

A REDISCOVERED *TOGATUS* FROM POMPELO

Luis ROMERO NOVELLA¹
Rubén MONTOYA GONZÁLEZ

RESUMEN: A bronze sculpture of a *togatus*, lost for more than a century in American private collections, has been recently rediscovered. As for its origin, although it had been traditionally located in the Roman province of *Gallia*, recent studies have demonstrated that this sculpture emerged from the city of *Pompelo* in the Roman province of *Hispania Citerior*. In this article a stylistic analysis of the sculpture will be conducted, drawing new conclusions with regard to its typology, chronology and display.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Roman sculpture, *togatus*, *Pompelo*, Roman bronze sculpture.

ABSTRACT: Actualmente ha sido reencontrada una escultura en bronce de un *togatus*, que se ha tenido por desaparecida durante más de un siglo. La pieza procede de la ciudad de *Pompelo* y ha pasado desapercibida por diversas colecciones privadas estadounidenses como procedente de la Galia. Se realiza un análisis detallado de la pieza aportando importantes novedades en cuanto a su adscripción tipológica y cronológica.

KEYWORDS: Escultura romana, *togatus*, *Pompelo*, bronce romanos.

¹ Universidad de Navarra. Dirección electrónica: lromero@alumni.unav.es
University of Leicester. Dirección electrónica: rubenmontoyagonzalez@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION²

Large Roman bronze sculpture from *Hispania* is characterised by its scarcity (Trillmich, 1990). This is due to the processes of amortization to which the sculptures were subjected after the dismantling of the structures in which they were displayed, in addition to the practice of melting down statues for issuing the minting of coins (Trillmich, 1990: 37-38). Bronze *togatus* statues are even rarer; until the recent rediscovery of the *togatus* from *Pompelo* (fig.1), to which this study is dedicated, the example from Periate (Granada) had been considered the best example from the Roman province of *Hispania* (Arce, 1982, Mendoza, 1981: 411- 426 and Ramos, 2003: 58-61),

The sculpture was found in the city of Pamplona during excavations carried out in 1895 (Iturralde and Suit, 1895: 177-180), subsequently disappearing with no information about its location available until recent times. It was M. H. Olcina, participant in a congress in Germany, who discovered the current whereabouts of the sculpture, thanks to the comments of C. C. Mattusch (George Mason University). M.H. Olcina not only knew the current location of the objects, but also had studied it (Mattusch, 1996).

Based on this new disclosure it has been possible to trace the historical trail of the sculpture to which a French origin had been initially attributed. Initially after its discovery and disappearance in *Pompelo*, it was part of a private French collection; during the 1960s the object had been located in Versailles. Afterwards, the sculpture was sold in Paris by the antiquarian N. Koutoulakis (unknown date) and it has been supposed that in this time the sculpture could have been relocated to the USA.

In 1895 the sculpture was acquired in New York by J.W. Kluge at the Royal-Athena Galleries (VV.AA., 1985). Ten years later, still belonging to the collection of Kluge, the object was displayed in the exhibition “The Fire of Hephaistos: Large Classical Bronzes from North American Collections,” displayed between April 1996 and April 1997 (Mattusch, 1996: 343-347).

The sculpture was subsequently auctioned by Christie’s in New York on 9-12-2010³, although it was not purchased. In 2012, the sculpture was presented in the exhibition “Dialogues Between Art & Design”, organised by Phillips de Pury & Company. It is worth noting that in this exhibition the sculpture was

² We would like to thank Javier Andreu for his continuous comments and suggestions in this article, to M. García-Barberena’s availability and comments on unpublished information of the Roman *forum* of *Pompelo* and her permission to include some notes on it. In addition, we would like to thank Sarah Scott for her suggestions on the importance of highlighting the archaeological context of this sculpture. Finally, thanks to Zachary Remijas and Jane Ainsworth for their invaluable comments on earlier drafts of this article.

³ Sale 2364, lote 193

not being sold, rather only exhibited (Moss, 2012: 46), and nowadays it is not possible to know if the sculpture belongs to the company or not after unsuccessful attempts to make contact with them.

2. CONTEXT

Regarding the physical display of the sculpture, the scarcity of references to its context becomes evident when one considers recent studies. As indicated by S. Scott, this has been a common procedure in Classical Archaeology and objects have been often isolated from the contexts in which they were found (Scott, 2006: 628-643). In this way, material culture (e.g. sculpture, paintings or mosaics) has been placed into artificial categories based on modern aesthetic judgments. Furthermore, an artistic more than an archaeological focus is detectable when one considers approaches on Roman art.

As a consequence, no references to their archaeological contexts have been made (Renfrew, 2000, Brodie and Tubb, 2002, from Scott, 2006: 628-629). In fact, the Roman bronze sculpture presented in this article constitutes a clear example of the limitations of traditional approaches. By considering the physical space in which these objects were displayed, however, a better understanding of their meaning and functionality can be achieved (Elsner, 1995: 2007; an example of the extent to which different physical displays affected the meaning and interpretation of sculptures, although not focused on the typology approached in this article, can be found in Alexandridis, 2010: 252-279).

Focusing on the sculpture approached in this study, its discovery in 1895 in an excavation carried out in Navarrería Street. Along with the *togatus*, a bronze head of a second sculpture –currently lost– was also unearthed (Iturralde and Suit, 1895: 178). Immediately investigated after its discovery (Iturralde and Suit, 1895: 177-180), this sculpture was neglected by scholars until the close analysis carried out by J. C. Elorza (Elorza, 1974: 49-54). Some brief considerations were outlined in catalogues of exhibitions in which the sculpture was displayed (Mattusch, 1996: 343-347 and Moss, 2012: 46).

When one considers contextual data on this type of representation, however, new conclusions on its physical display can be established. First, according to its typology and stylistic characteristics, a public context (e.g. *fora* or theatres) can be suggested for the display of such types of representations (Garriguet, 2001: 105-116 and Boschung, 2002: 25-94). Second, when one considers recent studies on the Roman *forum* of *Pompeo* –carried out by M. García-Barberena as part of his PhD in the University of Navarra–, which was probably located in the surroundings of the Navarrería Square, a close relation between

this place and the discovery of the sculpture in 1895 becomes evident. Third, the public display of this object could be derived from initial publications in which it was noted that surrounding the bronze head belonging to a second sculpture, shafts and bases of columns were also found (Iturralde and Suit, 1895: 178). Based on this, the presence of the Roman forum of *Pompelo* in this area is reinforced. The work of the rear part of the sculpture suggests its display on a pedestal and not in a niche. In sum, no more data is available for the physical context of the sculpture, regularity in excavations carried out in this time –characterised by an absence of stratigraphic recording (see before)– and by the scarce description of the object made by the *Comisión de Monumentos*.

3. DESCRIPTION

The sculpture, made of bronze, shows a masculine figure wearing a *toga*; it is characterised by its great size (fig. 1). The head has been lost, as well as the left rear part of the body from the underarm to the feet (Mezquíriz, 2011: 27). The rest of the sculpture is in an excellent state of preservation. The dimensions of the preserved part are 157, 5 x 61 x 33 cm (Moss, 2012: 46). The man represented is dressed in a tunic covered by a large toga resting on his left arm. The toga features a long drape of the *sinus* under the right knee.

Though *umbus* and *balteus* are not preserved in this exemplar, the fine carving of the cloths (Mattusch, 1996: 344-347) and the rested pose of the sculpture, in which the legs are not distorted, stand out. The man represented wears a *calceus* for which no typology can be attributed (Goette, 1988: 449-464): this is caused by the impossibility of distinguishing between *calceus patricius*, *senatorius*, or *equester*, since the length of the tunic covers both feet (Goette, 1988: 450-451). In addition, some restorations in the *sinus*, *umbo* and left hand are detectable when comparing the images presented by the Commission of Monuments (Elorza, 1974: tav. 1) with its current state of preservation (Mattusch, 1996: 334).

As for its display, this sculpture would probably be located in the *forum* of the city, as part of the decorative programs honouring personalities or private individuals. It is not possible to determine, however, if this sculpture was representing a member of the imperial family or an individual from the local elite⁴.

⁴ As for the identification of the sculpture, some notes were done by P. Ozcáriz in his blog <http://esunaviejahistoria.blogspot.com.es/2015/03/el-togado-de-pompelo.html>

4. TYPOLOGICAL AND STYLISTIC ANALYSIS

According to J.C. Elorza, the most characteristic feature of the sculpture is the support of the tunic by the right hand⁵. In addition to Elorza's notes, Goette presented more parallels highlighting a similar support of the tunic by the left hand⁶. Focusing on the Roman province of *Hispania*, a similar gesture supporting the *sinus* is found in different examples⁷. Another significant feature is represented by the position of the left forearm, usually projected forward, but presented to the left in this example. This was possible due to the bronze's malleability.

For its typological adscription, the Ca model of the typology presented by H.R. Goette (Goette, 1990: 55-57 and 141-143) appears to be the most accurate. This identification is based on i) the absence of *umbus* in the toga –that is why the sculpture does not present the characteristic knot formed by the folds at the level of the stomach– and ii) due to the disposition and fall of the *sinus* and *balteus* of the toga in the frontal part. The first example of this model would be, according to Goette, a representation of the Arch of Titus in Rome (Goette, 1990: 55 and Taf. 32, 1.2). We do not agree with the suggestions of C.C. Mattusch on the type of representation, nor with the identification of the man with a pro-

⁵ He highlights different parallels: the sculpture of *C. Caecilius Saturnius* from the Lateranense Museum (ELORZA, 1974: 50); the *togatus* from *Via Appia* in the Chiaramonti Gallery of the Vatican Museum (ELORZA, 1974: 50); two *togati* from *Ostia* (ELORZA, 1974: 50 and GOETTE, 1990: 140-141 and Taf. 27, 5 and 31, 4); a sculpture from the Louvre Museum (ELORZA, 1974: 50); the reliefs of *T. Statilius Aper* from the Capitoline Museum (ELORZA, 1974: 50 and GOETTE, 1990: 133 and Taf. 20, 1) and a representation from the Arch of Beneventum (ELORZA, 1974: 50 and GOETTE, 1990: 142 and Taf. 15, 2.3).

⁶ Two sculptures from the Casino Massimo in Rome (GOETTE, 1990: 29 and Taf. 4, 6); one sculpture from Villa Borghese (GOETTE, 1990: 128 and Taf. 12, 2); a relief from the Vatican Museum (GOETTE, 1990: 41 and Taf. 12, 5); the *togatus* of *Virius Audentius* from Pozzuoli, actually in the Archaeological Museum of Campi Flegrei in Baia (GOETTE, 1990: 139 and Taf. 26, 2); one *togatus* from the Archaeological Museum of Naples (GOETTE, 1990: 139 and Taf. 26, 4); one *togatus* from the National Museum of Antiquities of Algeria (GOETTE, 1990: 144 and Taf. 39, 1); three sculptures from the National Museum of Roman Art in Rome (Goette, 1990: 143-145 and Taf. 36, 4; 40, 4 and 40, 6); one from Aphrodisias, actually in the Museum of Geyre (GOETTE, 1990: 146 and Taf. 45, 5), and another from Ephesus, currently in the Museum of Izmir (GOETTE, 1990: 146 and Taf. 45, 3).

⁷ Two sculptures from *Acinipo*, situated in the Museum of Ronda (BAENA DEL ALCÁZAR, 1984: 4-6 and BAENA DEL ALCÁZAR, 1996: 40); two examples with *bullae* were found in the theater of *Tarraco* and currently are protected in the Archaeological Museum of Tarragona (GARRIGUET, 2001: n° 73 and 74 and KOPPEL, 2004: 117-118). Another example was found in *Italica*, actually conserved in the Archaeological Museum of Seville (LEÓN, 1995: 64-65 and BAENA DEL ALCÁZAR, 2009: 244). Another example, to which a late chronology has been attributed, was found in *Segobriga*, actually displayed in the Museum of *Segobriga* (NOGUERA, 2012: n° 206).

moter of *circenses* performances represented in the act of starting the race (Mattusch, 1996: 343).

Focusing on the Ca model presented by H.R. Goette, further parallels to the *pompelonense* sculpture can be found⁸. As previously indicated, Roman bronze representations of the *togatus* are characterised by their scarcity due to the processes of amortization and melting. Exceptions to this are the bronze group of *togatus* from Herculaneum (Goette, 1990: 120-121 and Taf. 8, 2 and 8, 6), as well as the sculpture of *Aulus Metelus* from the Museum of Florence (Goette, 1990: 106 and Taf. 1, 1). As for the Spanish examples, that from Periate (Granada) constituted, until the rediscovery of the *togatus* object of this article, the unique example of Roman bronze sculpture in *Hispania* (Arce, 1982, Mendoza, 1981: 411- 426 and Ramos, 2003: 58-61)⁹.

Some parallels with regard to the fold of the tunic covering the *calcei*, a remarkable characteristic of the *pompelonense* example, can be found in feminine representations such as the *Pudicitia* type, *Eumachia* type, *Allia-Berlín* type, or *Koré* type (Baena del Alcázar, 2000: 18-23). It must be mentioned that this type of drape of the tunic is unusual in the majority of *togatus* sculptures, which generally do show the feet. This aspect is present in the *togatus* from *Astigi*, already mentioned (Goette, 1990: 141 and Taf. 31, 1 and Baena del Alcázar, 2009: 254) (fig. 2a).

If we consider the work of this sculpture, its hands stand out because of being poorly executed. Based on this, the creation of the sculpture could be related to a local workshop to which other bronze findings from this geographic region belong. This includes examples such as: the head found in Curia Street in *Pompelo* (Mezquíriz, 2011: 27 and 31) and a hand from the same city (Mezquíriz, 2011: 27 and 32); the pedestal with rests of *calcei* from *Cara* (Mezquíriz, 1993: 301-302; Mezquíriz, 2006: 174 and Mezquíriz, 2011: 28-33); the sculpted rests from *Andelo* (Mezquíriz, 2009: 177 and Mezquíriz, 2011: 29, 37); or the sculpted fragments from the *forum* of Los Bañales (Andreu, 2012: 48). As for the latter

⁸ A *togatus* from the Museum of Sousse (GOETTE, 1990: 141 and Taf. 31, 3); a *togatus* from *Ostia* (GOETTE, 1990: 141 and Taf. 31, 4); another *togatus* from the Museum of Guelma (GOETTE, 1990: 141 and Taf. 31, 6); two Spanish examples from *Italica* (GOETTE, 1990: 141 and Taf. 31, 2, LEÓN, 1995: 70-71, n° 17 and BAENA DEL ALCÁZAR, 2009: 254-255) (Fig. 2. b) and another one from *Astigi* (GOETTE, 1990: 141 and Taf. 31, 1, BAENA DEL ALCÁZAR, 2009: 254) (Fig. 2. a), both in the Archaeological Museum of Seville (see also LEÓN, 2009).

⁹ Though of a small size, a bronze *togatus* has been found in *Emerita Augusta*, actually in the National Museum of Roman Art (TRILLMICH, 1990: 108, 109 and 240, and VV.AA., 2007: 190-130). Furthermore, representations of bronze genies have been found in *Italica*, actually conserved in the Archaeological Museum of Seville (GARCÍA Y BELLIDO, 1949: 188, n° 216), in Puente Puñide, actually in the National Archaeological Museum (GARCÍA Y BELLIDO, 1969: 31-32) and in Freixido, from a private collection (GARCÍA Y BELLIDO, 1969: 30-31).

examples, they present similar execution, a fact which could suggest the activity of an unique workshop in these cities of the Vascones' region.

Finally, no consensus has been reached on the statue's chronology; different dates from an early Flavian period (Elorza, 1974: 51) to the half 2nd century AD (Mattusch, 1996: 346) have been attributed. Based on the evidence of the folds of the toga and on the absence of *umbus* and *balteus*, we consider the first half of the 2nd century AD as the most probable period for the *pompeleonense* example. Similar parallels which reinforce this chronology would be –as previously mentioned– those from the Museum of Sousse, *Ostia*, *Guelma*, *Ita-lica*, and *Astigi*. This chronology coincides with that of the *forum* of *Pompelo*, initiated in the Flavian period –after the promotion of the city to *municipium*–, and with signs of amortization at the end of the 2nd, or the beginning of the 3rd century AD.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The rediscovery of the sculpture studied in this article, characterised by its exceptional state of preservation, made this example one of the best examples of the Roman bronze sculpture from *Hispania*. As argued previously, it can be identified as an example of the Ca model of Goette's classification typologically. In addition, regarding its chronology, the first half of the 2nd century AD has been established based on parallels sharing the same folds of the toga and working of the cloths.

This rediscovery reaffirms the importance of sculpture cycles displayed in the Roman cities of the Northern area of the Iberian Peninsula, updated in the last years by new discoveries made, for instance, in the Roman city of Los Bañales (Romero, Andreu and Gabaldón, 2014: 197-216; Andreu, Romero and Montoya: 2014-15, 61-64 and Andreu, Romero and Montoya, forthcoming) or in *Iulia Libica* (Rodà, 2007: 754-755). In addition, the importance of the Roman city of *Pompelo*, for which new contextual data have been mentioned with regard to the location of its *forum*, can be derived from this rediscovery, as well from studies in process.

6. REFERENCES

- ALEXANDRIDIS, A. (2010), "Neutral bodies? Female portraitstatue types from the Late Republic to the 2nd century CE", in S. Halas, and T. Hodos (eds.), *Material Culture and Social Identities in the Ancient World*, Cambridge.
- ANDREU, J. (2012), *La ciudad romana de Los Bañales (Uncastillo-Zaragoza): guía histórico-arqueológica*, Zaragoza.
- ANDREU, J.; ROMERO L. and MONTOYA, R. (2014-15), "Los Bañales (Uncastillo, Zaragoza): ciuitas augústea", *Anales de Arqueología Cordobesa*, nº 25-26, 49-70.
- (forthcoming), "Avance a los retratos julio-claudios del foro de la ciudad romana de Los Bañales (Uncastillo, Zaragoza)", in *August i les províncies Occidentals* (Tarragona, 2014), Tarragona, np.
- ARCE, J. (1982), *El Togado Romano de Bronce hallado en Periate (Granada)*, Granada.
- BAENA DEL ALCÁZAR, L. (1984), "Esculturas romanas de Ronda y su comarca", *Jábega*, nº 47, 3-8.
- (1996), "Los togados de la Baetica: análisis epigráfico y escultórico", in J. Massó, and P. Sada (ed.), *Actas de las II Reunión sobre escultura romana en Hispania* (Tarragona, 1995), Tarragona, 31-48.
- (2000), "Tipología y funcionalidad de las esculturas femeninas vestidas de Hispania", in P. León and T. Nogales (eds.), *Actas de la III Reunión sobre Escultura Romana en Hispania* (Córdoba, 1998), Córdoba, 1-23.
- (2009), "Estatuas togadas y femeninas vestidas", in P. León (coord.), *Arte romano de la Bética. Escultura*, Sevilla, 235-275.
- BOSCHUNG, D. (2002), *Gens Augusta: Untersuchungen zu Aufstellung, Wirkung und Bedeutung der Statuengruppen des julisch-claudischen Kaiserhauses*, Mainz.
- BRODIE, N. and TUBB, K. (eds) (2002), *Illicit Antiquities: The Theft of Culture and the Extinction of Archaeology*, London.
- ELORZA, J. C. (1974), "Dos notables esculturas romanas del País Vasco-Navarro", *Príncipe de Viana*, nº 35, 49-54.
- ELSNER, J. (1995), *Art and the Roman Viewer*, Cambridge.
- (2007), *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art & Text*, Princeton and Oxford.
- GARRIGUET, J. A. (2001), *La imagen del poder imperial en Hispania. Tipos estatuarios, Corpus Signorum Imperii Romani II.1*, Murcia.
- GARCÍA Y BELLIDO, A. (1949), *Esculturas romanas de España y Portugal*, Madrid.
- (1969), "Esculturas romanas de Galicia", *Cuadernos de Estudios Gallegos*, nº 24, fasc. 72-74, 27-34.
- GOETTE, H. R. (1988), "Mulleus – Embas – Calceus. Ikonographische Studien zu römischem Schuhwerk", *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, nº 103, 401-464.

- GOETTE, H. R. (1990), *Studien zu Römischen Togadarstellungen*, Mainz y Rhein.
- ITURRALDE and SUIT, J. (1895), "Descubrimiento de antigüedades romanas en Pamplona", *Boletín de la Comisión de Monumentos de Navarra*, nº 8, 177-180.
- KOPPEL, E. M. (2004), "La escultura", in X. Dupré, (ed.), *Tarragona: Colonia Iulia Urbs Triumphalis Tarraco*, Roma, 111-122.
- LEÓN, P. (1995), *Esculturas de Itálica*, Sevilla.
- (2009), *Arte romano de la Bética II. Escultura*, Sevilla.
- MATTUSCH, C. C. (1996), *The Fire of Hephaistos: Large Classical Bronzes from North American Collections*, Cambridge.
- MENDOZA, A. (1981), "Avance al estudio del togado de bronce del Cortijo de Periate (Piñar, Granada)", *Cuadernos de Prehistoria de la Universidad de Granada*, nº 6, 411- 426.
- MEZQUÍRIZ, M. A. (1993), "Hallazgo de un calceus de bronce en Santacara", in F. Burkhalter y Arce, J. (eds), *Bronces y religión romana: actas del XI Congreso Internacional de Bronces Antiguos (Madrid, 1990)*, Madrid, 301-308.
- (2006), "La antigua ciudad de los carenses", *Trabajos de Arqueología Navarra*, nº 19, 147-268.
- (2009), *Andelo, ciudad romana*, Pamplona.
- (2011), "Catálogo de bronce romanos recuperados en el territorio de Navarra", *Trabajos de arqueología Navarra*, nº 23, 21-118.
- MOSS, M. (2012), *Dialogues Between Art & Design*, Nueva York.
- NOGUERA, J. M. (2012), *Segobriga (Provincia de Cuenca, Hispania Citerior), Corpus Signorum Imperii Romani-España*, vol. I, 4, Tarragona.
- RAMOS, M. (2003), "El Togado de Periate", *Mus-A*, nº 1, 58-61.
- RENFREW, C. (2000), *Loot, Legitimacy and Ownership*, London.
- ROMERO, L.; ANDREU, J. and GABALDÓN, M. (2014), "Un thoracatus imperial de Los Bañales (Uncastillo, Zaragoza)", *Zephyrus*, nº 73, 197-216.
- RODÀ, I. (2007), "Documentos e imágenes de culto imperial en la Tarraconense septentrional", in T. Nogales y J. González (coord.), *Culto imperial: política y poder: Actas del Congreso Internacional Culto Imperial: política y poder (Mérida, 2006)*, 739-761.
- SCOTT, S. (2006), "Art and the Archaeologist", *World Archaeology*, vol. 38, n. 4, Debates in "World Archaeology", 628-643.
- TRILLMICH, W. (1990), *Los Bronces romanos en España*, Madrid.
- VV.AA. (1985), *Art of the Ancient World*, Nueva York, vol. IV, nº 277.
- (2007), *Roma S.P.Q.R. Catálogo de la exposición*, Madrid.



Fig. 1
Togatus from *Pompeo* viewed from different angles (Mattusch, 1996: 344)



Fig. 2

a) *Togatus* from *Astigi*, currently in the Archaeological Museum of Sevilla (L. Romero) y
b) *Togatus* from *Italica*, currently in the Archaeological Museum of Sevilla (L. Romero)