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The Egyptian collection of The Metropolitan Museum of Art is arguably the finest and most extensive in North America. Some of its most precious and beautiful objects, however, are very fragmentary; the most renowned of these is a highly polished jasper jaw and mouth of a head believed to portray Queen Tiye of the Eighteenth Dynasty.1 A graywacke fragment, not as well known, from the head of a somewhat less than life-sized statue was discovered at Heliopolis by Flinders Petrie (Figure 1).2 It constitutes a substantial part of the face of an exceptionally well-sculpted figure. No trace of hair or a headdress remains, and for reasons given later in this article, I argue that the original image probably had a royal headdress. The right eye, most of the right eyebrow, and both ears are missing. The right nostril and part of the nose are preserved, as are the left eye and eyebrow, mouth, and the balance of the face. Though incomplete, the object is strikingly elegant and deserves its prominent place in the Museum’s galleries of ancient Egyptian art. Its date and original purpose, however, have not been conclusively determined.

B. V. Bothmer assigned the graywacke fragment to the Twenty-sixth, or Saite, Dynasty (664-525 B.C.).3 He opined, without further elaboration, that it was from a statue of Apries (589-570 B.C.), the fourth king of that dynasty. Comparing the Museum’s fragment with representations of that pharaoh, as well as those immediately preceding and succeeding him, should establish if there is a relationship among them. I will attempt to demonstrate that there are compelling reasons to reassess the work to a considerably later date in the third century B.C. I also attempt to identify the subject as a specific personage other than Apries.

The most arresting feature of the graywacke fragment is the left eye. It is very large, wide open, and formed by two raised, or plastically rounded, lines. The top lid forms an almost semicircular arc. The line of the lower lid is almost straight by comparison. At the inner canthus, the lids join to form a distinct protuberance. The shape of the eye is unnaturally round—a trait not unknown in Egyptian sculpture. Examples of this configuration are common on statues of the Old and early Middle Kingdoms.4 The eyebrow in low relief gradually tapers in width from the nose past the outer canthus of the eye to end in a point. Its delicate curvature generally parallels the upper lid of the eye. The mouth is generous and thick-lipped (see detail, Figure 2), with a well-defined philtrum. Above the corners of the mouth, which show traces of drill holes, folds of flesh overlap from the cheeks. At first glance, the slight depression caused by this phenomenon resembles the indentation left by the fine muscle over the upper lip; in fact, this muscle is not depicted here.5 The prominent chin forms a distinct knob. Aside from this feature and the flesh folds adjacent to the mouth, very little other definition is in evidence. Neither the cheekbones nor the jawbone have been indicated, hidden instead by the considerable amount of flesh on this face.

In order to date and possibly identify the fragment, it will be useful to compare the surviving features, the material, and the nature of the damage it sustained with other statues exhibiting similar characteristics, as well as with portraits of Apries. Some Egyptologists argue that such an analysis is subjective and lacks the substantive proof provided by an inscription or an archaeological context.6 Unfortunately, many objects are too incomplete to have a meaningful inscription—one in which the name of a known, and therefore datable, individual is in evidence. Furthermore, inscriptions were often usurped in succeeding generations or added to previously uninscribed statues.7 Even an archaeological context can be misleading. With the comparatively rare exception of statuary actually found in intact tombs or temples, most objects are usually recovered from rubble heaps or in sites distinct from their original location, as was the Museum’s graywacke fragment. Petrie records that it was discov-
Figure 1. Fragment, Egyptian. Graywacke. H. 17 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of The Egyptian Research Account, 1912, 12.187.31
ered in a field near the obelisk of Sesostris I along with other incomplete statuary from the New and Middle Kingdoms.9

Therefore, to determine the most likely origin of this object, its style must be related to other examples whose identification is reasonably certain. The finding place of the Metropolitan Museum’s facial fragment offers some circumstantial evidence regarding its identity that will be taken into consideration as well. In some respects, such as poses and headdresses, the figural representations of ancient Egyptians remained fairly static over the course of approximately 3,000 years. Style did change, however, and it would appear that, even on idealized royal portraits, artists strove to make these images recognizable. Royal likenesses often were the models employed for the representations of private persons.10 Similarities in the physiognomies of royal images are the basis of identifications used in this study.

One characteristic that suggests a Saite date for the fragment is its material, a stone favored in that period.11 Its use, however, was by no means confined to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. It appears early in the Old Kingdom and is used well into the Ptolemaic period.12 Although often called schist,13 it is usually graywacke, a stone quarried in the Wadi Hammamat in Middle Egypt.14 According to the latest available information, this is the only location in Egypt where it was found.15 It was highly prized, as indicated by a quarry inscription in the Wadi Hammamat referring to the material as “this precious mineral.”16 Graywacke’s exceedingly fine grain and comparative softness permit it to be worked to a fine, satiny finish, with crisp detail and extensive modeling. Since artisans of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty took advantage of these traits to produce images of superb quality, the fact that the Metropolitan Museum’s facial fragment exhibits the fine, satiny finish and crisp detail would, therefore, partially support the hypothesis of a Saite attribution.

Aside, however, from both the material, which was not exclusive to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, and the undeniable skill of the sculptor, the style of the face differs significantly from well-attested examples of that time. Although there are numerous examples of inscribed, unquestionably assignable statues of the Saite Dynasty, only a small selection of them need be illustrated and compared to the facial fragment. I will consider only the products of royal workshops, choosing examples that are typical and span the years of that dynasty, also recognizing that these ateliers were the centers for stylistic developments throughout the various dynastic periods. The arguments for assigning the Museum’s facial fragment to a royal figure, though only circumstantial, can nevertheless be stated persuasively. The very fine sculptural quality is certainly indicative of a royal workshop provenance. This point was raised by both Bothmer and the anonymous writer of the text of the Museum exhibition label that describes the fragment.17 The extreme damage that the original sustained—only the small piece remaining—indicates that it was deliberately smashed,18 a common fate of royal representations.19 The fragment was from an almost life-sized statue, a feature not unknown in private representations, but more likely to be found in an important royal statue.

A private collection in New York contains a graywacke seated statuette of Osiris that bears a dedication to Psamtik I (664–610 B.C.) (Figure 3).20 The
workmanship of this almost pristine figure is remarkably fine, suggesting its origin in a royal atelier. The undamaged face is probably the official image of that king. The eyes are almond-shaped with heavy, plastically rounded upper lids that continue well past the eyes to form cosmetic lines. The opening of the eye is narrow and delineated by two shallow arcs. Surmounting the eyes are untapered eyebrows, in low relief, that parallel the upper eyelids. These features are typical of statues from the early part of the Saite Dynasty and are found on almost all of that period’s royal and private portraits. Examples of statuary bearing inscriptions of later Twenty-sixth Dynasty pharaohs include a head in Paris inscribed for Psamtik II (595–589 B.C.) and another, in Bologna, bearing the name of Apries (Figure 4). Both faces have almond-shaped eyes that are not quite as narrow as those of the New York Osiris figure, but are of similar form. Amasis (570–526 B.C.) was the penultimate ruler of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. His attributed, but uninscribed, portraits are in several collections, including that of The Metropolitan Museum of Art (Figure 5). Although the latter is an uninscribed head from a small sphinx, the features are clearly recognizable as those of Amasis. The eyes, in particular, are typical of the late Twenty-sixth Dynasty, almond-shaped, narrow, and slightly slanted. Although variations in their rendering occur, the almond shape of the eyes appears to be a consistent feature—perhaps a reflection of the Libyan origin of the rulers of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. The hemispherical eye shape of the Metropolitan’s fragment does not occur on portraits, royal or private, during that period.

The mouth of the graywacke fragment with its thick, wide lips and drill holes in the corners, finds no parallels on royal statues from the Saite Dynasty. Drills were probably used by sculptors to position, and to begin to fashion, the corners of the mouth throughout most of the ancient Egyptian era. In the course of modeling and finishing, the round and sometimes deep holes were usually erased. The marks left by drills on a considerable amount of post-Ramesside sculpture, as well as on some earlier Ramesside statuary, are particularly visible because of the limited facial modeling. The presence of drill holes is diagnostic for identification of royal statuary made after the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, until almost midway through the Ptolemaic period. The combination of the broad mouth with thick lips on the graywacke fragment differs significantly from the rather narrow mouths on the portraits of the Saite rulers. On the representation of Psamtik II, the lips are thick, but the mouth is extremely narrow. The Bologna head of Apries also has a narrow, but thinner-lipped mouth.

Another contrast between the graywacke piece and the Twenty-sixth Dynasty portraits is evident in the facial shape. The Metropolitan Museum of Art’s fragment is round, fleshy, and devoid of modeling that would indicate a bony substructure. All of these features differ from the style of the royal representations of the Saite pharaohs (see Figure 4). They have long, lean, angular faces with accentuated cheekbones and an undulating modeling of the skin below them. Although the chins of the Saite statues are firm, they are neither round nor protuberant. The style used in the presentation of kings in the Twenty-sixth Dynasty has its roots in the New King-
dom. In that earlier time the pharaohs were shown as youthful, vigorous, and athletic-looking individuals. Their portraits were taut and portrayed ideal, godlike individuals. Only portraits of Akhenaten present exceptions to that form.

Since it is apparent that the Metropolitan Museum’s fragment was not made during the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, it will be compared to later royal representations that offer substantial stylistic parallels to it. The closest resemblances occur in the early Ptolemaic period. One of these rarely datable objects is in Strasbourg (Figure 6). The statue, inscribed for Ptolemy II (285–246 B.C.), is preserved from the center of its chest to the border (frontlet) at the bottom of its nemes headdress. The nose is almost obliterated, but the balance of the face is mostly intact, except for the chin, where a large chip is missing. There are a number of striking similarities between the head of this statue and the Heliopolis fragment. The most obvious is the shape of the eyes. The Strasbourg sculpture has very wide-open eyes formed by a semicircular arc of the upper lid and a shallow arc of the lower lid. These plastically rendered lids join at the inner canthi to form a bump identical to that of the Metropolitan Museum’s fragment. Also surviving are traces of the eyebrows. Like those of the Metropolitan fragment, they are plastically rounded and taper to a point past the outer canthi of the eyes.
The mouth of the Strasbourg statue, although damaged, shows deep and prominent drill holes, as well as thick lips. It should be noted that the shape of this mouth does vary significantly from that of the graywacke fragment: it has a slight smile and a substantially different curvature of the lips. Like the Metropolitan fragment, however, the face is almost devoid of modeling. The undefined cheekbones and the roundness of the face create an impression of flesh overwhelming the bony substructure of the face. Too much of the chin is missing to determine if it had the same knobby shape as that of the Metropolitan Museum’s fragment. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to surmise that the chin was unusually prominent, since that feature appears on virtually every representation of the early Ptolemies, including those in relief. The back pillar of the Strasbourg statue has survived with the name of Ptolemy II, which is fortunate, since its style differs considerably from the only other inscribed statue of this king, now in the Vatican (Figure 7). Clearly archaizing, the latter is close in appearance to representations of Nectanebo I (380–362 B.C.) and Nectanebo II (360–343 B.C.). The Vatican image of Ptolemy II is idealized and closely follows a pattern established in the royal workshops of the Thirtieth Dynasty. The correspondence is made clear by comparing it to a fine inscribed portrait of Nectanebo I from Hermopolis, now in Cairo (Figure 8). The different styles in the two inscribed depictions of Ptolemy II may be attributed to a growing influence of the Hellenistic sculptors on their counterparts in native Egyptian workshops, as exemplified by the Strasbourg representation. It is, however, also possible that the Strasbourg statue simply portrays an older Ptolemy II than does the Vatican one. The latter possibility was raised by Dorothea Arnold and cannot be excluded from consideration; but nei-
ther can the fundamentally different approach in the two works be disregarded.36

Hellenistic influence, and its effect on native Egyptian sculpture workshops, has been clearly elucidated by R. R. R. Smith. In a forthcoming publication Smith writes:

Royal interest in the dissemination of images in the temples is plainly stated in the Mendes stele, and the priests' interest in the style or manner (tropos) of the statues is explicitly attested in the Rosetta decree. The clergy's decision to have Ptolemy's features represented in a Hellenistic idiom in some statues in addition to the usual statues with purely pharaonic features was analogous to their decision to publish their decrees in the Greek language as well as Egyptian. This measurable iconographic assimilation of the traditional image of pharaoh to Ptolemaic royal style and to particular types was meant to represent to the Egyptian temple-goer the distinctive nature and identity of the Ptolemaic pharaoh residing in his foreign capital at Alexandria.37

The Strasbourg Ptolemy II, with its large eyes and fleshy features, is much closer than the Vatican statue to numerous coin and clay sealing portraits of the king that were always drawn in a purely Hellenistic manner.38 These relics of the Ptolemies exhibit the prognathous, fleshy faces, and aquiline noses that appear to have been hereditary characteristics common to the Greek rulers of Egypt.39 Despite a number of similarities, there is no certainty that the Heliopolis fragment and the image in Strasbourg represent the same king. Other royal representations of the early Ptolemaic period are from Hellenistic workshops.40 No inscribed statues of either Ptolemy I (305–284 B.C.) or Ptolemy III (246–221 B.C.) are known.

In a forthcoming study, I assign a votive head in Kansas City to Ptolemy I (Figure 9).41 This finely executed object exhibits some characteristics of the late Thirtieth Dynasty—notably the slanted, almond-shaped eyes. It also demonstrates the beginning of Greek influence on native workshops, at least in portraying the Ptolemies in a more lifelike manner. Although these characteristics are not so pronounced as in either the Strasbourg Ptolemy II or the Metropolitan Museum’s fragment, there is more fleshiness, particularly on the cheeks and around the mouth, on this representation than on those of the kings of the Thirtieth Dynasty. The Kansas City head also has a double chin—a feature unknown on late dynastic figures. This head appears to be an amalgam of stylistic characteristics falling between those of the Strasbourg statue of Ptolemy II and the earlier representations of the two Nectanebos. A single possible example, however, cannot be deemed sufficient to illustrate the genre characteristic of native ateliers from the time of Ptolemy I. Although the Kansas City head shares some Hellenistic traits with the Metropolitan fragment, it is clearly of an earlier date. Because of the substantial Hellenistic influence present in the Strasbourg representation, I consider it to be later in the reign of Ptolemy II than the Vatican statue. The Metropolitan’s face fragment is probably datable to the latter part of the reign of that king or, at the latest, to Ptolemy III.

There is little known about early Ptolemaic private statuary made in native Egyptian workshops. Because a firm chronology based on genealogical or stylistic evidence has not yet been established for that time,42 the dating of many inscribed private representations remains unresolved.43 Therefore, the Strasbourg representation, a small number of stucco profiles believed to depict the early Ptolemies, and coin and clay sealing portraits constitute

the major body of available evidence for comparison to the graywacke fragment. The purpose of the stucco profiles is unknown. Possibly they were votive objects similar in use to the many raised relief plaques that remain from the Ptolemaic period.44 A private collection in New York contains such an object (Figure 10).45 Bianchi notes that it is close to a group assigned by Varga to Ptolemy II.46 On this plaque, the thick lips, the drill hole, and the heavy fleshiness attest to a Ptolemaic origin. The eye and eyebrow of the profile are exceptionally close to those of both the Metropolitan fragment and the Strasbourg bust. The exaggerated arc of the upper lid, the straight line of the lower, and the lump formed at the inner canthus give the eye an unmistakable resemblance to the one on the Metropolitan Museum’s face. The mouth of the stucco profile is also very similar to that of the Museum’s fragment —more so than the mouth of the Strasbourg statue. On an almost identical object in Amsterdam, the single eye in profile is the same shape as that of the graywacke fragment, as are the heavy facial features.47

The field in which the Metropolitan Museum’s fragment was found is located in Heliopolis, the ancient capital of the Thirteenth nome of lower Egypt. Royal occupation at this site is assumed from the time of King Djoser of the Third Dynasty until the end of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty.48 According to Strabo, the invading armies of the Persian king Cambyses destroyed or heavily damaged the city sometime after 524 B.C.49 Petrie comments that he was unable to find remains of any occupation later than the Twenty-sixth Dynasty during his investigation and excavations there (Petrie also noted that, due to modern buildings on the site, he was unable to explore the ancient city fully).50 If that were the case, a Ptolemaic dating of the graywacke face would be difficult to sustain.

There is, however, sufficient evidence to support the argument for an early Ptolemaic restoration of Heliopolis. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, two remarkable and complete granite statues, one bearing the name of Ptolemy II and the second the name of his principal wife and sister, Arsinoë II, were discovered in Rome. Both are now in the Museo Gregoriano Egizio in that same city.51 No doubt a pair, they were carved in the same red granite and are identical in size and style. They were almost surely originally erected in Heliopolis; the statue of Arsinoë II bears an inscription confirming its origin.52 Assuming that they are a pair, the statue of Ptolemy II must have come from Heliopolis. The inscription on the statue of Arsinoë reads, in part (as translated by Dr. J. Allen), “Beloved of Atun, Lord of the Two Lands, [the Heliopolitan].”53 The statue of Ptolemy II has an inscription that points to the same provenance. In the translation of Dr. Allen, it reads, “[Beloved of] Re-Herakhti . . . .” Since there were temples dedicated to both Atun and Re-Herakhti in Heliopolis,54 the presence of these statues in Heliopolis would certainly seem to confirm that Ptolemy II was active in building and restoring that city in the third century B.C. It also increases the likelihood that the graywacke face represents that king.

To recapitulate, there are various reasons for placing the date of the Heliopolis fragment in the middle of the third century B.C. The fragment is most likely from a royal statue. It does not share any stylistic characteristics with pre-Ptolemaic royal representations. It shows strong similarities to an inscribed statue of Ptolemy II in Strasbourg. It has significant points of resemblance to stucco profiles, probably of the early Ptolemies, and coin portraits
that are certainly of Ptolemy II. The archaeological context, with reasonable evidence that Ptolemy II dedicated statues at the site, tends to corroborate an attribution of the Heliopolis fragment to that king.

The reassignment of the Museum's fragment from a Saite date may imply to some a denigration of its artistic value. Ptolemaic sculpture is not usually included among the great art of ancient Egypt. C. Aldred wrote that Ptolemaic art "suffered a parallel alienation," referring to what he described as the "deplorable" reliefs and inscriptions of that period. He also wrote, however, that portrait sculpture of that time was "a last bright flame."

Perhaps this apparent and enduring bias can be explained by a lack of systematic study as well as by apparent confusion about the role of Hellenistic influence on Egyptian workshops. Although the influence was primarily unidirectional, it clearly revitalized and promoted new concepts in the Egyptian ateliers. The result of these new ideas is epitomized by the "Boston Green Head," which surely is one of the finest portraits ever made in Egypt. Nor does it stand alone. The exhibition "Cleopatra's Egypt" at the Brooklyn Museum showed many exceptional works from the Ptolemaic period. The unusually excellent work on the Metropolitan's fragment may have persuaded Egyptologists to place its date in the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. That attribution perhaps implies that it was too fine a sculpture to belong to the Ptolemaic period. However, a 3,000-year tradition did not vanish at the end of native rule in 343 B.C. Rather, it slowly metamorphosed and served the religious and political needs of a new era. The Metropolitan Museum's fragment is a good example of the stylistic changes wrought by foreign influence and its assimilation into established traditions. Like many other products of Egyptian workshops in the Ptolemaic period, it is of excellent quality and shows the continuing mastery of the later sculptors.
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NOTES


4. An early example, datable to the Fifth Dynasty, is in Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, AS 75; limestone, H. 51.8 cm; see E. Rogge, Corpus Antiquitatum Aegyptiacarum 15 (Mainz, 1993) p. 15.6, pl. 15.8. From the early Middle Kingdom is a statue of Sesostris I in Cairo, The Egyptian Museum, CG 411; limestone, H. 190 cm; see D. Wildung, L'Age d'or de l'Egypte (Fribourg, 1984) p. 80, no. 72, ill. p. 81.

5. The orbicularis oris muscle. This subcutaneous organ is often depicted in Egyptian portraits and is usually and correctly shown traversing the upper lip. An excellent example is on a portrait of Sesostris III, the Luxor Museum, J. 34; red granite, H. 80 cm; see E. R. Russmann, Egyptian Sculpture: Cairo and Luxor (Austin, Texas, 1989) p. 61, no. 26, ill.

6. For example, H. De Meulenaere; "Meskhênet à Abydos," Religion und Philosophie im alten Ägypten: Festgabe für Philippe Derchain (Louvain, 1991) p. 245. De Meulenaere here states that identification without a philological basis is "extrêmement fragile."


8. The best-known example was the discovery, at the beginning of this century, of a great number of mostly Late Period statues in the Karnak cache. These statues had obviously been discarded at a time after the end of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty.

9. W. M. F. Petrie and E. Mackay, Heliopolis, p. 5. The authors date the two royal heads found with the Metropolitan Museum's fragment to the Eighteenth Dynasty. I think it more likely that one of them, no. 2 in plate 6, is from the early Middle Kingdom.


11. It is impossible to quantify either the number of datable Saite Dynasty statues in collections throughout the world or how many of them are made of graywacke. From personal knowledge of the many hundreds of Twenty-sixth Dynasty statues included in Bothmer's archive of photographs of sculpture from the Late Period, I can fairly state that the majority are made from that stone.

12. One of the earliest royal statues is made of graywacke. It is of King Khasekhem of the Second Dynasty and is in Cairo, Egyptian Museum, JE 32161; graywacke, H. 56 cm; see Russmann, Egyptian Sculpture, pp. 10-12, no. 1, ill. In the Ptolemaic Period,
there is an abundance of graywacke statues. Among them are the Boston Green Head, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 04, 1749; graywacke, H. 10.8 cm; see R. Bianchi, Cleopatra's Egypt: Age of the Ptolemies (Brooklyn, 1988) no. 45, p. 140, ill. In the same catalogue is the Berlin Green Head, Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum, 12500; graywacke, H. 21.5 cm, no. 46, p. 141, ill.

13. For instance, schist, rather than graywacke, is used throughout ESLP as well as by Bianchi in Cleopatra's Egypt.

14. I am indebted to Dr. Clair R. Ossian, a geologist and mineralogist, for properly identifying the stone as graywacke.


17. In the MMA's descriptive label for the piece, the writer recognized that the features of the fragment substantially differed from those of the royal representations of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty.

18. Russmann, Egyptian Sculpture, p. 3, discusses the deliberate mutilation of royal statues to ensure that workmen destroying them were not subject to revenge from these godlike representations. Although the author refers to the mutilation of the nose, mouth, and eyes, I believe that this explanation could be extended to the total destruction of those figures.


20. New York, the Thalassic Collection; graywacke, H. 35.9 cm. Illustrated in Sotheby's Catalogue (June 25, 1992) no. 31.

21. See E. R. Russmann, "Relief Decoration in the Tomb of Mentuemet (TT 34)," forthcoming in JARCE (1994) n.95. I am grateful for Dr. Russmann's permission to read and cite this article prior to its publication.

22. Among the many examples of this configuration of the eyes are ESLP, no. 27, fig. 55; no. 28, fig. 56; no. 28, fig. 57; no. 34, fig. 74; no. 38 A, fig. 83; no. 39, figs. 84–85; and no. 41, figs. 89–91. Also see H. De Meulenaere and B. V. Bothmer, "Une tête d'Osis au Musée du Louvre," Kémi 19 (1969) pp. 9–16. The authors illustrate a number of Osiris figures from the Saite Dynasty, all of which have the narrow, almond-shaped eyes.


27. An example of noticeable drill holes on a Nineteenth Dynasty statue is found on a portrait of Mentetamun, wife and daughter of Ramesses II; see R. Freed, Ramesses the Great (Memphis, 1987) p. 134, no. 4, ill.


29. Strasbourg, Université de Strasbourg, 1585; quartzite, H. 33.5 cm; see ESLP, p. 122, no. 97, figs. 242–243. See also Antiquités Égyptiennes (Strasbourg, 1973) p. 56, no. 269, fig. 36.

30. An excellent example of the jutting chin on a relief representation of Ptolemy II is that on the west wall of the Isis Temple in Philae; see E. Vassilika, Ptolemaic Philae (Louvain, 1989) pl. 19 A. Another relief representation showing the combination of fleshy cheeks and a very prominent jaw is a plaque attributed to Ptolemy I in Lyon; see K. Mysliwiec, "Un portrait ptolemaïque de Coptos," Bulletin des Musées et Monuments Lyonnais 5 (1974) p. 31, fig. 2.


32. Josephson, Royal Sculpture of the Late Period.

33. Cairo, the Egyptian Museum. JE 87298; limestone; see G. Roeder, Hermopolis 1929–1939 (Hildesheim, 1959) p. 286, pl. 57 B.


35. In a personal communication in 1994.

36. As an example of an individual being portrayed at different ages, two statues of Amenhotep Son of Hapu, from the Eighteenth Dynasty. Both are in Cairo, the Egyptian Museum, JE 44861 and CG 42127; see Russmann, Egyptian Sculpture, nos. 50 and 51, ill. pp. 105–106.

37. R. R. R. Smith, "Ptolemaic Portraits: Alexandrian Types, Egyptian Versions" (Getty Museum Publication, forthcoming). I am grateful for the permission of Dr. Smith to quote from this unpublished article.

38. Ptolemy II is depicted with the prominent jaw and fleshy face on a coin portrait in Bianchi, Cleopatra's Egypt, no. 61 b, p. 160, ill. A similar group of those features appears on a coin portrait of Ptolemy III. See Smith, "Ptolemaic Portraits," fig. 2.

40. For examples, see H. Kyrieleis, Bildnisse der Ptolemäer (Berlin, 1975) pls. 2–5ff.


42. The most ambitious attempt to do so is in Bianchi’s Cleopatra’s Egypt. Unfortunately, many of the entries are ambiguous regarding datings and offer a fairly wide range of time.

43. Even the inscribed statue of Horsitutu has elicited substantial questions about its date. Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung, 2271; granite, H. 113 cm. Bianchi in Cleopatra’s Egypt calls attention to the area of disagreement between B. Schweitzer and himself on its date.

44. For example, the bust of a queen, MMA, acc. no. 07.228.2; limestone, 18.4 cm x 10.5 cm; see E. Young, “Sculptors’ Models or Votives?” MMAB (March 1964) p. 246, ill. This article thoroughly discusses the uses of these objects. Also, see T. F. L[ieps-]ner, “Modelle,” Lexikon der Ägyptologie (LA) 4 (Wiesbaden, 1982) cols. 168–180.

45. New York, collection of R. Keresey; plaster, 25.4 x 18.4 x 6 cm; see Bianchi, Cleopatra’s Egypt, p. 129, no. 34.


47. Amsterdam, The Allard Pierson Museum, 54; limestone (?), dimensions unknown. Unpublished. From the photograph, which I have seen only on a postcard from the museum, it is obvious that the material is stucco. The legend on the postcard reads “limestone.”


49. Strabo 17, 1, 27 (805).

50. Petrie and Mackay, Heliopolis, p. 2.

51. See note 31 for the statue of Ptolemy II. The statue of the Vatican Arsinôe II is Museo Gregoriano Egizio 25; red granite, H. 240 cm; see Botti and Romanelli, Le Sculpture, pp. 22–23, no. 31, pls. 22, 31, 33, 31, 21, 31.

52. K. Sethe, Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechisch-römischen Zeit (Leipzig, 1904) II 71, II 72.

53. Dr. Allen is associate curator in the Department of Egyptian Art at The Metropolitan Museum of Art. I am grateful to him for his assistance in translating the inscription, as well as supplying the reference used in note 52.

54. L. K., LA, col. 1111.

55. As late as 1993, the art of the Ptolemaic period was termed “degenerate” in a paper delivered at the Getty Museum symposium on Ptolemaic Alexandria in May of that year. Although this opinion is not universally shared by art historians, it was delivered by a knowledgeable museum curator.

56. Aldred, Egyptian Art, pp. 240.

57. Ibid.

58. See Smith, Hellenistic Sculpture, pp. 86ff.

59. See note 13.