GREEK SCULPTURE IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT

By A. W. LAWRENCE

With Plates XVIII-XXIV.

It has been said that an Alexandrian School existed with ideals markedly different from those of the rest of the Hellenistic world. This question must be settled if the development of Hellenistic sculpture is to be traced; I have therefore collected what

1 It might be useful to give references here to a few recent publications of importance for the general study of Graeco-Egyptian art (and indirectly of the sculpture), as Wace's summary is no longer adequate (B.S.A., ix, 1902-3, 211-242). Pagenstecher has produced a theory (Landschaft. Relief, Sitz. Heidelb. Akad., Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1919, 1 Abh.) that there were Alexandrian stucco originals behind the Roman bucolic reliefs whilst the heroic-mythological reliefs began in Asia at the same period. He himself notes the complete absence in the reliefs of anything reminiscent of Egypt, and although the stuccoes might all have perished yet landscape elements should appear in other Alexandrian work, and he can find nothing of the sort except a few imperial terracottas showing apes and negroes climbing palm-trees. Sieveking's idea (text to Br.-Br., 621-630, Postscript) that the bucolic scenes are merely later than the mythological seems to me therefore to hold good till further notice. (See also PFUHL, Jahrb., xx, 1905, 154). The so-called Alexandrian Grotesques have been dealt with by WACE (B.S.A., x, 1903-4, 103), and by SIEVEKING (Terrakotten der Samml. Loeb, text to Pl. 86) who attributes them to Asia Minor; Pagenstecher's view (Landschaft. Rel., 39), that they were made everywhere, is more plausible.

University College, London, possesses a number of terracotta heads representing men of various nationalities from the foreign quarter of Memphis (PETRIE, Memphis, i, 15, Pls. XXXV-XLIV; Palace of Apries, 16, Pls. XXVII-XXXIV). The early date proposed for them is obviously incorrect and it is probable that all are Hellenistic; some certainly are (e.g., Memphis, i, Pls. XLII, nos. 57-60, XLIII, nos. 61-67; Palace, Pls. XXX, nos. 95-97, XXXI, nos. 98, 102, 105, 106). The Greek vases found with them (Memphis, i, Pl. XLVI, nos. 5, 6) and the satyr mask (ibid., Pl. XLIX) confirm this dating. The majority of the so-called Graeco-Egyptian terracottas are known to belong to Roman times although some few may be Hellenistic (VALD. SCHMIDT, Graesk-Aegyptiske Terrakotter; WEBER, Åg.-gr. Terrakotten; K. M. Kaufmann's catalogue of the Frankfort Åg. Terrakotten was republished in 1915 under the title Åg. Koroplastik). The genuine Hellenistic terracotta is quite different, e.g., some from Alexandria, Bull. Société d'Alex., no. 9 (191), 58; the one on the top of an urn (Fig. 17) was found with other urns which bore inscriptions of an early Ptolemy, probably Ptolemy III.

In ceramics Alexandria seems to have had a good record, as might have been expected from what is known of the luxury of the city (COURBY, Vases à reliefs; BRECCIA, Alexandrea ad Aegyptum). The inscribed Hadra vases date between 284 and 249 (POMTOW, Berliner philolog. Wochenschrift, 1910, 1094, correcting Pagenstecher's publication of them, A.J.A. 3, xiii, 1909, 387). It is surprising that Graeco-Egyptian jewelry was not of finer quality (cf. Guide du Musée du Caire, 1915, 438, a deserved condemnation); a few portrait-gems have been identified as Ptolemy's or their queens (FURTWÄNGLER, Ant. Gemmen, Pls. XXXI, no. 29; XXXII, nos. 10, 15, 16, 22, 31, 36; LXI, no. 47), and the Tazza Farnese in Naples seems to be second-century work done for the Egyptian market (op. cit., LIV-LV).

The Sieglin excavations at Alexandria furnished Pagenstecher with the material for his researches into the source of the Pompeian mural decorations. (Alex. Studien, Sitz. Heidelb. Akad., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1917, 12 Abh., 20; and the later book Nekropolea.) His opinion is that the First Pompeian Style originated in Alexandria but spread quickly and became universal, but that there is no justification for seeing any Alexandrian influence in the subsequent styles: the Second Style does not begin (in Rome and Pompei) till the time of
remains of Graeco-Egyptian work in the round, and I wish people to look at the collection and see that it is bad.  

In this paper I deal only with objects reputed to have been found in Egypt, and for the majority of the more remarkable ones an Egyptian provenance can be guaranteed. Collections of Hellenistic work from the country may be seen in the museums of Alexandria, Cairo and Dresden, and in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek. Most pieces are small and obviously of careless execution, which bears out Brunn's remark that one might as well expect to find a school of skating as a school of sculpture in a place like Alexandria where there is no good stone within reach. Schreiber's theory after all is comparatively new and certainly original; as Cullerera puts it, "the general opinion before Schreiber wrote was that Alexandria really had no art of sculpture, and we shall probably have to return to this old opinion."

There is an argument on the other side to account for the paucity of the material from Alexandria itself: the land has subsided, some of the finest portions of the Ptolemaic city are now beneath the sea and the rest of it is so deep down below the modern town that not
1. Male head. *Copenhagen.*
2. Head from the Naue Collection. *Copenhagen.*
4. Female head. *Dresden.*
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much has been discovered. But there is no reason to suppose that the amount of sculpture there was ever very considerable. It was a cosmopolitan place where most of the inhabitants were not Greeks, and most of the Greeks had no right of citizenship, and the citizenship had little political value. There was no municipal autonomy after the Hellenic pattern; there was not even a boule: hence we do not find a demos voting the erection of monuments, and the artist's hope of subsistence lay in orders from wealthy residents, who had few uses for sculpture. The royal patronage was chiefly given to native architects and sculptors who worked in the old Egyptian style, and yet it has become a commonplace that in this field "Ptolemaic art is worse every way than Pharaonic," a truth which should not encourage us to expect great things from the Greek sculptors whose livelihood depended on the occasional needs of their fellow-countrymen in Alexandria or the provincial towns. It must be remembered too that the demand for high-class stone monuments and offerings was a relic of the old Aegean life and therefore was bound to disappear in the process of racial and cultural denationalization. The assimilation of Hellenic and native art began quite early: the reliefs from the tomb of Petosiris (time of Philip Arrhidaeus, or c. 300 B.C.) have a strong Greek flavour, and in the catacombs of Alexandria we find an Egyptian false-door as early as 200 and a painting of Egyptian manner at about 180. This helps to explain the aesthetic inferiority of the Later Hellenistic statues, grave-stelae and coins.

My aim here will be to trace the history of sculpture in the round from Alexander's conquest to the second century B.C. Works of this period are usually small and poor, but most of them—especially the later ones—have a distinctive character. This applies to objects discovered, and presumably made, in all parts of the country, and the designation "Alexandrian" is therefore over-narrow.

In the early years of the Greek occupation a certain number of sculptures seem to have been imported into Egypt, and others too were made there by artists fetched from abroad. The local style which was evolved in the presence of these sculptures naturally owed something to each of the fourth century masters, but it was indebted most of all to Praxiteles. The life and seductiveness of a Praxitelean marble were largely the result of easily-acquired technical methods—a sfumato rendering of flesh, a sleek but well-developed body, and rough-blocked hair—and any man who used these devices could be sure of producing a passably life-like effect. The impressionist style was accordingly popular in every Hellenistic country and not least so in Egypt: one of the earliest of these imitations of Praxiteles is a female head from Memphis, which passed from the Naue Collection to the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (Pl. XVIII, 2).
It has not the modelling of a first-class work, but the softness of the technique glozes over its imperfections. The languid Dresden head (Pl. XVIII, 4), contemplative and smiling, with half-closed eyes, can also be ascribed to a successor of Praxiteles. It is not unlike a head from Cyzicus in the same museum. But Praxiteles was not the only influence in the studios of Egypt. Lysippus has to be taken into account (e.g., a plaster head of a youth in Rostock) as well as the various authors of the portraits of Alexander, of whom many heads are found in Egypt. Moreover Pfuhl has shown that the earliest examples of Alexandrian grave-stones are the work of Athenians. As for Bryaxis, the Serapis is the sort of work we might expect from him, but the attribution does not rest on any firm foundation and the statue has even been placed (on external evidence) as late as the reigns of Ptolemy IV or VI. A bearded Zeus (or Asclepius) in the Alexandria Museum, too, is of the fourth century "Otricoli" type which cannot be ascribed with certainty to any known artist. The style of Scopas may be recognized in the head of a youth at Alexandria, whilst there are traces of both Scopas and Lysippus in another young man at Copenhagen: in him their vigour is combined with a softening pensiveness that comes from the Praxitelean heritage. A like blending of different traditions may be seen in a good little figure of a satyr in the Cairo Museum: this shows Praxitelean influence in the face, but it is more bumpy than a work of pre-Hellenistic times would have been, and the body too is heavy though carefully muscled. This bumpiness is a typical feature in art of the end of the fourth century, and more so in Egypt than elsewhere. We find it in a small Dresden head which otherwise reminds one of both Agias and Apoxyomenos. It has a wide face and flat cheeks, the nose is straight and of equal width throughout its length, the nostrils are deeply set in, and there is a great dimple below the mouth. The hair is not carved and must have been supplied in plaster. A better work of similar tendencies is the head of a bearded god at Alexandria (Pl. XIX, 3), which at a first glance achieves a fine impression of dignity and power, but strikes one as weak on more acquaintance. It has the overhanging brows and the thick nose, the morbidezza and the careless

1 Herrmann, no. 137; Arch. Anz., 1891, 25 (drawing); Arndt, Zeitschr. d. Munch. Alt.-ver., 1897, 1, Fig. 3 (photo.); a cast in Ashmolean. Found at Gizah.
2 Rev. arch., xxv, 1894 II, Pls. XVII–XVIII; Arch. Anz., 1894, 28, 10; Brunn-Bruckmann, 390.
3 Arch. Anz., 1918, 112 and Fig. 2. On the Lysippic influence, Alex. Studien, Part III.
4 Collected by Schreiber, Strena Helbigiana, 277, and Bildn. Alex. Ct. sale cat. Coll. Lambros-Dattari, no. 354, Pl. XXXIII, no. 317, Pl. XXXIV.
5 Ath. Mitth., xxvi, 1901, 264.
6 Levy, Sarapis, Rev. de l'hist. des religions, 1913, 61; Sethe, Sarapis, 19. Stylistically it goes with the Dionysus from the Thrasyllus Mon. (Ath. Mitth., xiii, 1888, Pl. VIII); the copy to trust is the statue in Alexandria (Ath. Mitth., xxxi, 1906, Pls. VI, VII).
7 Rm. 12, no. 36; Breccia, 203, Fig. 73; text to Br.-Br., 605, Fig. 6; Six, J. H. S., xiii, 1923, 31, Pl. I, is unaware that it is a replica of the Otricoli Zeus and attributes to Bryaxis; Poulsen, Coll. Ustinnov, 16 (dealing with a copy from Gaza in Christiania Mus.).
8 Rm. 12, no. 16; Breccia, 191, Fig. 62. Found at Alexandria? By the courtesy of Dr. Breccia I am enabled to publish this and other objects in his museum.
9 N.C.G. Cat. (Tillaeg, 1914 and 1925), no. 262a, (Tillaeg) Pl. IV; Vald. Schmidt, Gr.-Aegyptisk Terrakotter, Fig. 198.
10 Edgar, Cat. Gr. Sculpture, no. 27447, 9 and Pl. IV; Arch. Anz., 1901, 199, no. 5 and Fig. 2.
11 Münchner Jahrb., x, 1916/7, 182, Fig. 3 (Sieveking).
12 Rm. 12, no. 37; Breccia, 203.
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   Alexandria.

2. Colossal head with horns of Isis.
   Hildesheim.

3. Head of a god.
   Alexandria.
hair—all the stock elements of an “impressive” work of the school—but there is something feeble about those deep-set eyes and the half-open mouth.

The straining after effect, with the consequent exaggeration and distortion of the features, can be dated to the early third century: the coins of Ptolemy I have it so markedly as to look like caricatures. There is a head in Thera¹ which strongly resembles that on his coins, and as its provenance is a Ptolemaic building in an Egyptian protectorate there is every reason to accept the attribution. Unfortunately it is in very poor condition, and in point of fact the best portrait of him is on a plaster-cast from a plaque that belongs to the Memphis find which is now in Hildesheim² and is thereby dated to before 220. There is no reason to suppose that the plaque was modelled in his life-time, and it gave in fact an ideal representation.

The original group of Aphrodite and the Triton can be stylistically connected, as Wace has shown, with the “Antioch” of Eutychides, which is probably of 296 B.C. The Dresden copy³ (Pl. XX) might be almost contemporary; a statuette in the Cairo Museum⁴ seems to give a later version of the Aphrodite, who now has become a slim maiden with a quietly beautiful face. The Dresden figure is headless: the body is conventional and somewhat thick. The Triton too is sturdily built, though his muscles are slurred over; but the disproportionate width of the thighs is no doubt a muddle of the copyist’s. The face and neck have been drastically cleaned, though we can still see enough to make a description worthwhile. The forehead is fleshy and he has heavy brows overshadowing the outer corners of the eyes, while the inner corners are very deeply set (so that the place of the eyes is really supplied by shadow), also he has a down-turned mouth with prominent lips and a big dimple below, and fat cheeks into which the nose is sunk.

A head of Alexander in the Alexandria Museum⁵ (Pl. XXI) is flatter and more careless, but can be classed with the Triton. It is in fact an ideal work and does not claim to be a portrait. For other specimens of semi-portraiture we can take a head in the Ny Carlsberg collection⁶ (Pl. XVIII, 1) and another in the Louvre⁷ (Pl. XXII). With these things one feels that the expression was specially assumed for the occasion. It was the fashion then throughout the Hellenistic world for a portrait to look strained and violent, but it shows up worse in Egypt than elsewhere because so often there is nothing in a head from Egypt except the expression. I mean that the facility of their impressionist technique had induced sculptors to neglect detail in their modelling and trust to the soft finish to conceal the fact that they had put no more work than they could help into the different parts of the face but merely made it up of various blank planes. Compare one of these heads with the “Seleucus”

¹ Thera, i, 245, text fig., and Pl. XXI.
² Arch. Anz., 1907, 368, Fig. 7; Denkm. d. Pelizaeus Mus., Figs. 56, 57; Rubensohn, Hellenist. Silbergerät, no. 32, Pl. VI. Cf. the other head, no. 12, Pl. X. The Louvre marble portrait is dismissed by Dickins, J.H.S., xxxiv, 1914, 295, in an article which assembles the supposed heads of early Ptolemies and deals fully with the question of facial resemblance.
³ Herrmann, no. 196; Wace, B.S.A., ix, 1902/3, 221, Fig. 1; Dickins, Hellenistic Sculpture, Fig. 25. Came from Alexandria, and I do not perceive that it differs at all from Graeco-Egyptian work; I have seen a torso found in the Delta which was of Polyclitan type but similar to the Dresden group in marble, surface and dowel-system.
⁴ Cat. no. 27454, Pl. VI; Maspéro, Guide du Musée (1915), Fig. 83. Said to be from Alexandria.
⁵ Rm. 12, no. 16a; Breccia, 191. Found in Alexandria.
⁶ N.C.G. Cat., no. 453 and Pl. XXXIII; Arndt-Br., Portr., 577. From Memphis.
⁷ Cat. no. 3168; Waldstein, Gr. Sculp. and Modern Art, Pl. XXXIX. Boxer’s ears.
bust at Naples, the original of which belonged to much the same period but to a different school, and the poverty of the Graeco-Egyptian head will be obvious. The "Seleucus" is done with great attention to all such details as the shape of the mouth, the ears, the furrows in the cheeks, and every bit of it is full of meaning, whereas if the other head were found in fragments it would scarcely seem worth while to fit them up again. Especially noteworthy is the contrast in the eyes, the "Seleucus" eyes so excellently accurate and life-like, and the other's quite empty of intelligence, mere spaces. But in marble with a high polish this kind of sculpture is fairly successful; I give as examples a small Alexander head (Pl. XVIII, 3) which has a surface like melting wax, and that supreme piece of bad illusionist work, the Sieglin Head, which is so designed as to require the minimum of modelling and that in straight lines.

There is a queer little group of Bellerophon on Pegasus of which we have a headless example in Alexandria (Pl. XX) and another (of barbarous execution) at Homs of Barbary; a relief at Budapest might go back to the same original. The head at Homs is indeterminate, but the general feel of the thing would incline one to put it in the "violent" period, and the drapery is consonant with such a dating. Further confirmation is afforded by a relief which von Bissing ascribes to the first decades of the third century, and Pagenstecher accepts as Early Hellenistic: as befits a conventional sepulchral subject the treatment is more conventional than in the Bellerophon (e.g., the mane is hogged instead of long and tangled), but the similarity is sufficient to make it reasonable to consider them contemporary.

The faint Lionardo smile of fourth-century women gave place to a passionate intensity of gaze which finds its counterpart in the male heads we have discussed. Such female heads are numerous, especially in the Egyptian museums, but most of them are small and of poor workmanship, and hence unpublished. The hair was usually supplied in stucco; they have a straight nose and a deep long dimple under a pouting mouth. The craftsmen had a trick of tilting the head into some strained position in order to heighten the expression, which as a matter of fact often degenerated in their unskilful hands into one of mere sulkiness. Similar sculpture appears to have been made in other Hellenistic countries (some heads are found in S. Russia), but the better kind of Egyptian work is unmistakable. A statuette of Aphrodite, in the Cairo Museum, gives us one of these passionate heads in conjunction with

1 Guida, 890; Hekler, 68; Delbrück, Ant. Portr., Pl. 22, Figs. 11, 15.
2 Alex. Mus. Rm. 12, Case B, no. 22; Schreiber, Bildn. Alex., Pl. III D, 2 (from a cast).
3 Schreiber, op. cit., Pl. 11 C; Bernoulli, Darstellungen Alex., Figs. 7, 8; B.S.A., xxi, 1914/6, Pl. III, 3. From Alexandria. I regret that I only know it from the photographs and am somewhat vague as to the date of it.
4 Rm. 16, no. 32; Breccia, 224; Arch. Anz., 1896, 93, Fig. 3.
5 Notizario arch., III, 1922, 81 and Fig. 10.
6 Az antik Plastikai (1920), Rm. 11, no. 61, with plate at end.
7 Nekropolis, 5 and Fig. 2. Bought in Cairo, but the material is Alexandrian stone.
8 For typical examples see Jahrb., xxiv, 1909, 83, Fig. 12; and the head from Lower Egypt, N.C.G. Cat. (Tillaeg, 1914 and 1925), no. 330a, (Tillaeg) Pl. VI, also ill. Vald. Schmidt, Gr.-Aeg. Terrak., Fig 195.
9 This habit of finishing things in stucco has been put down to a desire to economize in marble, which is not found in Lower Egypt and so was naturally expensive there. But in most cases the quantity saved is infinitesimal, and the practice was employed in other countries where marble was abundant. It seems therefore to have been a device to save labour rather than material.
10 Arch. Anz., 1913, 215, Figs. 63, 64; 1914, 206, Fig. 1.
11 Cat. no. 27458, Pl. VI; Bull. Comm., 1897, 113, Fig. 1. From Koptos.
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a fleshy type of body. Another, a diademed head of uncertain sex in Rostock, goes back to the same original as a Helios copied in the school of Aphrodisias. The finest of them all is a head of a goddess which was discovered in the Serapeum and is now in the Alexandria Museum (Pl. XXI). I have mentioned the Naue Head as an example of what Graeco-Egyptian art was at its beginning; comparison with it will show how far the school had discarded its early ideals in the evolution of a new if eclectic type. If it were safe to judge by a single instance one might say that the new style did not come into vogue until 300, for we have a female statuette which retains the calm and happy face, while its pose inclines to the pathetic, and its drapery resembles the "Antioch" in Budapest and the Themis of Rhamnus.

There is also a group in Alexandria which has been interpreted as Queen Berenice II mourning for her daughter: if this were correct it would have been carved at about 238. But it might equally well be an ordinary sepulchral monument; in style and material (local nummulitic limestone) it is comparable to the stele of two Pisidian women and other early Alexandrian grave-stones. The faces are in a damaged condition, but they seem to have been of much the same type as the Serapeum head, with coarse wide features. The date, judging by the grave-stones, should be somewhere around 238; there are moreover two painted stelae from Pagasae which have similar figures, and Arvanitopoulos says they belong epigraphically to the second half of the century; he is inclined to put one before 225 and the other just after it. Another limestone funerary statue, a half-length female figure in the Egyptian collection at Athens, is also paralleled on the Pagasae stelae, but its protruding eyes and blank features suggest that it might be later by a generation or two.

The over-emotional ideals of this school were bound to be modified. A revolt against the violent male type is already evidenced in the later coins of Ptolemy II (284–247). With their help Edgar has identified a limestone statue in Cairo as a portrait of him. The surface is in a bad state, but the figure is evidently that of a king and the face is what might be expected in this reign: there is still plenty of strength there but the exaggerated masculinity of the older work is toned down. It is by no means a realistic portrait, in fact the treatment is analogous to that of the Cairo statuette of Heracles wearing the lion-skin as a hood, a "face of pronouncedly Hellenistic type with lumpy modelling." Dickins identifies the Louvre head called Soter as Ptolemy II, and Edgar also recognizes him and his wife in two bronze statuettes in the British Museum. It is good enough stylistically:

1 Arch. Anz., 1918, 114 and Fig. 3.
2 Rm. 12, no. 20; Breccia, 100, Fig. 24, 193.
3 Cairo Mus., Cat. no. 27464, Pl. VII. Found at Memphis.
4 Breccia, 313, Fig. 196: Journ. internat. numism., 1, 1898, Pl. 10; Mon. Piot, iv, 1899, 230, Pl. XIX; Collignon, Statues funér., 187, Fig. 114.
5 Pfuhl, Ath. Mitth., xxvi, 1901, 258, Pl. XVIII, 2. For other stelae see elsewhere in the same article.
6 Volo Mus., Cat. nos. 20, 125.
7 Svoronos, Journ. internat. numism., 1, 1898, 228, Pl. IX, identifies as Berenice II.
8 Especially those with heads of Soter and Berenice, and himself and Arsinoe. (B.M. Cat., Ptol., Pl. VII, 1–4; Svoronos, Münzen der Ptol., 91, Pl. 14, dates them from 271 onwards.)
9 J.H.S., xxxiii, 1913, 50, Pl. II; better illustrated by Mariani, Notiz. arch., III, 1922, 13, Figs. 9–11. From Aphroditopolis.
10 Cat. no. 27446, Pl. IV. Found at Memphis.
11 J.H.S., xxxiv, 1914, 295, 297, Fig. 1; Delbrück, Ant. Porträts, Pl. 23.
12 J.H.S., xxvi, 1906, 281, Pl. XVIII. Perdrizet (Bromes de la Coll. Fouquet, 39) doubts their representing Ptolemies, which is rather uncalled-for since the attributes are all in favour of this interpretation (as Edgar says, J.H.S., xxxiii, 1913, 52, n. 4).
the eyes seem rather sharp, the male body is heavy and the other resembles those glazed vases, of Alexandrian manufacture and advanced third century date, which bear figures of queens in relief. It is probably the same king who appears on the "Alexander Cameo" at Vienna: somewhat of the heavy-brow mannerism survives, for both sexes, and his eye is deep-set; on the other hand the intensity of Soter's time is absent and a certain amount of blankness has crept in. The Petrograd cameo I only know from photographs, and I hold no views regarding it. There is said too to be a marble head of Ptolemy II in the Sieglin Collection, but I do not know it.

Of Ptolemy III there may be several portraits extant. The best is a colossal basalt head in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, an open-faced thing and pleasant after its Mussolini predecessors. I have no faith in the clumsy little granite head in the Terme. Breccia adds a head and a bust in Alexandria; their wide eyes with sharply outlined upper lids and the breadth and general emptiness of the faces would suit the period. I do not propose to enter into the question of their resemblance; great latitude must be allowed as the average royal portrait was of course executed from memory and it is doubtful whether a canonical type existed for anybody except Soter. In the case of one of the plaster-casts in Hildesheim we have external evidence in favour of the identification.

I am inclined to put the Young Warrior of the Alexandria Museum at about this time. It is an attempt to achieve an animated expression without distorting the features: "the architectural effect of head and face is obtained by the use of straight lines." The bronze portrait of a lady in Boston also finds its right place here (Pl. XXIII).

To a large extent the artistic movement that produced all these sculptures was a reaction to naturalism. The course of events may be observed on the coins, whose highest pitch of realistic portraiture is attained in the gold pieces struck by Ptolemy IV (221–203); the beginnings of the naturalistic school can be placed before 250 (on the strength of the coins of Ptolemy II) and by the last quarter of the century it was fully developed. It favoured more pensive types of face than its contemporary, the realistic school of Pergamon. For

1 Courby, Vases à reliefs, 509.
2 Furtwängler, Gemmen, Pl. 53, 1; Bernoulli, Darstell. Alex., 130, Pl. VIII 1.
3 Furtw., Pl. 53, 2; Bernoulli, 126, Pl. IX 1.
4 Arndt, Glypt., Pl. 208; accepted as Ptolemy III by Dickins, J.H.S., xxxiv, 1914, 297, Fig. 4. 3, 299.
5 Paribeni, Guida, no. 564; Arch. Anz., 1911, 168, Fig. 5.
6 Rm. 12, nos. 15, 15a; Breccia, 196, Fig. 67; English edn., Figs. 85–87.
7 Rubensohn, Hellenist. Silbergerät, no. 13, Pl. X. From Memphis. The collection of casts was gathered during this generation, and a large proportion of the original silver-work was probably of contemporary Egyptian make; it might be possible even to ascribe a number of pieces (bust-medallions) to one hand, perhaps that of the master of the shop.
8 Rm. 12, no. 18; Breccia, 192, Figs. 63, 64. The pupils are indicated, which in Egypt is not a proof of Roman date.
9 Cat. no. 56; Froehner, Coll. Tyasckiewicz (Munich edn.), Pls. XXXXIII, XXXXIV; Chase, Sculpture in Amer., Fig. 160. From Memphis or near it. Photograph by Prof. Clarence Kennedy of Smith College; for the use of it and the views of the other two Boston heads I am indebted to Dr. Caskey and the Museum of Fine Arts.
10 B.M. Cat., Ptol., Pl. XV; Svoronos, Münzen der Ptol., Pls. LXXV–LXXVII.
11 Svoronos, as I said above, dates the better coins from 271 onwards.
12 But terracottas found at Hadra give Pergamene types of Gauls and satyrs (Breccia, 260, Figs. 120, 121; Mon. Piot, xviii, 1910, Pl. VIII), and there is a sufficiently Pergamene statuette of a satyr in Cairo, found in Egypt (Mon. Piot, 76, Fig. 15; Rayet, Mon. de l'art ant., Pl. 86, no. 7), as well as the famous head
Bronze head from the Tyszkiewicz Collection. Boston.

Fragmentary female head. Alexandria.
Plate XXIV.

Arinoe, wife of Ptolemy IV. Boston.

Ptolemy IV. Boston.
pure realism its masterpiece is a wonderful fragment in Alexandria, perhaps the portrait of Berenice II\(^1\) (Pl. XXIII). I should like to remark on the presence here of a number of traditional devices of the Graeco-Egyptian sculptor, the wide face and thick cheeks which reveal no signs of the bone beneath, the lack of detail except in the most significant features, the sketchiness of the less conspicuous parts of the hair. A characteristic of late rather than early times is the prominence and sharpness of the upper eyelid.

A pair of heads in Boston\(^2\) (Pl. XXIV) have been rightly identified as Ptolemy IV and his wife. The woman is interesting; the other is not a good piece of work, but it conveys a correct impression of the miserable man. The "Harpocrates" gem produced by Blum\(^3\) does not look to me as though it resembled him. More supposed portraits, on a mould in Cairo\(^4\) and on the relief of the "Apotheosis of Homer\(^5\)", have been sufficiently condemned by others.

Sculpture in Egypt now begins to go downhill. Coins of Ptolemy V suggest that heads with vacant faces and wide yet carefully-modelled eyes should be put in the first half of the second century, \(e.g.,\) the Naples bronze which used to be described as Ptolemy II\(^6\). A head of a goddess in the Berlin Museum\(^7\) may be taken as the corresponding female type. The eyes are large and blank, with the upper eyelid prominent, and are set far back from the nose; the mouth is pouting; nose and forehead run at different angles so that the profile is very unclassic; there is a notable lack of modelling in the face. Somewhat similar is a horned female head in Hildesheim\(^8\) (Pl. XIX, 2) which has been compared to Damophon's work. Here the face is heavy, the nose thick, the upper eyelid prominent; the lips are pushed out and the hollow beneath the mouth is so deep that the chin seems to stick out like a plum. The hair is sketchy and the ears have an unfinished appearance (especially the right). Perhaps a female head in the Warocqué Collection\(^9\) may belong to the same class: I cannot tell from the reproduction.

A half-length funerary statue of a woman from Thera\(^10\), an Egyptian protectorate, has transparent drapery such as was invented towards the middle of the second century; from the stiffness of the pose one would put it before the Cleopatra at Delos, a work of 138/7\(^11\) of a Gaul which is rumoured to have come from either Thasos or the Fayûm (Schreiber, Gallierkopf; Mon. Piot, 67, Pl. VII; Dickins, Hellen. Sculp., Fig. 6).

1 Rm. 12, no. 21; Breccia, 194. A related type occurs on a gem, Furtwängler, Ant. Gemmen, Pl. XXXI 29; XXXII 34.
2 Cat. nos. 57, 58; Dutilh, Journ. internat. num., iii, 1900, 313, Pls. 15, 16; found in Egypt, probably between Hadra and Canopus.
4 Suggested by Hauser, Jahresh., viii, 1905, 83; see Edgar's reply in the next vol., 27.
5 Dickins, J.H.S., xxxiv, 1914, 301; Hauser tries a new identification, Jahresh., viii, 1905, 85, with a coin of Alexander Bala, but Lippold rejects it, Röm. Mitth., xxxii, 1918, 77.
6 Hebler, 73a; Wace, J.H.S., xxxiv, 1905, 91, Pl. VIII 1, says the style is late 3rd cent.; Dickins, J.H.S., xxxiv, 1914, 296, points out that it does not resemble Ptol. II; Ippel, Bronzefund von Galjubah, 65, compares coin-portraits of Ptol. V and VI. From Herculaneum.
7 K. Beschr., 1478. From Egypt.
8 Denkm. d. Pelizaeus Mus., no. 1776. Island marble: ht. 45 cm.; bought in Egypt. I am much indebted to the Director, Prof. Dr. Roeder, for allowing me to publish it.
9 Cat. no. 161; Hauser, Berliner philol. Wochen schrift, 1905, 70. From Memphis; made out of a column-base.
10 Nat. Mus., Athens. Kavvadias, Cat. no. 780; Jahresh., i, 1896, 4, Fig. 2; Collignon, Statues funér., Fig. 190. Found with sepulchral inscription, C.I.G., xii, 3, no. 873.
11 B.C.H., xxxi, 1907, 415, Fig. 9; Collignon, op. cit., Fig. 188.
These half-length female figures appear to belong to the Egyptian sphere of influence, thus we have the Athens one from Egypt\(^1\) (which may as well be contemporary with this as earlier) and others from Thera itself and Anaphe, Melos, and Cyrene\(^2\).

For the last hundred years of Ptolemaic rule the coins are of no assistance, except in so far as they lead us to expect that there will be no sculpture of aesthetic value. The Greeks are now losing their sense of nationality; they give Egyptian names to their children, they intermarry with the natives, they adopt Egyptian designs for their votive offerings and their tombs\(^3\). It would be tiresome to deal at length with the art of such Levantine decadence.

The great blankness of the face is the most distinctive feature of the Antoniades Head in the Alexandria Museum\(^4\). A second century date is probable for a female head (\('?\) portrait of a queen) in Copenhagen\(^5\). It is also the most likely on various grounds for the Cairo Siren\(^6\). This strange figure is the only visible member of a monument which lies before the Serapeum at Memphis and consists of eleven statues of famous men and a group of animals and monstrous creatures of unknown import. They were dug up by Mariette, who took some very bad drawings of them and buried them again, with the exception of the Siren. He stated that they were covered with Greek *graffiti*, so it should be possible to determine the age of the monument if it were re-excavated.

The so-called Ptolemy I of Copenhagen\(^7\) should probably come late in the second century. Milne thinks it might be Soter II who reigned in Egypt 116–108 and 88–80. Among the better specimens of Late Hellenistic work are the alabaster head of Alexander in Cairo\(^8\), the bronze Apollo in the British Museum\(^9\), and a female head in Alexandria\(^10\) (Pl. XIX, 1), which is chiefly remarkable for the elaborate ornamentation of the hair: it has the heads of a lion and bull to either side and wears a complicated crown with a crescent on top.

In Ippel's study\(^11\) of the bronze statuettes from Kalyüb (the stock of a country goldsmith a day's journey from Memphis), he tries to date them at c. 200 B.C. or earlier on the grounds that they show no Neo-Attic or archaistic tendencies and that they are often reminiscent

---

\(^{1}\) *Journ. internat. numism.*, I, 1898, Pl. 9.

\(^{2}\) *Jahresh.*, I, 1898, 5.

\(^{3}\) *Journal*, 1922, 139; PAGENSTECHER, *Nekropolis*. It is interesting to know that a granite head in Egyptian style has been discovered in Aegina harbour; it bears a hieroglyphic inscription of Ptolemy VI, and one wonders what it was doing there (*Ath. Mitth.*, xii, 1887, 212, Pls. VII, VIII; now in Nat. Mus., Athens). The king may have had a liking for foreign arts, if it is true that he is the man represented on a semi-Parthian gem in Paris wearing the crown of Egypt. (*Furtwängler, Ant. Gemmen*, Pl. XXXI 25; *Lippold, Gemmen*, Pl. LXX 5.)

\(^{4}\) Rm. 12, Lge. case A, no. 5; BRECCIA, 195, Fig. 66.

\(^{5}\) N.C.G. Cat. (and *Tillaeg*, 1914 and 1925), no. 278, Pl. XX; Poulsen identifies tentatively as one of the wives of Euergetes II (127–117); or, he says, she might be a personification of Africa.

\(^{6}\) Cat. no. 27506, Pl. VIII; MASPERO, *Guide* (1915), Fig. 80. *Bull. Comm.*, 1897, 123, and Cat., 28 n., for the evidence in favour of a second century dating. *Wilcken, Jahrb.*, xxxi, 1917, 149, gives a long discussion of the whole monument; for the date see 198.—Note that the eyes have the pupils marked.

\(^{7}\) N.C.G. Cat. (*Tillaeg*, 1914 and 1925), no. 453a, (*Tillaeg*) Pl. VIII; in the 1925 edn. Poulsen says it represents the same man as the head of “Attalus I” from Pergamon and identifies him as Lysimachus of Thrace. *Dickins, J.H.S.*, xxxiv, 1914, 295, Fig. 2; *Milne, J.H.S.*, xxxvi, 1916, 98, n. 2; *Arndt-Bri., Portr.*, 853–4.

\(^{8}\) Cat. no. 27476, Pl. X. “Found among objects of the later Hellenistic period.”

\(^{9}\) Cat. no. 828; *Select Bronzes*, Pl. XLI; BULLE, 81. From Ziftah.

\(^{10}\) Rm. 12, no. 7; BRECCIA, 195—he believes it to be a queen represented as a goddess.

\(^{11}\) *Bronzefund v. Galjüb*, 85.
GREEK SCULPTURE IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT

of fourth-century art. It may be pointed out that the archaistic and Neo-Attic styles were certainly not popular in Egypt and probably never existed there, and that the majority of the types represented in the hoard also occur in Romano-Egyptian terracottas. These terracottas have now been adequately studied with the help of excavation results and it is known that the vast majority belong to Late Imperial times, although some few may be Hellenistic. There is a great and acknowledged difference in style between the bronzes and the plaster-casts from Memphis, the last of which are of c. 220, but the affinity of the bronzes and the terracottas leaps to the eye. In the face of this evidence I do not see how the Kalyûb statuettes can be older than the end of the second century. Their principal value lies in the fact that they enable us to watch the transition from Hellenistic to Roman.

I suppose it is essential that I should say something about the well-known statue of the Nile. The best copy of it, the one in the Vatican, was found in an Isisac sanctuary at Rome together with the Louvre figure of the Tiber. The two river-gods are of unequal workmanship, and it has accordingly been suggested that the Nile is a reproduction of an older Alexandrian statue and the Tiber a counterpart to it produced to order by a Roman sculptor. The reclining type of the deity exists in sculptures and coins, but a seated type is the only one which occurs in the Romano-Egyptian terracottas. This god is seated too in the carvings of the Tazza Farnese, which is probably a piece of second-century Ptolemaic work. Personifications were prevalent in Egypt under the Empire, but it is to be noted that none (except two Victoryes) is present among a large batch of clay-sealings from Edfu which Milne dates to c. 100 B.C. This would incline one to believe that the Egyptian type of Hapi was the only image of the god until fairly late in the Ptolemaic period and the Hellenic representation then produced was a seated figure. The pictorial character of the Vatican statue is obvious, and it may well be that its original was a painting executed at a time when Italy took much interest in Egypt and Egyptian cults. The conception is sufficiently paralleled by the Tellus scene of Carthage and the Ara Pacis, and the view that we have to do with a purely Roman type has much to commend it.

A head in Egyptian headdress, now in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, has been identified as Berenice II (wherein it has shared the fate of most of the female heads supposed to be “Alexandrian”), though why a portrait of a third-century queen should have been kept in a Roman temple it is difficult to understand. Hekler has since pointed out that the headdress is more suitable for Isis, and he and von Bissing would label it accordingly as an Isis-Nekhbet-Aphrodite, or possibly as a Roman lady so represented. The Egyptian inspiration is evident: it is a marble imitation of a post-Pharaonic granite sculpture. A mould in Hildesheim is remarkably like it, and the date is probably the beginning of the Empire.

In the preceding pages I have endeavoured to present the history of Hellenistic-Egyptian sculpture, from its beginning as the eclectic product of all the artistic currents of the fourth

1 E.g., the Aphrodite Anadyomene, Eros and Psyche, sphinx, bunch of grapes, snake, the various kinds of Bes, Isis and Harpocrates. The bust of Aphrodite and Eros, no. 60, is paralleled by an early-looking terracotta protome which Ippel notes and illustrates, Fig. 15.


3 Brunn-Br., 196 (Nile), 197 (Tiber).


5 Furtwängler, Ant. Gemmen, Pl. LV.

6 J.H.S., xxv, 1916, 87. One bears the cartouche of Ptolemy X.

7 Bull. Comm., 1897, 118, Pl. VIII; Delbrück, Portr., Pl. 28; Hekler, Jahresh., xiv 1911, 119

Found in a sanctuary of Isis and Serapis at Rome.

8 Rubensohn, Hellenist. Silbergerat, no. 65, Pl. XVII.
century, through its periods of passionate extravagance and subsequently of naturalism, to its decline, when conventionality is only relieved by painstaking workmanship. Later artistic movements in the country are semi-oriental; thus a revival in native sculpture occurred in the first century B.C., when some curious portraits were turned out under Graeco-Roman influence. Hellenism was given new life by political changes introduced after the Roman conquest, and accordingly there was an increase in the output of the Greek communities; they found expression not so much in copies of old masterpieces and in imperial portraits as in painted or modelled representations of their dead, in ivories, and in those crude terracottas which were made in such numbers down to Coptic times. But the style of these things connects them with Asia rather than with Europe, and there is little of the Hellenic or Hellenistic spirit there.

1 Mostly in Cairo (see Cat.) and Munich. Some can be dated by their hieroglyphic inscriptions.
3 The painted portraits do not begin with Hadrian, as Petrie said, but in the first century A.D. (EDGAR, J.H.S., xxv, 1905, 225).