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Abstract

The honorific monuments erected in Late Antiquity in the city of Aphrodisias are striking in their preservation and in their appearance. Two scholars, Charlotte Roueché and R.R.R. Smith, have provided full and ground-breaking publications of these monuments and have extracted important information from careful study of the epigraphic and sculptural elements. Further study conducted under the aegis of Smith and B. Ward-Perkins in the Last Statues of Antiquity Project has grounded these monuments in the larger, empire-wide context of Late Antiquity. These fine academic studies have made these late Aphrodisian honours points of reference. Without the work of these distinguished scholars, this paper would not be possible or relevant. This paper seeks merely to focus attention on small details of structure, technique, and iconography in an attempt to sharpen our vision of the very last of these monuments. It endeavours to distinguish tendencies specific to the sixth-century honorific statuary habit at Aphrodisias and to understand the concept of re-use and recycling in that last moment of the statue culture in this conservative city, by looking at three monuments dedicated to the same man in the last moments of the habit. These are three statues monuments to one Rhodopaios of the second quarter of the sixth century, preserved in different states. The paper is divided into three parts; an introduction that considers the main trends of honorific statuary, the presentation of the three monuments of Rhodopaios, and a conclusion.

Introduction

Scholars of the material culture of the Roman Empire can immediately distinguish sculpted monuments, especially portraits, of c. 20 BC from those of AD 230. Yet, the chronological period – of the exact same length – from AD 300 to 550 provides significant challenges. Throughout the combined period, 20 BC to AD 550, there is a continuity of concept and purpose in portrait sculpture in the Roman Empire. A public portrait statue was part of an established mutually-sustaining exchange between wealthy individuals and their community, memorial for financial maintenance. A private portrait between two individuals or family mem-

bers was similarly a memorial in exchange for personal favours. The portrait monuments consisted of portrait head, a body dressed in a socially-meaningful costume, and a base which elevated the statue and spelled out his contribution (FIG. 1). The difficulty in chronological recognition in the second period arises from two concurrent trends, “decline” and “accumulation.” Political, economic, and artistic considerations in Late Antiquity entailed a decline in the number of these objects and a related decline in producers and in the marble industry as a whole. At the same time, the old honours (statues and bases) had accumulated and aged. Many of these were made redundant because of damage or urban renewal. This led to re-deployment and re-carving of old honours for new honours. This is what we now call sustainable practice, it makes good sense in a competitive market, and it has a positive and desired connotation. But for archaeologists, it makes the statuary of the fourth to sixth centuries more difficult to evaluate than that of the first to early third centuries because it was less likely to have been made directly from a pristine rectangular block. In addition, archaeologists now also begin to wonder about potential re-deployment even of the objects whose first use they can confidently assign to the first to early third centuries. The problem is not merely chronological but also about intent and the message that a re-used object conveyed to its viewers. Were the viewers aware of the re-use, was it a deliberate visual connection, and what was the aesthetic value of the monuments?

The city of Aphrodisias with its unbroken history and outstanding state of preservation has provided invaluable lessons about statue honours in Late Antiquity. Among the latest of statue honours preserved at Aphrodisias are three monuments erected to the same man, a certain Rhodopaios. These three monuments merit attention because they are reliably dated in the sixth century and are surely contemporary monuments. They are also well set, conceptually within a long tradition and physically within a city-scape.

Multiple honours for one man. Multiple statuary honours to private individuals within one city are well-attested in the Roman world and mark exceptional citizens. Two outstanding examples from Athens demonstrate clearly the range of such possibilities from funerary to public contexts: the early second-century tomb monument of Philoppapos shows the deceased as a Roman senator, a descendant of Hellenistic kings, and as an Athenian citizen, and each deme of the city appears to have erected a statue of Ti. Claudius Atticus Herodes for a total of 13 statues to the same man in some public space (possibly the Agora) in the mid-second century.

At Aphrodisias, as three public monuments to one local individual, those of Rhodopaios stand out. From the late first century BC to the sixth century AD, the site preserves 22 instances of private individuals honoured with more than one statue which equates to about 10% of the total extant honours. Nineteen are cases of individuals who received two statue honours and three cases, Titus Flavius Sallustius Athenagoras, Tiberius Claudius Diogenes, 3

3 Cf. two examples from Aphrodisias: an early imperial statue group of Achilles and Troilos that was re-used in the fourth century in the civil basilica without its base (Smith, Hallett 2015) and a statue of Aemilia Lepida of c. AD 25, which seems unlikely to have remained a representation to the same woman into the fourth century AD (Lenaghan 2020), 31-32.

4 Above notes 1 and 2.

5 ala2004 85, 86, and 87; also LSA-188, 194, and 233.
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and Rhodopaios, are men who received more than two honours. Among these 22 honorands are local men, women, boys, and three Roman officials (a governor of AD 251-263, a centurio frumentarius again of mid-third-century date, and an early fifth-century governor and vicar). It should be noted that all the multiple honours are attested by statue bases and that there are no indisputable cases of two extant portraits (see below for the possible Rhodopaios exception) of the same non-imperial man from Aphrodisias. The majority (13) of the individuals who earned multiple honours are from the later second to third centuries; three are first century BC to first century AD, four are second century, and two belong in the sixth century. The bases of these monuments are always made from white marble and those for the same honorands often resemble each other because they were constructed for similar locations (if not the same context) and within similar time frames; the bases for the sons of Menippos presumably for the same context or the two for the governor Marcus Aurelius Diogenes, certainly from a public context and dated AD 253-260, well illustrate these situations (Fig. 2a-b). When the bases differ, it is generally a reflection of the different frame in which they were set. The case of Titus Flavius Sallustius Athenagoras, a Roman senator and son of an imperial procurator in the middle to late second century AD who received four statues at Aphrodisias, demonstrates this (Fig. 2c-d). He was honoured by the boule and demos (assembly and people), by the patris (the fatherland, a formulation that should refer to a different process and/or location than that of the assembly and people), and twice by clients. One of the honours for him set up by a client is a tall rectangular shaft which was presumably set between upper and lower moulded elements to form a free-standing monument; the honour set up by the boule and demos is a short squat base with upper and lower mouldings included, presumably set into an architectural frame; and two further honours (that of the patris and one of the clients) are written on wall blocks and include the names of other members of his illustrious family, presumably from a tomb. A certain Tiberius Claudius Diogenes of the late second or third century received at least three honours; he was honoured twice by his brother (one of these on the end of the analemma wall of the Bouleuterion), and once on the cornice of the logeion of the Theatre. Thus, twice his base was an integrated architectural element rather than an independent support, and so they were distinctly different. The two honours to Flavius Palmatus, the consular governor of Caria and the vicar of Asia, merit mention because of their early sixth-century date. One in prose was preserved on a statue base excavated with its statue in 1972 (Fig. 1), and the other in verse was recorded probably at Aphrodisias.


8 M. Aur. Diogenes is a governor; Aur. Gaius is the centurio frumentarius; Fl. Palmatus is the Vicar of Asia.

9 Bases for sons of Menippos, Smith et al. 2006, pl. 3 H126 and H127. Bases for M. Aur. Diogenes ala2004 5, 6 and Smith et al. 2006, pl. 3 H42.


and clearly commemorates the same man.\textsuperscript{13} These examples demonstrate that in the statue tradition at Aphrodisias multiple honours to a non-imperial individual, usually a man from the city, were always possible and were particularly attested in the later second to early third centuries, but that the statistics are slightly misleading because they include repetition of honours on family tomb monuments. In all of these respects, Aphrodisias presents a picture of what were normal statue habits.

It is the ways in which the three extant statue bases preserving inscribed texts for Rhodopaios correspond to and differ from the established patterns of statuary monuments at Aphrodisias that merit exploration as the markers or stamp of their period (early to mid-sixth century) on the continuous tradition. The texts of the Rhodopaios bases, which have been well-studied, are an excellent starting point.\textsuperscript{14} In their listing of reasons for the monuments, the texts give his benefactions and titles which place him in the second quarter of the sixth century AD. All three texts note that he is an Aphrodisian and that there is a reciprocated love between fatherland and native son. In addition, he is a \textit{magnificentissimus} “father;” a benefactor who has gifted grain, a bathing establishment, and long-forgotten pleasures to the city; he receives a marble image to withstand time. The term father perhaps refers to the title “father of the city” which was created in the mid-fifth century; the adjective \textit{magnificentissimus} became used by outstanding local men only in the late fifth century; the unusual emphasis on the corn supply and famine seems to refer to a plague of AD 540/541. These three honorific monuments are then among the latest of such honorific monuments at Aphrodisias. They belong with probability after a significant period of rebuilding at Aphrodisias that has been recently placed in conjunction with an earthquake of c. AD 494.\textsuperscript{15} Against the background of the high-imperial monuments of Aphrodisias and the late-antique epigraphic record, investigation of the materiality of these three monuments reveals tendencies – sculptural, structural, and economic – that are particular to this final phase of the statue habit. They provide a case study for the choices, desires, and economic reality in the last moments of the statue habit in a city which had a strong sculptural tradition.

\textit{The first monument for Rhodopaios (FIG. 3)}

The first monument to Rhodopaios features a tall, shallow, dark blue-grey shaft which was first recorded by Boulanger in 1913.\textsuperscript{16} Inscribed on the shaft in carefully set lines and neat lettering is an epigram, which C. Rouéché has presented:

\begin{verbatim}
Ἀγαθῇ Τύχ[η]
pολλὰ μέν, ὦ Ῥοδοπαῖε,
tῇ δορήσαο πάτρῃ
πολλὰ τὰ μὴν λέγειν
5 εὔκολα μήτρ’ ἄριστειν·
ἡ δὲ πόλις σε, πάτερ,
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{ala}2004 \textit{85}, \textit{86}, \textit{87}.
\textsuperscript{15} Wilson 2019, 476-479.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{ala}2004 \textit{85}, LSA-188.
To Good Fortune. You have made many presents to your country, Rhodopaeus, so many that they are not easy to say or to count; and the city has presented you with great honours, father, having set up your image in marble so that time may not obscure your image – you who are loved by many – overshadowing it with forgetfulness. With good fortune!

Only recently has the shaft been discussed as part of a larger monument. Both the lower and upper elements, between which the shaft was set, have been identified and indicate that the base was located directly in front of the northern pier of the east façade of the Hadrianic Baths. The upper element allowed a fragment of statuary – the feet of a chlamys statue of the later fourth or early fifth century – to be associated with the monument and more precisely to be identified as the physical incarnation of the marmarea eikōn. The fragment of statuary shows a man wearing a chlamys and closed leather shoes; at his feet are a box of scrolls and in complete examples, the figure holds a scroll. All other statues depicted in this dress from this site (and elsewhere) date no earlier than the Theodosian period.

As with the statue, the upper and lower elements of the base cannot date before the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth century AD. The lower block is irregular and simple; the upper block has poorly-executed simple mouldings. The lower block recalls architectural elements excavated south-east of the Sebasteion and just north-east of the Agora Gate along the Tetrapylon street, the city’s main north-south avenue. It looks like an adaptation (one long side cut back) of the simple cushions (Fig. 4) that were set between the Ionic column capitals and the springing arches made of brick. These rectangular cushions of similar size and height have a profile of a band and then a sloping diagonal surface. Those columns on the street must date after AD 400 when the street was significantly raised and may well date even later to an intervention of c. AD 500 or thereafter. The lower block of the first Rhodopaios monument would then seem to have been either a fifth-century element of a building project which had already fallen or a never-used, left-over element from a building project of the early sixth century. The upper element of the monument is without any inscription, has visible marble flaws, and a simple profile that is outside the canonical range of high-

---

17 Lenaghan 2019.
imperial upper plinths. It resembles in particular another upper element, found at the Hadri- 
anic Baths, which bears a late-antique inscribed invocation to Good Fortune (see below) (FIG. 
10). Thus, the upper element also may have been originally made in the late fourth to early 
fifth century for some other project or might plausibly have been made specifically for this 
monument.

The blue-grey shaft of the first monument to Rhodopaios was not made as a statue base. 
Visible tool work, the engraved design, and the material itself make this clear. It has clamp 
cuttings at the centre of the top and at the bottom of the back that do not correspond to the 
cuttings on the upper and lower elements, and there is deep tooling on the lower part of the 
front surface as if to remove something.20 The design of the border, which recalls the soffit of 
an architrave, appears also on revetment panelling and on dividing posts (a blue post sur-
mounted by a reclining divinity is still in situ in the Bouleuterion, FIG. 5) and not in the con-
text of inscribed statue bases. Here the inscription does not correspond to the decorative bo-
der. Finally, the dark blue-grey marble is not attested for a single statue base in the high-
imal period. Only the base for a later fifth- or early sixth-century honorand named Albi-
nus uses this same marble and in that case the base is a re-used column.21

The complete pedestal construction of the first Rhodopaios monument (upper element, 
lower element, and shaft) as a totality finds close parallels at the city’s Theatre Baths.22 On 
the east side of a room with a shallow central pool, between the pool and the broad paved 
courtyard or road, stand two tall supports at the end of short walls. These two tall supports are 
tripartite and conceived with the same aesthetic as the base for Rhodopaios (FIG. 6). Each of 
these supports consists of a simple unmoulded marble base, a pillar of similar dimensions to 
that of the Rhodopaios shaft, and a rectangular upper element with sloping sides.23 Three 
sides of these pillars are decorated with the same frame motif (soffit-like pattern) as the broad 
side of the Rhodopaios base; the capitals have simple mouldings on their broad sides and egg 
and dart motifs on their short sides. Although these objects have been catalogued as door jambs, they do not have a clear structural architectural function, but they do demarcate a rec-
tangular pool area on the east side of the room. I would suggest that in their final use they 
were pedestals or bases for some decorative object, possibly small, and that the shafts, as that 
of the first Rhodopaios monument, were originally made as posts and re-used here at a sec-
ond moment.

These considerations allow for the following conclusion with regard to the first Rhodopai-
os monument: it was made of a chlamys statue which could at earliest be Theodosian in date, 
lower and upper elements which were most likely made in the fifth or sixth century, and a 
blue-grey shaft of indeterminate date that resembles posts and panelling. Its moment of com-
ilation was probably contemporary with that of the two monuments at the Theatre Baths. 
The complete, new sixth-century monument was a narrow tower of blue and white marble on 
which was set a finely-worked statue. The viewer might have noticed that the upper and lower 
mouldings were not carved with traditional architectural detail but with mod-
ern/contemporary profiles. The overall effect would have been chromatically-lively, elegant,

20 Lenaghan 2019, 506-507, Figs. 38.8-9.
21 ala2004 82.
22 Lenaghan 2019, 514, Fig. 38.20.
and modern. The contemporary viewer was not intended to see re-use or to consider it awkward in any way.

*The second monument for Rhodopoios (Fig. 3b)*

A fragmentary column with an inscription commemorating the city’s erection of a second marble statue for Rhodopoios (Fig. 3b) was excavated in the forecourt of the Hadrianic Baths by Paul Gaudin in 1904. The inscription has again been well-published and studied.24

\[
\begin{aligned}
[τὸν \, \, \, \, \, \, \, \, λιθάργητον \, \, \, \, \, \, \, \, εἰ - \\
[ερ]γέτην \, \, \, \, \, \, \, \, τὸν \, \, \, \, \, \, \, λου - \\
[τ]ροίς \, \, \, \, \, \, \, καὶ \, \, \, \, \, \, \, σιταρχίας \\
λοιμῶν \, \, \, \, \, \, \, καὶ \, \, \, \, \, \, \, λιμῶν \, \, \, \, \, \, \, ἀπε - \\
[λά]σαντα \, \, \, \, \, \, \, Ροδοπαιόν \\
[τ]ὸν \, \, \, \, \, \, \, φυλόπατριν \, \, \, \, \, \, \, ποθόδο - \\
[σ]ε πόλ. <ε>ίς \, \, \, \, \, \, \, δευτέρη \\
[τ]ῆδ' \, \, \, \, \, \, \, εἰκόνι \, \, \, \, \, \, \, μαρμάραι \\
κοσμήσασα \, \, \, \, \, \, \, ἀξίας \\
10 \, \, \, \, \, \, \, [τ]ῇ \, \, \, \, \, \, \, μείσατο \, \, \, \, \, \, \, τιμάζ. \\
\end{aligned}
\]

Cross

The never-to-be-forgotten benefactor, who, with baths and with command of the corn-supply, drove away plague and famine, Rhodopaeus, lover of his country; the city, loving him, has adorned him with this second marble image, repaying him with worthy honours.

The mention of the corn-supply (*sitaxia*), famine (*limon*), and plague are such unusual details in prosperous Aphrodisias that Rouéché connected them to a famine of AD 540/541. The extant base is a re-used column shaft, and it is in fact a blue and white column shaft of the distinctive Yazır quarries. It is about 114 cm tall and has a diameter of 46-48 cm which tapers slightly.

With no extant cuttings on the shaft, there is no secure way to reconstruct the monument to which it belonged. However, it is likely that it was crowned by an upper element on which an invocation was written. The invocation is unlikely to have been on the shaft since on the viewer’s right side there is no trace of letters above the first preserved line; that is, there is enough space preserved for letters, but there are no letters.

The columnar shaft would also have sat on a lower element that would have lifted it off the floor level. In the area of the Baths in which the columnar shaft for the second statue of Rhodopaios was found, that is the southern part of the palaestra court, one object meets the criteria of a lower element. It is a separately worked lower element which has a crudely moulded neck to receive a columnar element (Fig. 8). It was recorded in 2012 between pedestals in the east aisle of the palaestra court. It shows a square plinth out of which rises a neck

24 ala2004 86, LSA-194.
set to one side; the neck would seem to have been set toward the front. There are mouldings around the neck of the column on the front and sides; at the back they are not rendered. The moulding consists of a poorly executed torus below, a broad band, and then a flattened torus above. Three details indicate that it was a base: the lack of cuttings and the particularly evenly worked and unmarked lower surface; the flat upper surface of the neck which again has no cuttings for clamps; and the lack of height of the lowermost band. The diameter at the neck is 55 cm which is similar to the monument for Menandros, and it seems to have been conceived possibly to match the lower element of the base. In addition to the columnar shaft for Rhodopaios, there was also a columnar blue marble shaft of similar dimension found in the adjacent west stoa of the South Agora and inscribed with honours for Albinus. Albinus was moreover a contemporary of Rhodopaios. Given the fragmentary nature of the shafts for both Rhodopaios and for Albinus, the lower element cannot be assigned to either with certainty; yet it gives a good idea of what the lower base for both monuments looked like. It is also important to note that in this area – the forecourt of the Baths and the western stoa of the South Agora – a total of seven columnar monuments were found: one to Menandros of possibly AD 385-388, four to the Theodosian emperors, one to the empress Flacilla, and one to Albinus of the sixth century. It would seem that in this area columnar monuments were chosen with deliberate respect for the other monuments in the immediate vicinity.

In addition to being particularly suited to its urban context, the base also reflects a time-specific, city-wide trend. The shaft of the column used for the central part of this second Rhodopaios monument is made of a distinctive local marble that is a speckled blue grey. It comes from a quarry located to the west of Aphrodisias. The quarry is first attested in the second century at the Hadrianic Baths; it is the marble used for the large pedestals and some monolithic columns in the forecourt. The marble and the dimensions of the Rhodopaios shaft correspond closely to the columns re-erected at a late-antique moment on both sides of the avenue in front (to the east) of the city’s Theatre Baths (FIG. 7, and also FIG. 6) and in a church-like building referred to as Gaudin’s Gymnasium. Both of these projects were late-antique in date and the Theatre Baths have already been noted above as having a relationship with the first monument to Rhodopaios. Probably a stockpile of such speckled blue-grey columns, deriving from the same source, was available at the same sixth-century moment, and thus the city deployed them contemporaneously both for the project at the Theatre Baths and also for the statue monument to Rhodopaios. The dismantling of a large building or complex, such as the temenos of the Temple of Aphrodite at the end of the fifth century, might have been the source of such columns.

The third monument for Rhodopaios

The third base for Rhodopaios (FIG. 8) was recorded in 1713 by William Sherard and then recovered in only a few fragments by the New York University Excavation. It repeats the
title magnificentissimus and the mention of the famine and specifically names the Baths as the Olympian Baths. Roueché presents it, as follow:

Ἀγαθῇ [Τύ]χῃ·
[τὸν] μεγαλοπρεπὲς
στατον Ῥοδόπαιον
τὸν φιλόπατριν καὶ
5 [ἀρ]ωγόν τοῦ δήμου,
[τὸν] ἀρχὴγόν τῆς
φιλοτιμίας τοῦ
θερινοῦ Ὀλυμπί
οὐ λουτροῦ
καὶ σιτοδότην ὁ -
μοῦ δὲ καὶ τής κτίστην,
τὸν ἄν[α]νεστήν
τὸν λη[θ]αργηθεῖσον
tέρψαιον, τ[όν] [δί]-
ά πάντ[α] [[ήμω]ν ιδία]
τε καὶ κο[ινή] [ἀλη]-
θάργητον[ν] [εὐερ]-
γέτην ὃ[νδρίαν]
τὶ κοσμή[σασα]
20 τὸ τρι[τον] [ἡ πόλις]

To Good Fortune. The magnificentissimus Rhodopaeus, the lover of his country and defender of the people, the originator of the generous gift of the summer Olympian bath, and giver of corn as well as founder, renewer of pleasures that had been forgotten, the never-to-be-forgotten benefactor to us in everything, privately and public—the city (has honoured him) adorning him with a statue for the third time.

Of the three monuments, least can be said about the physicality of this, the third honour to Rhodopaios, because of its poor preservation. The inscribed shaft follows the most common form for a statue base at Aphrodisias, tall, rectangular, and with a moulded frame. It was almost certainly re-used from an older statue monument. It has a width of 59 cm and a height of at least 88 cm; the mouldings and the width of the shaft are equivalent to those of the base for Titus Flavius Sallustius Athenagoras of the second century (FlG. 2d) which was re-used for a statue of Valens, and which has a height of c. 120 cm. As the inscription for Valens was placed on the back panel of the earlier base for Athenagoras, so too the text for Rhodopaios was probably inscribed on what was originally intended as a back panel. The lack of finish in the mouldings around the panel, which consist of visible chisel strokes (vertical above, horizontal on the viewer’s right), suggests this. Thus, this the third monument features a typical high-imperial shaft in white marble used back to front, and as such it looks distinctly different from the other two bases for Rhodopaios. Its original location remains unknown.
On this monument, the invocation to good fortune is inscribed on the upper frame of the rectangular shaft. This suggests probably that the upper element of the base was not a re-used upper element of a high-imperial base but an architectural element of a later date.\textsuperscript{30} That is, the upper element lacked the obvious space for the inscribed invocation.

The upper element might thus well be imagined to have looked like the upper element of the first monument to Rhodopaios (Fig. 3a) which is a late object that lacks the invocation. The lettering of this third monument recalls an inscribed upper element found at the Hadraniac Baths which is similar in shape to the upper element of the first monument to Rhodopaios in dimensions and mouldings (Fig. 10).\textsuperscript{31} The lettering in the case of the third monument and in the case of the upper element from the Baths is thin and finely inscribed, with light serifs at all terminations and alphas with a crossing of two downward slanting lines. The upper element even features an initial cross that is similarly worked to the cross that marks the end of the inscription of the second monument to Rhodopaios (Fig. 3 vs. Fig. 10). This upper element was certainly contemporary with the shafts for Rhodopaios. Notably its appearance recalls the uninscribed upper moulding of the first monument for Rhodopaios. These two upper elements probably convey the common aesthetic of one moment which depended on the architectural outputs of that moment. The size, solidity, lettering, and find location of this upper element with the invocation even make it possible that it once crowned the second base to Rhodopaios—a columnar shaft with a diameter of 45-50 cm. The shaft for Rhodopaios is broken on the upper right where the clamp appears on the upper element; the shaft for Rhodopaios lacks the invocation to Good Fortune which appears on this object; this object begins with a cross and Rhodopaios’ base ends with a cross.

**Associated Statuary**

In addition to these elements of the statue bases, a fragment of a statue and two heads can be plausibly connected to the three monuments. The fragment of the statue of the first monument has been identified (see above) and resembles chlamys statues of the fourth century. The re-use of a fourth-century body in a sixth-century monument similarly occurs on the statue of Flavius Palmatus whose head was pinned to its togate body by a thin metal dowel at the base of the neck (Fig. 1). The two portrait heads, potentially of Rhodopaios, are both life-size (that is smaller than high-imperial portraits), both wear hairstyles of the first half of the sixth century, and both have clear technical markers of that date; the pupils and irises are flat disks set on the surface of the eyeball. The fully-preserved portrait head (now in Boston), excavated in the “souterrains des les Thermes,” preserved folds from a chlamys statue on its right shoulder and a 20-cm metal dowel (diameter c. 5 cm) that projected from the base of the neck downwards. The head was certainly intended to be placed on a marble chlamys statue of a sixth-century monument. The second head, a fragment found by villagers in 1971, seems to represent the same man; that is, the two different marble heads of the sixth century are based on

\textsuperscript{30} It is difficult to imagine no upper element at Aphrodisias. Only the monument to Oecumenius lacks a moulded element and that might arguably be due to preservation.

one model. This is potentially the only preserved instance of two surviving portraits to the same private man at Aphrodisias.

Whether they were recarved from existing heads mattered little to their audience. That was simply the economic choice of the sculptor. They were made on commission to represent a specific individual of the sixth century and were surely viewed as new portraits. Find location, dress, date, and similar physiognomy and hairstyle strongly suggest that the two represented Rhodopaios.

Conclusion

Multiple honours to a non-imperial man, especially a local man of outstanding prominence, was always possible in the Roman period – that is from the late first century BC to the sixth century AD – at Aphrodisias. Such honours commemorated a handful of special individuals, on average about four every one hundred years. Thus, the three extant honours to a Rhodopaios of the sixth century mark him as special and represent a remarkable conceptual continuity. Interestingly, multiple honours are not attested by extant statuary of the high-imperial period from the site, and so the two potential portrait heads of Rhodopaios would represent a unique case of preservation. One might suggest that earlier multiple portraits occurred more frequently in bronze and thus have been more easily lost.

The overriding structure of all three monuments to Rhodopaios as tall bases surmounted by life-size statues also follows the established format of free-standing honorific portrait monuments at Aphrodisias. The choice of the general vocabulary of the three monuments seems also to have been plausibly dictated by respect for the pre-existing context. That is, the columnar shaft appears in a location which has predominantly columnar bases, and the chlamys statue appears among other chlamys statues. The carving of the associated portrait heads is high-quality and forceful. Thus, the general physicality, as the concept, of these three sixth-century monuments belongs strongly in the context of traditional and conservative Aphrodisias which had produced such portraits since the end of the first century BC.

The truly sixth-century features of these monuments have been hitherto little noted and lie in the variety of form and material displayed by the three contemporary bases to Rhodopaios. This variety allows the three monuments to be readily distinguished from each other; they are the dark blue pillar monument or honour 1, the speckled Yazır columnar monument or honour 2, and the traditional, large rectangular monument with moulded frame or honour 3 (Fig. 3). It is the forms and materials available for the construction of the standard vocabulary of the statue monument that has significantly changed and that reflects the sixth century. The diversity in the form and materials allows the three monuments to be readily distinguished not only from each other but also from monuments of other eras.

Details of the earlier statue monuments of the high-imperial period at Aphrodisias reflected the eras in which they were created. The profiles of upper and lower elements find parallels in profiles in contemporary architecture, and block sizes correspond to contemporary quarrying practices; these are obvious aesthetic and economic fashions. Thus, not surprisingly the three monuments of Rhodopaios reflect sixth-century architecture and the marble industry in general. They apply the available sixth-century materials and aesthetic to the language of the honorific monument. Striking parallels for the parts of these three monuments are obvious
in the last architecture of the city. These include the cushions above the capitals from the Street, the rampant re-use of the blue-grey Yazır columns, which probably came from the dismantling of a second-century monument, and the two pillars in the Theatre Baths. This uniform aesthetic and production suggest a chronological unity among the above-mentioned monuments which further archaeological exploration and careful study will clarify more precisely. This sixth-century aesthetic is of course an aesthetic determined by a number of factors which include the availability of primary resources, sculptural expertise, and contemporary building projects. That is, the re-use of the blue-grey, speckled Yazır columns must have been in part dictated by the existence of such columns that had been taken from defunct buildings, but the new architectural elements reflect the skill and training of the available sculptors and attest to a business of sixth-century building in the city of Aphrodisias. It reminds us forcefully that these are monuments within the urban, built landscape not simply poems or sculptures.

The three monuments answer the academic questions of the meaning of re-use clearly. All of the parts demonstrate that in the sixth century, statuary monuments were made in part from re-used elements and in part possibly from new architectural elements. Whether new or re-cut from extant blocks, all parts were clearly worked to look and be new, to fit with due respect into the existing urban landscape, and to accompany renovations (whose donors they were in fact commemorating). Parts were not to be recognised separately as redeployed elements from another era. In their desire, they are extremely traditional.

Julia Lenaghan
Oxford University
Julia.lenaghan@classics.ox.ac.uk
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Fig. 1 – Photomontage of statue monument to L. Ant. Dometeinos, c. AD 200 and of statue monument to Fl. Palmatus, c. AD 500.
Fig. 2 – Two similar statue bases inscribed with honours for governor Marcus Aurelius Diogenes and two differing statue supports inscribed with honours for T. Sallustius Athenagoras.

Fig. 3 – Three statue bases for Rhodopaios, c. AD 540 (I. Cartwright, G. Petruccioli, and U. Outschar).
Fig. 4 – Lower element of statue base 1 for Rhodopaios viewed upside down (right) in order to compare with ‘pillow’ above Ionic column (left) from the late Tetrapylon street.

Fig. 5 – High-imperial post with reclining figure from the Bouleuterion.
FIG. 6 – Piers at the Theatre Baths.

FIG. 7 – Speckled columns erected in the sixth century (?) in hall east of the Theatre Baths with inset statue base 2 for Rhodopoaios.
FIG. 8 – Late-antique lower element from the Hadrianic Baths.

FIG. 9 – Fragments of statue base 3 of Rhodopaios showing unfinished mouldings and lettering.
THREE MONUMENTS TO RHODOPAIOS: A CASE STUDY OF RE-USE AND CONTINUITY...

Fig. 10 – Upper element with invocation from sixth-century monument (G. Petruccioli).