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1. Introduction

The role of Naukratis as a significant Eastern Mediterranean trade hub is confirmed by the numerous Cypriot alabaster, limestone and terracotta figures dating from the late 7th century onwards that have been found in the site’s Greek sanctuaries. Indeed, it was the discovery of a Cypriot alabaster figure that led Flinders Petrie to Naukratis in the first place (Fig. 1; see the chapter on Discovery and excavation).¹ The quantity of Cypriot figures found within the earliest layers of the Greek sanctuaries of Aphrodite,² Apollo³ and to a lesser degree the sanctuary of Hera and the Hellenion⁴ are an indicator of the intensity of contact and trade between the East Greek cities, Saite Egypt and Cyprus.

The Cypriot figurines from Naukratis reflect the diverse range of subjects that were depicted by Cypriot sculptors and coroplasts who used a range of techniques and materials and were influenced by a variety of regional styles associated with different settlements on Cyprus. They include handmade, wheel-made and mould-made terracotta figures as well as stone figures carved from soft limestone and alabaster. As with the vast assemblages known from Cyprus itself (see the examples assembled in the online research catalogue Ancient Cyprus in the British Museum), the majority of pieces from Naukratis represent male or female worshippers, usually carrying objects for dedication or animals to sacrifice. Animals, riders, chariots and other figure groups are also attested, alongside small numbers of representations of fantastic creatures and deities. The soft limestone used to carve the majority of the stone figures was probably principally sourced from the region of Idalion and Larnaca, with similar figure types also known from Kition and Salamis.⁵ The (gypsum) alabaster used to make the other Cypriot stone figures are difficult to source specifically.⁶ The terracotta figures from Naukratis have equally close parallels and often from the same mould series as examples found and presumably made in Salamis⁷, Paphos, Kition and Amathus.

Cypriot figurines are attested at Naukratis mostly during the period 620–525 BC, although they continue in small numbers throughout the Cypro-Classical period until around 300 BC. To date, 262 Cypriot figures have been identified, of which 139 are stone and 123 are terracotta. Among these, it is the Cypro-Archaic stone figures that have received the most scholarly attention, with two recent catalogue monographs dedicated to their study.⁸ Nevertheless, much remains to be learnt about this important

¹ Petrie letter to R.S. Poole dated 1/12/1883, EES Archive XVIII, 10. All images in this chapter, unless otherwise indicated, are © Trustees of the British Museum.
² Gardiner 1888, 34, contexts ΦΒ, Φ€3–5, 8, 10, TAK16–17.
³ Petrie 1886a, pl. 44 stratum ΑΠ1–4 and ΑΠ7.
⁴ Gutch 1898–9, 71–2.
⁷ And the surrounding region, such as Achna (Fourrier 2007, 103–7; Henke 2011, 212). Production was previously attributed to Arso on the basis of numerous examples found there (Schmidt 1968; Karageorghis 1999, 195–206).
group, as also about the numerous and previously mostly unpublished and unstudied terracottas. This chapter will describe the main types of stone and terracotta figures found at Naukratis, starting with the limestone and alabaster pieces before moving on to the terracotta figures. A brief discussion of the chronological development, context, distribution and use of these figures follows, based upon findspot information reconstructed with the help of markings on objects and unpublished excavation notes and diaries (Fig. 2) as well as the study of related finds groups at Naukratis, aimed at placing these artefacts within their temporal and cultural context.

1.1. Chronology

In broad terms, the majority (226) of Cypriot figures found at Naukratis can be dated to c. 620–525 BC, with relatively few (37) dated to c. 525–300 BC. The chronology of Cypriot material culture is, however, complicated and contested, a limiting factor in our ability to date Cypriot figures confidently. Fortunately, a growing body of parallels from dated archaeological contexts across the eastern Mediterranean allows us to assign increasingly precise and accurate dates. In this we are further aided by a much-improved understanding of the dating of contexts within which the Naukratis material itself was found.

The chronologies developed for Cypriot figures in the past have often been very precise, dating pieces to a specific decade (Fig. 3). However, recent archaeological studies have called into question whether this precision is also accurate, following the realization of obvious conflicts arising when applying the dating systems created by Gjerstad (1934; 1948) and Schmidt (1968). Some styles previously interpreted as temporally specific are now recognized as contemporary regional phenomena, while others are now given earlier dates based on the ‘higher chronology’ (earlier dating) suggested by recent excavations at Miletos and Samos. A reappraisal of the archaeological contexts of the Naukratis finds shows that figurines belonging to Schmidt’s Groups 1–4, assumed by him to follow in a chronological sequence (720–670/60 BC, 670/60–640/30 BC, 640/30–600 BC and 600–570/60 BC respectively), are found together in Naukratis deposits dated 620–525 BC. From this it would appear that Schmidt’s groups 1 and 2 have a too specific and too early production date, whilst his group 4 is dated too late (see Table 1).

The extensive recent publications of Nick and Höckmann on the figurines from Naukratis used the chronological data available at that time (Figs 3–4) and so were not aware yet of the most recent work undertaken at Samos, Knidos and Miletos that has produced convincing new evidence for an
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9 There has been much debate on the conflicting chronologies of Cypriot artefacts and their placement within the political history of Cyprus (Gjerstad 1948, 449–78; Schmidt 1968; Vermeule 1974; Lewe 1975; Gaber-Saletan 1986; Hunt 1982, 278; Hunt 1990, 296; Reyes 1994, 164, table 6) and specifically the influence of these dating systems on the dating of stratigraphic sequences in which they were found, or the industries and styles to which Cypriot figurines were ascribed (Karageorghis 1993a; 1995; 1996; 1998; 1999; Fournier 2007, 103–7; Henke 2011, 211–17).


earlier dating of the terracottas, with implications for the dating of the stone figures from the same or subsequent deposits. This catalogue uses revised dates based on these new parallels, the date of the archaeological contexts in which these figures were found and the objects that were found alongside them.

Nick had (correctly) dated the Cypriot limestone figures from Naukratis to the period 620–525 BC, recognizing that few in the group could be much later than 550 BC. However, her dating of parallels from Samos and from Vroulia and Lindos on Rhodes is in need of some adjustment. The use of a terminus ante quem of 570/560 BC at the little temple of Vroulia and of 560/550 BC for the acropolis of Lindos would appear to be confirmed by Schmidt’s dating of pieces from the Heraion in Samos between 620–590 BC and 570/560 BC, based upon his dating of the sanctuary’s earliest monumental temple, ‘Dipteros I’. However, this temple is now understood to date slightly earlier to c. 575 BC. The numerous parallels from Samos should thus be considered as dating between 620/590 and 575 BC. This is supported by recent excavations at the Heraion of Samos, the Aphrodite sanctuary at Miletos and the sanctuary at Emeçik near Knidos (see Table 1). In particular, parallels for Cypriot terracotta figures from Naukratis were found in a deposit dated to 640/630 BC on Samos and a bothros closed in 630/620 BC in Miletos. The Samos bothros was free of limestone figures, whilst the Milesian one possessed a limited variety. Parallels for some limestone figures from Naukratis (Fig. 5) have been found in later deposits dated 580/570 BC in Samos and in mixed deposits dating to 494 BC in Miletos. Excavations at Knidos have yielded parallels for both early terracotta and later limestone figures from Naukratis in a mixed terrace construction fill closed around 570 BC or 560 BC that, however, contains artefacts dated as early as 640–590 BC. The majority of both limestone and terracotta figures from Naukratis thus have numerous parallels that come from contexts deposited before 570 BC.

1.2 Stratigraphy at Naukratis

The stratigraphic approach to excavation employed at Naukratis was relatively advanced for the late 19th century and its reassessment provides new insights into the sequences of dedication, clearance and redeposition of Cypriot figures. A general terminus post quem for the Cypriot material from Naukratis is provided by the overall assemblage from the site, notably some of the Greek painted pottery which can be dated relatively reliably, 15

---

17 Blinkenberg 1931, 5.
18 Schmidt 1968, 98. All subsequent references in this chapter to parallels within Schmidt’s groups (1968) incorporate stratigraphic phasing adjustments by Kienast (1998, 111–31) and Hendrich (2007), as suggested by Henke (2011, 213).
20 At Miletos most were found in thick layers dating c. 494 BC on the slopes of the Aphrodite sanctuary hill (Senff 2009, 220). In the Samian Heraion recent excavations uncovered limestone sculpture in later deposits of c. 580–570 BC (Henke pers. comm. 2013).
21 Senff pers. comm. and forthcoming. Three limestone falcons, a lion and a female figure holding a ram are known from the 630/620 BC Miletos bothros (see Figs 22 and 26 for later examples of these subjects in limestone).
22 For Miletos see Senff 2009, 219. This probably also includes pieces deposited before 570 BC or 560 BC, but disturbed subsequently.
24 The earliest Greek pottery from the sanctuaries, where the majority of Cypriot figures were found, is unlikely to significantly predate 620 BC; see Schlotzhauer 2012, 32–3 and here the...
which suggests that the foundation of the Greek sanctuaries and probably the site’s establishment as a whole took place no earlier than c. 620 BC (see also the chapter on Naukratis: a city and trading port in Egypt).

Cypriot figures were found in four main areas of Naukratis: in a series of secondary bothros fills in the Apollo sanctuary;\(^{25}\) in primary, secondary and tertiary deposits\(^{26}\) within the Aphrodite sanctuary; within the Hera sanctuary and in nearby tertiary deposits (redeposited bothros fills from a possibly as yet unidentified sanctuary?) in the eastern part of the town;\(^{27}\) and from Saite period and later deposits within the Hellenion.

Even though large parts of the sanctuary of Apollo had already been destroyed before Petrie rediscovered Naukratis, he was able to excavate and record a sequence of construction layers, surfaces and votive pits. The significance of the stratigraphy in the Apollo sanctuary had been recognized by Gjerstad (1934, 70).\(^{29}\) However, his proposed sequence of four major temple building projects between 570–520 BC\(^{30}\) is too congested and not convincing.\(^{31}\) Instead, Petrie’s original model of an earlier limestone temple followed by a later marble temple is the most likely.\(^{32}\)

\(^{25}\) Nick 2006, 19.

\(^{26}\) Petrie’s ‘trench with bowls’ is best labelled a bothros, i.e. a pit or trench filled with cleared votives and other ‘sacred rubbish’, deposited with variable care. Some authors prefer the term tavoia; both terms can have very specific meanings depending upon one’s definition. On the subject of votive offerings and ‘sacred rubbish’ there is a wide bibliography (see discussion and further bibliography in Hägg 1988; Hiber 2003, 141–9, 163–74; Bocher 2006–7, 90–1; Osborne 2010; Lindström and Pilz 2013, 268–9, 274; Bentz and Bumke 2013, 277–80 see Bocher and Pakkanen forthcoming).

\(^{27}\) Primary deposits are those preserved within their original intended position (for example the contents of a grave). Secondary deposits are those that have subsequently been moved (for example the fill of a pit, cleared from its original position on an altar). Tertiary deposits are those that have been redeposited subsequently (for example a pit fill subsequently dug up and redeposited and used in a construction fill).

\(^{28}\) Petrie 1886a, 36.

\(^{29}\) A full analysis of the stratigraphic sequence of the Apollo sanctuary will need to incorporate other finds such as pottery and the recent survey and excavations at the site (Thomas and Villing 2013; forthcoming). This will be the subject of future publications.

\(^{30}\) Gjerstad proposed four temples: Apollo I built after 570 BC; Apollo II built after 555 BC; Apollo III built after 545 BC and Apollo IV built after 520 BC (Gjerstad 1959, 151, 164). His phase Apollo I is a (bothros) pit fill, probably associated with a limestone temple, though no archaeological relationship with an architectural structure is recorded. Apollo II is a mud surface sealing of this pit, with no known associated structural remains. What Gjerstad proposes as Apollo phase III is a mud-brick temenos wall surrounding the temple, with a footing two courses deep. The foundation trench for this temenos wall was dug down from the same floor level that served the Apollo IV marble temple, making these of contemporary use, if not contemporary construction. Thus all phases, in fact, could relate to the two temple phases as originally suggested by Petrie: an earlier limestone temple with various floors, modifications and pits and trenches cut subsequently, before the second temple (equal to Gjerstad’s Apollo IV and dated 530–520/10 BC by Koenigs 2007, 313–44) was built, with a mud–brick temenos wall and various associated pits. As the earliest evidence for a limestone temple significantly post-dates the earliest attested votives, there is no reason to assume any stone-built structures within the sanctuary before 560–550 BC (Koenigs 2007, 313–44; see also the chapter on Topography).

\(^{31}\) Gjerstad (1959, 161–3, figs 4, 6 and 8) suggests valid parallels, but assigned incorrect dates for these parallels because of his flawed chronology for the ‘second proto–Cypriote’ and ‘early Neo–Cypriote’ styles (dated by him to 580–560 BC and 560–550 BC, respectively). The actual pieces (British Museum, 1886,0401.1479; 1886,0401.1424 and 1886,0401.1386) should instead be dated to 620–600 BC, 620–590 BC and 610–575 BC, respectively, on the basis of parallels (Karageorghis 1995, 49–51, pl. 25.3 Type I(viii)37; Henke 2011, 218–9; Nick 2006, 59, Type 2.1; Yon 1974, Types 1 B, C and F); for more details, see the relevant online catalogue entries.

\(^{32}\) See also the analysis of the extant fragments of temple architecture from the Apollo sanctuary by Koenigs 2007.
Of particular use is the stratified sequence recorded by Petrie of five fills (AΠ1–5)\(^3\) within a single 1.45m deep trench – which we may call a bothros\(^4\) – dug through the ‘basal mud’ (sterile soil), on which the first limestone temple of Apollo was built in the second quarter of the 6th century BC. This was sealed by a hard clay surface and further layers that covered the area (AΠ6–7), followed in c. 530–510 BC by the construction of the marble temple.\(^5\) Contexts AΠ1–3 contained Cypriot terracottas that have parallels at Samos, Miletos, Knidos, Salamis and Arsos (and the Levant) dated 620–600 BC and 620–550 BC respectively (Figs 6–8). Later trench fills, contexts AΠ3–4, contained limestone figures (Fig. 9) with parallels known from Salamis, Kition, Rhodes, Knidos, Chios, Samos, Miletos, Cyprus and Amrit dated 610–560 BC. This dating is confirmed also by votive lamps from this deposit.\(^6\) The final trench fill, context AΠ5, contained faience figures that can be dated to 580–550 BC (see the chapter on Mixed style faience figures). This stratified sequence in all likelihood represents a series of sanctuary clearances, although it remains unclear how many events exactly are represented and whether the bothros would have been left open in between.\(^7\) A single alabastron in the shape of a kore, the only alabaster object preserved from the sanctuary of Apollo, was found in context AΠ7, a deposit just below the floor associated with the second Apollo temple (dated after c. 530 BC). The finds from these contexts thus broadly support Petrie’s assessment of the stratigraphy (Table 1).\(^8\)

\(^3\) The fills can be dated on the basis of the finds made within these contexts (see Table 1). The dating of these five layers overlaps, but appears to be in the correct chronological order, suggesting they do indeed represent a sequence of deposits. We cannot be certain how many actual deposits are represented, but Petrie certainly believed there were five distinct layers representing five different deposition events.

\(^4\) Whilst Petrie’s stratigraphic sequence for the ‘general series’ within the bothros is quite convincing, his assumption that context AΠ10 is contemporaneous with stratum AΠ1 must be incorrect, as this context contained faience hawks of a type that can be dated to c. 580–550 BC and that were also found in the later stratum AΠ5 (see also the chapter on Mixed style faience figures). This area, if not the whole trench, may thus represent a number of different pits cut through and disturbing earlier pit fills.

\(^5\) Gjerstad 1959, 164; Koenigs 2007, 341.

\(^6\) An Ephesian Howland Type 9/11 lamp dated 600–575 BC was found in AΠ4 (British Museum, 1886,0401.1336).

\(^7\) It could represent three or more separate events or a continuous deposition. The pit may have been left open (which would seem impractical for a feature in a central position in a sanctuary) or sealed and re-dug each time. The presence of broken feet in sand suggests that some of the figures may have been placed upright, and subsequently damaged during further digging/deposition. If left open, the sand observed by Petrie may have been an aeolian deposition by the annual khamsin winds.

\(^8\) Petrie 1886a, pl. 44; contra Gjerstad 1959, 164.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After 250 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ1239</td>
<td>Temple 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before 494 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330–250 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ6.9.11</td>
<td>Temple 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–330 BC</td>
<td>AP8</td>
<td>Φ5,10 (fill)</td>
<td>Lower - Dipteros I (c. 575 BC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530–510 BC</td>
<td>Alabaster</td>
<td>Φ4, 8 (fill?)</td>
<td>before 570/560 BC</td>
<td>before 575 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550–525 BC</td>
<td>Faience</td>
<td>Φ3,7</td>
<td>Lower - terrace fill</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575–525 BC</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>ΦA.B</td>
<td>Terrace fill</td>
<td>620–590 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600–560 BC</td>
<td>Terracottas (Schmidt 4)</td>
<td>Φ2,1, Φ16,177</td>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>620–590 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620–590 BC</td>
<td>Terracottas (Schmidt 1)</td>
<td>Φ4, 8</td>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>620–590 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620–590 BC</td>
<td>Terracottas (Schmidt 2)</td>
<td>Φ12</td>
<td>Lower -</td>
<td>630–640 BC</td>
<td>640–620 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>630/620 BC closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Tabulation of the stratigraphy of the sanctuaries of Apollo and Aphrodite at Naukratis and contemporary deposits in Knidos, Samos and Miletos

The sanctuary of Aphrodite was excavated stratigraphically by Gardner with Petrie’s assistance; sections and plans were published in 1888 (Gardner 1888). Information on contexts encountered in the Aphrodite sanctuary is recorded in Gardner’s notebook and in museum registers, and context numbers are preserved written (in pencil) on many objects.

39 It is uncertain whether contexts 13 and 14, outside the temenos wall, relate to any specific building phase, as this wall was built for the first Aphrodite temple and existed during all three phases.
40 Gardner believed the second temple of Aphrodite to date to after the Persian invasion of Egypt in 525 BC (1888,36). The sole architectural fragment preserved from the area of the sanctuary (recovered before the excavations allowed for the sanctuary to be identified) is a column fragment dated to 520–500 BC, but this has been argued to belong to a votive column rather than to any temple structure (Koenigs 2007, 345–6, cat. no. 44, pls 23, 28).
41 On Knidos, see Berges 2006; Tuna et al. 2009; on Samos, Schmidt 1968, dating corrected by Henke 2011; on Miletos, Sentil 2009; Henke 2009; 2011. On the Apollo sanctuary in Naukratis, see Petrie 1886a and on the Aphrodite sanctuary Gardner 1888. The published contextual information for the Aphrodite sanctuary has been supplemented by extensive archival research from unpublished notebooks (Gardner 1885–6 Notebook 5; Petrie 1885–6 Notebook 74).
42 The notebooks of Petrie and Gardner (Gardner 1885–6 Notebook 5, 1; Petrie 1885–6 Notebook 74, 39–40) supplement the published account (Gardner 1888, pls I–III) and record that Petrie started the excavations, but that they were completed by Gardner and Griffith (Petrie 1885–6 Notebook 74, 39). Contrary to popular opinion (Boardman 1980, 118; Jenkins 2001, 163), the excavations of Gardner were not haphazard for their day, but merely incompletely published. Descriptions of the contexts from wells 1 and 2 (ΦA & B, Fig. 10) and other sanctuary deposits (Φ1–14) are recorded in Petrie’s and Gardner’s notebooks and can be related to their sections and plans. A detailed account of the stratigraphy of the Aphrodite sanctuary will be the subject of forthcoming publications.
43 Figures and lamps were often individually marked in pencil with a ‘Φ’, followed by a number. On some occasions the more complete marking ΤΑΦ was used. Pottery was not normally marked, as all pottery from this temple was originally shipped in boxes labelled by context, though this information was often lost, either during the distribution by the Egypt Exploration Fund or during registration in museums (only the registers of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and the British Museum record some of these details).
Of the 19 contexts recorded, we now know that at least nine contained Cypriot figures or figure vessels. Gardner describes the contexts as mixed, underneath a destruction or rebuild phase, providing a terminus ante quem of c. 525 BC. Contexts Φ4, 5 and 10 probably are secondary or tertiary deposits, mixed ground for the second temple. However, contexts Φ1, 2, 3, 7, 8, A and B (Fig. 10) may represent primary or secondary deposits (Table 1).

This sequence, whilst not particularly refined, does reflect a certain historical progression. First, in the Saite period, the Aphrodite sanctuary contained primary or secondary deposits of terracottas dating 620–550 BC and limestone figures from 610–560 BC within contexts Φ3 and ΦB. We do not know the location of contexts ΤΑΦ16 and ΤΑΦ17 in the sequence.

The subsequent layers, ‘low levels north of the temple’ Φ4 (Fig. 11) and ‘by the altar’ Φ8 (Fig. 12), may represent primary or secondary deposits, or be associated with the subsequent construction fills (Φ5 and Φ10) that were used to raise the ground on which the second temple was built. These construction fill layers contained terracotta figures dating 620–600 BC, 620–550 BC and 600–525 BC, limestone figures dating 620–560 BC, 580–550 BC and two alabaster alabastra and a tripod bowl (Fig. 12) dated 575–550 BC and 550–525 BC respectively. Thus the majority of material dedicated in the sanctuary from 620–600 BC onwards and throughout the Saite period was redeposited, possibly for the third time, in around 550–525 BC as construction fill. This provides a terminus ante quem for the second Aphrodite temple as well as for the alabaster sculpture, which as in the sanctuary of Apollo is only found in later Saite deposits (c. 575–525 BC).

The majority of those figures not from the Aphrodite or Apollo sanctuaries come from Petrie’s excavations in ‘almost the oldest stratum (6th to 5th century BC) of the middle of the eastern side of the town’. Cypriot terracotta chariot groups and riders dating 620–550 BC were also found in this area, discovered by Petrie in what he identified as ‘mid-5th century BC’ contexts in the town. These are likely to be tertiary deposits from a Greek sanctuary close by. The nearby levelled and robbed remains of the

---

44 Gardner 1888, 36; Nick 2006, 19.
45 The relevant context numbers are recorded in the table above, with their approximate position in the sequence. A complete sequence of this stratigraphy will be published elsewhere, incorporating information for all objects that have had their context reconstructed. The precise relationship between contexts 16 and 17 and the rest of the sequence is not recorded by Gardner, though they are described as from the Saite temple area (Aphrodite temple 1) and this material exclusively is earlier than all other contexts containing Cypriot figures.
46 Contexts ΤΑΦ 16–17 are known only because they were recorded, in relation to some registered objects, in the registration book for 1911 of the British Museum’s Egyptian Department, but without any indication of a stratigraphic relationship with other contexts, merely with the date ‘Saite’ and findspot ‘Aphrodite sanctuary’.
47 Recorded by Petrie in his notebook (Petrie 1885–6 Notebook 74, 39–40), when he was assisting Gardner during the second season of excavations at Naukratis.
48 It is likely that the majority of pieces ascribed to the temple of Aphrodite, but without recorded context, come from this deposit. Also the majority of Cypriot figures from Gardner’s excavations without a recorded find spot probably came from here. Independent dating is provided by East Greek figure aryballoi found in this layer, context Φ5 (British Museum, 1888,0601.752.d).
49 Petrie is referring here to 6th or 5th century BC deposits that were probably disturbed by modern activity: ‘These are found in almost the oldest stratum of the town, principally along the middle of the eastern side. Whether found in houses or thrown out into the roads, I have never seen, as they have always been found by diggers not in my employment’ (Petrie 1886a, 36).
50 Petrie 1886a, 36.
sanctuaries of Apollo and Hera are the most probable origin for these redeposited pieces. More votive figures should and would have been found in those sanctuaries, if they had not already been largely destroyed by sebbakhin prior to Petrie’s excavations. Alternatively, another unidentified sanctuary could be responsible for this distribution.

The reassessment of the stratigraphy of Naukratis thus broadly supports Petrie’s assessment of the chronological sequence (if not necessarily his absolute dates) for the sanctuary of Apollo. It also agrees with the higher chronology suggested by recent work at Miletos and Samos, and confirms Fourrier’s identification of contemporary regional styles in Cyprus51 at least as far as it concerns material exported from Cyprus.52 Its precise implications for the dating of specific figure types will be set out in more detail below. Overall, we can observe a relatively short and intense period of the import of Cypriot terracotta to Naukratis starting in c. 620–600 BC53 and continuing until c. 560 BC. Cypriot and Cypro-Ionian type limestone figures were brought to Naukratis slightly later in c. 610–560 BC, probably concentrated around 600–570 BC. Few limestone pieces are recorded for the period of 560–525 BC. The less common Cypro-Ionian style alabaster figures and vessels can be dated to c. 575–525 BC (Fig. 13) and have only been found in the final Saite period layers in the Apollo and Aphrodite sanctuaries. There appears to have been a general drop in the import of Cypriot figures from before 550 BC, with the majority of Cypriot figures (terracotta and stone) dating significantly before a decline in 545–525 BC.54

In all three phases, the Cypriot figurines from Naukratis find many parallels on Cyprus itself, but it is East Greek sites that provide the most useful parallels, both in terms of dated contexts and the sequence of deposition (see Table 1). This may be in part because of shared offering practices among the mobile community of traders operating in the eastern Mediterranean, who are likely to have been responsible for making these offerings. The apparently significant drop in Cypriot figures during the late Saite period of 560–525 BC, and their absence from the Apollo bothros stratum A15 (in contrast to locally manufactured faience figures dated c. 580–550 BC that were found in later levels, but may have had a different function and meaning in a votive offering context) raises questions about the scale of contact and trade between Cyprus, East Greece and Egypt in the decade preceding the annexation of Cyprus by Persia in c. 545 BC.55

52 Cyproit regional styles persisted for longer periods of production and use on Cyprus than are represented by their chronologically more limited export to sites such as Naukratis.
53 The date indicated by pottery finds for the earliest operation of the Greek sanctuaries of Naukratis, c. 620–610 BC (cf. e.g. Schlottzauer 2012, 32–3), suggests that the production of Schmidt’s group 4 terracottas, dated by Henke to 640–630 BC and 630–620 BC, may have continued to the end of that century, or at least that they were still in circulation as late as 600 BC.
55 As Cypriots were assisting the Persian king Cyrus against the Carians in c. 545 BC and against Babylon in 539 BC, Cyproit dependency on Persia may have started before 545 BC (Mehl 2009, 64), agreeing with Gjerstad’s chronology for this event (Gjerstad 1948, 449–78; Hunt 1990, 278). Alternatively, the same evidence may merely represent Cypriot kingdoms choosing to ally themselves with different foreign powers, adapting to the changing political circumstances. For this reason it is not certain that Cyrus was annexed prior to 525 BC (Hunt 1990, 296; Reyes 1994, 164, table 6), although it is possible. The limited and contradictory sources leave open numerous possible interpretations as to whether all or part of Cyprus was ruled by Assyrians, Neo-Babylonians, Egyptians, Persians or indeed were independent during this period (Mehl 2009, 60–5). Irrespective of the extent to which Cypriot
Persian period Cypriot limestone figures are few in number, concentrated in the Hellenion and Aphrodite sanctuary.\(^56\)

2. Limestone and alabaster figures

Of the currently known 262 Cypriot figures from Naukratis, 139 are made of stone; of these, 130 are Cypro-Archaic, most dating between 610–560 BC, with a few pieces from as late as 525 BC. Typologies for the Cypriot alabaster and limestone figures found at Naukratis have been developed by Nick and Höckmann, who published catalogues of 59 and 37 pieces, respectively, dated c. 620–525 BC.\(^57\) The present chapter and catalogue follows their basic classification, supplementing their catalogue with an additional 47 examples\(^66\) of Cypro-Archaic and Cypro-Classical figures (Fig. 14)\(^58\) while removing a number of pieces of dubious provenance.\(^60\) It also adds revisions to various aspects of contextual and site distribution information, affecting our understanding of the figures and our assessment of the dating of broad groups on the basis of recent finds in Cyprus and East Greece. The few known Cypro-Classical pieces from Naukratis are also included.

The studies by Nick and Höckmann arrange the material into broad stylistic and iconographic groups, with Nick covering limestone Cypriot and Cypro-Ionian figures (dated by her to c. 625–525 BC), while Höckmann covers kouroi and korai and divides them by form (or subject) and style.

Höckmann’s four style groups\(^61\) are as follows:

- **Egyptianizing (group 1; 600–575 BC)**
- **Cypriot (group 2; 580–570 BC, Fig. 15)**
- **Cypro-Ionian (group 3; 580–550 BC, Fig. 16)**
- **Cypro-Ionian (late) (group 4; 550–525 BC)**

Independence or foreign rule may have influenced Cypriot relations with Egypt, the figurines provide a useful proxy data set for contact between these two places, albeit only with regard to those travellers who engaged in specific dedication practices involving Cypriot figurines.\(^58\) Context was rarely recorded by the excavators for these later pieces.

\(^{51}\) I have introduced two deviations from those catalogues: first, the alabaster figures here appear at the end of the catalogue as they seem to be products of a separate industry, albeit closely related with aspects of the Cypriot limestone industries. Second, the nude kouroi lion tamers have been separated from Nick’s type 1.4, which otherwise comprises only clothed males, and moved after the variants of nude kouroi described by Höckmann, as in style and distribution the type follows more closely the limestone and alabaster kouros industries.

\(^{55}\) Some further pieces were not included within the catalogue, because they are lost or have been impossible to identify so far, but may be added at a later point.

\(^{59}\) Two unprovenanced early 6th century BC pieces in the Egyptian department of the Louvre (Hermay 1989, 483, nos E21032–3) are tentatively identified as coming from Naukratis in the Louvre registers. They were transferred specifically to the Egyptian department by the Musée Guimet, presumably because they were originally housed within the Musée Guimet’s Egyptian collection. As the Musée Guimet received ‘5 archeaic figures’ from Naukratis from the Egypt Exploration Fund in 1895, they could theoretically come from either Petrie’s or Gardner’s excavations. It is not certain that the ‘5 archeaic figures’ referred to archeaic Cypriot figures, as we do know of two faience and three terracotta Egyptian figures that all date to later periods and are otherwise not listed on the Egypt Exploration Fund distribution list of 1895. Also, as the dedicatory inscription on E21032 is not discussed by Petrie or Gardner, such a provenance seems unlikely. Moreover, Cypro-style stone flute players with a provenance of Naukratis are not known from any other collection (Gardner 1888, 57, ‘alabaster, not limestone as described by Hermay 1989, 483, no. E21033).

\(^{60}\) Three kouroi published by Höckmann (2007, nos N5, N8, N25) have dubious provenances and should not be associated with Naukratis. They are included at the end of the catalogue here for comparative reasons alongside explanations for their exclusion.


---

Figure 14 Previously unpublished alabaster kouros figure, c. 580–550 BC. Mercer Art Gallery, Harrogate, HARGM10393. Photograph © Harrogate Museums & Arts, Harrogate Borough Council. Photographer Ross Thomas, British Museum
The five form groups\(^{62}\) comprise:

1. Kouroi
2. 'Adoranten' kouroi
3. Mantle kouroi
4. Korai
5. Figure vessels

For ease of referencing, I refer here (and in the catalogue entries) to these form and style groups in combination, placing Höckmann’s style number after the form number. Thus, Höckmann type 1.1, is form 1 (kouroi) in style group 1 (Egyptianizing).

As has been argued above, the re-dating of parallels from old and new excavations at Samos, Miletos and Knidos and the reappraisal of the stratigraphy at Naukratis suggest that the majority of Cypriot limestone figure types found at Naukratis date between c. 620–590 BC and 575–560 BC (this chronological framework, however, does not apply to the alabaster pieces discussed below, which are products of a related, if later, industry). It largely, but not entirely, agrees with Nick’s and Höckmann’s dating. Höckmann’s groups 1 and 2 fit in this sequence, but not 3. It also narrows down some of Nick’s rather broad date ranges by suggesting that many of her figurines are earlier rather than later, particularly the animals, lion tamer groups and kriophoroi.

The majority of the limestone figurines from Naukratis belong to the so-called ‘Aegean class’ or ‘Cypro-Ionian’ style, interpreted as a mixed Greek-Cypriot style, which is found distributed widely across Cyprus and especially the Eastern Mediterranean, including Samos, Rhodes (particularly Lindos, Kamiros and Vroulia), Knidos, Delos, Chios, Ephesos, Miletos and the Phoenician cities of Byblos, Amrit/Marathos and Sidon. On account of their frequent occurrence outside Cyprus and their obvious Greek traits, examples of the style are sometimes suspected to have been locally produced at East Greek sites and/or at Naukratis. The same is true also for a small group of broadly contemporary Cypriot alabaster figures (580–525 BC),\(^{63}\) whose subjects and style overlap with the Cypriot limestone figures to a considerable degree. Most scientific analyses carried out so far, however, have identified the limestone used for figures of differing styles as Cypriot.\(^{64}\) More specifically, the limestone used in the figures from Naukratis, a soft fine-grained creamy yet chalky limestone in which visible foraminifera shells (globigerinids) produce a distinctive pock-marked or burst bubble appearance, may have been sourced from quarries in the region around Idalion, north of Larnaca.


\(^{64}\) Jenkins 2000, 160–1; Kourou et al. 2002; Polikreti et al. 2004, 1017–19; Fockenberg 2006, 195–8; Seriff 2009, 220. The Egyptian limestone that was used to produce Egyptian style figures found at Naukratis is visibly different in texture, colour and hardness (see the chapter on Egyptian Late Period figures).

---
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The origin of the (gypsum) alabaster remains difficult to determine specifically, though Cyprus is a likely candidate. This fine-grained, soft and easy to work sedimentary rock is represented at Naukratis mainly by figurines, figured alabastra, bowls and lids. It can be scientifically distinguished from calcium carbonate, i.e. calcite, which is the (local) material used for the production of alabastra at Naukratis and elsewhere in Egypt (see the chapter on Stone vessels). While the export of Cypriot raw materials cannot be excluded as a theoretical possibility, it overall seems unlikely, not least as there is no other evidence that would support the existence of an Archaic Cypriot sculptor’s workshop at Naukratis, or elsewhere in Egypt (although absence of evidence is not evidence of absence).

Moreover, the figures belong to a distinctive and established Cypriot tradition of making both stone and terracotta figurines that includes the incorporation of a mixture of Assyrian (Fig. 17), Phoenician, Egyptian, Persian and (Aegean or Ionian) Greek features. Developments in style and iconography may have been influenced by the political situation in 7th and 6th century BC Cyprus, as a period of Assyrian domination between 708 and 612 BC was followed by Egyptian domination around 570 BC and Persian domination after 545 BC. However, the exact political situation over this period is not clear and is contested in scholarship. Nor can we be sure how and to what degree the political situation would have influenced the work of sculptors and coroplasts. More likely than direct ‘influence’ is a scenario in which the political and economic situation constrained or enabled the movement of people and the demand for figurines, thus impacting on the techniques and materials, subjects, iconographic features and style of figurine production. It was the Cypriot, Greek and Phoenician merchant communities that transported and used the figurines themselves, as well as their customers, who probably drove the adoption of foreign features in different regions of Cyprus in response to changing demand, with ‘Aegean’ or ‘Cypro-Ionian’ figurines quite possibly produced by Cypriot sculptors specifically for a Greek market.

2.1. Male figures wearing a chiton

Cypro-Archaic limestone figures represent both male and female worshippers and for both the backs are represented flat. The earlier examples have rough sawn backs, whilst later examples have smooth, even rounded, but still formless backs. They are often finely painted, sometimes with vermilion, including red and black paint depicting the eyes, lips, hair, clothing designs and jewellery. Many head fragments are known, but difficult to place within any typology of form or subject (Nick type 1.7, variously dated 600–525 BC). Single male figures come in three poses: standing, striding and (rarely) seated, with differences in these broad groups. The standing examples have three main variants: plain standing

---

56 Gypsum alabaster and calcite have long been confused in the literature (e.g. Möller 2000a, 163), with figured alabastra made from gypsum alabaster erroneously believed to have been produced at Naukratis on account of the finds of calcite drill cores from a local workshop of (non-figured) calcite alabastra (see the chapter on Stone vessels). In fact, the two materials are easily distinguishable with scientific methods (see Höckmann 2007, 21–2 with n. 106).
and wearing a long dress, often called a *chiton*, and a mantle, or *himation*;°° carrying a lyre; or carrying a ram (*kriophoroi*). All these types are all known from Cyprus, but with the exception of the plain type are more common at east Greek sites.°°

**Standing male worshippers** without an offering or instrument are shown wearing a long wide *chiton* covered by a tasselled *himation* crossing diagonally from the left shoulder to the right knee (Fig. 18). They often wear a conical cap with cheek-guards or other headdress over long hair.°°

This type is also common in terracotta (see below), where it is always bearded.°° Limestone figures of beardless youths were more common at Naukratis than bearded males, as is also the case in Cyprus. Nick’s dating for this type of c. 625–575 BC°° is confirmed by recent discoveries in deposits dated between 620 BC/600 BC and 575 BC. However, the question remains to what degree these figures were already produced and distributed before 600 BC. At Naukratis, they are not found in the earliest layers of the Apollo sanctuary bothros, but of course this is only a small deposit and the majority of pieces from Naukratis are from disturbed secondary or tertiary deposits.

A rare **seated figure°°** dated broadly by Nick to 600–550 BC, is very similar in dress and style to examples from Samos and Knidos that come from layers dated earlier than c. 575 BC or 560 BC. A date range of c. 600–560 BC for this type seems most likely.

Two finely crafted and brightly painted figures of **young male musicians**, standing while playing a lyre, have been found at Naukratis.°°° They wear a long *chiton* covered by an *ependytes*, a thigh-length overgarment (Fig. 19). No examples of this type are known from stratified deposits predating 575 or 570 BC, but one of the Naukratis specimens was found in stratum ΑΠ13 of the bothros (dated c. 620–560 BC), below context ΑΠ5 (dated 580–550 BC). For these reasons a date range of c. 575–550 BC is suggested here for the type, broader than that proposed by Nick.

**Kriophoroi**, ram-bearing youths (Fig. 20), wear a ‘short-sleeved, belted *chiton*,’ more accurately described as an Egyptian ‘apron and kilt’ or *shendyt*,°°°° found also on other early Cypriot limestone figures of youths. All Naukratis examples have unworked backs and it is uncertain from the fragments whether the figures were standing or striding. The type has been dated to 575–550 BC,°° though parallels suggest that an earlier date of

---

°° Though commonly called such in the literature on these figures, the *chiton* and *himation* are in a distinctively Cypriot style, so the use of these Greek terms may be misleading.


°°° Nick 2006. Type 1.1; Petrie Museum, London, UC16470, UC16472; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE26761, JE36254; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.160, 11.45973; British Museum, 1904.0309.3.

°°° Gardner 1888, pls XV.1 and 5, XIV.8; British Museum, 1886.0401.1479.


°°°° Ibid., Type 1.6; British Museum, 1888.0601.32.

°°°°° Ibid., Type 1.2; British Museum, 1886.0401.1488, 1888.0601.28.

°°°°°° Ibid., Type 1.3; British Museum, 1886.0401.1516, 1888.0601.26; Petrie Museum, London, UJC16622.

°°°°°° Ibid., Type 1.3; Petrie Museum, London, UC16622; British Museum, 1886.0401.1334.
600–560 BC is more likely. Produced in Cyprus, figures of this type appear to have been almost exclusively exported to East Greece.

**Striding youths** wearing ‘apron and kilt’ are usually shown empty handed (Fig. 21), though one related figure (the ‘hunter’) carries a bow, two hares and two young boars. In dress, pose and style they are closely related to 6th century BC Egyptianizing male limestone statuary found in Cyprus and Phoenicia and could be considered diminutive forms of the same. Contemporary warrior figures in this dress are known from Cyprus in both terracotta and limestone. This group is dated 600–550 BC by Nick, except for the ‘hunter’, a unique figure of related form but different workmanship, which on stylistic grounds she dates to the middle of the 6th century BC, similar to Pryce who had placed it c. 540 BC. Cypriot figures in a striding pose have been found elsewhere in earlier contexts of c. 600–575 and c. 600–560 BC, although variation within this group does not exclude the possibility of a later date for these examples.

### 2.2. Female figures wearing a chiton

The female plaque figures were made in the same way as the male, often with flat unworked backs. Female figures are depicted with long hair, most frequently (but not always) covered by a veil lifted above the forehead, sometimes with a flattened top, and falling behind large ears down the back. They often wear large earrings, bracelets and one or two necklaces with a central medallion, and a simple long chiton, often with a deep seated kolpos (overfold), sometimes held bunched at the front. When not holding the chiton, they are typically depicted with one arm crossing the torso and holding an offering: a bowl (Fig. 22), saucer, lamp, bird (Fig. 23), lotus flower, miniature calf, tambour or disc; the other arm hangs down flat by her side. These figures are similar in form, iconography and pose to many contemporary terracotta plaques and hollow figures found in the sanctuaries at Naukratis, though the limestone statuettes are usually of finer quality. Some have aspects that could be considered Egyptianizing or feature such as plaited hair and pleated chiton that may betray an Ionian influence. To what extent these features might also signify temporal change and/or (Cypriot) regional fashions remains to be investigated.

Nick distinguished a range of variations among the female worshippers in this group, dating these variants to 610–575 BC, 600–550 BC and 550–525 BC, respectively. To these groups we can add a number of newly recognized examples, including a type wearing a pleated chiton (Fig. 23),

---

78 Schmidt 1968, pl. 97, nos C121, C122, C182 and C195, see also C160; Berges 2006, 83–4, nos 55–6; Tuna et al. 2009, 232.
79 Höckmann 2009, 256.
80 Nick 2006, Type 1.4.
81 Ibid., Type 1.3.2; British Museum, 1888.0601.20; for the reading of the inscription see Johnston 2003, 164.
83 Counts 2012, 158–9.
84 Pryce 1928, B451.
85 Schmidt 1968, pl. 103, no. C96; Berges 2006, 90–1, nos 72, 76.
86 British Museum, 1888.0601.23. Parallels are known from Samos (Schmidt 1968, pl. 111, no. C.179). Regarding Ionian influence see Herrymary 1981, 35.
87 Nick 2006, Type 2.1. Nick (division by Nick, but lettered subdivisions have been added by the present author for clarity) dated these variants to 600–575 BC (Type 2.1a, N23–5), 600–550 BC (Type 2.1b, N26–9; Type 2.1c, N30–8; Type 2.1d, N37–40) and 550–525 BC (Nick Type 2.1e, N41–2). Further details for each piece are included in the online catalogue.
also known from Samos. The early 6th century dates with a *terminus ante quem* of 560–550 BC must now be revised upwards to 575 BC, with most of the Samian parallels for the Naukratis pieces cited by Nick now dated between c. 620/600–575 BC. Recent excavations in Samos have revealed further parallels in a deposit dated 580–570 BC, whilst at Knidos parallels have been found in contexts dated 640/590–570/560 BC.

At Naukratis, five examples of the type were found in the Apollo bothros in layers AT3–4, underneath a layer containing faience amulets dated 580–550 BC (see the chapter on Mixed style faience figures). Since, as noted above, parallels from other sites come from contexts dated 620/600 to 575/560 BC, a date of 600–560 BC for the type is indicated. However, the latest variants (Nick Type 2.1e, Fig. 24) are not attested in deposits dated c. 620–560 BC at Naukratis, Samos, Miletos or Knidos, making a later date of c. 560–525 BC for them more likely.

### 2.3 Groups and action scenes

A small number of more complex figures representing actions or group scenes are known from Naukratis (Nick Type 3). They include a representation of a woman kneading dough and a seated *kourophoros* (Fig. 25), thought to be a Cypriot adaptation of the traditional Egyptian iconography of Isis-Hathor nursing Horus. A figure group of a bull with two attendants has been dated to c. 600–550 BC on the basis of the shape of one of the vessels it depicts and the style of the attendants’ garments. Additional pieces not featured in previous catalogues include two riders and a chariot group. No contextual information is preserved for them; rare and unprovenanced parallels for their iconography have been dated to the 5th century BC, but the subjects are also represented in the (earlier) Cypriot terracotta assemblage from Naukratis. Finally, the fragment of a base of a figure of a falcon flanked by two striding figures in Cypriot limestone and Cypriot style has been found in the sanctuary of Aphrodite, probably in a Saite period deposit. The dating of these unique pieces is difficult, though constrained by the dates of the contexts in which they were found in Naukratis (c. 610–525 BC). In all likelihood they are contemporary with the majority of the Cypriot limestone figures from the site (c. 600–560 BC).

---

88 Schmidt 1968, pl. 111, no. C.179.
89 Nick (2006) followed Schmidt’s dating (1968), which as noted above has subsequently been revised by Henke (Henke 2011, 213, 219–21).
91 Berges 2006, 82–4, nos 40–45, 60.
92 British Museum, 1886.0401.18, 1386–7; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE26759–60.
93 Nick 2006, N41–42, Type 2.1e.
94 British Museum, 1886.0401.1388.
95 British Museum, 1888.0601.31.
96 Nick 2006, 123.
97 British Museum, 1886.0401.1390.
2.4 Animal figures

The Cypro-Ionian figure industry produced a range of lion and falcon figures (Fig. 26). Although present on Cyprus (Trikomo, Salamis and Larnaka), the majority of known examples come from Rhodes, Knidos, Samos, Miletos and Chios. Previously dated to c. 575–550 BC, stratified parallels now suggest the period between 620/600 BC and 575/560 BC, with good parallels from Samos dated 580–570 BC. Some chronological development has been postulated for the style of the lion figures found at Knidos and further research may produce a more refined chronological sequence and typology for these pieces.

2.5 Alabaster and limestone ‘lion tamers’

Three finely carved nude and beardless, yet muscular youths with long hair (kouroi) holding lions in front of them are known from Naukratis. Two are carved from limestone, the third from gypsum alabaster (calcium sulphate). They are depicted in the same striding position and carved in the round in great detail like other kouroi. This similarity was recognized by both Smith and Nick who argue that the figures probably originated from the same workshop that also produced a group of kouroi from Naukratis. Previously dated to 575–550 BC, excavated parallels come from deposits dated earlier, c. 600–575/560 BC. At Naukratis itself, Petrie found one piece ‘in almost the oldest stratum of the town, principally along the middle of the eastern side’, next to the temples of Apollo and Hera, from where they might have been cleared at a later point in time, while Gardner excavated an example in the Aphrodite sanctuary. The type was thus dedicated in at least two different sanctuaries at Naukratis. Often considered the representation of a hero, its interpretation remains debated.

2.6 Cypro-Ionian kouroi figures in limestone

Striding kouroi in limestone (Höckmann form 1) have been broadly divided into three stylistic groups: an Egyptianizing style group 1, dated to 600–575 BC (Fig. 28); a Cypriot style group 2, dated to c. 580–570 BC (Fig. 15); and a Cypro-Ionian style group 3, dated to 575–550 BC (Fig. 29). Most stratified parallels for limestone kouroi can be dated to c. 600–570/560 BC. The three limestone pieces of Type 1.3 were given earlier

102 Nick 2006, Types 4.1 and 4.2.
108 Nick 2006, Type 1.5; British Museum, 1886.0401.1381; 1888.0601.27; Fitzwilliam Museum, GR.5.1899.
109 Smith 1892, no. 110; Nick 2006, 46–51.
110 Nick 2006, 46–51; Smith 1892, no. 540.
113 Petrie 1886a, 36, pl. I.
116 Ibid., henceforth Types 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.
117 Ibid., N11, N15 and N22.
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(570–560 BC) or broader dates (600–550 BC) by Höckmann than the alabaster examples (575–550 BC) from the same group 3. Yet this group of limestone figures is too small and incoherent or indeed similar enough to the supposedly contemporary alabaster pieces\(^{117}\) to allow for such specific dating. Within Naukratis itself, Höckmann’s dating of groups 1.1 and 1.2 is supported by examples of the type within stratum AP3–4 of the Apollo sanctuary bothros alongside material dated c. 600–560 BC; the fact that no alabaster kouroi have been found in early deposits within the Apollo or Aphrodite sanctuaries appears to support a later date for them.

2.6 Cypro-Ionian alabaster kouroi, ‘adorant kouroi’ and ‘mantle kouroi’

Cypriot alabaster kouroi appear closely related to Greek sculpture and were probably produced on Cyprus, perhaps specifically for a Greek market.\(^{118}\) Some examples preserve traces of their original paint: reddish-brown on the body, vermillion on lips and hair band, and black on hair, eyes, eyebrows, moustache and pubic hair.\(^{119}\)

The gypsum alabaster kouroi preserved from Naukratis present considerable variation in style and iconography. Three forms were distinguished by Höckmann (forms 1–3): the standard striding nude kouros form, with arms by his sides (Fig. 16);\(^{120}\) the nude kouroi ‘adorant’ form, with one arm across his chest (Fig. 30);\(^{121}\) and the ‘mantle kouroi’, wearing thin, closely fitting Revealing clothes (Fig. 31).\(^{122}\) Like the limestone kouroi, they fall into early Egyptianizing (group 1), Cypriot (group 2) and Cypro-Ionian (groups 3 and 4) styles, though not all types are attested in all styles. The standard kouros figure was probably only produced in style groups 1–3, as were the limestone examples (dated 590–580 BC, 580–570 BC and 575–550 BC respectively). A single example from group 4 is of uncertain provenance and, with only the head preserved, difficult to identify.\(^{123}\) The ‘adorant’ type was probably only produced in style group 3 (similarly dated 590–580 BC and 575–550 BC), as the only extant example of an ‘adorant’ in group 1 is very fragmentary and not certainly in this pose.\(^{124}\) Only a single ‘mantle kouroi’ in style group 3 (dated to 575–550 BC) can be given a definite Naukratis provenance, as the only other known example cited by Höckmann (in style group 4) is almost certainly not from Naukratis.\(^{125}\) Excluding those kouroi with dubious identifications or provenance means that we cannot be certain that any group 4 alabaster kouroi were found at Naukratis.

---

\(^{117}\) Group 3 limestone pieces have arms that join the rigid and straight waist, whilst group 3 alabaster pieces have cut away gaps between the waist and the elbow. There are also differences in the way the back, buttocks and pubic area are carved.

\(^{118}\) As indicated by scientific analysis (Jenkins 2001, 166–73, contra Pryce 1928, 183–4; Höckmann 2007, 176–7).


\(^{121}\) Ibid., Type 2; British Museum, 1888.0601.14; 1886.0401.1383; Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, 56.

\(^{122}\) Ibid., Type 3; British Museum, 1886.0401.1490.

\(^{123}\) Ibid., N21; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, CG27428.

\(^{124}\) Ibid., N28; Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, no.56.

\(^{125}\) Ibid., N 26; National Archaeological Museum, Athens, 450S. This was acquired in Cyprus (Jenkins 2001, 168). Discussion of problematic provenances for this and other pieces (Höckmann 2007, N5) can be found in the catalogue entry for each piece.
If we exclude the group 4 kouroi, all Naukratis alabaster kouoi type figures were found in the early layers AF1–4 in the Apollo sanctuary bothros or the early Aphrodite sanctuary contexts. Four alabaster kouroi were found in the sanctuary of Aphrodite, but no precise contexts are recorded for these pieces. Other alabaster figures with context information were all found in late Saite period levels.

2.7 Other Cypro-Ionian alabaster figures: korai, figured alabastra, tripod bowls and priest

Other Cypro-Ionian style alabaster figures and vessels have been placed within Höckmann’s style groups 3 and 4, dated between 575–550 BC and 550–525 BC respectively. These include a single kore, four alabastra in the form of korai and five shallow tripod bowls, probably used as containers for cosmetics or toiletries.

Of the alabastra, all of which can be dated to 575–550 BC, one example was found in the stratum associated with the construction of the second Apollo temple, AF7 (Fig. 32). Two further examples were found in the Aphrodite sanctuary, one in context Φ8, next the altar of the first temple of Aphrodite, and another in context Φ10. All three are thus from late Saite period layers, on the basis of the pottery and figurines found there, that immediately precede the construction of the second temple of Aphrodite in c. 550–500 BC. They probably post-date the majority of Cypriot limestone (610–560 BC) and terracotta figures (620–550 BC) found at Naukratis.

Five fragments of alabaster tripod bowls are preserved from Naukratis, representing three different forms distinguished by differently shaped legs. The first type, with two examples, features a female head above what appears to be a single lion’s foot (Fig. 33) and probably falls within Höckmann’s style groups 3 or 4, dated broadly to 575–525 BC, contemporary to the majority of alabaster figures from Naukratis. The second type, with two examples, has feet in the form of complete sphinxes; and dates from 550–525 BC (Fig. 13). The final type depicts sirens holding children to their breast and are also dated to c. 550–525 BC (Fig. 34).

---

126 One piece had been associated with the Apollo sanctuary on the basis of a mistaken reading of the British Museum catalogue (British Museum, 1888,1006.1; Smith 1892, no. 200; Höckmann 2007, N9, 176–7; pls 8–9, 38a). It was acquired in 1888 from Petrie, who had assisted in the excavation of the Aphrodite sanctuary in 1885–6, where the few alabaster kouroi with a recorded excavation context were found.

127 Höckmann 2007 Types 4 and 5.

128 On figured alabaster alabastra, see Bubenheimer-Erhart 2012, 24–31; Höckmann 2007, 137–9; Jenkins 2001, 172–3; Riis 1956. Their production is commonly located on Cyprus.

129 Höckmann 2007, 190–1.

130 ibid., group 3.

131 Previously erroneously attributed to the Aphrodite sanctuary (Ibid., N36, p. 190; pl. 40c–d; British Museum, 1886,0401.1393).

132 ibid., 189–90, N35, pl. 40 a–b; British Museum, 1888,0601.15.

133 ibid., 189, N34; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 88.736.

134 However, representing more than three vessels as each are subtly different in size and design.

135 Redpath Museum, Montreal, 2532.02; 2532.01. The carving appears to show a large lion’s paw with four toes, but the carving is rather crude and it is possible that this is an attempt to represent a sphinx.

136 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, RES.88.45; 86.168.

137 British Museum, 1886,0401.1508 (Höckmann 2007, 190–1, N37, Type 5.4).
another possibly comes from the temple of Apollo.\textsuperscript{138} Parallels for such bowls are known from Late Archaic tombs in Olbia on the Black Sea where they were found with pottery dated to c. 520–510 BC.\textsuperscript{139} The finds from Olbia suggest that such bowls usually had lids and might have been used as cosmetics containers.

Two examples of youths in an ‘Egyptian apron and kilt’ in alabaster are known from Naukratis. One is an upper torso with missing lower arms and rejoined head (Fig. 1), the other a newly identified lower body fragment with a kilt broken at the waist and knees (Fig. 35). The first example wears a Cypriot cap with turned-up ear-pieces over long hair, an Egyptian apron and a leopard skin. With few known parallels, the figure has been interpreted as representing a warrior, an Egyptian Sem-priest or priest of Amun.\textsuperscript{140} Alternatively it could be the result of a misunderstanding of an Ionic chiton and mantle dress as is also represented on kriophoroi and striding figures in limestone from Naukratis dated 600–560 BC,\textsuperscript{141} with contemporary parallels from Cyprus and East Greece.\textsuperscript{142}

Within the stratigraphic sequence of Naukratis, alabaster figures have been found in the late Saite period levels of the temple of Apollo and Aphrodite and redeposited in the ‘middle of the eastern side’ of the town.\textsuperscript{143} Although a few of the alabaster figures are dated relatively early on stylistic grounds by Höckmann (Groups 1 and 2 dated 590/580 BC, and 580/570 BC respectively), the majority of alabaster figures fit into Höckmann’s later style group 3 (575–550 BC). Thus the alabaster figures overlap with the closely related limestone statuette production (particularly of kouroi) described above, but post-date many of the flat-backed limestone figures found at Naukratis.

2.8 Cypro-Classical limestone sculpture

Nine Cypro-Classical limestone sculptures are known from Naukratis, most of them previously unpublished or incorrectly identified (‘late Hellenistic’\textsuperscript{144}). The largest of these figures represents a crouching child with a raised dress revealing his genitals, a type known as a ‘temple boy’ (Fig. 36),\textsuperscript{145} dating from 450–400 BC.\textsuperscript{146} It is one of a group of such temple boy figures from Naukratis from the period 450–300 BC;\textsuperscript{147} the type is well known in Cyprus from sanctuary deposits of 450 BC down to the Hellenistic period.

\textsuperscript{138} Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, RES.88.45 and British Museum, 1886.0401.1508 (Höckmann 2007, 190) respectively. FS is a mixed deposit containing material dated to both 575–550 BC and 550–525 BC.
\textsuperscript{139} Belin de Ballu 1972, pls 64–5; Skudnova 1988, 107; 118–21, nos 160–1, 182; Pharmakowsky 1913, 199–201, pls 41–4; Trofomova 2007. 101. Pottery dates courtesy of Villing pers. comm. See Höckmann 2007, 190–1 for a discussion of these parallels.
\textsuperscript{140} Petrie 1886a, 36; Jenkins 2001, 171; Nick 2006, 44–6, Type 1.4.
\textsuperscript{141} Nick 2006, Types 1.3 and 1.3.2.
\textsuperscript{142} Counts 2011, 158–9.
\textsuperscript{143} Petrie 1886a, 36.
\textsuperscript{144} Budde and Nicholls 1967, no. 77/80, pl. 26.
\textsuperscript{146} Beer 1994, pls 84.d, 86.b 87.e–g.
\textsuperscript{147} Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1886.457; Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam, 7835; Spurlock Museum, Champaign, 1926.02.0032; probably Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR.3.1899.
though a small number of examples have also been found elsewhere, such as at Carthage.\textsuperscript{148}

Three female worshippers,\textsuperscript{149} each in a different style, can be dated to 500–375 BC (Fig. 37).\textsuperscript{150} They represent the continuation of an older form of female worshipper also attested at Naukratis\textsuperscript{151} and display strong archaizing features. A single piece of Classical style sculpture, a representation of Herakles\textsuperscript{152} on a base with the inscription ‘Sikon from Kyp(ros) made (and) Aristion (dedicated) to Herakles’ (see the chapter on Greek and Latin Stone inscriptions)\textsuperscript{153} was found in the Hellenion, where other likely Cypro- Classical pieces were also found, though their precise findspots were not recorded.\textsuperscript{154} The limited number and range of Cypriot imports of the Cypro-Classical period matches the pattern for Cypriot terracottas found at Naukratis.

### 3. Terracotta figures

Cypriot terracotta figures are amongst the earliest finds attested from Naukratis. Like the Cypriot stone figures, Cypriot terracottas were found concentrated within deposits in the sanctuaries of Aphrodite, Apollo and (to a lesser degree) the Hellenion and the sanctuary of Hera. Most date to the period between 620 and 525 BC, although both the Hellenion and the sanctuary of Aphrodite also contained pieces dated 525–300 BC. A wide variety of materials, technologies and techniques were used in the production of the hand-made or mould-made figure plaques, mould-made hollow figures and wheel-made pieces found at Naukratis. This wide variety of techniques was previously thought to represent chronological developments,\textsuperscript{155} but all have been found together in contemporary deposits at Naukratis. It is more likely that they represent regional differences,\textsuperscript{156} a hypothesis now confirmed by fabric analysis.\textsuperscript{157} For this reason, the figures are here ordered primarily by material, technique, origin and date, to complement existing established typologies,\textsuperscript{158} alongside contextual information on how and when they were used in Naukratis.

Excellent parallels for the Cypriot terracotta figurines from Naukratis can be found on Cyprus, particularly from three specific regions: the areas of

\begin{itemize}
  \item [\textsuperscript{148}] Beer 1994; Lafﬁneur 1994, 141–8; Tatton-Brown 1997; Senff 1993. Parallels in the British Museum are from the sanctuary of Apollo, Idalion (1917,0701.125) and from Amathus (1894,1101.724).
  \item [\textsuperscript{149}] British Museum, 1911,0606.6; Spurlock Museum, Champaign, 1926.02.0029; Bristol City Art Gallery & Museum, H446.c.
  \item [\textsuperscript{150}] Hemmary 1989, 358, 371–3, nos 718, 750, 754, 756.
  \item [\textsuperscript{151}] Yon 1974, 64, Type III B; see Nick 2006, Type 2.1.
  \item [\textsuperscript{152}] The identiﬁcation of this sculpture as Herakles relies upon the dedicatory inscription to Herakles, as the feet and base, which may represent the base of a club, are not conclusive.
  \item [\textsuperscript{153}] British Museum, 1900,0214.22 (Höckmann and Möller 2006, 13; Höckmann 2010, 27).
  \item [\textsuperscript{154}] Based on their acquisition data, they probably come from two different areas. Some were excavated within the Hellenion by Hogarth in 1903, whilst others were excavated by Petrie and Gardner in 1885–6 in the sanctuary of Aphrodite. This is not always clear.
  \item [\textsuperscript{155}] Schmidt 1968, groups 2–4. Were one to follow Schmidt’s chronology, pieces from Samos that have parallels at Naukratis would have to be dated to c. 670–630 BC (Schmidt’s second group: Schmidt 1968, T235, T1900, T386), which is highly unlikely given that at this date Naukratis is unlikely to have existed.
  \item [\textsuperscript{156}] Fourrier 2007, 113–20; Henke 2011, 211–12.
  \item [\textsuperscript{157}] Unpublished scientiﬁc analyses of a small group of Cypriot terracotta ﬁgurines from Naukratis by Michela Spataro at the British Museum. Publication of these results are in preparation.
\end{itemize}
Salamis, Kition/Amathus and Paphos. The types represented at Naukratis were widely exported and are well attested in contemporary Eastern Mediterranean centres such as Miletos and Samos. Different materials, techniques and styles are characteristic for each Cypriot region. Just as the technique and the clay fabric are intimately linked to available resources and regional styles, so often is the choice of subjects.

The majority of the figures preserved from Naukratis are mould-made figure-plaques of male or female worshippers, made of a pale calcareous fabric with coarse black inclusions (Fabric 1). This same fabric was used to make crude hand-made riders, chariot groups, animals (offerings?) and centaur ‘toys’. Hollow mould-made figures of female, and rarely male, worshippers as well as some hollow chariot groups come in a related pale calcareous fabric with fine igneous inclusions (Fabric 2). Both groups were popular in the Salamis region, where a range of variable clay sources was available. Mould-made and hollow figures in an Egyptianizing style representing sphinxes and the Egyptian god Ptah and some wheel-made figures have a pink-brown calcareous clay with fine white, red and black inclusions (Fabric 3). They correspond to types popular in Kition and Amathus. Finally, hand-made figures of women wearing high headdresses with their arms outreached in a praying pose are of a type popular in Paphos where they were made of a red-brown clay with coarse grey inclusions (Fabric 4). Scientific analyses of the fabrics of a small group of examples of these types have recently been carried out by Michela Spataro at the British Museum and will be published soon.

3.1.1. Hand-made female figures with uplifted arms (Paphos ‘goddess’ types)

Five Cypriot terracotta figures of women with uplifted arms in a typical prayer pose, shown wearing a tall headdress and produced in a crude hand-made style, are known from Naukratis (Fig. 38). The orant pose suggests they represent a female worshipper or priestess, though the figures have also been interpreted as ‘goddesses’. Close parallels have been uncovered at the site of Yeroskipou-Monagri near Paphos in south-west Cyprus, where these forms were common and apparently unchanged from the 1st century BC. The fabric (Fabric 4) is very different from that used to create other Cypriot figures and is consistent with the fabric of examples from Paphos, the location of a long-
established cult of Aphrodite.\textsuperscript{167} Examples at Naukratis have been found exclusively in Saite period contexts from the temple of Aphrodite.\textsuperscript{168}

3.1.2. Hand-made animals, riders and toys from Salamis

A number of hand-made figures representing animals (deer, dogs and bears), centaur toys and riders (Fig. 39) are made from a calcareous yellow-brown clay with abundant coarse igneous inclusions (Fabric 1). The style of the figures corresponds to types well known from and probably made in Salamis,\textsuperscript{169} but also found at Amathus\textsuperscript{170} and Kourion.\textsuperscript{171} In technique and style they belong to a very long-lived tradition, particularly the horse and rider figures, which appear in Cyprus, as they do in the Near East and Aegean, in the Cypro-Geometric I–III periods and clearly remain important until the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{172} At Naukratis, two examples were found in the Apollo sanctuary in an early bothros stratum, AN12, dated 620–570 BC.\textsuperscript{173} Naturalistic variants made of a fine orange-brown fabric (unlikely to be from the same source) and with late Cypro-Archaic II parallels\textsuperscript{174} have been found with late Saite period material, redeposited in c. 525 BC.\textsuperscript{175}

3.2. Wheel-made ‘pillar’ figures from Kition and elsewhere

A small number of terracotta figures with wheel-made ‘pillar’ shaped bodies, mould-made heads (Fig. 40) and hand-made arms have been found at Naukratis, representing females or figures of indeterminate sex.\textsuperscript{176} In one case the figure is of a worshipper, carrying a small ram for sacrifice (Fig. 41). Though the fabric of this type has not yet been scientifically analysed, the light pink-brown calcareous clay is consistent with the fabric of figures in the Egyptianizing style discussed below (Fabric 3), suggesting production at Kition where this type is often, though not exclusively, found.\textsuperscript{177} The type probably copies, or is influenced by, Levantine ‘pillar figurines’ common in the 7th century BC.\textsuperscript{178} When found in Cyprus it is often assigned a date in the 6th or even early 5th century BC.\textsuperscript{179} However, examples from the Heraion of Samos can now be dated to 640–600 BC.\textsuperscript{180} None of the Naukratis examples have definite provenance information recorded, though some are likely to have come from the sanctuary of Aphrodite. A single piece, with a plastic added ‘turban’-like headdress, was found in the earliest layers of the Hellenion, though it is possibly not of a

\textsuperscript{167} Ibid. Comparison of the geology represented in thin sections of these Naukratis examples with the geology around Paphos will be discussed in the forthcoming work of Michela Spataro.
\textsuperscript{168} Bolton Museum, 1911.44.26; 1911.44.27; 1911.44.31; British Museum, 1911.0710.96; 1911.0710.97.
\textsuperscript{169} Karageorghis 1995, 76, Type II(i)11; pl. 38.8, Type II(i)128. pl. 40.5, Type II(i)66–8. pl. 45.1–3; Fourrier 2007, 25, pl. 1.1; Walters 1903.
\textsuperscript{170} Murray, Smith and Walters 1900, 112, fig. 164.9; Karageorghis 1995, Type II(e)(2). pl. 49.7.
\textsuperscript{171} Winter 1991, 221. See also Kiely 2011 (British Museum Online Research Catalogue Ancient Cyprus: Ancient Kourion).
\textsuperscript{172} Winter 1991, 221.
\textsuperscript{173} British Museum, 1886.0401.1467; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1886.496.
\textsuperscript{174} Karageorghis 1995; 1996; Fourrier and Queyrel 1998, 650.
\textsuperscript{175} British Museum, 1888.0601.91 context 94.
\textsuperscript{177} Fourrier 2007, 54–61.
\textsuperscript{178} For example see late 7th century BC parallels from Ashkelon (Cohen 2011, 468, nos 87–90).
\textsuperscript{179} Karageorghis 1998, Type II(iii)1&2.
\textsuperscript{180} Schmidt 1968, 75, 98, T355, T385; Group 4 dated to 600–560 BC; revised date by Henke 2011, 219.
Kition or even a Cypriot fabric, being non-calcaric and without obvious igneous inclusions and having a friable, laminated silty texture (Fig. 42).\(^{181}\)

Figure-shaped vessels from Naukratis come in a range of forms. A vessel in the form of a kore and one of a pig (Fig. 43)\(^{182}\) were both found in the sanctuary of Aphrodite. Cypriot pig vessels are a well-known type that continues into the Hellenistic period,\(^{183}\) though the Naukratis example was found in a Saite period context in a well within the Aphrodite sanctuary (well 2, context ΦB). Animal figures in the form of a goat, cow or monkey were also made as attachments for wheel-made jars. None of the examples from Naukratis have a known provenance; they may have been acquired by the excavators from locals rather than actually excavated, in which case they may have been broken off from larger vessels before sale.

### 3.3.1 Mould-made solid figure plaques from Salamis

Mould-made figure plaques of bearded male and bejewelled female worshippers found at Naukratis are made from pale yellow–brown calcaric clay with abundant coarse igneous inclusions (Fabric 1). The type is well known and the majority of pieces from Naukratis were also copied in or exported to areas of Cyprus, such as Arsos,\(^{184}\) and across the Eastern Mediterranean.\(^{185}\) Bearded male worshippers, sometimes described as ‘Asiaic’ or ‘Assyrian’, are featured with long hair under a conical cap with cheek-guards or a turban-like headdress; they wear a long wide chiton covered by a himation with a tasselled fringe crossing from the left shoulder to the right knee (Fig. 17).\(^{186}\) The female figures wear an Egyptian wig or headdress, as well as distinctive jewellery including a necklace with central pendant and carry a tambour or rectangular tablet (Fig. 44) The figures thus clearly incorporate fashions, features and styles represented on contemporary limestone figures of the period c. 610–560 BC\(^ {187}\) and hollow terracotta figures of c. 620–590 BC.\(^ {188}\)

Commonly dated to between the late 7th and 6th century BC,\(^ {189}\) terracotta figures of this type are well attested at East Greek and Phoenician coastal sites from c. 640–600 BC, but continue to possibly as late as 550 BC.\(^ {190}\) Fourteen examples have been found in Saite period levels in the Aphrodite sanctuary.

A third group depicts beardless youths wearing a conical cap. A specimen of this type was found in level AP1 of the bothros in the Apollo sanctuary (Fig. 6), dated 620–590 BC; among the known parallels is also an example from Knidos.\(^ {191}\)

---

\(^{181}\) Thomas, Cypriot figures

\(^{182}\) This could be a Levantine piece. Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA313.

\(^{183}\) British Museum, 1888,0601.661 also emulated in local Nile silt ware, British Museum, 1886,0401,1375.

\(^{184}\) Buchholz 1967, 141-8.


\(^{186}\) Blinkenberg 1931; Schmidt 1968; Kleibl 2006; Henke 2011.

\(^{187}\) Karageorghis 1995, 49–51, pl. 25. 2–4 Type I(viii) 34–8.

\(^{188}\) Nick 2006 Type 1.1; Type 2.1, above.

\(^{189}\) See 3.3.2 below, Schmidt 1968, 22, Group 4.

\(^{190}\) Gjerstad 1948, 105–7, pl. 7; Schmidt 1968, 9–21, Group 2; Karageorghis 1999, pl. 51.4, Type VI(ii).

\(^{191}\) Kleibl 2006, 162, pl. 90, no. 357; Henke 2009, 216, Fig. 2.

\(^{192}\) Karageorghis 1995, 49–51, pl. 25.3 Type I(vii) 37, see also 34–8 from Idalion, Ayia Irini, Ayios Georghios Spatharikou and Samos; Kleibl 2006, 164, pl. 94, no. 376.
3.3.2 Mould-made hollow figures from Salamis

A further group of terracotta figurines from Naukratis are the mould-made hollow representations of female worshippers, with finely detailed almond-shaped eyes and full lips. Their hair is concealed under a veil below an elaborate turban-shaped headdress. They wear distinctive large earrings and a double necklace with central medallion and carry a rectangular tablet (stylus?) or tambour (Fig. 45). The figures are made of pale orange calcareous clay with fine black inclusions (Fabric 2). A single, large example with the same construction technique and style, but possibly of a male worshipper, is also known. Common and probably produced in the Salamis area around 640/630–600 BC, examples of this type have been found widely distributed across the East Greek and Phoenician area. At Naukratis, examples have been found in the bothros of the Apollo sanctuary (context ΑΠ3, dated to 620–570 BC, Fig. 8) and in Saite period levels near the altar in the Aphrodite sanctuary (context Φ8), before its reconstruction after 550–500 BC. A single piece from the Hellenion is a rarity in an area largely populated by Persian period terracottas from South Ionia and Rhodes (see the chapter on Greek terracotta figures). Though all examples of this type were probably redeposited from within the shrines in which they were originally offered, they may not necessarily have been displaced from their temenos altogether. If so, this would mean that the sanctuaries of Apollo and Aphrodite as well as the Hellenion received Cypriot terracotta dedications shortly after the foundation of Naukratis in the late 7th century BC.

Numerous fragments have been found at Naukratis of distinctive chariot quadriga groups, including hollow horse figures with tasselled harnesses, chariot trappings and a chariot crew wearing conical helmets. Featuring both mould-made and hand-made components, these figurines were made of a pale yellow or orange calcareous clay with black inclusions (Fabrics 1 and 2). They are brightly painted in yellow and red. Petrie found a number of pieces in what he calls ‘mid-5th century BC’ contexts within the town, which may ultimately derive from the nearby Greek sanctuaries of Apollo or Hera. Other fragments were found in Saite period contexts Φ16–17 within the Aphrodite sanctuary. The type can be dated to c. 620–550 BC.

3.4. Egyptianizing mould-made hollow figures from Kition(?)

Three mould-made and hollow Egyptianizing figures have been found at Naukratis, including a representation of Ptah-Patek (Fig. 46) and two sphinx heads, made of a fine calcareous pink-brown clay. Such Egyptianizing figures have been classified by Gjerstad as of ‘Eastern Neo–

---

184 Henke 2011, 212.
185 Schmidt 1968, 43, 87, group 4 dated 600–560 BC now revised to 640–600 BC.
187 Petrie 1886a, 36.
188 Schmidt 1968, 22–36; Karageorghis 1995, Type II(iii).
189 British Museum, 1889.0601.100, 1889.0601.101 and Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, RES.87.262.
Cypriote style’ and assigned a date of ‘570–520 BC’, though they more likely represent a regional style and are of an earlier date. The figure of Ptah comes from the sanctuary of Hera; its salmon pink-brown clay (Fabric 4) is consistent with parallels from Kition. Parallels from Amathus and Kition have been given highly variable dates ranging from 700–500 BC, 600–475 BC to 525–450 BC.

Two identical sphinx heads were probably both found in the sanctuary of Aphrodite, but no precise findspot information is available; an unprovenanced parallel for them has been dated to between the end of the 7th and the beginning of the 6th centuries BC. Without good contextual evidence the dating of these types has therefore remained uncertain.

3.5. Cypro-Classical figures

A number of mould-made and hollow Cypro-Classical figures of women, sometimes seated, wearing an ornate high kalathos headdress over long hair, have been found in the Hellenion and in later levels of the sanctuary of Aphrodite (Figs 47–8). They are made in a ‘naturalistic’ Classical Greek style from a fine pale yellow calcareous fabric (perhaps a variant of Fabric 1 or 2) and are invariably coated with a white wash or slip as preparation for paint. The earliest known parallels for the type come from the sanctuary of the ‘Great Goddess’ in Salamis and have been dated to 500–480 BC.

Other parallels have been dated later to 450–350 BC and into the early Hellenistic period. Examples from the ‘Great Goddess’ sanctuary of Kition have been placed in the 4th to 3rd centuries BC. The type could represent a deity or a priestess. At Naukratis, the latest variant of a female figure wearing a kalathos headdress, which can be dated to c. 300–250 BC, was found in finds spots 5 or 6 of the Hellenion precinct.

Further late Cypriot terracotta figurines at Naukratis include a group of completely preserved female figures that follow the late 4th and early 3rd century BC Tanagra style (Fig. 48). Two ‘naturalistic’ male portrait busts dated c. 400–300 BC were found in the later levels of the Aphrodite sanctuary. They have parallels from Marion, Kourion and Limassol in terracotta and from Idalion in limestone.

200 Gjerstad 1948, 470. However, see discussions above on Gjerstad’s dating.
201 For example see British Museum, 1880.0710.30. Comparison of the geology represented in thin sections of this Naukratis example with the geology around Kition will be discussed in the forthcoming work of Michela Spataro.
202 Karageorghis 1996, 14, pl.8.3 Type D(b)1; Murray, Smith and Walters 1900, 113–14, fig. 165.4; Breitenstein 1941, pl. 5.44; Fourrier and Queyrel 1998, 316–17, 351, nos 510–12, 565–6.
203 British Museum, 1888.0601.101; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, RES.87.262. Both were found during the season in which the Aphrodite sanctuary was excavated, but the British Museum piece has no findspot information recorded in its registers.
204 Fourrier and Queyrel 1998, 189, no. 284, AM 3563.
205 Morloup 1994, 16, 107, 114, see also 86.
206 Ibid., nos 31–2, 44–5, 60, 164, 168, 172, 178.
207 The ‘Great Goddess’ was identified with Artemis from the Hellenistic period onwards (Yon 1991, 301–6).
209 Gutch 1888–9, 84.
210 British Museum, 1890.0731.53 and 1896.0201.212. A later Hellenistic date could be suspected for 1890.0731.53. Cf. Fourrier and Queyrel 1998, 473–6, nos 722–4, 726, all dated to the 4th century BC or the Hellenistic period. See also Young and Young 1955.
211 British Museum, 1872.0816.63 and 1872.0816.53.
4. Contexts, use, iconography and meaning

Cypriot figures differ from other classes of finds at Naukratis in their period of use, subject matter and through the contexts in which they were found. Whilst Egyptian and Greek figurative representations of humans and animals are known from Naukratis, they were not commonly found in the Greek sanctuaries of Naukratis in secure 7th and early 6th century BC contexts, unlike the Cypriot figurines. Insights into the uses and meaning of the Cypriot figures from Naukratis may be gained from the subjects they depict, from the rare dedicatory inscriptions some of them bear and from what information we can gather on their use-lives, particularly their deposition. As argued above, the range of materials and techniques represented betrays the figures’ origins and reflects the changing needs and practices of traders and travellers who brought these figurines to Naukratis from the Cypriot towns of Salamis, Kition, Amathus and Paphos.

Whilst some of the figures were purchased by Petrie or Hogarth and thus lack a secure findspot, the majority (and all those with a known excavated context) come from one of five areas of the site:

1. Levels in the Aphrodite sanctuary of the Saite and later periods: original deposits in the temple area (Φ1, 2, 3, 16, 17), outside of the temple area (Φ4), by the altar (Φ8) and in wells 1 and 2 (ΦA & B); also redeposited fills (Φ5, 7, 10) and fills under the second temple (Φ6, 9, 11); and levels of subsequent periods down to Hellenistic times (Φ12, 13, 14).
2. The sanctuary of Hera (a figure of Ptah-Patek, Fig. 45).
3. Deposits in the sanctuary of Apollo, bothros strata AΠ1–5.
4. A deposit in the eastern area of the town, possibly consisting of material from the sanctuaries of Apollo and Hera redeposited through activity in ancient (5th century BC?) and/or modern times, prior to Petrie’s work at the site.
5. Deposits in the Hellenion precinct in the ‘lowest (archaic) levels’ (Gutch 1898–9, 82) and Hellenistic levels.

Cypriot figures thus appear almost exclusively as dedications in Greek sanctuaries, having been found by altars, in wells, redeposited in bothroi following sanctuary clearances and in tertiary deposits resulting from later sanctuary building developments. Most represent male or female worshippers and/or sacrificial offerings of live young animals. In addition, there are rare Egyptianizing figures of sphinxes (sanctuary of Aphrodite) and of Ptah (sanctuary of Hera), made in Kition or Amathus, as well as three centaur ‘toys’ (dedicated in the sanctuary of Aphrodite). Cypro-Classical figures of temple boys, of a kalathos-wearing enthroned ‘Great...
Goddess’ or priestess, and Tanagra-style females represent later fashions or traditions.

The rich body of Cypriot figures from Naukratis represents hundreds of acts of individual worship and acts of devotion to a deity. Some light is shed on the possible mechanics (and motives) of this ritual practice by the anecdote of the Greek trader Herostratus of Naukratis who, at the time of “the twenty-third Olympiad...having sailed round many lands, ...touched also at Paphos in Cyprus. There he bought a statuette of Aphrodite, a span high, of archaic style, and went off with it to Naukratis...and having sacrificed to the goddess, and dedicated the image to Aphrodite, he called his friends and relations to a banquet in the temple itself.”

The argument that traders regularly picked up figures en route is supported by excavations of contemporary shipwrecks, which have yielded votive figures that apparently never made it to their destination. It appears that it was just as usual to offer Cypriot figures when arriving via Cyprus, as it was common to dedicate Greek pottery in sanctuaries when travelling from or via Miletos or Chios. Indeed, the study of the Cypriot figurines from Naukratis presented here lends support to a link between ‘Aphrodite’s landing site’ at Paphos and the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Naukratis that is suggested in the story of Herostratus, as five terracotta female ‘goddess’ figures of Paphos type and fabric have been found in the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Naukratis.

Equal quantities of male and female figures are represented at Naukratis, with 44% women, 43% men, 2% baby boys and 11% animals and fantastic creatures. Male figures are more commonly made of stone and female figures in terracotta. However, figures of women were not necessarily also offered by women. Of the three extant stone figures with Greek inscriptions, all name men as dedicants, even though one is a representation of a woman. Two of these pieces, dedications to Aphrodite by Polyermos and Kallias in the early 6th century BC, were found within the sanctuary of Aphrodite by the altar just north of the temple.

What else do we know about the dedicants of the figures? The Greek inscriptions and the fact that the figures were dedicated in Greek sanctuaries identified by Herodotus as Greek foundations and attested by the archaeological record (notably the inscribed Greek pottery) to have been frequented by Greek worshippers, makes it most likely that it was (East) Greek traders and travellers who dedicated the Cypriot figurines.

---

218 Despite Archaic shipwrecks being relatively rare in comparison to later periods, figurines are known from a number of shipwrecks (Panvini 2001, 35, 60–1, fig. 40; Parker 1992, 17, 527, see 84 on Cadiz F and 438 on Tyre G). Figurines were also found on wrecks of later periods (Parker 1992, 134, 189, 197, 401, 453). Others shipwrecks yielded lamps (Parker 1992, 146, 151, 456) or fine ware vessels (Parker 1992, 175, 192) that could have been offered at sanctuaries in place of figurines.
219 See the chapters on Naukratis: a city and trading port in Egypt, Ceramic inscriptions and Chian pottery.
220 Homer, Odyssey viii.362.
221 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, RES.88.48 and British Museum, 1888,0601.20.
However, we cannot be certain that such figures were dedicated exclusively by Greeks, since other groups – including Cypriots – may also have had access to these temples. In fact, the find of two Cypro-syllabic graffiti on Classical Greek pottery in the Hellenion show this explicitly. As noted above, the Hellenion moreover yielded a Classical statuette of Herakles made by a Cypriot sculptor. Cypriots and Phoenicians themselves may have brought and dedicated some of the figures, which were popular and were also used in the same way in Cypriot and Phoenician sanctuaries. As is well attested, both Cypriots and Phoenicians were in close contact with each other and both traded with Egypt in the late 7th and 6th centuries BC. Could the concentration of 115 Cypriot figures in the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Naukratis be explained by the presence of Cypriot and Phoenician traders at this sanctuary, in addition to Greek visitors? Might this temple have been a particularly pertinent destination for someone travelling from Cyprus – and if so, why was it omitted from Herodotus’ list of Greek sanctuaries at Naukratis?

Another consideration is whether particular figure types were more common in specific sanctuaries and if certain representations were more appropriate for individual deities. Whilst it is tempting to associate for example the single representation of Ptah with the Hera cult at Naukratis as similar figures were also found in the Herion in Samos, this is only a single piece. Also the association of lion tamer figures from Naukratis with Apollo Milesius is not supported by their distribution. No lion tamers were found in the Apollo sanctuary, but they were found in the Aphrodite sanctuary, in the east part of the town (adjacent to the Hellenion, Apollo and Hera sanctuaries) and in the ‘south site’. Almost all the terracotta and stone Cypriot figure types were represented in the Aphrodite sanctuary, and many of them were found in the much smaller assemblage in the sanctuary of Apollo. Indeed even the female to male ratio of figurines in both these two sanctuaries is even. The town, Hellenion and Hera sanctuary assemblages are too small to compare, for although the assemblages from the different sanctuaries are broadly contemporary, the assemblages for each sanctuary are of very different sizes. This was partially determined by the state of preservation of each sanctuary when discovered and excavated by Petrie, Gardner and Hogarth. Nevertheless, there seems to have been no particular relation between the iconography of the figures and the deity that they were offered to at Naukratis.

---

223 British Museum, 1900.0214.17 and Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1912.29; see the chapter on Ceramic inscriptions, section 6, and Höckmann and Möller 2006, 13.
224 Both Phoenician and Ionian ships are mentioned in the customs accounts preserved on the ‘Elephantine Papyrus’ dated 475 BC or 454 BC (Porten and Yardeni 1993, §C1.1 and §C3.7; Yardeni 1994, 67–78; Tal 2009, 1, 8). The scarcity of Cypriot and Phoenician inscribed dedications in comparison to East Greek inscriptions may represent an actual imbalance between the representation of these different groups at Naukratis, or the absence of a Phoenician or Cypriot sanctuary at Naukratis (or indeed its discovery). Alternatively, the bias in the archaeological record could be partially explained by different dedicatory practices that affected the choices of objects (pottery or figures) for dedication and their modification (adding an inscription or not).
225 At the point of writing. Further pieces may be identified in future.
226 Ebbinghaus 2006, 201. Ebbinghaus suggests that the Greeks correlated Hera with Egyptian Mut, Hathor and Isis.
227 Two additional contemporary Greek figures of Ptah are known, but they have no provenance to associate them with a Greek sanctuary (Rhodian, Ashmolean Museum AN1886.499 and Samian, British Museum, 1886.0401.1441).
228 Nick 2001; Höckmann 2013, 370–1, 374. For alternative identifications see Senff 2004; 2009, 224; Buddle and Nicholls 1964, 6.
229 Nick 2006, Type 1.5; British Museum, 1886.0401.1381; 1888.0601.27; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR.5.1899.
Ultimately, all we can be (reasonably) sure about is the origin of the dedications, rather than who dedicated them (with the exception of rare instances). Unlike on Rhodes, in Cyprus and in the Levant we do not know of any Cypriot pieces from the (mostly Classical and later) cemetery of Naukratis that might have provided further clues as to an individual’s identity. Nevertheless, for travellers to Egypt from Cyprus, the sanctuary of Aphrodite was apparently the most popular place to dedicate Cypriot figures, although smaller numbers were also found in the sanctuaries of Apollo and Hera (probably under-represented) and (mostly in later periods) in the Hellenion. Outside Naukratis, a small number of figures are also known from Thonis-Herakleion, Saqqara, Memphis and Sais. The tradition of bringing (and dedicating) Cypriot figures to Egypt continued until the founding of Alexandria, despite a significant drop during the first Persian period.

5. Conclusions

Stone and terracotta figures served a range of functions at Naukratis, but the Cypriot pieces had a very specific purpose as votive dedications, presumably offered to the greatest extent by visitors to the site at the Greek sanctuaries of Apollo and Hera, the Hellenion and particularly the sanctuary of Aphrodite. Whilst we can see in these figures the adoption of Egyptianizing features by Cypriot craftsmen that was probably a result of political or economic relations intertwined with chains of supply and demand mediated by (as well as directly involving) Greek and Phoenician traders, they do not, however, necessarily imply any far-reaching cultural or religious integration between Egypt and the Mediterranean world. There are distinctive differences, notably in terms of iconography and find contexts, between the substantial bodies of Egyptian figures at Naukratis on the one hand and the Cypriot terracotta and limestone figures on the other (as discussed elsewhere in more detail, see introduction chapter on stone and terracotta figures and the chapter on Egyptian Late Period figures). We can observe different patterns of ritual use for these two distinct groups, with little or no overlap in the distribution and use of figures from different origins that may have signified emulation or copying.

The Cypriot figures from Naukratis mirror forms and practices attested also at other Eastern Mediterranean, Greek and Phoenician sites. A number of styles are represented that derive from a range of Cypriot production centres, which were also important entrepôts that distributed goods produced in and traded by Cyprus. At Naukratis the figures were probably...

231 Cypro-Archaic figures in stone and terracottas account for 28% of objects from the sanctuary of Aphrodite. However, Greek pottery from this sanctuary is under-represented (large quantities of pottery from the sanctuary of Aphrodite were brought back from Egypt in boxes labelled with “Φ” context numbers after the 1884–5 season, information which was apparently lost when the pieces were subsequently distributed to museums by the Egypt Exploration Fund); Nevertheless, this contrasts significantly with the very low proportion of Cypro-Archaic figures in stone and terracottas represented in the Apollo sanctuary (<2%), the Hellenion (2%), Hera sanctuary (1%), the Dioskouroi sanctuary (0%) and the town (3%).
232 Gutch 1898–9, 71–2.
234 Comparisons between Cypriot and Egyptian figurine usage is discussed further in the introductory chapter.
offered by travellers coming from or via Cyprus and possibly belonging to different ethnic groups, though their destination, as far as we can tell so far, was exclusively the Greek sanctuaries of Naukratis, and the only securely attested dedicants appear to be Greeks. The figures produced between 575–525 BC in Cyprus and transported to Naukratis are increasingly ‘Greek’ in style, in comparison to the Cypro-Archaic forms that came before. This is a common feature in Cypriot figurine production at this time, but may also represent, as has been argued, production specifically for Greek customers. 235

![Graph showing the distribution of Cypriot terracotta and stone figures found at Naukratis over time](image)

Both the limestone and the terracotta figures derive primarily from the areas of Salamis and Kition (and possibly Amathus), with a few examples from Paphos. The earliest imports of c. 620–590 BC arrive from Salamis, although examples from Paphos and Kition/Amathus probably appear at the same time or shortly after. Both male and female worshippers are depicted, as well as chariot groups, riders and animals (possibly representing offerings). Limestone figures gain prominence around c. 600–570 BC, but terracotta figures remain present, too. The limestone was probably sourced from quarries between Kition and Salamis, but particularly the latter; both sites also provide good parallels for the figure types from Naukratis. Limestone and alabaster figures continue to be important in the period c. 575–525 BC, but tail off after c. 560 BC. The peak in the dedication of Cypriot figures in 620–570/560 BC coincides with a peak in Chian and Corinthian pottery, dedicated in the same sanctuaries, which was also followed by a rapid decline (see the chapters on Chian pottery and Corinthian pottery).

By the Persian period, Cypriot figure dedications are rare, compared to dedications of East Greek and other Greek figures (see the chapter on Greek terracotta figures) and Greek pottery, though some examples are 235 Jenkins 2001, 177.
still found in the Hellenion and the Aphrodite sanctuary. The few Cypriot figures that arrive are now in a Greek style. They mostly date to the 4th century BC, with a small peak of activity perhaps during the reign of Nectanebo I (whose particular interest in Naukratis is attested by his ‘decree of Sais’ of 380 BC). In the Macedonian period an increase in Cypriot (as well as Greek and East Greek) figures may reflect increased trade links with Cyprus in the period before Alexandria was fully established. The sole inscribed piece from the 4th century BC is a dedication by Aristion to Herakles in the Hellenion. The practice of dedicating Cypriot, or indeed non-local figures in general, ceases around 300 BC. In all likelihood this indicates that ‘international’ traders, including those travelling from Cyprus, now only rarely reached Naukratis. Alexandria had become their main port of trade, where new temples to Greek gods were being constructed to serve foreign travellers to Egypt.

236 Bomhard 2012.