"Transformations of Antiquity". A Berlin Concept

Johannes Helmrath

Egyptology is the product of a concept best described as the pluralization of antiquity, which developed over the course of several centuries of an antiquarian interest in Aegyptiaca to the evolution of Egyptology into an academic subject and area of research in its own right during the nineteenth century.

This process began in the Renaissance, when classical antiquity was adapted as emphatically as it was antiquarianized with new vigor. The existence of "other antiquities", e.g. a Persian, a Hebrew, a Babylonian and, above all, an Egyptian antiquity, in addition to the canonized classical, Greco-Roman one, was not only recognized, but practiced, leading to the emergence of subjects such as Assyriology, Hettitology, Etruscology etc. in the course of the greater process of differentiation of specialist cultures.

As is well known, there already were exchange and appropriation processes at play between Rome and the Egyptian culture during antiquity, ostentatiously manifested in the transfer of a number of obelisks to Rome and their placement there as a symbol of power, a kind of "spoliare Aegytios" (Ex. 12,36). The Roman fascination with Egypt was—rather obviously—ambivalent (similar to the portrayal of Egypt in the Old Testament); the tall spires of the obelisks stood in stark contrast to the decadent Egypt of *monstra*, of the barking dog-headed god of Cleopatra (*latrator Anubis*; Verg., Aen. VIII, 700). The commonalities highlighted so far revolve around the term that shall be discussed in the following section: transformation.

I would like to present some basic principles of a concept of transformation that was developed in Berlin between 2005 and 2016 at Humboldt University within the framework of the so-called "Sonderforschungsbereich" (SFB) 644 (a collaborative research unit) titled "Transformationen der Antike" ("Transformations of Antiquity"). Over the years, around 25 professors and numerous collaborators from the fields of ancient and medieval history, religious studies, classical philology, Romance, English and German philologies, medieval Latin, art history, archaeology, political science and historical theology collaborated on developing this concept of transformation and put it to the test by applying it to approximately 30 different projects. A series entitled "Transformationen der

Antike" (*TA*) was founded for the publication of monographs and anthologies produced within the scope of SFB 644.[1]

The following introduction to this complex concept can only be woodcut-like and must, due to the brevity of this format, leave aside many terms and even more of the challenges associated with it, for instance the problem of canonization of antiquity or the contingency of transformations as well as the role of agency and imagination.[2] The concept can be summarized in the following definition containing the most important terms: [3]

---

[1] Some representative volumes of the series "Transformationen der Antike" (=TA) (see also note 2), in which about 60 volumes have been published so far: Lutz Bergemann, *Ralph Cudworth – System aus Transformation. Zur Naturphilosophie der Cambridge Platonists und ihrer Methode*, Transformationen der Antike 23 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), best example of meticulous and productive use of the transformation concept in interpreting philosophical texts. Further volumes, beginning with the volume of the first conference: Hartmut Böhme, Christof Rapp and Wolfgang Rösler, ed., *Übersetzung und Transformation*, TA 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), see about Egypt in this volume: Alain Schnapp, "Le sentiment des ruines de l'Orient ancien aux Lumières", 193–215 and Michael Niedermeier, "Von der Schrift in die Landschaft. Die Isis-Imitation des Apuleius in der Mystischen Partie des Wörlitzer Gartens", 267–308; Georg Töpfer and Hartmut Böhme, ed., *Transformationen antiker Wissenschaften*, TA 15 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2010), see Wilfried Nippel, "Institionalisierung der Alten Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert", 157–69; Johannes Helmrath, Albert Schirrmeister and Stefan Schlelein, ed., *Medien und Sprachen humanistischer Geschichtsschreibung*, TA 11 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2009); Johannes Helmrath, Albert Schirrmeister and Stefan Schlelein, ed., *Historiographie des Humanismus. Literarische Verfahren, soziale Praxis, geschichtliche Räume*, TA 12 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013); Anna Heinze, Sebastian Möckel and Werner Röcke, ed., *Grenzen der Antike. Die Produktivität von Grenzen in Transformationsprozessen*, TA 28 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014); Philipp Brüllmann, Ursula Rombach and Cornelia Wilde, ed., *Imagination, Transformation und die Entstehung des Neuen*, TA 31 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014); Hartmut Böhme, Werner Röcke and Ulrike C.A. Stephan, *Contingentia. Transformationen des Zufalls*, TA 38 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2016); Johannes Helmrath, Eva Marlene Hausteiner and Ulf Jensen, ed., *Antike als Transformation. Konzepte zur Beschreibung kulturellen Wandels*, TA 49 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter 2017); Helmut Pfeiffer, Irene Fantappié and Tobias Roth, ed., *Renaissance Rewritings*, TA 50 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2017); Ursula Rombach and Peter Seiler, ed., *"Imitatio" als Transformation. Theorie und Praxis der Antikennachahmung in der frühen Neuzeit* (Petersberg: Imhof, 2012); Bernd Roling and Bernhard Schirg, ed., *Boreas Rising. Antiquarianism and national narratives in 17th and 18th century Scandinavia*, TA 53 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2019). See also the following notes.

[2] Many of them are treated in the articles and books gathered in note 3.

[3] See the toolkit of Lutz Bergemann, Martin Dönike, Albert Schirrmeister, Georg Toepfer, Marco Walter, and Julia Weitbrecht in: "Transformation: A Concept for the Study of Cultural Change", in *Beyond Reception. Renaissance Humanism and the Transformation*

> *Transformations* are complex processes of change that occur between a *sphere of reference* and a *sphere of reception*.[4] *Transformations* are effected by *agents* (who do not necessarily have to be human beings) belonging to the *reception sphere*, who, by selecting, adopting, or otherwise incorporating an aspect of the (antique or seen as antique) *reference sphere*, modify the *reception sphere* while at the same time construing the *reference sphere*. This close connection between modification and construction is an essential characteristic of transformation processes, which can occur both diachronically and synchronically. Such processes therefore lead to something "new" in two senses, namely to mutually dependent, novel configurations in both the *reference culture* and the *reception culture*. This relationship of interdependency, of reciprocity, will be denoted in what follows by the term *allelopoiesis*, a neologism formed from the Greek roots *állelon* (mutual, reciprocal) and *poiesis* (creation, generation).[5]

The scholar, that is to say we, assume the role of the *observer*, who is inevitably part of the transformation chain themselves.

One may pronounce the tongue twister *Allelopoiesis* with a certain irony, but I think it is nevertheless useful and illuminating. The reciprocity of the change, a two-sided permeability so to speak, is of course seldom symmetrical.[6] In my opinion, it is above all important to get used to this oscillating movement of thought in the analysis of transformation processes. In any case, transformation

---

of Classical Antiquity, ed. Patrick Baker, Johannes Helmrath and Craig Kallendorf, TA 62 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2019), 9–25. The original article was published in German in the so-called "red book" which contains six further model-articles: Lutz Bergemann, Martin Dönike et al., "Transformation. Ein Konzept zur Erforschung kulturellen Wandels", in Hartmut Böhme, Lutz Bergemann et al., ed., *Transformation. Ein Konzept zur Erforschung kulturellen Wandels*, (München: Fink 2011), 39–56, see also the programmatic and important introduction of the research unit's speaker from 2005 to 2011 in this volume: Hartmut Böhme: *Einladung zur Transformation*, 7–38. See also: Johannes Helmrath, Eva Marlene Hausteiner and Ulf Jensen, *Antike als Transformation. Konzepte zur Beschreibung kulturellen Wandels*, TA 49 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter: 2017).

[4] Technical terms from the *transformation methodology* will be placed in *italics* from here on.

[5] Böhme: *Einladung zur Transformation*, 9.

[6] Roman Barton and Thomas Micklich, two members of the research unit, criticized this "dyadic model" of *allelopoiesis* as "a fiction of autopoiesis" and supplemented it with a triadic model taken from Charles Peirce's theory of signs: object, representamen and interpretant. They then applied it to the transformations of the antique concept of sympathy (Marcus Aurelius) by the Scottish philosophers Shaftesbury, Smith and Hume. Published only in very brief form, in: Roman Barton, "The Making of the sympathetic Imagination. Transformations of sympathy in British Eighteenth Century Ethics, Poetics and Fiction" (Phil. Diss., Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 2019), 4–9.

goes far beyond the traditional "reception". In this respect, the transformation concept claims to become a theory of cultural change.

The following assumption can hardly be contested: "Antiquity" (artefacts, terms, texts, concepts, practices, arts, scientific discourses etc.) was never fixed; never a stable entity. It was constructed, reshaped, reconstituted in every later appropriation; it is transmitted to us in a chain of appropriations that cannot be reconstructed in detail whose links are uncountable; a network of transformations. It is based on a kind of moderate constructivism, which the German romantic poet Novalis had already advocated in his day.[7]

The appropriation of antiquity in this reciprocal way essentially served the construction of the reception culture and was tailored to its needs: Nietzsche's Dionysos, for instance, portrays a much altered god: he has hardly anything to do with antiquity anymore, he has become what essentially is a construction for the self-interpretation of anti-classicistic modernity.[8] In this context, the clairvoyance of Romanticism is worthy of note again. As Friedrich Schlegel already pointedly formulated: "Everyone has yet found in the ancients what he needed or wished, above all himself."[9]

When planning a research association, it is necessary to position oneself within the scholarly landscape and to "historicize" oneself in a certain way. This is not easy for contemporaries. Naturally, the Berlin research unit did not reinvent the wheel. It is a conglomerate of authors and concepts by which the research unit was consciously or unconsciously inspired and from which many terms were borrowed and made effective in a new context. An accurate reconstruction of these sources is impossible. Only a few names are given below: Important were art historians like Aby Warburg and his idea of picture vehicles (Bilderfahrzeuge), Erwin Panofsky, whose term "disjunction" was explicitly borrowed for the type-list, while Salvatore Settis was the only one who had

---

[7] Novalis in a fragment about Goethe 1798/99, quoted by Böhme, "Einladung" (as n. 3), 12–3: "[…] man irrt sehr, wenn man glaubt, daß es Antiken giebt. Erst jezt fängt die Antike an zu entstehen. Sie wird unter den Augen und der Seele des Künstlers Die Reste des Alterthums sind nur die specifischen Reitze zur Bildung der Antike. Nicht mit Händen wird die Antike gemacht. Der Geist bringt sie durch das Auge hervor – und der gehaune Stein ist nur der Körper, der erst durch sie Bedeutung erhält, und zur Erscheinung derselben wird."

[8] Dionysos was one of the research unit's projects, see: Renate Schlesier, ed., *A Different God. Dionysos and Ancient Polytheism* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011).

[9] Cited by Böhme, "Einladung" (see n. 3): 12. ("Jeder hat noch immer bei den Alten gefunden, was er brauchte, oder wünschte, vorzüglich sich selbst.")

provided a typological approach by investigating the transformative reception of Roman models in Anglo-Saxon ivory carvings.[10] A contribution was made by linguists and philologists such as Ernst Robert Curtius, Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva with her concept of intertextuality, like the "Constance-school" of Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser and their model of "Rezeption". The Berlin philosopher Paul Asmuth and his study "Interpretation – Transformation" on the reception of Plato in German idealism provided important impulses.[11]

In the following section, the Organon, the conceptual tool for more concrete work, will be discussed in greater detail. It is not about labelling, but about analyzing transformation processes in a more differentiated and nuanced manner. It is not enough to say that Ralph Cudworth (1617–1688), the Cambridge Platonist, transformed or received stoic and platonic texts. It is necessary to show exactly how Cudworth (one of the research unit's projects)[12] used techniques such as *assimilation, montage, encapsulation, hybridization, inversion* etc. in his interpretation of antique philosophical text-spolia or Renaissance Platonic texts in the long-wave transformation chain of Platonism. In this way, this adapted antiquity becomes one's own ground of resonance.

---

[10] Salvatore Settis, "Von 'auctoritas' zu 'vetustas': die antike Kunst in mittelalterlicher Sicht", *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 51,2 (1988): 157–79. See also Salvatore Settis, ed., *Memoria dell' antico nell'arte italiana*, 3 vol. (Turin: Einaudi, 1984–1986).

[11] Christoph Asmuth, *Interpretation-Transformation. Das Platonbild bei Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schleiermacher und Schopenhauer und das Legitimationsproblem der Philosophiegeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 2006).

[12] Bergemann, *Cudworth* (see n. 1), esp. the introduction: 1–98. About Neoplatonism see also Verena Olejniczak Lobsien, *Transparency and Dissimulation. Configurations of Neoplatonism in Early Modern English Literature,* TA 16 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2010).

The essence of the *Organon* is that it highlights the nuances of the degrees (Modi) and types (Typen) of change. We distinguish three basic *Modi of Transformation*, covering three differing degrees of transformation:

1. Degree of **Modification** *(Modifikationsgrad)* (concerning: *reference culture*): oscillating between *conservation and innovation*;

2. Degree of **Incorporation** *(Inkorporationsgrad)* concerning: *reception culture*): oscillating between *inclusion and exclusion*;

3. Degree of **Affinity** *(Evaluationsgrad)* (concerning: *agent*): oscillating between *identification and alienation (Distanzierung)*.

To these three modes of transformation several *types (Typen) of transformation* are subsequently assigned. They allow us to conduct a more precise analysis and diagnosis of what exactly happens, what changes in the transformation process.

Like almost all terms in the humanities, ours have a long semantic history. One of the types should be picked out in advance because its provenance is particularly clear: disjunction, i.e. the alleged disjunction of form and meaning in medieval art as it was shaped by Erwin Panofsky. Although this thesis has been strongly relativized, especially its apodictic "wherever", the definition of the term "disjunction of meaning and form" remains valuable for the transformation concept.[13] The types can in turn be divided into three groups: Inclusion, exclusion and recombination.

---

[13] "Wherever in the high and later Middle Ages a work of art borrows its form from a classical model, this form is almost invariably invested with a non-classical, normally Christian, significance; wherever in the high and later Middle Ages a work of art borrows its theme from classical poetry, legend, history or mythology this theme is quite invariably presented in a non-classical, normally contemporary form."; Erwin Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (Princeton: Paladin, 1960). About "disjunction" see also Settis, "Von 'auctoritas' zu 'vetustas'" (see n. 10), 166f. and the paper by Ulrich Rehm in this issue of Aegyptiaca.

Transformation Types (English—German)[14]

I. Inclusion

1. Appropriation (Appropriation)

a. Definition: a transformation that detaches a reference object from its original context and incorporates it, largely preserved, into the reception culture. (The term is also used more generally in the sense of "reception" of antiquity, as in the text above).

b. Example: "One example of *appropriation* is provided by humanist editions of ancient historiographical and semi-historiographical texts, such as the Swiss humanist Heinrich Glarean's 1544 edition of Caesar's *Commentarii de bello Gallico*. The text as then known is included in its entirety and is supplemented with commentaries on geographical designations and the text's content, by prefatory images such as a map, and by still other texts. Through these alterations, the ancient text—the self-justification of a military commander—is adapted to the reading habits of a humanistically educated audience, but it still exists independently. In this way, humanist editorial practice brands the ancient version as 'other' while at the same time claiming it for itself in the commentary."[15]

2. Assimilation (Assimilation)

a. Definition: a transformation that integrates elements of the reference sphere into the context of the reception culture, fusing the two together.

b. Example: "An example of a moralizing Christian *assimilation* is the didactic program that Conrad of Hirsau (1030–c. 1091) formulated in his *Dialogus super auctores*, for use in monastic schools. In its conceptual arrangement of didactic material, this handbook of Latin literature constructs a textual canon of pagan and Christian authors that ignores temporal and religious boundaries and instead seems homogeneous and continuous. The differences between ancient and Christian authorities disappear, since, in Conrad's

---

[14] The translation into English is provided mostly by Patrick Baker, a collaborator of the research unit. It is a result of a long debate with a number of American colleagues led by Craig Kallendorf and Ada Palmer in Berlin about the transformation types and their translatability.

[15] Bergemann, Dönike et al., "Transformation", (see n. 3), 17.

presentation, a pious and judicious reception of ancient works shows that they can be read as sources of divine truth."[16]

3. Disjunction (Disjunktion)

a. Definition (following Erwin Panofsky): a transformation in which something from the reference culture is dressed in a form belonging to the reception culture, or in which something from the reception culture is endowed with a form belonging to the reception culture.

b. Example: images of Caesar or other Roman emperors in the armor of a medieval knight—or inversely emperor Charles V. in the armor of a Roman Emperor (see also above).

4. Encapsulation (Einkapselung)

a. Definition: a transformation in which a reference object is passed down unchanged and integrated as a self-contained whole into the reception sphere.

b. Example 1: reliefs spoliated from the mausoleum of Halicarnassus and reused; example 2: the Augustus-Cameo in the center of the so-called Lotharkreuz (cross of Lothaire) at Aachen (cathedral treasure), obtaining a new function in the new context, as a "Kaiserbild im Kreuz" (see below).

5. Reconstruction and Supplementation (Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung)

a) Definition: a transformation oriented by and through the connection of fragments, or only of clues
   i) attempts at restoring a lost or only fragmentarily preserved whole
   ii) in supplementation, the reference elements are usually interpreted more freely in the process of "completion".

b) Example 1: Thomas May's *Supplementum Lucani* (1640) to "complete" Lucan's epos *Pharsalia*; example 2: completion of fragmentary antique

---

[16] Bergemann, Dönike, et al. "Transformation", (see n. 3), 17–8. Only with the first terms can the examples be so detailed. For the rest, they are more closely related. Reference is generally made to Bergemann, Dönike et al., "Transformation".

torsos from 16th to 19th century; the 1506 discovered "Laokoon" is the most prominent. The supplementation mirrors the supplementer's particular vision of antiquity.[17]

6. Substitution

a. Definition: a transformation that exchanges one cultural complex for another.

b. Example: Petrarch's poetic crowning in 1341 at the Capitol of Rome: a middle-age university ritual is replaced by an alleged "antique" one.

II.   EXCLUSION

7. Focalization/Obfuscation (Fokussierung/ Ausblendung)

a. Definition: a transformation in which the agent's interest is concentrated on a specific object while other items or circumstances around the object are neglected or obfuscated.

b. Example: Winckelmann's notion of Greek art as characterized by "noble simplicity and quiet grandeur" ("edle Einfalt, stille Größe").

8. Ignorance/ Nescience (Ignoranz)

a. Definition: a transformation that pays no attention to certain things or circumstances
α. active ignorance = the conscious refusal to acknowledge something
β. passive ignorance = the (unconscious) inability to take cognizance of something.

b. Example: "An example of *ignorance* is the stance taken in the field of classical archaeology toward the colored painting of ancient sculpture. Although the polychrome nature of numerous works had been documented

---

[17] See Sascha Kansteiner, ed., *Ergänzungsprozesse. Transformation antiker Skulptur durch Restaurierung,* TA 26 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013); about the Laokoon project: Susanne Muth, ed., *Laokoon. Auf der Suche nach einem Meisterwerk* (Rahden: Marie Leidorf, 2017).

and described, the notion of a 'white antiquity' endured far into the twentieth century."[18]

9. Creative destruction (Kreative Zerstörung)

a. Definition: a transformation in which the deliberate destruction of elements from the reference sphere is the necessary condition for the creation of something new; the empty space left by the act of destruction provides the possibility for cultural change.

b. Example: Bramante's, Michelangelo's and their followers destruction of the Constantinian church of St. Peter's and the parallel construction of New St. Peter's.

10. Negation (Negation)

a. Definition: a transformative process of active and explicit exclusion; the object is rejected, but it continues to remain present through the negative relationship or rather is first constructed via this relationship.

b. Example: Marinetti's *Futurist Manifesto* (1909): "a roaring car is more beautiful than the Nike of Samothrace."

III.   Recombination

11. Hybridization (Hybridisierung)

a. Definition: a transformation in which novel cultural configurations are formed from elements of the reference and reception cultures, including intersections, characteristic syncretisms, and fusions, also of contrary and contradictory elements.

b. Example: Alexander poems of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries or the "Ovide moralisée" of Bersuire (see also: Assimilation).

---

[18] Bergemann, Dönike et al. "Transformation", 20 (see note 3).

12. Montage/Assembly (Montage/ Assemblage)

a. Definition: a transformation that individually takes up various elements from the reference sphere and puts them together with elements from other spheres, creating a new relationship between them.

b. Example 1: Justus Lipsius' use of the *cento* technique in his *Politicorum libri sex* (1589); example 2: Ralph Cudworth's montage of antique philosophical word-spolia (see above).

13. Translation (Übersetzung)

a. Definition: a transformation that transposes content from a reference culture into a reception culture, thereby recombining it under changed circumstances. This includes first and foremost any translation of an antique source language into a target language.[19]

b. Example 1: Every translation from an antique source language into a modern target language, e.g. Hölderlin's translations of Sophocles and Pindar; example 2: intertextual translation of ancient references in James Joyce's *Ulysses*.

14. Resignification/Inversion (Umdeutung/ Inversion)

a. Definition: a transformation that leaves elements of the reference culture recognizable as such but creates semantic shifts.

b. Example: Giordano Bruno's special handling of Aristotelianism in his *Camoeracensis Acrotismus / Disputation of Cambrai* (1588).

---

[19] The Berlin collaborate research unit "Transformationen der Antike" included a project dealing with translations and translation theory, primarily in the 19th and 20th century. Some publications: Böhme, Rapp and Rösler, ed., *Übersetzung und Transformation* (see n. 1); Martin Harbsmeier, Josefine Kitzbichler, Katja Lubitz and Nina Mindt, ed., *Übersetzung antiker Literatur. Funktionen und Konzeptionen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* TA 7 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2007); Josefine Kitzbichler, Katja Lubitz and Nina Mindt, ed., *Theorie der Übersetzung antiker Literatur in Deutschlad seit 1800*; idem, *Dokumente zur Theorie der Übersetzung antiker Literatur in Deutschland seit 1800*, TA 9–10 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2009); Josefine Kitzbichler and Ulrike C.A. Stephan, ed., *Studien zur Praxis der Übersetzung antiker Literatur. Geschichten-Analysen-Kritik*, TA 35 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2016).

Some modifying remarks about the concept's *Organon*:

1. This set of analytic tools may appear rather schematic, but it does not form a casuistic system, rather a fluid and versatile one. The use is variable: for instance, several tools can be used in combination at the same time if one wishes to underline the variety of transformational aspects.

2. These fourteen tools are not proportional, they are partly overlapping, meaning that the number of tools could essentially be concentrated or reduced to a smaller number, e.g. to eight types.[20]

3. The tools vary in importance with regard to the wide range of disciplines. Art historians for instance favor the usage of "disjunction" and "hybridity" whereas historians of science tend to use the terms "substitution" or "creative destruction" more frequently.

A particular vivid example[21] of the transformation of an ancient artefact is the so-called Lothar Cross (height 50 cm—approx. 20 inches)[22] in the Aachen Cathedral Treasury. It is dominated by the famous Augustus cameo, an appropriated artefact or *spolium* of antiquity, placed in the center of a Christian cross decorated with precious stones, a *crux gemmata*, with the Lothar Cross possibly being the most splendid of its kind.[23] The cameo, by being set into a Christian cross, was thus decontextualized by the agent, the Ottonian artist, in

---

[20] See the proposals of Georg Töpfer relating to a concentration of the tools: "Transformationen des Lebensbegriffs. Vom antiken Seelen- zum neuzeitlichen Organismuskonzept", in: Böhme, Bergemann et al., ed., *Transformationen* (see n. 3), 137–82 and 165–74. Töpfer concentrates the tools on the following eight, two of which (*) are new creations: Appropriation, Idealisierung*, Hybridisierung, Projektion*, Inkapsulation, Negation, Inversion, Destruktion.

[21] I have tried to analyze the ciceronian speeches of Enea Silvio Piccolomini (Pius II, 1405–1464) in German diets of 1454/55 using the transformation types: Johannes Helmrath, "Political Assembly Speeches, German diets and Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini", in Baker, Helmrath and Kallendorf, ed., *Beyond Reception* (see n. 3), 71–94.

[22] Perhaps a gift of the West-Francian king Louis V to emperor Otto II of c. 980/81 or a gift by emperor Otto III to the Canonry of St. Mary in Aachen a few years later. Its name derives from Emperor Lothair II's stamp seal, which was incorporated into the lower half of the longitudinal beam.

[23] Josef Deér, "Das Kaiserbild im Kreuz. Ein Beitrag zur politischen Theologie des frühen Mittelalters", *Schweizer Beiträge zur Allgemeinen Geschichte* 13 (1955): 48–110; Norbert Wibiral, "Augustus patrem figurat. Zu den Betrachtungsweisen des Zentralsteines am Lotharkreuz im Domschatz zu Aachen", *Aachener Kunstblätter* 60 (1994): 105–30.

relation to his (unknown) former function and newly- or re-contextualized in a delicate hybridity. Although materially more or less unaltered—this *encapsulation* is characteristic for most *spolia*—the cameo was substantially changed in its function and meaning, it is physically and so to speak "auratically" transferred to the Christian cross and transformed by being "Christianized". Conversely, the Christian cross is so to speak "imperialized" through the imbedded integration of the emperor's cameo portrait (Kaiserbild im Kreuz). We can at least presume that the possibly Rhinish artist did not ignore but recognize "this white stone image of a man" as an emperor, presumably precisely as Augustus. So the emperor seems to become Christ, and Christ seems to become a Roman emperor; by the same mutual or allelopoietic process the cross with the engraved Saviour on the other side is transformed by the "imperial" aura evoked and implemented by the cameo.

Evidence of the concept can be provided by practical work. Lastly, ninety-five per cent of all transformation research remains stringently philological, historical, art historical, archaeological work. Nevertheless, the experience of the Berlin research unit's long "Transformationen der Antike"-experience has proven that the *Organon* forms a set of workable tools. This contribution tries to encourage further research.