



Egypt and the Roman Empire

# Before the Empire: Egypt and Rome

---

ROLF MICHAEL  
SCHNEIDER

Long before the Roman conquest of Egypt in 30 BC, Egyptian culture had a considerable presence in Italy. The few surviving snippets of information highlighting this relationship before the imperial age suggest a fascinating story, spiced with innovations, uncertainties, and contradictions. In Etruria, Egyptian forms were known to the elite as early as the seventh century BC, a time when powerful local families interacted with their equals in Rome, economically, culturally, and politically.<sup>1</sup> Especially significant are the superb gold objects found in one of the richest Etruscan tombs, the so-called Regolini-Galassi tomb in Cerveteri (ancient Caere), situated some thirty miles northwest of Rome.<sup>2</sup> In 1836, excavators unearthed, among other exceptional gold objects, a large horseshoe-shaped pectoral of thin gold with embossed friezes of goats, griffins, chimeras, lions, deer, winged women, and Pegasus (fig. 60).<sup>3</sup> Reinforced by an additional sheet of copper, the pectoral would have been originally stitched onto the chest of funeral garments, which probably belonged to a certain Larthia, who must have enjoyed a high status considering the assemblage of magnificent artifacts in the tomb. Such pectorals have a long tradition in Egypt, where they were part of the ceremonial dress of the dead, shown, for example, on mummies, anthropoid sarcophagi, and statues.<sup>4</sup> Though different in material and decoration, the pectoral from Cerveteri copies Egyptian models in form and function. With other Egyptian and Egyptianizing objects found in Etruria, the pectoral demonstrates that in the Archaic period local craftsmen and the elite were familiar with such prestigious foreign artifacts and the stories traveling with them.<sup>5</sup>

Little is known about the presence of Egypt in Rome between the fifth and the early third centuries BC. In 273 BC, however, Ptolemy II Philadelphos of Alexandria initiated official relations with Rome (fig. 61).<sup>6</sup> In response to this overture, three Romans of high rank, Numerius Fabius Pictor, Quintus Fabius



FIGURE 60 | Pectoral, Etruscan, ca. 650–600 BC. Found in the Regolini-Galassi tomb, Cerveteri. Gold, 42 × 38.1 cm (16½ × 15 in.). Vatican City, Musei Vaticani, Museo Etrusco Gregoriano, 20553

Maximus, and Quintus Ogulnius Gallus, were sent as ambassadors to sign a treaty of *amicitia* (friendship) between Alexandria and Rome. When they returned from Alexandria, according to the historian Dionysios of Halikarnassos (ca. 60–7 BC), they “handed over to the public treasury the gifts which they had received from the king. But the Roman Senate, admiring the men for all their achievements, did not permit them to turn the royal gifts over to the state, but allowed them to take them back to their homes as a reward of merit and as a memento for future generations.”<sup>7</sup> This account illustrates with startling clarity how from the early Hellenistic period onward, members of the Roman elite enriched their homes with art from Egypt, just as their affluent Etruscan neighbors centuries before had honored the dead with Egyptianizing artifacts made of gold.

Another incident that sheds light on the well-established relationship between Egypt and Rome is reported by the first-century BC historian Diodorus Siculus.<sup>8</sup> When in autumn 164 BC Ptolemy VI Philometor (180–145 BC) was exiled from Egypt by his

own brother Ptolemy VIII Euergetes for a year, it was to Rome he went, where he was received by his fellow countryman “Demetrius, the topographer, a man Ptolemy had often entertained when he was resident in Alexandria.”<sup>9</sup> Later, in the early first century AD, Valerius Maximus describes this same Demetrius as an “Alexandrian painter.”<sup>10</sup> It is evident that Alexandrian artists had been present in Rome since the first half of the second century BC, and it is unlikely that Demetrius was a rare exception. As he was called both a topographer and a painter, it is plausible to suppose that he was a landscape artist, who commenced painting in Alexandria before he moved to Rome. Working here at a time when Greek art, looted by Roman generals, had begun to flow into Rome and immigrant Greek artists also traveled to the city, Demetrius proves that Alexandrian artists also were in demand.<sup>11</sup>

The painter’s special focus on landscape brings to mind a second group of artists in Rome, namely the mosaicists. Regardless of whether they came from Alexandria or art centers elsewhere, the mosaicists show an increasing Roman interest in



FIGURE 61 | Pentadrachm with head of Ptolemy I, struck under Ptolemy II; Ptolemaic, minted in Alexandria, 285–246 BC. Gold, diam: 2.3 cm (1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>16</sub> in.). Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, Anonymous gift in memory of Zoë Willbour (1864–1885), 36.444

FIGURE 62 | Nile mosaic, Roman, ca. 100 BC. Found in an apsidal basilica near the forum, Palestrina (ancient Praeneste). 4.31 × 5.85 m (14 ft., 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>16</sub> in. × 19 ft., 2<sup>9</sup>/<sub>16</sub> in.). Palestrina, Museo Nazionale Prenestino

depictions focusing on the Land of the Nile. An outstanding example was found in Palestrina (ancient Praeneste), situated some twenty-six miles east of Rome: around 100 BC, a highly skilled workshop began to lay out the large semicircular floor mosaic in the apse of the town's basilica complex. The mosaic shows, from a bird's-eye view, a condensed yet clever synopsis of the Nile. The artists reduced an almost thousand-mile-long stretch of the Nile to roughly 270 square feet, in which they depicted the river from the Delta to the Nubian mountains, a design developed from contemporary landscape paintings (fig. 62).<sup>12</sup> In the same period, floor mosaics with scenes of the Nile were popular elsewhere in Italy, especially in Rome and Campania.<sup>13</sup> A third group of artists, again from either





FIGURE 63 | Tazza Farnese, Roman, first century BC? Banded sardonyx agate, diam: 21.7 cm (8<sup>9</sup>/<sub>16</sub> in.). Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, 27611

Alexandria or the Greek east, some of whom may have worked in Rome, were specialists in cutting intaglios, cameos, and vessels in semiprecious stones, such as the exceptional, nearly 22-cm-wide Tazza Farnese in Naples, made of banded agate and weighing 1.42 kg (fig. 63).<sup>14</sup> It shows in Hellenistic style a bearded figure apparently personifying the River Nile and next to him six elaborate figures representing Egyptian and Hellenistic concepts of abundance, religion, and power.

Roman embassies to Egypt may also have promoted the Egyptianizing art produced in Hellenistic Rome. When Scipio Africanus, the destroyer of Carthage, and his entourage visited Egypt in 140/139 BC, King Ptolemy VIII Euergetes, wearing the finest transparent clothes,<sup>15</sup> tried to impress the Roman ambassadors with royal feasts and pomp as a way of confirming Egypt's proverbial luxury.<sup>16</sup> According to Diodorus Siculus, the Romans did not seem to be much interested in such displays, but

*observed most carefully those things which were really worth their viewing; such as the situation of the city, and its prosperity, and particularly the features of the Pharos [Alexandria's world-famous lighthouse]. From there they sailed to Memphis, and took note of the goodness of the land, the advantages provided by the river Nile, the number of cities, the infinite thousands of inhabitants, the strong defenses of Egypt, the excellence of the country, and how well equipped it was to support and defend a large empire.*<sup>17</sup>

Here Roman fascination with Egypt's unique environment, people, and civilization reads almost like a description of the Praeneste Nile mosaic.

One of the most graphic descriptions of Egyptian luxury is handed down a century later by the early imperial poet Lucan, when he reports on a banquet organized by Cleopatra VII (69–30 BC) in her royal palace at Alexandria to welcome Caesar

after his victory at Pharsalus in 48 BC.<sup>18</sup> In the pro-Augustan literary tradition, Lucan introduces the very young and well-educated queen initially as “Egypt’s shame, . . . her un-chastity a bane to Rome,” who even rattled the Capitol with her sistrum, the percussion instrument of Isis.<sup>19</sup> Then the poet continues: “As her beauty . . . and lust pleaded for her, she passed a sinful night with her corrupted arbiter. . . . The happy event was celebrated with a feast, and Cleopatra displayed, with tumultuous preparations, a magnificence that Rome has not yet equaled even now.”<sup>20</sup> In the subsequent narrative of the dining hall’s splendor, Lucan pulled out all the literary stops to electrify his readers and to criticize Egyptian extravagance as immoral.<sup>21</sup> He knew only too well that the rich in Rome liked both to revel in and to condemn such extremes. The Roman people were confronted with similar contradictions when Cleopatra and young Ptolemaios Caesarion, fathered by Caesar, visited Rome in mid-46 BC.<sup>22</sup> As was obligatory, the queen resided outside the city’s sacred boundary in Caesar’s luxurious country house set in the Horti Caesaris on the west bank of the Tiber.<sup>23</sup> Caesar then committed a sacrilege in the heart of Rome by placing in the temple of Venus Genetrix within his own forum (Iulium) “a beautiful image of Cleopatra” in the form of a golden statue, alongside Venus, the divine progenitor of his family, and the city’s Trojan forefathers.<sup>24</sup> This setting provocatively linked the queen of Egypt to Venus and the very foundation of Rome.

Cleopatra captivated in turn Sextus Pompeius, Julius Caesar, and Marc Antony, who fathered three children with her and eventually committed suicide when his arch-enemy, Octavian, defeated Egypt in 30 BC.<sup>25</sup> According to pro-Augustan literary tradition, Antony, with his passion for a monarchy and Dionysiac lifestyle, favored Egypt over Rome. The historian Cassius Dio, for example, reports that in 34 BC, when Antony, Cleopatra, and their children entered Alexandria in a procession, the Roman general declared his Egyptian wife “Queen of Kings” and her son Ptolemaios, called Caesarion, “King of Kings.”<sup>26</sup> In a further move, Antony bestowed all the land between India and the Hellespont on his three children, as if these regions were already in his possession.<sup>27</sup> In Rome, however, Cleopatra’s enemies feared that she was planning a war of revenge that “was to array all the East against Rome, establish herself as empress of the world at Rome, cast justice from the Capitol, and inaugurate a new universal kingdom.”<sup>28</sup> Plutarch, who reports around AD 100 on the same event, adds that “Cleopatra both then, and at other times when she appeared in public, assumed a robe sacred to Isis and was addressed as the New Isis.”<sup>29</sup>

By this time, the worship of Isis and her brother-husband Osiris, reinvented as Serapis in the early days of Alexandria, was already widespread in Rome and her southern hinterland. Who

were Isis and Serapis?<sup>30</sup> While the latter was related to concepts of abundance and resurrection and, inter alia, identified as being close to Dionysos (Bacchus), Isis, often associated with Aphrodite (Venus) and Demeter (Ceres), was worshipped as the ideal mother and wife, the patroness of nature, magic, and plenitude. She also had her own mysteries. Isis was venerated in Rome by all people, from the poor and downtrodden to the political elite. In his book on Isis, Apuleius, a Roman intellectual of the second century AD, reveals the supreme divinity of the “Queen of Heaven” to her Roman worshipper Lucius: “I, mother of all Nature and mistress of the elements, first-born of the ages and greatest of powers divine, . . . I am worshipped in differing forms, with varying rites, under many names, by all the world.”<sup>31</sup> Unfortunately, little is known about when the two deities arrived in Italy, though there is some evidence of where, when, and how the two Egyptian gods became integrated into Roman worship.<sup>32</sup>

A dated building inscription found at the Roman colony of Puteoli (modern Pozzuoli), on the Bay of Naples some 135 miles southeast of Rome, reports on a “contract for making a wall in the area which is in front of the temple of Serapis situated across the road.”<sup>33</sup> The inscription offers significant information: the Egyptian god was venerated before 105 BC at Rome’s most important harbor, which had been used for trade with Egypt at least since the second century BC,<sup>34</sup> and his temple served as a prominent marker to locate building works in the Roman colony. From Puteoli, located on one of Rome’s main commercial arteries, the cult of Serapis could easily travel north. And the temple itself suggests that the worship of Serapis and Isis was common in Campania. The figure of Isis with the infant Harpokrates, from Herculaneum, is one of numerous terracotta figurines from Campania representing, like many Egyptian portrayals of the goddess, a lactating mother figure (cat. 157). Several examples were found in Capua and have been dated to the late fourth century BC (fig. 64).<sup>35</sup> This was the period when the city, like Puteoli, which was founded some twenty miles to the south, became connected to Rome by the Via Appia.

At about the same time, the late second or early first century BC, Isis worship commenced in Pompeii.<sup>36</sup> A fine marble statue of Isis in the Archaic style found in the portico of the temple of Isis—a dedication from one of her worshippers, Lucius Caecilius Phoebus—refers to the great age of the goddess and her worship (cat. 154).<sup>37</sup> The sculpture alludes by its design to models typical of two different cultures: marble statues of maidens (*korai*) produced in late Archaic Athens and figures of the goddess Isis made of Egyptian stone during Ptolemaic rule. The long diaphanous chiton of the Pompeian statue has much in common with images of both the Greek Aphrodite and the Egyptian-style Isis.<sup>38</sup> Dated by scholars to either about 120–80 BC



FIGURE 64 | Figurine of a mother goddess, Greek, ca. 300 BC. Found at Capua. Terracotta, H: 17.3 cm (6<sup>7</sup>/<sub>16</sub> in.). Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, 20916

dove-headdress is a well-known attribute of Egyptianizing figures of Aphrodite and Isis produced in Hellenistic and Roman times (fig. 65).<sup>43</sup> Krug concedes that the Egyptian “Geierhaube” and the Greek dove-headdress look at first glance quite similar to each other, but argues that this iconographic resemblance was intentional, to promote cross-cultural readings within Egyptian, Ptolemaic, and Hellenistic traditions. The marble head is an excellent example of the superb quality and complexity of the images of Egyptian gods commissioned by the Roman elite and produced in the finest workshops in Rome.

The earliest attested date for Isis in Rome is supplied by Apuleius.<sup>44</sup> He mentions that *pastophori*, ritual “shrine or fabric bearers,” were recorded as members of a very old and sacrosanct *collegium* of Isis and Osiris established at the time of the Roman general Sulla (ca. 138–78 BC).<sup>45</sup> In view of this evidence, it is quite possible that Isis was already being worshipped in Rome in the second century BC.<sup>46</sup> Later, however, especially between 59 BC and the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, Isis worshippers in Rome suffered badly from official persecutions.<sup>47</sup> Valerius Maximus tells a graphic story about the intense dislike of some of the Roman rich toward the two Egyptian gods: “When the Senate decreed that the temples of Isis and Serapis had to be demolished and none of the workmen dared touch them, consul Lucius Aemilius Paullus took off his official gown (*toga praetexta*), seized an axe, and dashed it against the doors of that temple.”<sup>48</sup> It is not clear which of the Lucii Aemilii Paulli, who served as consuls between 219 and 34 BC, Valerius meant. What matters here, however, is that there was a divide between different social classes when it came to the two Egyptian gods in Rome. While the common people worshipped them, members of the elite supported their expulsion. It is questionable, however, whether the different attitudes recorded by Valerius are indeed based on clear-cut social distinctions. Isis had more advocates than opponents among the elite.<sup>49</sup> In fact, as is known from Cassius Dio, in 43 BC Rome’s political leaders, Octavian, Marcus Antonius, and Aemilius Lepidus, the *tresviri rei publicae constituendae*, the Commission of Three for settling the constitution, voted for a temple dedicated to Serapis and Isis.<sup>50</sup> Whether the temple was built or not is irrelevant. What the vote underlines is the various dynamics that fueled the great popularity of the Isis cult in late Republican Rome. This event is given a further political dimension if considered alongside an episode involving Marcus Volusius when he was aedile of the people in 43 BC and proscribed by the *tresviri* mentioned above. According to Valerius Maximus and Appian, Volusius borrowed from a friend, who was a priest of Isis, the ceremonial robe and dog’s-head mask associated with her cult as the most efficient disguise in which to escape from Rome.<sup>51</sup>

For AD 20–50, the workmanship points to the latter.<sup>39</sup> Despite the statue’s early imperial date, it is significant in our context that Caecilius Phoebus chose the distinct Archaic style to mark the timeless beauty of Isis, her Egyptian origin, and the long tradition of her cult in Pompeii.

A head of outstanding quality from a lost statue of Isis, made of Parian marble in the late Hellenistic period (ca. 150–30 BC), provides evidence of the goddess’s presence in Rome (cat. 170).<sup>40</sup> The head’s tripartite wig, covered by a headdress of a bird spread out in a cap-like manner, is a hairstyle commonly used for Ptolemaic queens and Hellenistic representations of Isis.<sup>41</sup> The bird’s neck and head are lost but originally fitted into the hole on top of the headdress. Misreading this feature as the headdress of a vulture, the popular Egyptian “Geierhaube,” has led most scholars to identify the subject as Cleopatra VII in the guise of Isis. In 2004, however, Antje Krug argued that the flat headdress does not depict a vulture but more likely a dove.<sup>42</sup> And indeed, the

FIGURE 65 | Statuette of Isis-Aphrodite, Roman, ca. 100 BC–AD 100. Bronze, H: 30 cm (11<sup>1</sup>/<sub>16</sub> in.). Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung, Bz85



The religion of Isis and Serapis, which was concentrated within urban environments in Italy, was at certain places and specific times the subject of either persecution or patronage, or both.<sup>53</sup> Perhaps it was the transgressive nature of Isis and Serapis that provoked such contrary reactions, as it conflicted with traditional Roman values. Thus, even though worshippers of Isis suffered persecution in Rome, we cannot conclude that there was strong resistance to her cult or that of other Egyptian gods. On the contrary, as Greg Woolf reasoned, part of the attraction and popularity of Isis “was linked to the wider fascination with all things Egyptian . . . [and the] complex of cosmological claims and ritual performances that struck adherents as genuinely new.”<sup>54</sup> It was probably this element of novelty that activated the conflict between the Isis cult and the powers at Rome. Ernest Gellner argues that the belief of followers of charismatic deities such as Isis and Serapis was “difficult” as it involved “an element of both menace and risk.”<sup>55</sup> These were some of the challenges attached to the new Egyptian cults in Rome. Their captivating fascination and otherness contributed substantially to the process by which additional Egyptian factors became essential to Roman life: in politics, in religion, in the economy, and especially in art.

In the end, it was such diverse dynamics as those discussed above that laid the groundwork for a new means to appropriate and integrate Egypt into imperial Rome. When describing the most beautiful constructions in the history of Rome, Pliny the Elder (AD 23–79) chose Egypt as a major point of reference.<sup>56</sup> In fact, apart from Greece, no other culture became so popular in Rome as the Land of the Nile, a popularity actively supported by the Roman elite. Take, for example, the luxury of finely polished Egyptian stones, such as red and gray granite, purple porphyry, and green or dark schist used for architecture, sculpture, and vessels, or, since the time of Augustus (27 BC–AD 14), the Egyptian obelisks—of all monolithic artwork the most challenging to move, let alone transport to Rome.<sup>57</sup> While many of the above objects were made before the mythic-historical foundation of Rome (traditionally 753 BC), it is not known when they first entered the city. It is generally agreed that, except for a few forerunners, the majority of Egyptian art arrived after Rome’s conquest of Egypt in 30 BC. Yet this assumption is far from certain. As long as we have no decisive historical or contextual evidence to support the later date, the earlier arrival of Egyptian things in Italy and Rome remains equally possible. The increasing presence of both Egyptian and Egyptianizing gods and objects in Roman Italy paved the way for the eternal city to become, by the time of Augustus, home to the most famed icons of Egypt: the obelisks and the pyramids.<sup>58</sup>

- 1 Cornell 1995, 151–72; Izzet 2007, 15, 228–30.
- 2 Pareti 1947; Sannibale 2008.
- 3 Pareti 1947, 201–2, no. 63, plate 9; von Bothmer 1966; Bubenheimer-Erhart 2005, 155–56, fig. 1; Sannibale 2008; Sannibale 2012.
- 4 Bubenheimer-Erhart 2005, 156; Frede 2005; Sannibale 2008; Sannibale 2012.
- 5 Bubenheimer-Erhart 2005, 156–61; Francocci 2011.
- 6 Lampela 1998, 33–51; Coarelli 2008, 37–39. Whether Lycophron's Rome-friendly poem *Alexandra* (whose content and chronology are disputed) should indeed be placed in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphos and linked to the agreement of 273 BC, as Coarelli (2008, 39–43) so astutely argues, is hard to decide as it is based on too many assumptions.
- 7 Dion. Hal. 20.14. See also, Livy (summary of lost book 14); Cass. Dio 10.41; Just. *Epit.* 18.2.9; Val. Max. 4.3.9; Eutr. 2.15.
- 8 For here and what follows, see Lampela 1998, 33–51 (also 76–110, on “Rome as a champion of Ptolemy V Epiphanes”); Coarelli 2008, 43–45.
- 9 Diod. Sic. 31.18.2.
- 10 Val. Max. 5.1.1–2.
- 11 For Greek artists in pre-imperial Rome, see Settis, Anguissola, and Gasparotto 2015.
- 12 Meyboom 1995/2016; Andrae 2003, 78–110; Zevi and Bove 2008, 78–87; Hinterhöller 2009; Swetnam-Burland 2015, 150–54.
- 13 Meyboom 1995/2016; Versluys 2002, 58–170; Andrae 2003, 111–25.
- 14 La Rocca 1984; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 66–67 (for Alexandrian gem carvers, see 59–72 and 75–75); Schmidt 2008; Belozerskaya 2012; Lapatin 2015, 255–56, plate 124.
- 15 Mentioned by the second-century AD historian Justin (*Epit.* 38.8.10: “perlucidae vestis”).
- 16 For this embassy and the royal virtue of utmost abundance (Greek *tryphē*), see Heinen 1983; Lampela 1998, 200–204; Schneider 2000, 373–74.
- 17 Diod. 33.28b.1–3 (quote, 33.28b.2). See Heinen 1983; Lampela 1998, 200–204.
- 18 For Cleopatra, see Walker and Higgs 2001; Gentili 2013.
- 19 Luc. *B Civ.* 10.59–63; for the banquet, see Stein-Hölkeskamp 2005, 159–62. For Lucan on Caesar and Cleopatra, see Zwierlein 2010.
- 20 Luc. *B Civ.* 10.104–10.
- 21 Luc. *B Civ.* 10.104–93.
- 22 Gruen 2003.
- 23 Cic. *Att.* 15.15.2; Cass. Dio 43.27.3.
- 24 App. *B Civ.* 2.102 (quote); Cass. Dio 51.22.3. Whether his likeness of Cleopatra is indeed reflected in the Venus statue from the Esquiline Hill in Rome, as recently argued by Andrae 2006, 14–47, is highly controversial.
- 25 For Antony and Cleopatra, see Interdonato 2008.
- 26 Cass. Dio 49.41.1. For the historical context, see Srootman 2010.
- 27 Cass. Dio 49.41.2–3.
- 28 Syme 1939, 274.
- 29 Plut. *Ant.* 54.1–5 (quote, 54.5).
- 30 Bricault 2013.
- 31 Apul. *Met.* 11.5. For Apuleius's book 11 on Isis, see Keulen and Egelhaaf-Gaiser 2015, while Sfameni Gasparro 2007 tackles the Hellenistic face of Isis.
- 32 An overview on Isis in Rome and her southern hinterland is provided by Gasparini 2008 (with bibliography).
- 33 CIL I<sup>2</sup>, 698 (*Lex parieti faciendo in area quae est ante aedem Serapi trans viam. Qui redemerit*). According to [www.attalus.org/docs/cil/laws.html](http://www.attalus.org/docs/cil/laws.html) (accessed December 2016), the inscription was cut or recut in the imperial age, but copied from the original document. For the temple of Serapis, see Zevi 2006, esp. 73–75 and 77, cat. II.1.
- 34 For a brief outline, see Coarelli 2008, 45–47.
- 35 C. Cozzolino in Arslan et al. 1997, 519–21, cat. V.214–V.218; M. Cappozzo and F. Grasso in Gentili 2013, 256, cat. 27 and 28, respectively; Swetnam-Burland 2015, 34–35, figs. 1.7a–c.
- 36 Cantilena and Sampaolo 1992; Hoffmann 1993; Sampaolo 2006; Moormann 2007; D'Alessio 2009, 67–79; Swetnam-Burland 2015, 105–41.
- 37 Hoffmann 1993, 128–29; C. Cozzolino in Arslan et al. 1997, 428, cat. 5.46; Quack 2005; Sampaolo 2006, 113, cat. II.56; Swetnam-Burland 2015, 58–60; 107, fig. 3.1, no. 9.
- 38 See, for example, Arslan et al. 1997, 67, cat. II.39; 71, cat. II.45; 96–97, cat. III.1 and III.3.
- 39 For further works in the Archaic style, see Fuchs 1999, 39–58; Hallett 2015.
- 40 S. Ensoli in Arslan et al. 1997, 396–97, cat. V.15; S.–A. Ashton in Walker and Higgs 2001, 216–17, cat. 194; Krug 2004 (detailed contribution); Krug 2005; V. Mazzuca in Gentili 2013, 22 and 224, cat. 1.
- 41 Ashton 2001a. Krug 2004 provides further references for this and what follows.
- 42 Krug 2004.
- 43 Krug 2004, 184–85, figs. 5a, b.
- 44 For Isis worship in pre-imperial Rome, see Takács 1995, 27–70; Versluys 2004.
- 45 Apul. *Met.* 11.17 (*pastophorum quod sacrosancti collegii nomen est*); 30 (*collegii vetustissimi et sub illis Syllae temporibus conditi numia*); see Bricault 2012. “Priests of the Isis Capitolina,” attested in two inscriptions carved ca. 100–50 BC, have been claimed to be associated with the above *collegium*; see the clarifying remarks by Versluys 2004; Tucci 2006; Gasparini 2008, 100–102; Arata 2010.
- 46 Gasparini 2008, 100.
- 47 Takács 1995, 56–70; Woolf 2014, 86–90.
- 48 Val. Max. 1.3.4; see Takács 1995, 57–59; Versluys 2004, 432.
- 49 Woolf 2014, 89.
- 50 Cass. Dio 47.15.4.
- 51 Val. Max. 7.3.8; App. *B Civ.* 4.47; see Gundel 1961; Takács 1995, 68–69, 123; Bricault 2001–2, 32–33; Versluys 2004, 429.
- 52 For this and what follows, see Woolf 2014, 86–92.
- 53 Woolf 2014, 88.
- 54 Gellner 1993, 41–42.
- 55 Plin. *HN* 36.64–94; see Schneider 2016, 421–22.
- 56 Schneider 2004; Parker 2007; Curran et al. 2009, 35–61; Swetnam-Burland 2015, 65–104.
- 57 For obelisks, see previous note. Pyramids: Fulvio 1543, 166v–168r; Rushforth 1919, 42; Neudecker 2005; Meniconi 2009–10; Swetnam-Burland 2015, 82–90.