

The Trajanic Tondo from Roman Ankara: In Search of the Identity of a Roman Masterpiece

Roma Dönemi Ankara'sına Ait Bir Trajan Dönemi Tondosu: Bir Roma Şaheserinin Kimlik Arayışı

Stephen MITCHELL

Prof., Archaeology
s.mitchell@exeter.ac.uk

Abstract

A magnificent Roman bronze tondo, now in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, which displays an elderly male figure, was excavated in the Ulus area of Ankara in 1947, and identified as a portrait of the Roman emperor Trajan. This article rejects this identification and argues that this is a private portrait of a prominent citizen of Ancyra dating between c. AD 100 and 130. A fragmentary inscription which contains a decree of the Association of Performing Artists dating to the reign of Hadrian (AD 117-138) records that one of the benefactors of this association should be honoured with two gilded shield-mounted images, and it is argued that the Ankara bronze tondo was one of these images. The subject of the inscribed decree, and therefore the person portrayed by the tondo, was either a well-documented Ancyran cultural benefactor called Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus, or an anonymous contemporary figure of the Hadrianic period.

Keywords: Roman portraits, Ancyra, Performing artists, Imago clipeata, Roman inscriptions, Trajan, Hadrian

Öz

1947 yılında Ankara'nın Ulus bölgesindeki bir kazı sırasında, günümüzde Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi'nde sergilenmekte olan, Roma Dönemi'ne ait yaşlı bir adam figürünün betimlendiği muhteşem bir bronz tondo bulunmuştu. Tondo, Roma İmparatoru Trajan'ın portresi şeklinde tanımlanıyordu. Makalede, bu kimlik saptamasının yanlış olduğu, portrenin aslında MS 100 ile 130 yılları arasında yapılmış kişisel bir portre olduğu ve burada tasvir edilen kişinin Ancyra bölgesinde, dönemin seçkin bir vatandaşı olduğu ileri sürülmektedir. Hadrian Dönemi'ne ait (MS 117-138) Performans Sanatçıları Birliği'ne ait bir hükmü içeren bir yazıt parçasında, söz konusu birliğe yardımda bulunan hayırsever vatandaşlardan birinin, iki adet zırhlı ve ata binmiş şekilde tasvirlendiği altın yaldızlı portreler ile onurlandırıldığı belirtilmiştir ve Ankara'da bulunan bronz tondonun da bu iki tablodan biri olduğu düşünülmektedir. Yazılı hükümda bahsedilen kişinin, yani tondoda betimlenen kişinin Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus isminde, Ancyra bölgesinde tanınan ve hakkında oldukça fazla sayıda yazılı kaynak bulunan, kültürel alanlarda yardımseverliğiyle tanınan bir kişi olduğu ya da Hadrian döneminin önemli kişilerinden ismi bilinmeyen bir şahıs olduğu öne sürülmektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Roma Dönemi portreleri, Ancyra, Performans sanatçıları, Imago clipeata, Roma Dönemi yazıtları, Trajan, Hadrian

Introduction

The Roman city of Ancyra was capital of the province of Galatia, created by the emperor Augustus in 25 BC. The temple of Rome and Augustus, beside the Hacı Bayram Mosque, is a remarkable monument from the earliest period of Roman imperial rule in Anatolia. However, for the next century relatively few securely dated monuments and documents survive from the city, although Kadioğlu, Gökay and Mitchell (2011, pp. 243-252), in their recent archaeological study of Roman Ancyra, have been able to trace the development of the city plan and important public buildings, including the theatre, with more precision than was previously possible. Historical information about Roman Ankara becomes much more plentiful in the second century AD, owing to the large number of important inscriptions that have been recorded in the city.¹ We know that citizens of Ancyra provided military support for the emperor Trajan's campaigns against the Parthians in AD 114, and his successor, Hadrian, passed through the city soon after he became emperor in AD 117, and Ancyra, like many cities of the eastern Roman empire, enjoyed a remarkable cultural renaissance under Hadrian.²

One of the signs of this renaissance was the creation of an international festival and competition for performing artists in AD 128 called the *mystikos agon* ('the contest of the mysteries'), whose founder and first president was a wealthy Ancyran citizen called Ulpus Aelius Pompeianus. The association of performing artists, which was known by its full ancient title as 'the world-wide association of artists connected with Dionysus and the emperor Traianus Hadrianus Caesar Augustus, victors in sacred games and crown-wearers, and their fellow competitors', passed two decrees honouring its benefactors which have survived among the inscriptions of Ancyra. The first of these was in honour of Ulpus Aelius Pompeianus. The second is fragmentary and the person honoured cannot be identified for certain. The text has normally been restored as a second decree for Pompeianus, but may in fact refer to another benefactor of the artists' association, who remains anonymous for us, as his name is no longer readable on the inscription.³

A remarkable and unusual feature of the second decree is the nature of the honour that was awarded to the artistic benefactor. He was to be commemorated with two gilded images in the form of a shield. Each of these, to use the Latin technical term, would have been an *imago clipeata*, a shield-mounted image (Winkes, 1969). Visitors to the Museum




Figure 1. Bronze *imago clipeata* frontal view. Museum of Anatolian Civilizations.

Source: Budde, 1965, pl. 58.

of Anatolian Civilizations at Ankara will readily recognize the outstanding item of Roman art discovered in Ankara, a bronze tondo, decorated with a life-size bust which has often been identified as a portrait of the emperor Trajan (Figure 1).⁴ Art works in bronze, which were more readily damaged than stone busts or statues, and were also easily melted down, are only rarely preserved from antiquity. The Ankara tondo is one of the finest pieces of this type to have survived. In this paper I shall argue that this superb piece of Roman sculpture does not represent the emperor Trajan, but is one of the portraits mentioned in the second decree of the Artists' association. It should accordingly be identified as a portrait either of Ulpus Aelius Pompeianus, the founder of Ankara's *mystikos agon* in AD 128, or of an anonymous benefactor of about the same period, who was also closely involved in Ankara's Hadrianic cultural renaissance.

The Ankara Tondo

The tondo was discovered in 1947, when the foundations for an extension to the Ankara Belediye Hanı were being excavated between Ulus square and the Anafartalar markets. The exact find spot appears to have been close to the



corner of Anafartalar Street and Susam Street, north of the Hallaç Mahmut Mosque. Unfortunately no detailed account of the archaeological context of the discovery has ever been published. The first extensive publication, by Nuri Gökçe in 1957, indicates that the tondo was found about two metres below the modern ground level inside a large ancient structure whose front wall was built from ashlar masonry. This observation, combined with the location of the discovery in the centre of Roman Ankara, suggests strongly that the find context was in a public building. Parallels found in inscriptions which mention the award of bronze tondos confirm that these were usually placed in civic buildings or public areas, in order that the honorand's distinction was placed on full public display⁵. For instance, the long inscription in honour of Menogenes of Sardis, who had undertaken an important diplomatic embassy to the emperor Augustus in 6/5 BC, included a resolution proposed by the city magistrates that an *eikon grapte enhoplos epichrysos*, a painted portrait image on a gilded shield, be displayed in the agora, and a proposal on behalf of the *gerousia* (the city elders) that a similar image be placed in the *presbytikon*, the Old Persons' club. Meanwhile the resolutions proposed by four separate high priests of the imperial cult in Asia all prescribed that he should be honoured by an *eikon grapte enhoplos epichrysos* to be set up in whichever city of Asia he chose. Menogenes' son Isidorus, was also to be honoured with a portrait on a gilded shield, which should be displayed in the *paidiskon*, the gymnasium for training boys.⁶ These texts present a range of typical locations in which these prestigious portrait images could be put on show. The Ankara tondo was found in association with architectural fragments, coins and pottery of the first and second century AD, some figurines of horses, and an unspecified inscription fragment.⁷ The find of the tondo was linked by the discoverers with an honorific inscription set up by one of Ancyra's civic tribes, the tribe '*Hiera Boulaia*', which had been noted in the outer city wall by the stairway leading up to Ankara Castle. On these grounds the excavated building in Ulus was identified as Ancyra's ancient *bouleuterion* (council chamber) (Gökçe, 1957).⁸ More recent scholars have adopted this suggestion (Vermeule, 1965),⁹ but it goes beyond the evidence. Although the inscription was set up by a tribe named after the *boule* (Ancyra's city council) and actually states that the person was honoured in accordance with a proclamation of the council and people, it says nothing about the actual location of the council chamber. In any case this inscription has no connection with the find-spot of the bronze tondo.

However, the recent publication of a reliable map of Roman Ancyra makes clear that the tondo's find spot was very close to the intersection of Ankara's main north-south street, the *cardo maximus*, part of which has been excavated and is now visible west of the Zincirli Mosque, and the west-east *decumanus maximus*, which must have followed the course of Anafartalar Street (Kadioğlu, Gökay, Mitchell, 2011, pp. 143-157). The bronze tondo, therefore, was displayed in a public building located in the city centre of Roman Ancyra. There is no archaeological proof that there was a central administrative square (a forum, or an agora) at the junction of these main streets, but this is entirely possible.

The subject of the tondo was immediately identified by Turkish scholars as the emperor Trajan (Gökçe, 1957). They were followed by the German art historian Ludwig Budde, who wrote an article, illustrated with excellent photographs, supporting this identification (Budde, 1965), and this view has been widely adopted, notably by the American scholar Cornelius Vermeule, who wrote that "the aged Trajan in bronze from the Bouleuterion at Ankara in Galatia, an *imago clipeata*, indicates that local artists could create masterful portraits that did not depend on prototypes sent from Rome, Athens or Ephesus" (Vermeule, 1968, p. 244, pl. 132; Vermeule, 1965, p. 376, fig. 29). Two standard modern biographies of the emperor Trajan, in English by Julian Bennett and in German by Karl Strobel, understandably adopt the identification, for if the tondo indeed depicts Trajan, it is by far the most striking and distinctive of his surviving portraits (Bennett, 1997, pl. 2D; Strobel, 2010, pp. 449-451).

However, Budde's article immediately provoked doubts about the identification. In particular Jale İnan and Elisabeth Rosenbaum, in their definitive catalogue of portrait sculpture from Asia Minor, produced arguments that this was a private portrait of the Hadrianic period. Before examining the arguments, it is necessary to take a close look at the portrait.

The object is in the form of a bust which has been attached with high technical skill to a shield-shaped frame, and it belongs to the distinctive genre of the shield image, *imago clipeata* (Figure 2). The diameter of the shield is 63.8 cms. and the height of the bust 55.2 cms. It is made from bronze, and a chemical analysis carried out when the find was first cleaned and restored, gave the constituent elements as copper 69.81%, lead 18.67% and tin 8.48% (Gökçe, 1957, p. 11; İnan and Rosenbaum, 1966, p. 208).¹⁰ Colour photographs




Figure 2. Bronze *imago clipeata* from the right. Museum of Anatolian Civilizations.

Source: Budde, 1965, pl. 61a.

of the bust suggest that it was originally gilded with a patina of gold, although this was not confirmed by the original laboratory examination, which doubtless depended on a sample taken from the invisible back side of the tondo.¹¹ It seems likely, therefore, that the bust conformed exactly to what contemporary Greek texts describe as ‘a gilded image set on a shield’, an *enaspidios epichrysos eikon* or an *eikon grapte enhoplos epichrysos*.¹² On each side of the bust there are two small holes in the rim of the tondo. These were designed for nails that fixed the shield to a wooden panel or frame, and enabled it to be suitably displayed.

The tondo depicts the bust of a man (Figure 3 and 4). He has a prominent, slightly hooked nose, and bushy eyebrows. His hair is brushed forward in wavy strands in a layered style, with a thin fringe at the front and short side burns in front of the ears. The face is lined with pronounced horizontal lines on the forehead, and asymmetric




Figure 3. Bronze *imago clipeata*, profile of bust. Museum of Anatolian Civilizations.

Source: Budde, 1965, pl. 62a.

clefts above the nose, as well as by deep furrows running from his nostrils to the mouth, more emphatically marked on the right than on the left side. The eyes are deep-set with creases at the outer edge of the eye-sockets, and the man's gaze is fixed directly on the viewer. The mouth suggests a hint of a smile behind tightly compressed lips; the chin juts forward slightly; the neck is lightly wrinkled. The overall appearance suggests a man in his sixties.¹³

This short description emphasizes the features of the bust which lead the viewer to identify it as an individual portrait, that is as a deliberate attempt by a skilled and perceptive artist to represent both the personal features and something of the personality of the sitter. This is an important point which is relevant to the arguments about the identity of the portrait, to be discussed later. However, the tondo also presents important generic aspects. The man depicted wears a simple crown of laurel leaves. It is likely




Figure 4. Bronze *imago clipeata*, frontal view of bust. Museum of Anatolian Civilizations.

Source: Budde, 1965, pl. 62b.

that a small decorative medallion was originally attached to the wreath at the point above the subject's brow. In real life such wreaths were worn in ceremonial contexts such as festivals (Budde, 1965). Crowns or wreaths were a common mark of distinction in the life of ancient Graeco-Roman cities, and not restricted to emperors or exclusive to high office-holders (Rumscheid, 2000). They might be worn by priests, civic magistrates, city benefactors, or indeed Roman officials and rulers. In this case the choice of laurel, one of the attributes of the god Apollo, leader of the Muses and a god of music and poetry, might imply that the subject had a reputation as a cultural patron, but other interpretations are possible. Laurel wreaths, for instance, could be associated with victories in any form, on the battle field as well as in athletic or musical competitions (Hafner, 1967).¹⁴ Military associations are unlikely in this case as the wearer does not display any other military attributes, such as armour, and appears not even to be wearing a toga,

the symbol of Roman citizenship. The bust itself is in fact set within a second wreath, also depicting a dense mass of overlapping leaves, which are bound together by four wavy ties on either side of the portrait head. The foliage is again probably meant to be laurel.¹⁵

The subject's dress has been variously interpreted. The first publications suggested that the man was wearing a toga worn over an undergarment (*tunica*), thus emphasizing his identity as a Roman citizen.¹⁶ However, Rosenbaum and Inan more plausibly argued that the dress was the usual formal attire of an urban Greek of the second century AD, a *himation* worn over a *chiton* (Inan and Alföldi Rosenbaum, 1966; Kleiner, 1992, pp. 209-212). This appears to be correct as the heavier folds of a toga ought to be visible over the subject's right as well as his left shoulder, if it had been the artist's intention to depict this.

The date of the tondo can be fixed roughly to the period AD 100-130 by the subject's hair-style, which is very close to the standard hair-style shown on Trajanic imperial statues. It cannot be dated earlier than his reign between AD 98 and 117, when the style established itself. However, it could also be a little later than this, as men who adopted the Trajanic style in middle age might often have retained the fashion as they grew older, out of conservatism, or as a conscious way of marking that they had been members, in their prime, of Trajan's generation. Inan and Rosenbaum argued that the the careful working of the eyes of the Ankara bronze, differentiating both the irises and the pupils, was typical of work of the Hadrianic period or later, and they suggested that the bust could not have been produced before the middle Hadrianic period, around AD 130. However, the criterion they use only applies to marble, not to bronze statues, where such treatment of the eye details is commonplace at much earlier periods.¹⁷ Accordingly the best argument for the date of the portrait still remains the stylistic treatment of the portrait features, and above all the depiction of the hairstyle, which is unmistakably Trajanic.

Is it possible to make further progress with identifying the person represented by the portrait? The argument that this was the emperor Trajan rested principally on the hair-style, which conforms closely with that shown on many representations of Trajan.¹⁸ Although other images of Trajan display similar cheek folds, the emperor's face is otherwise virtually unlined and its features are notably more rounded than those of the Ankara bust. Trajan's 'portraits' invariably depict a man in his middle years, depicting a mature but

certainly not an aged ruler.¹⁹ The discrepancies between the mature emperor of his regular portrait types and the much older figure at Ankara, as well as the absence of any other unambiguous external indication that the Ankara tondo represents an imperial figure, exclude the identification with Trajan.²⁰

Some alternative suggestions have been made. Ludwig Budde himself suggested the possibility that it depicted the emperor's father, who had enjoyed a distinguished career as a Roman senator in the previous generation, and he has been followed by Diana Kleiner (Budde, 1966; Kleiner, 1992). G. Hafner (1967), reviewing Budde's first publication, conjectured that it might represent Trajan's imperial predecessor, Nerva (AD 96-98). Neither of these suggestions is supported by strong arguments. The Ankara bust, apart from the crooked nose profile, does not resemble existing Nerva portraits, which is familiar from about a dozen sculpted examples as well as coin types, and no sculpted portrait of Trajan's father can be certainly identified today, although his image was occasionally featured on his son's coinage.

One important difficulty with these alternative suggestions is that in neither case could the artist have been in a position to create the portrait based on a live sitting with the subject. Imperial portraits were widely reproduced on the basis of models, which were circulated and became available for local artists to copy. This was a procedure by which ideal images of the ruler, designed for propagandistic purposes, were disseminated across the Roman empire.²¹ However, a consequence of this method of production was that imperial portraits were not primarily concerned to present a genuine likeness, but were designed to emphasize features which were important for imperial self-representation. The Ankara portrait, on the other hand, confronts us with the individuality of its subject. The vivid personal details revealed in the handling of the face surely stemmed from the artist's direct acquaintance with the sitter. It is difficult to avoid subjectivity in offering judgements about the realism of portraits, but all commentators on the Ankara bronze emphasize its vivid verism.²² This Roman sculpture is a portrait conceived and produced in the same spirit and on the same basis as the work of 17th or 18th century European artists who drew their subjects from life. The artist who produced the tondo must have based his work on sittings by his subject. If this argument is accepted, the Ankara tondo cannot be a portrait of one of Trajan's forebears, either his true father, M. Ulpius Traianus, or



Figure 5. Ankara Roman Baths. Decree of the Performing Artists' Association in honour of Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus, AD 128. Source: Mitchell and French, 2012, no. 141.

his adoptive father, the emperor Nerva. The verism of the Ankara portrait is an important argument in support of the conclusion that it depicts a distinguished private individual, presumably an Ancyran citizen, of the Trajanic or Hadrianic period, whose image was produced from life.²³

It may be possible to go a little further than this. In 2012, I gave a lecture in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations at Ankara, later repeated in various German universities, suggesting that the bust portrays a prominent Ancyran citizen called Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus, who founded a musical and theatrical festival in Ankara in AD 128. Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus was honoured in a long resolution of the 'the world-wide association of artists connected with Dionysus and the emperor Traianus Hadrianus Caesar Augustus'; the most important performing artists' association in the Roman empire, when he acted as the first president, the *agonothetes*, of a festival called the *mystikos agon* during



the reign of Trajan's successor, the emperor Hadrian (AD 117-138). This decree, which is carved on a statue base for Pompeianus that is now preserved in the Roman Baths, is exactly dated by a reference to the Roman consuls of AD 128 (Figure 5) (Mitchell and French, 2012, nos. 140 and 141).

In addition to the decree on the statue base, two other inscriptions from Ankara appeared to mention the same man. One is a now lost statue base set up to honour Pompeianus by the *Phyle III Menorizeiton*, one of the twelve city tribes of Ancyra (Mitchell and French, 2012, no. 142). The other, which is much more informative, is a second lengthy decree set up by the association of performing artists. Although the inscription is broken into two fragments,

and suffers from several gaps in the text, it seemed, according to the old copies and reconstructions, also to have been set up in honour of Pompeianus. What is more, the resolution specifically stated that he was to be honoured with two gilded images on shields, *eikones epichrysoi enaspidioi*, and that these were to be displayed at 'most conspicuous place in his home city, which the city magistrates should designate for the purpose' (Mitchell and French, 2012, no. 143). Since, unlike the more routine honour of a free-standing statue, it was a relatively unusual distinction be voted an *imago clipeata*,²⁴ and this is the only time that one is mentioned in the Ankara documentation, it is extremely tempting to link the archaeological find with this inscription. This second decree is also of the Hadrianic period and the chronology fits well with the stylistic dating of the bust.




Figure 7. Ankara Castle (Zindan Gate). Second decree (lower part) of the Performing Artists' Association of the Hadrianic period mentioning the honour of two gilded images on shields. Source: Mitchell and French, 2012, no. 143.




Figure 6. Ankara Castle (Zindan Gate). Second decree (upper part) of the Performing Artists' Association of the Hadrianic period mentioning the honour of two gilded images on shields. Source: Mitchell and French, 2012, no. 143.

Moreover, the laurel wreath worn by the subject would be entirely appropriate for the president of a Greek cultural festival being honoured by the performing artists' association. If the text of the decree awarding the tondos can be definitively restored to assign this honour to Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus, it follows that the portrait should be of Pompeianus himself.²⁵

Another circumstantial argument can be used to support this conjecture. In addition to being a native of Ancyra, Pompeianus was a Roman citizen and he took the two citizen names (*gentilicia*) Ulpius Aelius. The first of these is the family name of the emperor Trajan, and there is no doubt that he received his citizenship from Trajan during his reign. He was exactly the type of person who would have adopted the imperial hair-style to show that he was a prominent imperial loyalist. It is unusual for new citizens to have two *gentilicia*,²⁶ but in this case the name Aelius suggests that P. Aelius Hadrianus, the future emperor Hadrian, had played some part in obtaining Roman citizen status for Pompeianus. Hadrian shared Pompeianus' enthusiasm for cultural activities and artistic festivals, and this may have been the basis of a friendship between the two men, established at an unknown time before Hadrian became emperor. This friendship culminated when the aged Pompeianus founded the *mystikos agon* in honour of Hadrian at Ankara in AD 128.

Conclusion

For these reasons it remains tempting to identify the bust as representing Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus. However, the conclusion must be qualified, since the reading and reconstruction of the text of the second decree, mentioning the award of two gilded images on shields, is disputable, and the restoration of Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus' name remains uncertain. Another detail is that the second decree also appears to refer to the award of a wreath of ivy leaves, appropriate for Dionysus, god of the theatre, whereas the man portrayed by the bronze bust wears laurel. The two parts of this inscription were built into the Byzantine wall above the main entrance, the Zindan Kapısı, of Ankara Kale, and until 2011 the only available version of the text was based on a copy that had been made in 1858 (Buckler and J. Keil, 1926).²⁷ In 2011 I took a long-distance photograph of the upper part of the inscription, but it was not until 2013 that I could make good photographs of both parts of the inscription with a telephoto lens (Figure 6 and 7). Further work on the text is now needed to establish a correct reading, but already it is clear that the text may record honours

not to Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus but to another prominent Ancyran citizen of the same period. In that case, even if the bronze tondo found in Ulus is correctly identified with one of the two images mentioned in the inscription, which still appears likely, the subject may not be Pompeianus but an anonymous contemporary benefactor, also one of the prominent figures of the Trajanic period, who during his old age used his wealth and status to promote cultural activity in Ancyra under Hadrian.

Notes

- 1 For a full account of the contribution of inscriptions to our understanding of Ankara's history from the first to the third century AD, see Kadioğlu, Gökay and Mitchell (2011, pp. 19-76), especially pp. 51-55 for cultural activities; Mitchell and French (2012, pp. 1-36); Mitchell (2012, pp. 523-530).
- 2 There is a large literature on Hadrian's promotion of Greek culture; see Willers (1990); Jones (1996, pp. 29-56). For the *Mystikos Agon* and high culture in Roman Ancyra see Mitchell and French (2012, pp. 20-22).
- 3 The two decrees are published in Mitchell and French (2012, nos. 141 and 143).
- 4 Inv. no. 10345. The tondo is on display in the Roman gallery of the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations. I am very grateful to Dr Melih Arslan, former director of the Museums, for his invaluable encouragement during my work on the inscriptions of Ankara, and to Professor Bert Smith of Oxford University for his advice on the interpretation of the bronze bust. I am also grateful to the comments of two anonymous reviewers whose suggestions have led me to clarify several of my arguments.
- 5 For the whole subject, see now Ma (2013).
- 6 See IGRR vol. IV ins. no. 1756. Parag. 4, line 48 for *magistrates*; parag. VI, line 71-72 for *gerousia*; parag. VII, line 79-80, parag. VIII, line 86-87, parag. IX, line 95-96, parag. X, line 114 for *Asian high priests*; parag. XI, line 129-130, parag. XII, line 136-137 for *Isidorus*.
- 7 It appears that this was a primary archaeological context and not, as a reviewer suggests, a secondary deposit where the bronze might have been placed prior to smelting for recycling. Strobel (2010, pp. 449-451), makes the suggestion that the bronze was not recovered when the building where it was displayed was brought down by an earthquake.
- 8 For the inscription see Erzen (1946, p. 94). The discovery of the tondo was first reported by Gülekli, (1948, p. 89 and fig. 11) (which I have not seen). Apparently the inscription mentioned by Gökçe and Erzen is the text now reproduced as Mitchell and French (2012, p. 250, no. 88), which was visible, although hardly legible, in in one of the towers of the lower fortifications of Ankara Kale during the 1980s.



- 9 376 states that evidence of a monumental building in the excavations indicates that the bronze *imago clipeata* evidently adorned the walls of the imperial *bouleuterion*; Vermeule (1968, 244) ('from the bouleuterion').¹⁰ See also Giuliano (1959, p. 172, ff.146).
- 10 The metal percentages are suitable for a soft form of bronze, suitable for fine working.
- 11 This is evident on colour postcards available from the museum, and also in the photo published by Budde (1966) in the art magazine *Pantheon*.
- 12 For the terminology see above n.6 and the commentary to Mitchell and French (2012, no. 143). The epigraphic references to gilding in these contexts are in almost all cases to bronzes, not to artworks produced in other materials such as wood or marble.
- 13 Fuller expert descriptions of the portrait are to be found in the publications of Budde, and of Inan and Alföldi-Rosenbaum.
- 14 Hafner (1967), 355 pointed out that the wreath should allude to Apollo but was not an exclusive imperial attribute.
- 15 See Winkes (1969, pp. 73-80).
- 16 See the publications of Gökçe, Budde and Winkes.
- 17 I am grateful to Professor Bert Smith for advice on this point.
- 18 The standard work is Gross (1940).
- 19 The nearest parallel among authentic depictions of Trajan is the relief of the emperor found on the Arch of Beneventum, which was probably put up after the emperor's death by his successor Hadrian c. AD 117-119.
- 20 See the arguments of Fittschen (1973, pp. 46-66), and of Lahusen and Formigli (2001, pp.204-2066, no. 123).
- 21 The fundamental study is Zanker (1983).
- 22 See Vermeule (1968, p. 244), who adhered to the Trajan identification, but recognised that this was not compatible with the usual way in which the imperial image was disseminated (see previous note and the quotation at Vermeule, 1968, p. 244; Vermeule, 1965, p. 376). Budde (1965) in his article described the tondo as a unique original portrait of the highest quality, which depicted the aged Trajan 'wie er gegen seines Lebens wirklich gewesen sein muss', and which he thought would have been based on a death mask obtained when the emperor died in Cilicia in AD 117. Although neither Vermeule's nor Budde's theory about the production of the portrait is plausible, their aesthetic assessments of the image's extraordinary realism and individuality are not ill judged.
- 23 As concluded by Inan and Alföldi-Rosenbaum (1966) and Winkes (1969, pp. 73-80).
- 24 See the commentary to Mitchell and French (2012, no. 143) for parallels, but the list of these could be extended, including of course the decrees from Sardis for Menogenes, mentioned above in n. 6.
- 25 This argument, presented in my lecture, led Melih Arslan, the then director of the Anatolian Civilizations Museum, to present the identification in his recent guide book, *The Museum of Anatolian Civilizations: A guide to Ankara throughout the ages* (2013, pp. 194-195).
- 26 For Roman naming practices, see Salway (1994).
- 27 Buckler and Keil's reconstruction forms the basis for Mitchell and French (2012, no. 143).

References

- Arslan, M. (2013). *The Museum of Anatolian Civilizations: A guide to Ankara throughout the ages*. Ankara: Alter Yayıncılık.
- Bennett, J. (1997). *Trajan: Optimus princeps: A life and times*. London: Routledge.
- Buckler, W. H., & Keil, J. (1926). Two resolutions of the dionysiac artists from Angora. *Journal of Roman Studies*, 16(2), 245-252.
- Budde, L. (1965). Imago clipeata des Kaisers Traian in Ankara. *Antike Plastik*, 4, 103-117.
- Budde, L. (1966). Die bildnisse des Marcus Ulpius Traianus Pater [The portraits of Marcus Ulpius Traianus Pater]. *Pantheon*, 24, 69-78.
- Erzen, A. (1946). *İlkçağda Ankara*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Fittschen, K. (1973). Roman and Early Byzantine portrait sculpture in Asia minor [Review]. *Göttingen Gelehrte Anzeiger*, 225, 46-67.
- Giuliano, A. (1959). La ritrattistica dell'Asia minore dall'89 a.C. al 211 d.C. *RIASA VIII*, 147-201.
- Gökçe, N. (1957). *Ankara Traianus portresi = A portrait of Trajan recently discovered in Ankara*. Ankara: Tarhan Kitabevi.
- Gross, W. H. (1940). *Bildnisse Traians*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.
- Gülekli, N. C. (1948). *Ankara: Tarih, arkeoloji*. Ankara: Doğu Matbaası.
- Hafner, G. (1967). Antike Plastik, 5. Der Kasseler Apollon und seine repliken [Review]. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung für Kritik der Internationalen Wissenschaft* 88, 826-829.
- Inscriptiones ad Graecae ad res Romanas Pertinentes (IGRR) IV, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII. (1911-1927)*. R. Cagnat and at al. (Eds.). Paris: Leroux.
- Inan, J. & Alföldi-Rosenbaum, E. (1966). *Roman and Early Byzantine portrait sculpture in Asia minor*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, C. P. (1996). The Panhellenion. *Chiron*, 26, 29-56.
- Kadıoğlu, M., Gökay, K., & Mitchell, S. (2011). *Roma Dönemi'nde Ankyra*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Kadıoğlu, M., Gökay, K., & Mitchell, S. (2011). *Roman Ancyra*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.



- Kleiner, D. E. E. (1992). *Roman sculpture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lahusen, G., & Formigli, E. (2001). *Römische bildnisse aus bronze: Kunst und technik*. München: Hirmer Verlag.
- Ma, J. (2013). *Statues and cities: Honorific portraits and civic identity in the Hellenistic world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, S. (2012). Roma Dönemi'nde Ankyra: Epigrafik kültür. In Y. Kurt ve E. Ünlü (Ed.). *Tarihte Ankara Uluslararası Sempozyumu, Ankara 25-26 Ekim 2011: Bildiriler* (pp. 523-530). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Bölümü.
- Mitchell, S., & French, D. (2012). *The Greek and Latin inscriptions of Ankara (Ancyra): Vol. I*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Rumscheid, J. (2000). *Kranz und Krone: Zu insignien, siegespreisen und ehrenzeichen der Römischen Kaiserzeit*. Tübingen: E. Wasmuth Verlag.
- Salway, B. (1994). What's in a name? A survey of Roman dynastic practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700. *Journal of Roman Studies*, 84, 124-145.
- Strobel, K. (2010). *Kaiser Traian: Eine epoche der weltgeschichte*. Regensburg: Pustet.
- Willers, D. (1990). *Hadrians panhellenisches programm: Archäologische beiträge zur neugestaltung Athens durch Hadrian*. Basel: Vereinigung der Freunde Antiker Kunst.
- Winkes, R. (1969). *Clipeata imago: Studien zu einer römischen Bildnisform*. Bonn: R. Habelt.
- Vermeule, C. C. (1965). A Greek theme and its survivals: The ruler's shield (Tondo image) in tomb and temple. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 109(6), 361-397.
- Vermeule, C. C. (1968). *Roman imperial art in Greece and Asia minor*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Zanker, P. (1983). *Provinzielle kaiserporträts: Zur rezeption der selbstdarstellung des princeps*. München: in Komm. bei C.H. Beck.