

A Tortured Image: The Biography of Lucullus' Dying Hercules

Ann Kuttner

In mentione statuarum est et una non praetereunda, quamquam auctoris incerti, iuxta rostra, Hercules tunicati, sola eo habitu Romae, torva facie sentiensque suprema tunicae. in hac tres sunt tituli: L. Luculli imperatoris de manubiis, alter: pupillum Luculli filium ex S. C. dedicasse, tertius: T. Septimium Sabinum aed. cur. ex privato in publicem restituisse. tot certaminum tantaque dignationis simulacrum id fuit.¹

[In any mention of statues there is one that must not be passed over, even though by an unknown maker, adjoining the Rostra [in the Roman Forum]; [it is] of a Hercules Tunicatus, the only one [of Hercules] in that costume at Rome, with his visage wild, and feeling the last fatal pangs from the [poisoned] tunic. On this statue[’s base] the inscriptions are three in number: [one, that it came] from the war booty of *imperator* L[ucius Licinius] Lucullus; another, that the son of Lucullus while still under guardianship (*pupillus*) had dedicated it by Senatorial decree (*senatus consultum*); the third, that T[itus] Septimius while curule aedile had restored it to public ownership out of private hands. Of so many contests and of such great regard/ honor was this, then, an image]

multa et Luculli invexere²

[Much [sculpture] did the Luculli, too, bring [into the city of Rome]]

In Book 34.37, the first focused art-historical segment of his colossal encyclopedia the *Naturalis Historia*, Pliny the Elder says that, in case it may give his readers pleasure (“voluptarium”), his method in the face of the overwhelming number of statues in existence will be to touch on those that are most famous and for any reason well known (“insignia maxime et aliqua de causa notata”), as well as on the most famous artists. Reputation could mean a fame local to Rome, not just fame in a broader (Greek) art-historical sense. Seeking to convey the vast number of statues at Rome itself, Pliny cites three Republican instances, over a century and more before he finished his work in 77/78 CE:³ the 3000 statues with which Republican magistrate Marcus Scaurus

¹ Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 34.93, ed. Karl Mayhoff (Leipzig, 1897).

² Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 34.37.

³ The date is set by the reference to the sixth consulship of emperor Titus, 77 CE, in the dedicatory preface (*epistula praefatoria*), ch. 3; Titus was consul for the seventh time in 79, and Pliny died in August of that year in the eruption of Vesuvius. Bibliographic annotation has been kept to a minimum, aiming at sources who give a good portal to further bibliography; no slight is intended to scholarship omitted, and historical phenomena that I cannot footnote in

decorated a stage set (in 58 BCE); how Mummius (after his triumph of 145 BCE) filled the city with statues from conquered Achaia (and elsewhere in Greece); then, next and last in his triad, the crucial comment on the Luculli (generals in the late 70s and early 60s BCE). Pliny's words can cover sculpture from multiple sources: older Greek masterpieces brought to Rome as booty during the Republic and under Augustus; similar works brought in by purchase; and new commissions from contemporary workshops (especially from the late second century BCE onwards). The Luculli intended are the brothers Lucius Licinius Lucullus the consul of 74 (118–57/56 BCE) and victor in the second Mithridatic War, my subject here (when I say Lucullus, this is who I mean),⁴ and Marcus Terentius Varro Lucullus, consul of 73.⁵

Indeed, both are saluted in book 34 for an estimable work of Greek art brought to Rome as booty: Marcus' colossal Apollo by Calamis from Apollonia Pontica (*NH* 34.39–40),⁶ and the Hercules brought by Lucius (*NH* 34.93) that is the subject of this essay. Pliny's comment conveys that there was a great deal more that the brothers brought into Rome, even if to our frustration he gives no further details. Some of this assortment they may have purchased or commissioned, and/or kept privately. Lucullus did intensively collect statues and paintings⁷ which will have included "old masterpieces" as well as new work; it is likely, however, that some of the copious amount referred to was shared with the Roman public, especially if it came as spoils from the brothers' great campaigns. As a Roman cultural artifact, the Hercules Tunicatus was a work singled out first by the man who seized it abroad to bring it to Rome; its installation was a highly deliberated choice each of the three times it was put into place; the written spectacle of the Hercules Tunicatus was a deliberated choice too, by Pliny. The record of its multiple installations, its visible excellence and its emotive power all draw the author to tell

this compressed space are easily searchable. Extant images referenced (like the Laocoon) are easily found on the open web, and I have given, for instance, museum database URLs for others. The Greek and Roman authors referenced are all in Loeb (bilingual) editions; because they are now online at many college and university libraries (search for ancient author's name and "Loeb") I have mostly adhered to these as edition sources, not least as none of my citations are philologically problematic in their readings. Some, though, are also online in the *Perseus* project (<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>, consulted August 2016), which does include Pliny the Elders' *Naturalis Historia* (go to Collections > Greek and Roman Materials).

⁴ For basic historical data on Licinius Lucullus, see the 1999 entry by Wolfgang Will, 166–67 I 26 in *Der Neue Pauly Enzyklopädie der Antike* vol. 7, ed. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (Stuttgart and Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler); and, in the old *RE* vol. 70 (1926), the still valuable and detailed appraisal by Matthias Gelzer, 376–417 s.v. Licinius (Lucullus) 104, the consul of 74, in *Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. Georg Wissowa and Wilhelm Kroll (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler). For the scant data on Lucullus' son, in the same volume of the *RE*, s.v. Licinius (Lucullus) 110, and in the *Neue Pauly*, s.v. Licinius (Lucullus) 167 I 28. The one biography is the short, useful work by Arthur Keaveney, *Lucullus: A Life* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992). Valuable for bibliography and commentary is also Manuel Tröster, *Themes, Character and Politics in Plutarch's Life of Lucullus: The Construction of a Roman Aristocrat*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 201 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2008), 22–28 discuss the ancient sources. Lucullus' name recurs in any history of the complex Republican politics of the first century BCE; Plutarch's account makes him a byword for late Republican private luxury and the villa, and for aristocratic philhellenism in that age.

⁵ Pliny is not at all likely to mean the consul Lucius Licinius Lucullus of 151/150, who fought the Celtiberians in Spain, or his son the praetor of 104 who fought a slave revolt in Sicily. Neither war was productive of masterpiece art booty. The victor of the Mithridatic wars, noted for interest in art, has to be one of the Luculli intended, and his brother follows.

⁶ Pliny, *NH* 4.92, 34.39, 30 cubits tall, costing originally 500 talents, dedicated to Jupiter on the Capitol; Strabo, *Geography* 7.6.1, ed. Horace Jones (Cambridge MA, 1924); Appian (who places it on the Palatine), *Illyrian Wars* 30, ed. Horace White (Cambridge MA, 1913).

⁷ Plutarch, *Lucullus* 39, ed. Bernadotte Perrin (Cambridge MA, 1919).

us as much as he does, as one of the instances that bears out the pronouncement (*NH* 34.37) that his discussion will span images remarkable for a variety of reasons.

The statue of the dying Hercules, evidently rendered with artistic techniques able to express acute pathos, showed the hero near death, clad in and tormented by the poisoned garment tinged with the blood of the centaur Nessos given to him by Hercules' consort Deianeira, who had thought it an aphrodisiac charm. (She was deceived about the blood's efficacy by the centaur himself, when he was wounded by Hercules, who thwarted Nessos' intended rape of Deianeira.) It was originally set up by Lucullus in his role as a successful general: the inscription "from his spoils" ("de manubiis") means that the statue was a pre-existing monument taken to Rome by Lucullus, as booty in his war in the east against Mithridates of Pontus, over whom he celebrated a triumph in 63 BCE, having returned to Rome in 66.

In this essay I seek to explore the case of this Hercules of Lucullus, a striking work of art that by Pliny's day stood in the Roman Forum by the Rostra (the grand speaker platform at the Forum's west end, near the Curia). An unusual and powerful image, it deserves attention, and can afford a special glimpse into some of the monumental landscape of late Republican and early Imperial Rome. Much that ancient art historians and archaeologists do is to work with the material traces of the past; but there is also an archaeology of the text, which is an artifact in its own right. This project seeks to excavate just such an artifact made of Roman words, about a particular image, its patrons, its potential impacts, its engagement with Roman space, and the responses it might have elicited from viewers at Rome. The dossier here has multiple facets, contexts, and implications, some well known in sub-fields of ancient Roman studies; the aim of this narrative is to offer an interpretation of Pliny's engagement with the city of monuments, the place of the Hercules marker in that community, and potential Roman responses to it. The maker of the statue is not known and never can be; its setting in the foreign Hellenized city, sanctuary or palace from which it came to Rome can only be guessed. However, as a monument (*monimentum*) at Rome for Roman aims, the statue display had three makers, its successive patrons. We can think of Pliny as monument maker also, in his work of record and praise. The image is listed in Pape's survey of originally Greek booty art in Republican Rome,⁸ but most of the extant scholarly commentary focuses on the inscription "from spoils" ("de manubiis") in ancient historians' debates over the legal status of Roman triumphators' *manubiae*. Only a couple of scholars have carried out an explicitly art-historical approach. Andrew Stewart gives the work laconic but telling mention in discussing the tragic and the exemplary in Hellenistic (and Roman) mythological images of bodily and mental pain.⁹ Even though he does not seek to enquire further into the image's Roman contexts, his essay broaches the question of what the rendering of a hero in torment does as a prominent public marker for the Roman communal gaze, and addresses the potential philosophical content of the *exemplum* that it made.

⁸ Magrit Pape, *Griechische Kunstwerke aus Kriegebeute und ihre öffentliche Aufstellung in Rome. Von der Eroberung von Syrakus bis in augusteische Zeit* (Ph.D. diss., University of Hamburg, 1975), on the Hercules Tunicatus at 47–49, mostly focuses on the inscriptions. The image is missing in Alessandra Bravi, *Griechische Kunstwerke im politischen Leben Roms und Konstantinopels* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014).

⁹ See below. Andrew Stewart, "Baroque Classics: The Tragic Muse and the *Exemplum*," in *Classical Pasts: The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome*, ed. James Porter (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 127–55. The most recent overview of how Romans made use of "Greek" myth in art, with such images' potential for exemplarity as well as their power to engage emotions, is Zahra Newby, *Greek Myths In Roman Art and Culture: Imagery, Values and Identity in Italy, 50 BC–AD 250* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2016); see also her survey piece, "Displaying myth for Roman eyes," in *A Companion to Greek Mythology*, ed. Ken Dowden and Niall Livingstone (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 265–81.

“Of so many contests and of such great regard was this, then, an image”: Pliny’s closing phrase puns on the context and the content of the statue. *Certamen*, struggle or contest, implies together Hercules’ fight with pain and death, Lucullus’ successful contest with Mithridates to retain Roman control in the eastern Mediterranean, and the sorts of contest for political and cultural space that the strange inscription sequence implies. It might also gloss a fact that may have been known to more historically minded readers in Pliny’s day, that Lucullus had to fight hard against political enemies to win his triumph from the Senate. Pliny was making a point about how unusual this assortment of dedicatory texts was for one monument, and expected his readers as well to find the case strange; indeed, there is no parallel in extant inscribed bases for so many dedicatory texts as a unified display. Normally only one act of dedication was commemorated. These texts in accumulation documented the monument’s having gone through different sorts of efforts to make it last, each *titulus* marking a distinct historical moment. The display expressed the will of an individual whose action in erecting the statue spoke to values of the Roman aristocracy and plebs, and also the administrative decision of an elite collective of senators and magistrates acting on behalf of that Roman community, on behalf of a monument that ended up quite near the Curia itself.

How could a statue that was already dedicated get dedicated again, and why by an *S.C.* (*senatus consultum* decree)? How could it leave the public realm once it was dedicated? Any attempt at sorting this out veers close to novelistic reconstruction, but it’s worth the risk to tease out some potential stories as a way of thinking about the monuments of Rome. After its first installation—perhaps in the Forum or perhaps elsewhere—the image had to be moved or reinstalled for some reason; it stood again thanks to efforts credited to Lucullus’ young son, that is, after his father’s death in 56 BCE. A contest to aid the boy was waged by whatever faction of the Senate voted for this honor to the now dead Lucullus; that project must have been led by the boy’s guardian, who was still young enough to be a ward (*pupillus*, says Pliny), probably of Lucullus’ brother-in-law Cato the Younger. Scholars think the boy was born around 65; that implies an event of the late 50s, after Lucullus’ death in 56,¹⁰ and most likely after the death of his paternal uncle Marcus Terentius Varro Lucullus shortly after (Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 43). The boy’s mother was Cato’s half-sister or niece Servilia, and Cato as his senior male relative was left his guardian.¹¹ Then, at some unknown point, the statue disappeared from public view, at least from where it then stood, whether into private hands, warehoused, or moved to a more obscure location. Finally, the successful efforts of a curule aedile returned the statue to a prominent place.

¹⁰ Pape, *Kriegebeute*, 48 points out that in 49 BCE the boy and his mother were taken east by his uncle and guardian Cato. The youth died without heirs in 42, ending the line of the Licinii Luculli. Raised by Cato, his allegiance went to the faction of Caesar’s assassins, and he followed the armies of Brutus and Cassius to Philippi where he died. See Cicero, *Philippics* 10.4, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, rev. John Ramsey and Gesine Manuwald (Cambridge, MA, 2009); Velleius Paterculus 2.71, ed. Frederick Shipley (Cambridge, MA, 1924); Valerius Maximus 4.7 ch. 4, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Cambridge, MA, 2000) (giving his praenomen as Marcus).

¹¹ The youth’s connection to Cato is stressed by the contemporary Cicero, in *De Finibus* 3.7-9, ed. H. Harris Rackham (Cambridge MA, 1931); this dialogue opens at Lucullus’ estate at Tusculum which now belongs to the younger Lucullus. Finding Cato reading in the library at the estate, Cicero acknowledges Cato’s guardianship, while professing himself as also devoted to the youth’s education and well-being, for the sake of his friendship with young Lucullus’ father.

An aedile Titus Septimius Sabinus is otherwise unknown, but a Septimius Sabinus was praetor in 28, and so can have been aedile around 30 BCE.¹² The turbulent years of civil contention after the death of Caesar provide context for when the Hercules could have fallen into private hands, despoiled by, for instance, Antony, and restored to public view at Rome under Octavian after the battle of Actium in 31 BCE.¹³ (Below I return to the question of the statue's location in the Forum and by the Rostra, and what contexts those offered for Sabinus' setting of the image, especially if Augustan.) For each of the incarnations of the display subsequent to Lucullus' original dedication, it seems to be the case that each previous inscription was also restored. Pliny may be mixing a report of exact wording in the inscriptions with some of his own paraphrase, and certainly condenses information from what was available to him. His omissions include the dating by consular magistracies of the *senatus consultum* for Lucullus' son, which would likely have been included in that *titulus*, and the consuls of the year might also have been named in the aedile's text. But the basic content is clear enough.

The statue of Hercules, Pliny makes clear, is a "simulacrum," as he calls it, of several kinds, literal and metaphorical. An admirable and visually gripping work of art in its own right, it also made a striking addition to the corpus of images of Hercules at Rome, among which Pliny specifies its unique iconography; it was also a Roman *monumentum*, tied to Roman persons and events. As such it preserved memory of important cultural and socio-political circumstances. A monument of victory for Lucullus and the *res publica*, it also conveyed the esteem of Lucullus for this piece as a man of culture and piety, and his devotion as a great statesman to sharing his artistically valuable possessions with the people of Rome (something for any other great man to emulate). It expressed the son's piety in maintaining his father's memorial and memory (with the implied fidelity of the boy's guardian to his own trust); it testified to the respect with which the senatorial elite honored this marker of historical achievement and proper clan devotion; and it showed respect by the last magistrate who looked after it for Republican monumental heritage and public artistic patrimony. The *dignatio* (great worth or esteem) stated in Pliny's apostrophe can translate equally to the regard held by multiple patrons and viewers for this statue, and to the statue's own intrinsic value; it hints that a sovereign Roman virtue, *dignitas*, accrues to the depicted hero, and to the patrons. In Roman thinking, none of the other facets of the monument detracted from the precious character of its artistic value, and from the strong emotional and cognitive impact it was intended to make on the viewer; each aspect of the work strengthened the others, making for a distinctive marker in the heart of Rome's urban landscape.

As archaeologists of culture we should appreciate just how lucky we are to have this testimony. It's not just that the encyclopedic *Naturalis Historia* survived antiquity, and that for it the polymath Pliny undertook those long segments on the *artes* of painting (under minerals) and of sculpture (categorized among stone and metal) in which this statue description occurs. The "Hercules in/of the [Poisoned] Tunic" enters the encyclopedia completely dependent on Pliny's subjective reaction to the work. What he wrote was for the most part a story of Greek artists and

¹² Pape, *Kriegebeute*, 49, following Israel Shatzman, "The Roman General's Authority over Booty," *Historia* 21, no. 2 (1972): 177–205 at 188; for the praetor, T. R. S. Broughton, *Supplement to the Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (New York: American Philological Association, 1960), 57.

¹³ Scholars uniformly naturally believe Antony to have had a special devotion to Hercules because Plutarch, *Antony* 4.1–3 says that his appearance reminded people of paintings and statues of Hercules, that his clan claimed mythological descent from an Anton son of Hercules, and that Antony felt he confirmed this tradition in his appearance. Appian knew this tradition when in *Bellum civile* 3.16 he had Octavian and Antony exchange barbs that brought up Antony's Herculean lineage. Antony did plunder from sanctuaries in the east, and after defeating him Octavian put such dedications back.

their masterworks from the Archaic period to the early third century BCE, though some works seem to us now to be later, and some of the Greek artists named worked in Rome in the Late Republic. We know well that his sources for what we call his art history were, especially, Greek books of the Hellenistic period (late fourth and third centuries BCE), and a well-informed first-century BCE Roman work on antiquities at Rome by the polymath aristocrat Marcus Terentius Varro. Because so many monuments of Greek sculpture and painting had come to Rome as booty from the wars of expansion into Greek South Italy and Sicily and the eastern Mediterranean world, from the later third century BCE onwards through Augustus' eastern conquests in his last civil war, Pliny is often able to direct his Roman readers' attention to works by attested artists visible at Rome. Pliny's Rome, as often discussed, emerges as a metropolis of sophisticated character in which Greek masterpieces were as much on show as at any Greek sanctuary or civic space. But at a few places in books 34–36 (the sustained art histories), Pliny breaks away from his bibliography and tells the reader that something is an impressive work of art even if its artist is unknown to him, whether that maker was a famous ancient or one of the late Republican or Imperial age working at Rome. This exhortation to Romans to appreciate fine artistry, even without the certification of a handbook name, can have been a response to appreciation that was already in place, as much as it is Pliny's effort to assist such appreciation. His section about the Hercules Tunicatus is part of that project, as he says (*NH* 34.93): "In any mention of statues there is one that must not be passed over, even though by an unknown maker" ["In mentione statuarum est et una non praetereunda, quamquam auctoris incerti"]. This appeal to the reader-viewer is meant to encourage attentive spectatorship of an already visible image, urging a fresh return to a known monument by those who might well have encountered it already. Pliny writes as if his audience could be in Rome, whether habitually or not. At the same time, his observations deliberately tantalize the ancient reader who was not at Rome, who had never visited the city nor might ever do so, offering information useful for seeming an urbane sophisticate about the capital's art and history. The estimation of these authorless works is proved, in Pliny's demonstration, by marks of the valuation put on them, as evidenced by the engagement of special persons, locations, and legal strictures. The best-known example now is when the incomparable Laocoon, whose makers are named, is saluted and specified to be in the palace of emperor Titus (*NH* 36.37).¹⁴ In the densely packed narrative of makers, works, and other information, Pliny has little room to digress on any one artwork, but occasionally does so; that is how we learn of the Lucullan Hercules, in a section as long as that given the Laocoon, though Pliny does not know who made it. One can compare how, in *NH* 34.38, Pliny illustrates the height to which bronze sculpture has risen with an "exemplum," as he calls it, of daring execution ("audacia"): an image of striking realism depicting a wounded hound, at the Capitoline precinct of Juno, of unknown authorship by Pliny's day but considered so valuable that its custodians were liable to the death penalty for damage to it. In fact, *NH* 36.27–29 is a long digression specifically about the works at Rome that a thoughtful viewer should esteem even if their authorship is unknown or in doubt, let alone of recent date. The section lists twelve separate

¹⁴ Pliny, *NH* 36.37: "Nor, finally, is there much reputation for a number of artists, against whose fame for outstanding works there militates the number of makers [of a work], since it is not possible either for one [artist] to lay claim to the glory [of the work] or for several to be acclaimed equally, just as is the case with the Laocoon that is in the house of the emperor Titus, a work that must be preferred to all others of the art of both painting and sculpture. For the outstanding artists Hagesandros, Polydorus and Athenadorus of Rhodes made, out of one block, him, his children, and the marvelous intertwining of the serpents, *de consilii sententia* [from a plan agreed upon?]."

statues (without expanded commentary), including another monument for whose safety keepers were answerable with their lives.

One of the problems Pliny faces in trying to determine the artist of a given work is the occasional reticence of Roman inscribed bases. Those of what scholars label *spolia* (transferred sculptural masterpieces like Lucullus') often lacked the artist's name and might be very imprecise or silent about their source; no extant Republican base that tags what it bore as spoils names an artist. Newer work made in the city might also be unsigned, while Greek and Roman paintings were typically put up without any inscription at all. The public spaces of Republican and Imperial Rome were full of inscribed texts on buildings, monuments, and statue bases, but could also lack information that viewer-readers were expected to know on their own by education or tradition, if they cared to; historical and literary texts and oral tradition transmitted some of that knowledge, but it was vulnerable to erosion. As Pliny comments in the header to this digression about now-anonymous works (*NH* 36.27), "At Rome indeed the vast profusion of works of art and current forgetfulness, and even more the multitudes of kinds of duties and offices and business all however carry us away from *contemplatio*, since such *admiratio* belongs to those with more leisure and ideally needs much quiet for its setting." Faced with this situation, it is a meaningful step for Pliny to direct us to read the inscribed base of the Hercules Tunicatus and look at the image. He configures himself as both an admirable connoisseur and respecter of historical monuments; just as he sets aside precious space in his dense prose for the Hercules Tunicatus, he's telling us to set aside at least a moment for sustained attention to an image and monument in one of the city's busiest places, a setting crowded with people and images, by the Rostra in the Roman Forum.

Booty and Triumph

Besides Pape (discussed above), the scholars who have been drawn to Pliny's passage about the Hercules Tunicatus are historians who see data to use when discussing the specific nature of what Roman sources call *manubiae* and *praeda*. These categories of booty comprised either or both the material proceeds of campaigns, including works of art and valuable artifacts, and the money raised from seized cash and from the sale of booty. Some part of this was controlled by a campaign's supreme commander; portions of it went to subordinate officers and soldiery in some way at the commander's discretion, and a significant part was destined for the state treasury. Victorious generals who were awarded a triumph by the Senate had the custom of publicly dedicating works of art from their spoils, and the right to do so, as many documented instances tell us. That they did not need a vote of the Senate to authorize such monuments, to our knowledge, makes the *senatus consultum* for Lucullus' son to (re)erect this statue especially puzzling. Scholars have wished to take Pliny's words as a direct transcription of words found in the inscription about Lucullus, and used these to document that generals did keep *manubiae* for themselves; these could comprise "things" such as booty, including works of art, with which the general could make a public show. A distinction has been raised between the control of *manubiae* by the general, and outright ownership of them. One thesis is that the general could reserve *manubiae* as long as he intended them for the public benefit since they were properly the property of the state. At the same time, there is some evidence that *manubiae* could stay in the former commander's hands for some years before being deployed; thus, the control exercised by the former imperator was very strong, even if one agrees with Churchill that this did not translate

into outright ownership.¹⁵ Indeed, our statue of Hercules, Churchill argues, was passed to Lucullus' son as heir inheriting the obligation to put it in the public domain, enforced by a *senatus consultum*;¹⁶ this, however, seems an unheard-of circumstance, that an heir should need to be ordered by the Senate to do what clan piety and ambition would dictate in any case. What is most likely is that the *S.C.* authorized the boy and his guardians to re-install a statue that had already stood, perhaps even authorizing a particular setting like the area of the Rostra.

There seems to be a consensus among historians intent on the legalities of booty that the Lucullan monument had only two life phases: first, as something put up by the junior Lucullus with a Senate decree (a *senatus consultum*) as mandate, with a remark that the work came from his father's booty, a physical legacy of his father's possessions; second, as something that had been removed from, and was then restored to, public view. I disagree. I think the case is very strong that Lucullus did erect the statue in the first instance. Historians now and Pliny then (and his Roman contemporaries in the later first century CE) find this history odd to understand; the statue stood out for its being recurrently marked. But Pliny does seem to be quite clear about listing three distinct inscriptions as referring to distinct occasions; such are the grounds for his comment about "so many" contests or quarrels and "so much" regard that he conveys are given witness by the first Lucullan inscription, then "another (*alter*)," then a "third" (*ter*). However the last dedicator Sabinus knew about the earlier inscriptions (or if by some oddity the base itself was repurposed and inscribed two or three times), Pliny seems to be directing us to look at something with three discrete inscribed fields, each easily distinguishable from the other. Admittedly, our record of Republican art is sadly small, now, and there is much we do not understand; but in that extant evidence, at least, we do not hear of posthumous booty monuments for which the property of dead Republican *triumphatores* was put up in public for the first time. Moreover, Lucullus had plenty of time to set up this memorial, after his triumph in 63 and before his decline in the mid-50s and death in 56, and surely will not have wished to wait to make a triumphal dedication.

What would the Lucullan inscription have actually said? The terse phrase in Pliny may well have been, indeed, all that the first inscription recorded (e.g., *L. Licinius Lucullus de manubiis*). By the later third century at least, generals who celebrated a triumph frequently selected from their displays, when these included fine images, at least one work of art for public dedication, typically at a sanctuary. (The practice continued through the reign of Augustus, which saw both the last triumphs celebrated over new territories rich in fine art and the last non-imperial triumphs.) This dedication might be something newly made, such as the history paintings that some *triumphatores* put on permanent show;¹⁷ it might be, as in this study, a statue that in at least

¹⁵ The case is argued in detail by J. B. Churchill, "Ex qua quod vellent facerent: Roman Magistrates' Authority over *Praeda* and *Manubiae*," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129 (1999): 85–116, especially at 93–95 and 98–99. For a lucid distillation with further bibliography, Margaret Miles, *Art as Plunder: The Ancient Origins of Debate about Cultural Property* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 53–55; the standard other article is Israel Shatzman, "The Roman General's Authority over Booty," *Historia* 21.2 (1972): 177–205.

¹⁶ Churchill, "Praeda and Manubiae," 108; he believes the *senatus consultum* in the second inscription reported by Pliny was a mandate, of which this would be the only extant evidence, "that *manubiae* be dedicated by heirs after the death of the holder." Churchill is followed by Eric Orlin, *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), at 121–22, in a detailed discussion of how generals used booty; Pape, *Kriegebeute*, 48–49 holds a similar opinion. Shatzman, "Authority over Booty," 188, also thinks Lucullus held on to the statue until his death.

¹⁷ For the evidence on Roman Republican history painting, see Peter Holliday, "Roman Triumphal Painting: Its Function, Development, and Reception," *Art Bulletin* 79 (1997): 130–47 at 137–38, 142 for images painted in

some cases we know to have been booty. On the one hand, some actual bases for statues have survived, whose inscriptions make clear that the images were dedicated booty: what they say—and sometimes all that they say—is “X captured [this]” (*X cepit*),¹⁸ often though not always with the source site or people given, or “X gave [this]” (*X dedit*). Some omit any explicit verb of taking or giving, or simply note “Y place having been captured” (*Y capta*).

Only one other extant statue base says, “X [dedicated this] from his *manubiae*” (*X de manubiis*)¹⁹—strikingly, of the same era as Lucullus. If Pliny was paraphrasing from an inscription with the “seized from” formula, he omitted that source information, but his curiosity about the image seems strong enough to infer that he was confronted with a simple *de manubiis* text. Non-epigraphic texts have survived that note a general dedicating a particular statue, and sometimes give the artist’s name and/or source site for a transferred work, but these do not note inscriptions and thus omit the tag *de manubiis*; Pliny uses it only this once, though he describes other dedications from *spolia* taken in war. Over time, such Republican dedications blended into the cityscape of Rome, or into other Italian communities where they could be placed, with a new sort of identity. We can expect these special pieces to have been among a sometimes far greater number of works of art assembled at Rome and marched through it in triumph, when the campaign in question subjugated cities that, from Carthage to Tarentum to Ambracia, did have images and precious artifacts worth spoliating that could be judged to constitute fine art by Hellenized Mediterranean standards. One of the striking things about Lucullus’ triumph of 63 over Mithridates was that it in fact eschewed masterpiece art displays, if we can trust Plutarch’s account (*Lucullus* 37.2–4) that he concentrated the show upon arms, armor, banquetware in precious metal, and treasure, with no mention of art works (apart from a gold image of Mithridates). All the more reason for this patron so invested in his own persona as a person of high culture and of stature meriting a commemorative monument, to get a manubial dedication like the Hercules Tunicatus up in place as soon as possible when his triumph was awarded in 63 BCE.

Whatever one believes of the modern debate over *manubiae* and *praeda* as meaning commanders’ ownership or not, it is clear that the general, or his agents, controlled the selection of works to be transported back to Rome for triumphal display and dedication when a city or sanctuary was pillaged, and that the general who was awarded a triumph controlled when and where any images among his *spolia* were to be dedicated. A worthy leader was a man of integrity who did not keep for his private possession what could be put publicly on show, or even sold for the benefit of the state; one of the reasons Lucullus will have wished his manubial statue display

connection with triumph and put on permanent show. For a case example, see Michael Koortbojian, “A Painted Exemplum at Rome’s Temple of Liberty,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 92 (2002): 33–48. We do not have evidence for what became of images for which we hear only of their temporary display in or around the triumph. Perhaps more were displayed permanently in public than extant sources record.

¹⁸ Republican booty dedications known from texts and inscriptions are discussed in a range of scholarly sources. Here see the handy collection of manubial inscriptions in Michel Tarpin, “Inscriptions républicains et triomphe: rituel et obligations sociales,” *Latomus* 70/71 (2011) (special issue, *Corolla Epigraphica: Hommages au professeur Yves Burnand* II, ed. Carl Deroux): 683–99, counting at least twenty relevant inscriptions, the oldest (Tarpin 691) being for Marcus Fulvius Flaccus, consul of 264, spoils from Volsinii at the twin temples of Mater Matuta and Fortuna.

¹⁹ Cn. Domitius Calvinus, consul in 53 and 40, from the Palatine, *C. Domitius M.f. Calvinus/ pontifex/ cos. iter(um) imper(ator)/ de manubiis*, *CIL* VI.8.3, 1301 (Tarpin, “Inscriptions,” 695). Cf. a military tribune, not a commanding general, who gave to Fortuna “from my *praeda*” at Tusculum, *M. Fourio(s) C.f. tribunus/ [milita]re de praedat Fortune dedet*, *CIL* XIV.2557 (Tarpin, “Inscriptions,” 687 n. 16)—though this may have been a new votive from money *praeda*.

to be made as quickly as possible will have been to demonstrate that he showed just such uprightness. We know of his conduct in Asia and as a commander that some of his soldiers resented what they saw as too tight a hand on bonuses to them rather than transfer to the treasury, and that among the Greek cities of Asia he wished to appear an eminently just governor when it came to tax debts they owed to Rome, stamping out corruption among Roman tax collectors (the *publicani*). That therefore set an important faction of the equestrian order, and moneyed interests, against him; upon his returning to Rome, bitter factional infighting would strip him of his command in the Mithridatic Wars to give it to Pompey, and delay his triumph for three whole years after his laying down of his command.²⁰ Pliny's comment that the statue documents "contests" (*certamines*) may be a reference to this fact. Making a pointed show of rectitude over what belonged to the Roman community will thus have had special weight, especially if we are to understand from Pliny *NH* 34.37 ("the Luculli brought much [sculpture into Rome]") that he did bring back a good deal of art from the Greek cities and Mithridatid palaces in his sphere of command. Lucullus' modern biographer Keaveney proposes that the Hercules Tunicatus was "the only adornment Lucullus added to the beauties of Rome," noting that outside of Rome Lucullus is known only to have added to the shrine of Diana at Nemi; in this Lucullus we should then see "self effacement and refusal to seek immortality in bricks and mortar."²¹ Yet without the random chance of Pliny's fascination by the Hercules, we would not know even of that dedication; because Lucullus vowed and built no temple in connection with his campaigns, unlike some other generals, does not mean he did not care strongly to make a public mark beautifying Rome with his *manubiae*, and it would be unwise to conclude outright that he dedicated no other works of art *de manubiis* or otherwise.

A rich range of textual testimonia document the entry into Rome of works of art taken in war and repurposed for public display at Rome especially in religious settings, starting already in the fourth century BCE and intensifying in the third. Sources sometimes presented Marcellus' sack of Syracuse in 211 and the resultant triumph as a critical turning point when Greek art first entered Rome and alien luxury started to soften the city's *mores*; it's clear that this is rhetorical topos and not truth, but certainly as Rome expanded aggressively into Greek South Italy and Sicily, and then into the east Mediterranean, the conquerors encountered a wealth of art and source cultures that esteemed art and artifice greatly, with "art history" texts to boot. How Rome picked up the Hellenic understanding of "Greek" masterpiece culture is an oft-told narrative, in which the coming of art spoils to the city played a crucial part, along with the influx of Greek architects and artists to the city of Rome as the second century BCE wore on.²² In Lucullus' own era, intense pressure to dedicate art spoils, not keep them, is well documented in extant texts by his younger contemporary Cicero. In Cicero's rebukes in the famous prosecution speeches against the extortionate collector Verres, corrupt governor of Sicily, Cicero holds up as counter-

²⁰ On Lucullus' outstanding governorship of the provincials in Asia, see Keaveney, *Lucullus*, 95–98; the machinations of the *publicani* and the whittling away of Lucullus' command, 115; other enemies, Pompey and the revocation of his command altogether, 120–28; the role of the tribune Memmius in barring award of triumph, related events, and the final award, 129–35.

²¹ Keaveney, *Lucullus*, 136.

²² For the age of art pillage in warfare, fourth to first century BCE, with its complex connection to Rome's attitudes to art thought Greek, see, briefly: Erich Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), ch. 3, "Art and Civic Life," 84–130; Steven Rutledge, *Ancient Rome as a Museum: Power, Identity and the Culture of Collecting* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 31–48 in ch. 2, "Collecting and Acquisition"; ch. 1, "Art as Roman Plunder," of Margaret Miles, *Art as Plunder*; Alessandra Bravi, *Griechische Kunstwerke im politischen Leben Roms*.

examples to Verres the great generals who filled Italy with their spoils but kept their own houses empty of those treasures (*Verr.* 1.55 and 3.8); in *On Duties* (*De officiis*) 2.76 he similarly adduces as examples of integrity in public service eminent commanders who got no private wealth out of their commands, saying of, for instance, Mummius (who triumphed in 146) that “he preferred to ornament Italy rather than his own *domus*; yet by that adornment of Italy that very house appears, to my eyes, still more splendidly ornamented.”

To return to classic Roman manubial inscriptions, of which Lucullus’ inscription was an example in Pliny’s telling ([L. Licinius Lucullus] *de manubiis*): scholars well recognize how, in such Roman acts of ritualized spoliation, an image’s former identity was lost with its original base, thus erasing its former votive character, along with the memory of its first donor and even of its artist. (One can expect a standard Greek base to have always included at least the giver, if not always the artist, in the case of public dedications, though the bases of cult statues within temples were uninscribed.) But such an image’s new identity made a new conqueror-donor now famous, and singled out the piece as something specially chosen, taken away and shared with the Roman community and its gods; these spolia were often sanctuary dedications, and “dedicated” (in *NH* 34.93, “*dedicasse*”) in the Hercules Tunicatus’ *senatus consultum* inscription implies it was also made a *res sacra*, or sanctified object (which it could have been in much of the Forum). Such works’ re-monumentalization proclaimed them to be, just as they had been for the source culture, impressive images very much worth looking at. They remained admirable instances of artifice: for these political monuments, the character that we would call “artistic” made such a gift to the community impressive in the first instance. The work was foregrounded as valuable art, pleasing to gods and the Roman people, precisely by stripping away the old contexts in which it had been “embedded.”²³ Stripping away old meanings left iconography and visual expression all the more sovereign for what was now an important element of décor for Roman communal public space.²⁴ Thus, Pliny wants us, as Romans, to approach the Hercules Tunicatus as a work of art, not just a triumphalist marker.

The phenomenon of Greek art transferred to private and public display at Rome is part of the complicated story of what is now termed Roman “philhellenism” in the last centuries of the Republic. Whatever voices were occasionally raised against over-investment in Greek ideas about art, a significant majority of the elite found public favor in sharing Greek masterpieces with the community. Aristocrats sought to impress one another, too, by the excellence of the work they put on public show, and also with their private holdings as elite mansions came to be filled by the first century BCE with paintings and statues. Lucullus was given a high profile as

²³ See Jeremy Tanner, *The Invention of Art History in Ancient Greece. Religion, Society and Artistic Rationalisation* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 222–31 at 226–27, in particular about art spolia taken by the Hellenistic kings of Pergamon, which did preserve the original artists’ names but none of the original circumstance of dedication; more on the Attalid booty displays, Ann Kuttner, “Hellenistic Court Collecting from Alexander to the Attalids, in *Museum Archetypes and Collecting in the Ancient World*, ed. Maia Gahtan and Donatella Pegazzano (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 45–53 at 48–51.

²⁴ Most recently on how art transferred to Rome as spoils lost a former and acquired a newer semiotic charge, and the character of décor, see Paolo Liverani, “The Culture of Collecting in Roma: Between Politics and Administration,” in *Museum Archetypes and Collecting in the Ancient World*, ed. Maia Gahtan and Donatella Pegazzano (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 72–77 at 73 and 77. At 73 he cites Pliny’s passage and the statue as an example of substituted complex meanings (hyper-codification). The vast literature on Roman philhellenism, in regard to literary culture, philosophy, and rhetoric, and in regard to material and visual culture, is too large to rehearse here. Still foundational is Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, passim, on aristocrats’ engagement with Greek art (not least and artists in ch. 3 (“Art and Civic Life”) and the opening sections of ch. 4 (“Art and Ideology”)); for a quite detailed recent exploration cf. Alessandra Bravi’s 2014 *Griechische Kunstwerke im politischen Leben Roms*.

such a collector by Plutarch's sources, which were fascinated by his private luxury in general (semi-public, seeing as the elite house was so permeable to visitors and clients) (*Lucullus* 39–41), including (39) the paintings and statues into which he poured his wealth in the years after his campaign. In a culture in which the lawyer Cicero could firmly announce to his audience at trial “The Roman people hate private *luxuria* as much as they esteem public *magnificentia*,”²⁵ the Hercules could be a public monument to Lucullus' taste and urbanity, and to his generosity in sharing it. The action of Lucullus' son (and his guardian Cato) in going to the Senate to see the monument re-erected would have honored such a persona, and reflected well on the boy himself.

We can't know exactly where Lucullus' statue came from, except that cities on his campaign itinerary were located in northwestern and northern Anatolia and its hinterlands. Greek cities that would have been able to supply fine statuary to him were located especially in his sphere on the northwest Aegean coast (such as Lampsakos near the Hellespont) and round the Hellespont to the Black Sea shores of Pontos, where cities on the coast were Greek foundations that retained cultural ties to the Greek world despite falling under Mithridates' domain. The cult statues in Greek temples seem to have been, typically, highly static images, with the subject calmly sitting or standing, and not story sculptures; this piece which was narrative, and moreover showed the hero in torment, will have been not a cult image but a dedication in a sanctuary or in a civic space such as an agora (though Hercules was associated with the gymnasium, this image of his torment might not have seemed apt there). It could even come from one of Mithridates' palaces. The king's fortified strongholds were found “full of great treasures” (Plutarch, *Lucullus* 18). The king of Pontos was committed to an image of himself as friend of Hellenic culture; Mithridates can easily be imagined either taking or buying an older statue of Hercules from his expanded domains in Asia Minor, or else commissioning a new one. As other Hellenistic monarchs had done, going back to Alexander, Mithridates sometimes posed as a new Heracles, as documented by the famous head of Mithridates (now in the Louvre) draped in the hero's lion-skin.²⁶ If this kind of royal self-construction was common knowledge, Lucullus and his contemporaries can have thought of the statue as a token of the god's directly abandoning the enemy king to aid him and the city of Rome instead, suggestive of the formal ritual summoning of an enemy's god to Rome, *evocatio*.

We know Lucullus could be highly selective in what he took from a given community, and also that he might place pious weight on what he took away. According to Strabo (12.3.11), at the wealthy Pontic Greek city of Sinope (one of Mithridates' capitals), for instance, he took only a globe by one Billaros and a statue by (fourth-century) Sthennis of one of the city's legendary heroes, Autolykos. Lucullus found that statue on the shore (Plutarch, *Lucullus* 23) as loot abandoned by Mithridates' Cilician forces, which Lucullus had just managed to expel from the city. In Plutarch's telling, Lucullus dreamt the night before taking the city of a figure that spoke to him and said “go forward, Autolykos wishes to meet you,” and when the identity of the statue was explained to him, he realized the omen of good fortune; Appian backs up the account of the

²⁵ *Pro Murena* 76, ed. Jeffrey Henderson (Cambridge MA, 1977).

²⁶ For the Louvre head (Ma 2321) see R. R. R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 122–23 (citing also coinage at Odessos that conflates the king's portrait with Alexander-Heracles), cat. 83 at 171, pls. 51, 52.1–2; J. J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 35–37 and fig. 29; as a Roman-era replica of the Hellenistic original, cat. 214 at 270–71 in *Pergamon and the Hellenistic Kingdoms of the Ancient World*, ed. Carlos Picón and Seán Hemingway (The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016). Online image in the Louvre database (Atlas): http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/cartelfr/visite?srv=crt_frm_rs&langue=fr&initCritere=true, consulted August 2016 (search term: Mithridate).

dream and the statue (*Mithridatic Wars* 83). That anecdote may well be authentic or, at least, authentically circulated on Lucullus' behalf in his lifetime; Lucullus had learnt from his friend and commander Sulla, Plutarch added, to trust the portents given by dreams. Lucullus clearly felt no impiety in taking what must have originally been a religious dedication as well as a masterpiece back to Rome with him, though he liberated Sinope and left it otherwise unpillaged. It is likely that he dedicated rather than kept such an image, to which he himself attached religious significance as a portent of victory; if he kept hold of it for private display, that would be remarkable in its own right.

Erecting a Hercules as his triumphal monument would also have had both political and religious import; Lucullus gave the hero-god special credit for his successes. Sulla, Lucullus' friend and mentor, already tithed to Hercules (Plutarch, *Sulla* 35.1), thus singling out the god as an important sponsor of his military success.²⁷ (He also restored an important Republican temple of Hercules Custos [Guardian] at the Circus Flaminius, a significant location for the triumphal parade.)²⁸ Writing in the Augustan period, Diodorus Siculus²⁹ described tithing from one's possessions to Hercules as a widespread Roman (Republican) custom performed to bring good fortune, supposedly following Hercules' own promise to the Arcadians who welcomed him to Rome that those who would tithe to him once he became a god would especially prosper. Diodorus names Lucullus as the key example of someone who set aside great personal wealth for the god, and says that Lucullus spent it on spectacular public banquets (4.21.4). The occasion for this will have been the triumph,³⁰ which Lucullus marked in a novel way with an enormous public feast; perhaps some such banquets were held before the event while Lucullus was waiting for his award, and after it too. The iconicity of the "banqueting Hercules" with his cup, triumphantly relaxed at the end of his Labors, or even imagined already in the afterlife, was a powerful one at Rome; Lucullus' entertaining the *Senatus Populusque Romanus* to feast for triumph well befitted the god in question. The image of the drinking Hercules as a patron of victory dated back at least to Alexander the Great's banquet displays of the *Herakles epitrapezios* (at/on the table) by Lysippos; if we decide to trust the pedigree for the image given by the Flavian poet Statius' (*Silvae* 4.6), that Sulla may have owned the image now in the possession of one Novius Vindex, then we know Lucullus will have encountered the artifact, given his close friendship with that fellow devotee of Hercules, Sulla.

²⁷ The late Roman regionary catalogues also note an otherwise mysterious Hercules Sullanus; *LTUR* 3 (*Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*), ed. Eva Margareta Steinby, vol. 3 (Rome: Edizioni Qasar, 1996), s.v. (Domenico Palombi). For public sites at Rome, including monuments for Hercules, see also Samuel Ball Platner and Thomas Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), online at *Perseus* (<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>, consulted August 2016 (go to Collections > Greek and Roman Materials)). Platner's tome remains extremely useful for ancient sources and data, occasionally slightly updated in Lawrence Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); my notes will give only *LTUR* entries, leaving the reader to find the entries in Platner and Richardson.

²⁸ *LTUR* 3, s.v. Hercules Custos, aedes (Alessandro Viscogliosi); the Augustan poet Ovid, *Fasti* 6.209–12, ed. Jeffrey Henderson (Cambridge, MA: rev. ed. 1996) cites (line 12) the Sullan inscription, "if you ask of the *titulus*, Sulla approved this work."

²⁹ 4.21.3–4, ed. Charles Oldfather (Cambridge MA, 1935).

³⁰ Pliny, *NH* 14.96 says that when Lucullus returned from Asia he made public distribution of 100,000 jars of wine; Plutarch, in *Lucullus* 37, closes the description of the triumph with mention of a magnificent banquet for the city and surrounding communities. Mary Beard, *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 161 remarks that this is the only case in our sources before a particular banquet of Caesar of "large scale dining," and observes that there is no comparable record of a feast for the people after a triumph in the extant records.

A key contextual fact for Pliny and the image he describes is that Lucullus' Rome was rich in shrines to Hercules—a god engaged with the primeval site of Rome whose cult was naturalized among Italic peoples, including Latins, from a very early date. The site of his Ara Maxima in the Forum Boarium was said to go back to the hero's own altar where he celebrated the slaying of the monster Cacus and the retrieval of his stolen cattle, and worship of Hercules was already well established in the Archaic city.³¹ The “unconquered” (*invictus*) deity was linked to war and triumph from very early on: in the Forum Boarium stood an archaic statue of Hercules *triumphalis* thought to date back to the first days of Rome when Hercules visited the site of the future city, and Evander honored him for his defeat of the monster Cacus (Pliny, *NH* 34.33); for the occasion of the triumph, the statue was always dressed in triumphal robes, as it will have been for Lucullus. Notable here is that from the late third century through Lucullus' day, commanders multiplied honors to Hercules for granting victory to the *res publica* under his care. Those honors that took place for victories in the Punic Wars with Carthage were, also, reference to and contestation of Carthaginian claims to the favor of Hercules-Melkart, and parried Hannibal's personal ideological deployment of the cult, as scholars note.³² I broached above the possibility that, analogously, Mithridates' self-image as Herculean can have informed the dedication by his conqueror Lucullus. The second century saw the elaboration of the Ara Maxima in its final form,³³ and the erection of several new temples to Hercules by such commanders as Mummius and Fulvius Nobilior, to complement more ancient temples;³⁴ I discuss below the outstanding statue dedication by the *triumphator* Fabius Maximus of the colossus of Hercules, taken at his conquest of Tarentum in 209 in the war against Hannibal (Pliny *NH* 34.40; Strabo 6.3.1; Plutarch, *Fabius* 22.6). Singling out for dedication a statue of Hercules in order to commemorate his triumph would therefore let Lucullus both express personal devotion to the god and situate his triumphal *monumentum* within a very meaningful Republican cultic, cultural, and political landscape, establishing him as one of a distinguished line of leaders adding to Hercules' public honors across the city.³⁵ (Indeed, his great rival Pompey was also to build a temple of Hercules, probably after his triumph in 61 over enemies

³¹ See for instance Gianfranco Adornato, “L'area sacra di S. Omobono: Per una revisione della documentazione archeologica,” *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome: Antiquité* 115 (2003): 809–35 (I thank the anonymous reader for this reference) on worship and images of Hercules at Archaic Rome.

³² Briefly, on Punic and Hannibalic devotion and Roman contestation with it (as with other cults with Carthaginian analogues) see Richard Miles, “Hannibal and Propaganda,” in *A Companion to the Punic Wars*, ed. Dexter Hoyos (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2011), 260–79 at 267–75.

³³ *LTUR* 3, s.v. Hercules Invictus, Ara Maxima (Filippo Coarelli).

³⁴ See for instance *LTUR* 3, s.v. Hercules Invictus, aedes (Forum Boarium) (Filippo Coarelli); s.v. Hercules Victor, aedes (Filippo Coarelli), for the ancient temple in the Forum Boarium and another Republican shrine at the Porta Trigemina; s.v. Hercules Victor, aedes et signum (Domenico Palombi), for the temple in the Forum Boarium vowed by Lucius Mummius the conqueror of Achaëa in 145, which he built and gave a cult statue to as censor in 142; s.v. Hercules, aedes Aemiliana (Filippo Coarelli), for a temple which might have been put up by Scipio Aemilianus for victory in the Punic Wars or by Aemilius Paullus, victor over Macedon, who triumphed in 167; s.v. Hercules Musarum, aedes (Alessandro Viscogliosi) for the temple built by triumphator Fulvius Nobilior, perhaps when censor in 179 BCE, with statues of the Muses spoliated from Ambrakia brought back for his triumph of 187. Besides shrines and markers listed in these notes, others of now uncertain date existed as well.

³⁵ On the manipulation of images of and architecture for Hercules by Roman commanders and statesmen, see recently e.g., the detailed arguments of Alessandra Bravi, *Griechische Kunstwerke im politischen Leben Roms*: e.g., 26–29, Fabius Maximus; 35–42, Fulvius Nobilior; 147–55, for paintings of Hercules dedicated in the Portico of Philippus (around Nobilior's temple) and the Portico of Octavia. Use the index for more. (She omits Lucullus' Hercules Tunicatus.)

including Mithridates.)³⁶ Each subsequent instantiation of the statue (by Lucullus' son, by the aedile Sabinus) rejoined it to this Herculean landscape, of which Pliny knew his Roman readers were well aware.

The Rostra and a Speaking Monument

This is a good point at which to consider the placement of the statue and how that could affect responses to it. In Pliny's day it was in the Forum Romanum, right beside the Rostra ("iuxta rostra"), where it was placed by the curule aedile Septimius Sabinus who seems to have restored the statue to a public place. If it is correct that this man was the known praetor of 28, and thus active under Augustus' control of Rome, its placement here (for the first time or again) follows with the Augustan remaking of those Rostra. When Pliny says "Rostra" with no qualification, one should take him to mean the speaker platform at the northwest end of the Forum, near the Curia and Comitium, not the second speaker platform added by Augustus in front of the Temple of Divus Julius. When Caesar rebuilt the Curia in 44 he meant to shift the orientation of the older Republican Rostra on the south side of the Comitium before the Curia Hostilia, the senate house and speakers' platform of Lucullus' day, and may have started to build the new platform before his assassination in 44; this project was certainly carried out under Augustus.³⁷

The pre-Caesarian Rostra was the site of a number of statues, both on and near the platform, where an honorific could be placed in a most eye-catching location,³⁸ as Pliny describes specifications for a memorial portrait at the Rostra voted by the Senate. In the remaking of the Rostra in the Augustan period, there may have been an effort to shift Republican dedications so that they kept their prior relationship to the platform. We can see this in the case of a special class of images, those portraits voted by the Senate of men who died while on diplomatic service to the state. The oldest of these were the images of four fifth-century BCE ambassadors to Fidenae, slain at that city (Pliny, *NH* 34.24), which stood at the Rostra, saluted also by Cicero (*Philippics* 9.2). He gestures in that same text to the image of Cnaeus Octavius, who was killed on an embassy to the Seleukids in 162; its inscription, containing the senatorial mandate for the statue's installation, is a source for Pliny (*NH* 34.24). Both authors name other Republican figures killed on diplomatic service as if discussing their portraits; Cicero's observations are made in a project to gain from the Senate an honorific statue for Servius Sulpicius, dead on embassy to Antony, with the *senatus consultum* authorizing it to be recorded on its base (*Philippics* 9.7), to be placed at the Rostra. He makes a point useful here for the workings of the exemplary *monumentum*, saying (9.1) that from its outset the point of this commemorative tradition was to influence the Roman citizen spectator "so that in dangerous wars men would be more courageous in assuming the office of ambassador." That is, images of men who met an untimely and wrongful death in the service of the *res publica* showed Romans that their service was valued, and held out the promise of *gloria* afforded by a monument as an inducement to run the risk of a similar death. At this platform, then, the statue of a dying hero approaching immortality could have a similar function as an encouragement to exemplary service on the side

³⁶ Vitruvius 3.3.5, ed. Valentin Rose (Leipzig, 1867); Pliny, *NH* 34.57; *LTUR* 3, s.v. Hercules Pompeianus, aedes (Filippo Coarelli).

³⁷ *LTUR* 4 (1999), s.v. Rostra (età repubblicana) (Filippo Coarelli) and s.v. Rostra Augusti (Patrizia Verduchi).

³⁸ Pliny, *NH* 34.24: after Gnaeus Octavius, a second-century BCE diplomat, was slain on his embassy to Syria he was voted a commemorative portrait and "the Senate ordered the statue to be set up in as eye-catching a place as possible (*quam oculatissimo loco*), and it is at the Rostra."

of the right. Lucullus was not buried at Rome, but at his estate at Tusculum (Plutarch, *Life of Lucullus* 43); at Rome, the statue of Hercules, as tended by his son, could be in a certain respect a *monumentum* in the funerary sense of that word, as well as a monument to triumph.

What became in the Caesaro-Augustan period of the Rostra of the Republican statues that once stood there, such as these dead legates, and others (like the ancient image of the early Republican leader Camillus, Pliny, *NH* 34.23, and the equestrian images of Sulla and Pompey, Velleius, 2.61)? “Iuxta rostra” [“close to the Rostra”] was also the site (*NH* 34.21) in Pliny’s day of three Sibyls whose dedicators he names from the bases, meant to suggest the divinely guided fates of Rome (one at least must have been that particular archaic Sibyl of Cumae who gave Rome her Sibylline Books); other markers were here as well. Did these images enjoy in the later first century CE the same placement as they had had before? I think that the answer is yes; at least some of the most important memorials of the Republican period were kept in close proximity to the speaker platform, even in its shifting state. When Pliny tells us that it was on the basis of a formal senatorial mandate (*senatus consultum*) that Lucullus’ young son dedicated the Hercules, he is talking about the kind of bill that sometimes specified where a statue was to be placed, and that sometimes, to reward and impress, gave the patron free choice of eminent position. Perhaps Lucullus’ image already stood in the Forum here or elsewhere before it was removed and had to be reinstalled; the statue is unlikely to have been removed if it stood at a sanctuary, but may have been cleared away from public space if unprotected by Senatorial decree.³⁹ I think that if Lucullus’ statue did not already in the first instance stand near the Rostra in the Forum Romanum, it did so in its second dedication, as confirmed by the Senate, with all the resonance that such a position would create; if this is correct, the corollary to be drawn is that when the curule aedile Septimius Sabinus restored the statue to the position which Pliny knew, he was restoring that Republican Lucullan relationship to the speaker platform.

Torment and Endurance

Now to turn back to the image as Pliny describes it, “torva facie sentiensque suprema tunicae,” [“with his visage wild (or savage, grim), feeling the last fatal pangs from the [poisoned] tunic.”] It is unusual of Pliny to explore an image’s appearance in this way, with a miniature rhetorical ekphrasis that invites the reader to an empathic shudder, as either witnessing or suffering a horrible event. Normally Pliny restricts himself in mentioning the subject of a representation to literal iconographic markers, such as Hercules in the (poisoned) tunic; there is no exact parallel elsewhere in the encyclopedia for such interpretative treatment of the character of an image.

³⁹ We do hear of public statuary being shifted, including votives. Famously, Sulla removed from the Capitolium the statuary of a trophy monument of his enemy Marius during their hostilities while Sulla held Rome, and it seems to have been handed over to someone who could keep it safe, since Caesar put the statuary back up. See Plutarch, *Caesar* 5–6; Suetonius, *Divus Julius* 11. It’s hard though to think what enemy of Lucullus would wish to or be able to relegate his monument, between his triumph and the dedication by his young son. We do hear of the censors of 159 BCE (P. Cornelius Scipio and M. Popilius) removing from the Forum all statues of former magistrates “except those which had been erected by decree of the Senate or People” (Pliny, *NH* 34.30); Marcus Aemilius Lepidus in 179 BCE cleared from the Capitolium precinct images and votives that hindered movement (Livy, 40.51.3, ed. B. O. Foster (Cambridge MA, 1919). Augustus moved portrait statues from the Capitol to the Campus Martius (Suetonius, *Caligula* 34), and Claudius later moved honorary statues from many public sites, decreeing the Senate had to authorize private dedications. See Liverani, “Culture of Collecting,” at 73 and following for the management of public “collections” including (75) the clearing away of images, and the evidence for the keeping of inventories by, for instance, *curatores aedium sacrarum et operum publicorum* (official curators for sacred buildings and public works).

As an image that explored extreme sensations of pain, and portrayed its protagonist with a distorted countenance as he struggled to control painful sensations and felt his life ending, this may well be a work of the period now known as “Hellenistic,” meaning the post-Classical period extending from around the mid-fourth century BCE (when masters like Skopas and Lysippos began to explore effects of pathos intensively) to Lucullus’ day. There’s a slight chance it could be fifth-century Greek (Classical): Pliny (*NH* 34.59) cites from his Greek sources a bronze image at Syracuse by Pythagoras of Rhegion of “a lame man, the pain of whose ulcer even those gazing on it are seen to feel”; however, the very comment shows how Pliny and his post-Classical sources valued the artistic expression of pain and the ways in which mimetic realism could engross the empathetic spectator.⁴⁰ The statue can have appealed to period tastes of the first century BCE at Rome, just as it continued to impress ever after; Pliny, who so admired the Laocoon and Juno’s wounded hound, as well as this statue, is representative of a significant range of Roman interest in the visual expression of pain in art, one not simply to be equated with pleasure in watching gladiatorial combat or torture in the arena.⁴¹

Hercules was visibly fighting off great agony, for his face (*facies*) showed signs of strain by some marked expression—grim, fierce, savage, or tormented (*torvus* can have any one of these meanings⁴²). Thinking of Hellenistic and Roman works, one would imagine the lips perhaps parted, at the least, and facial musculature somehow contracted, head perhaps sharply twisted to one side; the bodily posture likely showed reaction to sensation in some way, by some compositional modification of a standing or even seated pose (standing, more likely). *Suprema sentiens* means the hero was feeling his final, dying moments; following the story, he was to be imagined as near or already on the pyre, upon which he would bravely or despairingly immolate himself to escape the insupportable effects of the poisoned tunic. This means a fictional location at Mount Oeta, where the sanctuary of Hercules preserved the supposed traces of the pyre, a spot of pious pilgrimage.⁴³ Throughout the Greco-Roman period, Hercules was most frequently portrayed as naked, apart from his lion-skin; the image may have been holding a club to aid its identification, with the viewer adding up the implied sensation of great pain (novel in extant

⁴⁰ *NH* 34.59: “Pythagoras Reginus [...] Syracusis autem claudicantem, cuius ulceris dolorem sentire etiam spectantes videntur.” Since a monumental genre study of an anonymous wounded figure as such is highly unlikely in the fifth century, this must be a mythological hero, and suggestions that it showed the wounded Philoctetes, his snake-bitten foot festering, are good ones. The anonymous reader suggested that the Dying Niobids whom we know from multiple Roman versions are replicas of fifth-century originals, but this is still a subject of debate; they might go back to fourth-century early Hellenistic works with classicizing features. Images of the Dying Niobids were on display at the Temple of Apollo Medicus, what became the Augustan Temple of Apollo Sosianus; Pliny notes in *NH* 36.28, see above, that they have lost a sure attribution, though he guesses at early Hellenistic names (Scopas, Praxiteles). For how the extant replicas functioned for viewers to instantiate an imagined world in the imperial villa gardens where they come from, see Zahra Newby, “The Aesthetics of Violence: Myth and Danger in Roman Domestic Landscapes,” *Classical Antiquity* 31, no. 2 (2012): 349–89.

⁴¹ On Roman responses to these spectacles, which could be moralized as showcasing *virtus*, in the case of combat, and of inculcating righteousness, in the case of punishments, see, still foundational, Carlin Barton, *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans: The Gladiator and the Monster* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), and Kathleen Coleman, “Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 80 (1990): 44–73.

⁴² See for instance Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.415, ed. G. P. Goold (Cambridge MA, 1999), where the horrid Fury Allecto has a naturally *torva facies* (“torvam faciem”), the same phrase as Pliny applies to the Hercules, and Horace, *Odes* 1.28.17, ed. Niall Rudd (Cambridge MA, 2004), where a *torvus* Mars watches the display of dying men that the Furies provide him (“dant alios Furiae torvo spectacula Marti”).

⁴³ In the second century BCE the general Marcus Acilius Glabrio “ascended Oeta and made sacrifice to Hercules at that spot which they call The Pyre, because the mortal body of the god was burnt here,” Livy 36.30.

images of Hercules) and the costume (*chiton* or *tunica*), to grasp the storied moment. The maker would have intended that, upon identifying the depicted moment, the viewer would respond with aesthetic awe at the exquisitely effective suggestion of the hero's state, and also by engaging with the figure as if it were located in real time and space; this is the kind of participation with the world of the represented that Pliny's telling, if compressed description presumes. Pathos: Hercules was not only suffering bodily pain, but also had to overcome great emotional distress. He would have felt enormously betrayed, and enraged by his consort Deianeira, who had sent him the tunic (as highlighted in literary accounts), and then also felt emotionally moved in complex ways when her ignorance of the fatal presence of poison was finally revealed to him. For Deianeira staged her trick when Hercules brought back a new concubine, Iole, from his siege of Oechalia, the event that triggered Deianeira's recourse to what she thought (deceived by vengeful Nessos) was a powerful aphrodisiac charm. The spectator was free to imagine whether Hercules still believed she had poisoned him willingly, or whether, following the story as told in extant tragedy (below), he had already discovered that Deianeira herself had been tricked, a victory for Nessos; the spectator could decide whether Hercules had not yet or only just decided to hasten his own death, or whether he already stood on the pyre awaiting or even amidst the flames, calling on his father Jupiter.

Pliny calls the subject unique at Rome, and there is no reason to disbelieve him about the city's public art; the only documented parallel for the statue that transports the viewer to the peak of Mt. Oeta is the image in the Porticus Octaviae by Artemon of Hercules on the mountain, which showed him already entering into heaven, "his mortality burnt away."⁴⁴ This episode in Hercules' life survives in no extant work of Greek and Roman representation.⁴⁵ There is one other document of its depiction, an important one: it was executed by one of the great early Hellenistic painters, Aristeides of Thebes. This painting of "Heracles put to great suffering (*kataponoumenos*) by the robe of Deianeira" was seized in Mummius' sack of Corinth (Strabo, *Geography* 8.6.23). That painting may well have come to Rome, auctioned to a wealthy collector to raise money for the treasury, if it did not stay in the Greek East. Aristeides was a master whom we know explored images of enormous pathos that involved moments of near-death and inner and outer suffering.⁴⁶ The painting can have included an appropriate setting, and other figures—Hercules' son Hyllas, for instance, or his friend Philoctetes, who lit the pyre for him and received his bow, and/or nameless servants expressing wonder and horror. As is the case for single statues, in contrast to painting, in Lucullus' image all the essence of time and event was summed up in one figure. Grief, shock, pity, admiration, fascination: a range of emotions that viewers of Hercules' last moments may have felt were available for empathic exploration. Even to one

⁴⁴ Pliny, *NH* 35.139: "Herculem ab Oeta monte Doridos exusta mortalitate consensu deorum in caelum euntem."

⁴⁵ It lacks altogether in *LIMC*, *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 4 (Zurich and Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1988), s.v. Herakles (Boardman), 728–838.

⁴⁶ Strabo's passage quoted Polybios as saying (in now lost portions of his *History*) that, present at Corinth, he saw the painting of Heracles, like the Dionysos of Aristeides, in the possession of (Mummius') soldiers; Strabo, who visited Rome under Augustus, says he has not seen the Heracles but did see the Dionysos in the Temple of Ceres, as did Pliny (*NH* 35.24), recording that Attalos of Pergamon tried to buy it from Mummius. The Hercules can have gone to that royal collector or another Greek if auctioned off at Corinth rather than, later, in Rome, or been kept by Mummius, privately or dedicated. Aristeides is acclaimed by Pliny's sources for *NH* 35.98 for his mastery at painting the soul (*animus*), and human feeling (*sensus*), i.e., the elements of both *pathos* and *ethos*. The example given is an image of a mother dying of a wound (in her chest), whose infant seeks her breast to suckle; the painting conveys her grief and fear that the child would take in blood with milk.

ignorant of the story, the grimness of the hero's appearance to which Pliny testifies would ask an emotive response.

This kind of emotional and intellectual exercise—of being transported by representation to participate in a story's moment, and with the inviting chance to react as if protagonist or protagonist's spectators—was very much the aim of Classical and Hellenistic Greek story sculpture, as well as of Roman mimetic naturalism. It's fascinating to consider its exploitation here as elsewhere for a political public monument, and it seems a seduction to meditate exemplary meanings. Graham Zanker famously discusses the steps of this response to sculpture in the Hellenistic age, effected by modes of realism, as one of viewer supplementation of story and context, and viewer integration of self and the image's world.⁴⁷ Andrew Stewart, who has written especially tellingly of the methods and aims of the "Hellenistic baroque," talks about the viewer importing information (and therefore sensation) from "outside the frame." He includes the Hercules of Lucullus among his case examples of Hellenistic and Roman sculpture exploring physical and/or psychological pain and moments near death, images offering what in Latin rhetorical terms could be called an *exemplum doloris*,⁴⁸ partly mediated by a tragic sensibility, the naturalistic suggestive rendering of such a moment could be compared to rhetorical techniques of amplification. Stewart cites the Hanging Marsyas, face distorted by pain and fear, known in multiple Roman replicas after what scholars wish to believe was a Hellenistic Greek original; the other obvious example is the dying Laocoon, made at Rome in the early Empire by a trio of sculptors from Rhodes (Pliny, *NH* 36.37). That team can be looked at as being at once late Hellenistic Greek and as working at early Imperial Rome, straddling cultures, for their signatures were found at the imperial villa at Sperlonga on the Augustan or Tiberian statue group of Odysseus' ship, shown attacked by Scylla; here Scylla's trapped victims have expressions of great pain and terror, while Odysseus' face is vividly animated by an open-mouthed, glaring expression expressing courage in the face of danger and enraged determination to save his men.⁴⁹ Taking the Hercules of Lucullus as having an eminently tragic theme (easy, as we know of at least two treatments, by Sophocles and by pseudo-Seneca) Stewart proposes that it might even proffer a Stoic positive *exemplum* of a fight against the passions, showing *virtus* and *dignitas*.⁵⁰ In that reading he follows scholarly tendencies to read Stoic positive connotations into Senecan Hercules tragedies (the *Hercules Furens* and the pseudo-Senecan *Hercules Oetaeus*, below).

Now, there are difficulties in reconciling a Stoic reading and a tragic rendering of a hero's suffering. The ideal Stoic hero achieves resistance to and even equanimity in the face of pain, whether mental, emotional, or physical; some scholars have read an image like the Hanging Marsyas or even the Laocoon as tagging the subject as culpable in his own suffering, and meant

⁴⁷ Graham Zanker, *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), with 152–67 specifically addressing images showing pain.

⁴⁸ Stewart, "Baroque Classics," at 141–53 on *exemplum* and *paradeigma*; on apposing art to the tragic sensibility in the Hellenistic world and the late Roman Republic, 128–35. For more recent work in this vein, Newby, *Greek Myths* and "Displaying Myth."

⁴⁹ Recently, see, e.g., Newby, "Aesthetics of Violence," 358–61. For readings of the story sculptures at this early imperial villa (Augustan or Tiberian) as not only entertaining but also potentially ethically exemplary, emphasizing Odysseus' bravery, see, e.g., Ann Kuttner, "Delight and Danger: Motion in the Roman Water Garden at Sperlonga and Tivoli," in *Landscape Design and the Experience of Motion*, ed. Michel Conan (Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2003), 103–56 at 131–32, online at <http://www.doaks.org/resources/publications/doaks-online-publications/motion>, consulted August 2016.

⁵⁰ Stewart, "Baroque Classics," 130, 154.

to incur our reproving judgment in his agony.⁵¹ Whatever the merits of that hypothesis, the case of the suffering Hercules Tunicatus is complex. Did Pliny's statue, in Pliny's telling, come across as only showing acutely the ravages of pain, or did it also seem to show the hero trying to master it? The language of the description tantalizes. Though Hercules was caught in the causality of his downfall, it is also the case that instead of death he ultimately gained immortality. No public image of him in his final torment could escape the aura of that salvation, in a Rome so devoted to his worship: the courage of his self-immolation also cast a positive shadow.

In Greek Classical-era art (fifth and earlier fourth century BCE), the faces of admirable protagonists in statuary and relief, in the extant record, are little or not at all moved by emotion, weariness, or pain, unlike Hercules' *torva facies*. The vivid delineation of fierce emotions and physical suffering was reserved for the villains in a piece, especially those who were part-beast, such as the centaurs battling the Lapiths on the metopes of the Parthenon and the pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia, or, from the second century, the Giants of the Great Altar of Pergamon. The effort to make faces strongly signal emotion and sensation in the case of positive protagonists, and to explore heroic pathos in sculpture, was especially furthered by fourth-century masters like Skopas and Lysippos. Lysippos is, for instance, believed to have explored emotional and physical duress in images of Hercules. The extant example of that project is the "Farnese Hercules" type known from the over-life-sized marble replica found at the Baths of Caracalla, a Weary Heracles;⁵² exhausted by his labor, the apples of the Hesperides now clutched behind his back, he leans hard on his club, his right arm dangling openhanded in sign of exhaustion, his head lowered, open-mouthed, gazing towards the ground. The viewer knows, while Hercules does not, that this Labor will help him win immortality. We also know textually of a colossal "Weary Heracles" by the same artist, the bronze from the acropolis of Tarentum, which Fabius Maximus brought to Rome for his triumph over Hannibal's forces. Some sources (Pliny, *NH* 34.40; Plutarch, *Fabius* 22.6; Strabo 6.3.1) give only the hero's name as the subject of the statue, but it may well be the image transferred to Constantinople that is described by a Byzantine writer in great detail as showing an exhausted, slumped, and despondent hero.⁵³

For Fabius, devotion to Hercules was both general, in the sense that he shared the cult of victorious Hercules with all his fellow citizens, and particular. His clan traced their descent to Hercules, a flattering legend of which the inscribed image could remind people. As a monument to the repulse of Hannibal, that devotee of Melkart/Hercules (above), the statue had an aura of *evocatio*; a hero epitomizing triumphant *virtus* "was a stark reminder that Fabius was the real hero of the war and the real conqueror of Hannibal [...] It was a case where a Roman grandee used the artist, the subject and the work's various historical associations to make a statement

⁵¹ This essay is not the place to rehearse the lengthy study of the Laocoon. Stewart has relevant bibliography through the mid-2000s; for bibliography up through the 1990s, see also Richard Brilliant, *My Laocoön: Alternative Claims in the Interpretation of Artworks* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000). More material is in *Laocoonte. Alle origini dei Musei Vaticani. Quinto centenario dei Musei Vaticani 1506–2006* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2006). For a broad treatment of the statue as an image of culpable suffering, Nigel Spivey, *Enduring Creation: Art, Pain and Fortitude* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), chapter 2, 25 and following.

⁵² J. J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, fig. 41.

⁵³ Niketas Choniates, *De Signis Constantinopolitanis* 5 (ed. Bekker), trans. Andrew Stewart (*100 Greek Sculptors, Their Careers and Extant Works*, s.v. Lysippos and Lysistratos, Sons of Lys[ippos?] of Sikyon, T 103 at *Perseus*, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>, consulted August 2016 (go to Collections > Greek and Roman Materials). For the shifted statue, Sarah Bassett, *The Urban Image of Late Antique Constantinople* (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 152–54.

regarding his own achievements.”⁵⁴ The statue’s *pathos* and promise could hold special meaning for the forces of Fabius, too, glossing the endurance with which it had withstood the weary months of the siege of Tarentum, and indeed the labors of all in the armies of the Republic in these crippling wars. As an *exemplum*, Fabius’ Hercules could align with fundamental Roman values, military but also more broadly socio-political—the value placed upon effort on behalf of the right, no matter the physical toll, a burden whose open depiction indeed served to convey the very extent of that effort. To those with even basic knowledge of myth and religion, the Labor of the Golden Apples was a token of Hercules’ eventual immortality, glossing eternal fame for his conquerors.⁵⁵ The Hercules Tunicatus of Lucullus, on the verge of that apotheosis, also asked the spectator to meditate on just what sort of positive *exemplum* it might convey. That was potentially a more complex proceeding. The statue was highly rhetorical in the expressive address that Pliny testifies it made, suggesting exemplary power—an emblematic mythic or religious narrative as a vehicle for meditation. Such expressive style itself had iconic resonance, in the Roman sphere as in the Greek one—it could be a sign indexing a particular relationship to the image as something to think and feel with and about, and it endorsed a commitment to the hortatory or didactic mediation of truths. The statue both made Hercules fully human, in its posture of pain and perhaps of attempted control, and also presaged his ascent. As an image evoking suicide, it was terrifying and uplifting in equal measure. One was meant to recoil, surely—so the artist and the image’s several Greek and Roman patrons must have intended—at the thought of how great an agony it must be that would lead a man to prefer quick death by fire and of how brave he must be to stage it. This could have positive significance, in the Roman sphere: the Roman understanding of honor suicide began to take shape during the Punic Wars, as an effect of the successive civil wars of the first century BCE. (After young Lucullus put up the statue in the late 50s or early 40s with Cato the Younger as his guardian, Cato himself, like other foes of Caesar, chose to commit suicide rather than fall into the enemy’s hands.) By Pliny’s day, honor suicide among the Roman elite also occurred as a response to the persecution of evil emperors. The expiring Hercules could be an emblem of such scorn of mere death.

One is entitled to wonder—even if it can’t ever be proved—if Lucullus imagined his own experience of political betrayal and eventual triumph in this dedication (see above, on the efforts of his enemies to deny him a triumph and cripple his career). But he persevered, finally triumphed, and won the right to dedicate *de manubiis*, as Pliny records his inscription. The possible implication that it could be the emblem of a sorely tried and ultimately vindicated Roman hero might have existed when the Senate passed its mandate for the statue’s dedication by his son, an honorific of great weight. Set up posthumously by Lucullus’ son, it was in some sense a funerary monument as well; the dying hero headed for a glorious afterlife could be a resonant metaphor for such a project, setting aside just what it was that brought Hercules to this extremity and instead looking to the long record of his Labors, and to the apotheosis that those earned for him. Even long after Lucullus’ day, Romans with a taste for history will have known at least the outlines of his story. The age of the Republic, and the complex personalities and events of its later decades, held an enduring fascination in the post-Republican period. Emperors from Augustus onwards claimed to still guarantee its institutions as if there had been no change. Lucullus is likely to have figured among the cycle of portraits of leading Republican statesmen and commanders—the *summi viri* or “most outstanding men” in Augustus’ Forum—whom the emperor is said to have characterized as an “exemplar” for what citizens should ask of him and

⁵⁴ Rutledge, *Ancient Rome as a Museum*, 38–40.

⁵⁵ See Alessandra Bravi, *Griechische Kunstwerke im politischen Leben Roms*, 26–29.

his successors.⁵⁶ The later part of Lucullus' life could seem over-idle, but his achievements in war and as a statesman remained admirable all the same.

If the Septimius Sabinus who restored the Republican statue really is the praetor of 28, thus active as an aedile around 30 or shortly before, in the Rome of Augustus/Octavian, then one can contextualize this restoration in light of Augustus' professed habit of seeing monuments of the great men of the Republic restored "along with their original inscriptions" ["manentibus titulis," Suetonius, *Augustus* 31.5],⁵⁷ "he often urged other leading men that, each according to his means, should adorn the city with monuments, whether new, or old ones remade and beautified" (29.4). Lucullus' family lineage ended with his son's death at Philippi, so non-relatives had to step in to restore the Hercules Tunicatus. The Augustan program, that aimed to look after the visible image of the Republic as something metonymic with its supposed constitutional restoration and restored religious observance, was well expressed by *cura* taken for such a meaningful dedication as this: something from triumphal *manubiae*, a remarkable clan monument at that, a memorial of senatorial action on behalf of excellence as well, showing *pietas* in several senses. The action of the aedile Sabinus—the last person to get the monument up—rescued and perpetuated the memory of the Luculli, embodying a commitment to look after the Republic's *ornamenta* of the city⁵⁸ and, through them, the *exempla* set by its historical figures. Insofar as the monument also evoked the poignant memory of Lucullus' son, by means of its inscription, it brought back memories of the Civil Wars in which Octavian had triumphed, since the still-youthful younger Lucullus died on the side of Caesar's assassins in their contest with Octavian. But once in power, Octavian/Augustus set aside the proscriptions of his earliest career and practiced much clemency towards surviving enemies, and took the trouble himself to restore the monuments of his adopted father's great enemy, Pompey. If this official re-dedication was of the Augustan era, it could seem like a retrospective pardon of the young Lucullus, in line with the official regime.

Those troubled by autocracy, or at least by its particularly despotic representative, also turned to thoughts of the Republic, however, for examples of integrity and endurance, and to try to understand the struggles between great men that eventually brought the Republic down. For them Lucullus would have been as complex a figure as he appears in Plutarch: an outstanding commander and man of learning (as he appears also in Cicero); a man of undeniable integrity on many counts, caught up in tangled factional infighting of the kind that would lead to autocracy in the end; a man praised by great Republican leaders like Cicero whose works were foundational to elite education, yet also someone who had become at life's end a quietist, politically, who could be thought of as turning far too much towards luxury, but who, all the same, was also

⁵⁶ Suetonius, *Augustus* 31.5, ed. Maximilian Ihm (Leipzig, 1907). On this collection of Republican leaders in peace and war, the teleological view of history it expressed on Augustus' behalf, and the nature of the Roman *monumentum*, see Josephine Shaya, "The Public Life of Monuments: The Summi Viri of the Forum of Augustus," *American Journal of Archaeology* 117, no. 1 (2013): 83–110.

⁵⁷ "Next to the immortal gods he held in honor the memory of the commanders who had raised the *imperium* of the Roman people from smallest to greatest state; and therefore he restored the works of any of them with the [original] inscriptions left remaining, and dedicated statues of all in triumphal costume in either portico of his forum."

⁵⁸ The aediles could have public monuments and sacred spaces in their sphere of action; Pape, *Kriegebeute*, 49 notes the evidence for their competence extending to shrines, and what Sabinus did was rescue and restore what can have been a religiously dedicated work. Republican curule aediles who are known to have dedicated important sculpture (the Wolf and Twins, either at the Lupercal cave or in the Roman Forum) were the Ogulnii, brother magistrates, who also dedicated fine temple furniture and sanctuary pavements, Livy 10.23.11-12; see, for instance, Jane DeRose Evans, *The Art of Persuasion: Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 75–85 at 80–81.

mourned sincerely when he died. Young Lucullus' fate could draw a sigh from the historically literate. In Pliny's day the Republic, its vices and its virtues were very much on the mind of the elite and sub-elites alike; still fresh were the murderous excesses of Nero's reign and the onset of bitter civil war again in 69, with its revival of Republican rhetoric about liberty and peace. Emperor Vespasian, who came to power in that year, made much of his stewardship of a good Republican legacy and of monuments like the Capitolium that could symbolize it.⁵⁹ Pliny must have known that here, as throughout his record of dedications, he would seem to his readers to solicit a meditation on the men and monuments of the Republic. His words on the Hercules of Lucullus were specifically designed to do just that. Many viewers and readers of the monument under the Principate can have had such thoughts already, and would continue down the centuries, in a city so marked by pre-Imperial places and images. Emperors like Augustus, Domitian, Hadrian and others used Hercules as an exemplar; but emperors could not control all discussions, all thoughts.

This image was caught in a narrative about overcoming pain and fear, whether Hercules as depicted had reached that state yet or not. That quality of endurance could be read in a philosophical sense. Hercules' habit of resistance to necessary and chosen dangers translated well into the codes of exemplary male conduct that demonstrated *arete* or, to a Roman, *virtus*. The highly military Hercules of Rome, who presided over outstanding martial *disciplina*, was especially apt for moral philosophizing there, as he had been for Hellenistic rulers who, since the days of Alexander, often evoked him as paradigm and even ancestor. One of the ironies of Lucullus' life is that the classic "choice of Herakles" made in favor of Virtue (the way of hard work and control of appetites) over Vice⁶⁰ could be seen as set aside in his final years for a life of great luxury. Lucullus had a taste for philosophy, as we know from his intimate association with Antiochos of Ascalon, a leading exponent of Academic philosophy with close ties to Stoicism, who worked intensively on the relationship between virtue and happiness.⁶¹ Lucullus must at least once have meditated on his Hercules statue from the standpoint of moral philosophy, the archaeologist of emotion can assert, and will certainly have known that other educated Greeks and Romans with similar training might also do so. He kept an acclaimed open house at his grand library (Plutarch *Lucullus* 41) for Greek visiting politicians and thinkers of all kinds, and similarly engaged Roman friends like Cicero. (Cicero gave Lucullus eponymous pride of place in the second book of his *Academica*, where 1–4 eulogizes Lucullus' career and talents.) A Catonian reading is worth considering as well, for the version of the statue installed on behalf of Lucullus' son perhaps under Cato's care. What will the guardian have guided his ward to think of the image? What did the movers of the *senatus consultum* that got the statue (back) say about its import to their fellow senators?

⁵⁹ See, for instance, Andrew Gallia, *Remembering the Roman Republic: Culture, Politics, and History under the Principate* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), which focuses on the period from the fall of Nero through the reign of Trajan, with occasional close attention to monuments (like Vespasian and the Capitolium, and Trajan's reissue of Republican coin types); also good, though without attention to the visual record, is Alain Gowing, *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture* (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁶⁰ Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 2.21.-33, ed. Jeffrey Henderson (Cambridge MA, 2014), adapting Prodikos.

⁶¹ Briefly on this figure, James Allen, "Antiochos of Ascalon," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2011 Edition), ed. Edward Zalta, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/antiochos-ascalon/>, consulted August 2016. Antiochos, already well established as a thinker and teacher, moved from Athens to Rome in 88, and quickly formed ties with Lucullus, among others; he died in 69/68 BCE. (Cicero knew him and his work well.) The friendship was praised in Plutarch, *Lucullus* 41; for the nature of his advising of and praise for Lucullus, see for instance Tröster, *Life of Lucullus*, 24, 45, and 130.

Poetics

This narrative has offered discussion about a kind of official version of how the statue could function as a political, sociological, and religious exemplum. But there were less prescribed responses as well, ones that might simply revel in the vivid aesthetic depiction of pain, or other educated responses that might query the hero's nobility in the course of more complex reactions. I conclude by looking briefly at what we know of the written Hercules and the performed Hercules, and at several authors who, like their audiences at Rome, can easily have known the Hercules Tunicatus had they ever entered the Forum and cast an eye over its statues; their readers in turn could bring a literary sensibility to the image in order to heighten their response and further prompt thoughts of *exemplum*. Like so much of the story sculpture of Rome, it staged a kind of play, in visual terms. The communal experience of drama was an important urban phenomenon at Rome from at least the third century onward, with many days a year devoted to free public dramas by Lucullus' day. A Republican playwright like the enduringly popular second-century BCE Accius was a master at "presenting scene after scene of unbearable suffering" with a sensitivity to visual as well as aural effects,⁶² offering an education in the consumption of any images of pain. The elite not only attended plays along with a host of ordinary people, but also read widely and deeply in Greek and Latin drama. For Greek/Hellenized viewers of the image in its first setting, and educated spectators subsequently, Sophocles' treatment can have come to mind; in seeing the Lucullan statue, educated Greeks in Rome, including those thronging Lucullus' own libraries, had that Sophoclean response accessible. Lucullus himself was known for his learning and culture, his *paideia*, and at his famous library which must have included many Greek texts (Plutarch, *Lucullus* 41) he may well have read Sophocles' *Trachineai*. Others in his circle certainly had: importantly, Cicero included his own Latin translation of the dying Hercules' lament and peroration, in the *Tusculan Disputations* (written in 45 BCE) at 2.20–22, to persuade his philosophizing audience of the reality of pain ("Can we scorn pain, when we can see Hercules himself suffering so immeasurably?").⁶³ In the Augustan age Ovid took up the dramatic plot and worked the story of the horrible death and triumphant apotheosis of Hercules into his *Metamorphoses*, prefaced by the story of Nessos and Deianeira (9.1–272). Though Ovid's hero groans and shrieks with pain, with the narrative exploring the poison's effects, once he is within the fire he ignores the flames and lies down among them placidly as if on a banquet couch. From the standpoint of Ovidian narrative, a man with a *torva facies* will not have reached such a state, though he might approach it.⁶⁴ Like other educated Romans, Pliny himself may have read Ovid; one can wonder if he ever

⁶² Accius, for whom we know nearly fifty attested tragedies, was born around 170 BCE and lived into the early first century BCE, so Lucullus grew up with this golden age of Latin drama just behind. See Anthony Boyle, *Roman Tragedy* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2006), 110–25, at 119.

⁶³ Ed. Jeffrey Henderson (Cambridge MA, 1927). Cf. 2.19, the spectacle that Philoctetes saw of "Hercules [...] on Oeta howling from the *magnitudo* of his pains," which Cicero makes an excuse for Philoctetes' own groaning over his wound. Petra Schierl thinks that here in the *Tusculan Disputations* Cicero "fosters the impression that wailing heroes are characteristic of Greek rather than Roman tragedy," with Roman tragedians instead expressing positive examples of the endurance of pain; "Roman Tragedy—Ciceronian Tragedy? Cicero's Influence on our Perception of Roman Tragedy," in *Brill's Companion to Roman Tragedy*, ed. George Harrison (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 45–62, at 61–62.

⁶⁴ Further, *Heroides* 9, probably authentically Ovidian, has Deianeira as its voice: she learns while writing her epistle that her husband is dying by her fault, and resolves to die (her suicide was part of the dramatic tradition).

knew the Roman tragedy *Hercules Oetaeus*,⁶⁵ if it was written and circulated before he died in 79 (it is variously now dated to the later first century/early second century CE). That play opens with Hercules' prayer to his father Jupiter to be allowed to ascend to heaven; little does the hero know that his taking of Iole will provoke Deianeira to despairing anger, an all too painful spur to death and subsequent apotheosis. The drama gives great space, far more than did Sophocles, to Hercules' rage and pain, his wild actions and his laments; but it ends with his rigorously maintained calm in his final moments on earth (1692–1755), his utterances from apotheosis, and a stirring closing exhortation by the chorus that urges us (1983–96) to achieve immortal *virtus* as the reward of a life lived bravely, if we are strong, *fortes*, so that at death *gloria* may open a path to the gods—a denouement often taken as infused by Stoic models. The literary corpus, then, points to several options for a Roman spectator: to dwell on the hero's exemplary last moments, or simply to be caught up in the satisfying drama of love gone wrong and disaster striking.

Philosophy or entertainment? Exciting spectacle or (also) *exemplum*? Art, history, or religion? The passage in Pliny that is the source of and guide to this brief essay itself seems to expect this wide range of responses to a much-enduring and highly visible major monument at the heart of the city of Rome. In each of its Roman instantiations (and I believe there were three, not just two) the *simulacrum* of the dying Hercules invited attentive viewing. With the original statue lost, we are still fortunate to have enough from Pliny to exercise our own imaginations in envisioning the display and its Greek and Roman audiences. In doing so, we join all those ancient readers of Pliny's Rome from around Italy and the Empire who also never saw the original, but who may felt urged by Pliny, as I have been, to exercise their bent towards visualization and speculation.

⁶⁵ Ed. John Fitch (Cambridge MA, 2002). Debate still is ongoing about whether the *Hercules Oetaeus* is by Seneca (d. 65) or by a very Senecan anonymous, writing probably in the Flavian or perhaps in the early Trajanic period. For the play and its close, briefly, Boyle, *Roman Tragedy* 221–23, and with further comment to its extremely Stoic close, Christopher Star, "Roman Tragedy and Philosophy," in *Brill's Companion to Roman Tragedy*, ed. George Harrison (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 238–59, at 255.