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Cypro-Archaic terracotta figurines constitute a large proportion of the archaeological votive finds at many East Aegean sanctuaries and, to a smaller but still conspicuous degree, at Naukratis as well. Thus, they attest the considerable mobility of objects of cultic significance throughout the Eastern Mediterranean world in the 8th and 7th centuries BC. At the same time, despite more than a century of research, the precise chronology of Cypro-Archaic terracotta figurines is still unclear and much debated, even when they come from archaeological contexts on the island itself — not to mention the many unprovenanced examples found in museums. This makes it difficult to understand when and how Cypriot terracotta figurines were used outside the island or to assess the impact they had on local production and ritual usage during a period of intense connections and cultural borrowing between the Levant, Cyprus, Egypt and the Aegean, including the phenomenon known as the orientalising phase of Greek culture.

Because well-dated contexts on Cyprus itself were lacking, early research on Cypriot sculpture (which did not distinguish terracottas from limestone sculpture), including the question of when large-scale statues emerged on the island, depended on the subjective sense of style and prejudices of the respective scholars. Their judgements were greatly influenced by their responses to Classical Greek art. Consequently, Cypriot sculpture was often labelled as unsophisticated, passive, and incapable of independent artistic creativity (for a summary of the history of modern research on Cypriot sculpture, see Counts 2001).

John Linton Myres, for example, dated the emergence of Syrian, Egyptian and Greek elements in Cypriot sculpture production to successive waves of political or cultural intervention on the island by Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians and Greeks. This resulted in a very high chronology starting in the 8th century BC (Myres 1914, 194, 198, 202). Arnold Walter Lawrence, on the other
hand, argued for a strong inspiration from Greek sculpture in general and, accordingly, proposed a low chronology (Lawrence 1926; see also Pryce 1931, 7, 11–146; Counts 2001, 143–45). Many scholars rejected the idea that large-scale sculpture emerged on Cyprus earlier than in Greece itself and, in particular, the possibility of its impact on early Greek sculpture or cultural practices more generally (Childs 2001), thereby supporting lower dating ranges.

The first chronological model for the stylistic development of Cypriot sculpture based on stratigraphic evidence was presented by Einar Gjerstad. Gjerstad drew his conclusions from the stratigraphy of the sanctuary at Ayia Irini on Cyprus, which yielded a huge number of terracotta figurines. For the Cypro-Archaic terracotta figurines, Gjerstad distinguished four different styles: Proto-Cypriot I (650–560 BC); Proto-Cypriot II (c. 600–540 BC); Neo-Cypriot (c. 560–520 BC); and Archaic Cypro-Greek (540–450 BC) (Gjerstad et al. 1948, 92–109; Counts 2001, 147–49). From the start, his definition of styles was strongly challenged by other scholars, not least for its rather vague stylistic criteria and the overlapping chronological sequences. The latter were taken as an argument for not designating them as chronological styles at all. Furthermore, the interpretation of the archaeological contexts that Gjerstad used to determine the stylistic chronology was sharply criticised. Since well-dated contexts were lacking in Cyprus, most of these were located outside the island, in the East Aegean but also at Naukratis. In this respect, the stratigraphic evidence for dating Cypriot terracotta figurines in the Heraion of Samos, which yielded the largest group of Cypriot figurines outside the island itself, was and remains particularly important. Gjerstad himself never accepted this, since it meant significant chronological shifts of some of the styles, as Dieter Ohly outlined as early as 1940 (Ohly 1940; see Counts 2001, 149–51).

Finally, in the publication of the Cypriot terracotta and limestone statues found in the Heraion of Samos, Schmidt argued for only one Proto-Cypriot style (Schmidt 1968, 95–98, 136 n. 65) and for dating the Neo-Cypriot style between 610/600 and 570/560 BC (Schmidt 1968, 37–44). On the other hand, Schmidt interpreted the different production techniques of Cypriot terracotta figurines — namely, hand-made, wheel-made, mould-made solid (plaque-shaped) or mould-made hollow figurines — as partly chronological phenomena.

Some scholars rejected Schmidt’s scheme and numerous attempts to assimilate the two chronological systems have failed (among others, Lewe 1975; Demetriou 1978; Stylianou 2003). In 2007, in the light of the higher dates for the occurrence of the Neo-Cypriot style from the Aegean (while also questioning the stratigraphy of the finds from Ayia Irini), Sabine Fourrier convincingly explained Gjerstad’s sequential styles as contemporary regional styles; she also challenged Schmidt’s chronological order of different production techniques, arguing that these, too, should be interpreted as contemporary regional phenomena (Fourrier 2007, 14–17, 89–92, 103–7). Thus, different styles and production techniques are characteristic of different Cypriot centres or regions. Fourrier allocated the Neo-Cypriot style and, thus, the majority of Cypriot terracotta figurines found in the East Aegean — whose conspicuously uniform style has already

2 The final date of 570/560 BC for the end of the import of Cypriot terracotta figurines was given by the dating of the foundation of Dipteros I in the Heraion of Samos to c. 560 BC. As fragments of Cypriot terracotta figurines, classified by Gerhard Schmidt as the latest imported statues, were found underneath the temple’s foundations, Schmidt argued for a terminus ante quem of about 570/560 BC (Schmidt 1968, 70, 98). But Hermann J. Kienast (1998, 113) argued convincingly for a higher dating of Dipteros I to c. 575 BC. Furthermore, new excavations east of the altars in 2010–13, executed under the direction of Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier, show evidence of at least three layers of sacrificial debris underneath Altar VIII (‘Rhokos-Altar’); they contained Cypriot terracottas and date only to 590/580 BC and not to 570/560 BC (Henke 2017b).
been pointed out by various scholars, as outlined by Hermary (1991, 143–45) – to the local style of Salamis in the eastern part of Cyprus (Fourrier 2007, 23–37, 106–7, 114). The style is characterised by the extensive use of moulds in the production of plaque-shaped and hollow figurines and was greatly inspired by the sculptural style of the surrounding East Mediterranean cultures. Fourrier’s allocation of the figurine styles also clarifies the phenomenon of so few production centres on Cyprus being represented in the complex of Cypro- Archaic terracotta figurines in the East Aegean as well as at Naukratis (Thomas 2015, 20–21). These production centres are, primarily, Salamis and, to a much lesser degree, Kition/ Amathous. Probably, only a few figurines originate in centres located in western Cyprus, such as Paphos, for example. This fact is important when we investigate who dedicated these figurines in the Aegean and also when we examine the practices for which these figurines were initially created.

The Samian stratigraphy had already indicated earlier dates, and Fourrier argued convincingly for an earlier absolute date for the figurines exported to the East Aegean and Naukratis than that originally proposed by Gjerstad. This, in turn, implies a much earlier date for the beginning of large-scale production on Cyprus itself, as Antoine Hermary (1991) has already demonstrated (though he adhered to the dates for the latest occurrence of the Neo-Cypriot style in the Aegean proposed by Schmidt).

New evidence from Miletos for dating Cypriot terracotta figurines in the East Aegean

New stratigraphic evidence from the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Miletos has finally confirmed an even higher date for the import of Cypriot or, specifically, East Cypriot/Salaminian terracotta figurines in the East Aegean than hitherto expected. According to this evidence, the import of these terracotta figurines started around 670 BC or a little earlier and did not reach its peak before the middle of the century. Evidence even suggests that the majority of the figurines were imported within a very short period of approximately one or two decades, from c. 650/640 BC until c. 630 BC, and not 570/560 BC as suggested by Gerhard Schmidt (Henke 2017a, 191–93; a slightly higher date for the terracotta figurines on Samos within the first quarter of the 6th century has already been proposed by Kyrieleis 1989 and Stylianou 2003). Stylistic and technical features of the figurines lead to the conclusion that the majority of figurines allocated to this short period of ‘mass import’ between c. 650/640 BC and c. 630 BC – comprising both plaque-shaped and hollow figurines – was produced by a few more-or-less contemporary workshops in the vicinity of Salamis. The proposed date of c. 630 BC for the end of imported Cypriot terracotta figurines seems to conflict with some of the Naukratis finds, which could not have reached the city before its generally accepted founding date in c. 620 BC; below, I shall return to this point.

The small number of workshops producing Cypriot terracotta figurines in the East Aegean is indicated by the fact that many terracotta figurines, or parts of them, can be allocated to the same moulds and to the distinctive modelling practices of individual craftsmen. In this respect, the mould-made plaque-shaped figurines constitute many examples that were made from the same moulds (Ikosi 1993, 14–26, 28–32). So far, this specific feature has not been found in the hollow figurines to the same extent. This is due to the confusing range of typological and iconographic variations in the specific technique used for this kind of hollow figurines. In this paper I discuss two characteristic groups of figurines that I have extensively discussed in other publications (Henke 2009; 2011; 2017a). In these earlier papers, the study focused on the technical aspects of
the Cypriot terracotta figurines in the East Aegean rather than on chronological or overarching cultural-anthropological questions, which were not discussed in detail but which are summarised in the second part of the present paper.

The female statue T 600 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) found in the Heraion of Samos (Fig. 1) belongs to the first of these two groups. It was shaped by using small moulds for some details of the figurine, such as the hands or ear caps. The largest part of the body, however, consists of numerous individual pieces of clay that were added and modelled by the craftsman. Most of the physiognomy of the figurine and details such as the jewellery or the hair were shaped by the individual creative hand of the craftsman, and reflect his own personal conception of shape. This terracotta was included by Schmidt in his fourth group from Samos (Schmidt 1968, 39–44). Further statues on Samos – of different sex and type – show a close stylistic relationship with T 600, as pointed out by Schmidt, who dated these figurines to an extended period within the first quarter of the 6th century. Together with very similar figurines from other find locations in the East Aegean, such as Rhodes or Knidos, Aegina or Salamis-Toumba on Cyprus, these terracotta statues constitute a large stylistic group of figurines, as most recently pointed out by Hermary and Fourrier (Hermary 1991; Fourrier 2007). It remained unnoticed, however, that the close relationship of all of these figurines springs from the fact that they were most likely made by the same craftsman or, at least, by a closely cooperating group of craftsmen within one workshop.

Fig. 1: Cypriot mould-made hollow figurine from Samos (T 600). After Schmidt 1968, pl. 71. D-DAI-ATH-Samos 2274. All rights reserved. Photograph by H. Wagner.

All the faces of the figurines listed in the appendix come from the same mould. This is proved by conspicuous details appearing on all the faces in question. They all show, for instance, an identical rendering of the left eyebrow (Henke 2011, 215 fig. 6; 2017a, pl. 12). Apart from the identical structure of the hair locks themselves, a deep and wide incision at the lower edge of the second triangular hair section is striking. This feature was already part of the prototype or patrinx from which the mould was taken. This specific feature was reproduced on all the figurines in question (for a more detailed description see Henke 2011, 213–16; 2017a, 82–90). The double-bordered right eyebrow (Henke 2011, 215, fig. 7; 2017a, pl. 12) constitutes another characteristic feature shared by all these figurines: above the upper outline of the right eyebrow, a more flattened second outline is visible. Therefore, it seems very likely that all these faces were made in the same mould. Evidence for different generations of moulds, which should be indicated by a steady reduction in sizes, cannot be observed. All other details were formed separately by hand and then added to the statue. The faces, for instance, show variously elongated or rounded outlines caused by the deformation that took place when they were applied to the rest of the body and when the other parts of the head were formed.

The original iconography of the prototype from which the mould was cast can be reconstructed from the female head T 1906+2798 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) found in the Heraion of Samos (Fig. 2; Henke 2011, 214). The forelock ends in a straight edge on the forehead, followed by two lines of small stamped curls. The upper line of curls is followed by incised vertical strands of hair. Here, one can clearly see the line where the soft strand structure given by the mould becomes a hard and more deeply scratched feature incised by the craftsman after joining the face to the back of the head (Schmidt 1968, pl. 77 right). A slight elevation on the surface also makes the joint visible (Henke 2011, 214). The identical hair structure formed by the mould appears once again below the missing part of the turban-like bulge around the forehead on the female head T 1888+1979 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) from the Heraion (Fig. 3). After moulding, the craftsman modified the iconography by applying the bulge and cutting the forelocks into small fringes. Another female head from Samos (Henke 2011, 215, fig. 8) shows this structure as well, even though only one curl is still visible after the intensive modification by the craftsman. The fragment illustrates the process of modelling the statues: the craftsman erased the original iconography given by the mould, and shaped and applied all other details by hand. A detailed examination of these freely shaped parts reveals conspicuous similarities in the selection, combination and shape of iconographic motifs, which indicates that they were produced by a single individual or, at least, by a closely connected group of craftsmen within the same workshop. One example is the straight band of rectangular forelocks of the figurines T 1888+1979 from Samos (Fig. 3; Schmidt 1968, pl. 79), GR.11.1890 (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum) from Salamis-Toumba (Karageorghis, Vassilika and Wilson 1999, 66 cat. no. 118) and 1891.8–6.39 (London, British Museum) (Fig. 4; V. Karageorghis 1993, cat. no. 73, pl. 20.1–2), or Z10.27.6 (Miletos, excavation depot) from Miletos (Fig. 5; Henke 2017a, pl. 1.1). For this the craftsman smoothed the stamped curls above the straight lower edge of the forelocks, as already described for the forehead of T 1906+2798 from Samos. Afterwards, he cut this plane band into many very small and short rectangular strands, which, in turn, are structured by two or three incisions running diagonally in different directions. The lower corners of the rectangular fringes are cut off. This iconography is, of course, not unique, but the proportion and the outlining of the strands are so similar that the same craftsman can be assumed.

3 Jastrow 1941.
Fig. 2 Cypriot mould-made hollow figurine from Samos (T 1906+2798). After Schmidt 1968, pl. 77. D-DAI-ATH-Samos 6830. All rights reserved. Photograph by E. Feiler.

Fig. 3: Cypriot mould-made hollow figurine from Samos (T 1888+1979). After Schmidt 1968, pl. 79. D-DAI-ATH-Samos 6808. All rights reserved. Photograph by E. Feiler.

Fig. 4: Cypriot mould-made hollow figurine from Salamis-Toumba, now in the British Museum (1891.8-6.39). After V. Karageorghis 1993, pl. 20, 2. © Trustees of the British Museum.

Fig. 5: Cypriot mould-made hollow figurine from Miletos (Z 10.27.6). After Henke 2017a, pl. 1, 1. Milet-Archiv, Neg. Z10276-1. All rights reserved. Photograph by D. Johannes.

Also striking are the realistically rendered folds of the upturned cheek-pieces that cover the upper part of the ears of T 419 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) from Samos (Fig. 6; Schmidt 1968, pls 67–68) and GR.11.1890 from Salamis-Toumba (V. Karageorghis 1993, pl. 25.6; Henke 2017a, 11.1). They were formed by folding a piece of clay upward in the same way as the caps were worn in reality. In the case of other figurines, such as the stylistically related head GR.22.1891 (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum) (V. Karageorghis 1993, pl. 25.5 [here inv. no. GR.3d.1888]; Henke 2017a, pl. 11.5) – found in Salamis-Toumba and made in a different mould – the cheek-pieces were modelled by a separately attached piece of clay but without recreating the fold in a realistic way. Moreover, the entire ear is visible, in contrast to the heads T 419 and GR.11.1890 (for a detailed presentation of further similarities in shape and modelling techniques see Henke 2017a, 82–90).

Thus, in addition to an identical mould being used to produce all these faces, other features show a high degree of conformity in the overall rendering, and this allows us to identify the conspicuous conception of shape of an individual craftsman or, at least, the uniform canon of a closely connected group of craftsmen.

It seems very unlikely that a single mould could be used for as long as several decades; several years, or even fewer, seem more realistic. Even if this claim remains unsupported, the identical overall rendering and conception of shape apparent in these figurines support the assumption that they were created by only a few craftsmen, if not by a single one. Consequently, all figurines would have been made within a limited time span. A newly excavated bothros in the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Miletos produced fragments of terracotta faces (Fig. 5; Henke 2011, 215, fig. 10; Fig. 6: Cypriot mould-made hollow figurine from Samos (T 419). After Schmidt 1968, pl. 67. D-DAI-ATH-Samos 5115. All rights reserved. Photograph by E.-M. Czakó.)
that were made in the same mould as the figurines mentioned above. Since the bothros was closed around 630 BC, the figurines, dated by Schmidt to the first quarter of the 6th century, must have been produced and exported to the East Aegean before this date, but probably not earlier than the middle of the 7th century BC (for the dating of the bothros see Neeft 2017).

Considering that some of these terracotta figurines were found in a sanctuary deposit at Salamis-Toumba on Cyprus, just to the south of the urban centre, while others of similar type were found in other parts of the urban centre, it seems likely that the workshop was located in the same area. That would explain the close stylistic relationship between the plaque-shaped terracotta 756 (Larnaka, Pierides Foundation Museum) from Achna on Cyprus (Henke 2017a, pl. 14.2) and the hollow figurine T 600 from Samos (Fig. 1). Their common features are the rounded head with half-moon-shaped eyes, a broad mouth with straight lips and triangular incised corners, and a head supported by a long neck. The chest of both statues is broad, and the wide shoulders are straight and horizontal. The upper arms are immense and broadly modelled. The outline of the long hair reaches the outer points of the shoulders. Its lower border ends close to their upper outline. The chest is situated very high on the body and close to the outline of the shoulders. The stylistic relationship between the statues T 600 and 756 is so close that they probably originate from the same workshop, if not the same craftsman but, of course, not from the same mould (Henke 2011, 216–17; 2017a, 89–90).

The technical and stylistic features mentioned above, such as the ear being covered by the Cypriot cap, the rendering of the forelocks, eyes and mouth, or the structuring of the eyebrows, can also be detected in other, differently sized, statues. Thus, it seems very likely that the small head T 2540 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) (Schmidt 1968, pl. 44) from Samos or the life-sized face C 111 (Nikosia, Cyprus Museum) (V. Karageorghis 1993, pl. 20.5; Henke 2017a, pl. 15.1) and other life-sized figurines from Salamis-Toumba (see Henke 2017a, 93–94 pl. 15.4.6–7) were made by the same craftsman or group of craftsmen as the figurines above, even though they do not come from the same mould. If these observations are correct, figurines of all sizes and different techniques were all produced by the same artisans.

That terracotta figurines of different sizes and techniques were related to a closely connected group of craftsmen, or even a single artisan, can also be observed in other figurines, which play a central role in the discussion of style and chronology. One of these figurines, which belongs to the second group, I want to discuss here, is the terracotta Arsos 540 (Nikosia, Cyprus Museum) from Arsos (Gjerstad et al. 1948, pl. 7, left; Henke 2017a, pl. 17.1). The entire front of the statue

4 Referring to Ohly 1940, 63, Schmidt (1968, 37) quotes that the head T 419 (Fig. 5) was found under the oldest plaster of the cultic bath (Kultbad) in the Heraion of Samos. Buschor (1930, 31) linked this plaster with the building of the southern stoa (Südhalte), hitherto dated c. 640/630 BC (Walter 1957, 48). But Walter (1957, 48, 49) linked the plaster and the cultic bath with a later modification of the southern stoa and the new regulation of the river Imbrasos, all dated by him to the second decade (620/610 BC) of the 7th century BC. Just two years later, Walter (1959, 64) dated the cultic bath to c. 600 BC. Regardless of the shifting dates for the context of T 419, a much earlier production for this group of figurines in the 7th century was already indicated then. Furthermore, the heads T 3833 (Kyrileis 1989, 62, fig. 8; Henke 2017a, pl. 12.16) and T 3834 (Kyrileis 1989, 63, fig. 9; Henke 2017a, pl. 10.1) were found in 1983/84 by Helmut Kyrileis in a well in the Heraion of Samos, which was used between 630 and 590 BC (Kyrileis 1989, 53). Therefore, Stylianou (2003, 40) argued for a much earlier date for the terracotta figurines in question, as already proposed by Hermary (1991). The context in Miletos provides new evidence for a still higher chronology of the figurines before 630 BC.

5 Approximately 60 female figurines of types compared by the excavators to those from Rhodes were also found at Toumba.
was made in a single mould that was usually used to produce plaque-shaped figurines. The plaque-shaped terracotta B 130 (London, British Museum) from Kameiros on Rhodes comes from the same mould, as Gerhard Schmidt and Jaqueline Karageorghis (Schmidt 1968, pl. 126; J. Karageorghis 1999, 205–6, Kat. VII[i] 36–37) have already pointed out. Only the turban-like bulge around the forehead was added by the craftsman after moulding. The back of the figurine Arsos 540 was made by pressing various pieces of clay together. No further physiognomic details are indicated.

Other hollow figurines from the Heraion of Samos, such as T 385 (Schmidt 1968, pl. 81; Henke 2017a, pl. 17.4) and T 2041 (Schmidt 1968, pl. 81), but also T 602 (Schmidt 1968, pl. 78; Henke 2017a, pl. 17.3), T 2563 (Schmidt 1968, pl. 81; Henke 2017a, pl. 17.2), or T 237 (Schmidt 1968, pl. 79; Henke 2017a, pl. 18.1), all in the Archaeological Museum in Vathy, were also formed in this mould. The preserved outline of the original mould-made curls above the forehead, and the swelling of the surface close to the outer end of the right eyebrow, which can be observed in all of these figurines, prove this assumption. For example, the arch of the left curl of the two curls above the nose always extends a little further into the face than the right one. The original iconography, indicated by the mould, with twisted strands of forelocks ending in a semi-circular curl above the forehead, is very well preserved on the head T 602 (Henke 2017a, pl. 18.2), but it is also detectable on the figurines T 385 (Henke 2017a, pl. 18.3) and T 237 (Henke 2017a, pl. 18.1). It is, therefore, not surprising that an unpublished female head in the Museum of Rhodes, found in Ialysos, which in contrast is bare-headed, can also be attributed to the same mould. Two other fragments of bare-headed variations were found in Miletos (Henke 2017a, pls 22.1 and 22.3), but the corpus of figurine fragments made in this mould, whether with or without the turban-like bulge around the forehead, found in East Aegean sanctuaries is, generally, remarkably large (Henke 2017a, 96–104).

The shoulder fragment T 2105 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) (Schmidt 1968, pl. 76) found in the Heraion of Samos, for instance, was also made in the same mould as Arsos 540. It was found in a context (Fundgruppe XXVIII) that Hans Walter dated to c. 600 BC (Schmidt 1968, 87 Region F 2; Walter 1968, 88 Fundgruppe XXVIII). Other fragments originating from the same mould as the figurine Arsos 540 were also found in the pit in the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Miletos, which was closed around 630 BC (Henke 2017a, pls 20.4, 21.1, 21.4 and 23.2). Consequently, it seems improbable that heads such as T 385 from Samos or the figurine Arsos 540 date to later in the 7th or even to the 6th century, as Gerhard Schmidt (1968, 43) has previously proposed.

Other terracotta figurines, such as T 241+2127 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) (Schmidt 1968, pl. 68; Henke 2017a, pl. 24.1) and T 663 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) from Samos (Schmidt 1968, pl. 69; Henke 2017a, pl. 25.5), the head Z08.472.3 (Miletos, Archaeological Museum) from Miletos (Henke 2017a, pl. 25.4), the head no. 48 (Famagusta, District Museum) from the sea at Salamis (V. Karageorghis 1993, pl. 54.5; Henke 2017a, pl. 19.1), or the figurine C 104 (Nikosia, Cyprus Museum) (V. Karageorghis 1995, pl. 9.6; Henke 2017a, pl. 19.3) – all of different sizes, types and manufacturing techniques – may also be connected to the same production milieu as Arsos 540. First of all, a particularly uniform hairstyle and headdress stand in contrast to the first group of figurines. This includes the recurring mould-made small plastic curls of the forelocks as well as the identical way in which the craftsman reworked the turban-like bulge around the forehead. For example, the arch of the left curl of the two curls above the nose always extends a little further into the face than the right one. The original iconography, indicated by the mould, with twisted strands of forelocks ending in a semi-circular curl above the forehead, is very well preserved on the head T 602 (Henke 2017a, pl. 18.2), but it is also detectable on the figurines T 385 (Henke 2017a, pl. 18.3) and T 237 (Henke 2017a, pl. 18.1). It is, therefore, not surprising that an unpublished female head in the Museum of Rhodes, found in Ialysos, which in contrast is bare-headed, can also be attributed to the same mould. Two other fragments of bare-headed variations were found in Miletos (Henke 2017a, pls 22.1 and 22.3), but the corpus of figurine fragments made in this mould, whether with or without the turban-like bulge around the forehead, found in East Aegean sanctuaries is, generally, remarkably large (Henke 2017a, 96–104).
like bulge above the forehead. He aligned the vertically incised lines of the turban-like bulge according to the size and form of the curls of the forelock. The lines always start or end in the middle of the curls and in the corners between them.

Other connecting features are the expression and the rendering of the eyes and mouth. There is a tendency to shape the eyeballs more plastically and organically. The upper eyelid ascends relatively steeply from the inner corner of the eyes, reaches its apex before the middle of the eye and then flattens out towards the outer corner of the eye. The line of the lower eyelid is straighter but not flat, in contrast to the other production group discussed above. Now, the lid follows the bulging, curved eyeball. Towards the outer end of the eye, the lower lid turns up gently, which is again more noticeable in the left eye. This ascending line seems to be a specific feature of this production group and occurs on all these heads, even when the modelling is less careful or when the heads are very small. The lips are broad and protruding, with deep and long incised labial angles down to the chin. As for dating these figurines: Z08.472.3 also belongs to the Milesian pit that was closed around 630 BC (for a more detailed description see Henke 2017a, 104–10).

In comparison with the terracotta figurines T 600 and 756 discussed above, the statue Arsos 540 shows a different conception of the human body. Here, the neck is short, which makes the shoulders seem very high, as if they were pulled up, and the arms are slender. The upper part of the body is elongated with low-positioned breasts. On the whole, the entire upper part of the statue appears more stretched out and less well-proportioned than the statue 756. This conception of the human body can be observed in all the figurines sharing other closely related features, as described above (for example C 139 and C 104 in the Cyprus Museum in Nikosia [V. Karageorghis 1995, pl. 9.5–6; Henke 2017a, pl. 19.2–3]).

The production of these technically and stylistically closely related groups of terracotta figurines – each probably made by the same individuals or groups of craftsmen – cannot have taken place over a long period of several decades. Taking into account similar groups (not presented in this paper [for these groups see Henke 2017a]) and the fact that the bothros in Miletos yielded fragments of all of these groups, it seems more plausible that the majority of terracotta figurines found in the East Aegean was produced and imported earlier than 630 BC. Considering the Samian stratigraphy, the majority of these hollow and plaque-shaped figurines reached the East Aegean not before the middle of the 7th century. Consequently, a very short period of about twenty, or even as few as ten, years should be estimated.7

The new terminus ante quem of c. 630 BC for the production and import of Cypriot terracotta figurines in the East Aegean conflicts with the dates given by the foundation date of Naukratis around 620 BC, since some figurines found there show close stylistic as well as some mould-based parallels in the East Aegean.8 Recent discussions on an earlier ‘founding’ date of Naukratis were

---

7 All Samian contexts with a previous terminus ante quem of c. 640/630 BC or earlier are lacking fragments of Cypriot terracotta that can be associated with the here discussed groups of figurines (for example: under Hekatompedos II [Schmidt 1968, 89], Altar V [Schmidt 1968, 73–74], under the southern stoa [Südhaule] [Schmidt 1968, 83–5]). They contain other groups of terracottas in much smaller quantities. But most of these contexts may have to be dated slightly lower in the 7th century, as soon to be published by Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier (Walter, Clemente and Niemeier in print). Thus, only a couple of Cypriot figurines in the Heraion were found in contexts earlier than the middle of the century, such as, for example, the wheel-made terracotta T 1799 with a mould-made head (Schmidt 1968, 49–53 pl. 91), probably from Kition (Fourrier 2007, 53–8).

8 For example, British Museum 1886.0401.1479 (Thomas 2015, 5, fig. 6) and the figurine Museum Marmaris inv.-no. 11.10.99 ST 99-K 8c-10,53 from Knidos (Kleibl 2006, cat. no. 376, pl. 94.3; the figurine from Knidos is interpreted as a female or a...
rejected, although some areas of the city could have been settled before 620 BC (Schlotzhauer 2012, 25–35; Thomas 2015, 4–5, n. 24). But the higher date for some of the Cypriot terracotta figurines in Naukratis before or around 630 BC does not seem to contradict the usual dating ranges of finds at this site. Thus, a few pieces of the earliest material groups in Naukratis, such as, for example, the Chian and Corinthian pottery (Bergeron 2015a, 5–7; 2015b, 3), Bird Cups or other Ionian pottery (Schlotzhauer 2012, 34) also range between 640/630 and 610/600 BC. Consequently, the date of 630 BC for some of the earlier Cypriot figurines in Naukratis is not unreasonable. Furthermore, it cannot be excluded that some older material circulated and was dedicated after this date. Primarily, however, this supposed date affects the import of Cypriot terracotta figurines into the East Aegean and the dedication practices in this particular region and does not necessarily apply to Naukratis, which probably had a different background, as we will consider below. Finally, the date probably does not affect the production of such figurines on Cyprus itself, which raises the question of how long after c. 630 BC figurines similar to the East Aegean finds may have been manufactured on Cyprus and have reached Naukratis a little later.9

To summarise at this point: the entire corpus of Cypriot terracotta figurines in the East Aegean can be dated to the 7th century BC, when many other foreign objects of eastern origin were dedicated in Greek sanctuaries. They are of particular interest because this trans-Mediterranean connection is associated with the intensified impact that elements of eastern culture had on early Greek communities. This, in turn, is taken to imply the transfer of cultural, cultic and/or technological knowledge, which induced processes of analogous innovation or even social change. However, in contrast to many of these other foreign objects, which usually consist of quite rare typological groups of objects or even unique pieces, the imported Cypriot terracotta figurines number – depending on the respective sanctuary – at least several hundred. In some places, such as Samos or Knidos, the Cypriot imports temporarily even replaced the local terracotta dedications (Ohly 1940, 60–61). Similar quantities can be observed in the aegyptiana, in particular in the Graeco-Egyptian faïences dedicated at many East Aegean Archaic sanctuaries, mainly in the Heraion of Samos and the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Miletos. Here, this material has already initiated a discussion on the adoption of cult practices (Ebbinghaus 2006, 200–1 and 217; Hölbl 2006, 87–88; 2007, 457–58; 2014). In the case of the Cypriot terracotta figurines, however, such a discussion has only just begun, mainly because many scholars have denied the possibility that local Eastern Greek donors, rather than Cypriot travellers, donated the terracotta remodelled male, but it seems that the broad girdle and the indicated folds underneath suggest that the figurine originally represented a male) or the head British Museum 1886,0401.1424 (Thomas 2015, 6, fig. 8) and the head fragment ST 00-K 8c-20,34 from Knidos (Kleibl 2006, cat. no. 381, pl. 95,3) as well as the head T 2603 from the Heraion of Samos (Schmidt 1968, pl. 80; for a more detailed discussion see Henke 2017a, 138–40).

9 The fill of the bothros in Miletos is considered by the excavator Volkmar von Graeve (2013, 7–8) as destruction debris accumulated after an attack on the city. Thus, the situation causing the disposal of the items might be due to a third party and not initiated by some internal needs of the sanctuary, such as, for example, regular and systematic cleanings or even cultic or topographical changes etc., as has been assumed for similar contexts at some other sanctuaries. Thus, one cannot preclude the possibility that some of the Cypriot terracottas of later contexts reached the East Aegean or Naukratis some time after 630 BC. However, taking into account the close stylistic and technical relationship of the figurines in question, this timespan should not be stretched over a lengthy period, such as a decade or more.

Of great importance for the chronology will be the exact dating of the late 7th–early 6th century BC shipwreck found at Bozburun, near Marmaris, on the southwestern coast of Turkey, as it contained Cypriot terracotta figurines and, especially, limestone statues in Cypriot style (Özdaş and Kızıldağ 2016; 2017, 45).
figurines. In this regard, the corpus of Cypriot terracotta figurines on Samos and in Miletos but also in Naukratis (Thomas 2015, 27) may provide new insights.

In the second part of this paper, I compare some characteristic features of the corpora of Cypriot and local terracotta figurines in the East Aegean as possible evidence for technical innovations at some selected local East Aegean terracotta production sites. In the third part, I discuss the identity of the figurines’ donors (see also Henke forthcoming, where this issue is discussed; for a more detailed investigation see Henke 2017a). The probability of some cultic innovation transfer from Cyprus, to which the Cypriot terracotta figurines may possibly testify, is also examined in this context.

Did Cypriot terracotta figurine technologies inspire local Ionian coroplastics?

G. Schmidt, among others, questioned whether the local Ionian – in this case, the Samian – coroplastic was technically as well as stylistically inspired by Cypriot terracotta figurines (Schmidt 1968, 120–26). Although he was merely following the general reluctance to concede that Cypriot art had any impact on Greek sculpture, evidence for such an interaction is, admittedly, not immediately obvious. However, he assumed at least some connection between the plaque-shaped mould-made Cypriot figurines and the mould-made Samian terracotta figurines of the late 7th–early 6th century (Ohly 1941, pl. 34; Schmidt 1968, 123). On account of the proposed new dates for the imported Cypriot terracotta figurines, this possible interaction should, at any rate, be re-examined.

Of specific interest in Miletos, Samos and Rhodes is a group of plaque-shaped male bare-headed terracotta figurines in Cypriot style; they wear a long, short-sleeved girdled chiton with lateral kolpoi covering the girdle, and a tassel-fringed himation. The tasselled fringe runs from the left shoulder down to the right knee. The upper edge of the mantle around the neck is pulled down by the right fist, whereas the left arm is stretched out vertically along the left side of the body. The statues are thus presented in a specific Cypriot garment, which is usually thought to be inspired by Assyrian archetypes (among others, Thomas 2015, 23). The dress and gesture recur in many Cypriot terracotta and limestone statues and represent a specific Cypriot iconographic type sometimes labelled as ‘Mantelmann’. In most cases, however, these figurines are bearded and wear the typical pointed Cypriot cap with up- or (much less commonly) downturned cheek-pieces, in contrast to the previously mentioned plaque-shaped figurines in the East Aegean. However, similar beardless figurines of the same type are represented by Cypriot-style limestone statues (Nick 2006, no. 1; Thomas 2015, 3, fig. 4; although the chiton of the example from Naukratis is not girdled). Only on the head T1812 from Samos (Schmidt 1968, pl. 7) are the strands of a beard incised at the throat, whereas on the head of the figurine 2003 from Rhodes (Blinkenberg 1931, pl. 89; Wriedt Sørensen 1991, pl. 68c), a pointed beard and a cap were added by hand.

As the chemical analyses by Vassilis Kilikoglou showed (Kilikoglou et al. 2009, 200 and 205, Abb. 8 SAH 69; Henke 2017a, 181–87, pls 75–77), the figurines in question are made of clay of Eastern Greek origin. All of them were produced in the same mould or moulds taken from the same patrix. One head was found in the potters’ quarter at Kalabaktepe in Miletos, which was occupied from the Geometric period onward. The context of the head dates to the second half of the 7th century. A patrix of these figurines was dedicated in the sanctuary of Aphrodite on
Zeytintepe (Henke 2017a, 288, cat. no. 207). Unfortunately, the fragment was not found in a datable context. The figurines in question can be dated, however, by the Samian contexts, which are, so far, dated to c. 670/650 BC (Henke 2017a, 181–87). It follows that similar plaque-shaped terracotta figurines, too, must have been produced on Cyprus itself before this terminus. The date coincides with the beginning of a highly intensified production of Daedalic plaque-shaped terracotta figurines in the same settlement at Miletos (von Graeve 2007; 2013, 10–14; 2017, 15–16, 19–28). Studies of these Daedalic and Cypriot-style terracottas revealed similarities in the technique by which both kinds of terracottas were produced. A specific feature of local Milesian plaque-shaped terracottas since the appearance of the Daedalic statues is the significantly curved back side at the level of the head; Volkmar von Graeve interprets this feature as the result of a particular practice in handling the mould and the figure during the production process (Figs 7-8). This feature is unusual in imported plaque-shaped terracottas from Cyprus (for example Schmidt 1968, pl. 53; T 636) but well attested in the Cypriot-style terracottas made of local East Ionian clay (Figs 9-10). Furthermore, it seems that the Cypriot-style terracotta figurines in question were not made in one single mould, as is commonly assumed for Cypriot plaque-shaped terracotta figurines. Apparently, the body and head at least were made in two different moulds and then joined. This is visible at the joint between the neck and the shoulders of Z08.356.1+Z09.73.3 (Fig. 9a b). The even surface in the break shows that this edge was originally a connecting point smoothed by the craftsman before joining head and body. This practice is confirmed by the patrix found in the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Miletos, which consists only of the figure’s head (Henke 2017a, pl. 76, 5–7). The technique of creating plaque-shaped terracotta figurines by joining several separately moulded pieces is, as far as I know, unknown on Cyprus but well attested in the Daedalic plaque-shaped terracotta figurines in Miletos (von Graeve 2017, 20–26). This suggests that the Cypriot-style terracotta figurines found in Miletos and on Samos were apparently made by local craftsmen. This is supported by the way in which the mould is filled with many thin layers of clay, a feature they share with the local Ionian mould made and Daedalic figurines (von Graeve 2017, 18–19, 23). In contrast, the craftsmen creating the imported Cypriot plaque-shaped figurines formed solid terracotta figurines by covering the inner surface of the mould with an initial thin layer of clay and then filling the remaining cavity with lumps of clay. Sometimes, a second thin layer of clay completes the filling at the back, which results in a flat and even surface. Sometimes, the whole rear side can be curved – slightly concave or convex – depending on how the mould was filled with clay.

Taking these factors into account, it seems that around 670 BC or a little earlier the technical innovation of forming terracotta figurines by using moulds reached Ionia. This probably happened through contacts with Crete and Cyprus, as Dieter Ohly and Gerhard Schmidt had already realised (Ohly 1940, 60; Schmidt 1968, 120–26.). The first plaque-shaped figurines were imported. Ionian craftsmen – especially Milesian artisans – adopted this innovation immediately and produced plaque-shaped terracotta figurines in Daedalic and Cypriot style. In producing plaque-shaped Cypriot-style terracotta figurines, however, the local craftsmen used a technique – not found, so far, in original Cypriot plaque-shaped figurines from Cyprus itself – of joining several separately moulded pieces. It can, therefore, be questioned whether the adoption of the...
Figs 7a-b: Daedalic plaque-shaped figurine from Miletos (Z 08.463.7); front and side views. After von Graeve 2017, 25, fig. 25 6. Photographs by D. Johannes.

Fig. 8a-b: Daedalic plaque-shaped figurine from Miletos (Z 94.73.6); front and side views. After von Graeve 2007, pl. 88, 3–4. Photographs by D. Johannes.
Figs 9a b: Cypriot style plaque-shaped figurine from Miletos (Z 08.356.1+Z 09.73.3); front and side views. After Henke 2017a, pl. 75, 5–6. Milet-Archiv, Neg. Z083561-1 and Z083561-2. All rights reserved. Photographs by D. Johannes.

Figs 10a b: Cypriot style plaque-shaped figurine from Miletos (TC 94); front and side views. After Henke 2017a, pl. 76, 3–4. Milet-Archiv, Neg. ZTC94-1 and ZTC94-2 – all rights reserved. Photographs by D. Johannes.
The technique of plaque-shaped figurines was strongly inspired by Cyprus. It is quite surprising, however, that the local craftsmen chose to produce Cypriot-style figurines wearing Cypriot costume, but the production technique they chose was of local character.

It seems clear overall that approximately around the middle of the 7th century BC, the plaque-shaped Cypriot-style figurines and plaque-shaped terracotta figurines from Cyprus itself were not in demand in Miletos unlike the Daedalic figurines. Only mould-made hollow terracotta figurines from Cyprus were dedicated at Miletos in larger quantities at that time, in contrast to Samos or Rhodes, for example.

According to the Samian stratigraphy, Cypriot terracottas with mould-made faces and wheel-shaped bodies – showing Phoenician influence and which were very common in Kition (Schmidt 1968, 50 3; Fourrier 2007, 57 8) – were imported alongside the plaque-shaped figurines at the same time, that is around 670 BC or a little earlier (Schmidt 1968, 51, 84, 88, Taf. 91 T 1799 and Taf. 93 T 2061). Dieter Ohly and Veronica Jarosch drew attention to some local Samian terracotta figurines produced by a similar technique, which Jarosch dated, approximately, to the second quarter of the 7th century (Jarosch 1994, 58–59). Therefore, it can be assumed that the production of local terracottas in this technique was possibly inspired by Cypriot imports. At least, it seems that the local production started simultaneously with the import of the Cypriot figurines in question (Henke 2017a, 196–97). Since Cypriot terracotta figurines found in contexts earlier than 670 BC are lacking in the Heraion of Samos, it seems that Cypriot figurines were not imported before that date to create a taste or need for local copies over a longer period of time. In Miletos, similar techniques for producing local terracotta figurines were also observed by von Graeve, but, on the basis of stratigraphic evidence, a precise date for the beginning of this production between 690 and 630 BC is, so far, not possible (von Graeve 2017, 15–19).

If, generally, the proposed new date for Cypriot terracottas in the East Aegean (up to 630 BC) is correct, a great number of mould-made hollow terracotta figurines – such as Arsos 540 or T 600, mentioned above – in different sizes and types reached the Ionian sanctuaries during a very short period around the third quarter of the 7th century. According to Veronica Jarosch, Samian craftsmen started, once again, to produce the first local mould-made hollow terracotta figurines around 640/630 BC. Two different production techniques, related to the described Cypriot techniques, can be identified. Similar to the technique of Arsos 540, some local statues were produced by using moulds for plaque-shaped Daedalic figurines that were filled with only one layer of clay. Instead of filling up the rest of the cavity with pieces of clay, as in solid plaque-shaped terracotta figurines, the craftsmen added, in some cases, a back side consisting of a single flat piece of clay without any physiognomic details (Jarosch 1994, 48, pls 64 T 692 and 65 T 693 T 695). Similarly to the terracotta figurine T 600, other statues were made by using small moulds to produce only parts of the figurine, such as the face. The rest of the body and the elaborate details of the garment were shaped by hand and built up with various bits of clay. Sometimes, the lower part of the body was wheel-made (Jarosch 1994, 48, 50, pls 66 T 666, T 676, T 924, T 925 and 67 T 675 and T 679).

That the extensive import of these terracotta figurines from Cyprus coincided with the

---

11 In contrast to the c. 1,230 Daedalic plaque-shaped figurines of the 7th century (von Graeve 2017, 27), so far, only nine imported Cypriot plaque-shaped terracotta figurines and 12 plaque-shaped terracotta figurines of Cypriot style are known from Miletos (Henke 2017a, 57–58).

12 The stratigraphic contexts of both figurines with mould-made faces and wheel-made bodies are dated to c. 670/660 BC.
beginning of the use of similar techniques by local Samian craftsmen may attest that, at least on Samos, the Cypriot figurines did, indeed, provide technical inspiration. In that case, it seems more likely that the local craftsmen acquired these techniques by observing the imported statues, rather than by personal contacts and interaction with Cypriot artisans. Otherwise, the chosen techniques would be much more comparable in detail than, in fact, they are.

As mentioned above, there are some conspicuous technical differences, aside from the obvious stylistic ones. One example is the Cypriot-style plaque-shaped male figurines discussed above. In this case, the local craftsmen chose techniques of handling the clay and shaping the figurines that, so far, have not been detected in the imported original Cypriot terracotta figurines, but which are very common in the local Milesian Daedalic figurines. Furthermore, very early in the last quarter of the 7th century, the Ionian craftsmen started to use the double-mould technique to shape the front and the back of the figurines, which was totally unknown on Cyprus (Ohly 1941, pls 34–35; von Graeve 2007). For the moment, we can at least propose that the import of Cypriot terracotta figurines made using specific techniques coincided with the emergence of corresponding techniques in Ionia. Consequently, the production of similar terracotta figurines in East Greece could have been inspired by these imports. It is not, however, possible to be certain at this point.

On the other hand, if the production of plaque-shaped terracotta figurines was not strongly inspired by the technique of the Cypriot imports, why, then, did the local Ionian craftsmen produce terracotta figurines in Cypriot style and attire? This question leads to another controversial issue in the studies of Cypriot terracotta figurines: namely, the identity of the donors dedicating Cypriot and Cypriot-style figurines in the East Aegean.

On the identity of donors dedicating terracotta figurines

A particularly controversial issue in Cypriot terracotta studies concerns the identity of the donors in East Greek sanctuaries. Helmut Kyrieleis has argued that since the figurines are not wearing Ionian but typical Cypriot garments, they cannot be seen as representatives of Greek worshippers (Kyrieleis 2009, 140). He maintained that the donors of the terracottas in the East Aegean were Cypriot in origin. It does not seem very likely, though, that the Cypriot garment of the terracotta figurines deterred East Ionian worshippers from dedicating them. As we saw above, Ionian potters produced plaque-shaped figurines in Cypriot style and wearing Cypriot garments for the local market (see above). For example, the East Greek mercenary in Egypt, Pedon, apparently of higher military rank, was not deterred from representing himself with an Egyptian-type statue in a sanctuary in the area of Miletos in Asia Minor. In Egypt, it was quite common for individuals of similar rank to Pedon to dedicate this type of statue (Haider 1996, 100–1; Vittmann 2003, fig. 103; Ebbinghaus 2006, 195; Bumke 2007, 366–68). Although, generally, only a few Cypriot or Cypriot-style figurines bear a dedication inscription, we have at least one dedication inscription on a Cypriot-style limestone statue (carrying a sacrificial animal) from Lindos on Rhodes that mentions the Greek donor, Hekatios (Blinkenberg 1931, 436, fig. 54; Kourou et al. 2002, 73–77; Höckmann 2009, 254, figs 5–6). In Naukratis, two inscriptions on Cypriot-style limestone figurines...
statues of the early 6th century BC were dedicated to Aphrodite by Kallias and Polymeros (Johnston 2015, 5). At least in the latter case, we can exclude the possibility that Polymeros himself was represented by the figurine, since it depicts a woman. The statues prove, though, that at least some Greeks chose Cypriot-style limestone statues as votive gifts. However, no inscriptions that could clarify this issue are found on any of the great number of Cypriot terracotta figurines.

If we assume that the donors of the terracotta figurines were Cypriots, it would imply that the abrupt end of imported Cypriot terracotta figurines in East Aegean sanctuaries was caused by a sudden rupture in the commercial relationships between the two territories and that the Cypriot donors of the terracotta figurines left the East Aegean regions immediately. So far, no plausible explanation for such a scenario has been found, as already argued by Lone Wriedt Sørensen (1991, 234–38). Moreover, it raises the question why, in the 7th century BC, large groups of Cypriots preferred to dedicate a great number of Cypriot terracotta figurines specifically in sanctuaries of this region – compared to other parts of the Mediterranean outside of Cyprus – and why they stopped this practice abruptly at the end of the century.

Anja Ulbrich’s comprehensive study of sanctuaries of the Kypria (Great Goddess of Cyprus) confirms earlier assumptions that there existed a specific dedication practice based on the gender of the worshipped deity (Ulbrich 2008, 60–63). Ancient Cypriots thus dedicated predominantly female figurines in sanctuaries of female deities and male figurines in shrines of male divinities. Only in the case of divine couples does the gender of the figurines appear to be more balanced. It is not very surprising, therefore, that in the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Miletos female figurines dominate the dedications of anthropomorphic Cypriot terracotta figurines (von Graeve 2013, 14–17; Henke 2017a, 49; forthcoming) or that male figurines are in the majority in the sanctuary of Apollo in Knidos (Kleibl 2006). In the sanctuary of Hera on Samos, however, the proportion of male and female Cypriot terracottas is strikingly balanced, although female figurines still predominate (Henke 2017a, 220, Tab. 3). So far, there is no evidence for the worship of a male deity in the sanctuary in the 7th century BC.

On Samos, the presumed Cypriot donors of the terracottas would thus have transgressed their own Cypriot customs. A similar phenomenon was observed by Ursula Höckmann (2009, 256) in the Cypriot terracotta and limestone statues of young men carrying a sacrificial animal, which are dedicated on Cyprus in sanctuaries of male deities but which in the East Aegean and in Naukratis are dedicated to female deities as well. The trend of dedicating both male and female figurines to the sanctuary of Hera on Samos had actually emerged already at the end of the 8th and the beginning of the 7th century, as Veronika Jarosch observed in the corpus of the local Samian terracotta figurines (Jarosch 1994, 95–96; Henke 2017a, 220, Tab. 3). In this context, anthropomorphic figurines also became gradually more significant than zoomorphic figurines. The dedications of Cypriot terracotta figurines thus continued and enhanced this local Samian

Knidos, since the clay is of Knidian origin, and the inscription, in a Greek alphabet used in the area of Knidos, was painted on the surface before firing.

14 Wriedt Sørensen argued, of course, on the basis of the previous chronology by Gerhard Schmidt, who dated the end of the import of Cypriot terracotta figurines to c. 570/560 BC.

15 The only evidence for cults of other deities alongside Hera in the Heraion of Samos is the well-known treasure inscription found by Carl Curtius in the village of Mytilini, which mentions Aphrodite and Hermes (Ohly 1953, 46–58; Buschor 1957). The inscription dates to the 4th century BC, however, and does not prove that there was a cult of these deities at this location in earlier times.
trend, which emerged before the import of Cypriot terracottas even started. Furthermore, the Cypriot imports almost completely replaced the local Samian figurines. If we accept the assumption that primarily Cypriot donors dedicated Cypriot terracotta figurines, then the local inhabitants of Samos must have abruptly stopped their well-established practice of offering terracotta figurines, while Cypriots began to dedicate terracotta figurines in huge quantities, as Dieter Ohly and Gerhard Schmidt have previously remarked (Ohly 1940, 57–58; Schmidt 1968, 12; Henke 2017a, 220, Tab. 3). Besides, Cypriot terracotta figurines were found in the sanctuaries of Athena in Lindos, Kameiros, Ialysos and Old Smyrna. On Cyprus, Athena and Anat were apparently not recipients of figural terracotta votive gifts (Ulbrich 2008, 151). Furthermore, the number of male figurines found at Lindos shows a relatively high proportion in comparison to the dominating female figurines (Wriedt Sørensen 1991, pl. 64).

Accordingly, the dedications of Cypriot terracotta figurines in East Aegean sanctuaries reflected and continued local cult practices, which can be observed at other sanctuaries as well. Cypriot terracottas were thus only offered in larger quantities to deities who already received terracotta votives, such as, for example, Hera on Samos, Aphrodite in Miletos, Athena in Lindos or Apollo in Knidos. By contrast, the Artemision in Ephesos (Muss 2007; Dewailly and Muss 2008) or the sanctuaries of Artemis in Miletos and Apollo in Didyma generally did not yield significant numbers of terracotta figurines.

Moreover, distinctive preferences for various production techniques and sizes of Cypriot terracottas at the sanctuaries in question can be observed. In Miletos, for instance, plaque-shaped Cypriot or Cypriot-style terracottas are very rare, in contrast to hollow mould-made figurines (Henke 2017a, 57–58 and 207–8). This could be explained by the local production of Daedalic plaque-shaped terracotta figurines, which eventually replaced the demand for the Cypriot figurines made using this technique (see above). In contrast to Miletos, at Lindos on Rhodes plaque-shaped Cypriot figurines dominate the terracotta finds, whereas on Samos the proportion of plaque-shaped and hollow mould-made Cypriot terracotta figurines is more balanced (Wriedt Sørensen 1991, 225–26 and 232, pl. 64; Henke 2017a, 207–8). In Knidos, hollow figurines were preferred (Kleibl 2006). Since there was no noteworthy contemporary local terracotta production at these locations, the different proportions of terracotta techniques may indicate that local donors preferred figurines made in certain specific techniques.16 Even if, at first sight, similar preferences could have been due to Cypriot donors, the specific picture of Cypriot terracotta figurines in the different East Greek sanctuaries seems to speak, all in all, more convincingly for predominantly local Greek donors.17

16 As Volkmar von Graeve (2017, 15–16) has pointed out, mixed-style terracottas with wheel-made or solid bodies and mould-made faces as well as other figurines, usually classified as Geometric figurines, were dedicated in Miletos along with Daedalic mould-made terracotta figurines. Von Graeve, among others, explained this by saying that different iconographical types were not represented by Daedalic figurines. Thus, the production technique seems to be connected with a specific ideological significance and would not be only a question of taste or value.

17 Sabine Fourrier (2012, 301) pointed out a certain conservatism or traditionalism in the dedication practices of terracottas on Cyprus, in the sense that predominantly local products and types were dedicated in the respective sanctuaries of a specific region. This may also explain why, even in the East Aegean, Cypriot donors preferred to dedicate certain production types. In this case, however, the question arises of why they predominantly preferred East Cypriot or, respectively, Salaminian products. Were there only East Cypriots present or were there mainly Salaminian products available in the East Aegean, possibly thanks to Salamis being a main trading city in contact with East Greece? The latter case is possible, of course, which seems to lend the phenomenon a merely commercial or economic aspect. But does this really explain, for example,
Even the previously mentioned predominance of female or male figurines at various sanctuaries, such as Miletos or Knidos, raises further questions regarding the assumption of solely Cypriot donors. In this context, it may be difficult to argue about the meaning and significance of the terracotta figurines, since this question is still not solved and may never be answered convincingly. If, as assumed, the majority of terracotta figurines on Cyprus actually do represent their donors, and Cypriots dedicated the Cypriot terracottas to East Aegean sanctuaries, it is most likely that the figurines served the same purpose at these locations, too. In that case, one has to ask whether the female terracotta figurines could actually be offered only by female Cypriot worshippers and male statues only by male donors. Otherwise, this would imply the presence of female as well as male Cypriots in the East Aegean, which possibility, of course, cannot be totally precluded. But, taking into account the varying quantities of male and female figurines at the different East Aegean find locations, this presence would vary considerably at the different East Aegean poleis.

On the other hand, if the figurines are seen as ambivalent objects with varying meanings and purposes depending on the wishes and concerns of the donors, it is very likely that male worshippers, too, could dedicate female terracotta figurines. The dedication of a female limestone statue by Polymeros at Naukratis, mentioned above, proves that this was at least possible. Whether this case was an exception to the rule, or not, cannot be determined. The graffiti in the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Miletos at least demonstrate that local men as well as women, with similar concerns regarding marriage, family fertility or the protection of mother and child, offered to Aphrodite (Ehrhardt 2013; Henke 2017a, 49–50). Usually, the graffiti were engraved on symposium pottery associated with the male sphere and not on terracottas. Nevertheless, it indicates the possibility that men and, therefore, male Cypriots, too, could offer female figurines with similar wishes at various sanctuaries of female deities in the East Aegean and, probably, on Cyprus as well. Yet, if this interpretation is correct – as the amount of female Cypriot figurines in the East Aegean suggests – why should there be so many pleas or private concerns expressed by travelling Cypriots so far away from home? Could the terracotta figurines perhaps also be why the assumed Cypriot or Salamian donors in Miletos did not dedicate Cypriot plaque-shaped terracottas, although the dedication of plaque-shaped figurines was generally very common there? Or did they now consider the Daedalic figurines as appropriate substitutes for their own Cypriot terracottas? Although there is no certain proof, I think it is more likely that the picture of production types in the East Aegean reflects more local East Greek rather than Cypriot preferences and customs.

18 Catherine M. Keesling (2010, 102), for example, in her comparative study of Greek and Cypriot votive korai, came to the conclusion that the reception of at least the Cypriot female votive figurines (if not all votive statues), which were often interpreted as generic, anonymous images, was much more contextual than iconographic. Thus, they could have been used by different donors in a very ambivalent way.

19 Anja Ulbrich (2008, 70–77), among others, has pointed out that the rich jewellery of female Cypriot terracotta figurines is similar to the iconography of Astarte figurines and corresponding aspects of fertility; Reinhard Senff (1993, 69) determined that in the case of the limestone statues of Idalion, dedication inscriptions are generally only preserved with male statues and that these inscriptions would mention male dedicators [though these are few in number and late in date]. According to Senff, only one inscription is known to mention a woman, namely Baatsallum, who dedicated statues of her grandsons. As Senff argued, the inscription does not prove a general custom of women dedicating male statues, since Baatsallum offered the statues to fulfill a pledge of her late son. Senff contrasted this picture with the situation of the Archaic korai from the Acropolis in Athens, for which male donors are sufficiently attested. But this fact cannot be taken as a convincing argument for excluding men generally from dedicating female statues on Cyprus. At most, it may only exclude women as ordinary donors of male statues. Furthermore, the respective inscriptions are generally dated to later periods and are no proof of Archaic practices.
interpreted as evidence of marriages between East Aegean and Cypriot persons? At least, that could explain the presence of a large number of Cypriots in the East Aegean. But, again, it would not account for the relatively short time span during which Cypriot terracotta figurines appeared in the East Aegean before disappearing so abruptly. The more convincing interpretation seems to me that the local East Aegean population, following the already existing customs of the respective locations, was responsible for dedicating the Cypriot terracotta figurines, which would explain the nuanced local differences in the corpus of these figurines at the various find locations.

How does this interpretation relate to the Naukratis finds and does it affect them? Judging by the Cypriot terracotta figurines published so far, it seems that the conditions in Naukratis differ somewhat from the situation in the East Aegean, even if the figurines come mainly from the same production centres on Cyprus (Salamin/Amathous, Paphos) as those found in the East Aegean and find close parallels there (Thomas 2015, 20–21). However, the main production groups, such as figurines directly related to Samos T 600 or Arzos 540 – mentioned above – or figurines that can be assigned to the workshop of C 609 (Henke 2017a, 134–41) from Arzos as well as smaller groups, such as figurines related to T 1472 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) (Henke 2017a, 126–32) or T 1106 (Vathy, Archaeological Museum) (Henke 2017a, 120–22) from the Heraion of Samos, are apparently barely, if at all, represented at Naukratis. On the one hand, this could confirm the proposed chronology, as the contexts in Naukratis are later than 630 BC and continue long after even the lowest dates proposed for the Aegean findspot. On the other hand – or in addition – the background of the dedications in Naukratis may differ from the situation in the East Aegean.

Naukratis was founded as a commercial port and mainly visited by travellers and merchants, but it surely had a permanent resident population as well. However, it was not a Greek polis with a collective identity and tradition. Thus it seems very likely, that the figurines were brought in by travellers, who had picked them up on their way via Cyprus or brought them directly from Cyprus (as Thomas [2015, 26–28] has already proposed). Thomas came at least to the same conclusion, namely, that it was East Greek travellers and merchants rather than Cypriots who dedicated the Cypriot terracotta figurines. This group and some Cypriots probably did, indeed, also dedicate Cypriot figurines in East Greek sanctuaries, but they cannot be responsible for dedicating the majority of Cypriot terracotta figurines in the East Aegean, as I have already argued above. Most of the terracotta figurines in Naukratis seem to be small, easily transportable statues suitable for travellers, merchants and mercenaries. Apparently, figurines of 40–50cm or larger – up to life-size – were not or at least hardly dedicated in Naukratis, but in the East Aegean. A similar pattern can be seen in the dimensions of the limestone statues. As in the story of the trader Herostratos (Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 15.675f–676c), the terracotta figurines in Naukratis were single, personally chosen objects probably bought by their donors on Cyprus itself, rather than being shipped merchandise (for example, Özdas and Kizildag 2016; 2017; at the shipwreck near Bozburun the excavators have discovered, so far, fragments of around seven sculptures:

20 At least, marriages between East Greeks and Egyptians and, in particular, between Carians and Egyptians are well attested for the time of intense contact between East Greece and Egypt in Archaic times since Psamtek I and, especially, for the late 7th and early 6th century (Kammerzell 1993; Vittmann 2003, 155–235). The question is, why could we not expect similar connections between Cypriot and East Greek families even earlier, taking into account the geostrategic location of the island and the Greek origin of larger groups of its inhabitants? The latter might facilitate and support intercultural communication (Henke 2017a, 203, 216–17).

a lower part of a hollow female terracotta figurine measuring originally \( c. \ 120 \text{cm} \), a helmeted male figurine and some female figurines, and lion and falcon statues of limestone). As for the numerous figurines made from the same mould found in the East Aegean, one may suspect, for this region that these represent shipped merchandise, in contrast to Naukratis. Furthermore, in contrast to the East Aegean, the dedications in Naukratis did not stop, since figurines of a clearly later date have been found (Thomas 2015, 2 and 20).

The picture in Naukratis may also be explained, of course, as a regional and city-specific phenomenon, comparable to the varying selections of figural types evident at the different East Aegean sanctuaries. In the East Aegean, the selection is based on an already existing tradition of dedicating terracotta figurines or on other preferences of a collective tradition developed and cultivated by an established community, which was not the case at Naukratis. The quantity of finds suggests that there existed certain preferences for specific Greek deities receiving figurine dedications, such as Aphrodite or Apollo. A more specific selection of types cannot be detected based on the known finds (Thomas 2015, 28). Although there is no absolute proof, it seems that the circumstances for dedicating Cypriot figurines in Naukratis differ from those in the East Aegean and reflect rather the dedication practices of merchants and travellers.

Similar variations in the selection of specific figural types at different East Aegean sanctuaries are evident in the corpus of faïences. Based on her study of the finds in the sanctuary of Hera at Samos, Virginia Webb has observed that the majority of faïences in the sanctuary represent small zoomorphic and anthropomorphic statues without a suspension ring (Phase II – Section II; Webb 1978, 7, 81–107; 2016, 11–12 and 103–71; see also Webb in this volume), mainly figurines representing falcons (Webb 2016, 11–12 and 151–52). Other types, such as scarabs or other amulets, for example, occur far less frequently (Webb 2016, 63–75 and 95–98). These were very common, however, at other sites, such as, for example, in the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Miletos (Hölbl 2014). The variety of types found in Cypriot terracotta figurines is thus comparable to that seen in the corpus of other East Aegean votive categories. In the case of the faïences, such variations are traced back to the different relationships that Greek communities had with the Near East and to specific local preferences and cult customs in Greek sanctuaries rather than to foreign travellers, especially since there is a possibility that there existed production centres in the East Aegean itself (Hölbl 2007, 458–59). It is, therefore, more probable that the dedication of Cypriot terracottas in the East Aegean had a similar background, without assuming, however, that there existed specific workshops in this region.

In the Heraion of Samos, the new higher date that I propose for the end of imported Cypriot terracotta figurines of around 630 BC coincides with the emergence of this new group of faïence figurines mentioned above. New excavations close to the altar area provide evidence that the interest of Samian worshippers in these Graeco-Egyptian figurines changed relatively suddenly in the last quarter of the 7th and the very early 6th century BC (for the new excavation see Henke 2017b). At this time, the import of Cypriot terracottas was already abating. This decline did not affect the dedication of Cypriot or Cypriot-style limestone statues, which continued. These statues frequently depict iconographic types that are not represented in the corpus of Cypriot terracottas in the East Aegean, such as lions, falcons, rams, lion bearers, kourotrophoi or kouros-like male statues. In some ways, these limestone statues show a closer affinity to the faïence figurines than to the imported Cypriot terracotta figurines. Therefore, one could ask whether there is,

---

21 Dieter Berges (2006) saw a predominately Egyptian influence in the production of the so-called Cypriot or Cypriot-style...
at least on Samos, any connection between the increase in the new faience dedications and the decrease in Cypriot terracotta figurines – perhaps induced by a more intense contact with Egypt that inspired new cult practices.

In the case of the faience figurines, many types found in East Aegean sanctuaries refer to aspects of family fertility (Hölbl 2014), as is similarly supposed at least for the female Cypriot terracottas related to the iconography of Astarte figurines (Ulbrich 2008, 70–77). According to Günther Hölbl, most of these faience figurines refer to the protection of mother and child. Others seem to be more related to protection in general. All of them, however, were apparently selected by the worshippers in Greek sanctuaries on account of their initial purposes in Egypt, as far as they aligned with Greek religious concepts (Hölbl 2007, 457–58; 2014). Nevertheless, they may also have transferred some new religious and cultic ideas into the Greek world in the same way.

It seems that the faience figurines, substantially similar in content, were deliberately chosen gifts that the Greek worshippers donated to their deities according to their original Egyptian meanings. Why should similar interpretations not also apply to the dedications of Cypriot terracottas in the East Aegean? Veronika Jarosch (1994) has pointed out that the sudden and extensive appearance of local anthropomorphic terracotta figurines – predominantly female statues with vertically outstretched arms – at the end of the 8th and the beginning of the 7th century BC in the Heraion of Samos was already inspired by Oriental depictions of the naked goddess, i.e., Astarte. This would also indicate that some Near Eastern religious iconographies, or perhaps even concrete religious concepts or cult practices, were adopted as well (Jarosch 1994, 78–79). The same development could also be possible in many other Greek sanctuaries located in the same or other regions, so that a direct inspiration from the Near East or an indirect one by third parties is not absolutely certain. So far, as shown by the well-preserved painted details of the local figurines deposited in the Heraion, the sexual characteristics of the terracotta figurines are often clearly emphasised, even when the figurines are dressed in long garments. They were frequently adorned with rich jewellery (for example, Jarosch 1994, pls 41, 714 and 718; 48, 542; 49, 558; 51, 559; 53, 567; 65, 694 and 695; von Graeve 2013, 13–14 describes similar features in the Daedalic figurines in Miletos). The same features characterise the Cypriot female terracotta figurines from the eastern part of Cyprus dedicated in the East Greek sanctuaries, although in a much more elaborate manner. The underlying concept, however, seems to be similar if not identical. Similar features also characterise the mixed-style anthropomorphic faience figurines.

Regarding the terracotta figurines of young men bearing a sacrificial animal – usually a young goat – Ursula Höckmann pointed out that this motif probably represents a specific sacrifice by a youth at the stage of his initiation into the world of adults, comparable to Greek customs (Höckmann 2009, 254–56). At least, it could be interpreted in this way by Greek worshippers, as this motif also appears, in a modified way, in Greek kouroi statues of the early 6th century. However, the motif, similarly modified, also appears in Cypriot-style limestone statues found in limestone statues, despite simultaneous references to North Syrian art. These would affect, in particular, the meaning and purpose of the iconographic types (especially, Berges 2006, 85–101). Berges (2006, 66–74) believes that the workshops of these statues were located in the East Aegean.

22 An inspiration via Crete has also been discussed; clear relationships with eastern cults of female goddesses related to Astarte – such as Aphrodite on Cyprus – generally characterise, for example, the cult of the Milesian Aphrodite in Oikous at Zeytintepe, which was established in the early 7th century BC (von Graeve 2013).
the East Aegean and in Naukratis, which were probably produced for the specific taste of Greek customers in the late 7th and early 6th century. Ursula Höckmann suggested that the motif of these limestone statues and Greek kouros statues was adopted from the original Cypriot examples in terracotta and limestone and then modified to suit Greek taste.

A similar development could possibly be assumed for the Cypriot-style plaque-shaped terracotta figurines in Miletos or Samos. It may also apply to the similarly designed male limestone statue in Naukratis, mentioned above, depicting a beardless youth dressed in a long, sleeveless chiton and long himation with a tasselled fringe. On Cyprus, the dress commonly occurs on bearded mature males wearing the Cypriot cap. In Ionia, the Archaic cloaked, beardless kouros type of the 6th century BC shows features that are also related to these cloaked, beardless Cypriot-style terracotta figurines as well as limestone statues. Consequently, this variation of the Cypriot-style figurines may be such a modification accommodating Greek tastes, too.

Therefore, the Cypriot terracotta figurines in question could have been deliberately chosen according to criteria that were compatible with already existing religious concepts or customs in East Greek sanctuaries. Still to be discussed is the question of whether or not these terracotta figurines can be interpreted as evidence for a transfer of new religious ideas or cult practices from Cyprus into the East Aegean – at least in sanctuaries such as the Heraion of Samos or the temenos of Aphrodite in Miletos, where, as in the case of the female figurines, such processes were initiated before the major import of Cypriot terracottas even began. This does not mean that such inspirations could not have been transferred via Cyprus, even if they are not directly connected with the terracotta imports. By contrast, in the sanctuary of Apollo at Emecik in Knidos the anthropomorphic Cypriot figurines apparently replaced the zoomorphic terracottas without any local predecessors (Kleibl 2006). In this case, it seems, at least for the moment, that the practice of dedicating male anthropomorphic terracotta figurines could indeed have been initiated under the direct impact of contemporary Cypriot cult practices or, at least, by the presence of the great numbers of imported Cypriot terracottas at other Ionian sites. If the early dating of the terracotta figurines is correct, it seems that there were no typological predecessors for male figurines carrying a sacrificial animal before the Cypriot terracotta figurines were imported. Consequently, it still remains possible that the type was originally introduced by the Cypriot figurines, as Ursula Höckmann has already suggested. We could also ask, however, whether there just happened to exist a Cypriot figurine type appropriate for already existing Greek customs, or whether some new rites, or at least some new variations of comparable customs, were adopted together with this iconographic type (compare Höckmann 2009, 254–56).

The possible importance of Cypriot sculpture for the development of large-size Greek sculpture was discussed by William A. P. Childs (2001). He emphasised the conspicuous status of Cyprus as a cultural hub and important interstation in the intercultural contacts between the Greek communities and the East (Childs 2001, 124–26). Even if the inspiration on Greek large-size sculpture is not clearly verifiable, the similarity of related developments on Cyprus and in Greece may suggest relevant interactions. This may also apply to the practice of dedicating anthropomorphic terracotta figurines before the huge import of Cypriot terracotta figurines in the East Aegean even began. There may also be a time lag between the various East Aegean communities and sanctuaries for such adoptions, so that in some cases, as at Knidos, the practice perhaps prevailed later, after the Cypriot imports had already started.
Conclusion

Cypro-Archaic terracotta figurines constitute an important archaeological find group at many East Aegean sanctuaries. The region yielded, at any rate, the largest quantity outside Cyprus itself. Naukratis, too, provided a significantly smaller but still important number of figurines, although Cypriot-style limestone statues predominate at this location. Therefore, it is surprising that even after a century of research many important issues are still controversial. This applies particularly to the chronology, as well as to important cultural-anthropological questions such as the meaning and significance the figurines and the identity of their donors. As Sabine Fourrier has already demonstrated (Fourrier 2007, 35 6 and 106 7), the majority of Cypriot terracotta figurines originated from workshops in the eastern part of Cyprus, if not in Salamis itself. She, among others, argued for a higher dating of the figurines in the 7th century. New stratigraphic evidence from the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Miletos, together with the already known stratigraphy at the Heraion of Samos, gives reason to believe that the import of Cypriot figurines may have begun – even if such imports were initially few in number – around 670 BC, but that most of the figurines reached the East Aegean in large quantities during a very short period between c. 650/640 and c. 630 BC. These dates can be determined because it is possible to allocate many of the figurines to a few workshops, or, probably, even to single artisans, and because of the fact that examples of these figurines were found in a bothros in Miletos that was closed in c. 630 BC.

In regard to these new dates, we have to ask whether the Cypriot imports had any impact on the production techniques of local Ionian terracotta figurines, since, at many of the sites, the technique of using moulds or producing large-size figurines was not yet developed before the arrival of the Cypriot imports.

A group of Cypriot-style plaque-shaped male terracotta figurines found at Samos, Miletos and Rhodes is dressed in what appears to be a typical Cypriot costume. However, there are variations, such as figures without the Cypriot cap and beard, which are not common on Cyprus itself and indicate that this may be a type made to suit Greek taste. In addition, these plaque-shaped figurines were not made in a single mould, as on Cyprus itself; rather, the various parts were cast in several moulds and joined together after moulding. Actually, this and other technical details characterise local Milesian plaque-shaped Daedalic figurines, so that, in this case, evidence for technical Cypriot inspiration on local coroplastics cannot be proved.

On Samos, however, imported Cypriot wheel-made figurines with moulded faces or hollow mould-made figurines apparently coincide with the beginning of the use of similar techniques in the production of local Samian terracotta figurines. In this case, it seems that the local potters closely observed the imported products and were inspired by them, rather than by personal interaction with Cypriot craftsmen. Otherwise, one would expect closer similarities between Cypriot and Ionian techniques than is actually the case.

Concerning the identity of the donors who dedicated Cypriot figurines in the East Aegean and in Naukratis, previous arguments have supported a predominantly Greek identity, but the conviction that Cypriots dedicated the figurines in question is still under debate. In regard to a Greek donor identity, many scholars focus on merchants and other travellers. I argue for a more heterogeneous picture, showing that in Naukratis the dedications could well have been made by merchants and travellers but that in the East Aegean the figurines were imported as regular merchandise and the majority of them were bought and dedicated by the local population In
support of such a scenario, I refer to the way in which different figurine types and techniques were selected as votive gifts at different East Aegean sanctuaries. In some cases, this phenomenon may be linked to local preferences and already established customs, which sometimes, as, for example, in the Heraion of Samos, even seem to differ from Cypriot customs. Although female figurines dominate here, the strong presence of male figurines makes a striking contrast to the Cypriot practice of dedicating female anthropomorphic figurines in sanctuaries of female deities. However, the increase in the presence of male statues had already begun before the extensive dedications of Cypriot figurines even started. Furthermore, the fact that common Cypriot figurial types appear as variations possibly modified in a Greek manner also speaks for Greek donors.

The meaning of the figurines, at least in the East Aegean sanctuaries and in Naukratis, is probably quite ambivalent. The statues may have represented their donors in some cases, but did not necessarily, as some of the rare dedication inscriptions suggest. At least in the East Aegean, we should assume that the figurines were used more flexibly (as other scholars have already suggested): namely, that men could offer female figurines and women could dedicate male statues. At least, dedication inscriptions on other find categories in the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Miletos indicate that men, too, appealed to Aphrodite with concerns about marriage or childbirth, pleas that are generally associated with women. However, this does not allow us to draw any conclusions on practices in Cyprus itself, where the situation may have been different.

Then, the question arises whether any religious or cultic adaptations or inspirations were connected with the increasing practice of dedicating Cypriot figurines in East Greek sanctuaries. At the moment, we have no clear evidence for such a scenario, even if, as in the sanctuary of Apollo at Knidos, the dedications of Cypriot anthropomorphic figurines seem to appear without any local anthropomorphic predecessors existing alongside the many local zoomorphic terracotta figurines. Therefore, it is at least possible that the practice of dedicating anthropomorphic figurines in the sanctuary was inspired by Cypriot customs, as previously argued by Childs. At the moment, however, it seems quite likely that the figurines in question dedicated at the East Aegean sites were chosen on account of their original Cypriot meanings and uses, if these were compatible with already existing Greek religious and cultic concepts. Various scholars assume a similar practice in the dedications of Egyptian or Egyptianising Archaic Greek faiences at East Aegean sanctuaries during the same period. Taking this into account, it seems possible that the variations of Cypriot types found in Cypriot-style terracotta and limestone sculpture in East Aegean sanctuaries as well as in Naukratis are modifications that accommodate Greek taste, but that they also influenced pre-existing Greek religious and social customs.

Appendix

List of hollow figurines with faces made in the same mould like the face of the female statue T 600 from the Heraion of Samos:

**Salamis-Toumba on Cyprus:**

British Museum 1891,0806.39 (Fig. 4; Karageorghis 1993, cat. no. 73, pl. 20.1–2; Henke 2017a, pl. 11.3), Fitzwilliam Museum GR.11.1890 (Karageorghis 1993, cat. no. 99, pl. 25.6; Henke 2017a, pl. 11.1; see also Karageorghis, Vassiliki and Wilson 1999, 66 cat. no. 118), Cyprus Museum C 101 (Karageorghis 1993, cat. no. 145, pl. 33.4; Henke 2017a, 10.2; for the identification of the head as

a find from Salamis-Toumba see Henke 2009, 211 n. 14; Henke 2017a, 83 n. 577).

Unknown site on Cyprus:
Nikosia, Cyprus Museum C 115 (Karageorghis 1993, cat. no. 148, pl. 33.7; Henke 2017a, pl. 10.5).

Apollo sanctuary of Emecik (Knidos):
Marmaris Museum 10.41,2000. a: ST 00-I 7c-4,13; b: ST 00-I 9c-8,6 (Kleibl 2006, cat. no. 362, pl. 92.3–4; Henke 2017a, pl. 10.3) and Inv. no. 11.5.99. - ST 99 I–7b–12 (Kleibl 2006, cat. no. 388, pl. 96.4; Henke 2017a, pl. 10.4).

Heraion of Samos:
T 419 (Fig. 5; Schmidt 1968, pls 67–68; Henke 2017a, pl. 11.6); T 600 (Fig. 1; Schmidt 1968, pl. 719; Henke 2017a, pl. 14.1.3); T 1906+2798 (Fig. 2; Schmidt 1968, pl. 77; Henke 2017a, pl. 11.4, 2011, 214, fig. 4); T 1888–1979 (Fig. 3; Schmidt 1968, pl. 79; Henke 2017a, pl. 11.2); T 1728 (Schmidt 1968, pl. 80); T 3834 (Kyrieleis 1989, 63 fig. 9; Henke 2017a, pl. 10.1); T 3833 (Kyrieleis 1989, 62 fig. 8; Henke 2017a, pl. 12.16).

Aegina:
From Kolonna (Schmidt 1968, pl. 125 = Margreiter 1988, cat. no. 132, pl. 7; Margreiter 1988, cat. no. 131).

Rhodes:
From Kameiros, British Museum B 169 (Schmidt 1968, pl. 125) and further unpublished fragments from Ialysos in the Museum of Rhodes
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