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1. Introduction

Greek and Roman sculpture were rare finds at Naukratis. The excavators were careful to keep every small fragment of sculpture that they found, although they were clearly disappointed by the preservation of what remnants they did discover.\(^1\) Ptolemaic and Roman period sculpture includes mainly small statuettes, but there are also a few fragments of full or half-life-sized statues, usually made of imported marble (there being limited evidence of marble sources quarried in Egypt during this period).\(^2\)

To this small group, can be added some examples of attempts at producing Greek and Roman sculpture from local materials (limestone, sandstone and calcite). Sometimes Egyptian tools and techniques were used to make these sculptures, with their sculptors endeavouring to produce Greek styles and/or subjects. Finally there is a group of Greek/Roman-Egyptian sculpture that utilized traditional Egyptian materials, techniques and subjects, while adopting some Greek or Roman characteristics. Nevertheless, identifying the tradition (let alone the ethnicity) of the sculptor remains highly speculative when based on the materials, tools and techniques used or the subject depicted. This is a highly varied assemblage comprising fragmentary remains dating to the Classical Greek, Hellenistic and Roman periods.

The scarcity of sculpture at Naukratis may be explained by the poor preservation of the Persian, Ptolemaic and Roman levels and phases of the settlement, particularly the Greek sanctuaries where we may have expected to find such objects. When Naukratis was discovered only parts of the Archaic phases of the Greek sanctuaries were still intact, the later contexts that might have yielded more sculpture had almost completely disappeared. One exception is a group of marble and limestone cats that were sold on the antiquities market in 1895, which must have been found within a well-preserved context in the northern part of the settlement. This chapter discusses all sculpture fragments from Naukratis, but the limitations of this material only allow for a brief analysis. Only for the group of cat sculptures can a full discussion be presented.

1.1 Stone and workshops

The sculpture discussed here is predominantly ‘Greek’; Egyptian sculpture and stone figurines are discussed in separate chapters.\(^3\) The pieces are

---

1 Petrie 1886, 36, 40; Edgar 1903, v. All images are © Trustees of the British Museum, unless otherwise indicated.
2 Bianchi 2003, 22, note 58, a source at Gebel Rokham is suggested for a late Ptolemaic sculpture in New York (MMA 89.2.660). It is unlikely that any of the Naukratis material came from this source, and the periods in which this (largely destroyed) quarry was operational are still debated (Harrell and Storemyr 2009; Harrell 2013).
3 See chapters on, Egyptian Late Period figures Cypriot figures and the forthcoming chapter on Egyptian sculpture. Overlap exists in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods where Egyptian, Greek and Roman influences in technique and subject are all represented. For this reason some pieces are discussed in both chapters. The research presented here was only possible because of the help of numerous scholars. Don Bailey first undertook some archival research on the cats from Naukratis, before passing this onto Peter Higgs. Adrienn Almásy and Cary Martin have assisted with the identification and reading of the Demotic, whilst Alan Johnston and Julia Lougovaya have assisted with the reading and dating of the Greek inscriptions. The research of both Alexandra Villing and Aurélia Masson has informed different aspects of this work.
essentially Greek in terms of their material and technique, if not necessarily in subject, or they show Greek themes but using Egyptian materials and techniques: a rather mixed assemblage that reflects the mixed Greek-Egyptian audience and origin. The demand for mixed Greek-Egyptian sculpture is something that we might expect in Macedonian and Ptolemaic Egypt, especially at Naukratis, which had long housed a local Greek population. For this reason, the investigation of carving techniques is particularly promising at sites such as Naukratis, where we might expect technology and ideas to have been transferred between people from different regions. Therefore, special attention is paid below to the techniques and technology employed by craftsmen in the creation of the sculpture. While it is not possible to attribute pieces to specific workshops, it is clear that some pieces belong together as the products of the same workshop.

The local geology of Naukratis comprises alluvial deposits with no accessible bedrock in its immediate hinterland, which means that sculpture was either brought into Naukratis complete, or was carved locally of imported materials. Marble was imported from Greece and East Greece, whilst Cypriot limestone, Egyptian limestone (from Memphis and Alexandria), sandstone, calcite and (rarely) basalt were also used for carving. Marble was imported into Naukratis from three identified sources: Mount Pentelikos near Athens, the Ephesus region and the island of Paros. The earliest known marble at Naukratis was imported from Ephesus for the construction of the second temple of Apollo, completed between 550 BC and 500 BC. It is unlikely that any of the marble sculptures or figurines predate the Ephesian architectural elements. It is possible that some smaller statuettes reused marble from the temple or waste stone in sculptors’ workshops, although the marble cats came from other sources.

Limestone quarried in Egypt and Cyprus was also used for sculptures. Cypriot and Cypro-Ionian style figures in alabaster and limestone were imported directly from Cyprus (i.e. not made locally) in considerable numbers, although later Cypro-Classical pieces were relatively rare. Egyptian figurines and sculptures were predominantly made of a soft white limestone, probably sourced from the Memphite region near Saqqâra, where the figure types found at Naukratis are known to have been made. With the exception of the limestone relief of a warrior that provides evidence for a local workshop, no ‘unfinished’ stone figures or sculpture, with the exception of the Egyptian sculpture, have been found at Naukratis and it is likely that all the sculpture arrived ready carved.

---

4 Carbon isotope analysis undertaken by K. Mathews in 1990 (in Altekamp 1991, 390ff) on five marble fragments from the sanctuary of Apollo (British Museum, 1886.0401.42; 1886.0401.57; 1886.0401.38; 1886.0401.39; 1886.0401.10) suggest that the pieces were from Ephesus (see also Koenigs 2007, 330–1).
5 Koenigs 2007, 330–1, cat. no. 19, pl. 17; Pryce 1928.
6 Gypsum Alabaster from Cyprus, not available in Egypt and distinct from ‘Egyptian Alabaster’, which is a form of calcite (see chapter on Cypriot figures).
7 See chapter on Cypriot figures.
8 See chapter on Egyptian Late Period figures.
9 British Museum, 1900.0214.21 (Koenigs 2007, 346–7 no. 45, pl. 32).
10 See forthcoming chapter on Egyptian sculpture, particularly trial pieces.
1.2 Distribution

The distribution of sculpture across Naukratis follows the pattern of the more numerous limestone and terracotta figures, although the sample size is very small. While stone and terracotta figurine fragments found at the site total over 2000 pieces\(^\text{11}\) and cover all periods of the site’s history across the Saite, Achaemenid, Ptolemaic and Roman periods, sculpture elements number a mere 54\(^\text{12}\) and are predominantly of the Classical and early Hellenistic periods. As with the terracotta and stone figurines found at Naukratis, the majority of sculptural pieces with a known find-spot were discovered within the Greek sanctuaries of Naukratis.

The Greek sanctuaries were the main focus of early excavations at Naukratis, but were in areas already largely robbed of building materials, either repurposed, such as column drums now distributed across the modern settlements built over the site,\(^\text{13}\) or slaked into lime. In addition these sanctuaries were on the whole very poorly preserved except for the earliest and deepest Archaic levels. For this reason, the small assemblage of sculpture tells us precious little about the votive offering activities of permanent residents and visitors to the sanctuaries during the Classical and Hellenistic periods. There are wider political and socio-economic factors that may also explain the paucity of 5th to 1st century BC sculpture from the city, such as the changing role of Naukratis within the port network of Egypt. The importation of figurines of all materials into Naukratis severely declined between c. 300–270 BC, after the construction of the port and city of Alexandria. This corresponded with a rapid decline in the importation of limestone Egyptian figurines from the Memphite region during the 3rd century BC.

1.3 The assemblage

Greek and Roman sculpture did not develop in isolation. The vast majority of the over 400 stone sculptures and figurines found at Naukratis were Late Period Egyptian figurines from Memphis and Archaic figurines imported from Cyprus. Over 2000 figurines of terracotta and stone were found at Naukratis. Almost all of the imported examples arrived before the early 3rd century BC. Hellenistic and Roman figurines were almost entirely locally made from terracotta, with stone rarely represented, even from other parts of Egypt.\(^\text{14}\) Whilst the Greek and Roman sculpture broadly follow the same trends as that of terracotta and stone figurines found at Naukratis, it also provides us with the few examples of imported full and half-size sculpture and smaller statuettes that were brought to Naukratis during the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.

While Egyptian and Cypriot sculpture are catalogued separately, they are referred to here, where appropriate. The small number of Cypriot limestone

---

\(^{11}\) See chapters on Egyptian Late Period figures, Cypriot figures, Greek terracotta figures and Ptolemaic and Roman figures.

\(^{12}\) This includes a few sculpture fragments that have been lost since discovery. Inscribed sculpture bases are excluded and instead discussed in the chapter on Stone inscriptions. Also added to this figure are a number of Egyptian sculptures of the Ptolemaic and Roman period, discussed in section 6.

\(^{13}\) Coulson 1996, 14–16, fig.7.

\(^{14}\) See chapters on Egyptian Late Period figures, Cypriot figures, Greek terracotta figures and Ptolemaic and Roman figures.
figures of Cypro-Classical and early Hellenistic date (as well as some ‘Greek-Roman’ Egyptian sculpture) are of relevance here because objects from the corpus of ‘Greek and Roman’ sculpture borrowed heavily from Egyptian and Cypriot tools, technique, materials, style or subject. The assemblage can be broadly separated into the following groups:

Section 2 discusses a small, putative group of four Archaic Greek sculptures dating to the 6th century BC. Section 3 introduces a group of 22 early Ptolemaic period sculptures of cats and other felines in both Greek and Egyptian styles. Section 4 analyzes late Classical to Hellenistic sculpture of half- to life-sized scale. Hellenistic and early Imperial marble15 statuettes (mainly of Aphrodite and Eros) are discussed in section 5. Section 6 presents a small group of Ptolemaic and Roman Egyptian sculpture comprising objects of distinctly Egyptian subjects, but carved in a Greek style or Greek subjects made of local Egyptian materials. Section 7 comprises a brief summary of the relief sculpture from Naukratis and section 8 offers a conclusion.

2. Archaic Greek sculpture

Four stone figures found at Naukratis are tentatively identified here as being of Archaic Greek origin. They fit neither Late Period Egyptian nor Cypro-Archaic types, which otherwise account for all other stone sculpture or figurines of this period found at Naukratis. All four examples seem to have been discovered within 6th century BC contexts or conform to Archaic styles. However, a Cypriot (or even local) origin cannot be excluded. Two limestone busts (Figs 1–2)16 have been putatively identified as comb handles.17 Both have large eyes, simple noses and egg-shaped heads. One is probably female,18 with long hair falling down over her shoulders and back, carved in the Archaic manner with criss-crossing lines at the front and a few vertical striations at the back. The bust was found within the sanctuary of Aphrodite, and so was probably a votive offering dedicated to the deity.

Two fragments of marble19 statuettes from Naukratis,20 now housed in the Petrie Museum,21 are a worn female head with large almond shaped eyes set in a rounded face (Fig. 3) and a fragment of a hand22 holding a tambour (Fig. 4). The head is described in the Petrie Museum register as from a ‘kore’ statuette. A limestone parallel from Cyprus has been dated by Hermary from the late 6th to early 5th century BC.23 If so, the style is East

---

15 Copies of 4th and 3rd century BC originals, but probably only popular from the late 2nd century BC onwards (Havelock 1995). British Museum, EA68551 was probably made of calcite, although the rest of the group were of marble.
16 Kelvingrove Art Gallery & Museum, Glasgow, 1895.1.g (from the Sanctuary of Aphrodite Context Φ147); Egyptian Museum, Cairo, TR29/3/36/2 (acquired from Sebakhin, see Hogarth, Lorimer and Edgar 1905, 135, fig. 14). The authors did not examine the piece in Glasgow in person so it has not been possible to distinguish between a potential Egyptian, Cypriot or Greek source.
17 Hogarth, Lorimer and Edgar 1905, 135, fig. 14.
18 No breasts are modelled so it might even be male.
19 Both are registered as marble, although the state of preservation and surface of the pieces made this impossible to confirm. Calcite or Alabaster could also be considered.
20 No contextual information is available for either piece.
21 Petrie Museum, London, UC54623; UC54625.
22 Probably calcite, although marble cannot be ruled out without analysis.
Greek. However, the piece is severely worn perhaps giving the false impression that it is Archaic rather than Archaising. A later date cannot be excluded because the arrangement of the woman’s hair, in two rows of ringlets, is reminiscent of the ‘‘sis-locks’ and the fleshy folds on the throat (‘rings of Venus’) would suggest a later date as these features are found on Egyptian figured of the Ptolemaic period.24 The second fragment is of a ‘marble’ hand holding either a tambour or an offering bowl and is of a comparable late 6th or early 5th century BC date.

3. Early Ptolemaic sculptures of cats and other felines in Greek and Egyptian style

The largest group of later Greek sculptures is an incredible find not normally discussed in studies of Greek sculpture. A collection of 22 fragments of cat and other feline sculptures, both life-sized and under and carved in a range of styles and different materials was discovered at Naukratis and is housed today in two locations: two complete cats in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo25 and 20 fragments in the British Museum.26 The sculptures broadly date from c. 330–200 BC and are discussed in detail below.

The cat sculptures came not from official excavations but were bought by Petrie and the Egyptian Museum from antiquities dealers, and the Naukratis provenance has only recently been determined through archival work. The examples in Cairo were acquired by the Egyptian Museum in Damanhur (the closest large modern city to ancient Naukratis) in 1895 together with objects from Naukratis.27 Furthermore, the 5th century BC funerary stele of a Milesian Greek acquired together with these cats may suggests that the objects were found in the northern area of the settlement near the cemetery, Dioskouroi, and in Hellenion sanctuaries.28

The second group was acquired by Flinders Petrie, who first saw the cats in Cairo on the 26th November 1895. In his notes from that day Petrie dates the sculptures to the 4th century BC.29 Petrie purchased the cats

---

21 Possibly wearing a necklace, but the piece is very eroded.
22 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE31184 and JE31185.
24 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE31184 and JE31185 cat sculptures were acquired with JE31183 (CG9241), a c. 500–450 BC limestone funerary stele of Metrodoros, son of Apollonides, of Miletos. This stele is interpreted as coming from Naukratis (Milne 1905, 60; Bernard 1970, no. 33; Johnston 2015, 3–4 see Greek and Latin inscriptions on stone). The funerary stele of a Milesian acquired in Damanhur is most likely to have come from Naukratis, the only settlement with a Greek cemetery dating to the 5th century BC near this modern city. Subsequently in 1898, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE33010 and JE33011 were acquired from Damanhur and the Cairo registers record the origin as Naukratis.
26 Extract from W. M. Flinders Petrie’s Journal 26th November 1895. “I saw a curious lot from Naukratis (the Naukratis context was added to the journal entry by Petrie at a later date) 6 cats life-size, 5 in marble & 1 in limestone, with a base of one inscribed ΓΑΛΑΤΕIΑ:ΘΕΥΔΟΤΟΥ ΒΟΥΒΑΣΤI ‘Galatea daughter of Theodotus to Boubastis’. They are all in running attitudes, some with birds in mouth, & of Greek work. From the cutting of the inscription probably of the 5th cent[ury] BC. I made a bid & expect to get them when I come away, for [the] Brit[ish] Mus[ueum].”
from Abd es-Salam Khatat in Cairo in 1896,\textsuperscript{30} who fabricated a Boubastis (Tell Basta) provenance. Petrie subsequently corrects the find-spot to Naukratis in his notes, but does not explain why.\textsuperscript{31} As both the Cairo and the British Museum cats were on the market in 1895, it is likely that they came from the same context. Petrie’s correction of the find-spot may be explained by his knowledge of the Cairo cats acquired in Damanhur. The cats reached the British Museum in 1897 and were subsequently purchased and registered in 1905.\textsuperscript{32} One of the objects is a limestone base for a cat with the inscribed dedication $\Gamma$ΑΛΑΤΕΙΑ:ΘΕΥΔΟΤΟΥ ΒΟΥΒΑΣΤΙ (Galatea daughter of Theodotos to Boubastis), placing the group within a Bubasteion, a temple of Bastet.\textsuperscript{33}

The connection between the two groups, each independently ascribed to Naukratis, is demonstrated by the likelihood that they were produced within the same workshops and that some might have been created as pairs intended to be dedicated together in the same sanctuary.\textsuperscript{34} Interestingly, several terracotta (Fig. 5) and bronze (Figs 6–7) figures of cats are also known from Naukratis. A terracotta cat was found in the north-eastern part of the town (Fig. 5)\textsuperscript{35} and the bronze examples discovered either in the southern area of the site within the ‘cache of bronzes’ (Fig. 6),\textsuperscript{36} or with no find-spot information (Fig. 7). The combined collection history of Petrie’s stone cats and the Cairo cats suggests that both groups were found in the same year, in the northern part of Naukratis near the cemetery and the Hellenion, within a sanctuary of Bastet which cannot be more specifically located.

3.1 The cat in Greek sculpture

The scarcity of representations of cats in Greek and Roman art almost raises the question whether cats were present in Greece or Italy at all. They are rarely depicted in sculpture, pottery, wall painting, or mosaics. Whilst Minoan frescos and seal stones and Mycenaean bronze work borrowed and reinterpreted contemporary New Kingdom Egyptian-inspired scenes of ‘cats hunting ducks’,\textsuperscript{37} the Greeks hardly represented cats at all, finding Egyptian religion and ritual surrounding cats alien.\textsuperscript{38} This appears highly unusual considering how frequently other domesticated or semi-wild animals are represented in scenes showing children at play. Children were

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} Petrie Journal 1896–7, Notebook 21, scan 4. Petrie acquires cats from Abd es Salam Khatat (Quirke 2010, 130; presumably refers to the group of marble and limestone cats in the British Museum).
\item \textsuperscript{31} A Petrie letter dated to the 16 July 1904 (Letter 756), mentions that Petrie bought the cats in Cairo in 1896, and that they were said to be from Boubastis (not Naukratis) although this is added above main text as an addition. He dates them to the 1st or 2nd century BC. They had been exhibited in his annual exhibition in 1897.
\item \textsuperscript{32} From Letter books in Greek and Roman Department in the British Museum 1904–5, P-Z. Letter 755. 8 June 1905. Petrie thanks Cecil Smith for remembering the ‘pussies’ (entered in the deposit book for September 1897), finally bought for £15 and registered in 1905. They were first registered as coming from Tell Basta (despite Petrie’s correction).
\item \textsuperscript{33} British Museum, 1905,0612.20. SB 1-1107. For potential contemporary (3rd century BC) use of the name see graffiti from Abydos (I. Memnonion 201, 2; I. Memnonion 205, 1).
\item \textsuperscript{34} Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE31184 is the partner of British Museum, 1905,0612.10. These cats were possibly produced to be dedicated together as a pair.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA720. Probably located within the area just south east of the Hellenion (Gutch 1898–9, 96, no. 720).
\item \textsuperscript{36} Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.259; 86.311; Liverpool World Museum, 9,9,86,113; Bolton Museum, 1886.31.66.a; Masson 2015; Masson forthcoming.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Engels 1999, 50–1.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Herodotus 2.60, 65–7. Or even the subject for comedy (Timocles The Egyptians 1.4 in Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae, 7.55, Engels 1999, 37).
\end{itemize}
frequently shown on votive and funerary stelai tormenting rabbits and hares, taunting wild fowl and occasionally accompanied by presumably pet dogs. The absence of cats can be explained by the theory that the cat was only introduced to Greece as a household pet very late, replacing the weasel or snake to protect homes from rodents. There is some evidence to suggest that domestic cats were introduced to southern Italy and Cyrenaica from Egypt, before reaching most of the eastern Mediterranean. Cats seem to have reached the Greek mainland and islands relatively late, with representations of them becoming slightly more common during the 4th century BC onwards, when they were still not a popular household pet. Literary references to cats are also scarce.

The earliest known Greek representation of a cat comes from an Archaic statue base in Athens, showing a dog and cat fight. The cat’s arched-backed posture and modelling, while being firmly entrenched in the formulae of Archaic styles, approaches naturalism. The only figure of a cat on Classical Greek sculpture is on an Athenian funerary stele found on Aegina and dated to about 430 BC. A young man and his servant boy are engaged in an unusually touching scene with household pets. A cat, now headless, crouches down hoping to pounce on a bird that is about to be placed safely back in its cage by the youth who holds it in his left hand. The damage to the cat’s head makes stylistic comparisons with the cats from Naukratis difficult, but its naturalistic modelling is similar. Cats are depicted on a small number of Attic red figure vessels but it is invariably difficult to distinguish wild cats or small panthers from domestic cats.

While still a rarity, cats do feature in art from Western Greek and Etruscan Italy from the 5th century BC onwards, where they appear in domestic contexts as if they were pets. Cats are less common in Roman art; the ‘cat hunting ducks’ scene is represented famously in a mosaic from Pompeii and similar examples in the Rome area, but these may be representations of Aegyptiacca popular in early Imperial Roman Italy. Big cats, particularly lions and leopards, are more frequent subjects for Greek and Roman sculpture. Unclear (and rare) Gallo-Roman examples were probably intended to represent big cats, rather than domestic cats.

---

40 Kallimachos Hymn VI, To Demeter; Herodotos 2.66, who discusses (what from a Greek perspective is strange) the sacred value Egyptians attach to cats. Herodotus (67) goes on to describe the mumification and burial of cats at Bubastis where the important cult centre of Bastet was based.
41 Richter 1930, 33–5.
42 Kaltsas 2002, 148–9, no. 287.
43 Found in the British Museum on a series of Attic red-figure vessels: 1864,1007.84 (hydria); 1905,0710.9 (lobster askos), and c. 400–320 BC Italian red-figure vessels: 1867,0508.1175 (skyphos); 1867,0508.1284 (lebes-gamikos); 1867,0508.1323 (pelike) (Smith 1896, nos E171; F126; F207; F308; see also Engels1999, 88–97; Ashmead 1978, 39–47).
46 A powerfully modelled marble figure of a cat and snake, with the cat’s fur meticulously carved, was previously thought to be a heavily restored Roman work (Sutton 1984,312–32), but is now commonly believed to be an 18th-century creation.
47 Espérandieu 1911, 87–8, no. 2906.
3.2 The cat in Egyptian sculpture

Representations of cats occurred regularly in the art of Egypt from the New Kingdom onwards. The long-established Egyptian belief in the protective power and sacredness of cats is well documented and fed into the visual arts over a long period. This phenomenon was particularly associated with the growth of animal cults during the Late Period and Ptolemaic period, where mummified cats were dedicated to the goddess Bastet, a deity particularly revered in Lower Egypt. Bastet was subsequently incorporated into the cult of Isis, and the sacred cat was additionally associated with the cult of Horus. With the development of the Serapis-Isis-Horus cult under Ptolemy I and its subsequent growth, the image of the sacred cat spread along with the cult. Cats in Egyptian art come in the form of limestone sculptures, stone and faience amulets, and bronzes, and Naukratis has yielded numerous bronze and glazed composition figures and amulets. Almost all examples are in the form of a seated cat, a type which has a long, indigenous tradition in Egypt and is distinct from the few Greek images. In general, the tail of the Egyptian cat lies alongside (from rump to paw) in a seated position (Figs 6–7), and around one of the rear haunches for Egyptian lions (as on cat example Fig. 8). In Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, terracotta figures of cats were produced in considerable numbers, in a variety of poses.

Representations of cats associated with the cult of Bastet were produced as hollow cast figures, cat amulets (Fig. 7), cat-shaped coffins, and as three-dimensional, bronze cat figures placed on coffin boxes (Fig. 6). The finest examples were produced in the Late Period and early Ptolemaic periods. At Naukratis, hollow-cast rectangular boxes topped with a solid-cast figure of a seated cat, probably functioned as votive boxes containing parts of mummified cats, and were found within a bronze cache dated c. 450–350 BC (Fig. 6). Another example is a c. 400–100 BC solid-cast, seated cat figure which was attached to a model offering-table, and functioned as a votive offering or was used as an amulet. These types of mummy case and amulets were common in Bubastis, the main cult centre of the goddess, but were also discovered at other Nile Delta sites, such as Thonis-Heracleion, Tanis and the Memphite region.

50 The Ptolemaic Temple of Horus at Edfu carries the inscription ‘Isis is the soul of Bastet’ (Engels 1999, 35).
51 Engels 1999, 37 on the observation by Sextus Empiricus (Pyrrh 3.221.2) that Alexandrian’s sacrificed cats to Horus in the 2nd century AD.
52 Masson 2015; Masson forthcoming.
53 Málek 1993, 102, 105.
54 Terracotta cat figures are commonly dated to either the Ptolemaic or Roman periods (Biers 2004, 23, no.29; Walker 1996, 94–5, nos 141 and 142; Bayer-Niemeier 1988, nos 590–4, pl.104, 1–5). However, recent 3rd century BC discoveries in Alexandria (Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012) may lead to revising the dating of some of these terracotta cats to the early Ptolemaic period.
55 British Museum, EA49138
56 British Museum, EA27586
57 Comprising hollow cast figures or mummy cases (British Museum, EA11562; EA11555) and an elaborate group with a cat-headed human figure of Bastet with her four kittens in seated cat pose (British Museum, EA25565).
58 Weiss 2012, 297–298; 783–91, pl. 49, Type T32, no. 1002. From Thebes (British Museum, EA64372); from ‘Egypt’ (British Museum, EA6764; EA61546; EA36172; EA58517; EA11556).
The finest bronze sculptures of cats are known from Late Period Saqqâra, where many examples were found within the Abusir cat pit excavated during the 1840s. Numerous hollow-cast, bronze cat mummy cases with incised decoration were found, with two acquired by the British Museum in 1847–9 still containing cat mummies. Arguably the finest example (probably from Saqqâra), known as the Gayer-Anderson cat, has incised details, an inlaid silver sun-disc and Wadjet-eye pectoral on the chest, golden earrings and a nose-ring. In Saqqâra, a number of wooden cats have been found dating to the Late Period and Ptolemaic period.

The Memphite region, specifically Saqqâra, was also significant in the Late Period and early Ptolemaic period for its production of Egyptian limestone sculpture, although limestone cats were possibly not dedicated in Saqqâra as none are reported to have been found there and limestone cat sculptures are exceptionally rare. A relief sculpture of a female cat, dated to the Late Period or early Ptolemaic period, was found in Mendes, Egypt. Rare travertine or calcite vessels in the form of cats are also known.

Cat amulets, probably depicting Bastet, were produced from the New Kingdom onwards in a range of stone (mainly rock crystal and glazed steatite). Cats are particularly well represented within the repertoire of faience amulets from the 18th Dynasty, possibly growing in popularity during the subsequent Third Intermediate Period and into the Late Period. Representations of cats on (or as) amulets are predominantly seated, although couchant forms are also known. Some figures clearly show the goddess Bastet, sometimes accompanied with her children depicted as kittens (Fig. 8). By the early 6th century BC cats are represented on scaraboids at Naukratis. Small simple, seated cat amulets continued to be popular in the Ptolemaic period in the Delta, at sites such as at Tell Dafana. However, the standard pose, and distribution of cat amulets associated with animal cults and the Bastet cult differ greatly from the cat sculptures outlined below.

**3.3 Marble cats from Naukratis**

A group of at least seven marble, life-sized cats, formed from 11 individual fragments, was found at Naukratis. This group is distinct in both its material and subject from the limestone groups as discussed below, for (with a single exception) they depict cat and bird groups. To date there are no pharaonic stone sculptural representations of cats in groups or of cats catching (or devouring) birds. Six of the birds have preserved traces of...
blue paint, while the cats were painted yellow. The one exception with no bird should be included in this group because\(^6^8\) the marble, style and technique is very similar to the other examples.

Greek workmanship is suggested through the techniques and styles of the marble cats. The marble was imported from at least two different sources: Parian marble (group A), from the island of Paros in the Aegean Sea and Pentelic marble (group B) from the Mount Pentelikos near Athens.\(^6^9\) Interestingly the cats produced from the two marble types are in different styles: the Parian types resemble domestic cats, while the Pentelic types appear more feral, more muscular, leonine cats. They are the products of two different workshops/sculptors, each using a different source of marble. The style and techniques of the workmanship could be broadly dated from the later 5th or 4th century BC through to the 1st century BC. None of these pieces are likely to be Roman. However, the date of this Naukratis group, and parallels from Alexandria, can be further narrowed to c. 330–200 BC on the basis of paleography, dating formula on votive inscriptions, stratigraphy and associated artefacts, which is discussed in full below.

The Parian group (A) consists of domestic cats, their surfaces and undersides carefully finished. This group shows a stylistic tendency for a sharp transition between the stomach and the leg. Two of the cats share an unrealistic, rather flat or two-dimensional, turn of the head (the other looks ahead).\(^7^0\) The body length of each cat varies, as do their scales and poses, thus Parian group \(A\)\(^7^1\) is a selection of individual examples without any evidence of pairs.\(^7^2\)

A1. A female cat moves forwards, a bird grasped in its paw, its head already devoured by the cat (Fig. 9).\(^7^3\) The whole piece was carved from a medium-grained, possibly Parian marble that has weathered to a warm golden colour. The cat originally had inlaid eyes (now lost) and its surface is finely finished and polished. There are traces of tool marks in the form of claw chisel and drill holes (not ‘running drill’\(^7^4\)). All legs, except the raised leg and paw are restored in plaster along with the base. A hole in the underside might have secured the original support for the long-bodied cat.

A2. Five fragments of a male cat\(^7^5\) creeping forwards, head turned sharply to its right (Fig. 10). The figure was carved from a translucent
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\(^6^8\) British Museum, 1905.0612.7.

\(^6^9\) Identified through macroscopic inspection by Peter Higgs.

\(^7^0\) Cairo JE31185 is reminiscent to that of British Museum, 1905.0612.7 (with fragments 18, 15, 16 and 17).

\(^7^1\) Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE31185, British Museum, 1905.0612.6 and 1905.0612.7.

\(^7^2\) Unless the three joining British Museum fragments 1905.0612.15, 16 and 17 do not belong with the two joining body fragments of cat 1905.0612.7 and 18 (see note 70 below).

\(^7^3\) British Museum, 1905.0612.6.

\(^7^4\) The expression ‘running drill’ refers to a technique where the spinning drill was used both vertically into the stone and horizontally across the sculpture.

\(^7^5\) British Museum, 1905.0612.7. 1905.0612.18, plus non joining 1905.0612.15, 1905.0612.16, 1905.0612.17. The rear paw has a more rounded form than the fore-paw, which fits the posture of the cat 1905.0612.7. The rear right leg is outstretched, the paw touching the ground gently, unlike the two legs which step forward where the paw is placed firmly on the ground, and therefore appears to be more elongated in plan. Both base fragments (1905.0612.15 and 16), show this arrangement of paws. They suit perfectly the walking movement of the cat. If these paws (1905.0612.15, 16 and 17) do not belong to this particular cat (1905.0612.7 and 18), then they belong to another Parian marble cat of similar scale and style. The bases and the cat both have a similar, unfinished appearance about them which suggests that they do indeed belong together.
Parian marble with a greenish hue. The separate paw fragments seem to correspond in scale and position with the legs of the cat and most likely belong with the torso. While the carving is detailed, particularly its feline features, its surface is less well finished than A1, but the underside is treated with more care, even the testicles which are partially hidden by the tail. Much of the body is covered with claw chisel marks, but there are no visible drill holes. There is a possibility that the tool marks were intentionally retained to create the illusion of fur. The undersides of each plinth fragment (with cat paws) from this cat are roughly worked with a punch to facilitate a sound grip onto the base on which the sculpture was originally displayed. Greek workmanship is evident in the preserved tool marks. A hole in the stump of the tail indicates that the tail was separately carved and pinned on with a dowel. This is the only cat represented in this group without a bird, assuming that all the paw fragments belong to this sculpture, and that the plinth or base (into which this sculpture was set, see Fig. 17) didn’t originally hold a bird.

A3. Cat and bird group carved from bluish white (Parian?) marble (Fig. 11). The cat is represented immediately after pouncing and seizing a bird, in its mouth. All that remains of the bird is one wing, the rest having broken away. The cat’s lower legs have broken off presumably when the sculpture was separated from its plinth. The facial features are carved with great detail and the cat’s body is bony but muscular. Traces of yellow pigment remain on the back.

The Pentelic Group (B) is formed of powerful, muscular and alert leonine cats in active poses that resemble wild cats or leopards (lions are unlikely). Alternatively the sculptor tried to create a life-sized cat in stone but, being more familiar with the physiology of lions, created a mini-lion, or leonine cat. The rendering of detail, sharply cut groin and stretched back leg contrasts distinctly with the other marble and limestone cats which are more rounded, less angular and more relaxed.

The four examples were possibly made by the same sculptor, originally intended to be displayed as two pairs: with B1 and 2 (Figs 12–13) together and B3 and B4 possibly a pair (Figs 14–15).

The head fragment (B3, Fig. 14) probably comes from a cat (with a now missing body) that would have been a pair to the one in Cairo (B4, Fig. 15) as they share stylistic affinities and are of a similar scale. The head (B3) does not join or belong with B1 or B2 (Figs 12–13), to which it had erroneously been attached when restored at the British Museum upon arrival there after 1905. However, this and B4 were probably made in the same workshop or possibly even carved by the sculptor who produced B1 and B2. While the individual cats that make up a pair differ slightly in
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76 Piecing is common in sculpture carved from Parian marble.
77 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE31185.
78 See also British Museum, 1905,0612.4, 1905,0612.5.
79 British Museum, 1905,0612.10.
80 Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE31184.
81 British Museum, 1905,0612.10 was reconstructed in the British Museum with 1905,0612.4, some time after 1905. However the head is burnt (the body is not), the neck muscles on the head face forward (the body to the side) and the head is too big.
82 British Museum, 1905,0612.10 and Cairo JE31184.
83 British Museum, 1905,0612.4 & 1905,0612.5.
scale, the differences are minimal (they are not exact mechanically carved, mirror copies of each other). These groups were probably designed and carved to be seen from a particular viewpoint due to the unfinished nature of the rear of these cats.

B1. This is a powerful muscular male leonine cat (Fig. 12), with clawed front paws digging into the wing of a twisted bird. The group is carved from a fine-grained, white (probably) Pentelic marble with mica seams. The running drill was used to separate the body from the plinth and the rump from the tail. The underside of the cat is less well finished with most of the surface covered with claw chisel marks. Traces of Egyptian blue paint remain on the beak of the bird, red (blood?) on the paws and yellow paint on the rear right leg of the cat. The back and left outstretched wing of the bird are only roughly carved, its underside blocked out coarsely with a punch, and the bird’s eye is marked only by an unfinished drill hole. The top of the plinth is roughly worked.

B2. A powerful muscular male leonine cat pouncing on a bird (Fig. 13), its front paws clawing into the bird’s twisted body. The group was carved from a fine-grained, white (probably) Pentelic marble with mica seams, although less micaceous than B1. The running drill was used to mark groves around the chest, groin and rump, and to separate the tail from the rump. Most of the surface is covered with claw chisel marks. The underside and chest are roughly finished. A modern dowel hole in the neck was used to affix B3 (Fig. 14, joined with a plaster collar), when the two fragments were displayed together, although they do not belong together.

B3. Front section from a head of a leonine cat sculpture (Fig. 14), with a large chin, broad face and flat nose. It was carved from a fine-grained (probably) Pentelic marble with mica seams. The head is carefully and powerfully modelled, with strongly pronounced features and large eyes with well-defined lids. Its whiskers were carved as shallow grooves, surrounded by fur, sketchily rendered with shallow grooves and possible indications of a mane. Most of the surface is covered with claw chisel marks. Red paint survives around the eyes. Red and yellow discoloration may have been caused by ancient heat or fire damage.

B4. A powerful muscular leonine cat facing forward (Fig. 15), with clawed front paws resting on a twisted bird. The cat’s head is raised upwards on a long neck, its body hunched as if it has just pounced on its prey. The face has exaggerated features similar to B3 with twisted ears, wide eyes, a snarling and swollen mouth. The group was carved from a fine-grained, white (probably) Pentelic marble. Most of the surface is covered with claw chisel marks. A support below the belly joins the torso to a rough plinth that would probably have been inserted into a display base with an inscribed dedication (see Fig. 17). Remains of yellow paint survive
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84 British Museum, 1905,0612.5 is slightly larger and more muscled than 1905,0612.4.
85 British Museum, 1905,0612.4.
86 As per British Museum, 1905,0612.5 below.
87 British Museum, 1905,0612.5.
88 British Museum, 1905,0612.10.
89 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE31184.
on the torso. Traces of drill marks are evident and the surface has received only a cursory finish. The head has been recently reattached. 90

3.4 Limestone cats from Naukratis

The limestone cats are highly variable and distinct from the two marble groups. This group of sculptures, with a single exception (C1), was carved without birds. They were produced from a range of different Egyptian limestones with significant variation in stone quality. Both larger and smaller than life-size cats are represented within this group, carved in a range of poses and in both Greek and Egyptian sculptural styles. Three main groups can be discerned: cat and bird group (Group C); prowling cat (Group D); and seated cat (Groups E and F). All are distinct from the reclining limestone cat sculptures found only in Alexandria (Group G).

The single cat and bird Group C (Fig. 16) resembles some of the marble examples much more closely, while the other groups (D through to G) are distinctly different. The naturalistic style and painted decoration of Group C suggest that these are of Greek workmanship or influence. The close similarity between A3 (Fig. 11) and C1 (Fig. 16), suggests that a sculptor working in Egypt, possibly Naukratis, was working with both Egyptian limestone and imported marble.

C1. A cat turns its head sharply to its left holding a bird in its mouth, of which only part of the wings remain (Fig. 16). The surface of the soft limestone is badly weathered, eroded and stained, and the cat’s legs and much of its tail are missing. The facial features are discernible, but worn. The group was carved from soft limestone, probably from the Memphite region and identical to the limestone base C2 (Fig. 17), which possibly belongs to this cat.

C2. Base for a cat sculpture, 91 carved from soft limestone, probably from the Memphite region (Fig. 17). This base probably belonged to Cat C1, 92 according to its material, weathering and the dimensions of the cutting in the top surface. This deep depression would be appropriate for a cat of the size of C1 and also the position in which it stands, but the cat would no doubt have been standing on a plinth which would have been inserted into the cutting on the base: the fact that there is no possible join means the connection is uncertain, if plausible. The Greek inscription Γαλατεία Θευδότου Βουβάστι can be dated to c. 325–250 BC. 93

The prowling cats of Group D look straight ahead, with anatomically abnormally long necks and relatively small heads. These felines seem to be inspired by the Greek-style cats, but are not convincingly life-like, having unusual proportions. Rather than having been carved with chisels,

90 The head is original and was only separated from the body by historic damage within the Egyptian Museum after acquisition.
91 British Museum, 1905,0612.2.
92 British Museum, 1905,0612.2. In Alexandria, however, marble infant statues were found with limestone bases (Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, fig. 23).
93 British Museum, 1905,0612.20 (Johnston 2015, 9, in chapter on Greek and Latin inscriptions on stone; Villing et al. 2013, fig. 45, in chapter on Material Culture; Marshall 1916, 1079a, where this inscription is incorrectly said to be found in Tell Basta and dated 200–1 BC. Dated c.325–250 BC (Julia Lougovaya pers. comm.) or early Ptolemaic (Johnston 2015, 9, in chapter on Greek and Latin inscriptions on stone).
the stone appears to have been cut with blades using techniques often seen in Egyptian limestone sculpture. The two examples D1 and D2 are almost identical in technique and were probably made by the same sculptor and so therefore might have been set up as a pair.

D1. This is a life-sized, sleek and prowling cat, originally with its right leg forward, although all its legs have now broken away quite close to its body (Fig. 18). The sculpture was cut from soft Memphite limestone. The cat’s small head stretches forwards on a long neck in front of hunched shoulders and her rear legs were both extended as if poised ready to pounce. The cat’s face is carefully carved with large, almost spherical eyes with sharply defined lids, rounded features and a broad nose. Strangely, the nipples were painted on in brown/black paint which still survives.

D2. This is an under life-sized, prowling cat with its right leg forward, preserved only to just behind its front legs (Fig. 19). The cat was cut from soft Memphite limestone. The head rises up slightly on its long neck and follows the line of the body facing forwards. The shoulders are hunched. The whole design closely follows that of D1. The cat’s facial features are meticulously cut into the stone, with large eyes, sharply cut eyelids, round features and a broad nose and shallow whiskers.

The seated cats carved in Egyptian style (Groups E and F) can be subdivided into two sub-groups based upon stone and technique. There is, however, a distinct difference in quality, naturalism and cultural influences which suggests that they must derive from at least two different workshops. At one end of the scale there is E1 (Fig. 20), a single finely modelled, naturalistic – but static – cat inspired by Egyptian bronzes. The anatomy of E1 is well understood with the legs under the chest and the tail curled against the side of the body. This resembles Egyptian bronze statuettes, although the arrangement of the tail (which normally rests on the base) is different to most stone sculptures, perhaps for practical reasons concerning the nature of the Egyptian shelly limestone.

E1. A seated cat with its tail positioned like that of an Egyptian sphinx, now missing its head, which has been restored in plaster (Fig. 20). The sculpture was carved from hard, shelly, dioritic limestone. The surfaces have been left relatively rough perhaps because the stone does not take a smooth polish. The cat’s tail is carved in relief, curled as if wrapped around the outside of the leg and body. The front of the base preserves the fragmentary remains of a demotic inscription of Ptolemaic date which appears to have been intentionally (and almost entirely) removed. This is the only known stone cat sculpture with a demotic inscription: all others are inscribed with dedications in Greek. Two potential readings can be suggested, either ‘which made’ or the Ptolemaic regnal dating formula.
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94 See chapter on Egyptian Late Period figures in terracotta and stone.
95 See British Museum, 1905.0612.11 and British Museum, 1905.0612.8.
96 British Museum, 1905.0612.8.
97 British Museum, 1905.0612.11.
98 British Museum, 1905.0612.3.
99 See discussion of the Gayer-Anderson cat and others from Saqqara.
100 See parallel carved from steatite illustrated in Fig. 8 above (British Museum, EA11558).
101 To protect the tail from damage, as seen with all examples with free tails from this group.
102 British Museum, 1905.0612.3.
‘year 20’. The Demotic dating formula records the regnal years of Ptolemaic kings. This formula was used since Ptolemy I, although applied late in his reign, thus year 20 is only recognized, for example with the Eponymos Priest lists after c. 290 BC, and most likely corresponds to the reigns of Ptolemy II in 08/04/266 BC–26/03/265 BC, Ptolemy III in 03/08/228 BC–22/08/227 BC. Although the reigns of Ptolemy XII and Cleopatra VII were technically long enough, this dating formula is not attested during their 1st century BC reigns. If indeed a dating formula, this would place the dedication of this cat in 266/255 BC or 228/227 BC, with 186/185 BC and 162/161 BC as less likely possibilities. Several parallels (if genuine) have been recently sold on the art market.

Examples of Group F are far removed in terms of quality from E1, but their seated postures follow the same general design. Their ill-proportioned bodies and peculiar faces appear closer to lions than cats, but are probably intended to be the latter rather than the former. This group resembles the style of Memphite animal sculptures, particularly jackal-dogs, found at Naukratis and Saqqara, where they found within structures and alongside objects associated with the cult of Anubis. Both the cats and the dogs are seated in the same way, poised on a rectangular base, with an anatomically inaccurate and awkward simple slope of the body from the chest to the paws; the tails are carved in profile against the side and legs of the animal. This design is distinct from the naturalistic representation of E1. This whole group was probably carved from soft Memphite limestone.

F1. A complete, small leonine-cat seated in Egyptian style (Fig. 21), carved from soft fine Memphite limestone. The cat has a muscular, square body with chunky legs. The large head (broken off in antiquity) has been rejoined with plaster in modern times so that the joining surfaces could not be investigated and it cannot be proved whether the head belongs, although the scale and design match the body well. While the cat is relatively well modelled, it is more leonine than feline in form. Whiskers and hatched lines around its neck represent a mane. This is the smallest of the cat group.

F2. Torso and head fragment of small leonine cat (or lion) seated in an Egyptian style (Fig. 22). The cat was cut from soft, fine Memphite limestone. The legs are broken. The whiskers and hatched lines around the neck represent a thick mane. The body is only superficially modelled. The presence of a mane on the throat suggests the sculptor either
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103 Demotic reading […]t[… or […] HT-s-p 20[…] (Adrienn Almásy Pers. Comm.). Either reading is possible with the same characters.
105 Clarysse, Veken & Vleeming 1983, 6, no.25.
106 Ibid, 12, no.53. Ptolemy V and Ptolemy VI are late possibilities (186/185 and 162/161 respectively, ibid.22, 28, 40, nos 105, 129). Ptolemy VIII is impossible as it coincides with (overlapping) Ptolemy VI year 31.
107 Seated cat in limestone, missing front paws and base (Sotheby’s New York 15/12/2016 lot 50; Sotheby’s, New York, 20/06/1990, no. 93; Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York 20/23/04/1949, no. 36; Joseph Brummer, inv. no. P76). A head in a similar limestone was recently sold in London (Christie’s London 07/10/2010, lot 33, French collection acquired during the 1940s).
108 Two complete, but damaged dogs were found just north of the Great Temenos of Amun-Ra at Naukratis (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 86.179 and 86.178). Examples from the Anubieion at Saqqara have been dated to the Late Period (Jeffreys et al. 1988, pl. 26a, 78/226, see also pl. 41e–f, pl. 16a–d), but come from surface deposits associated with early Ptolemaic material.
intended to depict a lion, or struggled to depict a domestic cat. Seated lions in this style are well attested in both stone and wood before Naukratis was founded.\textsuperscript{109}

F3. Lower parts and base of a male cat seated in the Egyptian style (Fig. 23), carved from soft fine Memphite limestone. Traces of red and yellow paint are preserved on the top and sides of the base. The paws have traces of black paint. All that survives are the paws, tail and testicles of a male cat. The close similarity in style and form with limestone jackal-dog sculptures, mentioned earlier, means it is possible that this was not from a cat sculpture, although its context (with other cat sculptures), makes that identification still the most likely.

3.5 Sandstone cat from Naukratis

There is one fragment of a cat carved from sandstone. This head fragment seems to be from a large, seated leonine cat.

F4. A head and neck fragment from a large (male?) leonine cat, probably seated in Egyptian style (Fig. 24). It is carved from soft, fine sandstone, now weathered and worn. The cat’s large, wide face with long nose and powerful jaw suggests that this is a wild cat. Although damaged and badly weathered, traces of whiskers remain on the right side. While carved from sandstone, this sculpture belongs with the group of limestone, leonine cats seated in an Egyptian manner.

3.6 Limestone cats discovered in Alexandria in c. 1928–1935

Parallels for the cat sculptures from Naukratis are known only from the city of Alexandria. Two limestone cats carved in the same style and possibly produced by the same sculptor, now in Cairo and London, survive from there, along with a third of a different style.\textsuperscript{110} The Cairo example (G2 below) was acquired from a dealer in 1935, who provided a (incorrect) Boubastis provenance.\textsuperscript{111} The British Museum example (Fig. 25) was discovered in Alexandria.\textsuperscript{112} Both pieces were probably acquired in the early 1930s and both were likely found in Alexandria, even though they may have been acquired in Cairo. It is highly unlikely that they were from the Naukratis group found in 1895.\textsuperscript{113} Numerous close parallels were unearthed during the 2009–10 rescue excavation of a temple of Bastet in Kom el-Dika, Alexandria (discussed in section 3.7 below).

\textsuperscript{109} Brooklyn Museum, New York, 37.42E. Dated c. 690-664 BC on the basis of an inscription of the 25th Dynasty Pharaoh Taharqa.

\textsuperscript{110} British Museum, EA64368 and Museum of Agriculture, Cairo, inv.601 (Wagner 1984, 247–52). Wagner believed that the British Museum, EA64368 cat was made by the same sculptor as the Cairo example.

\textsuperscript{111} Museum of Agriculture, Cairo, inv.601. The dealer, identified by the inscription KHAWAM on the cat’s legs, had a shop on Rue Khan el-Khalili in Cairo. A Boubastis provenance was a common assumption for cat figurines found at a range of settlements in Egypt. Although the Boubastis provenance may not have been a deliberate deception, falsified provenances could be motivated by an intention to make the object more desirable. No such limestone or marble cat sculptures have been found in Boubastis. However, both the 1930s Alexandrian and 1895 Naukratis cat sculptures were given dubious Boubastis provenance by dealers.

\textsuperscript{112} British Museum, EA64368 bequeathed by Oscar Raphael in 1945, but acquired probably in the 1930s.

\textsuperscript{113} Probably all found in Alexandria and acquired in either Alexandria or Cairo between 1928 and 1935.
G1. Couchant (reclining) domestic cat with its head raised, holding a bird (Fig. 25)\textsuperscript{114} carved from coarse hard (Alexandrian?) limestone. Set on a rectangular base that was damaged, obscuring any face that may have once held an inscription.

G2. Couchant domestic cat, its head rests on its paws, holding a bird,\textsuperscript{115} carved from coarse hard (Alexandrian?) limestone. Set on a rectangular base, inscribed with the dedication Νικήτης Βουβροτή with Greek lettering of c. 330–280BC date or slightly later.\textsuperscript{116}

G3. Domestic female cat reclining on her side, legs extended and suckling three kittens (Fig. 26). The group was carved from a coarse hard (Alexandrian?) limestone.\textsuperscript{117} It is possible that this theme had Late Period precedents in faience and bronze, although many parallels do not have a secure provenance.\textsuperscript{118}

3.7 Limestone and terracotta cats discovered in Alexandria in 2009–10

One hundred and seventy-two limestone cats and 384 terracotta figures of cats were found during the rescue excavation within the remains of a 60x15 m early Ptolemaic temple of Boubastis at Kom el-Dika in central Alexandria.\textsuperscript{119} The complex was re-built by Berenike II\textsuperscript{120} (c. 246–221 BC) and continued to operate during the reign of Ptolemy IV (221–204 BC), if not later.\textsuperscript{121} The temple by Berenike I was built over an earlier temple to Boubastis, the votive offerings from which were preserved in at least three pits or caches\textsuperscript{122} found filled with sculpture, figurines, pottery and coins deposited in the (early) 3rd century BC. The bases of six cat and three infant (probably representations of the Egyptian god Harpokrates) sculptures bore Greek inscriptions,\textsuperscript{123} which can be compared with the base inscribed Νικήτης Βουβροτή described above and probably from the

\textsuperscript{114} British Museum 1945,1012.2. Registered in 1945 following the bequest of Oscar Charles Raphael, who died in 1941. Oscar Charles Raphael acquired the piece, in the 1920s or (most likely) the 1930s.

\textsuperscript{115} Museum of Agriculture, Cairo, Inv. 601.


\textsuperscript{117} British Museum, EAS9042 was acquired from Denis P Kyticas, an antiquities dealer operating from 1924 out of 37 Shari Taufik in Cairo. Note similar workmanship can be seen on the jackal-dog (British Museum, EA57356), that has been dated ‘Roman’. However, similar representations, whilst commonly dated to the Roman period, are also found in Ptolemaic contexts.

\textsuperscript{118} Bianchi 2011; Bianchi 2015, (Toshiaki Shimizu), 81, no 66.

\textsuperscript{119} Kom el-Dika, under Ismail Fahmy street (Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012). Queen Berenike’s cat goddess temple discovered in Alexandria, Egypt. (Ann Wuyts 19/01/2010) and Queen’s Cat Goddess Temple Found in Egypt (Andrew Bossone 21/01/2010).

\textsuperscript{120} Wife of King Ptolemy III.

\textsuperscript{121} The article suggests the temple may have functioned until the Imperial Roman period (Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, 429), although reports suggests it was significantly below the level (and stratigraphically earlier than) a nearby late Ptolemaic/early Roman bath, cistern, well and canal (Ann Wuyts 19/01/2010; Andrew Bossone 21/01/2010).

\textsuperscript{122} It is not clear whether all three, or just one of the caches were underneath the foundation deposit of Berenike II. The date of all groups however would fit with these being deposited during the 3rd century BC.

\textsuperscript{123} Not all published, but discussed in Chaniots et al. 2016, 569 (SEG 62-1743) after the report by Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012.
same temple.\textsuperscript{124} The published inscriptions on the cat sculptures in Alexandria can be dated between 330–280 BC and 300–200 BC. Whilst the temple was rebuilt by Berenike II (represented by the foundations), the floor of this temple in later periods is not preserved.\textsuperscript{125} Exactly when the temple fell out of use is not clear, but after it was abandoned, it was used as a stone quarry. The area continued to be occupied, with a nearby cistern, well and canal (possibly associated with baths) built during the late Ptolemaic or early Imperial Roman periods, perhaps using stone robbed from the temple. The ground level during the early Imperial Roman period was at a significantly higher level than that of the ruins of the early Ptolemaic temple, suggesting that it had been abandoned at this time.

The 172 limestone cat statues\textsuperscript{126} were unearthed in three different areas of the site, along with limestone statues of women and children. Bronze, faience and terracotta figurines of Egyptian deities, including many representations of the gods Harpokrates and Ptah, were also found. The three caches excavated in 2009–10 are described below, followed by a putative fourth that may have been discovered in the 1930s (the sculptures are described in section 3.6 above).

Cache 1 was deposited after 300–261 BC. Fifty limestone and 384 terracotta cats as well as sculptures of limestone and marble infants can be dated on the basis of their association with diagnostic Tanagra\textsuperscript{127} and Egyptian terracotta figures dating to c. 330–200 BC,\textsuperscript{128} Proto Rhodian amphorae dating to c. 310–260 BC\textsuperscript{129} and coins of 300–261 BC.\textsuperscript{130} All associated material from the site identified by the excavators in publication as of ‘4th century BC’ date, could equally be of early 3rd century BC date. This cannot be assumed to be evidence of a 4th century temple on this site, or residual material from an earlier structure.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{124} Nekhm Bouţaḥ (SEG 37–1623) dated c. 300 BC (Wagner 1984, 247–52) and c. 330–280 BC or slightly later (Julia Lougovay pers. comm.).
\textsuperscript{125} Abd El-Maksoud et al. (2012, 429) suggested continued use into the early Imperial Roman period, although this is contradicted by other accounts (Ann Wuyts 19/01/2010; Andrew Bossone 21/01/2010) and a later discussion in the same article on the preservation of the temple.
\textsuperscript{126} Belonging mainly to the same type (Group G) as Museum of Agriculture, Cairo, inv.601 and British Museum, EA 64368. No marble examples were found.
\textsuperscript{127} See chapters on Egyptian Late Period figures, Greek terracotta figures and Ptolemaic and Roman figures. Close parallels for Tanagra style terracottas have been found in contexts dated c. 350–250 BC and later (see Kassab Tezgör 2007; 2010, 187; Muller 2010, 103; Burn and Higgins 2001, 26 see Jeammet 2010 and articles within, particularly Kassab Tezgör 2010, 186). On the c. 350 BC appearance of the melon coiffure hairstyle see the discussion by Lopes (2008, 104). Similar terracottas have been found within the c. 331–275 BC Chatby/Qatby cemetery and Alexandria Necropolis dated to c. 275–200 BC (Kassab Tezgör 2007, 17).
\textsuperscript{128} Egyptian terracotta figurines of Harpokrates reclining, holding or strangling a goose, have parallels from Naukratis (See chapter on Egyptian Late Period figures, Thomas 2015, 49–50, Brussels, A.1833, and British Museum 1973.0501.24; and see also 1973.0501.19–20; 1973.0501.13; 1973.0501.5; 1973.0501.6; 1973.0501.39) and Alexandria (See chapter on Egyptian Late Period figures, Thomas 2015, 49–50, British Museum, 1845.0705.1, dated to c. 245 BC, based upon associated coins), sometimes wearing a Macedonian cloak, and often macro-phalic. Other parallels have been found in Saqqara (Jeffreys et al. 1988, fig. 54, pl. 18a–b, no. 77/23) and the wider Memphis region (Petrie Museum, London, UC48350, UC48467, UC48476 and, later, hollow variant UC48407).
\textsuperscript{129} Proto Rhodian amphorae with a mushroom rim are normally dated c. 350–250 BC, although epigraphic evidence can only certainly date them to the period 305–290 BC, with some evidence that they continued until the 270s (Johnston 2015, see chapter on Greek and Latin inscriptions on stone).
\textsuperscript{130} Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, 435.
\textsuperscript{131} Pottery lekythos and crater from this deposit were dated to the early 4th century BC (Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012). However, an early 3rd century BC date cannot be excluded (Breccia 1914, 48–49, nos 88–90, pl. XLVI, 68–70; on the c. 330–200 BC date of Chatby/Sciabit Necropolis tombs see Kassab Tezgör 2007, 17).
The terracotta cat figures came in three main forms (but it is not clear whether they were all from three mould series).\(^{132}\) The terracotta cats are similar, but not from the same mould series or fabric, as the example found in the north-eastern part of the ‘town’ at Naukratis.\(^{133}\) A second possible cat fragment from Naukratis may belong to one of the Alexandrian terracotta cat types.\(^{134}\) The limestone cats from this deposit (that have been published) belong to Group G,\(^{135}\) with one example of Group C.\(^{136}\)

Cache 2 was deposited during (or after) the 3rd century BC. One hundred and nine limestone cat sculptures (or fragments) and infant sculptures were deposited in a pit above a series of Egyptian (probably Nile silt) Greek-style red-slipped, thickened-rim ‘fish plate’ dishes,\(^{137}\) and Egyptian style plain-rimmed saucers with flat bases.\(^{138}\) The limestone cat sculptures that have been published belong to Group G,\(^{139}\) and a single example of Group E.\(^{140}\)

Cache 3 was deposited during or after the 3rd century BC and consisted only of limestone sculpture, including 13 cats. A Greek dedication on one of the cats by Philixio can be dated c. 300–200 BC.\(^{141}\) The limestone cat sculptures belong to Group G,\(^{142}\) with a single example from Group E.\(^{143}\)

### 3.8 The relationship between the 1928–35 and 2009 Alexandria cats

The 172 Kom el-Dika cats made of limestone and the 384 of terracotta mostly depict the same couchant type of cat as the 1930s group from Alexandria (Group G). The most distinctive difference between the Naukratis and Alexandrian groups is that the majority of the Alexandrian cats are shown reclining, whilst all the Naukratis cats are shown moving, standing or seated. The Alexandrian cats were carved from a hard, coarse limestone with an integral rectangular plinth, which sometimes supports a Greek inscription.

---


\(^{133}\) Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA720 (Gutch 1898–9, 96, no. 720).

\(^{134}\) British Museum, 2011.5009.288 is a fragment from the back of the head and possibly of Alexandrian fabric. It could belong to Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, Types 1 or 3. Egyptian Museum, Cairo TR14/9/18/15 from Naukratis resembles Alexandria Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, Type 2, but is smaller and not certainly a cat.

\(^{135}\) Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, 441, fig.18, inv.97.

\(^{136}\) Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, 138, fig.14. Note this is the only cat illustrated from Alexandria not sitting or couchant. This example also seems to be holding a bird in its mouth.

\(^{137}\) These vessels were produced from the 3rd century BC onwards (see forthcoming chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman pottery; Berlin 2001, fig. 2.1.20; Élaigne 2000b). Such vessels were produced at Tell al-Harabiy, west of Alexandria, during the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, but are also known from 3rd century BC contexts (Majcherek and el-Shennawi 1992, 136, fig. 4).

\(^{138}\) Hayes and Harlaut 2002, 105, fig. 23, c. 120 BC; Élaigne 2000a, 19, 12, fig. 1, no. 6 50 BC–AD 50; Élaigne 1998, 81, figs 15–16).

\(^{139}\) Possibly with string cut bases (not clear from the photograph), a form that continues from the Late Period into the beginning of the Ptolemaic period (Thomas forthcoming; see Berlin 2001, fig.2.4, 1–7).

\(^ {140}\) Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, 441, fig. 20, inv.190.

\(^ {141}\) Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, 441, fig.19, inv. 121 is particularly similar to an example sold by Sotheby’s New York in 2016 (lot 50).

\(^ {142}\) c. 300–200 BC (Julia Lougouvaia pers. comm.), or c. 200 BC (Tybout in Chaniots et al. 2016, 569, SEG 62-1743).

\(^ {143}\) Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, 441, fig.22, inv.219. Dated c. 300-200 BC on the basis of its inscription, but with a close parallel with an inscription dated c. 330–280 BC.

\(^ {144}\) Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, 441, fig. 21, inv. 224, with a close parallel from Naukratis with a demotic dating formula for 265/6 BC or 227/8 BC.
The close similarities in form, material and date between the Alexandrian cats discovered in the 1930s and 2009 may suggest a close relationship that could be explained by them coming from the same sanctuary. The 2009 excavations in Kom el-Dikka revealed only the northern half of the Bubastis temple. The southern half of the temple had already been destroyed by an old development of the Alexandrian railway station and access road to the south. Group G should perhaps be considered as coming from a fourth ‘cache’ discovered before 1935, during one of the phases of development of the Alexandria railways station. It is possible that a limestone cat attested on the art market since at least the 1940s could also have been from this ‘cache’.

The Alexandria group spans the period 330–200 BC, judging from the date of their inscriptions, and the associated materials. The narrowest date range that can be proposed is c. 280–243 BC (constrained by the latest possible date for the paleography of the earliest Greek dedication inscription and the earliest possible date the cats could have been buried in caches). At least Cache 1, if not all, were deposited before the re-foundation of the Boubastis temple by Berenike II, although one cannot exclude the possibility that Cache 2 or 3 could have been buried after this foundation event, but still within the 3rd century BC. If the 1930s cat assemblage can be considered a fourth ‘cache’ (or from a number of caches), the presence of an inscription dated c. 330–280 BC, would make this group contemporary with the other three.

There are some rare exceptions from the 2009 Alexandria cat group, which resemble the Naukratis seated cats (Group E) and a single limestone cat and bird group (Group C). There are also similarities between the few terracotta fragments excavated by Petrie and Hogarth at Naukratis and the three mould types found at Alexandria. Similarities in form, subject and material should (perhaps) be expected as both groups are contemporary, being of early to mid-3rd century BC date (although an end of 4th century BC date cannot be excluded). However, the Naukratis and Alexandrian groups are on the whole distinctly different considering their contemporary nature.

3.9 Marble and limestone cat sculpture in Egypt

Marble, limestone and sandstone were sourced from at least five different quarries (two marbles, two limestones and the sandstone) to produce six different types of cat sculptures at Naukratis (Groups A to F). Groups A, B, D and F are exclusively found at Naukratis, whilst Group G is exclusively found at Alexandria. Groups C and E are found at both Alexandria and Naukratis. The whole collection can be broadly split into two groups, standing cats (with birds) on separate inscribed bases (Groups A to C) joined with an irregular textured grip on the plinth, and reclining or seated.

---

144 Seated cat in limestone, missing front paws and base (Sotheby’s New York 15/12/2016 lot 50; Sotheby’s, New York, 20/06/1990, no. 93; Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York 20–23/04/1949, no. 36; Joseph Brummer, inv. no. P76). A head in a similar limestone was recently sold in London (Christie’s London 07/10/2010, lot 33, French collection acquired during the 1940s). See also lot 50 sold by Sotheby’s New York in 2016.

145 At the beginning of Berenike II’s reign.

146 Νικίππη Βουβάστις (SEG 37-1623) dated c. 300 BC (Wagner 1984, 247–252) and c. 330–280 BC and slightly later (Julia Lougovay pers. comm.).
cats with occasionally inscribed, integral rectangular bases (Groups D to G).

Group A is made of Parian marble and show domestic cats, usually catching birds, and are of Greek workmanship. Group B are made of Pentelic marble, showing leonine cats pouncing on birds and were made in pairs. Group C show domestic cats with birds carved in a Greek style, but using Egyptian Memphite limestone (and were found at both Naukratis and Alexandria).

Group D is made of Memphite limestone and were attempts at depicting long-necked, prowling cats. Egyptian techniques and materials were used, but the cat sculptures display the influence of Greek form and styles, as explained earlier. Group E are made of (Alexandrian?) dioritic shelly limestone and show domestic cats seated with their tails positioned like those of sphinxes. These were carved in Egyptian style, using materials and techniques uncommon in Greek workshops and were found at both Naukratis and Alexandria. Group F are made of Memphite limestone and sandstone and represent leonine cats seated in Egyptian style, carved using traditional Egyptian materials and techniques. Finally Group G are made of Alexandrian (?) limestone and show crouchant cats holding birds. These were carved using Egyptian techniques and materials, but influenced by Greek styles and were exclusively found in Alexandria.

Cats within Groups A and C follow a similar style and were carved using Greek techniques. Although subtly different (marble Group A and limestone Group C are closer to each other than either are to marble Group B) and possibly made by different sculptors, the group reference the same subject and may have been produced in the same workshop, perhaps based in Naukratis. The presence of cat sculptures in the Naukratis group, possibly made by the same sculptor (Groups A and C), in both imported marble and Egyptian limestone, suggest that the materials may have been imported for carving in Egypt, potentially Naukratis, or less likely Alexandria. It is possible that the Parian and Pentelic marble may have been re-used form earlier buildings or monuments at Naukratis and not specifically imported to produce the cats, although this seems unlikely as we do not have architectural fragments in either marble to confirm this. Group B is distinct, and could have been imported or produced locally by another sculptor, who was not as adept at carving cats.

Other Greek style sculpture of animals discovered in Naukratis (by Gardner in 1886) includes a small limestone greyhound (Fig. 27) lying curled up scratching his ear with his right hind paw. The hound is a pet, wearing a red collar, and this piece was made for a purpose differing from that of the cats. However, the hound, like the cats, is another example of the Ptolemaic period experimentation with soft Egyptian limestone to create Greek style sculpture of animals.

The single example carved from dioritic shelly limestone (Fig. 20) seems inspired by Egyptian bronze work. It is of the highest quality, but arguably of Egyptian manufacture. Group F is also of Egyptian, probably Memphite manufacture, from a workshop that produced sculpture for animal cults that...
also included jackals and dogs. Group D is perhaps the most interesting, utilizing Egyptian techniques and tools, whilst showing cats with features that resemble those on Egyptian group F. The sculptor, however, seems to have been influenced by the Greek style cats of groups A, B and C. While the materials and techniques are close to those used in the Memphite region, no close parallels are known from the Bubasteion of Saqqâra, despite recent excavations revealing significant activity (and cat figures in other materials and cat mummies) between the 30th Dynasty and the Roman period.

3.10 Religious significance of birds

All the birds represented in the groups of cats and birds from Naukratis in the British Museum were covered with traces of Egyptian blue paint. The meaning of this blue does not necessarily indicate the actual colour of the real birds that they represent, but might have ritual significance. There was a tradition for representing the ibis/heron and the hawk in blue in Egyptian art despite their natural grey plumage. Blue represented fertility, good luck, and more specifically the Nile and the Nile inundation.

The bird is not clearly defined and it is possible that different bird species were depicted. However, on three examples the short neck, short beak and stout body suggest that a dove or pigeon is represented (Figs 9, 12, 13), which can have blue-grey plumage. Both pigeons and geese have a long history as sacrificial animals in Egypt. Geese during the Late Period were commonly sacrificed for Horus, the son of Isis, representing the symbolic destruction of the enemy. 3rd century BC depictions of Harpokrates (Horus) show him strangling a fox-goose. Geese were also sacrificed during the festival of Isis in Alexandria and Philadelphia and for the deified Arsinoe II Philadelphos (after c. 268 BC). It is possible that the cat’s symbolic association with the god/goddess, and the strangling of the bird representing the symbolic destruction of the enemy by the god/goddess (as was the case for Horus explained above), meant that the birds represented, in a secondary sense, an offering.

147 However no close parallels are known in limestone of cats from Saqqara or Memphis where sculptures of jackals/dogs have been discovered.
148 Specifically rock pigeons (Johnston 2000).
149 Association with the gods as sacrificial animals and as embodiments of Amun, Re and Geb. They featured in foundation deposits of temples and in Opening of the Mouth ceremonies (Villing 2017).
150 Egyptian Nile or fox-goose (chenalopex aegyptica), were known to the Greeks (Aristophanes: Birds 1303; Olck 1910, 712; Keller 1913, 226–7; Pollard 1977, 65).
152 British Museum, 1845,0705.1; Ridgway 2006, 645 fig. 1; Schollmeyer 2003; 2007
153 Dunand 1973, 76; P. Cair. Zen. IV.59560; BGU VII.1501
154 P. Oxy. 27 2465; Schorn 2001, who was likened to Aphrodite and Isis
155 Villing 2017; see chapter on Material Culture.
3.11 Conclusions

All evidence points to the fact that the cats were votive offerings dedicated within a Bubasteion (temple of Bastet) at Naukratis. The Naukratis group can be dated on the basis of paleography of the Greek inscriptions and dating formula used in a demotic inscription to c. 325–227 BC. Parallels from Alexandria can be dated c. 330–200 BC, confirmed by associated finds, palaeography and (probably) their stratigraphic relationship with (underneath, i.e. earlier than) the new foundations of a rebuild of the Bubasteion dedicated by Berenike II. This provides a *terminus post quem* of 244–221 BC. One could possibly reduce the date to a narrower range for the Alexandrian cats to c. 280–243 BC (see above). There are 4th century BC, and indeed earlier parallels, for the Egyptian style seated cats (but usually in other materials), and both the large Memphite Bubasteion and the limestone sculpture industry in Saqqâra have a peak in activity from c. 380 BC onwards, but this continues into the Ptolemaic period. Some of the associated finds found at Alexandria could predate 330 BC, but none of the contexts within which these cats were found can date before 300 BC because of the material found with them. There is no reason, therefore, to assume that the Alexandrian or Naukratite cats have to belong to the 4th century BC. In addition to paleography, stratigraphy, associated materials and dating formula, there is a further consideration that may place all of these cats within the 3rd century BC: the meaning of the symbolism, the function of the sculptures, and the role of the Bubastis cult in the early Ptolemaic period.

The Bubastis temple in Alexandria was re-built by Berenike II (244–221 BC), and the cat sculptures found there broadly fit into the period 330–200 BC, possibly more specifically c. 280–243 BC, which is consistent with the Naukratis examples dated 325/250–266/227 BC. The cats are a Ptolemaic, Hellenised, expression of the Egyptian goddess Bastet called Boubastis for a Greek audience. The moon goddess aspect of Bastet/Boubastis was associated by the Greeks with the same characteristic of Artemis. It is possible that in addition to functioning as a new representation of Artemis, the Greek inhabitants of Naukratis and Alexandria supported this cult as an expression of loyalty towards the Ptolemaic Dynasty that had manipulated the Boubastis cult for political advantage. The re-foundation of the Bubasteion in Alexandria by Berenike II in c. 244–221 BC coincided with the movement of the Bubasteia (the festival of the goddess Bastet) by Ptolemy III (her husband) to coincide with the Ptolemaic dynastic festival called Euergetia, as an early Ptolemaic dynastic act of propaganda. The Boubastis cults of Alexandria and

---

156 The stratigraphic relationship is not clear from the excavations and the late date of c. 200 BC (Tybout in Chaniots et al. 2016: 569, SEG 62:1743) for the palaeography of inv.219 (Abd El-Maksoud et al. 2012, 441, fig.22, inv.219) would seem to contradict this. A broader date range of c. 300–200 BC, however, seems more likely (Julia Lougovaya pers. comm.).

157 Late Period to Roman cat mummies and sculpture in various media uncovered at the site confirm this cult had a peak in activity during from the 4th to the 1st centuries BC.

158 Redeposited within cache pits, so not from the original use, but presumably re-deposited with contemporary material dedicated at the same time.

159 Greek inscriptions dated on the basis of palaeography all fall within the range 330/280 BC–300/200 BC: comprising Nikkipe c. 330–280 BC; Galateia c. 325–250 BC; Philixo c. 300–200 BC.

159 On the 1st of (the Egyptian month of) Psyni, to coincide with the rising of Sothis (the dog star), believed to be the harbinger of the Nile inundation (Montserrat 1996, 170; Delia 1998, 545). The date of the Bubasteia festival was manipulated with the intention of integrating the
(possibly) Naukratis were associated with the Ptolemaic queens, at least as sponsors. It may not be coincidence that the (only) demotic dedication on a cat sculpture, possibly inscribed 266/265 BC,161 follows the deification of Arsinoe II in 268–6 BC.162

The iconography of some of the naturalistic cats (and also the infants from Kom-el-Dikka) also shares some features recorded for mid-3rd century BC Isis and Arsinoe II cults and representations of the Ptolemaic Pharaoh in the form of Harpokrates (Horus-the-child). The cats are often depicted killing or trapping a blue bird. This may be somehow linked with the popular subject on 3rd century BC Ptolemaic figures and sculpture of Harpokrates strangling a bird, who is a representation of the Ptolemaic Dynasty (sometimes shown in Macedonian dress) strangling his enemies.163 Bird sacrifices were performed during the mid-3rd century BC festivals of Isis in Alexandria and Philadelphia164 and of the deified empress Arsinoe II ‘Philadelphos’ after c. 268 BC.165 Could these trapped blue birds be indirect allusions of offerings to the deified queen and an expression of dynastic loyalty? Could the cats represent avatars of deities associated with the Ptolemaic Dynasty? The cats do represent the support of Greek elites for cults and sanctuaries sponsored by and for the deified Ptolemaic queens.

The cat votive sculptures are of a subject and style that did not belong in either Greek or Egyptian religion or art. They represent a specifically early Ptolemaic expression of the Bastet cult that coincided with the dynastic propaganda of deifying Ptolemaic queens and associating them with the goddess Isis (at this time also associated with Bastet). The infant sculptures and figurines found at the Alexandria Boubasteion also represent Horus-the-child. A few examples (also trapping birds) wear female dress (a chiton), were previously identified as girls, but should perhaps he associated with Harpokratis (a dual gendered version of Harpocrates associated with the fertility of the Nile inundation and the inundation god Hapi).166

---

161 See above.
162 Arsinoe was worshipped in Egypt, Cyrus and the Aegean Islands (Caneca 2012, 80), and had acquired the traits of Demeter, Aphrodite Euploia as the protector of Navigation, and Isis as part of the divine couple Serapis-Isis (Caneca 2012, 80–3.). The ‘Arsinoeia’ took place in the summer, just before the Nile flood in Alexandria (P.Cair.Zen.1 59096). See Caneva 2012, 75–102; Thompson 1973, 173, no 145, pl.L.
163 Specifically geese, for example in representations of Harpokrates (British Museum, 1845.705.1; Ridgway 2006, 645 fig. 1; Schollmeyer 2003; 2007) see also (Junker 1910, 69–79; Wildung 1977; Graindorge 1996, 89–91; Bouanich 2005, 151). Note macro-phallic representations and also female versions were represented at this time, possibly representing an association between Horus, Hapi and the Nile inundation. Rarely these figures are also represented strangling a bird (See chapter on Egyptian Late Period figures, by Thomas 2015, 60–1).
164 Dunand 1973, 76; P. Cair. Zen. IV.59560 (dated December 254 BC); BGU VII.1501.
165 Arsinoe II was likened to Aphrodite and Isis (Schorn 2001; P. Oxy. 27 2465).
166 Distinct from the standard male representation of Harpokrates (Horus-the-child). Harpocrates was depicted during the Macedonian and early Ptolemaic periods. Representations displayed both male and female attributes, perhaps associating Horus-the-child with features (pendulous breasts and large belly associated with fertility) usually belonging to the the Nile inundation god Hapi. These figurines were sometimes also represented macro-phallic (see chapter on Egyptian Late Period figures, by Thomas 2015, 60–1).
Starting with the creation of the cult of Arsinoe (Philadelphos) II, deified by Ptolemy II in 268-263 BC, and the installation of the Arsinoea festival, the new Ptolemaic dynastic cults reached their peak during the reigns of Ptolemy II, III and IV. These cults persisted until the end of the Ptolemaic period, although the archaeological, epigraphic and papyrological evidence of these cults suggests a decline over the 2nd and 1st centuries BC. The Romans independently adopted the Boubastis cults, association with Artemis/Diana cult centres (in Rome, Ostia, Nemi, and Pompeii), although there was no direct connection with the two early Ptolemaic Bubasteions.

Who were the people dedicating to Boubastis? Three published names from cat sculptures are Galateia daughter of Theodotos (325–250 BC, Naukratis), Nikippos (330–280 BC Alexandria) and Philixo (300–200 BC Alexandria). Two further names, Phormion and Aristoboule, were inscribed on infant sculpture bases dedicated to Boubastis in Alexandria. These names are rare in Egypt, but are attested in the 3rd century BC. Whilst one cannot make any certain identifications of like named individuals, certain onomastic patterns can be recognized concerning where the name may have come from. Galateia is attested on graffiti from Abydos, as is her father’s name Theodotos. Philixo is a rare name, attested once in Hellenistic Sicily and possibly on two fragmentary graffiti from western Thebes. Nikippos, possibly a variant of Nikippe, is recorded on an inscription from the Serapeum in Saqqara, dated 275–175 BC. Nikippe could be an Attic name. The name Phormion is attested at Philadelphia in 263–229 BC, at Gurob in 248–242 BC and Krokdilopolis in 221 BC (all in Egypt). Otherwise the name is also attested at Oropos, Boeotia, Greece in 221–204 BC. The name Aristoboule is attested in the Hadra cemetery, Alexandria. The dedicants in Alexandria and Naukratis were potentially a well-travelled group, although we cannot be certain these were the same individuals.

---

168 See discussion in forthcoming chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman faience vessels.
169 None can certainly be identified, but all attestations are referenced below.
170 I. Memnonion 201, 2; I. Memnonion 205, 1. Interestingly Theodotos was also attested with this graffiti group (I. Memnonion 279, 1–2 I. Memnonion 604, 4). Theodotos is also represented in west Thebes (I. Syr. 1121, 2), Alexandria (SB 1 5859, 1) and Memphis (SEG 27, 1107, this has been dated to c. 400 BC), although his is a more commonly attested name.
171 Julia Lougovaya pers. comm.
172 Both partially preserved as both Φαρμίων is only attested in 3rd century BC texts (SEG 49, 2301, 7; SB 26-16613.
173 Julia Lougovaya (pers. comm.) suggests at Nikippos is possibly a variant of Nikippe, which is only attested in Attica, Euboea and Boeotia during the 4th and 3rd centuries BC (LGPN: IGII.7395; IGII.12024; IGII.1292; IGXII.964; IGXII.86; IGXII.437; I. Syr. 431, 1; I. Syr. 395, 1), so another reading is possible.
174 SEG 49-2301, 7; SB 26-16613.
176 See discussion in forthcoming chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman faience vessels.
177 None can certainly be identified, but all attestations are referenced below.
178 I. Memnonion 201, 2; I. Memnonion 205, 1. Interestingly Theodotos was also attested with this graffiti group (I. Memnonion 279, 1–2 I. Memnonion 604, 4). Theodotos is also represented in west Thebes (I. Syr. 1121, 2), Alexandria (SB 1 5859, 1) and Memphis (SEG 27, 1107, this has been dated to c. 400 BC), although his is a more commonly attested name.
179 Julia Lougovaya pers. comm.
180 Both partially preserved as both Φαρμίων is only attested in 3rd century BC texts (SEG 49, 2301, 7; SB 26-16613.
181 Julia Lougovaya (pers. comm.) suggests at Nikippos is possibly a variant of Nikippe, which is only attested in Attica, Euboea and Boeotia during the 4th and 3rd centuries BC (LGPN: IGII.7395; IGII.12024; IGII.1292; IGXII.964; IGXII.86; IGXII.437; I. Syr. 431, 1; I. Syr. 395, 1), so another reading is possible.
182 SEG 49-2301, 7; SB 26-16613.
Greek worshippers dedicated sculptures of a female or male cat catching a bird carved in a Greek style, sometimes with Greek dedicatory inscriptions. Because the sculptures so completely and consistently diverge in both material and subject from the conservative iconography (of a seated female cat) characteristic for the long established and ongoing Egyptian Bastet cults in Bubastis and Saqqâra, the Naukratis and Kom el-Dikka cat groups represent a very different practice. It is unlikely that both the dedicants and sculptors misunderstood the Bastet cult so consistently and carefully. Instead their production was intended for a different cult with a different audience. This audience was the new international Greek elite of early Ptolemaic Egypt that included Greeks who had settled at and married into the Egyptian communities of Naukratis. The only demotic dedication on a cat sculpture was found on an Egyptian style seated cat. The name of the dedicant was (intentionally?) erased so we will never know who that person was. However, this unique example shows there was at least one visitor to the Naukratis Bubasteion who respected (or at least referenced) the conservative iconography of the established Bastet cults of Egypt.

4. Late Classical to Hellenistic sculpture, c. 400–100 BC

Half- to life-sized marble Greek sculpture is extremely rare at Naukratis with only seven fragments\(^{177}\) preserved, dating from c. 400 to 100 BC. These comprise three fragments of drapery (Figs 30–2)\(^{178}\), two hands (Figs 28–9)\(^{179}\) and two foot fragments (Figs 33–4).\(^{180}\) The presence of drapery fragments confirms that sculpture found at Naukratis could be both entirely made of marble, mixed media or acrolithic (Fig. 29).\(^{181}\) Some of the torsos might have been made from local limestone, with extremities and/or flesh parts carved from finer marble. The fragmentary nature of the sculpture suggests that the majority of the site’s ancient statuary was recycled, possibly in lime-kilns used in construction during the Roman, Byzantine and/or modern periods. Despite the small size and fragmentary nature of the surviving sculptures, they are of high quality.\(^{182}\) The styles correspond with the general carving styles common across the eastern Mediterranean during the 4th–1st centuries BC. These sculptures might have been imported ready-made or produced in Greek workshops at Naukratis, and are of either Parian or Pentelic marble, although they have not been subject to isotopic analysis.

---

\(^{177}\) Seven located fragments, plus two fragments that could not be located (discussed below).

\(^{178}\) Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, H2226.h; Liverpool World Museum, 9.9.86.17; British Museum, 1886.0401.1217.

\(^{179}\) Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA301; Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, H2014; Liverpool World Museum, 9.9.86.18.

\(^{180}\) Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, H918; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Cls.Inv.76.

\(^{181}\) Note the hand fragment Bristol Museum & Art Gallery H2014 was pieced, and possibly from an acrolithic sculpture.

\(^{182}\) The fragments are too small for suitable comparisons to be made to determine close parallels. However, 2nd and 1st century BC fragments from the Heraion on Samos are broadly similar (Horn 1972, 96–7, pl.40, nos 34–6; 124, pl.63, nos 97–8).
Three of the pieces were probably found within late Classical or Hellenistic phases of the Aphrodite sanctuary (Figs 29, 31, 33). A hand fragment (Fig. 28) ‘picked up in the temple region’…was ‘…one of the finest pieces of work I have ever seen,’ according to Petrie. It was found near but not necessarily within the Apollo sanctuary. The northern part of the site was home to the Greek Hellenion, Dioskouroi, Apollo and Hera sanctuaries, and the fragment is likely to have come from one of these sanctuaries. The remaining three sculpture fragments were found in this part of the site during Petrie’s first season at Naukratis and are probably, but not certainly, from Greek sanctuaries.

---

183 Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, H2226.h; H2014; H918 and Cypro Classical limestone figurine H446c, were probably all sent to Bristol in 1911, but from the second season of excavations at Naukratis in 1885. At least two of the objects have sanctuary of Aphrodite context numbers written on the back, suggesting these came from the Classical to Hellenistic phases of that temple.

184 Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA301.

185 Petrie Journal 1884–5, 184.

186 British Museum, 1886.0401.1217; Liverpool World Museum, 9,9,86,18; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Cls.Inv.76.
5. Hellenistic miniature marble statuettes

Hellenistic miniature statues of gods, heroes and goddesses, mostly in marble, comprise a small number of fragments (13) from Naukratis. Aphrodite and Eros are the most commonly identified characters represented. There are few male figures (Figs 35–8), comprising torso, head and arm fragments of Herakles, Eros and unidentified characters. One ‘Eros’ torso (Fig. 37) was identified by Petrie as ‘Herakles’ and ‘found in a stratum of about 400 BC’. This date seems too early for this type. Budde and Nicholls suggest a late Hellenistic or Imperial date for a similar piece from Naukratis (Fig. 36), which preserves red pigment on the torso and purple on the chlamys. Eros statuettes were popular and are often found in association with Aphrodite figures (such as those discussed below) in late Hellenistic and early Imperial contexts. The Herakles type has been discussed by Schmidt, who dates the piece to the 2nd century BC, although an earlier (Hellenistic) date is possible. They have parallels from Samos dated to the 2nd century BC, and from Delos.

The majority of miniature female statuettes from Naukratis are Aphrodite types dated c. 200–30 BC with some possible Roman versions also. One

---

187 Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA304 is probably male, but this is not certain. Such fragments are difficult to date with parallels ranging from the late 4th century BC (British Museum 1886.0401.1333, discussed below) and the dated mid-2nd century AD (based on context) from Myos Hormos (Peacock and Blue 2011, 130, no. 30, fig. 11.7). Also represented within the assemblage of Cypro-Classical limestone figures (see chapter Cypriot figures).

188 Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR.24.1899 and British Museum, 1886.0401.1385. Both have holes in the back for the insertion of wings, although this is not certain for British Museum, 1886.0401.1385 as with this example the holes may have been for repair.

189 Petrie Journal 1884–5, 74. Hogarth compared this with the example he found GR24.1899 (Hogarth et al 1905, pl.14.8).

190 ‘Classicizing work of late Hellenistic or early Imperial date’ (Budde and Nicholls 1967, 46, no. 78, pl. 24; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR.24.1899).

191 With close parallels from Delos, Marcadé 1969, A4137.

192 Schmidt 1997, 47–8, pl.10, no.17.

193 Horn 1972, pl.45, no.76.

194 Delos (Marcadé 1969, nos A972, A2350, A4660).
exception is a fragment of an arm holding an early Hellenistic kantharos (Fig. 39) of the late 4th century BC.\textsuperscript{196}

The Aphrodite figures comprise Aphrodite Euploia in sandal-binder pose (Fig. 41)\textsuperscript{197} and Anadyomene types (Fig. 40).\textsuperscript{198} Miniature versions of these types were popular and may have been modelled on a 3rd century BC painting by Apelles.\textsuperscript{199} To this group at Naukratis one should add six heads from Aphrodite (or Artemis), miniature sculptures in marble and calcite (Figs 42–7).

The presence of Hellenistic and early Roman Euploia and Anadyomene sculptures in Naukratis is not surprising considering their presence in Greek port cities that were in direct trading contact with Naukratis and their popularity in Alexandria. Aphrodite Euploia and Anadyomene sculptures were associated with cults that were popular with sailors and at ports, such as Alexandria.\textsuperscript{200} The popular Anadyomene type, for example, is known from Alexandria, where parallels have been dated from the 1st century BC to the 2nd century AD.\textsuperscript{201} Close parallels have been discovered in Corinth\textsuperscript{202} and Delos.\textsuperscript{203} Variants of the sandal-binder pose\textsuperscript{204} were found in the hills of the Hadra and Ibrahimiieh cemeteries of Alexandria,\textsuperscript{205} with a fine example now in Cairo;\textsuperscript{206} another example was found in the Memphite cemetery of Saqqâra.\textsuperscript{207} A close, but slightly larger, parallel for the Naukratis example was found at Corinth.\textsuperscript{208} Other parallels are known from Delos.\textsuperscript{209}

\textsuperscript{196} The kantharos depicted has parallels in ceramic (British Museum, 1898,0712.1) dated 400–390 BC and in bronze (British Museum 1882,1009.2) dated 330–300 BC.\textsuperscript{197} British Museum, 1886,0401.1528. Close Ptolemaic parallel from Egypt (Cairo CG27456), 2nd century BC parallel from Knossos (British Museum, 2000,0522.1) and two examples from the Temple of Aphrodite and the Temple of Dionysos, Cyrenaica dated between 100 BC and AD 100 (British Museum 1861,1127.51; 1861,1127.119). Numerous parallels acquired in Egypt or found in Alexandria dating from the 2nd century BC to the 1st century AD (Adriani 1961, nos 102–5, see also squating form 106–111; Alexandria 3519, 20498, 20859, 23333, 25765, 3434, 25735, 25637; British Museum, 1926,0415.6 and form with dolphin in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 27457 Adriani 1961, 79).

\textsuperscript{198} Hamilton College INV633. Numerous late Ptolemaic parallels from Egypt (Edgar 1903, Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG27454), including a 2nd century BC parallel from San el-Hagar (British Museum 1926,0415.3) and 1st century BC to 1st century AD example from Tell el-Yahudiya (British Museum 1927,0318.54). Numerous parallels found in Alexandria or ‘acquired in Egypt’ and probably all dating from the 2nd century BC to the 1st century AD (Adriani 1961, nos 78, 85, 87, 88, 95, 96, 98,100–101; Alexandria 17045, 3458, 26026, 10167, 3461, 3451, 3428, 3449; Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG27454; Buddle and Nicholls 1964, nos 85 and 86; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR.2.1954; GR.3.1954).

\textsuperscript{199} Possibly only popular from the late 2nd century BC onwards (Havelock 1995; Machaira 1993, 199–203).

\textsuperscript{200} Eckert 2016, for Naukratis in particular see 247–53.

\textsuperscript{201} Found in Alexandria (Michalowski 1971, no.6 and no.8, respectively; Edgar 1903, CG27454, but now in Cairo with parallel CG27455 that was found in Koptos).\textsuperscript{202} This version is twice the size (Johnson 1931, 42, no. 44, reg.1181; for parallels see Reinach 1910, 205.7; Bernoulli 1873, 286–95; Laurence 1969, 45).

\textsuperscript{203} Marcadé 1969, A122, A4216, A4150, see 5418, 1789.

\textsuperscript{204} Numerous examples in the British Museum, for example the 2nd century BC example from the Fayum GR1882,1014.2. The chained form of Andromeda (?) cannot be excluded as per examples found in the Fayum and Alexandria (Adriani 1961, nos 81–3; Alexandria 3457, 3444).

\textsuperscript{205} Breccia 1970, 27, pl. XVI, no.64.

\textsuperscript{206} Edgar 1903, CG27456, see also Edgar 1903, 27457; Adriani 1961, no. 79.

\textsuperscript{207} Not sandal-binder type, but leaning forward in same fashion (Edgar 1903, 12, CG27457).

\textsuperscript{208} Corinth IX, 43, no.46, reg.1182.

\textsuperscript{209} Marcadé 1969, A1790, 1788, 2938, 1788.
The female heads are presumably from similar statuettes of Aphrodite, but none of them join onto the surviving Aphrodite torsos and could conceivably have come from Aphrodite (or Artemis) statues of various types. Dating them (Figs 42–44) more specifically than 4th through to the 1st centuries BC is difficult, although small scale sculpture (Figs 45–7) was generally more popular in the later Hellenistic period. Some of the heads have a steghane, either modelled into the stone (Figs 44, 46) or added in metal (Fig. 42) over a worked area in the hair. One head of Aphrodite (Fig. 43) is identified as classicizing work of the late Hellenistic period by Budde and Nicholls.\footnote{See Marcadé 1969, A2129, A449 'Artemis', A2060, A5157, A4215, A5153–4, A5345.} Parallels for the Hellenistic Naukratis examples (Figs 42–4) were found in Samos\footnote{Newcastle Museum AREGYPT 435 has a parallel identified as Ptolemaic (Petrie Museum, London, UC54845).} where they have been dated to the 2nd or 1st centuries BC.\footnote{British Museum 1886,0401,1217, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Cls.Inv.76.} Further parallels of a comparable date have been found in Delos,\footnote{British Museum 1886,0401,1217, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Cls.Inv.76.} where they are highly variable in form, like the Naukratis examples. Overall, most parallels for the Naukratis miniature Aphrodite statuettes, have been dated broadly to the late Hellenistic\footnote{See Marcadé 1969, A2129, A449 'Artemis', A2060, A5001, A5157, A4215, A5153–4, A5345.} or early Imperial Roman period.\footnote{Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1886.449 was given an early Hellenistic date in the register.} Typical of this period are elongated lower torsos, short and narrow upper bodies with small breasts, small heads and long legs. However, many of the variations seen within the small sample from Naukratis probably represent variations in quality rather than a chronological development: fine and poor work could occur simultaneously.

The group does, however, suggest that the Aphrodite cult at Naukratis was still flourishing into the late Ptolemaic and Roman periods as also indicated by Athenaean (15.682; 13).
6. Ptolemaic and Romano-Egyptian sculpture in marble, calcite, limestone and basalt

Egypt produced a diverse, but more conspicuously Egyptian range of sculpture during this long period. Egyptian workshops appear to have been influenced by Greek and Roman practices, but adapted them to produce Egyptian subjects or were carved using exclusive Egyptian techniques and materials. A small group of six Ptolemaic and Romano-Egyptian sculptures (discussed below) in a range of materials were found at Naukratis. As we have already noted in the section describing the cat sculptures, this is a period in which sculptor and consumer operated within a complicated, markedly international, but recognizably Egyptian market. Distinct Egyptian subjects are visible, such as the Harpokrates (Fig. 48), a Hellenised form of the Egyptian Horus-the-child (Horpekhrod) carved from imported marble. Another example is a marble frog (Fig. 49). Frogs and toads were acknowledged as symbols marking the fertility caused by the inundation of the Nile, and these creatures were frequently shown on lamps in the Roman period. Symbolic representations of the Nile and Egypt were common across the Roman Empire in the early Imperial Roman period, when Roman artists also influenced sculptors working in Egypt.

Figure 48 Marble head from a statuette of Harpokrates (Horus), from Naukratis, c.300–100 BC. British Museum, 1886,0401.1494

Figure 49 Marble frog fountain spout from Naukratis, Roman (?). Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam, 7878. Photograph © Allard Pierson Museum

Figure 51 Granodiorite or granite right foot from a striding statue, from Naukratis, c.300–100 BC. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Cls.Inv.77; S.1317. Photograph © Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

Figure 52 Basalt bust from a statue of a standing man in priestly dress, c.100–1 BC. Egyptian Museum, Cairo. JE27193 (Edgar 1903, CG32743). Photograph © Egyptian Museum, Cairo


\[\text{Figure 51. Granodiorite or granite right foot from a striding statue, from Naukratis, c.300–100 BC. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Cls.Inv.77; S.1317. Photograph © Museum of Fine Arts, Boston}\]

\[\text{Figure 52. Basalt bust from a statue of a standing man in priestly dress, c.100–1 BC. Egyptian Museum, Cairo. JE27193 (Edgar 1903, CG32743). Photograph © Egyptian Museum, Cairo}\]

\[\text{216 Registered in Amsterdam as of Hellenistic date and said to be acquired in Naukratis (Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam, 7878). However, Roman parallels exist (Moormann 2000; Sotheby’s 15/12/2016 lot 51, acquired in the 1950s; see Jashemski and Meyer 2002, 327, fig. 275; National Archaeological Museum, Naples, inv. no. 121323).}\]

\[\text{217 Possibly associated with Heqet, the frog-headed goddess of fertility. See chapters on Lamps and Late Period figures.}\]
A second distinct group of sculpture includes limestone (probably Memphite) sculpture produced by Egyptian craftsmen but representing Greek characters and subjects. The demand for Greek figures in the form of herms (Fig. 50) and representations of Greek gods such as Zeus,218 was met in part by local attempts at Greek styles (by sculptors of unknown ethnicity), often using low quality, often soft, limestone, which required different tools and techniques. An example of this is the crude herm made of Memphite(?) limestone, wearing a cloak painted yellow (Fig. 50). The treatment of the musculature and the contrapposto pose could be interpreted as poor Greek work in locally available materials.

In addition to these Greek-style works, Egyptian sculptural traditions persisted into the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. Three examples of half- or full-sized Egyptian sculpture of the Ptolemaic period are discussed here.219 The first is a right foot fragment from a striding statue carved from a dark granite or granodiorite, dated from the 3rd to 2nd century BC (Fig. 51). The second is a bust from a standing figure of a man in priestly dress with a back pillar, dated to the 1st century BC (Fig. 52).220 Parallels of this type of figure carved from basalt or diorite, of the mid- to late-1st century BC, have been interpreted by scholars as expressing a mood of ‘gentle sadness and resignation.’221 It is not certain that this was the original intention of the sculptor, but more appropriate to the serious nature of the subject’s profession or social status. The third example is a statue of a Ptolemaic queen (Fig. 53), dressed as Isis, with a Uraeus and a back pillar.222 This is a common type with parallels in basalt, marble, limestone or diorite.223 The statue follows Egyptian sculptural traditions, with one foot advanced, and is Egyptian work of early Ptolemaic date. This is a period when black diorite, granodiorite and granite sculpture from Canopus224 and Alexandria225 in a mixed Greek and Egyptian style were carved by individuals (of unknown ethnicity) who had mastered Egyptian hard stone carving techniques.

7. Relief sculpture

Naukratis also yielded eight sculptures carved in relief. These comprise two classical architectural frieze fragments from an Isis temple and funerary stele found within the cemetery.226

---

219 And discussed fully in the forthcoming Egyptian sculpture chapter by Masson.
220 Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE27193 (Edgar 1903, CG27494).
221 Bothmer, de Meulenaere and Müller 1960, nos 131–3 and 136, dated 80–30 BC, see also no. 118 (dated earlier); Walker and Higgs 2001, nos 138 and 189–90.
222 Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG27471, SRS/10230 (Edgar 1903, 18, pl.IX, CG27471). The curls of the coiffure and the knotted costume are not certain indications that Isis was depicted (Rondot 2013). The Uraeus and socket for a headdress would seem to confirm this, however.
223 Bothmer et al. 1960, nos 113, see also 105, 123, 130, dated 240/200–80/50 BC; Walker and Higgs 2001 no.164; Witt 1997; for a finer and earlier example: Goddio and Fabre 2008, 308, no. 110; Goddio and Masson-Berghoff 2016, 95).
224 (identified as Berenike II and Arsinoe II (Goddio and Fabre 2008, 294, nos.17 and 18, SCA204 and SCA208; Goddio and Masson-Berghoff 2016, 92–3).
226 Inscriptions on the funerary stele are discussed in Greek and Latin inscriptions on stone; the Classical Greek relief sculpture is also included in the forthcoming chapter on Greek temple elements, the Roman relief sculpture is further treated in the forthcoming chapter on Egyptian sculpture.
Two Greek relief sculptures, probably from architectural friezes, were found in the Hellenion. The first has an unfinished figure of a striding warrior with a crested Corinthian helmet, spear and a shield (Fig. 54). The background has been cut back to reveal only the outline of the figure, carved in low relief with no hint of any modelling begun other than slightly rounded calf muscles.\textsuperscript{227} This was found near the shrine of Aphroditus within the Hellenion, and is dated c. 522–500 BC.\textsuperscript{228} The second limestone relief has a striding man holding a staff, carved in low relief, with a prominent belly (Fig. 55). It was found within a small shrine in the Hellenion dated c. 530–500 BC.\textsuperscript{229} The style of the carving reflects both east Greek and Egyptian styles: the man’s short garment is like both an Egyptian kilt and a Greek chiton, although it is not clear whether the man is bare-chested or wearing a tunic. These two reliefs are of comparable size, technique, design and date and might have been part of an architectural frieze or decorated part of a monument, perhaps a base.

Two early Roman relief sculptures of first century AD date have a distinctly Egyptian character. The first is a marble relief with a strikingly serpentine Dionysos (equated with the Egyptian god Osirus), wearing a nebris, himation and hemhemet crown standing on an eagle, while carrying a cornucopia and a bunch of grapes.\textsuperscript{230} Harpokrates (the son of Osirus) stands in the top right corner (Fig. 56) raising his arm in reverence. The second limestone relief is carved with serpentine form Isis (Isis-Thermouthis) and Serapis (Fig. 57), both depicted as striking cobras (uraei). Such serpentine representations were common in Naukratis\textsuperscript{231} and across Egypt, with parallels from Alexandria, Canopus and Oxyrhynchus, dating from the 1st and 2nd centuries AD.\textsuperscript{232} Such relief sculptures were probably inserted in a wall, possibly as votive offerings within a Roman period Isis (or Osiris-Isis-Harpokrates triad) temple.\textsuperscript{233} Traces of red and yellow paint are preserved on the blocks indicating the colour scheme of the walls.

\textsuperscript{227} Pryce believed that the figure was not unfinished but its surface prepared for added details in paint. He also thought that the relief was votive and not architectural because the sides were not smoothed for insertion into a frieze. Pryce 1928, 180–1, catalogue B437.

\textsuperscript{228} British Museum, 1900.0214.21; Hogarth et al. 1898–9, 33, 65–7, pl. IX; Pryce 1928, no. B437; Höckmann 2007, 141–2; Koenigs 2007, 346–7 no. 45, pl. 32.

\textsuperscript{229} The shrine was built above a context containing 6th century BC pottery, and occupation deposits contained Attic red figure pottery. First published in Hogarth, Lorimer and Edgar, 1905, 126–7, fig. 8.


\textsuperscript{231} Representations of Serapis, and particularly Isis, were common in various media across Egypt. See silver bracelet terminals and diadem from Naukratis (British Museum, 1886.0401.1753–1754, 1886.0401.1765). See parallels from the forthcoming Jewellery and mirrors chapter.

\textsuperscript{232} Goddio 2008, 278, 296, no. 30; British Museum, 1911.0617.22; Walker and Higgs 2000, 61, 149; 2001, 124-5, 151.

\textsuperscript{233} See silver bracelet terminals (British Museum, 1886.0401.1753–1754), diadem (1886.0401.1765) and limestone horned altar (1886.0401.1567) parallels and the discussion of the location of a putative Roman period Isis temple in Naukratis within the forthcoming Jewellery and mirrors and Altars, sundials, minor architectural objects and models chapters.
Funerary stelai with scenes carved in relief include a 4th century BC marble example, since lost, and two limestone late Ptolemaic or Roman funerary stelai. One shows a funerary banquet for a man accompanied by his wife(?) holding a snake and two attendants. A horse pokes its head through a window (Fig. 58). This type, common across the eastern Mediterranean, dates to about 200–25 BC. The second limestone stele originally showed the deceased and his dog, although only part of their feet remain. The epitaph is for Herakleides son of Chairemon, and is dated c. 30 BC–AD 100. A single limestone funerary altar (Fig. 59) is known from Naukratis. Decorated with bulls’ heads and hanging leafy garlands of fruit and flowers, this example has close Hellenistic parallels from Alexandria, c. 150–90 BC Delos and c. 200–30 BC Knidos.

8. Concluding thoughts on Greek and Roman sculpture at Naukratis

The Greek and Roman sculpture from Naukratis comprises a wide variety of subjects and materials betraying the settlement’s long period of occupation, mixed population and its significant role in long distance trade. Apart from the two interesting reliefs, Archaic Greek sculpture is barely represented, with only a few tiny fragments of Greek-style, half- to full-scale marble sculpture preserved. Most of the pieces of larger-scale, marble figures and statuettes fall within the Hellenistic period, a time of (apparent) decline for the Greek sanctuaries where these finds were concentrated.

It is likely that the majority of stone sculpture made and/or set up at Naukratis was destroyed, leaving an uneven record of what originally must have been produced and displayed there. The preference for marble, and to a lesser degree limestone, over the more durable granite or other materials may explain the scarcity and fragmentary nature of the assemblage. Marble and limestone were valuable recyclable resources for slaking in lime kilns. It may have been the Roman and Byzantine inhabitants of Naukratis who effectively and efficiently destroyed much of the city’s sculpture, transforming it into Late Roman architecture or lime mortar. Preservation was a particular problem for the Ptolemaic and Roman phases of these sanctuaries, because of Roman and Byzantine

234 Fragmentary depicting a woman(?) seated, holding the hand of a standing man, with a small naked boy to left. This is only known from a photograph by Petrie (Petrie Delta Series no. 401; EES Archives, "Marble near sunlight indoors" Petrie Notebook 23), and possibly the "slab of sculpture from an early tomb; of three figures, of no interest" (Petrie journal 1884–5, p. 49) that he saw in nearby village of Teh el Barud. Probably a 4th-century BC, Athenian-style grave relief (Clairmont 1993; Clairmont 1995).

235 Small fragment (Bristol Museum & Art Gallery, H919) and more complete examples British Museum, 1886,0401.3, 1888,0601.35.

236 British Museum, 1888,0601.35; Gardner 1888, 22–3; Pryce 1892, no. 728 Gardner lists this as well as another grave stelai as having ‘found last year’ but not within ‘the limits of the ancient city’ (Gardner 1888, 22).

237 British Museum, 1886,0401.3, see chapter on Greek and Latin inscriptions on stone.


239 Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum, 32046 (Abd el-Fattah and Seif el-Din 2010, who published Alexandrian parallels).

240 British Museum, 1847,1220.2; 1825,0713.5; 1847,1220.1; Budde and Nicholls 1967, pl. 22, nos 71–2.

241 British Museum, 1888,1003.2; 1888,1003.1.
recycling and because the sanctuaries were (with the exception of some Archaic phases) already mostly destroyed before Petrie discovered Naukratis.

There is precious little typical mixed Greek-Egyptian style sculpture preserved at Naukratis, compared with that from Memphis, Alexandria or Thonis Heraklion, despite the settlement’s continued significance (and status) as a Greek city throughout the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. Among the extant material, full- and half-scale marble sculpture, as well as statuettes found at Naukratis, are predominantly associated with the goddess Aphrodite. Most of the sculpture was either found within (or near) the Aphrodite sanctuaries or portray the goddess, or her son Eros. This demonstrates the continued significance of the Archaic Aphrodite cult(s) at Naukratis into the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.

The unique group of rare and exceptional cat sculptures from Naukratis provide an extremely important insight into an otherwise rare subject in Greek art, particularly in marble sculpture. The dedicatory inscriptions in both Greek and demotic provide important insights into the function of these sculptures. These were probably concealed within a cache, buried deep and away from later occupants (as was the case with the Alexandrian parallels discussed above) which protected them from the recycling that affected so much of the other sculpture. Dating from the early or mid-3rd century BC, these cat figures represent dedications by the Greek elite at Naukratis to the cult of Boubastis and patronized by deified Ptolemaic queens. This cultic activity coincided with the largest building project undertaken at Naukratis, Ptolemy II’s reconstruction of the pylon of the sanctuary of Amun Ra in 285–246 BC. Participation through attending, sacrificing to and building temples for the dynastic cults and those patronized by the dynasty (such as the Boubastis cult) was a necessary statement of loyalty by the Greek-Macedonian elite that was rewarded.242

This Hellenised form of Bastet introduced by the Ptolemaic dynasty was part of a wider programme of change that took place from the end of the 4th century BC through to the mid-3rd century BC. The purpose of these changes was to assimilate Greek and Egyptian religious practices and to integrate the Ptolemaic dynasty into the traditional festivals and everyday religious experiences of Egypt. The cats (as with the construction of the pylon of Ptolemy II) are expressions of Ptolemaic dynastic propaganda, influence and investment during the early to mid-3rd century BC that show how the support of the Egyptian and Greek communities of Naukratis was sought by the new Ptolemaic dynasty.

242 The Macedonian and Greek elite benefited from a monopolization of priestly, administrative and military offices, and were bestowed with economic favours, such as tax reforms and exemptions.