



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Egypt beyond representation : materials and materiality of Aegyptiaca Romana

Müskens, S.W.G.

Citation

Müskens, S. W. G. (2017, March 16). *Egypt beyond representation : materials and materiality of Aegyptiaca Romana*. Archaeological Studies Leiden University. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/46693>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/46693>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/46693> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Müskens, Sander

Title: Egypt beyond representation : materials and materiality of Aegyptiaca Romana

Issue Date: 2017-03-16

2. The category and classification of Aegyptiaca

In the absence of an ancient terminology to describe the totality or specific classes of ‘Egyptian’ and ‘Egyptian-looking’ material culture from the Roman world, scholars have created a modern vocabulary for its classification.⁴⁷ Some have suggested the adoption of specific definitions to describe the different manifestations of Egypt in the Roman world as precise as possible, while others essentially refrain from applying specific terminologies or use various terms without properly defining them. This study adopts the term Aegyptiaca to cover the totality of Egyptian and Egyptianising artefacts, that is, all objects that originate from Egypt or that evoke an association with Egypt in terms of style, subject matter, or by means of another Roman association.⁴⁸ This definition, coined by Versluys, was repeated some years later in an article by Swetnam-Burland, who intended to indicate all “things or matters related to Egypt” regardless of provenance.⁴⁹ However, this understanding of the concept of Aegyptiaca was subsequently rejected by Malaise. Acknowledging that objects subsumed under the heading of Aegyptiaca as defined by Versluys served widely different, contextually dependent functions, he argued that “il n’est pas souhaitable de regrouper sous un même vocable des réalités aussi diverses dans leurs intentions”.⁵⁰ Considering the supposed importance of the cults of Isis in the Roman world in particular,⁵¹ he instead proposed a more precise

terminology that distinguishes between Aegyptiaca (all Egyptian and Egyptianising artefacts that do not relate to the Isis cults, regardless of chronology), Pharaonica (all artefacts related to the Egyptian cults of Isis and related gods, regardless of chronology and Egyptian or Italian manufacture), Nilotica (all artefacts related to the Nile flood), and products of Egyptomania (recreations and adaptations of Egyptian artefacts, in particular reflecting Roman fascinations of Egypt).⁵²

It is evident that most definitions entail notions of chronology, provenance, manufacture, style, and particular subject matters. These concepts are also reflected in the problematic terms Egyptian and Egyptianising, which are often used to subdivide Egyptian material culture in the Roman world regardless of the adhered definitions. The following discussion explores the foundations and implications of the Egyptian – Egyptianising dichotomy in more detail in order to elucidate the premises that underlie modern approaches to and engagements with artefacts that we associate with Egypt.

47. On (the nearly complete absence of) relevant terminology in ancient sources, see Swetnam-Burland (2007) 119 with references.

48. Versluys (2002) 305; cf. Versluys & Meyboom (2000) 110 n. 1, and Malaise (2005) 201-204 for an overview of different applications of the concept of Aegyptiaca in scholarly literature. It should be emphasised that the term Aegyptiaca will be used as an etic concept in this study, for which see *infra*, section I.3.

49. Swetnam-Burland (2007) 119 (both quotations), and 110-119 in general.

50. Malaise (2005) 19.

51. The sources that attest to the so-called diffusion between the 4th century BC and the 4th century AD of the Isis cults outside of Egypt are sometimes called Isiaca, in order to set them apart from Aegyptiaca (which is then meant to refer to all Egyptian

and Egyptianising artefacts distributed outside Egypt prior to the 4th century BC, i.e. before the supposed dissemination of the Isis cults and Isiaca began): see Bricault (2000), esp. 91-92, *ibid.* (2001) xi. These sources (epigraphic and material) would mainly relate to a certain circle of originally Egyptian deities, the so-called *gens isiaque*, consisting of Anubis/Hermanubis, Apis, Bubastis, Harpocrates, Horus, Hydreios, Isis, Neilos, Nephthys, Osiris, and Sarapis: see Malaise (2007) 21-31, cf. *ibid.* (2005) 33-78 for an extensive discussion of the different members, and 79-117 for the companions of the Isiac family (including Bes, Ammon, Thoth, Sobek, and Antinous). Another rarely used term refers to all source material relating to the god Sarapis alone: Sarapiaca. According to Bricault (2000, 92 n. 4) this term should be avoided altogether, while its use for studies focusing on this deity only is accepted by Malaise (2005, 30-31).

52. Malaise (2005) 201-220, *ibid.* (2007) 34-38; Malaise’s definitions of Aegyptiaca, Pharaonica, and Nilotica were recently repeated by Capriotti Vittozzi (2013, 33-34).

2.1 WINCKELMANN'S SYNTHESIS ON EGYPTIAN ART HISTORY: THE FOUNDATIONS

"The categories Winckelmann first distinguished remain deeply embedded in modern approaches towards objects of antiquity – in a sense, the stages Winckelmann defined still today are most often canonical in art historical and classical archaeological studies, implicit or explicit"

Preziosi (1998) 21

"Eine einfache Erwägung zeigt, daß alle Klassifikationen, die der Mensch jemals gemacht hat, willkürlich, künstlich und falsch sind. Aber eine ebenso einfache Erwägung zeigt, daß diese Klassifikationen nützlich und unentbehrlich und vor allem unvermeidlich sind, weil sie einer eingeboren Tendenz unseres Denkens entspringen. Denn im Menschen lebt ein tiefer Wille zur Einteilung, er hat einen heftigen, ja leidenschaftlichen Hang, die Dinge abzugrenzen, einzufrieden, zu etikettieren"

Friedell (1947) 59

The exact origins of the distinction between Egyptian and Egyptianising remain unclear. I have been unable to determine when exactly the term Egyptianising was first used to describe objects related to but not quite like Egyptian objects. However, the intellectual legacy from which it has been inherited can be traced back to the work of Winckelmann. "Winckelmann est le premier", Lafaye wrote in 1884, "qui ait enseigné à reconnaître le style d'imitation dans les ouvrages qu'avant lui on qualifiait en bloc d'égyptiens; cette distinction est devenue classique".⁵³ When, how, and why this distinction became the prevailing, even classic interpretation are interesting questions that cannot be easily answered,⁵⁴ but it is evident that Lafaye's words

are still very relevant today, as we shall see below. The essential merit of Winckelmann's historical synthesis was the historical dimension that it added to the understanding of ancient art.⁵⁵ Consequently, artefacts were no longer timeless remnants of an undifferentiated past but could be systematically and,

artefacts without paying any attention to its origins and definitions. In retrospect, this seems to have substantially contributed to the seemingly straightforward (and therefore typically implicit) nature of the classification of Egyptian material culture. However, considering its importance for our understanding of and engagements with Aegyptiaca in the Roman world, it would be interesting to explore when, how, and why this classification system had come into existence and how its persistence can be explained. Judging from Lafaye's words, written in 1884, the distinction must have been canonised sometime between the late 18th century (that is, after the initial publication of Winckelmann's *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* in 1764 and its second edition in 1776, respectively) and the late 19th century. The key to understanding Lafaye's remark must therefore lie in 19th century scholarship on ancient Egypt and its material culture. As we have seen above, this period was indeed a formative period for the institutionalisation of academic disciplines, and it was essential in many respects for the directions in which these disciplines and their generated knowledge have subsequently developed (cf. *supra*, 7-9). Despite early criticism, the reception of Winckelmann's writings on the history of ancient art, as postulated most prominently in his *Geschichte der Kunst*, has essentially been a classic success story that earned Winckelmann general praise as founding father of the modern disciplines of art history and Classical archaeology.

55. *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* was originally published in Dresden in 1764, but Winckelmann began to make plans for a second edition already one year later. "Sobald ich Luft bekomme", Winckelmann wrote in a letter in 1765, "werde ich eine vollständigere Ausgabe der Geschichte der Kunst besorgen. Wir sind heute klüger als wir gestern war" (quotation from Winckelmann 2002, vii). Before the publication of a second edition, however, a critical supplement was published, entitled *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (Dresden 1767), which contained comments on and corrections of the first edition. The second significantly expanded edition would not be published (posthumously) until 1776 in Vienna (Winckelmann was murdered in 1768). A historical discussion on the various editions of *Geschichte der Kunst* and related writings can be found in the prelude to the 2002-edition of Winckelmann's texts (edited by A.H. Borbein, T.W. Gaethgens, J. Irmscher, M. Kunze) = Winckelmann (2002) vii-xi. I have consulted this edition throughout my research. Subsequent references will refer to this edition; page numbers will be given as found in this edition. Following the 2002-edition, I will use *GK1* to refer to the first edition (Dresden 1764); *GK2* will be used to refer to the second edition (Vienna 1776). For *Anmerkungen*, originally published in Dresden, 1767, I have consulted the 2008-edition by A.H. Borbein and M. Kunze = Winckelmann (2008). Subsequent references will refer to this edition; page numbers will be given as found in this edition.

53. Lafaye (1884) 243-244.

54. This remark has gone unnoticed in later literature, despite the important role of Lafaye's book in the scholarship on Aegyptiaca Romana. Apart from a loose remark in a footnote of an otherwise unrelated article on the history of Egyptology (Whitehouse 1992, 66 n. 12), I have not found any other reference that explicitly mentions a relationship between Winckelmann and the classification of Egyptian material culture. Rather, scholars writing about Aegyptiaca in the Roman world usually use the distinction between categories of Egyptian and Egyptianising

above all, chronologically classified. “The classical artistic tradition”, Alex Potts writes, “no longer simply presented itself as a timeless ideal, but took on the character of a historical phenomenon, caught up in a cycle of development manifest in changes of style from the crudely archaic through successive refinements to a phase of classical perfection in the fifth and fourth centuries BC, and from there to imitation and eventual decline. It is with Winckelmann that the modern distinction between an earlier, purer Greek tradition, and a later, imitative, and inherently inferior Greco-Roman one, first began to take hold”.⁵⁶ Key to the understanding and application of Winckelmann’s evolutionary model was the belief that sculpture would reflect the characteristic social and cultural circumstances of a particular environment and period that shaped its creation in a direct and, above all, fixed way. These circumstances would be manifest in changes of what Winckelmann called style.⁵⁷

The supposed static relationship between style and chronology implied that random artefacts could now be chronologically organised on the basis of a careful empirical analysis of their (stylistic) characteristics. Hence, Greek sculpture was divided into four style-periods, or *Stilepochen*, that would have developed from “[...] archaic crudeness and simplicity (*der ältere Stil*) [...] through successive refinements to an early classical austere phase (*der hohe Stil*) [...], then to a later classical graceful and beautiful phase (*der schöne Stil*) [...], and on from there to imitation, over-elaboration, and decline (*der Stil der Nachahmer*)”.⁵⁸

In similar vein, Winckelmann distinguished three subsequent style-periods in Egyptian history: *der ältere* (or *wahre Aegyptische*) *Stil* that would have lasted from the earliest times of Egyptian history until the invasion of Cambyses; *der spätere Stil* covering the period between the Persian and Ptolemaic periods; and finally the *Nachahmungen Aegyptischer Werke unter dem Kaiser Hadrian*.⁵⁹ The latter category was further subdivided into objects that closely imitated Egyptian originals and those that combined Egyptian and Greek art forms. Presumptions about the sculptures’ place of manufacture and the ethnicity of the sculptors were inherent to these different style-periods. Objects of the first and second groups were considered to be made in Egypt by Egyptian craftsmen. Roman imitations, on the other hand, were regarded as neither made in Egypt nor by Egyptian craftsmen.⁶⁰ The criteria for

informed several historical studies, which treated history in comparable terms of birth, maturity, and decline. This evolutionary approach is clearly echoed, for instance, in the title of Edward Gibbon’s seminal *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (first published between 1776-1788, some years after Winckelmann’s *Geschichte der Kunst* first appeared). Cf. Preziosi (1998) 26, Ritner (1992a).

56. Potts (2003) 130. This distinction would largely shape future scholarship on Greek and Roman sculptures known as *Kopienkritik*, for which see also *supra*, n. 13.

57. Note that rather than style only, which is understood here as the making of something in a particular way, Winckelmann’s (and later authors’) classification of sculpture indeed heavily depends on stylistic analysis, yet also includes (e)valuations of formal, iconographic, and, at least to some extent, material properties.

58. Potts (2006) 3. The understanding of history as cyclic patterns of rise and decline implied that some *Stilepochen* were understood as superior or inferior to others, just as some cultures and their artistic productions were considered to be inferior or superior to other cultures. For Winckelmann, Classical Greek sculpture represented the beau idéal; consequently, sculpture that preceded or succeeded Greek productions from the 5th and 4th centuries BC would be irrevocably inferior. Winckelmann’s evolutionary conceptualisation of historical developments is firmly rooted in Enlightenment thinking. Instigated by a widespread concern about contemporary Baroque culture – which was conceived as a period of decline – the then current self-conscious attitude

59. See Appendix A for an excerpt from a letter dating to 1761, in which Winckelmann first postulated his thesis on Egyptian art history that he would further elaborate upon in the first edition of his *Geschichte der Kunst* (1764). As can be inferred from several quotations in Winckelmann’s text, objects from the latter group are clearly to be understood as imitations and therefore essentially as not quite the real thing, like objects from the other two *Stilepochen*. The figures of the sculptures of this category, “[...] welche den alten Aegyptischen Figuren ähnlicher, als jene, kommen, und weder in Aegypten, noch von Künstlern dieses Landes, gearbeitet worden, sondern Nachahmungen Aegyptischer Werke sind, welche Kaiser Hadrian machen lassen und, so viel mir wissend ist, sind dieselben alle in dessen Villa zu Tivoli gefunden. An einigen ließ er die ältesten Aegyptischen Figuren genau nachahmen; an andern vereinigte er die Aegyptische Kunst mit der Griechischen [...] Das ganze”, Winckelmann continues, “hat eine Aegyptische Gestalt, aber die Theile haben nicht die Aegyptische Form”. The particular traits would rather be similar to Greek forms. Winckelmann writes: “Die größte Verschiedenheit aber lieget in dem Gesichte: welches weder auf Aegyptische Art gearbeitet, noch sonst ihren Köpfen ähnlich ist. Die Augen [...] sind nach dem Systema der Griechischen Kunst tief gesenket [...] Die Form des Gesichts ist vielmehr Griechisch [...]”. A little later, Winckelmann adds with regard to the dress of the objects from this category: “In der Bekleidung der Figuren, welche Nachahmungen der ältesten Aegyptischen sind, verhält es sich allgemein, wie mit der Zeichnung und der Form derselben”. All quotations from Winckelmann (2002) 86-88 (*GKI*).

60. “Zu den Statuen [of the third group] können die Sphinxen gerechnet werden, und es sind vier derselben von schwarzem Granit in der Villa Albani, deren Köpfe eine Bildung haben, die

classifying a certain sculpture would be formal design (*Bildung/Form*), artistic rendering (*Zeichnung*), and dress (*Bekleidung*). It is evident from these criteria that, rather than style alone, formal and iconographical features were also considered to be characteristic for particular timeframes.⁶¹

Winckelmann's *Geschichte der Kunst* not merely offered a new synthesis of the history of Egyptian art; more than anything, it provided a tangible *method* for the periodisation of Egyptian sculptures where his

mutmaßlich in Ägypten nicht kann entworfen und gearbeitet sein": Winckelmann (2002) 88 (*GKI*).

61. It is interesting to note that, despite the emphasis on style and subject matter, Winckelmann seems to have become increasingly aware of the importance of materials. In *GKI*, the materials used for Egyptian sculpture are only briefly discussed (original page numbers 63-67). When his *Anmerkungen* were published three years later, Winckelmann's thoughts on the development of the Egyptian visual arts had not changed to the extent that a complete revision had become necessary. "Von der Kunst der Aegypter finde ich nichts besonders, was die Zeichnung, als das Wesen derselben, betrifft, hier von neuen zu bemerken [...]", Winckelmann opens his commentary on *GKI*'s section on Egyptian art (Winckelmann 2008, 35). The subsequent pages of commentary are devoted to minor adjustments and additions, without changing the essence of his theory. The most significant additions are made, however, to the section on the materials used; in contrast to *GKI*, Winckelmann here elaborates on the use of white marble and Imperial porphyry for (Pharaonic) Egyptian sculpture (Winckelmann 2008, 39-41). The increasing importance of materials used also emanates from the relevant section in *GK2*, which had been substantially enlarged in comparison to the brief discussion in *GKI* (original page numbers 101-115). Winckelmann seems to have been particularly concerned with the geological source of the materials used. This emerges, for instance, from his correspondence with the French geologist Nicolas Desmarest between 1766 and 1767; in one of these letters, Winckelmann essentially argues for the importance of a collaboration between the social and natural sciences to gain a better understanding of antiquity (!): "Il seroit nécessaire [...] de faire voyager ensemble des Antiquaires et des Naturalistes avec un ou deux Dessinateurs [...] J'insiste encore sur un point important: je voudrais que tous les Voyageurs se préparassent à ce beau travail par un séjour au moins d'un an à Rome". Any such thorough preparation, Winckelmann continues, is necessary to improve the quality of the observations made by travellers. "Ah! quand est-ce que pourra se réaliser ce beau projet?" (Winckelmann 1956, 309-311 no. 900: letter from Winckelmann to Desmarest, dated to 5 September 1767). While these plans were not realised due to Winckelmann's untimely death in 1768, and although the reason for this specific interest is not explicitly mentioned and therefore cannot be easily proven here, it seems not unlikely that Winckelmann envisioned using material choice as supporting criterion for his classification system. The importance of materials in Winckelmann's classification system is briefly mentioned by Grimm (2005b) 167.

contemporaries, such as Comte de Caylus, had failed to do so. Although Winckelmann's historical synthesis was substantially revised by later scholars,⁶² the method of *Stilgeschichte*, with its emphasis on visual (stylistic) analysis as well as its underlying presumptions, would remain fundamental for future engagements with Egyptian material culture.⁶³ Indeed, as the following sections will make clear, most scholars that subsequently wrote about *Aegyptiaca Romana* did so in what was essentially a Winckelmannian tradition, although usually implicitly (and probably unconsciously). The best example of this practice is Anne Rouillet's book, which will therefore be discussed first in greater detail.

2.2 ROUILLET'S THE EGYPTIAN AND EGYPTIANIZING MONUMENTS FROM IMPERIAL ROME (1972)

Although the terms Egyptian and Egyptianising feature prominently in the title of the book, it does not explicitly define them. A better insight into the author's understanding of Egyptian material culture can be gained from one of the introductory chapters, entitled 'Type and style of the Egyptian and Egyptianizing monuments of

-
62. In particular, the decipherment of the hieroglyphic script in the early 1820s enabled Champollion and his successors to assess the character of Egyptian art in a way that had not been possible before. The dialogue between the work of Winckelmann and his early successors, who wrote about the understanding and periodisation of Egyptian art, in particular Champollion, is the topic of Buhe (2014). This contribution contains several interesting observations that may serve as starting point for a better understanding of the character of the nascent discipline of Egyptology and the canonisation of the understanding of Egyptian art in the 19th century. I thank Prof. van Eck for the reference to this article.
63. This is what Elsner (2003, 99-101, and 103-104) calls "style art history", which, as he shows on the basis of a brief discussion of the Arch of Constantine in Rome, already existed in the 16th century. The lasting importance of Winckelmann's writings for the academic disciplines of art history and Classical archaeology has been widely recognised in modern scholarship; see, e.g., Haskell (1994) 70: "Es ist für uns sehr schwer, von der Vorstellung Abschied zu nehmen, daß die künstlerische Schönheit ein Wertesystem widerspiegelt [...]"; cf. Preziosi (1998) and the *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft* (2003) 337-338. As mentioned above, the influence of Winckelmann's synthesis of Egyptian art history on modern Egyptology was emphasised in the international exhibition held between 2004 and 2006 and in the accompanying exhibition catalogue, most clearly so in Grimm (2005a); cf. *supra*, 6-7 and n. 14.

Imperial Rome'.⁶⁴ This chapter is divided into two parts and it seems that its respective parts largely correspond to the relevant classes. Hence, 'Egyptian' objects are 'monuments exported from Egypt to Imperial Rome', whereas 'Egyptianizing' objects are broadly understood as 'monuments created at Rome'.⁶⁵

'Egyptian' artefacts originate from Egypt and therefore they are considered to be genuine. Their authenticity is deemed to emanate from two closely related aspects. First, there is a temporal dimension. Authentic Egyptian objects are considered to have been made before the Imperial Roman period. A majority of them would date to the Late Period (664-332 BC) and are therefore seen as relatively contemporary productions. Regardless of the accuracy of these proposed datings and their implications for the classification of the listed objects, a survey of Roulet's 'Egyptian' objects demonstrates that a pre-Roman date of manufacture is not always strictly maintained as defining criterion.⁶⁶

64. Roulet (1972) 13-22.

65. *Ibid.*, 14 and 18, respectively.

66. *Ibid.*, 153-156; Appendix III. The numerous question marks in the appendix readily demonstrate the incomplete information about the listed objects and are illustrative of some of the main problems that surround the dating of Egyptian sculpture. A proper identification is often only possible on the basis of hieroglyphic inscriptions and when objects are sufficiently well preserved. Especially when royal cartouches of a pharaoh's name are present, an object can be more or less securely attributed to a specific reign and the (approximate) historical timeframe that is known from other sources (not taking into account the common practice of usurpation). Alternatively, when names of private individuals are mentioned in inscriptions, an approximate dating can often be reconstructed on the basis of prosopographic analysis. In certain cases, other types of written information may contribute to the correct identification of Egyptian sculpture, such as the mentioning of specific historical events, provenances, or palaeography. However, because of archaeological preservation, on the one hand, and a general decline of the practice of inscribing Egyptian sculpture from the Late Period onwards, on the other, the dating of many (fragments of) sculptures is not without its problems. In the absence of solid points of reference, close stylistic and typological analyses remain the main heuristic devices for investigation (Hartwig 2015, esp. 41-45; this practice is also called connoisseurship: see Josephson 2015). These methods certainly have their merits, although it is now generally accepted that detailed chronologies based on stylistic (and typological) developments are, at best, problematic. This is clearly shown in Roulet's Appendix III. A specific dating is only given when the name of the relevant pharaoh, obtained from preserved cartouches, is known. In the absence of these points of reference, and when the dating of relevant objects consequently comes to depend on stylistic and typological analyses, there is room for speculation and doubt.

Some of the objects in the appendix would be of 'Ptolemaic or Roman' date, but are nevertheless listed among the monuments exported from Egypt to Rome, while two figures of Osiris Canopus are said to be of Imperial Roman date but presumably of Alexandrian, i.e., Egyptian, workmanship.⁶⁷ This seems to suggest that the authenticity of Egyptian objects needs not necessarily be determined by a pre-Roman dating alone. Artefacts manufactured in Egypt under Roman rule may also classify as 'genuine Egyptian' objects. This leads to the second and seemingly closely related aspect of the authenticity of Egyptian objects: they are considered to have been manufactured in Egypt proper and, although not explicitly mentioned in the book, supposedly by skilled Egyptian craftsmen. For Roulet, therefore, the classification of Egyptian sculpture also has ethnic-geographic connotations.

Her understanding of 'Egyptianizing' objects is quite different. This classification evidently has a geographical dimension that sets the artefacts in this group apart from 'Egyptian' objects. In the book's introduction, Roulet argues: "[...] though it is risky to suppose that a Roman Egyptianizing copy or creation, of which the actual origin is unknown, must come from Rome, this, in fact, is most likely", and somewhat later she states that "the copies must have been executed in Italy. It is virtually certain that the duplicates were made in Rome to fulfil the needs of the layout of a temple, palace or villa. The Egyptian craftsmen, authors of such pieces, settled in Italy in the 1st century A.D. to satisfy an already significant demand".⁶⁸ Even though these statements are not substantiated, they provide important clues for understanding Roulet's ideas about 'Egyptianizing' objects and to elucidate the broader context in which the assertion about place of manufacture has to be understood. It can be inferred that the term Egyptianising embodies aspects of time, copying and duplicating, and ethnicity. Egyptianising artefacts would have been manufactured

The sharp increase of question marks concerning the attribution to a specific pharaoh, which can be readily explained by the aforementioned absence of cartouches (and the perceived non-individuality of Egyptian sculpture), is accompanied by a general increase of uncertainty in the attribution of objects to a specific dynasty, which, in turn, reflects the limitations of chronologies based on style and typology.

67. Objects no. 170, 174, 268-270 and 301a-b (all Ptolemaic or Roman), and 144b and 147 (Osiris Canopus), respectively.

68. Quotations taken from Roulet (1972) xiv and 19, respectively.

in Imperial Roman times, they would have been inspired by or “dans le style” of genuine Egyptian art, and copies and duplicates would furthermore have been carved by Egyptian sculptors. In order to fully reconstruct Roullet’s understanding of *Aegyptiaca*, we must consider these three aspects separately.

The temporal division is not always strictly maintained and, moreover, the dating of many so-called Egyptianising objects is not always clear. For instance, the statue of the Apis-bull, the so-called Apis Brancaccio, is listed among the objects created in Rome, although the proposed datings are not clearly indicative of a Roman Imperial date of manufacture.⁶⁹ Furthermore, Egyptianising objects are considered to be inspired by authentic Egyptian objects and therefore essentially regarded as *not* authentic. A survey of Roullet’s catalogue descriptions of these Egyptianising artefacts indicates that this group can be further divided into four sub-groups. The majority of these are described as either Roman creations in Egyptianising style or Roman imitations. Besides these two sub-groups, other Egyptianising objects are specified as Roman copies and Roman creations with Egyptianising motifs or décor.⁷⁰ Although not explicitly stated, it appears that these four sub-groups represent the relative degrees to which authentic Egyptian sculptures are (understood to be) reproduced, as if according to a scale of perceived *Egyptianness*. In decreasing order of resemblance, the implicit order runs from Roman copies, to Roman imitations, to Roman creations in Egyptianising style, to Roman creations with Egyptianising motifs or décor.⁷¹

We have already seen that, according to Roullet, the most faithful reproductions of Egyptian artefacts, copies and duplicates, were supposedly made by Egyptians. More specifically, she argues that “the working of hard stone, the respect for Egyptian proportions and way of representation were severe demands on a Roman sculptor trained to express classical figures in marble or limestone. A good copy could only be done properly by an Egyptian. Strong doubts must be felt about accepting the thesis that these copies were executed at Alexandria, in second-rate workshops. Why should the Roman emperors and aristocracy have ordered a relatively mediocre production and taken the trouble to have it brought back to Italy, when they could have found excellent genuine pieces only a few miles away?”⁷² This clearly suggests that the supposed ethnicity of the sculptors of copies and duplicates would be based on a presumed relationship between material and stylistic properties of objects, on the one hand, and the technical capability of artists from a certain (ethnic) background, on the other. The (in)competence of sculptors, in other words, is measured against a modern and imaginary ideal of how Egyptian style and iconography should look (and subsequently is made assessable through visual analysis). The underlying idea, it seems, is that Romans would be the creators of sculptures made from marble and limestone in what we usually call a Classical style,

created after a genuine piece, but used independently of it”. The two duplicates, no. 277 and 281, are described in Roullet’s Appendix IV as Roman copies, which are furthermore said to be faithful reproductions of authentic Egyptian objects that were probably made by Egyptian craftsmen in the respective catalogue entries. Imitations, on the other hand, are said to be created *after* genuine objects, and therefore considered as less faithful and, consequently, less authentic; these are, in other words, less ‘truly Egyptian’. In similar vein, it may be argued that Roman creations in Egyptianising style would be a step further away still from genuine Egyptian objects, since these would not have been created after authentic objects at all, but merely allude to authentic Egyptian objects through their stylistic properties. Finally, Roullet considers Roman creations with Egyptianising motifs or décor as representing objects that are neither made after genuine Egyptian objects, nor understood to recall Egyptian artistic traditions by means of stylistic properties. According to her, they would merely incorporate Egyptian-looking elements in their (otherwise non-Egyptian looking) compositions. Therefore, these objects would evidently rank lowest on the scale of *Egyptianness*. For a similar notion see Lafaye (1884, 244), where objects in a ‘style d’imitation’ are said to display “[...] une infinité de nuances; il y a des degrés dans la soumission dont les artistes font preuve à l’égard de leurs modèles égyptiens [...]”.

72. Roullet (1972) 18-19.

69. Roullet (1972) 129-130 no. 267. The ‘monuments created at Rome’ are listed in Roullet’s Appendix IV, p. 157-158. A survey of the catalogue descriptions on the basis of the objects cited in this appendix demonstrates that the dating of many artefacts is uncertain; cf. *supra*, n. 66.

70. Roman creations in Egyptianising style (n = 63); Roman imitations (n = 65); Roman copies (n = 8); Roman creations with Egyptianising motifs or décor (n = 3). Note that only objects that provide useful information about the sub-classification of this class of artefacts were taken into account. For that reason, descriptions that specify that a certain object would be ‘Roman’, or a ‘Roman creation’, have not been included – although in these cases the question remains what ‘Roman’ specifically means: chronological, geographical, ethnical, ...?

71. This relative order can be reconstructed from several remarks by the author. With regard to Roman copies and imitations, Roullet says (1972, 18; my italics): “A careful distinction should be made between duplicates (nos. 277, 181) created to balance an isolated genuine monument, and *mere* imitations

while Egyptians (and Egyptians only!) had the skill and knowledge to (re-)produce sculptures from hard stones in a so-called Egyptian style. This presumes, in other words, a direct and linear relationship between peoples and objects or, more specifically, between ethnicity, style, and material.

The above quotation also illustrates the perceived relationship between Egyptianising and Egyptian objects. Roulet considers Egyptianising productions to be “relatively mediocre”, as opposed to Egyptian or “excellent genuine pieces”.⁷³ Clearly, the classification of Egyptian material culture, and the Egyptian – Egyptianising dichotomy in particular, also involves value judgement. The specific judgement of a certain object, it seems, relates to that object’s (perceived) proximity to (what is considered as) an Egyptian ideal or, in other words, its *Egyptianness*. Authentic Egyptian objects are considered to be excellent and beautiful, whereas the farther down an object would rank on the scale of *Egyptianness*, the less excellent, beautiful, etc. that particular object would be.⁷⁴

Chronology appears to be a determining factor in this valuation process.⁷⁵ Roulet asserts that “It is interesting to note that the second generation of Egyptian workers in Italy had already lost the skill and style of their fathers (a phenomenon also noticeable in Egypt at the same time, but to a lesser extent). If Domitian’s production could still be classed as Egyptian, Hadrian’s creations were often only Egyptianizing [...]”. Shortly after she adds that “the late Roman Empire was to Egyptian art what the 19th century was to mediaeval art, and Hadrian’s revivals could match Viollet-le-Duc’s”.⁷⁶ This powerful equation is explained in very

absolute terms in the closing section of her paragraph on Egyptianising objects. Because it is particularly illustrative of Roulet’s understanding of Egyptian material culture altogether, it is useful to quote it here in full: “As an illustration of the deep misunderstanding of Egyptian representation by the Romans, two Roman restorations made of genuine Egyptian pieces may be cited. Hadrian had, presumably among his collections, the body of a Ptolemaic Isis, a full figure covered with the narrow pleated tunic knotted between the heavy breasts; only its head was missing. But it was thought easy to repair, for the restorer found a new head among other Egyptian fragments, that of a priest with a short wig (?XXXth Dynasty-Ptolemaic) [...] The Romans not only failed to distinguish two different styles, they could not even tell the sexes apart. Another restoration which constitutes a vandalism, was executed on a beautiful but damaged Ptolemaic Isis [...] The restorer here erased a good deal of the sensuous curves of the body and clumsily managed to cut into the hard stone a new Hellenistic drapery with diagonal pleats”.⁷⁷

Now that the underlying premises have been clarified, we will discuss two examples that illustrate how the classification of Egyptian sculpture actually works in scholarly practice. Roulet’s catalogue includes two sculptures of the originally Egyptian dwarf-god Bes in Imperial porphyry, catalogue numbers 105 and 109, respectively. “The Romans were the first to use the Egyptian red porphyry”, Roulet notes in one of the introductory chapters, and therefore concludes that both statues can only be dated to the Imperial Roman period.⁷⁸

73. Roulet (1972) 19.

74. It is therefore perhaps no coincidence that Malaise uses the adjective “beau” to describe what he calls an “Alexandrine” relief, a marble relief depicting, among other things, an enthroned figure of Sarapis. In Malaise’s opinion, the relief would have been made in Alexandria around the 2nd century BC: Malaise (1972a) 229-230 no. 420; cf. *infra*, 126 no. 044.

75. Egyptianising objects are understood to be derivative of older (Egyptian) artefacts, in the same way as the word ‘Egyptianising’ is derived from the term ‘Egyptian’. Simply put, the older the artefact, the more authentically Egyptian and hence superior to later productions it would be. From that perspective, the start of the Imperial Roman period would be the decisive chronological watershed.

76. Quotations from Roulet (1972) 20. Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc (1814-1879) was a French architect and architectural theorist, best known for his (over-)restorations of medieval

buildings, such as the Notre Dame de Paris and the city of Carcassonne in southern France. His restoration works were part of a broader 19th-century European movement that sought to restore medieval buildings to how they might have looked in their original state (in England known as Victorian restorations). Viollet-le-Duc’s interventions brought profound changes to the original character of the buildings. Rather than restoring the buildings in their original and historically correct state, he altered them to fit his personal, ideal vision of the Middle Ages. See L. Sorensen, “Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc”, *Dictionary of Art Historians* (available online at <https://dictionaryofarthistorians.org/violletleduce.htm>; accessed January 15, 2015).

77. Roulet (1972) 21-22. Note (a) that the Ptolemaic Isis (genuine) is specified as beautiful, and the Roman (non-authentic) restoration a clumsy vandalism, and (b) that the cited examples serve to illustrate the deep misunderstanding of Egyptian material culture by Romans.

78. Quotation from *ibid.*, 19.

This also implies, on the basis of her analysis, that they would be essentially not authentic and therefore classify as Egyptianising rather than as Egyptian objects.⁷⁹ More specifically, object no. 105 is said to probably have been the work of Egyptian craftsmen (and therefore a copy, although this is not explicitly mentioned), while object no. 109 is considered to be a Roman imitation. What caused this different perception, given the fact that both statues portray a similar subject matter and are carved from the same hard stone, Egyptian Imperial porphyry?

The answer to this question lies in the respective sculptures' perceived proximity to genuine Egyptian examples, and more specifically in their respective iconographical models and particular details. Object no. 109 is a squatting figure of Bes (Fig. 1.2.1). Several iconographical features can be distinguished that allow for a secure identification of the subject matter as the dwarf-god (e.g., a corpulent, squat body, form of ears, nose, and beard). Other features that can be recognised from the photograph of the sculpture reproduced in Roulet are the squared base on which the figure rests and the lower part of a back-pillar. Neither of these specific features nor a general description are presented in the relevant catalogue entry. Besides the material used, it only mentions that the sculpture would be a "Roman imitation". The rationale for this (supposedly straightforward) classification cannot be inferred from the summary description, and the question why this object was perceived as a Roman imitation therefore remains open.

Let us first consider the other Bes sculpture (no. 105), which presents the dwarf-god with a frontal depiction of the goddess' Hathor head on top (Fig. 1.2.2). The description of the objects reads as follows: "The form of the pedestal is an adaptation of a motif used for sistrum handles and, sometimes, other minor objects [...] A back pillar runs along the whole height of the pedestal". Although brief, the description is important in two respects. First, the statue is described in Egyptological terms, contrary to the other Bes sculpture. In other words, the particular iconographical model of this sculpture can be related to objects known from ancient Egypt proper. This is demonstrated by the cited Egyptological literature in the catalogue entry of Bes no. 105 that refers to "the same motif on Egyptian

objects".⁸⁰ Moreover, it is mentioned explicitly that the back-pillar of the statue runs along the entire height of the pedestal. This is important because this particular feature is often considered to be characteristic of (genuine) Egyptian sculpture. In contrast, the absence of a back-pillar or formal adaptations and different heights of this feature are usually considered as one of the characteristics typical of Roman Imperial times and therefore of non-authentic productions.⁸¹

Because formal, stylistic and iconographic features are considered to relate to aspects of time, authenticity, and ethnicity in a direct and fixed way, empirical observations of the particularities of material culture can be used as an (inductive) method for classification. This typically Winckelmannian *modus operandi* can be observed throughout Roulet's book and provides the key to understanding her different classifications of the Bes sculptures. Since the two statues are carved from Imperial porphyry that was only quarried in Roman times, both objects date from the Roman Imperial period and therefore classify as Egyptianising rather than Egyptian artefacts.⁸² The following sub-

80. The motif is indeed known from several Egyptian examples. It occurred most prominently on the rattles that were used in the cult for the Egyptian goddess Hathor and served, among others things, an apotropaic purpose that refers back to Egyptian religion and mythology; cf. Müskens (2014a) with references.

81. Hence, Roulet (1972, 20) writes about sculptures dating from the Roman period that "Back pillars were either forgotten or replaced by a little obelisk [...], a tree trunk [...], or even a heavy coat falling straight from the shoulders down to the feet".

82. It would be interesting to find out what Roulet's classification of object no. 105 would have been if it had not been carved from Imperial porphyry but, for instance, from another Egyptian stone material that was also used for sculptural purposes in Egypt before Roman Imperial times. The sculpture must have struck the author as altogether 'quite Egyptian', otherwise she certainly would not have argued that it presumably was the work of an Egyptian craftsman (who, in her opinion, would have been the only one capable of making a good copy). In this case, however, the material that was used acts as a give-away for the dating of the sculpture, which, in turn, must have ruled out the possibility of the sculpture being authentic Egyptian. The material was indeed rarely used before Roman Imperial times and for small objects only. The Romans were the first to actively quarry this material, which was used for both sculptural and architectonic purposes (cf. Müskens 2010). But what would have happened if this particular sculpture was carved from the characteristic pink granite from Aswan, one of the most prominent materials for Egyptian sculpture that had already known a long tradition before the Roman period? Of course we cannot know for sure, but it is interesting to contemplate, as it relates more generally to

79. And they are indeed listed as such in Appendix IV.



Fig. 1.2.1. Sculpture of Bes in Imperial porphyry, Rouillet's cat. no. 109 (after Rouillet 1972, pl. 93, fig. 126).

classification of one object as a Roman copy and the other as Roman imitation can be explained by their respective degrees of perceived *Egyptianness*. The particular iconographical model, or typology, and the representation of the back-pillar of object no. 105 must have struck Rouillet as more 'genuinely Egyptian' than the typology and 'un-Egyptian' form of the back-pillar of object no. 109. The former, Bes no. 105, must have appeared to her as the next best thing after a genuine Egyptian object, and therefore a Roman copy executed by Egyptian craftsmen. In contrast, object no. 109 could only be lower on the scale of perceived *Egyptianness*. Since it does not concern an altogether new creation executed in an Egyptian-looking style that could only have been made in Imperial Roman times (and by a

the question which role materials used play in the classification of Egyptian sculpture.



Fig. 1.2.2. Sculpture of Bes in Imperial porphyry, Rouillet's cat. no. 105 (after Rouillet 1972, pl. 91, fig. 122).

Roman?), Rouillet considered it not as a Roman creation in Egyptianising style, but as a Roman imitation that was made after a genuine object.

2.3 MALAISE'S INVENTAIRE PRÉLIMINAIRE (1972)

Malaise's inventory of *Aegyptiaca* from Italy remains fundamental to the present day.⁸³ However, the book provides no theoretical background to explain the terms that are used to determine and classify the objects under discussion.⁸⁴ Therefore, in order to reconstruct the grounds on which Malaise classifies Egyptian material culture, I made a survey of the attestations of the terms 'Egyptian' and 'Egyptianising' as well as other related classificatory terms. The results are collected in Table 1.2.1 below.⁸⁵ The findings indicate

83. Malaise (1972a); cf. *supra*, n. 32.

84. Consequently, 'Egyptian' and 'Egyptianising' are used as descriptive adjectives without explanation, as illustrated by the following quotations: "ce qui est égyptien ou égyptisant", "les œuvres égyptiennes ou égyptisantes", "sculptures égyptiennes ou égyptisantes" (Malaise 1972a, xii, xiii, and 188, respectively).

85. The overview is based on the archaeological evidence from Rome: Malaise (1972a) 167-237. Coins are excluded since the terminology central to this discussion is not applied to these objects. Numbers in the table refer to Malaise's catalogue numbers. Besides attestations of the terms 'Egyptian' and

Table 1.2.1. Survey of classificatory terminology of Aegyptiaca in Malaise (1972a).

Cat. no.	“Egyptian”
319	“Partie supérieure d’une statuette égyptienne de basalte (XVIIIe dynastie?)”
341	“Une seule sculpture égyptienne provient du Capitole [...] Il s’agit d’un fragment d’une statuette en serpentine d’un personnage agenouillé portant un <i>naos</i> . Ce travail d’époque romaine [...]”
383	“Fragment de clepsydre égyptienne”
407	“Fragment d’une statuette égyptienne d’époque saïte (XXVIe dynastie)”
419a	“Un fragment de frise égyptienne, en basalte noir, de Nectanébo Ier (XXXe dynastie)”
425	“Une clepsydre égyptienne du IIIe s. avant J.-C.”
	“Egyptianising”
317	“Relief en marbre de style égyptisant [...] Ces fragments [...] datent, au plus tard, de la première moitié du IIe s. (peut-être bien de l’époque d’Adrien)”
362	“Sphinx royal en granit rose avec <i>nemes</i> et uraeus. Travail de style égyptisant, d’époque ptolémaïque ou romaine”
399	“Fragment d’une tête féminine égyptisante en marbre [...] Il doit s’agir de la copie d’une Isis ptolémaïque”
405	“Fragment acéphale d’une statuette féminine égyptisante en terre cuite”
414	“Deux statuettes en marbre blanc [...] figurant deux offrants nus agenouillés sur les talons et présentant une table d’offrande égyptienne [...] Œuvre sortie d’un atelier romain, mais de facture égyptisante”
424	“Statue royale en basalte. Cette sculpture égyptisante, probablement une œuvre de l’époque d’Adrien”
	Other references
307	“Une statue de prêtresse égyptienne en marbre salin [...] Style égyptien d’imitation”
309	“Base de colonne sculptée de fleurs de lotus. Style d’imitation”
323	“Statue de Sérapis assis [...] Il s’agit d’une copie romaine du IIe siècle du type bryaxidien”
337	“Fragment d’une statuette en basalte vert foncé d’un naophore. Œuvre ptolémaïque ou d’imitation romaine”
339	“Chapiteau ionique taillé dans un bloc de marbre de remploi. Ce bloc était orné d’une figure égyptienne d’imitation”
356	“Chapiteau campaniforme en marbre et [...] partie inférieure de la colonne [...] Cette colonne est une imitation romaine des colonnes égyptiennes campaniformes”
363 (352/368 /386)	“Colonne de granit de style égypto-romain [...] Le fût [...] imite sommairement les colonnes égyptiennes [...] Ces reliefs rappellent les scènes égyptiennes et offrent le même manque de perspective; mais il convient de relever des nouveautés romaines [...] Ces reliefs, sans doute exécutés en Italie [...]”
381	“Le style de ces motifs [i.e., of motifs on a marble entablature] est égypto-romain”
384bis	“Grosse dalle fragmentaire de granit ornée de reliefs [...] Œuvre importée d’Égypte”
392	“Fragment de marbre représentant Isis en haut relief [...] Ce relief semble une copie romaine exécutée, vers le milieu du IIe siècle, à partir d’un original hellénistique du IIe s. avant notre ère”
394	“Un fragment de statuette égypto-romaine”
396	“Fragment de relief en marbre [w. seated divinities wearing <i>nemes</i> -headaddresses and holding <i>was</i> -scepters] Copie romaine d’un original d’époque tardive”
397	“Fragment d’un relief en marbre [w. various Egyptian crowns] Copie romaine”
398	“Fragment de relief en marbre [...] En-dessous, un Apis est couché sur une enseigne. Le style de l’animal n’a rien d’égyptien. Copie romaine”
400	“Chapiteau hathorique en marbre [...] Copie romaine”
404	“Fragment de plaque de terre cuite ornée de la tête d’Ammon [...] Copie d’un original ptolémaïque”

several overlaps between Malaise and Roullet with regard to their understanding of Aegyptiaca and their underlying principles of classification. The term Egyptian is most often used as adjective in combination with a pre-Roman Imperial date of manufacture, although, like in Roullet's book, this temporal division is not always strictly maintained.⁸⁶ Moreover, Malaise's connotations of Egyptianising are comparable to those in Roullet's work, reflecting aspects of time,⁸⁷ copying and imitating,⁸⁸ and geography (as well as ethnicity?).⁸⁹ Perceived *Egyptianness* appears to be the main heuristic device to determine the specific classification.

'Egyptianising' proper, the table includes other references that elucidate Malaise's classification and understanding of Egyptian material culture.

86. Naophoros statuette no. 341 is said to be an Egyptian sculpture dating from the Roman period.
87. In general, the term Egyptianising is used to denote objects of Roman Imperial age, even though, as is the case with Roullet, it may also be applied to refer to objects dating from older periods: a royal sphinx from granite (no. 362) is said to be a "travail de style égyptisant, d'époque ptolémaïque ou romaine". A similar notion is present in Lafaye's work, who argues that it is probable that the "style d'imitation [i.e., Egyptianising objects] était répandu à Alexandrie bien avant qu'Isis et Sérapis ne fussent connus à Rome": Lafaye (1884) 244.
88. In the case of a fragmentarily preserved Egyptianising female head "il doit s'agir de la copie d'une Isis ptolémaïque" (no. 399). The imitation of so-called Egyptian styles is closely related to the Roman Imperial period (no. 323: "copie romaine du II^e siècle du type bryaxidien [i.e., early Ptolemaic]"; 337: "Œuvre ptolémaïque ou d'imitation romaine; 392: "copie romaine exécutée, vers le milieu du II^e siècle, à partir d'un original hellénistique du II^e s. avant notre ère; 396: "Copie romaine d'un original d'époque tardive"; 404: "Copie d'un original ptolémaïque") and it would have resulted in an Egyptian-Roman or Egyptian imitation style: no. 363, 381, 394 (Egyptian-Roman); 307, 309, and 339 (Egyptian imitations); 356, 397, 398, and 400 (Roman copies).
89. The practice of summarily imitating Egyptian columns is associated with an Italian place of manufacture (no. 363), and two marble statuettes with Egyptian offering plateaus are said to be "Œuvre[s] sortie[s] d'un atelier romain, mais de facture égyptisante" (no. 414). The latter description is directly copied from one of the works Malaise cites in the relevant catalogue entry, namely, Bosticco (1952, 32), where the statuettes are said to be made by an inexperienced imitator of Egyptian sculpture: "Le statuette sono uscite dalla bottega di un modesto imitatore di età romana il quale rivela la sua imperizia nella pesantezza del modellato e in quel senso di abbandono che giunge sino alla deformazione del piede, poggiato sullo zoccolo con cui fa corpo: le mani sono appena abbozzate". For the marble statuettes, see *infra*, 99-100 no. 017-018.

2.4 LEMBKE'S DIE FORMALE SYSTEMATIK DER AEGYPTIACA IM ISEUM CAMPENSE (1994)

The most explicit explanation of the classification of Aegyptiaca in the Roman world is found in Katja Lembke's book on the Iseum Campense in Rome.⁹⁰ She makes a distinction between Egyptian and Egyptianising objects, and breaks the latter category down into Egyptian-Roman and Roman-Egyptian classes. The latter subdivision is subsequently divided into copies, imitations, and objects with Egyptian motifs. This model is largely comparable to the above-discussed classification systems, and to a large extent this is also true for its underlying presumptions. Hence, according to Lembke, Egyptian objects would have been made in Egypt by Egyptian craftsmen before the Roman annexation of Egypt in 30 BC. Aegyptiaca made after this chronological watershed are considered to be Egyptianising, and this group would contain both objects "die in Ägypten oder von Ägyptern hergestellt wurden" – namely, the so-called Egyptian-Roman works – and "Arbeiten römischer Bildhauer in Italien", or Roman-Egyptian works.⁹¹ Again, *perceived Egyptianness* emerges as main heuristic device: in decreasing order of resemblance to 'genuine' Egyptian objects, the order first runs from Egyptian via Egyptian-Roman to Roman-Egyptian artefacts, and subsequently, within the latter group, from copies, imitations, to objects with Egyptian motifs.⁹²

However, more than in any of the previously discussed works, the materials used are considered as an important criterion for classification. Lembke presents a hierarchy of materials that would express the different degrees to which materials of genuine Egyptian sculpture were reproduced. In doing so, she uses the geological provenance of materials as argument

90. This topic is treated in the section entitled Die formale Systematik der Aegyptiaca im Iseum Campense: Lembke (1994) 33-50, which essentially is an adaptation of a previous categorisation of Egyptian sculptures from the Villa Torlonia in Rome: Curto (1967); cf. Lembke (1994) 34 n. 82.

91. Lembke (1994) 36 and 41, respectively.

92. "Die drei Gruppen der Kopien, Umbildungen und motivischen Übernahmen sind linear in dem Sinn zu verstehen, als sie sich hinsichtlich des Materials und der Berücksichtigung ägyptischer Kunstprinzipien jeweils weiter von den Vorbildern [i.e., genuine Egyptian objects] entfernen": *ibid.*, 49.

to determine the place of manufacture of Aegyptiaca (*Herkunft*). Hence, according to her interpretation, the categories of Egyptian and Egyptian-Roman Egyptianising objects, the two categories that can be considered to be most authentically Egyptian because they are made in Egypt by Egyptians, are entirely made from Egyptian stone materials.⁹³ Going farther down the scale of *Egyptianness*, we go from copies that are made from *Hartgesteinen*, like Egyptian and Egyptian-Roman Aegyptiaca, but that no longer stem from Egyptian sources, to imitations where “im Vergleich zu den bisher betrachteten Gruppen [...] erstmals das Material Marmor [erscheint]”, to objects with Egyptian motifs whereby “die Materialien ägyptischer Kunst fremd [sind], denn es gibt keine Anzeichen für die Verwendung von Marmor [...] in pharaonischer Zeit”.⁹⁴

As we have seen, the above-mentioned scholars approached formal, stylistic and iconographic features of material culture as related to aspects of time, authenticity, and ethnicity in direct and predetermined ways.⁹⁵ In addition, Lembke’s work suggests that materials also relate to these aspects, and to the ethnicity of sculptors in particular. Namely, she explains the differences between Egyptianising copies (in coloured stones of non-Egyptian origin) and Egyptian originals based on the difficulties that Roman sculptors (the presumed authors of copies) would have had in working hard stones. Instead, she adds a little later, Roman sculptors “[waren] es gewohnt, mit Marmor zu arbeiten, [und] zeigen dabei eine größere Fähigkeit als bei dem Umgang mit Hartgesteinen”.⁹⁶

2.5 CONCLUSION: AEGYPTIACA AND THE FOCUS ON REPRESENTATION

This section has shown that, probably initiated by Winckelmann, the paradigm that has so far dominated the study of Aegyptiaca in the Roman world has resulted in a research tradition that strongly relies on representation. *What* is represented determines whether or not we define objects as Aegyptiaca in the first place, and these objects are further subdivided into either Egyptian or Egyptianising classes based on *how* certain themes are represented. Subject matter and style, in other words, are generally treated as the main heuristic devices to understand the broad variety of artefacts that we associate with Egypt. Crucial to this is the implicit assumption that perceived style and iconography relate to place of manufacture and ethnicity in a fixed and direct way. *Where* Aegyptiaca were made and *who* made them are therefore two key questions in the current approaches to these objects.

The above discussion also demonstrates that the distinction between Egyptian and Egyptianising objects is essentially a modern construction and not one of Romans. In other words, terms like Egyptian and Egyptianising say more about modern understandings of Egyptian material culture than about Roman ones. This has important methodological implications for previous approaches to Aegyptiaca. Defining an object as either Egyptian or Egyptianising seriously complicates a bottom-up assessment of its Roman understandings, since that classification in fact already determines its interpretation. Terms like Egyptian and Egyptianising by definition imply that the (perceived) *Egyptianness* of these artefacts, which is principally defined on the basis of modern understandings of subject matter and style, chiefly determined their meaning in Roman contexts. By projecting our interpretations of Aegyptiaca as cultural representations of Egypt onto the Roman world, we not only presume that our understandings of *Egyptianness* – which may vary considerably between different scholars, as the above discussion has shown – are the same as Roman understandings of *Egyptianness*, we also exclude the possibility that these objects could have functioned in the Roman world for other reasons than what they represent according to our opinions, namely, Egyptian subject matters executed in Egyptian styles.

93. Lembke (1994) 34 and 36, respectively. In this respect, see also Lembke’s explanation of Egyptian-Roman Aegyptiaca: “Grundlage für diese Einordnung sind erstens die Materialien, die ägyptischen Werken entsprechen, zweitens die Ikonographie, die in ägyptischer Tradition steht, und drittens die künstlerische Gestaltung, die ebenfalls ägyptisch geprägt ist. Gewandelt hat sich nur der Stil der Skulpturen bzw. Der Inschrift auf dem Obelisk” (quotation from p. 36).

94. Quotations taken from *ibid.*, 42 and 48, respectively; on the use of white marble in Pharaonic Egypt, cf. *infra*, 73 with n. 304.

95. On this matter see now also Swetnam-Burland (2015) 41f.

96. Lembke (1994) 41, quotation from p. 42. For a similar idea about the relationship between certain materials and the ethnicity of sculptors, see the quotation from Anne Roullet’s book above (*supra*, 20).

Recognising these issues, Molly Swetnam-Burland has recently proposed to move beyond modern classifications like Egyptian and Egyptianising by redirecting attention towards quintessentially Roman receptions of so-called Aegyptiaca.⁹⁷ She thus has shifted the line of inquiry from top-down projections of what Egypt means (to her), to more flexible, bottom-up engagements that allow for an assessment of how objects that we call Egyptian functioned in their Roman contexts and of the characteristics that determined their use and perception. Rather than place of origin, she argues that the efficacy of Aegyptiaca for the Roman viewer would have primarily resulted from their subject matter, style, and theme.⁹⁸ While this assertion is not unproblematic in itself, as an object's place of origin could be an important asset in the way it was used and perceived in its (new) context,⁹⁹ this approach is nevertheless a methodical step forward since it no longer uncritically subscribes to established approaches to Aegyptiaca and related terminologies, and instead looks for more flexible interpretations.

Again, however, the focus is first and foremost on subject matter and stylistic execution. What Swetnam-Burland and most other scholars to date have not sufficiently recognised are the importance of the materials of Aegyptiaca and the social values that may be related to certain materials. Although the use of materials seems to play an important role in current classifications of Aegyptiaca, albeit mostly implicitly,¹⁰⁰

previous studies are characterised by a general neglect of the materials used, which are typically dismissed with a single word that merely indicates whether an object is made, for example, of granite or marble.¹⁰¹ Not only are these characterisations often found to be incorrect, as will become clear in Part III of this study, the material data are also only rarely involved in discussions of how these objects functioned and

Representations of Sarapis in white marble are a good case in point. Although they form a substantial part of the material evidence from Rome in Malaise's work (1972a), they are altogether lacking in Roulet's inventory of Aegyptiaca from that city (Roulet 1972). The identification of the famous white marble statue of the Esquiline Venus is even more heavily debated and therefore particularly illustrative of the problematic definition of Aegyptiaca. Venus is one of the suggested identifications, as well as Cleopatra VII, Isis-Aphrodite, and even Drusilla-Isis-Aphrodite. None of these views is generally accepted, however, and as a result the statue has irregularly appeared in overviews of Aegyptiaca from Rome (see *infra*, 110 no. 028). Such examples make clear that, although there is some kind of common understanding of what is (deemed) Egyptian and what is not, there is also a grey area in between where individual opinions abound – and where the materials used seem to play an important role. While the specific role of material choice in considerations and strategies of object classification remains to be elucidated, this observation nevertheless suggests that the material constituent of Aegyptiaca in some way influences our understanding of objects as having something to do with Egypt or not. The previously mentioned different levels of perceived *Egyptianness* may help explain what is at stake here: coloured stones possibly represent a stronger mental association with Egypt than white marbles, at least for us modern observers. The interesting question then becomes whether a similar observation holds true from a Roman perspective or, in other words, what role materials played in Roman perceptions of objects we call Aegyptiaca.

97. “Their employment [i.e., of the terms Egyptian and Egyptianising] often masks problematic assumptions about both the production and reception”: Swetnam-Burland (2007) 114. The author briefly draws attention to the relative valuation inherent in “the pejorative *-izing* designation” (p. 116), and mentions several problematic notions, including perceived authenticity, inferiority and superiority, (mis)understanding, ethnicity of sculptors, and (modern) perception of style.

98. Swetnam-Burland (2007), esp. 120; see also *ibid.* (2015) 19 for a similar view.

99. As Mol (2013, esp. 123) demonstrates.

100. It appears that objects whose classification as Aegyptiaca or either Egyptian/Egyptianising artefacts is most heavily disputed are frequently carved from white marble, while objects that have invariably been classified as Aegyptiaca are often made from coloured stone materials. Hence, while all scholars have classified objects like monumental obelisks or the zoomorphic sculptures of Thoth in the Capitoline Museum – inscribed with hieroglyphs, with Egyptian stylistic characteristics, and made from coloured hardstones (see *infra*, 152-155 no. 070-071) – as Egyptian artefacts, the understanding of other objects as Aegyptiaca is contested and indeed may differ between authors.

101. The lack of attention for the materials of Aegyptiaca is perhaps surprising given the recent developments in both Italian/Roman and Egyptian archaeology, where material characterisation studies are currently booming. This is attested, for instance, by the numerous contributions to the proceedings of the Association for the Study of Marbles and Other Stones in Antiquity (henceforth: ASMOSIA) by scholars like L. Lazzarini, S. Walker, M. Waelkens, Y. Maniatis, N. Herz, P. Pensabene, R. Tykot, D. Attanasio, M. Bruno, J.J. Herrmann Jr., P. Blanc, and J. Harrell. The few Aegyptiaca of which the materials have been characterised by petrographic analyses include the *columnae caelatae* from the Iseum Campense in Rome, which were shown to be carved from *granito dell'Elba* (Bongrani 1992, esp. 67 with n. 1; cf. *infra*, 238-245 no. 113-116), and a sphinx in private possession, made from ‘green porphyry’, following an analysis by the Department of Mineralogy of the British Museum – although it remains unclear what kind of green porphyry is concerned (Lembke 1994, 252, no. E45). See now also Müskens *et al.* (2017) for non-destructive analyses of the stones used for Aegyptiaca.

were perceived. That this is an important omission in current scholarship is demonstrated by recent analyses of Aegyptiaca from Pompeii. For instance, Eva Mol has convincingly shown that the particular efficacy of an ‘Egyptian’-style Horus statuette in travertine from the Casa degli Amorini Dorati likely resided in its stylistic and atypical material properties and the social values related to these characteristics, rather than primarily having to do with the fact that it represents the Egyptian falcon-headed deity Horus.¹⁰² Such examples demonstrate the necessity of a more integrated approach to so-called Aegyptiaca from the Roman world and elucidate that stylistic and iconographic analysis alone cannot provide complete answers to questions about the motivations for the import, contextualisation, and copying of so-called Aegyptiaca – all of which remain heavily debated and poorly understood.

102. Mol (2013), esp. 124-125, and (2015a) 332-391.