SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi
Ağustos 2014, Sayı: 32, ss. 177-196

SDU Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences
August 2014, No: 32, pp..177-196

A Group of Marble Statuettes in the Ödemiş Museum

Onur GÜLBAY*

ABSTRACT

This study comprises seven statuettes which are today preserved in the depot of the Museum of Ödemiş and which, within the framework of the museum's renovation works, are planned to be displayed among the museum exhibits in the near future. As part of a study entitled *The Stone Artifacts of the Ödemiş Museum*, supported by the University of Dokuz Eylül Research Fund and now in the preparatory stages, they are here presented for the first time to the scholarly world. These statuettes consist of one god and goddesses: two Venuses, one Hecate, one Diana, one Aesculapius, one Cybele and a Ceres or Priestess. This study aims to present and date the statuettes by comparing their stylistic, plastic and chronological characteristics with similar examples. Although the head and arm section of Diana, the left hand of the second Venus and the right hand of Cybele and, of Aesculapius, the right hand of and the portion below his ankles are lost, the fact that the statuettes are otherwise intact or completed makes them important from the standpoint of condition[1]. It is thought that the statuettes were very probably used either in a domestic cult or as votive offerings. They are dated to within the first half of the 2nd or beginning of the 3rd centuries A.D. on the basis of their general workmanship characteristics.

Keywords: *Ödemiş Museum, Marble Statuette, Domestic Cult, Votive Offering*

Ödemiş Müzesi'nden Bir Grup Mermer Heykelcik

ÖZET

Bu çalışma hazırlık aşamasında olduğumuz ve Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Araştırma Fonundan destekli *Ödemiş Müzesi Taş Eserleri Katalogu* başlıklı çalışma kapsamında, ilk defa bilim dünyasına sunulan, bugün Ödemiş Müzesi deposunda korunan ve müze yenileme çalışmaları kapsamında yakın bir gelecekte teşhirde sergilenmesi düşünülen yedi adet heykelciği kapsamaktadır. Bu heykelcikler iki Venus, bir Hekate, bir Diana, bir Aesculapius, bir Kybele ve Ceres ya da Rahibe, tanrı ve tanrıçalarından oluşmaktadır. Bu çalışmayla heykelciklerin stilistik, plastik ve kronolojik özellikleri benzer örneklerle karşılaştırılarak eserlerin tarihlendirilmesi ve

* *PhD, University of Dokuz Eylül, Faculty of Letters, Department of Archaeology, onur.gulbay@deu.edu.tr*

[1] I am indebted to the Director of the Ödemiş Museum, Mrs. Sevda Çetin, to Specialist Ms. Ayşen Gürsel and to staff member Mr.Vecdi Bilgiç, who have been generous with their permission and help in this study.

tanıtılması amaçlanmaktadır. Eserlerden Diana'nın baş ve kol bölümü, Venus'ün sol eli ile Kybele'nin sağ eli ve Aesculapius'un sağ eli ile ayak bileklerinden sonraki bölümü kayıp olsa da, heykelciklerin sağlam ya da tamamlanmış olmaları eserleri kondisyon anlamında önemli kılmaktadır. Heykelciklerin büyük bir olasılıkla ya ev içi bir kültte, ya da adak sunu olarak kullanıldıkları düşünülmektedir. Genel işçilik özellikleri itibariyle eserler M.S. 2.yy'ın ilk yarısına ya da 3. yy başına tarihlendirilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Ödemiş Müzesi, Mermer Heykelcik, Ev Kültü, Adak Sunusu*

Introduction

The study entitled "*A Group of Marble Statuettes in the Ödemiş Museum"* is a detailed sub-study of the catalogue entitled "*The Stone Artifacts of the Ödemiş Museum*". This is work continuing with the support of the Dokuz Eylül University Research Fund. The study considers artifacts included in the museum inventory but not exhibited, works which the museum intends to be put on display following renovation work that is currently being carried out. The study comprises 6 goddesses and 1 god, a total of 7 statuettes of good workmanship quality and whose average height is around 30 cm. The aim is to demonstrate through this study what kind of statues were used for worship, either as votive offerings or in domestic cults, in the Phrygian-Lydian region during the Roman period. Further, another aim of the study is to introduce these works of quality workmanship, here presented to the scientific world for the first time.

These statuettes consist of god and goddesses: two Venuses, Hecate, Diana, Aesculapius, Cybele and a Ceres or Priestess. This study aims to present and date the statuettes by comparing their stylistic, plastic and chronological characteristics with similar examples. Although the head and arm section of Diana, the left hand of the second Venus and the right hand of Cybele and, of Aesculapius, the right hand of and the portion below his ankles are lost, the fact that the statuettes are otherwise intact or completed makes them important from the standpoint of condition.

In this study, first of all, similar specimens were researched and, based upon the attributes that the figures carry, the statuettes were identified. At this stage the identity of one work, about which it was thought only that it might be Ceres or a priestess, did not acquire certitude, but the other works were definitely identified. At another stage an attempt was made to identify the date of the works through comparison with the workmanship characteristics of similar examples. Because the works entered the museum inventory mostly through purchase it's not possible to state

their provenance definitely. But from their general characteristics one may interpret them as belonging to the region of Phrigia[2] (Afyon: Dokimeion).

1. Hecate (Figure. 1)

Inventory No: 250, Find Place: Unknown, Museum Acquisition: Turned over from the Afyon Museum, Height: 30.5cm, Width: 12.5 cm

The Hecate[3] is thought to have been probably a votive offering, a grave gift, or worshiped inside a house in a cult niche; it is a small depiction of the goddess[4], 30cm by 12.5 cm. The statuette was brought to the museum in two pieces and completed through restoration. The goddess is depicted as having three heads; especially in the region of Phrygia, there are to be found numerous typologically similar ones depicted with the same form and measurements in Anatolia.[5] Although the exact provenance of the work is unknown, from its Phrygian style it is understood that it may came to the museum from dokimeion near Afyon. However it is thought that examples of larger dimensions (50 cm-1m) were also used in Anatolia as votive offerings in cult areas.[6] The work is formed of three joined female figures. The woman in the middle is the main one and the other two figures are depicted as joined to it, turned ¾ to the side away from the central figure.[7] The figures wear the *khiton*[8] and the garment details on the central figure are discernible.

Although the heads of the figures all bear a stephane, in accordance with the custom of grouping around a central column, a column appears in

---

[2] Patrizio Pensabene, Roman Sculpture in Asia Minor, Proceedings of the International Conference to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Italian excavations at Hierapolis in Phrygia, held on May 24-26, 2007 in Cavallino(Lecce), "Su alcuni aspetti produttivi delle "scuole" di scultura di Docimio, Afrodisia e Nicomedia, see similar examples, fig.3.13, 37-61, JRA 80, 2008.

[3] As a general bibliography for Hecate,Werth 2006, 34-146; Coşkun Daşbacak, Hecate Cults in Anatolia: Rituals and Dedications in Lagina (Cult and Sanctuary Through the Ages From the Bronze Age to the Late Antiquity), 16-19 November 2007, Slovakia, 143-148, 2007; Ramazan Özgan, Die Skulpturen von Stratonikeia, Asia Minor Studien, Band 32, for Hecate, 48-49, 1999.

Şahin 2006, 59.:Although the writer says that in the *Theogonia* Hecate is the goddess of all things, he also states that in the late period she was worshipped as the goddess of ghosts and spirits and the guardian of crossroads. For further details see Şahin, 2011, 237-257.

[4] N. Eda Akyürek Şahin, Antalya Müzesi'nden İki Hekateion, *Adalya, XIV*, 2011, 238-241, 2011.

[5] N. Eda Akyürek Şahin, Anadolu 'da Hekate Korpusu ve Çeşitli Müzelerde Hekate Eserleri Üzerine Çalışmalar Bir Ön Rapor, *Arkeoloji Sanat 121*, 59-62, 2006.

[6] Şahin, Antalya, 2011, 241.

[7] Elpis Mitropoulou, Triple Hekate Mainly on Votive Reliefs Coins Gems and Amulets, Athens, 67, see similar Afyon example, fig.24 bis, No 5bis, 1978.

[8] Şahin, ibid. 238.

the form of a high *polos* upon the head of the central figure.[9] This archaic form construction of the statue in the posture of a *xoanon* is also related to the custom of tree goddess worship whose roots reach back to ancient times.[10] Also we know that an altar arranged for early Hecate Cult in Miletos in 6th BC.[11] It is also possible to meet archaistic Hecates (Hecate-Artemis-Selene) of similar form in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.[12] It is in the worship of idols that we encounter the earliest examples of a trio of goddesses-gods joined to each other.[13] The faces of the statue are plump, while their hair is, in the typical Hellenistic tradition, parted in the middle and swept back in the form of tight waves, reflecting the goddess' style. In the foreground the three headed goddess also holds a total of four torches, relevant to the mysteries of the underworld.[14] While the central figure advances her right leg slightly forward, the feet of the side figures are not depicted. It is seen that not only the front of the statuette but also its back surface have been modeled. On the back other torches in the hands of the figures standing to the sides, as well as the folds of their garments, have been rendered. From the standpoint of both typology and measurements this statue resembles to a great degree another Hecate statue found in the Afyon Museum.[15] With its plain workmanship of sharply defined and harsh lines, this work can very probably be dated to within the first half of 2nd century A.D.

2. Venus Genetrix (Figure. 2)
Inventory No: 249, Find Place: Unknown, Museum Acquisition: Turned over from the Afyon Museum, Height: 34 cm, Width: 13.4 cm

The Venus Genetrix is one of the best known among goddess types.[16] Though the work was in three pieces it has been completed

[9] Şahin, ibid. 241.
[10] Fahri Işık, Doğa Ana Kubaba: Tanrıçaların Ege'de Buluşması, 23, 1999.; Mustafa Şahin, Mehmet Taşlıalan, Smyrna Agorası Heykeltıraşlık Buluntuları, Olba XVIII, 205, Fig.41-42, 2010; Christine Alexander, A Wooden Hekataion of the Hellenistic Period, The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, Vol. 34, No. 12, 272-274, 1939.
[11] Daşbacak, Hekate, 2007, 143.: The author determine that, Caria region is accepted as the home land of Hecate.
[12] Robert W. Daniel, Hekate's Peplos *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik, Band. 72*, 278, 1988 ; For the typology problems of Hecate-Artemis see: Gualandi 1969, 233-272.
[13] Işık, Doğa, 1999, 15-16.
[14] N. WERTH, Hekate. Untersuchungen Zur Dreigestaltigen Göttin Antiquitates 37, 153-165, 2006.
[15] Şahin, Anadolu 'da, 2006, 62.
[16] *Historia Nat.* XXXV.156: Pliny states that this statue type was first made in bronze by the Athenian sculptor Callimachus. It is known that both large and small sized copies of the type were made in large numbers in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Additionally, because

following a successful restoration. As a general characteristic of the type its *himation* is transparent and shows the shape of the body.[17] The goddess holds her garment with her raised right hand, held immediately beside her head. As for the portion of the garment on the left, this passes immediately below the breast, leaving it bare, and goes over the shoulder to the rear. The goddess carries in her left hand the apple given by Paris. Beneath the left hand of the goddess, though his wings are not discernible, there is also a naked Eros who has been depicted as carrying in one hand an "*aulos*"? (double flute).[18]

It is see from a relatively few traces of red that the work was originally painted. In particular, on the part upon the feet the contours of the garment hem were completed with a red line; additionally one observes that this red line continues upon the folds to the left of the Eros and also upon the folds which pass under the breast and to the back. This shows that all of the garment edges were painted with a red line. Further, one can observe traces of red paint upon the stephane of the goddess. The back of the statuette was unworked, only raked with a chisel. Although this type of the goddess is very well known, the depiction here of Eros with an "*aulos*"? is an unusual style. Possibly this can be related to the cults of Phrygia, the geography where it was found. For it is known that the instrument was used in the Cybele cult ceremonies of Phrygia[19] and in the Appolo-Marsiyas myth.[20] The statuette, in a style that incorporates local influences, occurs in western Anatolia as a different variation of our well-known Venus Genetrix type.[21]

Venus was the ancestress of the Roman Empire she was even more frequently depicted in the Imperial period, in association with the establishment of her cult.

[17] This element of transparency emerges as a stylistic characteristic of its time in the general sculptural art of the Classical Period, at the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 4th century B.C. The sculptor Callimachus' first Venus Genetrix statue is assigned to this period. A large sized example of the statue is today exhibited in the Capitoline Museum.

[18] Katherine Schlesinger,. *The Greek Aulos*. London: Methuen & co., ltd.1939;
M. L. West, Ancient Greek Music, Oxford 1992, 81: According to tradition the aulos came from the East, perhaps Phrygia. The practice of playing pipes was universal in the Near East, from before 2000 BC, according to West.; Coreen Emmie Rose Morsink, The Composition of New Music Inspired by Music Philosophy and Musical Theoretical Writings from Ancient Greece, (unpublished doctoral thesis) London, 2013, 15.; Kostas Kotsanas, The Musical Instruments Of The Ancient Greeks, 2012.; Devrim Sönmez, Antik Dönemde Anadolu'da Müzik ve Müzik Aletleri, (unpublished master's thesis), Konya, 105-122, 2008.

[19] Canan Albayrak, Anadolu 'da Kybele - Attis Kültü 2007, (unpublished master's thesis), Ankara, 122, 2007.

[20] Sönmez, Antik, 2008, 122.

[21] Cornelia G. Harcum, A Statue of the Type Called the Venus Genetrix in the Royal Ontario Museum, : American Journal of Archaeology, Vol. 31, No. 2,141-152, 1927; Dorothy Kent

It is thought that the statuette was made for a domestic cult or as a votive offering in a sacred precinct.[22] A goddess figure which very much resembles these artifacts is found in the private collection of the Maryland Museum and Side.[23] But in Maryland work there is no *aulos* in the hand as is the case with the Eros here and second similar statuette from Dokimeion.[24] (Afyon) Through the general characteristics of the work it can be dated to within the first half of the 2nd century A.D.

3. Venus (Figure. 3)
Inventory No: 2733, Find Place: Kiraz, Museum Acquisition: Purchase, Height: 36 cm, Width: 11.5 cm.

The goddess is clothed up to the waist. She is depicted in a classic manner in a way to emphasize the extreme *contrapposto* ("S"-shaped body), with one leg advanced forward and one held back.[25] This concept results in showing the garment folds between her legs as pulled taut. The head is again rendered in a classical style, the hair parted in the middle and pulled back in waves to form a chignon. Her right hand is on her hip; her left one holds the bunched cloth of the garment which comes from upon the right leg and, covering the pubic area, makes a diagonal across the statuette. But the left hand, broken off near the elbow**,** is missing.

The elbow of the goddess is portrayed as resting upon another female figure dressed in a *himation*. Though in general a block is used for support in statues, human figures are also used as in this case. One observes that the support in the form of a statuette to the left of the goddess is depicted on a high, round base immediately to the goddess' left. This smaller figure is depicted in a form reminiscent of the archaistic *kore* types that we see in the Hellenistic period.[26] Her right hand is modeled as being placed upon her breast, while her left hand hangs free. While this pose is reminiscent of the form that we know as Kore with bird, it is not clear whether there is a bird in her hand or not. For this reason one can only describe the small statuette as having a generally archaistic style.[27] The back of the statuette is also worked and the garment folds shown.

Hill, Venus in the Roman East, The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery, Vol. 31/32, 6,12 1968/1969.
[22] Elizabeth Bartman, Ancient Sculptural Copies in Miniature, New York, 31-48, 1992.
[23] Jale İnan, Roman Sculpture in Side, (for similar Venus Generix), 41-43, Ankara, 1975.
[24] Pensabene, Roman Sculpture, 2008, 37-61, fig.3.13.
[25] Anthony F. Janson, *History of Art*. 5th edn. London: Thames & Hudson, 139, 1995.
[26] Christine Mitchell Havelock, Archaistic Reliefs Of The Hellenistic Period, *American Journal Of Archaeology, Vol. 68, No. 1*, 43-58, 1964.
[27] Havelock, ibid, 43-58.

An exactly similar statuette of the goddess is today on exhibit in the Paleopolis Museum on the Greek island of Andros. This statuette has a short round base as in the case of our statuette here. But this base was inserted into another, rectangular base. For this reason it is thought that our goddess statuette was also, as with the example in Andros, inserted in a similar way into a rectangular base. As with the other small sized goddesses, the Venus statuette was very probably made to be used either as a votive offering or in a domestic cult.[28] By its general characteristics the statuette can be dated to within the first half of the 2nd century A.D.

4. Diana (Figure. 4)
Inventory No: 253, Find Place: Unknown, Museum Acquisition: Turned over from the Afyon Museum, Height: 31.5 cm, Width: 15 cm

Diana the Huntress, or Diana hunting with her dog, is one of the goddess's widespread types.[29] It is thought that the first one was made towards the end of the 4th century B.C.[30] Though in Anatolia Diana is mostly known in her Mother Goddess type, particularly at Ephesus, this is an example of her depiction in the Greek fashion. Probably because of the small size of the statuette, it is thought that the goddess was used in a domestic cult devoted to the goddess. The head, arms and bow of Diana are missing; she wears a short garment in the form of a tunic reaching as far as the knees and wound around her waist. With the folds of drapery flying from the sides an effort was made to depict movement and the instant before shooting an arrow. While on some large sized similar statues the movement of the garment is rendered by its clinging to the body due to the wind, on the statuette an attempt has been made to give this impression solely with folds blowing to the side, and the main part of the dress, upon the trunk of the body, has been depicted as heavy and motionless. In this statuette the right leg has been emphasized as being behind, while the left one is advanced to the front. On the goddess' feet a detail that we know from large statues, leather boots, are not very clearly discernible. Immediately beside the advanced left leg of the statuette is depicted a dog looking at her. Just to the side of the dog one sees a support in the form of a half block. The work is place upon a curved concave triangular base. The back of the statuette has been worked, the folds of drapery are given in "v"

---

[28] Bartman, Ancient, 1992, 31-48.
[29] Christa Landwehr, Die Römischen Skulpturen von Caesarea Mauretaniae, Ideal Plastik I, DAI Band 18, Berlin, 40-45, Tafel 34-35-36, 1993.;J. Donald Hughes, Artemis: Goddess of Conservation, *Forest & Conservation History, Vol. 34, No. 4*, 194, 1990.
[30] RRR Smith, Hellensitic Sculpture, London, Thames & Hudson, 87, 2005.

shape both above and below the waist. It is thought that the statuette of the goddess was used either as a votive offering or in a domestic cult.[31]

An identically similar one of Diana in this style, of which the large size parts are preserved, is today exhibited in the Museum of Cos. Further, of three other similar examples, one is the statue of Diana retrieved from Leptis Magna and today displayed in Tripoli, while another one is on exhibit in the Capitoline[32] and last one from Perge in Antalya Museum.[33] The statuette reflects the characteristics of the Roman period by the quality of its workmanship. For this reason it can be dated to within the first half of the 2nd century A.D.

5. Cybele (Figure. 5)
Inventory No: 252, Find Place: Unknown, Museum Acquisition: Turned over from the Afyon Museum, Height: 13.5 cm, Width: 6.9 cm

With her lions and her hand drum[34](*tympanon*) this is a statuette of Cybele[35], coming from the tradition of the most widely worshipped mother goddess of the region of Phrygia.[36] The head of the goddess was restored and mounted in place. Though there are some broken areas on her nose and neck the facial details can be discerned. Because they were not carved in much detail, the parting of the hair in two in the middle and its wavy form flowing towards the back can barely be made out. Although the tradition of the head being covered is known from examples retrieved with an intact head, here it is not clear whether the head was covered or not because the head was later restored. Yet from the other examples studied it is seen that on most of them the head is covered with part of the garment (*capite velato*).[37] On her head she also bears a high *stephane*, which is related to the polos tradition. The goddess is in a seated position on a throne; while she is depicted with a hand drum under her left hand, the right one is missing. On known examples the right hand is generally shown upon the head of a lion with the palm open and turned upwards. The goddess wears a heavy *khiton*.

---

31 Bartman, Ancient, 31-48.
32 Smith, ibid, 87.
33 Alessandra Bravi, "Le immagini negli spazi pubblici di Perge in epoca adrianea", 311, fig.20.7, JRA 80,2008.
34 Birgitte Bøgh, Phrygian Background of Kybele Numen, *Vol. 54, Fasc. 3*, 316-317 2007.
35 Fahri Işık, Zur Entstehung Phrygischer Felsdenkmäler, Anatolian Studies, Vol. 37, 163-178, 1987.; Lynn E. Roller, The Great Mother at Gordion: The Hellenization of an Anatolian Cult, The Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 111, 128-143,1991.
36 Friederike Naumann, Die Ikonographie die Kybele in der Phrygischen und der Griechischen Kunst. *Beiheft 28 der Istanbuler Mittelungen*, 1-394,Tübingen, 1983; Bøgh, Phrygian, 2007, 309-331; Albayrak, Anadolu 'da, 2007, 122.
37 Bøgh, Phrygian, 2007, 307.

Looking at the statuette from the front, one observes that she is reclining towards the right in the direction of the hand upon the drum.

While the depiction of the lion on the goddess' left side is depicted in smaller form, the lion on the other side has been rendered as larger and with a wide mane. In studies carried out, although the presence of a lion on both sides is noted, not much attention has been paid to the difference between them on certain statuettes. But here the different sized lion types should probably be related to the idea of picturing one as being ahead and the other behind. A statuette of similar dimensions to ours is today found in the Eskişehir Anatolian Museum. In that one also the difference between the lions depicted to the left and right of Cybele, signifying depth, is striking.

One sees that the garment is bound to the body with a cord in a section immediately below the bust of the goddess and that the folds of the bunched cloth formed under the navel are directed towards the left. Contrary to a side by side form for the legs of the goddess, and though she is in a seated position, the left leg has been depicted as more slightly forward than the left one. As a result of this the garment has formed a diagonal fold upon the legs. With the exception of the back of the statuette's head the other parts have not been worked and have been left smooth. The dimensions of the statuette of the goddess are very small; it is thought that it had a similar purpose to that of the other goddess statuettes, being used either in a domestic cult or as a votive offering.[38] Many similar examples of this form of the goddess, both large and small, are known.[39] The work can be dated by its general characteristics to within the first half of the 2nd century A.D.

6. Ceres or Priestess? (Figure. 6)
Inventory No: 251, Find Place: Unknown, Museum Acquisition: Turned over from the Afyon Museum Height: 32 cm, Width: 12.5 cm

Among the statuettes under study this is the only one that cannot be identified with certainty. Based upon the general characteristics of the work, there is a discussion: does it belong to the goddess Ceres? or to a priestess? The garment is depicted as wrapping the whole body, covering the head (*capite velato*) over a stephane in the form of a crown. Although this crown-wreath is more used on goddesses, it's also known to be used also on priestesses in relation to their sacredness. The garment is of a form which

[38] Bartman, Ancient, 1992, 31-48,

[39] Naumann, Die Ikonographie, 1-394.; see similar examples of Cybele in Phrigia: Serdar Aybek, Mehmet Tuna, Mahir Atıcı, İzmir Tarih ve Sanat Müzesi Heykel Kataloğu, fig. 37(Kula in Phrygia)-38(Kula in Phyrigia), Ankara 2009 ; Pensabene, Roman Sculpture, 2008, 37-61, fig.3.13.

wraps the whole body tightly. As with the other goddesses mentioned above, the hair is pictured as parted in the middle and swept back in a wavy form. The face has a goddess-like expression and looks into the horizon. As well as the face the garment leaves the right arm and hand and the left hand bare.

The figure carries the bunched folds of the garment wrapped around her hand. This gesture is generally made with a single hand; here it is done with both hands. The reason for this is the garment's heavy folds. The figure is pictured with the left leg advanced and the right leg behind; the folds formed as a result are depicted as taut ridges upon the legs. Immediately beside the advanced left leg half a support block has been used. While in large sized sculptural depictions the support blocks are used as a static balancing element, in small statuettes these blocks are functionless copies of the large originals. The work is placed upon a base of rectangular form. The back of the work is roughly worked; an attempt has been made to make the viewer sense the texture of the garment hanging down from the head. The lack of another figure or attribute related to the statuette makes it impossible to identify the artifact exactly. As with the other examples this Goddess or Priestess must have been made as a votive offering or for use in a domestic cult.[40] Because it exhibits plain lines and good quality workmanship and because the pupils of the eyes have been rendered, it can be dated to within the first half of the 2nd century A.D.

7. Aesculapius (Figure. 7)
Inventory No: 1064, Find Place: Unknown, Museum Acquisition: Turned over from the İstanbul Archaeology Museum, Height: 27.5 cm, Width: 9.5 cm

With his half nude form clothed up to the waist and his long wavy hair, the god Aesculapius meets us in a classical style.[41] The hair of the statuette is done in the *anastole* fashion as in the god Jupiter, parted in the middle and falling in waves immediately in back of the cheeks as far as the shoulders.[42] The depiction of hair and beard was kept superficial; detailed

[40] Bartman, Ancient, 1992, 31-48.
[41] M. Bieber, A Bronze Statuette in Cincinnati and Its Place in the History of the Asklepios Types, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 101*, No. 1 (Feb. 15, 1957), 81, Fig.20-22, 1957.
[42] Renate, Kabus-Preisshofen, Die Hellenistische Plastik der Insel Kos, Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaologischen Instituts, 14. Beiheft der Athenischen Abteilung, 57-63,see similar roman period Aesculapius types,Tafel-1, Kat Nr. 46, Tafel-2, Kat Nr.47, Tafel-8, Kat Nr.1-3, 1989; Guy P. R. Métraux, A New Head of Zeus from Sardis Author(s*): American Journal of Archaeology, Vol. 75, No. 2*, 156. 1971.

drill and chisel work was not used. Because the head of the statuette was broken it was repaired through restoration. On the bearded godly face the pupils of the eyes were carved. In a form that we see mostly on male deities and philosophers the garment hangs down from the left shoulder leaving the right shoulder and breast bare.[43] Beneath the waist the garment, making a coiled wad is held in the god's left hand. As a result of the right leg's being advanced the folds are observed to be pulled taut upon the legs in this direction.

The feet and base, being broken off, are lost. In large sized examples of this work the god carries a staff with snakes in his right hand.[44] In this statuette also the points where the staff was fastened to the statue are observable as two protrusions above the right leg. But because the right hand and a portion of the chest of the statuette are broken off. This part is lost. The statuette in question is a small Roman copy of the large sized work today known as the Chiaramonti Aesculapius in Ostia.[45] The back of the statuette has been worked; the folds have been depicted in a diagonal form wrapping the whole back and legs. On the basis of its dimensions this god, as with the other examples, was made to be used either as a votive offering or in a domestic cult.[46] In particular by its hair style and the deep working of the pupils of the eyes[47], the work can be dated to within the beginning of the 3rd century A.D.[48]

Conclusion

From studies based on marble sources, 3 important Anatolian workshops that produced small figurines are known. These marble types are the *Dokimian, Proconnesian and Aphrodisian.*[49]The statuettes examined in the Ödemiş Museum, identified by their general characteristics as belonging to small sized goddesses and to one god, may be interpreted as the work of the *Dokimeion* that is the Afyon School of sculpture; this was a center of

[43] Bieber, A Bronze, 1957, 70-92.
[44] Bieber, ibid, 70-92.
[45]Bieber, ibid,79, 85, 86, Fig.31.; Mustafa Şahin, Mehmet Taşlıalan, (Smyrna) 198-199, Fig.36, 2010.
[46] Bartman, Ancient, 1992, 31-48; Pensabene, Roman Sculpture, 2008, 37-61, fig.3.13.
[47]Celal Şimşek, "Sculpture from Laodikeia (Laodicea ad Lycum)", see similar facial expression which dated the beginning of the 3th century A.D. 340, fig.22.9, JRA 80,2008.
[48] George M.A. Hanfmann, Nancy H. Ramage, Sculpture from Sardis: The Finds Through 1975, 111-112, fig.254-256, Cambridge, 1978; Lea M. Stirling, Pagan Statuettes in Late Antique Corinth: Sculpture from the Panayia Domus, Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. 77, No. 1,148,154, 2008.
[49] Elizabeth Bartman, Miniature, see footnote 56, 26-27, 1992.

production for statues of this type.[50]For, of the works studied and with the exception of the "Venus" and the "Aesculapius", all the goddess figures are works donated by the Afyon Museum to the Ödemiş Museum and sent in the early 1980's with the aim of enriching the collection of the newly opened museum. While the Venus statuette that did not come from Afyon was found in the sub-district of Kiraz, very near Ödemiş, the statuette of Aesculapius was sent from the İstanbul Archaeology Museum to the Ödemiş Museum. Furthermore there are numerous statuettes of gods and goddesses displayed in the Afyon Musem which are of a type closely resembling that of the works brought to the Ödemiş Museum.[51]Also, examples resembling the Hecate, the Venus Genetrix, the Cybele and the Aesculapius which are the subject of the present paper, and which have the same dimensions as them, are today found in the Afyon Museum.[52]Most of the small figurines in the Afyon Museum are works brought from the surroundings of Afyon.[53]

In conclusion these works, thought to have been used during the Roman period as votive offerings or in domestic cults, are religious motifs, and in general it is not incorrect to speak of a serious increase in their numbers with the Roman period.[54]Hundreds of works of this size are exhibited in various museums of Anatolia. They were exact copies of large scale works and for the common people in particular, after terracotta works, they were economically the second most easily accessible group of religious artifacts. Though one may mention a serious increase in the production and export of small sized figurines in the first half of the 2nd century A.D., when the wealth of the Roma Empire reached its summit, it is possible to encounter these works in Anatolia until Late Antiquity.[55]

While one sees examples which measure up to a maximum of 1 m in height the works examined are on average 30 cm high and 12 cm wide.

While all the works except Aesculapius were dated by the characteristics of their workmanship to within the first half of the 2nd century A.D., Aesculapius is dated to the beginning of the 3rd century A.D.

---

[50] Patrizio Pensabene, "Su alcuni aspetti produttivi delle "scuole" di scultura di Docimio, Afrodisia e Nicomedia, 46-48, JRA 80, 2008.; Thomas Drew Bear, Afyon Müzesin'de Bir Heykel Definesi, X. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı, 147-152, Ankara,1992.

[51]Patrizio Pensabene,ibid,47, fig.3.13, JRA 80, 2008.

[52]Patrizio Pensabene,ibid,47, fig.3.13, JRA 80, 2008.

[53]Patrizio Pensabene,ibid,48, JRA 80, 2008.

[54] Elizabeth Bartman, Miniature, 26-27, 1992.

[55] Elizabeth Bartman, ibid, 26-27, 1992.



Figure 1: Hecate



Figure 2: Venus Genetrix



Figure 3: Venus



Figure 4: Diana



Figure 5: Cybele



Figure 6: Ceres or Priestess ?



Figure 7: Aesculapius

Bibliography

ALBAYRAK, Canan, Anadolu'da Kybele - Attis Kültü 2007, 122 (unpublished master's thesis), Ankara, 2007.

ALEXANDER, Christine, A Wooden Hekataion of the Hellenistic Period, The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, Vol. 34, No. 12, 272-274, 1939.

AYBEK, Serdar, Mehmet Tuna, Mahir Atıcı, İzmir Tarih ve Sanat Müzesi Heykel Kataloğu, fig. 37-38 Ankara 2009.

BARTMAN, Elizabeth, Ancient Sculptural Copies in Miniature, New York, 31-48, 1992.

BRAVI, Alessandra, Roman Sculpture in Asia Minor, Proceedings of the International Conference to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Italian excavations at Hierapolis in Phrygia, held on May 24-26, 2007 in Cavallino(Lecce), "Le immagini negli spazi pubblici di Perge in epoca adrianea",311, fig.20.7,JRA 80,2008.

BEAR, Drew Thomas, Afyon Müzesin'de Bir Heykel Definesi, X. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı, 147-152, Ankara,1992.

BIEBER, M., A Bronze Statuette in Cincinnati and Its Place in the History of the Asklepios Types, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 101, No. 1 (Feb. 15, 1957), 70-92. 1957.

BØGH, Birgitte, Phrygian Background of Kybele Numen, Vol. 54, Fasc. 3, 316-317, 2007.

DAŞBACAK, Coşkun, Hecate Cults in Anatolia: Rituals and Dedications in Lagina, (Cult and Sanctuary Through the Ages From the Bronze Age to the Late Antiquity), 16-19 November, Slovakia, 143-148, 2007.

DANIEL, Robert W., Hekate's Peplos Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Band. 72, 278, 1988.

GUALANDI, Giorgio, Artemis-Hekate Un Problema Di Tipologia Nella Scultura Ellenistica Revue Archéologique, Nouvelle Série, Fasc. 2, 1969, 233-272, 1969.

HANFMANN, George, M.A. Nancy H. Ramage, Sculpture from Sardis: The Finds Through 1975, Cambridge, 1978.

HAVELOCK, Christine Mitchell, Archaistic Reliefs of the Hellenistic Period, American Journal of Archaeology, Vol. 68, No. 1, 43-58, 1964.

HARCUM, G., Cornelia, A Statue of the Type Called the Venus Genetrix in the Royal Ontario Museum, American Journal of Archaeology, Vol. 31, No. 2, 141-152, 1927.

HUGHES, J. Donald, Artemis: Goddess of Conservation, Forest & Conservation History, Vol. 34, No. 4, 194, 1990.

HILL, Kent Dorothy, Venus in the Roman East, The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery, Vol. 31/32, 6,12, 1968/1969.

KOTSANAS, Kostas, The Musical Instruments Of The Ancient Greeks., 2012.

LANDWEHR, Christa, Die Römischen Skulpturen von Caesarea Mauretaniae, Ideal Plastik I, DAI Band 18, Berlin, 1993.

MÉTRAUX, Guy P. R., A New Head of Zeus from Sardis Author(s): American Journal of Archaeology Vol. 75, No. 2, 156. 1971.

MORSINK, Coreen Emmie Rose, The Composition of New MusicInspired by Music Philosophy and Musical Theoretical Writings from Ancient Greece, (unpublished doctoral thesis) London,15, 2013.

MITROPOULOU, Elpis, Triple Hekate Mainly on Votive Reliefs Coins Gems and Amulets, Athens, 67, fig.24bis, No. 5bis, 1978.

NAUMANN, Friederike, Die Ikonographie die Kybele in der phrygischen und der griechischen Kunst. Beiheft 28 der Istanbuler Mittelungen, Tübingen, 1983.

ÖZGAN, Ramazan, Die Skulpturen von Stratonikeia, Asia Minor Studien, Band 32, 48-49, 1999.

PENSABENE, Patrizio Roman Sculpture in Asia Minor, Proceedings of the International Conference to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Italian excavations at Hierapolis in Phrygia, held on May 24-26, 2007 in Cavallino(Lecce), "Su alcuni aspetti produttivi delle "scuole" di scultura di Docimio, Afrodisia e Nicomedia, 37-61, JRA 80, 2008.

PREISSHOFEN-Kabus, Renate, Die Hellenistische Plastik der Insel Kos, Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaologischen Instituts, 14. Beiheft der Athenischen Abteilung, 57-63, 1989.

ROLLER, Lynn E., The Great Mother at Gordion: The Hellenization of an Anatolian Cult, The Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 111, 128-143,1991.

SCHLESINGER, Katherine. The Greek Aulos. London: Methuen & co., ltd.1939.

SMITH, RRR, Hellensitic Sculpture, London, Thames & Hudson, 2005.

STIRLING, M. Lea, Pagan Statuettes in Late Antique Corinth: Sculpture from the Panayia Domus, Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. 77, No. 1,148,154, 2008.

SÖNMEZ, Devrim, Antik Dönemde Anadolu'da Müzik ve Müzik Aletleri, (unpublished master's thesis), Konya, 2008.

ŞAHİN, N. Eda Akyürek, Anadolu'da Hekate Korpusu ve Çeşitli Müzelerde Hekate Eserleri Üzerine Çalışmalar Bir Ön Rapor, Arkeoloji Sanat 121, 59-62, 2006.

ŞAHİN, N. Eda Akyürek, Antalya Müzesi'nden İki Hekateion, Adalya, XIV, 2011, 238-241, 2011.

ŞAHİN, Mustafa, Taşlıalan Mehmet, Smyrna Agorası Heykeltıraşlık Buluntuları, Olba XVIII, 205, Fig.41-42, 2010.

ŞİMŞEK, Celal, Roman Sculpture in Asia Minor, Proceedings of the International Conference to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Italian excavations at Hierapolis in Phrygia, held on May 24-26, 2007 in Cavallino(Lecce), "Sculpture from Laodikeia (Laodicea ad Lycum)", 340, fig.22.9, JRA 80,2008.

IŞIK, Fahri, Doğa Ana Kubaba: Tanrıçaların Egede Buluşması, İstanbul 1999.

IŞIK, Fahri, Zur Entstehung Phrygischer Felsdenkmäler, Anatolian Studies, Vol. 37, 163-178, 1987.

İNAN, Jale, Roman Sculpture in Side, Ankara, 1975.

JANSON, Anthony F., *History of Art*. 5th edn. London: Thames & Hudson, 1995.

WEST, M. L., Ancient Greek Music, Oxford, 81, 1992.

WERTH, N., Hekate. Untersuchungen zur dreigestaltigen Göttin, Antiquitates 37, 2006.