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Abstract

Volume I of this thesis is concerned with the relationship and development of the Greek and Egyptian-style Ptolemaic royal sculpture from Egypt. After an introductory outline of previous scholarship, the historical and religious backgrounds to the presentation of the royal image are surveyed. Chapter 2 considers the chronology and identification of royal sculptures in the Hellenistic style, and the influence of Egyptian art on the Greek-style representations. Chapter 3 examines the iconographic and stylistic developments of Egyptian-style Ptolemaic royal sculpture in respect to earlier Egyptian royal portraiture; and the emergence of representations of royal women.

Chapter 4 explores the interaction between Greek and Egyptian elements on Hellenistic representations that are manufactured in hard stones, and Egyptian sculptures which exhibit Greek portrait features. The Egyptian material covers statues of Ptolemaic royal women with naturalistic coiffures and the development and function of Egyptian-style representations of male rulers with Greek portrait features.

Chapter 5 considers a group of sculptures representing royal women with Greek elements, which are generally believed to associate the queens with the goddess Isis. I place the evidence within a chronological sequence, referring to the purely Egyptian-style portraits that are discussed in Chapter 3, and then examine the function and origins of this type of image.

Chapter 6 explores the early Ptolemaic rulers' relationship to and patronage of the cult of Sarapis. Concentrating on the archaeological evidence from Alexandria and Memphis, I consider the extent to which the image of Sarapis was Hellenised as a result of royal policy. Finally, Chapter 7 amalgamates points of interest that have arisen from the earlier chapters.

Volume II is a catalogue of 165 sculptures some hitherto unpublished.
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<td></td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>Brooklyn, Brooklyn Museum of Art</td>
<td>74.220</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum</td>
<td>3222</td>
<td></td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum</td>
<td>3936</td>
<td></td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>Brooklyn, Brooklyn Museum of Art</td>
<td>71.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art</td>
<td>89.2.660</td>
<td></td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum</td>
<td>18370</td>
<td></td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>Cairo, Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>27473</td>
<td></td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum</td>
<td>3916</td>
<td></td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Location/Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 3912</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 14941</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td>Memphis Sarapieion</td>
<td>515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

AA Archäologischer Anzeiger
AF Archäologische Forschungen
AGWG Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen
AJA American Journal of Archaeology
AM Athenische Mitteilungen
AMGR Annuaire du Musée Gréco-Romain
AntCl L’Antiquité Classique
AntK Antike Kunst
Arch.Cl. Archeologica Classica
AS Ancient Society
ASAE Annales du Service des Antiquités de l’Égypte
AsAtene Annuario della regia scuola archeologica di Atene
ASP American Studies in Papyrology
BES Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar
BdA Bolletino d’Arte
BHM Bulletin of the Hermitage Museum
BICS Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies
BIE Bulletin de l’Institut de l’Égypte
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<table>
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Previous Scholarship

Although the Ptolemaic royal image has been the subject of many individual studies, there remains an imbalance in the extent of scholarly attention devoted to the different styles of imagery. The Greek-style representations have been studied and published in far greater detail than their Egyptian-style counterparts and generally the two styles of representation are treated independently, because of the separation between the disciplines of Egyptology and Greek art history.¹

Initially, the study of Ptolemaic royal portraiture was dominated by the question of the existence of an ‘Alexandrian’ school of art.² One of the reasons that Lawrence and later Noshy had given for the existence of an Alexandrian school was the Mouseion; they believed that if the royal house patronised scholarship that they would also support artistic schools. Lawrence argued that if there was a school of art and it reflected the Mouseion, it might be expected to conserve the styles of the past whilst representing the cosmopolitan Greek community of Alexandria, a community which included temporary as well as permanent residents. According to Lawrence’s reasoning, such an institution would have attracted artists from all over the Greek world and would have paralleled the significance of the Mouseion in literary history.

More recently, scholars have tended to conclude that Alexandrian sculpture has much in common with that from other Hellenistic cities, that it was influenced by the fourth century classical schools, and that it did not follow its own unique course of development.³ The question was most recently re-addressed by Bianchi and Stewart who once again dispelled the idea of an Alexandrian school of art.⁴

¹ Lawrence (1925) 179-90 [Greek, Egyptian and ‘mixed’]; Noshy (1937) 83-142 [Greek, Egyptian and ‘mixed’]; Bothmer (1960b) [Egyptian and ‘mixed’]; Bianchi ed. (1988) [Greek, Egyptian and ‘mixed’]; R. Smith (1998) [Greek and ‘mixed’]; Josephson (1997a) 1-20 and (1997b) [Egyptian]. See also conference papers that are concerned with Ptolemaic art such as Alexandria and Alexandrianism (1996).
² See Stewart (1996) for general background to the debate.
⁴ See Bianchi (1996) 191-202, especially 191-2; and Stewart (1996) 231-46, on the idea of a Hellenistic Alexandrian school of art.
Lawrence was also the first to attempt to divide the various categories of Ptolemaic portraiture, and was followed by Noshy, who was heavily influenced by his predecessor’s work.\textsuperscript{5} These divisions are important because they indicate that there was more than one type of royal portrait issued in Egypt by the Ptolemaic royal house. Lawrence’s categories are as follows:

Unmixed Sculpture
- Greek style free of Egyptian influences.
- Egyptian style free of Greek influences.

Sculpture with mixed elements
- Sculpture in the Greek style but with Egyptian subjects, motives, material or techniques.
- Sculpture in the Egyptian style with Greek subjects or motives.
- Sculpture categorised by attempts at fusion of styles.

These categories do not reveal the subtle differences in many of the surviving images. More recently, Smith defined four groups in relation to “pharaonic” art; these divisions are more representative of the material than any previous attempts to categorise Ptolemaic sculpture.\textsuperscript{6} His categories are more sensitive to the material because he acknowledges that rather than there simply being a mixed-style, only the Egyptian sculpture is affected by an outside influence. Smith looks at Ptolemaic royal portraiture in the broader context of Hellenistic royal portraiture, concentrating on Greek-style representations in the main text. Whilst this perspective is essential for both the understanding of the Greek-style royal image and for the comparison with certain royal image types that recur in Egyptian contexts, there are many questions that remain unanswered: What significance do the Greek portrait features and attributes on the Egyptian-style statues have?\textsuperscript{7} Why do the Egyptian sculptors begin to produce more Hellenised versions of Egyptian statuary? Were these images

\textsuperscript{5} Lawrence (1925) 179-90 and Noshy (1937) 83-142.
\textsuperscript{6} R. Smith (1998) 87.
\textsuperscript{7} R. Smith (1996) addressed the question of the use of Greek models by the Egyptian artists. For a further discussion see Chapter 4 below.
intended for Greek or Egyptian audiences or are they testimony to the cross-cultural climate in Egypt during the second and first centuries BC?

Smith's divisions are as follows:

- Purely pharaonic.
- Pharaonic regalia but with "a face which is treated in a naturalistic Greek style".
- Pharaonic regalia but with "a face which is treated in a naturalistic Greek style and the addition of an external and obviously Greek element, such as hair beneath the headdress".
- Purely Greek.

These artistic divisions have been made purely on stylistic grounds. It is, however, possible to divide the sculptures further by taking account of the 'ideological' associations of many representations. The term 'ideological' is not one that is commonly applied to art history, but has been used by historians to refer to symbolic meanings which can be transferred to cross-cultural or foreign ideas, usually of a religious nature; thus the term is useful within this context. There are also sites at which parallel dedications of images that remain true to their tradition appear with representations from another tradition, so that the same message is portrayed via the two different artistic traditions. In some cases, such as the Alexandrian Sarapieion, it is possible to determine that certain rulers commissioned statues in both artistic styles; this phenomenon has wider ideological implications.

In his essay, 'The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure', Koenen discusses the question of syncretism, both artistic and ideological, comparing the languages in the various decrees and the royal titles that were used in both contexts. He also draws on evidence such as the use of an eagle on the reverse of Ptolemaic coinage, claiming that the symbol would have been equally relevant to an Egyptian as to a Greek and that the appearance of sceptres on coin portraits is a reference to the sceptre that

---

*Note: The term 'ideological' is not commonly used in art history, but has been applied by historians to refer to symbolic meanings that can be transferred to cross-cultural or foreign ideas, usually of a religious nature. This term is useful within this context.*

---

*Footnote 8: For the use of the term 'ideological' see for example Koenen (1993).*
appears on the Ptolemaic temple reliefs and on Egyptian stelae. Although his work has major implications for the study of Ptolemaic kingship and draws on evidence from both Greek and Egyptian contexts, Koenen’s interpretation has a heavily Greek bias. This tendency is the result of the interdisciplinary nature of work on the Ptolemaic Period and few scholars are equally well versed in both traditions. To say that there is either Greek or Egyptian influence is to over-simplify a very complex artistic phenomenon and whilst the Egyptian artistic tradition in particular appears to have adopted Greek attributes and portrait types, the sculpture cannot really be said to be Hellenised since it remains essentially Egyptian.

Surprisingly little work has been undertaken on the Egyptian-style Ptolemaic royal sculpture and there is no single monograph that covers the whole period or that assembles all of the various categories in their entirety. The primary aim of this thesis is to undertake the task of providing a chronological framework and then to comprehend how the various categories of sculpture might have been used and what function the statues would have served. This work is a refinement of some of the earlier endeavours to place the Egyptian material in a chronological sequence. The second purpose of this study is to determine what evidence exists for cross-cultural borrowing between the Egyptian and Greek traditions.

The most obvious examples of cross-cultural borrowing are the Egyptian-style statues with Greek portrait features and the images of queens with Greek attributes. The existence of the so-called ‘mixed school’ of Ptolemaic art is particularly problematic and in many past studies there has been a tendency to over-simplify

---


10 It was precisely this argument that Bianchi (1988) 64 rather unsuccessfully put forward with regard to the adoption of the cornucopia on Egyptian-style representations of Ptolemaic queens and the lightning bolt held by Philadelphos on the Tanis relief he wrote: "...the appearance of non-Egyptian motifs in Egyptian works does not necessarily denote artistic foreign influence".

11 Catalogue numbers 99-128 for group one and 129-147 for the representations of queens with a cornucopia, corkscrew locks and Hellenistic drapery.
complicated and subtle iconographic evidence to support or reject an argument. The idea that there was a Hellenistic influence on Egyptian statuary of the Ptolemaic Period was first mooted by Maspero regarding the statue of Hor from Alexandria.\textsuperscript{12} Maspero believed that it showed signs of non-Egyptian modelling on the hair and in particular the drapery. The concept of Hellenistic influence was accepted by Egyptologists and Hellenists alike and has remained the general focus of many subsequent works.\textsuperscript{13}

It is not only the question of cross-cultural influence on the two dominant artistic traditions in Ptolemaic Egypt that has caused controversy; the criteria used for dating have also led to conflicting views on the development of Greek and Egyptian-style Ptolemaic portraiture, and on the dating of individual pieces.\textsuperscript{14} These discrepancies can be explained by the nature of the history of the study of Egyptian-style portraiture in the Ptolemaic period. In respect to the Egyptian statuary, there has been a tendency to select individual pieces and to date them without considering the wider chronological sequence. This is largely because exhibitions, such as the one held in 1960 at The Brooklyn Museum, have played an important role in the history of the discipline.

Bothmer's exhibition catalogue remains an important contribution to the understanding of the pharaonic art of the Late Period and includes catalogue entries of the Ptolemaic Period, but is not confined to royal portraiture. Bothmer used key sculptures to illustrate the development of private and royal Egyptian sculpture from 700 BC to AD 100. However, since then many of his dates have been challenged.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} Maspero (1887) 234-7, Cairo, Egyptian Museum inv. CG 697, Hor son of Hor. For bibliography and illustration see Rausch ed. (1998) 173, no. 120.
\textsuperscript{13} See also Lawrence (1925), Noshy (1937) and more recently Grimm (1975) and Vandersleyen (1975). See also Bianchi (1988) 55 for discussion of the history of the development of the idea that Egyptian statuary was influenced by Hellenistic art.
\textsuperscript{14} See appendix on the dating of the New Haven head inv. 4.1.1953, which is generally dated to the reign of Ptolemy III, despite the Roman characteristics; see also Cat. 107 which is dated to the reign of Ptolemy V but also commonly identified as Augustus or Tiberius, and Cat. 80, which has been identified as Nectanebo I and Ptolemy X.
\textsuperscript{15} In particular the dating of the Boston Green head and the Berlin Green head, which are now generally accepted to be fourth century BC in date. See Josephson (1997a) 18-20 and Bianchi, ed. (1988) 59-60, who dates them to the second and first century BC respectively.
Bothmer accepted the earlier views that many Ptolemaic statues showed signs of non-Egyptian influence. In 1996, however, he revised his earlier thoughts concerning the influence of Hellenistic art on Egyptian sculpture from the early Ptolemaic Period.

Bianchi had already dismissed the idea that there was any influence of Greek art on Ptolemaic Egyptian-style material, in the catalogue of another exhibition at The Brooklyn Museum, held in 1988, both in the individual catalogue entries and in an essay entitled ‘Pharaonic art in Ptolemaic Egypt’. More recently Josephson has written an article and a monograph on the subject of Late Period and early Ptolemaic Egyptian-style royal portraiture. Like Bothmer, he believes that there was a Hellenistic influence on Egyptian sculpture from the reign of Ptolemy I and even suggests that there was a degree of influence from the earlier Greek settlers in the fourth century BC, as expressed by the rounded fleshy appearance of the portrait heads and bodies of the subjects.

As mentioned, Greek-style statuary has been the subject of considerable scholarship. By far the most comprehensive work on Ptolemaic royal portraits is Kyrieleis’ study, which includes a comprehensive catalogue and discussion of the individual attributes and the portrait type of each ruler. However, Kyrieleis concentrates on the Greek-style royal image, including those Egyptian statues with Greek portrait features. The aim of Kyrieleis’ study was to establish a chronological sequence for Greek-style royal representations and to distinguish the various iconographic attributes that were associated with each ruler; he includes several types of royal representation, although he concentrates on sculpture. This on the whole is successful, although there have

---

16 Bothmer (1960b) 159-160 in particular, with reference to the costume on Cat. 136.
17 Bothmer (1996) 215-30 still maintains that there is evidence for the influence of Greek art on Egyptian sculpture, although he dismisses the pleated folded male costume, the serrated scarf with fringed borders; the pleated female costume, deviation of arms from the subject’s sides, representation of apotheosis, a more shapely female body, receding hairline and exuberant torso modelling as Hellenistic.
19 Josephson (1997a) and (1997b).
20 Kyrieleis (1975).
21 There are some Egyptian-style representations included in the catalogue, mainly those with the Greek-style portraits or attributes associated with the Hellenistic tradition.
been subsequent re-identifications of several portraits. Kyrieleis suggests that in addition to a Greek influence on the Egyptian Ptolemaic royal image, there are elements of Egyptian portraiture found on the Greek representations of rulers. This view is also adopted by Bianchi, who so vehemently dismisses the idea of a Hellenistic influence on the Egyptian material.

1.2 Aims of the Thesis

In addition to refining the chronology of Ptolemaic sculpture and considering the evidence for cross-cultural borrowing, this thesis looks at the way in which the rulers used their images to promote their dynasty, firstly in separate contexts and then to consider why some of the Egyptian-style sculptures adopt Greek attributes. There is also the issue of the degree of control that the rulers exercised over their images. Did the ruler typically dedicate images of himself? How much control did the royal house exercise over the royal image?

For the purpose of this study, the main focus will be on statuary in the round. Other types of royal representation will be cited for comparison and dating. The catalogue includes all of the basic types of Ptolemaic royal statue, but precludes bronze statuettes or the more indistinguishable heads of rulers that were manufactured probably as votives by wealthier members of the population.

The objective is to place the evidence for royal representations into a chronological sequence and to establish the context where each category of image would have been placed. Chapters 2 and 3 deal with the representations that were manufactured according to the Greek and Egyptian traditions respectively, with no outside

---

22 Kyrieleis (1975) 40-1, 92 and 129. R. Smith (1998) 88, disputes the idea that there was any Egyptian influence on the Greek portrait types. The main problem with Kyrieleis' theory is, as Smith points out, that he fails to analyse the various categories of Ptolemaic portraiture.  
23 Bianchi, ed. (1988) 168, no. 64.  
influence. **Chapters 4 and 5** address the question of Greek artistic influence on two types of royal statuary:

- Egyptian-style statues of predominantly, though not exclusively, male rulers with Greek portrait features.
- Egyptian-style images of queens with attributes associated with the Greek dynastic cult.

Finally, **Chapter 6** considers the evidence at the Alexandrian and Memphite sanctuaries of Sarapis, both of the individual rulers' association with the god and the relationship between the Greek and Egyptian-style statuary at the sites.

Very few royal representations have definitive contexts, and even when a provenance is known it is usually very general, giving a city rather than a specific location within it. For this reason it is necessary to consider the various contexts for the royal image and the background to the social and religious climate of the period.

The nature of sculptors' work must also be considered. Sculptors travelled to their assignments, and although the Ptolemaic rulers would have been able to afford to commission many representations, there would be no need for an institution dedicated to the production of royal images. It would seem more likely that the rulers used a specific artist or consultant and that this image was passed on in the form of models to other workshops outside Alexandria.²⁵

There is also the question of the degree of control that was exercised by the royal house or indeed the level of interest that the rulers showed in the way that they were presented to their subjects. If Rostovtzeff's view of a tightly controlled and ordered administrative system were upheld, one would expect that the control extended to important matters such as the portrayal of the royal house.²⁶ More recently Samuel questioned the organisation of the state under the Ptolemies and suggested that few could distinguish between public and private roles.²⁷ These interpretations have an

---

²⁵ R. Smith (1996) cites the higher quality Egyptian version of a Greek portrait as evidence for the existence of models for the royal portraits, 203-213.
²⁶ Rostovtzeff (1941) on the administration of Egypt during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphos.
important bearing on the role of the ruler in the presentation of the royal image. However, the royal interest in the dynastic cult and the promotion of the dynasty suggests that the responsibility was very much a royal concern, and if this did not involve the king himself, it was certainly the concern of his advisors. The uniformity of private and public dedications supports this idea.

1.3 The historical context for the development of royal portraiture

There was a long tradition in Egyptian art of representing royals in sculpture and relief. The most immediate precedents to this study are the representations of the Persian dynasties. Whilst there are numerous royal images dating to the first period of Persian control, none have been allocated to the second.²⁸ Nor are there any recognised statues of Alexander the Great, although the ruler appears in relief representation at the Shrine of the Bark at Luxor temple. In contrast the early Ptolemaic rulers follow those of the Thirtieth Dynasty, for whom there are many recognised representations.²⁹ Because of a lack of interest in the representation of women from the sixth century BC, there are very few images of royal or private women for the two centuries before Ptolemaic rule.³⁰

The third century BC, particularly the reign of Philadelphos, is generally considered to be a period of prosperity when the Ptolemaic dynasty was at its most powerful. The rulers adopted a policy of supporting both the Greek and Egyptian traditions and religions in an attempt to establish their place in Egyptian culture whilst seemingly promoting their own Macedonian heritage to the Greek immigrants and the wider Greek world. The Greek and Egyptian-style dedications in the capital, Alexandria, show that the early rulers were keen to promote themselves as both Hellenistic dynast and Pharaoh. Material from as early as the reign of Ptolemy II indicates that the ruler attempted to portray himself according to both artistic traditions. Evidence from the

---
²⁸ See Josephson (1997b) 1.
²⁹ See Josephson (1997b) 1-32.
³⁰ Bothmer (1960b) 116 makes the same observation.
Sarapieion and from around the harbour area of Fort Qait Bey has revealed that many of the royal representations were made according to the Egyptian tradition. In order to fully understand the royal image it is necessary to look at the interaction between the Greek and Egyptian categories rather than treating each type separately.

Outside the capital the rulers paid for the restoration or building of Egyptian temples and paid money to native cults. Soter paid for the costly burial of the Apis Bull of the cow Ta-nt-Aset, shortly after he took control of Egypt; this continued a tradition that had been favoured by the Twenty-sixth dynasty and other Late Period rulers. There was also a concerted effort on behalf of the royal house to spread their patronage throughout the country. Under Ptolemy I the main area of concentration was the Delta, with temples also appearing in the Faïyum at Tebtunis and Bacchias. Under Ptolemy II we see the patronage extending to Upper Egypt with temples at Coptos, Hibis in the Western desert, Karnak and Philae. Ptolemy III continued his father's policies and supported the temples at Aswan and Karnak, whilst starting a project at Edfu; he also patronised temples in the Faïyum and the Delta with a large building project at the Alexandrian Sarapieion. With such a conspicuous support of the temples and the Egyptian religion it would seem logical to expect that the Egyptian royal image would be promoted in a similar manner and that it would reflect the earlier representations of Pharaoh.

The reign of Ptolemy IV has been seen as a turning point in the dynasty's fortunes. Whilst the ruler continued the building projects of his predecessors in Alexandria and beyond, the political climate and the Ptolemaic foreign policies are believed to have upset the balance of power. There had been unrest during the reign of Ptolemy III; however, under Philopator the uprising occurred when the dynasty was in a particularly weak position towards the end of his reign. The battle of Raphia, when a large Egyptian contingent fought as part of the army for the first time was considered by ancient and many modern historians to have raised the expectations of

---

31 For a discussion of the new finds from around the harbour area in Alexandria see Chapters 4 and 5, and for the purely Egyptian-style evidence see Chapter 3.
the Egyptians, which consequently led to native uprisings. However, the idea that Philopator had not been well informed and supportive of the Egyptian tradition has recently been radically revised. It is therefore, necessary to see the changes during and after the reign of Ptolemy IV not in terms of Egyptianisation resulting in weakness of the dynasty but rather as a different way of relating to Egyptian culture. Nor did the situation simply involve the rising of the Egyptians against the royal house; the native rebels attacked Egyptian temples, as the text of the Rosetta decree demonstrates.

The problems continued under Ptolemy V, who was a minor at the time of his accession. In 206 BC, towards the end of Philopator's reign, the rebel pharaoh Ḥr-[...] was crowned at Thebes and his successor, An-[]-'ru ruled' until 186 BC. Following an uprising in Alexandria, the royal court was moved to Memphis. This move may explain the introduction of Egyptian-style statues with Greek features and the cessation of parallel Greek and Egyptian dedications at sanctuaries such as the Sarapeion at Memphis and Alexandria. The fact that Ptolemy V's queen was a Seleucid princess seems also to be reflected in the lack of sculpture representing her. However, this may have reflected a lack of interest in the Greek royal image. Although Alexandria was important for the development and promotion of the Hellenistic royal image, it is unlikely that the move to Memphis would have affected the production of Hellenistic portraits because the Greek advisors and artists would have moved to Memphis. It is, however, possible that the Greek and Egyptian artists worked together in close quarters for the first time and that the native sculptors incorporated the familiar Greek portraits in their own work. It is also possible that the ruler's supporters used a Greek portrait on the Egyptian statuary in order to distinguish him from the rebel pharaoh.

37 See Polybios V. 34 and V. 107, where he writes the following “Πολεμαί(ν) γε μὲν εὐθέως ἀπὸ τοῦτων τῶν καιρῶν συνέβαινε γέγονεται τὸν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλήνες πόλεμον.” Although Polybios explains that the Egyptians had gained confidence because of their success at the battle of Raphia, McGing (1997) 280-282, has recently questioned the date of the revolt by the Egyptians, and he suggests convincingly in n. 31 that εὐθέως should be taken less literally and that it could refer to a later uprising.

38 See McGing (1997) 282-283 for further evidence that Egyptians fought Egyptians during this period; he concludes that the cause of the revolt was social rather than nationalistic.

Rebellion, dynastic rivalry, civil war and Roman intervention from the time of Ptolemy VI to Ptolemy XII can be associated with an increasingly wider range of royal images, particularly in the Egyptian-style statuary. The developments in the dynastic cult may also have played an important role in the chosen royal image and it is important to consider the historical background to the royal cult in order to understand why developments and changes in the Ptolemaic royal image occurred. It is interesting that under Cleopatra VII when Egypt becomes more powerful, the queen reverts to the images that were common in the third century BC rather than continuing the styles in which her immediate predecessors had presented themselves.

1.4 Royal cults

Religion played an important role in the typology of the Ptolemaic royal image and it is necessary to look carefully at the various royal cults and the royal patronage of Greek and Egyptian religion if the functions for the various categories are to be determined. The separate Greek and Egyptian traditions are also important in the understanding of any cross-cultural borrowing. There are five main aspects to the religious representations of the Ptolemaic royal image:

- Ptolemy as Pharaoh: alive he was the embodiment of Horus, and dead he was Osiris, lord of the underworld.
- Association or assimilation with an established deity.
- Ruler cult.
- Dynastic cult.
- Σύνναως Θεός.

With the exception of the first category, the above classifications are essentially Greek. However, evidence from decrees suggests that the Egyptian priesthood participated in all of these forms of royal cult. The Ptolemaic rulers were of course

---

42 Compare Winter (1978) and Quaegebeur (1989) for the acceptance of the Greek royal cult into Egyptian temples.
considered to be the embodiment of Horus during their lifetime and Osiris in death.\textsuperscript{40} This role is, however, quite distinct from that of the ruler cult, which was essentially a Greek institution and one that was adopted by the other Hellenistic dynasts.\textsuperscript{41} In the case of this type of worship, a specific ruler was selected by a city for veneration, thus forming a regional rather than national cult. Alexander the Great was treated in this way by his successors; and the deification of an individual by specific cities did not preclude others from following suit. However, the important factors are that these cults were not controlled by a central body and that they were individual. It is also probably fair to assume that the worship of the individual, in this case Alexander, was regionalised. The relationship between Alexandria and the deified Alexander was particularly close since the ruler was both founder of the city and was buried there.\textsuperscript{42} It is not clear whether the Egyptian temples accepted the ruler cult of Alexander the Great and the lack of evidence for the veneration of Alexander in the Egyptian temples would suggest that the ruler was of little importance to the native religion. The fact that the native priesthood chose not to add the names of Alexander and Theoi Soteres to the dating formulae following Philopator’s reforms may also imply that their commitment lay with the Theoi Adelphoi.\textsuperscript{43}

In contrast, the dynastic cult (which was again subdivided into the deification of royal pairs and the promotion of individual queens) was extremely prevalent in terms of associated representations in both Greek and Egyptian contexts. The cult was controlled by the state and was promoted throughout Egypt rather than being confined to Alexandria and, under Ptolemy IV, Ptolemais. For this reason one might expect that the associated cult statues were also centrally controlled.

The dynastic cult was inaugurated by Ptolemy II and was attached to the existing cult of Alexander in Alexandria. Documentation comes from the names of eponymous

\textsuperscript{40} See Quirke (1992) 70-104.
\textsuperscript{41} Fraser (1998) 214. It is of course possible that the Egyptian ruler cult influenced the Greek ruler cult, which subsequently spread throughout the Hellenistic world.
\textsuperscript{42} Stewart (1993) 224 on the importance of the cult and sema of Alexander in the Hellenistic world.
\textsuperscript{43} Koenen (1993) 53 suggests that to have added the name of the Theoi Soteres, following Ptolemy IV’s reforms, would have meant that they would also have had to introduce Alexander, and that both were precluded simply on the grounds on convenience.
priests and their cult titles; thus the development of the cult and any subsequent
to Alexander's cult in 272/1 BC while Arsinoe, his sister and
derived from the period. Ptolemy II added the cult of himself and Arsinoe II as
queen was still alive. Thus from the beginning, the dynastic cult involved the
promotion and worship of living rulers. Following her death in 270 BC, Arsinoe II
was then awarded an individual cult, which was allocated separate priestesses called
the kanephori. Hence, from the time of Philadelphos, there was the original cult of
Alexandria to which the cult of the Theoi Adelphoi was attached and then the cult of
Arsinoe II. Ptolemy II also instigated a cult of the Theoi Soteres, but it remained
separate from the cult of Alexander and the associated dynastic cults. Not until the
time of Ptolemy IV was the cult of the founder of the dynasty attached to that of
Alexander. Ptolemy IV was also responsible for further developments. He
instigated a new centre and priesthood for the ruler cult at Ptolemais, in Upper Egypt,
as an addition to that at Alexandria. The ruler also deified his mother, Berenike II,
placing her priestess (athlophoros) before that of Arsinoe II in the dating formula.
The Theoi Euergetai had, of course, joined themselves to the cult of Alexander, the
Theoi Adelphoi, and Arsinoe II during their reign.

At Philadelphia in the Faiyum and also in Alexandria the shrines of the Theoi
Adelphoi and Arsinoe were quite distinct. As the dating formula shows, each
branch of the dynastic cult had its own priests or priestesses. One might also
assume that distinctive statues were manufactured for each function. However, as

45 Fraser (1998) 218 offers several reasons for this, none of which seem to be particularly convincing. Fraser suggests that Soter himself left instructions that he was not to be associated with Alexander because as his contemporary it was wrong that the hero be obscured by the cults of others. Fraser also comments on the lack of references to Soter and Berenike I as gods during their lifetime.
47 Fraser (1998) 219 footnote 239 also notes that Berenike's position ahead of that of Arsinoe remained constant and that it was not the case that the most recently deified ruler or pair were given priority over earlier members of the cult. Fraser, 220, also claims that Ptolemy IV deliberately elevated the Theoi Soteres and Berenike II rather than the Theoi Adelphoi. However, the changes may simply have been a consequence of the rebuilding of Alexander's tomb and the cult centre in Alexandria.
48 Fraser (1998) 228.
49 On the dating formulae and names of the priests see Clarysse and Van der Veken (1983).
Pliny's description of the representation of Arsinoe II demonstrates, many of the images were made from precious materials which were subsequently re-used and are now lost. In addition to the many independent shrines within cities, festivals were held in honour of specific rulers to commemorate their deification. These celebrations would have generated a considerable amount of temporary art including sculpture or would have created new decorative images for the palaces or city centre.

Under Ptolemy VIII, the ruler and his two queens appear as the Theoi Euergetai. The rulers also take on the role of priests of the dynastic cult, including Cleopatra III after the death of Ptolemy VIII; the presence of Cleopatra III in a male priesthood is testimony to her independent role as ruler of Egypt. The complexities of the dynastic cult by the end of the second century BC are illustrated in a document dating to 105/4 BC, during the reign of Cleopatra III. Here the queen also adopts her own cult titles, but during her reign it is noteworthy that she also takes on the role of priestess. Similar documents demonstrate that, even during periods of political unrest, a degree of continuity existed, since the queen retains the title Thea Euergetis even though Ptolemy VIII was dead by 105/4 BC and Cleopatra ruled alone at first and then with his successors. Whether this development would affect the
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50 On the placement of the shrines see Fraser (1998) 228 and 230. On the floating statue of Arsinoe see Pliny Natural Histories XXXIV 42-43.
51 See descriptions of the Ptolemaia, and the Pompe of Philadelphos (Rice 1983). For assimilation and association to deities, see the Satyrus Decree P.Oxy. 31 (1956) no. 2465, column I and Fraser (1998) 255, n. 294. For the assimilation of royal women to various deities see Tondriau (1948) 14-30.
52 Koenen (1993) 55 claims that this is for economic reasons and, although there is no Greek precedent concludes that this practice is Hellenistic rather than Egyptian.
53 P. Köln 81: 'In the reign of Cleopatra, Thea Euergetis, also called Philometor, Dikaiosyne, Nikephoros and of Ptolemy Alexander, in the 13=10th year, while queen Cleopatra Thea Euergetis, also called Philometor, Dikaiosyne, Nikephoros was serving as priestess of the cult of Alexander, and of the Theoi Soteres, Theoi Adelphi, Theoi Euergetai, Theoi Philopatres and of the Theoi Epiphanes and of the Theoi Eupator and of the Theoi Philometor and of the Theos Neos Philopator and of the Theoi Euergetes, and of the Theoi Philometores; when Theodoros son of Seleukos.....and Exegetes, was priest for life, of queen Cleopatra Thea Euergetis, also called Philometor, Dikaiosyne, Nikephoros; when Mnemosyne, daughter of Nikanor was priestess of queen Cleopatra, Thea Euergetis, also Philometor, Dikaiosyne, Nikophoros; when Demetrios son of Theodoros was Hieros Polos of Isis, great mother of gods; when Olympias, daughter of Seleukos was priestess of Arsinoe Philopator....'
54 Quaegebeur (1988) 42 also notes that Ptolemy IX and X adopted the role of priest, in name at least.
55 On the dynastic rivalry in the second century BC see Holbl (1994) 156-172 and 183-93.
iconography of statuary is an issue that needs to be addressed. It could be argued that a ruler might maintain a static iconography for standardisation and recognition. However, a ruler may also have wished to promote new developments in the royal cult by means of representations that were subsequently commissioned.\textsuperscript{56} In the case of Cleopatra III, the developments are illustrated by the additional cult titles that are adopted by the queen.

The archaeological evidence for the promotion of the dynastic cult is much greater in Egyptian temples than in Greek sanctuaries, largely because of the native tradition of decorating temple walls with representations of rulers and deities. The various royal decrees from priestly synods are also extremely instructive with regard to the acceptance and promotion of the royal cults by the Egyptian priesthood.\textsuperscript{57}

The introduction of Sunnaoi Theoi, or temple-sharing gods, is also associated with the dynastic cult, and occurs in both Greek and Egyptian contexts. The terms εἰκών, ἄγαλμα and ξύλινον are all used in the decrees to refer to the statues which were set up to represent temple-sharing gods.\textsuperscript{58} One distinguishing factor is that all of the temple-sharing gods seem to be deceased members of the royal family. This observation is valid for the Pithom stele, which describes the details of the placing of images of Arsinoe II in all temples.\textsuperscript{59} The honours given to princess Berenike in the Canopus decree are also posthumous.\textsuperscript{60} Therefore, as the decrees demonstrate, to some degree the representations of rulers in a temple-sharing capacity were regulated by the state. However, private initiative seems also to have been a factor in the dedication of an image within a specific temple, as indicated by petitions requesting permission to dedicate statues on behalf of the royal house. The evidence of private

\textsuperscript{56} See Chapter 3, Section 3.6, Chapter 5, Section 5.2 and Chapter 7, Section 7.3.
\textsuperscript{57} Quaegebeur (1988) and (1989) discusses the Pithom stele, Mendes decree, Canopus decree, the Raphia decree and the Rosetta decree, which apply to Ptolemy II, Ptolemy III, Ptolemy IV and Ptolemy V respectively. Quaegebeur also discusses the temple reliefs at Karnak and Philae and the representations of the rulers that decorate them.
\textsuperscript{58} Nock (1931) 3 and 8 where εἰκών and ξύλινον are used with reference to Epiphanes in the Rosetta decree.
\textsuperscript{59} For the Pithom stele see Naville (1885) 16-20, plates 8-9 for text.
\textsuperscript{60} See Budge (1976) for the Canopus decree, Greek lines 12-16 Hieroglyph lines 27-36 and Demotic lines 45-74.
persons dedicating on behalf of the ruler is similar to the use of the word ὑπὲρ on dedicatory inscriptions at sanctuaries. In both cases the individual is honouring the ruler and making the offering to a god, not to the deified ruler.⁶¹

The association of the Ptolemaic royal house with individual deities is also expressed more directly by the rulers adopting the name of a deity, which occurs in three different forms.⁶² In the first instance the ruler borrows the name of a deity as a cult title. In the second, a ruler adds his or her own name to that of a god or goddess. The final form occurs when a ruler refers to himself as the deity, for example Dionysos, Neos Dionysos or, in the case of the queens, Isis or Nea Isis.⁶³ There is both visual and textual evidence for assimilation to or association with a specific deity in cult titles, inscriptions and representations. From the time of Ptolemy III, the rulers appear with the regalia of specific deities on coin images and on statuary.⁶⁴ The royal images are therefore an important source for the understanding of this association between deified ruler and the Greek and Egyptian pantheons.

In many instances the evidence for royal representations echoes the developments in the dynastic cult. The statues of rulers also shed light on the intended nuances of these complicated associations between the various rulers and established deities. Because of the dual importance of Isis and Sarapis Chapters 5 and 6 respectively concentrate on these two deities and their relationship with the royal house and the promotion of the two gods within the Greek and Egyptian religion traditions.

The religious policies of the Ptolemaic royal house are important in the understanding of the images of rulers which were produced and promoted by the

---

⁶¹ Nock (1931) 8-9.
⁶³ Fraser (1998) 221. Cleopatra III calls herself Isis and Plutarch states that Cleopatra VII also declared herself to be the New Isis. Fraser (1998) 244 questions whether this was actually the case; however, given that Ptolemy XII declared himself to be the new Dionysos, Fraser’s objections would seem to be unfounded.
⁶⁴ For further discussion see Chapter 2, Sections 2.2 and 2.9 on Ptolemy III and Berenike II. There appears to be a discrepancy in representations. The ruler associates himself with Dionysos on portraits in the round and with Zeus, Helios and Poseidon on the coins. This variation may, however, suggest that a ruler simply borrowed the attributes of a specific deity to promote associated qualities rather than to assimilate himself with the god.
court. At the same time, the statues offer further evidence for the understanding of the various royal cults and religious patronage. The question of religious meaning of statues will be addressed throughout this thesis, both in the charting of the development of the royal image and in the consideration of the interaction of the two cultures and the resulting representations.

1.5 Priests and Nationalism

Another important element in the study of the Egyptian-style Ptolemaic royal image is the involvement of the native priesthood. Our understanding of the attitude to the various Greek royal cults of the native priesthood has developed considerably over the last decade. Winter concluded that the Egyptian priests accepted the cults of the Ptolemaic rulers in Egyptian temples only under duress. Quaegebeur, however, has demonstrated that this does not seem to have been the case. The sculptural evidence also supports the idea that in addition to maintaining the traditional role of pharaoh and the associated representations, the Egyptians were keen to develop and adopt images that were more closely associated with the Greek royal cults. There is no doubt that during the second and first centuries BC there are certain manifestations of anti-Greek, Egyptian 'nationalism' probably emanating from some priestly circles. Such behaviour was not necessarily on account of the foreign ancestry of the Ptolemaic royal house; there are earlier instances of a general revolt by the Egyptian clergy against a native Egyptian pharaoh. The key factor was ma'at and it was the pharaoh's responsibility to see that this prevailed over confusion.

Eddy paints a rather bleak picture of cross-culturalism in Ptolemaic Egypt and also of the Egyptian priesthood's acceptance of the foreign rulers. Still, his references to the upsurge of nationalism and in particular the references in texts to the rebirth of

---

67 See Chapters 4 and 5 (below).
68 See Koenen (1993) 36-38 on ethnic tension and Eddy (1961) 257-294. McGing (1997) 281 suggests that social problems were also the cause of discontent.
69 On ma'at see Teeter (1997).
Sesostris III or Ramesses II may help to explain two separate phenomena. The first is the re-use of statues representing Ramesses II. If Eddy is correct in his belief that the support for earlier Egyptian pharaohs was popular in the Ptolemaic period, the evidence of earlier imports to Ptolemaic sites may in fact date to the second century BC. The reappearance of portraits of Sesostris III may also explain the resurgence of the so-called realistic portrait type in the fourth and second centuries BC. If this development were the case, it would suggest that the priests had a certain degree of influence over the royal image and it might also explain the reasons for the appearance of Egyptian-style statues with Greek portrait features from the time of Ptolemy V. The use of the Greek-style portrait would convey the idea that Pharaoh was a foreigner and would in no way compromise the royal eagerness to be seen as ruler of Egypt. The role of the Egyptian sculptors should also be taken into account. Unlike their Greek counterparts, who are celebrated as artists in the ancient literature, the Egyptian craftsmen seem to have fulfilled an almost priestly role.

The issues of royal control, nationalism and the acceptance of centrally controlled cults in the Egyptian temples are all important for the understanding of the development of the Ptolemaic royal image over three centuries of rule. Each issue will be discussed fully with respect to the types of sculpture that are included in this study.

---

70 Ashton (forthcoming) discusses the possibilities for the finds from Heliopolis in Alexandria.
71 This would support Bianchi (1988) and the idea that these heads owed nothing to Hellenistic influence. Eddy (1961) 284-5 mentions a reference in the Alexander Romance, to the rebirth of Nectanebo in the form of Alexander, this concept was echoed by the similarity of the Egyptian portrait types of the Thirtieth and Ptolemaic dynasties. See also Huss (1994) on the relationship between the titulary of the Ptolemaic royal house and the Thirtieth dynasty. It is possible that there was a degree of discontentment in Egypt under the Thirtieth Dynasty, since Nectanebo II’s rule was not always peaceful, ending in defeat by the Persians. See Chapter 3 for a discussion of the portraits of Sesostris III.
72 Ptolemy V was the first known ruler to have been crowned according to the Egyptian tradition at Memphis. The royal court was also moved there during his reign. See Thompson (1988) 118-21.
73 The distinction between sculptors and other craftsmen is illustrated by the fact that only the sculptors are named on the tomb reliefs: see Baines (1994) 73, and Krauss (1984) cat. 43-4. Quaegebeur (1989) 105-6 discusses the meaning of the word mnḥ as found in cult epithet mnḥ nṯr.t mnḥ.w (carrier of the Theoi Euergetai) and suggests that rather than referring to the person who administered the cult, it may refer to the person who sculpted the royal images.
Chapter 2: Representations and Functions of Greek-style Royal Portraiture

2.1 Introduction

The Greek-style portraits are in many respects the most frustrating group of royal representations from Ptolemaic Egypt. This is because of the fragmentary nature of the evidence: with few exceptions, only the portrait head is preserved, often without the attributes that were once attached to it in a different medium, and sometimes without the stucco details that finished the piece. Consequently the modern scholar has very little to help with the identification of individual pieces, particularly those without a context. The poor survival of the Greek-style sculptures is also due to the nature of their design. Sculptors often produced only the head of an image in marble; the body of the statue and indeed any attributes would have been manufactured in a different material, such as wood, precious metals, ivory or bronze. This practice may have evolved because of a lack of good quality marble from Egypt, on the other hand it would seem that there would have been little difference in the cost of importing larger pieces of marble from Ptolemaic possessions or via trade rather than producing a statue in gold or ivory.

The practice may also be linked to the deification of rulers and the dynastic cult, that it was seen to be more appropriate to portray the ruler in a combination of a recognisable marble portrait with the body in precious metals. The fashion may also have been influenced by the temporary art from the many festivals and processions that were held in Alexandria. Presumably the art that was manufactured for the processions, as described by Kallixeinos of Rhodes in Athenaeus' Deipnosophistai, would have been placed in public areas following the celebrations. This action
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2 On stones native to Egypt see Lucas (1962) 414-5. The only white marble is found in Gebel Rokham (east of Esna and two thirds of the way between the Nile and the Red Sea), although it is not known if the quarries were exploited in the Ptolemaic times. Pliny NH xxxvi. 67 mentions a marble called Memphites, after Memphis, although as Lucas points out this may not have been a true marble, but hard limestone.
3 Rice (1983).
would serve as a lasting reminder of the lavish festivals that were held in the capital, and also perhaps as a display for those who had missed the event by way of offering an impression of the original festival. It is also possible that sculptures were dedicated at temples around the city following the festival.

The Hellenistic portraits raise two main questions: firstly, whether the lost bodies of statues contained any Egyptian or egyptianising elements and secondly whether individual pieces were intended for sanctuaries or public places. In other words, whether they served a political, decorative or religious purpose. It is in this respect that the images on coinage and sealings are particularly useful, because although only the bust is shown, the rulers are often adorned with various attributes, often of a divine nature. The portraits in this medium, although stylised, offer an impression of a ruler’s portrait type, although the coins need to be used with a degree of caution since many images are posthumous.

Similarly on the Edfu sealings rulers are shown with very specific headdresses, which as mentioned do not survive on the stone portraits because they were attached separately. However, attributes of the sculpture and coin portraits do not always correspond. On the coin images of Ptolemy III the ruler is seen to associate himself with Helios, Poseidon and Zeus, and yet on the portraits in the round there is an overwhelming preference to associate the ruler with Dionysos.

Such discrepancies lead to the question of how much control the royal house exercised over their image and the role of models in the reproduction of a standard image. If, as Lawrence and Noshy presumed, the workshops in Alexandria were similar to the establishment at the Mouseion one would expect a range of artists in the capital would be commissioned on a temporary basis. Even if the Mouseion and workshops shared little in common, sculptors by the nature of their trade travelled to

---

5 Modern scholars have used coins as a reference with differing degrees of success. Kyrieleis (1975) relies heavily on coin images to identify portraits in the round, but seems to ignore the fact that many of the posthumous coin portraits would have been closer to the current ruler’s image than of the subject’s original portrait type.
6 For the coin portraits see Davis and Kraay (1980) figures 23-4 and 27. R. Smith (1998) pl. 75.
commissions and so might spend a brief period at the royal court and then move on to new work.\footnote{R. Smith (1998) 26 stresses the high status of Greek sculptors, which is paralleled by the native Egyptian sculptors over other craftsmen (see Chapter 3).}

Whilst no Greek equivalent to the Egyptian sculptors' models survive, the coinage was used as a means of promoting the current royal image. The obvious advantage of coin portraits is that they are often inscribed with the name of the ruler whose portrait they carry and so it is possible to establish portrait types for each king to compare with the sculpture in the round. Coins functioned not only as money in circulation, but also as Smith suggests, to remind the armies that the king paid their wages; this accounts for one particular function of the royal image.\footnote{R. Smith (1998) 14 and Koenen (1993) 29-30.} Coins also provide a convenient way of familiarising the wealthy members of communities with the image adopted by a particular ruler, so that at least some of the population would recognise a ruler's portrait in religious or political contexts. Royal seals also served an official purpose, representing the king's authority; thus the rulers needed an image that was easily recognisable and not of a general nature.\footnote{D.B. Thompson (1973) 80.}

There are also a surprising number of small heads, of both Ptolemaic rulers and queens of an idealised and general nature. These heads are often without attributes and easily confused with representations of Greek deities. Whilst this in itself is instructive because it demonstrates a further link between the royal house and the gods, the heads are of such a general nature that it is impossible to distinguish between rulers and often necessary to simply label pieces either third or second century BC.\footnote{R. Smith (1998) 88-9, believes that they were votives. Kyrieleis pays more attention to this group and some will be listed in the catalogue of this thesis Cat. Nos. 16, 30 and 51. The majority are, however, impossible to distinguish.} This type of dedication was probably made on behalf of the royal house and is no doubt associated with the faience cult vases, showing portraits of queens. The most comprehensive survey and the function of these vases was published in 1973 by D.B. Thompson. She attempted to build a chronological framework for the surviving pieces, using stylistic analysis and comparison of
portrait types with the coin sequence. The work is extremely useful in terms of understanding the function of a very specific type of royal image, but the portrait features are not of a sufficient quality to be of any real assistance with the sculpture.

The vases do, however, offer an interesting insight into the role of Ptolemaic queens in the presentation of the dynasty, from the third to the second centuries BC. They also give an impression of how some of the complete statues would have appeared. The images show the queen in Hellenistic costume with Greek attributes such as a diadem or stephane; in one hand they hold a cornucopia symbolising the fruits of Egypt and their role as provider, in the other they pour a libation from a bowl. Smith suggests that the small heads of queens were used in a similar way, in sanctuaries which were connected with the royal cult, possibly even by the second century BC representing the individual queen’s own cult or that which was connected with the ruler. There are other types of vessels, mostly made of metal, which are decorated with images of rulers, such as the Hildesheim portraits of Ptolemy I.

There are other complete representations of Ptolemaic rulers in the Hellenistic style, most commonly in the form of bronze statuettes. Three examples, now in the British Museum, offer an idea of how the larger statues once looked. The first two are a pair, representing Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, as illustrated by the double cornucopia that the female holds (an attribute associated with the Theoi Adelphoi). The queen’s image is very similar to that on the faience cult vases; the male stands naked, with a club in his left hand associating him with Herakles and an elephant cap on his head, associating him with Alexander the Great. The third is a bronze statuette of a ruler, probably Ptolemy III or IV. The ruler stands naked apart from a lion skin, which is flung over his left shoulder and a holds a small cornucopia in his right hand.

---

12 On attributes see Thompson (1973) 23-32.
14 Svenson (1995) 277, nos. 262-264, pl. 16, Rausch ed. (1998) 76, no. 31 and Bianchi ed. (1988) 146, no. 51 for the medallion, which is also discussed in Chapter 5, Section 5.5.
Scholars’ opinions on the development of Greek-style Ptolemaic portraiture have changed considerably over the years. Noshy and Lawrence, two of the earliest scholars to collect the Hellenistic representations, divided the evidence into four periods. Lawrence defines the first as a period of eclecticism, when the Alexandrian style evolved, followed by an intensity of expression, then naturalism and finally decline. The concept of a style declining is problematic, and subject to personal judgement. Ironically, the very decline to which both Lawrence and Noshy refer constitutes the emergence of a style of portrait which is, in its essence, exclusively Ptolemaic and not a product of the more general Hellenistic trends. The remainder of this chapter will consider the evidence for the Greek-style portraits of the Ptolemies chronologically, with the development of the male and female images treated separately. The question of the influence of the Egyptian tradition on the Hellenistic royal statuary will then be addressed.

2.2 Male Rulers in the third century BC

The portrait type of Soter during his life offers a marked contrast to that of Alexander the Great. Alexander’s Egyptian portrait shares much in common with those issued by the other Hellenistic monarchs, representing Alexander as hero and god. The familiar shoulder length hair, slightly upturned head and strong but fine facial features were something of a contrast to the image adopted by his successor in Egypt.

The most commonly found portrait of Ptolemy I is that which appears on coinage throughout the dynasty and on a marble statue, now in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek Museum, Copenhagen (Cat. 1). The portrait type is mature and strong rather than heroic, showing the characteristics of a leader rather than hero or god. That is not to say that it was a realistic image, on the contrary Soter would have been in his sixties when some of these portraits were issued and yet there is no indication of age. A

---

17 Lawrence (1925) 179 and Noshy (1937) 83.
18 Noshy (1937) 95 The fourth period: “Under Ptolemy V one observes features of degeneration which develop to such an extent that after the days of Ptolemy VIII one hardly finds any sculpture worthy of the name.”
second, more fragmentary and heavily restored marble head, now in the Louvre, Paris probably also dates to the third century BC, although the wide diadem suggests that it was restored in the late second or first century BC (Cat. 2). Both the Copenhagen and Paris portraits were possibly issued posthumously during the reign of Ptolemy II, and they are the only portraits in the round of the dynasty’s founder. Whilst the lack of sculptural representations of Ptolemy I could be the result of chance, the numbers commissioned may have been influenced by the development of the ruler cult during the third century BC. Although the cult of the Theoi Adelphoi was attached to the existing cult of Alexander the Great, the cult of the Theoi Soteres remained separate until the reign of Ptolemy IV, when it was joined to the main dynastic cult. Perhaps for this reason there are a greater number of portraits of Ptolemy II, because one would expect that the cult of Alexander, the Theoi Adelphoi and later Theoi Euergetai would receive more attention than a single cult of the Theoi Soteres.20

There are also relief portraits of Ptolemy I, also manufactured posthumously. One, in Hildesheim, bears a remarkable similarity in the position of the head and neck to portraits of Alexander; Soter wears a mitra, associating him with the god Dionysos and thus alluding to Alexander’s Indian campaigns.21 Another, in the form of a gold medallion shows the ruler in three-quarter view with the head slightly upturned.22 The strong chin and brow, which are illustrated on the Copenhagen head, are evident here in relief; his hair is shorter than that of Alexander, but it is wavy and styled in a manner similar to that of the hero. These features are typical of Soter’s coin portraits and a similar image is found on the Edfu sealings, probably manufactured during the late second century BC.23

Evidence for the use of sculpture by the Ptolemaic royal house is much greater under Ptolemy II. There are notable differences between the portraits that were

20 See Chapter 1 section 1:4 for further details of the development of the ruler cult.
manufactured during his lifetime and those which were issued posthumously. A marble portrait of Ptolemy II, now in the Louvre (Cat. 3), shows a less mature image than that of Ptolemy I, and may have been used by Philadelphos during his lifetime. The profile is remarkably similar to that on his coin portraits and clearly influenced by the representations of his father. Another diademed ruler, now in the Egyptian Museum Cairo, is of the same type (Cat. 5). The hair is similar and both portraits have a rounded face and a distinctive nose, which is smaller than that on Soter's images. A head now in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria (Cat. 6) offers a slightly more idealised, less extreme version of this type of portrait. The heavy treatment of the eyes, in particular the lids, may be attributed to a specific sculptor, on the other hand the head may date to the later part of Philadelphos' reign when the ruler used a more idealised portrait type, whilst maintaining the features of his earlier images. The same is true of a second Alexandrian statue, found in 1993 during the excavations of the site for the new library (Cat. 4). Again the image is youthful and idealised, but this does not necessarily mean that it represented a young ruler. The more idealised portrait type is related to the development and promotion of the ruler cult, and so consequently in the third century BC, rulers appear youthful despite their true age. The Roman copy of a bronze which was found in the Villa dei Papiri, offers a more refined version of this portrait type, showing Philadelphos as a more heroic or divine image than the Alexandria portraits.

Kyrieleis preferred to date the Alexandrian Philadelphos (Cat. 6) to the early part of the reign of Ptolemy III, comparing it to a bronze group in Istanbul. Such differences of opinion highlight the problems that arise when attempting to distinguish the early Ptolemaic portraits. The continuation and development of rulers' images after their death compound the problem and it is, therefore, not always

24 For various coin portraits see Kyrieleis (1975) plate 8 no. 1, where the ruler appears on a gold oktadrachmon, now in Athens.
25 Found with a female portrait, Cat. 28, see Section 2.8 below.
27 Kyrieleis (1975) 39 (C1), includes a head from Cyrene (C2), which he also believes to date to the reign of Ptolemy III. The bronze, as is often the case, is on too small a scale to compare to the marble portraits.
28 R. Smith (1998) 91, discusses the portraits of Ptolemy I and then Ptolemy IV, believing the majority of third century BC portraits to be too general to allow an accurate identification.
possible to discern whether a portrait represents the deceased ruler in the style of a successor.

There are two statues, both in Alexandria Museum, that fall within this category, almost certainly from the reign of Ptolemy III. The first (Cat. 7) has similar characteristics to Cat. 4 and Cat. 6; it is idealised and devoid of any remarkable features. Similarly Cat. 8 has no particular features that would allow certain identification with any of the third century rulers, with the exception of Ptolemy I. Nonetheless, they are important because although they may not be distinguishable today, they illustrate the importance of the attributes that would have once decorated or supported the portrait head. The body of the statue and the associated regalia, which is so apparent on the coinage, would no doubt have enabled identification within the statue’s original context. Most statues would also have stood on inscribed bases, particularly private dedications.

The variety in the coin portraits of Ptolemy III demonstrates the developments and changes of the royal image throughout the reign of a single ruler. The early representations of Ptolemy III are very close to that of Philadelphos as a Theos Adelphos, commissioned during his reign. This policy was no doubt a deliberate policy to associate Euergetes with his father and adoptive mother. His own image then becomes more corpulent than that of Philadelphos, and he adopts a series of divine attributes, including a diadem with rays, an aegis and trident; thus associating himself with the gods Helios, Zeus and Poseidon. On the portraits in the round, there is a more fleshy appearance particularly in the treatment of the lips, which are full, and the lower jaw. Three examples (Cat. 10-12) show the ruler with all of these features and the additional attribute of the mitra of the god Dionysos, who was associated with the royal family (possibly from the time of Ptolemy I). Whilst the use of the mitra may have served as a reminder of Alexander the Great’s own connections with the god, and so by association that of the Ptolemaic royal house, the

---

29 The head may even represent a royal prince, and is similar to the fragment of the so-called prince from the Memphis Sarapiæon, see Cat. 159 and 160.
30 Kyrieleis (1975) pl. 16 and 17. See also Baumer (1990) 5-8.
The reign of Ptolemy IV is in many respects a turning point in the evolution of the Greek-style royal image; his portrait clearly shows a development of the more corpulent image of Ptolemy III and accords with the literary accounts of the ruler's lifestyle and personality. His coin portraits show a rounded face with facial hair
and stylised head hair; Smith describes it as "more restrained in effect" than that of his father.\(^{36}\)

Of portraits in the round, only two can be ascribed with any certainty: the first is a small portrait in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria (Cat. 14). There is no visible facial hair, as on the coin portraits, but the small mouth, strong chin and stylised hair are very similar to those of the Boston Philopator (Cat. 13). The Alexandrian portrait has rings around the neck and these, coupled with the subject's fine features, give an almost feminine appearance to the representation. The Boston portrait (Cat. 13) is also effeminate in appearance, and this is accentuated by the much harder image of Arsinoe III (Cat. 49). Philopator has a weak chin, small pointed nose and small mouth, in contrast with the strong profile of the queen, and a more mature appearance, which again possibly reflected her stern reputation, as described by Eratosthenes and recorded in Athenaeus.\(^{37}\)

There are two further portraits in the Alexandria Museum that almost certainly represent Ptolemy IV (Cat. 15 and 16). Although they lack the quality of the Boston piece, the wide eyes, short nose and very full face are reminiscent of the images of Philopator. The first (Cat. 15) is a poor example of the portrait type; the proportions of the features do not seem to integrate successfully, resulting in an image which shows a shallow forehead, bulbous eyes and a rather small mouth. This piece is undoubtedly the result of poor sculpting. The second head (Cat. 16) is more successfully executed. The artist has attempted to show the ruler with his head turned to the right and gaze cast upwards in an heroic pose, reflecting the posthumous image of Alexander. The piece is still provincial in appearance, but the hair, heavy eyes and slightly fleshier mouth show that the artist was familiar with the developments in the royal portrait at this time.\(^{38}\)

---


\(^{37}\) Athenaeus *Deipnosophistae* 276 A-C. Also mentioned in Fraser (1998) 203; see footnote 112, Chapter 5 for text.

\(^{38}\) Kyrieleis (1975) 20 (B6) dates the statue to the reign of Ptolemy II, claiming that the features are typical of those on the portraits of this ruler. The position of the head and in particular the shape of the face does not, however, appear until the reign of Ptolemies III and IV. Whilst it is possible that it is a posthumous representation of Ptolemy II, it is unlikely that the piece dates to his reign.
Another portrait that is generally accepted to represent Ptolemy IV is a small limestone head from Hermopolis, now in the Louvre (Cat. 17). The piece is of interest because of the iconographic attributes that unusually survive intact. In addition to the diadem the ruler wears what appear to be small wings or horns, thus associating him with either Hermes or Dionysos. Given the literary evidence, one would expect the latter to be the most likely association; however, it is possible that the rulers associated themselves with individual deities such as Hermes in connection with the royal cult. It is also possible that there were other statues associating the ruler with Hermes, now either lost or without the original attributes. The portrait type shows a down-turned mouth and the usual heavy eyes, the brow is also very prominent, and although the piece is relatively small, careful attention has been given to detail.

Noshy classifies the portrait types of Ptolemy III and IV as naturalistic. This is because of the heavier image, which develops from the more stylised versions of portraiture used to represent Ptolemy I and II. In actual fact, the changes in the male and, in the case of Arsinoe III, female portrait type are probably no closer to the subject’s physical appearance than those of the earlier rulers. Hellenistic portraiture relies heavily on the use of physiognomy, that is to say it represents the subject’s personality rather than their physical attributes. In some cases, perhaps most obviously with Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II who was also know as Physcon or Fatty, the image may well have offered an accurate physical representation in addition to promoting the royal characteristic of Τρυφή or luxury. In the case of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III, however, there is nothing to support Noshy’s view that the images represent a new-found realism in the Ptolemaic image.

---

39 See Chapter 1, section 1: 4 on the assimilation of rulers to deities throughout temples in Alexandria and elsewhere.
40 Noshy (1937) 94.
42 Smith (1996) 68 and footnote 28 for further reading.
2.3 Ptolemy V

Noshy places the second and first century portraits in his fourth period, which represents a degeneration of features on the royal image. Smith, on the other hand, describes the coin portraits of Ptolemy V as "sharp and refined" but gives no parallel for them in the round. Kyrieleis includes a life-size marble statue, now in the Louvre, in his catalogue of representations of Ptolemy V. The sculpture (Cat. 18) has a very similar profile to the ruler's coin image, and is a longer version of Philopator's portrait, with a weak chin and sharp features.

2.4 Ptolemy VI

The portraits of Ptolemy VI are the first to produce more distinctive features. This development is especially noticeable on some of the ruler's coin portraits, where he is shown with a very prominent chin and hooked nose. This feature becomes prominent in the royal representations and may be a genetic characteristic, introduced to the dynasty by Cleopatra I, the Seleucid princess and wife of Ptolemy V. Although Ptolemy VI may have been as overweight as his brother, there is no indication of his corpulence on his known portrait types.

On the marble portrait in Alexandria the ruler is depicted with a rounded but not fat face, large almond-shaped eyes and a well-proportioned neck with a strong chin; the nose is unfortunately missing (Cat. 19). This image is more heroic than any of the earlier representations, and shows a change in the presentation of the royal portrait type. This is clearly the development of a type of image that began under Ptolemy III and continued under Ptolemy IV. The Sarapieion ruler (Cat. 9) is the best example from the third century BC.

2.5 Ptolemies VIII, IX and X

The second century BC was dominated by dynastic struggles, between Ptolemy VIII and his two wives and then between Ptolemy IX and X. The political climate seems,
however, to have had little effect on the quality of royal images. One seemingly new development is the reworking of earlier statues, which is a sign of the troubled times and possibly evidence of either financial problems or of damnatio memoriae of rival members of the dynasty. The portrait type of Ptolemy VIII, who was called Physcon by the Alexandrians, is known from his coins. The profile image shows the ruler with a hooked nose, flared nostril, a disproportionately large eye and rounded face with a double chin; the mouth is important because it is the only really distinguishing feature of this earlier Physcon portrait type; the lips are fleshy but still proportioned. This feature is best illustrated on an Egyptian-style portrait of the ruler (Cat. 78). Unfortunately there are no stone sculpture equivalents in the Greek-style representing this portrait type. The only Hellenistic representation of Ptolemy VIII is a stucco head, now in Hildesheim.

The study and identification of portrait types from the second half of the second century BC is impeded by the lack of coin portraits for Ptolemies IX and X, which means that it is impossible to know with any certainty which of the surviving portraits represents which ruler. Fortunately, it is possible to distinguish several late Ptolemaic portraits from clay seal impressions, the first group of which is said to be from Edfu and is now divided between the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto and the Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam. The second group was found at Nea

---

44 Maehler (1983a) 5, makes the same observation, in contrast to the view held by Lawrence (1925) 179 and Noshy 95.
45 See Kyrieleis (1975) pl. 52.1 and R. Smith (1998) pl. 75.17 for illustrations of the coin portrait. Plantzos (1998) 45 refers to two small garnet ring-stones with the same image. In the Edfu sealings there is an image showing three jugate rulers; this may represent Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatras II and III (ROM inv. 906.12.206-208).
46 Kyrieleis (1975) 64 and 71 cat. G1, pl. 52.2 for illustration; see also page 174 for earlier bibliography.
47 Kyrieleis (1975) 72, discusses Ptolemy XI. See also Krug (1978) who ascribes several of the sealings and portraits in the round to Ptolemy XI. Maehler (1983a) 9-10; R. Smith (1998) 95, note 60; Plantzos (1998) 45. Kyrieleis and Krug both suggest that some of the late Ptolemaic portraits represent Ptolemy XI, but as Maehler, Smith and Plantzos have pointed out, it is highly unlikely that he was represented in Ptolemaic imagery, because of his short rule.
48 The Amsterdam sealings remain unpublished. I am extremely grateful to Dr. Dimitris Plantzos for allowing me to consult and use his photographs of the collection, also for allowing me to see extracts of his forthcoming book on Ptolemaic cameos and seal impressions. Because I am more familiar with the sealings from the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), Toronto I shall refer mainly to this collection, published by Milne (1916) 87ff. The earliest scholarship is Kyrieleis (1975) 64-75, Krug (1978) 9-24 and Parlasca (1978) 25-30.
Paphos, Cyprus and so is to some extent less relevant to this thesis since it is concerned primarily with the Ptolemaic royal image in Egypt.49

Within the group there are four distinct portrait types. One clearly represents a Physcon, but the nose and chin are more accentuated than on portraits of Ptolemy VIII, and this type appears with some facial hair, but mostly clean-shaven.50 This portrait is generally accepted to represent Ptolemy X Alexander I, since the subject wears a plumed headress, which may be a reference to Alexander the Great and so Ptolemy X's title.51

The second portrait type appears in two slightly different forms: with a beard and clean-shaven.52 The subject has a large, hooked nose and slimmer face than that of Ptolemy VIII or the portrait believed to represent Ptolemy X. The ruler wears an eagle headress on several of the portraits, which is believed to be a reference to Soter I and so, by association, Ptolemy IX Soter.53 The bearded and clean-shaven versions of the same portrait type can be explained by Ptolemy IX's two separate periods of rule, from 116-107 BC and 88-81 BC, with Ptolemy X ruling from 107-88 BC.

Maehler agrees with the identification of the two different portrait types, but both Smith and Plantzos point out that Alexander did not exclusively wear the plumed headdress, thus the attribute cannot be attributed to Ptolemy X Alexander I with any real certainty.54 Even though this may be the case I am still inclined to agree with the original interpretation, on stylistic grounds, firstly because of the similarity between

---

49 The Nea Paphos sealings have not been fully published R. Smith (1998) 95, n. 2; Plantzos (1998) discusses some of the examples.
50 Most clearly illustrated on ROM, inv. 906.12.100, 102, 111 and 112. This is the type to which R. Smith (1998) 95 pl. 75.19.
52 ROM inv. 906.12.132 (beard) and 906.12.133 (clean-shaven); see R. Smith (1998) 95, pl. 75.18.
53 ROM inv. 906.12.125. For illustration see Maehler (1983a) pl. 2.c; Kyrieleis (1975) pl. 55.11 and R. Smith (1998) pl. 75.18. For discussion see Maehler (1983a) 9-10 and R. Smith (1998) 95-96, who also refers to the myth of Ptolemy I being exposed by Lagos and rescued by the eagle of Zeus (Pausanias 1.6.2).
54 See footnote 50 above. Smith and Plantzos note that although likely to refer to Alexander and so Ptolemy X, the helmet with plumes was worn by a variety of rulers.
portrait type of Ptolemy IX and that of his son Ptolemy XII Auletes, and secondly because of the two quite distinct types of portrait, that is to say bearded and clean-shaven.

The sealings are also instructive for the posthumous representation of rulers. The later rulers wear broad diadems whilst the images of earlier rulers from the Edfu hoard have a narrow diadem, suggesting that posthumous portraits remained close to the original representations of those rulers. It is generally accepted that the Edfu hoard dates from the late second to the first centuries BC, which means that the portraits of the earlier rulers were either posthumous images dating to the second or first centuries BC or that the new impressions remained close to the original. One might expect old models to be used instead of new, since contemporaries would instantly recognise the portraits of earlier rulers from existing statues that must have remained on display.

There is also an image amongst the Edfu hoard that is very similar to the profile of the Louvre Soter (Cat. 2), again with a broad diadem. Although the early portrait must have represented Soter, the re-cut version may have been intended to represent the second Soter, Ptolemy IX. Other sculptures from this period compare well with the images on the sealings.

Smith compared one portrait, now in a private collection (Cat. 20), to an Egyptian-style head of Ptolemy VIII (Cat. 78). Although the eyes and rounded face on both pieces are very similar, the prominent lower lip on Cat. 20 has more in common with the portraits of Ptolemy IX and X, and the sculpture is therefore more likely to represent one of the sons of Ptolemy VIII. The lack of beard would suggest that it perhaps represents Ptolemy X. However, the narrow channel that originally represented the diadem might indicate that the original statue was more likely to date

---

55 See Milne (1912) 87-101 for the Greek-style impressions and Plantzos (1998) for a more recent discussion.
56 Smith (1996) 207, fig. 5. In R. Smith (1998) 167, cat. 58 (a reprint of the 1988 edition), Smith suggests that the head represents Ptolemy IX or X.
to the reigns of Ptolemy IX and X. This is supported by the similarity between the
eyes of Cat. 20 and Cat. 78, it is possible that it originally represented Ptolemy VIII
and was re-cut under Ptolemy X. If, however, the piece was re-cut as a result of
damnatio memoriae, the sculpture was probably made to represent Ptolemy X and
then adapted to portray Ptolemy IX, who was also called Physcon.57

Another statue that was clearly re-cut in antiquity is a marble head now in the Boston
Museum of Fine Arts (Cat. 21). Stucco additions form a low beard on the piece,
which would suggest that the statue was originally made to represent Ptolemy X and
then adopted by Ptolemy IX during the second part of his reign. It is, however, also
possible that it survived the reign of Ptolemy X as a representation of his exiled
brother and was then updated with the beard to accord with a new image of Ptolemy
IX, again during the second part of his rule. The mouth is particularly close to that
on Cat. 20, and the nose on the Boston head gives some impression of that now
missing on the former piece. A slightly less well-preserved head, now in Malibu
(Cat. 22), shares very similar features to those previously discussed. The subject has
a low beard and a slimmer face, of the type associated with Ptolemy IX. The lips are
fleshy and the mouth is proportionately rather wide, which is a common feature on
the seal impressions of the portrait type that is associated with Ptolemy X. It may
also be possible that the Malibu head was once intended to represent the younger
brother and then adapted to portray Ptolemy IX during the second part of his reign.

Another head in Malibu (Cat. 23) supports this hypothesis. Although badly
damaged, the head is of Physcon type and appears to have once had a very fleshy
proportionately large mouth; it is without a beard.58 Cat. 24 also suggests that
Ptolemy IX had a more reserved portrait type, at least during the early part of his
rule.59 However, the nose is missing and so it is not possible to know for certain

57 On the titles adopted by the Ptolemaic dynasty see Volkmann (1959) 1722 and 1739.
58 It is true that this portrait type in the Edfu sealings is sometimes shown with a beard, however, the
beards on Cat. Nos. 20-22 are fuller than those on the sealings.
59 This accords with the Egyptian-style sculptures with Greek portrait features, see Cat. Nos. 117, 118
and 120.
whether it was hooked in the usual fashion. The mouth, however, is less full and generally of better proportions, but the sculpture still has the characteristic beard and eyes, which are very similar to those on the portraits of Ptolemy VIII. The traces of the wide diadem support the identification of this portrait as a late Ptolemy and the less extreme features would suggest that it is Ptolemy IX; the beard eliminates a later ruler.

2.6 Ptolemy XII

Although the Ptolemaic royal image re-appears on the coin sequence again under Auletes, the identification of sculptures is still problematic. The nose and chin become more prominent, and it is clear from the images on the Edfu sealings that this is a separate portrait type. It appears on two portraits in the round; the first, a small bronze head in a private collection, copies the portrait that appears on the sealings accurately. The second, a marble head in the Louvre, Paris (Cat. 26), seems to have been re-worked from an earlier portrait. In addition to a diadem, the ruler may have worn a mitra across the forehead, again a reference to his association with Dionysos. The forehead is damaged, but there is clearly a band across the top that must have been part of an attribute. The lips are fleshy, but not quite as full as those on the portraits of Ptolemy X. The nose is also very similar to, although slightly less hooked than that on the portrait that has been identified as Ptolemy X. The chin differs slightly, in that it is more square in appearance, and does not rise upwards towards the bottom lip. It seems that there was clearly an attempt to link Auletes' portrait type with those of his father, reflecting one of his cult titles, Philopator.

The final representation from this group of late Ptolemies is the most problematic (Cat. 25). The piece, from Aphroditopolis and now in Cairo Museum, is unique in that the entire statue survives. Until recently it was identified as Mark Antony, because of a similarity to the coin portraits of the Roman. However, Maehler

---

60 ROM 906.12.122 and 906.12.140 for probable representations of Ptolemy XII. On the latter the ruler wears a Greek-style headdress, on the former he wears the Egyptian double crown.
dismissed this identification on the grounds that whilst Mark Antony was called θεός he did not take the title of βασιλεύς; he suggests Ptolemy IX as an alternative identification.\textsuperscript{63} However, the shape of the mouth and jaw are very close to the Louvre Auletes (Cat. 26). It is possible that the similarity can be explained by the re-use of the Paris statue; but it is also possible that the Cairo ruler represents Ptolemy XII, this would also account for the confusion with the portraits of Mark Antony since the two have similar portrait features.

2.7 Ptolemies XIII, XIV and XV

There are no Hellenistic portraits of Ptolemies XIII to XV. Whilst it is unlikely that images of the brothers of Cleopatra VII would survive the queen’s rule, the lack of representations for Caesarion needs more carefully explaining. It could be that the boy’s images were destroyed by or on behalf of Augustus following Caesarion’s death. There are Egyptian-style statues of Caesarion that have survived, as there are Egyptian images of Cleopatra VII.\textsuperscript{64} This discrepancy may indicate a difference in the treatment of the statues from the two traditions, that the Egyptian-style representations were either ignored or spared by Augustus.

2.8 Berenike I and Arsinoe II

There are no portraits of Berenike I in the round. In fact the queen does not appear on her own, but is typically shown behind the image of Soter in a jugate position. Such images can be found on posthumous coins of the Theoi Soteres and on a relief in Alexandria depicting the royal pair.\textsuperscript{65} On the relief the queen has a rounded face, very similar to that of Soter just as her features also mimic those of her consort when they appear together on coinage. The lack of representations of Berenike I is a parallel to the scarcity of those of Ptolemy I and is perhaps to be expected, given the

\textsuperscript{63} Maehler (1983a) 9-10 and R. Smith (1998) 97 and 168, who dates the statue to the late second to early first century BC.

\textsuperscript{64} For representations of Caesarion see Cat. Nos. 125, 126 and 127.

\textsuperscript{65} Alexandria Greco-Roman Museum inv. 24345. For illustration see Rausch ed. (1998) 79, no. 37; and 78, no. 34 for the coin portrait of the Theoi Soteres.
popularity of the cult of Arsinoe II. Berenike I was not deified in her own right, as later queens were, and certainly under Ptolemy II and III the rulers promoted the cult of Arsinoe II. In many ways Arsinoe II seems to have been the dynasty’s most prominent female; this is illustrated by the number of posthumous representations throughout the period and also by Ptolemy III’s adoption of Arsinoe as his mother.66

On the coin images of the Theoi Adelphoi, Arsinoe’s portrait type is clearly based on that of her brother and it is the posthumous portraits of the deified queen that best illustrate the independence of the development of the female royal image. It is also possible that some of the portraits represent the sister of the rulers, Philoteira, whose cult was celebrated as a separate entity, and who must have been represented or even associated with the royal couple.67 The portraits of Arsinoe II potentially span a much greater period than those of her brother, and it is her posthumous image for which there is the most evidence, reflecting the interest and popularity of her cult.68

The Bonn Arsinoe (Cat. 27) is the closest portrait in stone to the posthumous representations of the queen on coins. It is unusual because of the emphasis given to the frontal position of the head, which may indicate an early date for the portrait. The features are very angular; particularly the sharp lines of the nose and deliberate curves of the mouth. Such characteristics, along with the high polish, which had been applied in antiquity, led Kyrieleis and later Bianchi to conclude that the piece was influenced by the Egyptian tradition.69 Whilst it is tempting to suggest that the piece is a parallel for the Hellenistic features on Egyptian-style statuary, this example is an isolated case. Furthermore, the angular appearance may simply indicate an early date for the piece, perhaps even during Arsinoe’s lifetime, before she was deified in her own right. The other portraits of the queen are quite different in appearance, and one would expect that there would be a greater number of

---

66 This can be seen clearly on the gateway of Euergetes at Karnak, where the ruler makes offerings to the Theoi Adelphoi. The titular on stelae and papyri also names the Theoi Adelphoi as his parents. The ruler’s real mother was Arsinoe I, Philadelphos’ first wife.
67 See Chapter 1, Section 1.4 for details of the royal cult. On the cult of Philoteira see DJ Thompson (1988) 127 and 131, also Fraser (1998) 229.
68 For a general account of Arsinoe II see Longega (1968).
69 Kyrieleis (1975) 40-1 and 92, also Bianchi ed. (1988) 168, no. 64.
posthumous portraits of the queen, simply because of the greater time span and the more ardent promotion of her cult by the royal house.

A small head in Alexandria Museum (Cat. 29) illustrates the more usual type of portrait associated with the queen. The head has similar features to the Bonn Arsinoe: large eyes, thin eyebrows, a straight nose and a clearly defined mouth. The only difference is that the modelling on the Alexandrian head is much softer than the angular lines of the Bonn portrait. The head of Cat. 29 is also slightly raised, with the chin tilted upwards, giving the impression that the queen is gazing past the viewer into the air. Such a position is typically reserved for heroic figures or gods, and for this reason the portrait must represent Arsinoe as a goddess.

Two further examples of this type can also be found in the Alexandrian museum. The first (Cat. 28) was found recently at the site of the new Alexandrian library and is part of a pair.70 The portraits of Arsinoe II parallel the distinction between Philadephos’ representations in that her living image was much closer to her brother’s portrait type than those manufactured after her death. On Cat. 28 the queen’s image reflects the male ruler’s broad, rounded face. Her lips are fuller and her eyes more oval and executed more softly towards the brow, and yet there is a striking similarity between the pair. This similarity is more than simply the result of an individual sculptor’s style; there are subtle differences in the details such as the eyes and lips, which are rendered in a more feminine manner than those of the ruler. Because the heads are executed in limestone, it is possible that they formed part of an entire stone statue rather than being separate portraits that were inserted into a body of a different material, as is often the case with marble representations. The second portrait (Cat. 30) is largely distinguishable because of the mouth, which has the characteristic upturned corners that appear on the images of Arsinoe II. Both sculptures probably date to the reign of Euergetes, since they are more idealised in appearance and have much in common with the male portraits from this period. The fragment of a very similar statue is now held in the Brooklyn Museum of Art (Cat. 31). No attributes remain and so it is impossible to know for certain whether

70 See also Cat. 4, Section 2.2 for the male portrait.
the piece represents Arsinoe II or a goddess in the portrait style of the queen. It is included in this catalogue because it is said to be from Alexandria and because even without attributes the portrait features are typical of the posthumous representations of Arsinoe II. Stylistically the Brooklyn fragment has much in common with a colossal head, now in Cairo Museum (Cat. 32). The classification of the piece is difficult, not least of all because it is on a much larger scale than the other representations. However, the straight nose and the very distinctive mouth would suggest that the piece represents Arsinoe II. The piece was almost certainly a cult statue of the queen, perhaps in one of her temples; the details may well have been finished in stucco in the usual Alexandrian fashion. It is remarkably similar to a portrait on a smaller scale, now in a private collection (Cat. 35). Again this particular portrait has much in common, stylistically, with the images of Berenike II and was probably executed during the reign of Ptolemy III or possibly Ptolemy IV. The image is a refined version of Arsinoe II’s portrait type; on this example the sculptor has shown Venus rings around the neck and the piece is softly modelled.

The Venus rings are also found on a head of Arsinoe II, now in Mariemont Museum (Cat. 33). The piece was highly polished in antiquity and was carefully executed with a very natural turn in the head. Like many of these portraits the queen would have originally worn a veil, and the traces are visible at the back of the neck. A less successful version of the same portrait type from Tell Timai also probably represents Arsinoe II (Cat. 34). On this statue the queen looks straight upwards; the features are less distinctive than on many of the other portraits and yet the remnants of a veil indicate that the subject was more likely to be royal rather than a goddess. Such statues probably functioned as cult statues in smaller sanctuaries within Alexandria. Certainly the description of a temple built by Philadelphos in honour of his sister (with the magnetically supported image of the queen floating around the inner sanctuary) demonstrates, if nothing else, a vivid imagination on the author’s behalf.72

---

71 The polish on this particular example is similar to that on the Bonn Arsinoe (Cat. 27). Kyrieleis and Bianchi argued that such a finish was further proof of an Egyptian influence on a Hellenistic representation. That the Mariemont queen also has this finish would suggest that the effect was not necessarily Egyptian, since this piece owes nothing to the native artistic tradition.
72 Pliny Natural Histories XXXIV.42-43 and Blomfield (1905) 31-32 for discussion on the statue of Arsinoe II at the Arsinoeum.
The important factor is that nothing seems to have been too elaborate for the Ptolemaic capital, and this is again illustrated by the description of the Pompe of Ptolemy II. The majority of the heads that are discussed in this chapter would have been slotted into ornate statues made of precious metals or decorated with precious and semi-precious stones, unfortunately now lost. Some, however, may well have served a civic function within the royal palaces and public areas of the city as a reminder to the people of their rulers.

2.9 Berenike II

Like Arsinoe II, Berenike II was given her own posthumous cult, in addition to being worshipped along with her husband as the Theoi Euergetai. Smith parallels her portrait type to that of the goddess Aphrodite, as opposed to Arsinoe II, whom he associates with the Artemis type. One representation that almost certainly dates to the queen’s reign is part of a pair of statues representing Berenike and Euergetes (Cat. 36). The queen wears her hair in corkscrew locks rather than the usual melon coiffure, a style that also appears on her earlier portraits from Cyrene. This is the earliest example of a sculpture with the corkscrew hairstyle in Egypt and it is commonly described as a representation of a queen that is associated with the goddess Isis. There is nothing, however, to indicate that this particular coiffure was anything more than a changing fashion at this time, and it is not until the Roman period that there is any evidence to associate it with the goddess Isis. The style is more commonly found in the second century BC, and were it not for the characteristically prominent chin, this sculpture would fit more comfortably in this period.

The same portrait features can be found on another statue from Tell Timai (Cat. 37). The queen wears her hair in a central parting; the unfinished top of the head suggests

---

74 For the male ruler see Cat. 12, Section 2.2.
75 See Robinson (1965) 249 for fourth century BC images of Libya on the coins of Cyrenaica.
77 For further discussion see Section 2.11 below.
that she once wore a veil. The chin is pointed in the same manner as the former statue (Cat. 36) from the site. Also noticeable are the drill holes at the corners of the mouth, a feature that appears on other portraits of Berenike II, including a head now in Alexandria Museum (Cat. 38), which is a more stylised version of this portrait type. On both heads the waves of the hair have an almost crinkled appearance, and this again is a common feature on the queen's portraits, probably dating to her reign.

A third statue from Tell Timai (Cat. 39) is the final image from this group of representations, reflecting the queen's portrait-type during her reign. Although fragmentary, the same prominent chin is apparent and the drill holes at the corners of the mouth are also shown in the usual manner. This group is very close to one of the queen's coin portraits.78

The second group of portraits shows a broader, less angular portrait type, as typified by the Kassel queen (Cat. 40). Although this image has the same frontal pose as the Bonn Arsinoe II (Cat. 27) and is quite rigid in appearance, there is no suggestion of an Egyptian influence on this particular piece.79 This portrait is arguably one of the most splendid from Egypt; the soft modelling of the face and the preservation of colour give an idea of the original appearance. The portrait type is found on five other representations of Berenike II, all probably dating to the later part of her reign or to the reign of her son Philopator. Perhaps the most important is a full-length statue of the queen made from limestone (Cat. 41). The seated figure is generally accepted to represent the queen Berenike with the princess Berenike, whose deification is mentioned in the Canopus decree. The overall impression is idealised, with the child, shown to be disproportionately small, leaning against her mother's knee. The statue is not of the best quality, it was produced from local limestone and the carving is not exceptional but it is nevertheless important because it gives an impression of how the other heads would have looked in their original setting.

78 See Kyrieleis (1975) pl. 82.1 and 2 for this type and compare the second group that is closer to the coins illustrated on pl. 82.3 and 4, with the longer nose and less prominent chin and pp. 94-96 for discussion.

79 Bianchi ed. (1988) 172-3, no. 67. This is because of the softer modelling that Bianchi is equating with the Hellenistic tradition; however, the fact that some Hellenistic statues were shown in a frontal position weakens the argument regarding the Bonn Arsinoe.
Another sculpture (Cat. 42) has very similar features to the portrait on the statue, the head is tilted at the same angle, and the queen appears to be staring into the distance. The portrait also has Venus rings on the neck, a common feature in the portraits of the Ptolemaic women from this period onwards. Like many other representations, the unfinished back of the head suggests that the queen also wore a veil.

Another fine sculpture, unusually with a known provenance, illustrates the importance of paint on the Hellenistic portraits (Cat. 43). The portrait is very close to the Kassel queen (Cat. 40), only there has been more attention to the position of the head, which is inclined slightly to the subject’s left. There are traces of paint on the eyebrows, eyes and hair. In profile the sculpture is very similar to Berenike’s coin portraits. Similarly, the Sarapieion queen (Cat. 44) has colour preserved on the hair and eyes. Because of its scale the statue was probably a cult statue at the sanctuary of Sarapis. It was found with a bust of the god and Kyrieleis associated it with another male portrait, now in Paris, which he believed was part of the group because of shared stylistic features. Although the association seems to be correct, the portrait type is not that of Arsinoe III, and for this reason the group is more likely to represent Berenike II and Ptolemy III. It may be that the group was manufactured during the reign of Ptolemy IV, in which case Kyrieleis’ original date would stand. It is unlikely that it represents Cleopatra I not least because the main period for royal patronage at the Alexandrian Sarapieion is under Ptolemy III and IV. Thus it would make more sense for the piece to date to this period and not to a time when the royal court had been moved to Memphis.

Another well-preserved portrait, also in the Louvre, Paris (Cat. 45), shows a similar type to the Sarapieion queen. Brunelle dismissed the sculpture as a portrait, despite

---

80 For a greater impression of the use of colour see Thompson (1973) 11-12 on the remains of painted decoration of the faience oinochoai, which was probably intended to imitate the sculpture.
81 See Kyrieleis (1975) pl. 82.4 for a gold oktadrachmon in Berlin.
82 See Cat. 9 above Section 2.2. Kyrieleis (1975) 49-51 for discussion and dating of the group.
83 See Chapter 6, Section 6.8.
the diadem and similarity to other representations of Berenike II. The hair in particular is carefully sculpted and has survived intact because it was carved in marble rather than added in the usual stucco. This representation offers a further example of Berenike's portrait type.

The final portrait in this group is also said to be from Alexandria and is now in the Louvre, Paris (Cat. 46). This portrait has also been identified as Arsinoe III, but lacks the very distinctive profile of this queen. It probably dates to the reign of Ptolemy IV and has several features in common with the other portraits in this group. The mouth in particular is very similar to that of the Sarapieion queen, and is much fuller than that of the other queens. The youthful image is also not typical of Arsinoe III. The portrait could be a posthumous representation of Arsinoe II, even though the features are not typical of this queen; equally it may represent Berenike II. The proportionately large number of representations of Berenike reflects the developments in the ruler cult under Ptolemy IV. However, it is possible that some of the images were intended to represent Arsinoe II but were manufactured during the reign of Ptolemy IV and were influenced by later stylistic developments. This posthumous practice potentially causes more confusion with the succession of each new queen.

2.10 Arsinoe III

There are three further portraits that are difficult to identify because they are a hybrid of the portraits of Berenike II and Arsinoe III. Overall the images are closer to the known representations of Arsinoe III, but they do not conform to her standard portrait type. The first (Cat. 47), now in Alexandria Museum, shows a mature woman, with heavy eyelids that are more commonly found on the portraits of earlier queens, the nose is small and the mouth is finely carved with a slightly sullen

86 See Chapter 1 section 1.4.
appearance. Although some of these features, such as the eyes and nose, are similar to those on the first group of Berenike II portraits the overall affect is closer to the images of Arsinoe III.

A second head from Ptolemais Euergetis, and now in the museum at Karanis, displays very similar features to the Alexandrian head only on a larger scale (Cat. 53). The most notable similarity is the very sullen mouth and prominent eyelids. However, the overall shape of the face is a little more rounded than the typical portraits of Arsinoe III and it may therefore represent Arsinoe II, but date to the Philopator’s rule.

Another bust, now in Cairo Museum (Cat. 48) although poorly executed, seems to be an attempt to portray Arsinoe III. The coiffure and diadem are carefully finished and yet the nostrils are carved at a peculiar angle, causing the nose to appear hooked. This may well have been a failed attempt to carve the very distinctive profile of Arsinoe III, found on the coin portraits and several sculptures in the round.

The portrait of the Boston queen (Cat. 49) offers a marked contrast to the youthful appearance of the male head (Cat. 13). The queen has a stern appearance, with a precisely sculpted nose, that is very close to the coin profiles. The portrait type shows a marked contrast to that of earlier queens; although it is idealised, it offers an insight to the queen’s character. A rare bronze (Cat. 50), now in Mantua, portrays the same features as the marble head in Boston. The portrait appears to be softer in the bronze; the features are not as sharp as on the marble head resulting in a more flattering portrait of the queen. The hairstyle is also identical to that on the coins. Both portraits are said to have come from Alexandria and together they allow an accurate impression of the female royal portrait at this time. There is a move away from the idealised, divine images that are seen under Arsinoe II and Berenike II; but this may reflect the fact that Arsinoe III was not deified in her own right but was worshipped only with Ptolemy IV, as the Theoi Philopatores.

---

87 See Athenaeus Deipnosophistae 276 A-C and Fraser (1998) chapter 5 footnote 112 for text.
A small head, now in Alexandria Museum, also probably represents Arsinoe III (Cat. 51). The features are not very clear because of the sculpture's small scale; however, the profile is similar to that of the Arsinoe III. It is an important piece, mainly because the veil and stephane were carved from the marble and so survive intact. The head gives an impression of how the many portraits, now without their headdresses, would have appeared. The large eyes, mouth and chin are very similar to a head, now in Cairo Museum, from Bubastis (Cat. 52). This portrait has more in common with the Mantua bronze and is more softly modelled than the Boston head. The distinctive profile and sullen mouth remain the same, but the slight twist of the head results in a less severe image.

2.11 Second Century Queens

The reign of Cleopatra I sees the adoption of the corkscrew coiffure by the Ptolemaic royal women. This hairstyle is often referred to as the Isis coiffure, because of its later association with the goddess in her Greco-Roman form. It consists of rows of ringlets, either of one length or with a shorter row lying on top of the longer locks. Svenson divides the group into 6 hairstyles, half of which have a bun at the back of the head in addition to the locks. The queens still wear a diadem or stephane, and on Cat. 55 the subject once wore a veil, the remains of which are visible at the back of the head. A head in the Walters Art Gallery (Cat. 54) also represents a second century queen; comparison with the coin portrait would suggest that it represented Cleopatra I and not Arsinoe III as is suggested. One must presume that these relatively small portraits were perhaps associated with citizens who wished to make a dedication on behalf of the royal house, compared to the larger scale portraits that are more likely to have been more closely connected with the rulers. This, in conjunction with the poor coin record for the second century, would explain why the

---

88 The only example of a representation with this particular hairstyle is a small head, said to be from Hermopolis and now in the Louvre, Paris (inv. MA 3081). See Svenson (1995) fig. 6 and Harmiaux (1998) 88-9, no. 90 for illustration. The head does not appear to be a portrait and is possibly Roman in date.

89 Reeder (1988) 105 cat. 28.
portrait features are not instantly recognisable and seem to have been intended as a more general type of image with less attention to detail.

Many scholars assume that these images were specifically made to represent the queens as Isis, both in Greek and Egyptian-style statues.\textsuperscript{90} However, such conclusions are heavily influenced by our knowledge of the iconography of Isis in the Roman period and there is little to suggest that this was the case in the Second century BC. The locks first appear on portraits of Berenike II (Cat. 36) in Egypt and even earlier period when the princess lived in Cyrene. Although it is perhaps less interesting to conclude that the ‘Isis coiffure’ was, at the time of its introduction, simply a reflection of a new fashion that was associated with the Ptolemaic queens and was only subsequently adopted to represent Isis (with whom they assimilated themselves), this is the most plausible explanation. The fact that there are no surviving portraits in the round of Cleopatras I-V with the melon coiffure would support the idea that the hairstyle was indeed a fashion. The lack of evidence for Cleopatra VII, who was closely associated with Isis, being portrayed with this coiffure would support the above explanation.

The most striking of this group is the Louvre Cleopatra (Cat. 56). It is distinct from the smaller marble heads because it is more carefully manufactured and has the ‘hallmarks’ of a major royal workshop. Smith calls it “masculinizing” and compares it stylistically to the Alexandria Philometor (Cat. 19).\textsuperscript{91} In character the two statues offer quite opposite images. The portrait of Philometor is very dreamy in appearance, and according to Smith represents \textit{eunoia}, whereas the queen represents \textit{deinotes}. The portrait possibly represents Cleopatra III, wife of Ptolemy VIII, who later ruled with her two sons Ptolemy IX and X. It clearly shows a mature subject, and the sharp movement of the queen’s head and her stern expression accentuates this. It has been suggested that as a type it echoes the increasing power that was enjoyed by the queens, and their new role of either regent or ruler in their own right.

\textsuperscript{90} R. Smith (1998) 94 and Svenson (1995) 95-97 for discussion. See also \textit{Chapter 5} for fuller discussion.
\textsuperscript{91} R. Smith (1998) 94.
However, there are no such portraits from the time of Cleopatra VII, perhaps the most independent of the Ptolemaic queens. This would suggest that the Louvre Cleopatra is testament to the emergence of a strong Alexandrian portrait type and that it offers further evidence against Lawrence and Noshy’s view that the second century BC was a period of decline in terms of the production of sculpture in Egypt.

A smaller head now in Alexandria Museum (Cat. 57) is sculpted in a similar manner to the Louvre Cleopatra. The artist has attempted to recreate the same sharp, upward movement that is seen on the larger statue. The portrait features on the two statues are not the same, and the fringe of the hair is also styled differently. The most striking resemblance is the dynamic pose adopted by both subjects, which illustrates that this development was perhaps the result of a single artist’s work which was then copied on smaller scale representations.

2.12 Cleopatra VII

No sculptures have been identified as Cleopatra V Tryphaena or Berenike IV. However, Kyrieleis suggested that one of the Edfu sealings showed Auletes with his consort. The lack of portraits for the women of this period may reflect the turbulent political situation in Egypt during the first century BC. Unfortunately the lack of images immediately before Cleopatra VII’s reign impede our understanding of the development of this particular queen’s image.

The portraits of Cleopatra VII offer a contrast to those of the second century queens. Her portrait type looks back to the third century BC in both the Greek and Egyptian styles, which may have been part of a deliberate policy to reaffirm the dynasty’s power. The queen may have specifically intended to associate herself with Arsinoe II, since she adopts the double cornucopia on the reverse of her coins and quite possibly on statues that are now lost. Her portraits also served to link her with her

93 See Poole (1883) 98, pl. 30.6-7.
father in their physical appearance, promoting her as rightful heir and reflecting her cult title of Philopator or father loving. Coin images show that the queen was represented with a melon coiffure rather than with the corkscrew locks.

Of the three identifiable portraits in the round, the Berlin (Cat. 58) and the Vatican (Cat. 59) heads are more Roman than Hellenistic in appearance. The Cherchel (Cat. 60) portrait was found in Mauretania, modern Algeria, but has more in common with the Alexandrian portraits of the second centuries BC and with the portraits of Auletes. All three show a youthful image, with strong nose and a rounded face, very similar to the coin portraits from Egypt and also many of the seal impressions from Edfu.

The finest of the three is the Berlin head; careful attention has been given to the details such as the curls on the forehead. The piece is clearly a copy of the same portrait type that appears on the Alexandrian coins and yet there is a distinctly Roman treatment of the hair, which might suggest that it was manufactured in Italy rather than imported from Egypt. Similarly, the Vatican Cleopatra offers a slightly poorer version of the same portrait type.

If the pair were manufactured in Italy there is the obvious question of their function. It is possible that they were brought over from Egypt for Octavian’s triumphal march or that they were manufactured in Italy as copies of the queen’s image. Their date is surely still BC and whilst Octavian is said to have left the gold statue of Cleopatra in the temple of Venus it is unlikely that he would have promoted her beyond the gesture of saving an image that Caesar erected. For this reason it seems unlikely, but not impossible, that other portraits of Cleopatra were manufactured during her stay in Rome. One further possibility is that the statues represent Cleopatra Selene,
but the close similarity between the sculptures and the coin portraits of Cleopatra VII would imply that the sculptures were intended to represent this queen and not her daughter.

The same argument could well be used for the Cherchel head, which offers a more stylised version of the same portrait. This particular piece seems to have more in common with the Alexandrian portraits of the second century BC; the strong brow and mouth are very similar to some of the smaller marble sculptures from Alexandria. Is it possible that this particular head was manufactured in Egypt? Without consulting the sculpture itself it is not possible to say for certain. It is possible that all three sculptures originated in Egypt and that they simply represent chronological or geographic differences. Certainly, many of the Hellenistic images of Cleopatra VII have been lost in the same way that there are so few representations of other first century BC rulers.

2.13 The Influence of Egyptian Art on the Hellenistic Royal Image

Whilst it has been suggested that the Hellenistic sculptors may have been influenced by the Egyptian artistic tradition, there is little evidence to substantiate the claim.98 The evidence from sealings suggests that any Egyptian influence on the Greek royal portrait manifested itself in the form of attributes that were worn by the rulers rather than a visual influence on the style. Unfortunately there are few complete statues and with few exceptions the portraits have lost their original attributes. Certainly the female royal portraits seem to have worn Hellenistic costume and headdresses; even where the original attributes are missing there are often traces of the veil for example.

It is possible that some of the portraits were inserted in egyptianising statues, but this must remain conjecture. The complete statues do not share any features in common with the Egyptian images of the period. Similarly the images of queens on faience

---

cult vases show Hellenistic matrons rather than Egyptian queens; and the bronze statuette of Arsinoe II, now in the British Museum, is Greek in style. It is therefore unlikely that the missing bodies of statues provide evidence for an Egyptian influence on the Greek representations of rulers.

2.14 Conclusion

The male and female Hellenistic royal portraits follow very similar patterns of development. They begin as stylised images, which are soon idealised and later fulfil a psychological role in that they portray characteristics of the rulers, often in a manner which is considered to be unflattering by the modern viewer. The reversion to the third century ‘classical’ portrait types under Cleopatra VII was surely part of a deliberate policy by this queen to associate herself with the early rulers, in particular with Arsinoe II, whose attributes she adopts. The introduction of the corkscrew coiffure by Berenike II and its later adoption by the early Cleopatras is a reflection of a fashion rather than an affiliation with the goddess Isis; this is confirmed by the lack of this coiffure on the images of Cleopatra VII who was closely associated with the goddess during her lifetime.

---

99 EA 38443. This statuette indicates how the complete bronze statues of third century rulers might have looked.
Chapter 3: Evidence for and Function of Egyptian-Style Royal Representations

3.1 Pre-Ptolemaic Egyptian-style Portraiture

It is important to establish whether the Hellenistic artistic traditions and the promotion of the Greek-style image influenced the production of naturalistic portrait types during the Ptolemaic Period. Greeks had settled in Egypt since the Twenty-sixth Dynasty but the Ptolemies were the first rulers to promote the style actively. Although naturalism in Egyptian portraiture is sometimes said to have been introduced as a direct result of Greek influence, its acceptance was a completely indigenous innovation. References to a few specific periods are sufficient to illustrate that the so-called 'naturalistic' style is well documented in Egypt prior to the arrival of the first Greeks.

A considerable difficulty arises in the definition of various portrait types, in particular with regard to the meaning of 'naturalistic' or 'individualistic'. Are such portraits really any closer to the subject's physical appearance than an idealising image? Although sporadic attempts at naturalism exist earlier, the Fourth Dynasty (2680-2565 BC) saw a regular production of this style. The famous bust of Ankh-haf, now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, shows that the sculptors of the Fourth Dynasty were attempting to produce non-idealised portrait types. The effect, however, is somewhat stylised and it is not possible to know whether the resulting sculptures were intended to be close representations of the subject.

---

1 Bothmer (1960b) xxxviii states that only in the fourth century BC does naturalism occur in Egyptian portraiture.
2 Assmann (1996) 55, avoids the problem of defining the various types of portraiture by differentiating between sculptor and subject, thus concluding that the naturalistic images also represent how the subject wished to be seen rather than how the sculptor saw him. Because of the many social and religious constraints Egyptian sculptors were obliged to follow certain prescribed formulae, including naturalism. The artists' perceptions were consequently of no importance. Spanel (1988) 1-37 discusses this point at length in an exhibition catalogue on ancient Egyptian portraiture. See also Ashton and Spanel (forthcoming), entry on portraiture.
3 W. Smith (1998) 56-61 figs. 103-106 for the so-called Reserve heads. Smith distinguishes two separate schools for this period, both producing naturalistic portrait types. See also Tefnin (1991) 19 and for the most recent article on Ankh-haf see Bolshakov (1991) 5-15.
The portraits of Twelfth Dynasty pharaoh Sesostris III are also considered to be naturalistic. However, the image adopted by Sesostris III and other Egyptian rulers, although naturalistic in appearance, also denoted a suitably contemplative and expressive image for a ruler. It is not, therefore, possible to conclude that the artists were attempting to recreate the physical appearance of their subjects. The Nineteenth Dynasty mummified profile of Ramesses II compares well with the large nose on his portraits in the round and in paintings and relief. However, the representations of Sesostris III may indicate a different kind of naturalistic portrait. ‘Realistic’ portraits first appear under Sesostris II and are copied closely by Sesostris III; their reappearance, over a millennium later on portraits of private individuals in the Thirteenth Dynasty, suggests that ‘realistic’ or ‘naturalistic’ portraiture was a convention and that such images are no guide to the person’s physical appearance. The similarity between the Ramesside portraits and their subject’s actual appearance is perhaps closer to the practice found on Ptolemaic representations, particularly in the second century BC, where a corpulent image is used by Ptolemies VIII-X.

Naturalistic portraiture clearly can be found in Egypt well before the Ptolemaic Period. Whether the style really does offer a realistic physical representation is of little consequence, the fact remains that this type of portraiture was not wholly a result of Hellenistic influence. Although these images were distinctive, the Thirtieth Dynasty and early Ptolemaic representations follow the long established tradition of associating the new ruler with his predecessor for political reasons.

During the Late Period, a renewed interest in the non-idealising portrait type in private representations appears. The re-dating of the so-called Berlin and the Boston Green Heads to the fourth century BC supports the idea that the Ptolemies were not responsible for the introduction of the style. However, the Ptolemies were responsible for new developments such as the naturalistic presentation of royal

---

women. Not until the Ptolemaic Period is there such an interest in the individual portrayal of the female form. This is largely due to the increased importance of the women in the royal cult, particularly in the case of Arsinoe II. Cleopatra I ruled briefly effectively by herself (180-76 BC), Cleopatra II had an independent role in the civil war against Ptolemy VIII, and Cleopatra III also ruled in her own right, as regent to her sons. Interestingly enough Cleopatra III's dominant political position seems to have been reflected in her artistic representations, unlike Cleopatra VII who stands behind her son on the temple reliefs at Denderah. The Egyptian artists seem to cope easily with the wider use of the female royal image, the introduction of which can attributed to the Greek rulers. In the early stages the female royal images remain idealised, with little to distinguish the Ptolemaic women from earlier representations of the female form. However, during the second century BC the Egyptian artists borrow from the iconography of the Hellenistic images for specific forms of statuary.

Royal women in the pharaonic period were most commonly portrayed as regents to their sons, often taking a protective position with their child seated on their knee. The first female to rule Egypt was Nitokris in the Sixth Dynasty, but very little survives from her reign; the first evidence for a female ruler using the full king's titulary dates to the Middle Kingdom and the reign of Sobeknefru. Sobeknefru is the first queen to wear the nemes headdress, and on a statue now in the Louvre, Paris, the queen wears a kilt over the usual dress for females. In addition, Hatshepsut often appears in the guise of a male pharaoh, even wearing a false beard, and is referred to in texts as a man. Perhaps the closest analogies can be drawn with the reigns of Nefertiti and Tauseret, two prominent women from the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. Both queens lived during periods of political instability and like the Ptolemaic queens both always appear in a female form; neither queen took

---

6 Bothmer (1960b) 118.
7 Quaegebeur (1988) 49-51, and on the titles of Cleopatra III, P. Köln II 81 in Chapter 1, Section 1.4, n. 48.
8 For a comprehensive discussion of female rulers see Bryan (1996) 25-36.
9 Bryan (1996) 29 'The Horus, she who is beloved of Ra, she of the two ladies, powerful daughter, mistress of the two lands, the golden falcon, enduring of appearances, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, the daughter of Ra Sobeknefru'.
11 On Hatshepsut see Tefnin (1979) and Ratié (1979). On some of the representations the queen is shown with breasts, whilst on others she has a masculine chest, see Vandier (1958) for discussion.
the royal titulary of pharaoh. Following the Nineteenth Dynasty husband and wife were often found to represent the monarchy. The Ptolemies followed this tradition, with the occasional autonomous rule by a woman.\textsuperscript{12}

3.2 Evidence for Egyptian-style Ptolemaic Royal Representations

I have attempted, where possible, to identify key portrait types of Ptolemaic royal sculpture from previous publications and from museum collections.\textsuperscript{13} The evidence suggests that Egyptian-style royal images were more regulated than those in the Greek-style.\textsuperscript{14} The large number of sculptors' models would support this idea.\textsuperscript{15} Other evidence for the use of statues in the round and representations of rulers are the decrees that were written in honour of the king by the priests who received their benefaction. Evidence from the Rosetta decree would suggest that, like the relief representations, the statues of rulers which were placed there were Egyptian in style. Line 23 of the Demotic inscription reads:

\begin{verbatim}
Mtw\textsuperscript{w} d\textsuperscript{s} n \ f (Ptlwmy\textsuperscript{3}s) n\textsuperscript{3} B\textsuperscript{k}y nty iw p\textsuperscript{3}y\textsuperscript{w} f whm (Ptlwmy\textsuperscript{3}s) i ir n\textsuperscript{3}t Km.t irm w\textsuperscript{3}twtw p\textsuperscript{3} ntr B niw.t iw f dy.t n f h\textsuperscript{3}p\textsuperscript{s} k\textsuperscript{n}y r p\textsuperscript{3} rpy rpy sp-2 p\textsuperscript{3} sp-3 nty wn\textsuperscript{3} n p\textsuperscript{3} rpy iw\textsuperscript{w} ir r h wp\textsuperscript{y} n rmt Km.t mtw n\textsuperscript{3} w\textsuperscript{3}twtw.w n p\textsuperscript{3} rpy rpy sp-2 sp-3 hr hwr.
\end{verbatim}

'Ptolemy the Protector of Egypt, who is to be called Ptolemy who protects Egypt, together with a statue of the god of the city giving him a sword of victory, in the temple and in each and every temple; [these shall be set up] in conspicuous places in

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{12}] Bryan (1996) 36, on the role of the royal women prior to the Ptolemaic period.
  \item[\textsuperscript{13}] Although where possible, I have been allowed access to the reserve collections of various museums, some objects are inaccessible. Such pieces will not appear in the catalogue but are referred to in the text.
  \item[\textsuperscript{14}] Many purely Egyptian-style representations remain unpublished, have been misidentified or misdated in museum registers and my catalogue will omit such objects.
  \item[\textsuperscript{15}] Some scholars interpret these portraits as votives rather than models. Bianchi (1979, 1981) concludes that a group of Twenty-sixth Dynasty plaques were ex-votos rather than models for sculptors. Although work has been done on this material, which ranges from the twenty-sixth dynasty to the Ptolemaic Period, there is no comprehensive publication of the pieces. It is necessary to distinguish between the plaques to which Bianchi refers and the portraits in the round such as catalogue 64 and 78, but at the same time there is a strong case for even the plaques to be interpreted as practice pieces or models. See also Bothmer (1953), Varga (1960), Young (1964) and Mysliwiec (1973).
\end{itemize}
the temples, and they shall be made after the fashion of the workmanship of Egyptian craftsmen’.

The corresponding Greek (in line 39) also implies that the statue will be made according to a specific tradition, but does not specify which tradition:

'Ἡ προσομοσθήσεται πτολεμαλευ τοῦ ἐπαμώναντος τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, ἡ παρεστήσεται ὁ κυριώτατος θεὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, διδοὺς αὐτῷ ὀπλον νικητικόν, ἀ ἐσται κατασκευασμέν[α τὸν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων].'

‘Which shall be inscribed Ptolemy the avenger of Egypt, and close to this image shall stand the [image of] the chief god of the temple presenting him the weapon of victory, which shall be constructed’.

Thus, the Egyptian tradition, in which the statue is to be made, is stressed in the Demotic and implied in the Greek. This instruction suggests that there was a perceived distinction between the two traditions at the time of Ptolemy V. This distinction between the traditions may have considerable bearing upon the understanding of the group of portraits which are discussed in Chapter 4; that is to say, sculptures which are made according to the Egyptian tradition but with Greek portrait features.

In line 14 of the Greek and Demotic texts of the Canopus decree, the statue of the deified princess Berenike and its attributes are explained. We are not told that it is to be made according to the Egyptian tradition, but the attributes and crown demonstrate that this was the case. The gold statue in question is, however, of a different nature from the often colossal representations of rulers which have survived and are discussed in more detail below. The gold statue of the princess Berenike was

---

16 OGIS I. 90, 140-166; 161 for the above lines.

17 OGIS I. 56, 89-110 (lines 61-62): ‘...εἰς τὴν ἑταθεμένην βασιλείαν τῇ ἑικόνι αὐτῆς διαφέρουσαν τὰς ἐπιτυμβεμένας ταῖς εἰκόνας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς βασιλείας Βερείκης ἐκ σταχιῶν διο, ὥς ἄνα μέσον ἐσται ἢ ἀσπιδωείδης βασιλεία, ταύτης δ᾿ ὀπίσω συμμετρον σκήπτων...’. ‘And for a royal crown set upon her image, distinct from the images of her mother, queen Berenike, to consist of two ears of grain in the middle of which shall be the asp-shaped insignia and behind which a commensurate papyrus-shaped scepter...’
to be a cult statue, to be tended by the priests and treated as a living deity. A reference to a sculptor or artist in AD 373 on a graffito at Philae who declares that he 'overlaid the figure of Cleopatra with gold' is further testament to the existence of this type of statue. There must have been many of these statues representing the rulers as temple-sharing gods and goddesses; however, no examples of this type of statue from the Ptolemaic Period remain, since gold would have been melted down. The most common types of surviving Egyptian royal representations are the hard stone or limestone images that were set up in temples and sanctuaries as a reminder of the king's patronage. The two types of statuary served very different functions.

3.3 Third Century BC Male Rulers

Very few Egyptian-style portraits of Ptolemaic rulers have a certain provenance. There is also a problem characteristic of all Ptolemaic portraiture: few statues have inscriptions identifying rulers. Indeed it is often extremely difficult to distinguish between Thirtieth Dynasty and early Ptolemaic sculptures. One portrait that demonstrates this point well, is the schist head of a ruler in Turin (Cat. 65). The head has been dated from the late fourth century BC to mid third century BC. Many of the features, including the drill holes at the corners of the mouth first appear under the Thirtieth Dynasty but continue into the Ptolemaic Period. This continuity may have been a deliberate policy on behalf of the royal house in order to maintain a link between the last Egyptian dynasty and the new royal house. On the other hand it may simply illustrate a continued use of the same royal models by workshops or a continued stylistic tradition for Egyptian-style portrait types. Without further knowledge of the degree of royal control involved in the decision of which images were to be used it is not possible to know whether the continuation of a portrait type was intentional or conventional.

\[\text{Quaegebeur (1988) 41 states that Griffith believed the Cleopatra to represent the last queen and that her cult continued until the time of Justinian. See Inscr. Philae no. 370.}\]
\[\text{Quaegebeur (1988) 41, also mentions a graffito dating to 266/65 BC which reads 'the handworker of the god, Psenamunis...has come to make a statue of the pharaoh and an effigy of Arsinoe'. These effigies would have been temple-sharing deities and again it is unlikely that they would have survived because of the nature of the materials used.}\]
\[\text{Josephson (1997b) 24-5.}\]
\[\text{Josephson (1997b) 19-20 makes the same point.}\]
There are only two inscribed statues dating from the third century BC, both representing Ptolemy II. They are very different in appearance and were it not for the inscriptions they would not obviously represent the same king. The Vatican Philadelphos (Cat. 69) was found in Rome but was originally from the temple complex at Heliopolis; the Strasbourg Philadelphos (Cat. 68) is believed to have originated in Coptos. Either chronological or geographic variation may therefore explain the stylistic differences. The Strasbourg Philadelphos is closer to the portraits of Nectanebo II, particularly with regard to the appearance of the mouth and the raised line of the eyebrows. If the other possible representations of Philadelphos are considered, the Strasbourg bust seems more likely to have been the result of an individual workshop's style rather than of chronological or stylistic development.

A fragment of a statue from Heliopolis and now in the MMA (Cat. 70) provides a hybrid of the two portrait types. Petrie and Bothmer originally dated the piece to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, but Josephson has more recently suggested that the head be dated to the early Ptolemaic period on stylistic grounds. The mouth is very similar to that of the Vatican Philadelphos but the fleshiness of the face and the plastic eyebrows are closer to the Strasbourg portrait.

The similarity of the Strasbourg piece to many Thirtieth Dynasty representations may imply that the portraits of Ptolemy I would also be difficult to distinguish from those of earlier rulers or that certain workshops may have been using the same or very similar models. Alternatively, the Strasbourg statue may have been inscribed

---

22 For discussion see Josephson (1997a) 44-5 and (1997b) 43-44.
23 Josephson (1997b) 43 makes the same observations, pointing out the similarity between the Vatican Philadelphos and the portraits of the Thirtieth Dynasty.
24 Bothmer (1960b) 122.
25 Petrie and Mackay (1915) 6 and Bothmer (1960b) 59 both assume that Heliopolis was destroyed by the Persians because of Strabo's comments in Geographies 17.1.27. For the arguments of a Ptolemaic date see Josephson (1995) 5-15 and Josephson (1997b) 44-45. Because Heliopolis has not been fully excavated and our knowledge of the site is consequently incomplete, it is not possible to argue a terminus post quem on Strabo's comments alone. If, as Josephson believes, the Heliopolis fragment is Ptolemaic, this would support the provenance of the Vatican statues and suggest that there were dedications at the temple under Ptolemy II.
26 Josephson (1997b) 42-3 addresses the lack of portraits attributed to Ptolemy I. He suggests that two portraits, Kansas 30-141 (Cat. 64) and BMA 53.75 (Cat. 63) may both represent the ruler.
simply with the name of Ptolemy, on an uninscribed sculpture of an earlier ruler. However, given the idiosyncrasies of the piece, it would seem to be Ptolemaic in date. The questions arising from this particular statue demonstrate the complexities of identifying and dating Egyptian-style Ptolemaic royal portraits. Unfortunately because of a lack of inscribed pieces, both the identification of many portraits and the sculptural types utilised by each king remain uncertain.

If the Greek-style images are representative of the number of portrait types per ruler, Ptolemy I had very few, perhaps because he was technically satrap of Egypt until 305/4 BC. Josephson suggests that a basalt head in the BMA (Cat. 63) be re-identified as Ptolemy I. Certainly, the head has stylistic differences from the inscribed portraits of Philadelphos; the most apparent is the slight dip of the eyebrows towards the ends. This feature is found on two other royal portraits: firstly a gypsum head in Kansas City (Cat. 64), which was probably a sculptor’s model and is remarkably similar to a portrait of a Ptolemaic ruler on one of a pair of colossal sphinxes.

The Alexandrian sphinxes were found at the Sarapieion in the southern district of Rhakotis; suggested identities have ranged from Rameses II to Ptolemy VI. Although it is not possible to know for certain whether the pair were moved to the sanctuary at a later date, their presence, if the re-dating to the third century BC is accepted, would be in keeping with our knowledge of the early history of the site. Stylistically, they fit more readily into the early Ptolemaic Period; however, there are minute differences in their portrait features, suggesting that they may well represent two distinct rulers. Firstly the two headdresses: they are both of the nemes variety, but one is plain, the other is striped. Both forms occur in the early Ptolemaic Period, but if the statues were intended as a pair (and given the size of the sanctuary, it is unlikely that there was an entire procession in the usual Egyptian manner), it might

---

28 Josephson (1997b) is the first to suggest that this piece be dated to the reign of Ptolemy I. For the Alexandrian sphinx see Cat. 61.
29 Empereur (1998) 108, labels the pair as Rameses II in a photograph. Bothmer (1960b) 148, compares them to the Santa Barbara sphinx head (Cat. 73) and dates all three to the mid-second century BC.
30 For a more detailed discussion see Ashton (forthcoming).
seem more appropriate for them to correspond. There are further irregularities in their portrait features. The example with the plain headdress (Cat. 61) has the same type of slightly raised eyebrows that were seen on the Kansas City and BMA heads ascribed to Ptolemy I. The second sphinx (Cat. 62) is reminiscent of the known portrait type of Ptolemy II and may well be the earliest example of this particular ruler's Egyptian-style portrait type. I have suggested that the two images were dedicated during the joint rule of Ptolemies I and II (286/5-283/2 BC); the dedication of statues in the native Egyptian-style at a sanctuary, which was essentially Egyptian, accords with their general policy in Alexandria at this time.31

Two other examples, one a sculptor's model in the BMA (Cat. 66), and the other in the Department of Egyptian Antiquities, the British Museum (Cat. 67) are also difficult to identify. The two pieces are extremely similar, and both have been dated from the late fourth to the early third century BC.32 Their date aside, the pair demonstrates the deliberate nature and use of models to convey the accepted royal image to workshops. Even if the BMA bust is a model, their similarity expresses a desire to control the royal image. The British Museum example is an unusual piece and its authenticity has been questioned.33 The primary anomalies are the stone, the addition of a beard and the position of the hand across the chest, which occurs elsewhere in Egyptian art but is only found on representations of royal women in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. The beard may indicate a funerary context and an assimilation with Osiris, and the features are distinctly Ptolemaic with careful attention to the detailing of the eyes and nose.34 Therefore it would seem reasonable

31 See also Chapter 6, Section 6.7 for further discussion on the nature of the Alexandrian Sarapieion.
32 For the BMA example (Cat. 66) see Bothmer (1960b) 122; Quaegebeur (1976) 122, Bianchi ed. (1988) 82-3 no. 1. For the portrait in the British Museum (Cat. 67) see Budge (1976) who identified it as Ptolemaic, and Josephson (1997b) who tentatively suggests that it represents Nectanebo II.
33 Josephson (1997b) 30 mentions a letter from Bothmer questioning the authenticity of the piece. There is nothing to substantiate Bothmer's opinion.
34 All of these features support the authenticity of the piece, and if a forger were to copy an ancient sculpture it would be easier to use a more familiar portrait type and not make the additions of the beard or uncommon hand gesture. Finding the calcite to sculpt the piece would also indicate a dedication beyond that of the average forger, for this alone would be difficult to acquire and immediately draw attention to the piece. For examples of females see Cat. 88 and 97. This positioning of the arm also occurs on private female portraits of the period.
to conclude that the piece is genuine and is an extremely important example of an early Ptolemaic representation.

The identification of the BMA (Cat. 66) and the London portraits (Cat. 67) is somewhat problematic. Like the Vatican Philadelphos both have wider mouths without the sickle smile of the Strasbourg portrait of the same ruler. However, on both statues the eyebrows dip towards the ends in the same manner as the portraits that have been identified as Ptolemy I. Although it is not possible to be certain which of the rulers the statues represent, the wide mouth suggests that they date to the period of co-regency or early in the reign of Philadelphos and probably represent this ruler.

The difficulty in distinguishing between Thirtieth Dynasty and Ptolemaic royal portraits is extremely instructive. The similarities in the Egyptian-style portraits are more obvious than for those in the Greek style. Ptolemy I adopts a very different portrait type from Alexander, and similarly there is no confusion between the royal images of Ptolemy I and his successors. The discrepancy between the two types of royal image could be the consequence of a lack of royal interest in the Egyptian tradition. However, the commitment of the royal house to the native tradition and indeed evidence of their religious policy both in Alexandria and elsewhere in Egypt demonstrates a commitment that exceeds mere tolerance. It is most likely that the rulers fashioned images that were similar to the portraits of their predecessors, particularly of the last Egyptian dynasty, to create a direct link and by extension to enhance themselves as Greeks with Egypt's antiquity. However, to what extent this

35 R. Smith (1998) 90-91, does not try to distinguish between third century portrait after Ptolemy I, until the reign of Ptolemy IV.

36 For examples of early Ptolemaic Egyptian temples see Vassilik (1989) on Philae, DJ. Thompson (1988) on Memphis; Fraser (1998) and Ashton (forthcoming) on Alexandria. Additions were also made at the Temples of Ptah, Montu, Amun, and Mut at Karnak under Ptolemy II, see Baines and Malek (1992) 90-92 for details. See also Huss (1994) 111-7 on the question of the Ptolemaic association with the Thirtieth Dynasty.

37 The ideas of enhancing Greece's antiquity can be found at the Memphis Sarapieion, see Chapter 6, Sections 6.5-6. The Persians ruled Egypt prior to Alexander's arrival, but given that the ancient sources suggest that they were not popular rulers (although this may have been Ptolemaic propaganda); it would seem logical for the Ptolemies to look to the Thirtieth Dynasty for inspiration of their portrait type. Since the Ptolemies wished to associate themselves with the Egyptian tradition, it would make sense for them to follow the portrait type of the last Egyptian rulers and not that of the
was a policy rather than simply a continuation of an existing style is difficult to tell. If the so-called sculptors’ models did in fact serve this purpose, it would seem that the royal image was uniform and quite possibly fashioned in a deliberate style. Two of the portraits of Philadelphos have inscriptions verifying the name of the ruler, which may indicate a need to distinguish between the Ptolemaic and earlier royal portraits because the portraits were so similar. That is to say, they were so similar that a cartouche or other identification of the subject was necessary.\textsuperscript{38} Because Greek portraits were circulated on coins, they would have been more familiar; thus Egyptian-style portraits would not have been so recognisable.

Under Ptolemy III and IV, however, there is a tendency for more stylised portraits in the Egyptian style. Unfortunately there are no inscribed portraits in the round of either ruler. Comparison with temple reliefs is often of little assistance because many of the faces have been obliterated. Even though the cartouche identifies the ruler the portrait details are lost. Although some similarities between portraits in relief and in sculpture do exist, an individual temple was the work of several craftsmen, and hence portraits in relief are not always uniform. In many cases I have dated the statues within this section to the reigns of Ptolemy III and IV by placing all of the evidence within a single relative chronological sequence.

One of the earliest representations of Ptolemy III is a colossal statue, now in Cairo Museum, from Naukratis (Cat. 71). The bag-wig is unusual for this period, but not unknown.\textsuperscript{39} An impressive piece, the statue demonstrates that under Ptolemy III the rulers continued to portray themselves according to the native tradition. The continued interest in Egyptian temples echoes this sentiment.\textsuperscript{40} Stylistically the statue differs only slightly from the earlier works and it belongs to a small group that cannot be identified with any certainty.

\textsuperscript{38} Assmann (1996) 66 discusses the use of inscriptions on statues rather than portrait features to distinguish specific rulers from one another.

\textsuperscript{39} See the Kom Abu Billo temple relief in the British Museum, EA 649, where the ruler (Ptolemy I) wears a bag wig.

\textsuperscript{40} Euergetes completed many of the projects begun by Philadelphos and started new building programmes, the most notable being Edfu.
One particularly striking feature on each of the portraits of Ptolemy III and IV is that they lack the careful attention to detail that is found on the earlier Ptolemaic representations. Generally, the later portraits are of a lower quality than those of Ptolemy I and II. During this period we see a general move away from the Thirtieth Dynasty style with harder facial lines introduced. This would suggest that the soft modelling on Egyptian portraits from the fourth century BC was not necessarily a Greek influence. Although the decline in royal interest does not necessarily explain the appearance of less carefully executed sculptures, the lack of models from this period may be directly linked to the decline in royal control and subsequently standards of royal portraiture. Since there is no definitive work on the quantity or date of sculptors' models, it is impossible to know whether a relaxing in the standards and control superseded the initial enthusiasm for a uniform Egyptian-style portrait type.

The most notable stylistic feature that separates these examples, chronologically rather than simply geographically, is the decrease in the use of drill holes at the corners of the mouth, which formed the characteristic smile of the portraits of the late fourth and early third centuries BC. A head from a sphinx in New Haven is in many ways a transitional piece (Cat. 72). The eyes are still almond-shaped and the lips are still fleshy, but a profile view reveals that the mouth is straighter than on the earlier examples. Another head of a sphinx in Santa Barbara (Cat. 73) is very similar to the New Haven head. The brows in particular show an adherence to the earlier portrait types. Why Bothmer associates the Santa Barbara sphinx with the Alexandrian Sarapieion sphinxes is difficult to understand. The features on the former are more stylised and clearly indicate a later form. The eyes in particular are more clearly defined and are slightly wider in appearance; the mouth is again fleshy but not as sickle-shaped as on the early portraits. A third head, in the BMA, is a slight variation on the other two portraits (Cat. 74). The mouth is more compact,

---

41 Scott (1986) 165-6 compares it to the BMA bust 37.37 E (Cat. 66). However, it is not as close a parallel as is implied when all of the available evidence is considered; whilst it is clearly Ptolemaic it belongs to a separate sub-group.

42 Bothmer (1960b) no. 114 dates the head and the Sarapieion sphinxes to the time of Ptolemy VI; given the similarity to the images of Ptolemy I and II, this suggestion seems unlikely.
and yet the eyes show the same type of outline. The nemes on this piece is striped, whereas the New Haven and Santa Barbara heads have a plain headdress; however, given that the Sarapieion sphinxes have both types, this divergence would seem to be a matter of stylistic variation rather than a chronological indicator.

The features on the BMA head are very similar to a well-preserved fragment of a statue in the Louvre (Cat. 75). The tightness of the mouth seems to force the lips to a smile that recalls the early Ptolemaic portraits. Bianchi’s dating of the statue to the first century BC has remained unchallenged. The primary reason for the late date seems to be the carving of the body and the height of the back pillar, which continues to a point approximately half way up the nemes headdress. The size of the statue or even a characteristic of an individual workshop may explain the extended height of the back pillar; the body shares characteristics with the early Ptolemaic torsos, and is quite different from the first century bodies.\(^{43}\) If the Paris sculpture is compared to the New Haven diorite statue (Cat. 76), which is generally dated to the end of the third century BC and has a lower back pillar, there is some difference in scale.\(^ {44}\) The portrait features on the New Haven statue (Cat. 76) seem to be later than those on the Louvre ruler; the chin is squared off, the mouth is much wider and the lips are thinner. In profile the cheeks of the New Haven statue’s head are much fleshier as a consequence of the change in the shape of the mouth because the drill holes no longer push the corners towards the cheeks. By comparison the Paris statue still retains a distinctly insipid appearance of the third century portrait types. One other very different feature that indicates a later date for the New Haven statue in the use of inlaid eyes. This feature is more commonly found in the second century BC, and therefore this particular example is more likely to represent Ptolemy IV than Ptolemy III.

A small dyad in the British Museum (Cat. 77) said to be from Upper Egypt, also probably dating from the end of the third century BC, demonstrates the Ptolemies’

---

\(^{43}\) Compare the statues of Caesarion Cat. 83, 125, 126 and 128, which show a greater attention to the modelling of the ribs and stomach.

\(^{44}\) Cat. 76, the New Haven statue, is preserved to the lower abdomen and 44.5 cm tall; whereas Cat. 75, the Louvre statue, is preserved to the middle of the kilt and measures 82 cm in height.
adherence to the pharaonic tradition of associating the ruler with a specific deity; here the god is Sobek. The facial features are similar to those of several other small-scale royal portraits, with the same very basic treatment of the eyes. This type of image was probably associated with the royal cult and may have been offered as private dedications in honour of the living king. The question of private dedications in the form of the royal image is somewhat controversial. Certainly, they may be the equivalent of the small-scale heads made according to the Greek tradition, many of which are on display in the Greco-Roman Museum in Alexandria.

Finally, a stylised, granite portrait in the British Museum (Cat. 79) is difficult to place. The portrait features, although Egyptian, are individualised; the subject has bulbous eyes and a distinctive nose that has a Hellenised appearance. The mouth, however, is similar to the late third century type, the lips are full but are not carefully modelled. The subject wears the red crown of Lower Egypt and the back pillar extends to its tip. This piece is difficult to date and also to identify because there are no parallels in the Egyptian style. The eyes are very similar to those of the Greek-style portraits of Ptolemy IV (Cat. 15-16) and it is possible that the sculptor was influenced by such representations. The mouth would also suggest a date of this period but the attention to the nose and the sculpting of the cheeks are closer to the portraits of Ptolemy V and VI, in whose reigns the Egyptian artists copied Greek-style portraits of the rulers. The statue may therefore be of great importance and the first example of its type.

3.4 Second to First Century BC Male Rulers

The evidence suggests that from the reign of Ptolemy V Egyptian style royal representations in the round underwent a dramatic development, with artists using Greek models for the portrait types. Interestingly, it would seem that there is a lack

---

45 See Bianchi (1979) on the question of ex-votos and the hanging of plaques with the royal representation during the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty.
46 See Chapter 2, Section 2.1.
47 Bothmer in a letter to the department questioned the authenticity of the piece and it has also been labelled as Roman in the card index. It remains unpublished.
of Egyptian sculptors’ models from the end of the third century BC until they reappear approximately a century later, under Ptolemy IX or X. The sculpture from this period is dealt with comprehensively in Chapter 4, where the implications behind the lack of evidence for sculptors’ models from the period are also discussed.

Purely Egyptian-style representations appear again under Ptolemy VIII with the Brussels Physcon (Cat. 78). This portrait type is quite different from the third century examples; the subject has a fleshy face with a small mouth and rounded eyes, which seem to be too close together. Smith includes it with the group of Egyptian-style statues with Greek portrait features. The lack of hair on the purely Egyptian-style portraits distinguishes this small group from the majority of the second and first century examples with a fringe of hair. The head to which Smith compares the Brussel’s Physcon (Cat. 20), although corpulent, does not share the exact features; the mouth is fleshier than the Brussels head, the eyes are different, and the jaw line is square on the Greek-style head and rounded on the Egyptian-style. The Brussels Egyptian-style head (Cat. 78) is a parallel rather than a copy of a Greek model. The mouth in particular betrays the sculptor’s Egyptian training; the drill holes at the corners are a ‘trademark’ and the rounded, fleshy chin and jowls are also executed in a manner which is reminiscent of earlier Ptolemaic Egyptian-style portraiture. Clearly the two pieces represent the same ruler and a comparison with the coin portraits of Ptolemy VIII would indeed support the identification. The sculpture is, however, entirely Egyptian in its style and owes only the inspiration for the type to the Greek tradition. Because corpulent images are known from much earlier Egyptian periods, this particular statue must be categorised outside the general grouping for the second century BC.

Egyptian versions of Greek portraits, which seem to run alongside the more Hellenised versions, are discussed fully in Chapter 4. There are two further

---

48 Since there is no complete catalogue of these models it is not possible to say for certain that there is a lacuna from the time of Ptolemy V to VIII. However, the majority of models and certainly all of the pieces that I have seen in Cairo, Cambridge, Oxford, London, New York, and Paris fall within the two date ranges specified above.


50 See Smith (1996) figure 5 for a comparison and Cat. 20.
examples and a sculptor’s model that fall within this specific category. The first is a small-scale basalt head in the Louvre, which shows the ruler wearing the Blue Crown; it probably represents Ptolemy X (Cat. 80).\textsuperscript{51} Like the Brussels and British Museum heads, this example is clearly influenced by the Greek portrait type. However, again it is a parallel to rather than a copy of the accepted Greek-style image. The existence of sculptors’ models from this period, such as Cat. 81, demonstrates that the traditional method of producing an official portrait type to be copied by local workshops was still very much followed.

Also belonging to this group is a large limestone statue of Ptolemy XII Auletes in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria (Cat. 82).\textsuperscript{52} The statue has a provincial appearance, and the poor quality of the stone does little to enhance it. The thin lips, large nose and eyes are in many ways similar to those of the Louvre head (Cat. 26). Like the other examples, it is purely Egyptian in style, particularly in the shape of the eyes and the eyebrows, which are very rounded.

Two torsos, now in the MMA, New York (Cat. 83), illustrate that not all late Ptolemaic art is degenerative or provincial in appearance.\textsuperscript{53} The carefully carved inscription on the back pillar is testimony to a continuation of the Egyptian tradition into the first century BC. The quality of this piece, which seems on the grounds of the cartouche to represent Ptolemy XII is youthful in appearance and is closer to the high quality of the Egyptian-style representations of Cleopatra VII. Compare Cat. 96 and 147, which also obviously date to the last years of the Ptolemaic Period.

\textsuperscript{51}Cat. 80 was dated to the reign of Nectanebo I, see Bianchi ed. (1988) 143, mainly because there were no other known Ptolemaic royal portraits in the round wearing a Blue crown. However, as Josephson (1997b) 15 points out, there are several relief representations showing rulers with this specific crown.

\textsuperscript{52}Parlasca (1976) identified Cat. 82 as Ptolemy X, but the piercing eyes and hooked nose seem to be closer to the portrait type of Auletes.

\textsuperscript{53}The second torso (inv. 1981.224.2), which is not included in this catalogue is uninscribed and less well preserved. Both statues date to the first century BC and are arguably the most carefully inscribed and sculpted pieces from the entire Ptolemaic Period.
3.5 Third Century BC Queens

The evidence for Egyptian-style representations of Ptolemaic queens must be considered alongside those of the so-called ‘Isis’ statues, which are discussed fully in Chapter 5. As with the discussion of the male rulers, I have attempted to place the evidence within a relative chronological framework. A similar pattern emerges: the early representations of queens correspond to those of the males. In both Egyptian and Greek-style representations of royal women, the identities of queens or other females are uncertain.54

The Vatican sculpture of Arsinoe (Cat. 84), like the Philadelphos (Cat. 69), establishes a chronological sequence. The colossal statue not only shows the portrait type of the queen, but also her associated iconographic attributes. The statue is one of a group of two or three, found in Rome but originating from Heliopolis.55 The inscription on the back pillar reads:

'The princess, inherent; daughter of Geb, the first, the daughter of the bull mrhw, the great generosity, the great favour, the daughter of the king, sister and spouse (of the king), woman of Upper and Lower Egypt, image of Isis, beloved of Hathor, mistress of the two lands, Arsinoe, who is beloved to her brother, beloved of Atum, mistress of the two lands. 56

Stylistically the piece clearly dates to the third century BC; however, it is difficult to say whether it was a posthumous dedication because there are no other portraits of

54 Quaegebeur (1983) 118, refers to a hieroglyphic inscription on a statue of a priestess associated with the royal cult of Philoteira. Such evidence might suggest that there were statues that represented female members of the royal family, other than queens. Similarly the deification of the Princess Berenike in the Canopus decree demonstrates that the royal cult extended beyond the immediate rulers.

55 The representation of Philadelphos has already been discussed above. The third statue is believed by some to be a Roman copy of the Vatican Arsinoe (Roullet 1979) and by others to be Ptolemaic in date (Quaegebeur 1983) 114. Although the second female (inv. 29) is very similar to the representation of Arsinoe it is almost certainly a Roman copy, a practice common in Imperial Rome.

56 For the inscription see Sethe (1904) 71-2 and Gauthier (1916) 241. For discussion see Gitton (1978) 389-403, who believes that the statue dates from Arsinoe’s lifetime and Quaegebeur (1983) 115, who believes that the statue may be posthumous. See also Koenen (1993) 28-29 on the role of the deified Arsinoe.
this size for comparison. The double uraeus is an important feature because it seems to have been commonly associated with the queen, clearly as a reference to her relationship with Philadelphos, in the same way that the double cornucopia was associated with the Greek royal cult. It seems more than likely that the two attributes were in some way connected and might even be seen as parallels from the two traditions.

Another identifiable feature on this representation would have been the crown. However, as Quaegebeur points out, the crown was not worn exclusively by Arsinoe II and it is possible that the same was true of the double uraeus. The double uraeus also appears on another third century BC representation identified as Arsinoe II, in the MMA, New York (Cat. 85), which has very similar features to the Vatican Arsinoe (Cat. 84). In particular, the careful outlining of the eyes and their almond shape of MMA head are reminiscent of those of the Vatican statue. Quaegebeur’s comments regarding the stylistic similarity between the MMA head (Cat. 85) and statues from the Thirtieth Dynasty demonstrate that the same policy of continuing the earlier portrait styles was valid for the female royal representations.

A similar problem arises with a limestone statue in the BMA (Cat. 86). The facial features are very similar to those of the MMA and Vatican Arsinoe heads; however, the queen has only a single uraeus. There are two possible explanations for this configuration. Firstly, the stylistic similarities are coincidental, reflecting the practice of other members of the royal house, Philoteira for example, in adopting Arsinoe II’s idealising image. Secondly, Arsinoe perhaps began to use the double uraeus for her portrait in the same way that Philoteira did for hers.

57 See Quaegebeur (1983) for discussion. For comparable examples of fourth and third century Egyptian-style statues of women see Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 1332 in Bothmer (1960b) 119-20, no. 95 figures 236-8; Brussels MRAH E. 3073 in Quaegebeur (1983) figures 9-11 and Louvre N. 2456 figures 5-8.
58 On the cornucopia see D.B. Thompson (1973) 32 and on the double uraeus see Griffiths (1561) 50-51.
60 See also Cat. 91 for full discussion below.
61 Bothmer (1960b) 125-6 fig. 244-46 and Quaegebeur (1983) 116.
62 A basalt head with similar features to the MMA Arsinoe head was registered in Zurich, Galerie Nefer in 1927. Nothing on this example, however, suggests that the image is a representation of Arsinoe II, which supports Quaegebeur’s point regarding the similarity of Late Period and early Ptolemaic portraiture.
uraeus following the inauguration of the cult of the Theoi Adelphoi; hence the BMA head may date to the period before this time, when the queen was represented with a single uraeus. Of the two possibilities, the former seems to be more likely; that the head represents another member of the royal family of Ptolemy II.

Another head, again with similar features, although probably dating to later in the third century BC is in a New York private collection (Cat. 87). The inlaid eyes are an unusual feature more typically found in the second century BC, but stylistically the head has more in common with works of the mid-third century BC. On this particular example the queen wears a cobra modius, with a single uraeus. Thus, it would seem unlikely that the statue represents Arsinoe II. By this time the iconography should have been uniform and may have been more important than the portrait features, particularly with respect to the women. The other possible explanation for the piece is that it represents a goddess, with portrait features of the time. This interpretation is really no different from the similarity of the portrait features under Ptolemy I and II and it is well to remember that the modern viewer sees only part of the entire picture. However, a final judgement remains elusive.

3.6 Second Century BC Queens

The second century representations of queens that fall under the so-called Isis category are extremely significant for the dating of portrait heads in the Egyptian style. A posthumous sculpture of Arsinoe II in the MMA (Cat. 136) is of particular importance because the drapery, portrait features and attributes are all well preserved. Stylistically and iconographically the statue dates to the mid-second century BC and thus is an important reference point for comparison. Although there is some temptation to date some second century sculptures by quality, standards varied and therefore quality cannot be used as a guide to chronology. Furthermore, some

---

63 Cat. 87, see Bianchi ed. (1988) no. 62 for publication, who dates it to around 280-70 BC. In a recent conversation J.A. Josephson suggested that the head dated to around the mid-second century BC, on account of the use of inlaid eyes. I would prefer to place it to the mid-late third century BC on stylistic grounds.

64 These statues are dealt with separately in Chapter 5.

65 See Cat. 136 and Chapter 5, Section 5.2 for discussion.
portrait types in Egyptian-style royal portraits were neglected or not promoted possibly reflecting the turbulent political situation under Ptolemy V, VI and VIII in particular.66

Quaegebeur and Rausch have dated the statue of a Ptolemaic queen in Cairo (Cat. 88) to the third century BC, probably on account of her Egyptian-style drapery. However, a closer inspection of the portrait features reveals a close similarity with the posthumous sculpture of Arsinoe II in the MMA, dating to the mid-second century BC (Cat. 136).67 The three statues are all close to earlier Egyptian-style representations of goddesses and may even be images of goddesses rather than of Ptolemaic queens, since they wear the vulture headdress. The inclusion of jewellery is also uncommon on the sheathed statues of the third century BC. Perhaps the most striking comparison is the rounded rather than oval shape of the eyes, a characteristic also found on the male representations of the second century BC.

Another piece that may arguably be labelled as provincial is the head of a queen in Kassel (Cat. 89). The head is badly worn, and yet enough survives to associate it with the MMA Arsinoe II portrait. That is not to say that the Kassel statue represents this queen, but it demonstrates the stylised form of the royal images; as illustrated by the missing vulture from the headdress. Similarly the statuette of a Ptolemaic queen once in the collection of the New York Russian Synod further demonstrates the type (Cat. 90). The existence of these images alongside the so-called Isis queens is of considerable interest because it implies that the two types were produced alongside one another and that they each served a specific purpose.

By far the best-preserved example of the traditional Egyptian-style representations is a statue of Arsinoe II in Leiden (Cat. 91). Again, the date of the piece and indeed the identification of the queen are controversial.68 If the torso alone had survived, a third

66 See the earlier discussion in Section 3.4 of the appearance of sculptors’ models and lack of evidence for examples dating to the second century BC.
67 Two similar statues (not included in the catalogue) also show very similar stylistic traits: Turin, Museo Egizio 1396, and Stockholm, Medelsshavsmuseet 15376.
68 Quaegebeur (1983) 110-112, 117 dates the statue to the third century BC on account of the drapery; Bianchi ed. (1988) 180-1 dates it to the second century BC.
century date would seem to be the most likely. However, the facial features are not typical of portraits dating from the early Ptolemaic Period. A closer consideration of the portrait features and in particular the shape of the face may explain why the two features appear on a single statue. By comparison with the Greek-style portraits, it is clear that under Cleopatra VII there is a return to the earlier styles of the third century BC. This fact is clearly demonstrated on a first century BC statue, now in the Hermitage Museum (Cat. 144), where the queen appears with a double cornucopia, tripartite wig and vulture headdress along with a style of dress which is a version of the sheath-like styles of the third century BC.69 Thus, the Hermitage statue combines the traditional wig and drapery with an attribute that is seen only on Egyptian-style statuary from the second century BC. The shape of the face on the Leiden statue is also more typical of the first century BC and with its angular jaw is very similar to the San Jose, California queen (Cat. 101), which is discussed in more detail below.

Quaegebeur also questioned the identification of the Leiden queen (Cat. 91), even though she wears a crown that is favoured by Arsinoe II. Bianchi preferred to identify the statue as Cleopatra II or III. However, given the popularity of the cult of Arsinoe well into the first century BC, coupled with the double uraeus and the crown, it would seem unnecessary to attempt to seek another identification.70 Its existence, alongside the images of the queens with Greek attributes, offers an insight into the function of royal statuary and the royal cult, because the Egyptian-style statues such as the Leiden queen must have fulfilled a different role from the functions that are discussed in Chapter 5. The description of the statue of the princess Berenike in the Canopus decree is very specific, and it would seem uncharacteristic for two versions of the same cult statue to be circulating at any one time.71 It is possible that the Leiden statue is a representation of the goddess Arsinoe rather than a posthumous statue of Arsinoe in the dynastic cult.

69 Cat. 144, see Chapter 5, Section 5.2 for a full discussion of the piece, which is traditionally identified as Arsinoe II on account of the double cornucopia.
70 Quaegebeur (1988) 42 and Bianchi ed. (1988) 180-1, who also suggests that the statue may represent a Cleopatra.
71 Quaegebeur (1988) 41, distinguishes between the various roles of the queens in the royal cult.
3.7 First Century BC Queens

There are other statues that fall within the same category as the Leiden queen and clearly represented the royal women outside the dynastic cult, as goddesses in their own right. They form two groups: with a single or triple uraeus. The Toronto (Cat. 92) and Alexandria (Cat. 93) queens are in many respects stylised images, lacking the careful attention to detail that is found on the earlier portraits. Both wear a single uraeus and could equally represent a goddess as a queen. They are important because they provide a link stylistically between the mid-second century and the mid-first century BC. The treatment of the mouths is similar to the earlier examples, where the drill holes are replaced by straighter lips and the shape of the face also has much in common with the early second century queens. Both have the type of drapery that was assumed by Quaegebeur and Bianchi to belong exclusively to the third century BC. Both statues probably represent Cleopatra IV or V. Stylistically they are more likely to date to the period immediately before the reign of Cleopatra VII.

There are four statues with a triple uraeus on the traditional Egyptian headdress, and a further three with corkscrew wig. This type of uraeus is controversial because some scholars interpret it as a double uraeus with the third, middle cobra as part of the vulture headdress. The first is a fragment of a statuette, once on loan to the BMA (Cat. 94), with archaising features such as the plastic eyebrows and the rendering of the mouth; the nose is very similar to that of the Toronto queen. A second, unpublished piece, now in the Louvre (Cat. 97) has more chiselled features but again wears a triple uraeus. The other two statues from this group, one now in San Jose (Cat. 95) and the other in Turin (Cat. 96), are better known. Bianchi associates the Turin, San Jose and Hermitage (Cat. 144) queens to demonstrate that

---

72 See for example the Hermitage queen (Cat. 144) or the MMA Cleopatra (Cat. 146).
73 This confusion seems to have arisen from a comparison to the statues which are discussed in Chapter 5, where the drapery does become more stylised in many ways as a parallel to the stylised hair on the Egyptian-style male portraits.
74 See also Chapter 5, Section 5.2, Cat. 144, 145 and 146.
75 Müller, cited in Bothmer (1960b) 147, suggests that the middle uraeus is part of the vulture headdress. However, as Bianchi ed. (1988) 176 points out, only the Turin statue wears a vulture cap and so it would seem that the three cobras are meant to be a specific iconographic attribute.
76 The present location of the Brummer statue is unknown.
although the iconography may be representative of a single ruler, it appears on different types of statues. This conjecture would support the idea that the two types of images served different purposes, or at least referred to different aspects of the deification of the royal women. That some attributes, such as the type of uraeus, were maintained would further demonstrate the uniformity of the control over the royal image.

Not only is the interpretation of the triple uraeus perplexing, but also the identification of the queen whom the sculptures represent. The Hermitage and MMA statues are dealt with in Chapter 5. The unpublished ex-BMA head has not been mentioned with this group, but is clearly associated. The San Jose queen has been dated from the third century to the first century BC. As with the Leiden queen, the putative early dating derives from the drapery. However, because the sheath-like garment reappears under Cleopatra VII as an attempt to associate her with the queens of the third century BC, its re-emergence may have been part of this policy. Supporting the first-century date of the statue are the portrait features and the treatment of the body; in particular the use of Venus rings around the neck, whilst a feature of earlier Egyptian male portraiture, is more commonly found on the Greek-style representations of queens. This type of portrait has little in common with the Egyptian-style portraits of Arsinoe II for which there is a certain date of the third century BC. Bianchi's argument that the San Jose queen appears less hawk-like without the nose, which is a restoration, and so less like the portrait type of Cleopatra VII, is not convincing. The angular features support her identity as Cleopatra VII.

There is also more than one possible explanation for the queens with the triple uraeus. Firstly, as Bothmer suggested in respect to the MMA Cleopatra (Cat. 146), the statues may represent Cleopatra III. Bothmer believed that the triple uraeus was

---

Bothmer (1960b) suggests that the piece represents Cleopatra II or III; Kyrieleis (1975) 119 and Quaeghebeur (1983) 114 associate it with Cleopatra VII. Bianchi ed. (1988) 176 disagrees, on account of the nose which was not ancient and claims that with it removed, the statue has nothing in common with the portrait type of Cleopatra VII. He then compares the San Jose queen to the basalt statue of a Cleopatra in Vienna but dates it to the third century BC on account of the drapery.
simply a reference to Cleopatra II and her rule with Ptolemy VI or VIII or that it was a reference to Cleopatras II, III and Ptolemy VIII during their rule.\textsuperscript{78}

Since Cleopatra III ruled with either of her sons separately, however, the three elements would seem to lose their significance. In addition to this point, the evidence suggests that not until the time of Cleopatra VII did the royal imagery revert back to third century prototypes. It would be equally possible for the statues with the triple uraeus to represent Cleopatra’s rule with Caesarion and their association with the dead Julius Caesar, as assimilation with Isis, Horus and Osiris. The triad is less likely to include Mark Antony. The portrait features on these statues are not by any means identical, but iconographically and stylistically, they all seem to date to the first century BC and may well represent Cleopatra VII. Certainly the drapery and use of the triple uraeus would support this conjecture. Whilst it is possible, just as with the occasional appropriation of the crown of Arsinoe II by subsequent queens, that the triple uraeus was used by other royal women, the other features suggest that they represent Cleopatra VII rather than a predecessor.

Finally, the Mariemont queen (Cat. 98) is generally accepted to be a representation of Cleopatra VII with either Mark Anthony or Caesarion.\textsuperscript{79} Since the sculpture is part of a dyad and the dating for the male ruler is relatively secure, it can also be placed in the mid first century BC. Her face has the same shape as that of the San Jose queen, and yet the treatment of the mouth has more in common with the early portraits of Arsinoe II. The statue is therefore archaising. The Mariemont queen appears to have once had a large single uraeus, a modius decorated with cobras, and the vulture cap. Thus this motif was arguably part of the general headdress. In addition to the third century portrait features, the queen wears the drapery of this period, the sheath-like dress; its appearance on this statue would support the re-dating of the Leiden piece to the late second to first century BC. The youthful image of the female might suggest that the dyad represented a young Cleopatra, but the single

\textsuperscript{78} Bothmer (1960b) 146.

\textsuperscript{79} The male ruler Cat. 129, which is discussed in Chapter 4, clearly dates to the mid-first century BC and the Egyptian-style queen is in keeping with Cleopatra’s image and its third century influence. See Quaegebeur (1983) 114 and Kyrieleis (1975) 184.
uraeus and the stylised and youthful image of the male ruler would suggest that the pair might represent Cleopatra Selene and Alexander Helios.

3.8 Conclusion

The evidence for Egyptian-style Ptolemaic royal portraiture would suggest that the rulers throughout the Ptolemaic period were keen to continue the native tradition of representation. The persistence of this type of statuary alongside Egyptian-style images that were more overtly influenced by Hellenistic art would suggest that each served a specific purpose. Although the use of naturalistic or veristic portrait types on the images of the male rulers occurs in the second century BC, it does not necessarily derive from an outside influence, as Bothmer believed.80 Certainly, there is nothing to suggest that the early royal portraits are simply a result of contact with Greek artistic tradition, particularly since they are so close to the representations of the Thirtieth Dynasty.

The female royal portraits follow a very similar pattern to those of the males and the evidence suggests that the Egyptian-style images were still produced alongside the statues of the queens that are believed to be associated with Isis. The promotion of the royal women is a consequence of the popularity of the ruler cult in both Greek and Egyptian contexts. The attributes that the so-called Isis statues adopt are clearly influenced by the Greek cult but should be considered within the same framework as the purely Egyptian-style royal images since they are Egyptian in style. This type of statue will be discussed fully in Chapter 5.

80 Bothmer (1960b) xxxviii.
Chapter 4: The Interaction between Greek and Egyptian Elements in Ptolemaic Royal Portraiture

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the adoption of foreign attributes or features on Ptolemaic royal sculpture and the interaction between the Greek and Egyptian artistic traditions. The so-called mixed-style is most commonly found on statues that are made according to the Egyptian Late Period tradition, with a back pillar, in striding stance, but with features that are more commonly associated with Hellenistic sculpture. On the male statues this phenomenon manifests itself in the portrait features (which are copied from the Greek-style images) and the inclusion of hair beneath the headdress. On a smaller group of female representations, the hair is in a Hellenistic coiffure, although the portrait features generally remain stylised. There is no evidence of a reciprocal cross-cultural borrowing on the Greek statues, with the exception of representations carved in a hard stone.

In his catalogue on Egyptian sculpture of the Late Period, Bothmer discussed a particular Egyptian-style portrait of a ruler, now in New Haven, with features that are clearly outside the normal indigenous type for this period; he identified the sculpture as an image of Ptolemy III.1 In a recent paper about the 'mixed style' portraits Smith concludes by stating that the phenomenon began at Memphis under Ptolemy III.2 A rather stylised portrait of red granite statue (Cat. 122), now in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria, also belongs to this type of statue and is commonly dated to

---

1Baringer Collection on loan to the Yale University Art Gallery inv. 4.1.1953. Needler (1949) 133-136 was the first to date the piece to the latter half of the third century BC; she cites Cat. 122 and Dutilh's identification of Ptolemy IV as a parallel, even though the two have very different appearances. Bothmer (1960b) 131-2, no. 103 who wrote the following: 'The identity of the king must remain at the present time a matter of conjecture. The entire field of Egyptian royal sculpture of the last three centuries has so long been neglected that even the available material has not been recorded, much less classified and analysed.' See also Scott (1986) 170-1 no. 96 and Bianchi ed. (1988) 147-8 cat. 52. Both date the head to the third century BC. Since Bothmer's dating of the head, there has been a general acceptance that the piece represents Ptolemy III, although more recently the identification has been more tentative, see Bothmer (1996) fig. 32. Most recently the piece has been cited as Ptolemaic, see W. Smith (1998) 249. See Appendix 1.2 below for a fuller discussion of the date of the statue.

2R. Smith (1996) 210 refers to this particular piece.
the to the third century BC.\textsuperscript{3} This identification has remained unchallenged, but neither piece seems to fit well within the stylistic framework of other third century BC images, when the traditional Egyptian-style royal image is continued.\textsuperscript{4}

The stylised curls on the Alexandria head (\textbf{Cat. 122}) have more in common with the late second century and early first century BC Egyptian-style portraits of the later Ptolemies. The hairline of the New Haven head is closer to the type of Roman hairstyle found under Nero, and I therefore date this particular piece to the first century AD.\textsuperscript{5} If these two sculptures do in fact represent Ptolemies III and IV, they are anomalies, for it is not until the time of Ptolemy V that there is a sufficient number of ‘mixed-style’ portraits to suggest that a change or development in the royal image had occurred. This dating also corresponds with the change in the female imagery and the introduction of the corkscrew coiffure on Egyptian portraits of the queens in Egypt.\textsuperscript{6}

The questions of sculptural origin, place and number of workshops cannot easily be answered because the majority of the representations have no definite provenance. Smith’s suggestion that the assimilation of styles began at Memphis seems more likely if the earlier examples are reattributed to the reign of Ptolemy V, since the ruler moved the royal court to the city from Alexandria. At Memphis, the rulers promoted their Macedonian heritage, as illustrated by the Greek-style statues close to the temple of Nectanebo and the burial chambers of the Apis bulls.\textsuperscript{7} At both Memphis and Alexandria the rulers were portrayed in both Greek and Egyptian statuary, and it is easy to see how the parallel dedications at such sites could have resulted in artists borrowing features from the other tradition.

The Delta is another obvious centre for individual workshops, if indeed the impetus for this type of ‘mixed-style’ representation came from native contexts, because there

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Dutilh (1905) 49-50 and Kyrieleis (1975) 37, 44 f., no. D2.
  \item \textsuperscript{4}See Chapter 3, Section 3.3.
  \item \textsuperscript{5} For comparison see Poulsen (1962) 99, no. 65, pl. 110-101.
  \item \textsuperscript{6}See Chapter 5 for a full discussion of this type of royal representation.
  \item \textsuperscript{7} See Chapter 6, Section 6.3 on the Memphis Sarapieion.
\end{itemize}
were established Egyptian temples in the area. There was also a large concentration of sizeable sanctuaries such as the Sarapieion at Alexandria and the temple of Osiris at Canopus, which were patronised by the royal house. In the Faiyum, all of the cultural ingredients were present, but the majority of the Ptolemaic shrines were dedicated by local people, as a way of demonstrating both their support for the royal house and their own personal wealth or the prosperity of the village.

In Upper Egypt the priests seem to have favoured the traditional representations of the pharaoh, as demonstrated by the relief decorations on all of the temples. The continuation of representations of the rulers in a purely pharaonic style also implies that the statues with Greek portrait features were intended for a specific role. The exception to this continuation of traditional Egyptian portraits in the south is one of the earliest examples of cross-cultural borrowing: the colossal statue of Ptolemy V Epiphanes from the Karnak temple, now in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (Cat. 107) shows a portrait type that is very close to the Hellenistic image of this ruler. This information is extremely important in determining the sculptural function because it would imply that the statues were intended for Egyptian temples as representations of the reigning pharaoh.

The Karnak Epiphanes (Cat. 107) demonstrates the priests' willingness to accept a pharaoh who was obviously foreign. It is interesting to note that the earliest example represents the first Ptolemy known to have been crowned according to the Egyptian tradition and a ruler whom we know to have fostered close links with the Egyptian priesthood thorough a series of synods in a time of rebellion and court faction.  

There is further evidence from Canopus with a mixed-style statue of Ptolemy VI (Cat. 110) and a later representation of Ptolemy X (Cat. 122). Similar pieces were

---

8 Thompson (1988) 120-121.
set up in Alexandria, alongside other earlier purely Egyptian-style images (Cat. 115 and 116) during the mid to late second century BC.\textsuperscript{9}

The reasons for the appearance of this type of statuary, at the end of the third century BC, may be a reflection of the change in the political climate or a development of the royal image. The distribution would accord with our knowledge that Egyptian sculptors travelled to commissions.\textsuperscript{10} This raises the important question about the appearance of Greek portrait types on Egyptian-style statuary. Was it a royal or priestly initiative and what did the ‘mixed style’ mean? Before considering the function of this sculptural group of statuary further, it is necessary to look more carefully at its chronological sequence.

4.2 Greek-style Portraits Manufactured in Egyptian Hard Stones

The ‘mixed-style’ as a phenomenon is not restricted to the development of Egyptian art, and the earliest examples of cross-cultural artistic borrowing are in fact Greek-style portraits manufactured in hard stone. These images form a category of their own, and apart from the use of a native material, they owe little to the Egyptian tradition. They are carved in Greek style, with Hellenistic coiffures and attributes such as the diadem rather than Egyptian crowns. With such representations, it is difficult to discern whether the pieces were carved by Egyptian sculptors for a Greek audience or whether they are by Greek sculptors experimenting with native stones. Of native deposits, only limestone would have been a medium familiar to the Greek artists. It was also the most easily available stone since it forms the hills of the Nile valley. Why then did the Greek sculptors on occasion use less familiar, hard stones?

The Greek artists are unlikely to have used hard stones for reasons of economy (to avoid importing marble), since the phenomenon first appears in the third century BC,

\textsuperscript{9} See Ashton (forthcoming) on the pharaonic artistic tradition in Ptolemaic Alexandria.

\textsuperscript{10} See the Chapter 1, Section 1.4 above, for a full discussion of native sculptors and their almost priestly role in the manufacture of statuary.
when Egypt and its rulers were still enjoying relative prosperity. It is possible that artists experimented with different stones for aesthetic or cultural reasons. Some of the finer-grained Egyptian stones are not dissimilar in appearance to the bronzes that would once have decorated the public and religious areas in cities and towns and it is possible they were used as a substitute.

Alternatively the use of the hard stones may have invoked the Ptolemaic rulers' role of pharaoh. The usual portrait features were probably maintained so that the Greek audience was able to identify the specific ruler. On all of these pieces, the artist has attempted to reproduce the standard portrait type for each monarch and in some instances has clearly struggled, with a rather stylised result. It would be tempting to label these pieces as Egyptian attempts to copy a foreign portrait type, but this would be unjustified particularly when the characteristics of Egyptian-style statues are taken into consideration.11

The earliest examples date to the reign of either Ptolemy III or IV. They are generally small scale, and although the portrait type is typical of the mid to late third century BC, the images remain general rather than individualised.12 To illustrate this type I have selected a small head now in the BMA (Cat. 99) which seems to have been originally inserted into a statue. The head has an unusually elaborate, twisted diadem and conforms to a standard portrait type. Heads of these proportions were probably used as votives, and their appearance in hard stones under Ptolemy III or IV may be linked to a more aggressive promotion of the dynastic cult on behalf of the royal house.13

---

11 See R. Smith (1996) 206-7 who comments that the Egyptian-style statue of Ptolemy VI (Cat. 110) is more carefully carved than the Hellenistic image (Cat. 19).
12 R. Smith (1998) 88-9 questions the possibility of identifying such heads and suggests that they were probably used as votives.
13 Ptolemy IV makes significant changes to the dynastic cult, namely the joining of the Theoi Soteres to the cult of Alexander the Great and the establishment of a separate cult to Berenike II, the ruler also established a separate cult at Ptolemais in Upper Egypt. See Chapter 1, section 1.4 above.
This type of hard stone image may have been seen as an alternative bronze, and the
inlaid eyes would have accentuated the similarity between the dark polished finish of
the metal and that of the basalt, from which this particular piece was carved. These
images are most appropriately categorised as experiments by Greek artists in new
types of stone, perhaps reflecting Egypt's wealth of quarries. The Greek-style
images that are sculpted from Egyptian stones do not seem to follow the same
sequence of development as their Egyptian counterparts. The Greek images are,
therefore, more likely to have been the result of artists, either Greek or Egyptian,
producing popular images of the royal house that were made for the dynastic cult
with a general portrait type in an available stone.

4.3 Egyptian-style Portraits of Ptolemaic Queens with Greek Features

The Egyptian representations of Ptolemaic royal women with Greek features form a
distinctive group. The earliest example of a mixed-style representation with a back
pillar is a basalt portrait, now in Copenhagen generally accepted to represent Arsinoe
III (Cat. 100).14 Her hair is parted down the centre, drawn back in a bun with an
unfinished narrow diadem. The result is a slightly stylised but exceptionally high
quality sculpture. Although the use of inlaid eyes is attested throughout the history
of Egyptian sculpture, their re-appearance here might suggest that the artist used a
bronze image as a model, which is also reflected in the stone that would once have
been highly polished. Because the piece is unique, dating it is a problem. However,
there is little to connect it with the portrait type of Arsinoe III; the mouth in particular
is not typical of the sullen configuration that is generally found on her images, and
the general appearance of the Copenhagen statue is youthful rather than matronly. It
has probably been dated to the third century BC because of the coiffure, but a second
head in Copenhagen (Cat. 101) demonstrates that the queens were not always
portrayed with the corkscrew coiffure in the early second century BC.

Like the ostensible Arsinoe III sculpture, the subject of the second Copenhagen statue (Cat. 101) wears her hair in a bun, rather than in corkscrew locks. Stylistically the piece is similar to the images of the mid-second century BC, with a rounded face, full lips and wide eyes. However, the sculptor has clearly struggled with the proportions of the forehead, which appears to be too high because of the central parting of the hair. Like the statues that show the queens wearing a corkscrew wig, this particular example has stylised portrait features rather than the individual representations in the Greek style. For this reason it is difficult to discern which queen was intended, but a comparison with the male portraits suggests that it dates to the reign of Ptolemy VI or VIII and probably represents either Cleopatra I or Cleopatra II; it is less likely to be an early portrait of Cleopatra III. The first portrait in Copenhagen (Cat. 100) is, therefore, probably slightly earlier and represents Cleopatra I.

The sharply carved eyebrows of Cat. 100 are similar to those of a colossal limestone statue from Alexandria (Cat. 103) and the Canopus Philometor (Cat. 110), whilst the lips are closer to those of Cat. 101. The three statues are probably, therefore, of a similar date. The coiffure of the Alexandrian statue is also very close to that of Cat. 101, and both queens wear a modius. On the former the base is carved in a circle of cobras, whereas the modius of Cat. 101 is roughly finished. The Alexandrian queen also has two rows of thick locks at the side of her head, but the fringe on both examples is remarkably similar. Although the queen wears a diadem, the rest of her regalia is Egyptian, and she may be seen as a female equivalent to the images of male rulers that are discussed below. Stylistically the Alexandrian piece probably dates to the time of Ptolemy VI or Ptolemy VIII and is, therefore, most likely to represent either Cleopatra I or II.

Despite the difference in stone and size, a badly damaged head, now in the British Museum (Cat. 102), bears a remarkable resemblance to the Alexandrian portrait;
both have the same hairstyle and very similar portrait features. Interestingly the eyes have incised pupils (a feature that is more commonly associated with Roman sculptures), yet the styling of the hair and the portrait features place it firmly within the Ptolemaic Period. Although the back of the head has been apparently sawn off, the frontal position of the head and the similarity with the Alexandrian sculpture suggest that it is Egyptian rather than Hellenistic.

A small schist head, now in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria (Cat. 104) and a larger head of a queen in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Cat. 105) illustrate the development of this type of statue. Because the back pillars are lower, the stylised curl that decorated the sides of the dorsal support was by this time redundant and had been replaced by a continuous row of corkscrew locks at the back of the head, usually resting on the shoulders. However, it is important to distinguish such examples from those on which the queen wears a more stylised corkscrew wig.15 The Alexandrian sculpture (Cat. 104) is a transitional piece, since the queen has locks at the sides and back of her head; she wears a thin diadem but the hole in the top of her head was almost certainly for the insertion of an Egyptian crown. The Vienna queen is slightly more problematic, in that her hair appears to be more stylised, particularly around the fringe, which consists of three layers of tight curls. However, the more naturalistic treatment of the back locks and the clear attempt to carve portrait features rather than a stylised image, distinguish the piece from the other statues with a corkscrew wig. Whereas the Alexandria (Cat. 103) and Copenhagen queen (Cat. 101) probably date from around the time of Ptolemy VI and VIII, the Vienna queen’s portrait type (Cat. 105) has more in common with the images of Ptolemy IX and X, and therefore probably represents Cleopatra III.

15 See Chapter 5 below for a full discussion of this type of statue and function. The sculptures discussed in this chapter belong to a distinct group of representations and for this reason are treated separately from the so-called ‘Isis’ statues.
Another unique representation of this queen was recorded at the temple of Sobek at Narmouthis in the Faiyum (Cat. 114). This piece is very unusual because it portrays a queen in the form of a royal sphinx; her portrait features are crudely carved and yet are clearly based on those of the male rulers from the site (Cat. 113 and 117). The queen wears her hair in a corkscrew coiffure and appears to have drapery represented between her breasts. The close-set eyes are again reminiscent of the portraits of Ptolemy VIII and the thin, wide mouth is similar to the slightly later images of Ptolemy IX and X.

The close attention to the Greek coiffure and the individualising portrait features that echo the male portraits of the period may have been introduced when the queens ruled in their own right, without a male consort. Like the portraits of the male rulers from this period, the Vienna queen shows a stylised, non-ideal portrait type with a corpulent face, weak chin and jowls, its closest parallel being the lost Berlin Ptolemy (Cat. 120). The earlier examples may represent Cleopatra I when she ruled Egypt as regent or Cleopatra II during a period when she controlled country in the absence of Ptolemy VIII (131-130 BC). Of all the female royal statues, this parallel group to the male ‘mixed-style’ is the smallest and the least commonly represented, but if the sculptures did commemorate the queens’ short, autonomous rule, the paucity of examples is not surprising.

Finally from this group, is the fragment of a statue of a queen, now in the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto (Cat. 106). Carved from limestone, the image does not appear to have had any kind of dorsal support. It is manufactured in an extremely crude fashion and has a disproportionate appearance. The face is poorly executed with an asymmetrical nose; there appears to be a vulture headdress, but the underlying wig flares out too widely at the sides and back with the result that she seems to have too much hair. The head also tilts slightly to the proper right, a posture that is associated with the Greek-style images, but Bothmer has shown that it appears
within the Egyptian repertoire. Like the British Museum statue (Cat. 102) the Toronto queen has incised pupils, which might suggest that although they were not a common feature on Hellenistic sculpture, they were found on Ptolemaic Egyptian statuary. This exceptional, if not outstanding, piece is probably the product of an Egyptian or Greek sculptor who attempted to imitate the other's artistic tradition. In either case, the result was not a success, but at least it suggests that Greek and Egyptian sculptors were experimenting with each other's styles. There are no images of Cleopatra VII in this general style, probably because she ruled with three kings rather than alone.

4.3 Egyptian-style Statues of Male Rulers with Greek Portrait Features

By far the largest sub-group within this assemblage, are the Egyptian-style male statues with Greek portrait features. I shall now attempt to place the evidence in a chronological sequence, before considering whether these particular examples were the result of artistic experimentation or whether the adoption of the Greek portrait features could have been introduced for a specific reason or function.

The death of Philopator marked the beginning of a much weaker royal house. The royal advisors obviously anticipated problems, and although the king died during the summer, his death was not made public until November. His successor, who was only six years old in 204 BC, was not crowned until 196 BC when he came of age. The Egyptian-style ceremony has its parallel in the change in both the Greek and the Egyptian-style representations. The portraits of Ptolemy V show a young man with rather weak features; the sculptures, such as a marble head in the Louvre (Cat. 18),

16 Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum inv. 10972; for illustration see Bothmer (1996) 223, fig. 29.
17 Hölbl (1994) 118, states that Philopator died in Spring or Summer 204 BC.
18 Koenen (1993) 71 and footnote 109, suggests that Epiphanes was not the first of the dynasty to be crowned.
are easily identified from the ruler's coin image. Although the wide almond-shaped eyes continue a Ptolemaic fashion known since the time of Soter, the thin nose, weak chin and small mouth are particular to Epiphanes and suggest a certain youthfulness. The apparent remodelling of the hair on the Louvre Epiphanes may have been an attempt to age the original image, for the king's appearance remained constant throughout his reign.

Two of the earliest images of Epiphanes (Cat. 108 and 109) are both made from calcite and show a slightly curious iconographic mixture. The portraits are similar to two images of Ptolemy IV in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria (Cat. 15 and 16). One of the heads (Cat. 108) belongs technically to the Greek tradition, since there is no sign of a dorsal support, and yet the rather stylised and frontal form is closer to the Egyptian-style representations. The manner in which the double crown sits directly on the subject's head gives the piece an Egyptianising rather than Egyptian appearance; there is also a diadem and a very Greek rendering of the hair covering the entire head. The lock of Horus, indicating a youthful subject, seems to have been accepted into the Greek iconography relatively early and commonly appears on Hellenised representations of Harpocrates of Ptolemaic date.

The second example (Cat. 109) is less carefully executed and has a back pillar. The ruler wears a diadem, a single uraeus and also has a Horus lock. The hair is carved in small knots and is generally more stylised than its Greek-style counterpart. Both examples have very similar portrait features to the Louvre Epiphanes (Cat. 18). The imagery of the two pieces is extremely interesting because it combines both Greek and Egyptian attributes, which are a curious mix, for they juxtapose the Greek diadem with the crown of Upper Egypt and it is almost as if the diadem has replaced the more usual nemes. The later examples from this category of statuary remain true

---

19 See Kyrieleis (1975) 52-8 and Chapter 2, Section 2.3 above for a more detailed discussion of the ruler's Greek portrait type.
20 See Kyrieleis (1975) 173.
to the Egyptian form and only adopt the portrait features of the ruler, ignoring foreign characteristics such as the diadem.

The more mature Egyptian-style representation of Epiphanes from Karnak demonstrates (Cat. 107), it is clear that the artist has simply added an already established portrait type to an Egyptian statue. The similarities of the details of the Louvre (Cat. 18) and Karnak Epiphanes (Cat. 107) are quite uncanny, and the side profiles of the pair are remarkably similar.\(^{21}\) The important visual symbolism, which is an essential part of the Egyptian tradition, is not affected by the adoption of a Greek portrait.\(^{22}\) Although Egyptian art is often considered to be stylised, relying heavily on symbolism to portray a message, each ruler has his own portrait type. From this point in the Ptolemaic Period, the artists begin to utilise an existing Greek image for their own representations of the pharaoh. Whether this represents a deliberate policy by the royal house or whether it is simply a natural artistic development remains to be considered, as do the implications behind the adoption of this policy if it was such.

The Greek-style portrait of Ptolemy VI, now in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria (Cat. 19) is extremely fine; the position of the head and the dreamy expression of the ruler all suggest that the artist was working from an original model, perhaps his own. There are several Egyptian-style adaptations, the most successful and closest to the Greek version being another head in the Greco-Roman Museum, originally from Canopus (Cat. 110). The similarity between these two portraits led Smith to suggest that both artists were working from the same model.\(^{23}\) The reason for his conclusion is that he believes the Canopus Philometor is of a higher quality than its Greek equivalent, thus the more successful version must have copied the

\(^{21}\) This piece has been identified as Alexander IV, Ptolemy III, Augustus and Tiberius. See catalogue entry for details.

\(^{22}\) See Ashton and Spanel (forthcoming) on the recognisability of Egyptian portrait types.

same model rather than the statue itself. It is the rendering of the hair in particular that has led Smith to draw this conclusion.

However, no surviving models suggest that the royal house was issuing portrait types for use in both Greek and Egyptian contexts. Because the traditional Egyptian models seem to cease at around the same time that the Egyptians begin to copy the Greek portraits, they perhaps did so because the royal house or whoever controlled the royal image failed to produce Egyptian-style models for sculptors to use. With no alternative, the sculptors may have turned to the more commonly promoted Greek images and adopted the models of the other tradition to accommodate the lack of guidance. Although Smith is quite right in his observations regarding the quality of the two portraits of Ptolemy VI (Cat. 19 and 110), the two sculptors were not necessarily sharing the same model. Because the Egyptian version is more successful, the two artists were perhaps using independent models for their work or the Egyptian sculptor simply had a better eye for detail.

The Canopus head (Cat. 110) is one of the earliest Ptolemaic examples of an Egyptian male portrait with inlaid eyes, which may indicate the type of model from which the Egyptian artist was working. If the Egyptian and Greek artists were copying the same model, there would be no need to include inlays for the eyes on the Egyptian head. If however, the Egyptian sculptor was using a bronze original as a model he would have automatically copied the inlaid eyes. This technique would also explain the careful styling of the hair on the Canopus head, which is, as Smith 24

Bothmer (1996) 225 considered the use of inlaid eyes possibly to denote Greek influence. However, the Greek Alexandrian artists seem to have favoured sculptured eyes rather than inlays, which might suggest that the technique was reintroduced by the Egyptian artists who may also have been copying marble portraits with painted eyes. It is interesting that they also seem to favour incised pupils whereas this feature does not appear on Hellenistic portraiture. The male portraits discussed here correspond with the date of the female portraits that were discussed in Section 4.2 above.

25 Although inlaid eyes are found on several Ptolemaic portraits, they are by no means the standard form, and their inclusion on the Canopus Philometor must have been intentional and probably indicative that the model also had inlaid eyes.
notes, superior to that of the Greek portrait. Certainly the appearance of bronze
statuary would have been closer to the hard stone Egyptian portraits than the tinted
white marble. However, the Canopus Philometor is an exceptional piece it perhaps
reflects the talent of an individual sculptor and not a general trend for producing
accurate copies of Greek models, original or shared.

The Aegina head (Cat. 111) was undoubtedly manufactured in Egypt and later
transported to Greece. The back pillar is inscribed with a cartouche bearing
Philometor's name, but even without it the styling of the hair would indicate the
identity. Although the Aegina head is a more stylised copy of a Greek portrait
type, the sculptor has paid great attention to such details as the hair and mouth.
However, the eyes are carved, not inlaid, possibly suggesting that the artist was using
a stone model for his work. This fact would support the idea that the Egyptian
sculptors copied whatever was available rather than using a standard model.

The final representation of Philometor is a poorly preserved head, now in Erlangen
Archäologisches Museum (Cat. 112). Unfortunately the area around the brow is
badly damaged and the full extent of the hairline is not discernible. The face is
slightly narrower than on the Canopus and Aegina sculptures and the eyes are set
very closely together, possibly indicating the influence of the portraits of Ptolemy
VIII. However, the hair and mouth are very similar to those on the Canopus head
(Cat. 110), which nonetheless is the better work.

From the reign of Ptolemy VIII, Egyptian artists introduced parallel portraits rather
than copying Hellenistic images. Stylised versions with the inclusion of hair

---

26 R. Smith (1996) 205 writes 'On the basis of the physiognomy alone, one would not have identified
it (the Aegina head) as the same king (as the Canopus head)'. This information may simply indicate a
chronological difference or lack of talent on the sculptor's behalf. R. Smith does, however, stress the
similarity of the hairline between the two sculptures.

27 Ptolemy VI ruled from 176 to 164 BC and was then deposed in favour of Ptolemy VIII until 163
BC, when he ruled for a further eighteen years. For the portrait type of Ptolemy VIII see Chapter 2,
Section 2.5 and Chapter 3, Section 3.4 above.
continued under Ptolemy IX and X; hence the Egyptianising versions can be classified as an interpretation of the royal image rather than a new development.

The portrait type adopted by Ptolemy VIII offers a stark contrast with the idealised images of his brother; the coin portraits show a corpulent image representing the royal quality of τρυψή.\(^{28}\) This development also reflects the unofficial name of Φώσκωμ or 'Fatty', which was attached to Ptolemies VIII, IX and X.\(^{29}\) Kyrieleis was the first to recognise the similarity between the coin images and the Greek and pharaonic portraits in the round.\(^{30}\) There are no Greek-style portraits of Ptolemy VIII in the round; a marble head, now in a private collection, (Cat. 20) is perhaps the closest example in the Greek style, but the lower lip is much fleshier than that of a diorite head in Brussels (Cat. 78) to which it has been compared. The Brussels Physcon is generally accepted to represent Ptolemy VIII and is often classified as an Egyptian sculpture with Greek portrait features.\(^{31}\) However, there are notable differences between the Brussels Physcon and Hellenistic images of this type: the absence of hair and the archaic smile on the Egyptian sculpture suggest that the artist was breaking with the new tradition of copying the Greek portrait type and reverting to the older, widely attested Egyptian corpulent type of portrait.\(^{32}\) In other words, the artist produced a parallel rather than an exact copy of the Greek portrait type. The result is undeniably similar, but when the Brussels head is compared to earlier Egyptian-style representations it does not conform. The Brussels head, although conveying the idea of the ruler's wealth through corpulent imagery, owes more to the Egyptian modelling. The concept of portraying the ruler in a corpulent manner is, however, innovative, since this type of image is found only on private portraits prior to the Ptolemaic period whereas the king is shown as slim and athletic. The artist clearly had the official image in mind when carving the piece, but it does not fall

\(^{28}\) Kyrieleis (1975) 163-4.
\(^{29}\) R. Smith (1998) 68.
\(^{30}\) Kyrieleis (1975) 64.
\(^{32}\) Bianchi ed. (1988) no. 48
within the category of ‘mixed style’. The quality of the carving and the overall appearance would suggest that these differences are the result of interpretation rather than inability to copy the original model.

Again, these variations may reflect the work of an individual artist rather than a new trend by Egyptian sculptors or they may simply result from chronological differences, since like Ptolemy IX and XII, Ptolemy VIII’s rule was divided into two periods. On two other representations, Ptolemy VIII appears with hair under the nemes headdress; unfortunately both examples are badly weathered. The head of a sphinx at the temple of Narmouthis in the Faiyum has the corpulent portrait type (Cat. 113). The full lips on a small, straight mouth and the closely set eyes would suggest that the identity of the subject is Ptolemy VIII rather than Ptolemy X. This face is mirrored by that of a colossal statue that was recovered from the coastal area of Alexandria (Cat. 115). The statue once had inlaid eyes and is the only extant representation of Ptolemy VIII with this feature. The hair is just visible on the left side of the face; like that on the portraits of Ptolemy VI it is finely carved and avoids the stylised locks of the Narmouthis sphinx (Cat. 113). To what extent this stylistic feature is a chronological indicator will be discussed below.

Our knowledge of Ptolemaic portraiture from the death of Ptolemy VIII to the accession of Ptolemy XII is less certain, because of the lack of coin portraits of Ptolemy IX and X. There are two separate types of portrait, one similar to that of Ptolemy VIII, but with facial hair, and a second with a leaner face. Several scholars have used the iconography on the Edfu sealings to try and identify the portrait types. Krug concludes that the leaner face represented Ptolemy IX whilst his successor was portrayed with a more corpulent image.33

---

One should perhaps expect two different portrait types for Ptolemy IX, a more youthful type which would have been executed during his early reign and a second, more mature version for the later years. Several of the portraits in the round have been reworked, complicating the issue further. One such example is the Milan sphinx (Cat. 117), which may be a reworking of a representation of Ptolemy VIII to represent Ptolemy IX in the first period of his reign. There is no Greek equivalent for these two images and yet they are similar enough to show that they were a type. As sculptures they lack the careful duplication of Greek portrait types, and this again is perhaps another indication of the more turbulent political situation in the late Ptolemaic Period.

Another sculpture that shows the characteristics of Egyptian art, is the so-called Berlin Lost Ptolemy (Cat. 120). The beard and overall shape of the face are very similar to the Greek portraits of Ptolemy IX, such as the Boston head (Cat. 21), but there is an undeniably Egyptian feel. The head and facial hair are stylised, but the carving is also rather crude. The mouth, which is slightly down-turned when viewed from the side, is too wide, and the lips are shapeless in a frontal view. The presence of a diadem with the original crown is also a slightly odd feature and again would imply that the sculptor was copying an original Greek portrait rather than an independent model. Because the sculpture is now lost and examination depends entirely upon photographs, it is difficult to ascertain whether the Egyptian appearance derives from the poor carving or whether it marks a more significant change in the adoption of Greek portrait types on pharaonic-style statues.

Two other statues that perhaps represent Ptolemy IX are a sculpture in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Cat. 118) and a statue, now in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria (Cat. 119). On both examples, the eyes are very

---

14 Ptolemy IX reigned from 116 to 107 BC and then again from 87 to 81 BC; his brother Ptolemy X ruled Egypt from 107 to 103 BC and then from 101 to 87 BC.
similar to those on the Brussels portrait of Ptolemy VIII, which are small and close-set. However, two noticeable differences are the leaner face and the more stylised hair. Both statues have the same characteristic mouth as the Milan sphinx of Ptolemy IX (Cat. 117), which is straight rather than rounded and fleshy. On the Vienna statue, the corners of the lips are slightly down-turned, no doubt an early example of a feature that was to become characteristic of the later Ptolemaic portraits. The most notable difference between these two examples and the earlier representations of Ptolemy VIII is the more stylised coiffure of snail-shell curls clearly visible beneath the nemes headdress in contrast to the more naturally rendered hair on the images of Ptolemy VI. Both the Alexandrian and the Vienna rulers have well-defined chins, with a deeply carved ridge below the lower lip. This characteristic also appears on the portraits of a young Ptolemaic ruler, probably Caesarion (Cats. 125-128).35 The well-defined chin became a common feature of Ptolemaic royal image from the reign of Ptolemy IX.

Unfortunately, because Ptolemy IX seems to have adopted a more corpulent image in the second part of his reign, it is difficult to distinguish the portraits of this ruler from those of his brother, Ptolemy X, who ruled during the same period, taking control of Egypt when his brother fell out of favour. One contemporary portrait is the Copenhagen Ptolemy from Memphis (Cat. 121) like the Berlin Lost Ptolemy the ruler wears a diadem and uraeus and has unusually stylised wavy hair covering his entire head. The fleshy lips with down-turned mouth and weak chin are so similar to some of the portraits on the Edfu sealings that they must represent the same ruler.36 In some respects, this image is similar to another late Ptolemy from Canopus, now in the Greco-Roman Museum Alexandria (Cat. 122).

35 There are, however, other stylistic differences to distinguish the first from the second century BC portraits in question. See below for further discussion.
36See Chapter 2, Section 2.5 above for a fuller discussion on the identities of the portrait types found in the Edfu sealings.
This portrait almost certainly represents Ptolemy X but was originally identified as Ptolemy IV by Dutilh, whose opinion is widely shared. The formal image of the piece fits well within the framework of the images of Ptolemy X. The stylised curls around the face, the corpulent features and the inlaid eyes are all marks of the late second to early first centuries BC. Instead of poor craftsmanship, the sculpture results from an interpretation or Egyptian parallel of a Greek portrait type; the face has a very Egyptian profile, particularly the jutting chin. The inlaid eyes resemble those of the Canopus Philometor (Cat. 110); also like the Philometor this statue was found at Canopus and it is possible that they were perhaps products of the same workshop. If so, the stylised form was deliberate since aesthetically the two pieces appear to be a world apart. To an Egyptian, the later portrait would represent the corpulent image of Ptolemy X because pharaonic art relies heavily on iconography and symbolism to relay a message. Egyptian artists continued to produce idealised representations of the Ptolemaic rulers, such as those found on temple reliefs. Thus, although native artists adopted the Greek royal image during the reigns of Ptolemy V and VI, some workshops or sculptors began to adapt the portraits and in many respects gave them a more Egyptian identity.

It is unlikely that there were portraits manufactured of Ptolemy XI, because of his short reign. The only Egyptian image of Ptolemy XII is the Tebtunis statue (Cat. 82), with portrait features that are similar to those on the ruler’s Hellenistic portraits but with no fringe of hair beneath the headdress. The lack of mixed-style representations during these two reigns does not signal the demise of the type, and there are several possible representations of the young Caesarion (Cats. 123-128). The only evidence for the promotion of Cleopatra VII with an escort is with her son

---

37 Dutilh (1905) 49 f., see also Kyrieleis (1975) 44-6, Bothmer (1996) 220 and most recently Grimm (1998) 99 and Rausch (1998) 209, no. 155. The side burns and curly appearance of the hair are similar to those on the coins of Ptolemy IV. However, the more corpulent ruler on the sealings also has facial hair and a similar hairstyle. This fact, along with the stylistic features that are discussed above indicate that the ruler represents Ptolemy X. Kiss (1984) 80 believes it to be a young Caracalla. See also R. Smith (1998) 97 no. 80, who categorises this piece as an unknown portrait type.
Ptolemy XV. Any other statues showing the queen with her brothers would have been destroyed or re-cut following their deaths.

All sculptures of Caesarion are in Egyptian format with stylised faces; however the young boy is sometimes shown with a Greek diadem rather than a *nemes* headdress. The BMA prince (*Cat. 126*) is the best preserved. The hair is more naturally rendered than that on the portraits of his immediate predecessors, and yet he retains the down-turned mouth and strong chin of Ptolemy IX and Cleopatra III. The eyes on the Brooklyn prince are inlaid, but once again the second representation from this period of a young prince has carved eyes. On the Bologna bust (*Cat. 127*) the prince wears a diadem with a single uraeus; his bulging eyes are reminiscent of the third century BC portraits of Ptolemy IV. The chin and mouth are very similar to those on the Vienna ruler (*Cat. 118*), but the less stylised hair places the piece firmly in the mid-first century BC. On a head now in the National Museum, Warsaw (*Cat. 125*) the ruler wears a diadem rather than the *nemes* and again has the hair carved over the entire head. The subject has similar features to the BMA and Bologna princes but for an unknown reason Kyrieleis identified the subject as Ptolemy II.\(^{38}\)

A statue now in Mantua (*Cat. 128*) that was identified by Curto as Caesarion also deserves consideration here.\(^{39}\) The sculptor seems to have attempted to render the statue in a more Hellenised manner than any of the previous examples, as can be seen clearly on the modelling of the rib cage and also the heavy fringe that appears from under the *nemes* headdress. The portrait features are similar to the other representations of Caesarion and the style of fringe is almost identical to a Greek-style portrait, now in the Benaki Museum Athens, of a more mature subject.\(^{40}\)

\(^{38}\) Kyrieleis (1975) 166. Stylistically this head fits better in the first century BC, and there is no evidence to suggest that this type of portrait appears before the reign of Ptolemy V.

\(^{39}\) Curto (1963) 113 f., and Kyrieleis H21 dates the statue to the first century BC.

\(^{40}\) Athens, Benaki Museum inv. 22588, for illustration see Kyrieleis (1975) H14, pl. 67.6-7.
The fragment of a colossal ruler from Hadra (Cat. 129) also dates to the first century BC. The ruler wears a nemes headdress with the hair visible beneath it; the fringe is, however, less stylised than the portraits of Ptolemies IX and X and more carefully carved than the usual hair in the Roman Period, which often consists of a straight fringe rather than the tousled style of the Ptolemaic Period. This statue, and the female that forms the second part of the dyad (Cat. 98), are also youthful in appearance. For iconographic reasons the female is unlikely to portray Cleopatra VII and is more likely to represent her daughter Cleopatra Selene. For this reason, the male with his stylised hair and general portrait type is more likely to represent Caesarion’s younger half-brother, Alexander Helios. Indeed the very flamboyant styling of the hair on the statue is deliberately reminiscent of Alexander the Great’s posthumous hairstyle and this would no doubt have been deliberate.

The last two statues in this section are more problematic. They both seem to date from the mid to late first century BC but do not fit quite so neatly into the chronological sequence. The first (Cat. 124) wears a Macedonian kausia but has stylised Egyptian portrait features that are more typical of the fourth and third centuries BC with the usual sickle-shaped smile. The portrait has inlaid eyebrows and eyes, which is again a later feature. The carefully carved hair under the headdress is also more typical of the Egyptian-style portraits of Ptolemy VI and as the above has illustrated, it re-emerges on the portraits of Caesarion. The piece may be deliberately archaising or alternatively may have been re-cut from an earlier third century piece. There are no obvious marks to suggest the latter, and the appearance of an archaising piece in the first century BC would accord with the Greek and

---

41 Whether Mark Anthony was depicted as pharaoh is questionable; as Maehler (1983a) 9 notes he did not take the title Bacchus, therefore, this particular representation is more likely to represent Caesarion.

42 See Chapter 3, Section 3.7 above for a discussion of the dating of the female statue.

43 Bianchi (1992) 69-75, dated the piece to the fourth century BC, comparing it stylistically to the portraits of Nectanebo I, II and Ptolemy II; he identified the subject as Alexander the Great. Josephson (1997b) 19 suggests that the subject is the young Ptolemy Philadelphos, son of Cleopatra VII and Mark Anthony, because of the kausia. He compares the hair to that on the Brooklyn Black Head (Brooklyn Museum of Art, inv. 58.30). Josephson alludes to a passage in Plutarch Life on Antony ch. 54, which describes Ptolemy Philadelphos at the Donations of Alexandria, wearing a Macedonian kausia.
Egyptian-style images of Cleopatra VII. Josephson’s arguments for the identity of the subject being Ptolemy Philadelphos, son of Mark Antony and Cleopatra, are extremely convincing and the kausia also appears on several of the Edfu sealings and on a terracotta portrait in a private collection, not included in this catalogue.44

The final piece in the catalogue for this section (Cat. 123), a sculpture in the National Museum, Athens, poses quite the opposite problem. Its portrait features have much in common with those of Ptolemy IX and Caesarion; that is to say, the thin, slightly down-turned mouth with the distinctive groove across the chin. The hair, however, is styled in a cable across the forehead and is more uniform than the usual Ptolemaic locks but not as stylised as the snail-shell curls on the portraits of Ptolemy IX and X. The cable fringe is more commonly found in the Roman Period, and yet the similarity of portrait features on the Athens head with the portraits that are mentioned earlier in this chapter would imply that the piece was Ptolemaic. Such problems are common when attempting to place this type of representation within a chronological sequence, because there seems to have been a considerable degree of artistic licence in the production of these Egyptian-style images with Greek portrait features. This freedom would perhaps accord with our knowledge of the Egyptian sculptors’ work routine, as powerful individuals who travelled to commissions not only to sculpt but also to breath life into the stone representations of the rulers and gods.

4.5 Function

It is possible that there were practical, artistic or ideological reasons for both the Egyptian-style statues with Greek portrait features and the Greek portraits that are executed in a hard stone. We know from sanctuaries such as the Sarapieion that Greek and Egyptian statues were often placed side by side, which may have resulted

44 See Bothmer (1996) 219 fig. 16 for a terracotta head, in a private collection in Amsterdam. See ROM 906.12. 66.
in one tradition borrowing from the other. The Greek-style images are sometimes shown with an Egyptianising crown and are manufactured in a native stone; this evidence might suggest that these pieces were deliberately made to appear ‘Egyptian’. Although these portraits are not technically Egyptian, to a Greek the token crown and unusual stone may have been convincing. The examples without an Egyptian headdress but in a hard stone may have fulfilled a similar role in the early stages of Ptolemaic rule or simply have been the result of artists experimenting with a wealth of new stones.

The Egyptian-style statues are less easily defined, and there are several possible functions that they might have served. The statues with Greek portrait features are manufactured alongside the more traditional Egyptian-style representations that parallel the Greek images, such as the Brussels Physcon (Cat. 78) or the Faiyum Aulettes (Cat. 82). This could indicate that only certain artists were copying the Greek-style portraits or, more importantly, that artists were interpreting the Greek portraits because of a lack of their own models. The result is that some statues appear to be interpretations of the Greek images, whilst others, such as the Canopus Philometor (Cat. 110), copy the original very closely and other sculptors produce very stylised versions of the original portrait types, making the features more Egyptian.

The majority of this group are life-sized or larger and this fact may also be significant. This type of statue would have been made for political rather than religious reasons and should be treated quite separately from the wooden or precious metal effigies that were nurtured by the priests in the inner sanctuaries of native temples. The colossal statues from the Alexandrian harbour (Cats. 115, 116, 137 and 138) may even have simply stood on the island of Pharos or perhaps in an open-

---

45 There is a difference between the images of gods that were tended by the priests, and the large statues that would have decorated the hypostyle hall and areas of the temple that were open to the public.
air temple; at twelve metres in height it is unlikely that they were kept indoors. There is no evidence from the island to suggest that there was a formal Egyptian temple, and certainly not one of such great proportions to house at least four statues of this size. The images of Ptolemy VI and X from Canopus may also have been located in a Greek sanctuary or Egyptian temple, since there were both in the city. The Karnak Ptolemy V would suggest that at least one example was housed in an Egyptian temple in the heart of the indigenous population rather than in an area heavily populated by Greeks.

Why should Egyptian sculptors have broken away from the purely Egyptian images that were used for the early Ptolemaic rulers, and why did they apparently suddenly begin to use Greek portraits as the models for their representations? Firstly, it is important to note that only the faces of these statues are affected by any outside influence. The striding stance and traditional regalia are maintained throughout the Ptolemaic Period on royal statues in the round, and the temple reliefs remain unchanged. It is likely that this type of statue served a very specific purpose and was perhaps even intended for both Greek and Egyptian audiences, or perhaps members of the population who shared both cultures, such as the Egyptians who became ‘Greek’ through service in the royal administration. By the time of Ptolemy V, the communities must have become quite accustomed to both artistic styles and were also of mixed culture and often ethnicity. Several Egyptian-style images have been found in Alexandria, and the rulers’ policy of maintaining Egyptian tradition at the Sarapeion in Alexandria, whilst placing Greek statues at the older sanctuary in Memphis, is testimony to their willingness to promote the two cultures side by side. The first appearance of a Ptolemy in the guise of pharaoh with foreign portrait features occurs at a time when there were uprisings in the Thebaid and a rival Egyptian pharaoh. It is possible that the Greek features were used to distinguish

---

46 See Empereur (1998) 76-7 who maintains that there were six statues outside the lighthouse.
48 See Chapter 1, Section 1.3 and McGing (1997) 282-283 for documentary evidence.
the ruler from the native pretenders to the throne, while still appealing to Egyptian cultural and artistic traditions.

The representations of royal women in the same fashion as men is a further point of interest. These statues are quite distinct from the other representations of royal women and consequently must have fulfilled a different purpose. The Egyptian sculptors clearly struggled with the rendering of the hair, and the overall result is rather stylised. Such representations are very rare, and as I have suggested, they may be interpreted as direct equivalents to the male statues, manufactured during the period in which Egypt was ruled by a lone female rather than male. On the Hadra dyad, the female (Cat. 98) is portrayed in a wholly Egyptian manner, whilst her male companion (Cat. 129) has stylised hair beneath the headdress. By the middle of the first century BC the sculptors had perhaps forgotten how to portray a female in this manner and so resorted to the more traditional style of sculpture.

In an essay on pharaonic-style art of the Ptolemaic Period, Bianchi argued that the adoption of features such as the Greek portrait type or the cornucopia on female statuary does not necessarily indicate a foreign influence on the Egyptian sculpture. Whilst this position is initially difficult to comprehend, particularly when there is such obvious evidence for the Hellenistic influence on Egyptian art, there is a degree of logic behind it. For the Egyptian sculptors were incorporating a portrait within their usual framework. Whether they used a new portrait type of Egyptian creation or borrow the features from another source, the result was still an essentially Egyptian statue. The borrowing of a foreign image (and indeed the interpretation of that image into an Egyptian form) is not a new phenomenon in Egyptian history. The more interesting question that lies behind the appearance of such images after over a century of Ptolemaic rule is perhaps less easily understood.

---

49 See Chapter 3, Section 3.1 above for pre-Ptolemaic representations of women.
There is an abundance of sculptors' models from the fourth and third centuries BC in museums throughout the world. However, for some reason there is no evidence for their continued use from the time of Ptolemy V until later in the second century BC. It is tempting to interpret this lack of interest in the Egyptian presentation of the dynasty as simply the result of royal preoccupation with other problems, but given that Ptolemy V is known to have been crowned as an Egyptian pharaoh and that he moved the royal court to Memphis, such neglect would seem to go against the general royal policies at this time, unless of course the introduction of such dual-purpose imagery was intended to bring the two traditions together and was simply the further step in an already existing policy to associate the two cultures.

There is of course a less favourable interpretation of these statues: that they are the result of the nationalist movement by the priests and were intended to represent their pharaoh in his true role, as a foreigner. However, this would seem to be the least likely scenario, particularly as the colossal statues were placed in the vicinity of the royal palaces in Alexandria, although one could argue, rather implausibly, that the later rulers would have missed the intended insult through their ignorance of the native culture.

When Bothmer defined which features on Egyptian sculpture in the Ptolemaic Period were the result of a Greek influence, he concluded that whilst certain realistic features were already part of the Egyptian repertory the characteristic of mood belonged to Hellenistic art. Because the types of image appear on the coinage and on portraits in the round, it is more likely that their concept was originally a Greek inspiration as with the title Φύλλοι. The idea of portraying wealthy and important males as corpulent was common in Egyptian art; pendent breasts and rolls of fat on

51 Compare Fairman (1974) on the Triumph of Horus, who suggests that the rulers were associated with Seth rather than Horus. Compare Koenen (1993) 39 who states that the ethnic origin of the pharaoh was unimportant as long as he functioned in his role.

52 Bothmer (1996) 223. Bothmer's comments are a matter of personal opinion, and there is the additional problem of defining 'mood' in sculpture.
the belly from the time of the Old Kingdom symbolised wealth and status. Therefore, the adoption of this particular imagery would not have been alien to Egyptians. Pharaohs are, however, usually shown as slender, and thus the corpulent imagery of the Ptolemaic rulers is either an adoption from the Greek portraits of the rulers or an attempt to portray the subject as he actually appeared; such images and ideologies are common throughout Hellenistic art. The new physiognomy seems to have been a characteristic with which native artists were comfortable and thus we find that some workshops no longer copy the royal model as faithfully as the earlier portraits. In other words the physcon portrait type could be translated rather than merely copied. It is easy to see how the two types of image merged.

There is, however, a further explanation for the stylised images with snail-shell curls that emerge under Ptolemies VIII, IX and X, and were replaced by statues which have more in common with the early examples of the 'mixed style' for Caesarion's image. These images could be classified as archaising, and this would accord with the popularity of archaising art in the second century BC, as advocated by Becatti and Havelock. This theory would only be plausible if the statues were placed in Greek sanctuaries, since the archaising representations in Egyptian art of the Ptolemaic period revert to earlier Egyptian styles, as seen on the Brummer head (Cat. 94) and the Mariemont queen (Cat. 98). Unfortunately the Vienna queen (Cat. 118) and a portrait of a ruler, now in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria (Cat. 119) are without a known provenance; the Canopus ruler (Cat. 122) could have come from a Greek or Egyptian context and so the reasons behind the apparently archaising images must remain conjecture.

---

54 See Havelock (1964) 43-58 and (1965) 331-340 who follows Becatti (1941). There are examples from the second and first centuries BC of archaism being used to evoke a sense of the past.
4.6 Conclusion

Neither the Greek portraits in hard stone nor the Egyptian statues with Greek features can properly be described as a mixed style, since the borrowing is very specific and controlled. The former seem only to have been experiments with a local medium and demonstrate the limitations of Greek artists when the results are compared with the Egyptian portraits of the time. The continuation of the separate traditions throughout the Ptolemaic Period implies that the adoption, and then adaptation, of Greek portrait types by native artists served a specific purpose. Although any conclusions concerning the place of manufacture are tentative because of the lack of provenance for the majority of the examples, there seems to have been a higher concentration of statues in the north including Alexandria and Canopus. These images were found in Egyptian temples, as the Karnak Epiphanes shows, but there is no reason why they should not also have appeared in Greek sanctuaries since the early Ptolemies promoted themselves as pharaoh in the Sarapieion at Alexandria and possibly elsewhere. The high percentage of uninscribed statues may be explained by the turbulent political climate of the second century BC, and this interpretation also applies at the temples where cartouches are left intentionally blank.

The putative use of the same models by both Egyptian and Greek sculptors seems unlikely. Although we have an abundance of models from the early Ptolemaic Period, there is a noticeable lacuna from the time of Ptolemy V to Ptolemy IX and again under Cleopatra and Caesarion. The high quality of the early portraits, particularly the Canopus Philometor, suggests that artists were using Greek bronze originals as models rather than stone copies. This fact would explain the characteristics of the finer hair on the coins of Philometor and the Egyptian version of his portrait. Although the duplication in a different medium demonstrates the skills of native artists, they were not necessarily more skilled than their Greek counterparts.
Chapter 5: Representations of Isis, Egypt and the Ptolemaic Queens

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with a group of statues of Ptolemaic royal women that are essentially Egyptian in style, but which share iconographic attributes with the Greek-style representations. The statues are linked stylistically and chronologically with the purely Egyptian-style representations, which were discussed in Chapter Three. The main differences between the two groups are the hairstyle, drapery and attributes, which are sometimes borrowed from the Greek tradition. Not all of the representations within this group have all three components. Many of the statues are fragmentary and so it is impossible to know their exact form. Very few have a provenance.

As Table 1 shows, the statues that do have a known find-spot originated in either the Delta or the Faiyum. This may be purely a coincidence, but on the other hand the concentration of finds within a particular region and indeed one which had a high Greek population may help in understanding the function of this distinctive group. The type of image was certainly adopted by the Romans and possibly the Greek communities in the Ptolemaic Period; only one version without a back pillar survives. It is executed in a hard stone and shares much in common with the earlier Egyptian prototypes. Unfortunately it cannot be dated with any certainty to the Ptolemaic period, but it demonstrates that the Greek workshops began to manufacture their own versions of this type of statuary, probably during the first century BC (Cat. 149).1

It has been suggested that this type of representation was intended to assimilate the Ptolemaic royal women to the goddess Isis.2 However, this association has more

---

1 This particular statue is clearly modelled on the Egyptian versions, and it is on first glance very close to the images that will be discussed in this chapter. Only the lack of back pillar and the soft modelling of the right arm place it within the Greek tradition.
2 See Walters (1989) 5-33 for a detailed account of the study of this type of representation. Bissing (1914) text with plate 112; Schaefer (1921) 194 f.; Vandebeek (1949) 18f., 38 f., 88 and 98; Needler
recently, and quite correctly, been disputed; with the conclusion that the association between this type of statue and Isis was not developed until the Roman Period and may even have been a direct consequence of Cleopatra VII's own assimilation to the goddess. Before considering the function of this group I shall attempt to establish a chronological sequence.

(1949) 137, all assumed that the statues were associated with Isis whereas Bianchi (1980) concluded that the Egyptian-style statues were not connected with Isis in any way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Coiffure</th>
<th>Dress</th>
<th>Headdress</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Faiyum</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ankh</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Canopus</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>double horn</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Single uraeus</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Isis crown</td>
<td>single horn</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Ma'amura</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Single uraeus</td>
<td>ankh</td>
<td>C-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Canopus</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>single horn</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>single horn</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Tripartite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>D-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Tripartite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Triple uraeus</td>
<td>ankh and double horn</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Triple uraeus</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Triple uraeus</td>
<td>single horn</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Double uraeus</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>double horn</td>
<td>E-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>single horn</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dress types**
- Type 1: fine, clinging drapery with plain edges
- Type 2: fine, clinging drapery with a fringe
- Type 3: more stylised drapery with a fringe and knot
- Type 4: more stylised drapery with plain edges and knot
- Type 5: nude appearance (similar to the purely Egyptian-style statues)
5.2 Chronology and Identification

One important factor to consider when attempting to establish a chronological sequence for any group of Ptolemaic representations is the existence of local workshops. Early commentaries on Ptolemaic sculpture tend to date any pieces of poor quality to the late second and first centuries BC. In reality poor quality may reflect regional rather than chronological differences or may be the result of a private rather than state sponsored dedication. In order to avoid errors in dating, it is necessary to look carefully at iconographic and stylistic subtleties, and I have attempted to do so where possible by comparison with the purely Egyptian-style representations. For simplicity, the statues are divided into subgroups (A-F), although these divisions are not necessarily indications of chronological differences.

Subgroup ‘A’ contains the earliest statues, including a queen that is now in the BMFA (Cat. 130), which has been dated to the third century BC on account of the fine, body-clinging drapery. The only difference between this piece and the early Ptolemaic statues such as the Vatican Arsinoe II (Cat. 84) is that the queens wear different garments. This type of dress is not, however, a chronological indicator: the traditional transparent dress of the Vatican Arsinoe continues throughout the Ptolemaic period and is not confined to the early years of Ptolemaic rule.

The knot on the BMFA statue (Cat. 130) may indicate a stylistic or chronological development and it may even be possible to equate it with specific changes in the royal cult. Although the head of the BMFA statue has not survived, there is no indication that the queen wore her hair in the corkscrew coiffure (since no trace survives on the shoulders), and it is possible that she wore a traditional Egyptian-style headdress. The absence of the corkscrew wig and the stylistic comparison with other Ptolemaic statuary would place the statue anywhere from the mid to late third century

---

3 On the Greek-style portraiture from Alexandria see Lawrence (1925) 179; Needler (1949) 140 offers the same view of the "degenerative" styles of the Egyptian sculpture from the second century BC.
4 Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Egyptian Department. Although the piece has not been published, the departmental files allocate a third century BC date.
BC. Assuming that the transparent drapery is an early feature, the BMFA queen is the first example to wear the knotted garment in Ptolemaic art, which suggests that unlike the other associated attributes, the origin of the so-called Isis knot was Egyptian rather than Greek. This idea is supported by the lack of Greek features on the BMFA queen.

There are two other related statues from subgroup ‘A’, both now in the Greco-Roman Museum in Alexandria. The first piece (Cat. 131) is very fragmentary and there is no sign of a cornucopia or the corkscrew coiffure, suggesting that the garment which later became synonymous with the goddess Isis in her Roman form was in fact of Egyptian in origin. Here, the drapery is tied in a double knot and has more clearly defined folds than the BMFA statue (Cat. 130), particularly under the breasts.

The second statue, which was found in the Faiyum and is also now in the Alexandria Museum (Cat. 132), is perhaps the earliest example of this type of statue with the corkscrew locks and is a slightly better preserved than Cat. 130. The knot is tied in a double form and positioned slightly higher than on the previous representations. The drapery still clings to the subject’s body, but the folds of the garment are more obvious. The queen holds both hands firmly by her sides, with hands clenched. The style of the drapery and also the appearance of the locks would date this piece to the early part of the second century BC, perhaps around the reign of Cleopatra I or II. The locks first appear on the Libyan coins of Berenike.

Although there is one Hellenistic representation of Berenike II wearing the coiffure in Egypt (Cat. 36), it is not until the time of Cleopatra I that the royal women regularly appear on coinage or

---

5 The idea that the soft modelling of the female body is influenced by the Hellenistic tradition as Bothmer (1960b) 120 suggests, is not convincing. See Bianchi ed. (1988) for contrary view, that this treatment of the female form was already established in the Egyptian artistic tradition. Breccia (1926) 19, believes the garment to be Greek in origin, see also Needler (1949) 138. Compare the view held by Bianchi (1980) and Walters (1988), who believe the garment to be Egyptian.

6 This statue was found in the Faiyum. The provenance in itself is an important factor and will be discussed fully below under the subject of the function of this type of image.

7 For the Cyrenaican coins see Robinson (1965) 249 pl. xxx. The cornucopia also appears on the reverse of these coins.
statues in the round with the Libyan locks.\(^8\) On the original coins of Berenike II from Cyrenaica, the queen personifies Libya or Africa. The regular adoption of the coiffure in the second century BC in Greek and then Egyptian contexts may well have had a stronger association with Egypt than the goddess Isis, particularly on Egyptian-style statues.

Two further statues with a slightly more elaborate type of dress may also be assigned to sub-group ‘A’. One is a well-preserved statue in Cairo, which has a slightly later style of drapery, with a greater emphasis on the folds (Cat. 133) but still transparent in appearance. The Cairo queen wears a garment with folds under the breasts and then draped over her right shoulder to form the knot with the central pleat of the dress. Both hands were held firmly by the queen’s sides, and thus there was no cornucopia. The scalloping of the shawl fringe over the queen’s right shoulder occurs on other representations.\(^9\) The other, a statue now in Paris (Cat. 134), has an almost identical decorative edge on the garment, and like the Cairo statue the subject holds her arms firmly by her sides, clutching an ankh rather than a cornucopia. The third example from the Villa Albani in Rome and now in Munich, has the same effect but the stone is highly polished, with a finish that has more in common with the Hadrianic copies from the Emperor’s villa at Tivoli.\(^10\) The Munich statue is therefore probably a close Roman copy of the Cairo and Paris representations and the originals date to the beginning of the second century BC.

The statues in subgroup ‘A’ are less stylised in appearance than the later second and first century BC examples. This phenomenon parallels the development of the Egyptian-style statues of male rulers with Greek portrait features, where the earliest examples are closer to the Greek images and in some cases of a higher standard.\(^11\)

---

\(^8\) Needler (1949) 139, suggests that the some versions of the corkscrew coiffure with the more naturalistic treatment of the fringe on Egyptian statuary were the result of artists confusing the Libyan and Greek styles.

\(^9\) A highly polished example that is not included in this catalogue in the Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst, Munich inv. WAF 26b. It is not included in this catalogue because it is most probably Roman in date. See Arslan (1997) 97, no. III.3 for illustration.

\(^10\) For the Vatican statues (inv. 33 and 117) see Roulet (1972) 97, no’s 141-142, figs. 160-161.

\(^11\) See Chapter 4 where I suggest that the sculptors were in fact copying bronze originals rather than the same models, as Smith (1996) believes.
One might expect a more pronounced Greek influence later when Greek workshops were established, if they were indeed responsible for the introduction of the style. That the opposite was the case may indicate a lack of interest on behalf of the royal house in the dissemination of their image. If the statues in subgroup ‘A’ represent third century queen Cat. 132 probably represents Cleopatra I on account of the corkscrew coiffure. The next subgroup (B) would therefore date to the early part of the reign of Cleopatra II (probably around the period of 170-145 BC), a time when the royal females gained a more powerful and independent role.\textsuperscript{12} This was also a time when there was a decline in the production of the faience oinochoai, which were closely connected with the Greek royal cult in the third century BC.\textsuperscript{13} It was during this period that the first evidence appeared for the use of specific attributes to distinguish individual queens and this change in iconography may well echo changes within the dynastic cult.\textsuperscript{14} From this point, many of the statues that survive intact have either a single or double cornucopia. The double cornucopia in Greek art was associated specifically with Arsinoe II, and later under Cleopatra VII the double version appears on the reverse of the queen’s coins.\textsuperscript{15}

A statuette of Arsinoe II, now in the MMA (Cat. 136), illustrates the developments in subgroup B. This statue is rare because it has survived intact and the back pillar is inscribed; thus it illustrates the association of Arsinoe II with the double cornucopia in Egyptian as well as Greek art.\textsuperscript{16} The queen wears a long garment to her ankles, which is pulled over the right shoulder and tied in a knot above the right breast; the material is gathered beneath her breasts and there is a slightly off-centre fold down the centre. Fortunately the head on this statue has been preserved, showing a stylised

\textsuperscript{12} See Fraser (1998) 115-131 for outline of the relationship of the ruling house with the Alexandrians and Hölbl (1994) for a more general history.

\textsuperscript{13} D.B. Thompson (1973) 46-48, on the chronology of the vases.

\textsuperscript{14} Namely that from the time of Cleopatra III, the rulers become their own priests and priestesses within the dynastic cult. See Section 5.4 below for a further discussion.

\textsuperscript{15} See Davis and Kraay (1980) fig. 42 for an example of the use of the double cornucopia on the reverse of Cleopatra’s coins. There is one example of the double cornucopia on the reverse of a coin of Ptolemy VIII, but this is not specifically linked with Cleopatra III, in the same way that the crown of Arsinoe II is associated with both Cleopatra III and VII.

\textsuperscript{16} Bianchi suggests in the Corpus of Late Egyptian Sculpture notes for this statue that the back pillar was deliberately damaged, it is therefore, possible that the statue was later re-used to represent another queen, perhaps Cleopatra VII, since the iconography would have been the same.
coiffure of corkscrew locks falling onto the queen’s shoulders and a second row of locks along her brow. The face is rounded, with large eyes, again a feature of the Greek-style portraits. It is in marked contrast to the other head of Arsinoe II in the same museum (Cat. 85), which owes nothing to the Greek tradition and is more typical of Arsinoe’s Egyptian portrait type. This portrait is a posthumous representation of the queen and is discernible only through her specific attribute, the double cornucopia. A colossal statue from Canopus and now in the Alexandria Museum has very similar drapery to the MMA Arsinoe (Cat. 136). The arms, however, are held firmly to her sides, with clenched fists, like the earliest versions of this type.

Subgroup ‘C’ contains four statues: two were salvaged from the Alexandrian harbour and are datable because of the associated male statues from the same context (Cat. 115 and 116). These representations have recently been assigned to the third century BC; but with their stylised drapery and the portrait features of the associated male rulers, they can be dated to the reigns of both Ptolemy VIII and X and thus represent Cleopatra III. It is just possible to distinguish the position where the cornucopia joined the upper left shoulder on the more fragmentary of the two female representations; the knot is also visible above the right breast (Cat. 139). The better-preserved statue shows more clearly the form of the mid-second century queens (Cat. 138). This example was a colossal piece with stylised locks and drapery; again, there are only traces of a cornucopia remaining on the left arm. The head shows a full face with inlaid eyes, which is another feature of the second century BC. Fortunately, the crown has also been preserved. It is purely Egyptian in style and is of a type worn by the goddess Isis and also by many of the Ptolemaic queens. It was recently suggested that this particular statue represented Arsinoe II, hence the third century BC date. Just as a third-century date cannot be attributed, it is equally

---

17 For the purely Egyptian-style states see Vatican Arsinoe II from Heliopolis (Cat. 84) and compare Leiden F1938/7.20 (Cat. 91) for a posthumous representation, which has portrait features that are close to those of Ptolemy VIII, particularly in respect to the mouth and eyes.
18 Inlaid eyes occur much earlier in dynastic art, Bothmer (1996) 225 mentions a Nectanebo portrait with inlaid eyes, but generally they do not seem to occur in the Ptolemaic period until the second century BC.
19 For a survey or the types of crowns at the Temple of Isis at Philae see Vassilika (1989) 315-326.
20 La Richie (1996) 82, see also catalogue entry for dating.
unlikely that this particular example represents even a posthumous Arsinoe II, since
the queen usually wears a very specific crown rather than the more general sun disk,
cow horns and double feathers.21

A much smaller statue now in New Haven (Cat. 137) shares the same stylised curls
on the forehead as the MMA Arsinoe II (Cat. 136) and the colossal queen from Fort
Qait Bey (Cat. 138).22 The fourth member of this subgroup also shares features with
the statues from subgroup ‘D’; it is in the form of a dyad, found at Ma’mura, near
Alexandria (Cat. 140). Like the statue from Canopus (Cat. 135) the Ma’mura queen
carries an ankh rather than a cornucopia, and her facial features are rounded and
similar to those of the MMA Arsinoe II (Cat. 136) and the colossal queen from Qait
Bey (Cat. 138). Although the divisions are artificial, the Ma’mura queen (Cat. 140)
is a link between subgroups ‘C’ and ‘D’, particularly in the rendering of the lower
skirt, which falls over the feet. A very similar style is found on a statue from
Canopus and now in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria (Cat. 141);
unfortunately the face has been destroyed and thus it is not possible to know whether
the queen wore a uraeus, although there are the remains of a diadem which might
suggest that she wore an attribute.

One further attribute, which becomes more common towards the end of the second
century BC is the inclusion of a uraeus in addition to the corkscrew locks. The
uraeus is of course an Egyptian feature, and it is interesting that, during the final
period of development, the tripartite wig also appears to replace the corkscrew
coiffure, which was a Greek characteristic.23 Again this seems to parallel the
developments that occur in the male Egyptian statues with Greek portrait features,
with native versions replacing close copies of the original portraits.

21 Quaegebeur (1988) 47 fig. 18, Dils (1998) discusses the various crowns of Arsinoe II.
22 The New Haven queen was cited by Needler (1949) 140, as an example of the degenerative style of
second century Egyptian sculpture.
23 Bothmer (1996) 225 enters into a confusing discussion of the origins of the corkscrew locks stating
that they were in fact Egyptian; it seems that what he means is their introduction outside Egypt was
largely through their use in an Egyptian context.
On a mid to late second century BC statue from Alexandria (Cat. 141) and a later sculpture now in Cambridge (Cat. 148) the drapery is also more carefully rendered and could perhaps be described as more Hellenised in appearance. Attention has been given on both statues to the chiton, which is clearly visible around the lower neck. This type of dress is essentially Greek rather than Egyptian in style; the knot, however, remains the same. The Venus rings, which are shown on the neck, are also a feature of Hellenistic rather than Egyptian-style portraits in the Ptolemaic Period, but occur on earlier Egyptian-style representations. The Alexandrian statue (Cat. 141), like the Ma’mura queen, shows that careful attention has been given to the lower section of the drapery, which covers the top of the queen’s feet rather than ending at the ankles. She also wears sandals, which are not typically shown on the Egyptian-style statues and again may be a concession to the Greek tradition. However, the statue remains essentially Egyptian, it is carved out of a hard stone and has the traditional back pillar. The Alexandrian statue probably dates to late second century BC; it was found at Canopus and is further evidence of the ability of native craftsmen to adopt attributes from a foreign tradition and combine them successfully with native art.

The next statue within sub-group ‘D’ is unfortunately without a head. The BMA queen (Cat. 142) holds a single cornucopia and again has a very stylised form of drapery, with just the remains of the corkscrew coiffure surviving on her shoulders. The drapery here completely obscures any hint of the body beneath it and although the folds are slightly heavier than those of the Ma’mura queen (Cat. 140), the BMA queen is of a similar date, that is to say mid to late second century BC.

Finally from subgroup ‘D’ is a statue from Touah, now in the Alexandria Museum (Cat. 143), which offers a link to the next subgroup. It has a heavily stylised

24 Vassilika (1995) 120 and Bothmer (1996) 225, who questions the Hellenistic origins of the serrated scarf and the pleated female costume. The Cambridge statue is almost certainly first century BC in date illustrating that the fashion for attention to detail on the drapery continued in some workshops, whilst others preferred the more traditional Egyptian-style drapery.
25 Vassilika (1995) 120, no. 56.
26 For the rings around the neck of earlier Egyptian portraits see Paris, Louvre N2454, which dates to the Twenty-seventh Dynasty.
garment and the queen wears a single uraeus on a diadem, but this time with the Egyptian tripartite wig. This move towards a more Egyptian appearance again parallels the male rulers' portraits and the next sub-group of statues of this type.

One of the statues in sub-group ‘E’, the Hermitage queen (Cat. 144), wears the same transparent garment that is found on the purely Egyptian-style statuary of the same date (Cat. 94-97), and like the Touah statue, the queen wears a tripartite wig, but this time decorated with a triple uraeus. The Hermitage queen has been identified as Arsinoe II, on account of the double cornucopia. However, given the strong portrait features on this statue, it would seem unlikely that this was in fact the case. If the MMA Cleopatra and BMA queen are considered, it would seem that they are more general representations of royal women; this may have been due to the unstable political climate during the later second and early first centuries BC. This contrasts with the carefully executed portrait on the Hermitage queen. For this reason I suggest that the Hermitage ruler represents Cleopatra VII, since it is under this ruler that there is a re-emergence of more carefully executed portrait types.

There are stylistic as well as iconographic reasons to support this argument. Firstly under Cleopatra VII, the royal image looks back to the third century BC for its inspiration in both Greek and Egyptian-style representations. Both statues show the queen with a more traditional form of costume; the clinging drapery that appeared on the BMFA queen (Cat. 130) has replaced the heavy folds. The Hermitage queen holds a double cornucopia and this symbol was associated with Cleopatra VII in addition to Arsinoe II, most probably to associate the later ruler with a more prosperous period of the dynasty. The promotion of the double cornucopia on the reverse of Cleopatra VII’s coinage illustrates the queen’s wish to be linked with Arsinoe II. On the relief decoration of the south wall of the temple of Denderah, Cleopatra wears a crown that was associated with Arsinoe II and the queen can be seen wearing the crown again on a stele now in the Egyptian Museum, Turin.

28 Quaegebeur (1983) 111-113, remarks that Cleopatra II also wore the crown of Arsinoe on the fourth pylon of the temple of Amun at Karnak and on the Ptolemaic gateway temple of Khonsu. The
Bothmer’s observations regarding the similarity between the hawk-like face of Cat. 144 and the coin portraits of Cleopatra VII also lend support to the re-identification of the Hermitage ‘Arsinoe’ as the last Ptolemaic queen. However, it is the quality of the piece that is the best argument for dating it to the end of the Ptolemaic period, and the iconography that links it most convincingly with Cleopatra VII.

There are other associated statues, including the MMA Cleopatra (Cat. 146), which has heavy and stylised drapery with the knot taking a very simple form. The queen wears her hair in a corkscrew coiffure, but on her head she also wears a diadem and triple uraeus. On her upper right arm the queen has a hieroglyphic cartouche, the authenticity of which has recently been disputed. Bothmer described the representation as “youthful in appearance” and chose to identify the queen as Cleopatra II in favour of Cleopatra VII, interpreting the triple uraeus as a symbol of that queen’s joint rule with Ptolemy VI and VIII. He dismisses the statue as a representation of Cleopatra VII on stylistic grounds, concluding that the only way that this statue could date to the first century BC only if it were from a “provincial” workshop. If, however, the triple uraeus was a reference to the rule of Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra II and Cleopatra II, it could be dated as late as 118 BC. Furthermore, if the colossal statue of a queen from Fort Qait Bey (Cat. 138) with a single uraeus is Cleopatra III, on account of the date of the associated male rulers, the MMA Cleopatra is likely to represent a later queen because of the difference in iconography. Finally the positioning of the right hand, which is held flat against the queen’s thigh rather than clenched, is further support for a mid-first century BC date.

The fragment of a statue (Cat. 147) that has remarkably similar features to the MMA portrait and may even have been carved by the same workshop was included in Kyrieleis’ catalogue of first century queens. The head is important because it has a crown was also worn by Cleopatra VII as seen on a stele from Thebes and now in Turin (inv. 1764) and on two of the relief scenes at the Temple of Hathor, Denderah.

29 Josephson and Stanwick (forthcoming).
30 Bothmer (1960b) 145-6, no. 113
31 Bothmer (1960b) 146. The provincial workshop would also explain the single rather than double cornucopia that was associated with Cleopatra VII as well as Arsinoe II, particularly as the attribute is Greek and the sculptor was clearly Egyptian.
double uraeus and was clearly intended to represent Arsinoe II, thus illustrating that the triple uraeus was a quite separate iconographic allusion. Because the two are contemporaneous, it is probable that they refer to two different queens.

The triple uraeus can be found on two other royal representations of this type. On a head now in the BMA Museum of Art (Cat. 145) the same coiffure as that of the MMA Cleopatra appears, including the curls along the forehead. The nose on the BMA queen is damaged, but a profile view of the statue shows a down-turned mouth and well-defined chin. The only difference is that the BMA queen has inlaid eyes, a characteristic that it shares with the Hermitage so-called Arsinoe II (Cat. 144). Bothmer describes the faces of the Hermitage and MMA queens as hawk-like and yet dismisses the possibility that they might represent Cleopatra VII.32 To this group he adds the San Jose queen (Cat. 95), which again has a triple uraeus but is purely Egyptian in iconography and style.33

The MMA Cleopatra (Cat. 146) and the BMA queen (Cat. 145) both have a somewhat youthful appearance; their features are not identical to the Hermitage representation and the iconography of the MMA queen also differs from the Hermitage, in that she holds a single cornucopia, which might suggest that they represent different rulers. On the other hand, there is no evidence to suggest that the portrait features on the Egyptian-style statues of Ptolemaic queens were as carefully reproduced as those on the representations of the male rulers. The iconographic attributes may have served to indicate the identity of the queen, which would explain why there is no evidence for sculptors' models of late Ptolemaic queens. It is equally possible that more than one queen used the triple uraeus or that a single queen changed her associated iconography at some point in her reign, thus, in her youth a queen used the general attribute of a single cornucopia and then at a later stage adopted the more specific double cornucopia. However, given the very particular

---

32 Bothmer (1960b) 147.
33 Bianchi in Bianchi ed. (1988) 176 no. 69 dismisses the possibility that the San Jose queen has a hawk-like appearance and associates it with a representation of a Cleopatra in Vienna. It would seem more likely that the San Jose (Cat. 95) queen represents Cleopatra III or V rather than VII. Again the triple uraeus may be explained by the former’s triple rule.
attributes and crowns that are described in the Ptolemaic decrees, it would seem unlikely that an individual would change his or her iconography. The use of an attribute by more than one member of the dynasty seems, however, to have been acceptable and would have served to associate a ruler with his or her ancestors.

The triple uraeus could also represent Cleopatra VII's rule with Mark Anthony and Caesarion as that of Cleopatra II, Ptolemy VI and VIII or Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra II and Cleopatra III. However, it would seem more likely that the triple version was intended to represent the dead Julius Caesar, Caesarion and Cleopatra and that it associated the triad with Osiris, Isis and Horus. The identification of the Hermitage queen as Arsinoe II is unlikely because she usually appears with a double rather than triple uraeus.

To summarise, the MMA Cleopatra (Cat. 146) could represent a young Cleopatra III and refer to her rule with Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II. Stylistically the portrait is later than the date that is allocated by Bothmer and is unlikely to represent Cleopatra II. The BMA queen (Cat. 145) is very similar to the MMA statue and must date to the same period. Both statues could on the other hand represent Cleopatra VII, and date to the period of her association with Caesar, after the birth of Caesarion (47 BC), when Cleopatra would still have been only 18 years of age. The modification of the imagery, particularly the drapery and wig of the Hermitage queen may have been part of an official change in the royal imagery that occurred following Cleopatra's new era in 37 BC.

Finally group 'E' contains two statues that are possibly later in date. The first is a fragment of a statue that has already been mentioned in respect of the careful attention to the Hellenistic drapery, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum (Cat. 148). This statue also has a double cornucopia and consequently has been identified as a

---

34 Compare Grant (1995) 99-100 on the representations of Cleopatra and Caesarion on the walls of the birth temple at Hermonthis.

posthumous representation of Arsinoe II. Although the statue has been dated to the mid-second century BC, it has two features suggesting that it actually dates to a century later. The first characteristic is the hair; these thinner and longer locks are seen on the MMA Cleopatra and on the second statue from sub-group ‘F’ now in Cairo (Cat. 149). All three statues have characteristic right hands; on the MMA statue the hand rests on the thigh, but on the Fitzwilliam and Cairo representations the queen actually holds the drapery in her right hand. The Cairo statue is also important because it is the only statue from the Ptolemaic period to have been manufactured without a back pillar; it is to all intents and purposes Hellenistic, albeit in a hard stone.

5.3 Origins

In order to understand the origins of this particular group of statues it is necessary to look at earlier and later examples of related material. This group of statues belongs firmly within the Egyptian tradition; they are Egyptian in style of execution and are often made from a hard stone, a feature more commonly associated with the native artistic tradition. Schaefer divided the so-called Isis statues into two separate groups:

1) Those in a conventional Egyptian pose with more formal drapery.
2) Those with a sense of movement with more naturalistic drapery.

The statues in the early part of this chapter fall into the first category, although Schaefer’s divisions are oversimplified and do not take account of the Egyptian-style images with drapery that was influenced by Hellenistic sculpture.

Of the three attributes that form the comprehensive iconography of this group, two are associated in the first instance with the Greek tradition- the corkscrew coiffure and the cornucopia. The distinctive garment is more problematic and was the subject

36 Vassiliki (1995) 120, dates the statue to the mid-second century BC. However, the position of the right hand, which clutches the drapery and the styling of the hair would suggest that the statue dates to the first century BC.
37 Schaefer (1921) 12 ff. and Needler (1949) 137.
of an article in 1980 by Bianchi entitled ‘Not the Isis Knot’. In his paper Bianchi unequivocally denies that there is any association between the statues from this group and the goddess Isis. However, although he offers some evidence to support his argument there are still gaps in the interpretation and the function of these particular royal representations. For the remainder of this chapter, I shall demonstrate that this group of statues fulfilled a very specific role and was not intended to associate the Ptolemaic queens with Isis or to represent the goddess herself.

The chronology that was established in the first part of this chapter suggests that these images appear around the middle of the third century BC and that initially their only distinguishing feature is the so-called Isis knot. The earliest representation of a queen wearing this garment, the fringed mantle is on the Pithom stele (264/3 BC). The relief shows a representation of Arsinoe II, who has the titulary ‘Arsinoe, image of Isis and Hathor’. Bianchi points to other pre-Ptolemaic representations in Egyptian art with drapery similar to that worn by the Ptolemaic queens. A knot also appears on a Twenty-fifth Dynasty relief showing a Kushite princess as the divine consort. The knot is clearly part of the established Egyptian artistic tradition and appears in the Egyptian repertoire well before the first evidence of its adoption in the Greek artistic tradition. However, the knots to which Bianchi refers are different from those that are associated with the Ptolemaic statues. Was the

---

39 Cairo Museum inv. CG 22183. Fraser (1998) 236 and D.B. Thompson (1973) 58-9 draw attention to the relief and use it as evidence of an association between the costume and Isis. Walters (1988) 10, n. 38 points out that the assimilation to the two goddesses demonstrates that the garment was not associated exclusively with Isis. For the Pithom stele see Naville (1885) 16-20, although fig. 8 does not show the fringed mantle.
40 Notably figure 4, (BMA inv. 47.120.3) and figure 11, (Louvre inv. E 11162) for the similar costume worn on the Egyptian-style Lirinum relief.
41 Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge inv. EGA 4542.1943. For illustration see Vassilika (1995) 106 catalogue number 49. On earlier drapery, particularly of the Nineteenth Dynasty, the knot is tied beneath the right breast rather than above or between.
42 For the examples of the costume on faience oinochoai see Alexandria Greco-Roman Museum inv. 16170 and Oxford, Ashmolean Museum inv. 1909.347. For discussion and illustrations see D.B. Thompson (1973) 165-6 no. 122 and 123, plates XLIII-IV, who dates one of the representations of a queen with the knot to the time of Berenike II purely on account of the portrait features. Although Berenike is portrayed with the corkscrew coiffure there seems no stylistic reason for this particular vase to date to the third century BC, particularly because it would be an isolated appearance of this iconography. It seems more realistic after a comparison with the Greek-style portraits to date both faience vases with queens wearing the so-called Isis knot and locks to the reign of Cleopatra II or III.
43 Bianchi (1980) 12, makes the point that the use of the knot to fasten the tripartite costume in Egyptian art is simply a way of fastening a garment as opposed to using a fibula. The Ptolemaic
introduction of the more stylised garment with heavier folds also Egyptian in origin? It is possible to note similarities between the heavier costume on Egyptian statues and their Greek counterparts. However, the heavier drapery and more importantly the appearance of a Hellenistic chiton beneath the fringed mantle corresponds with the adoption of the cornucopia, which suggests that the drapery on the statues that were categorised as sub-groups C and D in this thesis was influenced by the Hellenistic tradition. This echoes the developments in the Egyptian-style representations of male rulers, where Greek portrait types are adopted.

The statues with the Hellenised drapery appear alongside those with the more traditional sheath-like dress that were discussed in Chapter 3, which would suggest that they served a specific role, other than to associate the queens with the dynastic cult. It is also fairly safe to assume that this development occurred during the mid to late second century BC, probably during the reign of Cleopatra II or III, meaning that the earlier statues without the cornucopia were simply variants of the more general representations. Before any conclusions can be drawn with regard to the function of this type of statue it is also necessary to address the origins of the corkscrew wig and the relevance of the cornucopia. Egyptian artists adopted both attributes from the Greek tradition, unlike the drapery that was Egyptian in origin and later Hellenised.

On the Greek-style portraits of Ptolemaic queens the corkscrew coiffure is simply a new way of styling the hair that becomes fashionable in the second century BC and there is nothing to associate it with the goddess Isis. The appearance of this wig on Egyptian-style statuary is of little surprise when one considers that the native priesthood readily adopted the Greek dynastic cult and Greek cult titles and might even suggest a more direct link with the royal cult and the acceptance of religious garments, however, seem to have served a specific purpose, perhaps ritualistic rather than simply reflecting a fashion because they exist alongside the sheath-like garments.

44 Bothmer (1996) 225 also dismisses the idea that this type of garment belongs exclusively to the Greek tradition. For examples see Markoe and Capel eds. (1997) 169-74, catalogue number 92-4 (Nineteenth Dynasty).

45 Needler (1949) 138-9 believes that the locks are Egyptian and are intended to represent natural hair rather than a wig. Bothmer (1996) 225 note 48 states that traditionally the locks were believed to have first appeared in Egyptian art, but concludes that they also appear on Greek statuary long before they are seen on Egyptian representations.
developments. In other words, the wig shows the queens in the guise of a Greek but portrayed according to the Egyptian tradition. The cornucopia may also fulfil a similar role, since this was also associated with the Greek royal cult. Like the wig, it is unequivocally Greek in origin yet the images remain essentially Egyptian until the first century BC. In the next section the functions of the Egyptian-style statues will be considered before addressing the Hellenistic form of Isis.

5.4 Function of the Egyptian Statues

There is a problem in associating the Egyptian statues with those of the more general dynastic cult, because there are many examples on the relief decoration of temples that show the queens wearing the more traditional Egyptian garment. There are two possible explanations for this: firstly that the statues were used in Greek contexts, or alternatively that they fulfilled a very specific role within the Egyptian tradition. Unfortunately those statues with a known provenance have been found in areas where there was both a strong Greek and Egyptian religious tradition, namely Canopus and Alexandria. The two representations from the coastal region of Alexandria (Cat. 138 and 139) are the most instructive, because they were placed alongside representations of Ptolemy as pharaoh albeit with Greek portrait features. One of these statues also illustrates that these images wore a traditional Egyptian crown rather than the more Hellenised version that appears on sealings and rings. The type would, therefore, seem to be more closely associated with the Egyptian rather than the Greek tradition. However, the statues of the queens with Hellenistic features and the images of male rulers with portrait features that were recognisable to Greek subjects may have served a truly cross-cultural purpose.

Were the attributes intended to associate the queens with a specific deity or was the purpose of the costume simply to present the queens in a particular guise or role? The function that the cornucopia served is problematic, and its association with the

---

46 There are, however, instances in which the queens wear the tripartite costume, tied in a knot. Needler (1949) 138, n. 4 cites the relief of Ptolemy VIII and the two Cleopatras at Kom Ombo; Walters (1988) 8, footnote 21, cites the Kom el-Hisn stele (Cairo CG 22186) and the propylon of the temple of Khonsu at Karnak where Berenike II appears in a garment with a fringed mantle.
Roman form of Isis has tended to cloud any interpretation of its function within the Egyptian artistic and religious traditions. On the faience cult vases, the cornucopia is intended to represent the queen's role as mother of Egypt and provider; thus it overflows with the fruits of Egypt. The cult vases are often inscribed with the name of the goddess Tyche or Isis, but this is generally accepted to simply associate the queens with the qualities of these two deities rather than to be an attempt to assimilate themselves to existing goddesses. The symbol of the horn of plenty was generally associated with the goddess Tyche in the Greek tradition, and so was probably adopted by the queens to associate themselves with the role that the goddess fulfilled.

The one inscription on the Egyptian-style representations from this group (Cat. 136) would also support the idea that these statues were not intended to be associated with Isis. It reads: 'King's [daughter], king's [sister] king's [wife], daughter of [Amu]n, mistress of the two lands, Arsinoe, the divine, the beloved of the King who lives forever.'

This inscription is particularly important for our understanding of these images, as is the treatment of the representation of foreigners in Egyptian art. They are clearly intended to associate the queens with the Egyptian tradition, because they wear Egyptian crowns. However, there is also an obvious reference to the queens' Greek ancestry, since two of the attributes are established and more closely associated with the Greek artistic traditions. At least six of the ten images held a cornucopia, with a further ten out of twelve wearing the corkscrew wig. That some of the statues are shown with the more traditional tripartite wig and others hold an ankh rather than the

---

48 See Chapter 1, Section 1.4 for the distinction between assimilation to and association with deities.
49 The MMA Arsinoe II is the only inscribed version. See Bianchi (1980) 18-19 who points to the fact that the inscription refers to Amun rather than Isis. See also Walters (1988) 9-10.
50 As Table 1 shows, eight of the statues are too damaged to know for certain whether they held a cornucopia and similarly six statues are without a head.
cornucopia could indicate that this type served different functions or that the iconography was flexible or subject to regional variations.\textsuperscript{51}

The chronological sequence may, however, help to determine the function of the group. Perhaps the most obvious conclusion would be that the statues with the cornucopia are introduced to represent the queen as a priestess of the dynastic cult, under Cleopatra III.\textsuperscript{52} Certainly the images of the queens on the faience cult vases show them in a very active role, pouring a libation at an altar, and although at this stage they are not intended to represent priestesses, the images clearly show them fulfilling a functional role rather than simply receiving honours.\textsuperscript{53} Perhaps the Egyptian artists adopted the cornucopia to represent the new ‘active’ role played by the queens.\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{5.5 Hellenistic and Roman Isis}

Although there are many Hellenistic and Roman examples of terracotta figurines with attributes associated with Isis, they are extremely difficult to date and consequently of little use for the study of the development of the iconography of the goddess.\textsuperscript{55} There are also very few statues in the round from the Hellenistic period that are Greek in style. The earliest example of a Hellenised statue of this type from Egypt dates to the first century BC (\textit{Cat. 149}). From the front this statue is indistinguishable from the Egyptian images, the only difference being the exclusion

\textsuperscript{51} Although it would be tempting to see this as a chronological indicator, there is no evidence to suggest that this was the case and the fact that the Hermitage queen has both attributes indicates that the two types were probably still in use until the end of the Ptolemaic period.

\textsuperscript{52} Walters (1988) 11 points out that Cleopatra III has the greatest accumulation of Isis titles, see Fraser (1998) 219-20 and 244. The appearance of the more Hellenised version of the Egyptian-style statues during her reign may have become associated with the goddess Isis through the queen. See Koenen (1993) 55, who notes that Cleopatra III was priestess at least once in 105/4 BC.

\textsuperscript{53} D.B. Thompson (1973) 31.

\textsuperscript{54} As Bianchi (1980) 18, points out, the costume is worn by royals, goddesses and mortals alike. This demonstrates that the dress must have had a more general association, perhaps with the royal cult. This possibly would support the idea that these statues were in some way associated with the Egyptian version of the dynastic cult and that it could represent the queen or her priestesses, which may in turn explain the absence of the cornucopia on some pieces, since priestesses would presumably still be needed for the cults of the earlier queens. Bianchi notes that the unpublished inscribed pieces with a tripartite costume in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (JE 37027, 38017 and 37453) are associated with the cults of Amun and Hathor rather than Isis.

\textsuperscript{55} Walters (1988) 13 makes the same point.
of a back pillar. The subject also holds her dress with her right hand, but by this stage the Egyptian-style representations also adopt this pose (Cat. 148).

Unfortunately the head is missing and so it is not possible to discern whether the subject wore an Egyptian or Egyptianising crown. This factor is important in understanding what the statue represented and also whether it was intended to represent the goddess Isis. This type of image was eventually accepted into the Roman tradition, possibly via the Greeks in Egypt or in Ptolemaic possessions, who used it to represent the goddess Isis.56

The popularity of this type of statue among the Roman cults of Isis, has led to the identification of images from the Hellenistic Period to be identified as representations of the goddess or of Ptolemaic queens associated with Isis.57 If the evidence from the Roman period is ignored, there is little to support the assimilation of these statues with Isis in the Ptolemaic period. The close relationship between the queens and the Egyptian pantheon and their role as provider for Egypt led to the assimilation of certain attributes with Isis in the Roman Period. It is possible that this dissemination began during the Ptolemaic Period in Greek contexts, but there is no evidence to support this hypothesis.

If one considers the images that were used in the Hellenistic period outside Egypt to represent the goddess Isis, it is obvious that the iconography was not uniform. On Delos for example, the cult statue of Isis was very similar to that of the Greek Aphrodite.58 The two deities were already associated both in and outside Egypt, and so it is of little surprise that the population of Delos looked to Aphrodite for inspiration when they commissioned their cult statue of Isis. If the Egyptian statues are considered in this light, it is easy to see how images that were originally intended to represent Ptolemaic queens, could be misidentified as Isis, particularly when the second and first century queens were associating themselves with the goddess in their titulary.

56 See Walters (1988) 14, who claims that the earliest examples of Isis with this iconography come from Rhodes, followed by Delos and Kos.
57 Even in the most recent catalogue on Isis, see Malaise in Arslan ed. (1997) 86-95.
Many of the Roman statues or relief images that adopt the associated iconography are thought to represent priestesses of Isis. If, as suggested, the original Egyptian statues of Ptolemaic queens were introduced to represent them in their role as priestesses of their own cult, the appearance of the statues in ritual contexts as participant in cult activity in the Roman period is easily explained.

The representations of a female with the corkscrew locks and knotted mantle in the Hellenistic minor arts of Ptolemaic Egypt, such as the BMA medallion, need to be explained. The earliest appearance of the costume in a Hellenistic context is under Cleopatra I, when the queen appears on a faience oinochoe in the full costume, with the cornucopia and corkscrew locks. However, other images such as the BMA medallion are generally interpreted as representations of the goddess Isis. Because the male subject is always interpreted as Sarapis, his partner by association is equated with Isis.

Because the Ptolemaic queens are clearly the first to use the iconography in the Hellenistic tradition as well as in Egyptian contexts, it would seem unlikely that the same attributes would be shown to represent a goddess. There are three possible explanations for this interpretation. The first is that the male deity represents Zeus-Amun and not Sarapis; Bianchi mentions the link between the third century queens and the god Amun. This association may well have resulted in the appearance of queens as a kind of divine consort to the god, and subsequently the introduction of a specific costume and attributes again to distinguish the more usual role of the queens within the dynastic cult. If this hypothesis is accepted, the appearance of a Ptolemaic queen with corkscrew coiffure and Hellenised lotus crown alongside a bearded deity can be reinterpreted as the god Zeus rather than the less successful Sarapis. Zeus of course was the Greek equivalent to Amun and was also closely associated with the Ptolemaic dynasty through Alexander the Great. The link between Zeus-Amun and the rulers was one that the royal house would have been keen to promote in both

---

59 See Walters (1988) 25, on the Attic grave stelae, where the subject in the Isis costume holds a situla, implying that she served a cult role.
60 See Appendix 2.1.
61 See D.B. Thompson (1973) type IV figure: nos. 123, plate D and 124, plates XLIII-XLIV, both of which she identifies as Cleopatra I by the portrait features.
62 Bianchi (1980) 19, see also Quaegebeur (1988) 43.
Greek and Egyptian contexts. Since the iconographies of Sarapis, Zeus and Asclepios are often difficult to distinguish, the identity of the male subject on rings and sealings has always been accepted as Sarapis.63

The second explanation is that this pair represents the ruler, in the first instance Ptolemy IV in the guise of Sarapis, and that his consort appears as his queen, as seen on the faience oinochoai; this phenomenon would explain why on the earliest examples the queen does not wear the associated attributes of Isis.64 Finally, these representations may have been associated with Isis because of her close connection with the Ptolemaic royal women. The confusion in iconography may have resulted in the Greeks overseas and the Romans adopting the two images for their adopted Egyptian deities.65

The close associations between deities and their assimilation to foreign equivalents may explain how attributes that were intended to represent Ptolemaic queens were taken by the Hellenistic Greeks in Egypt and overseas to represent an Egyptian goddess. This amalgamation of roles played by major deities and the iconography of two cultures in best represented by a relief now in Milan Archaeological Museum.66 The object dates to around the time of Ptolemy VIII and shows a female with the corkscrew coiffure and portrait features more commonly associated with Cleopatra III; however, the related iconography makes reference to Horus, Sobek, Isis and Thmuis. In short, the iconography of particular deities was borrowed and sometimes adopted and then adapted by other gods. This blending of attributes is confusing but appears to have been perfectly acceptable in Ptolemaic Egypt. The practice is simply an extension of the many cult titles adopted by the royal house in association with gods, thus showing the rulers not as manifestations of a particular deity, but as fulfilling their role be it as provider or protector.

63 See Bianchi ed. (1988) 208 number 102, BMA inv. 78.85 for example.
64 See Castiglione (1978) pl. XIX for the queen without the corkscrew locks, and also pl. XX for an image with distinctive portrait features that would be associated with a queen rather than a goddess.
65 Walters (1988) 11-12 still assumes that these images represent Isis and Sarapis, even though she admits that there is little to support the identification prior to the Roman Period.
66 Inv. E 0.9.40114. for illustration see Arslan ed. (1997) 77.
5.6 Conclusion

This type of image represented the Ptolemaic queens in a specific role, associated with the royal cult rather than associating the subject with Isis. The early statues are Egyptian in style but from the second century BC the artists adopt Greek attributes and the costume becomes more Hellenised in appearance. In the first century BC the images revert to the more traditional garments and wigs, on occasion maintaining the cornucopia. This development reflects that of the male statues in the Egyptian style during the second and first centuries BC. This symbol and the corkscrew coiffure are Greek in origin and demonstrate a degree of cross-cultural borrowing, which is of little surprise in context. The drapery and knot can be firmly placed within the Egyptian artistic tradition and they in turn are accepted into the Greek imagery from at least the time of Cleopatra I. That the two cultures were able to use iconographic attributes that were foreign to their own tradition illustrates a much broader syncretism than simply the imitation of an artistic style.
Chapter 6: Sarapis and the Royal House

6.1 Introduction and Origins of Sarapis

The cult of Sarapis offers a unique insight into the Ptolemaic royal patronage of two parallel sanctuaries: the established Egyptian temple of Osiris at Memphis, that later housed the Sarapieion, and the newly founded sanctuary of Sarapis in Alexandria. This chapter will consider the relationship between the Ptolemies and Sarapis, the iconography of the Greek image of the deity and the ideological implications behind the cult. It will also examine the interaction of the Greek and Egyptian iconographic traditions as a parallel to the development of the royal images that were considered in the earlier chapters of this thesis. The role of Sarapis in Egypt has not been satisfactorily explored; there have been several scholarly works on the spread of the cult in the Roman Period, but the Ptolemaic form of the god must be treated separately from the later, Roman form.

There are several traditions surrounding the origins of Sarapis. The literary sources were written considerably later than the Ptolemaic Period and need to be treated with caution. Both Tacitus and Plutarch write about a prophetic dream of Ptolemy I, who sent men to Sinope to rescue the statue and then brought it back to Alexandria. There is also a later tradition that Alexander the Great was instructed by the oracle of Amun...
to set up statues of gods, including Sarapis in Alexandria whereas Arrian on the other hand merely records that Alexander set up statues to ‘Greek gods and Egyptian Isis’.  

Also writing considerably later than the Ptolemaic period, Clement of Alexandria in quoting Athenodorous states that the cult statue of Sarapis at the Alexandrian Sarapieion was dedicated by Sesostris. The Sesostris to whom he refers is Sesostris III who ruled Egypt from 1878-1848 BC; this particular ruler’s name appears in the nationalist texts of the second century BC, along with that of Ramesses II and Nectanebo II, which perhaps explains the possible anachronism. Although there is evidence of related activity at Memphis during the Nineteenth Dynasty, the cult is that of Osiris Apis and not Osarapis. Kákosy’s arguments regarding the confusion in the literary sources between the Twelfth and Nineteenth Dynasty rulers can, however, be extended to Nectanebo II and this would accord with the building of the temple at Memphis by Nectanebo I and II. The earliest text referring to Osarapis is the ‘Curse of Artemisia’ from Memphis: ‘ὁ δέσποτ’ ὦ Ὀσεράπι καὶ θεόι οἱ μετὰ τοῦ Ὁσεράπιος καθ[ημένοι]. It is not possible to know for certain whether there was a separate shrine or temple to the god at this time.

The Alexandrian Sarapis is closely linked to Osiris and more specifically, as his name would imply, to the cult of wsir-ḥp at Memphis. Despite this similarity,

---

5 Clement of Alexandria Protrepticus IV.48. ἀλλ’ ὦ Ἄθηνιόδωρος ὦ τοῦ Σάντωνος ἄρχαίζειν τῶν Σάραπιν βουληθεὶς οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅποι περίεπεσεν, ἐλέγχεται αὐτὸν ἁγάμα εἶναι γενητὸν. Σέσωστριν φησὶ τὸν Ἀγυπτικόν βασιλέα, τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν παρ’ Ἐλλην παραστραύματος ἐθνῶν, ἐπανελθόντα εἰς Ἀγυπτικὸν ἐπαγγέλθησθαι τεχνῶν ἰκανοῦς. τοῦ Ὀσεράπιν τοποθητοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δαιδαλθῆμα ἐκέλευσαν αὐτός πολυτέλεως, κατασκευαζεὶ δὲ αὐτὸν Βραϊδῆς ὁ δημιουργός, οὐχ ὦ Ἄθηνιός, ἄλλος δὲ τοὺς ὁμίσθους ἐκεῖνον τῷ βραχείῳ; δὲ ἔλθῃ κατακέχθηται εἰς δημιουργίαν μίκτη καὶ πουκήλη…καὶ τῷ ἑκ τῆς Ὀσεράπιος καὶ τῷ �[…]

6 See Chapter I Section 1.5. Kákosy (1976) 185-7 argues that Sesostris was confused with Ramesses II, who paid considerable attention to bull cults; the great priest at Memphis constructed the tomb chambers of for the Apis Bull. Because the two rulers enjoyed a revival during the second century BC along with Nectanebo II Kákosy’s arguments make a great deal of sense.  

7 For the curse of Artemisia see UPZ I (SB 5103), line 1 is quoted above. Fraser (1998) 250-251 note 474 on the date of the curse, which is not certain. Fraser quotes Wilcken UPZ pp. 97-8 who dates the papyrus to 325 BC, although suggests that it might in fact be slightly earlier.  

8 See Stambaugh (1972) 36-55 especially 38, where he claims that Sarapis and Osiris had become completely merged by the end of the Ptolemaic Period. Brady (1978) 11 and 17 claims that by the second century BC the Greeks had adopted more features of the Egyptian religion and that Sarapis was never really Hellenised in the same way that Isis was.
Fraser argues that the cult of the Hellenised god, Sarapis, originated from Alexandria and not the already established sanctuary of the dead Apis at Memphis and dismisses the references in the Delos inscription to the Memphite origins as propaganda. He considers the curse of Artemisia as a terminus post quem for the introduction of the cult of Sarapis, arguing that the author, a Greek, would have invoked the Greek god and not the Egyptian form. However, the curse of Artemisia would suggest that Sarapis was the end result of the process which progressively Hellenised the cult of Osiris and Apis. With regard to the archaeological evidence it is important to distinguish between the introduction of the cult and the commissioning of the cult statue, a factor that many of the literary texts fail to take into consideration.

6.2 Ptolemaic Sarapis

One of the main problems in the study of the Sarapis is the lack of evidence for the form of the cult statue at either Memphis or Alexandria. This is compounded by the popularity of the god in the Roman world, when the iconography developed into a more complicated form than the god had enjoyed under the Ptolemies. It is important to distinguish between representations of the god in Egypt and those from overseas. In Egypt the god was closely associated with the royal house, particularly at Alexandria, a relationship which gradually weakened as his cult spread outside the domains of Ptolemaic control. The association with the royal house in Egypt was particularly apparent under Ptolemy III and IV, as coins with the image of the god on the obverse show.

---

second century BC the Greeks had adopted more features of the Egyptian religion and that Sarapis was never really Hellenised in the same way that Isis was.


Fraser (1998) 251. However, what Fraser fails to realise is that Oserapis is the first stage in the Hellenisation of Osiris-Apis and that this, therefore, supports the idea that the cult originated at Memphis and was then brought to Alexandria.

Stambaugh (1972) 13 alludes to the same problem.

Brady (1978) 9 discusses the cult statue of Sarapis at Rhodes, which was dedicated by a Carian worshipper; interestingly the inscription accompanying the statue was written in demotic and lists Osiris-Hapi and Isis as the recipients, not the Hellenised Sarapis.

Stambaugh (1972) 19-25 differentiates between the Memphite and Alexandrian roles of Sarapis.

Stambaugh (1972) 31 n. 1, suggests that the coins were minted to commemorate the completion of Ptolemy III’s work on the Sarapieion by Ptolemy IV. Tram (1970) 56-59 and 77-80 argued that the position of the gods was intended to associate the divine pair more closely with the royal couple, since
Sarapis was associated with several deities, most commonly Asclepios, Zeus and Dionysos in the Greek tradition; Osiris and Apis in the Egyptian tradition. The temple complex at Memphis illustrates the relationship between all of these deities, since they were worshipped within the same compound. It is of little surprise that the gods served similar purposes or that their roles overlapped. At Memphis Sarapis fulfilled a chthonic, prophetic and healing role. This accords with his origins as a Hellenised form of the dead Apis. The healing and prophetic characteristics are closer to the role of Asclepios, and the iconography of Sarapis in the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods is closely linked to those of the god.

Sarapis first appears on the coins of Ptolemy IV. The atef crown distinguishes the god from Zeus, who has a similar appearance. It is possible that this image was intended to show the ruler and his queen as Sarapis and as either Isis or simply in her role of deified consort. One further representation of a statue of the god, dating from the first century BC appears on an Edfu sealing (Appendix 2.2), showing Sarapis standing and holding a sceptre; while his hair and beard have their characteristic waves. This representation is rare on two accounts: it is from Egypt, and secondly it is Hellenistic in date and may well be the standard image of the god from either Alexandria or Memphis.

6.3 Memphis

Memphis was the birth place of the Egyptian god Ptah, and it was also home to his living embodiment, the Apis bull, and the site of their burial. The town in the valley it was reminiscent of the royal representations on coins. Many of the coin images with a single head of a bearded deity are taken to represent Zeus rather than Sarapis.

---

15 D.J. Thompson (1983) 21-6, gives a clear account and impression of the necropolis area and the many cult activities there.
16 Fraser (1998) 256-7 and Stambaugh (1972) 75-79.
17 Castiglione (1978) 24, figure 10.
18 The atef crown is associated with Osiris, which suggests that the close association with the Memphite origins of the god were maintained on the Greek imagery. The portrait features on the 'Isis' behind Sarapis would suggest that she represents a Ptolemaic queen especially since the female subject does not wear the corkscrew coiffure.
19 Stambaugh (1972) 14 and 18, believes that the Memphis statue was a standing figure, whilst the Sarapis from Alexandria was seated.
was home to a community that was culturally mixed, and this cultural diversity was reflected by the religious centre of Memphis, which lay across the river in the necropolis area.\textsuperscript{20} When Alexander arrived in Egypt in 323 BC, he went to Memphis, and according to the literary sources, he sacrificed to the Apis bull.\textsuperscript{21} Soter did the same and during the early years of his reign resided in the city. Later under Ptolemy V, Memphis again became the royal residence. By the Ptolemaic Period, the cult of the dead Apis was already well established, and it was in this area that the temple of Sarapis was housed, over the vaults of the Apis bulls.\textsuperscript{22} Only fragments of the temple of Sarapis survive; there is no cult statue, and so it is not possible to know whether the environment was essentially Greek or Egyptian in character.\textsuperscript{23} Scholars generally believe that the chthonic aspects of the god would have been promoted at Memphis, but documentary evidence shows that the god gave prophecies and offered healing, thus fulfilling a role that was similar to that of Asclepios.\textsuperscript{24}

The activities at the sanctuary help to explain the presence of a group of statuary, dating to the Ptolemaic Period and contributing an overtly Greek presence at the site. The statues were discovered by Auguste Mariette in 1853 during an attempt to locate the burial chambers for the Apis bulls. The Greek sculptures seem to have been a frustration to Mariette as he gradually worked his way up the dromos in hope of locating the chambers that housed the dead Apis bulls. Mariette did, however, make detailed sketches of the pieces and the dromos, but it was not until a year after his death in 1882 that his notes were published by his successor Gaston Maspero.\textsuperscript{25} A

\textsuperscript{20}See D.J. Thompson (1983) 18-20 and 23, who discusses the cultural background and the various ethnic quarters of the town.
\textsuperscript{22}D.J. Thompson (1993) fig. 4. Brady (1978) 27 states that the Sarapieion at Memphis had only a Greek shrine and not a temple for Sarapis.
\textsuperscript{23}Stambaugh (1972) 18-22 believes that the cult statue at Memphis had a cornucopia, kalathos and chiton; he refers to the herm head as a copy of the statue, although the likely identification for it is probably Dionysos. The standing deity with a cornucopia on the Edfu sealings (\textit{Appendix 2.2}) gives an idea of how the statue might have looked. Stambaugh (1972) 21, also suggests that it was this statue and not the Alexandrian version that was associated with Bryaxis. See note 5 above.
\textsuperscript{24}Stambaugh (1972) 19-20 suggests that the cult statue wore a kalathos in order to stress the chthonic link with the deity at Memphis. On the Sarapieion papyri see D.J. Thompson (1993) 236: the worship of Asclepios/Imhotep took place in the temple of Sarapis, as did feasting in honour of Apis.
\textsuperscript{25}Maspero (1882).
second very detailed publication was then written by Ulrich Wilcken in 1917, although this concentrates on the sculpture from the dromos.\textsuperscript{26} In 1950 another French team returned to the site, under the direction of Jean-Philippe Lauer and Charles Picard.\textsuperscript{27} Their publication was heavily influenced by Mariette's original work, and they agree with his original interpretation and identification of the statues.

The hemicycle, as it is known, is closer to the temple of Nectanebo (in honour of an unknown deity) than to the Sarapieion, and contrary to popular belief, the group bears no reference to the Sarapis, except for the possible assimilation of Dionysos to Sarapis, since the main group is accompanied by a Dionysiac procession.\textsuperscript{28} The hemicycle would have been reached via an avenue of Thirtieth Dynasty sphinxes (Figure 1); but effectively blocks the earlier sculptural decoration from outside the temple of Nectanebo; the exedra is placed in the most prominent position, at the end of the Thirtieth Dynasty dromos, at the turning point before the visitor walks up the main complex and burial chambers. The visitor would have proceeded toward the Sarapieion, past the temple of Nectanebo and have seen the Ptolemaic group immediately upon turning right into the main dromos.\textsuperscript{29} Past the hemicycle the Dionysiac procession would have led the visitor further, the group itself appearing to be heading towards the main temple area. Then, past several smaller shrines, the visitor would have walked on a pathway to the temple complex. Thus, both the hemicycle and the procession played an integral role in the approach to the Sarapieion and other temples; one greeted the visitor the other directed the way to the gods, and perhaps offered a hint of one of the festivals to be attended, for Dionysos fulfilled a Bacchic rather than a chthonic role.\textsuperscript{30}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[26] Wilcken (1917) 149-203.
\item[27] Lauer and Picard (1955).
\item[28] The only statue from the temple of Nectanebo is that of Bes, now in the Louvre. It is unlikely, however, that Bes was the principal god. See Lauer and Picard (1955) 173-246 for the dromos sculptures of a procession of Dionysos; the god appears as an infant riding on the back of a lion and accompanied by other exotic beasts, including a peacock, panther and a female siren. All are Greek in style.
\item[29] See Wilcken (1914) 160-161.
\item[30] Dionysos was the Greek equivalent of Osiris, whether he fulfilled a chthonic or bacchic role.
\end{footnotes}
Figure 1. After Lauer and Picard (1955)
6.4 The Hemicycle

There have been two attempts to reconstruct the group of statues that Mariette found: firstly by Lauer and Picard (Figure 2) and then by Pietrzykowski (Figure 3).31 The statues were not necessarily found in their original positions, since they had been taken down, probably by the Christians and reassembled in late antiquity. Lauer and Picard advocate a different arrangement to that in their photographs of the group.32 Lauer and Picard take account of this arrangement, and the statues appear as the authors believed them to have originally stood. The statues are made of the local Tura limestone and are exposed, consequently they are poorly preserved. Because five of the statues are now missing and the remaining pieces are in such bad condition, I have worked from the 1955 photographs at the site.

Key to numbering following Lauer and Picard (1955)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cat. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cat. 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cat. 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cat. 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cat. 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cat. 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cat. 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cat. 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cat. 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cat. 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cat. 165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fragments: Cat. 160 and 161

31 Pietrzykowski (1976).
32 Lauer and Picard (1955) 6-7, pl. 27, change the position of two statues, numbers 3 or 5, so that the group is by alternate standing and seated.
Figure 2: Lauer and Picard (1955)
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Figure 4 shows an alternative formation to that advocated by Lauer and Picard (Figure 2) and Pietrzykowski (Figure 3); this plan negates the need to provide two ‘missing’ statues that Lauer and Picard include. There is also no reason to have alternate seating and standing figures; since there are no parallels to suggest that artists were using this order elsewhere. Because the statues were clearly re-assembled in late antiquity we may never know whether they were found as originally intended. By placing one of the standing figures at the centre of the piece the others are symmetrically placed (that is to say there is an equal number of standing and seated figures on each side).

Unfortunately the attributes that once distinguished the statues in the hemicycle are mostly missing, and so it is necessary to use logic as well as taking the portrait types into consideration, many of which are very similar to other poets, philosophers and playwrights. The identity of all of the statues is unlikely to be ever settled beyond doubt, and Figures 2-4 remain conjectural. Thus, the function of the group depends largely on which overall interpretation is accepted. The group was clearly designed to associate the ruler with the divine and also with the history of Greek literature, philosophy and science; there may also be a reference to Egypt’s role in this formation, since this after all is an Egyptian sanctuary. Ironically there is nothing to suggest that the group is in any way connected to Sarapis. The statues are away from the sanctuary of Sarapis and seem to have a closer physical relationship with the temple of Nectanebo. However, in many ways the statues paralleled the Hellenisation of Osarapis, particularly if there was underlying reference to Egyptian culture. For the remainder of this section each statue will be considered according to Figure 4, disregarding the plan that was proposed by Lauer and Picard, and later the arrangement by Pietrzykowski.

Starting from the centre of the hemicycle with Lauer and Picard's number 7 (Cat. 159), this statue represents a standing male, who leans on a pillar with his left arm

---

33 Note that Pietrzykowski (1976) 144-145, also omits Lauer and Picard’s number 12 (Aristotle) for which there is no evidence.
and stands in a pose very obviously influenced by Scopas, with the left leg across the calf of the right.\textsuperscript{36} Number 7 was unidentified by Lauer and Picard and Pietrzykowski. This type of image was commonly used to represent a specific form of Dionysos, known as the Dionysos Aegyptus.\textsuperscript{37} It first appears around the beginning of the second century BC and continues into the Christian era, when it is found on many ivory decorative plaques. Given that there is such a strong Dionysiac theme in the sculpture from the dromos, it would make sense for the god to appear within the main group. There is also the close association of the Ptolemaic dynasty with Dionysos and the god's connection to Sarapis and Osiris, in his chthonic role.

The remaining statues have been positioned in parallel pairs, starting with Lauer and Picard's Number 2 (Cat. 154) and number 4 (Cat. 155), which flank Dionysos. The former is the key for dating the monument; it is also the most controversial statue in terms of identification. It represents a male figure, who leans against a herm, which was believed by Mariette, Lauer and Picard to represent Sarapis.\textsuperscript{38} Because of this herm, they identified the main figure as Demetrios of Phaleron, who was advisor to Ptolemy I and who is credited with the idea of the Mouseion at Alexandria and by some as the 'inventor' of the god Sarapis.\textsuperscript{39} Demetrios of Phaleron was expelled from Egypt by Ptolemy II, because he objected to the king's incestuous marriage to his sister Arsinoe II. Lauer and Picard therefore dated the statues to the time of Ptolemy I, claiming that the damage to the head of Demetrios occurred during the reign of Ptolemy II, following their disagreement. Lauer and Picard take the head of the statue as confirmation of the subject's identity, even though it wears a diadem, indicating royalty.

Many have questioned the identity of the herm as Sarapis; Adriani was the first to suggest that it in fact represented Dionysos in his eastern form.\textsuperscript{40} Lauer and Picard's identification rests largely upon the polos which the god wears. There is, however,

\textsuperscript{36} Lauer and Picard (1955) 118 fig. 66. Stewart (1977) 104, pl. 104 on Skopas' Pothos statue, which may have inspired the Sarapieion figure.
\textsuperscript{37} LIMC vol. III.1 517-518 and for illustrations vol. III.2 409-410, nos. 25-39.
\textsuperscript{38} Lauer and Picard (1955) Ch. 4, 69-89.
\textsuperscript{39} Lauer and Picard (1955) 70-71.
\textsuperscript{40} Adriani (1961) 40-43.
no definitive evidence to suggest that this attribute was used for Sarapis during the early Ptolemaic Period, whereas there are representations of Dionysos wearing a polos during this period. Consequently it seems to make more sense to identify the herm as Dionysos rather than Sarapis, which means the statue is unlikely to represent Demetrios of Phaleron, particularly if it is dated later than the reign of Ptolemy II, when he fell out of favour. To support this argument is the fact that the rulers would be unlikely to promote the idea that Demetrios had invented Sarapis at the god's Egyptian home. The myths which are referred to by Plutarch and Tacitus seem to have been devised to enhance the god's origins, but there would seem little point in attempting to do so at Memphis. There is also the evidence from Alexandria which suggests that the Ptolemies were keen to promote the god's true Egyptian heritage rather than implying that he had been brought to Egypt from outside.

Pietrzykowski also identifies the herm as an image of Dionysos and believes statue number 2 to represent Alexander the Great. He also suggests that the procession from the dromos was connected to Alexander's Indian campaigns. However, Dionysos sits on Cerberus for one of the sculptures in the dromos and so there is some reference to the god's chthonic role, which links him to Osiris. Fortunately the portrait head of statue number 2 (Cat. 154) survives and although it is badly damaged, facial hair is visible on the cheek bones. Some of the head hair has also been preserved; it is short and has shallow waves. It is quite different from Alexander's usual portrait types, since he is shown without facial hair and with longer, more deeply carved waves of hair. The portrait is closer to those of Ptolemy IV, particularly in the use of facial hair, which is so apparent on many of his coin portraits.

On the other side of the Dionysos sculpture, parallel to Ptolemy IV, is Lauer and Picard's number 4 (Cat. 155). This statue has been badly mutilated. The subject stands in a relaxed position with the weight on his right leg; he leans on a square

---

41 LIMC vol. III.1 438 and vol. III.2 310, no. 136.
43 Castiglione (1978) 35, makes the same observation.
44 Stewart (1993) Appendix I 341, pl. 5-23.
pillar, resting on his left elbow. The himation, which is draped over the left shoulder then runs around the back and front to be gathered over the left arm, revealing a youthful, muscular body. Fortunately the base, which is decorated with two eagles, is preserved. On this evidence, Lauer and Picard suggest that the subject is Orpheus, appropriate to the group because of his chthonic connections.\textsuperscript{45} Pietrzykowski prefers to interpret the eagles as a reference to Zeus, as they appear on Ptolemaic coinage, and he identifies the statue as an image of Ptolemy I.\textsuperscript{46}

If, as Pietrzykowski suggests, Alexander were present, it would seem more likely that he was represented by statue number 4 (\textbf{Cat. 155}) rather than number 2 (\textbf{Cat. 154}), because of the eagles that decorate the base. There are representations of Alexander with eagles, and indeed they were used by the Macedonian royal family to represent their descent from Zeus.\textsuperscript{47} The Ptolemies also used the symbol, and it appears on the reverse of many Ptolemaic coins, which means that statue number 4 could represent either Alexander or Ptolemy I. Both individuals could fulfil the role of founder of the dynasty; thus either would be appropriate. However, there is further evidence from the time of Ptolemy IV which may indicate that the statue is more likely to represent Ptolemy. For it was under Philopator that the Theoi Soteres were linked to the main dynastic cult; initially they had their own individual cult and subsequent rulers were joined to that of Alexander.\textsuperscript{48} It would, therefore be possible that Philopator wished to promote his ancestor.

The next pair are both poets; since they sit on almost identical thrones with a panther skin decorating the sides, which is clearly a reference to the theatre and the role of Dionysos in this respect.\textsuperscript{49} Number 1 (\textbf{Cat. 153}) is identified by Lauer and Picard as Pindar.\textsuperscript{50} They believe it to be a copy of the bronze statue of the poet from the Stoa Basileos in Athens, which is described by Pausanias (10.24.4); Pietrzykowski

\textsuperscript{45} Lauer and Picard Ch. 5, 90-91.
\textsuperscript{46} Pietrzykowski (1976) 16, 145.
\textsuperscript{47} Stewart (1993) pl. 66-67, for the Neisos gem which is dated from 300 BC to 250 BC. See Koenen (1993) 44 discussion of the link between Alexander, the Ptolemies and Zeus.
\textsuperscript{48} Chapter 1, Section 1.4.
\textsuperscript{49} Lauer and Picard (1955) figs. 59-60.
\textsuperscript{50} Lauer and Picard (1955) Ch. 3, 48-68.
agrees. In 1955 the statue was well preserved; the photographs show a mature male, with shoulder length wavy hair and a beard; he wears a diadem and holds a lyre; on his feet he wears high-topped boots, associated with poets. The seat on which he sits is also finely carved, imitating a metal throne with visible rivets and joins. It has a high, curved back and the sides are decorated with a panther head and skin. Mariette recorded two inscriptions, one reading ΠΙΝΔΑ, (disappeared by 1951), which was taken to be the poet Pindar’s name. The second was on the back of the throne, and read ΔΙΟΝΤΙ (with a lunare sigma). By 1951 only CI remained. It was suggested that this was the name of the sculptor, but like the other inscriptions they seem to be later graffiti.

Number 6 (Cat. 158) is seated on an almost identical to that of Cat. 153 and represents a mature male who wears a heavy cloak. He turns towards the right but there is some movement of the upper body to the left. The left arm is raised and it was again suggested by Wilcken that he once held a lyre, although no traces of this survive. The condition of the head is rather fragile; the subject was bearded with medium-length wavy hair, and he appears to have once worn a crown of ivy leaves. Lauer and Picard and Pietrzykowski identify this statue as that of Homer and for this reason place it in the centre of the hemicycle. However, such a crown could also refer to the theatre and would consequently be more appropriate for a playwright.

If statue number 1 rather than number 6 represents a heroic Homer, the most obvious candidate for the latter would be Euripides, because of his popularity under the Ptolemies and also because of his known plays, in particular his account of Helen’s stay in Egypt during the Trojan War. There is also a comparable relief from Smyrna representing Euripides, but the playwright can also be represented as an

---

51 On the Stoa Basileos statue see Wilcken (1914) 164 and Lauer and Picard (1955) 60. Pausanias describes the sculpture 1.8.4, and Pseudo Aescynes Epist. 4.3.
52 Wilcken (1914) 163-4 suggests either Διονόσιος ὁ ἀνέβηκε or Διονόσιος ὁ ἐποίηκε.
53 Wilcken (1914) 168.
55 See Froidefond (1971) 218-223, on the association between Egypt and Helen of Troy in Euripides.
elderly man. The raised arm on the Memphis statue may well have once held a scroll rather than the lyre which Wilcken suggests.

Homer was much revered by Ptolemy IV and would be expected to appear in the group. However, he is not necessarily represented by statue number 6. On the Archelaos relief Homer appears not as the elderly blind type, but as a mature man. In many respects the statue of Pindar (Cat. 153) is closer to the type of Homer shown on the Archelaos relief; however, he holds a lyre and so is more likely to be associated with the lyric tradition. Stylistically too the Memphis statues are similar to the figures on the apotheosis relief, which supports the dating of the monument to the reign of Ptolemy IV. One of these statues is almost certainly of Homer. The problem lies in which type was used, if the poet was shown as divine then Lauer and Picard’s number 1 is the more obvious candidate.

The identity of the next pair is less controversial. Number 8 (Cat. 162) and 9 (Cat. 163) are interpreted as Protagoras and Thales respectively in Figure 2 and Figure 3. Number 8 (Cat. 162) is seated and represents an elderly male. He holds a box, which may offer a clue to his identity. There is also an inscription on the base of the figure, which seems to have been carved much later, perhaps when the statues were reassembled in late antiquity. It reads ΠΡΟΤΑΓ and is therefore believed to denote a representation of Protagoras. Lauer and Picard compare it stylistically to the statue of Dionysos from the theatre of Dionysos in Athens. But it is the seat that is the most interesting aspect for it is asymmetrical and the feet are those of a lion with the tip of the lion’s tail in the form of a lotus. The back of the chair is in the form of a single Ionic volute. The subject faced eastwards, towards the centre of the group if the reconstruction shown by Figure 4 is accepted. Lauer and Picard mention only that some eastern gods appear on seats such as these, but there is no identical

---

58 Richter (1984) 139-150 on types of representations of Homer, compare those of Pindar 176-80 which are notably different to the Memphis example.
59 Lauer and Picard (1955) 120-128, for inscription see 121.
60 Wilcken (1914) 165-66; Lauer and Picard (1955) 122.
parallel; they believed it to represent the sophist Protagoras, who claimed to teach virtue. This characteristic would perhaps make him a less obvious candidate, if the monument was commissioned under the reign of Ptolemy IV, given the ruler's reputation and lifestyle. However, Pythagoras was believed to have visited Egypt and would be an obvious choice to include in such a monument and the bare feet would certainly suggest that the subject was a philosopher.\textsuperscript{61} The key to this statue's identification lies in the box that he holds, and the elaborate nature of the seat must have once offered a clue to visitors in antiquity.

Number 9 (Cat. 163), which is preserved from the chest down. It is a standing male with the left leg raised and the foot resting on a stool. The left elbow rests on the knee and the overall impression is of a relaxed instruction. In his right hand he holds a stick. Lauer and Picard identified the subject as Thales, and the statue remains so designated in all three reconstructions.\textsuperscript{62}

The next pair also contains another inscribed piece: number 11 (Cat. 165). It is a fragment of a standing male with a long staff in his left hand. The inscription or rather graffito reads ΠΛΑΤΩ, and is consequently identified as Plato.\textsuperscript{63} In order to make the number of statues even, Lauer and Picard also supplied Aristotle the subject of statue number 12, although no fragment survives.\textsuperscript{64}

Statue number 5 (Cat. 156) is also badly eroded. It is a seated, elderly male with a wizened body, long hair and a long beard. He leans forward and twists his body at the same time, appearing in either great discomfort or agitated. The subject sits on what appears to be a square stool (almost altar like) and he rests on a low, square pillar. His right leg is placed firmly on the ground, and his left leg was raised with his foot rested on a now unidentifiable object. Lauer and Picard regarded the statue

\textsuperscript{61} See Froidefond (1971) 246-251 on Pythagoras in Egypt. Although there are no certain portraits of Pythagoras; see Richter (1984) 193, especially coin from Samos with representation of a seated Pythagoras.

\textsuperscript{62} Lauer and Picard (1955) 129-137 figs. 69-70.

\textsuperscript{63} See Froidefond (1971) 262-253 on the connection between Plato and Egypt. Lauer and Picard (1955) 144-147. Unusual because Plato normally has a μ at the end of the name.

\textsuperscript{64} Lauer and Picard (1955) See figure 1 above, the arrangement is discussed in pages 148-172 of the publication.
as a representation of Hesiod. However, its appearance seems almost satyr-like, and for this reason although the characteristic nose does not survive, I have suggested that it represents Socrates. This philosopher would have been an appropriate companion for Plato, just as the philosopher/mathematician Pythagoras would have been to Thales.

The final pair, on the ends of the monument according to Figure 4 are Lauer and Picard’s numbers 10 (Cat.164) and 3 (Cat. 157), which were identified as Heraclitus and an unknown figure respectively. The former is an elderly male with a bare chest and weak muscles. His right leg is crossed over the left, and he leans forward. He holds a staff with an animal head. On his feet are sandals with a high neck, which would have been adjustable with a strap at the top. The seat is a square stool with a cushion on top. On the back is a crudely carved graffito of a man holding a staff, very similar to the hieroglyph sr which means noble man or can be used as a determinative for an old man. Lauer and Picard offer no explanation for this. Pietrzykowski suggests that this statue represents a cynic philosopher, perhaps Diogenes because of his connection with Alexander. However, the statue does not fit the standard Diogenes type, who is typically shown either in an urn or standing, naked with a staff. There also no logical or artistic reason why the statue should represent Heraclitus. The only surviving attributes are the animal-headed staff and the sandals, which are described as having a high strap at the top. Physically, the statue depicts an elderly man, quite possibly a philosopher or intellectual. It is unlikely that the pair are poets, since the poets of the group have very specific thrones; I suggest, therefore, that number 10 represents Herodotus, because of his detailed account of the history of Egypt.

---

67 Lauer and Picard (1955) 137-143 figs. 77-82.
68 Lauer and Picard (1955) fig. 80; Gardiner (1988) sign A21, 444.
70 Richter (1984) 114-6 figs. 75a and b, for Diogenes as beggar. See Richter (1965) figs. 1061 and 1067 for Diogenes in a pithos.
71 See Froidefond (1971) 115-207 on Herodotus and Egypt.
Number 3 (Cat. 157) is seated on a square chair with an angular back. The man wears a heavy cloak which is deeply carved around the back. Wilcken suggested that the subject once held a lyre, since the left arm is raised above the head; however, it is possible that the subject held a staff or simply rested the arm on the back of the seat. The right arm rests on the arm of the chair. Lauer and Picard suggested that the statue represents an elderly poet, but made no guesses as to the identity. Number 3 has no remaining attributes apart from his heavily folded cloak. Solon would be appropriate, since he was said by Plato to have travelled in Egypt and to have conversed with the Egyptian priests.

There are two further fragments both of young men, which were found by Lauer in 1951, in the centre of the circle (Cat. 160 and 161). They are both on a smaller scale than the main figures and it is suggested that they belonged to statue number 6 or 7. Lauer and Picard believed that they personified the Iliad and the Odyssey, but such representations are typically female, as on the Archelaos relief. They concluded that they are adolescents. Matz, in his review of Lauer and Picard’s publication, identified the pair as Ptolemy VI and VIII. His conjecture is dependent on the fragments of a portrait head from one of the figures. He proposed a date of 176 BC for the dedication of the group, when Ptolemy VI was on the throne, although it would seem equally likely that they were commissioned during the reign of Ptolemy V or the regency of Cleopatra I.

6.5 The Dromos

In addition to the main group of sculpture, there is a related assemblage that was found along the dromos, which is treated in some detail in Lauer and Picard’s publication. Very few of these pieces now survive, with the exception of a female
siren which is now in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (Figure 5). The pieces are, like the main group, purely Greek in style and belonged to a Dionysiac procession that moved away from the hemicycle, towards the Sarapieion. The god appears as an infant, in a Hellenised anthropomorphic form, riding exotic beasts and accompanied by peacocks, panthers, falcons and sphinxes. The role in which he appears is Bacchic rather than chthonic, as shown by the many grapevines that decorate the animals which surround him. Unlike the Egyptian-style sphinxes the animal procession faces forwards rather than inwards, on a raised platform. One very obvious parallel for the group is the Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphos.

---

78 Cairo, Egyptian Museum inv. 27506. See Lauer and Picard (1955) 216-227 pl. 21. Mariette recorded a second siren, see Lauer and Picard (1955) fig. 121.

79 Rice (1983), especially for the use of exotic animals in the parade and the strong Dionysiac theme.
Pietrzykowski believes that the dromos procession is the key to the function of the main group; he concludes that the hemicycle was connected to the ruler cult and that the procession was a reference to Alexander the Great’s eastern campaigns. Lauer and Picard saw the monument as a celebration of Greek literature and scholarship, but this interpretation does not explain the overtly Bacchic theme of the related pieces from the dromos. Others have suggested that the group was commissioned to mark the place where Alexander’s body was first laid to rest before it was moved to Alexandria in 320 BC. The most recent discussion, albeit short, is by Zanker, who sees the statues as representations of the great thinkers of antiquity who are presented as the king’s advisors. He fails, however, to mention the Dionysiac imagery from the dromos.

6.6 Discussion and Interpretation

One comparable forerunner for the Memphis hemicycle is the Daochos monument from Delphi (dating from 338-336 BC), where the Thessalian ruler dedicated a group of athletic statues in the presence of Apollo, in order to attempt to legitimise his own Greek ancestry. The subject, arrangement and style are notably different from the Sarapieion group, but the motive for commissioning the two groups was probably similar, confirmation of legitimacy by a genealogical awareness. Another fourth century BC genealogical group that may have provided a model for the Memphis sculptures was the series of poets and philosophers represented on the tomb of Isokrates in Athens. Also from the mid-fourth century BC was the tomb of Theodekttes with its portraits of poets, mentioned by Plutarch and Pausanias. All of the examples, including the Memphis hemicycle affirmed rights of succession through emphasis on a genealogical presentation.

80 Pietrzykowski (1976) 43-62, 144.
83 Ridgway (1990) 46; Lauer and Picard (1955) 75.
85 Plutarch Moralia 837 c-d and Pausanias (1.37.4). See also Scholl (1994) 252-254, n. 62 for bibliography.
The group from Memphis may have been intended to link the Ptolemies with earlier Greek culture in Egypt. Thus, promoting their place in Egypt's history. This concept was hinted at by Lauer and Picard, in their identification of statue number 9 as Thales; they make reference to the influence of Egyptian mathematics on his work.\(^86\) It is very likely, however, that a number of the other statues were meant to represent men who had been influenced by Egypt, and that the rulers not only were attempting to link their own dynasty to that of Egypt by appearing as pharaoh, but were also intent upon stressing a much wider link between Egypt and Greece, as the foundation for their rule.

A column base from the Mazarita district of Alexandria (Figure 6) offers the closest stylistic parallel to the group.\(^87\) Depicting the twelve gods, the piece is dated to 200-150 BC. The similarity between the male figures and those from the hemicycle is quite striking. One male figure is accompanied by two eagles, and another stands with one leg overlapping the other, in the same pose as the Dionysos from Memphis. The seated gods also appear in very similar poses to those in the hemicycle.

\(^86\) Lauer and Picard (1955) 129-130.
\(^87\) See Tkaczw (1993) 225 number 102, also for earlier bibliography.
Some of the statues from Memphis are preserved well enough to allow a reasonable identification; others, however, must remain conjectural, and more heavily reliant on a logical rather than a stylistic analysis. The date of the group is in some ways more easily determined than the identification of single subjects. Stylistically the sculptures fit very well at the end of the third century BC, and for this reason alone they can be placed more easily within the reigns of Ptolemy IV or V, than that of Ptolemy I, as Lauer and Picard suggested. The two figures which were identified by Matz as Ptolemy VI and VIII, are not sufficient to date the entire monument to the reign of the Philometor, since they are made to a different scale and may have been added later. The portrait head of Cat. 154 is closer to the portraits of Ptolemy IV than those of Ptolemy VI, particularly the example from Boston (Cat. 13). It may be that the portrait is an early representation of Ptolemy V, whose portraits are very similar to his father’s. However, since Ptolemy V was the only legitimate son of Ptolemy IV, who was represented by the second statue? One possibility is that it represents an illegitimate child, but there are no parallel dedications of this kind in the early Ptolemaic Period at least. It is more likely that the figures were commissioned at a later point and that they were added to the monument in order to promote the link between the subjects and earlier members of the dynasty. No conclusive evidence supports Matz’s dating, and the stylistic evidence certainly points against it.

If the re-identification proposed in Figure 4 is accepted, it is more likely that the monument dates from the reign of Ptolemy IV. The fact that the statues are purely Greek in style would also suggest that they were no later than the end of his reign; from the reign of Ptolemy V, as Chapter 4 has shown, there is a growing trend in Egypt for the rulers to draw on both Greek and Egyptian traditions in sculpture, particularly at Egyptian sanctuaries. At Memphis and at the Sarapieion in Alexandria the parallel dedications respect the individual traditions. This fact would suggest the date of the monument at Memphis falls within the reigns of the first four rulers.

88 Lauer and Picard (1955) 149.
There are two further reasons to link Philopator with the dedication. Firstly there is the strong Dionysiac theme: although many of the Ptolemaic rulers associated themselves with Dionysos, it was Ptolemy IV who had a particular connection with the god, an association that was matched only by that of Ptolemy XII, who took the title Neos Dionysos. Secondly, it may even be possible to link the monument to a specific year and event. In 217 BC Ptolemy IV was involved in a dispute with Antiochus III over Coele-Syria. The decisive battle occurred at Raphia on 22nd June and Ptolemy was victorious. The battle was significant in more ways than one, since it was the first time that a Ptolemy had used large numbers of native Egyptian soldiers to fight on their behalf. In November of 217 BC there was a priestly synod at Memphis, and the king's achievements are celebrated on the Raphia stele (figure 7). At the top of the text is a traditional scene showing Ptolemy IV on horseback, accompanied by his wife, Arsinoe, standing before the Egyptian gods. What is interesting is that Ptolemy wears a Macedonian battle-dress and not the traditional Egyptian kilt. In many ways this representation parallels the presence of the Greek statues at the Memphis Sarapieion, and I propose that they may well have been dedicated to celebrate the Egyptian victory at Raphia, since it was to Memphis that Ptolemy IV returned.  

---

89 Hölbl (1994) 115-118.
6.7 The Sarapieion at Alexandria

The chronographer Eusebius places the foundation of the cult of Sarapis between the reigns of Ptolemy I and II, when the two jointly ruled Egypt between 285 and 282 BC. This dating accords with the archaeological evidence from the Alexandrian Sarapieion, where the earliest dedication at the site dates to the reign of Ptolemy II, with the formal sanctuary being dedicated under Ptolemy III. Eusebius's dates are also supported by the identification of two Egyptian-style sphinxes at the Alexandrian Sarapieion. Tacitus states that Ptolemy III was responsible for the dedication of the cult statue in Alexandria, since he financed the main building stages of the main temenos and temple. The only surviving dedications at the site prior to Euergetes' building works were to Isis and Osiris, and this fact is echoed in the ancient literary sources, suggesting that the worship of Sarapis was instigated under Euergetes, any earlier worship being concerned with Osiris. The date suggested by Eusebius could refer to the cult of Osiris, which was so closely associated with Sarapis especially at Memphis. As mentioned above, Clement of Alexandria, in quoting Athenodoros, states that the Twelfth Dynasty Egyptian king Sesostris commissioned the statue which represented Osiris, and that the artists were Greeks.

The passage does not state whether the cult statue was made according to the Greek or Egyptian tradition. The minor arts would suggest that there was a Hellenised form of Sarapis and the statue from the Sarapieion of a bearded deity almost certainly represents the god (Cat. 151) and can be dated to the reign of Ptolemy III. The metal statue to which Clement of Alexandria refers was not necessarily introduced by the Ptolemaic royal house, and may have been dedicated at a sanctuary of Osiris to represent the god. Both Tacitus and Clement mention Sesostris and perhaps should

---

90 Fraser (1998) 247 and 249.
91 See also Cat. 61 and Cat. 62.
92 See chapter 2, catalogue numbers 69 and 70. I have re-identified these two sphinxes as Ptolemy I and II on stylistic grounds.
93 Tacitus Histories 4. 84.
94 Fraser (1998) 248; Arrian states that Alexander built temples to 'Greek gods and Egyptian Isis'. Brady (1978) 9-10 and 41 implies that the two gods were the same anyway and that there are Greek dedications to Osiris.
not simply be dismissed, for earlier dynastic dedications that were found at the Alexandrian Sarapieion dating to the Twelfth, Nineteenth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties.\textsuperscript{96}

Although the original cult statue does not survive, scholars generally accept that the Roman copy in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria is closest to the original (Cat. 150).\textsuperscript{97} However, the locks on the forehead and the division of the beard are both Roman features and not typical of Hellenistic images of Sarapis.\textsuperscript{98} Since Athenodoros clearly states that the Bryaxis to whom he refers is not the Bryaxis of Mausoleum fame, it seems unlikely that the sculptor was the same. This distinction has not prevented some scholars from comparing the Alexandrian Sarapis to the statues from the Mausoleum which are now in the British Museum.\textsuperscript{99} If the sculptor was from Asia Minor, as his name suggests, it is possible that he was trained in the tradition of Bryaxis or was influenced by the Mausoleum statues. If the similarity between the Alexandria Sarapis (Cat. 150) and the Mausoleum sculptures reflects the date of the Alexandrian cult statue, it would mean that Bryaxis worked in Egypt during the reign of Nectanebo II.\textsuperscript{100} Stambaugh suggests a further connection between the cult statue of Sarapis and the iconography of certain Anatolian gods, namely the use of the cornucopia and the kalathos, both of which appear on the representation of Zeus of Labranda.\textsuperscript{101} This would accord with Clement of Alexandria's comments concerning Greek sculptors who were brought to Egypt, and

---

\textsuperscript{96} Tacitus \textit{Histories} 4.84. Although ancient texts often refer to Sesostris, his name is used as a convenient reference for earlier periods in Egyptian history, and the archaeological evidence offers no explanation why the sources chose this particular date for the establishment of the cult. It is possible that the story evolved following the movement of statues in the Roman Period, accurately referring to some of the material at the site. For dynastic material at the Sarapieion see Ashton (forthcoming); Tkaczow (1993) 223-238 for details and further bibliography. See also Strabo \textit{Geographies} 17.1.8 on the earlier settlement of Rhakotis.

\textsuperscript{97} Stambaugh (1972) also mentions the Delian statues, one of which (from Sarapeum B) is dated to before 166 BC. He notes that it did not wear a kalathos or special headdress. See also Charbonneaux (1962) 19 fig. 2 for the head from the statue. A relief representation from Rhodes has the same iconography, see British Museum GR, Sculpture 2150 and Maiuri (1932) 19, fig. 8. Both show a seated deity wearing a loosely draped himation and bare torso, holding a sceptre in his right hand.

\textsuperscript{98} See Castiglione (1983) 139-145 for examples of Hellenistic representations of Sarapis.

\textsuperscript{99} Loewy (1885) 322-323. Stambaugh (1972) 21 suggests that the Memphis statue was sculpted by Bryaxis.

\textsuperscript{100} See Section 6.1 above for the popularity of Sesostris III, Ramesses II and Nectanebo II in the second century Nationalist texts. Also Chapter 1, Section 1.5 on nationalism in Ptolemaic Egypt.

\textsuperscript{101} Stambaugh (1972) 21 note 1 and Gunter (1995) 56-60.
the artist of the cult statue being a Greek.\textsuperscript{102} However, it would seem more likely that there were two stages in the development of the sanctuary. That there was an Egyptian-style statue of the anthropomorphic Osiris prior to the Ptolemaic Period, and then a formal laying out of the sanctuary under Ptolemy III and the dedication of a second cult statue, this time of Sarapis.

There is no evidence to suggest that Sarapis wore a kalathos in his early representations; in the minor arts the god has a diadem, decorated with a Hellenised lotus, appearing in a Hellenised form with a small sun disk and cow's horns (again attached to a diadem rather than Egyptian crown).\textsuperscript{103} Stambaugh claims that such attributes are rare on representations of Sarapis, and yet the evidence from the minor arts suggests that this representation was typical of the god in Egypt.\textsuperscript{104} The Brooklyn medallion (Appendix 2.1) provides another example; the full beard of Sarapis was such a striking visual characteristic that it suggests that the images were intended to represent the deities rather than rulers in the guise of the gods. However, the portrait features of the accompanying 'Isis' would suggest that they represent the queen. Castiglione gathers several examples of Hellenistic sculptural representations of Sarapis, the majority having, where this feature is preserved, the characteristic central parting of two waves of hair that is reflected in the shape of the moustache.\textsuperscript{105} This hairstyle can also be found on the Brooklyn medallion and is typical of the Hellenistic coiffure rather than the corkscrew locks that appear on Roman representations of the god.

Early Ptolemaic evidence from the site suggests the rulers' commitment to the Egyptian tradition. From the reign of Ptolemy II there is a fragmentary statue, preserved from the base to the knees (Cat. 152). The statue, believed to represent Arsinoe II, was found in the northern part of the sanctuary that was identified by

\textsuperscript{102} Clement of Alexandria Protrepticus IV.48.
\textsuperscript{103} See Appendix 2. Stambaugh (1972) 23, note 2 says that the lotus crown is very rare. However, it appears on all of the Hellenistic representations of Sarapis and the Hellenised Isis in many of the minor arts.
\textsuperscript{104} Stambaugh (1972) 23-4.
\textsuperscript{105} Castiglione (1983) 139-145. The author includes two representations of the god with a polos (A2 and A3); the former he dates to the Roman Period but suggests that the second is Hellenistic, this conclusion is unlikely.
Botti as temple of Isis, but re-identified by Rowe as the early temple of Sarapis. It is impossible to tell whether the early temple was Greek or Egyptian in style but the statuary from this period is Egyptian.

There are also three Egyptian-style sphinxes: a colossal pair (Cat. 61 and 62) and a smaller individual example, which must have decorated the temple, perhaps even as part of a small dromos. The presence of Egyptian statuary suggests that the early sanctuary was more heavily influenced by the native tradition than has previously been suggested. This conjecture would accord with the area being inhabited by a large Egyptian population. The evidence also suggests that the rulers respected the Egyptian roots of the god, at least in the initial phases of the temple. Dedications show that there was a shrine to Osiris combined with the dynastic cult on the site during the reign of Ptolemy II. The fragment of an inscription dedicated to Arsinoe II, which now forms a support at the eastern side of ‘Pompey’s Pillar’ may also date to the third century BC. It is written in Greek and once supported a statue, a posthumous dedication to Arsinoe by Thastor son of Satyros. It has been suggested that because the stone is Egyptian (it has the appearance of green basalt but has also been described as grey granite) with a Greek inscription, the statue may also have reflected this mix and was Greek in style but executed in a hard stone.

---

108 On the ethnic division of Alexandria’s quarters see Bowman (1996) 204 and 109.
109 Fraser (1998) 228, 236 and 263 on the cult of the Theoi Adelphi at the site. See also Grimm (1983) 70-73 on the altar to the Theoi Adelphi.
110 Tkaczow (1993) 200 number 37. The stone has been described as grey and black granite and green basalt.
Figure 8. After Rowe
The main temple of the Alexandrian Sarapielion was excavated by Alan Rowe in 1943. His plan shows that there was a double colonnade most probably of faced limestone or marble, with underground chambers and small niches, presumably for cult activity. Only the foundations of the original Ptolemaic temple survive and it appears, as Rowe suggested, that the area to the north-east of the site was the position of the early temple (Figure 8). The foundation cuts show that the temple and colonnade was of substantial size. The few architectural fragments of the Ptolemaic period show that the building was Greek with marble Corinthian columns.

The first phase of building can be dated accurately because of foundation plaques, which Rowe found during his excavations in the south-east corner of the precinct. These deposits give the details about which rulers financed the building programme, and they show that it was not until the time of Ptolemy III that a formal sanctuary was built. Two sets dating from the reign of Ptolemy III were found; each set consists of one plaque each of gold, silver, bronze, faience, Nile mud and five of glass, inscribed with a Greek and hieroglyphic inscription. There are further plaques dating from the time of Ptolemy IV, which commemorate the building of a temple to Harpocrates. These dedication plaques clearly state that Euergetes built a νάος and a τέμενος, whereas those he laid at Canopus state that the ruler built only a τέμενος. The later plaques from Alexandria, placed at the sanctuary under the reign of Philopator, state that the rulers simply made a dedication to Harpocrates; they do not indicate whether it was a temple or sanctuary, more likely it was a shrine within the main complex. This practice has important ideological implications because although the use of foundation deposits is attested in cultures other than Egyptian their use here and indeed the inclusion of a hieroglyphic version of the text follows the standard practice in Egyptian sanctuaries. This accords with the
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111 Rowe (1946) 22-23.
112 Rowe (1946) plate IX.
113 Rowe (1942) 132 fig. 5, a Corinthian column from the so-called Ptolemaic Mausoleum from the centre of the site.
115 Rowe (1946) 7-10 on the plaques of Ptolemy III and 12-13 on Ptolemy IV, see also Thompson (1993) 149-56.
116 Rowe (1946) 11.
117 Rowe (1946) 14-19 on other foundation deposits.
substantial number of Egyptian-style representations at the site and demonstrates that the rulers were keen to promote the Egyptian tradition and the god's roots.

In contrast, the royal representations at the site from the reign of Ptolemy III are overwhelmingly Greek in style. Of particular interest are a pair of royal portraits (Cat. 9 and 44) and an associated head of Sarapis (Cat. 151), which have been dated and attributed to various rulers but are most probably representations of Ptolemy III and Berenike II. They show the royal pair and the god in an idealised, Greek, form and offer a sharp contrast to the pharaonic-style material from the reigns of Ptolemy I and II.

Thus, the archaeological evidence from the site suggests that Sarapis was a reflection of the unique position in which the Ptolemaic rulers found themselves, as foreign rulers who were fulfilling the role of pharaoh and adopting its traditions and requirements. The Hellenised image of the god and the presence of Greek-style portraits supports the idea that the rulers wished to be seen to fulfil both their ancestral and native roles. The position of the site, away from both the Greek palace area and the civic centre of the polis, and the artistic and ideological concessions that were made to the god's Egyptian origins also served to associate the rulers with the Egyptian tradition.

The presence of Egyptian-style statuary at the site raises serious questions about the interpretation of the god as a deity who was intended for the Greek immigrants. At both Alexandria and Memphis the early Ptolemaic rulers made dedications of Egyptian-style sculptures and buildings. Their motives are less certain. If the sanctuaries were already established, then the Egyptian-style royal representations

---

118 Various suggestions have been given for the identification of the rulers from the group. Kyrieleis (1975) H1 and L5 was the first to suggest that they were a pair, and he believed the male to represent Ptolemy VI on stylistic grounds. R. Smith (1998) 92 and 165-5 also associates the royal pair with the Sarapis head and dates them to the later third to early second century BC. Earlier suggestions include Ptolemy III and Berenike II. The most recent is by Quernal in Rausch (1998) who suggests that the queen represents Cleopatra I or II and the male Ptolemy IV. See Chapter 1 above for a full discussion.

119 See Ashton (forthcoming) for a fuller discussion of this subject.

120 Thompson (1988)117-25 discusses gifts from the Ptolemaic royal house to temples.
may have been an indication of the rulers' commitment to continue the pharaonic tradition.\textsuperscript{121} Indeed the members of the Ptolemaic royal house followed a policy of associating themselves with earlier dynastic traditions and this pattern can be seen throughout Egypt, but evidence for it in Alexandria demonstrates that the city was not exclusively Hellenic, despite suggestions to the contrary.\textsuperscript{122} That the rulers seem to target specific areas to promote their Egyptian persona shows that they were focusing on the areas in which there was a strong native tradition or a large Egyptian community.

The evidence from the Alexandrian Sarapieion helps to explain motives behind the rulers' expansion and patronage of the cult; for at the sanctuary we find a substantial presence of Egyptian representations of the royal house and the further use of pharaonic representations dating largely from the Twelfth, Nineteenth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties.\textsuperscript{123} Some of this material seems to have been moved from the abandoned site of Heliopolis most probably during the Roman period, since when Strabo described the sanctuary, it seems to have been structurally intact.\textsuperscript{124} There is evidence that the early rulers continued to patronise the sanctuary at Heliopolis.\textsuperscript{125} It is, therefore, not certain whether these earlier statues were brought to the Sarapieion by the later Ptolemaic rulers or were moved there during the rebuilding of the sanctuary in the first and second centuries AD.

6.8 Conclusion

The Hellenised Sarapis seems to have first appeared in Alexandria and was closely associated with the Ptolemaic royal house there. The hemicycle from Memphis may have also been a reflection of this relationship, but not surprisingly Sarapis there seems to have remained closer to wsir-Hp, given that the Apis bulls were buried

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{121} Kahil (1996) 75 also suggests this.
\item\textsuperscript{122} See Ashton (forthcoming) on the pharaonic tradition in Ptolemaic Alexandria.
\item\textsuperscript{124} Strabo, \textit{Geographies} 17.1.27-28. See Ashton (forthcoming) on the question of the movement of earlier monuments in the Ptolemaic period. Pliny, \textit{Natural Histories} XXVI.14.68-9, refers to the obelisk that was taken by Ptolemy II and placed in front of the temple of Arsinoe, but this is the only documented removal during the Ptolemaic Period.
\item\textsuperscript{125} See Cat. 69, 70 and 84; Chapter 3, Section 3.3.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
beneath the temple area. Because Sarapis was closely associated with the rulers only during the third century BC, we see parallel dedications of the Egyptian and Greek artistic traditions rather than statuary that draws on both artistic styles. Although outwardly the cult statue appears to have been Greek, there are none the less references to Egyptian attributes such as the *atef* crown, which seems to have been a standard attribute, and also the sceptre. There is no evidence to suggest that the kalathos, cornucopia or Cerberus were standard attributes in the god’s Ptolemaic form. Indeed, there are very few Hellenistic representations of the god at all, especially when compared to other deities. In the Edfu sealings Sarapis appears with a female figure, and only twice by himself (compared to the 20 or so representations of Isis or Ptolemaic queens). This picture would accord with Brady’s suggestion that the popularity of Sarapis decreased following the third century BC and was overtaken by the cult of Isis.

Sarapis was an example of a Hellenised Egyptian deity, in the same way that Isis was presented by and associated with the royal house in Greek contexts. That the rulers made a genuine attempt to claim their Egyptian legacy in Alexandria demonstrates their commitment to promoting Egyptian culture and their role as pharaoh to the Greek communities. The emphasis on their Egyptian ancestry also shows the support of the native priesthood for the ruler cult.

The Memphis and Alexandria sanctuaries also provide models for the patronage of Greek and Egyptian deities during the third and early second centuries BC. The evidence demonstrates that from the early Ptolemaic Period, there was either a policy or natural tendency for the rulers to dedicate statuary in both Greek and Egyptian styles at both types of sanctuary. In such an environment it is of little surprise that the artists began to experiment with or borrow from the other tradition, and this development may explain why the Egyptian artists in the second century BC started to use Greek portrait types. The cross-cultural borrowing may also help to solve the question of the possible Greek usage of the so-called Isis images as representations of

---

126 This is contrary to the belief held by Stambaugh (1972) 23 n. 1, who states that the Egyptianising crowns are rare in the Hellenistic period.

the goddess rather than the royal women. There would seem to be little point of Hellenising an already acceptable anthropomorphic form of a goddess. More importantly, however, the evidence from the two sanctuaries demonstrates just how easily the two cultures and forms of religion lived side by side; again this feature is echoed by the acceptance of the dynastic cult by the Egyptian priesthood. The boundaries between deities and between the two forms of religion were easily crossed and subsequently merged.

In order to understand the motives behind the commissioning and dedication of the Memphis group of statues it is necessary to consider the evidence from the sanctuary at Alexandria, where the rulers appear in both Greek and Egyptian-style representations. For the statues from the Memphis Sarapieion fulfil a similar role to the Egyptian images from Alexandria, that is to say, they remind an onlooker of the ruler’s second role. At Alexandria, the native roots and the pharaonic role were emphasised at the sanctuary of an essentially Greek god (Greek in appearance at least). At Memphis, where there was an already established native tradition, the ruler who commissioned the Hemicycle and dromos sculpture was offering Greek images in an Egyptian context. If this was a correct interpretation there must also have been an association between the group and the surrounding temples and gods, just as at Alexandria the rulers commissioned Egyptian images in order to promote the roots of Sarapis, they asserted their own heritage and legacy.
Chapter 7: Conclusions

7.1 Introduction

By collating the various types of Ptolemaic royal sculpture it has been possible, through stylistic and iconographical analysis, to gain a greater understanding of individual trends and consequently build a chronological framework for the material. The second century BC, which early Classicists and Egyptologists refer to as a period of degeneration, is arguably the most interesting period in the development of the Ptolemaic royal image because it is a time when the two artistic traditions become eclectic.\(^1\) It is also a time when the two types of royal portrait use the same image, apparently because the Egyptian artists begin to use the Greek representations as models for their work. This is reflected in the female royal portraiture, where attributes are taken from the Greek cults and used to serve a specific function on the statuary.

The foundations for this occurrence were laid firmly in the third century BC, under the first rulers. The evidence from the Alexandrian Sarapieion illustrates that the rulers were keen to promote the Greek and Egyptian tradition side by side in parallel dedications and images. Although the god Sarapis should be seen as a Hellenised version of an Egyptian deity rather than an attempt to merge the two religions, the sanctuaries provided both Greeks and Egyptians with an acceptable focus for their religious practices by offering corresponding establishments. At Memphis this was in the form of separate shrines within the main temple complex and at the Alexandrian Sarapieion there was both Greek and Egyptian sculpture.

There are significant differences between the presentation of the male and female rulers, particularly with regard to the Egyptian representations. This is characterised by the types of features that are adopted from the Greek tradition: portraits for the male rulers and attributes for the queens. The Egyptian artists often use a stylised portrait type to represent royal women, often reflecting the male portraits of the time.

\(^1\) Needler (1949) 140, Lawrence (1925) 179 and Noshy (1937) 95.
Was the practice of cross-cultural borrowing introduced for the first time as a consequence of Ptolemaic rule or is there earlier evidence of a foreign influence in the history of Egyptian art? It has been suggested that there was a Greek influence on Egyptian portraiture from as early as the fourth century BC. This influence manifests itself in two ways: firstly, the softer modelling of the features on images of Nectanebo I and II and secondly, the non-idealised private images such as the Boston and Berlin Green Heads. However, the phenomenon needs addressing more thoughtfully, particularly as the two forms are effectively opposites, because one type favours hard lines whereas the other is soft, with a more fleshy appearance. The former is documented in the portraiture of the Twelfth Dynasty, where Sesostris III adopted a more ‘naturalistic’ portrait type, and I have suggested that its re-emergence during the fourth century BC was as a consequence of the political instability and a need to look back to a historical figure to reaffirm Egypt’s position. Thus, the reappearance of this type of image is a continuation of a form of archaising that was also found in the Twenty-sixth Dynasty.

The softer modelling on the royal portraits of the Thirtieth and Ptolemaic Dynasties is less easily explained. It is clear that the early Ptolemaic rulers continued to use very similar if not the same portrait models for their Egyptian representations and I have suggested that this was to ensure the association between the last Egyptian dynasty and the new ruling house. It is tempting to view the soft modelling on these pieces as the result of Greek influence but there is no evidence to suggest that the artists looked outside their own tradition for inspiration. The development of the Egyptian royal portraits during the third century BC is extremely instructive because angular lines replace the soft modelling, as seen on the New Haven bust of a king (Cat. 76). In the second century BC the artists adopt very obvious foreign features, faithfully reproducing the Greek portrait types rather than showing traits of minor artistic influence. It is almost as if the artists are adopting foreign attributes and

---

2 Josephson (1997b) 11, compare Bothmer (1996) 215, who states that Hellenistic influence on sculpture in the round does not become evident until the third century BC.

3 Bothmer (1960b) 28, no. 24.
simply placing them in an unaltered Egyptian context, very similar to the iconographic attributes that appear on statues of the Ptolemaic queens.

7.2 The Egyptian-style representations of the male rulers

The earliest Egyptian representations from the Ptolemaic period are difficult to distinguish from the Thirtieth Dynasty portraits. This similarity was probably deliberate and a way of associating the new dynasty with the Egyptian kings of the past. The introduction of a more corpulent image under Ptolemyes VIII, IX and X is innovative, since the kings of earlier dynasties are always portrayed as slim and athletic individuals. In addition to the fleshy portraits representing kingly traits that are commonly associated with Hellenistic monarchy, these images probably show the rulers as they actually appeared. Ptolemy VIII was called Physcon by the Alexandrians and that this reflected his gross obesity is evident from Athenaeus’ description of the ruler:

‘Διὰ δὲ τρυφὴν διέφθαρτο τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ παχύτητος καὶ γαστρὸς μεγέθους, ἦν δυσπερίληπτον εἶναι συνέβαινεν...’.4

‘Through indulgence in luxury his body had become corrupted with fat and with a belly of such a size that it would have been hard to measure it with one’s arms.’

The name Physcon and the descriptions of the ruler do not imply that his qualities were admired, on the contrary he appears to have become a subject of ridicule and hatred.5 That the images reflected the ruler’s true appearance is important because this is the first certain evidence in the history of Egyptian portraiture of an individual reflecting their physical appearance.6 The Egyptian-style portraits are also parallels of the Hellenistic images of these particular kings, which again reflects the close relationship between the two artistic traditions.

---

4 Athenaeus Deipnosophistai XII. 549 e.
5 See Athenaeus Deipnosophistai XII. 549 d, who recalls that the Alexandrians also called Ptolemy VIII Κακέργητης.
6 Although many scholars claim that the Fifth Dynasty so-called reserve heads are realistic representations of individuals, it is not possible to know how accurate they are or indeed if the artists deliberately attempted to copy the subjects’ physical appearance. Similarly with the queen of Punt, it is not possible to know whether the subject truly appeared as she was portrayed. See Ashton and Spanel (forthcoming) for a further discussion.
The most obvious occurrence of association is found on the so-called mixed-style statues that are Egyptian in style but with Greek portrait features. Such images appear at a time of political unrest, when rival native rulers controlled the Thebaid and took the title pharaoh. I have suggested tentatively that the appearance of the earliest example (Cat. 107) at Karnak may well be related to the disturbances in the area, and that the inclusion of a Hellenistic portrait on the Egyptian statue was an attempt by the royal house to re-affirm their position. The accurate copying of the Greek portrait type occurs under Ptolemies V and VI, and possibly again on the images of Caesarion, although in this instance there are no Hellenistic equivalents to compare. The late second and early first century BC rulers prefer a more stylised or parallel images, although it is not clear whether this distinction was deliberate or simply the product of developments introduced by the Egyptian artists. The lack of sculptors’ models for the period between the reigns of Ptolemies V and IX suggests that the artists looked elsewhere for their inspiration and copied the Hellenistic images.

There are examples where the ruler appears with a diadem, but such images are generally reserved for princes. The clothing and headdresses usually reflect the Egyptian tradition. Thus the adoption of foreign features does not affect the Egyptian appearance of the statues; the features are adopted and later adapted to suit an Egyptian context. A similar phenomenon occurs also on the representations of the royal women at roughly the same period.

7.3 The Egyptian-style representations of the royal women

Even though for three centuries prior to Ptolemaic rule there were few sculptural representations of women, the Egyptian sculptors seem to have adapted easily to the demand for images of the Ptolemaic queens. The statues of Ptolemaic queens fall into three main categories:
1. Those that are essentially Egyptian with a tripartite wig and sheath-like drapery.
2. Those with Hellenistic attributes of a cornucopia, corkscrew wig and a more elaborately folded tripartite costume.
3. Those that are essentially Egyptian in style but with naturalistic treatment of the hair in locks and with a fringe that is more commonly associated with Hellenistic portraits.

Although groups two and three do not occur until the second century BC, some of the earliest statues show an awareness of the Greek traditions and iconography associated with individual queens. This fact is illustrated by the iconography of Arsinoe II, who wears a double uraeus to distinguish her from other goddesses and later queens (Cats. 84, 85, 91, 136). The double form of uraeus first appears on representations of male rulers in the Fifth Dynasty (2565-2420 BC). There are further examples of the double and then triple uraeus in the New Kingdom, most notably on queen Tiye. Griffiths believed that the double uraeus on Ptolemaic statuary had the same meaning as the single cobra, that the symbol represented kingship and the might of Horus. He mentioned that the double uraeus in the Pyramid texts is said to represent the king’s eyes and the Two Lands of Egypt. The re-appearance of the double uraeus as part of Arsinoe II’s iconography would, however, seem to have more in common with the queen’s association with the double cornucopia in the Hellenistic tradition, since she wears the double form on even posthumous statues (Cat. 91). An inscribed statue, now in the MMA (Cat. 136), shows that the double cornucopia was also adopted for her Egyptian representations rather than the usual single horn that was associated with other queens. It would, therefore, seem that the double uraeus was equivalent to the dikeras and that there was an ideological connection between the two artistic traditions in the third century BC.

---

7 Gardiner (1944) 48.
8 Griffiths (1961) 50, n. 27 mentions that the double uraeus was favoured by the Ethiopian kings; see also Louvre inv. E25493 for the triple uraeus.
9 Griffiths (1961) 50-51, notes that the double uraeus is not simply a duplication of the single but represents the uraeus goddess and vulture goddess with the latter in the guise of the former.
10 The cornucopia appears on the reverse of coinage showing Arsinoe and on faience cult vases, see Thompson (1973) 65, who believes that the dikeras represents double sovereignty. The use of the double and triple uraeus in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties seems to be associated with festivals. I am extremely grateful to Dr. Stephen Quirke for drawing this to my attention.
Griffiths, however, suggested that Cleopatra VII wore the double uraeus and that the queen used two asps for her suicide as a deliberate reference to the symbol.\textsuperscript{11} Whilst it is true that Cleopatra VII can be associated with the dikeras on her coinage, there is nothing to suggest that the queen wore a double uraeus. In 1983 Quaegebeur suggested that a statue of a queen, now in the Rosicrucian Museum, San Jose (Cat. 95) represented Cleopatra VII, on account of the hawk-like features of the portrait.\textsuperscript{12} However, the San Jose queen wears a triple uraeus. This particular attribute is found on six other statues; Bothmer cites four examples and proposes that the triple uraeus represented the reign of Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra II and Cleopatra III: \textsuperscript{13}

- Turin 1385 (Cat. 96)
- San Jose, Rosicrucian Museum 1582 (Cat. 95)
- New York, MMA 89.2.660 (Cat. 146)
- St. Petersburg, Hermitage 3936 (Cat. 144)

Bothmer dismissed the idea that the MMA statue (Cat. 146) represents Cleopatra VII on stylistic grounds. However, the styling of the wig, with locks of one length, and the position of the right hand, which rests on the queen’s drapery rather than being clenched, are all features of the first century BC. The piece is provincial in quality and yet the straight, slightly down-turned mouth and sharp nose all occur in the late second to first century Ptolemaic portraits. The single rather than double cornucopia can be explained as a misinterpretation by the Egyptian artist.

New evidence suggests that Cleopatras II and III wore the single uraeus. The colossal statue of a queen (Cat. 138) that was found with male statues of Ptolemies VIII and X (Cat. 115 and 116) must represent Cleopatra III; she wears a single uraeus. Other portraits from the second century BC also wear a single uraeus (Cat. 101 and 103).

\textsuperscript{11} Griffiths (1961) 51, after Spiegelberg.
\textsuperscript{12} Quaegebeur (1983) 114 and Kyrieleis (1975) 184, M7, who dates the statue to the first century BC.
\textsuperscript{13} Bothmer (1960b) 146-147, where Bothmer proposes that the MMA statue represents the Cleopatra II.
Bianchi dates the San Jose queen (Cat. 95) to the third century BC. However, there is no evidence to suggest that such non-idealised features appear until the later Ptolemaic period. He dismisses earlier claims that the statue represented Cleopatra VII because the nose has been restored and the face appears less hawk-like when the nose has been removed. Again, the features regardless of the nose are typical of the late second to first century BC.

The Hermitage queen (Cat. 144) is traditionally identified as a posthumous representation of Arsinoe II, on account of the double cornucopia, an attribute commonly associated with this particular queen. The date suggested in the Paris catalogue is 200 BC. This is unlikely, since the statue does not fit comfortably within the sequence of royal representations, nor are the portrait features typical of this period. The Hermitage statue is more likely to date to the first century BC. The identity is also open to question, because Arsinoe II is not the only queen to be associated with the double cornucopia. Cleopatra III often used the crown of Arsinoe and the double rather than single cornucopia and Cleopatra VII always used the double version when the symbol appeared on her coins. Furthermore, Arsinoe II always wears a double and not a triple uraeus on statues from the third to the late second century BC. The identity of the statue is, therefore, unlikely to be Arsinoe II.

There are in fact a further three statues with the triple uraeus:
- Brooklyn Museum of Art 71.12 (Cat. 145)
- Paris, Musée du Louvre E 13102. (Cat. 97)
- Brummer Collection (Cat. 94).

Müller offered a second suggestion: that the triple uraeus was in fact a double uraeus and the vulture head from the cap. However, this argument does not explain the appearance of the triple uraeus on the San Jose, MMA, St. Petersburg, BMA and Paris statues, since they do not wear a vulture headdress. The triple uraeus could refer to Cleopatra VII, Caesarion and the dead Julius Caesar in an attempt to assimilate the triad with the Egyptian gods Isis, Horus/Harpocrates and Osiris respectively. This would accord with Cleopatra's political and religious policies.

---

14 Bothmer (1960b) 147.
The inclusion of Caesar is only one step away from the queen’s assimilation to Isis and the coin portraits that show her suckling Caesarion in the manner of Isis and Harpocrates.

Stylistically the seven statues appear to represent a youthful queen rather than a mature ruler such as Cleopatra III. To support the argument for reattribution is the fact that the Alexandrian statue has a single uraeus. Finally there is the Brummer head (Cat. 94), which is archaising. This is a parallel for a male ruler with fourth century features but the addition of Greek attributes including a kausia and hair (Cat. 124). The male portrait has been dated to the first century BC and may well represent Caesarion. Such developments are reflected in the Greek-style portraits of Cleopatra VII, which look back to the third century BC for inspiration. Whilst the other statues in the group of queens with a triple uraeus could still be dated to the late second century BC, the Brummer head provides the final support for the association of the triple uraeus with the last of the Ptolemaic queens.

The lack of uniformity in the portrait types on these images is also typical of first century royal portraits, and can be explained by the apparent lack of sculptors’ models for the Egyptian-style royal image under Cleopatra VII, which was perhaps a reflection of the unstable political climate.

### 7.4 Archaism

Archaism is the continued use of features which were commonly employed during the archaic period of Greek art (680-480 BC) after the style had ceased. There are many examples of archaism attested in Greek art, and the style seems to have enjoyed a revival during the second century BC. There is nothing to suggest that the Greek-style royal representations from Ptolemaic Egypt copied the archaistic style, but there are examples that may be interpreted as Greek archaism on some of the Egyptian

---

statuary. This phenomenon occurs on the so-called mixed-style representations and the states of queens with Greek attributes.

In both instances the archaism is manifested in the styling of the hair. The earliest instances occur during the reigns of Cleopatra II-III. There are two examples from this period, the New Haven statuette (Cat. 137) and the Ma'amura queen (Cat. 140), on which both have stylised corkscrew coiffures with snail-shell curls on the forehead. The Vienna queen (Cat. 105) shows a more stylised version of this hairstyle and is one of the best examples, with three rows of stylised curls along the forehead. The snail-shell curls continue under Cleopatra VII and appear on two statues of the queen, (Cat. 145 and 146).

The same pattern can be found on statues of male rulers. The earliest examples date to the reign of Ptolemy IX and continue under Ptolemy X. The stylised rows of curls appear on a sphinx of Ptolemy IX, now in Milan (Cat. 177), and on a portrait of Ptolemy IX in Vienna (Cat. 118). There are two further portraits representing either Ptolemy IX or X, one in Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum (Cat. 119) and the other once in Berlin but now lost (Cat. 120); both have the stylised curls on the forehead. One of the best examples is the portrait of Ptolemy X from Canopus (Cat. 122). Here the curls are divided into two sections, with further stylised facial hair on the cheeks.

More carefully stylised curls of hair are found on an unusual representation of Ptolemy Philadelphos, son of Cleopatra VII and Mark Antony (Cat. 124). This statue is also interesting because the features are archaizing in Egyptian terms. The portrait is softly modelled and has more in common with the images of the fourth and third century rulers that those of the first century BC. There are two further examples of Egyptian archaism from the end of the Ptolemaic period: one is a representation of Cleopatra VII (Cat. 94), and the second is a statue of her daughter Cleopatra Selene from the Hadra district of Alexandria (Cat. 98). The former has features that are commonly found on the archaizing sculptures of the Twenty-sixth
dynasty, including plastic eyebrows and make-up lines. The latter is closer to the early Ptolemaic portraits and, were it not for the datable male statue (Cat. 129) that accompanies the queen, her image would be difficult to distinguish from the earlier Ptolemaic representations.

The re-appearance of the classic Greek and Egyptian styles under Cleopatra VII seems to have been part of a deliberate policy by the queen to separate the two traditions and return to the standards of the third century BC, when the Ptolemaic dynasty was at its height. The earlier more stylised images with archaising features may have been influenced by the more general trends of Hellenistic sculpture. That the phenomenon appears on the Egyptian-style images is extremely instructive because it shows that the rulers saw their history in terms of Egypt and so the only statues to appear with archaising features are those in the Egyptian style.

7.5 Egyptian Influence on Greek Sculpture

The evidence for Hellenistic sculptural representation is extremely poor because of the technique of the statues that were used to represent the Ptolemaic rulers. Marble or limestone heads were carved and then fitted into statue bodies of another material, usually wood, ivory or metal, which do not survive. This problem limits our knowledge of the Greek-style images considerably and for this reason it is difficult to recognise individual rulers, because one must depend on portrait features alone to identify the subject. The coins illustrate the importance of attributes in the identification of rulers but this evidence is also missing from the images in the round. There is nothing to suggest that the Egyptian tradition influenced the Hellenistic imagery on either the coins or the sculpture. There are, however, seal impressions that show the ruler wearing the double crown of Upper and Lower Egypt (Figure 9); these images are Egyptianising rather than accurate copies of the Egyptian regalia.

\[16\text{ Compare Bothmer (1960b) 13-14, no. 12 for a Twenty-fifth Dynasty female and for the Twenty-sixth Dynasty male rulers with plastic eyebrows see 57-59, nos. 50 and 51.}\]
Because these attributes do not survive on the sculpture it is not possible to say whether this type of borrowing was a common feature. It has been suggested that various features on the coinage are Egyptian in origin, typically the sceptres that appear behind the ruler. If such features are adopted from the Egyptian tradition, they provide evidence for ideological rather than artistic interaction. This would reflect the use of sculpture at sanctuaries such as the Sarapieion where native traditions are respected and Egyptian sculpture sits beside Hellenistic images of the kings.

See for example Cheshire (1982) 105-111 and Koenen (1993) 25-27; also Chapter 1, Section 1.1 for fuller discussion.
It has also been suggested that there is an Egyptian influence on some of the Greek-style portraits, particularly the Bonn Arsinoe II (Cat. 27), which dates to the third century BC. Bianchi's reasons for suggesting that the portrait is influenced by the Egyptian tradition are the high polish on the marble, the sharp lines and also the frontal position of the head. However, the Bonn Arsinoe has little in common with the soft modelling on the Egyptian portraits of this period, particularly the representations of Arsinoe II (Cat. 84 and 85).

The proportionate numbers of Greek and Egyptian representations differ considerably. The queens are well represented and their importance in the royal and dynastic cults is reflected in the number of associated images. In the Greek-style portraits there are several of Berenike II, particularly dating to the reign of Philopator, which accords with the ruler's deification and promotion of his mother's individual cult. There are, however, no securely identified images of Berenike in Egyptian sculpture. Similarly, there are few Hellenistic representations of Cleopatras I to III, but there are many examples in all three types of Egyptian sculpture dating to their reigns. Such discrepancies may illustrate the popularity or promotion of individual rulers both during their life and posthumously.

7.6 Conclusion

This thesis has shown that there are many examples of the interaction between Greek and Egyptian sculpture within the sphere of royal presentation. From early in the dynasty the rulers are shown in both Greek and Egyptian-style sculpture at the same sanctuaries. In Alexandria, there is considerable evidence for the promotion of the Egyptian artistic tradition from the time of Ptolemy I, and this continues through the second century BC with the final manifestation under Cleopatra VII.

The sculptures also illustrate that the divisions between Greek and Egyptian art were easily crossed, although generally in very specific and controlled ways; this reflects

the cultural climate of the second and first centuries BC when the Egyptian artists adopted Greek features in their work. This phenomenon echoes the ideological interaction between the two traditions and the flexibility on the part of the royal house and their subjects.
Appendix 1: Sculpture

1.1 Miho, Miho Museum

Granodiorite, h: 159.5 cm; w: 50 cm.
Provenance unknown
Condition: Good. The crown and feet are missing. The nose and mouth are damaged.
Second half of the 1st century BC? (Arsinoe II?).

Description
Egyptian-style statue of a goddess or queen with an uninscribed back pillar. The subject stands in striding stance and wears a sheath-like, transparent garment and a tripartite echeloned wig with a diadem and double uraeus. The torso is softly modelled and the sculptor has left two pieces of stone on either side of the left arm to support it. The left arm is held across the upper abdomen and the clenched hand holds a lily sceptre, which falls down the forearm. The right arm is held by the subject's side and the hand is held flat against the thigh.

Discussion
Kozloff (1997) suggests that this sculpture is a representation of Arsinoe II, re-cut from a statue of queen Tiye (Eighteenth Dynasty). A comparison with the statues of the Amarna royal women illustrates that this is unlikely to have been the case. The very distinctive curve of the Amarna eyebrows is nothing like the straight eyebrows on the Miho statue. The modelling of the eyes in particular on the Miho statue is closer to those on the Hermitage queen (Cat. 144), although the mouth is closer to the type found on third century BC statues. It is possible that the mouth is an archaizing feature.

The uraeus is an unusual form, with greater attention given to the tails of the cobras, than is typical in the Ptolemaic period. The wig, however, and the positioning on the forehead is very close to the images of Cleopatra VII. For this reason, it is likely that the statue is, s Kozloff suggests, a representation of Arsinoe II but is more likely to date to the first century BC. Without seeing the statue it is impossible to know for certain.

Bibliography
1.2 New Haven, Barringer Collection.

On extended loan to the Yale University Art Gallery 4.1.1953
Schist, h: 37 cm; h. of face: 15 cm; w: 30.5 cm; d: 24.4 cm.
Provenance unknown.

Condition: Good. The lappets of the nemes headdress are broken and the back of the head is missing. The nose is badly damaged and there are further marks to the chin and forehead. The inlays from the eyes and the cobra from the uraeus are missing. There is further superficial damage to the surface.

First half of the 1st century AD. (Nero?).

Description

Egyptian-style statue of a ruler with a nemes headdress and single uraeus. The face is rounded in appearance with a row of hair forming a fringe under the nemes headdress. The ruler has thin lips with a down-turned mouth, with no evidence of drill holes at the corners. The eyebrows are curved following the shape of the eyelids and the eyes, which were originally inlaid, are wide and round in appearance.

Discussion

Both Needler and Bothmer date this piece to the third century BC. However, Bothmer (1960b) compares the sculpture to a portrait of Ptolemy VI in Athens (Cat. 111) and a first century BC sculpture from Hadra, Alexandria (Cat. 129), which Bothmer also dates to the reign of Ptolemy VI. Comparison with the inscribed Athens statue and other images of Ptolemy VI of this type, illustrate that the features bare little resemblance to those of the New Haven statue.

The fuller, cord-like fringe is a feature that appears at the end of the Ptolemaic period and is more commonly found on the early Imperial portraits from Egypt. The down-turned mouth is also a later feature that appears under Ptolemy IX and X and continues on the images of Caesarion; it is also commonly found on Roman portraits, such as the Louvre Nero (inv. E 14705).

Although youthful, the face differs from the usual portrait type of Caesarion in that the chin is fuller and the face more rounded than Cats. 125-128, representing Caesarion. For this reason the piece should be dated to the early first century BC and because it lacks the distinctive hairstyle of Augustus possibly represents either Germanicus or Nero.
Bibliography

Appendix 2: Non-Sculpture

2.1 Brooklyn, Brooklyn Museum of Art 73.85
Gold Medallion: 2.8 cm x 2.4 cm
Provenance unknown.
Condition: Good.
Date: Reign of Ptolemy IV or V?

Description
Round gold medallion with busts of Isis and Sarapis standing proud from the background. The two deities are mainly frontal, although both turning slightly inwards towards each other; the female is slightly behind the male, and surrounded by a palm or lotus flower. She wears a solar disk and cow’s horn crown, which is attached to a thin diadem. Her hair is shown in the so-called Isis coiffure and falls in two sets of ringlets, one to around the bottom of her jaw line and the second on her shoulders. Her dress is gathered in a knot, tied on her left shoulder. Sarapis wears an atef crown, again attached to a diadem. His hair is shoulder length and falls in waves; his beard is thick and again is rendered in curls. He wears a Greek style tunic and mantle over his left shoulder.

Bibliography
2.2 Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum inv. 906.12.3§
Clay seal impression: Imp. 1.7cm x 1.3cm; Obj. 1.7cm x 1.4cm.
Said to be from Edfu, purchased by Dr. Currelly in Egypt.
Condition: Fair, small chips from the bottom.
1st Century BC?

Description
One of a series of seal impressions showing jugate representations of Sarapis and a female with corkscrew locks. Both look towards the right, with Sarapis is shown in front of female. He wears a laureate with small atef crown; his beard and hair are shown in unkempt waves. The female wears a diadem with a crown of sun disk and plumes.

Bibliography
Milne (1916) no. 38.
2.3 Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum inv. 109.12.32
Clay seal impression: Imp. 1.5cm x 1.2cm; Obj. 1.7cm x 1.6cm.
Said to be from Edfu, purchased in Egypt by Dr. Currelly.
Condition: Fair, crack down the middle of impression.
1st century BC?

Description
Clay seal impression with a depiction of Sarapis. The god stands with his head turned to his right; he wears a himation and has a sceptre in his left hand, his right hand is stretched out to the side. His hair and beard are shown in curls that fall onto his shoulders.
Unpublished
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