PICTORIAL WORKSHOPS IN POMPEII. EXPLORING SOME ROMAN NILOTIC PAINTINGS
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Abstract: From the 3rd century BP onwards, the relationship between Egypt and Rome grew clearer. When the treaty of amicitia was signed in the year 273 BP, the political, cultural, economic and religious impact on Italian territory was increasingly evident. Also, of relevance is the role of the artistic production resulting from the contact between the Roman and Egyptian worlds. The focus of this paper is on several Roman paintings characterised by the depiction of the Nile landscapes. In particular, the attention is turned to the records of four Pompeian contexts: Praedia of Iulia Felix –ii 4, 2–, Sarno Baths –viii 2, 17–, Temple of Isis –viii 7, 28– and House of the Pygmies –ix 5, 9–. By comparing certain iconographic details, the aim of this study is to highlight some analogies in the execution of the paintings examined. On this basis, some hypotheses could be put forward regarding the presence of the same team of painters in the four contexts or, as an alternative, the use of the same models among different artisans.
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Resumen: A partir del s. III a. C., la relación entre Egipto y Roma se hizo más clara. Con la firma del tratado de amicitia en el año 273 a. C., el impacto político, cultural, económico y religioso en el territorio de Italia fue cada vez más evidente. También es relevante el papel de la producción artística fruto del contacto entre los mundos romano y egipcio. Este artículo se ocupa de algunas pinturas romanas caracterizadas por la representación del paisaje del Nilo. Concretamente, la atención se dirige hacia las pinturas de cuatro contextos pompeyanos: Praedia de Iulia Felix –ii 4, 2–, Termas del Sarno –viii 2, 17–, Templo de Isis –viii 7, 28– y Casa de los Pigmeos –ix 5, 9–. A través de la comparación de ciertos detalles iconográficos, el objetivo de este estudio es poner de relieve algunas analogías en la ejecución de las pinturas examinadas. De esta manera, se podrían formular algunas hipótesis sobre la presencia de un mismo equipo de pintores en los cuatro contextos o, como alternativa, la utilización de los mismos modelos entre diferentes artesanos.
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1. Introduction

The fortune of the landscape motif in Roman painting is undoubtedly remarkable. Indeed, in the evolutionary stages of this genre, various ways of depicting it are attested, which stand out as expressions of developments adopted as early as the 6th century BP with Polygnotus of Thassos and later perfected during the 4th century BP (Rouveret, 1982: 571-588; La Rocca, 2008: 7-13; Croiselle, 2010: 19-24). It was only from the end of the 1st century BP onwards that the landscape in Roman painting became the co-protagonist alongside the subjects depicted, if not the absolute centre of representation, whereas in earlier periods it worked mainly as a background to the figurative scene (Salvadori, 2008: 23-25). This is clearly proven in the well-known passages from Pliny the Elder and Vitruvius describing the decorative systems of wall painting. The two authors’ words reconstitute the ‘landscape repertoire’ that shapes Roman panormas based on typological schemes, based on real ones, by taking the characterising elements out of them. The latter, defined as topia by Latin authors, could be considered as creative syntheses created by the artists’ inventiveness, i.e., as paesaggi della mente, as stated by La Rocca (2008: 32). This result achieved through a full mastery of drawing and technique is likely to be traced back to a model developed by Studius –or Studius–, the Augustan-era artist mentioned by Pliny as the inventor of depictions of villas, porticoes, woods, seaside towns and other landscape elements. Indeed, the art of Studius brought a dynamic expressiveness to the stylistic formulas of the republican era through the addition of scenes of human activity, no longer only set in a bucolic setting, as we learn in Vitruvius, but in an atmosphere of hedonistic taste (Ling, 1977: 1-16). Hence, a landscape shaped by man began to be depicted, with gardens, parks, canals, and water basins, enriched with human figurines that add colour and vivacity to the depictions. The Augustan painter would therefore have been inspired not directly by nature, but rather by its architectural

---

1 The author is recipient of a research contract “Ayudas para la recualificación del sistema universitario español. Modalidad Margarita Salas” financed by The European Union-NextGenerationEU. I would like to express my gratitude for the reviewers’ valuable feedbacks that helped to improve the paper.

2 “Eaque sunt scripta antiquis litteris Latinis, non fraudanda et Studio divi Augusti aetate, qui primus instituit amoenissimam parietum picturam, villas et porticuous ac topiaria opera, lucos, nemora, collae, piscinas, euripos, amnes, litora, qualia quis optaret, varias ibi obambulantium species aut navigantium teraque villas aduentum asellis aut vehiculis, iam piscantes, aucupantes aut venantes aut etiam vindemiantes” (“Moreover, credit should not be taken away from Studio, who lived in the Augustan age and was the first to invent the graceful mural painting, depicting country houses, harbours and landscape subjects, sacred groves, forests, hills, fishponds, canals, rivers, beaches, according to his own desires, and in that environment various kinds of people walking or sailing, or going by land to their villas on donkeys or chariots, or fishing or hunting or perhaps even harvesting grapes”). Plinius, *Nat. Hist.*, xxxv, 116; translation by Chambers, 2012. “Postea ingressi sunt, ut etiam aedificiorum figuras, columnarum et fastigiorum eminentes proiecturas imitarentur, patimenti autem locis, uti exedris, propter amplitudines parietum scenarum frontes tragico more aut comicó seu satyrico designarent, ambulationibus uero propter spatio longitundinis uarietatibus

---


4 Vitruvius, *De Arch.* vii, 5, 2.

Out of the multiple landscape versions depicted in the Roman pictorial repertoire, the so-called Nilotic landscapes stand out for their undoubtedly different features. These are shaped as fantasy landscapes that become fashionable paintings, even though they are represented with realism, recalling the Nile delta and the everyday activities taking place along the river (De Vos, 1980: 75-76; Versluys, 2002: 4-15; Bragantini, 2006: 162; Captrotti, 2006: 37-39). Furthermore, some iconographic elements are particularly recurrent in this figurative genre: the topoi of the Egyptian landscape appear as specific details, as stereotyped representations that can play an identifying role for scenes set along the Nile, even when analysed on their own (Voltan, 2022: 261-270).

In this paper, the focus is on some Nilotic paintings from four Pompeian contexts: Praedia of Iulia Felix –ii 4, 2–, Sarno Baths –viii 2, 17–, Temple of Isis –viii 7, 28– and House of the Pygmies –ix 5, 9–. The reason for analysing the paintings of these contexts is they are characterised by various iconographic details realised in a similar manner. Hence, some hypotheses seem possible regarding the presence of the same team of painters in the four contexts or, as an alternative, the use of the same figurative models as reference. However, before moving into this topic, a general overview regarding the Nilotic landscape in the Roman painting is provided.

2. The Roman Nilotic paintings: spread and chronology

From a chronological point of view, the paintings of Roman Egyptian landscapes are attested between the 1st century BP and 150 AD (De Vos, 1980: 75-95; Meyboom, 1995: 16-19; Versluys, 2002: 241-248; Merrils, 2017: 131-137). The wall fragments of the atrium of the Villa of the Mysteries in Pompeii –80-70 BP– represent the earliest attestation according to currently records (De Vos, 1980: 9-12; Versluys, 2002: 155-157). However, there are some chronologically more recent examples: the wall fragments of the Baths of the Hunters in Leptis Magna –dated around 250 AD– (Versluys, 2002: 187-189) and the pictorial frieze of a cistern from Salamis –dated to the 6th century AD– (Bardsweel and Sotiriou, 1939: 443-445). With regard to the geographical distribution of Nilotic paintings, the study includes evidence from: Italy, France, Libya, Cyprus, the West Bank, Greece and Spain.

The Italian peninsula certainly provides the largest and most varied archaeological records. The largest number of records is in the region of Campania, particularly in Pompeii; other records come from other neighbouring settlements such as Herculaneum, Gragnano and Stabia. As far as Lazio is concerned, paintings from Rome, Ostia and Bolsena are documented (Barbet, 1982: 102-114). Other examples with the same theme come from Lombardia and, more specifically, from Brescia –Domus di Dioniso (Versluys, 2002: 176-177; Mariani, 2003: 45-47; Salvadori, 2012: 262-263)– and Cremona –Piazza Marconi and Via Colletta (Mariani, 2017: 236-237)–. Among those from Marche are: a Nilotic frieze in a building in Ancona –Via Fanti– (Micheli, 2014: 409-413; Santucci, 2020: 79-92) and another in the nymphaeum of Cupra Marittima (Percossi, 1993: 47-70; Di Marco, 2022: 177-182). Outside the Italian borders, there are further Nilotic attestations in France –Villa of Mercin-et-Vaux, Temple of Cybele in Lyon, a building called ‘Clos de la Solitude’ and the residential complex of Villars (Leclant, 1984: 441-442; Versluys, 2002: 210-212; Barbet, 2008: 171-173)–; in Libya, in addition to the already mentioned case of Leptis Magna, there are some pictorial fragments from room u of the Villa of Dar Buc Ammèra in Zliten (Aurigemma, 1962: 57-58; Versluys, 2002: 192-195). In Greece, there are some paintings with Nilotic motifs in the corridor of a Roman tomb near Corinth (Versluys, 2002: 219-220); another attestation is found in the Herodium complex near Jerusalem (Rozenberg, 2009: 179-183).

5 This paper contains part of the results of the author’s PhD thesis aimed at the cataloguing and study of Nilotic-themed paintings attested in the provinces of the Roman Empire between the 1st century BP and the 6th century AD.
2020: 120-128). Finally, there is a pictorial panel with a Nilotic scene along the southern side of a Roman cistern discovered at Monte Sacro in Cartagena, Murcia (Velasco and Iborra, 2020: 133-141).

3. The Nilotic Contexts in Pompeii

As mentioned above, most Nilotic paintings are from the Italian region of Campania, in particular from the archaeological site of Pompeii (Fig. 1). As displayed in the map, almost 40 records come from the Vesuvian archaeological site and these are dated from 80-70 BC to 79 AD (Fig. 2). This study concerns the Nilotic paintings from four contexts: Praedia of Iulia Felix –ii 4, 2–, Sarno Baths –viii 2, 17–, Temple of Isis –vii 7, 28– and House of the Pygmies –ix 5, 9–. To be specific, these are two private settings –Praedia of Iulia Felix and House of the Pygmies– and two public ones –Sarno Baths and Temple of Isis–, the latter located in the same Regio viii. As for chronology, all the contexts are dated to the second half of the 1st century AD: 62-79 AD –Praedia and Temple of Isis–; around 70 AD –House of the Pygmies and Sarno Baths (Versluys, 2002: 109, 134, 143, 146)–. The settings of these paintings are: summer triclinium –Praedia– (Fig. 3); cubiculum –House of the Pygmies– (Fig. 4); frigidarium –Sarno Baths– (Fig. 5); porticus –Temple of Isis– (Fig. 6).

3.1. The Analysed Paintings: State of Art

At this point, the current state of art regarding the Nilotic paintings in the four Pompeian contexts is introduced. First of all, it is appropriate to start

This paper will not deal in detail in the topic of Egypt’s relations with Campania so as not to digress too much from the main theme. However, for a discussion about the relationship between Pharaonic Egypt and pre-Roman Campania, see: De Salvia, 2006: 21-30. On the relations between Campania and Egypt in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, see: De Caro, 1983: 53-58; Del Francia, 1991: 145-158. On the specific topic of Egyptian artefacts in Pompeii, see: Barrett, 2019; Bellucci, 2021.

from the insightful observations of Whitehouse concerning the Nilotic landscapes in the summer triclinium of the Praedia of Iulia Felix –ii 4, 2– (Fig. 7) and in room 1 of the House of the Pygmies –ix 5, 9– (Fig. 8). The researcher, analysing and comparing the fragments of both contexts, is sure of the iconographic affinity of some specific details such as, for example, the papyrus boat in the north wall of ix 5, 9 and that of the north wall of ii 4, 2. Furthermore, she highlights the almost similar dimensions of the figures depicted in the two contexts; however, she emphasizing the technical superiority in the execution of the frieze in the House of the Pygmies (Whitehouse, 1977: 61-62). Finally, she states that: “The two friezes are obviously contemporaneous, and it might further be argued that they are products of the same firm of decorators, and that the motifs which they contain were selected from the same source and assembled, by different hands, into the same sort of landscape”.

Another context examined in this paper is that of the Sarno Baths –viii 2, 17– (Fig. 9), situated in the southern sector of the city of Pompeii that are part of a larger and more articulated building complex, distributed on several levels along the hillside and overlooking the Sarno valley.
Fig. 2. Nilotic paintings spread in Pompeii (modified map from Sena Chiesa and Pontrandolfo, 2015: 32).

Fig. 3. Planimetry of the Praedia of Iulia Felix – II 4, 2– (Merrills, 2017: 114, fig. 3, n. 9); the arrow points the summer triclinium where the Nilotic paintings are located.

Fig. 4. Planimetry of the House of the Pygmies – IX 5, 9– (PPM IX, 486); the arrow points the Room I where the Nilotic paintings are located.
Some of the results of the complete 3D survey of the complex, obtained from the surveys already carried out by the Archaeological Park of Pompeii and by new surveys of the Univ. of Padua (MACH Project, 2015-2017), are particularly noteworthy (Bernardi and Busana, 2019: 231-239; Bonetto and Busana, 2021: 150-154). More specifically, the considerations relating to the Nilotic friezes placed along the perimeter above the frigidarium basin are also significant (Salvadori et al., 2018: 207-225; Salvadori and Sbrolli, 2018a: 527-545; 2018b: 49-53; Salvadori et al., 2019: 299-308). Of the friezes, it would be highlighted that some of the iconographic elements in them would recall some figurative details (Sampaolo, 1995: 200-213) in the Nilotic scene from the east porticus of the Temple of Isis –viii 7, 28– (Fig. 10). The focus would be on a certain figurative resemblance between the building structures, the lush vegetation, and the shape of the palms, although it is important to emphasise the different stylistic rendering. The spatial construction of the Nilotic scenes in these two contexts seems to be similar, and the representation of the pygmy characters is also quite close. In both contexts, in a more striking way than in other Nilotic attestations, these characters are depicted with very prominent buttocks, short and stubby limbs, curly hair and large heads. These images are clearly characterised by grotesque features that further emphasise a caricatured dimension, a peculiar aspect of

---

Fig. 5. Planimetry of the Sarno Baths, Level 3 –viii, 2, 17– (Salvadori and Sbrolli, 2018: 529, fig. 2); pointed the Frigidarium with Nilotic paintings.

Fig. 6. Planimetry of the Temple of Isis –viii, 7, 28– (Pesando and Guidobaldi, 2006: 69); pointed the East Porticus where the Nilotic paintings are located.

---

7 For specific studies on the context of the Sarno Baths, see: Koloski, 1990; Ioppolo, 1992.

8 On the basis of the study carried out in the author’s doctoral thesis, as well as numerous previous studies dedicated to the subject of pygmies, a number of specific characteristics of these figures mentioned in the text can be noted. However, I would like to stress the close iconographic relationship recognisable in the representation of pygmies in the contexts under analysis; in particular, such curly and bushy hair does not appear frequently in Roman Nilotic representations.
these figures\textsuperscript{9}. These features would also involve the pygmies depicted in ix 5, 9, as has already been correctly observed (Salvadori \textit{et al.}, 2018: 223). There are further similarities between the friezes of viii 2, 17 and those of ix 5, 9: “… piante acquatiche dalle larghe foglie, nella cui resa si riconoscono i tratti della vegetazione raffigurata nel fregio delle Terme” (Salvadori \textit{et al.}, 2018: 223).

\textsuperscript{9} On this topic, see: Cèbe, 1966; Bellucci and Voltan, 2022: 77-88.

3.2. Further comparative iconographic elements

After these preliminary considerations, I propose some further observations on some Nilotic iconographic elements from the contexts under analysis. Indeed, in my opinion, the so-called \textit{relazione di produzione}\textsuperscript{10} in figurative compositions with a Nilotic theme between the Praedia and the House of the Pygmies on the one hand, and the Sarno Baths, 

\textsuperscript{10} Expression from Bragantini (2004: 140).
the Temple of Isis and again the House of the Pygmies on the other, would seem to stand out clearly and strongly. In any case, I believe that it is crucial to check if there could be a single ‘production network’ among all the contexts analysed11. This would result from the use of the same iconographic models or the execution by the same team of artisans in the four settings. Firstly, the similarities in the realisation of the pygmy figures in the different records are considered. Although the stylistic rendering is not the same, it would seem legitimate to identify a common reference model among all the records. As a matter of fact, in the recurrent stocky, ungainly, and slightly grotesque physical forms seen in most

11 In this survey, an attempt has been made to stick as closely as possible to the four interrelated approaches to the study of Pompeian painters’ workshops, extensively explored by Esposito (2009: 20-25; 2017: 277).
of the Nilotic attestations, a certain affinity in depiction forms can be observed. Moreover, it is interesting to observe the particularly curly hair, a feature not often displayed in Nilotic scenes (Fig. 11).

Also, in the representation of the crocodile some iconographic similarities could be identified: in particular, in the details of ii 4, 2, viii 7, 28 and ix 5, 9 (Fig. 12). However, it is more complicated the comparison with the detail of viii 2, 17, now hardly visible. The representations of the crocodile figure in the Praedia and the Temple of Isis would seem rather similar in their compositional scheme and treatment of the animal’s armour. In both cases, the use of ‘lumeggiature’ in the lower area of the back can be observed. This depiction seems aimed towards a realistic purpose that is, instead, less clear in the detail of the House of the Pygmies, even though the initial model would appear to be the same. The way in which the flora is depicted would also help to reinforce the hypothesis being developed. Hence, the broad leaves and similar stylistic rendering characterise the details in the different contexts; the highly decorative feature of the stems in viii 2, 17 is outstanding (Fig. 13). In addition, especially in the friezes of the Temple of Isis and the House of the Pygmies, it is interesting to notice the same manner of depicting water. The movement effect is recreated through the depiction of a
series of thin, intermittent white lines, which bring realism and vitality to the scene.

Furthermore, through the comparison with Esposito’s recent works (2009; 2010: 215-227; 2017: 261-288; 2021: 53-69), based on stylistic comparisons with the decorative syntax, ornamental motifs and subjects of the high quality decorations of the Fourth Style of Pompeii, it would still be possible to hypothesise the use of the same patterns books or, otherwise, the application of reference models from the repertoire of a specific workshop in the contexts examined. Also, the choice of this decorative theme, as well as the quality of the execution, would confirm the high profile of the artisans who worked in these settings (Esposito, 2021: 65-66).

4. Closing observations

On the basis of the significant considerations published in recent years concerning the Nilotic paintings in the four Pompeian contexts, the aim of this paper was to propose further ideas on this topic. As mentioned previously, Helen Whitehouse had already correctly identified iconographic concordances between the Praedia and the House of the Pygmies. In a similar way, the recent studies carried out at the Sarno Baths have identified a number of figurative links between the contexts of the Baths, the Temple of Isis and the House of the Pygmies. In the light of these insightful remarks,

Fig. 11. Details with pygmies: a) Praedia of Iulia Felix – t 4, 2–; b) House of the Pygmies – ix 5, 9– (author, per gentile concessione del Ministero della Cultura-Parco Archeologico di Pompei); c) Sarno Baths – viii 2, 17– (Salvadori et al., 2018: 213); d) Temple of Isis – viii 7, 28– (author, per gentile concessione del Ministero della Cultura-Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli).

12 For example, it includes the identification of the Vettii workshop in Pompeii in different contexts of the Vesuvian city, including the Temple of Isis (Esposito, 2007: 149-164).
I believe it is possible to advance in this path by proposing the hypothesis of an ‘iconographic network’ common to all four the Pompeian contexts. They share a chronological proximity; perhaps, it could also be relevant that the two public contexts –Sarno Baths and Temple of Isis– are in the same Regio viii. Therefore, the hypothesis of the use of a common set of iconographic models through the circulation of pattern books or the presence of the same workshop team in the four contexts could be raised. The high level of execution of the paintings could suggest a prestigious patronage in all four cases (Fig. 14).

The observations introduced here aim to provide a further step forward in the study of production patterns among the different contexts in Pompeii. Whenever possible, the association of the four interconnected approaches to the study of Pompeian painting workshops13 together with the definition of the spaces that decoration holds within the culture of Roman society, interplays with the work of the painters in a very complex manner. Moreover, the ‘big circuits and high powered connections’14 that existed between the members of the Pompeian elite should also be considered in relation to a heritage of visual images, made up of formulas, schemes, compositions, but also of significant gestures, figures and codified postures (Andersen, 1985: 123-124). In this way, by researching and highlighting the relations of dependency or affinity between different patrons, it might also be possible to interweave the requests of the patrons and the modus operandi of the artisans, thus amplifying the concept of a single patron to groups of patrons15.

Fig. 12. Details with crocodiles: a) Praedia of Iulia Felix –II 4, 2– (Sampaolo, 2020: 24, fig. 2.3); b) House of the Pygmies –IX 5, 9– (author, per gentile concessione del Ministero della Cultura-Parco Archeologico di Pompei); c) Temple of Isis –VIII 7, 28– (author, per gentile concessione del Ministero della Cultura-Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli).

13 Specifically, it involves: 1. the analysis of technical characteristics in the execution of paintings; 2. the analysis of decorative schemes; 3. the regular association of groups of ornamental details with decorative schemes; 4. the recognition of the ‘hands’ of painters (Esposito, 2009: 20-25; 2017: 277).

14 Expression from Leach (2004: 262).

15 In general, on the complicated issue of the existence, as well as the type, of sketchbooks and the circulation of iconographies, see: Ghedini, 1997: 824-837; Grassigli, 1999: 447-468; Clarke, 2010: 203-214.
**Fig. 13.** Details with flora: a) Praedia of Iulia Felix –II 4, 2– (from Sampaolo, 2020: 24, fig. 2.3); b) House of the Pygmies –IX 5, 9– (from author, per gentile concessione del Ministero della Cultura-Parco Archeologico di Pompei); c) Sarno Baths –VIII 2, 17– (from Salvadori et al., 2018: 213); d) Temple of Isis –VIII 7, 28– (from author, per gentile concessione del Ministero della Cultura-Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli).

**Fig. 14.** Identification of the contexts involved in the analysis in the Pompeii plan (modified map from Sena Chiesa and Pontrandolfo, 2015: 32).
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