ALEXANDRIA IN AEGYPTO. THE USE AND MEANING OF EGYPTIAN ELEMENTS IN HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN ALEXANDRIA

Kyriakos Savvopoulos

Introduction

During the last decade, the "Egyptian face" of Alexandria has received quite some scholarly attention, especially from scholars who felt uneasy to accept the reconstruction of the city as a purely Greek one, as proposed, for example, by Peter M. Fraser, in his influential and important *Ptolemaic Alexandria* from 1972. Stimulated by this development, in my PhD research I have tried to come to a first general overview of the use and meaning of the Egyptian element in Hellenistic and Roman Alexandria on the basis of all archaeological material previously published, as well as an inclusion of the spectacular new finds of the last decade by the teams of Frank Goddio and Jean Yves Empereur, amongst others. In this article I would like to present some of the main conclusions of this research that tries, by developing an Alexandria *in Aegypto* perspective, to offer a complementary view to the traditional Alexandria *ad Aegyptum* picture that is often still taken for granted.[1]

The Available Data

A catalogue of all archaeological evidence from Alexandria was compiled to serve as a database. Of course such a database can never be complete, especially not given the fact that the new finds of the last decade have not always been published and that new material is discovered almost continuously. Its purpose, therefore, is not to be exhaustive but to provide a general overview of the occurrence, use and meaning of the

[1] The PhD research was undertaken at the Faculty of Archaeology from Leiden University under the supervision of M.J. Versluys. In the course of my research I have profited immensely from the advice by P. Gallo, J.-Y. Empereur and R.S. Bianchi.

Egyptian element. Interpretative questions to be answered on that basis include: What did the Egyptian element look like? How did it develop over time? What relations are there between the different (public and private) contexts? Where did the Egyptian face of the city become most apparent and why? And what relation is there between the Hellenistic and the Roman periods in this respect? The catalogue consists of the following categories: 1. funerary structures and related material, 2. monumental art and architecture, 3. coins, and 4. portable objects like *oinochoai*, gems and terracotta figurines.[2]

In the paragraphs below I will provide some case studies that, together, include all types of material mentioned. The five case studies serve to illustrate some of the main conclusions and aim to make clear how important it is to look for an Alexandria *in Aegypto* perspective, in the first place. As the chronological development of Alexandria and Alexandrian society is, of course, of crucial importance for our understanding of the Egyptian element, the case studies deal with subsequent historical periods. I will first discuss Egyptian elements in early Hellenistic tombs (1) and monumental architecture (2), then pay attention to funerary customs (3) and sculpture and other portable objects in the late Hellenistic period (4), before ending with a general overview on the Roman period (5).

1. *Egyptian Elements in Early Hellenistic Greco-Alexandrian Tombs: Shatby Hypogeaum A and Mustapha Pasha I*

Hypogaeum A in Shatby, dating from the late 4th to middle 3rd century BC, is one of the earliest examples available to study the use of the Egyptian element and its interaction with Greek forms and customs (fig. 1).[3] Cremation, which was applied in the case of these burials, should be considered as a common Greek practice; yet, compared to Greek examples, the structure is unusual. We deal with an underground

[2] The distribution of the material over the different categories is very uneven. The catalogue will provide three large categories (I. Monumental tombs of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, II. Monumental art and architecture and III. Coinage of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods) and deal with the portable objects in several appendices.

[3] For this tomb see E. *Breccia*, *La necropoli di Sciatbi*, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes (Musée d'Alexandrie) (Cairo 1912) xxxii–xlix; A. Adriani, *Repertorio d'arte dell'Egitto greco-romano* (Palermo 1966) 124–126 nº 79 and Venit, *Alexandria* 26–34.

structure of subsequent rooms where funerary urns were placed in *loculi*, narrow holes covered with slabs. There is also a *kline* room, reminiscent of the *klinai* of Macedonian tombs.[4]

The unusual layout and make-up of the structure can be explained in terms of Egyptian references, which were presented in a Greek visual dress. It is commonly thought, for instance, that the main Egyptian contribution in the origin of Alexandrian tombs was the adoption of the underground gallery layout, with *loculi* burials.[5] The *loculi* arrangement was quite common in animal *necropoleis* throughout Egypt, notably those at Memphis. Recently, the excavation of an early Macedonian settlement on Nelson Island brought some additional evidence to this question and it might shed new light on the origin of early Alexandrian structures, such as this of hypogeum A.[6] It concerns an underground *loculus* tomb of the 30th dynasty (or perhaps slightly later) with, adjacent to it, a Greek style rock-cut *kline* room, where a coin of Ptolemy I was found (fig. 2). Even if the use of this room remains unclear so far, it can be suggested that underground structures with *loculi* burials occurred in the neighbourhood area of Alexandria during the 4rth century BC. It seems therefore that the early Greek settlers were familiar with Egyptian structures and practices, which makes it only logical to assume that they borrowed elements from this repertoire to be included in the *necropoleis* of Alexandria. This assumption can be supported by the similarity that exists between the plans of the Nelson Island necropolis and the Shatby Hypogeum.

The Shatby hypogaeum is one of the earliest tombs showing what could be called a "double function". On the one hand it functions as the last residence of the dead, whose body was treated according to the Greek tradition. On the other hand, the structure seems to have served as a funerary temple as well; a meeting point between the worlds of the living and the dead. While the latter idea was not common to the Greek funerary tradition, it is characteristic for Egyptian tombs and funerary temples. According to the Egyptian tradition, the deceased

---

[4] On this relation, see the article by A.-M. Guimier-Sorbets and M.-D. Nenna, Le lit funeraire dans les nécropoles alexandrines, in: J.-Y. Empereur and M.-D. Nenna (eds.), *Nécropolis* 2, Études alexandrines 7 (Cairo 2003) 533–575.

[5] Venit, *Alexandria* 16.

[6] The site has been excavated by Turin University, under the direction of Paolo Gallo. For a first report see P. Gallo, Il contributo della ricerca italiana allo studio dell'area canopica, in: L. Ferro and C. Pallini (eds.), *Alessandria d'Egitto oltre il mito. Architettura, archeologia, transformazioni urbane* (Boves 2009) 66–75.

could be resurrected and continue to have a relationship with his relatives in his last residence. Consequently, Egyptian funerary and other religious structures aimed to fulfil this role. From this point of view, therefore, it is well possible that elements of the early Greco-Alexandrian tombs have been inspired by Egyptian structures and beliefs, which have been adapted to the Greco-Alexandrian visual vocabulary and funerary practice.

Mustapha Pasha tomb I, in its first phase dating to the middle of the 3rd century BC, presents a more monumental version of the same idea (fig. 3).[7] The overall structure is Greek in character, although it has no real parallel in the Greek world. At the same time, Egyptian references are profound in the structural layout, attributes, and decoration. These, however, seem to have been merely translated into the Greek visual vocabulary, resulting in a Greco-Alexandrian atmosphere, with some "indigenising" tones.

More specific Egyptian references, although covered in a Greek dress, seem to be hidden in the adoption of a narrow peristyle-court; in the axial emphasis of the structure leading to the south façade; in the sequence of rooms which lead from the court to the *loculi* burials; and in several aspects of illusionism between the court and the inner areas. Finally, Egyptian references are detectable in the overall arrangement and decoration of the south façade, for instance in the tripartite arrangement and the Egyptianising layout of the doorframes. It seems that we do not deal here with the *interpretatio graeca* of a specific type of Egyptian funerary structure, as has been proposed in the past.[8] Egyptian references seem to have been derived from the wider context of Egyptian funerary (and religious) architectural logic. The inhabitants of this tomb intended to promote a Greek-Macedonian origin and Greco-Alexandrian lifestyle. Still, this occurs within an Egyptianising frame, which would define them more specifically as Greeks in Egypt, but simultaneously as Greeks who were from Egypt, who died in Egypt, and who even might have fought for Egypt.[9]

---

[7] For this tomb see: A. Adriani, *Annuaire 1933/34–1934/35. La Nécropole de Moustafa Pacha* (Alexandria 1936); Venit, *Alexandria* 50–61.

[8] W.A. Daszewski, The origins of Hellenistic hypogea in Alexandria, in: M. Minas and J. Zeidler (eds.), *Aspekte spätägyptischer Kultur. Festschrift für Erich Winter zum 65. Geburtstag*, Aegyptiaca Treverensia 7 (Mainz am Rhein 1994) 51–68.

[9] For Alexandrian elites fighting in the Egyptian army see: C.A. La' da, Encounters with Egypt. The Hellenistic Experience, in: R. Matthews and C. Römer (eds.), *Ancient Perspectives on Egypt*, Encounters with ancient Egypt (London 2003) 166–167.

2. *Egyptian Elements in Early Hellenistic Monumental Art and Architecture: The Sarapeion*

A very different type of evidence concerns monumental art and architecture. This type of material can be related to public expressions of Alexandrian society, but, at the same time, has a lot to do with the (cultural) policy of the Ptolemaic authorities. Most of this evidence is derived from the Sarapeion, and that is not a coincidence. This sanctuary was a major medium for the Ptolemies to project messages of ideology and propaganda, as well as for Alexandrians to express their loyalty to the crown (fig. 4).[10] In addition, visits of the royal family to the Sarapeion, as well as their self-portrayal on that spot, contributed to the acceptance of the Greek rulers by the Egyptian community, and supported the Ptolemies in difficult situations by means of their close relation with the priesthood of Memphis.[11]

What about the Egyptian element in the Sarapeion? First of all we should consider its position. It was located at the heart of the Egyptian district, and not in the city centre or the royal quarters, like all the other important Ptolemaic institutions. It thus seems that this sanctuary aimed to act as a point of contact between the Greek and Egyptian parts of the city. The kings and elites participating in the rites and festivals were obliged to cross the entire Egyptian neighbourhood, while the Egyptian population venerated and celebrated in their own district. In the Ptolemaic period the sanctuary was mostly Greek in appearance, although several elements were inspired by the Egyptian tradition. There is, for instance, a narrow colonnaded court—unusual for Greek religious structures, but common for Egyptian ones—and there are underground galleries and a Nilometer. Foundation plaques from the temples of Sarapis and Harpocrates have been found with

[10] For the sanctuary of Sarapis see: M. Sabottka, *Das Serapeum in Alexandria. Untersuchungen zur Architektur und Baugeschichte des Heiligtums von der frühen ptolemäischen Zeit bis zur Zerstörung 391 n. Chr.* (PhD-diss. Berlin 1989); J. McKenzie, S. Gibson and A.T. Reyes, Reconstructing the Serapeum in Alexandria from the Archaeological Evidence, *JRS* 94 (2004) 73–114.

[11] Interesting in this respect, are a pair of statues of the priest Psenptah, Alexandria: Greco-Roman museum nº 17533, 17534 (under Ptolemy III) and a Naophoros statue of Petobastis I, Alexandria, Greco-Roman museum nº 27806 (under Ptolemy II). These people were high priests of Memphis whose status was recognised in Alexandria. The erection of their statues in the Sarapeion indicates the close relation between the royal house of Alexandria and the priesthood of the old capital of Memphis. For these ties, see: D. Thompson, *Memphis under the Ptolemies* (New Jersey 1988) 138–146.

both Greek and hieroglyphic inscriptions, a fact which suggests the importance of the Egyptian identity of the god, also in Alexandria. In addition, Egyptian style sphinxes and further decorative elements in the Egyptian style added Egyptian character to the sanctuary. These Egyptian style media were sometimes used as expressions of loyalty to the Ptolemaic dynasty by elite Alexandrians, as the dedicatory inscriptions of the (fragmentarily preserved) Ptolemaic statues executed in Egyptian granite make clear.[12] We see that in this early stage, Egyptian style media also served for the promotion of the Egyptian-Pharaonic face of the Ptolemies in the most important sanctuary of the city.

3. *Egyptian Elements in Late Hellenistic Funerary Customs*

Three important political and socio-cultural developments can be distinguished that make the late Ptolemaic period a very different context in comparison to the early Ptolemaic era. Egypt is now characterised by civil unrest and the Ptolemaic power and influence are internationally in decline. Greco-Egyptian interaction in the lower levels of society reach a very advanced stage: only now can we truly speak about a multi-cultural society. And, lastly, from the middle of the 2nd century BC onwards, Egyptians are able to participate in higher administrative and military positions after a process of Hellenisation in terms of name, education and lifestyle.[13] During this period, a new category of elite tombs is developed: the Egyptian version of elite-Alexandrian tombs where mummification is the main funerary practice. In addition, the architecture and wall decoration have a more profound Egyptian character, which contributes to the formation of an appropriate funerary environment according to the Egyptian tradition. Nevertheless, there is always space for Greco-Alexandrian decorative elements, which add a cosmopolitan, elite atmosphere to the structure. These tombs are quintessentially Alexandrian.[14]

---

[12] Fragment of Arsinoe II's statue: Alexandria, Greco-Roman museum nº 1941; statue base of Arsinoe II, dedicated by Thestor, son of Satyros (in situ); royal female statue, dating from the first half of 3rd century BC (Arsinoe II?): Alexandria, Greco-Roman museum nº 14941.

[13] Cf. supra n. 9.

[14] As Venit, *Alexandria* 68.

In case of Anfushy II, it is clear that on entering the structure we pass from the word of the living to the world of the dead.[15] The two paintings decorating the stairs, which lead from the ground level to underground, symbolically express this idea (fig. 5). In the upper one the deceased, who seems to have been a priest, is standing between Horus and a Pharaonic couple. The Pharaonic figures seem to represent the Ptolemies, and not Osiris and Isis.[16] The couple offers a jar to the deceased, while in the decoration at the lower flight of the stairs another jar is offered by the deceased to Osiris. Therefore, these two scenes indicate that we pass into the realm of Osiris now. This becomes even clearer when entering the inner structure. There the walls are covered by Egyptian style zones of coloured tiles, alternated with bigger plaques that show crowns of Osiris and Isis and figures of the jackal. In the back-wall of the inner area, an Egyptian style naiskos is projected in an illusionistic way; suggesting that this is the *adytum* of the structure through which the dead have to pass to (and from) the netherworld. It is in the late Ptolemaic period, that the naiskos is widely used, not only as a focal point of the tomb, but also as the entrance to the "actual location" of the dead in the other world, as implied by the naiskos-style *loculus* slabs. This was the case of the two great *loculi* in Anfushy V, which still might hide another possible reference to the Egyptian tradition. The wall decoration of Room 2 presents a series of trees, interrupted by some architectural elements in the form of doorframes (fig. 6).[17] These doorframes are presented, in my opinion, as holding the vaulted ceiling of the room, which is decorated with a tapestry-like design. It might be suggested, therefore, that the wall and ceiling decoration of the room together represent a kiosk that was situated in the middle of the garden. The idea of a kiosk within a garden—metaphorically representing the *abaton*, the tomb of Osiris—was quite popular in Egyptian funerary art, especially in the

---

[15] For this tomb, see: A. Adriani, Nécropoles de L'ile de Pharos. B). Section d'Anfuchy, *Annuaire 4 (1940–1950)* (Alexandria 1952) 55–128; Venit, *Alexandria* 77–85.

[16] There is no exclusive divine characteristic apart from the knot of the female figure. Yet, this knot is also known as the attribute of Ptolemaic queens, while similar royal figures are known from monumental sculpture of the late Ptolemaic period. See S.A. Ashton, *Ptolemaic royal sculpture from Egypt. The interaction between Greek and Egyptian traditions*, BAR 923 (Oxford 2001); ead., *The last queens of Egypt* (Harlow 2003).

[17] For this tomb and its paintings, see: Venit, *Alexandria* 85–90.

New Kingdom period: we are therefore likely to deal with an Egyptian element here.[18]

4. *Egyptian Elements in other Domains of late Hellenistic Alexandria*

The people who were buried in the Anfushy tombs and other elite *necropoleis* of the late Ptolemaic city, represent a new kind of elite people—from mixed descent or Hellenised Egyptian—who added a new colour to Alexandrian public life.[19] Probably also related to this group, was the Egyptian priest Hor, son of Hor, whose statue has been preserved (fig. 7). The statue of Hor includes typical Egyptian characteristics, such as his clothes, the back pillar that bears hieroglyphic inscriptions with information on his proficiency, as well as the style of the rendering of the figure. Still, this statue was intended to portray a person with Greek style public portrait image. Therefore, an Egyptian priest could have a Greek image, simultaneously preserving his Egyptian identity and activity.[20] These developments in Alexandrian society correspond with a new phase in Ptolemaic royal ideology. This new phase aimed to emphasise the Pharaonic identity of the Greek kings, as a reaction to the cultural and political developments both locally and internationally. In total seven Pharaonic statues belonging to the Late Ptolemaic dynasty have been preserved.[21] Such monuments could have been installed at various occasions; late Ptolemaic history suggests various possibilities. It could have been necessary to restore Ptolemaic authority, after the rebellion in Thebes in 130 BC, and from this period onwards, it could

[18] For the *abaton*, see Meyboom, *Nile Mosaic* appendices 8 and 9.

[19] In general the status of Egyptian priests, especially those of the temple of Ptah in Memphis, is raised in the later Ptolemaic period (2nd and 1st centuries BC). For example, the priest Psenptah II was married to a Berenike, who was closely related to the royal house. See G. Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (London and New York 2001) Appendix, reign of Ptolemy VIII, year 122 BC. Ibid. 222, 279–285 and 309–310.

[20] This might also be the case with the two Roman period statues of Canopic priests found in the city, see: *Egypt's sunken treasures* n° 464 and P. Gallo, *Une nouvelle statue en granit d'un prêtre portant l'"Osiris-Canope"*, Aegyptiaca Alexandrina VI (Cairo 2002) 21–24, and also with the priest displayed in Anfushy II (for which see supra n. 14, Adriani, Pl. XXVII, fig.1). We see in both cases that a hut is worn, while in Anfushy the hut covers the curls of the head, which are still projected in the forehead, and would look similar to Hor.

[21] Originating from the Pharos area and the eastern port and (1 statue group) from the Hadra district; see S.A. Ashton, The Egyptian tradition, in: A. Hirst and M. Silk (eds.), *Alexandria Real and Imagined* (Aldershot 2004) 25–40.

be related to the replacement of various kings and queens—like during the civil war between Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II (132–127 BC)—and their need to gain legitimacy as Pharaohs down to the reign of Cleopatra VII. Cleopatra VII extensively used Egyptian style media in order to promote the revised, more Egyptian ideology of her (potential) Ptolemaic empire. In the so-called Donations of Alexandria, Cleopatra acted as Isis in an Egyptian style dress.[22] Also in the coinage of the late Ptolemaic period, the Isis crown seems to represent the Egyptian face of the Ptolemaic authority and state.[23]

5. *Egyptian Elements in Roman Alexandria*

Taking a birds-eye perspective on the data available from the Roman period, it immediately becomes clear that Alexandrian coinage dominates the catalogue.[24] Egyptian gods, symbols, forms and buildings are represented in a wide variety. In total, 58 imperial figures published (on average) 33 types of coinage themes showing Egyptian elements. In terms of popularity the period from the reign of Domitian until that of Commodus stands out; from Commodus onwards mainly Sarapis and Isis are portrayed. Also before Commodus these two gods are by far the most popular Egyptian element, but the repertoire was broader at the time. Sarapis seems to have functioned as the tutelary deity of the Roman emperor par excellence. Another important element is the development of funerary customs (and their contexts) in Roman Alexandria.[25]

Roman authority seems to have utilised (and elaborated) the process of adaptation of Egyptian elements in order to conciliate Alexandrian society and, furthermore, to promote their own political goals.

[22] For this ceremony see now R. Strootman, Queen of Kings: Kleopatra VII and the Donations of Alexandria, in: M. Facella, T. Kaizer (eds.), *Client kingdoms in the Roman Near East* (forthcoming).

[23] As can be seen, for instance, in the coinage of Ptolemy X, where the eagle, symbol of the Ptolemies, holds the thunderbolt of Zeus at one side, and the crown of Isis at the other side.

[24] Recent literature includes D. Gerin, A. Geissen, M. Amandry (eds.), *Aegyptiaca serta in Soheir Bakhoum memoriam. Mélanges de numismatique, d'iconographie et d'histoire*, Collezioni Numismatiche—Materiali publici e privati 7 (Milano 2008). Also, the *Roman Provincial Coinage Online* project (*RPC* Online) of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; the *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* online (*SNG* Online). Cf. also the contribution by A. Geissen in this volume.

[25] This, however, is a separate story, which will not be dealt with in this paragraph. See for a recent overview and interpretation Riggs, *The beautiful burial*.

This policy was related to the assimilation of Alexandria and Egypt to the standards of the Roman Empire. Alexandrian society could continue its life according to its own multi-cultural rules, but the political, Ptolemaic presence and pretensions were to be forgotten. Egypt had to become an ordinary province of the Roman Empire with Alexandria as its capital. In line with this policy, the Egyptian tradition was used in many ways.

In the Sarapeion, for instance, Roman additions to the sanctuary like the "Roman portico" and the statue of the Apis bull (dedicated by Hadrian) were in an Egyptian style, although the "Roman portico" included some classical elements as well.

Yet, this was not the only use of Egyptian elements in Roman Alexandria. As is suggested now by many scholars analysing the new finds of the last decade, the new authority apparently managed to transfer and re-use monumental material from indigenous Pharaonic sites on a large scale (fig. 8).[26] Such material was concentrated in great quantities in the area of the Sarapeion, in the city centre, at the eastern port and on Pharos Island. While the exact function still has to be further explored in context, it is clear that the Egyptian material transferred to Alexandria can often been seen in connection to the most glorious dynasties of the land of the Nile (like the 12th, 18th, 19th and 26th dynasties). The transfer and re-use of monumental sculpture and architecture seems to have been a rather common Roman policy, not only in Egypt but also in Greece and Italy.[27] In contrast to this, the Ptolemies were famous for their extensive and expensive new sacred building activities all over the country; although often adding, like in Philae for instance, to long running Pharaonic projects.[28] By bringing

[26] See, for instance: Ashton, *The Egyptian tradition* 16–19 and 32; Stanwick, *Portraits of the Ptolemies* 19; McKenzie, *Architecture* 185–186.

[27] For instance, the temple of Ares was dismantled from a surrounding area of Attica and reinstalled in the Athenian agora. See J.M. Camp, *The Archaeology of Athens* (Athens 2004) 191. Also columns of the temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens were reused in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome by Sulla. See J.W. Stamper, *The Architecture of Roman Temples* (Cambridge 2005) 6–18 and 220–221.

[28] The only case for a Ptolemaic transfer and re-use of Pharaonic material might be a small group of the 30th Dynasty Pharaonica belonging to the last indigenous Pharaonic dynasty. These pieces are found in limited numbers in the royal quarter and the Soma area of Alexandria alone. Their use in Alexandria might have been related to issues of legitimacy. Such a case is also documented in literary sources: in Arsinoeion an obelisk of the 30th dynasty was re-erected; see Stanwick, *Portraits of the Ptolemies* 19; Ashton, *The Egyptian tradition* 18; McKenzie, *Architecture* 51.

Pharaonica in large quantities to Alexandria, the Romans could reframe the monumental image of the city in a wider chronological and historical context. Alexandria would represent not only the recent, and in a sense glorious, Ptolemaic past, but also the long indigenous history of the country it belonged to. The addition of Pharaonica, therefore, could have functioned to blur the monumental public appeal of the Ptolemaic dynasty in important public contexts.

Conclusion

The five case studies briefly presented above can do no justice, of course, to the multiple (and even contradictory) meanings that Egyptian elements will have had in Alexandria, in different contexts and different periods. Still, it is possible to distinguish a long-term development that seems to have a more general relevance.

During the early Hellenistic period (from the 4th to the mid 2nd century BC) Egyptian elements were involved in the expressions of the Ptolemaic court and Alexandrian society in order to legitimise, stabilise and promote their positions in Egypt and within the Hellenistic world. In the Late Ptolemaic period, Egyptian elements were used more actively and consciously in order to express a somewhat revised Ptolemaic ideology, as well as being the result of the sociocultural and ethnic integration of Alexandrian society. Flexibility is a keyword here. In the Roman period, the perception and the use of the Egyptian tradition was focused on the provision of a blessed afterlife in the funerary domain. In other contexts the Romans seem to have tried to convert Alexandria from an imperial capital, as imagined by the Ptolemies, into the capital of the Roman province of Egypt. To do so, they actively used Pharaonica in order to compose a "museum" of indigenous Pharaonic history in Alexandria. By giving Alexandria back the indigenous history of its country, Ptolemaic influences were marginalised in order to change Egypt into an ordinary Roman province, like all the others.

Addendum: New evidence concerning the use of Aegyptiaca in Alexandria

As addendum, I would like to present a recent find made by the underwater expedition of HIAMAS at the water area around cape Lochias.[29]

It is a monolithic pylon of about 3 meters high, a kind of miniature version of the even higher pylons of the Egyptian complexes (fig. 9). According to the excavators the pylon had not been transferred or reused, but was abandoned in situ, like in the case of the Pharos colossi.[30] The pylon seems to belong to the Greco-Roman period, since Egyptian temples would never have had such a monolithic piece in such small dimensions. Perhaps, therefore, we deal here with part of the Hellenistic-Roman temple for Isis Lochias. Depictions of such a temple as have been preserved on Alexandrian coins, do not contradict this hypothesis.[31]

[29] I would like to thank Harry Tzallas, director of the Hellenic Institute of Ancient and Mediaeval Alexandrian Studies for his permission to use and present this material.

[30] See most recently: Guimier-Sorbets, *L'image de Ptolémée*.

[31] There is no detailed description for this sanctuary. Yet, it is generally accepted that a temple of Isis was there, and this is repeated in several works including L. Kahil, Cults in Hellenistic Alexandria, in: M. True, K. Hamma (eds.), *Alexandria and Alexandrianism* (Malibu 1996) 82; F. Dunand, The factory of gods, in: C. Jacob and F. Polignac (eds.), *Alexandria, third century BC: the knowledge of the world in a single city* (Alexandria 2000) 56. For discussion on the location of Isis of Akra Lochias see P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972) II, n. 81. For figures of the coins: see *BMC* 542 (Trajan) and 879 (Hadrian).