

The Ludovisi “Suicidal Gaul” and his wife: bronze or marble original, Hellenistic or Roman?

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway

From 1981 to 2002, in various lectures and writings, I presented my suggestion about the “Roman” conception of the Ludovisi Suicidal Gaul, without eliciting positive responses. What has prompted me to re-open this issue after the passing of so many years? Perhaps the catalyst was a major exhibition — *Pergamon and the Hellenistic Kingdoms of the Ancient World* — held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York from April 18 to July 17, 2016, together with its impressive catalogue. There, an essay by M. Papini reviewed present knowledge about the victory dedications of the Attalids and the stone bases for them erected at Pergamon within the precinct of Athena Nikephoros. Although admitting that certainty was impossible and that serious difficulties existed about previously attempted reconstructions, he reproduced two drawings that showed the Ludovisi Gaul atop the large cylindrical monument as well as on the long rectangular pedestal “leaving aside [other] improbable attempts ... and even more the interpretation of the marble pieces as Roman works evoking Pergamon ‘in the grand manner’.”¹ The Ludovisi Gaul was not part of the New York exhibition. Its companion piece, the Dying Gaul collapsing on a broken trumpet, did receive a catalogue entry (by E. Polito) that reiterated the difficulty of visualizing the original placement. Yet these two Gauls (the “Trumpeter” and the Ludovisi Gaul) have joined the sculptures from the Pergamon Great Altar as virtual touchstones for our understanding of Pergamene style even though they may not be “Greek” at all, let alone Pergamene.²

Frequently cited works:

· *Pergamon MMA* = C. A. Picon and S. Hemingway (edd.), *Pergamon and the Hellenistic kingdoms of the ancient world* (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 2016).

· Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* = F. Queyrel, *La sculpture hellénistique*, vol. I. *Formes, thèmes et fonctions* (Paris 2016).

- 1 M. Papini, “Commemorations of victory: Attalid monuments to the defeat of the Galatians,” in *Pergamon MMA* 40-43, figs. 50-51 (quote at 42). See also V. Kästner (ibid. 34) placing the Ludovisi and the Dying Gaul on the long base: “... although preserved only in Roman copies. The most famous depictions of Celts from antiquity, they document the distinctive style of this major votive gift of Attalos”.
- 2 E. Polito, “Dying Gaul,” ibid., entry no. 97, pp. 176-77 and n.6, on the difficulty of placing the original bronze on a Pergamene base. Because of the extensive existing discussion of all the sculptures involved in the argument, I avoid mentioning the history of research or giving a detailed description, which can be found in the works already cited, as well as in Queyrel, *Sc. hell.*, and, most recently, in F. Herbin and F. Queyrel, “Les monuments attalides du Dromos à Délos (I): la “base des Galates,”” *BCH* 139-40 (2015-16) 267-319, especially 312, on which see more below (nn. 16 and 21). The alleged bronze “originals” are attributed by Pliny (*NH* 34.84) to several masters — including an Isigonos (*sic*) whose name has been emended to read Epigonos, to conform to a later passage (*NH* 34.88). They would have been taken to Rome by Nero, although Pliny’s mention is vague: *atque ex omnibus quae rettuli clarissima quaeque iam sunt dicata a Vespasiano principe in templo Pacis aliisque eius operibus, violentia Neronis in urbem convecta et in sellariis domus aurea disposta*. “Ex omnibus quae rettuli” include (without further description) “the battles of Attalos and Eumenes against the Gauls ...” by several artists, but also the “Boy Strangling the Goose” by Boethos (although out of sequence, since the master was better known as a silversmith). A long list in chronological/alphabetical order of other famous artists and their works from different periods (*NH* 34.83) precedes both these references; it includes an

Such locational difficulties have been pointed out several times by different scholars. The round pedestal had a domed top that was unlikely to be surmounted by a group of statues; the extant traces of attachments suggested rather the presence of trophies, at different levels. The crowning blocks of the long rectangular base (now in Berlin) have been examined by J. Marszal, who concluded that it was occupied by life-sized figures comprising horsemen; an extant bronze hoof seemed to fit exactly into one trace. He offered a frieze-like reconstruction of the entire dedication and specifically argued that the Ludovisi group was inappropriate not only because of its (larger) size and arrangement, but also because of its subject matter — the incongruous presence of the dead wife within the battle encounters depicted.³

The year 2016 also saw publication of another influential work: F. Queyrel’s *La sculpture hellénistique*, with extensive discussion and updated bibliography on all the major free-standing sculptures (whether originals or alleged copies) attributed to that period. Despite the difficulty of its size, he too would place the Ludovisi group on the long rectangular base, but at its S end, so that two main views of it would be offered to the spectator: from the front, highlighting the male figure; and, with an element of surprise, from the short side, revealing the dead wife (she is virtually invisible from the front).⁴ Queyrel would discount the possibility of Roman creations but narrowed the date of the copies to the Early Imperial age because of their use of marble from the Dokimeion quarries, exploited from the end of the Augustan period until the 4th c. but extensively used in Tiberian times, as is attested by the finds from the Sperlonga grotto.⁵

Amazon by Strongylion “*in comitatu Neronis principis circulatam*”.

- 3 J. R. Marszal, “Ubiquitous barbarians: representations of the Gauls at Pergamon and elsewhere,” in N. T. de Grummond and B. S. Ridgway (edd.), *From Pergamon to Sperlonga: sculpture and context* (Berkeley, CA 1990), specifically 208 with n.73 on 230 (mentioning A. Schober’s experiment with the hoof), and reconstruction drawing (fig. 76). This source is cited by both Papini (supra n.1) 42 with n.15 on 315, and Polito (supra n.2) 170 with n.6. My definition of the wife’s presence as “incongruous” refers not to the fact that she is shown as dead (corpses are often included in depictions of battle), but to the very presence of a female *in a combat context*. See also Marszal’s argument on this point (208-9): the battles mentioned by the inscription on the long base “were defensive ... [Having] wives and children on the battlefield to encourage the men to fight ... was not a common Gallic practice ... [They] were otherwise sent away from the conflict into areas protected by thick forests and difficult terrain” (historical examples are cited in his n.74 on 230-31).
- 4 Queyrel, *Sc. hell.*; for the privileged point of view of the Ludovisi Group, see 208; cf. his plan of the Sanctuary, fig. 210 on 207. His color pl. 6 on 21 shows that, although the suicidal dagger is largely restored, one section of it is ancient and connected to locks from the Gaul’s hair. The caption to the same plate (on 335-36) lists restorations to both the male and the female figure.
- 5 Queyrel *ibid.* 201-33, section entitled “*Les Grands Galates à Pergame et le petit ex-voto attalide de l’Acropole d’Athènes*”, with discussion of the Roman date on 206-7 with reference to D. Attanasio, M. Bruno and W. Prochaska, “The Docimian marble of the Ludovisi and Capitoline Gauls and other replicas of the Pergamene dedications,” *AJA* 115 (2011) 575-87. For the Sperlonga marbles, see M. Bruno, D. Attanasio and W. Prochaska, “Identificazione di origine dei marmi dei gruppi scultorei dell’antro di Tiberio a Sperlonga,” in G. Ghini and Z. Mari (edd.), *Lazio e Sabina* 8 (Rome 2012) 403-15 (*non vidi*). Cf. also next note. The wide chronological span for the use of Dokimeian marble may not prove the early date of manufacture of the sculptures under discussion, but neither does it disprove it. Other pieces from the Horti Sallustiani were in *pavonazzetto* from the same Turkish quarries and correspond to a sudden interest in colored stones, as a novelty, during Early Imperial times, which is attested at the Sperlonga Grotto by the Eagle and Ganymede group atop the cave. See also the comments by J. Isager, *Pliny on art and society* (London 1991), especially 175, on the sudden popularity of marble during the

The Sperlonga sculptural complex has been much discussed, and variously dated, since its discovery in 1957, but some consensus now seems to have been reached on the evidence of the stone employed and the masonry remains at the site: early in the lifetime of Tiberius, in the second third of the 1st c. B.C.⁶ The sculptors who signed the Skylla Group were Rhodian masters who probably belonged to the same workshop that produced the famous Laokoon, although the latter is in Parian marble. The style of the Sperlonga figures and some of their poses recall the Pergamon Altar; it had even been hypothesized (as occasionally also for the Laokoon) that they reproduced bronze Pergamene originals. It seems certain, however, that the compositions as we have them — at least the Blinding of Polyphemos and the Skylla Group — were made *ad hoc* for their intended location and were conceived in marble. The same is true for the Laokoon. Both bodies of work simply attest, at some remove in time, to an interest in that particular (baroque) style that we have come to think of as “Pergamene”.⁷

The traditional understanding of struts in ancient sculptures has read them as necessary support for subjects being copied into marble from original bronzes. The tensile strength of the metal allowed for unstable poses and expansive gestures, which the fragile structure of the stone would have made impossible without special arrangements. Amorphous, neutral remnants of uncarved marble were therefore left in place between the main block and the outlying features, each one placed where the individual carver felt the need for strengthening — hence the difference in the position of struts from sculpture to sculpture copying the same bronze prototype. Once considered unseemly or, at best, meant to be ignored, today such supports are viewed as examples of bravura occasionally even worthy of their own ornamentation. By contrast, a composition conceived from the start to be rendered in marble adopted different approaches to prevent breakage: instead of an anonymous treetrunk, a “narrative” dolphin could be carved next to the ankles of an Aphrodite or a Poseidon; a cuirass could support the legs of a warrior; a stretch of mantle could bridge the space between outstretched arm and torso; or an object could be added to a human figure to provide further information about the intended depiction. To be sure, neutral struts could also be employed, but in a rather inconspicuous manner.⁸

In Sperlonga’s Skylla and the Ship and Blinding of Polyphemos, a conception in marble is shown by the obvious connecting struts and the interaction among the figures, which

Augustan period.

- 6 Date: Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* 261; discussion of the complex on 258-65, especially 261-62 with acknowledgement that the architectural techniques have not yet been fully published and that the span 30-20 B.C. is thus simply a *terminus post quem*. See also bibliographic details in the captions to figs. 274-78 on 363-64.
- 7 The Laokoon has been thoroughly discussed by Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* 37-51, in particular, 48-49 on sculptors and dates, 49-50 on a possible bronze original, and 50 with reference to findspot, now officially established as the Horti Maecenatiani. See also pl. 2 on 18 and its caption on 334 with detailed description and bibliography. For extensive documentation on the modern findspot (and ancient possible location), see C. Häuber, *The eastern part of the Mons Oppius in Rome* (BullCom Suppl. 22, 2014) 611-26, especially 624 and n.139, with figs. 81-83 on 453-56 for comparisons with other finds from the same location: a Red Marsyas in *pavonazetto*, a head of a centaur, and a Blind Homer (Hellenistic) type that could share workshop and date with the Laokoon. On the topography of the Horti, see her 355-435.
- 8 For an early statement on carving techniques and their different devices, see B. S. Ridgway, “Stone and metal in Greek sculpture,” *Archaeology* 19 (1966) 31-42. On our revised understanding of struts, see M. B. Hollinshead, “Extending the reach of marble: struts in Greek and Roman sculpture,” in E. K. Gazda (ed.), *The ancient art of emulation* (MAAR Suppl.1, 2002) 117-52.

provide support for one another: the ship itself for the pilot who is being grasped by Skylla; the blinding pole that joins the two helpers of Odysseus. The same is true for the Laokoon, as is especially noticeable now that the ancient right arm of the father has been restored in place, and modern additions to the right arm of both sons have been removed. Limbs and snakes serve the function of struts, unobtrusively strengthening the human personages, to the extent that the Elder Pliny (*NH* 36.36) could believe the group to have been made *ex uno lapide*.

I suggest that the same marble conception can be inferred from the composition of the Ludovisi Gaul (fig. 1). The dead woman functions like the typical “narrative” support, strengthening the male’s pose while contributing to the total meaning; her left arm, which is restored, might not have been outstretched as much as at present. The true struts (for the mantle, and from the wife to the man’s thigh) are quite common in marble originals, at times almost as if to boast of the sculptor’s ability in carving from a single block. The peculiar angle of the warrior’s right arm, to some extent, echoes Laokoon’s right arm in that it is ‘anchored’ to the torso by the ‘strut’ of the suicidal weapon. Moreover, to be understood in its entirety the group requires to be viewed from all angles, not simply from a specific viewpoint. At Pergamon, whether on the round or the rectangular base, all-around and close inspection would have been precluded, either because of a high location or because additional combatants would have interfered.



Fig. 1. Ludovisi Gaul (Kim J. Hartswick).

We now know that the group entered the Ludovisi collection from the Italian family’s own grounds, which in antiquity formed part of the Horti Sallustiani. Laid out at the end of the 1st c. B.C., these extended, at least partially, over two hills: the gradual slope of the Quirinal at the south and perhaps the sharper slope of the Pincio at the north, with a deep valley in between. Any location of the sculpture within this area would have allowed

not only for circumambulation but perhaps also for a view slightly from above, thereby encompassing all major aspects of the composition.⁹

My suggestion that the Laokoon and the “Large Gauls” were created almost contemporaneously and for Roman viewers is not predicated on their alleged originality, there being no true copies preserved. This seems still true for the Trojan subject, although inspiration from the “minor arts” is possible. For the Gauls, especially the “Dying Trumpeter”, the pieces mentioned as comparisons could simply be part of the traditional repertoire for fighting men, and Odysseus’ companions in the blinding are ‘neutral’ male figures likely to find echoes in a variety of subjects.¹⁰ To be sure, however, other groups known from Sperlonga or elsewhere generated several replicas which may not all postdate the Augustan period.

Two two-figured monuments known from several marble replicas have been cited as possible inspirations from, or imitations of, the Ludovisi Gaul, and in connection with Pergamene art and presumed bronze originals of the 2nd c. B.C.: the “Pasquino Group”, and Achilles supporting the body of Penthesileia (occasionally used in antiquity as a pendant to the Pasquino). I have published my own opinions on such works, but, for objectivity’s sake, prefer here to cite a recent voice, that of F. Queyrel. He suggests a date around 70 B.C. for the Pasquino creation but considers the elder figure’s decorated helmet of the replicas a classicizing imitation of the beginning of the Imperial period. He sees the Achilles with Penthesileia as inspired by the Pasquino, with the motif known by A.D. 20–60 and repeated in the panel with Claudius and Britannia on the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias.¹¹ Thanks to

9 See K. J. Hartswick, *The Gardens of Sallust. A changing landscape* (Austin, TX 2004) 1–12, for general location and history, and Part III on some statuary from the Gardens (the Gauls are discussed on 104–8). Although the original setting of the two Gauls cannot be determined, the attribution to the Gardens is made on the basis of “the sudden appearance of the [two statues], without comment, in a Ludovisi inventory of 1633”, which may imply a discovery within the Ludovisi property “sometime after 1622” (ibid. 105).

10 For the Laokoon, no copies were cited even at the Paris conference in 2002: see my “Le Laocoon dans la sculpture hellénistique,” in E. Decoultot, J. Le Rider and F. Queyrel (edd.), *Le Laocoon: histoire et réception* (Revue Germanique Internationale 19 [2003]) 13–31. The Dying Gaul is said to be duplicated by a torso in Dresden (Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* 203–4 with fig. 201, dated to the Antonine period), although it is acknowledged that the wound on the proper right side of the body has been placed at a different level. I have not seen the Dresden torso, but from photographs it looks as if the remnants of the neck show no trace of a torque; the positions of the arms, to judge from the extant stumps, may have differed from those of the Trumpeter. Other possible copies do not refer specifically to the two Gauls from the Horti Sallustiani and are cited purely on the basis of their subject matter. In the case of Odysseus’ companions in the Blinding scene, that copies of the heads may exist is not surprising, since heads were combined at will with different bodies in Roman “copies”: see J. Fink, “Eine Kopf für Viele,” *RömMitt* 71 (1964) 152–57. Any imitation after the turn of the era can be explained by workshop practices. It is therefore invalid to adduce comparisons with sarcophagi and other reliefs to postulate Pergamene bronze prototypes.

11 Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* 253–55 (Achilles and Penthesileia), 249–53 (Pasquino Group) with figs. 257–59. The original position of the older figure’s head is attested by the unbroken copy immured into Rome’s Palazzo Braschi, which gives the composition its nickname. See ibid. 252 for the replica from Sperlonga and comparison with the Ludovisi Gaul. The group is usually supposed to depict Menelaos with the corpse of Patroklos; the version from Sperlonga, however, may show Ajax supporting the dead Achilles. Since at least one more interpretation (Aeneas with the body of Lausus) has been suggested, by A. H. Weis, “Odysseus at Sperlonga: Hellenistic hero or Roman heroic foil?,” in de Grummond and Ridgway (supra n.3) 111–65, and each rendering of the group may have implied different identities according to location, it seems best to refer to the composition as the Pasquino. Weis’s article contains some useful comments on the replicas and meanings of the Sperlonga subjects, although it has received little echo in the literature.

Queyrel’s thorough treatment, these sculptures need not be reviewed in depth here, but I highlight a specific point. Not only do both groups consist of a vital figure and a dead or dying body that functions as ‘mute support’, but both ‘live’ actors in the composition turn their heads abruptly toward an imaginary spectator, with the look of a ‘deer caught in the headlights’. A third personage seems implied by their pose — just as a threatening opponent seems implied by the Ludovisi Group. The same abrupt turn of the head is found in several other marble compositions that could be described as “single-figured groups” because of this imaginary viewer: the Borghese Warrior (or Hero) in the Louvre signed by Agasias of Ephesos; the Hermes tying (or untying) his sandal; and several of the pieces recovered from the Antikythera wreck that may belong to the epic world of the *Iliad*, whose subject was particularly popular in the Late Hellenistic period. Their dating is based on the time of the wreck (c.70 B.C.) and epigraphic/genealogic grounds (the master’s signature on the Borghese Warrior’s support). All these pieces, moreover, present considerable points of similarity with the Sperlonga sculptures — as well as echoes or adaptation of what we consider “Lysippan style”.¹²

Such classicizing traits are, however, combined also with ‘baroque’ elements that have prompted repeated comparisons with Pergamene art — as well as theories of lost bronze prototypes. Indeed, the impact of the Great Altar’s Gigantomachy Frieze has been so profound since its discovery that I did not hesitate to write about “The shadow of the Pergamon Altar” as a major factor influencing our stylistic judgment.¹³ Yet the many free-standing marble sculptures found at the site itself do not justify our assumptions — at least, to the extent that the pieces preserved do not possess narrative content. On the Altar, some of the Giants’ wild appearance has been taken to symbolize the ‘barbaric’ character of the Gauls, but none of the weapons used in that fight are typically Gallic and none of the perceived allusions to other opponents of the Attalids is more than generic. By contrast, the reliefs decorating the balustrade of the two stoas delimiting the Sanctuary of Athena Nikephoros make explicit, if anonymous, allusions to Eumenes II’s victories (189–188 B.C.) over

I refer to my own latest discussion of 1st-c. B.C. sculptures in Hellenistic style (*Hellenistic sculpture* III. *The styles of ca. 100–31 B.C.* [Madison, WI 2002] 68–95 with notes on 99–113) which includes the Laokoon, all the Sperlonga groups, villa decorations with scene involving Polyphemos and Odysseus (e.g., from Colle Cesarano and, in terracotta, in Tortoreto, plus additional ones) for the ampler treatment not feasible in the present article.

- 12 “Single-figured groups” implying an invisible spectator: for the term (“Einfigurengruppen”), see P. H. von Blanckenhagen, “Der ergänzende Betrachter, Bemerkungen zu einem Aspekt hellenistischer Kunst,” in *Wandlungen. Festschrift E. Homann-Wedeking* (Waldsassen 1975) 193–201, especially 197; also B. S. Ridgway, *Hellenistic sculpture* I. *The styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.* (Madison, WI 1990) 80 and *passim*. For the Borghese Warrior in the Louvre, see Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* 265–68, fig. 286 with caption on 364–65; for the Hermes with the Sandal, see *ibid.* 268 with fig. 291 and caption on 365; for the Small Iliad in marble from the Antikythera wreck, see *ibid.* 255–57. It has been pointed out to me that the abrupt turn of the head appears as early as on the Bassae frieze (5th c. B.C.) and within the “murder pediment” of the Alexander Sarcophagus (late 4th c. B.C.), yet these are both two-dimensional, many-figured compositions in relief with actions taking place all around them, rather than free-standing groups in isolation. By the same token, postures that appear similar to clearly Hellenistic statues (e.g., the Crouching Aphrodite) recur much earlier, on Black- and Red-figure vases. Pertinent, in this context is, e.g., the comment by J. Neils, “Praxiteles to Caravaggio: the *Apollo Sauroktonos* redefined,” *ArtB* 99 (2017) 17 and n.55, on unstable or complex poses on vases much preceeding such renderings in sculpture.
- 13 B. S. Ridgway, *Hellenistic sculpture* II. *The styles of ca. 200–100 B.C.* (Madison, WI 2000) as the title of chapt. 2. Details of the German excavations and subsequent impact are now amply discussed in the essays of *Pergamon MMA*.

the Gauls “in Greater Phrygia” and over Prusias I of Bithynia (186-184 B.C.) who employed Celtic mercenaries, but the latter’s weapons seem to date from a century earlier, according to a study in progress.¹⁴

It may be relevant to repeat here the reminder by N. de Grummond of “just how little has survived in the way of Hellenistic representations of the Gauls at Pergamon itself”.¹⁵ But some comments can be made from the monuments that were undoubtedly meant as commemorations of victory. Except for the detailed depiction of different enemies and events (each occupying a single section on the long rectangular base, as visualized by Marszal), the other monuments seem to have displayed trophies and bronze statues of Nike or of the ruler himself, in traditional format. The same approach seems to have prevailed among other Hellenistic rulers, who often derived their inspiration from the Classical period.¹⁶

On the Athenian Akropolis, the victorious Attalids were again represented by traditional, over-lifesized portraits or by triumphal chariots on pillar bases, but also by an unusual monument (124 m in length) that held no fewer than 132 under-lifesized bronze figures in combats comprising winners as well as defeated opponents. Long known through a description by Pausanias (1.25.2) and by at least 10 marble replicas from Rome, our understanding of this “Lesser Attalid Dedication” (c.200 B.C.) has now been greatly expanded by the discovery on the Akropolis of several blocks containing the attachment traces of the original bronze figures.¹⁷ Here, however, local influences on the Hellenistic conception, together with Roman demands affecting the copies, provide iconographic answers.¹⁸ Built in the very shadow of the Parthenon, the intent of the depiction was undoubtedly to rank the historical victories over Gauls and Persians with the legendary ones over Giants and Amazons shown on the 5th-c. metopes of the Parthenon. As for the marble copies, although no one-to-one correspondence with the extant traces of bronze

14 Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* 197-98, on the meaning of the Altar Gigantomachy; 179 on the weapon frieze in the Sanctuary of Athena Nikephoros (with figs. 166-67 and n.27), repeating the comment by T. Lejars who is investigating the topic. The specific victories are named by the dedicatory inscription on the propylon, but the mixture of weapon types on the reliefs make the occasions generic. Cf. *Pergamon MMA* no. 109a-c on 188-89 (V. Kästner). That most of the statues in the round recovered from Pergamon are in marble is probably due to the fact that they are either honorary or divine images. Yet, although the *bases* of the bronze dedications have survived, others, equally for bronze offerings, have not been recovered. To postulate a “lost” bronze original on the assumption that some areas of the site have not yet been excavated seems a specious argument.

15 N. T. de Grummond, “Gauls and Giants, Skylla and the Palladion: some responses,” in ead. and Ridgway (supra n.3) 255-77 (quotation on 256).

16 See, e.g., T. M. Brogan, *Hellenistic Nike: monuments commemorating military victories of the Attalid and Antigonid kingdoms, the Aitolian League and the Rhodian polis ca. 307 to 133 B.C.* (Ph.D. diss., Bryn Mawr College 1999); also several examples cited by Queyrel 2015-16 (supra n.2) with reference to coinage and other depictions.

17 Akropolis Long Monument: Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* 225-33. Initial and thorough publication of the Akropolis finds was provided by A. Stewart, *Attalos, Athens, and the Akropolis. The Pergamene “Little Barbarians” and their Roman and Renaissance legacy* (Cambridge 2004) (it includes an essay by M. Korres).

18 The marble bases in Athens show only the points of attachment of the individual figures and tell little about their identifying attributes; imitation of the Parthenon might have been predominant. At Rome, however, the marble figures were carved in one with individual plinths which carried both indication of landscape and weapons or other attributes, obviously added by the copyists and probably following the wishes of the Roman sponsor or the requirements of the intended setting; cf. Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* 231.

attachments on the blocks exists, their distinctive subjects and size plausibly suggest that they reproduce figures from the Athenian monument. Even though their intended setting in Rome is not known, modifications were undoubtedly required — including the elimination of the winners, and especially the addition of individual marble bases with their ‘attributes’. Technical analysis has shown that their marble derives from the Göktepe quarries near Aphrodisias, and their execution has been attributed to Aphrodisian sculptors working in Italy in the 2nd c. A.D.; it is assumed that a single commission, probably from an Imperial client, was responsible for the entire lot.¹⁹

Given the differences — sources of marble, distance in time, type of Roman commission and presumed setting —, no possible comparison can be made between the Ludovisi Gaul and the “Little Barbarians”. Yet other monuments exist that commemorate victories over Celtic enemies — *with marble originals*. The best known is the life-sized “Wounded Gaul” from the Agora of the Italians on Delos that stands in isolation on his own base, although the tilt of his head implies, once again, the presence of an imaginary viewer. A second Gaul statue survives at present only as a head lying on the ground (as shown by a point of adherence on its back), but images of Roman magistrates stood in nearby niches to allude to the victors over Celtic invaders. Queyrel mentions that the Late Hellenistic period witnessed a return to favor of such ethnic depictions, listing several events of Roman successes against “barbarians”. A third marble example — the striding legs of a man wearing tight-fitting trousers — certainly shows a Gaul because he wears his weapon on his right side, but he is said to have been found at Cerveteri (Caere) in Etruscan territory. Was it the Roman-influenced, Etruscan-connected locale that spurred this renewed interest in Celtic representations? It may even be irrelevant to mention that Caesar conquered and controlled “Celtic” Gallia in the 50s B.C.²⁰

We have been so captivated by the Pergamene discoveries that we have tended to minimize other iconographic expressions of conflicts with barbarians, yet both the Etruscans and the Romans had their share of problems with such enemies. J. Marszal has mentioned

19 Marble analysis: D. Attanasio, M. Bruno and W. Prochaska, “Aphrodisian marble from the Göktepe quarries: the Little Barbarians, Roman copies from the Attalid dedication in Athens,” *PBSR* 80 (2012) 65-87. Lack of one-to-one correspondence: Stewart (supra n.17) 193: “extant surfaces [of the newly found bases] do not allow an exact fit”; 271 (Korres): “they [the traces] merely indicate some possibilities and show that figures like those in Fig. 280 and the following perhaps stood on some of the blocks”.

Dating and attribution to Antonine-period sculptors: *Pergamon MMA*, entries nos. 99-10a-c (Persian, Giant, Amazon, Gaul) on 178-81 (S. Pafumi *et al.*). Influence from/on contemporary sarcophagi is suggested. The possible motivation toward the Roman copying, I believe, is the location of the bronzes *in Athens*, as seen and described by Pausanias (1.25.2; c.A.D. 170) — a city which still exercised a strong intellectual impact on the Romans — rather than Pergamon, which may not have been familiar to most Italic peoples. Warrior poses, even if similar to some of the combatants on the Pergamon Altar’s Gigantomachy, can be considered staples of battle compositions, even without direct influence from a single specific monument.

20 For the “Wounded Gaul” and “Head of a Gaul” from Delos, see Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* figs. 196-97 on 200-1, and color pl. 37 on 211, dated c.100-90 B.C. For the lower body of a Celt(?) wearing trousers, in New York, from Caere/Cerveteri, see Queyrel, *Sc. hell.* 203-4, fig. 206; a better illustration is found in Ridgway (supra n.13) pls. 81a-b.

On Late Republican and Early Imperial representations of Gauls, see also the comment by Marszal (supra n.3) 216: “Influence from Pergamon has been at times seen to stand behind the individual motifs, but the new subject matter has in several cases demanded a considerable reworking of the theme”.

a great number of post-Pergamene depictions; S. Steingraber has specifically addressed Pergamene influence over Etruscan culture; but other sources could be considered, especially since a tradition of 'baroque' style *ante litteram*, as it were, was well-known on Italic territory from Tarentine sculptures predating the Great Altar.²¹

Our conception of "Roman" sculpture

A major shift is beginning to occur in our conception of "Roman" sculpture. Once credited only with the creation of distinctive portraits or of historical reliefs, the entire production is now seen as much more imaginative and responding to enormous requests from the Italic public, whether made in workshops operating on Greek territory (the "Neo-Attic" ateliers) or by sculptors who had relocated in Italy to respond to the immediate demands of their new customers. Shipwrecks reveal the quantities of objects being shipped to Italy to furnish the villas of the new clients. Emphasis was placed on themes that connected Trojan or Greek heroes to Italic foundations, in a culture that created its own counterpart to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* with the *Aeneid*, as if to establish its self-identity.

As the Vergilian poem gave its own Roman slant to the Homeric stories, so the new sculptures imitated Greek styles but with their own creative component. A new taste for the picturesque peopled grottos and gardens with *marble* sculptures: not only Sperlonga but also the Blue Grotto in Capri; not only the Villa of Oplontis but also the Horti Sallustiani and Maecenatiani, and the private collections of Cicero and Asinius Pollio.²²

It is therefore clear that stylistic analysis, in the traditional sense of our evolutionary approach to sculptural chronology, is no longer viable, in that all previous styles were available for quotation by the end of the 1st c. B.C. and the beginning of the Principate. The recent *Oxford handbook of Roman sculpture* emphasizes this position, highlighting the veritable "passion for marble"²³ of the Romans that made sculpture ubiquitous in their lives. As S. Dillon has pointed out, even small provincial cities were filled with it, "in houses, on city gates, in theaters, along streets, in fountains and in baths, in sanctuaries and temples, in cemeteries" — a distribution that far surpasses the use of sculpture even in Hellenistic times.²⁴

21 Marszal *ibid.*; S. Steingraber, "Pergamene influence on Etruscan art," in de Grummond and Ridgway (supra n.3) 235-54. See also the important Italic perspective in de Grummond (supra n.15). The Introduction (1-16) to de Grummond and Ridgway (supra n.3) may be usefully read as background for the specific orientation of the three authors mentioned in this note. For additional material on Roman Republican coinage (and other objects), see Queyrel 2015-16 (supra n.2) 300-2. On Tarentine Hellenistic sculpture, see E. Lippolis, "La produzione in pietra," in *id.* (ed.), *I Greci in Occidente. Arte e artigianati in Magna Grecia* (Taranto 1996) 493-507; also Ridgway (supra n.13) 105 with ill. 16, and n.4 on 129-30. There is a good illustration of a metope from a tomb in Via Umbria imitating Alexander the Great: *Pergamon MMA*, no. 16 on 115, dated late 3rd to mid-2nd c. B.C. (L. Masiello).

22 See de Grummond (supra n.15). On the "Blue Grotto sculptures", see A. De Franciscis, *Le statue della Grotta Azzurra nell'Isola di Capri* (Naples 1964); B. S. Ridgway, "The setting of Greek sculpture," *Hesperia* 40 (1971) 356. It should be clear by now that I consider "Roman" all works intended to suit Roman taste and habits, starting in the 2nd c. B.C. As stated at Ridgway (supra n.12) 373, "the third century would ... appear as the last truly Greek time".

23 The expression is taken from my "A passion for marble," in G. E. Borromeo and C. C. Goulet (edd.), *Exhibition notes. Rethinking the Romans. New views on ancient sculpture = RISD Mus. Bull.* 13 (Spring 2001) 7-10. All the essays in those exhibition notes (3-36) are pertinent to my topic here.

24 For the "interpretation" of the various stylistic phases in Late Hellenistic times, see Ridgway (supra n.11). For a wider compass, see E. Friedland and M. Grunow Sobocinski (edd.), *The Oxford handbook of Roman sculpture* (Oxford 2015), with the review by S. Dillon at *BMCR* 2015.12.13, especially with reference to Section 4, as quoted; Dillon emphasizes the "central

Of special interest is the evidence from a “foreign” site: *Glanum* (Saint-Rémy) in *Gallia Narbonensis*. Made a Roman city officially in 27 B.C., after Caesar’s conquest, it erected a triumphal arch (c.A.D. 14) whose reliefs may be among the earliest monuments to include women as captives of war. In the same town, the mausoleum of a local Celtic family, the Julii, roughly contemporary with the Arch, has a podium decorated with scenes from both ‘history’ and mythology: an Amazonomachy, a fight between Trojans and Greeks for the body of Patroklos, a Boar Hunt on horseback (Meleager and the Kalydonian Boar?) and, finally, a cavalry battle with a Victory carrying a trophy. A study of the armor worn by the horsemen may not provide reliable information since foreign peoples serving in the Roman army (especially officers or members of the élite) tended to adopt their conquerors’ panoply. The Celts, like the Etruscans, were trying to imitate their Hellenistic and Roman former enemies in forging for themselves a similar form of expression.²⁵ It is worth asking, therefore, whose meaning is implicit in sculpture like the Laokoon and the Suicidal Gaul: a Greek one, a Roman one, or even that of the international viewers who visited Rome and strolled around the city’s gardens?²⁶

Much has been written about possible reactions to the Suicidal Gaul, depending on its identification with either a Pergamene or a Roman monument. Queyrel, believing that the emotions of the viewer favor the winner rather than the Gaul, therefore assumes the presence of a Greek public who shares the same values. Yet, by emphasizing the bravery of the loser, the implicit message would glorify his opponent — hence the Roman? Not only is the concept of suicide (not just to escape capture, as would be the motivation behind the Ludovisi Gaul) more diffused among the Roman élite than among Greek warriors, but the victimization of women is much more typical of Italic iconography, as was mentioned.²⁷

importance of sculpture to our understanding of Roman social history”.

- 25 For the monuments in Glanum, see Marszal (supra n.3) 217–18, with added comments on the type of armor adopted by the Gauls. For the practice among the Etruscans, see also M. J. Taylor, “Etruscan identity and service in the Roman army 300–100 B.C.E.,” *AJA* 121 (2017) 275–92. The same author has identified some naked Gauls (and their typical oblong shields) on the Aemilius Paullus Monument at Delphi: “The battle scene on Aemilius Paullus’s Pydna monument: a reevaluation,” *Hesperia* 85 (2016) 559–76. An interesting parallel because from Asia Minor is the weapons frieze from Miletos which depicts Amazonian peltas mixed with Gallic shields, thus equating both enemies(?) as quasi-legendary. Initially attributed to the propylon of the Bouleuterion, which would give it a date between 175 and 163 B.C. by its dedication to Antiochos IV, the frieze has more recently been redated to the 2nd c. A.D.: E. Polito, *Fulgentibus armis: Introduzione allo studio dei fregi d’armamenti* (Rome 1998) 213–14. On the victimization of women, see Marszal (supra n.3) 217 (in the context of the arch at Glanum): “the arches are the earliest well-dated monuments that include women among the captives of the war”. See also n.27..
- 26 See Polito’s entry in *Pergamon MMA* 176 with n.9, citing further bibliography on the contrasting views of the image of the barbarian. For Queyrel’s opinion, see *Sc. hell.* 55, also 255, describing the “ataraxia” of the barbarian Gaul whose face demonstrates no physical pain. I have not seen the recent re-examination of the ancient sources (and their prejudices) about “barbarians” by L. Baray, *Celtes, Galates et Gaulois, mercenaires de l’Antiquité* (Paris 2017), but cf. the review at *BMCR* 2017.12.03 .
- 27 It is traditionally held that suicide was a “barbarian” habit, inappropriate for Greeks. Yet Queyrel (*Sc. hell.* 205 and n.16) notes that a slightly variant depiction of suicide appears during the second half of the 2nd c. B.C. on the frieze of Magnesia’s Temple of Artemis Leukophryene. The subject, however, is an Amazonomachy and the suicidal warrior is a Greek, follower of Herakles (perhaps at Themiskyra) — therefore one of the aggressors/victors. The notion appears out of character. Suicide, however, seems to have been well-known to Romans: e.g., Brutus and Cassius, Marc Antony, Cato “Uticensis”, Petronius, Seneca, even the poet Lucan. For

The case of the Dying Gaul has been prejudiced by Pliny's reference (*NH* 34.88) to a work by Isigonos (*sic*) who made a *tubicen*, but a *broken* instrument is not implied by his wording and the depiction on the marble base of the Trumpeter is a Roman *tuba*, not the distinctive *carnyx* of the Celts. Equally, the *matri interfectae infante miserabiliter blandiente* that Pliny attributed to the same master is not identified as a Gaul, nor do the two monuments cited appear within a context of victory monuments but — when the entire passage is cited — as part of a repertoire of philosophers, comic actors, and athletes by many other sculptors. As a final consideration, I wish to stress that both the Ludovisi Gaul and the Laokoon are *not* expressing classical pathos — i.e., their own feelings — as much as they are *pathetic* — i.e., engendering emotions of pity and compassion in the viewer. The same can be said for the Pasquino Group and the Achilles and Penthesileia.

Inevitably, such speculations are largely subjective and may not reflect situations in antiquity. In the case of the two "Large Gauls", their established date and location within the Horti Sallustiani implies without question that they were seen by a "Roman" public. It can also be mentioned that one additional over-lifesized sculpture of a young warrior sitting on a base entered the Ludovisi inventories in 1641 and may also have depicted a Gaul. The description of the pose resembles that of the Ares Ludovisi, with which it has occasionally been confused and which, however, was found in an entirely different location. This "third Ludovisi Gaul" is in a relaxed attitude and still holds his (restored?) sword. If, indeed, this figure formed a group with the Ludovisi and the Dying Gauls, the total message of the composition might have to be reconsidered, perhaps as illustrating the Celts in three different situations: in repose, wounded, and committing suicide — thus placing all previous speculations into question.²⁸

We should look anew at sculptures of "Roman" execution without being influenced either by ancient literary sources — vague at best and written at great chronological distance from the works they mention — or by our own preconceived notions, in which originals such as Pergamon's Great Altar Frieze dominate our perception, and in which anything "Greek" is bound to be more original and creative than anything made during Roman times. The finds from Sperlonga have impressed upon us the realization that imitation of Greek styles need not imply lack of imagination and innovation, and that new settings may have inspired new, even spectacular compositions. It is because of this optic that I hope to have re-opened the issue of the Ludovisi Suicidal Gaul and his wife.

bridgway@brynmawr.edu

Bryn Mawr College, PA

Acknowledgements

I most warmly thank my (few) archaeological friends who encouraged me to try this more focused approach — no need to mention names: you know who you are! My deepest gratitude is to John Humphrey who, when asked for his personal opinion as a "Romanist", volunteered to publish my text. I am both delighted and honored to have my writing included in this important periodical. My hope is that it will spark, if not agreement, at least a lively discussion from diverse points of view.

women among enslaved captives, see, e.g., two artifacts with Early Roman Imperial content: the Gemma Augustea and the Grand Camée de France. Also n.25 above.

²⁸ Hartswick (supra n.9) 107 and nn. 142-43 on 185; B. S. Ridgway, *Fourth century styles in Greek sculpture* (Madison, WI 1997) 86 and n.24 on 103. On the Ares Ludovisi (not part of the Horti, since it is said to have been found near Palazzo Santa Croce), see *ibid.* 84 and n.22 on 103. Since the Horti Sallustiani are known to have also housed some funerary monuments, the "third Ludovisi Gaul" — owned by the Terme Museum but now exhibited in Palazzo Attems — may instead have formed part of such a memorial together with a twin counterpart now lost.