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Abstract
A wooden, openwork panel inscribed for Amasis and embellished with secondary glass inlays and gilding was discovered in 2018 by the Franco-Swiss Archaeological Mission at South Saqqara in a disturbed, archaeological context littered with bovine skeletal remains in the southern section of the pyramid complex of queen Ankhnespepy II. The panel’s openwork design finds its closest parallels in two-dimensional representations of funerary furnishing that suggest that this particular object formed part of the panoply of a sacred animal, suggested to have been a bull, the cults of which were supported by Amasis at Saqqara. Those comparisons call into question the function of all of the wooden panels embellished with glass inlays dated to the Late Period (given in Appendix) and whether the term, naos, is an appropriate designation for all such objects.

The Mission archéologique franco-suisse de Saqqâra,1 financially supported in part by the Fondation Gandur pour l’Art, Genève, excavated a remarkably well-preserved wooden panel exhibiting secondary inlays of glass with traces of gilding in a disturbed context in the southern section of the pyramid complex of Queen Ankhnespepy II (fig. 1).

1 I wish to recognize the following members of the Mission archéologique franco-suisse de Saqqâra: Philippe Collombert, Director; for entrusting the publication of this object to me: Alain Charron, conservateur en chef du musée départemental de l’Arles antique, for his profitable discussions; and Jérôme Rizzo, Université Paul-Valéry, Montpellier 3, the mission’s photographer. I am indebted to Jean Claude Gandur of the Fondation Gandur pour l’Art, Genève, for introducing me to Philippe and supporting my research during my tenure at the Fondation, during which time part of the research for this essay was completed. In particular I owe a debt of gratitude to Mervat Seif el-Din for providing me with offprints, and to Paola Davoli for several publications that feature prominently in the notes and for her continuing discussions with me about figural glass inlays in general. The acquisition of photographs used as figures in this essay was facilitated by Sylvia Schoske, Dietrich Wildung, and Jan Dahms in Munich; Yekaterina Barbash and Kathy Zurek-Doule in Brooklyn; Gloria R. Lopez, Kristen N. Qarles, Felicia Pickering, Barbara Watanabe, and James Krakker in Washington, D.C; Vincent Rondot and Audrey Viger in Paris; and François Maresquie of Meretseger Books. I thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. As always, I am indebted to Kyria Marcella Osborne for her copy-editing.
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Franco-suisse mission archéologique de Saqqara Field Number 18-6
Wood, with glass inlays, gilded, and stuccoed
30 cm. greatest width
26.5 cm. greatest height, tang to tang
2.5 cm. greatest thickness
2.5 cm. greatest width of the smaller wooden panel

The preserved panel, almost square in format, is designed as an openwork composition. The panel is composed of two separately crafted pieces of wood with their joint running vertically just to the (spectator’s) left of the cartouche (fig. 2). The two pieces have been fastened together without pegs or tenons. There is a single vertically aligned tang at approximately each of the four corners of the panel. The bottom left one is more fragmentary than the others. The skill of the fine joiners is evident in the manner in which the recesses into which the inlays were subsequently set have been designed so that they seamlessly span the joint with the result that the completed panel gives the impression that it had been cut from a single piece of wood.

The congruence between the design of each of the sockets and that of their corresponding inlays is so accurate as to suggest that each glass inlay was custom cast to fit into one and only one socket (fig. 3). Such precision
recalls that of the consummately crafted inlays so characteristic of the finest jewelry created during the Middle Kingdom, as a comparison with a pectoral from the tomb of Sithathorunet so graphically reveals. More remarkable still is the observation that the surfaces of the wood on the face of the panel have been gilded as have the vertical surfaces on the interiors of all of the cutouts (fig. 4). The vertical, exterior surface of the smaller wooden panel is completely gilded suggesting that it was intended to remain exposed and was never intended to be concealed by a door closing over it (fig. 5). The entire back of the panel, where the joint of the two pieces of wood is particularly evident, has been coated with a thin layer of plaster that does not appear to have been painted (fig. 6). Several of the glass inlays in the form of individual feathers exhibit an extraordinary technique that can best be compared to a human finger with its nail (fig. 7). The “finger” itself is either of blue or green glass on to which a red glass “nail” appears to have been fused. Such a technique appears to have been introduced for the first time during the Amarna Period as seen in the design of some of the feathers inlaid into the anthropoid, wooden sarcophagus discovered in KV 55 and in the design of the feathers on some of the jewels discovered in the tomb of Tutankhamun. The design seems to have been favored for glass inlays created during the reign of Amasis because this same technique is exhibited by the glass inlays in a second panel that is likewise inscribed for him. Isolated examples of such glass inlays were also discovered at Bacchias. The bichrome appearance of such inlays is achieved either by simply adhering one element to the other or by fusing both together.

5 Paris, Musée du Louvre E 605 (N 504). See Appendix, no. 3, below.
Fig. 7 (above). Bi-chrome inlays. Photo © Franco-suisse mission archéologique de Saqqara, Field Number 18-6; photographer, Jérôme Rizzo.

Fig. 5 (above left). Gilding on vertical exterior face of the panel. Photo © Franco-suisse mission archéologique de Saqqara, Field Number 18-6; photographer, Jérôme Rizzo.

Fig. 6 (left). Reverse of panel with seam (left). The surface has a thin layer of plaster. Photo © Franco-suisse mission archéologique de Saqqara, Field Number 18-6; photographer, Jérôme Rizzo.

Fig. 8. Detail of the goddess Khuit with her accompanying inscription. Photo © Franco-suisse mission archéologique de Saqqara, Field Number 18-6; photographer, Jérôme Rizzo.
The principal figure on the panel under discussion is that of a winged goddess facing right, kneeling upon a ground line. All of her flesh has been gilded, the layer appears to have been applied directly over a reddish-colored adhesive layer. Of her physiognomic features, only her eyebrow had originally been inlaid. Her accessories include a broad collar consisting of several strands of darker and lighter light blue glass inlays to which are attached green glass inlaid floral (?) elements. Her costume, assumed to have been a tightly fitting sheath, appears to have been designed with green colored glass inlays. Her upraised hand holds a green glass inlay of a maat-feather, its perimeter accented by a thin blue glass border.

The rectangular panel adjoined to the right side of the sun disc contains a hieroglyphic inscription of blue glass inlays oriented to the right and vertically bordered on each side by a thin framing band of blue glass. It reads:

\[\text{qd mdw in \textit{Hdwi}}\]

Recitation by Khuit

This goddess appears to be a personification of protection because the etymology of her name as based upon the root, \textit{hdwi} “to protect.” She is principally regarded as a protectress, not only of the deceased but also of newly born child gods. The motif of a goddess with winged arms spread in a gesture of protection is a time-honored motif with variations that developed in ancient Egyptian art over time.\footnote{R. Shonkwiler, “Sheltering Wings: Birds as Symbols of Protection in Ancient Egypt,” in R. Bailleul-LeSeur (ed.), \textit{Between Heaven and Earth: Birds in Ancient Egypt}, OIMP 36 (Chicago, 2012), 49–57.} The image is found on pectorals from the tomb of Tutankhamun,\footnote{El Mallakh and Brackman, \textit{The Gold of Tutankhamun}, nos. 89 and 91.} in vignettes within the tomb of Nefertari,\footnote{G. Thausing and H. Goedicke, \textit{Nofretari: Eine Dokumentation der Wandgemälde ihres Grabes} (Graz, 1971), figs. 46, 47, 52, and 53.} and on numerous representations on the sides of shrines on processional barques.\footnote{C. Traunecker, F. Le Saout, and O. Masson, \textit{La chapelle d’Achôris à Karnak II, Texte}, RGCS 5.1 (Paris, 1981), 83.} Often the winged arms of those goddesses embrace a cartouche. In this instance, the image of Khuit in conjunction with the cartouche between her wings, serves as a rebus, or visual pun, “the one who protects pharaoh,” who is specifically named in hieroglyphs of blue inlays within a blue glass inlaid cartouche: \textit{Hnum-ib-Re}...\footnote{P. Vernus, “Athrîbis,” \textit{La I}, col. 522.}

Khnum-ib-Re is the prenomen of Amasis (570–526 BC), the fifth pharaoh of Dynasty 26. The association of Khuit and Amasis may not be coincidental because her function as a protectress is reinforced by the recurrence of her epithet, \textit{hbs.t ntr} “the one who envelops the god,” particularly at Athribis, her principal cult center where Amasis appears to have been particularly active.\footnote{R. B. Gozzoli, \textit{Psammetichus II: Reign, Documents and Officials} (London, 2017), 20–22.} A wife of Psamtek II whose tomb was discovered at Athribis was named Ta-[net]-Khuit,\footnote{Mallawi, Mallawi Antiquities Museum 200, in H. Mesih and M. A. Elhitta, \textit{Mallawi Antiquities Museum: A Brief Description} (Cairo, 1979), 15 with pl. XVI.} and Amasis himself appears to have been particularly active there as well.

Although this panel is inscribed for Amasis, the object to which it belonged may not necessarily have been originally part of the funerary panoply of that pharaoh. The presence of his cartouche on this object resonates with numerous wooden receptacles containing the mumified remains of animals from the catacombs at Tuna el-Gebel that have panels that depict pharaohs in adoration.\footnote{H. P. Colburn, \textit{Archaeology of Empire in Achaemenid Egypt} (Edinburgh, 2020), 164–66, who opines that inscribed representations of pharaohs on such objects do not automatically imply that the pharaoh depicted was the object’s commissioner.} These examples may not even have been commissioned by the pharaohs depicted on them,\footnote{S. Davies and H. S. Smith, “Sacred Animal Temples at Saqqara,” in S. Quirke (ed.), \textit{The Temple in ancient Egypt: new discoveries and recent research} (London, 1997) 112–31, furthering the comments made earlier in that same volume by B. M. Bryan, “The Statue Program for the Mortuary Temple of Amenhotep III,” in Quirke, \textit{The Temple in Ancient Egypt}, 57–81; and A. Monson, “Political and Sacred Animals: Religious Associations in Greco-Roman Egypt,” in B. Eckhardt (ed.), \textit{Private Associations and Jewish Communities in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities}, Supplements to the Journal of the Study of Judaism 191 (Leiden, 2019), 37–57.} although one must always keep in mind that the numerous animal cults of the Late Period have been associated with the cults of individual divinized rulers.\footnote{S. Davies and H. S. Smith, “Sacred Animal Temples at Saqqara,” in S. Quirke (ed.), \textit{The Temple in ancient Egypt: new discoveries and recent research} (London, 1997) 112–31, furthering the comments made earlier in that same volume by B. M. Bryan, “The Statue Program for the Mortuary Temple of Amenhotep III,” in Quirke, \textit{The Temple in Ancient Egypt}, 57–81; and A. Monson, “Political and Sacred Animals: Religious Associations in Greco-Roman Egypt,” in B. Eckhardt (ed.), \textit{Private Associations and Jewish Communities in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities}, Supplements to the Journal of the Study of Judaism 191 (Leiden, 2019), 37–57.} The presence of Khuit protecting Amasis represented by his cartouche must be understood within this general context, religiously
protecting and adoring the targeted animal mummy, which we suggest was contained within the piece of furniture of which this panel was a part.

It is interesting to note that there are a handful of other fragments of wooden objects inscribed with the name of Amasis discovered at Saqqara. In addition to the panel under discussion, there is a door leaf in London inscribed with the prenomen of Amasis in black ink, and a fragment of a painted and gilded wooded cavetto cornice now in Toronto. Although discovered in unstratified contexts, each of those two objects was found in loci associated with animal cults. Such objects have almost universally been described as elements belonging to naos, from the Greek noun ναός, the extended meaning of which is a receptacle. The term is generically applied to any box-like structure, but is principally understood as a term referring to a “shrine” that served as an eternal abode for any deity and by extension for any royal or elite member of society whose image was placed within it. The ancient Egyptian nouns that are often considered to be synonyms for “naos” are much more nuanced in their connotative meanings that encompass concepts not only traditionally understood as naos in stone, wood, and other media, but which extend to any number of box-like containers such as a palanquin and even a cabinet. The continued use of the term naos within the context of these panels prejudices one’s understanding of their function(s) because the default meaning of that term excludes other functional possibilities. Arguably, they may have originally been components of reliquaries used to house the mumified remains of animals, rather than of naos, shrines in the strictest sense, for housing either divine, royal, or elite images.

The wooden panel under discussion must be taken into consideration with a second object discovered in 2016, that consists of a painted wooden receptacle housing a bundle designed as a pseudo-mummy of a recumbent bovine to which a head of a real cow was attached (fig. 9). Both the wooden panel (2018-6) and the pseudo-mummy within its painted wooden receptacle (2016-MASF) are best understood within the context of a series of two-dimensional representations discovered at Memphis that have been identified as images of the Apis Bull placed within a receptacle resting on a processional barque transported by a wagon, of which a relief in Paris serves as an exemplar. The pseudo-mummy discovered by the Franco-Swiss mission demonstrates that the relief in Paris is based on reality and is not the product of artistic license. The relief in Paris also suggests that the wooden panel under discussion may have been an element of a larger composition in which a series of panels was inserted into horizontal registers by means of tenons secured in place by rails, and that those horizontal registers may have been stacked one on top of another to form a series of registers not unlike those depicted on the relief in Paris.

Such a suggestion gains support from the fact that the two pieces of wood from which the panel under discussion was seamlessly joined. Such fine joinery suggests that it could easily have been added to similar panels in the same register, as perhaps illustrated in the representation of a funerary bier in a vignette from the pronaos of the tomb of Petosiris in Tuna el-Gebel, which clearly is intended to represent an openwork...
frize (fig. 10). Such a technique is clearly documented in the archaeological record. The relative dimensions of the panel under discussion and the presence of its tangs suggest that it was a component element of such a receptacle. These observations suggest that the animal associated with this object would have been relatively large and heavy, such as a bovine.

That such a constructed housing may have contained a bovine mummy with its head protruding from an open side seems to be confirmed by the observation that one side of the panel under discussion exhibits a finished, gilded, vertical edge that reveals no signs of wear which the presence of a repeatedly opened and closed door would have caused. The appearance of such a mummified bovine within the suggested receptacle to which this panel may have belonged would recall the appearance of the pseudo-mummy within its housing and the similar subject depicted in two-dimensional representations.

C. Boutantin opines that the representation of the bovine in its housing on the relief in Paris, and the others in her corpus, are to be understood as containers in which mummified animals were placed so that they could be transported to the place of their interment. She had earlier suggested that such depictions are also to be understood as “snapshots” of actual funerary processions. Her comments can, perhaps, be furthered. After the procession and interment, the head of such bovines would still be visible and arguably accessible as an interme-

28 Boutantin, “Quelques documents de la région Memphite,” 81, 89, 97–98.
diary\textsuperscript{30} for private devotion\textsuperscript{31} on every level of society\textsuperscript{32} because such objects functioned as important foci of daily life from possible incubation to dream interpretation and oracular pronouncements.\textsuperscript{33} Such participatory events were not solely restricted to the cultic praxis associated with the principal sacred animal at any given site,\textsuperscript{34} but are also documented by officials at animal cemeteries in general.\textsuperscript{35}

Within such cultic practices, the importance of confronting the face of the divinity is of paramount importance.\textsuperscript{36} Such a praxis is amply demonstrated by the oracular pronouncements delivered by simians at both Tuna

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image1.png}
\caption{A vignette of fine joiners constructing a funerary bier in the pronaos of the tomb of Petosiris at Tuna el-Gebel. Photo © François Maresquier, www.meretsegerbooks.com.}
\end{figure}

decoratives et significations multiples: les graphies suggestives du temple d'Hathor à Dendara,” \textit{BIFAO} 102 (2002), 90, for a discussion of such processions at Dendera.
\textsuperscript{30} H. te Velde, “A few remarks upon the religious significance of animals in ancient Egypt,” \textit{Numen} 27.1 (1980), 76–82.


\textsuperscript{32} D. Meeks, “Zoomorphic and image of the gods in ancient Egypt,” in C. Malamoud and J-P. Vernant (eds.), \textit{Corps des dieux} (Paris, 1986), 190, for a concise description of the suggested interaction between the worshipper and the mummified animal at moment when the one confronts the other.


\textsuperscript{34} G. Gorre, \textit{Les relations du clergé égyptien et des Lagides d'après les sources privées}, STH 45 (Louvain, 2009), 141–56, no. 30; and 194–97, no. 40.


el-Gebel\textsuperscript{37} and Saqqara,\textsuperscript{38} and by ibises at Thebes.\textsuperscript{39} Significantly, this practice is also attested in the performance of oracular pronouncements in which the petitioner interacts face-to-face with a sacred bull.\textsuperscript{40} It is within such a cultic praxis that one is to understand the function of the panel under discussion. Moreover, this face-to-face interaction between a petitioner and the divine must be integrated into the wider arena of such ancient Egyptian cultic praxis that includes the opening of shutters to reveal cultic reliefs\textsuperscript{41} and the opening and closing of other types of receptacles housing animal mummies.\textsuperscript{42} The practice was extended to include such interactions with the deceased as seen in the moveable mechanism exhibited by a painted, wooden box coffin now in Malibu\textsuperscript{43} as well as in the design of two vertically aligned receptacles, termed schreinartigen Särgen, in Berlin\textsuperscript{44} in which the praxis involved communication, perhaps not oracular in nature, with the deceased by the living. To these examples must be added representations on stelae in which a bust of the divine entity is represented within such an open doorless receptacle in order to be accessible for petitioners seeking oracular consultations\textsuperscript{45} in keeping with the liminal function of all such openings in such receptacles.\textsuperscript{46}

As already stated, the wooden panel was discovered by the Franco-Swiss Archaeological Mission at Saqqara in 2018 in a disturbed, archaeological contexts littered with bovine skeletal\textsuperscript{47} remains on two sides of the pyramid complex of queen Ankhnesepy II (fig. 11). The southern locus measured approximately 25 square meters and appears to have been continued along the western side of the precinct.\textsuperscript{48} The jumbled state of the remains of these bovines suggests that the deposits were both secondary\textsuperscript{49} and helter-skelter, resulting, as has been suggested, by a pillaging of one or more sacred sites because several of the remains exhibit clear signs of having been mummified.\textsuperscript{50} Numerous bovine skeletal remains, both male and female, have been found at the site. Provisional forensic analysis suggests that the population ranged in date from newly born calves to very aged adults.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{37} Kessler and Brose, Ägypten letzte Pyramide, 11.

\textsuperscript{38} Ray, Texts from the Bahban and Falcon Galleries, 39.

\textsuperscript{39} D. Klotz, Caesar in the City of Amun: Egyptian Temple Construction and Theology in Roman Thebes, MRE 15 (Turnhout, 2012), 216.

\textsuperscript{40} D. Klotz, “Two Overlooked Oracles,” JEA 96 (2010), 252.

\textsuperscript{41} J. D. Preisigke-Borsian, Bötchlein an ägyptischen Tempeln vom 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.: ihre Architektur, Zugänglichkeit, Ausstattung und Bedeutung, AAT 102 (Münster, 2021).

\textsuperscript{42} Mallawi Antiquities Museum 200 in Mesilla and Elhitta, Mallawi Antiquities Museum, 15 with plate XVI, although Colburn, Archaeology of Empire in Achaemenid Egypt, 162–67, suggests that this particular object may have been repurposed.


\textsuperscript{46} \textsuperscript{47} I thank both Mathieu Luret and Alain Charron for sharing this information with me, which will appear in the forthcoming publication, M. Luret, A. Charron, and L. Chaix, “A case of fluorosis in a bull (Bos taurus) linked to Apis worship at Saqqara (Egypt).”

\textsuperscript{48} I thank both Mathieu Luret and Alain Charron for sharing this information with me, which will appear in the forthcoming publication, M. Luret, A. Charron, and L. Chaix, “A case of fluorosis in a bull (Bos taurus) linked to Apis worship at Saqqara (Egypt).”


\textsuperscript{50} The extraordinarily large number of bovine skeletal remains found within these two areas are indicative of the enormous economic impact such endeavors must have had upon the economies at the time of their original interments, for which see M. C. Flossmann-Schütze, “Études sur le cadre de vie d’une association religieuse dans l’Égypte gréco-romaine: l’exemple de Touna el-Gebel,” in G. Rosati (ed.), Gli Augustali: Redazioni, funzioni, eventi, AdE 6 (1982), 37–69, furthering the comments of H. Brunner, “Die Rolle von Tüür und Tör im alten Ägypten,” Symbolon: Jahrbuch für Symbolforschung, Neue Folge 6 (1982), 37–59.

One has yet to identify the location(s) of the original archaeological site(s) from which those bovine remains found at the pyramid complex of queen Ankhnespepy II may have come. That such a suggested locus did in fact exist is reinforced by the observation that somewhere in Saqqara, perhaps even in the proximity the pyramid complex of Queen Ankhnespepy II, may lie a bovine animal necropolis, separate and distinct from the famed Apis bull burials in the Memphite Serapeum. Such a necropolis is mentioned in the papyrological documentation. That locus may have been situated anywhere within the zone stretching from North Saqqara to Abu Roash, to judge from the known animal necropolises that litter that area and from reports about the provenances of bovine mummies in Cairo. In antiquity, there was no strictly defined geographical border between the areas now designated as southern Saqqara and northern Abusir so that Miroslav Verner’s observation that there may have been several other bull cults at Saqqara—the gm-steers, members of the Apis bull’s entourage, his children—which are mentioned in the preserved documentation may in fact still wait to be discovered in this area.

52 Mission archéologique franco-suisse de Saqqara (Égypte), Rapport 2018, 7–8; and Mission archéologique franco-suisse de Saqqara (Égypte), Rapport 2016, 6–7, citing the remains of 252 heads of bovines.
55 Cairo, The Egyptian Museum CG 29516 in C. Gaillard and G. Daressy, La faune momifiée de l’antique Égypte (Cairo 1905), 16–18.
Consider for a moment that some of the bovine mummies, reportedly found in the 19th century, one of which now in Munich has been identified as an ox (fig. 12), and two more now in Washington, D.C. (fig. 13), would seem to confirm the existence of one or more of these bovine cemeteries in the Saqqara-Abusir zone. It is, therefore, tempting to attempt whether the bull mummies discovered by Dr. Henry Abbott (the one in Munich and those in Cairo), may have originally come from one and the same necropolis. Furthermore, the involvement of Amasis with animal cults at Saqqara is well-attested not only in relation to that of the Apis Bull, but also with that of the cult of the Mother of the Apis, which he is suggested to have initiated. In light of these observations, it is entirely plausible to suggest that the inlaid, gilded wooden panel discovered by the Mission archéologique franco-suisse de Saqqâra in a disturbed context in the southern section of the pyramid complex of queen Ankhespepy II can be associated with one or more bovine cults, perhaps even that of one of the bulls, promoted by pharaoh Amasis. The presence of these bovine remains should, therefore, caution one

---

56 Gaillard and Daressy, *La faune momifiée*, 16–18.


58 The example in Munich can be compared with three bovine mummies formerly in New York, Collection of Henry Abbott, *Catalogue of a Collection of Egyptian Antiquities, The Property of Henry Abbott, M.D.* (New York, 1854) 15–16, no. 125; and E. A. Powell, “Messengers to the Gods,” *Archaeology* (March-April 2014), 48–52. These entered the collections of The Brooklyn Museum of Art. Two were ultimately de-accessioned and entered the collections of the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History under inventory numbers 209589 [USNM A113941-0 and A113942, respectively: https://collections.nmnh.si.edu/search/anth/?viewed=2020.07.27]. For the third bovine mummy, The Brooklyn Museum of Art 37.1381E [https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/opencollection/objects/117932 <viewed on 14 November 2021>] judged too fragile to transfer to Washington, DC, is currently represented in that collection by a single one of its bones. Abbott simply records their provenance as “Dashour,” without providing details, although a backstory is provided by J. V. C. Smith, *A Pilgrimage to Egypt: Embracing a Diary of Explorations on the Nile; with Observations Illustrative of the Manners, Customs, and Institutions of the People and of the Present Condition of the Antiquities and Ruins* (Boston, 1959), 242–43.


60 Gaillard and Daressy *La faune momifiée*, 16–18. There appears to have been some confusion between the plates and the text in the publication by Gaillard and Daressy, because the “chat gante” described on page 8 does not appear to be the mummy illustrated on plate V, the caption of which identifies the mummy in that illustration as CG 29511, identified on page 12 as a gazelle.

against identifying any bovine depiction from the Memphite area as an Apis Bull, unless there is supporting, corroborative evidence.

APPENDIX

Inlays in both glass and faience either as isolated objects,62 or as parts of complete figures, designed as body parts of both divine and human beings together with wigs and accessories such as collars,63 have been discovered in abundance among fragmentary pieces of wood, admittedly in disturbed archaeological contexts dated to the Late and Roman Imperial Periods, most recently at the Fayumic sites of Bacchias64 and Dime (Soknopaiou Nesos).65 Inlays correctly identified as feathers66 can now be more properly understood on the basis of those on the wings of Khuit on the panel from Saqqara. It has been tacitly assumed that all of these wooden panels that are sometimes embellished with the types of inlays under discussion and are often gilded were component elements of objects putatively identified as naoi, at least one hypothetical reconstruction of which has been proposed using a papyrus in London as a didactic, architectural pattern-book of sorts on to which some of the secondary inlays from Dime have been theoretically superimposed.67 The use of such inlays continued into the early Christian Period.68

The majority of glass inlays that are suggested to date to the Late Period have not been found in association with wood.69 Since that is the case, the following list is provisional and includes only those wooden objects that are embellished with such glass inlays or that have been found with wooden fragments. The default interpretation of virtually all of these wooden panels incrusted with glass inlays is that they formed parts of naoi in which images of either deities or royals were housed. Several wooden receptacles from the animal cemeteries at Tuna el-Gebel are designed with moveable front panels that could be opened and closed to reveal the mumified animal within.70 That design suggests the object may have been used in a performance ritual, discussed above, as perhaps was the pseudo-mummy within a painted, wooden shrine (Field Number 2016-MASF). The finished edge of the wooden panel under discussion suggests that its “front” was open, doubtless to reveal its contents, suggested to have been a mumified bull. Consequently one should revisit each of the other objects listed in this Appendix in order to reassess their possible function(s).

1. Mission archéologique franco-suisse de Saqqara Field Number 18-6 inscribed for Amasis. This and the following two objects are the earliest datable examples of such wooden panels exhibiting glass inlays from the Late Period.71
2. Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum 969.137.2 discovered at Saqqara and inscribed for Amasis.72
3. Paris, Musée du Louvre N 504 (=E 605),73 also inscribed for Amasis.

---

63 Gasperini, Paolucci, and Tocci, Catalogo dei frammenti, 84–99; Cervi “L’arredo ligneo del tempio di Soknopao,” particularly page 293.
64 Gasperini, Paolucci, and Tocci Catalogo dei frammenti.
65 Cervi, “L’arredo ligneo del tempio di Soknopao.”
70 Mallawi, Mallawi Antiquities Museum 200 in Messiha and Elliotta, Mallawi Antiquities Museum, 15 with pl. XVI.
4. Bologna, Museo Civico di Bologna KS 289\textsuperscript{74} inscribed for Shr-ib-ra, one of the names of Petobastis-son-of-Bastet,\textsuperscript{75} a petty prince suggested to have led an insurrection against Aryandes, the Persian satrap of Egypt, in 522–520 BC.\textsuperscript{76} 

5. Paris, Musée du Louvre N 503\textsuperscript{77} inscribed for the same individual and ostensibly from the same object. 

6. Paris, Musée du Louvre N 874\textsuperscript{78} inscribed for the same individual and ostensibly from the same object. 


8. Cairo, The Egyptian Museum JE 91103,\textsuperscript{80} suggested to date to the same reign. 

9. Brooklyn, The Brooklyn Museum of Art 37.258E, 37.259E, and 37.260E\textsuperscript{81} inscribed for Nectanebo II of Dynasty 30. The earliest appearance of mosaic glass are not those exhibited by these panels,\textsuperscript{82} but are those found at Ain Manawir dated according to their archaeological context to the fifth century BC.\textsuperscript{83} Nevertheless, the glass inlays on the panels in Brooklyn are the earliest dated attestations for the appearance of new colors for that glass.\textsuperscript{84} 
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