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1. Introduction

With few exceptions, figures made in a Greek style are found at Naukratis between 620 and 300 BC, at a time when Naukratis operated as an Eastern Mediterranean trade hub and port of Egypt. The majority of imported Greek figurines are of an East Greek origin and are particularly common in some of the Archaic and Classical period sanctuary deposits of Naukratis. Previously only partly published (Gutch included only finds from Hogarth’s first season in his corpus,1 few figures were illustrated by Petrie and Gardner and only the best-preserved examples were included in the British Museum catalogues2), the present chapter aims to provide an overview of the totality of the extant corpus and its place in the development of the site.

Six main groups can be distinguished that fall broadly into three periods with parallels primarily coming from other East Greek, Cypriot and Phoenician sites.

The main groups to be distinguished are:

- East Greek hand-made and mould-made figure-plaques of c. 620–525 BC
- East Greek mould-made figures and figure-vases of c. 600–500 BC
- East Greek protomes and figures of c. 540–350 BC
- Mould-made hollow figures of late Classical and early Hellenistic type from East Greece and other parts of Greece of c. 400–300 BC and c. 350–250 BC respectively

There are also a small number of locally produced copies of Greek style figures, although this problematic group is often difficult to distinguish as it overlaps with the corpus of Egyptian figurines (see the chapter on Late Period Egyptian figures).

Greek terracotta figures were present in Naukratis from its foundation, but are rare finds in the earliest layers of the Saite period Greek sanctuaries of Aphrodite (Fig. 1)3 and Apollo.4 In the 6th century BC, finely made hollow figures and figure-shaped vessels in the form of women seated (Fig. 2) or standing, men, warriors, gorgons, Herakles, animals and fruit become popular. Alabastra in the form of women are particularly common towards the end of the 6th century BC,5 a time when large East Greek female protomes (korai?) (Fig. 3) in the same styles and fabrics are also attested.

---

1 Gutch 1898–9, 67–97. All images in this chapter, unless otherwise indicated, are © Trustees of the British Museum.
2 Walters 1903; Higgins 1954.
3 On komast figures see Mandel (2004) and Dasen (2010). Other figure vessels from the Aphrodite sanctuary (Gardner 1886, 34) include British Museum, 1911.0710.95, 1888.0601.660, 1888.0601.752.d, 1888.0601.752.b found in contexts Φ5, Φ8 and ΤΑΦ16–17 (see the chapter on Cypriot figures for description of contexts).
4 Petrie 1886a, Α15 or 8. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1886.495. Location ‘84’ is probably within the sanctuary of Apollo, equivalent to Α16 and 7 (Petrie 1886a, pl. 44), British Museum, 1886.0401.1421, 1886.0401.1400.
5 Scientific analysis has confirmed figures from Samos, Rhodes, South and North Ionia (see the forthcoming chapter on NA analyses).
in area 14 in the second phase of the Hellenion, an indicator of the intensity of contact between the Greek world and Egypt in the Persian period (525–402 BC). Greek terracotta figures are very rare in the 5th century and hardly more common in the 4th century BC. The few East Greek and other Greek terracotta figures dating to the 4th century BC represent a range of deities and female figures and were found primarily in the Hellenion, though two examples come from the cemetery. This pattern is mirrored with the rarely preserved Greek-style sculpture of the period, of which the few known fragments have been found mainly in the Aphroditæ sanctuary. The concentration of these types exclusively within sanctuary deposits or down sanctuary wells perhaps represents developments in the pattern of overseas trading partners and the sanctuaries in which traders and travellers chose to worship or to which they had access.

The Greek terracotta figures found at Naukratis were made in a range of workshops across different regions of the ancient Greek world. In addition to subject matter and style, their clay fabrics can be an important clue as to their likely place of production. However, the often fine and not very distinctive fabrics represented at Naukratis are difficult to distinguish and are problematic to identify as regards the provenance without the help of extensive research including chemical analyses and correlation with samples from known production places. Some limited chemical analysis has been carried out both in the course of our research and by other scholars and this has been crucial in informing our understanding of the groups presented here. However, the advances made so far are just a small beginning and further work is required for a more complete picture, as subtle and visually virtually undetectable variations may represent significant regional or chronological differences. Nevertheless, particularly when correlating fabric with style and iconography, groupings and trends emerge that appear to be of significance. On this basis a number of different ‘wares’ or fabric groups (here labelled ‘Fabric’) have been cautiously distinguished so as to help us understand broad patterns of production, movement and consumption within the corpus of figurines from Naukratis. However, they should not be mistaken for coherent characteristics of single workshops or single production sites.

- Fabric 1: pale cream clay with sparse fine black inclusions; Ionian. Aryballoi and alabastra in the form of women, pomegranates, komasts (Fig. 1), Acheloos as a bull and hedgehogs (Fig. 4) (c. 600–525 BC)
- Fabric 2: pale orange clay with abundant silver mica, black and coarse white inclusions; Samian. Aryballoi and alabastra in the

\[6\] Gutch 1898–9, 71–2.

\[7\] Gardner 1888, 55–9. See also the chapter on Cypriot figures for descriptions of other imports and the phasing of the sanctuaries.

\[8\] Primarily the earlier analyses carried out by Jones 1986 and the more recent analyses by Hans Mommsen, Bonn, as part of the present project. Most of Mommsen’s analyses remain to be fully published (see the forthcoming chapter on NA analyses), but some results are already accessible in Mommsen et al. 2006, Mommsen et al. 2012 and Coulé and Villing 2014. We are most grateful to Hans Mommsen for his invaluable contribution to our work.

\[9\] Previously thought to be Corinthian (Higgins 1959, 38–9, nos 1665, 1666; Payne 1940, pl. 108 no. 190), but placed within Jones’s Ionian B group following chemical (NA) analysis (Jones 1985, 668–70).
form of gorgons (Fig. 5). Herakles and birds; Ptah figures (c. 600–500 BC)

- Fabric 3: orange-brown clay with abundant mica inclusions; Ionian.
- Fabric 4: light grey-brown clay with black core; Rhodian.
- Fabric 5: red-brown clay with mica inclusions; Ionian(?)

The cream Ionian Fabric 1 and orange Samian Fabric 2 are not frequent among the terracotta figurines at Naukratis and appear almost exclusively in 6th century BC figure vases. The micaceous Ionian Fabric 3 is attested in a range of figure vases of the 6th century BC, but continues to be present among Classical figures. The mica-free Rhodian Fabric 4 appears at the end of the 6th century BC and dominates much of the Classical Greek imports.

2. Types and development

Hand-made, mould-made solid plaque figures as well as a variety of early hollow figures and figure vessels of fine workmanship are attested at Naukratis, reflecting the significant developments in the production of Greek terracottas during the period of 620–300 BC. However, the Naukratis corpus is limited to those types that were popular at Greek sites engaged in close contact and exchange with Naukratis. The following sections provide a summary of the main groups of figurines attested at Naukratis and discuss their significance for understanding dedication practices and trade links at Naukratis. More specific discussions of types and parallels can be found in the relevant catalogue entries.

2.1 Hand-made figures of animals and riders and female plaque figures

Amongst the terracotta finds from Naukratis is a small group of East Greek figurines belonging to the period of c. 620–525 BC, representing female figures, riders and animals in both a mould-made and hand-made format. Compared to the numerous contemporary East Greek vessels dedicated at the Greek sanctuaries of Naukratis, the East Greek figurines form a

---

10 British Museum, 1888.0601.94 and 1886.0401.1441 are both identified as Samian fabric using chemical (NA) analysis (see the forthcoming chapter on NA analyses).

11 Objects within this group were identified as Ionian, possibly Milesian, using chemical analysis by Jones (Jones 1985, 673). Subsequent analyses by Hans Mommsen of an Ionian flask in the shape of a kore and of a female protome (1886,0401.1400; 2011,5009.276) of the period 550–500 BC that seem to belong to this group suggests an Ionian origin (Mommsen Group U61a; see the forthcoming chapter on NA analyses). Visually the fabric resembles Ephesian Roman amphorae types (Bezeczky 2013).

12 Chemical (NA) analysis by Hans Mommsen of a protome found on Rhodes and from the same mould series as examples from Naukratis dated c. 500–425 BC (1885,1213.41) supports a Rhodian provenance for this fabric (Coullé and Villing 2014, 118, fig. 64; see also the forthcoming chapter on NA analyses).

13 To date no conclusive evidence exists to help locate the production centre(s) for this fabric, but an Ionian provenance seems likely.
surprisingly small group, a pattern that is unlikely to be due to the excavators leaving figures behind (for they appear to have kept all figurine fragments), but instead must represent votive offering practices at Naukratis.

Hand-made terracotta figure fragments include both solid and hollow representations of horses and riders and solid figures of bulls (Fig. 7). The rider and horse figures are made of an indistinct fine orange-brown fabric, with parallels for example from Kamiros on Rhodes¹⁴ and Halikarnassos.¹⁵ They are difficult to distinguish in style from contemporary Cypriot rider or chariot figure fragments, but they are distinct from Egyptian rider figures which are solid (see the chapter on Late Period Egyptian figures, Type H-R.1). Bull fragments¹⁶ dated c. 620–560 BC come in a coarser fabric with close parallels from the Knidian peninsula¹⁷ and similar pieces are also found in a local silt fabric as part of a long local tradition (see the chapter on Late Period Egyptian figures, Type H-A.1).

Only two early crude mould-made figure-plaques of female figures were found in Naukratis: a simple plaque (Fig. 8)¹⁸ and a fragment of a seated (?) figure (Fig. 9), found within the Aphrodite sanctuary¹⁹ and with East Greek parallels²⁰ dating from the period 620–525 BC. The former is Cypriot in style, although the fabric is unlike that of other Cypriot terracotta figures known from Naukratis.²¹

---

¹⁴ Jacopi 1930, 292–8, figs 323, 329.
¹⁵ Higgins 1954, 103–4, nos 301, 310–11.
¹⁸ Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-E.4684. The form resembles Cypriot production, although the fabric does not appear to fit with the other Cypriot terracotta figures found at Naukratis (see the chapter on Cypriot figures).
¹⁹ Kyoto University Museum, 643.5.
²¹ Cypriot type terracotta figurines were also copied in Samos and Rhodes (Karageorghis et al. 2009, 171–2, 189).
2.2 East Greek figure-vases and figurines

Hollow figures were rare in the 6th century BC, with the exception of a single hollow Aeolian terracotta head from the Aphrodite sanctuary (a vessel attachment?). Its production in Aeolis was confirmed by chemical (neutron activation, henceforth NA) analysis (Fig. 10).

More common in the 6th century BC are East Greek terracotta figures that functioned as aryballoi and alabastra. As they contained perfume, their contents were probably a key factor in their dedication. An example is a fine vase made in a two-piece mould in the form of the head of Herakles wearing a lion’s skin, with red and black painted decoration (Fig. 11).

These finely crafted thin-walled mould-made vessels combine the coroplast’s art with techniques developed by specialist potters. Some of them take their inspiration from stone vessels, notably alabastra (see the chapters on Cypriot figures and Egyptian stone vessels), but many are original creations by their makers. Although their place of production has previously been largely thought to be Rhodes due to the frequency of finds there, it now seems that figured aryballoi and alabastra were produced in a variety of fabrics that are likely to reflect a number of workshops in different locations.

Vessels in the shape of women and a single example in the form of a bearded man (Fig. 12), both in a micaeous orange-brown Ionian fabric (3) and a mica-free Rhodian fabric (4), were particularly popular in Naukratis in both seated and standing forms in the period 550/525–500 BC. This was a time when such vessels are attested widely across the Mediterranean including at sites such as Cumae, Selinus, Klasomenai, Erythrai, Rhodes, Miletos, Samos and Thera, but also at Memphis in Egypt. Some mould series were used to produce both figures and figure vases. The later variants no longer function as vessels but are purely hollow figures. Manufactured in both seated and standing form they are made in the same style but with later hair fashions and no longer feature the high polos and veil present in earlier examples.

Two Ptah figures (Fig. 13) with ribbed stomach and moulded hair dated to c. 550–500 BC belong to a widely distributed figure type that is known for example from Samos and Rhodes, but that also travelled far and reached Melos, Gela and Sicily. One of the pieces from Naukratis, in a pale fabric, is confirmed by recent NA analysis as having been made on Samos. The other figure has parallels that were found on Rhodes (Fig. 13), the production of which had previously been attributed to Rhodes.

22 Kerschner 2006, 112–13, 123, fig. 11; Villing and Schlotzhauer 2006a, 54.
23 British Museum, 1886.0401.1402; see Higgins 1954, 46, no. 50.
24 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 88.924.
25 Higgins 1954, 48–9, no. 61; Jones 1985, 673.
27 Kyoto University Museum, 843.3, dated 475–425 BC.
30 The piece had previously been ascribed to Rhodes on the basis of parallels (Higgins 1954, 57, no. 92), and subsequently to Ionia, probably Miletos, on the basis of chemical analysis.
2.3 Late Archaic and Classical East Greek protomes

A large number (295) of East Greek protome fragments of women wearing a veil have been found at Naukratis, representing at least 35 examples dating to the period of c. 540–350 BC (Fig. 13). Protomes\(^{32}\) were first made in East Greece around 550 BC\(^{33}\) before being copied in other parts of Greece and Magna Graecia (the Greek cities of southern Italy).\(^{34}\) At Naukratis only Ionian (Fabric 3), Rhodian (Fabric 4) and local Nile silt examples have been identified. No male protomes were found. The protomes are mould-made with an open back and with added plastic decoration, covered in a white coating and brightly painted in red, yellow, black and blue.\(^{35}\)

The earliest examples from Naukratis are Late Archaic, dating to c. 540–510 BC (Figs 14–15).\(^{36}\) They show a woman’s face in an Archaic East Greek style with almond shaped eyes and the hair mostly concealed by a veil. Close to Croissant’s ‘Aeolis’ and ‘Clazomenae’ Types F4 and G3, dated to 540–510 BC,\(^{37}\) they appear in Naukratis in a micaceous Fabric 3 which can be identified as Ionian (Fig. 14).\(^{38}\) The type had previously been believed to be Rhodian\(^{39}\) as a result of numerous examples of the type having been found at Lindos in deposits dated by the excavators to after 525 BC.\(^{40}\) The type is also known, for example, from Samos, dated to 550–525 BC,\(^{41}\) and Olynthus, dated to the 6th century BC.\(^{42}\) Although only 64 protome fragments can be securely identified as coming from the Hellenion, this is probably the source of the majority of the finds since the extant examples almost exclusively derive from the seasons when Hogarth excavated there.\(^{43}\) Four protomes from the Aphrodite sanctuary are later in date and are all of different fabrics to those found in the Hellenion.\(^{44}\)

(Jones 1985, 667–71). A Samian provenance is now suggested through chemical (NA) analysis by Hans Mommsen (see the forthcoming chapter on NA analyses).

\(^{31}\) Higgins 1954, 56–7, nos 87–92; British Museum, 1842.0728.754. These cannot, however, be assumed to be produced on Rhodes without chemical analysis, as the fine fabric and form are not diagnostic in themselves.

\(^{32}\) Also known as busts, shoulder-busts, protome-busts and, erroneously, ‘masks’.

\(^{33}\) Croissant 1983, 164.

\(^{34}\) Robinson 1931; 1933; 1952; Szabó 1994; Kilmer 1977, 65–7.

\(^{35}\) See blue painted earring fragment on protome from the British Museum, 2011,5009.275.


\(^{38}\) Chemical (NA) analysis of the protome fragments British Museum, 2011,5009.275 and 276 by Hans Mommsen suggest a likely Ionian origin for the analyzed pieces, see the forthcoming chapter on NA analyses. A protome of similar type from Rhodes, British Museum, 1864,1007.1370, was analyzed by Jones 1985, 667–71, and attributed to his Ionian B group. On the basis of similarities in form and fabric an Ionian provenance is likely for the whole group.

\(^{39}\) Higgins 1954, 69 and 91, nos 141 and 294.

\(^{40}\) Blinkenberg 1931, 591, pl. 116, nos 2463 and 2465, Type A1.

\(^{41}\) Tsakos 2007, 194, pl. 26.2.

\(^{42}\) Robinson 1952, 73–4, pls 1–3, nos 1–2.

\(^{43}\) A small group of protome fragments was also excavated (or acquired?) by Petrie during his 1884–5 season; these may come from the town area or possibly from the area of the Hellenion, which Petrie had not yet identified as a major structure. A smaller group was found by Petrie and Gardner in the Aphrodite sanctuary during the 1885–6 season.

\(^{44}\) Spurlock Museum, University of Illinois, Champaign, 1911.02.0017 (East Greek) dated c. 540–510 BC; University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology, Philadelphia, E184 (East Greek) dated c. 450–350 BC; National Museum of Ireland, Dublin, NMI 1911:387 (Levantine or Cypriot?) dated c. 550–450 BC; Kyoto University Museum, 643.12 (Cypriot) dated c. 400–300 BC.)
Numerous joining sherds of Early Classical Greek shoulder-bust protomes dated to c. 500–425 BC have been found at Naukratis. Unlike the group discussed above, they include the figures’ shoulders and arms, the increased complexity being characteristic for the type and period. A large group of joining sherds comes from at least two protome busts with a rather flat rendering of a woman wearing a veil; her hands are placed around her breasts and subtle drapery covers all her body with the exception of her wrists and hands (Fig. 16). They are made of Rhodian Fabric 4 and have numerous parallels from the same mould series at Lindos and elsewhere on Rhodes. The Rhodian provenance of the series is supported by recent NA analysis of an example from Rhodes made in the same mould (and visually of the same fabric) as an example from Naukratis that belongs to the same chemical group as a clay sample from Rhodes town, confirming earlier analyses of Rhodian protomes by Jones. Further examples of the type, not from the same mould series, also reached Olynthus in c. 500–400 BC. All the Naukratis examples are from the Hellenion.

A further group of protomes dated around c. 480–400 BC is characterized by even greater freedom and complexity (Figs 17–19). It consists of busts of women with idealized, yet ‘naturalistic’ and somewhat asymmetric faces, wearing an elaborate stephane (arc shaped headband) and earrings decorated with plastic rosettes and bows, necklaces and bracelets. Their hair is exposed, falling onto the shoulders, and they wear a form-hugging chiton that has slipped from the shoulder, revealing breasts only partly concealed by their hands. Their bare arms are adorned with bracelets. The rippled, crimped edge of their himation frames the composition. Parallels for the type are known from Lindos, dated by the excavators to 525–400 BC as well as after 400 BC. Further similar pieces dated to c. 500/450–400 BC come from elsewhere on Rhodes, Halikarnassos and Olynthus.

At Naukratis, Gutch dated many of this group to 450–400 BC or 400–350 BC, however, most were found in a context under the walls of the second phase of construction within the Hellenion precinct in room 14, elsewhere described as a late 5th-century BC deposit. A single piece from this group was found in the Aphrodite sanctuary. The fine red-brown fabric with a grey core of these protomes looks superficially similar to Ionian and

---

46 Blinkenberg 1931, 591, pl. 120, no. 2525, Type B2 (noting three copies from the same mould, Type B2); Higgins 1954, 89, no. 238, 1885, 1213.41, dated 525–400 BC and c. 450 BC.
47 Protome from Rhodes dated c. 500–425 BC (British Museum, 1885,1213.41): Coulié and Villing 2014, 118, fig. 64, see also the forthcoming chapter on NA analyses. Compare also earlier analyses by Jones, which attributed the protome fragment British Museum, 1951,0307.2 to his Rhodian Group C (Jones 1985, 668–71).
48 Robinson 1952, pls 12, 36, 38; nos 19, 83, 98 and 100.
50 Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA350, NA355; NA359; NA385, 425; NA488; NA389; NA401; 401, NA415; NA449.
51 Blinkenberg 1931, 591, Type B2, pls 147–8, no. 3140.
52 Higgins 1954, 89, 101, 127–8, 329, nos 239, 295, 443; British Museum, 1885,1213.41; Robinson 1952, pl. 12, no. 19; pl. 36, no. 83; pl. 38, nos 98 and 100, pl. 37, no. 86.
54 Ibid., 79, 83.
Rhodian fabrics (Fabrics 3 and 4), but the form and fabric of this group is highly variable and probably represents numerous different production sites. A small number of local copies in Nile silt were also made of this late type. Protomes in general become less frequent after the mid-5th century BC, and this is also the case at Naukratis where the few that might appear to be of early 4th-century BC date are more likely to belong in the late 5th century BC on the basis of stratigraphy and parallels.

In terms of find contexts and uses, Greek terracotta protomes in general have mostly been found in sanctuaries and graves and occasionally in domestic spheres. At Naukratis, no protomes are known from the cemetery. A few protomes come from the Aphrodite sanctuary. The majority of pieces with known finds spots (and probably also most other pieces excavated by Hogarth) derive from a deposit under the second phase of the Hellenion, dated to the end of the 5th century BC (on the basis of the date of the latest terracotta figures known to be found there), which includes protomes of the period from c. 540–510 to 400 BC. Their apparent association here with dedications to Aphrodite and their occurrence also in the sanctuary of Aphrodite itself, together with the fact that only female protomes were discovered, convinced Gutch that the protomes must be representations of Aphrodite.

The notion that protomes represent female deities – Athena, Aphrodite, Hera and especially ‘chthonic’ deities such as Demeter or Kore – is, however, contested, with many scholars holding that they more likely represent the devotee, unless specific attributes are present that clearly denote a deity. Yet in the case of Naukratis in particular such a scenario presents an obvious problem: all the protomes represent females, but if they were mostly dedicated, as seems likely, by (resident or passing) traders and travellers who brought them from East Greece to Naukratis specifically for dedication, then many of the dedicants would have been men (as is also supported by other evidence: see the chapters on Ceramic inscriptions, Stone inscriptions and Chian pottery). We may therefore question whether the protomes necessarily represent the dedicants themselves, or perhaps (female) member of their families. Dedications being made on behalf of family members (not entirely unparalleled in the Greek world) are one possibility, unless the protomes were brought to Naukratis in order to be dedicated by female residents. In either case, the

---

57 The results of NA analysis by Hans Mommesen (see the forthcoming chapter on NA analyses) of a single fragment from this group proved inconclusive. Visually the fabric is reminiscent of some Egyptian fabrics, but on balance an East Greek origin is more likely.
58 Kilmer 1977, 66; Smith 1949, 355; Stampolidis et al. 2011, 383, no. 72.
59 Kilmer 1977, 66; Smith 1949, 355; Stampolidis et al. 2011, 383, no. 72.
60 Kilmer 1977, 68; Smith 1949, 355; Blinkenberg 1931, 591.
61 Higgins 1954, 20–1; Kilmer 1977, 68. It is highly unlikely that they were ever used as funeral masks, unless this was some form of reuse: Kilmer 1977, 68; Smith 1949, 355.
62 Two pieces (Spurlock Museum, University of Illinois, Champaign, 1911.02.0017; University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, E184) are probably from the second (Persian period) phase of the Aphrodite sanctuary, although this is not certain as no context numbers are known for these pieces. A few examples excavated by Petrie from the first season are known, although we have no findspot for these as there is no indication in Petrie’s publications or unpublished notes other than his statement ‘I very arcahc head’ (Petrie 1886a, pl. 44), which may or may not refer to a protome.
63 Gutch 1898–9, 79–83; Edgar 1905, 131.
64 These protomes were found in the same area as groups of inscribed sherds with dedications to Aphrodite. It is not certain whether this association can be equated with a specific phase or context as the area was probably disturbed (Gutch 1898–9, 72).
65 Gutch 1898–9, 79; Smith 1949, 355.
66 Blinkenberg 1931, 588–9; Croissant 1983, 1–8; Muller 2009, 81–95.
67 Prêtre 2009, 7–27.
imported protomes testify to Naukratis’ close links with Ionia and, increasingly, Rhodes in the period of c. 540–400 BC; travellers from these areas and/or locals followed East Greek sanctuary dedicatory practices at Naukratis and chose (sanctuaries within) the Hellenion to make their dedications to Aphrodite (and other deities), possibly in preference to other sanctuaries at the site.67

2.4 Classical to Hellenistic East Greek and other Greek figures

Excavations at Naukratis yielded a diverse range of mould-made hollow terracotta figures depicting a range of subjects that reached Naukratis in the period of 500–300 BC. They include representations of Greek deities and mythological scenes as both plaques and figure groups, as well as examples of the rather ‘naturalistic’, if idealized, female draped figure and actor types (of ‘Tanagra’ type) that continued to be popular in the Hellenistic successor kingdoms in the 3rd century BC.68 The production techniques and styles of terracotta figurines at this period were similar across a wide area. The figures are coated with a white preparation and brightly painted in red, yellow and blue. They display a range of fine-grained fabrics from different production places, with the assemblage dominated by a number of fine micaceous and non-micaceous red-brown fabrics with a soapy texture closely resembling Ionian Fabric 3 and Rhodian Fabric 4.

Small numbers of figures and figure-plaques from Corinth, Melos and Athens reached Naukratis in c. 500–350 BC. Corinthian specimens dating to c. 500–400 BC, include two miniature protome busts (Fig. 20)69 and four figure-dolls of a female dancer with black hair, wearing a polos and a short chiton (Fig. 21).70 A figure-plaque of a dancing girl was made c. 480–470

---

67 Insofar as the picture presented by extant evidence can be considered reliable; it has to be assumed that levels later than the Archaic period had largely been obliterated by the time Petrie and Hogarth worked at the site.
68 It is the author’s opinion that few figures were imported after 300 BC, but the broad date given to parallels and the lack of stratigraphy mean that this interpretation has to remain tentative at present.
69 Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR.7.1899 GR.11.1899. The fabric is described as ‘red-beige Corinthian clay’ (Higgins 1954, 249), with numerous parallels known from Corinth, Athens, Boeotia, Rhodes, Cyrenaica and Taranto (Higgins 1954, 249, no. 911; Mollard-Besques 1954, 38, nos C93, C159, C215, C566; Merker 2000, 100). A later example was also found at Naukratis (Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA548), with parallels from the sanctuary of Demeter at Corinth (Merker 2000, 100, nos C158–160).
BC on Melos (Fig. 22). Among the rare Attic imports are female figures in a Classical Greek style, both seated and standing, dating to 450–350 BC (Fig. 23), variants of this form are more common at Naukratis in Ionian or Rhodian fabrics (Fig. 24).

Other types include a Rhodian temple boy figure (Fig. 25, see the chapter on Cypriot figures) from the same mould series and of the same fabric as an example from the Fikellura cemetery on Rhodes, dating from c. 450 BC. Fragments of three reclining male and female symposiasts probably fall late in the date range c. 500–350 BC and have parallels at Lindos and elsewhere on Rhodes and at Olynthus.

Greek Classical style female figures, both standing and seated, are shown wearing a low polos, veil and formless draped garments; they can be dated to the period of c. 500–400 BC, with parallels known from Rhodes. Later versions of the type have their foreheads framed by hair drawn back into a pointed sakkos (Fig. 23), and feature a form-hugging peplos; they either hold a bird as an offering or grasp the right breast. Some of these figures, dating to 500–450 BC, have been found in the Hellenion; numerous parallels on Rhodes may be indicative of Rhodes as the place of production, which is further supported by clay analysis, but there are also parallels in Athens in a different, probably local, fabric. Fabrics that could be associated with both Attic and East Greek or Rhodian productions are represented at Naukratis.

Later elaborate variants of seated females dated to c. 400–300 BC include representations of the enthroned goddess Cybele with a lion (Fig. 26). She wears disc-earrings, chiton, himation and a relief-decorated stephane, kalathos or polos over her wavy hair. They come from the Hellenion precinct and have parallels in form and fabric (for example) from Halikarnassos.

Fragments of finely crafted figures and figure groups of Aphrodite and Eros have also been found, coated with a white preparation for pink, blue and black painted decoration. Aphrodite is depicted wearing a stephane, her himation wrapped around her waist, passing up over the head and down again on to the left shoulder. Eros is depicted nude. Many fragments
cannot be ascribed to such groups with certainty, but represent poses that only make sense as part of such groups. Examples have been found in a well dated by the excavators to c. 400–350 BC (Fig. 27) and a piece identified as Corinthian by Higgins (Fig. 28) comes from a grave and can be dated to 375–325 BC. Within this group are some large fragments that possibly also belong to representations of Aphrodite and Eros alone or in groups.

Some fine but very fragmentary remains from a figure of ‘Aphrodite Anadyomene’ (Fig. 29) represent the goddess rising from the sea on a scallop shell. This subject was made famous in the 4th century BC through a painting by Apelles and there are later parallels in terracotta from Smyrna. Contemporary pieces in a similar style include a Europa on the bull from the Hellenion, dated c. 400–350 BC, with parallels from Cyrenaica and Boeotia although possibly made in Attica.

A group of East Greek relief plaques and open-backed figure groups of semi-clad or naked woman being pursued and molested by male figures are paralleled in style and fabric by pieces thought to be Attic and dated to 400–350 BC; a plaque showing such a scene in front of a Greek-style temple has parallels from Myrina whose dating must now be revised down to the late 4th or early 3rd century BC.

2.5 ‘Tanagra’ style figures

Among the finds from Naukratis is a small group of finely crafted, mould-made, hollow and brightly painted Greek figurines (Fig. 31) of the period c. 350–250 BC. These so called ‘Tanagra style’ figurines were inspired by
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85 Gutch 1898–9, 81, no. 38. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896–1908-G.93. Other wells excavated by Gutch and also thought to have contained material of a restricted date range have since been found to be of a wide range of dates (see chapters on Ptolemaic and Roman figures and local Greek style pottery).
86 NA analysis by Hughes (2001, 295, 301–5) found that British Museum, 1888,0601.125, did not fit with the cluster of Corinthian fabrics sampled. The fine red-brown fabric does not resemble known Corinthian pottery but does closely parallel Rhodian and some other East Greek fabrics (only pieces from Knidos, Halikarnassos and Smyrna in western Turkey were tested by Hughes). A parallel from Halikarnassos has also been attributed to Corinth by Higgins (1954, 265).
87 Higgins 1954, 264–5, no. 971; British Museum, 1888,0601.125. Although we cannot reconstruct specific grave groups, the majority of the known finds from the cemetery are coffin fittings dating to the Macedonian and early Ptolemaic period. This piece could be slightly earlier, however, as a small number of graves were found to contain Archaic and Classical Greek finds.
91 Cf. Pliny, History 35.91; Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 13.
93 Higgins 1954, 191, no. 720; British Museum, 1868,1020.46.a; 1891,0110.2.
97 Mollard-Besques 1963, pl.190 CA 1632; pl.177, MYR 195, MYR 690. Dated rather late to c. 200–100 BC.
98 See Kassab Tezgör (2010, 186) on revisions of the numismatic evidence used by Mollard-Besques. See also observations by Uhlenbrock (1990b, 73). Therefore this production should be considered alongside the ‘Tanagra style’ draped women discussed below.
99 Named after the Boeotian town of Tanagra, an early and major producer of the finest examples of this type and an unlikely source for the Naukratis pieces. The name ‘Tanagra’ has become synonymous with a specific style of early Hellenistic figurine produced in various Hellenistic production centres and as a result the term ‘Tanagra style’ is often used to describe the production of various centres, not just the famous centre of Tanagra itself (Burn and Higgins 2001, 26). It is used within this article as a shorthand for the famous style that
Figurines of this type depict Greek deities, mythological scenes, characters from theatre or draped women; they were found almost exclusively in the Greek sanctuaries or the cemetery of Naukratis, consistent with deposition practices common across mainland Greece, East Greece and North Africa during this period.\(^{102}\)

They are coated with a fine hard kaolinite white preparation, superior to that found on earlier and locally produced types,\(^ {103}\) on which painted decoration in bright blue, pink, yellow and black pigments is preserved. Made of a range of fine fabrics, the majority are in a soft fine red-brown micaceous clay of probable East Greek origin, though mainland Greek pieces can also be identified.

The figures depict women and sometimes boys and girls in everyday costume. Most common are female figures, usually wearing the ‘melon coiffure’\(^ {104}\) or a veil, with graceful movement showing through the drapery of the chiton and himation. Boys wear the Macedonian kausia and cloak. A few pieces represent theatre characters, possibly from Menander’s New Comedy (Figs 32 and 33), and mythological figures such as a satyr with a wine skin or Pan with Dionysus (Fig. 34).\(^ {105}\) The theatre masks are often of the slave character depicted with deeply furrowed asymmetric eyebrows, snub nose, gaping mouth and bulging eyes. Parallels are found across the Hellenistic world, particularly from the end of the 4th to the 2nd century BC.\(^ {106}\) Some of the masks (Fig. 32)\(^ {107}\) have close parallels that have been suggested to be Attic from the period 375–325 BC,\(^ {108}\) but are more likely of East Greek origin as the fabric is distinctly different from that of Attic figurines.

### 2.6 Locally produced figures of Greek style and type

A small group of East Greek style mould-made figures from Naukratis are made from a dense and finely levigated Nile silt fabric that is found
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\(^{100}\) The majority from Naukratis are either from Rhodes or elsewhere in East Greece, where there was a vigorous industry producing terracottas in Pergamon, Troy, Myrina, Smyrna and Priene.

\(^{101}\) Thomas, Greek terracotta figures

\(^{102}\) Naukratis: Greeks in Egypt

\(^{103}\) Includes draped female figures without implying an actual Tanagran origin (see Jeammet 2010 and articles within, particularly Kassab Tezgör 2010, 186).

\(^{104}\) Both Egyptian (Kassab Tezgör 2007, 2010, 187; Muller 2010, 103) and East Greek workshops (Kassab Tezgör 2010, 187), such as those of Myrina, took their models or moulds from Boeotian or Athenian workshops. For the development of this industry locally in Naukratis, see the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures; on Cypriot copies of the ‘Tanagra style’ see the chapter on Cypriot figures.


\(^{106}\) ‘Tanagras’ were commonly associated with sanctuaries, burials and dwellings (Jeammet and Mathieux 2010, 160–2, table 3), and were possibly representations of mortals that were used in religious rituals concerning rites of passage (ibid.).

\(^{107}\) Confirmed by chemical analysis (Bailey 2006, 264; 2008, 6; Burn and Higgins 2001, 313–15).

\(^{108}\) Introduced in c. 350 BC (Lopes 2008, 104).

\(^{109}\) Bailey 2008, 104, no. 3376; British Museum, 1911,0606.3. Probably from the sanctuary of Aphrodite.

\(^{110}\) Burn and Higgins 2001, 2267; British Museum, 1842,0728,750; 1856,1226,332.


\(^{112}\) Chesterman 1974, 43, no. 40; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR85e.1937; Higgins 1954, 737, 740, 741.
exclusively at Naukratis, where the figures were probably made.\footnote{Higgins 1954, 405.} Shown as wearing a polos, veil and earrings, the figures feature hollow bodies and solid heads pierced vertically by a central hole (Fig. 35).\footnote{British Museum, 1886,0401.1422. See also in catalogue British Museum, 1886,0401.1453; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1886-1908-G.85 and AN1896-1908-E.4661 (from same mould); Greenock Museum, 1987,467; Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA620.} The face is rendered in typical Late Archaic East Greek style as found in East Greek as well as Cypro-Ionian figures of c. 575–500 BC (see the chapter on Cypro-Ionian figures).\footnote{Contra Higgins 1954, 405.} The technology is unusual, however, combining a solid mould-made head and a hollow mould-made body with a vent running through the top of the head. A groove on the underside of the head,\footnote{For example see British Museum, 1886,0401.1422.} possibly a by-product of their construction on a wooden scaffold or cross, fitted a ridge on the hollow body section, creating a weak point common in this type (Fig. 33).\footnote{British Museum, 1888,0601.94.} Petrie suggested that they might have been attachments from a vase and a similar construction technique to that employed for the head of these pieces was used to produce (much smaller) Samian gorgon-shaped aryballoi from Naukratis dated 575–525 BC\footnote{Ibid., 36–44, nos 15, 35, 41, 42.} and late 7th to early 6th century BC pieces ascribed to Rhodian production.\footnote{Edwards 1885a, 260–1; Petrie 1886a, 36.} Examples of this type have been found in the town area of Naukratis\footnote{Also found in the recent excavations at Naukratis (Thomas and Villing forthcoming).} in a location adjacent to the sanctuaries of Apollo and Hera, alongside Cypro-Ionian figures dated c. 600–525 BC (see the chapter on Cypro-Ionian figures). As with locally produced Ionian-style tableware and lamps (see the chapters on Lamps, Stoves and Local Greek-style pottery),\footnote{Possibly wearing Cypro-Ionian influenced fashion. The earrings depicted on some figures of this class are also typical of Cypriot figurines such as British Museum, 1886,0401.1420, from the Apollo sanctuary stratum AF3 and dated c. 620–575 BC.} also often made from a finely levigated clay, these locally produced figures (or perhaps figure vessels) were probably made by and for East Greeks\footnote{Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-E.4751.} living in Naukratis for use as dedications within the local Greek sanctuaries. They are not very common in Naukratis, however, nor have they been found so far outside of Naukratis.

Figures made locally during the Classical period in an East Greek style have a fabric (macroskopically) identical to the organic local Nile silt fabric fired a red-brown colour with a black core that was used to produce contemporary Egyptian figures used in Egyptian domestic contexts (see the chapter on Late Period Egyptian figures). In the period of c. 450–350 BC, crude one- and possibly two-piece moulds were used in the local production of a range of Classical protomes (Fig. 36) and standing male and female figures. An example is a rather crude figure modelled on Athenian and East Greek types of standing female figures with their hair drawn back into a sakkos, for which imports are also attested at Naukratis (Fig. 37).\footnote{Also found in the recent excavations at Naukratis (Thomas and Villing forthcoming).} Often the back is plain and unworked, as in Egyptian plaque figures, which together with the identical fabric and firing conditions suggests that indigenous Egyptian techniques were being applied to the production of rather poor copies of East Greek figures, possibly by Egyptian coroplasts for a local (Greek) clientele. Sometimes the figures resemble Egyptian figure-plaques in construction, with the addition of a...
Greek *chiton* and *himation*,120 *polos* and hairstyles (Fig. 38)121 or the Greek-style ‘melon coiffure’ after 350 BC (Fig. 39).122 In these cases it is difficult to tell whether an Egyptian clientele sensitive to Greek culture was being targeted or customers of Greek origin, if indeed such distinctions are possible or relevant by this period. Unfortunately, the scarce contextual information available provides little clue as to how the figures were used and by whom.

Of special interest is the (rare) occurrence of iconographically ‘hybrid’ figures. One striking piece in this regard is a figure-plaque of a ‘temple boy’ (i.e. a crawling baby) of c. 475–425 BC that was moulded from a Rhodian prototype but transformed into an Egyptian figure of ithyphallic Harpokrates by means of an added macro-phallus and side-lock (Fig. 40, see the chapter on Late Period Egyptian figures). In this case the Greek model provided the basic form but was modified so as to acquire a specific local and very different meaning. Greek influence on the form of Egyptian terracottas, felt already in the Late Period, became even more pronounced in the Ptolemaic period (see the chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman figures), when imported figures are no longer attested at Naukratis.

### 3. Contexts and conclusions

Findings of East Greek and other Greek terracotta figures are concentrated in the sanctuaries of Naukratis. During the Saite period, a small number of hand-made and mould-made figure-plaques were brought to Naukratis, but Greek figures are attested in substantial numbers only with the advent of the finely crafted figure-vases of the 6th century BC. By the mid-6th century BC, towards the end of the Saite Period, figure-vases and protomes were being offered in the sanctuaries of Aphrodite, Hera and Apollo, alongside the significantly more numerous examples of Cypriot and Cypro-Ionian figures (see the chapter on Cypriot figures). At this time, a small and brief local production of female figures (perhaps as vessel attachments?) in a broadly East Greek or Cypro-Ionian style is also attested at Naukratis, manufactured in techniques not used by local Egyptian coroplasts.

In the later 6th century BC the pattern of Greek figurines at Naukratis changes with the previously popular Ionian types being replaced by different Ionian and other East Greek including Rhodian figures, a development perhaps related to changing patterns of contact and trade during Achaemenid rule in Egypt. Dedications both of pottery and figurines during this period appear to have been concentrated in the Hellenion, although this pattern probably in part reflects the variable state of preservation of different phases of use in different sanctuaries. Whilst at the Hellenion much of the evidence relating to earlier phases of activity was destroyed by construction work for the second phase around 400 BC, a layer of protomes in area 14, underneath this later phase, revealed numerous and varied types of Ionian and Rhodian protomes and other
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120 Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA632.
122 Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, E18841.
figures that were offered there in the period between 540 and 400 BC.\textsuperscript{123} As has been argued above, close similarities in form and fabric to finds from Rhodes and sometimes production from the same mould series suggest Rhodes as the production centre of many of these pieces, confirmed in some instances by clay analysis. Links between Naukratis and Rhodes, notably in the Classical period, are attested also in other ways, particularly by the inscribed stele honouring Damoxenos, a resident of Naukratis, as a proxenos and euergetes of the city of Lindos and decreeing that the stele be set up in the Hellenion (Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow, I.1.a.3019; see the chapter on Stone inscriptions). Even later in the Hellenistic period Naukratis received frequent consignments of Rhodian trade amphorae (see the chapter on Stamped amphorae), though at this time they were probably transshipped via Alexandria. These findings stand in contrast to the rather slim evidence for Archaic Rhodian pottery at Naukratis and underline the need to consider the archaeological assemblage in its entirety. Links with mainland Greece are not especially prominent in the figurine assemblage from Naukratis despite the occurrence of Corinthian and Laconian pottery and especially large quantities of Attic figured pottery as dedications in the local sanctuaries in the 6th century BC, continuing at lower levels throughout the 5th and into the 4th century BC. The rather different pattern that emerges from imported mainland Greek pottery versus figurines further supports the notion that these groups of pottery were frequently carried by East Greek and/or Aeginetan traders. If the traders had travelled directly from mainland Greece, they would have had access to the figurines produced by the numerous high quality terracotta industries there, which are not well represented at Naukratis.

During the Classical period figures were also produced locally at Naukratis. The same fabrics and techniques as employed by Egyptian coroplasts are used to produce (rather poor) copies of figure types otherwise imported from Rhodes and Ionia at this time. In rare instances, Greek figures were also modified so as to represent Egyptian deities. Even if our dataset is too limited to allow far-reaching conclusions, there are indications that in a setting involving close contact between Greeks and Egyptians, craftsmen strove to fulfill specific local demands of a mixed community and that some elements of a hybrid material culture had already developed by the 5th century BC. However, this phenomenon appears limited, with the majority of the evidence suggesting that boundaries between Greek and Egyptian material culture were largely upheld during the period.

In the period between 400 and 300 BC, East Greek (including probable Rhodian) figures of Aphrodite, Artemis, Cybele and other representations continued to be dedicated in the Hellenion.\textsuperscript{124} As confirmed also by other evidence,\textsuperscript{125} Greek traders still frequented Naukratis at this time, although we appear to have significantly less imported material from the period than from earlier periods, perhaps indicative of a decrease in the significance of Naukratis as a centre of international trade.\textsuperscript{126} The final imported figurines

\textsuperscript{123} Gutch 1898–9, 79.
\textsuperscript{125} Cf. for example the ‘decree of Sais’ of 380 BC: Bomhard 2012.
\textsuperscript{126} It has been argued that Herakleion-Thonis took over some of Naukratis’ role as an alternative port of trade. However, there is little evidence there of the Greek infrastructure that
show that Naukratis was affected by the changing Greek fashions of the day, exemplified by the appearance of mid-4th century BC Tanagra style figures, representations of Greek deities as well as of comic characters possibly from late 4th-century BC New Comedy. These were found in the Hellenion alongside pottery dedications to Greek deities, or deposited in wells, some of them possibly used as bothroi. Two particularly fine examples – one a figure group of Eros and Aphrodite, the other a youth with a lyre – were found in tombs in the cemetery (a third Greek-style figure fragment from the cemetery is a local version of a Tanagra type). A small number of Greek and East Greek figures are recorded as having been found in the ‘east part of the town’, however these pieces are likely to have been redeposited in antiquity or in more recent times, since one fragment from this group joins a piece said to come from the Hellenion.

As is the case for the Cypriot figures from Naukratis, none of the Greek figures can be securely attributed to domestic contexts.

The last figures to reach Naukratis from Greece date from early in the 3rd century BC. Already by this time local figurine production was prolific and had adopted Greek techniques and style, but these were used mostly to represent Egyptian subjects. Local figures were used in a far more widespread and varied way than the imported Greek figures (see the chapter on Late Period Egyptian figures). As a part of this trend, locally made figures of Egyptian deities, particularly Isis-Hathor, Harpokrates and Bes, also began to appear in Greek sanctuaries, especially the Hellenion, and in the wells associated with sanctuaries.

However, after the 3rd century BC, very few figurines can be interpreted with any confidence as dedications in the Greek sanctuaries of Naukratis, a development that may indicate a shift in local dedicatory practices, but also reflects the relatively poor state of recorded information on the archaeological contexts for the later periods of the city.

would have been required for traders to operate, which is represented at Naukratis in the form of the Greek temples and the Hellenion (see the chapter on Topography and Thomas and Villing 2013, Thomas forthcoming a).

127 Gutch 1898–9, 96–7, nos 296, 346–51.
128 Ibid., 83, no. 71; joining pieces Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA371, NA372 and NA813.
129 A well-preserved figure of a seated girl in the Tanagra style, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.398, was found in what Griffith (who was excavating for Petrie) identified as a Ptolemaic house (Griffith notebook 1885, 12), but it is probably locally produced rather than imported.
130 Petrie 1886a, 44.