The Louvre head wears a similar, but much less well-preserved bust-crown.⁷ As imperial priests were usually among the most prominent members of the local ruling élite and pre-eminent in local politics, this portrait type clearly represents a member of one of the leading families of 2nd-c. Ephesos.⁸

A brief summary of the previous scholarship on these portraits will provide a setting for the objectives of this paper. Izmir 570 was found in 1927 during excavation of the Gymnasium of Vedius in Ephesos. The statue was dated to the Antonine period by the excavator, J. Keil, who suggested the statue either depicted a sophist or the donor of the building, Publius Vedius Antoninus.⁹ Izmir 648 was found by Keil in 1930 during excavation of the East Gymnasium of Ephesos.¹⁰ He suggested this statue dated to the late 2nd or early 3rd c., and represented Flavius Damianus, the famous Ephesian sophist whose activities are described by Philostratos.¹¹

4 Inan-Rosenbaum 2, 176-77, no. 135, pl. 110.1-2.

5 Keil, *Vedius Gymnasium* 1 col. 39, no. 3, fig. 22; Miltner, *Ephesos* 61, fig. 54, n. 43; A. Giuliano, *RIA* n.s. 8 (1959) 197, no. X/11, fig. 39; Inan-Rosenbaum 1, 127-28, no. 150, pls. 83.3, 87.3-4; D. Brinkerhoff, *A collection of sculpture in classical and early Christian Antioch* (New York 1970) 11, figs. 8-9; H.-J. Kruse, *Römische weibliche Gewandstatuen des zweiten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (1975) 317; Manderscheid 90, no. 185, pl. 27; Dedeoğlu (supra n.3) 56.

6 As comparison, Izmir 648 is similar in size, quality, and finish to the fine portrait statues of priests from the Odeion and the Theater at Aphrodisias. These Aphrodisian statues also have two parallel incised lines down the shoulder and top of the right arm which mark the seam of the full-sleeved *chiton*, another sign of their high quality, and a detail they share with Izmir 648. All three statues are more roughly finished at the back, as they stood where their backs would not have been readily visible. For the Aphrodisian priests see Inan-Rosenbaum 1, 177-78, no. 239 (theater statue); Inan-Rosenbaum 2, 223-24, no. 194 (odeion statue); and K. T. Erım and R. R. R. Smith, *Aphrodisias Papers* 2 (JRA S2, 1991) 83-84.

7 For bust-crowns see Inan-Rosenbaum 2, 38-47; M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (Munich 1988) 187-88 (these crowns were also worn by *agonothetes*); id., *Chiron* 22 (1992) 355-58.

8 The social and political significance of the imperial cult priesthood in Asia Minor is well discussed by A. Stein in *Epitymbion: H. Swoboda dargebracht* (Reichenberg 1927) 300-11. See also G. W. Bowersock in W. den Boer (ed.), *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire romain* (Foundation Hardt, Entretiens 19, 1973) 177-206; M. Rossner, *Studii Clasice* 16 (1974) 101-42; S. Price, *Rituals and power: the Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor* (Oxford 1984) 62-64, 170-71, 211-12, and passim; R. A. Kearsley, *GRBS* 27 (1986) 183-92; Wörrle (supra n.7); S. J. Friesen, *Twice neokoros* (Leiden 1993) 76-113.

9 Supra n.5. Keil also suggested that a heavily reworked head found in room VI of the bath may be another portrait of Vedius (Inan-Rosenbaum 1, 144, no. 182). However, nothing of the original surface of either the beard or hair is preserved on this head, making it impossible to determine its relationship, if any, to the portraits under discussion here.

10 Supra n.3.

11 *V.Soph.* 605-6. For the inscription which Keil utilized in suggesting this identification see *East Gymnasium* 1 col. 31, fig. 15, n.3; *IvE* no. 439. For Flavius Damianus see also J. Keil, *ÖJhBeibl* 39 (1952) 18-20; G. Bowersock, *Greek sophists in the Roman empire* (Oxford 1969) 27-28, 47, 58.

After a brief mention by Giuliano in 1959,¹² Izmir 570 and Izmir 648 were included in Inan and Rosenbaum's 1966 catalogue of Roman and early Byzantine portraits from Asia Minor.¹³ They suggested a date for both statues in the time of Septimius Severus and connected the portraits stylistically, noting similarities in the treatment of the hair and beard, but they saw nothing further in this connection. It was not until the publication of the Louvre head by Inan and Rosenbaum in 1979 that it was first suggested the two statues in Izmir and the Louvre head might all represent the same man, Flavius Damianus.¹⁴ This suggestion, however, has neither been widely accepted nor fully explored. K. Fittschen, in his review of Inan and Rosenbaum's 1979 catalogue, explicitly rejects the suggestion that Izmir 570 belongs in this group, although he agrees the two priests, that is, Izmir 648 and the Louvre head, were clearly versions of the same portrait type whose identification as Flavius Damianus he accepted.¹⁵ The two separate identifications of the statues from Ephesos — that is, that Izmir 570 represents Vedius Antoninus and Izmir 648 Flavius Damianus — have also appeared in a recent discussion of the two baths.¹⁶

The purpose of this paper is to reexamine the typological relationship of these portraits, with the aid of new and more complete photographic documentation of the Izmir statues. The aim is to show that, by carefully comparing the details of hair, beard, and face design which are reproduced in all three examples, one can demonstrate that all three are versions of the same portrait type, and therefore represent the same person. The rarity of multiple examples of the portraits of private individuals from known archaeological contexts justifies a re-examination of this contested example. Its study can help shed light on the production and transmission of private portrait types, about which very little is known. In addition, the known find-spots of the statues from Ephesos provide us with archaeological contexts which will be helpful in suggesting whom this portrait type was meant to represent. Context is particularly important in the case of private portraits as external evidence for identification, such as coin portraits, is lacking.

The portraits and their typology

First, a brief explanation of methodology. The argument for connecting this group of portrait heads to a single portrait type is not based on similarity of appearance but on the reproduction of details that can be observed and described.¹⁷ This method of establishing a replica series is most familiar from the study of Roman imperial portraits. Here, a model image of the emperor was created by the imperial court in Rome from which the sculpted and coin portraits were then reproduced. Images that repeat the same particulars are grouped together as copies after a common model or type. The coin portraits of the emperors identify and help to date their sculpted portraits. Conformity to a given portrait model ensured easy recognizability. Ancient portrait statues use the same head/portrait type precisely to guarantee recognizability as the same person.

Variations and differences can, however, be found within any replica series based on a common model, both imperial and private. Such differences are probably the result of the technical process of reproducing an ancient marble portrait, as well as the aims and needs of the

¹² Supra n.5.

¹³ Inan-Rosenbaum 1, no. 150 (Izmir 570); no. 151 (Izmir 648).

¹⁴ Inan-Rosenbaum 2, no. 135. See also E. Alföldi-Rosenbaum in *Ritratto ufficiale e ritratto privato* (Rome 1988) 29.

¹⁵ GGA 236 (1984) 206, no. 135.

¹⁶ Yegül 473, nn.9 and 12.

¹⁷ On the method of reconstructing a portrait type see K. Fittschen, *JdI* 86 (1971) 214-52; D. Boschung, *Die Bildnisse des Caligula* (*Das römische Herrscherbild* I.4, 1989) ch. II; D. Boschung and M. Pfanner, *MüJb* 39 (1988) 20-23.

particular commission for which the portrait was made.¹⁸ Of the three portraits under discussion here, each head is, in fact, slightly different in appearance. The three are somewhat different in scale, with head heights ranging from 31 to 38 cm. Two have added attributes; in one the bust-crown was added separately, in the other it was carved in one piece with the head. The sculptural technique — that is, the use of the drill and chisel, the articulation of individual locks of the hair and beard, and the surface finish — varies somewhat in each example. The variations and adjustments, both of detail and expression, are probably the result of the portraits having been made by different sculptors, perhaps in different workshops.¹⁹ Even with these differences, the three portrait heads share a sufficient number of details which show they reproduce the same model.

In the application of this method to the portraits under discussion, I begin with Izmir 648 and the Louvre head, since it has been generally accepted that these two employ the same portrait type. Izmir 648 (figs. 1, 5, 8) wears a bust-crown which has been carved separately from the head. Though the head is very fragmentary, the three extant pieces of the face are well preserved. The Louvre head (figs. 2, 6, 9), which also wears the bust-crown, is complete, but the surface of the marble is heavily abraded, especially on the front of the face. The crowns worn by both are nearly identical in form; they consist of a rolled fillet and a wreath with a double row of leaves (laurel?), which carries a crown of 15 miniature draped busts. The bust crown of the Louvre head sits more naturally on top of the head and is integrated more convincingly with the design of the hairstyle, perhaps because it was carved in a single piece with the head.

The common features of face, hair, and beard design which these two heads share are the following (figs. 1-2). The brow is furrowed and there are two inward-curving creases at the root of the nose. The eyes are almond-shaped, and the pupils are indicated by two shallow drill-holes separated by a thin ridge of marble. The irises are lightly incised three-quarter circles. The hair is carefully and artfully arranged across the forehead below the fillet of the crown. In the center is an oval-shaped, loosely twisted knot of hair which starts above the right eye, is brought across the middle of the forehead, and loops back above the left eye. A small loop of hair hangs down below the central knot on the left. Six lank locks of hair are brushed forward onto the brow: three on the right side of the central knot, one in the middle, and two on the left.

This complex arrangement of the hair across the forehead was a distinctive feature of this portrait type as the sculptors were careful to adjust details of the design in order to accommodate the bust-crown. The sculptor of the Louvre head has been somewhat more successful in integrating the forehead hair with the crown. The lank locks of hair emerge from under the fillet in a more convincing and naturalistic manner, and the central knot of hair has been rendered in a more realistic fashion. The sculptor of Izmir 648, on the other hand, has tilted up and flattened out the central knot, while the lank forehead locks have been pushed forward onto the frontal plane of the head. This more awkward and disconnected rendering may be the result of the piecing and therefore separate production of head and crown.

In addition to the forehead hair, the form and arrangement of the beards of both heads correspond closely, but the individual details are much better preserved in Izmir 648 (figs. 5, 8). The locks of the beard on the cheeks are short and fine, engraved by means of fine lines into the surface of the marble. The locks along the jawline and below the chin are much thicker and longer and twist at the ends. The moustache completely covers the upper lip in fine parallel

18 For the technical aspects of portrait reproduction see M. Pfanner, *JdI* 104 (1989) 156-61, 176-257.

19 Vivid examples of the variations in detail, technique, and effect possible among the copies of a single portrait type of a private individual are provided by two Severan busts in Munich (D. Boschung, M. Pfanner, *MüJb* 39 [1988] 20-21), and two heads of the 2nd c. published in Inan-Rosenbaum 2, nos. 284 and 300.

Fig. 5. Izmir Archaeological Museum inv. no. 648

Fig. 6. Louvre inv. no. MND 012 (Louvre head)

Fig. 7. Izmir Archaeological Museum inv. no. 570

Fig. 4. Izmir 570 (left); Louvre head (right).

strands, while the ends of the moustache are long and thick and grow directly into the beard. There are short tufts of hair just beneath the lower lip. The ends of the moustache and the fine strands of hair covering the chin split into two long twisted locks that curl to the left. The drill has been used to separate and delineate the thicker mass of curls of the beard beneath the chin.

Although the beard and moustache of the Louvre head (figs. 6, 9) are heavily abraded, the triangular-shaped sections of short locks at the cheeks and the longer, fuller locks along the jaw and below the chin correspond closely in design and organization to the beard of Izmir 648. The technique and effect of the surface treatment of the Louvre head are, however, different. The locks at the cheeks are rendered by means of short strokes of the chisel into the surface of the marble, rather than by fine lines engraved on the surface. Despite these differences, the arrangement of hair above the forehead shows that these two portraits reproduce the same type. They were surely made by two different sculptors, perhaps in different workshops.

The third example of this portrait type — Izmir 570 (figs. 11-12) — was carved from a single piece of marble. The portrait head (figs. 3, 7, 10), almost perfectly preserved, is extremely fine, with much care and sensitivity in the carving of the hair and beard. The almond-shaped eyes have drilled pupils and lightly engraved irises which are three-quarter circles. The eyebrow hairs are lightly sketched. The forehead has a single shallow furrow, and there are two short and shallow creases at the root of the nose. When we compare the details of the hair and beard design, we see that Izmir 570 is typologically related to Izmir 648 and the Louvre head. Izmir 570 (fig. 4) has the same distinctive arrangement of hair across the forehead which looks, however, slightly different because of the absence of the crown. The twisted knot of hair sits more naturally and elegantly on top of the head. The 6 lank locks of hair brushed forward onto the forehead are slightly longer in this version because they start further back on top of the head in a more convincingly natural fashion. The basic arrangement of long, softly curling locks at the sides of the head of Izmir 570 (figs. 7, 10) is much the same as that of the more completely preserved Louvre head (figs. 6, 9). The locks curve forward along the nape of the neck and are brushed back at the sides.

The details of the beard of Izmir 570 (figs. 3, 7, 10) correspond closely with the well-preserved beard of Izmir 648 (figs. 1, 5, 8). The long full moustache completely conceals the upper lip, and there are three small tufts of hair directly beneath the lower lip. The thick moustache twists out at the ends and merges with the beard on either side of the chin. The strands which cover the chin end in two twisting locks. The locks of the beard on the cheeks are short and fine, and rendered in a manner which is similar to the technique used in the Louvre head. The beard is longer and thicker along the jawline and below the chin, and the locks twist into tight curls at the ends. While the form and arrangement of the beard is nearly identical to that of Izmir 648, the technique, style, and size of Izmir 570 produce a rather different effect. Its style of presentation is more elegant and mannered than Izmir 648, and the sculptural tech-

Fig.8. Izmir Archaeological Museum inv. no. 648

Fig.9. Louvre inv. no. MND 012 (Louvre head)

Fig.10. Izmir Archaeological Museum inv. no. 570

nique is more fluid and refined. As with the two priest portraits, such differences should probably be attributed to the hand of a different sculptor.

The design and details of physiognomy, beard, and hairstyle which Izmir 648 (1), the Louvre head (2), and Izmir 570 (3) share — that is, the almond-shaped eyes, the central knot of hair, the forehead locks, the beard composed of both long and short locks — can not be explained simply as formal affinities common to portraits that are close in date and broad context. Rather, these shared details were distinctive and identifying features of a common model which the sculptors were careful to include in each of the three versions. This guaranteed that all three statues would be recognized as the same person. A discussion of the possible identifications of that person, which depends on the contexts and dates of the two statues from Ephesos, forms the remainder of this paper.

The archaeological contexts and dates of Izmir 570 and Izmir 648

Both statues from Ephesos were part of the sculptural decoration of a large bath-gymnasium complex. The two baths were located at opposite ends of the city, just inside the walls directly next to a city gate. Anyone entering or leaving Ephesos would have passed by one of these baths, each with a large and elaborately decorated propylon opening on to a spacious palaestra. Izmir 570 (figs. 11-12) comes from the Gymnasium of Vedius, located on the NW side of the city near the stadium and next to the Koressos Gate.²⁰ The statue was found in the sumptuously decorated exedra or marble hall on the western side of the palaestra. Found along with Izmir 570 were fragments of at least 9 other statues, both portrait and ideal.²¹ They appear to have stood within the intercolumniations of a two-storey Corinthian columnar façade, fragments of which were found in the room.²² Keil suggested that Izmir 570 might be a portrait of the donor of the building. Indeed, one could expect that the three certainly private portraits (two male and one female) found in this room might represent the donor or members of the donor's family.²³

We know from epigraphic evidence who commissioned the building of the bath gymnasium complex. Two fragmentary inscriptions report that Publius Vedius Antoninus and his wife Flavia Papiane dedicated the bath-gymnasium to Artemis, Antoninus Pius and his family, and the city of Ephesos, in the proconsulate of L. Antonius Albus.²⁴ The inscription provides a secure Antonine date for the building of no later than 161. The precise date of the proconsulate of L. Antonius Albus, and therefore the exact date of the building's dedication, has long been a matter of contention. Most scholars have placed Albus' term of office in the late 140's.²⁵

20 Remains of this building complex have long been visible and were recorded by E. Falkener, *Ephesus and the Temple of Diana* (London 1862) 99-100; J. T. Wood, *Discoveries at Ephesus* (London 1877) 98, and F. Adler, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Topographie Kleinasien* (1872) 41-42. For the excavation reports see Keil, *Vedius Gymnasium* 1, cols. 20-45; Keil, *Vedius Gymnasium* 2, cols. 21-33; Keil, *ÖJhBeibl* 26 (1930) cols. 17-19. For general accounts of the complex as a whole, see Miltner, *Ephesos* 58-68; R. Maccanico, *ArchCl* 15 (1963) 38-42; W. Alzinger, *Die Ruinen von Ephesos* (Vienna 1972) 115-34; Yegül 282-84, figs. 321, 359.

21 For a complete list of the free-standing sculpture found in the Vedius Gymnasium, see Manderscheid 88-91, nos. 173-91.

22 The size, placement, and elaborate decoration of this marble hall suggest that it was an important focal point for the bath-gymnasium complex, although the precise function of the room is not known. For the association of this room type with the imperial cult, see F. K. Yegül, *ArtB* 64 (1982) 7-31; cf. Price (supra n.8) 136-46, esp. 144 and n.34.

23 See Manderscheid 34-38 for the imperial and private portrait statues found in baths.

24 For these inscriptions see Keil, *Vedius Gymnasium* 1, cols. 27-28; Keil, *Vedius Gymnasium* 2, cols. 25-29, fig. 12; *IvE* nos. 431, 438.

25 For example, W. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius* II (Prague 1933) 148; C. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the sacred tales* (Amsterdam 1968) 74-75, n.49, 135; H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imper-*

Fig. 11. Izmir Archaeological Museum inv. no. 570 Fig. 12. Izmir Archaeological Museum inv. no. 570 Fig. 13. Izmir Archaeological Museum inv. no. 648

Bowersock, however, has suggested a date of 160-61, and his redating was supported by Robert.²⁶ More recently, Eck has argued that a new inscription from Corinth provides additional evidence to support a date for Albus' proconsulate between 146 and 148.²⁷ Whichever date one favors, it seems reasonable to assume that the sculpture which decorated the columnar façade of the marble hall — including Izmir 570 — was in place at the time of the dedication of the building, and is, therefore, Antonine. Indeed, the dedicatory inscription states explicitly that Vedius was responsible for building the gymnasium 'from the foundations together with all the decoration'.²⁸

There is no specific archaeological evidence that suggests Izmir 570 or any of the other statues found with it were later additions to the sculptural program of the marble hall. According to Keil, all the statues found in this room are of the same imported marble and all are similar in technique. Each statue was carved from a single piece of marble, and each is of similar, very high quality.²⁹ The columnar façade of the marble hall was designed to accommodate sculpture, and since all the sculpture found within the room appears to be technically consistent, there is every reason to assume that all the sculpture, including our portrait statue, was in place at the time of the dedication of the building.

A number of technical and stylistic details of Izmir 570 can be found in other portraits of the Antonine period. The treatment of the hair — worked mostly with the chisel on the crown, deeply drilled framing the face — and the deep, short channels in the locks of the beard have affinities with the technique used in some versions of Antoninus Pius' main portrait type.³⁰ The contrast of the rough texture of the hair and beard with the smoothness of the flesh seen in Izmir 570 is a particularly Antonine effect. The shape and set of the eyes and the lack of surface modulation in the face of Izmir 570, and the use of the drill in both the beard and hair to separate and define locks, are characteristics of the portraits of Lucius Verus; a portrait of Verus from Pisidian Antioch, now in Istanbul, provides a good comparison.³¹ A wide variety of drill techniques can be found in portraits of the mid to later 2nd c., and the technique used in Izmir 570 falls easily within this range.³² A date in the Antonine period for this portrait statue cannot be excluded based on the style of the drill technique. The shape and treatment of the eyes in particular — so like those of Lucius Verus — are very much in favour of this date.

Izmir 648 (fig. 13), the statue of a priest identified as Flavius Damianus, was found in a large exedra or marble hall on the west side of the palaestra of the East Gymnasium at Ephesos. This large bath-gymnasium complex is located in the southeastern part of the city

ium Romanum (Göttingen 1979) no. 58; and R. Syme, *ZPE* 51 (1983) 276-77 with list on 290.

26 Bowersock, *HSCP* 72 (1967) 289-94; L. and R. Robert, *BullÉpig* 6 (1968) no. 171, p. 443.

27 *EpigSt* 9 (1972) 17-23.

28 *Supra* n.24.

29 My examination of the statues from the marble hall, which are on display in the Izmir Museum, confirmed Keil's observations.

30 See, for example, the bust of Antoninus Pius in the Capitoline Museum: K. Fittschen, P. Zanker, *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen I* (1985) no.59, pls. 67-68.

31 Inan-Rosenbaum 1, no. 50, pp. 79-80. See also the bust of Lucius Verus in the Capitoline Museum (Fittschen and Zanker [*supra* n.30] 79-81, no. 73), an example of his fourth portrait type, dated to 160-170. While the Lucius Verus is slightly later than the date range (146-161) proposed for the Vedius Gymnasium and its sculpture, allowances should be made for some private portraits being in advance of and others lagging behind the imperial court, both in terms of technique and style.

32 See, for example, the portraits of *kosmetai* in Athens: E. Lattanzi, *I ritratti dei cosmeti nel Museo Nazionale di Atene* (Rome 1968) no. 7, 39-40, pl. 7 a-b, no. 12, 45-46, pl. 12 a-b, and no. 13, 46-47, pl. 13 a-b; and a number of heads from the Athenian Agora: E. B. Harrison, *The Athenian Agora I: portrait sculpture* (Princeton 1953), especially nos. 28-30, pls. 18-20. See also the wide range of styles of 2nd-c. private portraits in *Kaiser Marc Aurel und seine Zeit* (Exhib. catalogue, Berlin 1988) 38-47.

next to the Magnesian Gate.³³ The statue comes from a room similar in plan and decoration to the room in the Gymnasium of Vedius where Izmir 570 was found. Nine additional statues were found with Izmir 648.³⁴ Two of these, a young girl and a seated woman with two children, are certainly private portraits. They and Izmir 648 may represent members of the family who built the bath.³⁵ In contrast to the Gymnasium of Vedius, however, there is no secure epigraphic evidence which names the person or family responsible for all or even part of its construction.³⁶

Izmir 648 came to be identified as a portrait statue of Flavius Damianus by the following process. Keil suggested that a fragment of an architrave inscribed]HΣ ANTΩ[found in the palaestra area of the bath-gymnasium be restored as META OYHΔΙΑΣ ΦΑΙΔΡΑΙΝ]HΣ ANTΩ[NEINHΣ,³⁷ that is, Vedia Phaedrina, daughter of Vedius Antoninus, the man who built the Vedius baths, and wife of Flavius Damianus. Keil thought the statue of the seated female with two children might represent Vedia Phaedrina,³⁸ and Izmir 648 her husband Flavius Damianus, since both statues apparently stood opposite one another in the marble hall. However, Keil's restoration of the architrave inscription is somewhat problematic,³⁹ and while we know a great deal about Damianus' activities both from Philostratos and from inscriptions, nowhere is it attested that he was an imperial priest such as is represented by both Izmir 648 and the Louvre head.⁴⁰

There are, however, a number of arguments which suggest that the earlier accepted identification of Izmir 570 as Publius Vedius Antoninus, and therefore by extension Izmir 648 and the Louvre head, could well be correct. Both the context and date of the portrait statue from the Gymnasium of Vedius (Izmir 570) strongly suggest that this portrait type represents a member of the Vedii Antonini, one of the most important and influential families of 2nd-c. Ephesos. The epigraphic dossier on this family is extensive, and provides a wealth of information about the offices and priesthoods they held, the benefactions they made to the city, and the honors

-
- 33 For reports of the excavation see Keil, *East Gymnasium* 1, cols. 25-51; Keil, *East Gymnasium* 2, cols. 6-12. On the complex in general see Miltner, *Ephesos* 74-78; Maccanico (supra n.20) 32-60, esp. 43-45; Alzinger (supra n.20) 30-32; Yegül 279-82, figs. 323, 351-52.
- 34 For the sculpture found in the East Gymnasium see Manderscheid 91-93, nos. 192-206, pl. 30; and M. Aurenhammer, *Die Skulpturen von Ephesos: Bildwerke aus Stein, Idealplastik I* (Forschungen in Ephesos X/1, Vienna 1990) 137-38, no. 115.
- 35 For the female statues see E. Atalay, *Weibliche Gewandstatuen des 2. Jahrhundert n.Chr. aus ephesischen Werkstätten* (Vienna 1989) no. 42, pp. 47-48, 107, fig. 87, and no. 53, pp. 54-55, pp. 111-12, figs. 103, 105, with further bibliography.
- 36 The East Bath-Gymnasium seems to have been built in two stages. The construction of the bath part of the complex is dated on the basis of ground plan and construction technique to the early to mid 2nd c. Based on the technique of construction and the style of the architectural ornament, however, it appears that the palaestra area, including the elaborately decorated propylon, the lecture hall, and the marble room with its statues, were added to the bath at a later date, in the later 2nd to early 3rd c. See Keil, *East Gymnasium* 1, cols. 28, 32-34; Miltner, *Ephesos* 74-78; Maccanico (supra n.20) 44-45; J. B. Ward-Perkins, *Roman imperial architecture* (New York 1981) 280-81; F. K. Yegül, *The Bath-Gymnasium complex at Sardis* (Cambridge, MA 1986) 137-38; A. Farrington in *Roman architecture in the Greek world* (London 1987) 50-51; Yegül 279-82, 423.
- 37 Keil, *East Gymnasium* 1, col. 31, fig. 15 and n.3; *IvE* no. 439. Keil dated the inscription to the late 2nd-early 3rd c. on the basis of the letter forms.
- 38 For Vedia Phaedrina see M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (Ier-IIe siècles)* (Louvain 1987) 613-14, no. 784. Keil reasoned that this statue most likely represents someone known for her fecundity: Vedia Phaedrina had at least 5 children.
- 39 See the cautious editing of this inscription in *IvE* no. 439. According to the entry in *IvE*, two additional letters are apparently preserved on the architrave, although they are not visible in Keil's photograph of the fragment. In addition, in none of the other inscriptions from Ephesos does Vedia Phaedrina use her father's cognomen. See, for example, *IvE* nos. 47,9; 678,8; 733; 2100; 3081.
- 40 For the inscriptions relating to Flavius Damianus see *IvE* VII, part 1, p. 90.

they received in return.⁴¹ The two leading men of the family in the middle to later 2nd c. — that is, contemporary with our portrait type — were M. Claudius P. Vedius Antoninus Sabinus and his son M. Claudius P. Vedius Antoninus Phaedrus Sabinianus (Vedius 2 and Vedius 3 respectively in *IvE*). A great deal of information about them both is preserved on an inscribed base for a statue of Vedius 3 set up by the *boule* and *demos* of Ephesos.⁴² From it we learn that the father, Vedius 2, was *prytanis*, *gymnasiarch*, twice secretary of the *demos*, *asiarch*, *panegyriarch* of the great Ephesian and the Pasithean games, and envoy to the senate and emperors. Two further inscriptions report that he was both *archiereus* of Asia and “*asiarch* of Asia”.⁴³ Vedius 3, whose statue stood on this base, is celebrated in the inscription as *prytanis*, secretary, *asiarch*, *gymnasiarch* of the great Ephesian games and *alytarch* of the Olympics, envoy to the senate and the emperors, and as particularly generous when *gymnasiarch* for Lucius Verus’ visit to Ephesos.

Vedius 3 is praised in the same inscription for eagerly and voluntarily adorning the city with many and great works, one of which was the gymnasium in which Izmir 570 was found.⁴⁴ Both Vedii are known to have been imperial priests: Vedius 2 was an *asiarch*, an *archiereus* of Asia, and an “*asiarch* of Asia”, while Vedius 3 was an *asiarch*.⁴⁵ Rather than Flavius Damianus, who is not known to have been an imperial priest, our portrait type surely represents one of these Vedii Antonini. The style of the portrait statue from the Gymnasium of Vedius presents the subject as a man of elegance and learning. The lank strands of hair and ‘philosophic’ length of beard express his intellectual interests,⁴⁶ while the carefully coiffed hair, tightly wrapped *himation*, and complex and artful pose express his *elegantia*, a quality prized in the Antonine period.⁴⁷ This elegant manner of presentation may have been meant to signify visually Vedius’ skills as a public speaker, skills explicitly praised in the inscription on the statue base

41 See the stemma and list of inscriptions assigned to the various Vedii Antonini in *IvE* VII, part 1, pp. 88–89, which I have followed. Cf. E. L. Bowie, *Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology* (Ankara 1978) 867–74; M. Wörrle, *AA* 1973, 470–77; Halfmann (supra n.25) 168–70, nos. 84, 84a, 84b; R. A. Kearsley, *EpAnat* 16 (1990) 76; M. D. Campanile, *I sacerdoti de Koinon d’Asia (I sec. a.C.–III sec. d.C.)* (Pisa 1994) 113–16; E. Fontani, *ZPE* 110 (1996) 227–37. The author is currently working on a comprehensive study of the monuments of the Vedii Antonini.

42 *IvE* no. 728; F. Miltner, *ÖJhBeibl* 44 (1959) cols. 257–63, fig. 124.

43 *IvE* no. 732 (*archiereus* of Asia) and no. 4110 (“*asiarch* of Asia”). A Publius Ve[dius Antoninus] also set up an altar for the imperial cult (*IvE* no. 1506).

44 Vedius 3 also built the *bouleuterion*, in which were set up portraits of his father, Lucius Verus, and Faustina (*IvE* nos. 285a, 460, 725, 1505). Bases for statues of himself and his son, Vedius 4, were found near the *bouleuterion* (*IvE* nos. 727, 731). A series of imperial letters from Antoninus Pius to Vedius were inscribed on the *proscenium* of the *bouleuterion*. Vedius’ status as imperial correspondent attests his power and prestige, which obviously extended beyond his native city, and suggests a close and privileged relationship with the imperial court. See F. Millar, *The emperor in the Roman world* (1977, 1992) 469–72.

45 The precise definition and nature of these priesthoods are a matter of contention. For recent discussions see Wörrle 1992 (supra n.7) and Friesen (supra n.8).

46 The style of the hair — the lank locks carefully arranged over the forehead and the artful knot of hair — is mannered and highly unusual; hair would not fall naturally in this way. Locks arranged in this fashion over the forehead are, however, a feature of the classical portrait type of Aristotle. In our portrait they may, therefore, refer to the subject’s learning, as well as his age. For the portrait of Aristotle see G. M. A. Richter, *The portraits of the Greeks* (London 1965) 172–74, figs. 976–1010; ead., *The portraits of the Greeks* (abbr. and rev. by R. Smith, 1984) 95–99, figs. 61–63. Similar locks are also a feature of a fine bust from Aphrodisias which probably represents a sophist: R. R. R. Smith, *JRS* 80 (1990) 148–50, no. 11, pls. XV–XVI. The fashion of emulating the style of Classical Greek portraits began in the 2nd c. A.D. See Harrison (supra n.32) 88–89; P. Zanker, *The mask of Sokrates* (Berkeley 1995) 217–33.

47 R. Marache, *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaisant au II^e siècle de notre ère* (Rennes 1952) 146–47; E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome* (Cambridge, MA 1980) 29–44.

mentioned above: both Vedii were sent as ambassadors before the senate and the emperors, and Vedius 3 is celebrated as obtaining what he (and the city) wanted.⁴⁸ Circumstantial evidence, then, strongly suggests an identification as one of these two men. It is neither possible on present evidence nor necessary to decide which of them, father or son, our portrait type represents.

Conclusion

Public statues of private individuals played an important rôle in Roman social and political life, and the portraits which survive can provide a vital visual dimension to the epigraphic evidence. Portrait statues were the most prestigious among a series of (primarily symbolic) awards given in exchange for services to a city. The Vedii Antonini were a family of generous civic benefactors. They held many local offices and priesthoods, provided the funds for a range of public services, and decorated their city with large and expensive buildings emphatically public in nature. Statue bases from Ephesos show that almost anywhere one went in the city one was bound to see portrait statues of this family. They included a large family group set up in the agora,⁴⁹ and another near the Scholastikia Baths.⁵⁰ Two statues of Vedius 3 stood in the theater.⁵¹ The multiplicity of images served to reinforce the family's power and prestige. The placement of their portrait statues in the baths served as visual reminders of the benefactors responsible for the pleasures being enjoyed.⁵² The use of the same head/portrait type ensured the different images would be recognized as the same person, strengthening this message. The two statues and one head discussed in this paper provide three versions of the carefully defined portrait type of one member of this great family of Ephesian benefactors.

Department of Classics, McMaster University, Hamilton

Acknowledgements

This study was first presented as a paper at the 95th Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America in Washington, D.C. The portrait statues in Izmir were examined during the summers of 1992 and 1993. I would like to thank the Director of the Izmir Archaeological Museum, Mr Turan Özkan, for taking new photographs of the Izmir statues. For correcting and improving this paper, as well as for much helpful discussion, the author is greatly indebted to Bert Smith. Friends and colleagues have also given many helpful comments and references: M. T. Boatwright, K. M. D. Dunbabin, D. C. Haggis, W. V. Harris, W. J. Slater, as well as the participants in a seminar on 2nd-c. Roman portraiture at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York, in the fall of 1993. I thank them all warmly.

48 *IvE* no. 728, ll. 18-21.

49 Bases for statues of 12 of the Vedii Antonini were found in the agora. See *IvE* nos. 726, 3075-85.

50 Statue bases for 4 members of the family have been found rebuilt into the Scholastikia Baths; they undoubtedly stood somewhere nearby. See *IvE* nos. 677, 728-30.

51 Along with one of his second wife, Valeria Lepida. See *IvE* nos. 2064-66. Vedius 3 has the most statue bases preserved, for a total of 6 statues (*IvE* nos. 727, 728, 2064, 2065, 3075, 4110).

52 Vedius 3 was also honored with the title of *ktistes* of the *patris* (*IvE* nos. 727, 2065, 3075). The inclusion of a statue of Androklos, the original *ktistes* of Ephesos, in the marble hall of the Vedius Gymnasium, in direct association with portraits of the Vedii Antonini, was especially meaningful. For the title of *ktistes* see Robert, *Hellenica* 4 (1948) 116.