ROYAL STATUES IN EGYPT 300 BC-AD 220: CONTEXT AND FUNCTION

VOLUME I: TEXT

Elizabeth Brophy

Keble College

DPhil Archaeology

ABSTRACT: Royal Statues in Egypt 300 BC - AD 220: Context and Function

Elizabeth Brophy, Keble College, D.Phil Archaeology,
Trinity Term 4th Year

The aim of this thesis is to approach Ptolemaic and Imperial royal sculpture in Egypt dating between 300 BC and AD 220 (the reigns of Ptolemy I and Caracalla) from a contextual point of view. To collect together the statuary items (recognised as statues, statue heads and fragments, and inscribed bases and plinths) that are identifiably royal and have a secure archaeological context, that is a secure find spot or a recoverable provenance, within Egypt. I then used this material, alongside other types of evidence such as textual sources and numismatic material, to consider the distribution, style, placement, and functions of the royal statues, and to answer the primary questions of where were these statues located? what was the relationship between statue, especially statue style, and placement? And what changes can be identified between Ptolemaic and Imperial royal sculpture?

From analysis of the sculptural evidence, this thesis was able to create a catalogue of 103 entries composed of 157 statuary items, and use this to identify the different styles of royal statues that existed in Ptolemaic and Imperial Egypt and the primary spaces for the placement of such imagery, namely religious and urban space. The results of this thesis, based on the available evidence, was the identification of a division between sculptural style and context regarding the royal statues, with Egyptian-style material being placed in Egyptian contexts, Greek-style material in Greek, and Imperial-style statues associated with classical contexts. The functions of the statues appear to have also typically been closely related to statue style and placement. Many of the statues were often directly associated with their location, meaning they were an intrinsic part of the function and appearance of the context they occupied, as well as acting as representations of the monarchs. Primarily, the royal statues acted as a way to establish and maintain communication between different groups in Egypt.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to my supervisors Prof. Bert Smith and Prof John Baines, both of whom have guided and advised me throughout this research. Thanks also to Dr. Elizabeth Frood, Dr Peter Stewart, Dr Maria Stamatopoulou, and Dr Peter Thonemann, all of whom read sections of this thesis and advised me during my transfer and confirmation. And to Dr Elizabeth Frood and Dr Robert Simpson who helped me gain insight and knowledge into the wider subject of Egyptology. Final thanks to the many people who supported me throughout this study and read multiple drafts, especially John and Geraldine Brophy, Laura Wood, Christina Jose, Zena Kamash, and many others.

CONTENTS

Volume I

Volume II

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The primary aim of this thesis is to approach Ptolemaic and Imperial royal sculpture in Egypt from a contextual point of view. To treat the material from an archaeological perspective, and to use this to consider their distribution, style, placement, and functions, so as to bring a new dimension to the wider understandings of these statues. To this end, the aim of this study is to focus on the sculptural material that is identifiably 'royal', dates between 300 BC and AD 220 (between the rules of Ptolemy I and Caracalla), and has an archaeological context; a secure find spot or recoverable provenance within Egypt. The sculptures themselves include full statues, fragmentary heads, and inscribed bases, and can be recognised as 'large scale' material, identified as statue heads no smaller than 15 cm. Due to this limit, smaller faience and terracotta heads or figurines will not be discussed, nor will the 'small Alexander heads' from Alexandria.[1] Because of these restrictions the sculptural material available is limited, as many examples do not have a secure context or find spot. This criterion provides a group of 157 statuary items that are presented in 103 catagloue entries, for example the collection of five heads from Thmuis are numbered **28 A-E** and **42** from the Fayoum includes a c.28 sphinxes.

There are exceptions to every rule, and here there are two objects that do not fit the criteria but have been included for specific reasons. The first is a Ptolemaic head (**41**) from the site of Karanis in the Fayoum region which, though smaller than the identified size, has been included due to its unusual and

[1] Kyrieleis 1975; Laube 2012.

well-documented find spot. The second is the head of Augustus (**69**) in the British Museum from the site of Meroe in the Sudan. This head is not from Egypt, but has been included because its original location was most likely in Upper Egypt, and it too has a well documented and discussed provenance.

In analysing this material, I focus on a number of questions and themes. The principal questions I consider are: where were the statues placed? How did the statues fit into their contexts? What was the relationship between statue category and context? What, if any, changes can be identified over time, particularly between Ptolemaic and Imperial rule? And what does this show regarding the function and purpose of these statues in Egypt? Alongside these questions I also consider the commissioning of the statues and the role of audience, alongside other literary and archaeological evidence.

Previous Scholarship

Previous research has taken a primarily stylistic approach to royal statues, focusing on identities and attributes, and placing them within a socio-political and artistic context. They have also divided the material by cultural style, analysing Greek and Egyptian material separately, creating two distinct spheres of scholarship. The major area of discussion has been the extent to which influence between the two stylistic traditions can be identified.

Bernard Bothmer's catalogue *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period 700-100 BC* (1969) was one of the first to bring together a collection of Ptolemaic sculpture, including royal material. Bothmer argued that Greek

influence could be identified in Egyptian sculpture. In his study of Ptolemaic portraits, *Bildnisse der Ptolemäer* (1975), Helmut Kyrieleis analysed Ptolemaic Greek-style material, producing a comprehensive catalogue of statues, heads, and figurines. His emphasis was on portrait analysis, and continued the idea that there was a 'mixed' style in the material, combining Greek and Egyptian forms.

Robert Bianchi argued against this concept in *Cleopatra's Egypt* (1988), claiming that what had been identified as Greek influence actually had its roots in more 'realistic' dynastic sculpture, meaning material from the pre-Ptolemaic or 'pharaonic' eras of Egypt. In the same year, Bert Smith produced his *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* dedicating a significant proportion to the discussion of Ptolemaic Greek and hard stone Egyptian sculpture. In his analysis, Smith writes that the idea of a 'mixed' statuary group is misleading, as there is only evidence for the use of Greek features on Egyptian statues, confined to the head. Jack Josephson's work, *Egyptian Royal Sculpture of the Late Period, 400-246 BC* (1997) returned to Bothmer's earlier view (that Greek influence can be identified in Egyptian sculpture) and through focusing on fourth and third century BC sculpture provides a clearer picture of the relationship between 30th Dynasty and early Ptolemaic material. At the Fifth International Congree of Italian Egyptian Studies entitled *Faraoni come dei, Tolemei come Faraoni* (2005) edited by Anna Maria Donadoni Roveri, a range of Ptolemaic and early Imperial sculpture and associated themes were discussed alongside general questions concerning Ptolemaic Egypt

More recently, two works have focused specifically on Egyptian statues and the question of Greek interaction. Sally-Ann Ashton's monograph, *Ptolemaic Royal Statues from Egypt: The Interaction between Greek and Egyptian Traditions* (2002) focused on the mixture of different styles and why this evolved. Paul Stanwick in *Portraits of the Ptolemies: Greek Kings as Egyptian Pharaohs* (2002), has provided the most up-to-date and comprehensive catalogue of Egyptian- style Ptolemaic royal statues. He also considered the role of placement and context in relation to statue function, on both a geographic and general level. He noted several trends in the sculpture relating to differences in style, material, and quality throughout Egypt.

Imperial statues from Egypt have received less attention in scholarship. The earliest work, Paul Graindor's *Bustes et statues-portraits d'Égypte Romaine* (1937), provides a small catalogue of Roman era sculpture, including a group of imperial portraits. The only major work focusing solely on Imperial statues in Egypt is Zsolt Kiss' *Etudes sur le portrait imperial romain en Egypte* (1984) in which he provides a comprehensive catalogue of Roman royal sculpture, though several identifications are questionable. Imperial imagery is found in other catalogues, such as Günter Grimm's *Kunst der Ptolemaer-und Romerzeit im Agyptischen Museum Kairo* (1975).

Approach

In order to analyse the evidence and answer my research questions, I approach the available material from both a thematic and geographical framework. The first two chapters take a solely thematic view to the material, providing

background to the creation, style, and historical and cultural environment of Ptolemaic and Imperial Egypt. The following chapters are based on a geographical methodology, beginning with Lower Egypt and ending with Alexandria and the outside world. I use each geographic area as a way to approach different questions and themes according to the available evidence. I provide a brief outline of each chapter below.

In Chapter Two: the Textual Sources I analyse the principal textual evidence (narratives, inscriptions, and letters) that provide descriptions of various royal statues and their contexts. These sources act as a gateway into understanding placement and function, providing insight into the amount of material that existed in Egypt, where it was located, and how and why it was created.

Chapter Three focuses on the Cult Statues, for which there is little sculptural evidence. Ruler cult and Imperial cult were popular forms of worship during this period, with three different traditions (Egyptian, Greek, Roman) present in Egypt. Statues related to them can be identified in texts and archaeological material. In looking at this material, the aim is to build up a picture of these various cults, and the statues position within them.

Chapter Four concerns the material from Lower Egypt, which provides a large group of statuary items, but few well preserved sites. My aim here is to establish the different categories of statue and site present in this study, and the principal locations for statue placement. Chapter Five is focused

on the Fayoum. The region provides a small group of Ptolemaic material and allows for discussion of the surroundings of royal statues, with a focus on Egyptian statues with Greek features. In Chapter Six, I analyse the material from Upper Egypt, which provides some of the best archaeological and literary evidence. My aim is to build upon what has been established in Lower Egypt and the Fayoum, and explore the functions of royal statues. I also discuss some of the more unusual elements of the evidence, such as Greek inscriptions on Egyptian statues, and Roman classical structures and sculpture located next to Egyptian ones.

Chapter Seven focuses on Alexandria, and recent work by Jean-Yves Empereur, Franck Goddio, and Judith McKenzie has produced a clearer picture of its environment. I have purposely chosen to focus on Alexandria last due to its position as both a central yet liminal city in Egypt. I have also chosen to analyse the city separately because of its material; it provides a high proportion of the evidence and a range of different statuary categories (seen in Table 1). In analysing the material from Alexandria, I not only identify context, placement, and environment within the city, but also attempt to identify whether this fits into the patterns observed in the rest of Egypt.

I end by discussing the material found outside Egypt. This material reinforces several of the arguments and patterns concerning placement and style, demonstrating a cohesive picture of context throughout this study.

CHAPTER 2: TEXTUAL SOURCES

From Ptolemaic and Imperial Egypt come a range of inscriptions, ostraca, and papyri documents, alongside a number of external narrative descriptions, that build up a picture of the country; its population, religions, and tax system. Many of these sources also provide brief references to royal statues; to creation, style, and context. The aim of this chapter is to identify and discuss the most relevant of these sources. In order to achieve this, I divide the material into two sections. The first focuses on a selection of literary sources that provide evidence for a range of different statue styles, contexts, and individuals. The second section concerns a collection of royal and religious inscriptions known as the priestly decrees. For each section I describe the evidence provided by each source, before discussing the material together in more detail.

A.1. Literary sources

The first section concerns a collection of otherwise unrelated documents here connected by the detailed information they provide regarding royal sculpture and its context. These sources are composed of inscriptions, letters, and books, and date from the third century BC to the fourth century AD. These include three focused on Ptolemaic sculpture - Libanius, Athenaeus and Senoucheri - and two concerned with Imperial statues - the Letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians and a group of tax receipts from Elephantine. I also note the nature of other useful literary sources and how they contribute to this topic.

A.1.1.Pseudo-Nicolaus [Libanius] Progymnasmata

The first source is present in the *Progymnasmata* of the Greek rhetorician Libanius of Antioch (AD 314-393).[2] The section under consideration here has been attributed to Pseudo-Nicolaus, the author of a late Antique or Byzantine collection of progymnasmata.[3] The passage in question describes the Temple of Tyche in Alexandria and the statues that stood within it.

The passage describes the temple as an enclosure in the middle of the city, adjacent or adjoined to the Museion. It states that the temple was circular and "divided into semi-circles" with jutting columns which functioned "as receptacles for statues [of the gods]...not all but twelve in number".[4] The passage goes on to state that one of the "column capital holds the Founder...and he stands there, himself bearing a token of Soter."[5] This has been interpreted by a number of scholars, including Judith McKenzie, to refer to a statue of Ptolemy I.[6] It should be noted that other scholars, such as Craig Gibson, interpret this line as referring to a statue of Alexander the Great.[7] Other statues included a complex group of Ge crowning Alexander the Great, and being crowned by Tyche, while surrounded by statues of Victory.[8] The passage ends by describing

[2] Text: Libanius *Descriptiones*, 25 - Foerster 1927, 529-531; Fraser 1972, n.417; Gibson 2007, 452-454. Text & translation: Gibson 2008, 486-491. Discussion; Fraser 1972, n.417; Stewart 1993, 244; McKenzie 2007, 244; Gibson 2007, 431-454.

[3] Gibson 2007, 433.

[4] Gibson 2008, 489, L 3-5.

[5] Gibson, 2008, 489, L 5.

[6] McKenzie 2007, 244.

[7] Gibson 2008, 489, n.89.

[8] Gibson 2008, 491, L 6-7.

two more statues, "one man philosophises on a chair at one end, while another stands naked at the other."[9]

This passage describes a highly complex and decorated structure, more likely attributable to the fourth century AD building than the Hellenistic one, due to the date of the source and the nature of the building design.[10] This structure most likely succeeded an earlier temple, and the sculpture described here can be attributed to the earlier structure given its emphasis on Alexander the Great. Though there is some discussion as to whether the text does refer to a statue of Ptolemy I, the presence of such a statue is possible given the king's focus on the surrounding structures and his own associations with both Tyche and Alexander. This text appears to place an image of Ptolemy I in one of the major monuments of Alexandria, closely associated with the Museion, and in relation to a number of other divine and royal images.

A.1.2.Callixeinus of Rhodes' On Alexandria in Athenaeus' Deipnosophists

One of the most substantial and detailed literary sources comes from Athenaeus of Naucratis (AD c.200).[11] His work, the *Deipnosophists*, focuses on three fictional banquets in which a range of topics are discussed by the learned guests. It provides a substantial collection of excerpts from other sources, citing 1250 authors.[12] Among these are two passages from Callixeinus of Rhodes' work *On*

[9] Gibson 2008, 491, L7.

[10] Fraser 1972, n.417; Gibson 2007, 433.

[11] Text: Trans Olson 2006, Athenaeus *Deinosophists* Book 5; All translations in text taken from here. Alternative translations given in footnotes. For Procession see: Rice 1983.

[12] OCD[3] 202.

Alexandria from the third century BC that refer to the presence of royal sculpture. The first passage describes the Great Procession and the second the Riverboat of Ptolemy IV.[13]

The first passage concerns the Great Procession of Alexandria, which took place some time between c.280-275 BC.[14] This text is the earliest and fullest account of a Greek religious procession from the classical world and its description provides an insight into the display and resources that went into similar events.[15] The Great Procession is actually composed of a number of separate processions dedicated to different gods which included exotic animals, vast quantities of food and wine, and enormous amounts of gold and silver – one section describes how "Four large gold tripods followed in the procession; also a gold storage chest for gold vessels, which was set with precious stones... Also two cup-stands and two gilded vessels made of glass; two gold stands four cubits high".[16]

Amongst all this display there were numerous representations of the gods, as well as statues of the royal family. One section describes the presence of a divine group in the Dionysiac procession including "statues of Alexander and Ptolemy wearing ivy garlands made of gold" forming a group

[13] Procession: 197c-203b; Riverboat: 204d-206d.

[14] Rice 1983, 185.

[15] Rice 1983, 1-2.

[16] 199f-200a; Rice 1983, 14-15"Next in the procession were four large three-legged tables of gold, and a golden jewel-encrusted chest...two cup stands, two gilded glass vessels, two golden stands for vessels"; Olson 2006, 464-465.

alongside Arete, Priapus, and Corinth.[17] The exact make-up of this group is difficult to identify due to a lacuna in the text.[18] In a later section, focusing on victors of the contests and a crowning ceremony, the text notes that "Ptolemy I and Berenike were honoured with three portrait-statues carried on gold carts, as well as with precincts at Dodona" and "Ptolemy Philadelphus, their son, was honoured with two gold portrait-statues carried on gold carts and set on columns".[19] As with the previous episode, the text in this passage is difficult to understand, and Ellen Rice suggests it might not have been part of the procession but a description of another event.[20]

The description of the Great Procession provides evidence for approximately nine golden Ptolemaic royal sculptures; the statue of Ptolemy in procession, three statues for Ptolemy I and Berenike I, and the two statues for Ptolemy II. These statues were created for a specific purpose and occupied a specific context seen in the text. The text is only an extract by Athenaeus from a longer work of Callixeinus, both of whom chose what to describe. Therefore, this text provides only a small insight into the scale of the procession and the images of the Ptolemies present there.

The Riverboat of Ptolemy IV is described as a highly decorated, ornate structure, a two-storey ship made of wood, gilt, and ivory, with dining

[17] 201d-201e; Rice 1983, 20-21 "statues of Alexander and Ptolemy wreathed in ivy crowns". Discussion of statues used: Rice 1983, 102-110; Olson 2006, 470-471.

[18] Rice 1983, 102.

[19] 203a-b; Rice 1983, 24-25 "Ptolemy I and Berenike were honoured with three statues in golden chariots with precincts at Dodona" and that "their son Ptolemy Philadelphus was honoured with two golden statues on golden chariots and with others on columns"; Olson 2006, 476- 477.

[20] Rice 1983, 126.

rooms, bedrooms, and a peristyle court.[21] A recreation can be seen in Günter Grimm's *Alexandria: Die erste Königsstadt der hellenistischen Welt* and in Michael Pfrommer's *Alexandria: Im Schatten der Pyramiden*.[22]

In one of the rooms, dedicated to Dionysus, an exedra had been constructed, decorated with gold and jewels, and "portrait-statues of the royal family fashioned from translucent marble were set inside it".[23] This family group at least included Ptolemy IV, his sister-wife Arsinoe III, and their son, and may have included one or all of the three previous royal couples. Such royal family groupings are known from the Hellenistic period, with examples including those of the Philippeion at Olympia and the ancestors of Antigonas Gonatas on Delos.[24] There are also examples from Egypt, such as a group excavated by Campbell Cowan Edgar at Tell Timai composed of a number of gods, a portrait of Alexander, and Ptolemaic royal portraits identified as Ptolemy III, Berenike II, Ptolemy IV, Arsinoe III, and Arsinoe II (**28**).[25]

There are a number of practical issues attached to the placement of a statue group in the Riverboat of Ptolemy IV, particularly when following the reconstruction of Pfrommer and Grimm. There are the issues of balance and weight, with a group of 'translucent marble' statues being placed along one side

[21] 204e-206d; Olson 2006, 482-491; McKenzie 2007, 62-64.

[22] Grimm 1998, 60-63; Pfrommer 1999, 93-95.

[23] 205f; Olson 2006, 488-489.

[24] Smith 1988, 21-22.

[25] Edgar 1909, 1-13; Lembke 2002, 113-146. Other examples in the catalogue include **68** and **78** (both also concern Ptolemy IV, Arsinoe III, and Ptolemy V).

of the first floor of the boat, making it liable to tip or sink. This is further stressed in the reconstruction by Grimm in which the statue group is composed not only of the first four Ptolemaic couples, but also with statues of Alexander the Great, Herakles, Zeus, and Dionysos, making a total of 12 statues.[26] There is no evidence to suggest these gods were present, though these ones are associated with the Ptolemies. Most likely, any statues on the boat would have been under life-size, and while the heads and extremeties would have been of marble, the bodies themselves would have been constructed of a lighter material, probably wood. A comparable statue group from Egypt is that from Tell Timai (**28**), where the statues would have only reached approximately 50 cm in height, and the surviving material included the marble heads and arms of the statues.

The Riverboat passage does not go into detail describing the statues. The focus of the passage is on the riverboat itself, and provides a detailed insight into the contexts of some of these royal images.

A.1.3. Senoucheri's inscription at Koptos

The next source is very different from the previous two; it is a basalt hieroglyphic inscription from the third century BC set up at the temple of Min at Koptos by the official Senoucheri (or Senenshepsu) during the reign of Ptolemy II.[27] In it, Senoucheri describes his positions within Ptolemaic Egypt and the duties he performed at the sanctuary, including the erection of statues. The

[26] Grimm 1998, 61, fig 70.

[27] Trans: Petrie 1896, 19-21; Discussion: Lloyd 2002.

inscription most likely comes from a statue of Senoucheri set up in the sanctuary.[28]

In the inscription, Senoucheri describes how he constructed a wall around the temple, built a pylon tower on the north of the dromos, and made "a shrine of basalt for Horus".[29] He states that he set up "statues of the King…and images of the Queen".[30] The king can be identified from the text as Ptolemy II, though the identity of the queen is more problematic. She is only called Arsinoe and is not given the title of sister, leading to the question of whether it is Ptolemy's first wife (Arsinoe I) or his later deified sister queen (Arsinoe II).[31] Both Flinders Petrie and Alan Lloyd suggest that the text refers to Arsinoe I, who was confined to the area around Koptos after the end of her marriage, and that Senoucheri was her keeper.[32]

The inscription of Senoucheri refers to a group of royal statues, most likely Egyptian-style, and shows they were set up at an Egyptian sanctuary. The text provides a general description of some parts of the temple (those endowed by Senoucheri) and the festivals that took place. It also provides an insight into how and why certain royal statues came to be created and set up, in this case by a royal official. There is no description of the statues, except that there was more than one pair.

---

[28] Petrie 1896, 19.

[29] Petrie 1896, 20, L17-21.

[30] Petrie 1896, 20, C 1 L 1.

[31] Petrie 1896, 21; identified as Arsinoe I; Quaegebeur 1998, No.83.

[32] Petrie 1896, 21; Lloyd 2002, 125-127.

A.1.4. Letter from Claudius to the Alexandrians

In AD 41 an embassy was sent by the Alexandrians to Rome to the newly installed Emperor Claudius to bestow honours upon him and to request his intervention in problems arising in the city.[33] Upon the death of Caligula, the tense relationship between the Greek and Jewish population in Alexandria had erupted into riots and massacres. The Alexandrians were hoping to persuade Claudius to side with them against the Jews. The letter that survives is Claudius' response to this embassy, dated 10th November. Copies were set up around Alexandria. In his letter, Claudius responds point by point to the honours being offered, including four different statue types to be erected in Alexandria and Egypt.

The first statue honour Claudius accepts is "the erection by you in several places statues of myself and my family". No other detail is provided. Charles Rose suggests this points to a Claudian family group being erected somewhere in Alexandria, and that it consisted of Claudius, his mother Antonia II, his wife Messalina, and his children, Octavia, Antonia III, and Britannicus.[34] This group is also seen on a number of tetradrachms produced in Alexandria between AD 41-43.[35]

[33] Text, Trans & Discussion: Rose 1997, No.128, 186-188; Trans: Lewis & Reinhold 1999, no.76.

[34] Rose 1997, 188.

[35] Miln 1971, 3; Trillmich 1978, 156-160; Rose 1997, 188.

The next is one or two golden statues of Claudius to be carried through the city on his monthly name days. This is accompanied by the announcement that a statue of the Augustan Peace will be erected in Rome, creating a direct link to the city. The use of these golden images in a procession is reminiscent of the Ptolemaic statues present in the Great Procession (described above). These statues are followed by permission to "erect the equestrian statues given by Vitrasius Pollio my procurator."

The final honour that Claudius accepts is the "erection of statues in four-horse chariots which you wish to set up to me at the entrances of the country, I consent to let one be placed at the town called Taposiris in Libya, another at Pharus in Alexandria, and a third at Pelusium in Egypt".[36] This provides a distinctive image type and a number of contexts for the statues around Egypt. This letter suggests that placing sculpture at the entrances of a country is an appropriate thing to do.

The Letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians provides a number of imperial images to consider, including a family group, equestrian images, golden statues, and chariot statues. Little information is provided concerning the actual context of these images, since they are simply labelled as being placed in Alexandria, but their description points to a variety of imperial imagery in the city.

A.1.5. Tax ostraca

[36] Lewis & Reinhold 1999, no.76.

From Thebes and Elephantine come a small collection of ostraca that are receipts for a special tax (μερισμός) for the provision or renovation of imperial images - *andrias* (ἀνδριάς), meaning portrait statue, and *protomē* (προτομή), usually referring to a bust.[37] The ostraca date from between the reigns of Trajan to Marcus Aurelius, though Fishwick suggests this is an accident of evidence and the tax could have been in place much earlier.[38] The majority of the receipts are concerned with information regarding the tax and statues, and provide little concerning the images themselves. There is one example that refers to an *andrias* of Trajan being placed in an imperial temple, a Caesareum, suggesting they were cult, or cultic, images.[39] A temple apparently dedicated to Trajan has been identified in Elephantine in papyrus documents and in the archaeological record.[40]

The ostraca demonstrate the presence of imperial images in precious metals in the south of Egypt occupying religious sanctuaries. They also show there was a centralised system for providing and maintaining these images.

A.1.6. Other sources

[37] Wilcken 1899, 152-155, no.94, 100, 105, 151, 249, 254; Wallace 1939, 159-162; Fishwick 1989.

[38] Fishwick 1989, 335-336.

[39] Wallace 1939, 159; Fishwick 1989, 336.

[40] Ubertini 2005, 75; Pfeiffer 2010, 244.

When considering context there are a number of other literary sources that should be taken into account, though they provide only fleeting references to particular statues. Examples include passages from Philo's letters where he states that the Caesareum in Alexandria had a "girdle of pictures and statues" and a fragment from the accounts of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Arsinoe which mentions "the piece of iron removed…from the machine constructed to facilitate the erection of the divine colossal statue of our lord the emperor Severus Antoninus [Caracalla]" pointing to the presence of such a statue at the site.[41] Neither of these sources provide direct evidence for specific statues or specific contexts, but they do afford a general view of the range of imagery that existed, and supply descriptions of the type of contexts such sculpture occupied (in both cases temples).

This is also seen in other literary material, the texts and inscriptions that form the main corpus of the ancient sources. These do not describe statues, but do provide detailed information concerning context on a larger scale. One of the best examples is Strabo's *Geography* 17.1, which contains a detailed, if imperfect, description of Alexandria and other key areas in Egypt at the turn of the first century.[42] Other sources include temple texts, such as the construction text of Edfu, located on the temple's exterior wall, which describes the different rooms and their functions.[43] There are also census

[41] Philo *Embassy to Gaius*, 151; *Select Papyri II* no.404.

[42] Strabo *Geography*, 17.1.

[43] Kurth 2004.

papyri fragments from the Fayoum, the study of which provides an insight into the make-up of the population of Egypt.[44]

A.2. Discussion of Literary sources

The literary sources identified here provide a varying (and sometimes limited) amount of information regarding royal statues; little is given concerning their style, substance, or attributes. The focus of theses sources is not on the statues themselves, but on the structures they occupied, the material that surrounded them, and their purpose. From the texts there can be identified three principal types of context; the religious, the royal, and the urban, as well as a small group of singular contextual examples. I now discuss each of these areas in more detail, using them to highlight the major trends identifiable in the textual evidence.

A.2.1. Religious context

The principal context identified in the literary sources is religious, locating the statues within a religious space. This is observed with the sculpture at the Tycheum, in the Great Procession, at the temple of Min at Kotpos, and in the tax receipt of Elephantine.[45] This focus on placing imagery within religious spaces is reflective of both Greek and Egyptian traditions, in which temples, and other religious areas, play host to a variety of non-divine representations and votives.

[44] Bagnall & Frier 1994; Clarysse & Thompson 2006.

[45] Tycheum: Libanius *Descriptiones*, 25 - Foerster 1927, 529-531; Fraser 1972, n.417; Temple of Min: Petrie 1896, 20, C 1 L 1; Tax reciept: Wallace 1939, 159; Fishwick 1989, 336.

The actual religious context of each text is very different, and reflects the different areas of religious display within Ptolemaic Egypt: the Greek sanctuary, the Egyptian temple, and the moving procession. The sculptures of each of these contexts were specifically designed to fit into that space. In both the description of the procession and the deeds of Senoucheri, it is clear the images were created for these events and areas.[46] The statues are directly linked to the contexts they are set up in, and this is reflected in their style (Egyptian-style, Greek-style) and their specific placement. This is best illustrated with the statues and busts referred to in the tax receipts, that were meant to be placed in imperial temples and whose identifications in the text and their descriptions (being gold and silver) demonstrates they were made to fit into such a context.[47]

These areas are more than religious spaces, they are also public spaces. The procession was designed to be seen by the population of Alexandria and any visitors to the city. The reference to the statues set up by Senoucheri suggests they would have been visible within the temple (as his own statue would have been).[48] Not all religious spaces were accessible to the general public, the Egyptian temple, for example, had varying levels of accessibility, with only the forecourt open to the masses.[49] The majority of those religious spaces referred to in the texts discussed here are areas for worship where

[46] Petrie 1896, 19-21.

[47] Fishwick 1989.

[48] Petrie 1896, 20, L 1.

[49] Robins 2005, 8-9; Goebs 2007, 276-8.

individuals could interact with the deity. They were places where these statues were meant to be seen by large groups and interacted with.

Placing these statues in these spaces also meant there was interaction within a specific spatial framework, one that already had a function, as the place of the deity. The placement of royal statues here demonstrated the relationship between the ruler and the deity in question. This is seen with the placement of Ptolemy I's statues in the Procession and Tycheum which associate him with Alexander the Great and a number of gods, aiming at emphasising his position as Alexander's legitimate heir and his divine lineage.[50] The same principle was at work in the placement of Ptolemy II's statues at the temple of Min at Koptos, though here it was also linking the king and queen to past pharaohs.[51] Positioning the statue in such contexts was even a way of hinting at the ruler's own divinity by associating them directly with the religious space

One of the notable aspects of this context is the emphasis placed on group imagery. None of the Ptolemaic statues stand alone in these texts. Rather, they form one element of large groups, usually involving divine or familial figures. From a contextual point of view, this shows the statues did not stand in isolation, but were part of more complex imagery. It also shows that the function of these statues was partially linked to associating the Ptolemaic individual or group with the others represented. The familial group especially presents a united royal couple to the world, and focuses on showing the strength

[50] Stewart 1993, 244.

[51] Petrie 1896, 19-21; Koptos' past: Galliano & Gabolde 2000.

of the dynasty. These elements are also observable in non-religious contexts, such as on the Riverboat and in the Letter of Claudius.[52]

A.2.2. Royal context

The second context is the royal context. By this I mean the private contexts of the Ptolemies and the royal court, specifically the Riverboat of Ptolemy IV.[53] Unlike the previous area, this is not a context provided for public consumption, but for a select group of family and members of the court.

From the description of the boat given above it is clear this context was exceptionally ostentatious and fully displayed the power and wealth of the Ptolemies. The familial group of royal statues are part of this display, fitting in alongside the tholos of Aphrodite and the Egyptian dining room as evidence of the wealth and power of the ruling dynasty. This type of demonstration of power, through objects and decoration, is also observable in the Great Procession.

The description of this space, and others such as the Pavilion of Ptolemy II also described in Athenaeus by Callixeinus, leads to the consideration of other types of royal contexts, for which little evidence survives.[54] The display of a royal dynastic group on the Riverboat to select

[52] Riverboat of Ptolemy IV: Olson 2006, 204d-206d; Letter of Claudius: Lewis & Reinhold 1999, no.76.

[53] Olson 2006, 204d-206d.

[54] Pavilion of Ptolemy II: Athenaeus Book 5 196-197c; Olson 2006, 446-455.

visitors suggests that such imagery was also found in the royal palaces of Alexandria or Memphis, and the same luxurious surroundings were also present.

The material present on the Riverboat, and in the Procession, are also representations of Ptolemaic group imagery. This type of familial representaion not only aims at displaying the dynasty, but can also be linked to ideas of created memory. In the representation of deceased family members the concept of memory, or memorium, is clear, the statues act as a reminder of past individuals. More than this though, such family groups aim at showing a memory of the past with a united family and strong dynasty. This concept can be seen when consideration is given to the absence of Arsinoe I in any family sculpture; she was the wife of Ptolemy II and the mother of Ptolemy III, but instead Ptolemy II's second wife (and sister) Arsinoe II is shown, and is even given the title 'mother' relating to Ptolemy III.[55] The familial sculpture of the Ptolemies found on the Riverboat, in the Tycheum, and in Thmuis (**28**) aim at reinforcing a particular memory and concept regarding the Ptolemaic dynasty, that they are strong, united, and unbroken.

A.2.3. Urban context

The urban context is the final element to consider. By urban, I am referring to those statues that can only be identified as being set up in a city but have no other contextual information. This is best illustrated in the Letter of Claudius where most of the statues are meant to stand in Alexandria, though there are no

[55] Hölbl 2001, 36. For examples of references to the Ptolemaic family group without Arsinoe I see the Canopus Decree or the scene of offerings made by Ptolemy III to Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II on the Gate of Euergetes at Karnak (fig. 13).

directions as to where they should be placed within the city.[56] Presumably this was left to the Alexandrians to decide.

For this context, information is derived from other literary sources. The Letter of Claudius provides no information, but the description of Strabo offers an outline of the city including a gymnasium, "magnificent public precincts and palaces", and claims that "the city is full of dedications and sanctuaries."[57] This provides the urban context for these statues, offering an idea of the world of images, monuments, and structures that the statues of Claudius and his family were joining.

To an extent, the description of the Great Procession can also be identified as an urban context as it is situated in Alexandria. The procession is focused on the city, allowing the population to witness and enjoy the spectacle. The procession even interacted with structures of the city, such as leaving a garland at the shrine of Berenike.[58] The context of the Great Procession, and its royal statues, is Alexandria itself.

The amount of royal imagery that existed in Alexandria is unknown but as the principal city it no doubt contained a large amount. This was a public context, open to view on a daily basis, demonstrating the power and rule of the royal group. The statues of Claudius present in the city were

[56] Lewis & Reinhold 1999, no.76.

[57] Strabo 17.1.

[58] Athenaeus Book 5, 202d; Translations: Rice 1983, 22-23; Olson 2006, 474-475; Discussion of Procession: Hölbl 2001, 94; Weber 2010, 65.

requested by the Alexandrians themselves, showing an acceptance of, and wider interaction with, royal sculpture as a means of representing the relationship between the city and ruler. The material of Alexandria also points to the existence of similar sculpture in other urban centres of Egypt, such as at Hermopolis Magna (see Chapter 6).

A.2.4. Other contexts

I conclude by briefly discussing the statues that do not fit into these contextual areas, the only example being the chariot statues of Claudius located at the entrances of Egypt.[59] This is a dynamic statue type, with a long history in Greek imagery, and setting it in such locations was symbolic of Claudius' control of Egypt. It should be noted that no chariot statues have been identified in Egypt.

A.3. Literary Sources: Conclusion

From the literary sources can be identified a number of different statues and their contexts. The religious, royal, and urban contexts of the images all have precedents in both Greek and Egyptian imagery, and display statues specifically created for these contexts. The sources show that within these contexts, there was an emphasis on displaying the wealth, power, and associations of the ruling group, not only through the physical decoration of structures but also through the proclivity for group imagery, placing emphasis on familial and divine ties.

[59] Lewis & Reinhold 1999, no.76.

B. Priestly Decrees

The second group of sources are the priestly decrees. They offer an invaluable starting point from which to study royal sculpture as they detail the creation of such statues by the king and the clergy, describing the material, purpose, ideology, and location of a variety of Egyptian-style images.[60] They also provide an insight into the relationship and interactions between king and clergy, as well as supplementing the wider understanding of cultic development and historical events.

The decrees themselves are records of the decisions made by a national synod of priests convened by the Ptolemaic kings. The synods, a development of the Ptolemaic period, were usually called because of an important event, such as a military victory. The decrees are concerned with a number of topics, such as religious reform, but primarily focus on describing the actions of the king and queen and the honours the priests have decided to confer on them. They generally follow the same basic structure; a prescript, providing a detailed dating formula and identifying the publishing body (the priests); a statement, including information concerning the activities of the king, describing his beneficence and military valour; a decision section describing the honours that are being given to the king (and queen) in recognition of his services; and details of publication which draws the decree to a close, establishing where the decree is to be set up and the scripts it is to be published in.[61]

[60] Discussion of the decrees: Onasch 1976; Huss 1991; Simpson 1996, 1-24; Clarysse 1999.

[61] Onasch 1976, 140; Simpson 1996, 22.

The priestly decrees were tri-scriptal documents written in Hieroglyphs, Demotic, and Greek. The major debate surrounding the decrees concerns which script was the original: Greek, the official language of the administration (Letronne 1942) or Demotic, the primary language of the priests (Mahaffy 1895), or Hieroglyphs the sacred script of Egypt.[62] The decrees themselves do not provide clear answers. Their form and nature are similar to Greek city decrees, especially voting honours for the monarchs, yet their content clearly shows Egyptian attitudes, for example how they describe the roles of the king.[63] Further, it is difficult to apply one concept to the entire group of decrees. Robert Simpson suggests that while Canopus is more Greek in its form and content, the others reflect Demotic input.[64] Added to this is the question of who wrote the decrees - the Egyptian clergy or the Greek administration? Willy Clarysse argues that even if it were the priests, there is no reason they would not have been able to write in Greek.[65] The only consensus is that all versions must have undergone multiple drafts in all scripts.

Between them, Werner Huss and Willy Clarysse have identified more than eleven different decrees dating from the reign of Ptolemy II to the reign of Ptolemy VI or the end of the second century BC.[66] Of these, six are

[62] General discussion of arguments concerning language: Simpson 1996, 22-24; Clarysse 1999, 41-62.

[63] Simpson 1996, 22.

[64] Simpson 1996, 23.

[65] Clarysse 1999, 54.

[66] Huss 1991, Table 201-203; Clarysse 1999, Table 42-43.

almost complete; the Mendes decree (270-246 BC), the Canopus decree (238 BC), the Raphia decree (217 BC), the Memphis decree (196 BC), the Second Philae decree (186 BC), and the First Philae decree (185/4 BC). Copies of these decrees have been found throughout Egypt pointing to wide dissemination of the text (Map 2).[67] The remaining decrees are fragmentary and provide little information.

B.1.1. Mendes decree

The Mendes decree is one of the earliest known decrees, and comes from one copy made of quartzite, H. 148 cm W. 77 cm (fig. 1).[68] It was published under a synod called to Mendes by Ptolemy II some time between 270-246 BC.[69] The reason for the synod was the enthronement of the Sacred Ram, but it was also used as the moment for the deification of Arsinoe II. The decree provides an insight into the relationship of one temple institution with the king, and offers details about the deification of the deceased queen.[70] The images of Arsinoe II created with this deification are the focus here.

The decree specifically refers to a statue of Arsinoe II being ordered by the king following her deification as a temple-sharing goddess. The decree states that a gilded image is to be set up in the shrines of all the temples of Egypt alongside the other gods.[71]

[67] Stanwick 2002, 7.

[68] Text and Translation of the Mendes Decree: Meulenaere *Mendes II*, 174-177.

[69] Huss 1991, 189-190.

[70] L11-14.

[71] L13-14.

This is not the only image identified in the Mendes decree; there is also a relief preserved above the text (fig. 2). The relief shows Ptolemy II making offerings to the Ram of Mendes and other gods. Behind the king stands Arsinoe II and Ptolemy 'the son', and on the right behind the Ram of Mendes stands Harpokrates, the deceased Ram of Mendes, Hatmehit (the nome's goddess), and the goddess Arsinoe II.[72] This image is not described in the decree, but can be related to other reliefs such as that on the Pithom Decree (fig. 8).[73] This was also issued under Ptolemy II, and shows three scenes where the king is making offerings to a line of gods; two of these scenes include Arsinoe II as a goddess and one shows Ptolemy II offering to a king, possibly Ptolemy I.[74] The publication section of the Mendes decree is no longer extant.

The decree provides two different types of images and two different contexts. It establishes the cult statue of the new goddess, Arsinoe Philadelphus, states the statue is to be located in the shrine, and provides the stele relief. In this instance, the images of the queen are commanded by the king, not bestowed by the priests.[75] This illustrates how the deification of Arsinoe II was an act of policy on the part of Ptolemy II.

---

[72] Quaegebeur 1978, 249-250; Hölbl 2001, 84.

[73] The Pithom Stele; Naville 1903, 18-21; for other examples of reliefs see; for Ptolemaic: Quaegebeur 1978, 249-250; for Egyptian: Valbelle 1999, 85-90; for Persian: Briant 1999, 91-115.

[74] Naville 1903, 18-19.

[75] L11.

B.1.2. Canopus decree

The Canopus decree was issued under Ptolemy III on the 7th March 238 BC by a synod convened in Canopus.[76] It is preserved in six copies:

1. Stele from Kom el-Hisn, discovered 1881 (Cairo Museum; CG22186, JE37548), limestone. H. 202 cm L. 95 cm W. 70 cm. All three scripts are preserved with Hieroglyphs at the top, Demotic in the middle, and Greek at the bottom. The relief above the text is also preserved (fig. 3).[77]
2. Stele from Tanis, discovered 1861 (Cairo Museum; CG22187, JE22261), limestone. H. 220 cm L. 79 cm W. 32 cm. All three scripts are preserved, but with Hieroglyphs and Greek on the front face, and Demotic on the left side. There is a winged sun disk at the top, but no relief.[78]
3. Stele from Cairo, discovered 1800 (Louvre C122), basalt. H. 195 cm L. 40 cm W. 30 cm. It is in poor condition as it was used as a threshold in a mosque. Only the right half now remains visible. Part of a relief and the three texts can be seen.
4. Stele from Karnak, discovered 1929 (set up in front of third pylon of Karnak Temple), red granite. H. 223 cm L. 159 cm W. 55 cm. The text is mostly illegible, having been defaced in antiquity. The Hieroglyphic text and 5 lines of Demotic are present, but work appears to have stopped. There is space for the rest of the text but no evidence of it.

[76] Text: Demotic: Simpson 1996, 224-239 (Kom el Hisn stele & Tanis Stele); Greek (text & commentary); Bernand 1992, no.8-10, vol I 22-35, vol II 30-36 Translations: unless stated otherwise, all quotes are taken from the translated version of the Greek (G) Austin 2006, no.271; the comparative Demotic lines are also noted in the footnotes (D) and refer to Simpson.

[77] Bernand 1992, no.8, 22-27.

[78] Bernand 1992, no.9, 28-34.

5. Fragment from Elkab, discovered 1946 (Cairo Museum 17/3/46/1), sandstone. H. 21 cm L. 13 cm W. 16 cm. It appears to be the right hand edge of the stele. On one face are four lines of Hieroglyphs, and on the other side nine lines of Greek, both of which correspond to parts in the Kom el Hisn copy.[79]
6. Fragment from Tell Basta, discovered 1929 (Port Said Museum no.493), black granite, irregular shape, the remaining inscription is approximately 20 x 17 cm. This is a middle part of the stele preserving eight lines of Hieroglyphs which correspond to part of the Kom el-Hisn copy.

The synod had assembled at Canopus for a number of reasons, including the birthday and jubilee of the king, but was primarily concerned with reform; the increase of the priestly phylai to five and altering the calendar to stabilise the celebration of festivals.[80] The decree states that while the synod was in session, the Princess Berenike died and so the priests agreed, with the approval of the king and queen, to make her a goddess.[81]

The Canopus decree provides details for two separate images of the princess in relation to her cult. The first image follows a brief description of the honours for her, and states there should be made

[79] Bernand 1992, no.10, 34-35.

[80] G L25-45; D L25-45.

[81] G L45-55; D L45-54.

> "a sacred statue of her of gold inlaid with precious stones in each of the temples of the first and second class and set it up in the holy place…under the name Berenike, Mistress of Virgins."[82]

The decree then continues to describe the cultic rituals that should be performed to the statue, its role in festival processions, and the type of crown the statue should wear (which is specifically noted as being different from her mother's, Berenike II).[83] For the second image, the decree states

> "the daughters of the priests shall make another statue of Berenike Mistress of Virgins, to which they shall likewise perform a sacrifice and all the other customary celebrations for this festival".[84]

The Canopus decree's concluding publication section is clear that the decree is to be put up in the most conspicuous part of the temple.[85]

There is a surviving relief found on the Kom el-Hisn copy of the decree (fig. 3). On the left from the centre it shows Ptolemy III, Berenike II, Thoth, Seshat, Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, and Ptolemy I and Berenike I; all the Ptolemaic couples, depicted in Egyptian form, holding the divine attributes of the *ankh* and sceptre.[86] The Ptolemies stand on the left facing seven gods of Egypt on the right. This image was not prescribed in the decree.

---

[82] G L59-64; D L58-64.

[83] G L61-62; D L61-62.

[84] G L65; D L65.

[85] G L74-75; D L74.

[86] Quaegebeur 1978, 247 - notes that this is our first representation of the first Ptolemaic Queen, though it is in a later document; Hölbl 2001, 107.

The Canopus decree describes the material, iconography, context, and worship of one image, and the creation and context of another. The cult statue of the princess is, like that of Arsinoe II in the Mendes decree, to be located in the shrines of Egyptian temples. The image made by the daughters of the priests appears, from the description of its worship, to have had a more public role, though its exact context is not described. The stelae also have a different context in relation to the two statues, as they are to be located in a conspicuous part of the temple.

The Canopus decree also hints at another set of images. It specifically states the crown of the princess will be different from her mother's, Berenike II (seen in the relief on the Kom el-Hisn stele). This suggests that there needed to be a differentiation between the two, and that a similar cult statue of her mother existed in the shrines. By this time Ptolemy III and Berenike II were acknowledged as the *Theoi Euergetai* in both Egyptian and Greek ruler worship, and would therefore have their own cult statues in the temples. The decree provides an idea of the nature of shrines for the Ptolemies, and the imagery employed to distinguish between them.

B.1.3. Raphia decree

The Raphia decree was issued under Ptolemy IV on the 15th November 217 BC in Memphis.[87] It takes its name from the victory of the battle of Raphia in the

[87] Text & Translation: Simpson 1996, 242-257 (Tell el-Maskhuta stela & Mit Raphina Stele) – all quotes are from Simpson's translation; for translation of the few Greek fragments see Bernand 1992, no.12-14, vol I 37-41, vol II 37-44.

Fourth Syrian War, the occasion for the synod, which the decree describes in detail.[88]

The decree is known from three fragmented copies, and though tri-scriptal, only the Demotic is preserved enough to be of use:

1. Stele from Pithom, discovered 1923 (Tell el-Maskhuta) (Cairo Museum; CG50048, JE47806), limestone. H. 63 cm L. 61.5 cm W. 16 cm. Only the upper portion is preserved. On the front is a relief scene of the king on horseback, beneath this is the Hieroglyphic text with three complete and eight incomplete lines. The rear face has the Demotic text, which is complete but for the first nine and last ten incomplete lines. The Greek was on the sides, but is unclear (fig. 4).[89]
2. Fragment from Kom el-Qala'a at Mit Rahina, purchased 1902 (Cairo Museum; CG31088, JE35635), basalt. H. 32 cm L. 43 cm W. 35 cm. This is the upper left corner of the stele. On the front is part of a relief and the beginning of the Hieroglyphic text, while on the back face is the end of the Demotic text and eight lines of Greek (fig. 5).[90]
3. Fragment from Tod, current location unknown, limestone. H. 47 cm L. 27 cm W. ?. This fragment is now lost and only known from a photograph. It is the left edge of the front face of a stele, and it appears

[88] L9-26.

[89] Bernand 1992, no.14, 37-43.

[90] Bernand 1992, no.13, 37.

to have had all the texts on the front. Only the last twenty lines of the Demotic and first six of the Greek survive.[91]

The Raphia decree is different from both the Mendes and Canopus decrees in the number of images it concerns, and why these images are being produced (not due to deification). It signals the beginning of a group of decrees that follow a similar formula, and describe the same category of statues.

The Raphia decree describes two sets of images. For the first, the decree states

> "that a statue should be set up for King Ptolemy…which should be called Ptolemy who has vindicated his father, whose prowess is fine, and a statue of his sister Arsinoe, the Father-Loving Gods…they being made in the manner of Egyptian work, and a statue should be produced of the local god of the temple, and it should be placed upon the base on which the statue of the king stands…giving to him a scimitar of valour."[92]

The decree states this triad is to be set up in the most public part of the temples. This statue group is to be attended by the priests three times a day, and receive the same service as other statues of the gods out in the open.[93]

The next image to be described is the relief above the text. It describes the king:

[91] Bernand 1992, no.12, 37.

[92] L32-34.

[93] L35.

> "wearing his panoply of war and crowned with a diadem…and smiting a kneeling figure with the lance which he holds in accordance with what happened to the king who prevailed in battle."[94]

The image is preserved on the stele from Pithom; the king is central with a woman (Arsinoe III?) behind and an Egyptian deity holding the prisoner in front (fig. 4). The king himself is on horseback and dressed in Macedonian style, wearing a cuirass. There is another version of the relief on the decree from Mit Rahina. It is damaged and simpler, but it too shows a queen behind Ptolemy IV seated on a rearing horse with a lance, this time clad in Egyptian attire (fig. 5).[95] This image of the king recalls Greek equestrian statues.[96] The publication section of the Raphia decree is lost.

The Raphia decree presents two new groups of images, both of which relate to the victory at Raphia, the reason for the synod. First, the statue group, providing a detailed picture of the characteristics, style, location, and cultic attention give to these statues. This is the first instance where an image is described as being located in the most conspicuous part of the temple. In the second, the decree offers a first description of the accompanying relief, one that has a direct link to what is discussed in the text - military victory. This image utilises Graeco-Macedonian features, such as equestrian imagery, as well as

[94] L35-37.

[95] Hölbl 2001, 162-165.

[96] Laubscher 1991, 226-227 – he suggests this equestrian image was fairly common-place.

Egyptian style to create a new image to convey familiar and traditional messages.[97]

The Raphia decree is not complete. There are several lines that are damaged or missing. From these areas can be identified two further references to images. Firstly, after the description of the relief there is mention of a procession in which "the shrine of the Father-Loving gods should be taken."[98] This is similar to later decrees, particularly the Memphis decree, where cult images are described in the same terms as being part of festival processions.[99] This appears to be what is referred to here. It is possible that the decree also alludes to a second image. Towards the end of the decree there is a reference to the creation of something (there is a lacuna in the text at this point) to be made by the priests, scribes, and rest of the people which can receive offerings.[100] In his translation, Simpson suggests that it is a statue that is being made and worshipped, a parallel with the images made for the Princess Berenike by the priest's daughters in the Canopus Decree.[101] If these are statues, then there are two more statues and contexts in this decree; the first being the private cult statue, comparable with those in the Mendes and Canopus decrees, and the second referring to a form of domestic ruler cult, though one which is being created by the state in association with the temples.

---

[97] For a fuller discussion of the relief see Thissen 1966, 71-73 & 80-84; Laubscher 1991, 226-227.

[98] L37-39.

[99] Memphis H L8; D L25; G L42.

[100] L 41-42.

[101] Raphia: L41-42 Canopus: G L65; D L65.

B.1.4. Memphis decree

The Memphis decree was issued under Ptolemy V on the 27th March 196 BC in Memphis.[102] It is preserved in four copies;

1. Stele from Rosetta, discovered 1799 (British Museum EA24), granodiorite. H. 118 cm L. 77 cm W. 30 cm. The top and bottom are lost, but the rest is in good condition. All three texts are on the front face, first Hieroglyphs, then Demotic, and then Greek (fig. 6).[103]
2. Stele from El-Nobaira, discovered 1884 (Cairo Museum: CG22188 JE37592), sandstone. H. 127 cm L. 51 cm W. ?. Only the Hieroglyphic version of the text is present below a relief of the king and gods. This stele is a version of the decree from 183 BC, fourteen years after the synod, and so has some changes and omissions.
3. Stele from Nub Taha, discovered 1923 (Graeco-Roman Museum Alexandria, 21352), basalt. H. 120 cm L. 77 cm W. 22 cm. This is in poor condition having been used as an oil press. The front face now has no inscription, and the back is unfinished. The sides preserved the beginning of the Greek text.[104]
4. Fragments from Elephantine, discovered 1907-8 (Louvre AF10006), sandstone. H. 16.5 cm L. 17 cm W. 6 cm. The fragments consist of

[102] Text: Greek text & commentary: Bernand 1992, no.16-18, vol I 44-57, vol II 46-56 (includes French translation), Demotic text: Simpson 1996, 258-271. Translations: Quirke & Andrews 1988, Hieroglyphics (H), Demotic (D) & Greek (G), 16-22; Another Greek translation - Austin 2006, no.283. Another Demotic translation – Simpson 1996, 258-271 – all quotes are taken from the Greek translation of the Rosetta Stone by Quirke & Andrews, comparative lines of Demotic (D) and Hieroglyphs (H) are given in the footnotes.

[103] Quirke & Andrews 1988, 16-22; Bernand 1992, no.16, 44-49.

[104] Bernand 1992, no.17, 50-53.

> eleven lines of Demotic that correspond to the Rosetta stone. There are also two other fragments from Elephantine in the Louvre (AF10007; E12677 sizes: various) which appear to belong to the same stele.[105]

The reason for the synod was the coronation of Ptolemy V, as well as the establishment of his cult.[106] This decree is central to the debate concerning the change in balance of power between the monarchy and the clergy, and the 'Egyptianisation' of the Ptolemies.[107] It is similar in form to the Raphia decree.

The Memphis decree deals specifically with two images of Ptolemy V. The first is:

> "to set up an image of the ever-living king Ptolemy…in each temple in the most conspicuous place, which is to be called Ptolemy, defender of Egypt, next to which shall be set the principal god of the temple giving him a weapon conductive to victory which are to be sculpted after the Egyptian fashion."[108]

This is almost exactly the same as the group in the Raphia decree, and was also to be attended by the priests three times a day.[109] The second image, which is missing but suspected in the Raphia decree, is the creation of a cult statue "and a gold shrine in each of the temples, and to install it in the sanctuaries with the

[105] Bernand 1992, no.18, 54-57.

[106] G L8; D L5.

[107] Onasch 1978, 137-155; Johnson 1995, 145-155.

[108] G L38-39; D L22-23; H L6.

[109] G L40; D L23-24; H L7.

other shrines" that should be taken out in processions.[110] This is followed by a detailed description of the shrine and what its iconography represents.[111]

Towards the end of the Memphis decree there is reference to worship by private individuals: "and it will be permitted for other private individuals to celebrate the festival and to set up for themselves the aforementioned shrine and to keep it in their homes."[112] This section does not refer to a statue, but to a shrine, suggesting that some form of domestic ruler cult is taking place. Such a shrine could have contained a royal statue. This is similar in form to the damaged section at the end of the Raphia decree.

In the Memphis decree, there are two separate images being presented, with two different contexts and purposes; the more visual statue group to be placed in the Egyptian temples and the cult statue to be placed within the shrine and only come out during festivals.

B.1.5. Second Philae decree

The Second decree of Philae is actually the earlier of the two priestly decrees from the temple of Isis; the name is due to an error in dating during initial studies, but has since been maintained for clarity.[113] The decree is only known from one source at Philae where it is inscribed on the western curtain wall of the

[110] G L41-43; D L24-25: H L7-8.

[111] G L43-46; D L25-28; H L9-10.

[112] G L52-53; D L31-32; H L13-14.

[113] Text & Translations: Müller 1920, Hieroglyphs (H) & Demotic (D) 57-88 – all quotes from here; given the damaged nature of the text the best rendered quote will be used, this will be footnoted and its comparative other given alongside it.

Mammisi (birth-house), overlooking the peristyle court of the temple (fig. 7; cat site. 26). The publication section states it is to be published in Hieroglyphics, Demotic, and Greek, though there is no evidence of Greek at the site.[114] The decree, and its neighbour, are both badly damaged due to a relief of Ptolemy XII cutting through them.

The decree was issued under Ptolemy V on the 6th September 186 BC in Alexandria.[115] It is primarily concerned with describing the victory over the rebellious south, after Upper Egypt seceded from the rest of Egypt with a separate line of pharaohs, and the restoration of Ptolemaic rule.[116] To this end the decree is partly concerned with restoring royal authority and focuses on the introduction of royal cult.

The decree describes three types of image. The first is the same statue group as that in the Raphia and Memphis decrees; the decree states that there should be

> "set up a statue of the king…Ptolemy…called Ptolemy Lord of Victory, and an image of his sister-wife…Cleopatra, the Gods Epiphanes, in the two-fold holiest places of every adytum…in the court of the multitude of the temple, in work of sculptors of Egypt. And be set up an image of the local god..." [117]

The god is to present the king with a sword.

---

[114] Simpson 1996, 5-6.

[115] Huss 1991, 196; Simpson 1996, 5-6.

[116] H L4c-5d; D L3h-4c.

[117] H L13f-14e; D L11c-11h.

The second image is the relief on the stele, which corresponds closely to the relief associated with the Raphia decree, with the king "slaying an enemy while there is the local god giving to him a royal scimitar of victory."[118] This does not survive.

The third set of images concerns the cult statues of the king and queen. This set of statues is difficult to identify fully due to a lacuna in the text. The decree does state that when a [cult] statue of the king is to be brought out on processions, so should the [cult] statue of the queen. Further, the queen is to receive special honours in which her [cult] statue is to be carried out every year and a half.[119] The decree does not state where these statues are to be located.

The Second Philae decree presents familiar groups of images. The victorious king group to be located in a public court, a victorious relief on the decree which is also to be located in the court, and the cult statues.

B.1.6. First Philae decree

The first decree of Philae was published a year after the second in c.185 BC in Memphis.[120] It is known from two copies:

[118] H L15b; D L12d.

[119] H L16d-17c; D L13g-14c.

[120] Text & Translation: Müller,1920, Hieroglyphs (H) & Demotic (D), 31-56 - all quotes from here; given the damaged nature of the text the best rendered quote will be used, this will be footnoted first and its comparative other given alongside it.

1. Inscription from Philae; inscribed on the Mammisi wall to the right (north) of the Second Decree. It has preserved seventeen lines of Hieroglyphs, sixteen lines of Demotic, and no evidence of Greek (fig .7).
2. Fragment from Dendera, discovered 1950, sandstone. H. 32 cm L. 51 cm, W. 8 cm; the upper left text of a stele with thirteen lines of Hieroglyphs, and the bottom of a scene just visible.

The occasion of the decree was the enthronement of a new Apis Bull, but the decree is also a re-issue of the Memphis decree of 196 BC which now extends the honours granted to the king to the queen, Cleopatra I, and creates a new festival for her.

The First Philae decree is only concerned with images of Cleopatra I, primarily in adding them to the already existent ones of her husband. The first image is a statue of the queen to be set up alongside the group of her husband and the local deity described in the Memphis decree.[121] The second image it describes is a 'venerable' or cultic one which is to be brought out with the statue of the king and other gods during processions. This is followed by a detailed description of the gold shrine inlaid with precious stones to be created for the statues of the king and queen, which will reside in the holiest place with the other gods.[122]

[121] 1Philae H L9b-10a, D L9f-10d; Memphis H L6-7; D L22-24; G L38-41.

[122] H L11a-11d; D L11e-11g.

The final decree of the synodal group succinctly shows three of the major image categories that exist in the decrees and their contexts.

B.1.7. Karnak decree

Alongside the synodal priestly decrees there is one other decree that is included here as it too describes a set of royal statues and their location. The Karnak Decree was found in four fragments along the dromos of the Temple of Amun at Karnak.[123] The decree, which is only preserved in Greek, was issued by the Theban clergy and follows a similar formula to the synodal decrees. Its preserved publication section describes it as tri-scriptal.[124] The date of the decree is an area of debate, though its reference to a Cleopatra does narrow the possibilities; the main contenders are Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I or Ptolemy VII and Cleopatra II.[125]

In the two fragments labelled C & D of the stele, the decree deals with one set of images. It states that statues of the king and queen are to be created of black stone, five cubits high, and they are to be placed in the same location as the stele, in a conspicuous place on the dromos of Amun.[126]

The Karnak decree presents information concerning the specific location, material and style of these two statues. It is noteworthy that it comes

[123] Text, Translation & Discussion: Wagner 1971, 1-38 – all references from here, and the line numbers correspond to those for the fragments C & D; Bingen 2002, 295-302 – re-orders the fragments.

[124] Wagner 1971, 4; Fragments C & D L16-18.

[125] Wagner 1971, 21 – Ptolemy V; Bingen 2002, 300-302 – Ptolemy VIII & Cleopatra II.

[126] Wagner 1971, 20; Fragments C & D L20-21.

from a local temple clergy, rather than a national synod alongside the king, and so highlights the creation of royal sculpture on a local level.

B.2. Discussion of priestly decrees

In analysing the priestly decrees it is possible to identify five different types of image: the cult statue, the statue group, the Karnak couple, the reliefs on the stelae, and the images (or shrines) to be created by others. All the images come with a specified context and a prescription as to how they should be treated. I now discuss these types in more depth, focusing on the language and terminology used so as to gain a clearer understanding of the imagery and their context.

B.2.1. Cult statues

The 'cult statue' type can be identified in almost every decree. This is unsurprising given they are often concerned with the establishment of royal cult in the Egyptian temples. That these images can be thought of as cult statues, meaning specifically the holy images of a deity or principal images for the focus of a cult, is seen through the language used. In the Canopus decree the statue of princess Berenike is referred to as *agalma,* meaning a sacred statue for the gods, while in the Memphis decree the statue of Ptolemy V is called *xoanon*, a term that specifically refers to an archaic sacred image.[127] For both decrees, the Demotic *sḫm nṯr* and Hieroglyphic *sḫm ḫw* are used.[128] The term *sḫm*, used in both texts, originally meant 'might' but by the Ptolemaic period had come to

[127] Daumas 1952, 175-176.

[128] Daumas 1952, 175-176.

refer a statue of a deity.[129] The use of the term *nṯr* meaning god, and *ḫw* meaning oneness/uniqueness, further emphasises the divine nature of the statue, and combined with *sḫm* was used to refer to cult statues.[130] The use of all these different terms together in the decrees, given their meanings, demonstrates that these statues are specifically cult statues.

This is further attested by the descriptions that state they are to be made of gold and precious stones. In the Canopus decree princess Berenike's statue is described as being of "gold inlaid with precious stones" and in the First Philae decree it is stated that the "the statues of the gods of Egypt" are of gold and precious stones.[131] The traditional cult statues of Egypt were made of such precious materials.[132]

The context of these statues is clearly expressed in the decrees; they are to be located in their own shrine within the sanctuary (except in Canopus, where the statue of Princess Berenike is only to be set up in the sanctuary). These shrines are described as being made of gold and precious stones, the Memphis decree calls the shrine a "naos of gold" and declares that it is to have specific iconography so that it is recognisable.[133] The shrines were

[129] Hornung 1996, 137-139; Wilson 1997, 903; *Chicago Demotic Dictionary* 2001, 146.

[130] Wilson 1997, 710; *Chicago Demotic Dictionary* 2001, 146.

[131] Canopus; G L59-60, D L 58-59; Philae 1 H L7a-7e, D 7b-7e.

[132] Robins 2005, 4-6; See chapter 3 for more discussion.

[133] Memphis; Bernand 1992, G L41; translated as "a gold shrine" in Quirke & Andrews 1988, L41.

fairly small and portable and were taken out during processions.[134] The type of procession meant is illustrated in the staircase reliefs from Dendera (fig. 10) which show a line of priests carrying small shrines to the roof of the temple.

In identifying the location of the shrines, focus is on the word sanctuary, and the meanings of the different terms used in the decrees. In the Canopus decree, the location of the statue is described as καθιδρῦσαι ἐν τῶι ἁγίωι, meaning the statue is to be set up in a holy place, and in the Memphis decree as καθιδρῦσαι ἐν τοῖς ἀδύτοις μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ναῶν, meaning it is to be set up in the sanctuary with the other shrines. In both decrees, the terminology refers to the holy place or inner sanctuary of a temple. For almost all the decrees, the Demotic phrase used is *pȝ nt wʿb*, meaning literally "that which is pure."[135] The Hieroglyphic phrase *pr-nṯr* translates as god's mansion, and refers to the inner sanctuary as well as the shrine depending on its context.[136] Taken together, these phrases can only refer to one part of an Egyptian temple; the enclosed sanctuary with the principal naos of the temple deity at the centre, surrounded by shrines to the other gods who existed there as *synnaoi theoi* (temple-sharing gods). This was the holiest part of the temple and can be identified in the plan of Edfu as the area labelled A-M (fig. 11). These statues were cult statues in the full sense of that term, and as such they were situated in the sanctuary of the temple.

[134] Memphis G L42-43, D L25-26, H 8-9; Philae 1 H L11e-11f D L11h-12a.

[135] *Chicago Demotic Dictionary* 2001, 20.

[136] Daumas 1952, 172; Wilson 1997, 350.

B.2.2. Statue groups

The second type of image appears in the three decrees from Ptolemy IV and V (Raphia, Memphis, and Philae); this is the statue group composed of the king, queen, and local god. There has been some question about whether this image is in fact a statue group as the words used, *eikon, twt*, and *ḫnty* can all refer to any type of image.[137] Stanwick has suggested these were actually reliefs, like those found on temple pylons, such as that of Ptolemy XII at Edfu.[138] This interpretation is appealing, but there are a number of problems. Firstly, these words can refer to statues, and are used to do so elsewhere in the decrees, for example in the First Philae decree where the sacred statue of the queen is referred to as *twt.*[139] The number of images to be put up throughout the temples of Egypt makes more sense in relation to a statue group. In addition, while it is always dangerous to argue from absence of evidence, there are no examples of these particular images in relief for these particular kings in such locations. Furthermore, the decrees specify that the images must be attended by the priests three times a day in accordance with Egyptian rituals toward statues in temples, and that the royal images are to be treated like those of the other gods, associating them with other Egyptian statues.[140]

The context of the statue group is an area of some debate. The Greek phrase, ἐν τῶι ἐπιφανεστάτωι τόπωι*,* meaning 'in the most conspicuous

[137] Stanwick 2002, 7-8.

[138] Stanwick 2002,7-8.

[139] First Philae H L11b.

[140] Quirke 1992, 75.

place', is used in honorific decrees of the Greek cities during this period.[141] This phrase is not very specific, and in other Greek decrees there is often an area mentioned, such as the agora. Here, it is used in relation to the Egyptian temple, but it is unclear whether it refers to the temple building or the general sanctuary. The phrase does rule out most of the main part of the temple building (the hypostyle hall, pronaos, and naos) as these areas were restricted to anyone but the priests. It focuses attention on the front court and surrounding area of the temple complex. The Demotic phrase *n pȝ mȝ mȝʿ nt wnḥ n pȝ jrpy,* meaning 'the place that is most open of the temple', is similarly vague, but useful in that it does focus on the temple itself.[142] The most illuminating part is the Hieroglyphic version, *wsḫt mšʿ nt ḥwt-nṯr*, which translates as 'the court of the multitude/people of the god's house.'[143] The term *wsḫt* meaning 'court' referred to a number of areas in the temple, but by the Ptolemaic period was used on its own to refer to the front (peristyle) court.[144] Following on from this, the term *ḥwt-nṯr* means 'gods house' and is specifically used to designate the temple.[145] From the language of the decrees, the statue groups must be placed within the forecourt of the temple, identified in the plan of the temple of Edfu as H' (fig. 11).

[141] Examples of use of '*the most conspicuous place*' – Decree of Ilium in honour of Antiochus I *OGIS* no.219*;* Austin 2006, no.162; Establishment of a Royal cult of Laodike *OGIS* no.224, Bagnall & Derow 2004, no.158.

[142] Daumas 1952, 169-170; Simpson 1996.

[143] Daumas 1952, 169-170; Simpson 1996.

[144] Wilson 1997, 261-2; Konrad, 2006 77-84.

[145] Wilson 1997, 630; Konrad 2006, 8-9 - the term is attested in earlier periods from the reign of Amenhotep II at the temple of Khnum on Elephantine.

This is further supported by the location of the decrees themselves, which are also to be set up in the most conspicuous place. Both Philae decrees are found inscribed on the Mammisi (birth-house) wall in the forecourt of the temple of Isis, and other decrees such as the copy of the Canopus decree from the temple of Amun at Tanis come from the area of this court.

The question arises as to why a more specific description was not given in the Greek version of the decree. Daumas suggests it was because the writer did not fully understand the layout and accessibility of the Egyptian temple.[146] This seems unlikely as the Egyptian priests were clearly involved in the composition of the decrees. It might be that as the Greek phrase was a common one, used to identify an important place in Greek inscriptions (including religious space) it was considered appropriate for the Greek version. The Egyptian version though, chose to be more specific, employing terminology that made sense within that context.

Alongside this group of statues, I want to consider the royal couple described in the Karnak decree. They share some similarities with the royal statues of the priestly decrees; the decrees themselves are similar, though the Karnak decree is produced on a local level, and the statues are large scale stone images of the king and queen in Egyptian style, though in the case of Karnak they are singular and do not form a group. In this capacity, the Karnak statues are like the traditional Egyptian-style representations of the Ptolemies

[146] Daumas 1952, 171.

found at temple sites, like the fragment of a Cleopatra from Karnak (**65**), and are reminiscent of those set up by Senoucheri. The context of the statues of the Karnak decree is different and clearer than those in the priestly decrees, though described using similar language. The Karnak statues are described as being set up in 'the most conspicuous place on the dromos of Amun' ἐν τῶι ἐπιφανεστάτωι *τιόπωι* ἐπὶ τοῦ δρόμου τοῦ Ἄμμωνος.[147] Once again this standard Greek phrase is used, but this time it allows the identification of placement on the dromos of the temple (where the decree was found). Despite using the same language, this provides a separate context from that previously discussed, for these were to be located outside the main temple building, possibly even outside the walls of the temple complex, where anyone could view them.

This evidence confirms the ideas concerning the group statues, as the Karnak ones are not described in the same way; they are given a specific location and it is not specified that they should receive cult, i.e. any form of ritual or worship.[148] As the Greek stands, it seems there is a second, more visible and open context for another set of statues.

B.2.3.Reliefs and other images

The last two sets of images to consider are the stelae reliefs and the statues to be made by others. They are different in format and design from those previously examined. They provide an insight into other types of imagery in and around temple complexes, and so add to the understanding of the nature of the context

[147] Wagner. 1971, C &D L 19-21.

[148] Most likely these would have received some form of cult from the public.

of those statues already discussed. The stelae reliefs can be identified on three of the decrees, and are specifically mentioned in two of them. They fall into two groups; the line of deities with the royal family (usually pro-offering to the deities; fig. 2 & 3), and the king on horseback (fig. 4 & 5).

The first group is part of a general form of representation of the Ptolemies in Egypt; there is similar imagery on the Pithom decree (fig. 8), and in temple reliefs such as at Kom Ombo of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II offering to the gods, and later of Ptolemy VIII and his wives at the same sanctuary.[149] In these images emphasis is placed on the piety of the king and queen, and, for some, on their divinity.[150]

The second type of image is prescribed in two of the decrees, though only preserved in fragments of the Raphia decree. It consists of the king on horseback, holding a lance, with the queen behind and a deity holding a kneeling figure in front. This is a particularly interesting relief for its use of Greek and Egyptian forms. The only comparable image from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt is the stele of Cornelius Gallus, which also commemorates a military victory, the suppression of a southern revolt (fig. 9).[151] The stele is damaged, but it shows a figure on a rearing horse holding a lance, with a cowering figure in front (due to damage, it is difficult to identify the figure on

[149] Quaegebeur 1989a, 100.

[150] Quaegebeur 1978, 247-255.

[151] For the stele of Cornelius Gallus see: Daumas 1952, 265-266; Bernand 1969, no.128, Hoffman et al 2009.

horseback).[152] Laubscher suggests that this type of image would have been more prevalent in Hellenistic Egypt than scholars realise.[153]

The preserved publication sections of the decrees state they were to be set up next to the statue group in 'the most conspicuous place', translated in the Hieroglyphic version as in 'the court of the common people'. This puts the reliefs alongside the statues in the first court of the temple, which is supported by the presence of the Philae decrees on the Mammisi wall within the first court of the temple of Isis. This makes sense, given that the stelae refer to the statues, explaining the reason for their existence. The Karnak decree is similar, but it places the decree on the dromos alongside its statues. There is a question as to the visibility of the stelae and other images; the Philae decree for example, is located high up where it cannot be easily viewed (fig. 7). The reliefs provide an insight into the presentation of the Ptolemies alongside the statues.

The last group of images to consider are those authorised by the decrees, but created by another group. The only clear evidence for this is in the Canopus decree, where the daughters of the priests are to make a sacred statue of the princess Berenike. In Greek the term used is *agalma* and in Demotic it is *rpy.t* which specifically refers to the statue of a female. The exact action is unclear, but what can be seen is a form of public creation and worship of a royal statue (though not one of the king or queen). The other decrees are not as explicit. They do not use the same language and, in some, the relevant areas have been destroyed. Rather, there are references to the creation and use of

[152] Hoffman et al 2009, 19 (for comparison with the Raphia Decree see 27-29).

[153] Laubscher 1991, 223-229.

shrines. These shrines are an area of debate, and the decrees could refer to the worship of shrines rather than cult statues.[154] The translations point to the creation of a shrine by the priests and public and their involvement in a form of royal cult.

It is important to be aware that the decrees are only providing an ideal of what images should be set up and where; this does not mean that their instructions were followed. This is observed at Philae where there is no evidence for the publication of the text in Greek, as the decree states there should be, and in the two similar, but slightly different, reliefs of the Raphia decree, demonstrating there is always room for interpretation. The decrees are also concerned solely with statues placed in Egyptian temples, one aspect of contextual placement in Ptolemaic Egypt. They show only a select group of images, which, while being generally representative, are not all inclusive.

The priestly decrees are an invaluable source for Ptolemaic statuary, providing a range of evidence for one general context, the Egyptian temples. From them it is possible to identify a number of different types of imagery, from cult statues to reliefs, and to identify more specifically where they were located. Furthermore, they provide a better understanding of the creation and function of royal statuary.

[154] Stanwick 2002, 9.

C. Commissioning statues

One of the principal features of the literary sources is the information they provide concerning the creation of these statues. Statues were not random objects, but were often carefully chosen, crafted, and placed images, aimed at fulfilling a variety of functions. These sources show the different groups who were responsible for the commissioning and placement of such images, from which can be identified the reasons for creation and the statue's function. I briefly identify these groups, demonstrating the role of rulers, the clergy, and individuals.

The role of the ruler in the creation of the statues is identifiable in the majority of the sources. In the Athenaeus passages this can be assumed from the context; it was most likely the Ptolemies who decided on the themes of the Procession and Ptolemy IV who decorated his own riverboat. This involvement is also observable in the Mendes decree, where Ptolemy II is responsible for the deification of his sister-queen Arsinoe II, and the Letter of Claudius, who has the final say on what type of statues can be erected to him and where.[155] These all show the direct influence of the ruler on the creation of statues, and their control over attributes and placement. In maintaining control of their imagery, the rulers were able to manage the way they were represented and the messages their statues passed on. These statues were their primary form of interaction with their subjects, and so how they looked and where they stood were an important part of the dialogue between the two groups.

[155] Mendes: L11-14; Claudius: Lewis & Reinhold, 1999, No.76.

The texts also identify the role of officials in the production of statues, sometimes alongside the king and queen, and at other times alone. The priestly decrees show the role of the clergy in the creation of images for the Egyptian temples. They identify the king's virtues and actions and in response set up statues, which they will tend to themselves.[156] The clergy created specific imagery in line with their own traditions, and so were fulfilling the needs of their world, which requires the king to be present in the temple, linking him to past traditions, and demonstrating their own loyalty to the king. The clergy were doing this with the guidance or approval of the ruler. The creation of these statues was dictated at synods overseen by the monarchs, suggesting that their concept might have originated from ther ruler, or that at least there was a certain amount of foreknowledge and approval.

The same could also be true for other administrators. Senoucheri is the best example of an administrator and member of the Egyptian elite creating royal statues, and in a similar context to those of the priestly decrees. It is possible he too required a level of permission to erect statuary. This comes to the fore in relation to the Letter from Claudius as mentioned above; Claudius gives his permission for the statues, yet they will be created by the community of Alexandria and by the procurator.

Many of the textual sources point to a certain amount of central control in the creation of royal imagery. This is explicitly shown in the tax

[156] Raphia: L32-35; Memphis: G L38-40; D L22-24; H L6-7; Philae 2: H L13f-14e; D L11c-11h.

receipts of Elephantine, where the provision of funds for the creation and maintenance of imperial statues is controlled by tax, and in the priestly decrees where even domestic ruler worship is partially controlled and determined by the elite. This is not the case for all royal images, as discussed below, but the sources provide substantial evidence for control of the creation, distribution, and style of royal imagery by the monarchy or clergy, even when set up by individuals, cities or the elite.

The evidence for the creation of statues by communities and individuals primarily comes from the epigraphical evidence. This is seen in a statue base to Ptolemy XII from Tebtunis (**46B**) that provides an inscription dedicated to the king and a series of bases to Caracalla (**95 B-F**) set up in Alexandria by the Alexandrians and Romans. With these bases (and their accompanying statues) the question is to what extent they were purely the result of local involvement, or whether official sanction had to be given in order for them to be erected. The reasons for erecting such imagery was simple: to honour the ruler, to gain favour with them, and even to thank them. The inscription to Ptolemy XII is especially reminiscent of inscriptions by Greek cities to Hellenistic Kings. The Letter of Claudius illustrates the reciprocal relationship communities had with their rulers.

Statues set up by individuals are found throughout Egypt, and range from high quality bases such as the triad set up by the commanders of the indigenous troop in Alexandria for Ptolemy V and his parents (**78**) to more simple creations such as the sphinx at Zaweit el-Amwat by Protos (**48**). These

individual dedications and offerings are part of a wider group of evidence concerning dedications to, and on behalf of, the ruler. These demonstrate the place of the rulers in the lives of their people; the king might have been in Alexandria, but his presence was felt and understood hundreds of miles away. They show the loyalty and interaction between people and monarchy, as well as feeding into the traditional forms of representation in the ancient world.

The textual sources point to the creators of royal statues as the rulers, the clergy, the elite, communities and individuals. They demonstrate the control the rulers had over the majority of their imagery and its importance in the dialogue between them and the people. It also shows how wide-ranging this was and how royal statues from Alexandria to Aswan were part of this wider network of display, control and communication.

D. Textual Sources: Conclusion

The textual sources provide a range of evidence for the context of Ptolemaic royal statues; from general descriptions of places to specific instructions for their creation, location, and treatment. From them a range of contexts can be identified, but more than this, the nature of those contexts, how they functioned and how their purposes are seen. These sources complement each other in this way, the priestly decrees show official instructions for royal images, in the form of the clergy and the monarchy, while the inscription of Senoucheri shows a different background to a similar context. Those in the literary texts, such as Athenaeus, show a different part of Ptolemaic and Imperial Egypt, providing

evidence that would not exist otherwise. These sources also supply a base from which to go on to analyse and think about the archaeological evidence. One important aspect to draw from the material is the amount of royal imagery which existed during this time, and of which only a small proportion survives. Stewart suggests that Alexander would have been a familiar face in Alexandria, and from these sources it is possible to suggest the same for the Ptolemies and Emperors, not only in Alexandria, but throughout Egypt.[157]

[157] Stewart 1993, 252.

CHAPTER 3: CULT STATUES

The cult statue was one of the most important elements of temple and worship; it was the representation of the focus of cult (the deity) and the principal point of interaction between the human and divine. Both the Ptolemies and the Emperors were the focus of cult in Egypt and elsewhere in the Greek East, and their statues formed a crucial part of this. There are few, if any, extant examples of cult statues, particularly from Egypt; the majority of the evidence comes from textual sources which do not always focus on the statues themselves. In discussing cult statues it is important to understand that the term covers three different and distinct types of cult, which must each be analysed separately. I begin by focusing on the cult statues of the Ptolemies in the Egyptian temples, the most well-known area due to the survival of the priestly decrees and the remains of Ptolemaic temples. I then discuss statues associated with Greek-style cult in Egypt, principally based in Alexandria and Ptolemais. Finally, I focus on the Imperial cult in Egypt, including the position of the Emperors within the Egyptian temples. The evidence for each section varies considerably, and provides insight into the presence and context of royal cultic statues in Egypt.

A. Cult Statues of the Ptolemies in Egyptian temples

Directions for the creation of cults and cult statues of the Ptolemies in the Egyptian temples can be found in the priestly decrees; for Arsinoe II, the Princess Berenike, Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III, and Ptolemy V and Cleopatra

I.[158] That these are cult statues is made clear through the wording of these texts and the descriptions they provide (see Chapter 2). Here, I focus on establishing the nature and perception of these statues, as well as identifying their placement and treatment within the temples. These two aspects are directly linked and both must be explored in order to fully understand Ptolemaic cult. I begin by discussing Egyptian cult statues in general, before establishing the place of the Ptolemies and their cult within the temples.

A.1. Egyptian cult statues

Statues of gods in ancient Egypt were meant to act as more than decorative or representative items; they were meant to be vessels (one could term them bodies), in which the *ba*, or manifestation, of the divine being could take up residence.[159] Any statue of the god, from a colossal granite image to a faience statuette, could house the god, or part of him. There was a clear distinction between a statue that was inhabited and one that was not; this status was altered in the Opening of the Mouth ritual, which awakened the statue and was performed when a statue was completed. This meant that a number of different statues in Egypt received cult, but not all were cult statues.[160] The cult statue

[158] Arsinoe II - Mendes: Meulenaere *Mendes II*, 174-177, L 13-14; Princess Berenike - Canopus: Demotic Simpson 1996, 224-239; Austin 2006, no.271 G L59-64, D L58-64; Ptolemy V - Memphis: Quirke & Andrews 1988, Hieroglyphics (H), Demotic (D) & Greek (G), 16-22, G L41-43, D L24-25, H L7-8; Cleopatra I - Philae 2: Müller 1920, 57-88, H L13e-14c, D L16d-117b; Philae 1: H L10e-11e, D L11a-12a. These are the texts which are used for translations and transliterations; any alternative source will be noted in the footnotes. References follow the same pattern as in chapter 2.

[159] Assmann 2001, 45; Robins 2005, 1. For an in-depth discussion of the ritual see Lorton, 1999 147-178.

[160] Robins 2005, 2.

was the main statue of the temple, the primary and most powerful place for the god to dwell.

Egyptian dynastic texts point to the statues representing the gods on a physical level. In the *Book of the Cow of Heaven*, Re is described with "his bones being silver, his flesh gold, and his hair true lapis lazuli."[161] These materials are echoed in other texts as the make-up of the gods, both in heaven and in their statues on earth, such as in the Restoration Inscription of Tutankhamun which states "his [Amun's] holy image being of electrum, lapis lazuli, turquoise, and every precious stone" and the Coronation Inscription of King Horemheb describes the setting up of divine statues "each to their exact shape out of costly gemstones."[162] These were the materials (gold, silver, and precious stones) of both the deity and cult statue, and it is probable that the descriptions of the gods given in these texts were inspired by the cult statues themselves.[163] Only a few possible examples of these statues survive. One is a falcon-headed god in the Miho Museum, though it may be a votive; a solid-cast silver statue measuring approx. 42 cm, once entirely inlaid with gold, its wig inlaid with lapis lazuli, and eyes of rock crystal (fig. 12).[164]

These descriptions correlate with the information given in the priestly decrees concerning Ptolemaic cult statues. The statue of the Princess

[161] Lichtheim 1976, 197-199.

[162] Murnane 1995, no. 99, 213 & no.106, 233.

[163] Robins 2005, 4-6.

[164] *Miho Museum South Wing* 1997, cat no.5.

Berenike in the Canopus decree is described as being "gold inlaid with precious stones," in the Memphis decree Ptolemy V's statue is described in the same way, and in Philae 1 it is stated that the "the statues of the gods of Egypt" are of gold and precious stones.[165] These passages both confirm the nature and materials of the Egyptian cult statue and show that the Ptolemaic cult statues were comparable.

The location of the Egyptian cult statue is clear - it resided within a shrine in the sanctuary of the temple. Its exact location could vary depending on the temple, but it would be either in the central naos with its barque, or in the axial shrine behind it (fig. 11 A/I).[166] There was probably more than one cult statue of the deity, not least for practical reasons as the statues would often have to leave on processions, sometimes for many days, but were needed in the temple on a daily basis in order to partake of the daily ritual.[167] The cult statues of the god of the temple were not alone; a community of gods shared the temple, some residing in the chapels surrounding the naos.[168] They were usually connected to the principal god in some capacity, and over time many gods developed their own Ennead.[169] The word Ennead (*psḏt*), coined from the Greek word for nine, originally referred to a group of nine gods who surrounded the principal deity, sometimes connected through familial bonds. Over time the term

[165] Canopus; G L59-60, D L 58-59; Memphis G L41, D L24, H L7-8; Philae 1; Müller,1920, 31-56, H L7a-7e, D 7b-7e.

[166] Hornung 1982, 135; Wilkinson 2000, 70; Assmann 2001, 32; Robins 2005, 6-7.

[167] Robins 2005, 10.

[168] Assmann 2001, 7-38.

[169] Meeks & Favard-Meeks 1996, 36.

developed to designate the community of gods resident in the temple. The cult statues of these temple-sharing gods might have been of the same type as those of the main deity.

The cult statues of the temple were pivotal to its ritual and theology; it was through the rituals performed for the statues that order was maintained.[170] There were numerous types of rituals and festivals, but the primary one was the daily ritual. This was performed three times a day, at dawn, midday, and sunset.[171] It involved waking up the deity by unsealing the shrine, and bringing the statue out to be washed, anointed, and clothed, as well as to receive offerings. This was done first to the principal cult statue, then the other cult statues, and then the offerings were taken to the other statues in the temple, including those of the kings and other non-royal individuals. At the end of the ritual, the statue was returned to its shrine, which was re-sealed.[172]

The sanctuary and the statues were isolated from the world, and access to them was limited. Within the temple there was a strict hierarchy of priests, and only the principal officiant and those immediately beneath him (the higher clergy) could enter the sanctuary.[173] It was this individual who oversaw the daily ritual and, in theory, only he gazed upon the god. In practice this is unlikely to have happened, the other priests were also involved in the ritual and

[170] Robins 2005, 8-9; Goebs 2007, 276-8.

[171] Finnestad 1997, 204-210; Lorton, 1999 131-144; Sauneron 2000, 82-91.

[172] Finnestad 1997, 204-210; Lorton, 1999 131-144; Sauneron 2000, 82-91.

[173] Sauneron 2000, 54, 59-60, & 81.

had responsibility to the other gods in the temple. There would also be times when the principal officiant could not undertake the ritual. At the more important temples he would often be away on business, leaving the ritual to his subordinate. The number of people who came into contact with Egyptian cult statues was severely limited, even the priests who carried them in the processions would not have seen them as they were carried in enclosed shrines (fig. 10).[174] The statues housed the most powerful form of the divine, and to prevent contamination only the purest few could interact with them.

A.2. Cults of the Ptolemies

The existence of a cult statue implies the existence of a cult. Here, I focus on the cult of the Ptolemies in the Egyptian temples, which was separate from, though related to, the Eponymous Greek cult in Alexandria and Ptolemaios (see below).[175] The cult in the Egyptian temples began with the deification of Arsinoe II in the Mendes decree and the establishment of the *Theoi Adelphoi* by Ptolemy II c.270 BC. It was from the time of Ptolemy III, who established the *Theoi Euergetai*, that Ptolemaic cult became a common and permanent feature of the Egyptian temple.[176] Ruler cult and dynastic cult form two strands of the cult of the Ptolemies.

In his article, "Der Herrscherkult in den ägyptischen Ptolemäertempeln", Erich Winter proposed that while there was evidence of a

[174] Sauneron 2000, 70-71.

[175] Quaegebeur 1989a, 110-111; Quaegebeur 1989b, 45; Pfeiffer 2008, 455.

[176] Quaegebeur 1989a, 94-96; Hölbl 2001, 105-111.

dynastic cult in temple reliefs, the idea of a cult of the living ruler could not be supported.[177] Evidence for a dynastic cult focusing on the deceased royal couples is plentiful, and Winter provided a detailed list of examples, such as the relief on the Gate of Euergetes at Karnak, which shows Ptolemy III making offerings to Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II (fig. 13).[178] This list has since been added to, with Jan Quaegebeur identifying a number of scenes including one at Kom Ombo that shows Ptolemy VI offering wine to his parents.[179] These all point to an active dynastic cult of deceased monarchs in the temples, supported by the Ptolemies.

Quaegebeur argued that Winter's criteria of evidence for identifying cult examples needed expanding and that, in addition to the evidence for dynastic cult, he could identify scenes that showed the ruling Ptolemies were worshipped in the temples as gods.[180] He pointed to numerous representations of the royal couple as divine, such as the Kom el-Hisn stele relief, which shows Ptolemy III and Berenike III alongside their ancestors and other gods, holding divine (fig. 3).[181] He also cited two later examples from Kom Ombo. In the first Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II are represented with the gods Khonsu, Hareoeris, and Sobek.[182] The inscriptions surrounding them indicates their divinity.[183] In

[177] Winter 1979, 147-160.

[178] Winter 1979, 149.

[179] Quaegebeur 1989a, 100.

[180] Quaegebeur 1989a, 93-113.

[181] Quaegebeur 1989a, 102; This also shows dynastic cult as the first three couples are also divine.

[182] Quaegebeur 1989a, 100.

the second Ptolemy VIII and his wives are shown holding divine sceptres (fig. 14).[184]

Winter's main objection to this was that there are no scenes showing the ruling couple receiving offerings. Quaegebeur, however, argued that in view of the kings' role as supplicant, it would not be possible for him to present offerings to himself.[185] While this is a possible reason, there are some rare examples that do show a ruler as both human and divine. Earlier examples from the dynastic period, that is the pre-Ptolemaic era, suggest that such a form of representation was not unknown, as a relief from the temple at Soleb in Nubia demonstrates with Amenhotep III venerating his deified self, though this is a special case outside Egypt.[186] From the Ptolemaic period, the relief on the Mendes stele shows Arsinoe II as both offerer and goddess (fig. 2), and in foundation plaques from the temple of Mut and Khonsu at Tanis, Ptolemy IV is listed as being beloved of Mut, Khonsu, *Theoi Adelphoi* (Ptolemy II & Arsinoe II), *Theoi Euergetai* (Ptolemy III & Berenike II), and *Theoi Philopatores* (Ptolemy IV & Arsinoe III), meaning himself.[187]

Quaegebeur also took into account the titles of the Egyptian priests, which in the Ptolemaic period include the names of the royal couples. There were many instances where the priests clearly used the divine epithets of

[183] Quaegebeur 1989a, 100.

[184] Quaegebeur 1989a, 100.

[185] Quaegebeur 1989a, 96-97.

[186] Goebs 2007, 294, fig. 20.10.

[187] Quaegebeur 1989a, 100.

the ruling couple.[188] The priestly decrees also support this idea, with the institution of cult statues and religious honours for Ptolemy IV, Ptolemy V, and their wives, while they are still alive.

Winter and Quaegebeur agreed that the Ptolemies were incorporated into the temples as *synnaoi theoi*, temple-sharing gods, and identified a number of reliefs that represent them as such. Winter's list includes several examples of Ptolemy IV at Edfu offering to a line of gods that includes Horus, Hathor, Harsomtus, the *Theoi Euergetai*, the *Theoi Adelphoi*, and the *Theoi Soteres*.[189] Quaegebeur cited a stele in the British Museum which shows Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III before a local triad (fig. 15). The royal couple offers nothing, but their dress indicates that they are divine, and Quaegebeur asserts they are represented as *synnaoi theoi*, temple-sharing gods.[190] The priestly decrees are also clear that the cult statues and cult of the Ptolemies are to be placed alongside those of the gods of the temples. For example, First Philae decree states "[Be set up] a shrine...[and be placed there] the venerable image of...Ptolemy...with the divine statue of his sister-wife...put [this] in the holi(est) place with the shrines of the local gods".[191] In this way they could be integrated into the temple structure, its forms, practices, and traditions.

[188] Quaegebeur 1989a, 104-108; for more detailed study on the titles of the Priests see Lanciers, 1991.

[189] Winter 1979, 152.

[190] Quaegebeur 1989a, 98; Quaegebeur 1989b, 49.

[191] Philae 1 H L11a-11d, D 11d-11g.

The cult of the Ptolemies in the Egyptian temples was a new creation. The kings of Egypt had always had statues in the temples, statues of the royal *ka*, and occasionally their own cult statues, but the cult of the Ptolemies was different.[192] The divinity of the king in the dynastic period has been much debated; during that time it was the office of kingship that was divine, rather than the person.[193] There are examples of a king receiving cult in a particular place, even alongside another deity, the first such an attempt is seen with Amenhotep III who built a temple to Amun as the main deity and himself at Soleb in Nubia.[194] But this number is low; there are few kings turned gods in general in Egyptian tradition.[195] The best pharaonic examples are Amenophis III and Ramesses II, who were both deified in their lifetimes, though most of these cults were located in Nubia, and so were outside Egypt.[196] These cults show a distant precedent for the Ptolemaic cults, but theirs was still a new phenomenon; no previous cult had been as widespread or co-ordinated.

The primary aim of establishing a cult is to be associated with, or be made, divine. This cult not only accomplished this for one ruler, but for the dynasty as a whole. It integrated them into the traditions of their adopted country and designated them as the defenders and protectors of Egypt on multiple levels. They became incorporated into the local culture and traditions, and provided them with a link to the culture and people of Egypt, or at least with

[192] Nock 1986, 213; Habachi 1969.

[193] Habachi 1969, 45; Goebs 2007, 292.

[194] Nock 1986, 210; Habachi 1969; Goebs 2007, 192-4.

[195] Habachi 1969, 50.

[196] Habachi 1969.

the indigenous elite.[197] In her analysis of the cults of the *Theoi Adelphoi* and Arsinoe II, Sabine Müller emphasises their political character, that they were used by Ptolemy II to boost his own power.[198]

A.3. Arsinoe II and other single cults

The Ptolemaic cult was focused on the royal couples. In addition, some members of the royal family gained a cult of their own. The most important of these is Arsinoe II, whose deification is described in the Mendes decree.[199] Arsinoe was a powerful and popular queen, and some time after her death c.270 BC, she became *synnaos thea*, a temple-sharing goddess in her own right in the temples of Egypt.[200] Whether this deification preceded or followed the creation of the *Theoi Adelphoi* in the Egyptian temples and the Greek tradition is unclear. Arsinoe had shrines and temples throughout Egypt and was often associated with other goddesses such as Isis and Aphrodite. Arsinoe also had a distinct iconography in both Greek and Egyptian modes, with the double cornucopia in the former and a specific crown in the latter.[201] She came to occupy a high place at Memphis in the Temple of Ptah, and was even integrated into the pantheon at Thebes.[202] Her cult was separate from the principal Ptolemaic ruler cult (in

[197] Hölbl 2001, 284.

[198] Müller 2009, 262 & 299.

[199] Mendes: L11-14.

[200] Quaegebeur 1989b, 42-47; Hölbl 2001, 104-105; Müller 2009, 280-298.

[201] Quaegebeur 1989b, 42-47.

[202] Quaegebeur 1989b, 45.

which she was included) and it was maintained throughout the period in both Greek and Egyptian traditions.[203]

Two other female members of the Ptolemaic royal family received cult: Philotera, sister of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, and Princess Berenike, daughter of Ptolemy III and Berenike II. Unlike Arsinoe they were not queens and therefore could not be integrated into ruler cult. Philotera died some time before her sister Arsinoe, but was not deified until c.260 BC.[204] She received cult at Memphis which was less significant than that of her sister. Philotera was most often associated in a triad with her siblings (Ptolemy II & Arsinoe II) or in a dyad with her sister. In the Egyptian tradition it was popular to associate Arsinoe II with Isis and Philotera with Isis' sister Nephthys.[205] Her cult does not appear to have been as long-lasting as Arsinoe's, Müller suggests it may have been a political ploy by Ptolemy II to confirm his family's links to the divine world.[206] The second Ptolemaic cult was of Princess Berenike, described in the Canopus decree.[207] Her cult was focused on the temple at Canopus, but apart from the decree little is known about it.

A.4. Inside the temple

When identifying the location of the cult statues of the Ptolemies, it is desirable to place them within their individual shrines, inside the temple. The evidence for

[203] Quaegebeur 1998, 73-108 provides a list of material concerning the cult of Arsinoe II.

[204] Hölbl 2001, 103; Müller 2009, 299.

[205] Quaegebeur 1989b, 47; Müller 2009, 298.

[206] Müller 2009, 299.

[207] Canopus G L50-64, D L48-64.

this location comes primarily from the priestly decrees, which state that the statues are to be placed within their golden shrines in the sanctuary.[208] In the earlier discussion of the decrees it was established that the use of the term sanctuary, in both forms of the Greek *agias/aduton* and the Demotic *pȝ nt wʿb*/*pr-nṯr*, can only refer to this central sacred area.[209] It has been established that this is where the statues of the traditional Egyptian gods resided. The Ptolemies themselves were considered to be temple-sharing gods, and this places them alongside other Egyptian deities, both theologically and physically; it is explicitly stated in the First Philae decree that Cleopatra I's statue is "to be put in the holi(est) place with the shrines of the other gods."[210] This is supported by the general insistence running throughout the decrees that the statues of the Ptolemies (all types) are to be treated like those of the other gods, that things should be done "that normally are" or are "proper to do," such as receiving offerings and being included in processions.[211] This shows that the Ptolemaic statues were meant to be considered in the same way as the other Egyptian cult statues of the temple. This evidence points to the cult statues of the Ptolemies being located in the central sanctuary; for them to be elsewhere would segregate them from the other gods and would remove them from the sacred space.

The exact location of the statues is difficult to determine. If they were resident in the sanctuary of the temple, then there are a limited number of

[208] Canopus G L59, D L59; Memphis G L41-42, D L24-25, H L7-8; Philae 1 H L11a-11d, D L11d-11g.

[209] Daumas 1952, 172-176; Wilson 1997, 350; *Chicago Demotic Dictionary* 2001, 20.

[210] 1Philae H L11a-11d, D L11d-11g.

[211] Decrees: Mendes L13-14 (places the statues of Arsinoe alongside those of other goddesses); Raphia, Simpson 1996, 242-257, L35, 38 &39; Memphis G L40 & 48-50, D L24, 26, & 29-30, H L7, 11-12; Philae 2 H L17b, D L14c; Philae 1 H L 14e D L 14f.

options. They could have been kept in the crypts, which were usually beneath the sanctuary and accessible by the central area.[212] This seems unlikely; the crypts were mainly used as storage areas, and would have been impractical given that the cult statues were confined to shrines and used on a regular basis. The space in front of the sanctuary, connected to it, was the Hall of Ennead (fig. 11 N), and it was here that the barques were kept; this could be extended to include some of the shrines of the gods.[213] The emphasis in the priestly decrees is on the Ptolemaic statues being treated the same as the other cult statues, meaning the focus must be on the location of those other statues. The cult statues of the gods were located in the chapels surrounding the principal naos, and this is where the cult statues of the Ptolemies were also presumably kept. This would fit with the Ptolemies' relationship to the other gods as *synnaoi theoi*. It is possible that over time, as the numbers of cult statues increased, the Ptolemies would have gained their own room in the temple. The statues specific location would have varied from temple to temple, due to size and accessibility, and with no room other than the sanctuary specified in the decrees, the exact location was left in the hands of the priests.

In temples dedicated to the Ptolemies this would have been different. There are several examples of structures dedicated to the Ptolemies: Flinders Petrie identified a chapel at Tanis dedicated to Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, and the Pithom decree refers to a temple established at Arsinoe for Arsinoe

[212] Seen at the Temple of Isis at Dendera; Cauville 1992, 54-59; Hornung 1992, 116.

[213] Kurth 2004, 61.

II.[214] These are both Egyptian sanctuaries, and so would have functioned as such. This meant treating the statues of the monarchs as the principal deity. They would be located in the central naos, or the axial shrine behind, and would have been the main beneficiaries of any rituals.

In looking at the location of the statues, it is important to consider the statues' surroundings and the impact it had. Statues, images, and art objects are not figures on their own, they are to be viewed and understood in relation to the space around them; to other objects and the type of location they are set in.[215] Location and surroundings can play a significant role in the purpose of an object.

If the cult statues had been placed anywhere else in the temple they would not have had the same impact. They would not have been like the other gods and would not have been temple-sharing gods. By being placed in the sanctuary the statues became associated with the statues of other deities. This not only incorporated them fully into the Egyptian tradition (despite being a new cult), but also further established their divine nature. Being in that space, with those other divine objects, some of which may have been worshipped for hundreds of years, would have reflected upon the Ptolemaic statues and the Ptolemies themselves, placing them in the same world and ideology. It could be argued that as only a small number of people saw the statues in this location, this was not important. This argument ignores the fact that the statues were still known to be present with the other deities, and had the same restrictions. There

[214] Petrie 1885, 31; Naville 1903, "The Pithom Decree", 18-21, L20-21.

[215] Elkins 2002, 41.

can be power in hidden images, and the fact they could not be seen, like the other gods, would have contributed to their position.

Within the temple, every surface is decorated with relief imagery. As the sanctuary was the first part of the temple constructed, it was rarely unfinished. The reliefs in the sanctuary space were of the rituals and offerings to the gods made by the king (and queen), and they surrounded the cult statues, complimenting them and reflecting their position within the temple. For the Ptolemaic statues, there was another dimension to the reliefs, in that they represented themselves, or their predecessors, performing rituals. In the sanctuary, the Ptolemies were represented as both monarchs and deities. This emphasised their role in the temples, and presented a powerful image of gods who were real and vital to the preservation of Egypt.

The cult statues and reliefs, along with other representations, such as ritual equipment, contributed to the omni-presence of the royal couple, especially the king, in the temple. The role and presence of the king, particularly in the southern temples, has been questioned, specifically relating to his relevance.[216] With the representations of the king in relief, the king can be seen to have a constant presence in the temple. Through the cult statue holding their royal *ka*, the royal couple would have been considered present during rituals, and in relief they were eternally in attendance, performing those same rituals and offerings. Possibly, this was one of the purposes of the royal cult, to ensure the king was present throughout Egypt.

[216] Goyon 1989, 30-31 – he notes that there have been questions regarding a split between the north and south of Egypt, and the participation of the rulers in the south; Hölbl 2001, 89 – he suggests their liturgy developed without the king.

The cult statues were not visible; they were located in their shrines, accessible only to the higher clergy. How objects are viewed is directly influenced by their surroundings, especially religious objects, where their context is designed to compliment and emphasise their holiness.[217] When the priests approached them, they would have done so as they did other divine statues. Their location was distinctive, with its small size and limited lighting, and all interaction was highly ritualised. The daily ritual was a series of specific sections where every action was accompanied by hymns or prayers; they were wrapped in an impenetrable layer of ritual and worship. This further placed cult statues in the realm of the divine. The priests for their part were aware of the purpose of the rituals, and that they were performing them before the statue of an entity who held the fate of Egypt in his or her hands.

A.5. Leaving the temple

Festivals and processions were a major part of temple life, and were the only time the statues came into contact with the world beyond. During the processions, the statues of the deities were placed in their shrines on a barque and carried out of the temple. They followed a specific route, stopping at various points along the way to perform rituals, and then return home.[218] These processions could last many days and travel long distances. Not every festival was available to the public, or left the confines of the temple. One of the most

[217] Tanner 2001, 261-265: though focusing on classical Greek religious art, he makes some important and relevant points about the way culture shapes the viewing of statues, and how the religious interaction with the statue is reinforced through the manipulation of our senses through the surroundings.

[218] Fairman 1954, 183-186; Sauneron 2000, 92-96; Wilkinson, 2000, 95-98.

important festivals of the Egyptian calendar, the New Year festival, involved a procession to the temple roof.[219] A large number of festivals were celebrated, from national ones, to deity-specific ones, to local ones. The importance of the festival to the temple is reflected in the Festival Calendars inscribed on temple walls, a practice that continued into Ptolemaic and Imperial times.[220]

These processions and festivals were extremely important to the public, it was their opportunity to participate in the religious activities of the temple and become close to the divine. The priestly decrees refer to the inclusion of the people in the festivals for the Ptolemaic cult, allowing them to make a copy of the shrine.[221] During processions, oracles were given; anyone could approach a deity's shrine and ask a question. This was extremely popular, and became more so during the Ptolemaic and Imperial periods.[222]

The priestly decrees focus on the processions and festivals for the cult statues. The Memphis decree explicitly states that "in the great festivals in which the processions of the shrines take place they are to carry out [also] the [shrine] of the god Epiphanes Eu[charistos]."[223] This sentiment is echoed throughout the other decrees, and makes it clear that the cult statues are to be included in these processions. The Festival Calendar of Kom Ombo specifically

[219] Lorton 1999, 146.

[220] El-Sabban 2000, 154.

[221] Memphis: G L52-53, D L31-32, H L13-14; Philae 1 H L16c-16d D L15h-16b; In the Canopus decree there is a description of a statues made for processions - G L65; D L65; In Raphia there is a damaged area which mentions the processions and festivals - L41-42.

[222] Baines 1991, 170; *OEAE*^{2}, 610.

[223] Memphis G L42-43, D L25-26, H 8-9.

refers to the taking out of Ptolemaic cult statues on procession: "1st day of Akhet day 1: Appearing of Horus, Lord of Ombos, appearing of Euergetes, Philopator, Epiphanes, Philometor together with him."[224] This is the only time they are specifically named in a calendar, but given the extensive and growing list of royal statues this is not surprising. The other deities of the temple are also rarely listed, and are usually identified under the heading of the god's (his/her) Ennead or 'gods' of the temple.[225] In looking at the surviving Festival Calendars it can be suggested that whenever these phrases are used in relation to a procession, the cult statues of the Ptolemies should be included.

The decrees also provide details on festival and procession days for the royal couples themselves. In the Canopus decree there were festivals for Ptolemy III and Berenike III on the 5th, 9th and 25th of every month, as well as another festival on the first day of the second month for five days, and one for Princess Berenike on the 17th of the month Tybi, lasting four days.[226] In the Raphia decree there is mention of a victory festival for Ptolemy IV on the 10th day of Phakhon for five days.[227] And in the three decrees of Ptolemy V, there are festivals to him on the 9th, 17th, and 22nd of every month, as well as a number of others to him and Cleopatra I throughout the year.[228] These are only those festivals referred to in the decrees, but if they were expanded to include the rest

[224] El-Sabban 2000, 152; Calendar of Kom Ombo on the West side.

[225] El-Sabban 2000, 169-184; Temple of Edfu Calendars of Horus and Hathor (phrases used multiple times throughout).

[226] *Theoi Euergetai* G L33-38, D L32-41, Princess Berenike G L55-59, D L55-58.

[227] L36-39.

[228] Memphis: G L46-50, D L27-30, H L10-13; Philae 2 H L15b-16d, D L12f-13e; Philae 1 H L13d-15e, D L13f-15d.

of the Ptolemies, with the assumption that each couple had at least three festivals per month, there would be a large number of festivals in their honour, alongside all the others already established. There is also evidence that in at least some of these processions, the other Ptolemaic statues/shrines were to go out along with those of the ruling couple; this is referred to in the damaged text of the Raphia decree.[229] The Ptolemaic statues would be processing out of the temple on a regular basis, at least four times a month, probably more.

Despite leaving the sanctuary, the cult statues were still not seen, instead remaining in their shrines. Evidence for this can be found in the reliefs on the stairs of Dendera, showing a procession of priests carrying shrines (fig. 10), and in the priestly decrees, which specify that the shrines are to be taken out.[230] In the decrees there are descriptions of what the shrines are to look like: they are to be decorated with crowns, with the iconography of the individual royal, and they are to have their names in Hieroglyphs.[231] In the Memphis decree the purpose of this adornment is explicitly stated as being so the shrine "may be easily distinguished now and for time hereafter."[232] The shrine was expected to be taken out in processions during Ptolemy V's lifetime and after, and it was meant to be recognised as his shrine containing his statue.

[229] Raphia: L38-39.

[230] Raphia: L38-39; Memphis G L42-43, D L25, H L8; Philae 2 H L16d-17c, D L13e-14c; Philae 1 H L11e-11f D L11f-12a.

[231] Canopus: G L60-64, D L60-64; Memphis G L43-46, D L25-27, H L9-10; Philae 1 H L11f-13c, D L12a-13e.

[232] Memphis: G L43, D L25, H L8.

The statues' presence within the temple and the procession was a point of concern. The processions had a mass audience, and it is clear the Ptolemies wished for their people to see their statues and their position amongst the other deities, emphasising and securing their power and divinity. This was a way for the Ptolemies to interact with and make their presence felt to their subjects – just as they made their presence felt in the temple. The monarchy would have been a distant power to the majority, yet the way state and religion intertwined meant that the Ptolemies were vitally important. Through the cult in general, and the cult statues and processions, the Ptolemies were making their presence felt throughout all Egypt, and were linking themselves to their people. In emphasising their place within the processions, the Ptolemies are acknowledging the popular religion of Egypt, supporting it, and guaranteeing their own support.

A.6. Cult statues in Egyptian temples: Conclusion

In this analysis of Ptolemaic cult statues in the Egyptian temple, it has been possible to identify the Ptolemies as creating a new cult which was fully incorporated into the Egyptian tradition. They were *synnaoi theoi* in the temples, with the same material, iconography, and ritual as the gods of Egypt. The location of their statues continued this trend; they stood within their own shrines in the sacred chapels of the temple. They were not completely restricted to this space, and though still confined to their shrines, were taken out on processions, allowing a certain degree of display and contact with their people.

By creating this cult and being identified alongside the Egyptian deities, the Ptolemies were able to take on the mantle of the divine, to identify themselves with the culture and people of Egypt, and gain legitimacy, support, and display their power. Whether this worked is disputable, though it is clear from a number of texts that their cult was worshipped outside the temple proper.[233] In their cult statues they maintained a constant presence throughout their kingdom.

B. Greek cult statues of the Ptolemies

Existing in Egypt alongside the cult of the Ptolemies in the Egyptian temples were a number of different cults rooted in Greek tradition; they followed the same ideas, practices, imagery, and form, as other cults in the Greek world. For the Greek cults of the Ptolemies and their accompanying statues, there are no clear documents detailing their creation, context and purpose as the priestly decrees do for the Egyptian cults. Evidence is confined to sporadic references in papyrus documents and inscriptions, and to three specific groups of archaeological evidence: first, a small group of cult statues from the town of Thmuis in the Nile Delta, second, the remains of a temple from Hermopolis Magna in Upper Egypt, and lastly, a triad from the Serapeum in Alexandria. I begin with a brief description of the nature of Greek cults and cult statues in the classical world before identifying the various types of Greek cult that existed in Ptolemaic Egypt.

[233] Sadek 1987, 286; Pfeiffer 2008, 90-95; both provide evidence of 'clubs' or 'associations' in which the ruling couples were worshiped.

B.1. Greek cult statues

Greek cult statues were different from Egyptian in both style and ideology. While the Egyptian statue has a specific image type (small and of high cost materials), the Greek could range from colossal golden statues to life-size marble images, to smaller statuettes, they could even be aniconic.[234] The cult statues of the Greek world looked like non-cult statues, such as votives or civic imagery, making them difficult to identify in the archaeological record. And while the Egyptian statues were supposed to represent the god in a realistic manner, the Greek statues were not meant to be an accurate image of the divine being, they were simply a representation.[235] Traditionally, they stood alone within the temple, in the naos, facing the entrance. They were not typically the main focus of cult, that was the altar located in front of the temple, but they were the representation of the god who viewed and received any offerings. The sanctuary and the temple was the cult statues' principal home, and though located inside, they were not (usually) hidden.

In discussing the word cult, and its associated statues, it is easy to associate the word solely with the worship of gods. The main focus of cult in the classical world was the worship of gods and goddesses in temples with sacrifices and festivals. The line between the divine and human was more permeable, and so it was possible for humans, or those considered greater than human, to gain honours and cultic worship. This is seen most clearly in the cult offered to heroes, city founders, and (in the Hellenistic period) kings, on both a panhellenic and local scale.

[234] Price 1999, 56-57.

[235] Price 1999, 56.

B.2. Greek cults of the Ptolemies

There were a number of different types of Greek cult to the Ptolemies in Egypt. There were the official ruler cults and the dynastic cult centred on Alexandria and Ptolemais, as well as similar cults separate to these, which existed in towns throughout Egypt.

The Eponymous cult of Alexander the Great and the Ptolemies based in Alexandria is the best known. This is due to the titles of the Eponymous priest being used in the dating formulae of official documents, providing a broad idea of how this cult developed over time.[236] Ptolemy I established this as a cult to Alexander early in his reign. It developed into a dynastic cult through the actions of Ptolemy II and Ptolemy III who added themselves and their wives to the cult as the *Theoi Adelphoi* and the *Theoi Euergetai*. Following the addition of the *Theoi Philopatores* (Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III) and the first royal couple the *Theoi Soteres* (Ptolemy I and Berenike I) by Ptolemy IV, each successive ruler or ruling couple were added over time, until the reign of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy IX, after which records cease.[237] The cult was also home to a number of priestesses, including the *kanephoros* of Arsinoe II and the *athlophoros* of Berenike II.[238] Though singular offices, to individuals with their own festivals, these priestesses were part of this larger dynastic priesthood and cult.

[236] Eponymous cult: Koenen 1993 46-55; Hölb 2001; Pfeiffer 2008, 64-70; Weber 2010, 62-75: For general timetable of cultic activity see Hölbl 2001, Appendix, 318-352.

[237] Hölbl 2001, 287.

[238] Minas 1998; Pfeiffer 2008, 66-67.

The same pattern was repeated in the city of Ptolemais, founded by Ptolemy I.[239] The only difference was that the city began its dynastic cult with Ptolemy I, and used this as part of the dating formulae in its own documents and those of Upper Egypt.

There were also a number of individual ruler cults established in Alexandria.[240] These are mostly recorded in the literary sources through references to their temples, such as the cult and shrine for Berenike I known due to the comments in Athenaeus' description of the Great Procession, the Arsinoeion referred to in Pliny's *Natural History*, and the temple to Ptolemy IV, Arsinoe III, Serapis and Isis in Alexandria known through foundation plaques.[241] Few of these survive in the archaeological record. The cult of Berenike I, and that of the *Theoi Soteres*, was instituted by Ptolemy II, who was also responsible for creating cults to his sister-wife Arsinoe II, and to both himself and Arsinoe II as the *Theoi Adelphoi*. The cult of Arsinoe became one of the most popular in Egypt, and she gained a number of temples in Alexandria and elsewhere.[242] Through these actions Ptolemy II placed the power of creating cults in the hands of the king. Alexandria also contains examples of inscriptions making dedications both "on behalf of" the Ptolemies and directly to them.[243] There are also a number of faience *oinochoai* from Alexandria that depict

[239] Hölbl 2001, 170-171; Pfeiffer 2008, 68.

[240] Hölbl 2001; Pfeiffer 2008, 51-55; Weber 2010, 62-74.

[241] Shrine of Berenike I: Athenaeus Book 5, 202d; Rice 1983, 22-23; Olson 2006, 474-475; Discussion: Hölbl 2001, 94; Weber 2010, 65; Arsinoeion: Pliny *Nat Hist*, 34.42, McKenzie 2007, 51-52; Temple of Ptolemy IV: McKenzie 2007, 64.

[242] McKenzie 2007, 51-53 & 64; Pfeiffer 2008, 59-61.

[243] Pfeiffer 2008, 31-32.

images of women, identified through accompanying inscriptions as queens, partaking in ritual activity, and it is likely these objects were used in ruler cult.[244] For later rulers there is less evidence of individual ruler cult, though this does not mean it did not exist.

It is around these centrally created cults that the cults practiced elsewhere in Egypt were organised and based.[245] These were the dynastic and ruler cults that developed outside of the two central *poleis*, at locations such as Hierakopolis and Krokodilopolis, both of which supply inscriptions and dedications demonstrating the existence and practice of Ptolemaic cults.[246]

B.3. Thmuis

Above, I noted that Greek cult statues could be colossal, life-size, or statuettes, made out of various materials, and so it was their placement and how they were perceived that separated them from the general milieu. Due to this, it can be difficult to identify individual statues as cult statues without more evidence. So while there are probably many Ptolemiac heads which once received cult, they cannot be identified as such.

One group of images from Egypt can be idenitified as Ptolemaic cult statues. From Thmuis comes a group of 10 marble heads identified as

[244] Thompson 1973.

[245] Pfeiffer 2008, 52.

[246] Pfeiffer 2008, 53.

representing a group of Ptolemies and gods.[247] They were discovered by Campbell Cowan Edgar in 1908, in a small mudbrick structure with three pillars (cat site. 7). The exact identification of each head is a cause of debate, but Katja Lembke identifies them as representing Alexander the Great, Ptolemy III (**28A**), Ptolemy IV (**28B**), Arsinoe III (**28C**), Berenike II (**28D**), Arsinoe II (**28E**), Isis, Dionysos, and two Aphrodites.[248] Other significant finds from the structure include a number of marble limbs and several small marble altars.

Their identification as cult statues comes from the nature of the group itself; the inclusion of familiar deities such as Dionysos, Aphrodite, and Isis, and the presence of Alexander the Great and Arsinoe II, both of whom were gods in their own right in Egypt. Also, both royal couples, Ptolemy III and Berenike II and Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III, were identified as gods within their own lifetimes, as the *Theoi Euergetes* and *Theoi Philopatores* respectively. The group presented is intrinsically divine as all participants are deities. Additionally, the other material from the site (marble altars), their presence within a structure, and the grouping of these individuals together, point to the cultic nature of the images.

The statues are clearly a dynastic cultic group. They include two successive Ptolemaic couples (parents and children) as well as two important dynastic founders (Alexander and Arsinoe II). Even the deities represented are closely associated with the Ptolemaic dynasty, to the extent that various

[247] Thmuis: Baines & Malek 1980, 175; Ochsenschlager 1980 25-26: Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 84: Statues: Edgar 1909; Lembke 2000.

[248] Lembke 2000, 115-128; Walker & Higgs 2001, 49, no.11 - identify Isis as Berenike II.

monarchs are directly attached to them, as in the case of Aphrodite-Arsinoe. In her recreation of the plan of the statues, Lembke suggests the group formed couples, associating Alexander with Isis and Arsinoe II with Dionysos, further emphasising both a divine and familial concept.[249] These statues demonstrate both divine and dynastic themes, creating a dynastic shrine.

The images themselves are typically Greek in style. They are all marble, pieced with other material, and are carved in a recognisably Hellenistic royal style: with inclined heads, diadems, and wavy hair.[250] These heads would fit into any sanctuary in the Greek world. This statue style suggests that the cult practisced in the temple was also part of the Greek tradition.

The heads were discovered in a mud brick room with three pillars, and were concentrated along the northern wall and in the south-east corner (cat site. 7). A Roman wall and a three-roomed structure were located nearby.[251] This find spot reveals little about the presentation or arrangement of the statues. Both the statues and this context have been identified as being similar to another group of finds from the town of Athribis in Lower Egypt. At Athribis, excavators uncovered a number of Aphrodites in a room in a Ptolemaic villa (fig. 16).[252] Karol Mysliwiec notes that the rooms of Thmuis and Athribis are comparable in dimension, and the statues themselves are also similar in size

[249] Lembke 2000, 140.

[250] Smith,1991, 19-24 & 205-211.

[251] Edgar 1909, 1.

[252] Mysliwiec & Herbich 1988, 183; Mysliwiec 1992, 261.

and nature. The evidence from Thmuis and Athribis suggests this form of space was the primary type of context for small, possibly private, cults in Ptolemaic towns during this period.

The statues from Thmuis were part of a dynastic cult, most likely a private one. Through emphasising both the dynastic and divine aspects of this group, the statues would have functioned as reminders of the power, legitimacy, and nature of the Ptolemies. They also served as a sign of the devotion and loyalty of an individual or group in Thmuis, and show that amongst the population, the position of the Ptolemies as worthy of cult was embraced.

There are a large number of similar small heads from Egypt, representing both royal and divine imagery, not discussed here as they do not fit the parameters of this study, either due to their size or their lack of a secure provenance.[253] Their identity as cult statues cannot be confirmed. The existence of this material though, suggests that the type of cult and cult statues seen at Thmuis were an important part of representation and worship throughout Egypt as a whole.

B.4. Hermopolis Magna

From the town of Hermopolis Magna in Upper Egypt comes a Greek inscription from a Doric architrave, which reads:

> βασιλεῖ Πτο|λεμαίωι τῶι Πτολεμαίου κα|ὶ Ἀρσινόης, Θεῶν
> Ἀδελφῶν. καὶ Β|ασιλίσσηι Βερενίκηι τῆι ἀδελφῆι α|ὐτοῦ καὶ γυναικὶ
> Θεοῖς Εὐεργέτ|αις, καὶ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ Ἀρσινόηι Θ|εοῖς Ἀδελφοῖς τὰ

[253] Laube 2012 - a collection of small heads and figurines from the Sieglin expedition.

ἀγάλματα κ|αὶ τὸν ναὸν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐντὸ|ς τοῦ τεμένους|
καί τὴν στο|[ά]ν, οἱ τασσόμενοι ἐν τῶι Ἑρμο|πολίτηι νομῶι
κάτοικοι ἱππε[ῖ]|ς. εὐεργεσίας ἕνεκεν τῆς εἰς αὐτούς.

"To King Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the brother-and-sister gods, and to queen Berenike, his sister and wife, the benefactor gods, and to Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the brother-and-sister gods, the cavalry settlers stationed in the Hermopolite nome (have dedicated) the statues and the temple and the rest inside the sacred precinct and the stoa for the benefactions shown to them."[254]

This concerns the establishment of a temenos, temple, ancillary buildings, and statues, in honour of Ptolemy II, Arsinoe II, Ptolemy III, and Berenike II, as the *Theoi Adelphoi* and *Theoi Euergetai*, by cavalry settlers in 240 BC. The archaeological evidence from the site supports this inscription. Foundations show the presence of a rectangular colonnaded court with an entrance to the centre of the southern short side and the foundations of a smaller structure, most likely the temple itself, situated within the court, aligned with the entrance. From the site come fragments of the Ionic, Corinthian, and Doric architectural orders, including brightly painted capitals. The original location of the architrave inscription is unknown, though it is too big to have been set on top of the temple.[255]

The statues referred to in the text are called *agalmata*, a complex Greek term meaning sacred statues for the gods. It can be used to refer to offerings, but is more often associated with cult statues. Given its context here, in relation to a temple, and its primary position in the inscription as the first

[254] For Hermpolis Magna: Alston 2002, 238-242; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 162-167; *Excavations at El-Ashmunein vols I-V*: especially Spencer 1989; Bailey 1991; Spencer 1993; Mckenzie 2007, 56-58 & 158-160: For Inscription: Bernand 1999, no.1.

[255] McKenzie 2007, 56-58.

thing dedicated, it most likely refers to the cult statues of the temple. From Hermopolis Magna comes a marble head of Berenike II (49). Though the head has no find spot, it is tempting to associate it with this temple. This is a traditional Greek-style head, much like those from Thmuis, but on a larger scale. Even if it is not one of the statues dedicated here, the fact the inscription is in Greek, dedicated by Greek settlers suggests that the *agalmata* would have been similar.

The description of the dedication, including a temenos, temple, and stoa, are typical features of a Greek sanctuary. The archaeological evidence points towards a classical-style structure with the surviving foundations and remains of classical orders, making this the only surviving classical Ptolemaic structure outside of Alexandria.[256] Even the inscription is reminiscent of the language and ideas used by cities in the Greek east when dealing with Hellenistic kings.[257] All these features point to this being a large-scale, traditional Greek temple and cult. Like the material from Thmuis, it emphasises the Greek roots of the cult, though it is situated in Upper Egypt, and reflects the needs and cultural ideas of the dedicators.

This temple also serves to further demonstrate the difference between the Egyptian and Greek cults. Located only c.500-600 metres away from the Greek temple is the dynastic Egyptian temple to Thoth; in fact the Greek temple is located just outside its temenos, along the dromos (cat site. 21).

[256] McKenzie 2007, 56-58 & 158-60.

[257] Specifically using dedications as form of thanks and part of a dialogue with the kings: Chaniotis 2005, 433.

That the cavalry settlers chose to erect this temple, when there was another nearby capable of holding sacred, or even non-sacred, images of the kings, suggests that it did not meet their needs. Equally, it is clear that the statues they wanted to erect could not be located in that space, and so only a traditional Greek temple complex could be used.

This is a more public creation than the Thmuis shrine, and served a larger community. Its function was similar to that in Thmuis, in that it aimed at honouring the Ptolemies, and demonstrating loyalty and acceptance of them. The inscription claims the temple serves as thanks for the benefactions given by the rulers, and no doubt was aimed at gaining further favour. In this, it demonstrates the same role cult could play as observed in the Egyptian temple, that it was key in the interaction between the Ptolemies and their people, as a way for them to be seen and accepted.

B.5. Serapeum triad

The Serapeum triad consists of a group of three marble heads identified as representing the god Serapis, queen Arsinoe III (**76**), and king Ptolemy IV (**77**), and are identified as belonging in the Serapeum of Alexandria. The heads of Serapis and Arsinoe III were both discovered, along with a variety of other material, by Breccia in 1905-6 in a trench outside the sanctuary in Abu Mandur Street.[258] The head of Ptolemy IV, currently in the Louvre, has no provenance, but has been associated with the other heads by Kyrieleis based on stylistic and

[258] Breccia 1907, 72.

technical similarities.[259] Kyrieleis also suggests that this group formed a triad centred on Serapis with the king and queen positioned on either side of the god and turned to face him.[260]

The Serapeum of Alexandria was the principal sanctuary of the city designed to worship the god Serapis (fig. 30).[261] The sanctuary was in place during the reigns of Ptolemy I/II, but was completely rebuilt by Ptolemy III. Evidence of this structure includes foundation plaques of various materials written in Greek and Hieroglyphics, as well as the foundations of a colonnade with two entrances to the east, a temple within the temenos to the north (with a later shrine attached), a stoa-like building to the west of the temple, and two other earlier structures connected by an underground passage. Fragments from the site include classical-style architectural features and Roman coins show the temple was tetrastyle with Corinthian capitals and a Doric frieze.[262]

The identification of the triad as cult statues comes from the presence of Serapis, the principal deity of the Ptolemaic dynasty and of Alexandria. As with the statues of Thmuis, the statue of this god suggests a cultic aspect to the group. Their cultic nature can also be deduced from the association of the group with the sanctuary itself. It was the place of Serapis and a royal creation making the presence of a cultic group honouring the two

[259] Kyrieleis 1980, 383-387.

[260] Kyrieleis 1980, 383-387.

[261] For excavations and discussion on the Serapeum: Rowe 1946; Fraser 1972, 247-258, 267-270; Empereur 1998a, 89-109; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 69-72; McKenzie et al 2004; Sabottka 2008; Savopoulos 2011, 293-298; Schmidt 2013, 149-174.

[262] Handler 1971, 64-68; for discussion of the possible reconstructions of the Serapeum see: Sabbottka 2008, 165-181.

monarchs fitting. There is also other evidence in Alexandria that shows Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III were worshipped in association with Serapis; a group of foundation plaques from the city (similar to those from the Serapeum itself) demonstrates the presence of a temple dedicated to Serapis, Isis, and Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III as the *Theoi Philopatores*.[263] Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III also dedicated a temple to Haropokrates in the Serapeum, next to the main temple of Serapis.[264]

Both the excavated statue heads were found in a trench dug outside of the sanctuary itself. They are better placed in the sanctuary itself due to the lack of a suitable structure identified outside the sanctuary and given the size, material, and nature of the group (as a triad). Though cult statues, it is unlikely that these statues were the principal ones of the Serapeum. The Serapeum was linked to royal cult, as the statues testify, but there is no secure evidence to place them in the temple itself. The Serapeum of Alexandria was surrounded by a colonnade comprised of a number of rooms, and contained a variety of other structures, including the stoa-like building, allowing space for the placement and worship of this group. The space itself was comprised of classical architecture, and remains from the site include Corinthian and Doric fragments, suggesting the context of the statues conformed to classical style.

Unlike the sites of Thmuis and Hermopolis Magna, the Serapeum provides clear evidence for the presence of Egyptian material, including statuary, at the site. This suggests that the sanctuary itself was not wholly Greek

[263] McKenzie 2007, 64.

[264] Sabottka 2008, 181-186.

in its make-up, as indeed, neither was the principal deity. This creates a plethora of questions concerning the context and function of statues in Alexandria in general, and it is difficult to know exactly how this affects these images, which are in every other way typically Greek in style and form. These questions, and how these cult images fit into them, will be discussed in more detail in the later chapter dedicated to Alexandria, along with the wider range of material from the city.

The function of these cult statues was to associate the monarchs with Serapis, a theme of the *Theoi Philopatores* in Alexandria, as seen with the dedication of the aforementioned temple and their addition of a shrine to Harpocrates at the Serapeum itself. Alongside this, these statues emphasised the divinity of the Ptolemies. The statues placed them on equal footing with the god and allowed the monarchs to be worshipped. In this way, though these statues stood in a different forum, they conformed to the same functions as those seen in Thmuis and Hermopolis Magna. The principal difference is that the origins of the statues and structures at those sites are clear, they were created by a local group as part of their relationship (personal and public) with the monarchs. The origins of the Serapeum triad is unclear; they could have been created by a group, a member of the Alexandrian elite, or even the monarchs themselves. If this latter point is the case then the statues' function is more concerned with communicating with the public than with the monarchs themselves, and is a form of self-expression and promotion of their divine status rather than a sign of acceptance of that status by the population.

The Serapeum triad provides another set of images to those observed in Thmuis and Hermopolis Magna, but from it can be drawn similar themes concerning the context and function of cult statues. They aim at displaying the personal divinity and divine associations of the monarchsthrough placing them within the sanctuary. The primary difference is that in this case the origins of the statues may originate with the monarchs themselves, and would be the product of the monarchy communicating with the people of Alexandria.

B.6. Greek cult statues: Conclusion

Through examination of the principal groups of archaeological evidence it is possible to gain an insight into the form, style, and functions of Greek Ptolemaic cults and their statues. The shrine at Thmuis and the temple complex at Hermopolis Magna are both different, yet together they demonstrate the wholly Greek approach taken to these cults in Egypt, in their style and representation, and the distance placed between them and the Egyptian forms. They also emphasise the variety of approaches to these cults that existed: the private shrine and the larger community structure, and the different Ptolemies and gods associated within these. The Serapeum Triad contributes considerably to this, locating a group of statues within a larger sanctuary and continuing the concept of placement of classical material within a classical context. The Serapeum is a different sanctuary, and one that has a larger role to play within the discussion of statue context in Egypt. All these sites show the functions of these cults were basically the same: to demonstrate loyalty to the rulers, to emphasise their power, and act as a means of communication. They show that the idea of cults to the monarchs were widely accepted and practised.

C. Imperial cult statues

The imperial cult was a phenomenon that existed throughout the Roman Empire in a multitude of incarnations. My focus is on its Egyptian version, the cults that existed within the province and the statues that formed their focal point. Archaeological evidence for this is scarce, with only one group of material that can be securely identified as cult statues and two sites identifiable as the contexts of such statues. The rest of the evidence is confined to literary sources, principally papyrus records, including lists of processions, buildings, and tax records. I begin this discussion by briefly summarising the current understanding of imperial cult and statues in general, and the cult in Egypt itself. I then focus on a group of imperial cult statue bases and their shrine at the temple of Amun at Karnak, before discussing the evidence for other statues and temples in Egypt. I conclude by focusing on the position of the emperors and their statues in Egyptian temples. I avoid discussion of the perceived divinity of the emperors, except in understanding the position of their images in Egyptian temples. From the evidence it is possible to identify a vibrant imperial cult with specific ideas concerning the placement and use of cult statues.

C.1. Imperial cult and cult statues

The key aspect that needs to be understood in relation to imperial cult is that there was no such thing as *the* imperial cult. It was not a centralised, homogenous religion.[265] Rather, as a term, it can be applied to a range of different cults and actions, with different features and styles, throughout the

[265] Beard, North, & Price 1998, 318.

empire, from oath-taking, to sacrifices, to temple building, all of which change from province to province.[266] In some cases the only linking factor is that they form some type of cultic action to, or involving, the emperor and his family. Imperial cult was as diverse as the empire itself, though it often conformed to the traditions and functions of the Roman cults and cults of the local area.[267]

A common theme of imperial cult was the production and erection of cult statues. These statues can be difficult to identify as they can appear similar to civic statues. In his analysis of imperial cult in Asia Minor, Simon Price identifies three types of imperial cult statue; the cuirassed statue, the nude statue, and the civilian statue, all of which also existed in other contexts.[268] In identifying cult statues, Price notes first, they stood in temples rather than in civic space; no civic statue can be identified as receiving cult.[269] Second, the language used is an identifier; the term *agalmata* was most typically used to describe statues located in a temple identifying them as cult statues.[270] The language of statues in the Greek and Roman tradition is confusing, and Price notes that *eikones* could also receive cult, but in general it was the former term that was used. The language and placement of statues of imperial cult in Asia Minor conformed to the traditions of that area, suggesting that the same would occur elsewhere.

[266] Beard, North, & Price 1998, 318 & 348-363.

[267] Beard, North & Price 1998, 318 & 348-363.

[268] Price 1986, 179.

[269] Price 1986, 177.

[270] Price 1986, 177.

C.2. Imperial cult in Egypt

Imperial cult in Egypt was a distinct creation. Gregory Dundas observes that the material points to a higher than normal degree of central involvement, with a number of prefects responsible for dedications of temples and instituting festivals, and a focus on imperial temples located in *metropoleis*.[271] This evidence is based primarily on sporadic references to temples, processions, and cultic activity rather than on one particular source. From these references come information about imperial temples (Caesarea), festivals and 'Augustan days' (which celebrated important events in the imperial calendar), and statues carried in processions.[272]

The major question in relation to Egypt is the extent to which the Roman Emperors were incorporated into the Egyptian temples. Recent scholarship, especially by Dundas and Stefan Pfeiffer, has emphasised an Imperial break with the activities of the past.[273] Dundas thought this break was symbolised by the change in titles given to the Emperors in the temples, including use of the term *Autokrator*.[274] The Egyptian temples and their cults continued, under close supervision, but the emperors were not incorporated into them as *synnaoi theoi*.[275] This does not mean the emperors were ignored in the temples, they continued to be identified as pharaoh in reliefs and were

[271] Dundas 1993, 119.

[272] Dundas 1993, 119-126; Jong 2011, 626-629.

[273] Dundas 1993; Pfeiffer 2010.

[274] Dundas 1993, 68-88.

[275] Dundas 1993, 259-339; Pfeiffer 2010, 236 & 283-293.

incorporated in other ways, through festivals and processions, but they were not considered to be Egyptian gods.

C.3. Karnak

Located outside the first pylon of the Egyptian temple of Amun at Karnak in Upper Egypt is an imperial chapel, home to the only identifiable cult statue remains.[276] The chapel itself is a prostyle tetrastyle structure with Corinthian capitals (fig. 17 & 18). Placed alongside the inner walls of the cella are fourteen statue bases, four have surviving outlines of the attached stone statues and six have Greek inscriptions identifying two to Augustus as Zeus Eleutherios (**66 A, B**), three to Claudius (**66, C, D, E**), and one to Titus (**66 F**).

The first question that must be considered is whether these are the remains of cult statues. The principal evidence is their location. This structure is a small temple, and the statues are all placed inside the *cella* or *naos.* As Price noted, this was the traditional location for cult statues in Asia Minor.[277] There are also the inscriptions on the statue bases themselves, which refer to Augustus and Titus (and Vespasian) as *theon*. There has been much discussion on the meanings of the words *theon* and *theos* in Egypt, and their use in relation to the emperors, but in this case it seems clear the inscriptions refer to the (probably deceased) emperors as gods.[278] Pfeiffer notes that a similar chapel and

[276] Chevrier 1939, 557; Lauffray 1971, 118-121.

[277] Price 1986, 177.

[278] Jong 2006; Jong 2011.

group of statues have been identified as belonging to imperial cult in the forum of Narona in Dalmatia.[279]

Little remains of these statue bases, and so far no remains of their statues have been recovered. Given the nature of the chapel, its tetrastyle form and Corinthian capitals, they were most likely classical in style, a concept supported by the surviving outlines on the bases. What these bases emphasise is that the cult statues of the emperors in this context follow the same traditions and placements as others in the Greek east. They are not represented as Roman pharaohs and are not directly part of the Egyptian temple cult.

The chapel itself has no dedicatory inscription. Its origins and date can only be guessed at. The bases for Claudius have been identified by Jean Lauffray as belonging to the first year of his reign, AD 41/42, meaning that the chapel was established during the Julio-Claudian period, possibly as a temple to Augustus, and then remained in use, with new emperors added over time, to at least the Flavian period. Its style, as identified in the surviving fragments, is classical, and particularly Roman with the use of a podium and frontal steps. This evidence locates these cult statues within a typically Roman classical context, suggesting the actual cult also conformed to this type.

The chapels' classical nature is especially noticeable given that it is located on the dromos of the temple of Amun at Karnak, one of the oldest and most important religious sites in Egypt. In location, the chapel is able to

[279] Pfeiffer 2010, 143.

associate the emperors with the sanctuary and its history, yet also emphasise their difference, and the new regime that ruled the country. It provides visibility to the people of Egypt, with recent excavations suggesting that during the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, habitation around Karnak extended up to the walls of the sanctuary. [280] It also suggests that the Egyptian temple might no longer have been the primary way of interacting with the rulers. In their placement, the statues and the chapel function as both a way of creating visibility and a dialogue with the people of the area, and as a way to emphasise the distance between the Roman emperors and the Egyptian temple.

C.4. Other Imperial statues used in cult in Egypt

Within the statuary records of Egypt, there are many examples of imperial statues which *could* be identified as cultic ones, such as the colossal head of Hadrian from Athribis (**34)**, or the cuirassed statues of Marcus Aurelius (**90**) and Septimius Severus (**92**) found near Cleopatra's Needles in Alexandria. All three of these conform to ideas about the image of imperial cult statues, and come from areas reported to hold temples, but without further evidence it is impossible to identify them as such.

Other evidence comes from literary sources, though these can be difficult to substantiate, and are often associated with Egyptian temples rather than classical-style ones. In relation to the existence of statues in the classical context, there are the receipts for a special tax concerning the provision or

[280] Sullivan 2010, 23.

renovation of imperial statues discussed earlier (see Chapter 2).[281] One states that a statue of Trajan had been placed in the local Caesareum.[282] Ulrich Wilcken interpreted this as meaning the statues in the receipts were cult statues, providing evidence for cults and cult statues in Upper Egypt to emperors from the reigns of Hadrian to Marcus Aurelius.[283] The statues are described as being of gold and silver, and it is possible these are cult statues of Imperial temples whose maintenance is being paid for by the people and supervised by the state. The terms used to identify the statues in these receipts are *andrias* (ἀνδριάς), meaning a statue of a man, and *protomē* (προτομή), usually referring to a bust.[284] This language is not traditionally used to describe cultic images, and so points to another type of statue that resided in the temple. The *andrias* and *protomē* could be the same images that were taken out during processions in place of cult statues, though these are associated more with the Egyptian temples and will be discussed further on.

C.5. Caesarea

There are many Caesarea recorded throughout Egypt, usually in papyrus, some with only one line referring to them. Between them, Dundas and Pfeiffer have collected these together, allowing identification of Caesarea in Alexandria, Canopus, Arsinoe, Philadelphia, Herakleopolis, Oxyrhynchus, Hermopolis

[281] Wilcken 1899, 152-155, no.94, 100, 105, 151, 249, 254; Wallace 1939, 159-162; Fishwick 1989.

[282] Wallace 1939, 159; Fishwick 1989, 336.

[283] Wilcken 1988, 152-153; Fishwick 1989, 335-336.

[284] Fishwick 1989, 335-336.

Magna, Antinoopolis, Karnak, Lykopolis, Elephantine, and Philae.[285] A number of these towns are also identified as being home to temples to Hadrian and some to Faustina, including Alexandria, Arsinoe, Oxyrhynchus, and Hermopolis Magna.[286] The evidence provided by the literary sources, both for the Caesarea and the statues as discussed above, suggests that Imperial temples are the places to locate cult statues, and it is through a discussion of these locations that an understanding of statue context can be reached. Apart from the chapel at Karnak, little survives in the archaeological record. Even the large temple at Alexandria has only a few remains.[287] The only other re-constructible imperial temple in Egypt is located on the island sanctuary of the temple of Isis at Philae.[288]

The temple at Philae is a prostyle in antis tetrastyle temple with Corinthian capitals (fig. 19). In front of the temple stands a rectangular space for the placement of an altar or statue. An inscription on its architrave records its dedication:

> Αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι Σεβαστῶι σωτῆρι καὶ εὐεργέτῃ,(ἔτους) ιη
> ἐπὶ Ποπλίου Ῥοβρίου Βαρβάρου

[285] Dundas 1993, 135-177: Alexandria, Canopus, Arsinoe, Philadelphia, Oxyrhynchus, Hermopolis Magna, Lykopolis, Heptakomia, Philae; Pfeiffer 2010, 237-244: Alexandria, Philae, Canopus, Antioopolis, Arsinoe, Elephantine, Heptakomia, Herakleopolis, Hermopolis, Lykopolis, Oxyrhynchus, Philaedelphia.

[286] Dundas 1993, 135-177: Hadrian - Alexandria, Memphis, Arsinoe, Oxyrhynchus, Hermpolis Magna. Faustina - Oxyrhynchus, Hermpolis Magna; Pfeiffer 2010, 257-258: Hadrian - Alexandria, Memphis, Arsinoe, Bubastis, Herakleopolis, Hermopolis Magna, and Oxyrhynchus.

[287] McKenzie 2007, 177.

[288] Dundas 1993, 173-177; McKenzie 2007, 166-167; Pfeiffer 2010, 141-142.

"To Imperator Caesar Augustus, saviour and Benefactor, in the 18th year (13/12 BC) during the term of office of Publius Rubruius Barbarus."[289]

The chapel was a creation instituted during the term of Publius Rubruius Barbarus at one of the most important religious sites in Egyptian thought. It was also a classical Roman temple, with a podium and stairs, though one which incorporated local features such as the use of granite, diorite and an Egyptian cavetto cornice.[290] Originally dedicated to Augustus, a later dedication has been uncovered to Vespasian reading:

Αὐτοκρά[τορα Καίσαρα]
Ο̣ὐε̣[σπασιανὸν Σεβαστὸ]ν
τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ εὐεργέτηω,
οἱ ἀπὸ Φιλῶν καὶ Δωεκασχοίνου

"To Impera[tor Caesar] Ve[spasianus Augustu]s, Saviour and Benefactor, consecrated by the inhabitants of Philae and the Dodekaschoinos."[291]

This shows that the temple evolved into an imperial one, with emperors added over time, and the local inhabitants assumed its maintenance.

This description of the temple at Philae is similar to the one at Karnak. They have the same basic form, architectural features, a similar location, and show the same practice of adding emperors over time. It is possible they were created at the same time, or are representational of the type of structure used to house imperial cult statues.

[289] *OGIS* II 657; Bernand 1969, no.140, 72-76.

[290] McKenzie 2007, 166.

[291] Bernand 1969, no.161, 146-150.

It is the location that is most interesting; like the Imperial shrine at Karnak, this one is positioned in relation to a Egyptian temple. The Imperial temple at Philae is closely related to the Egyptian temple, simply because it is confined to the island, but it would have stood out as a different style, emphasising this juxtaposition of ideas in that these new imperial temples both draw on the importance and place of the older Egyptian ones and distinguish themselves from them. This pattern of erecting classical structures next to Egyptian temples is not confined to Imperial cult. The temple of Serapis at Luxor (fig. 20) was also a classical structure with a classical statue of Isis (still present, now headless) and along the dromos of Dendera classical *nymphaea* (fountain houses) were built.[292] The construction of classical style structures in relation to Egyptian temples was a feature of the Imperial period. These structures were aimed at both linking the new regime and culture to the Egyptian past, yet also asserting the new classical order and style. It seems that the emperors could only be represented at the Egyptian temples in this classical manner.

C.6. In Egyptian temples

The key question relating to imperial cult in Egypt has always been whether it was absorbed into the Egyptian temples, whether the statues of the emperors continued the Ptolemaic tradition of being *theoi synnaoi*. Recent work has shown such statues were not. There is no evidence to suggest the emperors were considered as gods alongside the traditional Egyptian deities.[293] This means

[292] McKenzie 2007, 168 & 160.

[293] Dundas 1993, 341-344; Pfeiffer 2010, 293-294.

there was no Egyptian cult statue of the emperor in the temple, in the holy of holies, as there had been for the Ptolemies.

This does not mean the emperors were left out of the Egyptian temples completely. The evidence demonstrates an imperial presence, but in a different way to that of the Ptolemaic kings. The emperors were identified as pharaohs in the reliefs of the temples, and were incorporated into that aspect of representation. There are also examples of cultic actions being paid towards the emperor in various ways: there are references to a prophet of Caesar at Memphis during the reign of Augustus, to a priest of the Naos of Caesar in the Fayoum, and of a shrine to Claudius at Oxyrhynchus.[294] These positions demonstrate the existence of cultic activity in the temples directed towards the emperors, but are not a universal and continuous feature, and do not identify the emperors as gods on the same level as the Egyptian ones.

Most important are the references made to images, specifically those being carried on procession and in the inventories of temples. A fragment from the Oxyhrynchus papyrus describes a procession listing the various gods involved, including Zeus, Hera, Kore, and Caracalla, Julia Domna, and Septimius Severus.[295] Inventories from the Oxyrhynkite nome, among others, mention statues identified as small effigies.[296] Like those identified in the tax receipts, these statues are generally referred to as *andrias* and *protomē*, language

[294] Naos: *P. Oxy. X* 1256; Claudius shrine: *P. Oxy. VIII*. 1144; General discussion: Dundas 1993, 313; Herklotz 2007, 304; Pfeiffer 2010, 282-285.

[295] *P. Oxy. XII* 1449; Pfeiffer 2010, 287-289.

[296] *P. Oxy. XII* 1449; Pfeiffer 2010, 286.

that does not typically associate them with cult statues. It has even been suggested that such images were not even statues, but could have been any representation of the emperor, such as a painting.[297]

This shows that there were imperial images in Egyptian temples that were not regarded cult statues, and so did not receive daily offerings. They were still an important part of ceremonies and festivals, and so possessed almost semi-cultic positions. The location of these statues or images within the temple is difficult to ascertain; they were not cult statues and so cannot be placed in the *naos* of a temple. Given their place in temple inventories, and their position in cultic activities, it would be logical to place them with the other equipment for such activities.

In some ways, the representation of the emperors in the Egyptian temples is reminiscent of the treatment of the dynastic pharaohs, who held a special place in the temple but were not worshipped as gods. This is seen most clearly in the continued representation of the emperors in pharaonic forms in relief and in the existence of offices such as the prophet of Caesar. In general, the representation of the emperors in Egypt did not conform to dynastic material, as seen in the existence classical shrines and statues of Philae and Karnak.

[297] Pfeiffer 2010, 287.

C.7. Imperial cult statues: Conclusion

There is little evidence for imperial cults or cult statues in Egypt, though more for other forms of imagery. The evidence that does exist, particularly from Karnak and Philae, points to Roman-style statues in a classical Roman context, albeit contexts that incorporated Egyptian stylistic features. This aspect of cult, which is confined to the Caesarea, is separate from the Egyptian temples. This division is made clear by the placement of imperial temples adjacent to Egyptian ones, a move that both emphasises the difference between the emperors and the old Egyptian forms and attempts to associate them together. In the Egyptian temples the emperors were incorporated, but not as gods with cult statues. Rather, semi-divine representational images were used in processions, and the emperors themselves received a form of cult through activities performed to them. They had a place in the temples, but as important, respected rulers or new pharaohs, not as gods.

CHAPTER 4: LOWER EGYPT

Lower Egypt encompasses the coastline of Egypt, from Cyrene to Syria and along the Nile Delta to Memphis and Saqqara (Map. 3). The Delta area, focused on the two main branches of the Nile, held over half the cultivable land in Egypt and the majority of its inhabitants. During the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, with the reorientation of the political and cultural elite to Alexandria, Lower Egypt became the principal region of the country.

Lower Egypt holds the largest concentration of contextualised statuary, with fifty-five examples, though detailed evidence for particular contexts is generally poor. The majority of statues have only a broad provenance rather than a specific find spot, and this, alongside the lack of physical remains and excavations in the area, allows little room for detailed discussion. The evidence from Lower Egypt can thus only be used to establish the general contexts of the statues. I begin by considering the different categories of statue from this region, and then focus on the sites the material comes from - Egyptian temples and *metropoleis*. I set out the basic features of these different sites and identify the locations royal statues normally occupied within them.

A. Categories of royal statue

The different categories of royal statue present in Ptolemaic and Imperial Egypt have already received substantial scholarly attention, especially in the works of

Bernard Bothmer, Helmut Kyrieleis, Bert Smith, and Paul Stanwick.[298] Lower Egypt provides a cross-section of all styles, a larger geographical breakdown of which is shown in Table 1. I briefly describe the six different categories of sculptural material present in this study.

The first category of statue is the most numerous - the Egyptian-style statue. This is the traditional pharaonic statue, typically standing with one leg forward, with a back-pillar, wearing a *shendyt*, *ureaus*, and headdress. Lower Egypt provides twenty-six provenanced examples of this style out of fifty-one found throughout the country, including three from the temple of Amun at Tanis - the broken torso statue (**23**), the seated pharaoh (**24**), and the statuette of Ptolemy II (**25**8.

The second category is the Greek-style statue. This is a Ptolemaic royal image that conforms to the classical forms of the Hellenistic world and ruler imagery. All possible examples of Ptolemaic Greek-style statuary have been collected by Kyrieleis.[299] Lower Egypt has eleven contextualised examples of this style, including the cult statue group from Thmuis (**28**) (see Chapter 3) and a head from Bubastis identified through portrait features as Arsinoe III (**31**). There are twenty provenanced examples of this style throughout Egypt.

The Imperial statue is the third statue category identified in the contextualised evidence of this study. This statue style is the traditional representation of the emperor, ranging from colossal images to life-size heads,

[298] Bothmer 1969; Kyrieleis 1975; Smith 1988; Stanwick 2002.

[299] Kyrieleis 1975.

and showing the emperor in civic, religious, or military dress. The only example from Lower Egypt is the colossal head of Hadrian from Athribis (**34**). There are nineteen others found elsewhere in the country, ten in Upper Egypt and nine in Alexandria, including a cuirassed Marcus Aurelius from Alexandria (**90**). The imperial style also represents other members of the imperial family, such as a head of Antonia Minor from Alexandria (**87**).

The fourth and fifth categories of statue are related. They are the Egyptian statues with Greek features (representing the Ptolemies), and the Egyptian statues with Roman features (representing the emperors). Both present a traditional pharaonic statue with classical elements incorporated into it, usually confined to the head, consisting of classical portrait features and hair. Egyptian statues with Greek features are identified in three locations, Canopus/Herakleion-Thonis (**6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 19**), the Fayoum (**42-46**), and Alexandria (**79-81, 84-86**) (though there are examples 'said to be from' other regions). Examples of these categories include the heads of Ptolemy IV (**6**) and Ptolemy VI (**7**) from Canopus. Lower Egypt provides seven examples of Egyptian statues with Greek features out of a total of twenty-one. Egyptian statues with Roman features are found in Lower and Upper Egypt and include statues of Caracalla from Tanis (**26**) and Mendes (**27**). Lower Egypt provides three Egyptian statues with Roman features out of a total of seven present in the catalogue.

A sixth and separate category is the inscribed statue base or plinth. These bases and plinths are included in this study as they often have a

strong provenance and provide insights into the representation of the king or emperor through epigraphic evidence. The style of the statues these bases supported is usually indeterminate, and use of a particular language in the inscription is not a guarantee of style. Not all the Greek inscribed bases present in the catalogue identify their accompanying statue as representing that of the monarch. These bases have been included because they were still meant to carry a statue, possibly of the royal referred to in the inscription, and they still provide insight into the placement of royal imagery and ideology in Egypt. There are also a number of bases where different scholars have translated the text differently, some suggesting the inscription does refer to a royal statue. There are three inscribed bases from Lower Egypt referring to monarchs, of Arsinoe III (**5**) and Cleopatra III (**8**) from Canopus, and Ptolemy III from Banub (**22**). There are eleven inscribed statue bases or plinths with a provenance in total.

B. Egyptian temples

The majority of the evidence in the catalogue comes from an Egyptian temple context. The statues either have a find spot within an Egyptian temple or a provenance from an Egyptian temple site. These examples include colossi from the temple of Amun-Gereb at Herakleion-Thonis (**17-18**), statues from the temple of Amun at Tanis (**23-26**), and statues from the temples at Mendes (**27**) and Pithom (**29**). This pattern is not confined to Lower Egypt, and is repeated throughout the country, observed in statues from the sanctuary of Renenutet at Medinet Madi in the Fayoum (**42-44**) and material from sites such as the temple of Amun at Karnak (**61-65**) and Isis on Philae (**67-68**). In order to understand

the context of these royal statues, I outline the major features of the Egyptian temple, and then identify the placement of royal sculpture.

The temple was the dominant feature of the Egyptian landscape and the principal form of monumental architecture. It functioned primarily as the house of the god, identified in the cult statue, and was wrapped in the rituals and rites discussed in Chapter 3. The temples also played a pivotal role in the politics and economy of the country. From the rule of Ptolemy I there was investment in Egyptian cults and architecture. It was during the Roman period that a general decline began, along with the movement of authority to the *idios logos* in Alexandria.[300] During Imperial rule, there were additions to numerous temples, but investment did not match the level of Ptolemaic involvement.[301]

The standard plan of the temple was developed during the New Kingdom and refined under Ptolemaic rule. It consisted of a series of regular spaces arranged in a linear pattern defined by a central pathway and monumental gates. The best preserved example is the temple of Edfu, begun by Ptolemy III in 237 BC and completed in 70 BC (fig. 11). From the inside out, Egyptian temples typically consisted of a central naos surrounded by chapels, a series of Halls with adjacent rooms (such as a library) and stairs leading to roof chapels, a pronoas, and open forecourt(s) defined by pylons. Outside the temple proper were a variety of other structures both sacred (such as the Mammisi (birth-house)), and secular (such as workshops). The entire temple area was

[300] Finnestad 1997, 229.

[301] McKenzie 2007, 136-41; also see Arnold 1999a for a chronological list of additions to temples in the Late Period.

enclosed by an undulating mud-brick wall representing the primordial waters. There were numerous gateways around this enclosure, with the principal one connected to the temple. This gate and the primary dromos often linked the temple to the Nile.[302]

In dynastic Egypt, temples had always functioned as the principal location for the placement of statuary, particularly royal statuary. The theological ideas of the Egyptian temple and the entwining of 'religion' and state made royal representation a necessary feature of construction and worship. There are many examples from the dynastic period that demonstrate this. From the Old Kingdom onwards royal statues are found standing in subsidiary chapels, open courts, lining pathways, defining pillars, and flanking gates.[303] Placement of sculpture is illustrated by the material found *in situ* at the temple of Amun at Karnak in Upper Egypt. In Azim & Reveillac's analysis of Legrain's excavations at Karnak, there are many examples of statues found in such areas, including ram-headed sphinxes lining the dromos and two alabaster colossi flanking the Tenth pylon (figs. 21 & 22).[304] Similar examples are observed with the line of sphinxes at the Temple of Amun at Luxor (fig. 24) and in the placement of statues within the Valley Temple of Khafre at Giza (fig. 25).[305] Loeben has also collected together evidence through reliefs and

[302] Finnestad 1997, 189-90; Coppens 2007, 10.

[303] Arnold 1999b, 41-9; Robins 2001, 34-42; Kjølby 2007, 231-44.

[304] Azim & Reveillac 2004, Sphinxes: 87-101, 4-1/27-34, Statues: 239-242, 4-7/1-4.

[305] Arnold 1999, 42.

inscriptions at Karnak demonstrating that statue placement, especially royal statues, conforms to these patterns.[306]

The statuary material located in these areas did not only represent the king. Accompanying him were statues of gods and the elite, often priests or scribes. Examples of such representation can be found in the Karnak Cachette from Upper Egypt, which was composed of large amounts of non-royal material up to and including the Ptolemaic period.[307] These statues occupied the same types of locations as royal material and served the same basic functions, to establish a presence in the temple.[308]

The current evidence presented by Ptolemaic and Imperial material from Egyptian temple sites shows that it followed the same patterns in placement and location as earlier dynastic sculpture. The focus of the statues' placement is on the forecourt of the temple and the dromos, and the definition of gates and entrances. There is no evidence for the presence of royal statues in relation to mortuary temples, as these structures are not a feature of this period.

The primary evidence for placing royal statues in the forecourt of the temple is in the priestly decrees, discussed in Chapter 2. The decrees of Raphia, Memphis, and Philae all detail the creation of Egyptian-style statues and state they are to be placed (in Hieroglyphics) in *wsḫt mšʿ nt ḥwt-nṯr*, which

[306] Loeben 2001.

[307] Karnak cachette: *IFAO* Cachette Database 2011, examples include - CK5 (K5) group statue, CK23 (K24) block statue, CK27 (K29) head of a priest, CK219 (K250) striding statue.

[308] Robins 2001, 41-2; Ben Tor 2001; Kjølby 2007.

translates as 'the court of the multitude of the god's house.'[309] This is the forecourt of the temple. A number of copies of the decrees have been found at the same Egyptian temple sites as royal sculptural material, including Tanis and Philae. Within the temple of Amun at Tanis (fig. 23), a copy of the Canopus decree was discovered in the temple area, along with a range of other material including sculpture and inscriptions from both the dynastic and Late Periods. The Canopus decree states that the inscription itself is also to be set up in the court of the multitude, identifying the area the decree was found as that court. This is also observed at the temple of Isis on Philae where the Philae decrees are inscribed on the Mammisi wall in the court (fig. 7). These texts show that this space was the location for the placement of Ptolemaic royal sculpture.[310]

The material from the temple of Amun at Tanis also demonstrates the placement of Ptolemaic and Imperial royal sculpture in these traditional areas. From Tanis comes a statue head of the emperor Caracalla (**26**). The head was discovered by Auguste Mariette, who gives its find spot as the temple of Amun. No further information is provided, but the head is listed alongside other finds including a dynastic sphinx and the statue of a queen, suggesting it came from a similar location.[311] With no further description, it can only be assumed Mariette meant the head came from within the temple itself. If the head originated from within the temple proper the only place this statue could be located is the forecourt, as no other space (the naos or halls) can be

[309] Raphia Decree: Simpson 1996, L35-37; Memphis Decree: Quirke & Andrews 1988, G L38-40; D L22-24; H L6-7; Second Philae: Muller 1920, H L13f-14e; D L11c-11h; First Philae: Müller 1920, H L9b-10a, D L9f-10d; Daumas 1952, 169-170; Simpson 1996.

[310] Canopus Decree: Bernand 1992, no.9; Simpson 1996; G L74-75; D L74.

[311] Mariette 1887, 15-16.

identified as holding sculpture during this period. The area identified as the forecourt of the temple of Amun is full of fragments of inscriptions (including the aforementioned Canopus decree), architecture, and sculpture.

A comparable location is known for the statue of Caracalla from the temple of Min at Koptos in Upper Egypt (**60**). This statue was found at the base of a set of stairs leading in to the temple in a small court-like area. Flinders Petrie suggested that the statue stood at the top of the stairs, defining the entrance. Also from the forecourts of Koptos come a fragment of a torso of Ptolemy III (**58**) and a fragment of the headdress of Arsinoe II (**59**). At Karnak a torso of a Ptolemy (**61**) was found as part of the Karnak Cachette in the seventh court of the temple. The accessibility of this material in the temple forecourt by the population is open to debate, but the statues were seen by the priests and elite, and were part of the rituals of the temple. All these statues point to the presence of Ptolemaic and Imperial royal sculpture in the forecourt of the Egyptian temple.

The other secure example for the placement of sculptural material at Tanis is the statuette of Ptolemy II (**25**). This statue was excavated by Petrie in front of a small shrine on the dromos of the temple. It is one of many royal statues to come from a temple dromos, including c.28 sphinxes (**42**) from the temple of Renenutet at Medinet Madi, two statues of late Ptolemies (**45-46**) from the temple of Soknebtunis at Tebtunis, a sphinx from Zaweit el-Amwat (**48**), and a statue of a Cleopatra from Karnak (**64**). This was a primary location for sculptural material. The dromos was the most highly visible part of the

temple. The statues placed there, such as this Ptolemy II, were the most accessible images of the temple, sculpture that could be interacted with. Evidence from the New Kingdom shows that royal and divine statues placed in such locations were the focus of cultic activity.[312] This statue of Ptolemy II (**25**) existed in a space so as to represent, and be a point of interaction with, him.

The role of the statue of Ptolemy II (and other material from the dromos of a temple) as an object for cultic interaction is further emphasised in its association not only with the temple of Amun, but also with a small Egyptian shrine. When Petrie excavated the area, he uncovered a structure interpreted by him as a shrine to Ptolemaic ruler cult based on the presence of this statue and two stelae depicting two Ptolemaic couples in a divine manner.[313] The statue was part of the construction and use of the shrine. Egyptian temple complexes were made up of numerous shrines and *naoi*, all of which commanded their own sculptural material.

C. Metropoleis

The second principal sites for the discovery of royal sculpture are the *metropoleis*, or major towns, of Egypt. In dynastic Egypt, the entire country was divided into administrative regions called nomes, each with its own capital. Little is known of these urban areas in the dynastic period. There is significantly more evidence from the Ptolemaic and Imperial periods, due to the excavation

[312] Habachi 1969, 17-19, 42-44, 49.

[313] Stelae: Ptolemy II & Arsinoe II - BM1056, *Cleopatra's Egypt* 1988, no.14, 103-104. Ptolemy IV & Arsinoe III - BM1054, *Cleopatra's Egypt* 1988, no.15, 105.

of sites such as Athribis in Lower Egypt. The majority of sculptural material from the *metropoleis* have been discovered without any architectural or immediate contextual framework. This means that, unlike material in the Egyptian temples, the statues of the *metropoleis* do not have direct contexts. It is necessary to understand the fabric of the towns in general in order to gain an idea of the setting of these statues.

During the Ptolemaic and Imperial periods, the towns of Egypt developed significantly, with the addition of Hellenic styles and culture creating a new fabric in Egypt. Though there were only three official Greek *poleis* (Alexandria, Naukratis, and Ptolemais Euergetis), papyri refer to the presence of Greek cultural institutions throughout the country, such as Gymnasia in Memphis and Thebes, Baths at Arsinoe and Philadelphia, and a Hippodrome in Herakleopolis Magna.[314] The Imperial period provides the majority of evidence concerning the *metropoleis* and their layout, especially the physical developments of the second century AD. These developments altered the make-up of towns to match other cities in the Roman east. The facilities and civic infrastructure, already in place in the Ptolemaic period, came to the fore. Excavations and papyri provide evidence for the construction of colonnaded *cardo* and *decumanus* streets, the primary streets around which everything grew, including stoai, gates, baths, temples, temples to imperial cult, tetrastylae, theatres, and bouleterea.[315]

[314] McKenzie 2007, 152-153.

[315] Bowman 2001, 179-82; McKenzie 2007, 154-60.

The best examples of these newly refurbished cities are found in Upper Egypt, particularly Hermopolis Magna and Oxyrhynchus. In Lower Egypt, the urban development is observed in the town of Athribis. Athribis was an ancient nome capital, with an Egyptian temple to Triphis. Recent Polish excavations have uncovered a large amount of the material and fabric of Athribis.[316] The material shows a shift in emphasis from (though not an abandonment of) the Egyptian temple in the west to the town in the east during the Ptolemaic and Imperial periods. The excavations have uncovered a large amount of ceramic material and several substantive Ptolemaic structures, including a villa containing sculptural fragments of several statues of Aphrodite.[317] There is also evidence for the development of Baths under Claudius and Nero, a colonnaded *cardo* and *decumanus* built in the mid-second century AD, a classical temple with Corinthian capitals, and the marble cornice and capital of a tetrastylon.[318]

The towns of Egypt provided the structures, amenities, and infrastructure required to place classical sculpture. Towns were the principal centres for representation in the Hellenistic and Roman period in the Greek East, and pivotal places for display include the agora, forum, theatre, baths, law courts, and gates.[319] These were places where statues were observed by the masses, and where events, meetings, and the business of the town took place.

[316] Mysliwiec & Herbich 1988; Mysliwiec 1992.

[317] Mysliwiec & Herbich 1988, 183; Mysliwiec 1992, 261.

[318] Alston 2002, 136-8; McKenzie 2007, 164.

[319] Smith 1988, 18-9; Fejfer 2008, 226-7; Stansbury-O'Donnell 2011, 134.

Examples of royal statues occupying such locations include the statue of Antiochus III in the council house at Teos, of Ptolemy III in an Athenian gymnasium, and the statues on the monumental gate at Perge that included emperors, their wives, founders of the city, and the dedicator's family.[320] Panhellenic and local sanctuaries were another area for display, for example the statues of Philip and his family in the Philippeion at Olympia, the column statues of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II dedicated by Kallikrates at Olympia, and the statue to Attalus II at Delphi.[321] The creation and dedication of royal statues was part of the dialogue between city and king.

The material from Egypt points to numerous towns providing the same contexts and placements for sculpture as towns did elsewhere in the ancient world. The principal evidence from Lower Egypt comes from Athribis where there are two heads, firstly a late Ptolemaic head identified through comparisons with seals from Edfu as Ptolemy IX/X (**33**), and secondly a colossal head of Hadrian (**34**). Neither of these statues was found within an architectural framework. The former statue has no find spot at all, while the latter was found in the north-west section of the town. Both heads suggest a placement in relation to the town. Athribis was a developed nome capital, complete with the necessary political and architectural infrastructure required to create these statues and place them within a specific context. The best example from the site of such a context is the non-royal representations of Aphrodite

[320] Antiochus III: Smith 1988, 19; Ptolemy Gymnasium: Pausanias I.17.2; Gate at Perge: Boatwright 2000, 64-5.

[321] Philippeion; Schultz 2009, 125-19; Statues: Hoepfner 1971, 11-54; Attalus II: Austin 1981, no.206.

from a shrine in the Ptolemaic villa, showing that such classical-style sculpture was placed in familiar locations.[322] The statue head of Hadrian (**34**) indicates the presence of monumental architecture at the site. Given the developments in Athribis during the second century AD, this statue was likely placed within its own structure, possibly a temple to Hadrian.[323]

Other material from *metropoleis* encounter the same problem. Though the material, such as the head of Arsinoe III from Bubastis (**31**), can be identified as belonging to towns, the statues are not situated within an architectural framework, and can only be identified as occupying a general context within the structures and locations of Hellenic-style towns.

This traditional placement of classical, non-royal, sculpture can be identified throughout the *metropoleis* of Egypt. From Hermopolis Magna in Upper Egypt are statue bases dedicated (in Greek) to Zeus Olympios and to a woman (Paullina?) set up by the city, demonstrating the presence of ideals and infrastructure typical of Greek towns.[324] The theatre at Oxyrhynchus, excavated by Petrie, was found to be decorated with colossal marble statues, most likely representing the Muses.[325] The classical temple of Serapis at Luxor had a classical-style Isis statue (fig. 20). These examples show that the erection of Greek-style statuary reflects practice found elsewhere in the Greek world and suggests that for the placement of statues in the *metropoleis* traditional contexts

[322] Mysliwiec & Herbich 1988, 183; Mysliwiec 1992, 261.

[323] Fejfer 2008, 427.

[324] Bernand 1999, no. 16 & 17.

[325] Petrie 2007, 52.

were used. The heads of the Ptolemaic and Imperial rulers stood in the same contexts as their Hellenistic cousins.

D. Other contexts

Examples of royal sculpture have been identified in three other context types, in graves, villages, and reused. Generally the examples are closely associated with other locations.

The first context regards the material found in graves. Three statues are identified as coming from tomb deposits, the Paraitonion head of Ptolemy IX found in a hypogeum tomb (**1**), the head of Arsinoe II from a crocodile tomb at Abu Rawash (**38**), and the plaster head of a first century BC Ptolemy found in a deposit outside an earlier tomb in Saqqara (**40**). All are part of ancient dumps, and are associated with other contexts. The Paraitonion head (**1**) is thought to have come from the nearby Hellenistic town of Paraitonion. A tomb is an unusual location for the placement of such imagery, and the head is better associated with the *metropolis* context where it could stand in a temple or agora. The head of Arsinoe II (**38**) has a closer association with the wider religious context of the site where it was found. The crocodile tomb is one part of a larger religious area and required the same imagery as the Egyptian temple, so this head can be associated with that general space. Only the plaster head of a late Ptolemy (**40**) was found where it was originally placed. This is a sculptor's model, identifiable from the painted lines on the eyes and face, and was found with a collection of other models including both Egyptian-and Greek-style

material. The deposit as a whole demonstrates the presence of a workshop in Saqqara that produced sculptures of the Ptolemaic kings as well as other images, and provides an insight into the creation and disposal of such images.

There is only one example of a royal statue from a village. From the site of Karanis in the Fayoum comes a head of a Ptolemy, found in one of the houses (**41**). There are no other examples for the solely domestic placement of royal imagery, though the priestly decrees refer to the creation of shrines by the people and at some temple sites domestic dwellings reached the temenos walls.[326]

Many statues, especially inscribed bases and plinths, are found reused. The base for a statue of Arsinoe III at Canopus (**5**) was reused as a step, and the base for the statues of Ptolemy VI (**67**) was found reused as the back of a bench for a boutique in Aswan. For such finds, an original placement is impossible to determine, though from the surrounding sites and epigraphic evidence a general provenance can be ascribed. The base of Arsinoe III can be associated with a temple given the ruins it was found close to and that it was dedicated by a 'priest of the Nile', while the reference to Isis and Horus on the base of Ptolemy VI (**67**) suggests it belongs on the island sanctuary of Isis on Philae.

[326] Canopus Decree: Bernand 1992, no.9; Simpson 1996; G L65; D L65; Raphia Decree: Simpson 1996, L41-42; Memphis Decree: Quirke & Andrews 1988, G L52-53; D L31-32; H L13-14.

E. Categories and context

In focusing on the placement of statues it is possible to identify a number of patterns relating to style and site.

The first pattern to note is the difference in the available material between the regions of Egypt. The material evidence is not evenly spread throughout each area, and there are significant differences in style and place (see Table 1). Firstly, there is the emphasis in the material of the Ptolemaic pharaonic statue, which outweighs all other statue styles everywhere but in Alexandria. Secondly, there is the distribution of Egyptian statues with Greek features. Despite the focus on this statue style in previous scholarship, there are few examples with good contexts, and the statues are found in only three areas in the whole country. The Egyptian statues with Roman features also display an unusual pattern, with the surviving seven concentrated in Lower and Upper Egypt at key temple sites. Finally, while the number of Greek-style images is equally distributed throughout the kingdom, the concentration of Imperial sculpture is in Alexandria and Upper Egypt. The reasons for these distribution patterns are partially due to accident of evidence and focus of excavation (especially the Egyptian material as the Egyptian temples are a focus for excavation), but they also point to a regional emphasis in stylistic representation. The geographical distribution of statue style suggests that different areas of Egypt were approached in different ways.

The primary pattern to emerge from the evidence of Lower Egypt itself is that Egyptian royal sculpture usually comes from the Egyptian temple and the Greek-and Imperial-style sculpture is typically found in the *metropoleis*. This pattern can be observed in the examples used in the discussion of each type of site. All the material identified as coming from the temple of Amun at Tanis is Egyptian style (**23-26**), as is the material from the sites of Pithom (**29**) and Heliopolis (**35-37**). Even Egyptian statues with Greek/Roman features follow this pattern, seen with the Caracallas from the temple of Amun at Tanis (**26**) and the temple of Banebdjedet at Mendes (**27**). Meanwhile, material associated with the *metropoleis* includes a Ptolemy (**33**) and Hadrian (**34**) from Athribis and the Arsinoe III from Bubastis (**31**), all of which are classical in style. This pattern is repeated throughout Egypt, with the sites of Medinet Madi (**42-44**), Koptos (**56-60**), and Karnak (**61-65**) all home to pharaonic material and those of Hermopolis Magna (**49-52**) and Aphroditopolis (**53-54**) to Greek-and Imperial-style representation.

There are several examples within the evidence presented here that do not fit this pattern exactly. The material from Canopus (**2-16**), almost entirely Egyptian in style, was primarily found in a dump, and though close to a temple-like structure, could have originated from anywhere in the town.[327] Herakleion-Thonis also provides material that is not associated with a temple site (**19**).[328] Are these statues actually part of a town context? In many ways they are, but this is not simple. The plan and structures of both sites is not the same as those of the *metropolis* of Athribis; there is no *cardo* or *decumanus*. Both sites

[327] Goddio 2007; Libonati, 2010.

[328] Goddio 2007; Libonati, 2010.

did have classical-style features; Canopus provides evidence of baths, mosaics, and Greek-style shrines, providing a context for the few examples of Greek-style material (**2 & 4**). But the towns themselves do not conform to the *metropoleis* pattern of Egypt or the classical world. Both sites demonstrate a clear Egyptian disposition in their material finds. While providing a 'town' context, the sites of Canopus and Herkleion-Thonis do so in a different way to the *metropleis* of Egypt.

The head of Hadrian from Athribis (**34**) also raises questions. The head was discovered in the vicinity of the dynastic temple to Triphis. There is a question as to whether the head should be associated with this space, flanking the doors of the temple alongside a line of sphinxes? There are several arguments against this suggestion, primarily the nature of Athribis during the period of discovery. The site was a jumble of blocks, making it difficult to associate finds with specific find spots. There is also other evidence that points to the presence of Imperial structures and statues located close to dynastic temples. This is observed at both Karnak and Philae, where imperial cult temples and images were erected along the dromos (see Chapter 3). It is possible that this head was part of a similar context, in a classical Roman structure, built purposefully for a cult and colossal statue of Hadrian, and placed adjacent to the Egyptian temple.

Final consideration must be given to the first century BC plaster head from Saqqara (**40**), and to other (non-royal) material from that site. The head was found in a mixed dump of Egyptian and Greek material, all from the

same workshop.[329] This suggests that in at least one area, two forms of stylistic material were being produced together. It raises the question as to whether there was a context where the two styles, Greek and Egyptian, were placed side-by-side. The bust, while being produced alongside classical material, cannot be defined as serving in such a context. Saqqara is home to one example of such placement. The dromos of the Egyptian-style Serapeum was decorated with Dionysiac imagery, in keeping with the god's Hellenised form. Bergmann suggests that one of the statue heads from this group can be identified as a Ptolemaic king; though Lauer and Picard note it is extremely worn and lacks the iconography for secure identification (it could represent a Dionysiac figure).[330] This is a distinctive site, and, alongside the Ptolemaic bust, raises further questions concerning the relationship between style and context. If the fragment were a Ptolemaic head, it would provide a unique view, surrounded by classical imagery and yet set within a larger Egyptian context. Given its position on the dromos of Serapis, an Egyptian god absorbed into Greek culture, it is possible this is a special case, highlighting the uniqueness of this particular god. Within non-royal material culture in Egypt, there are many examples of side-by-side material, and even some that combine Egyptian and Greek or Roman motifs. This varies throughout the country, and it does not appear to extend to large-scale royal sculpture.

[329] Emery 1970, 10; Hastings 1997.

[330] Lauer & Picard 1955, 259-260; Bergmann 2007, 246-263; McKenzie 2007, 119-120.

F. Lower Egypt: Conclusion

From this analysis of the material that has identifiable provenance from Lower Egypt collected here, it is possible to establish the primary contextual sites for the placement of royal sculpture of the Ptolemaic and Imperial period. The statues are found in the religious and urban areas of Egypt, in the Egyptian temple and the Greek *metropoleis*. In relation to the temple, the location for such imagery is typically the forecourts, gates, and *dromoi* of the sanctuaries. In this capacity they follow dynastic patterns of royal sculptural placement. The rulers also were only represented in Egyptian style in these sites. The Greek-and Roman-style material is found in the towns. Due to the lack of evidence, it is difficult to identify the exact placement of material in the *metropoleis*. The archaeological and papyrological evidence of the towns provide an insight into their make-up and allows the deduction that royal imagery placed there occupied traditional classical contexts.

CHAPTER 5: THE FAYOUM

The Fayoum, an oasis located to the west of the Nile approximately 100 km south of Cairo, is a unique area within Egypt due to its position, agriculture, and material evidence (Map 4).[331] Centred on Lake Moeris, which is responsible for its fertility, the region provides some of the best material evidence for the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. Under Ptolemy II the region was the focus of economic policies aimed at creating more agricultural land and providing space for settlers including Greek immigrants, veterans, and native Egyptians. This diversity was sustained into the Roman Empire which continued the practice of establishing veterans in the area. The archaeological material from the region includes hoards of papyri, mummy portraits, figurines, mud brick houses, and evidence of crocodile cults.[332]

From the Fayoum comes a small group of six statuary items from three distinct sites. A limestone head from the northern village of Karanis (**41**), a number (c.28) of sphinxes (**42**) and two Ptolemaic heads (**43 & 44**) from the temple of Medinet Madi, and two standing statues and one inscribed base (**45 & 46 A & B)** from the temple at Tebtunis. These items are all Ptolemaic, have detailed find spots, and each site has been thoroughly excavated. Though there is extensive evidence concerning the Roman Fayoum, there are no surviving Imperial images. I begin by discussing the statue head from Karanis, which provides an insight into the place of Ptolemaic imagery in a non-public location.

[331] For general background to the history & archaeology of the Fayoum see: Bowman 1986, 121-164; Wilfong 1999, 308-312; Bagnall 2000, 26-29; *OEAE* 2001, 96-7; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 127; Rowlandson 2005; Mueller 2006.

[332] Wilfong 1999, 309-311; Walker 2000; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 128.

I then consider the temple sites of Medinet Madi and Tebtunis together, focusing on the different elements that composed the context of the royal statues, and discussing the placement of Egyptian statues with Greek features and their purpose within the wider scheme of Ptolemaic sculpture.

A. Karanis: A domestic context

Karanis is a large village site on the northern side of the Fayoum, approximately 75 km from Cairo.[333] During ten years of excavation by the University of Michigan in the 1920s, five discrete layers of occupation dating from the third century BC to the fifth century AD were discovered, with material including mud brick houses (fig. 26), two Roman era Egyptian temples, a Roman bathhouse, papyri, and figurines of Greek and Egyptian deities, such as a bronze Zeus wearing an Atef crown (fig. 27).[334] A Greek-style limestone statue head (**41**) from the site has been identified by the Kelsey Museum as representing a Ptolemaic king, due to the fleshiness of the face and the presence of a diadem.[335] The head was found in an Antonine layer in House 84.

This Ptolemaic head has been identified by Elaine Gazda as originally standing in a wall niche within House 84.[336] The wall niche is a common feature of the houses of Karanis, and they functioned as a location for

[333] Excavation Reports: Gazda 1978; Gazda 2004: General Discussion of the site: Alston 1995, 117-142; Alston 2002, 52-8; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 131.

[334] Gazda 1978.

[335] Gazda 1978, no.37.

[336] Gazd, 1978, no.37.

the placement and display of such images. A selection of Ptolemaic style Aphrodite statues are also interpreted as occupying these niches.[337] The Ptolemaic head can be included alongside these statues as a classical-style representation of an important (divine?) figure within a home.

The statue occupied a domestic context, and was part of the decoration and fabric of the household. What is striking about the material from Karanis is that both Egyptian and Greek motifs are brought together. This 'mixing' of cultural styles is observed in the bronze Zeus wearing an Atef crown (fig. 27), and is also reflected in the ethnicity and relations of the population of the town; papyri point to a mixture of Greeks, Egyptians, and Romans, and suggest there was little concern about ethnic divisions showing that in the domestic sphere the line between the three cultures was blurred.[338] The Ptolemaic head (**41**) was surrounded by a range of 'mixed' style imagery, in a place where such imagery and 'mixing' was the norm. This evidence stands in contrast to what can be observed in royal sculpture in general, showing that in the public sphere different ideas concerning display existed.

B.1. Medinet Madi and Tebtunis

Medinet Madi and Tebtunis are two sites located approximately 15 km from each other in the southern part of the Fayoum (Map 4). Both sites are dominated by their temples and were excavated in the 1930s; Medinet Madi by Achille

[337] Gazda 1978 – Aphrodite examples no. 18 & 19; Zeus no.47.

[338] Zeus: Gazda 1978, no.47; Papyri: Alston 1995, 138.

Vogliano and Tebtunis by Carlo Anti and Gilbert Bagnani.[339] Both sites received additions to their temples throughout the Ptolemaic and Imperial periods, including kiosks, *deipneteria* (dining rooms), and sculpture. The sites also contain substantial remains of structures and other material such as shops, houses, and temples (cat sites. 17 & 18).

The two sites provide a small group of royal sculpture, all Egyptian statues with Greek features. From Medinet Madi comes a collection of approximately twenty-eight sphinxes, many representing the king in traditional Egyptian form with Greek facial features (**42**), but also including a number of female headed sphinxes.[340] There is also a head wearing a *nemes* most likely belonging to another sphinx (**43**), and a diademed head from the rubble layer inside the temple (**44**), the diadem suggests it represents a Ptolemaic king, though its features are similar to the striding draped males from this period.[341] From Tebtunis comes a standing, faceless king (**45**), a larger striding king (**46A**), and the now lost statue base inscribed to Ptolemy XII (**46B**) associated with the latter statue due to its find spot. Alongside these statues from Tebtunis there was found a full-length striding male (fig. 28), as well as a number of sculptured lions and stelae.[342] These are two of the best preserved sites in the region, and provide the best evidence for considering the relationship between environment and statue.

[339] Medinet Madi: Vogliano 1936; Vogliano 1937; Vogliano 1942; Tebtunis: Rondot 1997; Rondot 2004.

[340] Stanwick 2002, 23-4.

[341] Bianchi 1978; Rondot 2004, 139-141.

[342] Rondot 1997, 105.

B.2. Location and Environment

The typical locations for royal statuary in Egyptian temples in these periods have been identified as along the dromoi, flanking entrances, and within the open courts.[343] The material from Medinet Madi and Tebtunis are consistent with this pattern. Both the statues and base (**45 & 46 A & B)** from Tebtunis were discovered at the end of the dromos of the temple, defining the vestibule (fig. 29).[344] The sphinxes from Medinet Madi (**42**) lined the dromos of the temple. The statue head (**43**) from Medinet Madi comes from a rubble deposit within the 12th Dynasty temple. There is no reason to suppose that it did not belong to the dromos or courts.

A primary aspect concerning the context of the royal statues was that they did not exist at these sites in isolation. At Tebtunis and Medinet Madi the spaces inhabited by royal statues were shared by other imagery, including other royal statues. From Tebtunis come two significantly different royal examples, one small (**45**) and one large (**46A**), each representing a different king, as well as a number of sphinxes.[345] These statues did not stand directly next to each other, but they shared the same general space. The sphinxes of Medinet Madi (**42**) functioned in the same way, defining space and influencing the positioning of other material. Not only were these statues surrounded by other royal Ptolemies, but also by earlier kings. From Medinet Madi come examples of 12th Dynasty statuary. The presence of dynastic material is observed at the temples of Upper Egypt, especially at Koptos and Karnak. The

[343] Arnold 1999b, 41-9; Robins 2001, 34-42; Kjølby 2007, 231-44.

[344] Rondot 2004, 136-9.

[345] Rondot 2004, 136-7.

presence of other royal sculpture, from both the distant and immediate past, establishes a link between royal statues; they directly influence the placement of material at the site, and act as links to the past and history of Egypt.

The sculpture of a temple was not confined to royal statuary. From Tebtunis comes a fully preserved striding draped male, a distinctive statue type that has been much discussed, particularly by Robert Bianchi.[346] It was a type present at a number of temple sites, alongside examples of priest and scribe statues.[347] The presence of this statue continues the tradition of the elite placing statues of themselves in the temples. The striding male from Tebtunis was found on the dromos in front of the *deipneteria*.[348] Alongside these statues were others, of gods and animals (lions), placed there as part of the traditional make-up of the temple.[349] The presence of this material creates a distinctive statuary landscape within and around Egyptian temples. The royal statues were part of that. The royal statues of the Ptolemies, and the emperors in cases outside of the Fayoum, shared this space with earlier kings, with the elite, and with other representations. These statues contributed to the temple, and were an intrinsic part of context.

Sculpture was not the only thing to surround the temple, and at most sites throughout Egypt other structures closely linked to its ability to function are present outside the temenos. Along the dromoi of Medinet Madi

[346] Bianchi 1978; Rondot 2004, 139-42.

[347] Goyon et al 2004.

[348] Rondot 2004, 139-41.

[349] Rondot 1997, 105; Arnold 1999, 144a.

and Tebtunis stood shrines, dining rooms, and kiosks. These structures were part of the temple make-up, especially the dining rooms which acted as places for congregation, ritual, and celebration. These structures were also used for the positioning of statuary. A statue can be placed in front of a structure to add definition to it, because it is aesthetically pleasing, and because it was the best place to be seen. Examples of this include the striding draped male discussed above and the statuette of Ptolemy II from Tanis (**25**). This concept need not only be considered in relation to structures that exist when the statue is erected, but also in relation to later structures. Vincent Rondot suggests that the royal statues at Tebtunis (**45-46A**) lack bases because they were moved and re-used as part of reconstruction during the Roman period. This demonstrates not only that the surrounding structures have a direct impact on a statue (no matter when erected), but also shows the reuse of imagery.

The temples should not be thought of in isolation. Structures surrounded and encroached upon them. At Medinet Madi (and Karnak), the dromos was lined with domestic houses, and the temple was bordered by a portico and other classical structures that were built to directly relate to the temple.[350] The temples were closely engrained in their physical environment, and therefore so were their statues. The spaces around temples were meant to be used, and so the statues were viewed constantly, not only by those using the temple itself, but by those going about their business in the vicinity.

[350] Medinet Madi: Vogliano 1936; Vogliano 1938; Vogliano 1942; Tebtunis: Rondot 1997; Rondot 2004.

B.3. Egyptian statues with Greek features

One of the significant aspects of the sculptures from Medinet Madi (**43-44**) and Tebtunis (**45-46**) is that they are all Egyptian statues with Greek features, and have all been found in relation to an Egyptian temple, fitting into the traditional forms and usual spaces associated with Egyptian royal statues. This places them contextually within an Egyptian environment, and further underpins the idea put forward by Bert Smith that these are Egyptian statues with Greek additions, rather than a 'mixed' image.[351]

These statues existed in contexts composed of Greek and Roman structures, including pylons and porticoes, bath houses, and inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca that used Greek alongside Demotic. These features point to the presence or influence of Greek ideas and material in the Fayoum. The statues stood in what can only be described as an 'Egyptian' context, though the wider environment of these locations was influenced by other factors. Therefore their context is one with multiple cultural levels.

The best example is the statue and base of Ptolemy XII (**46 A & B**) from Tebtunis. The statue displays the traditional iconography of Egyptian art and pharaonic representation: it is frontal and wears the *nemes* and *shendyt*. Yet the statue includes Greek features - most notably the facial features, but also the accompanying inscription as identified and discussed by Guido Bastianini and Claudio Gallazzi.[352] This inscription is reminiscent of a number of honorary

[351] Smith 1988, 86-7.

[352] Bastianini & Gallazzi 1989.

dedications made in the Hellenistic kingdoms at this time, suggesting that whoever set it up was familiar with this practice. Bastianini and Gallazzi suggest that the dedicator was the village itself, or the elite, attempting to curry favour with the newly returned king.[353] The statue and inscription together demonstrates the use of two cultural traditions by the community of Tebtunis during the first century BC, and shows that the positioning of Egyptian imagery alongside Greek ideas and language was acceptable and practised.

There are still questions as to why Egyptian statues with Greek features with provenances are only found at the sites of Medinet Madi and Tebtunis, (and Alexandria and Canopus), despite the presence of Greek settlers throughout Egypt and evidence for the presence of Greek and Egyptian culture side-by-side in other areas, of gymnasia, Greeks in Egyptian temples, and the use of dual names.[354] The answer lies in the Fayoum, and its unique position within Ptolemaic and Imperial Egypt. The material it provides is different to elsewhere, not only in its preservation, but also in its nature, due to the larger concentration of immigrants, its economic focus, and prosperity. These factors led to the Fayoum creating a more cohesive and original popular culture, which expressed itself differently to elsewhere in Egypt.

From considering the environment it is possible to see the impact of this unique cultural diaspora on the statues. The statues were engrained in a complex context that influenced their style and the nature of their location.

[353] Bastianini & Gallazzi 1989.

[354] Gymnasium: McKenzie 2004, 152; Dual names: Clarysse 1995; Greek inscriptions: Łatjar 2006, 80-86.

Despite this, the context of the statues in the Fayoum was, at its most basic level, Egyptian, and the statues were primarily Egyptian statues located in a traditional Egyptian temple context, though one in which Greek imagery and culture was also present. This raises a number of questions concerning the link between style and context and suggests that it is typically the principal context that dictates the primary style of the statuary, such as an Egyptian temple or a Greek agora. The placement of a statue into the context it did not fit aesthetically, traditionally, or conceptually was unlikely. Therefore, in the Fayoum where the temple was the major monument, yet there was a unique cultural group of inhabitants, the statues erected were primarily Egyptian, with inserted Greek features so as to fully display, and reflect, the monarch and the community.

B.4. Audience and Ethnicity

A major feature of the debate surrounding Egyptian statues with Greek features has been the question of audience - were the statues created for a specific group? Audience is a pivotal concept for understanding context. In scholarship, there has been a concept of 'Egyptian' statues for Egyptians and 'Greek' statues for Greeks. Yet this concept is clearly untenable. Within the Fayoum, at Medinet Madi and Tebtunis, classical structures surround the Egyptian monuments, indicating the presence of classical ideas, and that there were individuals of such a sensibility coming into contact with the Egyptian temple. The statue and base of Ptolemy XII (**46 A & B**) demonstrates this. This is also seen in the graffiti, names, and inscriptions found at other temples.[355] Outside the Fayoum there are

[355] Rutherford 2003; Lajtar 2006.

examples of Greek structures beside Egyptian ones, the Serapeum at Saqqara and the classical shrines outside the temples of Luxor, Karnak and Philae.[356] There is also the question of how one would ensure a particular group saw a particular image. There was a certain amount of movement between cultural areas and any individual would have been able to see any statuary outside the temples of Medinet Madi and Tebtunis. It is difficult to continue the concept that one type of statuary, and one type of context, was favoured by one ethnicity. Even more so as the work of scholars such as Jean Bingen has demonstrated how difficult it is to pin-down concepts of ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt.[357]

C. The Fayoum: Conclusion

The royal sculpture from the Fayoum is a small group of material, but it shows that there is a direct relationship between context and statue, and that one informs the other in a multitude of ways.

The limestone head from House 84 at Karanis provides a domestic context illustrating the differences between public and private art forms. The material from Medinet Madi and Tebtunis demonstrates that the areas identified as locations of statues in Lower Egypt are to be found throughout the country. Building upon this, the material shows that statues at such sites did not exist in isolation, either from other statues, structures, or individuals. Context was a rich tapestry of features, and the royal statues both occupied this space, and were an integral part of it. In relation to the style of

[356] Lauer & Picard 1955, 259-260; Bergmann 2007, 246-263; McKenzie 2007, 119-120.

[357] Bingen 2007.

statues used, it becomes clear that context generally played a significant role in how statues were understood, and this influenced what style should be erected.

CHAPTER 6: UPPER EGYPT

The region of Upper Egypt consists of the southern two-thirds of the country from Herakleopolis Magna to Philae (including the area sometimes designated as Middle Egypt – Map 5). Due to the nature of the landscape, the major sites cling to the Nile, with a number of ports, quarries and trade routes leading to and from that area and the Red Sea. For much of the dynastic period, Upper Egypt held the centres of political, administrative, and religious power. With the establishment of the Ptolemaic dynasty, this power was greatly reduced, not only because of the relocation of political and religious emphasis to Alexandria and Memphis, but also due to a series of revolts and rebellions in the region from the second century BC onwards.

Upper Egypt provides twenty-six statuary items with an identifiable provenance, fourteen Ptolemaic (twelve Egyptian-style and two Greek-style) and twelve Imperial statues (seven traditional Imperial images, including inscribed bases, four Egyptian statues with Roman features, and the single tetrastylon dedicated to Marcus Aurelius **52**). Upper Egypt provides some of the best evidence for Ptolemaic and Imperial constructions, due to substantial temple remains and papyrus documents.

The focus of this chapter is on how the different categories of royal statues functioned within their contexts. I follow the patterns of distribution established in Lower Egypt and divide the material between the *metropolis* and the Egyptian temple. I begin by discussing the town and material

of Hermopolis Magna. I then take a broad approach to the Egyptian Temples, establishing the function of the royal statues, discussing the presence of Greek inscriptions accompanying Egyptian-style statues, and representations of the emperors in the temples. I end by considering the head of Augustus from Meroe, not a statue from Egypt, yet informative regarding the nature of context.

A.1. Hermopolis Magna and royal statues in classical towns

The *metropolis* of Hermopolis Magna, modern El-Ashmunein, is centrally located in the Nile valley, approximately 100 km south of Oxyrhynchus.[358] From the dynastic period it was a religious centre, home to a major temple to the god Thoth. Hermopolis Magna provides material evidence for Ptolemaic and Imperial towns through the so-called Repairs Papyrus. This is a report to the senate of the city from AD 264 by Aurelius Appianus that lists the buildings in need of maintenance along Antinoe St and the surrounding area.[359] This list refers to the Sun Gate, the north stoai, the first tetrastylon, the arch, the gate of the temple of Aphrodite, the temple of Tyche, the Great Tetrastylon, the tetrastylon of Athena, stoai, and the Moon Gate. And along a second street: a temple of Hadrian, a south-west stoa, the market building and stoa, the stoa near the agora, the temple of Serapis by the Nile, the *komasterion* (procession house), east and west *nymphaea* (fountain houses), and the temple of Tyche.[360] Other

[358] For Hermopolis Magna: Alston 2002, 238-242; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 162-167; *Excavations at El-Ashmunein vols I-V*: especially Spencer 1989; Bailey 1991; Spencer 1993; McKenzie 2007, 158-160.

[359] *Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten X* 1971, No.10299 (P. Vindob gr 12565).

[360] Bailey 1991, 57-59; McKenzie 2007, 158.

papyri documents supplement this list with structures from around the city, including temples to Apollo, Asklepios, Bastet, the Dioskouri, three to Serapis, Faustina, Alexander Severus and Julia Mamaea, a Sebasteion, and a Kaisereion.[361] As well as a council house, a town hall, a library, and a complex composed of the Baths of Hadrian, the gymnasium, and the Great Serapeum.[362]

The site has been visited, explored, and recorded since the 19th century, but the principal excavations were undertaken by A. Jeffrey Spencer and Donald Bailey in the 1980s.[363] Finds from the site consist of a range of architectural blocks and foundations for a variety of structures along the two main streets of the town (cat site. 21). The most substantial remains include the foundations and architectural remains of a classical-style structure, including Doric and Corinthian architectural features and a Greek architrave inscription dated to 240 BC that reads:

> βασιλεῖ Πτο|λεμαίωι τῶι Πτολεμαίου κα|ὶ Ἀρσινόης, Θεῶν
> Ἀδελφῶν. καὶ Β|ασιλίσσηι Βερενίκηι τῆι ἀδελφῆι α|ὐτοῦ καὶ γυναικὶ
> Θεοῖς Εὐεργέτ|αις, καὶ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ Ἀρσινόηι Θ|εοῖς Ἀδελφοῖς τὰ
> ἀγάλματα κ|αὶ τὸν ναὸν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐντὸ|ς τοῦ τεμένους|
> καί τὴν στο|[ά]ν, οἱ τασσόμενοι ἐν τῶι Ἑρμο|πολίτηι νομῶι
> κάτοικοι ἱππε[ῖ]|ς. εὐεργεσίας ἕνεκεν τῆς εἰς αὐτούς.

> "To King Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the brother-and-sister gods, and to queen Berenike, his sister and wife, the benefactor gods, and to Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the brother-and-sister gods, the cavalry settlers stationed in the Hermopolite nome (have dedicated) the statues

[361] Bailey 1991, 57-59; McKenzie 2007, 158.

[362] McKenzie 2007, 158.

[363] Spencer & Bailey 1984a; 1984b; Spencer 1989; 1993; Bailey 1991.

and the temple and the rest inside the sacred precinct and the stoa for the benefactions shown to them."[364]

Alongside this temple there are also the remains of the *komasterion* or procession house. Enough of this structure has been uncovered to create a reconstruction showing it had Corinthian capitals and a Roman style entrance.[365] The *komasterion* as a building type appears to have only existed in Roman Egypt.[366] Numerous other fragments (more capitals) have also been found, including a partial Corinthian capital belonging to the tetrastylon of Marcus Aurelius (**52**).[367] The town of Hermopolis Magna, despite the presence of a dynastic temple to the Egyptian god Thoth, sounds like a typical classical city in the Repairs Papyri and looks like one in the archaeological record.

As a town, Hermopolis Magna is not alone. From Oxyrhynchus comes a similar papyrus listing a number of the same structures along the main streets, including: temples to Tyche and Achilles, Demeter, Dionysus, and Hadrian, a record office, a market, baths, stoai, and a variety of tradesmen's shops and schools.[368] Other papyri add to the picture, referring to other temples and gymnasia. The archaeological evidence further emphasises the nature of the town, including the theatre excavated by Flinders Petrie, which held

[364] For Hermpolis Magna: Alston 2002, 238-242; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 162-167; *Excavations at El-Ashmunein vols I-V*: especially Spencer 1989; Bailey 1991; Spencer 1993; Mckenzie 2007, 56-58 & 158-160: For Inscription: Bernand 1999, no.1.

[365] Spencer & Bailey 1986, 231-7; Bailey 1990, 125-6; Alston 2002, 238-242; McKenzie 2007, 159-60.

[366] McKenzie 2007, 159.

[367] Spencer & Bailey 1984, 45-6; Spencer 1989, 74.

[368] *Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXIV* 1997, No.4441; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 158-61; McKenzie 2007, 160-63; Bowman et al 2007.

approximately 11000 people, and included a number of classical statues, most likely representing the Muses.[369] There are also two tetrastylae identified at the site, one with an inscription to Phocas (most likely erected earlier) and another recorded by Vivant Denon.[370] Similarly, Antinoopolis contained a number of these structures, as well as a *cardo* and *decumanus*, Ionic buildings, Doric colonnades, and a theatre.[371] Not every town in Roman Egypt developed this way, but neither was Hermopolis Magna a singular example. Rather it should be seen as fairly typical of the major centres of Roman Egypt.

A.2. Hermopolis Magna: Statue context

From Hermopolis Magna come three royal statues, a head of Berenike II (**49**), the torso of an emperor, possibly Hadrian (**50**), and a head of Antoninus Pius (**51**), as well as the column and inscription of part of a tetrastylon to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (**52**). Only the head of Berenike II (**49**) and the tetrastylon (**52**) have discussable contexts.

The head of Berenike II (**49**) (also discussed in Chapter 3) is a high quality work that demonstrates time and effort had gone into its creation (for instance, the marble was imported). It belongs in a suitably high standard context. If the head had been found in a space outside Egypt, at Pergamon or Priene for example, it would be associated with a major temple or some other fitting location. At Hermopolis Magna, the head is associated with the temple to the *Theoi Adelphoi* and *Theoi Euergetai*. The architrave inscription from the

[369] Petrie 2007; Coles 2007, 10.
[370] Bailey 1990, 130-33; Bailey 1991, 30; Coles 2007, 10.
[371] Alston 2008, 242-244; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 169-172; McKenzie 2007, 154-8.

sanctuary refers to the dedication of *agalmata* alongside the physical structures, and this term can refer to large-scale imagery. The context of the head of Berenike II was a large temple complex, using classical architectural features, and placed within a Hellenic town. This head most likely formed part of a group with other images from the site, providing a representation of the Ptolemaic dynasty within a typical Hellenistic framework.

It is the tetrastylon of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (**52**) that provides a specific context from the site.[372] A number of Roman era tetrastylae and column monuments exist within Egypt, the most well-known being the Column of Diocletian in Alexandria. The tetrastylae occupy classical contexts and enhance them with representations of the emperors. The other *metropoleis* surrounding Hermopolis Magna also possess tetrastylae. Antinoopolis and Oxyrhynchus both contain a group dating to the second century AD.[373] These monuments form a significant part of town structure and display within Egypt from the second century AD onwards. Their role in displaying the Emperor, his family, and his successors, was an important one.

In Hermopolis Magna, the Repairs Papyrus refers to three separate examples of tetrastylae, the First Tetrastylon, the Tetrastylon of Athena, and the Great Tetrastylon. It is the Great Tetrastylon that is of interest. This has been associated with a now missing dedicatory inscription to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (**52**), and a partial large Corinthian capital and column drum,

[372] Bailey 1990, 127-33; Bailey 1991, 29-32.

[373] Bailey 1990, 127-33; Bailey 1991, 30-32.

both with lewis holes, excavated by Bailey and Spencer.[374] All three items were found in the same vicinity, outside the eastern walls of the portico of the Great Basilica, around the intersection of the Dromos of Hermes and Antinoe Street. This is the location of the Great Tetrastylon seen in the Repairs Papyrus. It is Bailey who identifies these finds with the monument, stressing not only their location, but also the size of the capital and column drum, which are suitable for a tetrastylon. Bailey also compares the capital and drum with other material from the site, particularly fragments from the *komasterion*. These comparisons date the capital to the second half of the second century AD.[375] Though no statue survives there is little doubt that one stood atop the structure. The size of the Corinthian capital shows this is possible, and as Bailey states "the statue placed on the Hermopolis tetrastylon must have been truly colossal."[376] These fragments are all that remain of the larger monument, which entailed four columns standing at the four corners of the intersecting streets.

This description of the monument (**52**) provides a specific location. The tetrastylon was placed at the very centre of the town, surrounded by classical structures, with stoai and temples on all sides. The temple to Thoth was nearby, but the structure, and its statues, were clearly embedded in the 'Roman' part of the town. As part of the character of the town, the tetrastylon is a distinctive monument, and a classical one with its Corinthian capital and acanthus base. Such columns have a history in the classical landscape, from

[374] Bailey 1991, 29-32.

[375] Bailey 1991, 29-32.

[376] Bailey 1991, 31.

those of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II at Olympia through to those of the tetrarchs at Graret Gser el-Trab.[377] This column is both part of the external fabric of the classical town, and supports the distinctive classical context of the statue.

A.3. Statue function in the Metropoleis

Royal statues existed with a primary function - to represent the king, queen, or emperor. Specifically, individual statues or statue groups aimed at representing certain ideas concerning individuals - their lineage, their abilities, their personality. The statues of the Hellenistic kings provide some of the best illustrations of this, such as employing rams' horns to demonstrate strength and divine associations. In the material from Egypt and the *metropoleis*, this function is shown in the statue from Aphroditopolis (**53**). The statue is a typical representation of Hellenistic kingship, displaying a nude king with a portrait face holding a spear or sceptre and wearing the *chlamys*. It contains a host of ideas that dictate its meaning and context. It is a statue about conquest and the right to rule, presented using Hellenistic conventions. It may not be as fine or distinctive as the "Terme Ruler", but it is the same basic image, and is wrapped in the same group of cultural messages.[378] All these Greek-and Imperial-style marble statues from Egypt are the same in this respect, they are part of this visual language and represent the monarchs in that classical vocabulary.

The statues from Hermopolis Magna show that the royal statues of the *metropoleis* are part of the dialogue between monarch and town. This is observed in the dedication of the temple to the *Theoi Adelphoi* and *Theoi*

[377] Bailey 1991, 30.

[378] Smith 1988, cat no. 44; Smith 1991, 19-20.

Euergetai and the associated head of Berenike (**49**). This monument and statue were created by the local population and dedicated specifically to the monarchs, demonstrating a direct form of communication. This is also illustrated in the base dedicated to Ptolemy XII (**46B**) from Tebtunis in the Fayoum. These statues were part of the dialogue between town and king, an intrinsic part of the relationship between ruler and ruled during the Hellenistic and Imperial periods. These royal statues also represent a complex network of relationships in the ancient world. The tetrastylon of Marcus Aurelius (**52**) was set up in Hermopolis Magna and dedicated by the Prefect of Egypt (a common feature of dedications during the Imperial period, also seen in the Gallus Inscription and the temple of Augustus on Philae). This means the monument and statue create a direct relationship between town, Prefect, and emperor. The tetrastylon illustrates the complex set of relationships that existed in Egypt, and shows how royal statues functioned as a way to build and honour these relationships.

The statues of the *metropoleis* also function as the expression of Hellenism and Hellenistic ideals. The temple dedicated by the cavalry at Hermopolis Magna was set up specifically within the ideas and norms of Greek temple construction and dedication, to the extent the inscription could come from anywhere in the Greek world at this time. The same can also be said for the tetrastylon, especially as by the time it was erected, the monument was surrounded by other classical structures. I am not suggesting that these statues were part of a bulwark against Egyptian or Egyptianising motifs. Rather, that in the creation of these images, a choice was made in relation to their style, and the

choice of Greek and Imperial imagery shows they were part of a wider set of cultural norms that expressed the ideas and needs of the local population.

The context of the statue was vital to its ability to function. The point has already been made that context and imagery can be intertwined, the context of a statue can influence its function. For the Aphroditopolis statue (**53**), and those of Berenike II (**49**) and Marcus Aurelius (**52**), this is especially true. They were images that did not translate if positioned within a different context.[379] The statues did not fit into an Egyptian context. Not only would the image be visually jarring, but they would not be meaningful, they would not be able to fulfil their functions or impart their messages. The Egyptian, Greek, and Roman royal statues belong in recognisably Egyptian, Greek, and Roman spaces. And these spaces require the presence of such images in order to be properly functioning themselves.

B.1. Statue functions in Egyptian temples

At their root, Egyptian royal images served the same function as their Greek-and Imperial-style counterparts - they were representations of the Ptolemaic rulers as the Egyptian king. They aimed at sending messages to the people and elite of Egypt concerning the ruler's legitimacy, the strength of the dynasty, and their position within Egypt. These representations of the Ptolemies in the temples functioned to place and engrain them within Egyptian forms, tradition, and theology. On one level, the statues placed the Ptolemies alongside the dynastic

[379] Smith 1988, 32, 46-53; Smith 1991, 19-20.

monarchs, observed at the temple of Karnak, which still contains statues of earlier kings, and in the Karnak cachette which included alongside the statue of a Ptolemy (**61**) many examples of dynastic material. On another level, Egyptian-style statues also functioned simply to place the Ptolemies directly into the Egyptian temple, into the courts (**58-60**) and along the dromos (**48, 67**), where they were seen and interacted with by the elite and people of Egypt. The Ptolemies did not have to take this approach to representation in Egypt, it was a choice. In doing so, they were able to gain the support of the priests and the role of the temples and to establish their dynasty.

It is difficult to emphasise how much royal statues were part of the Egyptian temple. Egyptian statues were more than representations of the elite, they served proper functions within the temple. Sometimes physically and decoratively such as the use of sphinxes at Medinet Madi (**42**) which function to both decorate the dromos and to define it, and theologically, as the focus of cult, observed in the dedication of the sphinx to Apollo at Zaweit el-Amwat (**48**) and the statuette of Ptolemy II (**25**) at Tanis.[380] They were an extension of the monument, almost more than they were an extension of the individual represented.[381] This point is emphasised by Jan Assmann, who argues that the position of statues in the open court, one of the principal places for Ptolemaic statuary, exposes them to light and human view and therefore they "belong to the general appearance of the architectural structure and thus functioning in the

[380] Assmann 1996, 56.

[381] Assmann 1996, 65.

context of a subordinate text."[382] That is, they function in two dimensions, in themselves as representations of the monarch and as part of the wider infrastructure (and purpose of) the temple. This is illustrated by consideration of the statues outside the first pylon at Karnak as described in the Karnak decree, and other sculpture from a temple dromos such as the Cleopatra from Karnak (**67**) and the material from the temples of the Fayoum (**42-46**). These statues represent the king and queen, displaying them to the world and the people, associating them with the role of pharaoh, the power and responsibilities of that role, and the power of the temple. Equally, the statues position the king and queen in relation to the temple. They are part of the wider text that defines the entrance to the structure, the power that lies within it, showing its patronage and position.[383]

In such concepts Assmann is joined by other scholars, including Sergio Donadoni and Annette Kjølby. Donadoni emphasises the architectural nature of statues and the role they played in the life and practices of the sanctuary.[384] This is identified in the sphinxes from Medinet Madi (**42**), and elsewhere in Egypt, which fulfil both representational and architectural decorative functions. This can also be observed in the material from Koptos (**56-60**) and Karnak (**61-65**) that stood in the forecourt of the temple, and partook in the daily ritual alongside other divine and elite sculpture. Kjølby states that statues, and monuments, were part of distributing and extending the personhood

[382] Assmann 1996, 65.

[383] Donadoni 1989, 105.

[384] Donadoni 1989, 98-185.

of the individual through time and space. She notes the use of the placement of statues as an important part of establishing identity for the elite.[385] This is a concept that can easily be applied to the king and the Ptolemies. Placement was an important part of statue creation, which is why there is a focus on placement in the priestly decrees. The placement of royal sculpture on the dromos and in the forecourt functioned as a way to establish the Ptolemies identity as pharaoh and as part of Egypt and the temple.

These concepts demonstrate two aspects. Firstly, the importance of placement within the temple and the institutional nature of the presence of royal statues. Secondly, that statues functioned on multiple levels. Not only did the statues of the Ptolemies aim at communicating specific messages to their people, at representing the monarchs, and acting as foci for worship, but they also functioned as part of the matrix of the temple, part of the temple's messages and communication.

B.2. Egyptian statues with Greek inscriptions

A particular aspect of royal representation in the Egyptian temple is the presence of Greek inscriptions accompanying Egyptian-style statues. There are a number of examples of these throughout the country, but especially in Upper Egypt, including a sphinx from Zaweit el-Amwat (**48**), the base of Arsinoe from Thebes (**62**), and two bases from Philae (**67 & 68**) (and the base and statue from Tebtunis in the Fayoum, **46 A & B**). The main question concerns the purpose of these inscriptions, and how they were associated with the statue and its context.

[385] Kjolby 2007.

An inscription is meant to convey something about an image, the identity of the individual represented, the dedicator, and the reasons for it.[386] The use of Greek in the bases suggests that these were set up by, and intended to be seen by Greek-reading individuals. Upper Egypt had a strong Hellenic culture, seen at Hermopolis Magna and in the gymnasium inscription from Thebes.[387] There is also evidence of Greek writers at temple sites through graffiti, such as those from Deir el-Medina.[388] Evidence such as the priestly decrees, show that it was not just 'Greeks' who could read these inscriptions, the Egyptian elite and clergy could also read such inscriptions and documents. The inscribed bases exist alongside a number of others in temples, found at Philae and Dendera.[389]

The inscriptions are juxtaposed with Egyptian images. The sphinx from Zawiet el-Amwat is fully Egyptian (**48**) and the bases from Thebes (**62**) and Philae (**67-68**) indicate that the statues were Egyptian in style. The Greek inscription on the base of Ptolemy VI and his family (**68**) is also juxtaposed against a Demotic inscription. These inscriptions are indicative of the more complicated and nuanced interactions in material between Greek, Roman, and Egyptian cultures. The principal thrust of this discussion has been that different sculptural styles of royal statues are typically found in their traditional cultural contexts, within familiar architectural space. As highlighted in the

[386] Ma 2007, 205.

[387] Clarysse 1995, 1-20; McKenzie 2007, 152.

[388] Rutherford 2003, 171-189; Latjar 2006.

[389] Alston 2002, 199-202; Bingen 2007, 31-43.

discussion of the Fayoum, this division is not reflected in the material of the country as a whole. From the use of dual names to the terracottas of Horus in a Roman cuirass, there is clear evidence of interaction. Even at Hermopolis Magna, though the statues can be identified as being located within traditional contexts, the Greek/Roman town and the Egyptian temple existed side-by-side. In this capacity, the inscriptions stand as a reminder of this, and that Ptolemaic and Imperial royal statues are unusual in maintaining such a strict division.

B.3. Roman statues and Egyptian temples

In the Roman period the Egyptian temples continued to function, but with less freedom and under the overarching control of the *idios logos* in Alexandria. There were a number of small constructions, such as two temples in Hermopolis Magna, but the majority of work was confined to decoration.[390] The lack of new Egyptian temples compared to the number of new Caesarea or Hadrianea suggests that there was a different emphasis in Imperial Egypt.[391]

The Emperors demonstrate different patterns of representation to the Ptolemies. They are almost entirely represented in classical-style, and almost never in pharaonic form (only in their appearance in relief on Egyptian temple walls). This means there was a break with the traditions of Egyptian royal representation. Throughout the Ptolemaic period the traditional and wholly pharaonic statue was used as a form of representation, demonstrating an understanding and embracing of Egyptian culture by the ruling dynasty. In focusing on a different style of representation, the evidence suggests that under

[390] Arnold 1999a, 225-273; Also *Appendix: List of Late Period Temples*.

[391] Dundas 1993, 135-177; Pfeiffer 2010, 237-244.

the Empire there was not the same level of interaction or acceptance regarding royal imagery. In Egypt, the emperors looked much as they did elsewhere.

There is a small group of Egyptian statues with Roman features. Four of these statues come from Upper Egypt, two Caracallas from Sheik Fadl (**47**) and Koptos (**56**), a possible Hadrian from Hermopolis Magna (**50**) and the Karnak Augustus (**65**). I have kept these statues separate from the Egyptian statues with Greek features as they represent a different political power. The Egyptian statues with Roman features are still principally Egyptian statues and belong to an Egyptian context. All the examples come from major temple sites in Egypt; Tanis, Mendes, Hermopolis Magna, Koptos, Karnak, with the exception of Sheik Fadl. The Caracalla from Koptos (**56**) is the best example, discovered by Petrie at the bottom of a set of stairs leading up to the temple of Min and Isis.[392] Earlier evidence including the priestly decrees, show that the temples and their clergy were primarily responsible for creating and commissioning their own imagery and sculpture. These statues are then the product of these individual sites, acting as a way to demonstrate Imperial power in a familiar way to the local population and clergy, and perhaps to please the emperor himself.

There are a number of examples of classical Roman buildings erected alongside, or within, Egyptian temple complexes that contained classical-style Imperial statues. These have been discussed briefly in Chapter 3, but are worth mentioning again. The classical imperial structure of the Egyptian

[392] Koptos: Petrie 1896; Baines & Malek 1980, 111; Galliano & Gabolde 2000; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 214-217.

temples include a *nymphaeum* outside the pylon of the temple of Hathor at Dendera, the temple of Serapis at Luxor (fig. 20), a shrine to imperial cult at Karnak (fig. 17-18), and the temple to Augustus at Philae (fig. 19).[393] These structures stand in sharp contrast to their Egyptian surroundings, and though they use Egyptian material, the buildings are primarily composed of classical architectural forms. The very presence of these structures raises a number of questions, about who built them, their aims, and the Roman attitude towards Egypt and Egyptian culture. It demonstrates both a desire to link the new rulers to the dynastic temples, but also emphasises the new culture and new way of communicating with the emperors.

C. Upper Egypt: Conclusion

In analysing the evidence from Upper Egypt, the functions of the different royal statues have been established, and their relationship to the surrounding context. All statues function primarily as a means of representing the individual, of translating messages about that person (or group) to the masses. The royal statues of Egypt continue this pattern, and in their style and placement demonstrate the need of the rulers to communicate with different groups, in different ways. The statues of the *metropoleis*, especially at Hermopolis Magna, show the role of royal statues as part of complex relationships between town and ruler, and emphasise the presence of Greek ideas and forms. The statues in the Egyptian temples also show some of these facets, but more importantly, they demonstrate how close the statue is to the temple, and how they function

[393] Lauffray 1971, 118-121; Bailey 1990, 125, 127, 233.

together to both associate the monarch with the traditions of Egypt and to establish the temple itself. The available evidence demonstrates the importance of statuary in context, and suggests that style and function were dependant upon context to an extent.

The evidence of Upper Egypt also provided insights into the presence of Egyptian statues with Greek inscriptions. The present evidence also demonstrated the nuance and variety in Ptolemaic Egypt through the Egyptian-style statues accompanied by Greek inscriptions. The material from Upper Egypt also showed that Imperial sculpture did not reflect Egyptian culture in the same way as the Ptolemaic, and the Emperors were represented in their traditional forms, to the extent that they provided the necessary classical context at Egyptian sites to allow this. The Egyptian statues with Roman features were still linked to the overriding Egyptian context, but were also dependant on both the place they were created and the individual represented.

CHAPTER 7: MEROE

Meroe is approximately 400 miles south of the Roman Frontier, on the east bank of the Nile. It was the capital of the Meroitic kingdom, and is home to a number of archaeological remains. In 1910, John Garstang excavated the mound associated with the town and necropolis, discovering structures he identified as a palace and a number of temples.[394] During excavation a bronze head of Augustus was discovered (**69**). It was found buried in a pocket of clean sand in front of the entrance to a columned building decorated with frescoes of a king and queen in triumph, accompanied by bound captives. The head itself is an Actium type portrait with inlaid eyes that has been cut at the neck. Though the head was found outside Egypt, the evidence provided by its context and the debates surrounding its origin, make it an interesting addition to this study.

The context of the head of Augustus from Meroe (**69**) is clear. The structure where the head was found has been interpreted as a victory chapel, due to the presence of victory iconography on the walls. The placement of the head underneath the threshold is interpreted as part of the symbols of victory displayed in the shrine.

The head has been the cause of much discussion, namely relating to how it came to be in such a context. Robert Bosanquet suggested the statue was taken during the 'Ethiopian' raids on Upper Egypt during the first years of Roman rule, and may have been set up in Aswan in 30 BC for the visit by

[394] Garstang 1912, 45-52; Bosanquet 1912, 66-71; Walters 1915, Pl LXI; Haynes 1983, 177-181; Torok 1997.

Augustus, explaining its presence in Meroe as a spoil of war.[395] Haynes suggests that it was erected somewhere in Upper Egypt and taken during the Ethiopian raids between c.25-20 BC.[396] Though this would explain its location, under the threshold of a space that celebrates triumph, others suggest it is unlikely such a statue would have been in place at that time. Given the processes by which such imagery was constructed, a bronze statue could be produced quickly, so this is not a convincing argument. Another suggestion, that it was a gift from Augustus to the Meroitic Queen, is also extremely problematic.[397] As Bosanquet states, there would have been a huge number of bronze Augustus' throughout the Empire, and it is likely the head was originally set up at Aswan, or elsewhere in Upper Egypt, and then moved south. That the head originated in Egypt there seems little doubt.

This is the only contextualised example of a bronze head from Ptolemaic or Imperial Egypt. There are a number of non-provenanced bronze examples, such as the Mantua Arsinoe and the supposed Hadrian said to come from Qena, but there is no other evidence.[398]

From what has been discussed, it is possible to form an idea of the statue's original placement. The head is a classical image, and required a classical location, within a central space or a temple complex, like the head of Berenike II from Hermopolis Magna (**49**) or the Hadrian from Athribis (**34**). The

[395] Bosanquet 1912, 70.

[396] Haynes 1983, 177-181.

[397] Bosanquet 1912, 70.

[398] Mantua Arsinoe: Smith 1988, No.50; Qena Hadrian: Graindor 1937, No.11; Kiss 1984, 59.

head could also have been located in a military context, possibly in relation to the legion at Aswan. These would be typical locations for such a representation of the emperor.

CHAPTER 8: ALEXANDRIA

Founded by Alexander the Great in 332 BC, the city of Alexandria was the capital of Ptolemaic and Imperial Egypt (Map 6). Located between the Mediterranean and Lake Moeris, it was one of the principal centres for trade, culture, and learning during this period. The city has received a lot of attention from scholars over the last fifty years, particularly from Peter Fraser, Jean-Yves Empereur, and Judith McKenzie who have all contributed substantially to the understanding of the layout and fabric of the city.[399]

In the Roman period, Alexandria was known as *Alexandrea ad Aegyptum*, Alexandria by Egypt, and it is in this capacity that I consider Alexandria here, as both part of Egypt and separate from it. The aim of this chapter is to examine how the evidence of Alexandria fits into the patterns and sculptural landscape already identified throughout Egypt. I examine the Ptolemaic and Imperial periods separately. Previous evidence has demonstrated a difference in style and emphasis between the statues of these periods, and in continuing this division I identify how this pattern presents itself in Alexandria. Though all the material from Alexandria has a specific provenance, many are random finds, or else blocks reused in later structures. Due to this, I focus on certain examples from specific sites within the city. I conclude by considering the presence of dynastic, that is pre-Ptolemaic, material in Alexandria. I explore the reason for the presence of this material in the Ptolemaic and Roman capital,

[399] Fraser 1972; Empereur 1998a; McKenzie 2007.

and establish how this influences the context and function of the Late Period royal imagery.

A.1. Royal statues of Ptolemaic Alexandria

The statuary items representing the Ptolemies from Alexandria number twenty-two in total. In style and quantity, they follow the same patterns observed elsewhere in Egypt. The material is comprised primarily of Egyptian-style statues, ten altogether, with a small group of Greek-style heads, numbering four, and two bases of unknown style, both with Greek inscriptions. Alexandria also provides a small number of Egyptian statues with Greek features, six altogether. These statues span the entire Ptolemaic period, from the late fourth century to the first century BC.

The majority of these statuary items are chance finds, with little contextual evidence, such as the base to Ptolemy V and his parents (**78**) found near the Rosetta Gate, and the head and torso of Ptolemy IX (**81**) which has no architectural context and was found with some 'Hellenistic wares'. These statues provide a picture of the material that existed in the city, but reveal little about context. The contextual evidence is provided by a group of statues that occupy thoroughly excavated sites. These statues are concentrated in the Serapeum of Alexandria and the recent underwater excavations around the Pharos Island and the Royal Harbours. Alongside the evidence from these sites, some material can be discussed in context due to earlier descriptions and reports, such as the Hadra Dyad (**80**) whose archaeological context is preserved in a description by

Wilkinson. This material forms the basis for the discussion of Ptolemaic royal statues in Alexandria, and from it, it is possible to identify a number of trends specific to the city, yet also fitting with observed patterns.

A.2. The Serapeum

The Serapeum of Alexandria was the principal sanctuary of the city (fig. 30).[400] Though there was a sanctuary in place during the reigns of Ptolemy I and Ptolemy II, it was completely rebuilt by Ptolemy III, evidence for which is provided by foundation plaques written in Greek and Hieroglyphics.[401] It was this structure that stood throughout the Ptolemaic and early Imperial period, until it was destroyed and rebuilt in Roman style in the second half of the second century AD. The Serapeum is one of the most comprehensively excavated sites in the city, and its evidence has been compiled and discussed in detail in two separate studies by McKenzie and Michael Sabbottka.[402]

The Serapeum itself provides seven examples of royal statuary. These examples include two early Egyptian-style sphinxes (**70**), two bases to Arsinoe II (**73-74**) (**73** is of unknown style with a Greek inscription), a royal head identified by Evaristo Breccia as Berenike II (**75**) due to the hairstyle and idealised features, and two marble heads identified as Arsinoe III and Ptolemy IV (**76 & 77** - also discussed in Chapter 3) due to comparisons with other portraits, which formed a triad with a head of Serapis.

[400] For excavations and discussion on the Serapeum: Rowe 1946; Fraser 1972, 247-258, 267-270; Empereur 1998, 89-109; Bagnall & Rathbone 2004, 69-72; McKenzie et al 2004; Sabottka 2008; Savopoulos 2011, 293-298; Schmidt 2013, 149-174.

[401] Rowe 1946; McKenzie et al 2004, 81-82.

[402] McKenzie et al 2004; Sabottka 2008.

In relation to the general placement of these statues, their locations can only be suggested based on what is known at other sites. The sphinxes (**70**), though not a matching pair, were found together by Breccia in a trench running along the south side of the sanctuary. Following previous patterns, the sphinxes could have stood at the entrance to the sanctuary, or flanking another entrance or space within the temenos, as seen at the temple at Medinet Madi in the Fayoum (**42**). Since the sphinxes are early sculptures, they might have been related to the subterranean passages at the site.[403] The statue bases of Arsinoe II (**73-74**) are placed securely within the temenos, like the examples from Koptos (**58-60**). The base to Arsinoe II (**73**) visible in the substructure of Diocletian's column was reused from the surrounding area. These bases could belong to the first phase of the temple, but given the popularity of Arsinoe II throughout the Ptolemaic period this is difficult to establish.

The head of Berenike II (**75**) has no secure find spot, though Breccia appears certain it was found inside the temenos wall. This is the same location identified for the head of Berenike II at Hermopolis Magna (**49**) where it was associated within the temenos of the sanctuary of the *Theoi Adelphoi* and *Theoi Euergetai*. Given the position of other Greek-style statues in the Hellenistic world, the Alexandrian head would have stood within a room or exedra within the sanctuary. This is fitting as the main sanctuary was built under Ptolemy III and Berenike II. Finally, there is the triad of Ptolemy IV (**77**),

[403] McKenzie et al 2004, 83-84, 89-90.

Arsinoe III (**76**), and Serapis. The head of the queen and god were found outside the sanctuary (in the same trench as the sphinxes **70**). They are unlikely to have stood outside the sanctuary as there is no evidence of a shrine or structure to house them. The heads are more appropriately placed inside, in a similar context as that of Berenike II (**75**). These heads are most likely cult statues given the presence of Serapis and belong in a room where they could receive some type of cult. This is an appropriate statue group for the Serapeum as the smaller shrine built by Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III is located next to the temple.[404] The statues were part of the sanctuary, occupying traditional space, and fitting into it as part of its decoration, display, and infrastructure.

The principal feature of this sculptural evidence is that there are both Greek- (**75-77**) and Egyptian-style (**70, 73-74**) royal statues in the Serapeum. This is unusual when compared to the material examined throughout Egypt, where the trend for royal imagery has been to keep the two styles separate, within their specific contexts (this is more complex with other types of material culture). The answer to this side-by-side representation is identified within the Serapeum itself, and demonstrates that the statues are following the same patterns and rules as those elsewhere in Egypt.

In Alexandria, Serapis was an Egyptian god in Greek clothing. This duality was reflected in the sanctuary. The foundation plaques are part of Egyptian temple tradition, and refer to Serapis' Egyptian origin through the Hieroglyphic script (including his Egyptian name Osiri-Apis). The sanctuary

[404] McKenzie et al 2004, 84-85.

also had a Nilometer and continued to use the subterranean passages, whose exact function is unknown, but appear closely related in design to the necropoleis of Saqqara.[405] These Egyptian features were dressed up in Greek styles. Numismatic evidence shows the temple was a tetrastyle prostyle structure with a Doric entablature and Corinthian capitals, and many of the architectural features from the site are Greek in style, including Corinthian capitals.[406] There are also a number of non-royal sculptures in both Egyptian- and Greek-styles, including two statues of Pshenptah, an Egyptian priest and court official of Ptolemy X, and a range of Greek style material and inscriptions.[407]

The cult in Alexandria was made up of an Egyptian core (the god) surrounded by Greek physical elements (the temple). When viewed from this perspective the inclusion of Egyptian-and Greek-style royal imagery side-by-side is fitting. It supports the representation and infrastructure of the sanctuary itself. The Alexandrian Serapeum was a site where different categories of royal statues, and other material, could be placed together, as this side-by-side mixture was part of the basic foundation of the sanctuary. This concept fits with the patterns for statue and context already established in Egypt. Function and context are two possible determining factors in deciding the placement of imagery, with typically Egyptian-style in an Egyptian temple and Greek-style in a Greek temple. In the Serapeum at Alexandria, these two

[405] McKenzie et al 2004, 89-90.

[406] Handler 1971, 64-68; Fraser 1972, 266; McKenzie et al 2004, 85-87.

[407] Pshenptah: Tkaczow 1993, no.9; Savvopoulos 2011, no.8; Greek Sculpture: McKenzie et al 2004, 100.

contextual styles exist within one site, a site with a Greek outer face and Egyptian core. Therefore the site allows the existence of the two statue styles.

It is interesting to note which statues are Egyptian in style, and which Greek. The Egyptian royal material (**70, 73-74**) represents the earlier monarchs, and can be associated with the first phase of the temple. The later Greek-style ones represent the kings and queens who participated in creating the Greek façade for the god (Berenike II (**75**), Arsinoe III (**76**), and Ptolemy IV (**77**)). This indicates a temporal context at work, in which the earlier sanctuary was more Egyptian in look as well as focus. The sanctuary held both types of style of sculpture to the end of the Ptolemaic period, as seen in the priest statue of Pshenptah, so, while this suggests a change in emphasis concerning the representation of the monarch in the Serapeum, it does not cancel out what has already been established.

There is a question of how this context affected the statues' function. At the Alexandrian Serapeum, statues continued to maintain their traditional roles and purpose, the principal one being to represent the monarch in various forms. The sphinxes (**70**) represented the pharaoh as powerful and a protector, while the triad (**76-77**) represented the secure rule of the couple alongside their relationship with Serapis. In the Serapeum the statues were representing the different aspects of the monarch, in both Egyptian-and Greek-style showing their role as both pharaoh and *basileus*. The base to Arsinoe II (**73**) demonstrates the continued function of royal statues as both representations of the monarch, as objects of devotion to them and the god, and as part of a

complex series of interactions with the population. Its inscription shows it was dedicated by "Thestor son of Satyros, the Alexandrian", so it was a personal dedication and a public representation of the queen. The base shows how royal representation was placed in a sanctuary, by an individual or group, and that the statues functioned as a way of illustrating and creating a relationship between monarch and the public.

The primary question concerns the function of the second Egyptian statue identified as Arsinoe II (**74**). If this statue stood in a traditional Egyptian temple, it would have been incorporated into the rituals and fabric of that temple. The question is whether it could fulfil these roles in this space? Did the Alexandrian Serapeum have a liturgy the same, or similar, to the Egyptian temples? The temples of Serapis in the Mediterranean employed the use of Egyptian-style sculpture to emphasise their link to the god's Egyptian past, but these were more ornamental than ritual in function.[408] The presence of subterranean passages at the Alexandrian Serapeum, and their continued use, suggests there was a continuous element of Egyptian ritual practiced at the site, and this statue (and others like it) received the same attention and ritual, and fulfilled the same roles as other Egyptian-style material. This made the Egyptian statues part of wider Egyptian ideology concerning the place of the monarch and their role in the physical and spiritual protection of Egypt. If not, the royal statues, and other Egyptian sculpture, were only a representation of the Egyptian element of Ptolemaic kingship, and did not have the pivotal cultic function that restricted its access and dictated interaction.

[408] Fraser 1972, 266.

The statues of the Alexandrian Serapeum fit into observed trends and patterns for the placement of royal imagery observed elsewhere in Egypt. The use of different styles side-by-side fits into the unique design and focus of this sanctuary.

A.3. Underwater Ptolemaic statues: The Pharos and Royal Harbour

During the 1990s a series of underwater excavations took place in the harbours of Alexandria. First, by Empereur around the edge of the Pharos Island, the current location of the Quait Bey Fort, and later by Franck Goddio around what has been termed the 'Royal Harbours' due to identification of the eastern side as the site of the Ptolemaic royal palace (fig. 31).[409] These excavations uncovered material including architectural fragments and sculpture dating from the dynastic to the late Roman periods. From this material come nine royal Ptolemaic statues: from the Pharos, a group of six colossal granite statues (**79 A-F**), all heavily worn and fragmented, identified as representing three royal couples; and from the eastern side of the Harbour, three statues, two sphinxes (**83 & 84**) and the colossal head of a king identified by Zsolt Kiss as Caesareion (**85**) due to the fleshiness of the face.

The material from the Pharos (**79 A-F**) has drawn attention specifically because these are large scale Egyptian-style statues from such a prominent location. The Ptolemaic statues were part of a much larger group of material, amounting to approximately 3000 fragments including granite and

[409] Pharos excavations: Empereur 1995, 743-760; 1996, 959-970; 1998, 64-87; Royal Harbour excavations: Goddio & Yoyotte 1998; Goddio & Bernand 2004; Goddio *EST*.

marble columns, Corinthian capitals, and dynastic statuary.[410] The exact date of the statues themselves is difficult to determine given their condition and the nature of their find spot.

Empereur has suggested that, due to the find spot of the statues, and the existence and placement of their statue bases, these six statues stood at the base of the Lighthouse. The statues were then viewed by anyone entering or leaving the city, representing the power and dominance of the Ptolemies. Others have found this idea appealing. Many statues were placed in such liminal spaces, and literary and pictorial evidence shows the presence of other decorative statues on the Lighthouse.[411]

There is, however, no evidence to support this theory. There are many visual representations of the Lighthouse of Alexandria, particularly on Roman coins, and while versions differ in the detail they provide, there is no representation of large scale statues along its base, though they do show other figures that decorated the structure.[412] There is also no reference to such statues in any literary work, such as Strabo's *Geography*. Given the nature of the other evidence found underwater, which is a mixture of styles, materials, and dates, the area excavated was most likely a man-made dump created over time, meaning these statues could have stood anywhere in the city or anywhere within Egypt.

---

[410] Empereur 1998a, 71-75.

[411] Roman Coins: Handler 1971, 58-62; McKenzie 2007, 42.

[412] Handler 1971, 58-61.

If the statues did originally stand in Alexandria, this re-evaluation of the statues' context provides a wide number of sites they could have occupied. The Pharos Island is a likely location given their proximity, and other sculpture has been found there, including the base of a Triad (**72**). Drawing upon what has already been established, the statues most likely stood in a religious context, grouped together, as a demonstration of dynastic power. The statues could have stood within a sanctuary like the Serapeum, that utilised both Greek and Egyptian forms. An Egyptian-style context is likely, but there is little secure evidence for an Egyptian-style religious structure in Alexandria. Roman coins show Egyptian pylons and shrines identified as belonging to Isis and Osiris.[413] Recently, a small red granite pylon was discovered off the coast of the Acra Lochias dating to the late Ptolemaic/early Roman period, pointing to the presence of Egyptian architecture in the city.[414]

The majority of the statue fragments from the Pharos are too weathered to be able to identify attributes or facial features. The two that have been the least affected (**79 A & C**) are identified as Egyptian statues with Greek features. It was established when discussing the Fayoum, that this aspect itself did not appear to influence placement or context, but was the result of the influence of the wider environment upon the statues. Those in the Fayoum (**41-46**) still occupy traditional locations, i.e. the Egyptian temple, but reflect the wider social and cultural world of the local population. As there is no secure context for these colossi, it is difficult to analyse the use of these statues in the

[413] Handler 1971, 61-64.

[414] Savvopoulos 2011, no.12, 302, 317-18.

city. The material in the Serapeum has demonstrated that statues follow context, and so these statues can be placed in an Egyptian-style location, or in a context that uses both cultural styles. They are unlikely to have been placed in a totally Greek-style context. No matter where they stood, these statues were impressive displays of the Ptolemaic couples.

The statues excavated by Goddio in the late 1990s have a very different context. The aim of the project of Goddio's team was to map the ancient coastline of Alexandria, and whilst doing so they were able to identify several ancient structures, such as the Timonium, and uncovered a range of architectural fragments, sculpture, and inscriptions, including two Ptolemaic sphinxes (**83-84**) and a colossal pharaonic head (**85**) (fig. 31).

The two sphinxes (**83-84**) were found on the esplanade of the Antirhodos Island, located centrally in the harbour. Most of this area has been affected by the strong sea currents, and while the sphinxes are associated with the island, it is unlikely they were found *in situ*. The sphinxes were found with a collection of other material, including a Greek-and Egyptian-style statue of a Canopic Priest and a headless statue of a Greek-style Hermes.[415] Exactly what structure stood on the island is difficult to determine. A large amount of the material evidence dates to the Roman period, and it is hard to know the structure and plan of the island during the Ptolemaic era. Traditionally, sphinxes are

[415] Kiss 1998, 178-185; Goddio & Bernand 2004, 100-104; Libonati 2010.

located in a religious context, usually flanking doorways or entrances, and Kiss suggested that this is what was located on the island.[416]

As with the Serapeum, this was a space open to both styles of material. Goddio identifies this area as belonging to the palaces of the Ptolemies, so it is not surprising to find both the Egyptian and Greek sides displayed together, representing both aspects of Ptolemaic rule.

The colossal head (**85**) has a less secure find spot. The head was found along the ancient coastline opposite the Antirhodos Island. It was not found *in situ* and no trace of the body has been identified. It is difficult not to compare this head to the Pharos colossi, and to consider whether it served similar functions or occupied a similar context. A religious context is suggested by Kiss due to the surrounding material found on the coastline, including another sphinx.[417] Equally, the head served as part of the decoration, or definition, of the palace space, placed in a visible area to advertise the young king.

Altogether, the material in this area is identified as having strong religious and political themes, aspects that fit well into a palace context. The statues demonstrate the continued use of Egyptian-and Greek-styles side-by-side, an aspect that can be reconciled if this is what the context allows. This is a key element of representation of the Ptolemies in Alexandria.

[416] Kiss 1998, 175.

[417] Kiss 1998, 188.

A.4. The Hadra Dyad

The Hadra Dyad (**80**) is a partially preserved colossal standing duo with an Egyptian-style queen, and an Egyptian king with Greek facial features. Nothing remains archaeologically of its context, but there is a detailed description of its find spot recorded in John Wilkinson's *Modern Egypt* and present in the catalogue.

This description states that the dyad comes from the remains of a structure, identified by Wilkinson as a temple. The description refers to yellow marble (most likely sandstone) sphinxes, granite columns, a portico, and a pool or water feature. It is impossible to recreate a plan or outline of the site, but the description sounds like an Egyptian temple, especially the reference to the pool and sphinxes. The description also suggests the temple is round, which alters this interpretation, as Egyptian temples do not use such forms. Possibly Wilkinson and Richard Pococke (whose earlier discussion Wilkinson draws upon) are incorrect in identifying the temple as having been round, or it is a temple, like the Serapeum and the structures around the royal harbour, that employs both Greek and Egyptian features.

In either capacity, this statue stood within the confines of a sacred site or just outside, representing the king and queen in a traditional manner, and emphasising strength in their togetherness. If the structure was an Egyptian temple, this statue would have received cult, and been incorporated into the infrastructure of the temple. This statue is not the principal cult statue, and to identify this space as a dynastic shrine based solely on its existence is

incorrect. This statue is a representation of the monarchs in a temple, and the temple itself could be dedicated to any deity.

The temple and statue are located in the Hadra area, a space usually associated with the necropolis.[418] This was an early cemetery in the city's history, with hypogea decorated in Greek-style. The necropolis was quickly swallowed up by the expanding city, and from the area come a number of shrines and houses, as well as a second base to a Cleopatra (**82**), though this has no useable contextual evidence. The Hadra Dyad is part of a more low key, or 'ordinary' sanctuary than the Serapeum or major religious centres such as Tanis. It served to represent the monarch primarily to those in the neighbourhood. This does not change its overall function or context, but provides a less public and more small scale display of material in Alexandria.

A.5. Other material and contexts

The emphasis in this discussion has been on the Egyptian-style material, and its place within Alexandria, as this has the best contextual evidence. This focus neglects the largely Greek nature of the city. This nature is observed in the descriptions of Strabo, among others, who notes the classical institutions and design of the city.[419] The catalogue of Barbara Tkaczow, and many others, is also full of classical architectural features and sculptural fragments all pointing to the rich Greek style of Alexandria.[420] Alongside these are the many Greek-

[418] Tkaczow 1993, no.145, 176.

[419] Strabo 17.1.

[420] Tkaczow 1993; Tkaczow 2008 (focusing on Kom el Dikka); Examples of sculpture: Fragaki 2009.

style royal heads, large and small, with no provenance, that most likely come from the city.[421] The description, and other material, serve as a reminder that alongside these multi-style contexts, Alexandria had a classical form, with classical structures functioning as the context for statues.

B.1. Imperial statues in Roman Alexandria

The number of statues or bases to the Roman Emperors and members of the imperial family in Alexandria outweighs the number found elsewhere in Egypt, with seventeen altogether. These form a different group of material compared to the Ptolemaic ones as they fall into two principal categories, the full length statue, of which three survive, and the inscribed statue base, of which there are thirteen. There is also one female head identified as Antonia Minor due to the distinctive hairstyle from the Royal Harbours (**87**). Apart from this head, and a base to Mark Antony (**86**), all the material dates to the second and third centuries AD, with one to Trajan, and the rest to Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, Julia Domna, Septimius Severus, and Caracalla. As with the Ptolemaic material, many are scattered finds, but there are concentrations in the central area of the city and on the Antirhodos Island.

B.2. Central area

A number of imperial statues and bases have been recovered from the central area of Alexandria, in the vicinity of the modern Ramleh Tram Station and close to the location of the so-called Cleopatra's Needles. These include the three

[421] For a complete range of Greek style Ptolemaic heads see: Kyrieleis 1975; Smith 1988; Laube 2012.

standing emperors, a cuirassed Marcus Aurelius (**90**), a togate Marcus Aurelius (**91**), and a cuirassed Septimius Severus (**92**), as well as two inscribed bases, one to Mark Antony (**86**) and another to Caracalla (**96**). This area contains the remains of several different structures dated to the Imperial period. Though the central area has received few excavations, the material it has produced provides ample room for discussion.

The principal feature of this area is its association with the Caesareum, founded by Cleopatra and completed by Augustus.[422] The general location of this sanctuary was marked by the placement of Cleopatra's Needles, two obelisks from Heliopolis, moved by Augustus with inscriptions dating this transportation to approximately 12 BC. They are the only substantial pieces of evidence from the site, alongside some fragments of architecture and statue bases. The statues of Marcus Aurelius (**91**) and Septimius Severus (**92**) were found together near the Obelisks, and the bases of Mark Antony (**86**) and Caracalla (**96**) were both found near the Tram station.

That these statues could be associated with the Caesareum is possible. Philo provides the only real description of the site as follows:

> "huge and conspicuous fitted on a scale not found elsewhere with dedicated offerings, around it a girdle of pictures and statues in silver and gold, forming a precinct of vast breadth, embellished with porticoes, libraries, chambers, groves, gateways, and wide open courts, and everything which lavish expenditure could produce to beautify it – the whole a hope of safety to the voyager either going into or out of the harbour."[423]

[422] Discussion of the Caesareum: Empereur 1998a, 111-123; McKenzie 2007, 177-8.

[423] Philo *Embassy to Gaius*, 151.

The imperial statues (Marc Antony (**86**), Marcus Aurelius (**91**), Septimius Severus (**92**), and Caracalla (**96**)) could be part of this "girdle of pictures and statues." During excavations in the 1990s Empereur uncovered a number of finds associated with the sanctuary, including a two-column inscription dated to AD 175/6 honouring a magistrate responsible for looking after images of the emperor.[424]

This space is similar to any number of religious and secular spaces in the Roman Empire, in which the imperial image is a central part of the display and fabric of a town. There are few remains from the area to be secure of identifying the extent of the site, or its precise architectural features, but it appears to have resembled other Roman structures, and the presentation of the emperors followed other examples.

There are more substantial remains further west from the Caesareum. In 1880 during the building of the Hospital (and demolition of the Zizinia Theatre), a peristyle structure was uncovered, with a number of porphyry columns, marble pedestals, and broken statues, dating to the Late Roman period.[425] The cuirassed statue of Marcus Aurelius (**90**) was found in the adjacent building plot. This statue is associated with this peristyle building and stood alongside statues of other (later) emperors. Such a statue was at home in this space, and whatever the purpose of this building, which can only be

[424] Excavations & inscription: Empereur, Hesse, & Picard 1994, 511; Empereur 1998a, 114-116.

[425] Tkaczow 1993, no.50, 104.

identified as a public space of some kind, it fits into the wider concept of public imperial display.

Alongside the Caesareum and the peristyle building, this area is also the location of the so-called Temple of Isis Plousia (most likely another public building) and the so-called Tower of the Romans.[426] These structures are all dated to approximately the second or third centuries AD. Together with the statues, these buildings demonstrate a high level of Imperial public display and construction in this area. This coincides with a general trend of public works in Egypt in the second century AD, as observed at Athribis and Hermopolis Magna. In this construction and display, Alexandria comes to resemble many cities in the Roman East, which gain new buildings and representations of the Imperial house. The focus on this central area is located away from the focus of the Ptolemies, seen at the Serapeum and Palace, and demonstrates the reorientation of power to a new area.

B.3. Antirhodos Island

The second concentration of imperial material comes from the Antirhodos Island, which has already been discussed above. From the island comes a collection of seven inscriptions, one to Commodus (**95 A**), and six to Caracalla (**95 B-G**). There is an eighth inscription not included here as only one word remains.[427] The inscriptions follow the same basic pattern, and those to

[426] Tkaczow 1993, Temple of Isis Plousia no.49, 103-4; Peristyle building no.51, 105;Tower of the Romans no.82, 129-130; see also no.81-92, 128-136.

[427] Bernand 1998, no.2, 148; the word is "Lykopolis".

Caracalla are dedicated by the Romans and Alexandrians. The inscriptions and statues appear to show the relationship of the city with the emperor.

The context of the Antirhodos Island is difficult to establish. Like the Ptolemaic sphinxes, these columns were found on the esplanade, but at different points around the island. It is difficult to tell whether the inscriptions were purposely set up at different points, so these statues could be seen from land and sea, or whether they were placed together, facing the entrance of the island or the coastline. Either way, the statues were large scale images, the fragmented columns themselves are all over 1 m, and were aimed at displaying the relationship of Alexandria with the emperor, and who ruled Alexandria, Egypt, and the Mediterranean.

There is a question as to why these bases were placed on the Antirhodos Island. It dominates the harbour, and faces the Caesareum and the palace of the Ptolemies, by this point the governor's palace and headquarters. It is a location that cannot be missed from land or sea, and this must have fed into the decision to place the images there. The placement of the statues supports the Imperial dominance of the area, providing a clear sign of who was in charge. The presence of a sanctuary, especially one with representations of earlier kings, was an incentive for placement. Caracalla is one of the few emperors to be securely represented in pharaonic guise and so associations with an old sanctuary site, complete with pharaonic imagery, would have been appealing.

B.4. Numismatic evidence for Imperial statues

Alongside these areas, there is other evidence from Roman Alexandria for the presence of statues at other sites. These come from the numismatic evidence.

The numismatic evidence from Alexandria is useful for researching the buildings and architecture of the city. In this capacity, a number of commemorative arches have been noted. Susan Handler identified four types, dating to the reigns of Domitian, Trajan, and Hadrian.[428] These coins show the presence of statues on these arches, chariot groups on top and other statues in niches (fig. 32). There are many examples of imperial statues occupying such locations, such as the Gate at Perge and the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum, which had relief images of the emperor. If these Alexandrian arches were set up to a particular emperor, it is likely his statue would have adorned it.[429] There is though, no archaeological evidence to place alongside this material. As a context, the arches fit into what has been observed in Alexandria, Egypt, and elsewhere in the Roman East for the display of imperial imagery.

C. Pre-Ptolemaic sculpture in Alexandria

One of the key features of Alexandria is the presence of dynastic, that is pre-Ptolemaic, material, despite there being relatively little activity on the site pre-Alexander. The underwater excavations around the Pharos unearthed a large number of dynastic fragments, as did those in the harbour, and from the

[428] Handler 1971, 70-71.

[429] Gate at Perge: Boatwright 2000, 64-5: Arch at Beneventum: D'Ambra 1998, 82-83.

Serapeum come a granite falcon and statue of Ramesses II amongst other.[430] The most famous examples are Cleopatra's Needles, transported from Heliopolis around 12 BC. There is the question as to when this dynastic material as a whole was transported to the city. The presence of this material in the city, occupying the same contexts, is part of how Ptolemaic and Imperial royal statues could have been perceived.

First I must consider when this dynastic material was moved, specifically was it during the Ptolemaic or Roman periods? This has generated a large amount of debate, with some scholars (Jean-Pierre Corteggianni) suggesting this is a Ptolemaic programme, others (Paolo Gallo) that it was a purely Roman concept, and even the suggestion (Fraser, Yoyotte) that it can be identified as belonging to both periods.[431]

For the Ptolemies, there is one example of the movement of material to Alexandria, the obelisk for the Arsinoeion.[432] This obelisk has been used to demonstrate that this transportation habit was alive and well during the Ptolemiac period, and was instigated early on. There is no archaeological evidence for this object and it is only referred to by Pliny. Elsewhere the archaeological record shows the Ptolemies produced their own pharaonic material, including obelisks, as seen by those of Ptolemy VIII at Philae.[433] The obelisk of the Arsinoeion stands as the only example of such movement by the

[430] Empereur 1995; Empereur 1996; Yoyotte 1998; McKenzie et al 2004, 100.

[431] Fraser 1972, 266; Gallo 1997; Corteggianni 1998; Yoyotte 1998, 204-208.

[432] Pliny *Nat Hist*, 36.67.

[433] McQuitty 1976, 177-179; Hölbl 2002, 280.

Ptolemaic kings, and one that was for an exceptional monument and a much-loved queen.

In general, there is little evidence for the Ptolemies moving dynastic material anywhere in Egypt. Rather, the Ptolemaic period produces its own pharaonic material. The many examples of Egyptian-style statues and temples that have been analysed throughout this thesis point to a Ptolemaic policy of adoption and production rather than appropriation. It is often noted how adaptable the Ptolemies were to their Egyptian role of pharaoh, and there are many statues that show this side of them. This is also reflected in the material of Alexandria. The Serapeum sphinxes (**70**), the Pharos colossi (**79**), and the Hadra Dyad (**80**) are all Ptolemaic creations. The Egyptian material in Alexandria under the Ptolemies was Ptolemaic not dynastic.

There is more of a tradition for movement and transportation during the Imperial period, to which the many obelisks and statuary in Rome testify.[434] There is little evidence of investment in Egyptian-style material during the Imperial period. There are no examples of wholly Pharaonic Emperors, and only a selection of Egyptian statues with Roman features. And while there were Egyptian-style temples constructed and decorated during this period, focus turns to more classical structures which can be identified in the Repairs Papyrus of Hermopolis Magna.[435] The dynastic material in Alexandria should be attributed to transportation during the Imperial period.

[434] Roullett 1972; Ashton 2004.

[435] *Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Agypten X* 1971, No.10299 (P. Vindob gr 12565).

In relation to the context of Alexandria and royal statues, this creates an interesting picture. During the Ptolemaic period, the Egyptian material that existed was their own. It represented Ptolemaic Pharaohs and Ptolemaic Egypt, not the Egypt of the dynastic Pharaohs. Egyptian art and material culture had never been a monolithic whole, emerging in the First Dynasty and remaining unchanged to the 30th, it had always had phases and developments. This has been strongly acknowledged for Ptolemaic Egyptian temples, and the same is true for the royal statues, with the most noticeable development being the use of Greek features. Therefore the Egyptian material and style of Alexandria was a Ptolemaic one. This is demonstrated in the sites of the Serapeum and the Palace complex, where the Egyptian and Greek-style material sit side-by-side. The Egyptian-style statues of the Serapeum were as much Ptolemaic as their Greek counterparts, albeit with different traditions behind them.

Imperial Alexandria was a different matter. It appears to have been full of dynastic material, and the question is why? Kyriakos Savvopoulos suggests that the importation of dynastic material was an attempt to create a new narrative in relation to the Ptolemies, to provide them with a place within the dynastic history of Egypt and so lessen their position, prestige, and power in Alexandria.[436] This idea seems overly complex, especially as in general the Roman administration left Ptolemaic material and Egyptian traditions alone. More likely, the movement was part of a wider trend for the transportation of native material; a similar pattern is seen in Athens with a number of temples and

[436] Savvopoulos 2011, 305-306.

other structures moved to the Athenian Agora during the early Roman period, such as the temple of Ares.[437] This functioned as a way to emphasise the new Imperial rule and presence in the city. It could also be part of a general interest and trend in Egyptian material during this period, and where better to explore and show this element than Alexandria.

The presence of dynastic material in Alexandria was an Imperial development. As far as can be seen in the available evidence, the Ptolemies did not need use dynastic material as they produced their own, and placed it alongside their Greek forms. In the Imperial period, there is a change, with less investment in Egyptian-style construction, and the transportation of dynastic material to the capital, as a way to associate it with this long tradition and to add distance to the Ptolemaic dynasty.

D. Alexandria: Conclusion

The current material from Alexandria provides an insight into the royal statuary landscape of the city. What can be identified in examining the context of the available evidence is that while the way the context is framed and created for the Ptolemaic statues is different from elsewhere, it actually continues the trend of usually being dependant on the nature of the context the statue occupies. The Serapeum is a good example, where the existence of the Egyptian- and Greek-style material together is a reflection of the sanctuary itself. This is not to say that there were not other contexts where the Egyptian statue is in an Egyptian

[437] Camp 1992, 184-187

context or the Greek in a Greek context, but that within all these the same trends are followed.

This is also observed in the Imperial statues, which follow the traditions of representations of the Emperors, both in Egypt and elsewhere in the Empire. These statues occupy specific contexts in the dominant areas of the city, as part of a larger area of public space in which imperial statues were a primary part of decoration and display. Only those on the Antirhodos Island differ from this, though they continue the trend of displaying the relationship of the Alexandrians with the Emperor and displaying them in a dominant position. While there are no pharaonic emperors in Alexandria, it is clear that the movement of dynastic material can be attributed to the Imperial period. It functioned as a way to demonstrate Imperial power and to decorate the city.

The current evidence for royal statues from Alexandria shows that they occupy the same contexts as other statues in Egypt. The statues are found in prominent religious and political locations, and though they sit in contexts that do not exist in the other regions of Egypt, their presence is still determined primarily by these contexts. In this they follow the same patterns as other royal statues.

CHAPTER 9: OUTSIDE EGYPT

In order to complete this analysis of royal statues and context, it is important to consider the images that have been recovered from outside Egypt. This amounts to a small group of Ptolemaic statues, ten in all, nine hard-stone Egyptian-style statues and one marble head. In looking at the locations of these statues, I further show how elements of context, style, and function can be linked, and that particular categories of statue typically reside in particular spaces. By nature of the evidence, and the limits of this thesis, this chapter focuses primarily on the Ptolemaic material, whose Egyptian-style statues are identified as originating in Egypt.

A. Statues in Italy

The majority of the statues from outside Egypt come from Italy, specifically from Rome. This group is made up of seven statues, including the Vatican Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II (**36 & 37**) from Heliopolis found in the gardens of Sallust, a standing king from Bubastis found in Rome (**30**), a queen from the Iseum in Regio III (**97**), a Ptolemaic head from the Iseum in the Campus Martius (**98**), a Ptolemaic head found in the Tiber (**99**), and a standing king from the Temple to the Syrian Triad on the Capitoline (**100**). These are all large scale, hard stone, high quality Ptolemaic statues in Egyptian style. They originated in Egypt and some have inscriptions identifying their original context. They are primarily dated to the second century BC.

The existence of these statues in Rome can be attributed to the movement of material during the Roman Empire. After Augustus' acquisition of the country as a province in 30 BC, there was large scale movement of monuments and statuary to the Empire's capital, most notably obelisks, such as those that ornamented Augustus' tomb.[438] This material functioned as both a sign of Rome's domination over the country, and as a form of decoration for a city that contained artworks from elsewhere in the ancient world.[439] This acquisition and display continued, peaking under particular emperors such as Domitian and Hadrian, but also followed a more general trend for the consumption of Egyptian and Egyptianising products.[440]

In looking closely at the placement of the material, it is clear these statues were not merely plucked from Egypt and distributed in a random fashion, to decorate the streets of Rome. Rather, they occupied "Egyptian" contexts. The statues from Regio III (**97**) and the Campus Martius (**98**) stood inside Isea, and formed part of a wider sculptural programme decorating the sanctuaries with Egyptian material.[441] The Vatican Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II (**36 & 37**) found in the Gardens of Sallust, also come from an area defined as an "Egyptian" style context. The part of the Gardens they come from included other Egyptian material, such as a 19th Dynasty queen and Egyptian style architecture.[442] Kim Hartswick suggests this area of the Gardens was 'themed'

[438] Roullet 1971, 1-12, 43; Ashton 2004, 8-11.

[439] Roullet 1971, 18; Ashton 2004, 8.

[440] Roullet 1971, 18-20.

[441] Roullet 1971, 23-38.

[442] Roullet 1971, 45-51; Hartswick 2004, 130-138.

as Egyptian, with the appropriate architecture and imagery to go along with it.[443] Even the Temple of the Syrian Triad on the Capitoline followed this idea. The temple is not Egyptian, but it is eastern and foreign, and played host to more than one piece of Egyptian imagery.[444]

Egyptian-style Ptolemaic statues were not singular examples of Egyptian style material in Rome, surrounded by Corinthian capitals and marble athletes. They were placed in areas that were seen to have strong Egyptian links, with similar material. There was a concept that this type of space is where these statues belonged, as a way to reinforce the presence and origin of Isis, or to decorate a garden in a novel and fashionable way.

Martin Bommas writes that the inclusion of Egyptian style material in the Isea of Rome was linked strongly to memory. That these objects (amongst other material, such a living animals) were consciously used to create a memory of Egypt in these places, to recreate the Egyptian landscpae as the Romans thought they knew it, in order to link the glorious Roman present with the Egyptian past. It was though a fictionalised past, as the Roman's had no real memory of Egypt, instead they used what they thought they knew. In many ways this idea links with my obserations here. In placing the royal statues, the Roman's were following a very basic knowledge of where such imagery should be placed, i.e. in a temple. They understood that the Egyptian temples needed statues, and they were part of the temple make-up, and so acted accordingly.

[443] Hartswick 2004, 130-136.

[444] Lembke 1994, 221-244.

The Romans understood that the statues belonged in specific areas, though in this case they did so following Roman ideas.

Whilst considering the material in Italy and Rome, it is important to consider the number of Egyptian statues with Roman features found there. These have not been included in the catalogue, as they are not from Egypt. This is a group of statues made from Egyptian material and produced in an Egyptian style with Roman portrait features, but created in Italy and designed to be seen by audiences there.[445] These statues were part of a widespread development that saw the creation and display of Egyptian and Egyptianised products in Italy. Examples include a statue of Domitian associated with the Iseum at Beneventum (and a number of other examples as the Imperial cult was closely linked to that of Isis) and a number of statues of Antinous, particularly from Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli.[446] There are actually more of these Egyptian statues with Roman features present in Italy than in Egypt.

Despite being Roman versions of Egyptian ideas and images, these statues still conform to ideas about placement and style. The statue of Domitian for example, comes from the Iseum at Beneventum, donated by the emperor, and the Egyptian material at Hadrian's villa forms part of a themed area, similar to what has been described at the Gardens of Sallust.[447] Though not from Egypt, representing a pharaoh, or being displayed to Egyptians, these

[445] Roullet 1972, 18-22; Ashton 2004, 48-51.

[446] Ashton 2004, 172; Domitian: Müller 1969, 66; Hadrian's Villa: Roullet 1972, no.167b-172.

[447] Hartswick 2004, 130-136.

statues followed the same conventions as the Ptolemaic ones, and other statues in Egypt, in that they were placed in 'Egyptian' contexts. It is true these are 'Roman Egyptian' contexts, and do not have the same features, rituals, or history, but they illustrate the idea that such images were typically placed in familiar and appropriate contexts.

B. Other locations

Throughout their reign the Ptolemies had significant influence and investment in the Mediterranean. During the 3rd century BC the Ptolemaic empire reached its peak, stretching along the coast of Syria and across the islands of the Aegean, with continued interventionst activities in mainland Greece.[448] As the dynasty continued, their influenced slowly waned, becoming more focused on Egypt. The Ptolemaic presence in the Mediterranean though, resulted in a range of sculpture and other imagery being created that was never meant to be associated with Egypt, such as the statues of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II from Olympia.[449] The primary focus here is on the material that can be identified as originating in Egypt, though the presence of other Ptolemaic representation must be kept in mind.

Two other statues have been identified as representing Ptolemies in hard-stone Egyptian style, yet are not in Egypt. The first is the Aegina Ptolemy (**101**), a statue head of Ptolemy VI found in the sea off the coast of Aegina, and the second is the head of a Cleopatra from modern day Kerch in the Ukraine (**102**). Both statues have secure find spots, but provide no contextual

[448] Hölbl 2001, 35-77.

[449] Hoepfner 1971, 11-54.

evidence. Their locations suggest they were being transported from Egypt, probably during the Imperial period. Based on what has been seen in Rome, they may have been destined for an Iseum or Serapeum, both popular sanctuaries in the Mediterranean during the Roman Empire.

The final statue for consideration is the head of Ptolemy Apion (**103**), found inserted into the pedestal of a statue of C. Cornelius Lentullus Marcellinus in the sanctuary of Apollo at Cyrene. Technically, this head should not be part of this discussion. The head was never meant to stand in Egypt and is for a ruler who never ruled the country. It is still important to consider its place within Ptolemaic representation, and how it, and others, influenced the context of those statues in Egypt.

The statue was not found *in situ* and its original location is unknown, yet the sanctuary of Apollo is the perfect location for a marble head of a king. Like its cousins in the Serapeum of Alexandria (**75-77**), this head fits into this context. This could not have been an Egyptian image, firstly because Ptolemy Apion was not a pharaoh, but also because of the nature of the sanctuary and the culture surrounding it.

In relation to the number of Ptolemaic statues, this head acts as a reminder of the power and influence of the Ptolemaic dynasty during their rule. There are many Greek style marble and limestone heads of the Ptolemies without a provenance, and while many most likely originated in Alexandria, others belonged to the islands and *poleis* of the Aegean. There are already

examples of such imagery at Olympia, with the two statues of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II.[450] These Greek style Ptolemaic images existed throughout the Greek world, and usually conformed to the same general patterns of placement as those that were displayed in Egypt.

C. Outside Egypt: Conclusion

This small group of Ptolemaic statues demonstrates the huge amount of royal sculpture that existed in the Mediterranean, both during and after their rule. Specifically, it shows that whether the statue was transported from Egypt or set up in Rome, the statues appear to have followed some of the same patterns concerning context and style that were part of the statues displayed in Egypt. The Iseums and gardens of Italy might not have been the same as the temples of Tanis or Karnak, but they represented Egyptian art and ideas, and it was normally in such places Egyptian style statues of the Ptolemies (or emperors) were placed.

[450] Hoepfner 1971.

CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to analyse Ptolemaic and Imperial royal statues in Egypt from a contextual viewpoint. To focus on the identifiably royal material with an archaeological context or a recoverable provenance, and use this to identify and discuss the statue's placement, style, and function. This approach has identified a number of different statue categories, the various contexts the statues occupied relating to site and placement, and the range of functions the statues had. Based on the current evidence, it has demonstrated that generally there existed a relationship between context, statue, and function regarding the royal statues in Egypt.

The primary question facing this thesis was where were royal statues of the Ptolemaic and Imperial period located? Even by focusing on evidence with a secure find spot or recoverable provenance, there was little material that provided direct answers. The literary sources supplied a range of evidence for the general placement of particular statues, indicating religious and urban spaces as the most popular locations. The literary sources also highlighted some contexts not present in the archaeological record, such as the Great Procession of the Ptolemies. Analysis of cult statues also showed a religious context, and one that was divided into three distinct cultural areas, the Egyptian, Greek, and Roman.

The material in the catalogue shows that large scale royal statues occupied two specific contexts in Egypt, namely the Egyptian temple and the

metropoleis. Within these sites, royal statues typically conformed to the traditions of statue placement observed in other sculptural material in dynastic Egypt and the Hellenic East. The statues stood in courtyards, along the dromos, and at the entrances of the Egyptian temple. In the *metropoleis* the statues are associated with temples, theatres, and column monuments. Within this, the current evidence points to a general division in statue style and location, with Egyptian-style material located in Egyptian temples and Greek-and Imperial-style material in the *metropoleis*. This was observed in the material throughout Egypt, at sites such as the temple of Amun at Tanis and the town of Athribis in Lower Egypt and the temple of Amun at Karnak and the town of Hermopolis Magna in Upper Egypt. Even the Egyptian statues with Greek or Roman features followed this pattern by standing within Egyptian temples. This phenomenon regarding large scale royal sculpture does not necessarily translate to other types of material.

Royal sculpture needed to be placed in the appropriate context in order to fulfil their functions. The principal functions of all royal statues were to represent the individual, and to pass on messages concerning the Ptolemaic or Imperial dynasty, their divinity, and their power. This was illustrated most clearly with the statue from Aphroditpolis (**53**), a Hellenistic ruler statue tied to the imagery and messages of the period. One of the primary functions for these royal statues though was as part of a system of communication between the ruler and people of Egypt. This was first highlighted in the literary sources, which showed those responsible for the commissioning of royal statues, including the monarchs, clergy, elite and people, and was further emphasised in the epigraphic

evidence, such as the statue base of Ptolemy XII from Tebtunis (**46B**) and the inscriptions from Hermopolis Magna. All categories of royal statues were used to establish a relationship and dialogue between the rulers and the different groups of Egypt, and each group used their own cultural style and milieu in order to achieve this.

Many of the statues in this study had much wider functions, in that they were an intrinsic part of the context they occupied, especially the Egyptian-style material. In being placed within the Egyptian temple these statues had to fulfil the roles ascribed to them within Egyptian ideology and tradition. The statues were part of temple ritual and practice. It would be different for a Greek-or Imperial-style statue as it could not fulfil such a role within an Egyptian temple. The royal statues were tied to their contexts and environment in a direct way. By being placed in the appropriate space the statues could properly fulfil their functions.

It is possible to observe from this that the context, style, and function of the royal statues were usually entwined with each other. The statues functioned on multiple levels, and often needed to be placed in a particular type of context in order to meet these functions. The material in Alexandria also supports this idea, as the material from the Serapeum and the Royal Harbours shows that the combination of styles within a particular context. There was also the fact that in choosing to be represented in a particular sculptural and cultural style, the rulers or groups creating the statues in question were choosing a particular set of norms and ideas in which to project themselves and

communicate with the people, and alongside this was the need to place them within a context the statues would fit.

The final area this thesis considered was the difference in representation and placement between the Ptolemaic and Imperial royal statues, and a break was identified in the approach to representation between these two groups. From the available material it appears Ptolemaic sculpture was concentrated on the use of traditional Egyptian-style representation, whereas the Imperial statues are primarily classical in style, except for seven Egyptian statues with Roman features. This difference is part of a wider approach taken to Imperial representation in Egypt, reflected not only in the sculptural evidence but also in the construction record, including the emphasis on Imperial-style temples. The evidence indicates an alternative approach to representation during Imperial rule.

This study identified the locations of royal statues of the Ptolemies and Emperors in Egypt. It has demonstrated that there were specific sites a royal statue usually inhabited, and that there is no mixing of statue style and cultural context unless it is specifically allowed. This is particularly interesting, as it cannot be observed in other artistic areas of Egypt, suggesting the high profile cult and large stone royal statues were set apart. In their role representing the monarch, the royal statues needed to conform to traditional contexts in a way other material did not. In maintaining these traditions the Ptolemies and Emperors, and others responsible for commissioning royal statues, were reflecting their own ideas and policies, yet also conforming to the

perceived ideas of how and where royal statues should be placed, allowing them to fulfil their designated functions, primarily as a form of communication between monarch and people.

TABLE 1

	Egyptian	Egyptian with Greek	Egyptian with Roman	Greek	Roman	Unknown – Inscribed Bases	Total
Lower Egypt	**26**	**7**	**3**	**11**	**1**	**2**	**50**
Fayoum	**0**	**33**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**34**
Upper Egypt	**12**	**0**	**4**	**2**	**7**	**1**	**26**
Meroe	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**
Alexandr-ia	**12**	**5**	**0**	**3**	**4**	**15**	**39**
Outside Egypt	**3**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**7**
Total	**53**	**48**	**7**	**18**	**13**	**18**	**157**

Table 1: The distribution of the different categories of royal statue throughout the regions of Egypt.

ABBREVIATIONS

AfP	*Archiv für Payrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*
AJA	*American Journal of Archaeology*
AM	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*
AncSoc	*Ancient Society*
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*
ASAE	*Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*
BCH	*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*
BClevMus	*The Bulletin of Cleveland Museum of Art*
BdE	*Bibliothèque d'étude. Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*
BIFAO	*Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale*
BJRylLib	*Bulleting of the John Rylands Libaray*
BMusLyon	*Bulletin des musées et monuments lyonnais*
BSAA	*Bulletin de la Société archéologique d'Alexandrie*
BSRAA	*Bulletin de la Société royale d'archéologique d'Alexandrie*
CdE	*Chronique d'Égypte*
Cleopatra's Egypt	Fazzini, R, A, & Bianchi, R, S. (eds). 1988 *Cleopatra's Egypt: Age of the Ptolemies* (The Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn)
ESPL	Bothmer, B. 1960, *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period* (Brooklyn)
EST	Goddio, F. 2006 & 2008, *Egypt's Sunken Treasures*
EtTrav	*Études et travaux. Studia i prace. Travaux du Centre d'archéologie méditerranéene de l'Académie des sciences polonaise*
FIFAO	*Fouilles de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale*
GM	*Göttinger Miszellen*
JARCE	*Journal of American Research in Egypt*
JdI	*Jahrbuch des Deutsche Archäologischen Instituts*
JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
JHA	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JRA	*Journal of Roman Archaeology*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
LÄ	Helck, W, & Westendorf, W. 1975-1992, *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (Wiesbaden)
MÄS	*Münchner Ägyptologische Studien*
MDAIK	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo*

MIFAO	*Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*
OEAE	Redford, D, B. 2001, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*
OGIS	Dittenberger, W. 1903-1905 *Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae, vols 1-2* (Leipzig)
PM I-VII	Porter, B, & Moss, R, L, B. 1927-1981, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hierglyphic Texts, Statues, Reliefs and Paintings* (Clarendon Press, Oxford)
PM VIII	Malek, J, Magee, D, & Miles, E. 1999, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hierglyphic Texts, Statues, Reliefs and Paintings* (Clarendon Press, Oxford)
RA	*Revue archéologique*
RdE	*Revue d'égyptologie*
RT	*Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*
SAK	*Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur*
SASAE	*Supplément aux annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte*
ZÄS	*Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adriani, A. 1940, *Annuario del Museo greco-romano 1935-1939* (Alexandria)

Adriani, A. 1947, "Nuovi ritratti di Arsinoe III" *Arti Figurative 3* (Rome) 51-61

Alston, R. 1995, *Soldier and Society in Roman Egypt: A Social History* (Routledge, London)

Alston, R. 2002, *The City in Roman and Byzantine Egypt,* (Routledge, London)

Anderson, M, L. 1998 "Roman Portraits in Religious and Funerary Contexts" in M. L. Anderson & L. Nista. (eds.) *Roman Portraits in Context* (De Licia, Rome)

Arnold, D. 1999a, *Temples of the Last Pharaohs* (Oxford University Press, New York)

Arnold, D. 1999b, "Old Kingdom Statues in their Architectural Setting" in *Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids* (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) 41-49

Ashton, S. A. 2001, *Ptolemaic Royal Sculpture from Egypt: the interaction between Greek and Egyptian Traditions* (Archaeopress, Oxford)

Ashton, S. A. 2004, *Roman Egyptomania* (Golden House, London)

Assmann, J. 1996, "Preservation and the presentation of self in Ancient Egyptian Portraiture" in P. Der Manuelian. (ed.) *Studies in Honour of William Kelly Simpson* (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) 55-81

Assmann, J. 2001, *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt* (Cornell, University Press, Ithaca)

Athenaeus, *The Deipnosphists*, Trans C, B, Gulick. 1948 (Loeb Classical Library, London)

Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, Trans S, D, Olson. 2006 (Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, London)

Ausführliches Verzeichnis der aegyptischen Altertümer und Gipsabgüsse (Königliche Museen, Berlin, 1899)

Austin, M, M. 1981, *The Hellenistic World From Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Austin, M, M. 2006, *The Hellenistic World From Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Azim, M. & Réveillac, G. 2004 *Karnak dans l'objectif de Georges Legrain: catalogue raisonné des archives photographiques du premier directeur des travaux de Karnak de 1895 à 1917: 2 Volumes* (Centre national de la recherché scientifique éditions, Paris)

Badawy, A, M. 1975, "The Approach to the Egyptian temple in the Late and Graeco-Roman periods" *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde 102*, 79-90

Bagnall, R, S. 2000, "The Fayoum and its People" in S, Walker. (ed.) *Ancient Faces: MummyPortraits from Roman Egypt* (Routledge, New York) 26-9

Bagnall, R. & Frier, B. 1994, *The Demography of Roman Egypt* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Bagnall, R, S. & Derow, P. 2004, *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation* (Blackwell Publishing, Oxford)

Bagnall, R, S. & Rathbone, D, W. 2004, *Egypt: From Alexander to the Copts*, (British Museum Press, London)

Bailey, D, M. 1990, "Classical Architecture in Roman Egypt", in Henig. M. *Architecture and Architectural Sculpture in the Roman Empire* (Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, Oxford) 121-137

Bailey, D, M. 1991, *Hermopolis Magna: Buildings of the Roman Period* (British Museum Press, London)

Baines, J. 1991, “Society, Morality, and Religious Practice” in B, E, Shafer. (ed.) *Religion in Ancient Egypt: Gods, Myths and Personal Practice* (Cornell University Press, London) 123-200

Baines, J. & Malek, J. 1980, *Atlas of Ancient Egypt*, (Phaidon, Oxford)

Bastianini, G & Gallazzi, C. 1989, “Un'iscrizione inedita di Tebtynis per una statua controversa di Tolomeo XII” *Quaderni ticinesi di numismatica e antichità classiche 18*, 201-209

Beard, M. North, J. & Price, S. 1998, *Religions of Rome* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Ben Tor, D. 2001, *In the Presence of the Gods: Statues of Mortals in Egyptian Temples* (The Israel Museum, Jerusalem)

Bernand, A. 1969, *Les Inscriptions grecques de Philae* (Centre national de la recherché scientifique, Paris)

Bernand, A. 1970, *Le Delta égyptien d’après les textes grecs,* 3 Volumes (Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale)

Bernand, A. 1992, *La prose sur pierre dans l’Égypte hellénistique et romaine;* 2 volumes (Editions du Centre nationale de la recherché scientifique, Paris)

Bernand. É. 1975-1981, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques du Fayoum,* 2 Volumes (Bibliothèque d'étude 79-80, Institut français d’archéological orientale, Brill, Leiden)

Bernand, É. 1982, *Inscriptions grecques d’Égypte et de Nubie: Répertoire bibliographique des OGIS* (Belles Lettres, Paris)

Bernand, É. 1998, “Epigraphical Documents and Caracalla in Egypt” in F. Goddio. (ed.) *Alexandria: the submerged Royal Quarters* (Periplus, London) 143-167

Bernand, É. 1999, *Inscriptions grecques d’Hermoupolis Magna et de sa Nécropole*, (Bibliothèque d'étude 123, Institut français d’archéologiel orientale, Cairo)

Bernand, É. 2001, *Inscriptions grecques d’Alexandrie Ptolémaïque* (Bibliothèque d'étude 133, Institut français d’archéological orientale, Cairo)

Bergmann, M. 2007, "The Philosophers and Poets in the Serapieion at Memphis" in P, Schultz.& R, V, D, Hoff. (eds.) *Early Hellenistic Portraiture* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) 246-263

Bianchi, R. 1976, *The Striding Draped Male Figure of Ptolemaic Egypt* (Doctoral Thesis, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University)

Bianchi, R, S. 1978, "The Striding Draped Male Figure in Ptolemaic Egypt" in H, Maehler & V, M, Strocka (eds.) *Das Ptolemäische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions, 27.-29 September in Berlin* (Philip von Zabern, Mainz), 95-102

Bianchi, R, S. 1980, "Not the Isis knot" *Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar 2,* 9-31

Bianchi, R, S. 1988, "The Pharaonic Art of Ptolemaic Egypt" in R, A, Fazzini & R, S, Bianchi (eds.) *Cleopatra's Egypt: Age of the Ptolemies* (The Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn) 55-80

Bingen, J. 2002, "Le Décret Sacerdotal de Karnak" *Chronique d'Égypte 77,* 295-302

Bingen, J. 2007, *Hellenistic Egypt: Monarchy, Society, Economy, Culture* (University of Edinburgh Press, Edinburgh)

Bisson de la Roque, F. 1924, *Rapport sur les fouilles d'Abou Roasch fouilles de 1922 1923* (l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, Cairo)

Bissing, F, W. 1914, *Denkmäler ägyptischer sculptur. 2 Volumes* (F. Bruckmann, Munich)

Blyth, E. 2006, *Karnak: Evolution of a Temple* (Routledge, London)

Boatwright, M, T. 2000, "Just Window Dressing? Imperial Women as Architectural Sculpture" in D. Kleiner & S, B, Matheson (eds) *I Claudia II: Women in Roman Art and Society* (University of Texas Press, Austin) 61-76

Bol, P, C. 1994, *Forschungen zur Villa Albani: Katalog der antiken Bildwerke Vol 4* (Mann, Berlin)

Bommas, M. 2005, Heiligtum und Mysterium : Griechenland und seine ägyptischen Gottheiten (Philip von Zabern, Mainz)

Bommas, M. 2012, "The Iseum Campense as a Memory Site" in M, Bommas. J, Harrison, and P, Ray (eds.) *Memory and Urban Religion in the Ancient World* (Bloomsbury, London) 177-201

Borchardt, L. 1930, *Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten im Museum von Kairo* (Reichsdruckerei, Berlin)

Boschung, D. 1993, *Die Bildnisse des Augustus* (Mann, Berlin)

Bosanquet, R, C. 1912, "On the Bronze Portrait Head" *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology IV* (Liverpool University Press, Liverpool) 66-71

Bothmer, B, V. 1959, "La tête égyptienne d'Auxerre" *La Revue des Arts 9*, 98-108

Bothmer, B, V. et al, 1969, *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period 700-100 BC* (Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn)

Bothmer, B, V. 1996, "Hellenistic Elements in Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period" in *Alexandria and Alexandrianism* (Paul Getty Museum, Brooklyn) 215-230

Botti, G. 1897, *Fouilles à la Colonne Théodosienne (1896): mémoire présenté a la société* (Imprimerie générale L. Carrière, Alexandria)

Botti, G. 1897, *Plan de quartier "Rhacotis" das l'Alexandrie romaine* (Imprimerie générale L. Carrière, Alexandria)

Botti, G. 1898, *Plan de la ville d'Alexandrie a l'époque Ptolémaique; monuments et localités de l'ancienne Alexandrie d'apres les écrivains et les fouilles* (Imprimerie générale L. Carrière, Alexandria)

Botti, G. 1900, *Catalogue des monuments exposés au Musée Gréco-Romain d'Alexandrie* ((Imprimerie générale A. Mourès & cie, Alexandria)

Botti, G. 1902, "Bulletine épigraphique" *Bulletin de la Société royale d'archéologie d'Alexandrie 4*, 85-107

Boulos, T. 1910, "A Report on some Antiquities found in the inspectorate of Minieh" *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 10,* 114-115

Bowman, A, K. 1986, *Egypt after the Pharaohs, 332 BC – AD 642: from Alexander to the Arab Conquest* (British Museum Publications, London)

Bowman, A, K. 2001, "Urbanisation in Roman Egypt" in E, Fentress (ed.) *Romanization and the City: Creation, transformations and failures: papers of a conference held at the American Academy in Rome, 14-16th May 1998* (*Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement 38*, Portsmouth) 173-187

Bowman, A, K. et al. 2007, *Oxyrhynchus: A City & Its Texts*, (Egyptian Exploration Society, London)

Bulloch, W, A. 1993, *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (University of California Press, London)

Breccia, E. 1905, "Antiquités découvertes à Maamourah par S. A. le prince Omar Pacha Toussoun" *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie d'Alexandrie 8*, 107-117

Breccia, E. 1905, "Cronaca del museo e degli scavi e ritrovamenti nel territorio di Alessandria" *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie d'Alexandrie 8*, 118-132

Breccia, E. 1907, "Les fouilles dans le Serapeum d'Alexandrie en 1905-6" *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte 8*, 62-76

Breccia. E. 1911, *Iscrizioni greche e latine* (Cairo)

Breccia, E. 1914, *Alexandria ad Aegyptum: guide de la ville ancienne et moderne et du Musée Gréco-Romain* (Istituto Italiano d'arti grafiche, Bergamo)

Breccia, E. 1926, *Le rovine e i monumenti di Canopo. Teadelfia e il tempio di Pneferôs* (Officine dell'Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche, Bergamo)

Breccia, E. 1932, *Le Musée gréco-romain 1925-1931* (Instituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche, Bergamo)

Breccia, E. 1933, *Le Musée gréco-romain 1931-1932* (Instituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche, Bergamo)

Bresciani, E. 1997, "L'Università di Pisa nel Fayum: tra Medinet Madi e Kom Khelua" in *Archaeologia e Papiri nel Fayyum. Storia della ricerca, Problemi e*

prospettive: atti del convegno internazionale, Siracusa, 24-25 Maggio 1996 (Instituto Internazionale del Papiro, Siracusa) 57-68

Briant, P. 1999, "Inscriptions multilingues d'époque Achéménide: le lexte et l'image" in D, Valbelle & J, Leclant (eds) *Le Décret de Memphis* (Foundation Singer-Polignac, Paris) 91-115

Brissaud, P. & Zivie-Coche, C. 1998-2005, *Tanis: Travaux récents sur le tell Sân el Hagar, 3 Volumes* (Noêsis, Paris)

Camp, J, M. 1992, *The Athenian Agora: Excavations at the Heart of Classical Athens* (Thames & Hudson, London)

Cauville, S. 1987, "Les statues cultelles de Dendera d'après les inscriptions pariétales" *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale de Caire 87*, 73-117

Cauville, S. 1992, *Dendera: guide de archéologique* (Institut français d'archaéologie orientale, Cairo)

Chaban, M. 1910, "Monuments recueillis pendant les inspections" *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 10*, 28-30

Chamoux, F. 2003, *Hellenistic Civilization* (Blackwell Publishing, Oxford)

Chaniotis, A. 2005, "The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers" in A. Erskine (ed.) *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Blackwell Publishing, Oxford) 431-445

Chassinat, É. 1897-1918, *Temple d'Edfou I & II* (Institut Français d'archéologie orientale, Cairo)

Chassinat, É. 1934, *Le Temple de Dendara II* (Institut Français d'archéologie orientale, Cairo)

Chevrier, H. 1939, "Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1938-1939)" *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 39,* 553-601

Clarysse, W. 1995 “Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt” in S, P, Vleeming (ed) *Hundred-Gated Thebes: Acts of a Colloquium on Thebes and the Theban Area in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Brill, Leiden) 1-20

Clarysse, W. 1999 “Ptolémées et Temples” in D, Valbelle & J, Leclant (eds.) *Le Décret de Memphis* (Foundation Singer-Polignac, Paris) 41-62

Clarysse, W. & Thompson, D. 2006, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Coles, R, A. 2007 “Oxyrhynchus: A City and its Texts”, in A, K, Bowman et al. (eds.) *Oxyrhynchus: A City & Its Texts* (Egyptian Exploration Society, London) 3-17

Comstock, M, B. & Vermeule, C. 1976, *Sculpture in Stone* (Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Boston)

Coppens, F. 2007, *The Wabet: Tradition and Innovation in Temples in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Czech Institue of Egyptology, Oxford)

Corteggiani, J. P. 1998, "Les Aegyptiaca de la fouille sous-marine de Qaitbay" *Bulletin de la Société française d’égyptologie* 142, 25-40

Curto, S. 1985, *Le sculpture egizie ed egittizzanti nelle Ville Torlonia in Roma* (Brill, Leiden)

D’Ambra, E. 1998, *Roman Art* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998)

Dabrowski, L. 1962, “La topographie d’Athribis à l’époque romaine” *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 57*, 19-31

Daumas, F. 1952, *Les moyens d’expression du grec et de l'égyptien: Comparés dans les décrets de Canope et de Memphis* (*Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* Supplement 16)

Derriks, C. & Delvaux, 2009, *Antiquités égyptiennes au Musée royal de Mariemont* (Musée royal de Mariemont, Belgium)

Dittenberger, W. 1903-5, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (Leipzig)

Donadoni, S. 1989, “Images and Form: the Experience of Sculpture” in *Egyptian Civilisation: Monumental Art*, (Museum of Turin, Milan) 98-185

Donadoni Roveri, A,M. Aisoa, S. & Minà, P (eds.) (2003) *Faraoni come dei, Tolemei come Faraoni, Atti del V Congresso Internazionale Italo-Egiziano Torino, Archivio di Stato, 8-12 dicembre 2001* (Museo Egizio di Torino, Torino)

Dundas, G, S. 1993, *Pharaoh, Basileus, Imperator: The Roman Imperial Cult in Egypt* (UMI, Michigan)

Edgar, C, C. 1909, “Greek Sculpture from Tell Timai” in M, G, Maspero (ed.) *Le Musée Égyptien vol 3* (Institut français d’archéologie orientale, Cairo) 1-13

Edgar, C, C. 1913, “A Statue of a Hellenistic King” *Journal of Hellenic Studies 33,* 50-52

Elkins, J. 2002, "The Object Stares Back: On the Nature of Seeing" in S, B, Platt (ed.) *Religion, Art and Visual Culture* (Plagrave, Hampshire) 40-45

El-Fattah, A. & Gallo, P. 1998, “Aegyptiaca Alexandrina: Monuments pharaoniques decouverts récemment à Alexandrie” in J. Y. Empereur. (ed.) *Alexandrina Volume 1* (Institut français d’archéologie orientale, Cairo) 7-19

El-Sabban, S. 2000, *Temple Festival Calendars of Ancient Egypt* (Redwood Books)

El-Sawi, A. 1979, *Excavations at Tell Basta: Report of Seasons 1967-71 and Catalogue of Finds* (Charles University, Prague)

Emery, 1970, “Preliminary Reports on the Excavations at North Saqqara 1968-9” *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 56*, 5-11

Empereur, J. Y. 1995, “Alexandrie” *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique 119,* 743-760

Empereur, J. Y. 1996, “Alexandrie” *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique 120*, 959-970

Empereur, J. Y. 1998a, *Alexandria Rediscovered* (George Braziller Purblishing, New York)

Empereur, J. Y. et al, 1998b, *La Gloire d'Alexandrie: 7 Mai – 26 Juillet 1998* (Paris Musées, Paris)

Empereur, J. Y, Hesse, A, & Picard, O. 1994, "Alexandrie" *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique 118*, 503-519

Englebach, R. 1924, "The Treasure of Athribis" *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 24*, 178-185

Faider-Feytmans, G. 1952, *Les antiquités égyptiennes, grecques, étrusques, romaines et gallo-romaines du Musée de Mareimont* (Édition de la Librairie encyclopédique, Brussles)

Fairman, H, W. 1954, "Worship and Festivals in the Egyptian Temple" in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 37.1*, 165-203

Favard-Meeks, C. 1991, *Le temple de Behbeit el-Hagara: essai de reconstitution et d'interpretation* (H. Buske, Hamburg)

Favard-Meeks, C. 1998, "Mise à jour des ouvrages de Flinders Petrie sur les fouilles de Tanis" in P, Brissaud & C, Zivie-Coche (eds.) *Tanis: travaux récents sur le tell Sân Hagar. Mission français des fouilles de Tanis 1987-1997* (Noesis, Paris) 101-178

Fazzini, R, A. & Bianchi, R, S. (eds.), 1988, *Cleopatra's Egypt: Age of the Ptolemies* (The Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn) 55-80

Fejfer, J. 2008, *Roman Portraits in Context* (Walter de Gruyter, New York)

Finnestad, R, B. 1997, "Temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods: Ancient Traditions in New Contexts" in B, E, Shafer (ed.) *Temples of Ancient Egypt* (Cornell University Press, New York) 185-237

Fishwick, D. 1989, "Statues taxes in Roman Egypt" *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte 38*, 335-347

Fittschen, K. & Zanker, P. 1985, *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom Bd. 1 Kaiser- und Prinzenbildnisse* (Phillip von Zabern, Mainz)

Fragaki, H, 2009, "Une groupe de sculptures découvert dans le Quartier Royale d'Alexandrie" *Alexandrina* vol 3 (Institut français d'archéologie orientale, Cairo) 63-104

Fraser, P, M. 1960, "Inscriptions from Ptolemaic Egypt" *Berytus 13,* 123-161

Fraser, P, M. 1972, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Clarendon Press, Oxford)

Galliano, G. & Gabolde, M. 2000, *Coptos: L'Egypte antique aux portes du désert*, (Réunion des Musée Nationaux, Paris)

Gallo, P. 1990, "Quelques monuments royaux provenant de Behbeit el-Hagar" *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale de Caire 90,* 223-228

Gallo, P. 1997, *Ostraka demotici e ieratici dall'archivio bilingue di Narmuthis* (ETS, Pisa)

Garstang, J. 1912, "Second Interim Report on the Excavations at Meroe in Ethiopia" in *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology IV*, (Liverpool University Press, Liverpool) 45-52

Gazda, E, K. 1978, *Guardians of the Nile* (Kelsey Museum, University of Michigan)

Gazda, E, K, 2004, *Karanis: And Egyptian Town in Roman times* (Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan)

Gibson, C. 2007, "Alexander in the Tychaion: Ps-Libanius on the Statues" *Greek, Roman & Byzantine Studies 47,* 431-454

Gibson, C. 2008, *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta)

Goddio, F. 2006, *Egypt's Sunken Treasures* (Prestel, London)

Goddio, F. 2007, *The Topography and Excavation of Heracleion-Thonis and East Canopus (1996-2006)* (Institute of Archaeology, Oxford)

Goddio, F. 2008, *Egypt's Sunken Treasures* (Prestel, London)

Goddio, F. & Yoyotte, J, 1998, *Alexandria: The Submerged Royal Quarters* (Periplus, London)

Goddio, F. & Bernand, A. 2004, *Sunken Egypt: Alexandria* (Periplus, London)

Goebs, K. 2007, "Kingship" in T. Wilkinson (ed.) *The Egyptian World* (Routledge, London) 275-295

Goyon, J. C. 1988, "Ptolemaic Egypt: Priests and the Traditional Religion", in R, A, Fazzini. & R, S, Bianchi. (eds) *Cleopatra's Egypt: Age of the Ptolemies* (Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn) 29-40

Goyon, J. C. et al, (eds.) 2004, *Trésors d'Égypte: la 'cachette' de Karnak, 1904-2004, Exposition en homage à Georges Legrain à l'occasion du IXe Congrès International des Égyptologues, Musée Dauphinois, Grenoble, 4 Septembre 2004-5 Janvier 2005* (Conseil general de l'Isere, Grenoble)

Goyon, J. C. & Gabolde, M. 1991, "Trois pièces de Basse-époque et d'Époque Ptolémaïque au Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lyon" *Bulletin des Musées Lyonnais 3-4,* 2-27

Graindor, P. 1937, *Bustes et statues-portraits d'Égypte Romaine* (Imprimerie P. Barbey, Cairo)

Grenfell, B, P. & Hunt, A, S. 1914, *Oxyhrynchus Papyri,* Vol. X (Egypt Exploration Fund, London)

Grenfell, B, P. & Hunt, A, S. 1916, *Oxyhrynchus Papyri,* Vol. XII (Egypt Exploration Fund, London)

Griffith, F, Ll. 1890, "Tarraneh" in E, Naville & F, Ll, Griffith (eds), *The Mound of the Jew and the City of Onias: Belbeis, Samanood, Abusir, Tukh el Karamus 1887 and The Antiquities of Tell El Yahudiyeh and Miscellaneous Work in Lower Egypt During the Years 1887-1888* (Egyptian Exploration Society 7, London) 60-64

Grimm, G. & Johannes, D. 1975, *Kunst der Ptolemäer-und Römerzeit im Ägyptischen Museum Kairo* (P.von Zabern, Mainz)

Grimm, G. 1998, *Alexandria: Die erst Königsstadt der hellenistischen Welt: No;der aus der Nilmetropole von Alexander dem Grossen bis Kleopatra VII* (Philip von Zabern, Mainz)

Habachi, L. 1969, *Features of the Deification of Rameses II* (J.J.Augustin, Glückstadt)

Handler, S. 1971 "Architecture on the Roman Coins of Alexandria" *American Journal of Archaeology 75,* 57-74

Hartswick, K, J. 2004, *The Gardens of Sallust: A Changing Landscape* (University of Texas Press, Austin)

Hastings, E, A, 1997, *The Sculpture from the Sacred Animal Necropolis at North Saqqara 1964-1976* (Egypt Exploration Society, London)

Haynes, D, E, L. 1983, "The Date of the Bronze Head of Augustus from Meroe" in A, Adriani. N, Bonacasa, A, Di Vita. & G, Barone (eds.) *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico-romano: studi in onore di Achille Adriani* (L'Erma di Bretschneider, Rome)

Hawass, Z. 1997 "A Statue of Caracalla found in the Nile by a Fisherman" J, Phillips (ed) *Ancient Egypt, the Aegean, and the Near East: Studies in Honour of Martha Rhoads Bell vol 1* (Van Sicklen Books, San Antonio) 227-233

Helbig, W. 1963-1972, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom 4: Die Staatlichen Sammlungen* (E. Wasmuth, Tübingen)

Herklotz, F. 2007, *Prinzeps und Pharao: der Kult des Augustus in Agypten* (Doctoral Thesis Humboldt-Universität, Berlin)

Hill, M. 2007, *Gifts for the Gods: Images from Egyptian Temples* (Yale University Press, London)

Hoepfner, W. 1971, *Zwei Ptolemäerbauten: Das Ptolemäerweihgeschenk in Olympia und ein Bauvorhaben Alexandria* (*Mann, Berlin*)

Hoffman, F, Minas-Nerpel, M. & Pfeiffer, S. 2009, *Die dreisprachige Stele des C. Cornelius Gallus: Übersetzung und Kommentar* (De Gruyer, Berlin)

Hölbl, G. 2000, *Altägypten im Römischen Reich: Der römische Pharao und seine Tempel* (Philip von Zabern, Mainz)

Hölbl, G. 2001, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (trans Saavedra. T) (Routledge, London)

Hornblower, S & Spawforth, A. 1996, *Oxford Classical Dictionary; Third Edition* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)

Hornung, E. 1982, *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many* (trans. Baines. J) (Cornell University Press, New York)

Hornung, E. 1992, *Idea into Image: Essays on Ancient Egyptian Thought*, (trans Bredeck. E.) (Timken Publishing, New York)

Huss, W. 1991, "Die in Ptolemäischer Zeit verfassten Synodal-Dekrete der äegyptischen Priester" *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 88,* 189-216

Hunt, A, S. 1911, *Oxyhrynchus Papyri,* Vol. VIII (Egypt Exploration Fund, London, 1911)

Hunt, A, S. & Edgar, C, C. 1927, *Select Papyri* Volume II (Loeb Classical Library William Heinemann, London)

IFAO, 2011, *Karnak Cachette* (Institut française d'archéologie orientale) http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/cachette/about

Jombard, E, F. 1809, *Description de l'Egypte,* Volume 2 (Paris)

Johnson, C, G. 1995, "Ptolemy V and the Rosetta Decree: The Egyptianisation of the Ptolemaic Kings" *Ancient Society 26,* 145-155

Johnson, J, H. 2001, *The Demotic Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (The Oriental Institute, Chicago) http://oi.uchicago.edu/research/pubs/catalog/cdd/

Jong, de J. 2006, "Egyptian Papyri and "Divinity" of the Roman Emperor" L. de Bois, P, Funke, & J, Hahn, (eds.) *The Impact of Imperial Rome on Religions, Ritual, and Religious Life in the Roman Empire* (Brill, Leiden) 239-252

Jong, de J. 2011, "Celebrating Supermen: Divine Honors for Roman Emperors in Greek Papyri from Egypt" P, P, Iossif, A, S, Chankowski & C, C, Lorber (eds.) *More than Men, Less than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship* (Studia Hellenistica 51, Peeters, Leuven) 619-647

Josephson, J. 1995, "A Fragmentary Egyptian Head from Heliopolis" *Metropolitan Museum of Art Journal 30*, 5-15

Josephson, J. 1997, *Egyptian Royal Sculpture of the Late Period 400-246BC* (Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz)

Jouguet. P. 1939, "Note les inscriptions grecques découvertes à Karnak" *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 39*, 603-605

Jucker, H. 1981, "Römische Herrscherbildnisse aus Ägypten" *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt 2.12.2*, 667-725

Kayser, F. 1994, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines (non funéraires) d'Alexandrie impérial (Ier-IIIer s. apr.J-C)* (Institut français is d'archéologie oriental, Cairo)

Kiessling, E. 1971, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten X* (O. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden)

Kiss, Z. 1984, *Etudes sur le portrait impérial Romain en Egypte* (Editions scientifiques de Pologne, Varsovie)

Kiss, Z. 1995, “Quelques portraits impériaux romains d’Égypte” *Études et travaux. 17,* 53-71

Kiss, Z. 1998 “The Sculptures” in F, Goddio. & J, Yoyotte. (eds.) *Alexandria: The Submerged Royal Quarters* (Periplus, London)

Kjølby, A. 2007, *New Kingdom Private Temple Statues: A Study of Agency, Decision Making, and Materiality* (University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen)

Koenen, L. 1993, “The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure” A, Bulloch (ed.) *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World* (University of California Press, London) 25-115

Konrad, K. 2006, *Architektur und Theologie: pharaonische Tempelterminologie unter Berücksichtigung königsideologischer Aspekte* (Doctoral Thesis, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, Mainz)

Krug, A. 1978, “Die Bildnisse Ptolemaios IX, X, und IX” in H. Maehler & V. M. Strocka, (eds.) *Das Ptolemaische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions, 27.-29 September in Berlin* (Philip von Zabern, Mainz) 9-22

Krumeich, R. 2007, “Human Achievement and Divine Favour: The Religious Context of Early Hellenistic Portraiture” in P, Schultz & R, V, D, Hoff. (eds.) *Early Hellenistic Portraiture* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Kurth, D. 2004, *The Temple of Edfu: A Guide by an Ancient Priest* (The American University Press in Cairo, Cairo)

Kyrieleis, H. 1975, *Bildnisse der Ptolemäer* (Mann, Berlin)

Kyrieleis, H. 1980, “Ein Hellenistische Götter” *Stēlē: tomos eis mnēmēn Nikolaou Kontoleontos* (Sōmateio Hoi Philoi tou Nikolaou Kontoleontos, Athens) 383-387

Lanciers, E. 1991 “Die Ägyptischen Priester des Ptolemäischen Konigskultes” *Revue d'égyptologie 42,* 117-145

Łatjar, A. 2006, *Deir el-Bahari in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods: A Study of an Egyptian temple based on Greek Sources* (University of Warsaw, Warsaw)

Laube, I. 2012, *Expedition Ernst von Sieglin: Skulpturen des Hellenismus und der Kaiserzeit aus Ägypten* (Hirmer Verlag, Munich)

Laubscher, H, P. 1991, "Ptolemäische Reiterbilder" *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung 106*, 223-238

Lauer, J. P. & Picard, C. 1955, *Les Statues Ptolémaïques du Sarapieion de Memphis* (Publications de l'institut d'art et d'archéologie de l'Université de Paris, Paris)

Lauffray, J. 1971, "Abords occidentaux du premier Pylône de Karnak en 1968-1970" *Kêmi 21,* 77- 144

Lawrence, A, W. 1925, "Greek Sculpture in Ptolemaic Egypt" *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 11*, 179-190

Lee, L. & Quirke, S. 2000 "Painting Materials" in P. T Nicholson. & I. Shaw. (eds.) *Ancient Egyptian Material and Technology*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) 104-120

Lembke, K. 1994, *Das Iseum Campense in Rom: Studie über den Isiskult unter Domitian* (Verlag Archäeologie und Geschichte, Heidelberg)

Lembke, K. 2000 "Eine Ptolemaergalerie aus Thmuis/Tell Timai" *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 115*, 113-146

Leonard, A. 1997, *Ancient Naukratis: Excavations at a Greek Emporium in Egypt* (American School of Oriental Research, Cambridge)

Letronne, A, J. 1842, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Égypte* (Impriemerie royale, Paris)

Lewis, N. & Reinhold, M. 1999, *Roman Civilization: Selected Readings* Vol II (Columbia University Press, Oxford)

Libanius, *Descriptiones*, text Foerster. R. *Libanii Opera* (B.G. Teubneri, Lipsaie, 1927)

Libonati, E, S. 2010, *Egyptian Statuary from Aboukir Bay: Ptolemaic and Roman finds from Herakleion and Canopus* (Doctoral Thesis, University of Oxford)

Lichtheim, M. 1976, *Ancient Egyptian Literature Volume II: The New Kingdom* (University of California Press, London)

Lloyd, A, B. 2002, "The Egyptian Elite in the Early Ptolemaic Period. Some Hieroglyphic Evidence", in D. Ogden (ed.) *The Hellenistic World, New Perspectives*, (Duckworth, Swansea) 117-136

Loeben, C, E. 2001, *Beobachtungen zu Kontext und Funktion königlicher Statuen im Amun-Tempel von Karnak*, (DPhil Thesis, Humboldt University)

Lorton, D. 1999 "The Theology of Cult Statues in Ancient Egypt" in M, B, Dick (ed.) *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of the cult image in the Ancient Near East* (Eisenbrauns, Indiana)

Ma, J. 2007, "Hellenistic Honorific Statue and their Inscriptions", in Z, Newby & R, Leader- Newby, (eds.) *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) 203-220

MacCoull, L, S, B. 1988, *Discorus of Aphrodito: His Work and World*, (University of California Press, London)

MacQuitty, W. 1976, *Island of Isis: Philae, Temple of the Nile* (Macdonald and Jane's, London)

Maehler, H. 1983, "Der griechische Schule im ptolemäischen Ägypten" E. Van't Dack, P, Van Dessel, & W, Van Gucht (eds) *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven, 24-26 May 1982* (Lovanii, Leuven) 191-203

Mahaffy, J, P, 1895, *The Empire of the Ptolemies* (Macmillan, London)

Mariette, A. 1887, "Fragments et documents relatifs aux fouilles de Sân" *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et á l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes 9,* 1-20

Maspero, G. 1883, Correspondence in *Revue Archéologique*

Mayer, E. 2010 “Propaganda, staged applause, or local politics? Public Monuments from Augustus to Septimius Severus” in B, C, Ewald & C, F, Norena (eds.) *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) 111-134

McCann, A, M. 1968, *The Portraits of Septimius Severus (AD193-211)* (American Academy in Rome 30, Rome)

McKenzie, J. 2007, *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt c.300 BC TO AD 700* (Yale University Press, Oxford)

McKenzie, J, Gibson, S & Reyes, A, T. 2004, “Reconstructing the Serapeum in Alexandria from the Archaeological Evidence” *Journal of Roman Studies 94*, 73-121

Meeks, D. and Favard-Meeks, C. 1996, *Daily Life of the Egyptian Gods* (trans Goshgarian. G. M) (John Murray, London)

Messīḥa, H. 1983, *Finds from Kom Ichḳâw*, (Organisme général des impr. gouvernementales, Cairo)

Meulenaere, H. 1976, “The Mendes Decree” in P, MacKay. P & H, de Meulenaere, (eds.) *Mendes II* (Aris & Phillips, Warminster) 174-177

Meulenaere, H & MacKay, P. 1976, *Mendes II* (Aris & Phillips, Warminster)

Michalowski, K. 1935, “Un portrait égyptien d’Auguste au Musée du Caire” *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale de Caire 35*, 73-88

Michalowski, K. 1962, “Les fouilles polonaises à Tell Atrib en 1960” *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 57*, 67-77

Miho Museum, South Wing, 1997 (Miho Museum, Shigaraki)

Miln, J, G. 1971, *Catalogue of Alexandrian Coins* (Ashmolean Museum, London)

Minas, M. 1998, “Die Kanephoros Aspekte des Ptolemäischen Dynastiekults” in H. Melaerts (ed.) *Le culte dusSouverain dans l’Egypte ptolémaïque au IIIe siècle avant notre ère: actes du colloque international, Bruxelles, 10 mai 1995* (Studia Hellenistica 34, Peeters, Leuven) 43-60

Müller, W, M, 1920, *The Bilingual Decrees of Philae* (Carnegie Institution of Washington publication, Washington)

Müller, H, W. 1957, "Ein weiterer Arbeitsbericht des 'Corpus of Late Egyptian Sculpture" *Akten des 24th Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses Munchen 28 August bis 4 September 1957* (Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Wiesbaden) 64-71

Müller, H, W. 1969, *Der Isiskult im antiken Benevent und Katalog der Skulpturen aus den ägyptischen Heiligtumern im Museo del Sannio zu Benevent,* (B, Hessling, Berlin)

Müller, S. 2009, *Das hellenistische Königspaar in der medialen Repräsentation: Ptolemaios II und Arsinoe II* (W. De Gruyter, New York).

Mueller, K. 2006, *Settlements of the Ptolemies* (Peeters, Leuven)

Murnane, W, J. 1995, *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt* (Scholars Press, Atlanta)

Mysliwiec, K. 1973, "A Contribution to the study of Ptolemaic Royal Portraiture" *Études et travaux. 7*, 41-51

Mysliwiec, K. 1992b, "Some Egyptian Aspects of Hellenistic Cults at Athribis" *50 years of Polish Excavations in Egypt and the Bear East: Acts of the Symposium at Warsaw University, 1986* (Warsaw) 260-265

Mysliwiec, K, & Herbich, T, 1988, "Polish Archaeological Activities at Tell Atrib in 1985" *The Archaeology of the Nile Delta: Problems & Priorities* (Netherlands Foundation for Research in Egypt, Amsterdam) 177-203

Mysliwiec, K, et al 1988, "Remains of a Ptolemaic Villa at Athribis" *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo 44*, 183-197

Naville, E. 1903, *The Store City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus* (Egyptian Exploration Foundation, London)

Needler, W. 1949, "Some Ptolemaic Sculptures in the Yale University Art Gallery" *Berytus 9,* 129-141

Nicole, G. & Darier, G. 1909, "Le sanctuaire des dieux orientaux au Janicule" *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire: l'école français de Rome 29,* 3-86

Niemeyer, H, G. 1968, *Studien zur statuarischen Darstellung der römischen Kaiser* (Habilitationsschrift, Köln)

Nock, A. 1972, "Συνναοσ Θεοσ" in A. Nock (ed.) *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (Clarendon Press, Oxford) 202-251

Noshy, I. 1937, *The Arts in Ptolemaic Egypt: A Study of Greek and Egyptian influences in Ptolemaic Architecture and Scuplture* (University of London, London)

Ochsenschlager, E. 1980, "Tell Timai (South Kom)" E, S, Hall & B, V, Bothmer, (ed.) *Mendes I* (American Research Centre in Egypt, Cairo)

Onasch, C. 1976, "Zur Königsideologie der Ptolemäer in den Dekreten von Canopus und Memphis (Rosetta)"*Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete 24*, 137-155

Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Egypt Vols I-III, 2001, (Oxford University Press, Oxford)

Pagenstecher, R. 1923, *Expedition E. v. Sieglin II I.A* (Leipzig)

Parlasca, K. 1967, "Ein verkanntes hellenistisches Herrscherbildnis" *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 82*, 167-194

Parlasca, K. 1978, "Probleme der späten Ptolemäerbildnisse" in H. Maehler & V. M. Strocka, (eds.) *Das Ptolemaische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions, 27.-29 September in Berlin* (Philip von Zabern, Mainz) 25-30

Pausanias, *Guide to Greece 1: Central Greece*, (trans P, Levi) 1971 (Penguin Books, London)

Petrie, W, M, F. 1885, *Tanis 1* (Egyptian Exploration Society, London)

Petrie, W, M, F. 1896, *Koptos* (Quaritch, London)

Petrie, W, M, F. 1908, *Athribis* (School of Archaeology in Egypt, London)

Petrie, W, M, F. 1909, *Memphis* (School of Archaeology in Egypt, London)

Petrie, W, M, F, et al. 1915, *Heliopolis, Kafr Ammar, and Shurafa*, (School of Egyptology, London)

Petrie, W, M, F. 2007, "Oxyrhynchus Revisited" in Bowman. A. K. et al. *Oxyrhynchus: A City & Its Texts* (Egyptian Exploration Society, London) 50-69

Pfeiffer, S. 2008, *Herrscher-und Dynastiekult im Ptolemäerreich: Systematik und Einordnung der Kultformen* (C.H.Beck, Munich)

Pfeiffer, S. 2010, *Der römische Kaiser und das Land am Nil: Kaiserverehrung und Kaiserkult in Alexandria und Ägypten von Augustus bis Caracalla (30 v.Chr-217 n.Chr.)* (Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart)

Pfrommer, M, 1999, *Alexandria: im Schatten der Pyramiden* (Philipp von Zabern, Mainz)

Philip, P. 1905, *Antiquités Égyptiennes, Grecques et Romaines Appartenant à P. Philip et à divers Amateurs: sculptures, peintures, bronzes, étoffes, faiences, figures de Tanagra, verres irisés* (Hôtel Drouot, Paris, 10th, 11th, & 12th April)

Philo, *Embassy to Gaius*, (trans F, H, Colson & G. H. Whitaker) 1962 (Loeb Classical Library, William Heinemann)

Pliny, *Natural History*, trans. J, F, Healy, 1971 (Penguin, London)

Porter, B. & Moss, R, L, B. 1927-1981, *Typographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings vols 1-7* (Clarendon Press, Oxford)

Price, S, R, F. 1986, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Price, S. 1999 *Religions of the Greeks* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Quaegebeur, J. 1978, "Reines ptolémaïques et traditions égyptiennes" in H. Maehler & V. M. Strocka, (eds.) *Das Ptolemaische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions, 27.-29 September in Berlin* (Philip von Zabern, Mainz) 245-262

Quaegebeur, J. 1989a, "The Egyptian clergy and the cult of the Ptolemies" *Ancient Society 20*, 93-117

Quaegebeur, J. 1989b, "Cleopatra VII and the Cults of the Ptolemies" in R, A, Fazzini & R, S, Bianchi (eds.) *Cleopatra's Egypt* (Brooklyn Museum, New York) 41 54

Quaegebeur, J. 1998, "Documents égyptiens anciens et nouveaux relatifs à Arsinoé Philadelphe" in H, Melaerts (ed.) *Le culte du souverain dans l'egypt ptolémaïque au IIIe siècle avant notre ère: actes du colloque international, Bruxelles 10 mai 1995* (Studia Hellenistic 34, Peeters, Leuven) 73-108

Quirke, S. 1992, *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (British Museum Press, London)

Quirke, S. & Andrews, C. 1988, *The Rosetta Stone: A Facsimile Drawing* (British Museum Publications, London)

Redford, D, B. 2001, *Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)

Rice, E, E, 1983, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)

Riggs, C. 2012, *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)

Robins, G. 2001 *Egyptian Statues*, (Shire, Princes Risborough)

Robins, G. 2005, "Cult Statues in Ancient Egypt" in N, H, Wall (ed.) *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East* (American Schools of Oriental Research, Boston) 1-12

Rogge, E. 1999, *Statuen der 30. Dynastie und der Ptolemäisch-römischen Epoche* (Philip von Zabern, Mainz)

Romans and Barbarians, 1976 (Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Boston)

Rondot, V. 1997, “Le Temple de Soknebtynis à Tebtunis” in *Archeologia e Papiri nel Fayyum: Storia della ricerca, problemi e prospettive* (Instituto Internazionale del Papiro, Siracusa)

Rondot, V. 2004, *Tebtynis II: Le Temple de Soknebtynis et son Dromos* (Institut français d’archéologie orientale, Cairo)

Rose, C, B. 1997, *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Roullet, J. 1972, *The Egyptian and Egyptianising Monuments of Imperial Rome* (Brill, Leiden)

Rowe, A. 1946, *Discovery of the Famous Temple and Enclosure of Serapis at Alexandria* (*Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* Supplement 2)

Rowe, A. 1957, “A Contribution to the Archaeology of the Wester Desert: IV. The Great Serapeum of Alexandria” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 39*, 485-512

Rowlandson, J. 2005, “Town and Country in Ptolemaic Egypt” in A, Erskine (ed.) *Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Blackwell, London)

Rubensohn, O. 1902, “Griechisch-römische funde in Ägypten” *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 42-52

Rubensohn, O. 1906, “Äegypten” *Archäologischer Anzeiger,* 124-143

Rutherford, I. 2003, “Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman Egypt: New Perspectives on Graffiti from the Mennonion at Abydos” in R, Matthews & C, Roemer (eds.) *Ancient Perspectives on Egypt* (UCL Press, London)

Sabottka, M. 2008 *Das Serapeum in Alexandria: Untersuchungen zur Architectur und Baugeschichte des Heiligtums von der frühen ptolemäischen Zeit bis zur Zerstötung 391 n. Chr* (Institute français d'archéologie orientale, Cairo)

Sadek, A, I. 1987, *Popular Religion In Egypt during the New Kingdom* (Gerstenberg Verlag, Hildesheim)

Saint-Genis, 1818, *Descriptions des Antiquités d'Alexandrie et de ses environs,* in E, Jomard (ed.) *Description de l'Égypte Antiquites V* (Paris)

Saleh, A. A. 1981, *Excavations at Heliopolis: Ancient Egyptian Ounû* (Cairo University, Cairo)

Samuel, A, E. 1983 *From Athens to Alexandria: Hellenism and Social Goals in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Lovanii)

Sauneron, A. 1960, "Un document égyptien relatif à la divinisation de la reine Arsinoe II" *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale de Caire 60,* 83-109

Sauneron, S. 2000, *The Priests of Ancient Egypt* (Cornell University Press, London)

Savvopoulos, K. 2011, *Alexandria in Aegypto: The role of the Egyptian tradition in the Hellenistic and Roman periods; ideology, culture, identity, and public life* (Doctoral Thesis, University of Leiden, Leiden)

Savopoulos, K, & Bianchi, R. 2012, *Alexandrian Sculpture in the Graeco-Roman Museum* (Bibliotheca Alexandrina, Alexandria)

Sayce, A, H. 1895, "Archaeological News: Egypt" *American Journal of Archaeology 10*, 384-385

Schultz, P. 2009, "Divine Image and Royal Ideology in the Philippeion at Olympia" in J, T, Jensen et al (eds.) *Aspects of Ancient Greek Cult: Context, Ritual, and Iconography (Aarhus University Press, Aarhus)* 125-193

Shafter, B, E. 1997, "Temples, Priests and Rituals: An Overview" in B, E, Shafter (ed.) *Temples of Ancient Egypt* (Cornell University Press, New York)

Schmidt, S. 2013, "Ser Sturz des Serapis - Zur Bedeutung paganer Götterbilder in der spätantiken Gesellschaft Alexandrias" in T, Georges. F, Albrecht, and R, Feildmeier (eds.) *Alexandria: Civitatum Orbis Mediterranei Studia I* (Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen)

Schmitz, H. 1921, *Die Hellenistische-römischen Stadtanlagen in Aegypten* (Dissertation, Bonn)

Simpson, R, S. 1996, *Demotic Grammar in Ptolemaic Sacredotal Decrees* (Griffith Institute, Oxford)

Six, J. 1887 "Ein Porträt des Ptolemaios VI Philometor" *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung 12*, 212-222

Smith, R, R, R. 1988, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* (Clarendon Press, Oxford)

Smith, R, R, R. 1991, *Hellenistic Sculpture* (Thames & Hudson, London)

Smith, R, R, R. 1996, "Ptolemaic Portraits: Alexandrian Types, Egyptian Versions" in *Alexandria and Alexandrianism* (J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu)

Spencer, P. 1984, *The Egyptian Temple: A Lexicographical Study* (Kegan Paul International, London)

Spencer, A, J. 1989, *Excavations at El-Ashmunein II: The Temple Area*, (British Museum Press, London)

Spencer, A, J. 1993, *Excavations at El-Ashmunein III: The Town* (British Museum Press, London)

Spencer, A, J, & Bailey, D, M. 1984a, *British Museum Expedition to Middle Egypt: Ashmunein (1983)* (British Museum, London)

Spencer, A, J, & Bailey, D, M. 1984b, *Excavations at el-Ashmunein* (British Museum, London)

Spencer, A, J, & Bailey, D, M. 1986, *British Museum Expedition to Middle Egypt: Ashmunein (1985)* (British Museum, London)

Stansbury-O'Donnell, M, D. 2011, *Looking at Greek Art* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Stanwick, P, E. 1992, "A Royal Ptolemaic Bust in Alexandria" *Journal of the American Research Centre in Egypt 29,* 131-141

Stanwick, P, E. 2002, *Portraits of the Ptolemies* (University of Texas Press, Austin)

Stewart, A. 1993, *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics* (University of California Press, Oxford)

Strabo, *Geography*, trans H. L Jones (Loeb Classical Library, William Heineman, London, 1932)

Strocka, V, M. 1980, "Augustus als Pharao" R, A, Stucky & I, Jucker (eds.) *Eikones: Studien zum griechischen und römischen Bildnis: Festschrift Hans Jucker* (Franke, Bern) 177-180

Sullivan, E. 2010, "Karnak: Development of the Temple of Amun-Ra" *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology* (Department of Near Eastern Language and Cultures, UC Los Angeles) 1-34

Svenson, D. 1995, *Darstellungen hellenistischer Könige mit Götterattributen* (*Archäologische Studien 10*, Frankfurt)

Tanner, J. 2002, "Nature, Culture, and the body in Classical Greek Art" in C, Gosden (ed). *World Archaeology: Archaeology and Aesthetics Vol 33.2* (Routledge Journals, Abingdon)

Tefnin, R. 1969 "Un portrait de la reine Bérénice II. Trouvé en Égypte" *L'antiquité classique 38*, 89-100

"2000 Year Old Ptolemaic Statue found in Egypt" *The Telegraph*, 5th May, 2010 available at http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/egypt/76776/2000-year-old-Ptolemaic-statue-found-in-Egypt.html

Thiers, C. 2002, "Deux statues des dieux Philométors à Karnak (Karnak Caracol R177 + Cheikh Labib 94CL1421 ET Caire JE41218)" *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale de Caire 102*, 389-404

Thissen, H. 1966, *Studien zum Raphiadekret* (Meisenheim an Glan)

Thompson, D, J. 1973, *Ptolemaich Oinochoai and Portraits in Faience* (Oxford)

Thompson, D, J. 1988, *Memphis Under the Ptolemies* (Princeton University Press, Princeton)

Tkaczow, B. 1993, *Topography of Ancient Alexandria (An Archaeological Map)* (Centre d'archéologie Méditerranéenne de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Varsovie)

Tkaczow, B. 2008, *Alexandrie VIII: Architectural styles of Ancient Alexandria: Elements of Architectural Decoration from the Polish Excavations at Kom el-Dikka (1960-1993)* (Warsaw)

Torok, L. 1997, *Meroe City, an Ancient African Capital: John Garstang's Excavations in the Sudan* (Egypt Exploration Society, London)

Traunecker, C. 1999, *Coptos: Hommes et dieux sur le parvis de Geb*, (Peeters, Leuven)

Trillmich, W. 1978, *Famielienpropaganda der Kaisar Caligula und Claudius* (De Gruyter, Berlin)

Turaev, B. 1911, "Objets égyptiens et égyptisants trouvés dans la russie méridionale" *Revue archéologique 18*, 20-35

Ubertini, C. 2005, Restitution architecturale à partir des blocs et fragments épars d'époque ptolémaïque et romaine (Philip von Zabern, Mainz)

Uphill, E, P. 1988, *Egyptian Towns and Cities* (Shire Egyptology, Risborough)

Van de Walle, B. 1952, "Antiquités Égyptiennes" G. Faider-Feytmans (ed.) *Les antiquités égyptiennes, grecques, étrusques, romaines et gallo-romaines du Musée de Mareimont* (Édition de la Librairie encyclopédique, Brussles) 15-61

Valbelle, D. 1999, "Les décrets Égyptiens et leur affichage dans les Temples" in D. Valbelle & J, Leclant *Le Décret de Memphis* (Foundation Singer-Polignac, Paris) 67-90

Vandorpe, K. 1995, "City of Many a Gate, Harbour of Many a Rebel" in S, P, Vleeming (eds.) *Hundred-Gated Thebes: Acts of a Colloquium on Thebes and the Theban Area in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Brill, Leiden) 203-239

Venit, M. 2002, *The Monumental Tombs of Ancient Alexandria: Theatre of the Dead* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Vermeule, C, C. 1959, "Hellenistic and Cuirassed Statues" *Berytus 13,* 1-82

Vermeule, C, C. 1968, *Roman Imperial Art in Greece and Asia Minor* (Belknap Press of Harvard Univeristy Press, Massachusetts)

Verobovsek, A. 2007, "Befund order speculation? Der Standort privater Statuen in Tempeln des Alten und Mittleren Reiches" in B, Haring & A. Harroassowitz (eds) *Ägyptologische Tempeltagung: Funktion und Gebrauch altägyptischer Tempelräume*, (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden)

Vogliano, A. 1936, *Primo Rapporto degli scavi condotti dalla Missione archeologica d'Egitto deel R. Università di Milano nella zona di Madinet Madi* (L'institut français d'archéologie orientale, Milan)

Vogliano, A. 1937, *Secundo Rapporto degli scavi condotti dalla Missione archeologica d'Egitto deel R. Università di Milano nella zona di Madinet Madi* (L'institut français d'archéologie orientale, Milano)

Vogliano, A. 1942, *Un'impresa archaeological Milanese ai margini orientali del Deserto Libico* (Università Milano, Milano)

Wagner, G. 1971, "Inscriptions Grecques du Temple de Karnak" *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale de Caire 70,* 1-38

Wallace, S, L. 1939, *Taxation from Egypt: From Augustus to Diocletian* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)

Walker, S. 2000, *Ancient Faces: Mummy Portraits from Roman Egypt* (Routledge, New York)

Walker, S. & Burnett, A. 1981, *The Image of Augustus* (British Museum Publications, London)

Walker, S. & Higgs, P. 2001, *Cleopatra of Egypt: From History to Myth* (British Museum Press, London)

Walters, H, B. 1915, *British Museum. Select Bronzes Greek, Roman, and Etruscan, in the departments of antiquities* (British Museum, London)

Watzinger. C, 1927, *Expedition E. v. Sieglin II I B* (Leipzig)

Weber, G. 2010 "Ungleichheiten, Integration order Adaptation? Der Ptolemäische Herrscher-und Dynastiekult in griechisch-makedonischer Perspektive" G, Weber *Alexandreia und das Ptolemäische Ägypten kulturbegenungen in hellenisticher zeit* (Verlag Antike, Berlin) 55-77

Weigall, A, E, P. 1907, *A Report on the Antiquities of Lower Nubia* (Oxford, 1907)

Weill, R. & Jouguet, P. 1934, "Horus-Apollon au Kôm el-Ahmar de Zawiét el-Maietin" in *Melanges Maspero II* (*Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale 67*, Cairo) 81-104

Wescher, C. 1864 "Rapport sur sa Mission en Égypte" *Revue Archéologique 17,* 219-226

Wescher, C. 1866, *Bullettino dell'instituto di corrispondenza archeologica 38,* 199-201

Wilcken, U. 1899, *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien* (Gieseke & Devrient, Leipzig)

Wildung, D. & Grimm, G. 1978, *Götter-Pharaonen* (Haus der Kunst, Mainz)

Wilfong, T. 1999, "Fayoum: Graeco-Roman Sites" in K, A, Bard (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt* (Routledge, London) 308-312

Wilkinson, J, G. 1843, *Modern Egypt and Thebes: being a description of Egypt including information required for travellers in that country* (John Murray, London)

Wilkinson, R, H. 2000 *The Complete Temples of Ancient Egypt* (Thames & Hudson, London)

Wilkinson, R, H. 2003, *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt* (Thames & Hudson, London)

Winter, E. 1979, “Der Herrscherkult in den Ägyptichen Ptolemaertempeln” in H, V, Maehler & V, M, Strocka (ed.s) *Das Ptolemäische Ägypten: Akten des Internationalen Symposions 27-29 September 1976 in Berlin* (Philipp von Zabern, Mainz)

Wilson, P. 1997, *A Ptolemaic Lexikon: a lexicographical study of the texts in the Temple of Edfu* (Uitgeverij Peeters en Deparment Oosterse Studies, Leuven)

Wuyts, A. 4th May, 2010 "Ptolemaic Statue and Temple gate discovered at Taposiris Magna" *The Independant* available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/life style/history/ptolemaic-statue-and-temple-gate-discovered-at-taposiris-magna 1961972.html

Yoyotte, J. 1998, “Pharaonica” F, Goddio. & J, Yoyotte. (eds.) *Alexandria: The Submerged Royal Quarters* (Periplus, London)

Zivie-Coche, C. 2005, *Tanis III: travaux récents sur le tell Sân el-Hagar* (Editions Cybele, Paris)