

Sławomir Jędraszek
University of Gdańsk
e-mail: slawomir.jedraszek@ug.edu.pl

Roman Ideology Reflected in Egyptian Terracottas. Chosen Aspects

Egyptian iconographic formulas and themes, which were inspired by Egyptian arts and crafts, were incorporated into the visual propaganda campaign and iconographical language of Augustus. This is especially noticeable after his military success over the allied armies of Mark Antony and Cleopatra VII.

Egypt was vividly represented on Roman coins, by the presence of images which symbolized the country's wealth and culture. And so we come across the following representations: sistrum, ibis, lotus, as well as the personification of the Nile, the Sun, the Moon, the images of Apis, Osiris, Isis and Serapis. We have also examples of artifacts which could be identified with Egypt and its art, and which thanks to some details and formulas (which were part of their iconography) such as, among other items, military equipment can be identified with the Roman Imperial period.

The subject of this paper deals with problems surrounding the interpretation of various types of terracotta which were produced in Egypt. I will attempt to answer the question of whether iconographic themes and formulas which could be identified with the military success of Augustus, or more broadly with Roman ideology, which could be chronologically placed at the end of the first century BC or the beginning of the first century AD, were developed in the craft workshops operating at this period, especially those operating in Alexandria.

In Egypt the cult of the Pharaohs is well-known, and in general terms the identification of the Pharaoh as a god has a long and variable tradition. This situation did not radically change when Egypt became a Roman province. When Augustus arrived in Egypt, the traditional institution of ruler-cult established three centuries ago was so well established that Augustus was also considered a god, and all successive emperors after him¹.

¹ Niwiński 2004, 49.

Terracotta statuettes and coroplastic art in general, which are the main theme of this paper, constitute an exceptionally rich category of source material, which was characterized by multiple symbolic meanings and functions, mainly of a religious nature. This archaeological source, often quite rightly, has been identified with domestic religious practice and personal piety². Nevertheless, to this material we can also assign a wider significance identified with the surrounding symbolism which is of a general, political nature. Therefore, due to the broad spectrum of diverse themes occurring in coroplastic crafts, it is also possible to study a number of issues referring to political changes, as well as to identify the iconographic formulas, together with their values and meanings, and their ideological and propaganda function.

These considerations find their justification in the context of the reception of coroplastics. Because, as we know, this category of archaeological artefacts is characterized by their mass nature, they are able to find a market among the broad mass of social structures. Terracotta figurines, it may be assumed, were equally addressed to the elite of those times.

It should also be noted that in Roman Egypt, especially in the period recently following the annexation, only a small percent of the population living in the province could have actually enjoyed Roman citizenship. Therefore, some measures may have been taken especially by the spheres of elite Roman to include the Egyptian population as recipients. The coroplastic material discussed here, due to its nature and number, may reflect new developments, and models of different nature and content which were widely propagated and distributed.



Fig. 1.

Terracotta figure of a Roman soldier. A group, probably Hadrian menacing a captive.

©The Trustees of the British Museum.

² Dunand 1979; Jędraszek 2013a, 3–21.

One of the classic formulae – if I may use such a term – is a terracotta from the collections of the British Museum. This terracotta group has been identified with a period considerably later than that which is the subject of this conference. This interesting example of a terracotta, according to varying different identifications and interpretations, depicts the Emperor Hadrian³. The Emperor, depicted as a warrior in military dress but bare-headed, is holding an enemy in a rather characteristic manner by the hair, in a gesture of victory. He is thus shown in an important iconographic formula, in a characteristic pose. The enemy can be identified by his military attributes, like his sword and also by the characteristic oval shield, as a barbarian. He can also be identified symbolically with an enemy from southern borders of Egypt, but also generally with the concept of the enemy not further specified. In this context, we can suggest that we are dealing with a multi-level symbolism of meaning, which is a phenomenon which is quite frequently encountered.

The discussion on the above terracotta image is unique for several reasons, not least of all for the fact that it contains themes inherited from Egyptian dynastic times and culture. It can be identified with the ideology of power, where the king in a characteristic scene kills the enemy. The iconographic formula under discussion is linked to the theme of triumph (defeating and killing the enemy), and was incorporated into the language of the art of the Hellenistic period, and thereafter into that of the coroplastic of the Roman period, which extensively developed in Graeco-Roman Egypt.

This interesting example of the terracotta figure in the opinion of Donald M. Bailey, can be dated to the years AD 118–135⁴. His identification with particular embodiments of an emperor, or in a symbolic way with political events that occurred during their reigns, is relatively broad and diverse. There are a few options for the interpretation of the specifics of the iconographic theme. The image of the Roman Emperor, Hadrian, could symbolically represent Marcus Turbo, who was *praefectus praetorio* under Hadrian, who was responsible for

³ Bailey 2008, 139, no. 3509_{EA}, pl. 93; See also the discussion: Bailey 1996, 207–21; See also, an interesting comparison to a terracotta group in Munich, with an apotropaic Egyptian god Bes in the same pose, holding a victim (enemy) by the hair and threatening him with a sword held horizontally (See: Schoske 1989, 98, no. A18). More about the dwarf god Bes, with the transformation from his original leonine form into the military form found in the Hellenistic period, often shown fully armed, indicating his protective role in driving away demons, see: Jędraszek 2012, 145–177. See also the stone relief, from the collection of Marc Rosenberg, known as the Rosenberg stele, which, as suggested by D.M. Bailey, [...] *probably shows the god Antaios and is not a 'smiting-scene' involving an emperor* [...], after: Bailey 2008, 139; see also: Bailey 2005, 389–398; Kiss 1997, 291–296.

⁴ Bailey 2008, 139, no. 3509_{GR}, pl. 93.

suppressing the Jewish Revolt of AD 118⁵, which started under Trajan⁶, and which caused massive destruction in Egypt and Cyrenaica, but could also depict Antoninus Pius, who ended a revolt of the Alexandrians in which Lucius Munacius Felix, the Prefect died in AD 153⁷. The image of an emperor could be also identified with Marcus Aurelius, in whose reign the Bucolic Revolt was suppressed by Avidius Cassius in AD 172⁸. This figure could also be identified with Septimius Severus who defeated Pescennius Niger at Cyzicus⁹. As we can see, the identification of the iconographic scene with its historical theme, as well as a symbolic meaning, has led to a wide range of interpretations¹⁰.

One of the interesting aspects here is that a terracotta figurine cannot, as I have mentioned above, be identified, with Augustus' victory at the battle of Actium in 31 BC, and thereby with the annexation of Egypt, mainly due to the dating of this terracotta statuette. The terracotta from the British Museum is closely related to another group from Berlin¹¹, as well as to a terracotta statuette, dated to the second or third centuries AD from the collection of the University of Southern California¹², and should be associated with political events in Egypt, or indirectly to political events outside Egypt in this period.

It is well known that the ideology of the ancient Egyptian Pharaoh undoubtedly attributed most importantly religious attributes to the Pharaoh, but also showed him smiting his defeated enemies, as well as supervising the counting of enemy prisoners and killing them. Conceptions of this kind played a fundamental political and propagandistic role in the art of the New Kingdom, for example. Images of this kind in particular depicted the Pharaoh in his role as a supreme warlord.

In many monuments the Pharaoh was shown in classic scenes demonstrating his power, control, and expansion, when he kills and tramples enemies, holding a mace above his head, and holding a prisoner by the hair, as on the pre-dynastic Narmer Palette. These scenes, (among many others, for example: hunting scenes and slaughtering scenes) became permanent elements in official art images, as an important component of reliefs¹³, as an expression of one of the

⁵ Second Jewish Revolt (AD 115–118); Eusebius, *HE* 4, 2 ; Cass. Dio 68, 32; See: Méléze-Modrzejewski 2000, 246–247, 249, 261.

⁶ Levine 2013, 236–238.

⁷ Łukaszewicz 2006, 321; Capponi 2011, 32.

⁸ Łukaszewicz 2006, 322–323; Capponi 2011, 32.

⁹ See: <http://www.scf.usc.edu/~grantdix/WhatIsAKingToDo/TheSmitingImage.html> (11.01.2015).

¹⁰ Bailey 2008, 139.

¹¹ <https://dornsife.usc.edu/what-is-a-king-to-do/comparanda/> (11.01.2015).

¹² About physical analysis (Pigment Analysis), terracotta figurine from UCS, see: <https://dornsife.usc.edu/what-is-a-king-to-do/pigment-analysis> (11.01.2015).

¹³ Lipiński 2013, 228. For example, about Egyptian kingship during the Old Kingdom see: Bárta 2013, 257–283.

many aspects of the ideology of the Pharaoh's reign¹⁴ which was later adopted by Hellenistic and Roman coroplastic art and craft in Egypt. In this regard, it should be stressed that a very important role of the kings was their military leadership. As Jim Roy suggests: [...] *The king held absolute power [...]. Royal power was first established above all through military strength, and the king's role as military leader – by definition, victorious military leader – remained central*¹⁵, a point which has also been noted by Ragnhild Bjerre Finnestad: [...] *Even Roman imperial ideas coincided on specific points with pharaonic ideas, for example on the ruler's duties in war*¹⁶.

In this context, it should be noted that the coroplastic art of the Graeco-Roman period in Egypt provides many examples of terracotta statuettes showing figures trampling and triumphing over the enemy, and also fighting, which could be identified with military success¹⁷. We cannot exclude the possibility that some of these figurines may have functioned as individual memorabilia, relating to specific military campaigns, functioning perhaps as a souvenir of the owner who took part in them.

We can confidently state that in relation to the battle of Actium, this coroplastic art did not create any new and iconographically clear motif which we could precisely identify either with the decisive military confrontation between Mark Antony and Octavian at Actium, or with the subsequent conquest of Egypt in 30 BC.

Perhaps earlier themes, especially those with military iconography or showing trampling and *triumph* over the enemy, were assigned with new meanings and values. In my opinion, we cannot categorically ignore such a hypothesis, based on the fact that some of the iconographic terracotta motifs mentioned above, had been present in coroplastic art for many years and decades.

Of course we cannot categorically connect the military terracotta statuettes with any particular military campaign. Furthermore, the precise dating of terracotta figurines is extremely complex. This category of archaeological material is frequently bereft of precise information about the original archaeological context, apart from a few examples which come mainly from archaeological excavations¹⁸.

¹⁴ More about kingship in ancient Egypt, see: O'Connor, Silverman 1995.

¹⁵ Roy 1998, 111.

¹⁶ After: Ragnhild B. Finnestad 1997, 231.

¹⁷ See for example: Fischer 2003, 375–380; Jędraszek 2012a: 235–246; See for example, terracotta figurine that shows a rider dressed in the Macedonian fashion in a triumphal pose, Bailey 2008, 146, no. 3544_{GR}, pl. 146. The Macedonian national headgear, a type of beret known as a *kausia*, is particularly well represented among Alexandrian terracotta statuettes. This type of terracotta includes examples dating back to the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century BC. For example see: Szymańska, Babraj 2004, 35; Myśliwiec, Said 1999, 179–121.

¹⁸ As noted by L. Török, in his book about the terracotta in the Budapest collection: [...] *The overwhelming majority of Egyptian terracottas are unprovenanced objects which*

Moreover, today we cannot give a precise answer to the most important question: whether the various examples of terracotta figures which show Egyptian deities dressed in military style and armed with military equipment¹⁹, such as swords, knives and different types of shields, such as some examples of the most popular Egyptian apotropaic domestic deity Bes²⁰, or some statuettes *Horus the Child* – that is Harpocrates²¹, manifestations of Horus, the son of Osiris and Isis, can be certainly identified with Roman religion and culture, as is often suggested in the earlier literature.

It should be noted that we have problems with dating terracottas containing in a single statuette, graphic military elements and attributes from different times. Consequently, if a particular terracotta statuette is to be dated to the Roman period, as a result of, for example, an archaeological context, do all the elements of the armour and other military elements have to be dated to the same period too? We can only suggest that in the iconography of a single statuette or terracotta plaques, we have representations of elements drawn from different times, which are characterized by different traditions and proveniences. Some of them could be adopted from other groups of terracotta statuettes. As it has been suggested by Frederick G. Naerebout in the context of Egyptian gods shown in foreign armour: [...] *For simple reasons of chronology, the motif of the armoured gods cannot be Roman in whatever meaning one wants to give to that word. Their armour can be Roman, but it can be pre-Roman too – and thus the whole idea of gods donning armour must be pre-Roman as well* [...] ²², and furthermore: [...] *The danger of circularity in dating the material is ever present: this is a Roman period image so the armour must be Roman; this is Roman armour, so the image must be of Roman date* [...] ²³.

As for example, this is what David Frankfurter showed in his study about religion in Roman Egypt: [...] *Roman terra-cotta figurines found throughout Egypt all show a pronounced Hellenistic style of dress (including nudity), hair, and accoutrements. [...] But far from reflecting a broad ideological tendency*

cannot be dated on the basis of archaeological contexts. It was only in recent years that a terracotta material was first published from datable layers at Karanis, [...] excavated in the 1930s by the expedition of the University of Michigan, after: L. Török (Török 1995: 22).

¹⁹ Bailey 2008, 35, no. 3068_{GR}, pl. 12; 39–40, no.: 3095_{EA}–3102_{GR}, pl. 16–18.

²⁰ Jędraszek 2012, 145–177.

²¹ Naerebout 2014, 45; See also for example: Jędraszek 2014, 21 nn; We also know several examples of gods which are shown in full body armour. See for example: Bayer-Niemeier 1988, no.: 434–436, 441; Frankfurter 1998, pl. 1; Babraj, Szymańska, 2000, 184; Dunand 1990, no.: 30–33, 175–179. Bailey 2008, no.: 3067_{EA}, 3100_{EA}–3103_{EA}; Perdrizet, pl. XXXII; Török 1995, no.: 36–38, pl. XXIX–XXX; See also: Török 1995, 20–22.

²² after: Naerebout 2014, 51; On more discussion see: Naerebout 2014, 51–61.

²³ after: Naerebout 2014, 52.

*towards a transcendent and altogether Greek conceptualization of the goddess among Egyptians and Greco-Egyptians of the Roman period [...]*²⁴.

The very fact that in the Roman period, in some of the terracotta groups, as for example in the images of gods and goddess, we can observe some technical features that also characterize terracottas from the reigns of the kings of the Ptolemaic dynasty, is symptomatic.

Therefore, it should be noted that perhaps some of the iconographic formulas connected with smiting and trampling, as for example a horseman trampling enemies, which was created in the early Hellenistic period and which was still produced down to the first century BC, could be identified with the current political events.

Consequently, also in the case of some of the terracotta statuettes, especially those clearly showing the characteristics of religious iconography, we should note that the political content does not necessarily have to be clearly synonymous with any religious symbolism.

In this context, we can suggest a multilevel interpretation of terracotta artifacts, which also applies to determining their wide range of function as votive offerings deposited in a temple or shrine, as statuettes found in funerary contexts, and also, in some cases, as features of interior design, some of them with an educational function, others as toys.

One example of such a group of terracotta statuettes of which the iconographic prototypes had been created in the Hellenistic period, and which were still produced in the time of Roman Empire, would be the group of Nubian warriors, who were present in the structures of the armies of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt alike²⁵.

This terracotta statuette showing a Nubian axeman can certainly be dated to the Roman period²⁶. The statuette, with its very well imagined anatomical detail, depicts a stocky soldier, dressed in a strained fibule tunic. The warrior wears a cuirass with *pteruges*. The Nubian infantryman is armed with a double-headed axe of the simple shaft-hole type, with the shaft projecting beyond the head. The double-headed axe was the characteristic weapon of an Ethiopian soldier in Antiquity²⁷. The manner of composition and details of the iconography of this example of a terracotta statuette, and also naturalistic modeling – especially the representation of the drapery of his tunic, and other elements, suggest

²⁴ after: Frankfurter 1998, 103.

²⁵ Fischer-Bovet 2014, 160, 222.

²⁶ Ghalioungui, Wagner 1974, 193, no. 62c.

²⁷ Bailey 1996, 221–222, fot. 3; Strabo 17.1. 53–54. See also: Strabo 16.4.17, Malinowski 2007, 411–412.

that this Nubian axeman should be chronologically identified as coming from the Roman period²⁸.



Fig. 2.

Terracotta figure of a Nubian mercenary. Circa: 220BC–180BC.

©The Trustees of the British Museum.

Terracotta figurines depicting Nubian warriors appear for the first time in coroplastic art in the Hellenistic period²⁹. Their appearance may be associated with the reign of Ptolemy II, who conducted a Nubian campaign in 270 BC³⁰. However, in the Roman period, statuettes representing Nubian warriors, or the African soldiers, return to coroplastic art, perhaps as an echo of military struggles associated with the invasions in 24 BC, at a time when Gaius Petronius was the prefect of Egypt³¹. According to Strabo: [...] *Petronius, setting out with less than ten thousand infantry and eight hundred cavalry against thirty thousand men, first forced them to flee back to Pselchis, an Aethiopian city, and sent ambassadors to demand what they had taken, as also to ask the reasons why they had begun war [...]*³², followed by Petronius settling his men at Premis (Qasr Ibrim)³³: [...] *a fortified city, after passing through the sand-dunes [...]*³⁴ Next,

²⁸ See also terracotta figurine (from the 4th century AD), which has been found at Esna, Petrie 1905, pl. XLV no. 9.

²⁹ More about selected terracotta representations of Nubian warriors, see: Jędraszek 2015.

³⁰ See: Malinowski 2007, 238; Rostovtzeff 1953, 381–383; Burstein 2008a, 45; Fischer-Bovet 2014, 59. See also: Burstein 2008, 139; Jędraszek 2015.

³¹ Strabo 17. 53–54; Bailey 1996, 212; Kirwan 1957, 15–17; Jameson 1968, 71–84; Török 1997, 455 and next.

³² Strabo 17. 54.

³³ Łukaszewicz 2006, 270.

³⁴ Strabo 17. 54.

after long march: [...] *Petronius attacked and captured Nabata too*, [...] ³⁵. After two years there was a new Ethiopian attack. As a consequence, Gaius Petronius once again defeated people from Meroe ³⁶.

The iconographic theme presented above is one of the many examples of terracotta statuettes which were produced and created in the Hellenistic period and which in the later period, were still being developed and evolving. At the time of Roman rule, this formula could be identified with new values which were connected with more recent political events.



Fig. 3.
Terracotta model of a shield, with a relief of the god Antaios.
Roman period, second century AD.
©The Trustees of the British Museum.

One interesting terracotta plaque, probably dating back to the second century AD, is a fragment of a miniature model shield decorated with a relief of Antaios, the god of the Antaiopolite Nome, the Tenth Upper Egyptian Nome ³⁷, representing a scene, which could be identified with the ideology of kingship. The characteristic Egyptian ‘smiting scene’ has parallels to the similar scenes from the Pharaonic period. This terracotta model of a rectangular shield was found in Western Thebes ³⁸. On the right side of the fragment of the shield there

³⁵ Strabo 17. 54.

³⁶ Moore, see: Łukaszewicz 2006, 270–272.

³⁷ Bailey 2008, 42, no 3111_{GR}, pl. 19; Bailey 2005, 391.

³⁸ Bailey 1996, 207–213; Bailey 2005, 394–395. According to D.M. Bailey, *Antaios* [...] can be equated with the god Seth, whose consort Nephthys was, and the antelope was also regarded as an animal of Seth. [...] But not only with Seth: Antaios was syncretic with the falcon god Horus and it was near Antaiopolis that Isis and her son Horus battled with Seth to avenge the murder of her husband and his father Osiris [...]; Bailey 2005, 395.

is an interesting image – a bearded man, armoured, wearing a cuirass over a short-sleeved tunic, and with *pteryges* protecting his upper legs. The man who could be identified with an Emperor, probably Hadrian³⁹, as has been suggested by Donald M. Bailey⁴⁰, *threatens with a sword a diminutive captive held, almost hanging, by a rope in his left hand*⁴¹. The captive has a headdress adorned with antelope's horns and holds a double axe in his left hand⁴².

Obviously, as we mentioned above, it is possible that this terracotta represents one of the many iconographic themes, which could have been re-used by contemporary craftsmen in the time of Roman rule. It should be noted that the moulds for the production of terracotta statuettes or terracotta plaques could be used for a long time, and were often modified or repaired if damaged. Perhaps this fact, as well as other considerations, could suggest that a date of the second half of the first century BC would be appropriate for this terracotta. We cannot observe in the symbolism of the terracotta any motifs that could be connected with the early triumph of Rome and its political domination in Egypt. Unfortunately, today we are not able to clearly confirm this hypothesis with the evidence we have.

Nevertheless, we can agree with that thesis that it was only at the end of the first century BC, and especially during the second century AD, that the triumphant iconographic theme was developed in accordance with the tradition of the Egyptian triumph, and Egyptian kingship ideology, which was then linked to, or identified with, the Romans ruling over Egypt at the time.

We should conclude that the presence of distinctive features of fighting, victory and triumph, depicted on terracotta statuettes, could be interpreted as, for example, a representation of the Emperor Hadrian. This situation is the result of the evolution of many early terracotta themes, and was also the result of developed coroplastic formulas, themes which first emerged in the Hellenistic period, but which were subjected to the process of continuous modification.

³⁹ The identification of the bearded man as the Emperor is also suggested by Zsolt Kiss and Donald M. Bailey. See also examples of terracotta statues depicting Hadrian, Bailey 2008, 139, 3508_{GR}–3509_{GR}, pl. 93.

⁴⁰ The same scholar also noted: [...] *Hadrian seemed most likely, but one of the Antonines or Septimius Severus was also possible* [...], after: Bailey 2005, 389.

⁴¹ After: Bailey 2005, 395.

⁴² See: Bailey 2008, 42, pl. 19. As D. Bailey suggests: [...] *The antelope horns, and the double-axe held by the figure on the shield, may indicate that the captive is from beyond Egypt's southern borders* [...], after: Bailey 2005, 395.

In conclusion:

1. Part of the old terracotta forms, or some of their subjects, which started to be used during the Hellenistic period, were once again used at the beginning of Roman rule. Some of them could have a new content and meaning, which related to current political events.

2. At the beginning of the first century BC, and during the following period shortly after the political annexation of Egypt, we can observe a distant lack of terracotta symbolism containing motifs that could be connected with the Roman triumph or military success. These iconographic themes and formulas appear already in the second century after Christ⁴³, as examples of terracotta which was identified with the philhellenic Roman Emperor Hadrian⁴⁴.

In this context, we should also mention that when the Romans ruled over Egypt, in the arts of this kingdom, in the aspect of royal ideology and military success, the old traditions were widely propagated and rooted.

3. At the time when the most creative coroplastic crafts were developed in Egypt, generally from the second century BC, to the second century AD⁴⁵, to be more precise at the end of the second century AD, a clear iconographic formula, based on the local traditions in which the Pharaoh was replaced by the Roman Emperor, was developed. This terracotta formula, without raising broader concerns, should be identified with royal ideology and Roman propaganda.

In conclusion, we should also answer the question. Why such a terracotta formula, was not formed earlier? Here, as I have already partially pointed out above, we are doomed to a mere conjecture and speculation.

However, it should be noted that after the political annexation of Egypt by Augustus, terracottas were developed more intensively in the style characteristic for the Hellenistic period, continuing the formulas and images referring to both the Greek coroplastic art, as well as exhibiting inspiration derived from local traditions, in particular referring to the extremely rich local religious tradition.

Last but not least, we must note that in the first period of Roman domination in Egypt, the ideological and propaganda roles were fulfilled especially by the coinage. The coroplastic art and crafts needed much more time before new formulas could be promoted and disseminated, as well as more broadly propagated and consequently reproduced.

⁴³ These themes are more popular in the third century AD.

⁴⁴ Łukaszewicz 2006, 313.

⁴⁵ See for example, Török 1995, 25.

Streszczenie

Rzymska ideologia wyrażona w sztuce koroplastów Egiptu. Wybrane aspekty

Przedmiotem niniejszego artykułu jest próba udzielenia odpowiedzi na pytanie, czy w sztuce koroplastów Egiptu okresu grecko-rzymskiego wypracowano nową formułę ikonograficzną, którą należałoby identyfikować ze zwycięstwem militarnym Oktawiana, odniesionym w bitwie u przylądka Akcjum, a w konsekwencji z późniejszą aneksją Egiptu.

W artykule zostały poruszone wybrane kwestie odnoszące się do zabytków terakotowych, szczególnie masowo występujących w materiale archeologicznym Egiptu okresu hellenistycznego i rzymskiego. Autor zwraca między innymi uwagę na funkcje wiązane właśnie z tą kategorią źródeł, wskazując jednocześnie, iż oprócz funkcji religijnych identyfikowanych z terakotowymi zabytkami, szczególnie związanymi z tzw. prywatną religią, czy też indywidualną pobożnością, zabytki koroplastyczne mogły również pełnić inną rolę, niektórym z rzeczonych zabytków należy bowiem przypisać również szersze znaczenia odwołujące się między innymi do treści identyfikowanych z polityką propagandową. Tak sformułowana teza znajduje także uzasadnienie w kontekście adresatów, do których to kierowane były wyroby rzemiosła koroplastycznego, ponieważ, jak należy sądzić, terakotowe zabytki mogły znaleźć odbiorców wśród szerokich rzesz zróżnicowanego ówczesnie społeczeństwa, w tym również i w gronie jego elit.

W tekście przywołano kilka przykładów statuarycznych zabytków, które powstały w początkach okresu hellenistycznego i wytwarzane były nadal w okresie rzymskiego panowania, a których to symboliczne wartości mogły odwoływać się do rozmaitych wydarzeń politycznych, identyfikowanych chronologicznie zarówno z okresem hellenistycznym jak również z czasami rzymskiego panowania.

W podsumowaniu autor stwierdza między innymi, iż część starszych tematów-przedstawięń, ukształtowanych w okresie hellenistycznym, w początkach cesarstwa została ponownie wykorzystana. Tematom tym nadano, jak należy sądzić, nowe treści, które łączono z aktualnymi politycznymi wydarzeniami. Ponadto dla początków I wieku przed Chrystusem i czasów następujących krótko po politycznej aneksji Egiptu brakuje wyraźnie wypracowanego modelu lub obrazu o wyrażeniu wyeksponowanych cechach identyfikowanych z rzymską ikonografią. W materiale związanym z rzemiosłem koroplastycznym tego okresu, nie ma również motywów ikonograficznych identyfikowanych z rzymską aneksją

Egiptu. Tematy takie, co dokumentuje choćby zabytek terakotowy identyfikowany z przedstawieniem cesarza Hadriana, pojawiają się już w okresie II wieku po Chrystusie.

W czasach, gdy najbardziej kreatywnie rozwijało się rzemiosło koroplastyczne w Egipcie, czyli w przedziale chronologicznym od II wieku przed Chrystusem do II wieku po Chrystusie, w końcu tego okresu wypracowano wyraźną formułę ikonograficzną, opartą na miejscowym dziedzictwie, w której to króla zastąpiono cesarzem rzymskim. Obraz ten prawdopodobnie należy identyfikować z ideologią władzy i rzymską polityką propagandową.

W niniejszym tekście postawiono również pytanie o to, dlaczego temat plastycznie identyfikowany z rzymską aneksją Egiptu, czy też konkretnie ze zwycięstwem odniesionym przez Oktawiana, nie zaistniał w rzemiośle koroplastycznym wcześniej? Tu, jak stwierdzono, zdani jesteśmy tylko na spekulacje. Niemniej jednak należy zwrócić uwagę, iż po aneksji Egiptu przez Augusta koroplastyka rozwijała się intensywnie jeszcze w stylu charakterystycznym dla okresu hellenistycznego, kontynuując w swojej wytwórczości tematy i obrazy nawiązujące zarówno do sztuki koroplastów greckich, czerpiąc przy tym także inspiracje płynące z miejscowego dziedzictwa i tradycji, w szczególności natomiast odwołując się do niezwykle bogatej miejscowej tradycji religijnej. Ponadto należy podkreślić, że w początkowym okresie politycznej dominacji Rzymian szczególnie mennictwo spełniało rolę ideologiczną i propagandową, natomiast rzemiosło koroplastyczne wymagało odpowiedniego czasu, by nowa formuła mogła zostać wypracowana, jak też szerzej rozpropagowana i w konsekwencji powielana.

