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1. Introduction

Naukratis was a settlement in which many inhabitants adhered to Egyptian religious and cultural practices common in the Nile Delta. The Egyptian limestone and terracotta figures of the period c. 620–250 BC are an important group among the finds from Naukratis because they provide a clear link with native Egyptian practices at a settlement commonly misinterpreted as essentially Greek especially in its early phases. They comprise typical Lower Egyptian types also found at other contemporary settlements, notably representations of nude female (Fig. 1), ithyphallic males (Fig. 2) and Bes figures (Fig. 3) – in fact, phallic and ‘erotic’ figures used to be commonly known as ‘Naukratite figures’ because of the ‘great quantity of indecent statuettes’ uncovered at the site.

Despite their prominence, the c. 473 Egyptian figures from Naukratis remained little understood. This chapter will establish their typology, chart their chronological development and investigate their production, use and meaning. In particular it will place the use of Egyptian figures at Naukratis within its Lower Egyptian context. Detailed examination and critical evaluation of relevant parallels and their find contexts from across Egypt and beyond further help to resolve the problems presented by the current poor understanding and patchy publication of Late Period figures to date.

A better interpretation of the processes involved in both the production and the consumption of the figures is key to understanding their development and significance in technical, cultural/social, religious and economic terms. Production of Late Period Egyptian terracotta figures at Naukratis encompassed a variety of techniques: hand-made, mould-made figure-plaques and mould-made figures. In contrast, the carved soft limestone figures appear to belong to a single tradition, albeit with chronological changes regarding carving technique and style. There are no easily accessible local sources of limestone in Naukratis, but limestone figure production is well attested in the Memphite area, particularly Saqqara, which may have been the source for many if not all of the Egyptian limestone figures found at Naukratis.

The Late Period terracotta figures were made exploiting a range of techniques for fashioning, decorating and firing, using Nile silt fabrics that are very close to those used for other locally produced (Naukratite) pottery.

---

1. There is currently no evidence to suggest that figures from Naukratis predate c. 620 BC, though many figures have parallels from other sites from earlier periods. The terracotta and limestone figure industries of the Late Period persist into the beginning of the Ptolemaic period before their production ceases entirely. These later figurines are included in the present chapter because the continuation of these older industries is distinct from new figure industries of the late 4th century BC onwards, which are discussed in another chapter (see the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures, coffin-fittings and models). All images in this chapter, unless otherwise indicated, are © Trustees of the British Museum.

2. Despite the large numbers found, they were barely mentioned by Petrie (1886a, 13–16, 40, 44–5), Gardner (1888, 55–7), Gutch (1898–9, 69–71, 95, nos 271–80) or Edgar (1905a, 127–33). Bailey correctly (if broadly) dated and provenanced many of the Naukratis pieces in the British Museum (Bailey 2008).

3. Despite the large numbers found, they were barely mentioned by Petrie (1886a, 13–16, 40, 44–5), Gardner (1888, 55–7), Gutch (1898–9, 69–71, 95, nos 271–80) or Edgar (1905a, 127–33). Bailey correctly (if broadly) dated and provenanced many of the Naukratis pieces in the British Museum (Bailey 2008).

4. The dating of many pieces was contested, though the emergence of pieces from stratified archaeological contexts has recently resolved many issues (Redmount and Friedman 1997, 63–5; Spencer 2008; Bailey 2008). Numerous refinements are still required to the chronology and interpretation elaborated upon here that can only be resolved through future detailed contextual archaeological analysis.
and terracotta objects. Production at Naukratis is confirmed by finds of moulds and wasters found in the town (Fig. 4), and supported by the presence of numerous copies of the same mould series. However, fabric and style alone do not suffice for assigning figures to Naukratite production. Figures rarely travelled beyond the settlement of their production in Late Period Egypt. However, pieces made using the same techniques, in the same ‘style’ and depicting the same subjects are known across a wide area of Lower Egypt and some stone figures were probably transported. For example, some limestone pieces were probably brought to Naukratis from the Memphite region (Fig. 5). Also (although very rarely) terracotta figures from the same mould series were found at both Naukratis and Memphis. The vast range of material known from Memphis and Saqqara is so close to the large assemblage from Naukratis that these three archaeological sites may be considered as following the same chronological development from c. 620 to 250 BC in as far as the separate, but related, aspects of innovation and adoption of technology, material, technique, decoration, style and subject are concerned. Clearly there were close links between the Memphite area and Naukratis at this time, though there were also subtle differences. However, the large quantities of material from Saqqara, Memphis and Naukratis should not lead us to ignore similar, but more modest assemblages found at other sites in the western Nile Delta.

The scale of production, the adoption of new or foreign technologies and other innovations were driven primarily by demand. It is clear that there was a significant need for Egyptian religious objects for the domestic sphere at Naukratis, just as there was a demand for (often more expensive) traditional Egyptian offerings for the grand Egyptian temple precinct of Amun-Ra. The local repertoire encompasses a limited range of subjects, particularly nude females, ithyphallic males, riders and animals. These often represented Egyptian deities (Isis-Hathor, Harpokrates, Bes) or depicted offerings or sacrifices and were concerned with Egyptian religious votive and magical practices. Figures follow the fashions of their time, representing the demands of their consumers: hair styles, facial hair, jewellery and clothes, potentially being important markers of identity.

As is set out in more detail below, the ritual use of many figures is indicated by the contexts in which they were found – certain figure types were discovered in Greek sanctuaries or Egyptian temple votive deposits and caches – or by other evidence that points to their utilization in magico-medical rites and in domestic religion. Many of these rituals were

---

5 British Museum EA68849; Bailey 2008, no. 3263. Two early Ptolemaic workshops (sites ‘38’ and ‘95’) identified in the north-eastern industrial area of Naukratis by Petrie and Hogarth, which may have been built over, or developed from, earlier workshops, are discussed in the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures, coffin-fittings and models.
6 Products cast from the same mould, or mould copies.
7 The style is identical to that of Memphis and other Nile Delta sites.
8 One example from Naukratis (Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA603) is from the same mould (or mould series) as another example found at Memphis (Petrie 1909b, pl. 40, no. 46).
9 These are discussed in full in part 9 of this chapter ‘Beyond Naukratis’, where notably Schedia and Buto are discussed.
10 See the chapter on Bronze votive offerings and the forthcoming chapter on Egyptian sculpture.
11 See Marchi 2014, 97–100, on Tell el-Herr.
12 Petrie 1886a, 13–16; Gardner 1888, 55–7; Gutch 1898–9, 71; Edgar 1905a, 131.
everyday practices that are culturally specific and represent different types of identity (ethnic, gender and status); they reflect the interaction between individuals at Naukratis with Egyptian supernatural powers or deities who were being worshipped, consulted, celebrated or otherwise called upon. In some cases they indicate locally, or regionally (western Nile Delta), specific customs, but in others they appear to reflect more general Egyptian practice.

Tracing the continuation, adoption or abandonment of practices associated with Late Period figures contributes to our understanding of the immediate concerns and beliefs of a significant element within the population of Naukratis during what was a politically volatile and culturally innovative period.

2. Excavation, collection and publication

The Egyptian figures from Naukratis remain a little known and little studied group despite their quantity and importance. This can be put down to a number of factors. First, the brief publications of the early excavators of Naukratis, Petrie, Gardner and Hogarth gave more space to the Greek and Cypriot finds13 than the numerous distinctly Egyptian artefacts typical for the Nile Delta.14 Second, much of what has been written about the Egyptian limestone and terracotta figures from Naukratis in the past is now outdated or must be considered erroneous. Third, the study of these figurines is today hampered by the fact that some figures have been lost, sold or destroyed, others have lost their provenance or been attributed to an incorrect one, and many possess no specific excavation or contextual information whatsoever. This is further compounded by the lack of adequate recording of finds, though this problem is partly offset by information from the excavators’ unpublished notebooks and diaries, which have been so useful for reacquainting many artefacts with their correct provenance (see the chapter on Cypriot stone and terracotta figures). Finally, no previous study has ever attempted to consider the whole assemblage from Naukratis, a task that until now had been near impossible because of the finds’ distribution across the globe, compounded by their occasional mislabelling within various collections.

This, and the poor recording and publication of Petrie’s (closely related) Memphis excavations, have had particularly negative effects on our understanding of domestic religion of the late Saite to Ptolemaic periods in Lower Egypt, despite extensive material already having been available for study in various collections from the late 19th century.

---

13 Petrie 1886a, 13–16; Gardner 1888, 55–7; Gutch 1898–9, 71; Edgar 1903, 1–3, 18, 27, 32; Edgar 1905a, 131.
14 See the chapters on Egyptian Bronze votive offerings, Egyptian Late Period pottery, Offering spoons and the forthcoming chapter on scarabs, scaraboids and amulets.
2.1 Victorian collecting, attitudes and research

Victorian scholarship took little notice of the Late Period Egyptian figures, being more interested in the Greek or Cypriot objects, an attitude which has had a lasting effect on the state of the discipline today. The Egyptian figures were mentioned only vaguely in the brief publications and unpublished notebooks of the excavators and their findspots were rarely recorded. In addition, many of the Late Period Egyptian figures distributed later by the Egypt Exploration Fund were registered long after their acquisition by museums and sometimes supplied with a confused or erroneous provenance.

Many Egyptian figures from Naukratis were thought inappropriate for scholarly or general audiences and museums had no interest in displaying them to the public. This particularly concerns those figures that represent macrophallic (also called ‘ithyphallic’) males or erotic groups and that soon became synonymous with Naukratis. To Victorians these sexually explicit ‘Naukratite’ figures were ‘erotica’ and the study of them and related topics suffered: ‘the prudery of early excavators led to shrines of phallic cults being inadequately recorded, or them misconstruing the data according to their own prejudices, phalli were assumed to be from a late and “decadent” period.’ At Naukratis excavators noted the existence of such figures only obliquely and in passing; in his discussion of figures from the 1898–9 season, Gutch writes that the ‘large number of indecent types … perhaps ought to be added to the list, but a discussion of their types is profitless’. Similarly Edgar states: ‘The site … has produced a great quantity of indecent statuettes of various ages and in various materials. There is a large terracotta … in the Cairo Museum … which represents a procession …, the chief personage holds a musical instrument and his phallus is supported by four women (sic).’ This prudery did not apply to the ‘non-erotic’ nude female figures: ‘the necklace, bracelets, armlets, and garlands … were this damsel’s only attire … this delightful little statuette represents a dancing-girl, adorned in the flower wreaths for which Naukratis was famous throughout the world’.

In both early and recent scholarship, many female ‘Baubo’ figures (Fig. 6) were identified as components of ‘Greek ritual’, because of the assumed nature of Naukratis as a Greek colony, a misconception that has influenced

---

13 See Petrie 1886a and Gutch 1898–9.
14 The scale of the excavations and the difficult circumstances under which they were conducted mean that precise contextual information was often not recorded for objects from Naukratis. Careful analysis of the artefacts, object markings (field numbers), publications, notebooks and excavation diaries has revealed that even the smallest figure fragments from Naukratis were saved, often with better contextual information than was usual for the time and superior to that for other finds groups collected by the excavators. We can now distinguish between figure types commonly found in workshops, houses, Greek and Egyptian sanctuaries, down wells and in graves, enabling the modelling of use patterns across the site for different periods. Whilst we have such findspot information for some Late Period Egyptian figures, this is rare in comparison to that for the Cypriot and Greek material found in Greek sanctuaries that were excavated and recorded with a higher level of precision than other areas (see the chapters on Cypriot and Greek figures).
16 Montserrat 1996, 174; see Bailey 2008, no. 3218; contra Dunand 1990, no. 806, no. 804; fig. 4.7.
17 Gutch 1898–9, 95, nos 271–80.
18 Edgar 1905a, 130 (the women are male priests).
19 Edwards 1885b, 278.
20 Petrie 1886a, 40 on the association with Baubo; contra Edgar 1905a, 129.
the interpretation of the dating, use and meaning of these figures. Also the rarer rider figures, figures of fantastic creatures, musicians and animals are disproportionately well represented in the publications as the excavators felt obliged to discuss some of this local material, even if it was less representative of the actual assemblage than the ‘erotic’ and ‘phallic figures: ‘The horsemen are rather common, and are perhaps the rudest of all these classes; the man’s head is generally quite unformed’.24

Most figures were not immediately apparent within the various museum collections that housed Naukratis material, as they had not been registered or published or had an incorrect provenance or date. The fact that many were distributed by the Egypt Exploration Fund decades after the fieldwork and the long time it took many museums to register (sometimes incorrectly) the Late Period figures have resulted in an under-representation of these in subsequent scholarship. The process of cataloguing Naukratis artefacts, including over 2,050 stone and terracotta figures, for the present project has resulted in reincorporating into the Naukratis assemblage nearly 500 stone and terracotta figures, for the present project has resulted in reincorporating into the Naukratis assemblage nearly 500 stone and terracotta figures dating to the Late Period or beginning of the Ptolemaic period that would have otherwise not been considered as from Naukratis. In conjunction with the research and programmes of inventorization undertaken by curators of collaborating museums, this means that over 170 previously unknown or unprovenanced Late Period figures could be added to the Naukratis corpus discussed here (Fig. 7).25 Also some of the figurines from the same mould series as figures known to come from Naukratis (Fig. 8, example from Naukratis) that remain unprovenanced because of unclear acquisition information could in fact be from Naukratis. This ‘detective work’ has not just provided additional comparative, contextual and dating evidence, but also greatly increased the size of the corpus, highlighting the significance of Egyptian figures in Late Period Naukratis. It forces us to revise our views on the demographic composition of the settlement and on the meaning these figures held for the people of Lower Egypt.27

2.2 Modern scholarship

In 1885 Amelia Edwards published two short notes on ‘the terra-cottas of Naukratis’, stating that the figures would ‘be distributed among various museums, and, scattered far and wide…. never again will it be possible to compare them one with another, except in photographs or engravings’.28 Previous studies have been hindered by this distribution, with no single

---

23 The ‘pseudo-Baubo’, also known as ‘female beneficent demon’ type is now more specifically considered a Ptolemaic and Roman phenomenon (Bailey 2008, 43–7 with extensive bibliography; see the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman terracotta figures).
24 Petrie 1886a, 40; see also Gutch 1898–9.
25 At the British Museum 107 Late Period figures, previously separated into the Museum Secretum because of the ‘indecent’ subject matter depicted, were reincorporated into the Naukratis assemblage between 1965 and 2012 on the basis of distribution lists, museum registers, object marking, the study of terracotta fabrics and the known Naukratite mould series. At the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, 61 pieces sent by the Egypt Exploration Fund in 1914 had been given an incorrect Antinoopolis provenance resulting in an erroneous Roman date, see note 40 below.
26 Unprovenanced pieces within the Louvre, transferred from the Musee Guimet (Dunand 1990, see nos 143, 249–51, 625) and within Dresden and Tübingen Museums (Fischer 1994, see nos 1–19) may yet turn out to have come from Naukratis.
28 Edwards 1885a, 261.
collection having a representative sample of Naukratis material. With all known and accessible objects from the site, held in over 70 locations worldwide, now catalogued as part of the Naukratis project, it is once more possible to compare all excavated figures and to assess them in their totality and, at least broadly, in their original contexts.

In the meantime, a large body of research in museum catalogues has significantly advanced our understanding of individual objects from Naukratis, and also from comparable sites such as Memphis and Saqqara. The publication of such figures from a number of reliable Late Period and early Ptolemaic contexts from excavations, particularly in the Nile Delta, has grown significantly in the last 20 years. This means that the erroneous Roman period dating or misleading interpretations concerning the figurines' cultural significance or origin as in some way foreign, specifically Greek, can both now be discounted. Chronologies can also be refined, although there are clearly many questions left to answer.

In consequence, the phallic and erotic figures that had acquired the label ‘Naukratic figures’ and that had erroneously been associated with Greek culture can now be considered in a new light. As is argued in detail below, they are a diverse group of figures that is very much a Lower Egyptian phenomenon of the Late Period and early Ptolemaic period, the product of a variety of developments and influences from the 7th to the 3rd centuries BC. The few examples known from the ‘Greek world’ come from areas where Egyptian cults were celebrating the Egyptian New Year festivals, established under Ptolemaic rule such as with Cyprus or the result of a

---

29 As is set out in more detail in the chapter on Reconstructing a 19th-century excavation, the British Museum collection has a significant bias towards material from the Egypt Exploration Fund excavations of 1884–6, whilst the Museum of Classical Archaeology and the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge hold predominantly material from Hogarth’s 1898–9 excavations and the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford houses most of the finds from Hogarth’s 1903 fieldwork. The different research foci of each season have influenced the assemblage in each institution. There are thus great dangers in discussing the character of the material if one does not draw upon all the available evidence from all excavations and surveys in different areas and different periods of the site’s occupation. These problems are of course not specific to Naukratis.

30 Although the long years since have resulted in a number of casualties, with objects being destroyed, lost, or their provenance misattributed.

31 Most notably Don Bailey’s British Museum catalogue of 2008 incorporated previously unattributed Naukratis pieces that he registered during his time as curator in the British Museum. This to a large degree laid the foundation for my own research in this area.

32 Ashton’s work on Petrie’s large and comparable Memphis terracotta assemblage in the Petrie Museum was hindered by Petrie’s poor excavation records and by imprecise museum registers (Ashton 2003a, 73).

33 Martin 1981, 27, 89; Ashton 2003a, 73; Redmount and Friedman 1997, 63–5; Ballet 2011, 108–9, fig. 59; Spencer 2014, 53–4, 175, 178, 276–7; Marchi 2014, 97–8; For early Ptolemaic figures see Szymańska 2005. See section 9 ‘Beyond Naukratis’ below on excavated pieces from Tell el-Herr, Tell el-Dab’a, Schedia, Tell Atrib, Tanis, Buto and other sites. I am indebted to a number of researchers for sharing their unpublished work at Bubastis (V. Vaelske), Herakleion (S. Heinz), Schedia (M. Bergmann), Buto (P. Ballet) and Sais (P. Wilson).

34 The circular argument that they were the product of Greek influence because of Naukratis’ status as a ‘Greek settlement’, or represent Greek-influenced homosexual iconography (Myśliwiec 1997, 134; Masoud 2014, 26), should be discounted, as such figures had a wide distribution across Late Period and early Ptolemaic Lower Egypt.

35 It is hoped that this tentative step to develop typologies tracing the chronology of these pieces will soon be supplemented by the publication of studies currently underway on figures from contemporary Egyptian sites. Specialists working on terracottas have set up the Coroplastic Studies Interest Group to accelerate research on all groups of terracotta objects from different regions and periods.

36 Karageorghis 1984, 219, pl. 42.3, fig. 2, Louvre no. 2114.
long period of Egyptian contact, as with Delos.\textsuperscript{37} The phallic and erotic ‘Naukratis figures’ do not represent ‘Greek’ influence in Egypt, but instead represent the presence of Egyptian cults also in a Greek environment.

### 2.3 Issues of dating

The dating of many of the Naukratis pieces (or their parallels) discussed in this chapter has historically been vague, with scholars often resigning themselves to broad terms such as ‘Late Period to Ptolemaic’ or ‘Greco-Roman’. This highly unsatisfactory practice is due in part to the scarcity of stratified data, but also to a failure to engage with and reassess existing (often unpublished and difficult to access) evidence. This problem was compounded by the erroneous attribution of some Late Period Naukratis figures (dated c. 600–330 BC), distributed by the Egypt Exploration Fund in 1914 (Fig. 9),\textsuperscript{38} to Antinoopolis, founded c. AD 130.\textsuperscript{39} Researchers relying upon provenanced pieces from museum collections trusted this Antinoopolis provenance,\textsuperscript{40} resulting in considerable confusion in the scholarly assessment of the dating and meaning of phallic figures in Late Period and ‘Greco-Roman’ Egypt, though an earlier date is now generally accepted for these pieces.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{37} Barrett 2011, 433, whose interpretation relies on the assumption that all such figures represent individuals or concepts relating to these festivities and that they lack alternative, or indeed multiple, meanings as outlined above.

\textsuperscript{38} The Fitzwilliam Museum did not receive Antinopolis figurines from the Egypt Exploration Fund (O’Connell pers. comm.). The location of Antinopolis finds from these early excavations is published by O’Connell (2014a, 445). Few, exclusively Roman, terracotta figures were discovered by the Egypt Exploration Fund excavations of Antinopolis in 1914. The excavator’s and Egypt Exploration Fund’s records suggest that the few figurines found that season were photographed (and now in Manchester) and none are of this early type or represented in the Fitzwilliam assemblage (O’Connell 2014a, 445, 460; O’Connell 2014b). All the 44 terracotta figures are of types and fabrics already attested at Naukratis. Of the phallic terracottas, 29 are from mould series attested and probably made at Naukratis (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, e.79.1914, e.89.1914, e.113.1914, e.115.1914, e.122.1914, e.126.1914, e.127.1914, e.143.1914, e.87.1914, e.94.1914, e.95.1914, e.107.1914, e.111.1914, e.112.1914, e.122.1914, e.124.1914, e.141.1914, e.144.1914, e.145.1914, e.147.1914, e.82.1914, e.92.1914, e.105.1914, e.117.1914, e.121.1914, e.123.1914, e.133.1914, e.142.1914, e.81.1914). Two mould-fragments are preserved for these types from Naukratis (British Museum, 1886,0401.12, 1886,0401.1541). Two hand-made pieces are of an identical production only known from Naukratis to date (e.119.1914, e.98.1914; compare British Museum, 1973,0501.12, 1973,0501.18; Royal Museum of Art and History, Brussel, A.1836; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.386). Also, the two Ptolemaic nude pregnant female ‘Baubo’ figures are from the same mould series as pieces found at Naukratis (e.104.1914, e.86.1914). Only four pieces are actually of Roman date (e.106.1914, e.108.1914, e.150.1914, e.149.1914). The 23 limestone phallic figures are unlikely to have been made at Naukratis, as the source of limestone and thus most likely the workshops were probably in the Memphite region, but they are all of types commonly found at Naukratis (e.84.1914, e.85.1914, e.88.1914, e.90.1914, e.93.1914, e.96.1914, e.97.1914, e.99.1914, e.100.1914, e.101.1914, e.103.1914, e.110.1914, e.118.1914, e.120.1914, e.128.1914, e.129.1914, e.130.1914, e.131.1914, e.132.1914, e.134.1914, e.137.1914, e.138.1914, e.139.1914). It is thus reasonable to conclude that these, too, were found at Naukratis.

\textsuperscript{39} First identified by Bailey as a problematic provenance (2008), this group consists mostly of ithyphallic figures with 19 dated 600–300 BC and 39 dated 500–200 BC as well as five standard Ptolemaic and four Roman figures (see the chapter of \textit{Ptolemaic and Roman terracotta figures}). A further 61 figures in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge had been erroneously registered in 1914 as coming from Antinopolis (E.1914 sequence). Whilst there was a previous settlement in Antinopolis before Hadrian, only a few Ptolemaic sherds have been identified and the excavations had concentrated on the substantial Roman and Byzantine contexts.

\textsuperscript{40} This highly unsatisfactory practice is due in part to the scarcity of stratified data, but also to a failure to engage with and reassess existing (often unpublished and difficult to access) evidence. This problem was compounded by the erroneous attribution of some Late Period Naukratis figures (dated c. 600–330 BC), distributed by the Egypt Exploration Fund in 1914 (Fig. 9),\textsuperscript{38} to Antinopolis, founded c. AD 130.\textsuperscript{39} Researchers relying upon provenanced pieces from museum collections trusted this Antinopolis provenance,\textsuperscript{40} resulting in considerable confusion in the scholarly assessment of the dating and meaning of phallic figures in Late Period and ‘Greco-Roman’ Egypt, though an earlier date is now generally accepted for these pieces.\textsuperscript{41}
The figures themselves have distinctive features that are datable: technology and technique, style and subject. A lack of accurate and precise chronology\textsuperscript{42} for these pieces has led some scholars to be sceptical of just how useful manufacturing techniques and technology are for dating figures.\textsuperscript{43} However, a clear development of terracotta production in both Naukratis and Memphis is in fact traceable in the archaeological record, as is discussed in detail below.\textsuperscript{44} This concerns the development of manufacturing techniques, from hand-made figures, through mould-made figure-plaques, to the first solid and later hollow and vented free-standing figures. There are also developments in the selection and preparation of clay fabrics, the materials and style of painted decoration, and different firing methods determined by kiln technology. These will be discussed in detail below for each industry. A number of terracotta and limestone figures moreover include other datable features, such as specific pottery vessel forms (imported trade amphorae),\textsuperscript{45} or changing fashions of dress\textsuperscript{46} or hair,\textsuperscript{47} in addition to iconographic and stylistic features that cut across different media within the material culture of ancient Naukratis.

Close parallels from stratified deposits confirm a Late Period or early Ptolemaic period date for many of the Egyptian figures from Naukratis, with particularly close parallels found at Saqqara\textsuperscript{48} and Memphis.\textsuperscript{49} Recent publications of excavations at Tell el-Muqdam, Kom Firin, Herakleion, Mendes, Tell el-Balarnun, Tell Basta, Tanis and Tell el-Herr\textsuperscript{50} are also key for understanding the Late Period and early Ptolemaic production and distribution\textsuperscript{51} of these figures, whilst excavations at Athribis, Schedia and Alexandria are useful for understanding the end of this early Ptolemaic production. A large number of parallels for the Naukratis figurines are to be found within an important series of 4th-century phallic figures uncovered in association with the structures of the southern dependencies of the main temple complex in the sacred animal necropolis at North Saqqara, built in the mid-4th century BC.\textsuperscript{52} Further phallic figures were discovered in a mid-4th-century BC context\textsuperscript{53} and in subsequent 3rd- and 2nd-century BC layers in the area of the Anubieion at Saqqara.\textsuperscript{54}

However, the dating given in the publications of these finds needs to be reviewed critically as it is not always precise or accurate. Revisiting the

\textsuperscript{42} For example see Bailey 2008 and Török 1995.
\textsuperscript{43} Ashton 2003a.
\textsuperscript{44} Thomas and Nicholson 2013, 41–69.
\textsuperscript{45} In the case of a large group limestone figures from Sais, the depiction of a Greek Fikellura amphora of the late 6th or very early 5th century (Villing and Wilson forthcoming). Phoenician jars found on figure-plaques and Egyptian Late Period jars depicted on mould-made figures.
\textsuperscript{46} Also on some late 4th- or early 3rd-century BC figures, the Macedonian kausia and chlamys cloak is depicted on some mould-made figures and figure-plaques of boys or riders.
\textsuperscript{47} The melon coiffure, introduced after 350 BC, is found on some Egyptian figure-plaques.
\textsuperscript{48} Martin 1981.
\textsuperscript{49} Thomas and Nicholson 2013, 41–69.
\textsuperscript{50} Marchi 2014.
\textsuperscript{51} The majority of parallels however, come from only roughly provenanced, published or unpublished museum collections. These collections should not be ignored as they can still assist in understanding the regional distribution of figure types across time.
\textsuperscript{52} Associated with building activity during the 30th dynasty reign of Nectanebo II (360–340 BC) for block 3 (Martin 1973; 1981, see also block 5), supported by carbon 14 analysis (450–310 BC). A later Ptolemaic rebuild, dated 245–105 BC (carbon 14 analysis), was associated with the standard repertoire of hollow vented Ptolemaic terracotta figures also found in Naukratis (see the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures).
\textsuperscript{53} Pre-Ptolemaic levels (Phase iii, in Jeffreys et al. 1988).
\textsuperscript{54} Dated primarily by coins (Jeffreys et al. 1988), ithyphallic Harpokrates figures were concentrated in 3rd- and 2nd-century BC levels. It is not certain what proportion of the finds found within these contexts is residual.
stratigraphic sequences recorded from these excavations, two potential issues should be considered when dating material on the basis of its context. Firstly, much material is residual; objects are often found in later layers because they were redeposited at some subsequent stage, perhaps following much later building activity, a phenomenon clearly apparent at both Memphis and Saqqara. Secondly, not all material that appears to depict archaic forms is necessarily residual; archaizing features that were inspired by Late Period styles were common in the early Ptolemaic limestone figure industries of Saqqara. One should also remember in the case of the terracottas that moulds and mould series could be used for some time after the production of the first prototype.

Good contextual information is, of course, just as significant for understanding the use, function and meaning of pieces in a sanctuary, burial or domestic context, as it is for refining the dating of these artefacts. For finds from Naukratis as well as parallels from elsewhere, close critical attention to contexts thus forms the basis for many of the wider conclusions in this chapter.

2.4 Context at Naukratis

The early excavators of Naukratis found Egyptian figures across the site, though few have precise recorded findspots. Although stratigraphic levels were recognized by the excavators, clear, useful and reconstructable stratigraphic details were only recorded in relation to the Greek sanctuary structures, although artefacts found together in specific deposits, such as wells, can occasionally be reunited and were often dated by the excavators with differing levels of accuracy. The dating of the excavators Petrie and Hogarth needs to be reassessed carefully as their understanding of the sequence of Persian, Ptolemaic and Roman ceramics was not as good as the well-known Archaic and Classical Greek vases.

Most of the Late Period Egyptian figures were found outside the sanctuaries in what predominantly appears to be areas of domestic occupation (christened by Petrie as ‘the town’), particularly in the east, near the Hellenion, but also in the south, near the Great Temenos. Those found in the town – which was mostly not excavated but dug for

---

55 The archaeological deposit, dated on the basis of its latest find, offers little more than a terminus ante quem. Overreliance on coins limits an understanding of the true proportion of residual finds within a given deposit.
56 A particular issue with the substantial early Ptolemaic rebuilding projects in Egypt of both domestic and religious structures. For example excavations in the late 4th-century BC extension to Athribis near a Late Period temple and cemetery have produced blocks inscribed with the name of the 30th dynasty Pharaoh Nectanebo II (Myśliwiec 1997, 119–120; 2009, 136, n. 111), which may explain the presence of residual pieces.
57 Late Period and Ptolemaic figures were found in Roman, Late Antique, Islamic and modern deposits at Saqqara, however their occurrence within these residual deposits was rarer (very few were found in Roman deposits) than for the Late Period and early Ptolemaic period.
58 Ithyphallic Harpocrates figures (of Type L-I.6), now well known from early Ptolemaic excavated contexts, were dated to the Late Period by Martin (1981) because they have well-known Late Period precedents.
59 Petrie 1886a, 44–5; Gutch 1898–9, 69–70; Edgar 1905a, 127–9, 131–3.
60 The Ptolemaic stratigraphy was separated from earlier levels by a sandy deposit, raising the ground 8ft above the original basal mud, laid in response to rising groundwater prior to reconstruction in the Ptolemaic period (Hogarth 1898–9, 37, correctly dated Ptolemaic; Gutch 1898–9, 71, erroneously dated Roman).
61 During Hogarth’s excavations (Gutch 1898–9, 95; Hogarth et al. 1905, 129; Hogarth 1903 notebook and box list).
62 British Museum, 1886,0401.1504, location written on object.
A number of Egyptian figures were found associated with Hogarth’s ‘Southern Site’, the area around the Great Temenos. Further details from unpublished notebooks confirm that these mostly come from the area adjacent, but just outside, the Great Temenos wall, where they were possibly deposited as isolated votive offerings, or in the South Mound abutting the temenos wall. Egyptian limestone and terracotta figures were rarely found in Egyptian sanctuary deposits at Naukratis. Only three pieces were discovered in the casemate structure within the Great Temenos and one limestone rider came to light in a cache of Egyptian primarily 5th-century BC temple votives.

Whilst no standard Egyptian Late Period figurines are known to have been found within the sanctuary of Aphrodite and only three were found in the sanctuary of Apollo, Egyptian Isis-Hathor figure-plaques are known from the lowest levels of the Hellenion, where they were found alongside late 7th-, 6th- and 5th-century BC material. A figure-plaque fragment of Bes from a phallophoric procession group was also found there. Four stone rider figures were found in the south-western corner of the Hellenion and two more rider figures found down wells with ‘5th century BC’ pottery and a
one seated phallic terracotta and a stone ‘sphinx’ figure.\textsuperscript{76} The distribution of terracotta and limestone figures is however very different to that of Egyptian bronze and faience figures and amulets, which were mainly concentrated in the southern part of the town, in the Great Temenos and the bronze cache.\textsuperscript{77}

3. Typology of terracotta and stone figures

The detailed first-hand study of the finds from Naukratis together with archival documentation, as well as recent archaeological discoveries in Lower Egypt, make it possible to propose a new assessment of the chronological development of the Late Period figurines from Naukratis based on their technique of manufacture, subject, style and decoration.

Late Period Egyptian figures were made of a range of materials (limestone, a variety of terracotta fabrics and also plaster or faience), using various techniques (carved, mould-made or hand-made), technologies (different kiln conditions) and styles. The terracottas were made solid and are either three-dimensional (hand-made or made in a two-piece mould), or single mould-made figure-plaques. As is set out in more detail below, the manufacturing techniques represent workshop traditions that operated and developed over different, but overlapping, periods.\textsuperscript{78}

The typology developed here for the Naukratis material aims to provide a clear presentation of the corpus considering the use of different materials, technology and techniques by the different industries, but also the subject and style. This enables easy comparison between related subjects and styles across media, material and industry and thus throws into relief how figurines were the product of regional and international political as well as religious and socio-economic influences. The specific influences and their form are, however, difficult to discern (be they the product of the appropriation of foreign, international or multicultural features).

Clear and flexible, the typology was developed to include all Egyptian figures from Naukratis but can be supplemented and expanded as future research necessitates.

\textsuperscript{76} Hogarth 1905, 122. Two examples were found in a well deposit of the 5th century BC (Hogarth Diary 24–25/04/1903, well 2 bottom; Hogarth box list 1903, Box I and Box IV). Six limestone rider figures are listed in Hogarth’s 1903 box list (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. AN1896–1908-G.1007, AN1896–1908-G.1013, AN1896–1908-G.1039, AN1896–1908-G.1040, G.1041; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE36257). Of these, two were acquired (Box I), two were from the ‘South Site’ (in or near the Great Temenos, Box IV, bag 1) and two were from ‘Well 3’ (Box II included five undescribed stone figures, of which two are riders, one painted, as listed in Hogarth’s excavation diary). It is impossible to distinguish which two were which. The phallic figure Hogarth mentions is Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-G.4653, whilst the sphinx is probably AN1896–1908-G.72 It is not possible to locate precisely the wells from Hogarth’s 1903 season, though they appear to be in the region of the Hellenion and possibly further evidence of cleared votives from the Greek sanctuaries there. Well 1 was in the Hellenion, Well 2 is probably in or near the Hellenion, Well 3 may have been in the Hellenion, or to the south.

\textsuperscript{77} See the chapter on Bronze votive offerings and concerning the Egyptian faience figures and amulets see the forthcoming chapter on scarabs, scaraboids and amulets.

\textsuperscript{78} It was Ashton’s opinion that manufacturing techniques could not be used as a reliable dating tool for terracotta figures (Ashton 2003a, 72). The subject is complicated as there are compelling and overlapping regional styles, but nevertheless there are clear chronological sequences present within this material.
The typology arranges the figures first by material and technique of manufacture, followed by the subject, then the subject variant. For example; L-F.1.1, carved Limestone – Female figure plaque, Type 1, Variant 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Material and technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-</td>
<td>Figures carved from soft limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-</td>
<td>Hand-made terracotta figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-</td>
<td>Single-piece mould-made terracotta figure-plaques with a flat back. Made in a one-piece terracotta or plaster mould (includes composite figure-plaque and hand-made figures and figure groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-</td>
<td>Free standing and solid terracotta figures made from two or more plaster or terracotta moulds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hollow mould-made figures with a vent, characteristic of Greek imports into Egypt during the Late Period,79 are products of a technology not adopted in Egypt until the late 4th century BC and are treated in a separate chapter.80

The range of subjects depicted in Egyptian-made figures found at Naukratis is limited and repetitive. The vast majority falls into three subject groups: naked females, naked ithyphallic youths and male riders (occasionally also youths depicted ithyphallic). These figures represent characters from Egyptian religion, and often specific Egyptian deities can be identified on the basis of specific features, or followers associated with their worship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Iconography depicted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-F</td>
<td>Nude females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I</td>
<td>Ithyphallic youths, probably child-gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-E</td>
<td>Erotic symplegma couples or groups, usually incorporating ithyphallic youths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-P</td>
<td>Phallophoric procession groups incorporating ithyphallic child-gods, Bes and priests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-B</td>
<td>Bes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-R</td>
<td>Riders, including representations of ithyphallic child-gods or adult warriors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remainder make up only a small proportion of the assemblage:

- M Musicians
- S Sympotic figures
- A Animals; quadrupeds, birds and crocodiles
- H Hybrid or mythical creatures; sphinxes
- C Captives; bound, usually male
- O Miscellaneous unidentifiable, usually male, head or other fragments from the above groups

79 See the chapter on Greek terracotta figures.
80 See the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures.
In the following sections, the different types and subtypes will be presented in detail. All known examples with a secure Naukratis provenance or those pieces attributed to Naukratis on the basis of acquisition history and mould series are included in this study and compared with relevant parallels. Explanation of each piece’s attribution is provided in its catalogue entry.

Each industry is discussed in turn, before analyses of the figures’ (religious) meaning and function, their geographical distribution and the place of Naukratis in this context together with their chronological development.

The interpretation of whom the figures depict follows in section 8, but should first be introduced here. The nude female figures are often described simply as fertility or fecundity figures and are associated with female fecundity deities. Though not necessarily always representations of female fecundity deities (for they also appear on occasion to represent the devotee), they do seem to be associated with their cults. The most commonly associated deity with these figures is Hathor, and for this reason they can be called ‘Hathoric’ figures (i.e. associated with the cult of Hathor). However, identical figurines could be associated with female fecundity deities known by different names, for example Hathor, Isis, Aphrodite, Astarte or Anuket, thus the term fecundity female figurines would be more appropriate when such a cult affiliation is not known.

The ithyphallic babies or youths, usually depicted with a side-lock (when preserved), are occasionally enthroned and using hand gestures consistent with contemporary and subsequent (but non-ithyphallic) representations of Hor-pa-khered (Horus the Child) known to the Greeks and from the Ptolemaic period onwards as Harpokrates. Whilst many of these pieces have been associated with Hor-pa-khered (Harpokrates),
81 many scholars have been reticent to make this association.82 Indeed, later Roman examples have been interpreted as Horus the Child, associated with Min (often depicted phallic).83 The popularity of Egyptian child deities in the first millennium BC makes the presence of these pieces unsurprising, though various other Egyptian child gods could be suggested, such as Soumtus, Khonsu-Thoth, Harsomtu and Harpare-pa-khered.84 With this in mind it may seem safer to refer to these pieces as ithyphallic figures, belonging to the child deities’ circle. There are, however, other contextual considerations.

First, despite references to the cults of Amun, Thoth and Min at Naukratis, the Osiris-Isis-Harpokrates triad are by far the most commonly represented cult in Naukratis,85 with Hor-pa-khered (or later Harpokrates)86 by far the most commonly represented child deity from Naukratis, with only two (very different mummy-form) Khonsu-Thoth amulets known from the site.87 Secondly, many limestone ithyphallic figures were brought to Naukratis

81 Bailey 2008, 69–80. Note when Bailey published this catalogue, he was not aware that so many of them were contemporary and from the same site, Naukratis. This new contextual information demands that we consider this a potentially related group.
82 Schmidt 2003, 251–81.
83 Ballet and Galliano 2010, 197–220, figs 2–6.
84 See Budde, Sandri and Verhoeven 2003.
85 See the chapter on Bronze votive offerings.
86 Up to 472 representations of Hor-pa-khered or Harpokrates are known from Naukratis.
87 British Museum, 1885,1101.92; 1885,1101.51.
from the Memphite region, if not specifically Saqqara, whilst other terracottas copied closely those produced in that region (see below). These figures were found in association with the cult of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, but are not representations of this deity, but instead associated with the cult of Harpokrates and Bes. Finally, some early Ptolemaic representations of Harpokrates made at Naukratis clearly represent him as ithyphallic, albeit less obviously and less frequently than before. This is not surprising as these figures would have been contemporary with some of the latest limestone figures brought from the Memphite region. Despite difficulties in identification, by the end of the period we are discussing it is likely that the inhabitants would have identified such figures as representations of Harpokrates (if they used Greek) or Hor-pa-khered (if they used Egyptian language). It is, however, not impossible that, despite the clear popularity of the deity at Naukratis, this aspect had other epithets, titles or a regional name not known to us. These were clearly a popular group of figures of Lower Egyptian manufacture and remain an interesting group for ongoing debate concerning their meaning and use.

4. Egyptian carved limestone figures

Egyptian carved limestone figures as found in Naukratis are relatively common across Lower Egypt, with large quantities of parallels known from Memphis and Saqqara. The Saite and later industry drew upon a long dynastic Egyptian tradition, but changed significantly until its early Ptolemaic decline. The fine soft white limestone used was perfect for carving and retaining painted decoration and is well known in the Memphite region, the most likely and closest source for a limestone of this quality. Figures from this industry were certainly made in Saqqara during the 4th and 3rd centuries BC, although it is possible, if less likely, that figures were also produced in other places. Occasionally, poor quality limestone or mudstone was also used, possibly evidence of production in other places. Two distinct and competing styles are present in the assemblage, the first a traditional Egyptian production that is crude and flat, largely of the Saite period, but continuing in a modified form into the 4th century BC. The second style is more naturalistic in execution, with increasing elaboration and decoration over time.

In the Saite period, figures were crudely carved with a blade, leaving a flat bevelled or chamfered edge. They are either flat figure-plaques (Figs 6, 10 and 13) with an unfinished back or crude stand-alone figures. Even when...
they are stand-alone three-dimensional figures, there is a decidedly two-dimensional look about them (Fig. 12), with only crudely finished backs and sides as if they were only intended to be viewed from the front. Some are little more than oblong masses, with the dimmest indications of limbs and disc-shaped heads. The early types include nude (L-F.1, L-F.2), occasionally pregnant female (L-F.3), phallic Bes(?) (L-B.1), musician (L-M.1.1 and L-M.2.1), captive (L-C.1), hybrid fantastic creature (sphinx/human-headed cats or birds, L-H.1) figures and possibly riders (L-R.1).

Edgar was adamant that the horsemen were from the same workshop as the female figures, both 'common and popular in the 6th century BC; their manufacture continued over a long period' and Petrie dated this 'rude stone figures' industry to the 6th to 4th centuries BC, although both Petrie and Edgar may have confused and conflated later styles with this early production. Red or black painted decoration (Fig. 13) is often preserved, though the majority of the figure is left white, reminiscent of the finer workmanship found on numerous late 7th- to mid-6th-century Cypriot limestone figures from Naukratis.

This ‘Saite’ tradition overlaps with later productions, in which the figure is more finely carved with soft, rounded edges, is free standing and intended to be visible from multiple angles. The subjects depicted are more varied, with reclining symptic figures, musicians, nude females, fantastic hybrid creatures and other animals, and, increasingly dominant, ithyphallic figures as well as erotic groups. These are decorated with the same colour palette as before. The quality of this work is highly variable and can be fine (Fig. 16) or crude (Fig. 26), naturalistic (Fig. 46) or highly stylized (Fig. 18) with exaggerated facial features (bulging eyes, large noses, pointed beards, pointed heads and fat rolls above the stomach). Whilst the exaggerated features, found also on terracottas of the Persian Period, can be dated to the late 6th to early 4th century BC, a more naturalistic style was already in use at the same time and continued into the Ptolemaic period, as did some of the exaggerated features (pointed egg-shaped heads and fat rolls). The quality of the object does not seem to be diagnostic, with both high and low quality pieces dating from the Saite to the Ptolemaic period and some remain difficult to date. Indeed, the rather crude and stylized ithyphallic drum players are attested in both (pre Ptolemaic) 4th-century BC contexts and early Ptolemaic contexts in Saqqara, Alexandria and Schedia. Exactly when they stopped being produced is difficult to determine, as although they have been found residually in Islamic contexts, they are rare in contexts dating to the 1st century BC or later periods (when they were most likely residual finds), so were most likely produced and used in the 4th and 3rd centuries BC when they were commonly found (and when they were also copied in faience and terracotta), and production declined before or during the 2nd century BC.

94 Edgar 1905a, 129.
95 Petrie 1886a, 22, 34, 36, 40–1, 46, pl. 19.1–9.
96 Figures reclining in what appears to be a representation of symposia, adopted and adapted during Achaemenid rule and depicted in art from western Anatolia and Egypt (Miller 2011, 97–120).
97 Where they were made (Martin 1981, see no. 1217).
4.1 Female figures

Reclining female limestone figure-plaques, in earlier scholarship often called ‘concubines’, were common at Naukratis. These figures originate from an earlier Dynastic nude female on votive bed tradition, associated with the cults of Isis, Mut, Hathor and Anuket. According to Hogarth they were ‘scattered around the town’ and ‘common and popular in the sixth century’. Petrie also found them in the town, but also in what he dated ‘late 5th century BC’ contexts. The majority of these types were found in or adjacent to the Great Temenos area, the ‘South Site’ and east of (but just outside) the Great Temenos. These examples date from the late 7th to the 6th, and possibly into the late 5th century BC.

The most common form at Naukratis is a nude female reclining on a bed (Fig. 10), as simple figure-plaques (L-F.1.1). These are crudely carved rectangular limestone relief plaques of a reclining nude female figure, with a square-cut wig to the shoulders, often with one or two small children by her feet also with a square-cut wig or long hair. Red and black painted decoration depicting jewellery such as necklaces and bracelets is often preserved. There are close parallels from Memphis, Kom Firin, Sais, Hermopolis Magna, Buto as well as among other unprovenanced pieces from Egypt. Parallels found in late Saite contexts confirm that this type was already produced when Naukratis was founded. However, only a broad date of c. 620–400 BC for the Naukratis pieces is suggested as the later 5th-century BC contexts suggested by Petrie for some Naukratis examples means that an early Persian period date cannot currently be excluded for the continuity of this industry, or at least use of these pieces. Some appear to have been deliberately broken before being buried. One piece has a circular motif incised on the back, possibly a very crude wedjat eye or another protective symbol (Fig. 11).

---

98 See section 8.1 below.
99 Del Vesco 2009.
100 Hogarth et al. 1905, 129; Hogarth et al. 1898–9, pl. 19.4.
101 Petrie 1886a, 22, 36, 40–1, pl. 19.2, 7–9, Level 420.
105 A similar piece found at Buto depicted a Bes or daimon (P. Ballet pers. comm.). At Naukratis all appear to be diminutive females, not depicted with any features diagnostic of Bes, or a male child (with side-lock). However these are rather rudimentarily carved and not always clear.
106 Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl. 30, b.48, variant type 1.1c; Petrie Museum, London, UC 8650–3; UC8648 dated 26th dynasty.
107 Petrie 1884–5 notebook.
108 Daressy 1901; Masoud 2014; Villing and Wilson forthcoming.
109 El-Ashmunine, Spencer 1989, 51, pl. 80, 79, no. 111; Spencer, Bailey and Davies 1984, 100, fig. 12.3 and 12.8.
110 Including pieces from Buto found in late Saite contexts, discovered in 2013 (P. Ballet pers. comm.).
111 Petrie Museum, London, UC8649, UC8651, L-F.1.2 variants UC860, UC8653; see also UC8652.
112 Griffith notebook January 1885.
A contemporary, or slightly later variant from Naukratis, includes a three-dimensional rendering of the bed couch with individually carved feet and more detailed figures (Fig. 12), but can only be assigned the broad date of c. 620–400 BC without further evidence of parallels from well dated contexts (L-F.1.2). These are reminiscent of sympotic groups from Sais that can by dated on the basis of style and iconography to the later 6th or early 5th century BC. There is another nude female figure-plaque variant, but with no bed depicted (L-F.1.3). Stylistic considerations would suggest that pieces within this group from Naukratis should be dated c. 620–400 BC on the basis of stylistic similarities with type L-F.1.1. However, the absence of a bed suggests these could be considered representations of a standing female figure also known from contemporary stone and terracotta figures depicted in shrines (L-F.2, Fig. 13 below, see also P-F.3), which are known from later contexts in Egypt. Parallels for type L-F.2 were found, with depictions of nude females in shrines (P-F.3) in contexts dated c. 450–350 BC in Tell el-Herr.

Plaques of nude females standing in shrines (Fig. 14) or niches (L-F.2) appear in limestone, as they do in terracotta, in the Late Period and were produced for a long time. Limestone examples are rare in Naukratis. These can be dated broadly to the period c. 600–275 BC, on the basis of parallels dated to the Late Period from Tell el-Yahudiyya and Saqqara, and parallels from Ptolemaic contexts in Tell Balamun and Athribis. The example from Athribis wears the crown of Isis-Hathor and is standing with Osiris. Similar limestone figure-plaques of type L-F.1.3 and terracotta figure-plaques P-F.3 were found in Late Period houses within the fort at Tell el-Herr dating to the late 5th and early 4th centuries BC. However, evidence of their use in the 6th century is limited.

Simple triangular limestone plaques of a naked pregnant straddling woman, also known as ‘Baubo’ figures (L-F.3), were common in Naukratis in c. 620–400 BC (Fig. 15). Some were excavated by Hogarth in the north-western corner area of the Great Temenos, in a ‘6th century' deposit and were ‘common' in 6th-century deposits around the town.

---

115 We do not currently have the stratigraphic data to be certain whether these represent a late 6th- to 5th-century BC variant of L-F.1.1, though this hypothesis seems attractive on the basis of broader changes to the style of soft limestone figure industries of this period.
116 Daressy 1901, 230–9; Masoud 2014; Villing and Wilson forthcoming, dated to the late 6th/early 5th century.
118 Dated early 4th and late 5th to early 4th century BC respectively (Marchi 2014, 97–8, fig. 135b, fig. 136d, who also cites parallels from Gaza).
119 Type P-F.3 discussed below.
120 British Museum, 1888,0601.21, 1886,0401.1506; Alexandria, 16864; Heidelberg, 1725.
121 Depicting papyrus-columns, broken lintel and Hathor capitals (British Museum EA1875,0517.100).
122 Quibell 1907, pl. 30.5.
123 Spencer 2003, 35, no. 16, pl. 33.16.
124 Context dated from the end of the 4th to the 2nd century BC (Myśliwiec 1996, 10, fig. 2; 1997, 120; 2009, figs 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, pl. 3.1).
125 Marchi 2014, 97–8, figs 135–6.
126 Petrie 1886a, 40, pl. 19.4; Gutch 1889–90, 82, see notes for nos 49–56; Hogarth 1905, 127–9, fig. 8a; British Museum, 1885,0930.954; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, TR20/9/27/25. Also attributed to Naukratis (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, E.SU.146).
127 Edgar 1905a, 128–9, pl. 8a.
dated them to the 6th and 4th centuries BC.\textsuperscript{128} Parallels exist from Kom el Zalat (near Damanhur),\textsuperscript{129} Memphis\textsuperscript{130} and some have been acquired in Alexandria.\textsuperscript{131} However none have good contextual information to inform or test the dating of Petrie.

More ‘naturalistic’ limestone figures of nude (not visibly pregnant) females (\textit{L-F.4}) are rare, with both exceptional (and gilded) quality (Fig. 16)\textsuperscript{132} and poor quality examples\textsuperscript{133} represented at Naukratis.\textsuperscript{134} These pieces can be dated to c. 400–200 BC on the basis of 4th and 3rd century BC parallels excavated in Memphis\textsuperscript{135} and Saqqara.\textsuperscript{136}

A particularly fine example (Fig. 16) was found within a ‘Ptolemaic’ context in the casemate structure of the Great Temenos.\textsuperscript{137} The style, though fine and naturalistic, does have exaggerated long fingers and round breasts, not found on the contemporary terracotta figures representing the same subject.\textsuperscript{138} As with the terracotta versions, this may represent a later three-dimensional variant that developed from the flat figure-plaques produced previously (\textit{L-F.1.3} and \textit{L-F.2}).

\subsection*{4.2. Male phallic figures}

Representations of phallic male figures in soft limestone come as three different, but related and contemporary, subjects. First are representations of an ithyphallic baby or youth with side-lock. These are probably representations of a child-god, of which the most likely candidate is Hor-pa-kered (or later Harpokrates, and used below), Horus the child,\textsuperscript{139} the youthful Horus as a baby, usually carrying a wine amphora, or playing a musical instrument. Second are erotic groups involving an ithyphallic youth; and finally, figure-plaques of Harpokrates’ protector, Bes.

Representations of an ithyphallic Harpokrates as a bare-chested, ithyphallic youth enthroned on a block-seat (Fig. 17), with side-lock, right hand raised to his head\textsuperscript{140} and left arm at his side (\textit{L-I.1}), are rare at Naukratis.\textsuperscript{141} These have colourful red or pink painted flesh. They can only be dated broadly to c. 600–300 BC, with similarly dated parallels from Memphis\textsuperscript{142} and from 4th-century BC contexts at Saqqara.\textsuperscript{143}

\begin{figure}[h!]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{figure16}
\caption{Limestone figure-plaque of nude standing woman or goddess, with painted and gold leaf decoration (\textit{L-F.4}), c. 400–500 BC (context, possibly residual). British Museum, 1886.0401.1394}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h!]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{figure17}
\caption{Limestone figure of ithyphallic Harpokrates enthroned (\textit{L-I.1}), c. 600–400 BC. British Museum, 1965.0930.945}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h!]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{figure17}
\caption{Limestone figure of ithyphallic Harpokrates enthroned (\textit{L-I.1}), c. 600–400 BC. British Museum, 1965.0930.945}
\end{figure}

128 Petrie 1886a, 40, pl. 19.4.
129 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, SR5/6442.
131 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, SR5/6490.
134 Attributed to Naukratis; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, E.SU.147.
135 Thomas and Nicholson 2013, 62, P-68.
137 Petrie 1886a, 33; British Museum, 1886.0401.1394. However, this example was also dated to the Saite period by Edwards in an early publication on Naukratis (1885b, 278).
138 Type \textit{M-F.1}. The difference does not have to be chronological. It could reflect different influences on the limestone as opposed to the terracotta industries at this time. Voluptuous nude women with bobbed haircuts are already depicted in the 25th dynasty (see Riefstahl 1943–4; Russmann 2007, MMA – 30.8.93, though neither are close parallels for this piece).
139 These have been interpreted as priests, servants or followers of a child-god. However, many clearly depict a baby, and not an adult follower, as depicted on later Ptolemaic hollow mould-made figures (see the chapter on \textit{Ptolemaic and Roman figures}).
140 Hand raised and lower part of side-lock preserved on examples from the British Museum, 1965.0930.937, 2011.5011.15.
Ithyphallic naked youth with side-lock, squatting or seated upright and looking to the side (L-I.2), whilst holding his colossal phallus to himself, with the glans resting on top of his head (Fig. 18), is a common form represented also in terracotta at Naukratis. Though crude, the side-lock is clear and the form clearly represents that of a baby, likely the child-god Harpokrates. The figures usually rest on a rectangular or oval plinth, and often preserve traces of red or dark-pink painted flesh.144 This type can be dated c. 600–300 BC, with parallels from Late Period (probably late Saite) Kom Firin,145 30th dynasty Saqqara,146 Memphis147 and generally Egypt.148

Nude ithyphallic Harpokrates with side-lock figures with the phallus coiled around their necks (up and over the left shoulder, passing behind the neck and over the right shoulder) are usually depicted seated or squatting and are painted red (L-I.3). This popular form comes in both early (L-I.3.1, Fig. 19, dated c. 550–300 BC) and late (L-I.3.2, Fig. 20, dated c. 400–200 BC) variants149 on the basis of parallels. Parallels for the early form include two pieces that can be dated between c. 550 and the early 5th century BC from Sais150 and an unprovenanced example.151 Later variants have parallels from early Ptolemaic contexts from Kom Firin,152 and Tell Basta.153 Similar figures were made of terracotta.154 Faience parallels have been found at Palaepaphos on Cyprus155 and Naukratis,156 with others unprovenanced.157

Crude ithyphallic Harpokrates figures depicted (when complete) as a naked youth with side-lock, seated with knees raised and phallus extending forward (L-I.4), were common at Naukratis (Fig. 21).158 These are distinct from the finer, more stylized, more common and well-dated 400–200 BC pieces produced in Saqqara (L-I.5 and L-I.6), of which they are putatively suggested here to be the precursors. Accordingly, they have been dated cautiously to c. 600–300 BC as they could equally represent

---

143 Martin 1981, nos 301, 302. Also a parallel made of faience is similar in form (Martin 1981, no. 1075).
145 Spencer 2014, 277, F274. The majority of pottery found within this context is of Late Period (late Saite) date, as is almost certainly the case with the figurine found there too. However, a single Ptolemaic and a single Roman sherd were found within this context, probably contamination from the excavation or some earlier disturbance.
146 Martin 1981, no. 1513; Petrie Museum, London, UC60056.
147 Petrie Museum, London, UC48354, UC483546.
149 British Museum, EA90337; fragment 1965,0930.933 may be type L-I.4, see also 1965,0930.944) attributed to Naukratis (2011,5011.16; 2011,5011.14; 2011,5011.13; See also in terracotta (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, E.140.1914).
150 Daressy 1901; Masoud 2014, pl. 4; Villing and Wilson forthcoming; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE90245, exc. no. 84; JE90252 exc. no. 174. These are the earliest securely dated examples of this type; they can be dated based on their association with other pieces that include a depiction of specific amphora types.
151 British Museum, 1988,0229.1, EA71017.
152 But also playing a flute (Spencer 2014, F343).
154 Found in both Naukratis and Memphis (see M-I.5).
155 Clerc 1988, 53–8, pl. 16, Koukla Museum no. 86, dated 'Saite'.
156 British Museum, EA90388.
157 British Museum, EA90363.
A group of related finely carved ithyphallic child gods (clearly representing babies, probably Harpokrates) figures were produced in Saqqara in c. 400–200 BC and is represented also at Naukratis. These depict a naked youth with side-lock seated on a rectangular plaque, with knees raised and phallus extending forward, on which he carries a trigonous harp (L-I.5, Fig. 22), drum (L-I.6.1, Fig. 23), bowl (L-I.6.2, Fig. 24) or a frog (L-I.7, Fig. 25). Representations of Harpokrates rarely depict him playing a musical instrument, though they do exist amongst the later, early Ptolemaic terracottas from Naukratis.

The flesh is usually painted red or pink, and the base and instrument may have black and even blue (on the latest examples) painted decoration. Ithyphallic trigonous harp-playing Harpokrates figures were common at Naukratis; parallels come from 30th dynasty Saqqara, Memphis and unprovenanced Egypt. Similar figures are also common in faience and in terracotta, and production in all these materials extended into the early Ptolemaic period. The ithyphallic ‘drum players’ (L-I.6.1) are common in Naukratis, with rare variants carrying a pot or jar instead of a drum. Another close variant depicts a frog resting on the phallus, facing Harpokrates (L-I.7). Parallels for this production, and particularly the drummers, are well known from contexts dated 400–200 BC in Alexandria, Schedia, Saqqara, Athribis, Tell Basta.

Regional variants. Unprovenanced parallels have been found in Egypt and on Cyprus.

A few atypical pieces may be dated slightly earlier, or more generally to 500–200 BC. There appears to be a chronological development from large, crude pieces to more naturalistic smaller pieces, then to crude stylized small flat pieces in the early Ptolemaic period (see L-I.6).

Unprovenanced Egyptian parallels in the British Museum, EA90341, and various other collections. See type M.I.8.

The drum or tambour is usually clasped in both hands and is sometimes interpreted as a stele.

Some have been found in 2nd-century BC contexts, but these may be residual.

Regional and early Ptolemaic contexts (Quibell 1907, pl. 33; Martin 1981, nos 1209, 1261, 305, 1213, 1211, 801, 1214, 1215; Jeffreys et al. 1988, 33–5, 41, 63, pl. 20a–d, pl. 21a–b, figs 65–7); Petrie Museum, London, UC30603, 30601, 30821. Variant found only at Saqqara wears a Macedonian chlamys cloak (Martin 1981, no. 1210), dated c. 350–250 BC. Myśliwiec 1997, 122, pls 8.1–4, 9.1–2.

Late 4th to 3rd century BC levels (Vaelke pers. comm) (TB4a T/3 SCS3 KF001; TB3b Y/4 Bef.6 KF001).
Buto,\textsuperscript{179} Herakleion,\textsuperscript{180} Memphis,\textsuperscript{181} undated from Elephantine\textsuperscript{182} and unprovenanced.\textsuperscript{183} Terracotta production at Naukratis seems to have copied this limestone production closely (see M-I.8 and M-I.9).

Rare finely carved, more naturalistic (if still fantastic) representations of the same date (c. 400–200 BC) show an ithyphallic Harpokrates, painted red, standing or seated on his coiled phallus (L-I.8, Fig. 26).\textsuperscript{184} Dating is based upon contemporary parallels made of terracotta produced at Naukratis (M-I.9).

More common are representations of Harpokrates reclining on his oversized phallus, painted red (L-I.9, Fig. 27).\textsuperscript{185} The type can be dated c. 400–200 BC on the basis of parallels from 4th- and 3rd-century BC contexts at Saqqara,\textsuperscript{186} Tell Basta,\textsuperscript{187} Egypt\textsuperscript{188} and Cyprus.\textsuperscript{189} Similar faience figures (copies?) were found in Naukratis,\textsuperscript{190} Athribis,\textsuperscript{191} Saqqara,\textsuperscript{192} Memphis,\textsuperscript{193} Karnak\textsuperscript{194} and elsewhere in Egypt.\textsuperscript{195} They were also copied in terracotta, where they were occasionally depicted in Macedonian dress, wearing a kausia (hat) and chlamys (cloak) (M-I.11).

Erotic figure groups, also known as ‘symplegma’, depicting Harpokrates and his consort, are highly variable in quality and composition, yet often intricate. Painted with red and black paint, various versions are known from Egypt but not all types are represented at Naukratis. The earliest pieces from Naukratis (L-E.1, Fig. 28)\textsuperscript{196} are figure-plaques in the Saite style consistent with other figures dated above c. 600–400 BC. Similar pieces from Sais (but three dimensional, rather than as plaques) have been dated c. 550–450 BC.\textsuperscript{197} The majority of the more naturalistic and intricate sculptures are probably later, c. 400–200 BC (L-E.2, Fig. 29).\textsuperscript{198} Other parallels have been found in Memphis,\textsuperscript{199} Saqqara,\textsuperscript{200} Ashmunein,\textsuperscript{201} Tanis,\textsuperscript{202} Egypt\textsuperscript{203} and on the Karpass peninsula in Cyprus.\textsuperscript{204}

\textsuperscript{179} Beginning of the Ptolemaic period (Ballet 2011, 108–9, fig. 59).
\textsuperscript{180} Heinz forthcoming, no. 110. Probably all 4th century to early Ptolemaic.
\textsuperscript{181} Petrie Museum, London, UC48353, UC48355, UC48357, UC48360, UC48416–17, UC48360–73, UC48357, UC48361–73, UC48409. Probably all 4th century to early Ptolemaic.
\textsuperscript{182} Delange 2012, 313, nos 1049(?), 1050, 1052 and 1053(?).
\textsuperscript{183} Petrie Museum, London, UC35956, UC60038; British Museum EA90346, EA90347, EA90349, EA90356, EA20730, EA90340. Probably all 4th century to early Ptolemaic.
\textsuperscript{184} British Museum, 1965,0930.950, 1965,0930.948; Heidelberg Archäologisches Institut der Universität, ST47.
\textsuperscript{185} Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA307; British Museum, 1965,0930.942, EA90345, EA90343.
\textsuperscript{186} Martin 1981, no. 327.
\textsuperscript{187} Late 4th to 3rd century BC.
\textsuperscript{188} Unprovenanced pieces (British Museum, EA90342, EA90350; Petrie Museum, London, UC28467).
\textsuperscript{189} Louvre no. MN1408; Karageorghis 1984, 219, pl. 42.1–2.
\textsuperscript{190} British Museum, 1886,0401.1495.
\textsuperscript{191} 3rd century BC (Szymańska 1999, 73, fig. 2).
\textsuperscript{192} 30th Dynasty to early Ptolemaic (Martin 1981, 1074).
\textsuperscript{193} Petrie Museum, London, UC35956, UC60038; British Museum EA90346, EA90347, EA90349, EA20730, EA90340. Probably all 4th century to early Ptolemaic.
\textsuperscript{194} British Museum, 1965,0930.950, 1965,0930.948; Heidelberg Archäologisches Institut der Universität, ST47.
\textsuperscript{195} Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA307; British Museum, 1965,0930.942, EA90345, EA90343.
\textsuperscript{196} Martin 1981, no. 327.
\textsuperscript{197} Late 4th to 3rd century BC.
\textsuperscript{198} Unprovenanced pieces (British Museum, EA90342, EA90350; Petrie Museum, London, UC28467).
\textsuperscript{199} Petrie Museum, London, UC38352–4, UC38350–1, UC35954, UC75914.
Simple phallic figure-plaques in the Saite style (see contemporary L-F.1 and L-F.3) previously used to be interpreted as Bes (L-B.1), but may in fact be another representation of a child god (Harpokrates?) wearing an elaborate headdress (Fig. 30). These can be dated broadly to c. 620–400 BC, on the basis of similarities in form and technique (but not subject) to the more common and precisely dated L-F.1 and L-F.3 figures with an unprovenanced parallel from Egypt. Crudely carved from soft limestone, the large plaques feature clear representations of Bes brandishing a sword and holding a snake (L-B.2, Fig. 31). These seem to be part of the same limestone industry, but are significantly larger than all the other stone votives. They closely resemble the decoration in the Bes Chambers at Saqqara, in use during the early Ptolemaic period, but probably constructed in the 4th century BC.

4.3 Rider figures

Several simple flat figures of a diminutive rider (probably a child with a side-lock, though this is not clear) on a large galloping horse have been found at Naukratis, in both Greek and Egyptian ritual contexts. Usually made of soft limestone, a few pieces were also carved from mudstone (L-R.1, Fig. 32). Four were found in the Hellenion alongside 6th- and 5th-century BC material, one of which can be dated on the basis of a Greek inscription to 450–350 BC (Fig. 33). Two more were found in a well deposit dated by the excavators to the 5th century BC and another in a cache of predominantly 5th-century BC Egyptian temple votives. None of the pieces from Naukratis can be dated outside the period 550–350 BC, though Petrie proposed a date range of 600–300 BC and Edgar 600–500 BC. Parallels are known from Buto, Tell Dafana (likely 6th century BC)

205 Martin 1981, pl. 21c.
206 Martin 1987, 75; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, SR5/6329; Spencer 1993, 33, pl. 28, pl. 30, no. 36.
207 Brissaud 1987, 41, pl. 5c.
208 Unprovenanced (Bianchi 1988, pl. 34, 130; Yakata 1983, no. 70; British Museum, EA90358–9, EA27699, EA90339).
209 Karageorghis 1984, 219, pl. 41.2, fig. 1b, no.1934/XI-11/1.
211 Unprovenanced, but probably from Memphis or Naukratis (Petrie Museum, London, UC60075).
213 Dated tentatively c. 620–330 BC on the basis of Late Period parallels.
214 Quibell 1907.
216 In untouched earth, in the lowest 2 feet of deposits, containing 'early Naukratite pottery' (Edgar 1905a, 30, 39, 55, pl. 14.10–11, wall [35], i.e. Chian pottery of late 7th to 6th century BC date). Other artefacts from these earliest deposits include Late Archaic, but mostly Classical period pottery and terracottas from the end of the 6th and the 5th centuries BC.
217 Quibell 1907, 25.
219 In untouched earth, in the lowest 2 feet of deposits, containing 'early Naukratite pottery' (Edgar 1905a, 30, 39, 55, pl. 14.10–11, wall [35], i.e. Chian pottery of late 7th to 6th century BC date). Other artefacts from these earliest deposits include Late Archaic, but mostly Classical period pottery and terracottas from the end of the 6th and the 5th centuries BC.
220 British Museum, 1900,0214.27. The inscription Νυμφαιο... ἐπὶ τῷ... οὖς is dated 450–350 BC (see the chapter on Greek and Latin stone inscriptions).
221 Hogarth 1905, 122; Hogarth Diary 24–25/04/1905, well 2 bottom.
222 Petrie 1886a, 30, 40, pl. 19.5, see also 46. The bronze cache was under Petrie’s so-called ‘Ptolemaic building’ at the south of the town with objects now re-dated c. 480–400 BC. British Museum, 1886,0401.1766.
223 Petrie 1886a, 22, 34, 36, 40–1, 46, pl. 19.1–9.
224 Edgar 1905a, 129.
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though none of these provide precise dating evidence.

Variants of the child on horseback include rare ithyphallic examples (L-R.2, Fig. 34). The two small fragments from Naukratis\(^2\) have 4th-century BC parallels from Saqqara.\(^2\) These probably represent the same child-god character depicted on other ithyphallic limestone figures and similar, but only occasionally ithyphallic, terracottas of children on horseback (see discussion of M-R.1, P-R.2 below and section 8.2.3). They could, very tentatively, be interpreted as representations of Harpokrates, rare examples produced at the end of the Late Period and beginning of the Ptolemaic period. We do not know how the non-ithyphallic figures were interpreted, and they could have had different meanings for the Greek audience who dedicated examples within the Hellenion, with one example apparently referring to a nymph in the Greek inscription. Instead of their meaning(s) associated with Egyptian religious votive practice, these figurines may have instead functioned like other imported rider figures from Cyprus or East Greece when dedicated at the Greek sanctuaries.\(^2\)

4.4 Musicians, sympotic figures, captives, animals and fantastic creatures

Female musicians wearing a wig and occasionally naked (though this is often not clear), playing a drum/tambour (L-M.1) or a lyre/harp (L-M.2), form part of the crude limestone production that Petrie dated to 600–300 BC,\(^2\) but that is here assigned a date of c. 620–400 BC. The figures are crudely carved from soft limestone, with traces of red and black paint. Numerous variations exist in the instruments depicted and the carving style. Highly stylized drummers (L-M.1.1, Fig. 35) are most common at Naukratis,\(^2\) with slightly finer variants (L-M.1.2, Fig. 36)\(^2\) found in the early 6th-century BC scarab factory context.\(^2\)

Musicians playing harps (L-M.2.1, Fig. 37) follow the same style but are less common at Naukratis.\(^2\) A single three-dimensional lyre player (L-M.2.2, Fig. 38)\(^2\) was ascribed to Naukratis, but as it was from a private collection and the style is unusual, this single piece should be treated with caution.\(^2\) Parallels are known from Saite Kom Firin,\(^2\) c. 550 to early 5th-

---

\(^2\)British Museum, 1900,0214.27

\(^2\)Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Museum TR14/1/34/8.

\(^2\)Petrie 1888, 71, dated 7th century BC; Edgar 1905a, 129, dated 6th century BC.

\(^2\)Quibell 1907, 13.

\(^2\)Wilson pers. comm.

\(^2\)Dated c. 400–300 BC (British Museum, 1965,0930.949 and possibly 1965,0930.952).

\(^2\)Martin 1981, nos 303, 304.

\(^2\)Two possibly Cypriot imports (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-G.1027; British Museum, 1886,0401.1493) could similarly have been interpreted as representations of Harpokrates on horseback by an Egyptian audience.

\(^2\)Petrie 1886b.

\(^2\)Hogarth 1898–9, pl. 14.6; Hogarth et al. 1905, 130, pl. 14.6; Petrie 1886a, 40; British Museum, 1965,0930.930; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1886.543; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86,162.

\(^2\)Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86,163.

\(^2\)Petrie 1886a, 40, Level 335.


\(^2\)Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1922.212. The provenance of the piece is, however, conjectural as it comes from a private collection.

\(^2\)A parallel said to be from Thebes has been dated to the Middle Kingdom (Bourriau 1988). A close parallel from Abydos, has been dated to the New Kingdom (Kuninklijke Musea voor Kunst en Geschiedenis, Brussels, E.0262).
century BC Sais, and elsewhere in Egypt. The instruments played an important role in performances during the religious festivals surrounding the Nile inundation, which may explain why such figures were produced alongside representations of Isis-Hathor, Harpokrates and Bes.

Bearded sympotic figures are depicted reclining on a couch (L-S.1, Fig. 39) whilst drinking from a hemispherical cup. They are occasionally covered with a decorated blanket painted red and black. Whilst reclining at a drinking party is a Greek practice from c. 600 BC, depictions of the hemispherical cup held underneath with fingertips are a widespread feature of Achaemenid art that appears at the end of the 6th century BC and lasts until the 4th century BC. The Naukratis examples lack precise contextual information, limiting the dating of these pieces to comparisons with sympotic representations and a small number of parallels from Sais (c. 550–500 BC). An unprovenanced example closely related to the examples from Sais must be of similar date. The type clearly does not stem from a native Egyptian tradition and may have been influenced by Late Archaic East Greek (terracotta) depictions of symposiasts. Ritual commensality of the kind exemplified by the Greek symposion and widespread among Mediterranean communities by and large appears not to have been adopted by Egyptians, unless perhaps in exceptional instances, such as might be exemplified by places of intense cross-cultural contact such as Naukratis. The unprovenanced parallel includes a female of ‘concubine’ type, suggesting that this production overlapped with that of ‘concubine’ figures discussed above (L-F.1.1), although it also shares features with the later reclining ithyphallic Harpokrates figures in limestone (L-I.9), which betray the confluence of Greek and Egyptian ideas.

A range of animals and fantastic creatures was found in Naukratis. The most common are a series of upright, human-headed birds and cats (‘Libyan sphinx’ or ‘Bastet sphinx’) (L-H.1.1–2, Figs 40–1). Possibly (but not certainly) the outcome of Libyan period influence on Saite sculpture, such figures are common in the Saite soft limestone industry. Petrie dated

---

232 Masoud 2014; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 90239, exc. no. 78; JE 90240, exc. no. 79; JE 90241, exc. no. 80; JE90251, exc. no. 149.
233 Unprovenanced (Petrie Museum, London, UC4530, UC59370?, UC4530 with flute, see also UC8575 dated ‘middle kingdom’, UC33273, Petrie 1927, 58 pl. 50.312).
234 Pinch 1993; Manniche 1991; Barrett 2011.
235 On Greek sympotic practices since 600 BC, see Dentzer 1982; Baughan 2011, 19-53. On the adoption in Egypt and western Anatolia of the Persian practice of using hemispherical cups held in fingertips and their depiction in sympotic scenes from the end of the 6th century BC to the 4th century BC see Miller 2011, 97–120. For further discussion of the sympotic figures from Sais and Naukratis see Villing and Wilson forthcoming.
237 Daressy 1901, 230–9, esp. 234–5, pl. 1; Masoud 2014; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 35185; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 90242, ex. no. 81; JE90243, ex. no. 82; JE 90244, ex. no. 83. Not before 550 BC and probably not much later than 500 BC (Villing and Wilson forthcoming).
238 Louvre E11741: Dentzer 1982, 60, pl. 14 fig. 83.
them to c. 600–300 BC and Hogarth found an example in a ‘5th century BC’ well deposit, though some variants may be later in date.

A single example of a crude sphinx (L-H.2, Fig. 42), with Late Period or Ptolemaic parallels from Memphis and Saqqara, represents a type that was also copied in terracotta (M-H.1) and that has parallels from Memphis and unrecorded locations in Egypt.

Standard animals given a good realistic treatment are less common at Naukratis. They comprise representations of rams, birds, baboons and jackals (or less likely dogs), all animals associated with Egyptian deities. The group is too varied and rare to date more precisely than broadly to c. 600–330 BC. Two rams (L-A.1, Fig. 43) have an unprovenanced parallel that has been assigned a ‘Late Period’ date. Fragments of birds (L-A.2, Fig. 44), include a flat figure of a falcon (?) and two fragments of doves (?) with mobile heads. A few baboons (L-A.3, Fig. 45) were probably intended as representations of Thoth. They are rare at Naukratis and have parallels from Memphis in stone and plaster. A very small dog or jackal (L-A.4, Fig. 46) in very careful work can be compared to an early Ptolemaic figurine of a dog from Naukratis. We may note here also the find of two large-scale sculptures depicting stylized Anubis jackals, they were found in or near the Great Temenos and can be compared to pieces from Saqqara and Yusef, Goshen.

The final group of limestone figures are the highly varied captive figures (L-C.1, Fig. 47), crudely carved from soft limestone, in an L-shape, either kneeling or crouching with their limbs bound and heads only roughly indicated. None appear to have been painted. They are highly variable in form, though they appear to reference the style of the drummers (L-M.1) and sphinxes (L-H.1) and should perhaps be included within Petrie’s group of ‘rude stone figures’ that he dated broadly to c. 600–300 BC.

Petrie 1886a, 40, pl. 19.1 and 3. Petrie also notes that one was found in a Ptolemaic context.

Hogarth 1905, 122; Hogarth Diary 24–25/04/1903, well 2 bottom.

British Museum, 1886,0401.1396 and 1886,0401.1485. The majority probably date 620–400 BC.

British Museum, 1886,0401.1396.

Anthes and Bakry 1959; Anthes et al. 1965.

Quibell 1907, pl. 30.6a.

Unprovenanced Petrie Museum, London, UC60056. The date may not be reliable.

British Museum, 1886,0401.1483; possibly Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA309.

Petrie Museum, London, UC60056. The date may not be reliable.


British Museum, 1886,0401.1484, 1888,0601.78; and in wood Petrie Museum, London, UC60012.


Petrie Museum, London, UC60056. The date may not be reliable.

Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE27200.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.178, 86.179. See the forthcoming chapter on Egyptian sculpture.

Jeffreys et al. 1988, pl. 26a, 78/226, see also pl. 41e–f, pl. 16a–d.


Petrie 1886a, 36, 40; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.165; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1886.402, AN1886.453; British Museum, 2011.501.7, 1886,0401.1485; see also Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.183; British Museum, 1886,0401.1532, 1886,0401.1491.

Petrie 1886a, 22, 34, 36, 40–1, 46, pl. 19.
date them to c. 620–400 BC, with parallels from Saqqara,263 26th dynasty Tell Dafana264 and Herakleion.265 They are possibly components of magic spells.266

5. Egyptian hand-made terracotta figures

Hand-made terracotta figures from Naukratis are made from a red-brown Nile silt fabric with abundant large organic and mica inclusions, frequently with white inclusions.267 The fabric is usually poorly sorted, with a fine silty matrix, coarse quartz, mica and other inclusions. The figures were made by hand, with limbs and members joined to the body, details modelled between thumb and forefinger and some, such as eyes, pierced with a short but rough object such as a stick or bone. They were usually fired in an oxidizing atmosphere, at a relatively low temperature (although some examples are occasionally found over-fired, and burnt) producing a light and soft red-brown fabric, reminiscent of Late Period coarseware pottery, such as that used to make Saite period pigeon pots at nearby Kom Firin268 and essentially identical to the fabric used for terracotta figures found at other Lower Egyptian sites.269

Caution should be exercised when dating such figures, as many of the types have close New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period precedents,270 though differences between earlier and later pieces can often be recognized. There is a distinctive, pinched head style of figure that appears to be imitating the headgear worn by Persian riders; it is also apparent on ithyphallic figures from c. 500–330 BC contexts,271 but may have started slightly earlier (H-R.1, H-I.1).

Polychromy is not well represented with this group, with occasional traces of red slip or paint on flesh areas. The subjects represented at Naukratis are predominantly the same as those of contemporaneous plaque figures, namely riders, ithyphallic figures and female figures, though the presence of some animal figures, mostly quadrupeds (some, but not all, of which may be fragments of further rider figures), betrays an Egyptian tradition that predates, but continues into the Late Period. These figures have been found in Saite and Persian Period contexts, but later domestic production would be difficult to distinguish and in some cases is impossible to rule out.

263 Dated Late Period or (less likely) Ptolemaic (Martin 1981, no. 1217).
264 Petrie 1888; British Museum, 1887.0101.730, 1887.0101.731, 1887.0101.732, 1887.0101.733, 1887.0101.734, 1887.0101.735.
265 Heinz forthcoming, no. 245.
266 Rütner 1993.
267 Possibly a post-firing recalcification alteration caused by the humid environment (P. Ballet pers. comm.).
268 Thomas 2014a.
270 Spencer 2014.
271 Redmount and Friedman 1997, 63–5, fig. 5.
5.1 Hand-made nude female figures

Hand-made female figures (H-F.1, Fig. 48) are large, coarse and solid with a flat back and bulging, added eyes.\(^{272}\) It is often difficult to sex these when fragmentary. They can be dated to c. 620–400 BC on the basis of contexts and parallels. Three specimens were found by the north side of the ‘Great Temenos’ with ‘6th century BC’ pottery\(^{273}\) and examples were labelled ‘580 BC’ by the Egypt Exploration Fund before distribution. Parallels are known from Late Period Memphis,\(^{274}\) Saite Tell Dafana\(^{275}\) and Persian period Tell el-Muqdam\(^{276}\) and generally from Egypt.\(^{277}\) Their iconography is discussed below in section 8.1.

5.2 Hand-made ithyphallic male figures

A number of hand-made figures from Naukratis show an ithyphallic child, naked except for a pointed hat (or head?), with prominent buttocks, short chubby limbs and seated on a stool (H-I.1, Fig. 49).\(^{278}\) Made of a coarse organic Nile silt fabric, the flesh parts were painted red. They belong to the period of c. 525–330 BC and are so similar to type H-R.2 rider figures that upper body fragments can be indistinguishable.\(^{279}\) This seems to have been a local Naukratis production, although broadly similar pieces were made also elsewhere, with parallels known from Late Period Memphis.\(^{280}\) A similar style was used on a female figure of the late 5th century BC from Tell el-Muqdam.\(^{281}\) Variant H-I.2 (Fig. 50) is represented only by a single example,\(^{282}\) which was found in at the bottom of a well with ‘Persian period’ pottery of the 5th century BC, two stone horses (L-R.1) and a stone ‘sphinx’ figure (L-H.1).\(^{283}\) Variant H-I.2 has parallels from Memphis.\(^{284}\) A small number of crude, flat-backed sitting Harpokrates figures with a distinctive fat roll above the stomach and prominent nipples (H-I.3) were also found at Naukratis (Fig. 51); they can only be ascribed a broad date of c. 620–330 BC. The interpretation of the figures’ iconography is discussed below in section 8.2.

---

\(^{272}\) Edgar 1905a, 131–2, fig. 11; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, CG32802, CG32801, JE36255; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 88.878; Bolton Museum, 1886.31.22, see also unsexed heads Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-E.4719; Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, Bristol, H2256; H2800.

\(^{273}\) Hogarth et al. 1905, 131.

\(^{274}\) Petrie Museum, London, UC48429; UC47823; Petrie 1909b, pl. 43, no. 68, pl. 44 top right; Petrie 1909c, pl. 28, no. 70–71, pl.29, no. 85, see also pl. 32, no. 113 and pl. 34, nos 125–6, 131; Petrie et al. 1910, see pl. 45, nos 178–9; UC49892; see also Petrie Museum, London, UC49893; Petrie 1909b, 17, pl. 34, UC43514–6.

\(^{275}\) British Museum, 1906.0301.4.

\(^{276}\) Redmount and Friedman 1997, 63–5, fig. 5; following the style of types H-R.1 and H-I.1.

\(^{277}\) Bayer-Niemeier 1988, pl. 97.7, no. 556.


\(^{279}\) See British Museum, 1886.0401.1468.

\(^{280}\) Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl. 29c–e nos 202 and 204; Petrie 1909b, pl. 44; Petrie Museum, London, UC48351–2, see also UC49892–3 and UC48314–15. See also a similar composition on an unprovenanced piece in limestone (Petrie Museum, London, UC60036).

\(^{281}\) Redmount and Friedman 1997, 63–5, fig. 5.


\(^{283}\) Hogarth 1905, 122, 125, fig. 4.1–7; Hogarth Diary 24–25/04/1903, well 2 bottom

\(^{284}\) Petrie Museum, London, UC48351, see also UC49892–3 of uncertain subject and UC47798; Petrie 1909b, 17, pl. 34; nos 202–4; Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl. 29, nos 202 and 204; Giddy 1999, pl. 13, nos 57, 108, 1247.
5.3 Hand-made rider figures

Hand-made rider figures come in two different varieties: those with a diminutive (youth) rider on a large animal and those with an adult rider, where the horse is represented as disproportionally small. The first shows a small, poorly defined rider with short limbs (youth?) on a large horse with a straight back and square legs, tail flat against hind to one side (H-R.1, Fig. 52). The horse depicted is similar in form to contemporary Egyptian quadruped figures, and is proportionally larger and distinct from a second variety (H-R.2, Fig. 53) ridden by armed and armoured adult riders wearing pointed headdress and beards.

Figures of type H-R.1 are found in Third Intermediate Period to early Late Period contexts in Egypt, but they are rare at Naukratis and fragments are difficult to distinguish from other rider figures (H-R.2) or quadruped figures (H-A.1). Parallels include pieces dated between the ‘22nd and 25th dynasty’ from Ashmunein and Tukh el-Qaramus and Late Period parallels from Tanis, Kom Firin and Memphis. Note in particular one example that may be ithyphallic (see also L-R.2 and M-R.1), and see the discussion below in section 8.2.

Hand-made rider figures with pinched heads (and pointed chins, possibly representing kyrbasia (?) head gear and beards (?) (H-R.2) are distinguished from the earlier H-R.1 type by a larger rider in proportion to the horse. The horse is more dynamic, with angular legs and a curvy, sloping hind, imitating the mould-made and hand-made composite Persian rider figures that were themselves influenced by Achaemenid period rider figures found across that empire (see below P-R.1). The rider may wear a beard and kyrbasia, the high pointed headdress of the Persian cavalry also seen on contemporary Persian rider figures (P-R.1). The examples from Naukratis are stylistically so similar to H-I.1 that fragments are difficult to distinguish and are likely to be from the same workshop operating in c. 525–330 BC. Parallels are known from Memphis, dated c. 450–300 BC, from Tell el-Muqdam, Ashmunein, Kom Firin and unspecified findspots. This production is similar to Persian period production in Deve Hüyük, Syria and Kish, Iraq, often dated very broadly

---

287 Spencer 1993, nos 181–227, many of which are fragments of riders, but also quadrupeds.
288 Naville 1887, 56, pl. 17.5; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, TR14/1/34/5.
290 Spencer 2014, 176, F568, F440, F140, also possibly F556, F644, F855, F677, F588, F490, F653.
291 Petrie Museum, London, UC48060–7, see also UC47916, UC48322.
292 Bolton Museum, 1966.93.A.
293 Gutch 1898–9, 96, pl. 24, no. 345; Higgins 1954, 407; British Museum, 1886,0401.1468; see also 86.477; AN1886.510, see also Bolton Museum, 1966.93.A; Coulson 1996, 141–3, pl. 17.1, no.12.
294 Petrie Museum, London, UC48297, UC48063, see also UC48296–7; Petrie 1909b, pl. 44; Thomas and Nicholson 2013, P-3, P-8, P-41. See also possible chariot fragment from Memphis (Thomas and Nicholson 2013, 41, P-2.).
295 Redmount and Friedman 1997, 63.
298 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, TR14/1/34/6; CG32901.
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(700 BC or 550–330 BC)299 and to examples made in Cyprus,300 illustrating the wide popularity of such figures within the Achaemenid Empire.

5.4 Hand-made animal, prisoners and miscellaneous figures

Hand-made quadruped animals were made from ‘sausages’ of clay, on which details were pinched or impressed (H-A.1, Fig. 54). They are rare at Naukratis,301 despite being a common tradition across the Nile Delta from the New Kingdom to the Late Period.302 The animals comprise primarily bulls or cows, though rams may also be present, but this is not always clear. Parallels exist from Late Period Kom Firin,303 Tell el-Balamun,304 Memphis,305 c. 500–200 BC Mendes,306 Ashmunein,307 Tanis308 and Yahûdiyeh.309

Figures of horses (H-A.2, Fig. 55) can only be broadly dated c. 620–330 BC. The hand-made horses follow the earlier New Kingdom to Late Period tradition of quadruped figures common in the Nile Delta. Limestone parallels are also known from Memphis.310

Solid and hollow terracottas in the form of hedgehogs (H-A.3, Fig. 56), which occasionally functioned as rattles, are rare at Naukratis.311 There are Corinthian312 and Rhodian parallels313 as well as examples from Memphis314 and from c. 500–200 BC contexts at Mendes.315 Cumulatively these parallels would suggest the Egyptian copies were probably produced over the period c. 550–400 BC. Similarly, crude hand-made bird figures (H-A.4, Fig. 57)316 and crocodiles (H-A.5, Fig. 58)317 are rare at Naukratis; they can only be assigned a broad date of c. 620–330 BC. Parallels for birds are known from Late Period and earlier Memphis,318 Ramesside Kom

---

299 Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, ANE.75.1913; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1913.671; AN1913.648; AN1931.466; AN1925.150.
300 British Museum, 1886,0401.1467, 1911,0606.1, also from Naukratis.
301 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, RES.87.219, RES.87.217, 86.423; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.15.1989/9, .37.1887, E.237.1898/9; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1898–1908-E.4788, AN1886.507; Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA626, NA624; The Kyoto University Museum, 636.1, 638.5a, 638.5i, 638.5h, 638.5e, 638.5c, 638.2.
303 Spencer 2014, nos F490; F513; F545; F556; F596; F644; F653; F677; F655; F588.
304 Spencer 2014, nos F490; F513; F545; F556; F596; F644; F653; F677; F655; F588.
305 Bol and Kotera 1986, 63, no. 33.
306 Higgins 1954, nos 191 and 197.
310 Thomas and Nicholson 2013, 42, P-3; Petrie Museum, London, UC48296, UC48322; Petrie 1909b, pl. 44; Petrie 1909c, pl. 19; Anthes et al. 1965, pl. 49, no. 252; Giddy 1999, pl. 68, nos 245, 343, 429.
313 Brissaud 1994, fig. 9c; Brissaud 1995, 31, fig. 3a.
314 Petrie 1906, pl. 19.
317 Bol and Kotera 1986, 63, no. 33.
321 Thomas and Nicholson 2013, 41, P-2; Giddy 1999, pls 68–9, nos 495, 980, 799, 1565, 1721.
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Firin and c. 500–200 BC Mendes. Terracotta figures of crocodiles (H-A.5, Fig. 58) are rare among the animal figures examples from Naukratis. Some of the crocodiles may come from Late Period pottery vessels.

A miscellaneous group of hand-made figure-heads were very roughly put together (H-O.1), mostly seem to be male, and have bald or shaved heads (representing priests or child-gods?), although this is not certain as some fragments of female figures (H-F.1) can appear similar. Few were found at Naukratis (Fig. 59), compared to the vast numbers and variety in this style found in c. 535–300 BC Memphis.

A single finely made bound female prisoner figure from Naukratis (H-C.1) is unlike the stone captive male figures. It is likely to be Ptolemaic or later and may have been used in love magic.

6. Egyptian plaque figures

Egyptian plaque figures were made in a one-piece terracotta or plaster mould. This technique was also used to create complex three-dimensional model groups by adding additional mould-made and hand-made components.

Single mould-made terracotta plaque figures from Naukratis are made from a coarse, poorly sorted and organic red-brown Nile silt fabric (with abundant mica, white and quartz inclusions in a fine silty matrix) pressed into a flat plaster or limestone mould. They were usually left with an undecorated back. Once removed from the mould, the back and sides were sometimes modelled, or a base added. Excess clay was cut away with a knife, which was also used to add incised details that could alternatively be made with a roughly sharpened stick or bone. Some complex figure groups include various hand-made limbs, members and plaque figures added to the composition (P-R.1, P-P.1). Hand-made features were manipulated with finger and thumb and details incised in the same manner discussed above. Covered with a red wash, the figure was usually fired in an oxidizing atmosphere at a relatively low temperature, producing a light and soft red-brown fabric that, just like that of the hand-made figures discussed above, is reminiscent of Late Period coarseware.

319 Spencer 2014, 54, nos F690, F770.
323 Ashton 2003a, 74–5. Ashton conflates a variety of hand- and mould-made figures depicting a range of subjects of Late Period and Ptolemaic date. See also M-O.1 below. Thomas and Nicholson 2013, 41, P-1; Petrie Museum, London, UC47754, UC47756–7, UC47873, UC47894–5, UC48136–9, UC48514–16, UC48567, UC49900; Petrie 1909b, pl. 44; Petrie 1909c, pl. 28, no. 72; pl. 34, no. 127; Petrie et al. 1910, pl. 44, no. 188; Vaelckes 2012, 13.
324 Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA494.
Late Period figure plaques are clearly the continuation of an indigenous New Kingdom tradition, an 18th Dynasty innovation, developed out of hand-made types. New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period examples consisted almost entirely of nude female plaques found in domestic, cemetery, temple and fort contexts e.g. at Medinet Habu, Luxor, Deir el-Medina, Sawāma and Amarna and Memphis. This tradition continued until the late 4th or early 3rd century BC, with a greater repertoire of forms and subjects depicted in the later periods.

The Late Period, particularly in Lower Egypt, was a period of proliferation of figurine types, diversification of contexts and uses, and foreign influence, coinciding with mass production of these figures. Although the mould-made figure-plaque technique and technology used to create these was already used in Egypt before the Late Period, however, contact with the Near East, Cyprus and Greece influenced the style found on Egyptian figure-plaques.

Different types and changing styles can be observed. The most common, characterized by bulging, exaggerated facial features (eyes and nose), is represented from the end of the 6th through to the 4th century BC, being found in excavated contexts in Tell-el-Muqdam, Memphis and Saqqara, though represented also (as residual artefacts?) in early Ptolemaic levels. They were certainly popular by the (later) 6th century in Naukratis and were found in 6th and 5th century BC contexts there. The range of subjects includes primarily females and ithyphallic males, figure groups and Persian riders. The type and composition of the female and Persian rider plaques resembles closely that found across the Achaemenid Empire. However, the ithyphallic male forms, made in the same workshops, have only been found in Egypt and specifically within the Nile Delta, with key production sites at Naukratis and Memphis.

More naturalistic forms were probably influenced by Greek artistic styles, but also by Egyptian solid figures made from two-piece moulds of the 5th and 4th century BC and the subsequent hollow Greek style figures of the late 4th and 3rd century BC (see the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman terracotta figures). Some rider and ithyphallic figures are represented.

---

326 Thomas 2014a.
327 Pinch 1993.
328 Waraika 2009, 2, no. 3; Teeter 2010, nos 1–9 and 24–6.
329 Anthes and Bakry 1959, nos 200–1; Anthes et al. 1965, pl. 49.F.h, 242, 245, 248; Petrie 1909a, pl. 35.10; Petrie Museum, London, UC48396, 48148; Giddy 1999, pls 7–12.
330 Astarte plaques (Pinch 1993, 2.6.1 6B), rider and other figures (Downey 2003, 142–53; Pruss 2000, 54; Ziegler 1962, 482–536; McCown and Haines 1967).
331 Greece adopted mould-made figure-plaque technology from the Near East in the late 8th or early 7th century BC (Pfitz 2009, 99). With the exception of plastic vases produced using a mixed technique during the New Kingdom (Bourriaud 1987) and some attempts in Naukratis during the Late Period (see chapter on Greek terracotta figures), hollow moulded figurines were only copied from Greece in the 4th century BC (see chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman terracotta figures).
332 Redmount and Friedman 1997, 63–5.
334 Edgar 1905, 129.
335 Gutch 1898–9, nos 49–56.
wearing Macedonian dress (Fig. 84), whilst female figures are depicted with the melon hairstyle (Fig. 72), both features that postdate c. 350 BC, commonly represented in Egypt after 331 BC, and probably represent continued production during the Macedonian and early Ptolemaic periods. It is not impossible, however, that the Greek community at Naukratis and the already operational coroplastic workshops there may have been producing Greek-style figures in Naukratis prior to Alexander’s annexation of Egypt. These and other figure plaques have certainly been found in early 3rd century BC contexts, but it is doubtful that they overlap significantly with hollow figure types already produced in Naukratis from the end of the 4th century BC.

6.1 Figure-plaques of nude females

Plaques of nude females come in a range of forms, including figures with a plain or absent background (P-F.1), holding a tambour and wearing a polos (P-F.2), in an Egyptian shrine (P-F.3), in a ‘Graeco-Egyptian’ (see below) shrine with triangular pediment (P-F.4), or wearing Greek dress (P-F.5). All were made in a single mould and are of the same fabric, making it difficult to distinguish between types and subject when only fragments are preserved. They vary widely, with regards to size, complexity and details depicted, at Naukratis, as they do elsewhere in Egypt, where different variants can be found together (and are not necessarily regional or chronological features). The plaques are primarily a Lower Egyptian phenomenon of the Persian period and later that incorporate influences from Achaemenid period Phoenician sites in the Levant and indigenous Egyptian ‘fertility’, or ‘Hathoric’, figure types. Contemporary versions exist in limestone (L-F.2) and a parallel from Tanis was made of faience. Most female figure-plaques can be dated to the end of the 6th century to the 4th century BC; however, the production of some variants may have continued into the 3rd century BC and some rare or fragmentary examples can only be dated broadly to c. 620–330 BC. The significance of these figures is discussed below in section 8.1.

On figure-plaques of a nude female with a plain (P-F.1.1, Fig. 60) or absent (P-F.1.2, Fig. 61) background, the latter usually serves to accommodate an object or child. Narrow variants without a background, are clearly standing and very similar to types P-F.2 described below, with which they are likely to be contemporary. They can be dated c. 550–330 BC, with parallels from 4th or 3rd century BC Mendes, 5th to 3rd century BC Mendes, late 5th to 4th century BC Tell el-Muqdam, Saqqara, etc.

---

[^338]: Brissaud 1994, fig. 8d.  
[^342]: ibid., 67; Redford 2010, fig. 13.10.  
[^343]: Redmount and Friedman 1997, fig. 8.  
[^344]: Martin 1981, nos 1405, 1561.
Memphis,\textsuperscript{345} 5th century BC Tell el-Balamun,\textsuperscript{346} Herakleion,\textsuperscript{347} mid-4th century BC Tanis\textsuperscript{348} and Ashmunein,\textsuperscript{349} in addition to other unprovenanced parallels.\textsuperscript{350} Unpublished material from Tebtynis and Tanis\textsuperscript{351} may be from such P-F.1 to P-F.3 types, whilst published material from a c. 450–350 BC context from Tell el-Herr belong to a variant of type P-F.1.\textsuperscript{352} A rare variant, P-F.1.3 (Fig. 62),\textsuperscript{353} has a rounded back and more naturalistic style, giving the impression of three-dimensionality, but was still only made from a single mould, despite its similarity to two-piece mould-made (M-F.1) types. This has parallels from Saqqara\textsuperscript{354} and Ashmunein.\textsuperscript{355}

Terracotta plaques of nude females wearing a polos and holding a tambour to the chest (P-F.2, Fig. 63) have exaggerated facial features: bulging eyes, wigs and a slender frame. A group from Naukratis are probably from the same mould series,\textsuperscript{356} and some were found together within the Hellenion’s earliest levels, and alongside East Greek and Cypriot imported protomes and figures dating to the end of the 6th and the 5th century BC. This group can be broadly dated c. 550–330 BC, with parallels from Memphis,\textsuperscript{357} Herakleion,\textsuperscript{358} Late Period Hagr Edfu,\textsuperscript{359} mid-4th century BC Tanis\textsuperscript{360} and unprovenanced pieces from Egypt.\textsuperscript{361} An example from Memphis is possibly from the same mould series as one from Naukratis.\textsuperscript{362} A similar subject is found represented in Cypro-Archaic terracotta figures\textsuperscript{363} and in a limestone relief showing Bes and a woman from Leonarissos on the Karpass peninsula in Cyprus.\textsuperscript{364} This type of figure is also depicted on the phallophoric procession figures found at Naukratis and Memphis (see P-P.1 below).

Terracotta plaques of female figures standing in an Egyptian shrine are known in several variants from Naukratis (P-F.3),\textsuperscript{365} including examples depicted either without (P-F.3.1, Fig. 64)\textsuperscript{366} or with pillars supporting a lintel (P-F.3.2, Fig. 65)\textsuperscript{367} with a Phoenician amphora or other vessel (P-F.3.3,

\textsuperscript{345} Petrie Museum, London, UC48395, UC48148; Török 1995, 137–9, pl. 109, no. 206 acquired in Memphis.
\textsuperscript{346} Spencer 1996, 82, pl. 78, no. 79.
\textsuperscript{347} Heinz forthcoming, no. 107.
\textsuperscript{348} Brisaud 1995, 29, fig. 2a–c; Bailey 2008, no. 3001; British Museum, EA1885,1101.257 Late Period to Ptolemaic.
\textsuperscript{349} Roeder 1959, pl. 47o and q, r and s; pl. 47m, n, k, l.
\textsuperscript{350} Petrie Museum, London, UC45805; Török 1995, 137–9, pl. 109, no. 207; Kaufmann 1913, 100–3, fig. 69, 2–4; 1915, 107–9, nos 269–71; Bayer Niemeier 1988, 148, pl. 50, nos 263 to 266; Weber 1914, no. 199.
\textsuperscript{351} Rotté 2012, 13.
\textsuperscript{352} Marchi 2014, 97–8, figs 135–6.
\textsuperscript{353} Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology, NA592.
\textsuperscript{354} Quibell 1907, pl. 30.5; Jeffreys et al. 1988, 33, fig. 65, no. 79/20, pl. 19a.
\textsuperscript{355} Roeder 1959, pl. 47a, d, e.
\textsuperscript{357} Petrie 1909b, pl. 35, 11; Petrie Museum, London, UC48987; 48539; UC48147; UC48149; UC48393–4; UC48462; UC50473, UC48121, see also UC48395; Török 1995, 137–9, pl. 109, no. 208 acquired from Memphis.
\textsuperscript{358} Heinz forthcoming, no. 116.
\textsuperscript{359} See comments on context by O’Connell and Davies forthcoming and (in the same volume) Abu Zaid forthcoming, fig. 4.
\textsuperscript{360} Brisaud 1995, 29, fig. 2a.
\textsuperscript{361} Török 1995, 137–9, pl. 109, no. 209; Weber 1914, no. 199.
\textsuperscript{362} Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, H2029, Petrie Museum, London, UC48149.
\textsuperscript{364} Karageorghis 1984, 219, pl. 41.2, fig. 1b, no.1934/XI-11/1.
\textsuperscript{365} Higgins 1954, 404, no. 1542; Gutch 1898–9, 82, nos 51–5.
Terracotta figure-plaques depicting nude female figures in shrines with a triangular pediment (P-F.4) have a varied iconography. Some examples have architraves supported by columns in the form of two standing Bes figures on reclining lions. These are rare at Naukratis. Parallels are known only from Memphis. These plaques seem to be a later variant of types P-F.3 and L-F.2, dating to c. 500–300 BC. Although type P-F.4.1 and particularly the examples of P-F.4.2 illustrated appear to depict triangular pediments, an Egyptian rounded pediment from a kiosks (open shrine) is another possible interpretation of what is represented here. Nevertheless, these are rare representations and perhaps limited to Naukratis and Memphis and so could symbolize site-specific features related to the international context of these two cities.

Solid female figure-plaques in Greek Classical style, wearing a Greek-style dress and polos (P-F.5, Fig. 71) are attested in rare examples at Naukratis, covering the period of c. 500–250 BC. They include a head fragment wearing a polos of a Classical Greek date and influence and fragments...
preserving parts of the dress only. One figure is shown with a nude male child, like types P-F.1.1. A single example was found in the Hellenion precinct below the 2nd temple phase, confirming a Late Archaic date for this piece. Another example attributed to Naukratis appears to represent a woman with her hair drawn back as seen with the Greek ‘melon’ hair style (Fig. 72) typical of Greek figures dated 350–250 BC (see the chapter on Greek terracotta figures). However, this unusual (for Naukratis) piece may alternatively represent the short ‘coiffure’ typical from Late Period Egypt, and so not so diagnostic for dating. Rare parallels include a figure wearing a chiton found at Memphis and dated to the Ptolemaic period (?), and described as ‘male’. Male variants have been found at Memphis, dated to the 27th dynasty or Second Persian Period.

6.2 Figure-plaques of phallic males

Figure-plaques of ithyphallic seated youths with a side-lock and large phallus held on one side, sometimes holding a pot (P-I.1, Figs 73–4), are usually coarse, coated white and painted pink. Sometimes they possess a crude hollow base (Figs 73–4). Highly variable in form and common at Naukratis, numerous examples from the same mould series were discovered for this locally produced type. Fragments are often difficult to distinguish from ithyphallic bearded males (P-I.2, Fig. 75) unless the mould series is known. One c. 350–250 BC example appears to be wearing a kausia. The closest parallels are from Memphis, Tell el-Muqdam, Mendes and the Fayum, plus one example from Athribis dated c. 332–300 BC and some unprovenanced examples, suggesting that the type covers the period of c. 500–300 BC, with the kausia variant possibly persisting to 250 BC. A related variant, but not represented at Naukratis, carries a drum or a lute as well as being ithyphallic (the ithyphallic nature is not always visible in some fragments), and is well represented at Memphis.

---

386 Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA 632.
387 Hogarth et al. 1898–9, 81, no. 21, pl. X.21; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-G.78.
388 Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, E18841.
389 P. Ballet pers. comm.
390 Petrie Museum, London, UC47921, also UC48120, UC48119, UC47961, 27th dynasty example UC4805 and parallel wearing ‘Persian headdress’, UC48038.
395 Redford et al. 1991, 67 (although uncertain as not illustrated).
397 Myśliwiec 1997, 128; Myśliwiec 2009, pl. 18.1.
399 Except perhaps Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA591.
400 See also Petrie Museum, London, UC48386, UC33401–8, UC33412.
Figure-plaques of ithyphallic bearded males (P-I.2, Fig. 75) are coarsely made from a one-piece mould, coated white and painted pink, sometimes with a crude hollow base. Two similar mould series are represented at Naukratis, where they were probably made. Excavated parallels known from Memphis and Tell el-Muqdam, in addition to unprovenanced pieces, suggest a date of c. 500–300 BC for this type. An example from Athribis of P-I.1 or P-I.2 type was found in late a 4th-century BC deposit, and represents the latest known example from a reliable context.

Figure-plaques of an ithyphallic youth with a side-lock seated on a block-seat with forearms on thighs and hands each side of a projecting phallus (P-I.3, Fig. 76) were made from a one-piece mould, coated with white and painted pink. The type is rare in Naukratis and can only be broadly dated to c. 620–330 BC. Parallels are known from Temai el-Amohel and unspecified locations.

A single example of an ithyphallic youth with side-lock was made using the standard Egyptian Late Period terracotta plaque technology of contemporary Egyptian figures (P-I.4, Fig. 77). This piece can be dated closely because it is modelled on a well-known Rhodian type ‘temple boy’ hollow figurine type of mid-5th-century BC date. The single piece mould that produced this may have used a Rhodian terracotta as the original model of the mould. It has a crude hollow base and unmodelled back. Unlike the Rhodian temple boy model on which this was based, this figure was adapted to provide a different meaning. A side-lock was added to the right side of the face and an exaggerated phallus (tip broken and lost) was added to the front. This could not represent a standard ‘temple boy’ child, but instead falls within the large group of other ithyphallic youths form Naukratis made of limestone and terracotta. It was probably produced shortly after the Rhodian original, in the mid to late 5th century BC; the dating is supported by parallels from a late 5th-century BC context at Tell el-Muqdam and a Late Period piece excavated at Memphis. The parallels are in a similar pose, but are not direct copies of the Rhodian type. See also contemporary hand-made variants H-I.1 and later mould-made variants M-I.12.
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404 Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl. 29f, no. 203; Petrie Museum, London, UC33603–4, UC8402–4 and possibly UC8931, UC8747, UC8923–5. Another example may also be of this subject, but this is uncertain (Thomas and Nicholson 2013, 43, P-12).
405 Redmount and Friedman 1997, 65, fig. 7.
406 Fischer 1994, pl. 2, nos 11 and 10; Vogt 1924, pl. 85, no.3; Bayer Niemeier 1988, pl. 83.3, no. 454; Dunand 1990, no. 804, and similar 806.
407 Bailey 2008, 128; Myśliwiec 2009, pl. 16.1, who interprets this piece as a Hermaphrodite.
408 British Museum, 1965,0930.928; Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, H2257, H2258 and attributed to Naukratis, and from the same mould Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, E.117.1914.
409 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, SRS/6362.
410 Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1957.88; Laumonier 1921, no. 583.
413 Redmount and Friedman 1997, 76–7, fig. 18.
414 Thomas and Nicholson 2013, 229–30, P.109. However, this comes from a surface deposit, containing mixed Roman and Late Period (5th to 4th century BC) material.
Phallophoric figure groups are represented by a number of fragments found at Naukratis. They represent an ithyphallic child-god identified as ‘Harpokrates’ with side-lock on his right side, (Fig. 78, head fragment), his phallus carried by two Bes-figures, or priests dressed as Bes (Fig. 79) and two priests (see Fig. 122) with a naked female tambour player, wearing polos (copying types P-F.2, Fig. 63), sitting either on the child-god’s shoulder or draped across his head (P-P.1, Fig. 78). A number of fragments are known from Naukratis, but larger fragments and complete parallels come from 30th dynasty Saqqara, 4th-century BC Memphis, Late Period Memphis and unspecified Egyptian sites. In these complete examples the procession is made from a series of simple single mould-plaques attached together with hand-made sections, and the child-deity (interpreted below in section 8.2 as Harpokrates) is occasionally depicted holding a round object, usually described as a tambour. The child-god is represented much larger than the processing priests and Bes. The similarity to later Ptolemaic depictions of priests in a procession bearing shrines, and the Roman representations of an ithyphallic ‘Harpokrates-Min’ statue on a palanquin or litter, suggest that these groups may refer to religious processions with ithyphallic imagery. Parallels to similar ithyphallic youth figures carrying a small, usually female, figure on their shoulder like P-P.1 have been found in limestone at Herakleion and in faience at Saqqara. For a discussion of the religious background of this iconography, see below, section 8.2.2.

Bes plaques (P-B.1, Fig. 80) made from a one-piece mould, are rare at Naukratis, with only three examples recorded. They may be fragments from phallophoric figure groups of the kind discussed above. Late Period parallels from 5th- to 3rd-century BC contexts at Mendes, Memphis, Saqqara and Naukratis provide a broad date of c. 500–300 BC for the Naukratis pieces, although some armed variants (not known from Naukratis)
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416 See the discussion on the theophoric processing priest dressed as Bes (also ithyphallic) from Naukratis, dating to the 3rd or 2nd century BC (Bailey 2008, 60, no. 3154).
417 Gutch 1898/9, pl. 12.143; Edgar 1905a, 130, n. 6; Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA576, NA581, NA601; Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, H2805; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.389, 86.388; Bolton Museum, 1886.31.14, 1886.31.16 and 1886.31.15; Royal Museum of Art and History, Brussels, A.1837; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-E.4694; see also AN1896–1908-E.4720, either from or attributed to Naukratis and possibly from a phallophoric figure-group (British Museum, 1973,0501.1; 1973,0501.22; 1973,0501.32).
418 Martin 1981, 29, pl. 23, no. 306, see also nos 307, 1331 and 1332; Petrie Museum, London, UC30822.
419 Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl. 30, no. 206; Anthes et al. 1965, 129, pl. 49, nos 255 and 256; Thomas and Nicholson 2013, P-46, P-53, P-3857; Petrie Museum, London, UC48384, UC33595–601, UC33410, UC33602, UC47688, UC47973, UC48382, UC48385, UC48391, UC33605, UC48094; see also UC47801 and UC47814; Thomas and Nicholson 2013, P-46, P-53. Similar ithyphallic Harpokrates figures carrying a small, usually female, figure on their shoulder like P-P.1 have been found in terracotta from Memphis, Petrie Museum, London, UC48020.
420 Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl. 30, no. 206; Anthes et al. 1965, 129 nos 255 and 256.
421 Török 1995, pl. 34, no. 50; Bayer Niemeier 1988, 83.4, no. 455; Besques 1992, pl. 71 E381; Fischer 1994, nos 1–3. It is likely that many of the unprovenanced pieces were acquired in Cairo, and originally from the Memphite region on the basis of their form, their parallels and the collection history of such objects.
422 ballet 2007, fig. 6.
423 Heinz forthcoming, no. 108.
425 Bolton Museum, 1886.31.15, 1886.31.16, 1886.31.17.
427 Petrie Museum, London, UC47973, UC48109, UC50474; Petrie 1909b, pl. 35, no. 13; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, CG32871. None have good, secure contextual information.
428 British Museum, EA 1975,0726.16; Bailey 2005, no. 3090, dated Late Period or Ptolemaic; Martin 1981, pl. 27:1331, see nos 307, 328 in plaster; Quibell 1907, pl. 31.1.
continued to be produced into the Early Ptolemaic period, with parallels from Schedia, Tanis, early Ptolemaic Athribis and Tell Basta. There are also unprovenanced parallels. Similar Bes plaques were also made in Cyprus c. 600–450 BC.

‘Symplegma’ erotic group plaques (P-E.1, Fig. 81), part of a wider group made in a variety of styles and materials (see also L-E.1, L-E.2, M-E.1), depict an ithyphallic youth with an adult woman. The youth is depicted with short and chubby limbs, a round face and is usually shorter than his partner (see Figs 28, 29 and 114), making it unlikely that this is a representation of a priest. These are probably representations of ithyphallic child-gods and their consorts (depicted wearing an Egyptian wig and sometimes also carrying a tambour and polos, see P-F.2 and P-P.1). The type is attested by two coarsely made, fragmentary plaques attributed to Naukratis. Parallels from Memphis are of Late Period date, 5th- to 3rd-century BC contexts in Mendes and a dubiously provenanced piece from the ‘Fayum’ and an unprovenanced piece from Egypt dated 29th dynasty to Early Ptolemaic. Good parallels made from faience, mould-made terracotta (see M-E.1) and particularly limestone (see L-E.1) are known from Egypt. Erotic scene plaques from the Levant date to the Persian period. Some terracotta plaque fragments showing amphorae, with an unprovenanced parallel from the same mould, may belong to this group, as wine amphorae are frequently depicted as scenery or props in erotic scenes, as in the figures from Sais. Thus this small and fragmentary group can only be broadly dated to c. 500–300 BC.

6.3 Figure-plaques of riders

Persian riders (P-R.1, Fig. 82, dated c. 525–330 BC) were crudely constructed using a single-piece mould-made rider added to a hand-made...
horse. The rider wears a beard and kyrbasia, a Persian riding cloak and often carries a weapon and shield. Numerous ‘Persian Riders’ were found at Naukratis, one of which appears to be from the same mould as examples from Memphis (Fig. 83), suggesting that these were transported up and down the Nile branches. The type is common in Late Period Lower Egyptian sites, with numerous parallels from Memphis, Tanis, Tell Basta, late 4th-century BC Athribis, Tukh el-Qaramus, Tell Dafana, Deir el-Bahari, Herakleion or unprovenanced. A date associated with Achaemenid rule is confirmed by the presence of figures of the same style and technique (but different mould series) found in Persian period sites in Syria, Dura Europos, Ur and Nippur. Close parallels were found in stratified levels dated to the third quarter of the 5th century BC and subsequent pre-Ptolemaic 4th-century BC levels within the houses of the fort at Tell el-Herr. There is hope that further refinements may be possible in the future with the distinction of specific mould series. Late examples may be represented amongst finds in 4th-century BC contexts at Athribis and Tanis. Some authorities prefer a 4th- to 3rd-century BC date for the type, but examples found in Ptolemaic contexts could represent residual material within later disturbed deposits. To conclude, Persian rider figures are present in Egypt from the 5th century BC, but parallels from elsewhere in the Achaemenid Empire suggest that they could be expected in late 6th-century BC contexts also. Common in 4th-century BC contexts, they were subsequently replaced by Macedonian rider types (P-R.2, M-R.1) in the late 4th century BC.

So-called ‘Macedonian rider’ plaques (P-R.2, Fig. 84) depict a round-faced, short limbed youth on horse-back, wearing Macedonian dress (kausia, chlamys cloak and boots). The horse is rearing, trampling a vanquished foe or shield. This is a coarsely made relief, pressed into a one-piece mould, coated white and coarsely painted red. Although rare from Naukratis, parallels are known from Macedonian or early Ptolemaic contexts. Examples are known from Athribis, Tell Basta and Tanis. Some authorities prefer a 4th- to 3rd-century BC date for the type, but examples found in Ptolemaic contexts could represent residual material within later disturbed deposits. To conclude, ‘Macedonian rider’ plaques are present in Egypt from the 5th century BC, but parallels from elsewhere in the Achaemenid Empire suggest that they could be expected in late 6th-century BC contexts also. Common in 4th-century BC contexts, they were subsequently replaced by Macedonian rider types (P-R.2, M-R.1) in the late 4th century BC.
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446 Petrie 1909b, pl. 40, no. 46.
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contexts at Alexandria\textsuperscript{465} and Tell el-Herr\textsuperscript{466} in addition to some unprovenanced pieces.\textsuperscript{467} See also closely related and contemporary type M-R.1 (discussion on dating below), which are contemporary to type P-R.2\textsuperscript{468} and also found in in contexts dated c. 330–250 BC.

7. Egyptian solid mould-made terracotta figures

Production of mould-made solid terracotta figures using two or more moulds evolved at Naukratis from two different traditions. The first was perhaps an early attempt at making hollow figures with vents. Only the body was made hollow and the head was solid with added plastic decoration. Examples of this type only seem to represent females with one or both hands to the chest wearing a Greek style polos headdress. They are specific to Naukratis and influenced by East Greek and Cypriot dress and jewellery, and are made in an otherwise unattested technique, using Egyptian materials and possessing some Egyptian stylistic features (see also the chapter on Greek figures).

The second tradition is small, solid three-dimensional, two-piece mould-made figures. They were made from a hard, fine, heavy and sandy Nile silt fabric, with few visible organic inclusions. The fabric was selected and sorted differently from that used for hand-made figures and mould-made figure-plaques, though is still undeniably Nile silt and certainly local, as the moulds, wasters and the repetition of the mould series at Naukratis indicate.\textsuperscript{469} The fabric was pushed into a two-piece plaster mould (Fig. 4, no terracotta moulds of this type survive), sometimes as two halves that were then joined, tidied with a blade and then fired. The hard fabric seems to have been fired at a high temperature, often (but not always) in a reducing atmosphere, leading to the production of a grey figure (rather than the grey-brown produced by reducing conditions). Different kiln technology may have been used for these figures than was normal for the figure-plaques and the hand-made figures made at Naukratis. The fabric, firing temperature and observations regarding oxidizing/ reducing atmosphere are consistent with the difference between local Late Period pottery and early Ptolemaic pottery technology from Naukratis.\textsuperscript{470}

One should, however, be cautious before assuming such a change occurred in the Macedonian or Ptolemaic periods at Naukratis, as other evidence, discussed below, suggests that this was the product of technological and artistic developments that were already occurring in the 5th and 4th centuries BC before Greek rule. Some of these figures, however, are undeniably early Ptolemaic or Macedonian in date. The subjects depicted in these figures are identical to those of limestone figures, hand-made terracottas and figure-plaques, and comprise ithyphallic figures and nude female forms and riders.

\textsuperscript{465} Breccia 1930, 69–70, pl. 98, 2.
\textsuperscript{466} Ballet 2007, nos 6, 7, 8.
\textsuperscript{467} Bayer Niemeier 1988, pl. 91.4, no. 513.
\textsuperscript{469} British Museum, EA68849.
\textsuperscript{470} M. Spataro pers. comm.
The style of the figures follows that of certain limestone types, some of which can be dated to the late 6th or early 5th century BC. As with the limestone figures, the terracotta figures are usually small, lacking the complexity in form and subject of some plaque-figures, but highly detailed and naturalistic in style, often with traces of polychromy (red, pink, blue, black and green) that distinguished them from otherwise very similar contemporary limestone figures, which feature red and black only. This polychromy may be a chronological factor, as similar treatments are found on 4th-century BC and later Greek terracotta figures.471

The small, solid form of the figures may represent the technological limitations of the fabric and kiln architecture. The subsequent hollow figures made during the Ptolemaic period were larger and lighter (see chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman terracotta figures). Solid mould-made figures were first produced in Naukratis in the 5th century BC and continued to be made until around c. 300 BC or shortly after, when similar figures in limestone, gypsum and faience were also produced. This solid type appears to have evolved from an attempt to create more detailed, complex figures, following experiments to manufacture more intricate plaque-figures at the end of the Late Period. Some of the latest of this group are figures wearing Macedonian dress, a chlamys and kausia, distinctive of early Hellenistic Tanagra figures of c. 350–250 BC. The full Tanagra-style figure technology of hollow figures with vents was introduced to Naukratis at the end of the 4th century BC. After some overlap, hollow terracotta figures replaced solid figures by the middle or end of the 3rd century BC (see the chapters on Ptolemaic and Roman figures and Greek figures).

Whilst the naturalistic style, lime wash and polychromy shows some links between hollow and solid figures, it is unlikely that they were made in the same workshop, or at the same time, as they used both different fabrics and moulds and were fired at different temperatures. If contemporary, they were the products of separate workshops.

7.1 Mould-made nude female figures

Solid mould-made figures of naturalistic nude females (M-F.1, Fig. 85 and less certain M-F.2, Fig. 86) were rare in Naukratis.472 Dated to the late 4th or early 3rd century BC,473 all would probably fit within the period c. 400–250 BC. They may have been mere prototypes for the subsequently popular nude hollow and vented figures of Isis-Hathor type474 that started to be produced in the 3rd century BC and remained popular throughout the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.475 The type seems to have developed out of the later, more naturalistic, plaque types (P-F.1.3), with production in

471 However, this polychromy is a chronological feature of terracotta production at the end of the Late Period and not of the Roman period as suggested by Ashton (2003a, 72).
474 Bailey (ibid.) places no. 2992 within this group which he identifies as Hathor. In his discussion of 3rd-century BC textual evidence justifying the use of the term Isis-Hathor for these figures he states the text suggests; ‘though not wholly syncretic, but indicate aspects of both gods…thus Isis-Hathor is both the goddess as mother and the goddess as erotic being (Bailey 2008, 8).
475 Bailey 2008; Thomas 2011. See the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures.
Lower Egypt, certainly in Memphis, but possibly also at Naukratis. Early Ptolemaic parallels are known from Tell Basta,\textsuperscript{476} Memphis\textsuperscript{477} and Saqqara.\textsuperscript{478}

Women wearing East Greek style polos headdresses are represented at Naukratis in solid mould-made heads on hollow bodies with a vent running through the top of the head (\textit{M-F.3}, Fig. 87). Decorations, such as the polos and earrings were added by hand. A groove on the underside of the head was intended to fit onto the ridge of the body (as it is preserved on both torso and head fragments), but may have been the result of modelling the separate parts on a wooden frame or scaffolding as also seen on from Archaic Greek Rhodian figures.\textsuperscript{479} Higgins dated three of this group to the early or mid-6th century BC,\textsuperscript{480} whilst Amelia Edwards described one as an Archaic piece\textsuperscript{481} and Petrie dated it to the mid-5th century BC, although it was found alongside figurines that could be earlier.\textsuperscript{482}

This provides us with an unsatisfactory estimate of c. 550–450 BC, on the basis of imperfect contextual data and stylistic comparisons. The pieces may be an early and rare attempt to produce hollow figures.\textsuperscript{483} Figures of similar style have been found at Memphis, but the specific technology has not been identified outside of Naukratis (though may have been influenced by Rhodian techniques), where it was probably based.\textsuperscript{484} Petrie suggested the figures might be attachments from Egyptian vessels, though such attachments would be unique for Late Period Egyptian vessels; instead they most likely represents a hybrid form influenced by Archaic East Greek\textsuperscript{485} and Cypriot figures, although there are no close parallels from either region (see also the chapter on Greek figures).

7.2 Mould-made phallic male figures

Mould-made representations of ithyphallic males, mostly youths, come in 11 different forms, with numerous variants from many mould series, encompassing 82 figures and a plaster mould from Naukratis. Many (but not all) of these pieces had previously been tentatively interpreted as representations of Hor-pa-khered/Harpokrates.\textsuperscript{486}

Representations of an enthroned ithyphallic youth with a side-lock and their right hand raised (\textit{M-I.1}) in the manner of Hor-pa-khered/Harpokrates were mould-made of solid terracotta, in a two-piece mould and tided with a flat

\textsuperscript{476} Vaeliske 2012, 13.
\textsuperscript{477} Ashton 2003a, fig. 10:2; Petrie Museum, London, UC33572–3, UC45810–11, UC49896, UC45806–7; Petrie 1909b, pl. 35, nos 1, 8–9; Petrie 1909c, pl. 44 top left.
\textsuperscript{478} Quibell 1907, pl. 30.5; Martin 1981, no. 793 in plaster.
\textsuperscript{479} Higgins 1954, nos 35, 41. The Naukratis examples are, however, in a different (local) fabric and are more carefully constructed than the Rhodian examples.
\textsuperscript{480} See Török 1995, 52–7 and Fischer 1994, 34 on the association of these types with ithyphallic Horus/Harpokrates and his association with Min. See also Schmidt 2003, 251–6 on later variants and their problematic association with Harpokrates.
instrument, before being painted red or pink over a white coating, resembling limestone versions L-I.1. Two variants include an early (M-I.1.1, Fig. 88) and late variant (M-I.1.2, Fig. 89) dated c. 500–250 BC and 400–200 BC respectively on stylistic grounds. The dating of the later type is supported with parallels known from 4th-century BC Saqqara, Memphis, and from 3rd-century BC Ras el Soda, Alexandria. Variants holding a tambour were found at Smyrna, Turkey, Alexandria, and Memphis. This representation continued to be made into the 3rd century BC at Naukratis as a hollow terracotta, following the technology of the Ptolemaic period.

A range of related ithyphallic youths holding a musical instrument (trigonous harp or a tambour/drum), or a pot, and enthroned on a block-seat are known (M-I.2, Fig. 90). Like others within this group, they are solid, made in a two-piece mould, with white coating and painted red. The figure’s head, which is turned to his right, is shaved except for a side-lock. These too may be representations of Hor-pa-khered/Harpokrates. His right hand plays an instrument, held by his left hand and resting on his phallus. It is attributed to Naukratis, but no parallels exist with good independent dating and so the broad date of 500–250 BC is suggested for this type here following some of the published unprovenanced parallels.

An ithyphallic youth with side-lock seated upright or enthroned in the manner of other ithyphallic representations of child-gods (M-I.3, Fig. 91) is depicted with his huge phallus rising higher than his shaven head and resting against his left side; it is only crudely made with very summary treatment at the back. The solid terracotta form was created in a two-piece mould and painted red. Such figures are common in Naukratis, with an unprovenanced parallel from a different mould series and another from a possibly 6th-century Late Period context at Kom Farin, suggesting these may be some of the earliest such representations made at Naukratis, although a cautious long date range of c. 600–330 BC needs to be proposed for them at present.

Another ithyphallic youth with side-lock is depicted squatting upright, looking to the side (M-I.4), and holding his colossal phallus to himself, the

---

489 Martin 1981, nos 201, 302.
491 Himmelmann 1983, 47, 59, pl. 23a; Adriani 1952. See also Schmidt 2003, 251–6 problematic association with Harpokrates.
492 Bailey 2008; British Museum, 1877,0806.3.
493 Breccia 1930, no. 169.
496 British Museum, 1909,1201.20, 1973,0501.15, 1973,0501.40; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, E.79.1914. However, no examples are known to come from secure excavated contexts.
499 Seif el-Din 1998, 197, fig. 56.
500 Spencer 2014, 177, no. F274.
Thomas, Egyptian Late Period figures

Seated ithyphallic youths depicted with the phallus coiled around the neck (M-I.5) come in a variety of variants. The naked youth usually has a side-lock and is shown squatting and holding his phallus up and over the left shoulder (usually first), it then passes behind the neck and over the right shoulder. Three variants are known from different periods. The first variant with a side-lock is enthroned, as is the case with other representations of Late Period child-deities (M-I.5.1, Fig. 94). A second variant is shown squatting, wearing Macedonian military dress (kausia and chlamys cloak) and is bi-phallic (M-I.5.2, Fig. 95). Whilst the Macedonian dress confirms a late date for this variant of c. 330–250 BC, the kausia conceals standard traditional depictions of the side-lock otherwise found on almost all ithyphallic figures found at Naukratis when preserved. The final variant is of an ithyphallic youth standing, again depicted with a side-lock (M-I.5.3, Fig. 96). Whilst both M-I.5.2 and M-I.5.3 variants look early Ptolemaic in style, confirmed by the Macedonian dress depicted with the former, M-I.5.1 is more difficult to date, but could be earlier. For this reason the broad date of c. 600–300 BC is proposed for type M-I.5.1. Few parallels exist that can help refine the dating of these pieces, though they are known from Memphis. Parallels in limestone (see L-I.3 above), including two from a c. 550 BC–early 5th century BC context from Sais, provide rare early dates for these. Parallels dated generally to the ‘Late Period’ and made of faience are also known from Palaepaphos, Cyprus and other unprovenanced pieces were acquired in Egypt.

Another figure depicts a squatting ithyphallic youth with a coiled phallus carrying a jar (M-I.6, Figs 97–8). This form is naturalistically rendered, depicting a naked youth seated on a plain rectangular plinth, with a long side-lock on the left side of his shaven head, and his large phallus winding up round his waist. The youth holds a Late Period Egyptian amphora

---

501 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE33576. This is the only example from this mould series with a certain provenance. Large groups were found without a provenance within the British Museum (1973,0501.62, 1973,0501.61, 1973,0501.60, 1973,0501.59; Bailey 2008, nos 3224–7) and with an erroneous ‘Antinopolis?’ provenance at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (E.89.1914, E.127.1914). However, both the British Museum and Fitzwilliam pieces almost certainly came from the Egypt Exploration Fund 1884–6 excavations at Naukratis.


505 Leading most specialists not to include these within the ithyphallic child-god, or Harpocrates group (Bailey 2008, 71). However, see discussion in section 8.2.3 on Macedonian period representations of Harpocrates.


507 Petrie Museum, London, UC38349, see UC48390.

508 Daressy 1901, 230–9; Masoud 2014.

509 Clerc 1988, 53–8, pl. 18, Koukiia Museum, no. 86, dated ‘Saite’.

against his side. Common in Naukratis, all pieces seem to have been produced in the same workshop using a two-piece mould for these small solid terracottas with a white coating and red painted details. The presence of over-fired and unpainted wasters and a plaster mould confirms that Naukratis was the production place of this type. Unprovenanced parallels exist from the same mould series. A parallel in faience is known from Ptolemaic Athribis, but otherwise examples are rarely found outside of Naukratis. Bailey dates these to the Late Period, or early Ptolemaic period, recognizing the Late Period jar form also on related figure type M-I.9. The style, fine fabric and mould technology suggest a date towards the end of the use of this jar form in the 5th to the 4th century BC, but a cautious date of c. 500–250 BC is applied here.

The next group depict a squatting ithyphallic youth with coiled phallus, playing double-pipes (M-I.7.1, Fig. 99) or lute (M-I.7.2, Fig. 100). The otherwise naked ithyphallic youth is wearing Macedonian military dress (M-I.7.1) (chlamys cloak). No heads are preserved on this type to distinguish whether the youth had a side-lock, or, more likely (as in the case of type M-I.7.1) was wearing a kausia hat. He is seated on a rectangular plinth with his knees raised. This solid terracotta was produced in a two-piece mould and is decorated with a white coating and pink-painted flesh. Rare parallels are known from Memphis and Kom Firan together with unprovenanced pieces from the same mould series. Previously interpreted as ‘Macedonian soldiers’, these macrophallic youths are clearly not adults. Instead, as was common in late 4th- and early 3rd-

512 British Museum, EA68849 (Bailey 2008, no. 3263).
513 London UCL 1879; Fischer 1994, no. 16, = Vogt 1924, pl. 84, 3a–b, 5; Weber 1914, 77, fig. 52; Fischer 1994, no. 16; Török 1995, pl. 3, nos 51 and 53; Besques 1992, pl. 79, nos E401 and E402, see also Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 1916,1078; Cating 1967, 16, no. 23.
514 Myśliwiec 1997, pl. 6.1–2; 2009, pl. 6.2.
518 Spencer 2014, no. F343, but in limestone and possibly of an earlier Late Period type, without Macedonian military dress.
519 Fischer 1994, no. 17 = Vogt 1924, pl. 84, 1; Schmidt 1997, no. 132, Vogt 1924, pl. 84, 4; Dunand 1990, no. 809.
century BC Greek terracotta representations of boys. These are children. They are similar in style to the contemporary type M-I.5.2, and the Macedonian dress supports a date of c. 330–250 BC for the group.

A popular representation at Naukratis is of an ithyphallic youth (Harpokrates?) with his phallus extending forward to support a trigonous harp (M-I.8) between his raised knees. He is seated on a rectangular plinth. Examples come from a variety of two-piece mould series. His head is always turned to his left; he is coated with a white preparation and painted red or pink (flesh) and blue (harp). These figures are common at Naukratis, with six similar mould variants. The first variant (M-I.8.1, Fig. 101) includes at least three very similar mould series, all probably made at Naukratis, as an unpainted and over-fired waster was found there (Fig. 102). The second variant includes one mould series, probably made at Naukratis (M-I.8.2, Fig. 103). The third variant includes two examples from the same mould series, neither of which are certainly from Naukratis, although this is the most likely source and production place (M-I.8.3, Fig. 104). Another variant (M-I.8.4, Fig. 105) is larger and of a crude organic fabric and possibly from a single rather than a two-piece mould. It is also of uncertain provenance, though Naukratis is most likely. A number of unprovenanced parallels from the same mould series were also probably made at Naukratis, and there is also one parallel from Tell Timai. A number of other parallels in limestone have been found at Naukratis, Saqqara and Memphis (see L-I.5) and can be dated to c. 500–250 BC on the basis of these parallels.

Another locally produced type depicts an ithyphallic youth with side-lock (Harpokrates?) with his phallus extending forward supporting a jar (M-I.9)
and seated on a rectangular plinth with knees raised. The Late Period Egyptian amphora or pot rests on the phallus and is held in both hands. The solid terracotta is two-piece mould-made with a white coating and pink painted flesh. The head is turned to the side. The amphora is the same type as M-I.6, with handles placed midway on its body and an upright, occasionally double-grooved rim, typical of the 6th to 4th centuries BC. A plaster mould for a similar type was found at Naukratis. A number of pieces, probably from two mould series, M-I.9.1 (Fig. 106) and variant M-I.9.2 (Fig. 107), holding a bowl rather than an amphora, are known. Parallels include an unprovenanced mould and figures, but should be dated on the basis of style and the amphora depicted to c. 500–250 BC.

A rare representation is of a naked and ithyphallic youth standing or seated on his coiled phallus (M-I.10, Fig. 108). A solid terracotta, two-piece mould-made figure in a very similar style is attributed to Naukratis, although this form is more commonly made in limestone (L-I.7) and is dated to c. 400–200 BC on the basis of these parallels.

A few figures show an ithyphallic youth reclining on his phallus (M-I.11, Figs 109–11), usually depicted (when preserved) with a bald or shaved head and side-lock, but occasionally in Macedonian dress (for chlamys cloak see Fig. 110) and holding a goose (Fig. 111) or a pot. Some in this form have hermaphrodite like features, although this may be little more than just the representation of a plump baby. All are solid terracotta two-piece mould-made items with a white coating and are painted. They are well known from Naukratis. Variants are dated (M-I.11.1–2) c. 400–200 BC and (M-I.11.3–5) c. 330–200 BC on the basis of parallels that come
Depictions of non-phallic, crawling babies with a side-lock were rare at Naukratis (M-4.12, Fig. 112), with only two examples. These may be a local interpretation of common Greek and Cypriot ‘temple boy’ figures that may or may not have been intended as representations of child-gods such as Harpokrates (see P-I.4), or alternatively seen as real children (see the chapters on Cypriot figures and Greek figures). Early Ptolemaic parallels from Memphis and Egypt suggest these figures should be dated to c. 350–250 BC.

‘Symplegma’ erotic group figures, probably involving an ithyphallic youth and his consort (M-E.1, Figs 113–14), resemble those also produced as plaques, in stone and known from elsewhere in faience. They were made of solid terracotta using a two-piece mould and painted but are uncommon at Naukratis. Rare parallels are also known from Memphis or without provenance. More common parallels were made of limestone or as terracotta plaques dated from the late 6th to the 3rd century BC (see L-E.1 and P-E.1), including parallels from Saqqara but the closest parallels in other materials are faience examples from Memphis or without provenance. The parallels suggest that most should fall within the period c. 525–330 BC. Unfortunately the majority of symplegma figures known to us have no secure context and most of those that came from excavations are either too poorly preserved, or lack detailed stratigraphic information to help with dating. Although we cannot refine the dating, some clear features can be recognized from the numerous pieces preserved within museum collections. These clearly depict a youth with a side-lock and child-like from 4th- or 3rd-century BC Saqqara and from Memphis or are unprovenanced. This form is also commonly made of faience with parallels from Naukratis, 3rd-century BC Athribis, (early Ptolemaic) Saqqara or unprovenanced. Contemporary 3rd-century BC representations of non-ithyphallic children with geese include a depiction of a crowned Harpokrates, dated c. 245 BC.
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features (short and chubby limbs) with his adult (and usually larger) consort.555

7.3 Mould-made rider figures

Figures of riders wearing Macedonian dress (kausia, chlamys cloak and boots) (M-R.1, Fig. 115) are depicted seated on the back of a rearing horse trampling a vanquished foe. These were constructed from two mould-made halves, joined together and subsequently coated and painted. The two halves have often been separated as the join is poor. The fabric, technique and subject depicted resemble the contemporary P-R.2 figures. The few examples from Naukratis556 have parallels found in contexts dating to c. 330–250 BC in Tell el Maskhuta,557 3rd-century BC Athribis558 and Tanis,559 with others unprovenanced.560 Some examples are ithyphallic,561 suggesting that features found on rider figure types M-R.1, L-R.1, L-R.2, H-R.1 and P-R.2, may be related and should be distinguished from the Persian riders P-R.1. Although it is common to associate these riders with Hellenistic heroes, or specifically the Ptolemaic dynasty,562 the prevalence of identical iconography in subsequent representations of Harpokrates rider figures in various materials and media throughout the Ptolemaic and Roman periods563 suggest to me that these figures could be related, although the meaning of such figures could be context specific.

7.4 Mould-made fantastic creatures and miscellaneous figures

Animals and fantastic creatures are rarely attested in terracotta at Naukratis. Two different mould-made, solid terracotta sphinxes were found at the site (M-H.1, Fig. 116, dated c. 400–200 BC).564 Rare parallels come from Memphis,565 Saqqara566 or are unprovenanced.567 Although also made in limestone (L-H.1), the carved examples are of very different style.

A small group of mould-made solid male grotesque figures, with exaggerated features (M-O.1, Fig. 117),568 may be the precedents for the standard Ptolemaic ‘grotesque’ groups of cultists, dwarfs and dancers,569
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561 Bailey 2008, no. 3547. On rider representations of Harpokrates at Naukratis see Gutch 1898–9, 95. See also parallel from Zagazig, now in Cairo CG38296 (Boutantin 2014, 204).
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Figure 118 Mould-made solid terracotta head of man (?) in Egyptian style (M-O.2), c. 620–330 BC. Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, Bristol, H2011. Photograph © Bristol Museums, Galleries & Archives. Photography by British Museum staff.

8. Iconography: use and meaning

Figures were made at Naukratis in a variety of materials using a range of techniques and technologies, but they depict only a limited range of subjects, most likely subjects that were of particular concern or significance for the Egyptian inhabitants of Naukratis. Whilst there is a certain degree of continuity from the preceding centuries (with New Kingdom precedents for some types) present within the assemblage, there is also evidence for change, concerning the subjects represented, the style and iconography used to depict them, and the scale of production and consumption. Newly introduced types incorporated iconographic and stylistic features from the Persian Empire, Syria, the Levant, Cyprus,572 and later Macedonia.

The following section discusses the possible meaning that the most prominent of figure-types attested at Naukratis might have had for the inhabitants of Naukratis. Considering their iconography and uses, it tries to understand them both from a wider Mediterranean, Near Eastern and Egyptian as well as a local Nile Delta perspective. Both perspectives are relevant: the range of rider figures from the site, for example, is a phenomenon of the 1st millennium BC across the eastern Mediterranean and Middle East, while the figures of reclining symposiasts betray the confluence of Greek and Egyptian ideas. However, the majority of figures from Naukratis appear connected with Egyptian domestic religion, ritual and magic within, or related to, the framework of annual religious festivals. Nude females, sometimes with a child or in a shrine, ithyphallic (or ‘macrophallic’) youths, occasionally involved in phallophoric processions or sex acts,573 constitute the significant majority of Egyptian figures found in Naukratis – a picture that is mirrored in the whole of Lower Egypt. When considered together and in context, the numerous and seemingly unconnected fragmentary figures thus form a group that in many instances ultimately relates to religious practices and deities.

The deities represented include an ithyphallic child-god and their nude female companion, who in certain circumstances have been identified as Harpokrates and Hathor,574 although in the temporal and geographical context of many of the pieces discussed above, the Egyptian name Hor-pa-khered (Horus the child) would seem to be more likely to be correct. These ithyphallic figures seem to be connected with major Egyptian festivals, notably the inundation festivals (discussed below), although other festivals, rituals, contexts and deities are represented by other, more traditional Egyptian objects in other materials from Naukratis. It is not the purpose of this section to discuss all Egyptian cult and festivals that might

570 Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, H2011.
571 Petrie 1909b, pl. 44; Petrie et al. 1910, pl. 42, no. 135.
572 Such as exaggerated facial features, bulging eyes, pointed noses and also new jewellery, hair style and dress fashions common to the Eastern Mediterranean region.
573 Representations of hieros gamos (discussed below). As explained above, these cannot be considered priests or other adults, but instead represent a Lower Egyptian ithyphallic child deity, similar to the Harpokrates-Min represented on terracottas from Roman Coptos (Ballet and Galliano 2010, 197–220, figs 2–6).
574 Bailey 2008, 69–71 and 7–9 respectively.
have taken place at Naukratis as these are covered in other publications on this subject\textsuperscript{575} and in other chapters in this Catalogue,\textsuperscript{576} but instead to focus on what is represented within the Late Period limestone and terracotta figures found at the site. Particularly in the case of representations of the ithyphallic child-god this highlights a significant gap in our understanding of the meaning of these figures that requires explaining and further research. If we accept that ithyphallic child-god figures in terracottas and limestone represent an aspect of Hor-pa-khered/Harpokrates,\textsuperscript{577} one would expect numerous other representations of this cult to be attested in contemporary Naukratis. The more conservative corpus of Egyptian votive offerings and amulets in faience, stone and bronze amulets indeed shows a significant correlation, with almost all figurative representations of child-gods depicting Harpokrates. Only two child deity amulets found at Naukratis can be ascribed to figurative representations of an Egyptian child-god other than Harpokrates. In fact, the corpus of figurative Egyptian votive offerings at Naukratis primarily comprises members of the Osiris-Isis-Harpokrates triad, whose cult had already successfully spread across the Mediterranean by the end of the period we are discussing here.\textsuperscript{578} That said, the ithyphallic and erotic scenes that depict the youth with side-lock from Naukratis, and elsewhere in Lower Egypt, do not happily fit into our current understanding of Egyptian child gods in Egypt at this time. Nevertheless, they were very common representations within Lower Egypt, and I argue below that they are associated with a cult of Horus the child in some form.

8.1 Nude female figures

Nude female figures have a long tradition in Egypt, with hand-made terracottas being produced since the Predynastic period.\textsuperscript{579} Following an innovation in the 18th dynasty (16th–15th century BC), mould-made terracotta figure-plaques predominate, although limestone and faience figures and figure-plaques were also produced and have a well-charted development from the New Kingdom into the Third Intermediate Period.\textsuperscript{580} This strong Egyptian tradition is well represented in the archaeology of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Periods, from which numerous examples were found, predominantly in houses, but also in forts and ‘refuse zones’, not to mention in temples (particularly Hathor temples), as well as rarely in tombs at Medinet Habu, Luxor, Deir el-Medina, Sawâma and Amarna.\textsuperscript{581} Plain terracotta plaques of the 18th dynasty\textsuperscript{582} are very similar to those of the Late Period, and features that are present within the Late Period assemblages of Naukratis and Memphis are already attested during the New Kingdom. For example, figure-plaques of women wearing a headdress and with one arm across the chest have 18th dynasty origins\textsuperscript{583}

\textsuperscript{576} See chapters on Offering spoons, New Year’s flasks, The decoration of the temple of Amun and Bronze votive offerings and the forthcoming chapter on scarabs, scaraboids and amulets.
\textsuperscript{577} Also see arguments outlined in section 3 above.
\textsuperscript{578} Delia 1998, 550.
\textsuperscript{579} Abadiya, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, E3203.
\textsuperscript{580} Pinch 1993.
\textsuperscript{581} Waraksa 2009, 2, no. 3; Teeter 2010, nos 1–9 and 24–6.
\textsuperscript{582} Pinch 1993, Type 5 and 6A in ceramic and faience. Examples made of faience (specifically Type 5) were more commonly found in temple deposits.
and late 18th dynasty prototypes exist for the women reclining on bed figurines (L-F.1). The New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period nude female ‘fertility figures’ sometimes called ‘Hathoric figures’ are associated with domestic religion and the Hathor cult. However, this cannot be assumed for all subsequent representations and different regions of Egypt, where by the Late Period Egyptian nude female figures were used in different contexts and by different cults and communities for a variety of reasons.

In the Naukratis Late Period assemblage, four major variants of the nude ‘fertility figure’ can be recognized: reclining women with a child (L-F.1, P-F.1.1), women giving birth (L-F.3), females wearing a polos over long hair (or wig) and carrying a tambour (P-F.2) and finally women standing in the entrance to an Egyptian chapel (L-F.4, P-F.3; P-F.4).

Representations of reclining female figures, sometimes with one arm across the stomach, are part of a long Egyptian domestic religious tradition. Rare examples have magical texts preserved, which record that they were deliberately destroyed as a part of magico-medical healing and apotropaic rites performed by priests connected with the Hathor cult associated with, but not exclusively, women and childbirth. Although no Late Period examples from Naukratis carry magical texts, one 26th dynasty example from Upper Egypt bears a demotic inscription that names the child god Khonsu, which may refer to the protection of an unborn child. Similar figures had an apotropaic function during the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.

‘Hathoric figures’ were also thrown into the Nile to arouse the desire of the god Hapi during inundation rituals since the New Kingdom. This tradition continued until the early Ptolemaic period in Mendes.

Broader diachronic and cross-cultural approaches suggest that other interpretations may be possible. For example, in contemporary Archaic and Classical Greece, scholars studying nude female figure-plaques have replaced the ‘previously dominant concept of fertility (figure) by that of

584 Ibid., Type 6B–C; Delange 2012, 276–7, nos 815–30.
585 Pinch has convincingly argued that these figures cannot be considered ‘concubines’ of the dead as they were commonly found in domestic and temple contexts and rarely as (primarily female) grave goods (Pinch 1983; 1993, Ch. 2.9; 2006; Teeter 2010; contra Hogarth et al. 1905, 128). In Pinch’s study they were found to be associated with the Hathor cult; however, Waraksa studied similar assemblages associated with the cult of Mut (2009).
586 Identifying these nude figures specifically with Hathor is problematic, as during the Late Period and following developments of ‘mammisiac religion’ in the Third Intermediate Period, many Egyptian ‘Eye of Re goddesses’ (Hathor, Tefnut, Mut, Isis, Sakhmet, Bastet and Anuket) were associated with local variants of the inundation myth, rituals, festivals and the associated prosperity and fertility (Fazzinni 1988, 8–14).
587 Closely resembling Phoenician, Cypriot and Greek female figure-plaques sometimes called ‘Astarte plaques’. This possibly represents a shared understanding of elite consumption practices, rather than any direct or common religious influence.
588 Possibly referencing a pregnant pose, with the forearm resting in front of the prominent stomach.
589 But also known as Isis, Mut and Anuket.
590 Waraksa 2008, 2–3; 2009; Gutch 1898–9, 82 nos 49–56; Petrie 1886a, 40.
591 Teeter 2010, 43, n. 43; Wolze forthcoming on an example in Hanover Museum.
592 Dunand 1984.
594 Examples found in a river channel deposits dated between the 5th and the 3rd centuries BC at Mendes have been interpreted as a continuation of such rituals (Redford et al. 1991; 2004).
initiation', noting that they most likely depict young unmarried women, with the presence of a polos representing either bridal crowns or the headgear of priestesses, while cymbals/krotala may refer to ritual dances. In a recent study, Oliver Pilz suggests that such female figures, including 'dolls', form part of a complex and nuanced process of 'socialization' that changed over time.

The figures could of course have had different meanings depending upon context, or multiple layered meanings that were simultaneously religious, magical and social. At Naukratis most of these figures probably come from houses, as such figures were found 'scattered about the town'. However, they were also found just outside the temenos wall of the Egyptian temple precinct, near the Canopic river channel, and some were even found in the 6th and 5th century BC contexts of the Greek shrines within the Hellenion. Their use and meaning in Naukratis must have been highly varied, not least because there were different ethnic groups present and different religions practised there.

External influences during the Late Period resulted in significant changes in the form of female figures in Lower Egypt. The Near Eastern 'Astarte' plaques of Syria-Palestine, Cypriot and subsequently Greek female figure-plaques influenced those of Lower Egypt. Depictions of female deities standing within a shrine are distinct from those that represent reclining or pregnant females and are chronologically later, appearing in the late Saite or Persian Period and continuing into the beginning of the Ptolemaic period. The figurines are identified as representations of, or votive offerings in honour of, Hathor (Isis, Aphrodite, Astarte or Anuket). They are occasionally depicted wearing a headdress that specifically identifies them as Isis-Hathor (Figs 119–20).
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592 Pinch 1993, 2.6.1 6B.
594 Greece had since the late 8th or early 7th century BC adopted such mould-made figure-plaques from the Near East (Pilz 2009, 99).
595 Waraksa 2008, 1. Possibly introduced from the Levant.
596 Myśliwiec 1997, 120; 2009, figs 11, 13, 14. Context in Athribis dated c. 332–100 BC.
597 Hogarth et al. 1905, 128; Waraksa 2008, 2; 2009, no. 3; Török 1995, nos 203–9; Bayer Niemeier 1988, 148, nos 263–7; Tett 2010, nos 1 to 9 and 25 to 26; Hogarth 1905, 128; Del Vesco 2009; Rotté 2012, 15; Myśliwiec 1997, 120; 2009, figs 11, 13, 14.
598 The examples with a headdress seem to be later than those without. It is possible that the headdress is only significant in late 4th- to 3rd-century BC examples (see also example from Athribis Context dated end of the 4th to the 2nd century BC, Myśliwiec 1996, 10, fig. 2; 1997, Naukratis: Greeks in Egypt | 55
apparent borrowing of features from Astarte figures may not represent anything more than a regional fashion for the depiction of equivalent deities such as Astarte.

The standing goddesses are sometimes accompanied by a child or a wine amphora. The shrines within which they stand are typically Egyptian, being supported by columns depicting Bes, in the form of a lotus or palm, or with Hathor capitals (Fig. 121). What does this figure, with such a diverse range of symbols presented (wearing Isis-Hathor headdress or wig, with child, wine amphora, standing in shrine or with representations of Hathor and Bes) actually mean and what place and event is being commemorated?

The columned structures incorporate features and depictions of Hathor and Bes, but also allusions to birth (the child sometimes positioned alongside the female), wine and a nude female goddess (Isis-Hathor?). This structure could refer to one of four Egyptian chapel types we know from different sources:

- **Mammisi**, a birth chapel, used for celebrating the nativity of a child-god\(^{610}\)
- The ‘place of drunkenness’, \(^{611}\) used for celebrating the conception of a child-god
- The Bes Chambers, an archaeologically attested chapel in Saqqara \(^{612}\)
- A kiosk (open shrine) \(^{613}\)

The first three chapel structures are not necessarily mutually exclusive as the architecturally attested *mammisi*, the historically attested ‘place of drunkenness’ and the archaeologically attested ‘Bes Chambers’ may be regional variations of chapels that had a different meaning, function and name depending upon the religious calendar

*Mammisi* (‘birth houses’) were decorated with papyrus or palm columns, Hathor-headed capitals and scenes of the divine birth, all features depicted on the terracotta or limestone figures in shrines. \(^{614}\) Unfortunately the majority of *mammisi* that survive today are from a different region (Upper Egypt) and are of later Ptolemaic and Roman builds. As a result they may provide a misleading impression of what should be expected of Lower Egyptian Late Period representations of them.

---

\(^{120}\) 2009, figs 11, 13, 14), when in earlier representations the female figure (Hathor) merely wears a wig.

\(^{610}\) A term used to refer to a subsidiary chapel in late Egyptian architecture that is associated with the child-god (solar child) of the local triad (Koblauch and Gill 2012, 9–13; Arnold 2003, 33).

\(^{611}\) Also known as the ‘columned porch of drunkenness’ or ‘hall of roaming marches’, this chapel adjoined the temple of the deity. It is only attested in texts (Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 42–3).

\(^{612}\) A series of chambers attached to the Anubieion, a Late Period temple-town in Saqqara (Quibell 1907, 13; Martin 1981, 27–89; Jefferies et al. 1988, 33–63). The Bes Chambers may have operated as either a *mammisi* and/or the location of ritual sex acts (Klotz 2012, 395) associated with the ‘place of drunkenness’ concerning the ‘festival of drunkenness’. The Bes Chamber is discussed in the Saqqara section below.

\(^{613}\) This seems less likely to the author on the basis of architectural features depicted with the more detailed examples of types P-F.3-4, where the Bes or Hathor columns appear to be part of a larger structure. However, such depictions may not be faithful representations of reality.

\(^{614}\) Whilst much of the architecture looks decidedly Egyptian, three plaques (only known from Naukratis) depict a triangular pediment in conjunction with Egyptian architectural elements (Bes columns), suggesting that Greek architectural elements had been adopted into Egyptian religious architecture. Presumably this would suggest a Macedonian or Ptolemaic date for these pieces, although otherwise they look Late Period in style.

---

*Figure 121 Mould-made terracotta figure-plaque of a woman (P-F.3.4) c. 550–400 BC. Bolton Museum, 1966.92.A.*

Photograph © Bolton Library and Museum Service.

Photographer François Leclère, British Museum
Similarly, the large Bes and nude female figures depicted on the walls of the Bes Chambers are very similar in subject and style to the iconography of the figure-plaques (Fig. 126); indeed, such ‘Hathoric’ figure-plaques have also been found there, alongside ithyphallic male, phallophoric processions, riders and Bes figures, suggesting that all the Egyptian figure types represented at Naukratis were suitable votives for such a chapel context, but not exclusively used as such. Mammisi played a significant role in daily cult and annual festivals. Could the figure-plaques represent important events in the Egyptian religious calendar, such as the conception or birth of a child-god, and might they have been produced for the festivals associated with these important religious events? These questions are further discussed below in relation to contemporary and related groups of figures depicting ithyphallic Harpokrates, worshippers and processions and ‘erotic groups’.

8.2 Ithyphallic youth figures

Representations of the phallus have a long tradition in Egypt, with wooden phalluses at New Kingdom sites such as Deir el-Medineh, concerned with the cult of Hathor and macrophallic figure vessels relating to New Kingdom cults of Ptah and Hathor at Hagr Edfu, which would appear to refer to hieros gamos and concern the Ptah-Osiris and Min cults. Three-dimensional presentations of ithyphallic figures, however, appear to be primarily a Late Period phenomenon in Lower Egypt. The ithyphallic figures found at Naukratis are of infant deities, reflecting the popularity of the cults of infant gods (such as Harpokrates and Khons) and of child-loving divinities (such as Bastet and Bes) that developed in Egypt during the 1st millennium BC.

8.2.1 Ithyphallic Harpokrates

Ithyphallic figures in limestone, terracotta, gypsum and faience are relatively common in the 6th- to 3rd-century BC deposits of Lower Egypt. Despite considerable variation in material, technology, style and decoration, the group consistently depicts a seated ithyphallic plump baby with shaved head (or skull cap) and side-lock. They were identified by Gutch as Khonsu-Horus figures and subsequently by Bailey as Harpokrates, the Greek name for the Horus baby. The ithyphallic representation of Harpokrates symbolized the fertility of the Nile flood. Harpokrates is occasionally accompanied by the daemon Bes (as

---

615 In the Ptolemaic period mammisi were chosen as the location of wedding feasts (Montserrat, Fanti and Robinson 1994, 44) and the exchange of dowry was held ‘in the presence of Hathor’ (Montserrat, Fanti and Robinson 1994, 45), illustrating the central role Hathor temple chapels held in everyday rituals. These are, however, late and unusual documents that may not be characteristic of earlier periods and we should question to what degree such places could have been accessible for public festivities.


617 Pinch 1993; Martin 1981; Aksamit 1997, pl. 1.

618 Davies and O’Connell 2012, 54, 85, fig. 39; Beckh 2014, 35–43, figs 1–4.


620 Some hand-made ithyphallic figures from Memphis may be of Third Intermediate Period or Late Period date as the context is uncertain (Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl. 29, e202, e204).


622 See Bailey 2008; Martin 1987, 71–84; Myśliwiec 1997, 135, Ashton 2003a, 73 and parallels discussed above.

mediator, protector), priests and worshippers in procession (Fig. 122), or engaging in sexual intercourse with his consort Hathor (hieros gamos). Harpokrates is often depicted carrying objects or symbols related to the Nile inundation or to religious festivals, processions and rituals, such as frogs, wine amphorae, libation bowls and musical instruments (aulos flutes, trigonous harps and tambours). These symbols are not unique to ithyphallic Harpokrates figures, as individual musicians playing the same instruments or reclining, drinking symptic figures were also depicted with some early examples and both musical instruments and wine-jars are depicted in some erotic groups and nude female figure-plaques. The shared symbols between these different representations suggest that we should perhaps treat them together, all the more so as they were indeed often found together as a group.

Production centres in Memphis, Saqqara and Naukratis can be confirmed, though similarities in style and production suggest a close relationship between these production centres and specialists using different techniques and media (such as limestone, terracotta, faience and plaster). Material, technology, style and decoration varied considerably over this period and from site to site, and production of a variety of forms probably occurred simultaneously in many Delta temple-towns. Despite their variability the figures should be treated as a related group that represents religious and ritual practices in Lower Egypt during this period concerned with Egyptian cults of Hor-pa-khered/Harpokrates and Hathor (and Bes). Although also found in Cyprus, Turkey, Delos and in Upper Egypt, their distribution outside of Lower Egypt, particularly during the Late Period, was limited. This changed in the Ptolemaic period.

8.2.2 Phallophoric processions, priests and followers

A number of fragments belong to intriguing figured groups representing the procession of an ithyphallic Harpokrates, whose exaggerated phallus is carried by pairs of Bes-figures (Fig. 79) and priests (Fig. 122). The priests depicted are possibly those of Ptah-Sokaris-Osiris in Memphis and Saqqara, where such figures were commonly found.

These round disks are interpreted most convincingly as a tambour (small drum), though occasionally interpreted as a stele or a loaf of bread. The priests are depicted with side-locks and shaved heads (or skull cap), robed (never naked) and not ithyphallic, just as they are in Ptolemaic period depictions of priests in procession (see the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures). With fragmentary figures from Egypt it has been common for researchers to conflate (robed, non-phallic) adult priests with baby (naked, ithyphallic) Harpokrates figures. Though it was common for the Memphite priests of Ptah-Sokaris-Osiris to be depicted in this way (as the stele of the Priest of Ptah, possibly from or attributed to Naukratis and possibly from a phallophoric figure-group (British Museum, 1973,0501.1, 1973,0501.22, 1973,0501.32). Dated c. 500–450 BC.

Similar, but late, models of an ithyphallic Harpokrates statue on a litter used for a procession are known from Roman contexts at Coptos, where they have been identified as Horus the Child with some aspects of Min.634 Such phallic processions (which Plutarch635 also calls Pamyilia, with special references to Thebes) were accompanied by musical performances, celebrated hieros gamos by the cults of Ptah-Osiris and Min and are recorded by the Greeks who associated them with the Dionysiac thiasos.636 These processions were an important part of celebrating the inundation and agricultural fertility.637 In these phallophoric processions Harpokrates is depicted playing a tambour and sometimes carrying a nude polos-wearing female, also playing a tambour (Fig. 78). Harpokrates is always depicted larger than the priests or Bes638, who are in turn larger than the nude female tambour-carrying figures.639Whilst these figures are known from Saqqara, and the representation of the priests resembles those of Memphite priests of Ptah-Sokaris-Osiris, any association with that cult would appear to be related to the birth of Horus (Harpokrates),640 the son of Osiris, rather than with Ptah and the funerary cult at Saqqara, as is often overemphasized by specialists looking at the meaning and use of these figures.641 Such figures are rarely found in burials, but are instead known from shrines and domestic contexts.

It may also be important to recognize the close similarity in dress and style between the nude female tambour players carried by Harpokrates in these phallophoric groups and those identical female figures represented alone on plaques (specifically group P-F.2) and as part of erotic groups (specifically P-E.1), or the representations of women in the Bes Chambers in Saqqara.642 It could be the case that phallic figures, phallophoric groups
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633 Saqqara (Martin 1981, 29, pl. 23, no. 306, see also nos 307, 1331 and 1332; Petrie Museum, London, UC30822) and Memphis (Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl. 30, no. 206; Anthes et al. 1965, 129, pl. 49, nos 255 and 258; Thomas and Nicholson 2013, P-46, P-53, P-3857; Petrie Museum, London, UC48384, UC33605, UC33606, UC33607, UC33608, UC47963, UC48382, UC48385, UC48391, UC33605, UC48094; see also UC47801 and UC47814; Thomas and Nicholson 2013, P-46, P-53; Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl. 30, no. 206; Anthes et al. 1965, 129 nos 255 and 256) and also known from unspecified sites, but likely from the same region (Török 1995, pl. 34, no. 50; Bayer Niemeier 1988, pl. 83.4, no. 455; Besques 1992, pl. 71 E381; Fischer 1994, nos 1–5).

634 Ballet and Galliano 2010, 197–220.

635 Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride, 36.365B.

636 See Myśliwiec 1997, 126 and Coulon 2013, 182–3. Sadly the votive phalluses perhaps associated with such activities were inadequately recorded in many past archaeological excavations (Montserrat 1996, 174).

637 Herodotus 2.48; Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride, 36.365B; Montserrat 1996, 173–4; Coulon 2013, 182–3.

638 Bes is very rarely represented on his own in the Late Period material from Naukratis, but instead is usually found alongside Harpokrates or Hathor. The few stand-alone Bes figures are figure-plaques in terracotta or limestone, depicted, as they are in the Bes Chambers of Saqqara, holding a snake and/or brandishing a sword. All could conceivably be from a large figure-group or decoration for a shrine.

639 The female tambour players wearing a polos are depicted either lying across Harpokrates’ head, or sitting on his shoulder. As a result they are significantly smaller than Harpokrates, Bes or the priests. This is also the case on the walls of the Bes Chambers in Saqqara, where Bes is depicted larger than the nude female figures (Quibell 1907, 12–14, pls 28–9). See Fig. 126. In addition to the mammisi of that aspect of the cult.

640 See Bailey 2008, 69–70.

641 Quibell 1907, 12–14, pls 26–9, where ithyphallic figures in terracotta, faience and limestone were found as well as nude female figures and sphinxes (Quibell 1907, pl. 30.3, 5, 6).
and female tambour players were all produced in relation to the same religious event, but that female and male figures seem (based on the contextual evidence we have) to have been placed in other contexts and used differently.643

Another group that needs to be distinguished are the bearded ithyphallic males (P-I.2). These symbolize neither Harpokrates, nor his priests, but may instead be representations of his followers during a phallic procession. In this case the large phallus does not appear to be attached to the figure, but instead a model of a phallus is carried by a follower.644

8.2.3 Macedonian riders and ithyphallic youths in Macedonian dress

A popular Macedonian or Early Ptolemaic terracotta subject was of a youthful rider wearing Macedonian dress (kausia hat, chlamys cloak and boots), trampling his enemy under hoof. This group has been well published645 and figures are commonly associated with a Macedonian hero, one of the Ptolemies, occasionally specifically Ptolemy Sôter, an interpretation supported by their tight date range of c. 330–250 BC. However, these riders and a variety of ithyphallic figures also wearing Macedonian dress (M-I.5.3; M-I.6.2; M-I.7.1; M-I.11.4, Figs 110 and 123) are depicted as youths, with short limbs, and cherubic round faces. The kausia cap and chlamys cloak are common features on early Hellenistic terracotta representations of boys produced in Egypt and in Greece, so the dress does not automatically distinguish the wearer as an adult warrior. Why would the ruler be depicted as a youth and why would the ithyphallic youth figures, previously depicted in traditional Egyptian form (enthroned, with the traditional side-lock), now be depicted in this Greek dress? It is possible that the Pharaoh as Horus (the child) is represented here in the contemporary fashion suitable for a Macedonian pharaoh.647 This would perhaps explain why these plump ithyphallic baby figures wearing kausia, are the only such figures depicted without a side-lock. Nevertheless, the ithyphallic figures in Macedonian dress are an unusual and problematic group to explain.

Another ithyphallic youth representation that appears in the Macedonian period is the reclining Harpokrates strangling a sacrificial goose. This symbolic representation is also known from non-ithyphallic early Hellenistic representations of the same deity.648

In two examples, a frog sits on Harpokrates’ phallus, a symbol of the Nile flood and the god of the inundation, Hapi.649 This may explain another

643 They were generally found in different contexts at Naukratis.
644 Cf. Herodotus 2.48. It is highly unlikely to be a representation of Priapos (or indeed Silenos, contra Bailey 2008, 71), who was not commonly depicted before the Hellenistic period and is never depicted in this fashion, indeed the form and iconography is not Greek.
645 Brecchia 1930, 69–70, pl. 98, 2; Bayer-Niemeier 1988, 223–4, nos 514–15, pl. 90, 3, 5; Myśliwiec and Bakr Said 1999, 218, fig. 26a–d; Myśliwiec 2009, 37, pl. IV, 1; Ballet 2007, nos 6, 7, 8.
647 As Harpokrates was the child-deity aspect of Horus, associated with the pharaoh.
648 Hogarth et al. 1898–9; Ridgway 2006, 643–8; Schollmeyer 2003, 283–300; Schollmeyer 2007, 321–9. See c. 245 BC silver representation of non-ithyphallic crowned Harpokrates, from from Alexandria (British Museum, 1845,0705.1).
649 Hegel, the frog-headed goddess of fertility. See British Museum, EA90352 and Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, E.SU.142, with a parallel (Perdrizet 1921, no. 107).
feature of some ithyphallic figures, an aspect of Harpokrates of mixed gender displaying female features such as breasts, known as ‘Harpokratis’ and depicted pouring water jars. The mixed gender with pendulous breasts and large belly, taken together with a lotus headdress, water jar and frogs are all features of the inundation god Hapi. It is possible then that at Naukratis Harpokrates was recognized as possessing aspects previously ascribed to Hapi concerning the Nile inundation. This small and unusual group seems to date to the Macedonian period and may be viewed as pre-cursors to the popular Harpokratiss and Harpokrates figures of the Ptolemaic period. However, these representations are rare outside of Naukratis and any interpretations remain tentative at present.

In conclusion (to section 8.2), many (if not the majority) of the phallic figures were concerned with the cult of Hor-pa-Khered/Harpokrates and were heavily loaded with symbolism of the inundation festival, occasionally representing ritual processions. However, other, possibly multiple and changing meanings may also have been applied by the inhabitants of Naukratis to this group of objects over the long period of time they were produced and used. They were deposited primarily in domestic contexts at Naukratis, as well as, elsewhere, in bath houses. They do not seem to have been used as votives in sanctuaries except in the Bes Chambers at Saqqara. Their function in Egyptian domestic religion depended upon what power they were perceived to hold; this may have concerned fertility (specific or general) on different scales (personal, family and community). They may have been regarded as powerful objects, operating as amulets or apotropaic wards protecting the bearer or household against the evil eye as in Greek culture, or used in specific magical-medical rites of healing and curing, as also Horus-Khonsu cippi were used. Unfortunately we have no documentary evidence to further discern the precise mechanics of how these objects were used or perceived.

8.3 Festivals of hieros gamos and orgiastic cultic behaviour

Egyptians celebrated both the nativity and the conception of their deities. A significant class of figure groups known as ‘symplegma’ or ‘erotic groups’ depicting female and ithyphallic figures during sexual intercourse (Figs 124–5) may be representations of, or associated with, Egyptian hierogamies, the sexual unions between the gods (though suitable perhaps for the Macedonian and Ptolemaic periods, the Greek term hieros gamos is

---

650 Bailey 2008, 17. See also ithyphallic figures of this type identified as women (Bailey 2008, 69–71). However, some representations of ‘Harpokratis’ with pendulous breasts, wide hips and large belly may merely be representation of Harpokrates as a particularly plump baby. Myśliwiec argues the effeminate characteristics of Harpokrates are concerned with homoerotic imagery and a homosexual episode in Horus’ mythological biography and an association with Dionysus (Myśliwiec 1997, 133–4).

651 Hapi is commonly depicted wearing a lotus or papyrus thicket headdress, something that Harpokrates acquires in later Ptolemaic terracotta representations (see the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures).


653 They all seem to have come from the town area in Naukratis, as at Tell Muqdam (Redmount and Friedman 1997, 63–5).


656 Perhaps imbued with power through their association with sanctuaries, rituals or festivals.

657 Barrett 2011, 203.

unsatisfactory for explaining Late Period theology, it is used here in the absence of a suitable alternative). These figure groups feature a youth with side-lock and a nude female wearing a wig and sometimes also a polos headdress and carrying a tambour. Are these popular representations of hierogamies, or representations of other events? Egyptian’s believed hierogamies maintained Egypt’s fertility. However, such representations could also be interpreted representations of orgiastic cultic behaviour involving Memphite priests of Ptah-Osiris, who wore their hair in the same style and some evidence for this may come from scant and tentatively interpreted documentary evidence explained below.

Broadly, crucial dates within the Egyptian calendar concerned festivals that marked the return of the solar goddess (Isis-Hathor), her union (hieros gamos) with her consort Osiris and the conception and resulting birth of the solar child (Harpokrates). The return of Isis-Hathor and her union with Osiris also marked the New Year and were thought to induce the Nile flood. However, the interpretation of this calendar and the names of the deities changed over the course of the Late Period and subsequent Ptolemaic dynasty. Egyptians believed that the distant goddess’ return was signalled by Sothis (the dog star Sirius). Her return to Egypt was celebrated at her ‘Festival of Drunkenness’, although the ‘first day of drunkenness’ on New Year’s day and the day of ‘repeated drunkenness’ were also important festival days for her cult.

Festivals celebrating her return involved musicians playing sistra, harps (particularly the trigonous harp), tambours, drums, cymbals and clappers, accompanied by leaping, dancing, singing, feasting and drinking. Terracotta figures were certainly mass-produced for the inundation festival, and would include representations of the solar goddess, her retinue and worshippers (Bes, Ptah-Pataikos, so called ‘Baubo figures’, Nubian dancers, Sothic dogs and musicians) and the act of hieros gamos itself, or possibly cultic sex performed by priests.

Cultic sex (or ‘orgiastic cultic behaviour’) may have been performed during the ‘Festival of Drunkenness’ of the ‘distant goddess’ since the New Kingdom to induce the Nile flood, and may be depicted on the Turin Erotic Papyrus, though this is not certain. There are only two explicit cases of sexual intercourse in the cultic contexts of local goddesses
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659 Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 39.
660 20th of Thoth. Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 44, see also Quack 2013.
661 1st Thoth. Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 44.
662 5th Paopi. Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 44.
663 For it had erotic implications (Pinch 1993, pl. NY MAA 31.3.98; Myśliwiec 1997, 126).
664 Montserrat 1996, 169, 171; Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 43; see also Herodotus II.60.
665 Barrett 2011, 105.
666 Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 48–9; Brose 2009, 57–81; British Museum, EA50727.
668 British Museum, EA50727 may represent private rather than public ritual, whilst P. Turin 55001 provides no information on venue, occasion or motive (Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 48).
669 Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 50–1, O. Leuven 1 and 2, PSI Inv, D114a and PSI.3056 verso, in which the texts highlight the presence of strong criticism faced for such activity: ‘As for those who have called me evil, Mut will call them evil’ (Jasnow and Smith 2010–11). These texts betray local Egyptian resistance to Ptolemaic period Greek and Roman criticism of such ritual sex practices.
subsequently merged with the Isis-Hathor cult and another possible case of orgiastic cultic behaviour recorded during the Roman period during the Bubasteia festival of the goddess Bastet. It is certainly true that the exposure of genitalia was practised within Egyptian religion. However other explicit cases of ritual sex are ambiguous, unreliable or overtly political, and reported as abuses of power by the Egyptian priests of Isis on the wives of Roman citizens. Whether cultic sex took place or not within chapels such as the ‘place of drunkenness’ described above or other structures during the festival of drunkenness, it is less likely that the figures represent this ritual activity than the hierogamies – the sexual unions between gods – that were believed to make the world fertile. This view is supported by the frequent depiction of the male figure as an ithyphallic child-deity, instead of as a normally proportioned adult.

The aim of the annual and cyclical *hieros gamos* – the union of Hathor-Isis and the Horus-King – was to produce the new solar child, Harpokrates. Though the festival of the birth of the solar child falls 9 months after the inundation (1st of Oachons), Hathoric ritual objects associated with the New Year often depict or allude to the eventual birth of the solar child. It is perhaps in this context that the erotic figure groups should be explained, as they represent Harpokrates as a baby (with his side-lock) and Hathor begetting Harpokrates. However, this would be an unusual representation of Horus-the king as Horus-the child (Harpokrates).

8.4 Quadrupeds and riders

Rough hand-made quadruped figures were common in dynastic Egypt, found (as were cows) in temple contexts associated with the cult of Hathor and well represented in New Kingdom to Late Period domestic
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670 Al-Nehemanit and Mut-Sekhmet-Bastet-Wadjet respectively. Indeed at Edfu, Hathor-Sekhmet is mentioned in a hymn as she ‘before whom everyone performs sexual intercourse’ (Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 49).

672 A festival moved by Ptolemy III to coincide with Euergesia, on the 1st of Payni, and the rising of Sothis, harbinger of the Nile inundation (Montserrat 1996, 170; Delia 1998, 545). This festival was moved as an Early Ptolemaic dynastic act of propaganda, aimed at integrating the dynasty by manipulating traditional Egyptian festivals, to cement the Ptolemaic dynasty into the everyday religious experience of Egyptians in the Nile Delta.

677 Jasnow and Smith 2010–11, 50–1, P. Carlsberge 69.


679 Montserrat 1996, 166.

680 Barrett 2011, 124.

681 Ibid., 127.

682 Who in one example is depicted breast-feeding Harpokrates, whilst having intercourse with Harpokrates (Petrie Museum, London, UC38354, UC35953).

683 Pinch 1993.
contexts in the Delta and across Egypt, along with other animals, particularly rams, birds and hedgehogs. However, such hand-made animal-figures were not common at Naukratis. From the Third Intermediate Period, horses, riders and (rarely) chariots, were represented at Memphis, Ashmunein and Kom Firin. These Third Intermediate Period examples show a diminutive figure (child?) on horseback. The same can also be observed for limestone rider figures, depicting a crudely carved large horse with a small rider (child?), found in various temple and well contexts in Naukratis (discussed below). Two examples from the Hellenion at Naukratis carry 6th-century BC Greek inscriptions. Similar figures were also found in the Bes Chambers in Saqqara where they were associated with figures of ithyphallic youths. Ithyphallic limestone riders (L-R.2) may also refer to an Egyptian child deity such as Hor-pa-khered.

The normal sized riders found at Naukratis, by contrast, stand in a wider Middle-Eastern and Eastern Mediterranean tradition of representations of (aristocratic) horsemen, charioteers and cavalry. Many of these rider figures depict a bearded figure wearing a kyrbasia and Persian riding dress (P-R.1, H-R.2), and are commonly found on Achaemenid sites across the Near East, including Cyprus. Indeed, an imported Cypriot example was also found at Naukratis. Whilst various scholars have dated ‘Persian rider’ figures to between the 7th and the 3rd century BC, a date of 525–330 BC seems most likely, and they are certainly attested in 4th-century BC contexts. Who is represented remains a mystery, possibly the dedicant, a soldier, or a rider god such as Kakasbos of Sagalassos, Sozon, Herakles, Maseis, Apollo or Heron.

Different again are the so-called ‘Macedonian riders’, depicted wearing the Macedonian kausia and chlamys cloak. They may have been used differently from the Persian riders as, like the limestone pieces, they are sometimes depicted ithyphallic. This type was labelled ‘Eros on Horseback’, by Gutch, who considered them to be a portrayal of the warrior Harpokrates. This would explain the ithyphallic nature of some terracotta and limestone riders and the presence of both phallic and non-phallic limestone rider-figures in the Bes chambers and surrounding area at Saqqara, alongside ithyphallic figures. Macedonian riders have also been found in grave contexts.

In conclusion, we can distinguish three strands of rider figures at Naukratis. The first consists of rider figures representing a child on horseback, possibly a child-god such as Hor-pa-khered, originating in the (late) Third Intermediate Period Egyptian hand-made terracotta tradition, before subsequently being produced in limestone and occasionally depicted as ithyphallic (as became common by the 5th and 4th centuries BC). Second

684 Spencer 2014.
685 Spencer, Bailey and Davies 1984, 100; Spencer 1993, 33.
688 See the chapter on Cypriot figures in stone and terracotta.
690 Poblome 1998, 205.
691 Gutch 1898–9, nos 281–2.
692 Quibell 1907, 13; Martin 1981, nos 303–4.
come representations of a youth in Macedonian dress. The Persian riders, finally, represent bearded adult males and not a child-god at all. Whether they represent another, different deity (subsequently subsumed or forgotten?) or the dedicant is uncertain. These differences may also explain their different distribution, as limestone figures were found within votive deposits of both Egyptian and Greek sanctuaries at Naukratis, whilst the Persian riders were found in the town. This hypothesis appears to be contradicted, however, by other sites where Persian riders have been found in temple contexts.  

9. Beyond Naukratis

Naukratis did not exist in isolation, but was bound tightly into local, regional and international networks that were crucial in shaping its material culture. This is particularly visible with the figures from the site. The figures from Naukratis display features (subject, style, technique, technology and material) that are similar to those from other areas of Egypt with which its inhabitants had close connections. Some of the figures seem to have been transported between Egyptian settlements. In order to more fully understand the processes of production and consumption of figures at Naukratis we therefore need to consider them in their wider geographical context. The following section is a brief survey aimed at assessing regional patterns in comparison with Naukratis.

We have already recognized the close similarities that existed between Naukratis and figure production at Memphis and Saqqara at the apex of the Nile Delta, which is thus a natural place to start our survey. From this the discussion will move downstream along the Nile Delta branches from west to east, before finishing with Middle and Upper Egypt and some conclusions regarding the position of Naukratis in its regional context from the perspective of the figures.

9.1 Memphis and Saqqara

Excavations within the Memphite Nome have provided the closest known parallels for Egyptian figures from Naukratis. The results of various excavations within Memphis and its cemetery in Saqqara provide three particularly useful avenues of research for the Naukratis material. First, there is evidence of production of both limestone and terracotta figures, of types very close to those found at Naukratis. Secondly, there is a long history of the use of such figures. Finally, there is useful contextual information on their use, particularly within sanctuaries, such as in a structure at Saqqara named by Egyptologists the ‘Bes Chambers’.

Memphis (Mit Rahina) and Saqqara together have produced a range of female, male, rider and erotic figures. Due to the peculiarities of
excavation and preservation, the Persian period to the 4th century BC is particularly well represented in the material from Petrie’s and subsequent excavations. Memphite produced terracotta figures of ithyphallic Harpokrates and female figure plaques, including of figures in shrines, that are the closest stylistically to those found at Naukratis.

Mould-made terracotta plaques of nude females were a feature of offerings to Hathor in the Egyptian temples of Memphis. They occur in domestic contexts and, rarely, in burials, from the New Kingdom. Locally produced in Memphis, they have been found there in New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period contexts together with ithyphallic male figures and hand-made animal figures, whilst a few Late Period pieces were found on the surface. Nude female-in-shrine figure-plaques of 27th dynasty or later date were also excavated in Memphis, along with numerous phallophoric procession figure-groups. These were found in a range of industrial areas, sanctuaries and domestic spaces.

Excavations at Saqqara have produced Late Period to Ptolemaic figures of females, riders, erotic and particularly phallic figures of the 4th to 2nd centuries BC in terracotta, faience, and plaster, especially limestone, faience and terracotta phallic and phallophoric procession figure-groups. A large number of such figures were found associated with a series of chambers adjoining the temenos walls of the Anubieion temple-town, called the ‘Bes Chambers’. These chambers were decorated with depictions of Bes and nude women in relief, and deposits excavated there revealed a variety of ithyphallic figures, as well as nude female figures and rider figures in limestone, all dating from the period c. 400–200 BC. As discussed above (section 8), the function of this structure is debated.

Female figures are rare at Saqqara in comparison to Memphis. Limestone ithyphallic figures were produced at Saqqara, which is also the most likely source of the limestone ithyphallic Harpokrates figures found at Naukratis. The only notable absence from the Memphis and Saqqara material are the brightly painted two-piece solid mould-made ithyphallic figures distinctive of Naukratite production. It would appear that the movement of Egyptian figures was one-way; it flowed
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700 See mould in Edgar 1903, pl. 33, no. 32360.
703 Giddy 1999, 28–30, pls 7–12.
704 ibid., pl. 13.
705 ibid., pls 68–70.
706 ibid., notably no. 76, and ithyphallic no. 57.
708 ibid., P-46, P-53; Anthes and Bakry 1959, pl.30, no. 206; Anthes et al. 1965, 129 nos 255 and 256; numerous parallels from excavations in Memphis, now in the Petrie Museum.
709 Quibell 1907, 12–14, pls 26–9; Martin 1987, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, SR5/6204, 6207, 6311, 6355, 6373, 6374, 6384, nos 2–5; Hastings 1997, pl. 63, no. 251.
710 British Museum, 1971,0123,164.
711 British Museum, 1975,0726,19.
712 Martin 1981, no. 1332. One phallic figure was also found at nearby Giza (Martin 1987, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, SR5/6370).
713 Martin 1981, no. 1561.
downstream from the important Memphite cultic centres to Naukratis and not the other way round.

9.2 The Canopic branch

The closest parallels to the Memphite production are, unsurprisingly, connected to Naukratis via the Canopic Nile-branch and nearby canals. However, most nearby sites only have limited material from specific periods. Sais and Kom Firin provide useful Late Period parallels, whilst 4th-century BC parallels are known from Herakleion. The founding of Alexandria and Schedia also provides a useful terminus post quem of the late 4th century BC for parallels. Along the Canopic branch and in the immediate vicinity of Naukratis the full array of limestone and terracotta hand-made and plaque-made figures is attested, though the Naukratite production of solid mould-made figures was rarely found outside of Naukratis itself.

Downstream of Naukratis, at the Macedonian foundation of Schedia, the most common early Ptolemaic types were found, including limestone ithyphallic Harpokrates figures and terracotta Bes-plaques, which are reminiscent of the Memphite production. Along the Schedia canal towards Alexandria, a temple site at Ras el-Soda yielded limestone figures, plaques, and solid mould-made ithyphallic figures of late 4th- and 3rd-century BC date. At this time Alexandria had superseded nearby Herakleion, which possesses a slightly earlier assemblage of 4th-century BC figures, including theophoric (i.e. figures carrying statues of gods) and ithyphallic limestone types, and terracotta plaques of females (P-F.1, P-F.2), in addition to Persian riders. Herakleion, and later Schedia and Alexandria, provide (in much smaller quantities) the same standard Delta figures as attested at Naukratis in the 4th and 3rd centuries BC, when Naukratis was well connected to both sites, en-route between Memphis and the Mediterranean ports.

The nearby site of Kom Firin produced a number of figures that show a strong local tradition from the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period, such as quadruped and hand-made riders, of types rarely found at Naukratis. New Kingdom type cobra figures were most likely residual in Late Period and Ptolemaic contexts. Kom Firin also yielded a number of Saite carved limestone figures, including reclining female figures and drummers. Unlike at Naukratis, Persian Period types are rare, such as terracotta plaque-figures, limestone musician figures, female plaque-figures in terracotta and faience and a mould-made terracotta ithyphallic
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This is in stark contrast to Naukratis, which has a large number of 5th- and 4th-century BC figures of this type. The nearby site Kom el-Zalat on the desert edge produced a limestone plaque of a pregnant woman (L-F.3).\textsuperscript{726}

Connected to Naukratis and the Canopic branch by a canal, but also via the Saitic branch to the Sebennytic branch, the ancient capital of Sais (Sa el-Hagar) has produced a number of important parallels for Naukratis figures, including limestone riders and female plaques (L-R.1, L-F.1),\textsuperscript{727} as well as an important group of musicians, ithyphallic Harpokrates, reclining sympotic and erotic groups dated c. 550–early 5th century BC on the basis of style, pose, parallels and an amphorae represented.\textsuperscript{728}

9.3 The Sebennytic (or Phatnitic) branch

In the central Delta, at Athribis (Tell Atrib), a range of figures has been found in recent excavations of the late 4th-century BC Macedonian extension to the settlement, near the Late Period temple and cemetery of the site.\textsuperscript{729} Limestone female figures in shrines in a number of late variants of type (L-F.2)\textsuperscript{730} were found in contexts dated to the late 4th century BC and the 2nd century BC, as were Horus cippi.\textsuperscript{731} Some of these limestone figures seem to have been made in Athribis. A Persian rider head was found in a late 4th-century BC context,\textsuperscript{732} and a Macedonian rider in a 3rd-century BC context.\textsuperscript{733} A terracotta ithyphallic figure plaque was found in one of the earliest levels (P-I.2)\textsuperscript{734} and similar plaques of Bes\textsuperscript{736} and nude females have been published (P-F).\textsuperscript{736} Limestone ithyphallic Harpokrates (L-I.6)\textsuperscript{737} and faience versions (M-I.11)\textsuperscript{738} of phallic figures (M-I.6)\textsuperscript{739} were of typical Early Ptolemaic types. Though some may be residual, the stratigraphic information shows a continued operation of these Egyptian Late Period figure industries throughout the late 4th and into the 3rd or 2nd century BC, after which time they were replaced by standard hollow terracotta types.

Downstream, the Central Delta site of Leontopolis (Tell el-Muqdam) produced an assemblage very similar to the Persian period types from Naukratis. The typical hand-made and plaque figures of c. 500–330 BC include many ithyphallic terracotta plaques from domestic contexts (types P-F.1, P-F.3, P-I.1, P-I.2, P-I.4, H-F.1, H-R.1, H-I.1). Whilst we must await final publication of this site before conclusions can be drawn, the apparent
absence of solid mould-made and limestone figure types could be explained by regional and/or chronological differences.

Terracotta ithyphallic figures were found at Sebennytus (Samannud), including moulded types similar to those made at Naukratis (M-I.7), with others from nearby Mahalla el-Kubra. Herodotus describes Buto as a major node on the Sebennytic branch, although Buto, known today as Tell el-Farain, is currently located near the Rosetta branch. A limestone ithyphallic figure (L-I.1) and rider (L-R.1) are known to come from that site.

The site of Diospolis Kato (Tell el-Balamun), further downstream of Sebennytus as the Nile reached the Mediterranean, revealed a few hand-made rider figures of the Third Intermediate Period, though other examples were found in Ptolemaic pits cut through Third Intermediate Period levels; it is not always possible to confirm whether a rider or just a horse is depicted (H-R.2 or H-A.2). Late Period deposits have revealed Persian riders, nude females in shrines in both terracotta (P-F.3) and limestone (L-F.2).

9.4 The Mendesian branch

Branching off the Sebennytic branch below Sebennytus was the Mendesian branch. Mendes (Tell el-Ruba) has produced a number of figure-plaques and figures dated c. 500–200 BC of quadrupeds (H-A.1) and common nude female figure-plaques, either in a shrine (P-F.3 and P-F.4) or plain (P-F.1). Limestone ithyphallic figures, as well as phallic male figures (P-I.1–2), Bes-plaques (P-B.1) and faience and terracotta erotic groups are also known from Mendes. Nearby Thmuis (Tell Timai, Timai el-Amdid) has yielded further terracotta and faience ithyphallic and erotic groups and pregnant female ‘Baubo’ figures.

9.5 The Pelusiac branch

North of Memphis along the Pelusiac branch is Natho, also known as Leontopolis of Heliopolis (modern Tell el-Yahudiyyeh), from which a number of female and animal figures are recorded (L-F.2, P-F.3–4, H-A, P-F.4, L-F.2)
Further downstream, recent excavations at Bubastis (Tell Basta, el-Zagazig) have produced a number of Persian riders (P-R.1), female plaques and quadrupeds, in addition to terracotta, faience and limestone ithyphallic, phallicory and erotic groups. The nearby site of Saft el-Hinna also produced a terracotta erotic group. Following Bubastis, there was a junction on the Nile branch for the Canal of Darius, which reached Heroonpolis (Tell el-Maskhuta), where a limestone ithyphallic figure was found. Returning to the Pelusiac branch, a number of terracotta ithyphallic figures, as well as hand-made rider figures come from the site of Tuht el-Qaramus.

Just off the main Pelusiac branch the border town of Daphnae (Tell Dafana) produced a number of limestone figures, including riders (L-R.1) and a group of captives (L-C.1) as well as hand-made female (H-F) and Persian rider figures (P-R.1) and a terracotta erotic group. Connected to both the Pelusiac (according to Pseudo-Scylax) and Phatnitic branches, Tanis (San el-Hagar), has produced a variety of ithyphallic (L-I.5, M-I) and erotic groups (L-E.1) as well as Persian rider figures (P-R.1), quadrupeds and female figure-plaques (P-F.1), including examples found in 30th dynasty contexts. To the east, the fort of Tell el-Herr, a number of Persian Riders (P-R.1) and female figures in shrines (L-F.2, P-F.3) were found in 5th- and 4th-century contexts, whilst Macedonian rider figures (P-R.2) come from early Ptolemaic contexts.

9.6 Middle and Upper Egypt

In the Fayum a limited number of phallic figures have been found in limestone (L-I), with ithyphallic terracotta plaques, and an erotic figure-plaque from Gurob. Most phallic figures are of late types, including faience amulets of winged phalli from Kiman Faris. A number of traditional Egyptian terracotta female plaques were found at Tebtynis.

---

759 Tietze 2003, 55; Vaelske 2012, 13; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, CG32810, TR26/11/22/2, Vaelske pers. comm.
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775 Martin 1987, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, SR5/6424, 6483.
776 Petrie Museum, London, UC8654, dated to the 19th dynasty(?).
777 From Hawara, dated ‘Roman’ (Martin 1987, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, SR5/6236, 6337).
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In Middle Egypt at Hermopolis Magna (El-Ashmunein) a wide variety of Hathor-related female plaque-figures were found, including traditional Egyptian types of New Kingdom or Third Intermediate Period style779 and their Late Period variants with or without children.780 Local production is proven by the discovery of moulds found there.781 A number of examples were found there that follow the Delta tradition of nude females standing in a shrine (P-F.3.2),782 together with a limestone plaque of reclining ‘concubine’ type (L-F.1).783 Another close parallel with Lower Egyptian sites is the presence of ithyphallic Harpocrates figures in limestone (L-I.2)784 and moulded terracotta (M-I.11.3)785 as well as erotic groups of the same material,786 and a Bes figure plaque.787 Traditional hand-made quadruped figures were found in association with the female plaques,788 but from the Third Intermediate Period onwards, hand-made riders and horses also became popular in the settlement areas of Hermopolis Magna, though other animals (lions, cockerels and baboons in terracotta and limestone) were also found.789 Nearby, on the opposite side of the Nile, excavations at Antinoopolis have revealed one hand-made rider figure that is very similar to some of those found in Hermopolis Magna, though the remaining material is largely Roman.790 Stray finds include a faience figure from Beni Mazar791 and a squatting pottery figure from Deir Tasa.792

In the Theban region, there are a number of erotic or phallic figures and artefacts known. In Thebes itself, faience amulets of Ptolemaic date and erotic graffiti are documented.793 The closest parallels are some early Ptolemaic faience figures from Karnak, an ithyphallic Harpocrates with harp794 and ithyphallic reclining Harpocrates from the priest’s quarter.795 Nearby Deir el-Bahri produced a number of wooden and faience phalli that represent Hathoric offerings of the New Kingdom,796 consistent with contemporary offering practices at Gebelein,797 Elephantine798 and Deir el-Medina.799 A necropolis at Edfu (Hagr Edfu) housed a shrine of Hathor,800 where two terracotta figure-plaques were found, including one of a type
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779 Roeder 1931, pl. 25e, pl. 26b.
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783 Spencer 1989, 51, no. 111; Spencer, Bailey and Davies 1984, 100, fig. 12.3 and 12.8, from the surface.
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800 Davies and O’Connell 2012, 55–6; O’Connell and Davies forthcoming.
typically found in 4th-century Lower Egypt (P-F.2).\textsuperscript{801} Three limestone ithyphallic figures and an erotic group were also found at Elephantine.\textsuperscript{802}

9.7 Naukratis and the Nile Delta: figures in context

In summary, Late Period to early Ptolemaic sites in Lower Egypt possess the closest parallels to the figures found at Naukratis. Memphis and Saqqara provide the best comparisons, found within Egyptian temples, the ‘Bes chamber’ or domestic and industrial contexts. Many of the limestone and terracotta figures found downstream in Nile Delta sites, including Naukratis and Schedia, may have been produced at Memphis or Saqqara. However, regional centres (temple-towns), especially Naukratis, were mass producing mould-made terracotta figures, whilst, possibly on a domestic level, hand-made pieces were also being made to fulfil what appears to have been a rather large demand for these figures so frequently found in domestic contexts. These local productions were probably inspired by or copied from the Memphite industry, and stylistically they are all very similar. There was already a domestic demand for terracotta figures in the New Kingdom,\textsuperscript{803} but the types represented in the Late Period were different and changed further over time. The Naukratis productions of three-dimensional, mould-made, solid figures seem to have copied the Memphite limestone figure production.

The vast majority of parallels for Naukratite figures can be found within Lower Egypt, with the few pieces found outside Egypt coming from the Ptolemaic naval interests of Delos and Cyprus. Similarly most of the few pieces from Upper Egypt also come from early Ptolemaic contexts. Otherwise, from the Saite to the Macedonian dynasty, the Naukratis figures followed Nile Delta traditions inherited from the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period (female recliners, riders, quadrupeds and other animals, hybrid creatures, musicians and captives), until the introduction of new styles during the 6th century BC, particularly mould-made figure-plaques influenced by Levantine styles but representing Egyptian deities, which became the predominant industry of the following two centuries and which have been found in large numbers across the Delta.\textsuperscript{804} Persian rider types are particularly associated with sites with Persian garrisons (Tell Dafana, Naukratis, Bubastis, Tell el-Herr and Memphis) and examples from the same mould were found at both Memphis and Naukratis. Similarly the presence of captives, representing aggressive binding magic, was also associated with garrisons, forts and border towns (Tell Dafana, Naukratis, Herakleion and Memphis).\textsuperscript{805} Musicians and recliners, uncommon outside of Naukratis, Sais and Memphis, may be linked to elite practices, or rare foreign influences. In summary, the Late Period Naukratis assemblage is large and distinctive, but not unusual for an important and international temple-town in the Nile Delta.

\textsuperscript{801} Abu Zaid forthcoming, fig. 4.
\textsuperscript{802} Delange 2012, 313, nos 1049(?), 1050, 1052 and 1053(?).
\textsuperscript{803} Spencer 2014.
\textsuperscript{804} Redford \textit{et al}. 1991; Redford 2004.
\textsuperscript{805} Ritner 1993.
10. Production and consumption: spatial and diachronic patterns

Nearly 45% of all known figures from excavations at Naukratis were imported from East Greece and Cyprus, clustering particularly in the first century of the site’s history. However, the large assemblage of Late Period Egyptian terracotta and limestone figures shows there was a significant Egyptian community living in Late Period Naukratis. Eventually Egyptian figures eclipsed imports by the 4th century BC. Though some of the Late Period Egyptian figures display features adopted from Greek, Cypriot (P-I.4, M-F.3) and Persian (P-R.1) figures – some of which are specific to Naukratis – the local repertoire is generally consistent with the standard range of figures found in contemporary large temple-towns of Lower Egypt. The range reflects the practice of orthodox Lower Egyptian religion. Local types as well as imports from Memphis and Saqqara illustrate especially close links between the Memphite cults and Naukratis at this time. The volume and quality of the assemblage demonstrates that Naukratis was a major producer and consumer of figures and statuettes, as one would expect from a successful and busy city, though it does not appear to have influenced production within the wider region as some forms seem specific to Naukratis and have not been found outside of the town (for example P-I.4, M-F.3 and most M-I types).

10.1 Chronological developments

The most apparent pattern in the material is the proliferation of production and consumption of Egyptian figures that occurs during the 5th century BC and continues into the Ptolemaic period (Fig. 127). The Late Period limestone and terracotta industries declined during the 3rd century BC and were replaced by the even more popular mass-produced hollow Ptolemaic period terracotta figures, which nevertheless featured the same deities albeit in a new Hellenistic style. What does the increased popularity of figures depicting Harpokrates and Hathor – referring to the events surrounding the inundation festivals – mean? Does the increased volume represent a larger (Egyptian) population, greater ritual activity and greater influence by the priestly elite or merely greater consumption of figurative votives during rituals? Parallels from Memphis, Saqqara, Mendes and Leontopolis confirm the same pattern during the 5th to 3rd centuries BC. However, a refinement of the chronological sequence is required to see whether changes in the production and consumption of figures were

---

806 The importation of Greek wine amphorae continued and is well represented by wine amphorae stamps of the early 4th and 3rd centuries BC, consistent with the archaeological picture of Naukratis being a busy place, possibly at its largest extent, at this time (see the chapter on Stamped amphorae). This of course represents only a small section of the ceramic material not recorded or saved by the original excavators.


808 We do not at present have fine enough resolution to determine how abruptly the Late Period figure production was replaced by Ptolemaic style production. The overlap may have been as long as c. 350–200 BC, or as short as 330–275 BC. The Saqqara limestone figure production may have continued for longer than the terracotta industries. The Ptolemaic hollow terracotta figure production continued to produce the same subjects, in a naturalistic style: Isis-Hathor and pregnant female figures (‘Baubo’) and many Harpokrates figures (see the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures).

809 Which would require further excavations of contemporary assemblages and better absolute dating of pieces in museum collections.
related to specific dynasties or political events, such as a manipulation of Egyptian inundation festivals during the early Ptolemaic period.  

The range of subjects depicted changed over time. The diversity of subject matter declined over the course of the Late Period, which is particularly noticeable with the limestone figure industry. Saite limestone figures depicted various hybrid creatures, animals, female and male plaques, musicians, recliners and riders. At the beginning of the 6th century BC ithyphallic Harpokrates figures (and erotic groups) accounted for c. 40% of the Egyptian figure assemblage, but this had risen to over 81% of the assemblage by the 4th century BC (Fig. 128). Phallic figures and erotic figure groups appeared across Lower Egypt, in a local expression of the Lower Egyptian religious significance of the ithyphallic child-god Harpokrates and his hieros gamos with Hathor. The assemblage at Naukratis may be context specific, i.e. that the ithyphallic Harpokrates figures were used in domestic contexts where they were subsequently revealed during the excavations at Naukratis, whilst ‘Hathoric’ figures may be underrepresented because the early excavators of Naukratis did not excavate contexts from the Nile channel.

---

810 For example the movement of the Bubasteia festival by Ptolemy III to coincide with a dynastic festival Euergetia and the rising of Sothis, harbringer of the Nile inundation (Montserrat 1996, 170; Della 1998, 545), thus integrating the Ptolemaic dynasty into the everyday religious experience of Egyptians in the Nile Delta, a form of Ptolemaic dynastic propaganda. The choice to concentrate on depicting the conception of Harpokrates in association with the inundation festivals (over other Egyptian deities) is also significant as Horus the child was also an important (legitimizing) symbol of kingship.

811 By the 3rd century BC a diverse range of Greek style hollow-figures were being produced, but only a limited range of figures in the Late Period tradition. The late 7th century BC production is too difficult to date to be certain of the relative proportion of ithyphallic to non-ithyphallic figures owing to the over-reliance on 6th-century BC and later parallels for this study resulting from constraints within the current literature.

812 If they were used in Naukratis in the same manner as at Mendes, where they were found in river channel deposits of c. 500–200 BC (Redford et al. 1991; 2004).
10.2 The context and use of Egyptian figures at Naukratis

Of the 473 Egyptian figures discussed here only a small number have some form of contextual information preserved,813 but those that do shed some light on the context of use for this material. They include 54 from the town area, 17 from the Greek sanctuaries and 18 from the vicinity of the Great Temenos.

10.2.1 Egyptian sanctuary of Amun-Ra and vicinity

Within the casemate building (‘Great Mound’) of the Great Temenos, only a single limestone, gilded nude ‘Hathoric’ figure (L-F.4), two sphinxes (L-H.1) and a ram (L-A.1) were found.814 Immediately outside the Great Temenos, in the area Hogarth labelled the ‘South Site’,815 we have specific information concerning the finds of exclusively female figures and figure-plaques in limestone (L-F.1.1, L-F.1.2, L-F.3) and terracotta (H-F.1), immediately adjacent to the Temenos wall, in the north,816 north-west corner,817 east818 and at the South Mound,819 probably resulting from votive deposition in c. 620–500 BC. A female plaque and rattle of c. 500–300 BC were found just to the south west of the Great Temenos,820 near the Canopic river shore. Two limestone rider figures were also found by Hogarth in what he calls the ‘South Site’, near the Great Temenos (and temple of Amun) though precisely where cannot be discerned.821 A limestone rider figure was found with a large number of bronze and other votives predominantly of the 5th century BC, cleared from an Egyptian sanctuary, probably the Great Temenos.822

10.2.2. Greek sanctuaries

Eighteen Late Period figures were found within the Greek sanctuaries. They comprise one dubious piece from the sanctuary of Aphrodite, three unusual pieces from the sanctuary of Apollo and 14 more standard pieces representing riders, nude female figures and a single Bes from the Hellenion. The three limestone pieces from the sanctuary of Apollo include a female figure and two rather crude indiscernible pieces unlike anything else from the site.823 Within the Hellenion 15 pieces were found that can be separated into two distinct groups. Firstly, four limestone riders were found...
in the south-western corner of the Hellenion,\textsuperscript{824} though the number of Egyptian figures found in the Hellenion may be much higher if two unlocated wells were actually within this precinct.\textsuperscript{825} One rider possessed a (unclear) Greek dedicatory inscription dated c. 450–350 BC. A second group consists of 10 terracotta female figure-plaques, in a variety of types (P-F.1, P-F.2, P-F.3 and P-F.6),\textsuperscript{826} were found alongside and under Late Archaic to Classical East Greek terracotta protomes and dedications to Aphrodite (see the chapter on Greek terracotta figures). Were these the offerings of Egyptians to Aphrodite, a Greek deity they equated with Isis-Hathor? Or were they the offerings of Greeks using locally available figurines in the absence of Greek figures?

A comparison between Egyptian votive offerings found at the Hellenion and the Great Temenos show that both included the same figure types (nude female and rider figures), but used them differently. The terracotta and limestone figures in the north were deposited within the Greek Hellenion sanctuary, whilst the (predominantly limestone) figures were primarily deposited immediately outside the Egyptian temenos wall in the south. Phallic figures were not found within the Egyptian temenos, although two pieces dated c. 500–330 BC were possibly votive offerings from within the Hellenion.\textsuperscript{827}

10.2.3 Naukratis town

Within the town area a greater diversity of objects was found. However, specific contextual information is limited for these 54 pieces, which are simply labelled ‘town’\textsuperscript{828} or ‘eastern town’ areas,\textsuperscript{829} from surface collection,\textsuperscript{830} or disturbed deposits.\textsuperscript{831} Limestone drummers and a bird figure were found in or near the scarab factory, which was operational in c. 600–570 BC, and so can be dated to the 6th century BC, if this context can

\textsuperscript{824} Four examples (including one with Greek dedication dated c. 450–350 BC) were found in the south-western corner of the Hellenion, close to well ‘35’ and south of small chamber ‘34’, 1–2 ft. above the basal mud (Hogarth 1898–9, 31, no. 58), alongside Chian pottery of the 6th century BC (Edgar 1905, 30, 39, 55, pl. 14.10 and 11, wall [35]); Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1906-G.109; British Museum, 1900,0214.27; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE33573.2.

\textsuperscript{825} At least seven further Egyptian figures were found down wells, possibly within the Hellenion precinct, the focus of Hogarth’s attention in the northern area of Naukratis excavated in 1903 (it is not possible to locate precisely the wells from Hogarth’s 1903 season). Two limestone rider figures were found down well 3 with three other limestone figures (not described). Down well 2, 6th-century BC ‘Persian’ pottery was found alongside a seated phallic Harpokrates terracotta and a stone ‘sphinx’ figure (Hogarth 1905, 122; also referred to in Hogarth Diary 24–25/04/1903 (‘squatting indecent terracotta, but without head or end of penis’); Hogarth box list 1903, Box I and Box IV). Six limestone rider figures are listed in Hogarth’s 1903 box list (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-G.1007, AN1896–1908-G.1013, AN1896–1908-G.1039, AN1896–1908-G.1040, G.1041; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE36257). Of these two were from ‘Well 3’ (Box II included five undescibed stone figures, of which two are riders, one painted, as listed in Hogarth’s excavation diary). It is impossible to distinguish which two were which. The phallic figure Hogarth mentions is Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-E.4653, whilst the sphinx is probably AN1896–1908-G.72.

\textsuperscript{826} Gutch 1898–9, 81, nos 21, 49–56; Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA600, NA579, NA589, NA576, NA583, NA582, NA578, NA580; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-G.77, AN1896–1908-G.78. To this we can add one further unpublished head from the British Museum excavations of 2014 that was found in the vicinity of the Hellenion (Thomas and Villing forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{827} Neither are from certain or undisturbed contexts. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-E.4653 comes from a well that may have been within the Hellenion. The second piece AN1896–1908-E.4654, is possibly from a disturbed deposit.

\textsuperscript{828} Petrie 1886a.

\textsuperscript{829} Gutch 1898–9.

\textsuperscript{830} Coulson 1996.

\textsuperscript{831} Gutch 1898–9, 90, no. 143.
be trusted. A number of specific locations were written on the objects or distribution lists, though many cannot be related to the published maps.

Within the town there were a few hand-made animal figures of rams and crocodiles, typical of Egyptian domestic assemblages at nearby sites such as Kom Firin, and other crude figures of captives and indiscernible types, which may relate to magical, rather than votive religious practices. Magic and related rites were an integrated part of Egyptian theology, being part of the range of rituals that were performed by priests, indeed 'magic had a central place in orthodox Egyptian theology'. Frankfurter argues that during a period of decline for Egyptian organised religion in the Roman period, the priesthood retained its relevance to the wider community by shifting the focus away from temple-based festivals to rites of greater relevance to the crises and concerns of ordinary life, such as blessings and curses, childbirth and protection, love-spells and healing-spells, amulets and domestic altars. However, the reverse is also possible, namely that during the 5th to 4th centuries BC the priesthood were largely concerned with temple-based festival rites, in which the public involvement included the consumption of figures that were produced in large numbers during this period.

Late Period Egyptian figures from the town are predominantly representations of ithyphallic Harpokrates (P-I.1, P-I.2, P-I.3, L-I.5, L-I.6, M-I.3, M-I.8, M-I.6, H-I.1), phallic processions (P-P.1) and erotic scenes (P-E.1). In fact, almost all the ithyphallic figures from Naukratis for which we have a provenance were found in the town, following the pattern seen in contemporary Tell el-Muqdam. Their placement in domestic contexts may relate to their meaning and function, which might putatively be interpreted as an amuletic, apotropaic or protective power, perhaps related to the inundation festival and the fertility symbols they carried. Rider figures, particularly Persian riders, were common. However, limestone female plaques were rarely, and female terracotta plaques were never, found within the town.

10.2.4 Summary of the spatial distribution of Egyptian figures at Naukratis

In summary, some clear spatial distribution patterns emerge within the Late Period figure assemblage of Naukratis. These patterns reveal a gendered distinction, with female limestone (and a few terracotta) plaques concentrated around the Great Temenos, and female terracotta plaques also found within the Hellenion, associated with dedications to Aphrodite. Limestone riders were used as votive offerings in both the Egyptian

---

832 Petrie 1886a, 22, Level 420 just south of the scarab factory (National Museum of Scotland, Edinburgh, A.1886.518.6I); Petrie 1886a, 40, Level 335 in the Scarab factory; including some (but not all) of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.162, 86.163; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1886.543; British Museum, 1965,0930.930, 1886,0401.1517. For the operation date of the scarab factory, see forthcoming chapter on Scarabs, scaraboids and amulets.
833 Petrie’s ‘site 75’ and the ‘Ptolemaic building’, Hogarth’s site ‘28’ and ‘38’.
834 Spencer 2014.
836 Frankfurter 1998, 203.
837 Coulson 1996, no. 18, area D-19; Bolton Museum, 1966.88.8; British Museum, 1886,0401.1510. However, no specific context is recorded for these pieces. It is possible they were found adjacent to the Great Temenos or came from another unidentified Egyptian sanctuary.
sacred of the Great Temenos and the Greek Hellenion, where one example also bears a Greek inscription. In both cases, it is possible that their contexts in these sanctuaries relate to a systematic clearing out and ritual re-depositioning within a cache or down a well. Ithyphallic figures, Macedonian riders and Persian riders were predominantly found in the town area. The abundance of phallic and rider figures within houses mirrors the picture seen in contemporary Delta settlements such as Mendes. Egyptian Late Period figures appear to have been used by both Greek and Egyptian communities, appearing as offerings in ‘Greek’ sanctuaries, but certainly indicate a sizeable population following Egyptian religious practices at Naukratis.

11. Conclusions

From the founding of Naukratis in the late 7th century BC onwards, Egyptian figures served a range of functions at the site. As the figures are attested in all periods of occupation and in different contexts, they provide a useful insight into various aspects of the site’s history, its inhabitants, its place within regional and international networks, and the relationship between Greeks and Egyptians. Three major conclusions can be drawn from this study.

Firstly, despite the use of various technologies and materials, the Egyptian figures of Naukratis represent a coherent group, with common themes and subjects, and common patterns of usage.

Secondly, they are a distinct Lower Egyptian phenomenon of the Late Period that continued into the early Ptolemaic period. Production underwent changes in technology, subject and style, and combined long-lived local traditions with new influences deriving from contact with Greek, Levantine, Persian and Cypriot culture. However, no single group or source of external influence can be considered responsible for the industry as a whole, which, was generally by and for the local community. Specific Greek and Cypriot stylistic and technical influences are rare and had already been adopted by the 5th century BC, but appear alongside the remarkable continuity of New Kingdom traditions and techniques. The nascent hybridization, or fusing of elements of both Greek and Egyptian figures, and experimentation with techniques and technologies, rare elsewhere the Nile Delta and Egypt, paved the way for the subsequent Macedonian-Greek influenced industry of the late 4th century BC. By the 3rd century BC the Late Period industries were replaced by the mass-production of popular artefacts in a variety of media using Hellenistic coroplastic techniques and technologies.

Thirdly, the Egyptian figures of Naukratis are a manifestation of the everyday concerns of the inhabitants of Naukratis, which appears to have
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838 In the case of Egyptian sanctuary deposits such as the cache of bronzes described above.
839 Redford et al. 1991; Redford 2004. Female figures were less frequently found in the Late Period deposits.
840 See the chapters on Greek figures, Ptolemaic and Roman figures, models and coffin-fitting, lamps in terracotta and bronze, Portable stoves and the forthcoming chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman pottery.
included a significant element of people adhering to Egyptian religious traditions from the early days of the site. They offer valuable insights into Lower Egyptian religious practices, rituals and festivals. Whilst the specific meaning(s) of any one figure in a given context remains difficult to reconstruct, the vast majority most likely relate to concerns of fertility, health and wealth. Comparisons with the Egyptian theology recorded in Middle and Upper Egypt on the child-god texts are both later in date and also only present the views of a small priestly elite. Thus they are unlikely to represent the same beliefs as that of Late Period popular religion at village level. Instead at Naukratis the population was more likely to identify any child-figure with the most prominent familiar local deity who was Horpa-khered/Harpokrates.

Concerns with fertility – agricultural, human and animal – as well as with national, community and individual identity, were ritualized by Egyptians in the form of cult festivals. Symbols pertaining to these festivals permeate the work of sculptors and coroplasts, indicating a religious function. The figures from Naukratis include representations of ritual processions incorporating harpists, tambour and flute players, dancers and drinking led by priests, as well as hierogamies and possibly orgiastic cultic behaviour referencing these hierogamies. Symptomatic and erotic groups depict sex, music, and the consumption of Phoenician and Greek wine. In particular, they are closely related to the traditional Egyptian annual festivals activities surrounding the Nile inundation.

Mirroring what is found at other contemporary Nile Delta sites, the assemblage from Naukratis is specific to this region and this period. Although the styles and fashions represented on some figures betray Greek/Mediterranean and Near Eastern influences on this region, mostly this results in little more than a slight tweaking of traditional Egyptian religious iconography and votive practices. Past scholarship has often considered Late Period figures as unusual, even alien, and has found their meaning unclear, suspecting a link with orgiastic activity that is fundamentally un-Egyptian or at least influenced by contact with foreigners. However, they are fundamentally grounded in long-standing Egyptian traditions. Hierogamies and phallic cults have long been central in a belief-system in which festivals surrounding fertility and the Nile inundation played a crucial role, with the success of a largely agrarian society and state depending on them.

The scale of the production at Naukratis suggests that at Naukratis, as at Saqqara with its Bes Chambers, there may have been chapels (that are yet to be discovered at Naukratis, were misidentified or are already lost) associated with the cults of Hathor and Harpokrates that operated as the ‘place of drunkenness’ and ‘mammisi’ (place of conception and place of birth) during such festivals. The ‘Naukratite figures’ indicate a surge in the importance of such festivals in c. 500–300 BC and reflect the importance
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841 Budde, Sandri, and Veroeven 2003.
842 Greek and Phoenician wine may have been significant in these rituals, but like frankincense and myrrh from Yemen, these just represent high-value imports available during the period of intense trade between these regions.
843 Quibell 1907, 13. Quibell 1907, 13. However, a chapel at Naukratis may have looked and functioned differently.
such rituals held in the agricultural cycle and the religious calendar. Phallic figures were placed in houses, whilst female figures were dedicated in, or near sanctuaries and plaques were possibly thrown into the Nile. These practices were associated with festivals of the rising of the Nile flood and are marked in archaeological assemblages by a surge in figurine display.

Finally, figures are often assumed to be votive offerings, which broadly implies that the figures were displayed or deposited, without the intention of recovery or use, in a sacred place for religious purposes, or more specifically as gifts to deity(s), demon(s) or saint(s) before (for), or after (because of) help. In the case of the Naukratis figures, these may well represent votive offerings when found in and around Greek sanctuaries or the Egyptian Great Temenos. Although we cannot reconstruct with precision the actors, motivations and mechanics of these practices, there is at least a likelihood that they relate to deities otherwise known to have been worshipped found in the same area, for example by being mentioned on other dedications. But many more figures have been found in other and less specific contexts, such as near waterways or most frequently in domestic contexts. In domestic areas, including foundations, refuse or household-shrines, figurines might have functioned as amulets or (as illustrated by earlier examples with preserved magical texts) have been used (by priests?) in magico-medical healing and apotropaic rites.

Figures found in watery contexts or cemeteries may represent other forms of rituals or magic. Purposefully(? ) broken or pierced figures in particular are indicative of ritual practices that we would describe as ‘magic’, and the term ‘votive object’ may not be the most suitable label to apply to the way these objects were used. We are perhaps extending interpretation beyond what is possible to reconstruct accurately from even the best-recorded archaeological contexts. Clearly when considering complex material assemblages the temptation is great to fall back on the limited textual sources for guidance, but to do so risks conflating practices and flattening time, thus introducing misinterpretations. Although it may never be possible to fully untangle the intended or unintended multiple meanings that these figures had in the minds of their producers and consumers, the large assemblage from Naukratis adds vital new data to improve our understanding of the use and significance of these enigmatic figures.

846 M. Ali Hakim pers. comm. 2011; two figures of type P-F.1 (SCA numbers 301–2) were excavated next to the Canopic river branch.
848 Waraksa 2008, 2–3; 2009.
849 Montserrat 1996.