

NAUKRATIS.

PART II.

BY

ERNEST A. GARDNER, M.A.,

FELLOW OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE, CRAVEN STUDENT AND FORMERLY WORTS STUDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE;
DIRECTOR OF THE BRITISH SCHOOL OF ARCHEOLOGY AT ATHENS.

WITH AN APPENDIX,

BY

F. LL. GRIFFITH, B.A.,

OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM, FORMERLY STUDENT OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND.

SIXTH MEMOIR OF

THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE COMMITTEE.

LONDON :

TRÜBNER & CO., 57 & 59, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

1888.

LONDON

PRINTED BY GEORGE AND SIBTHORP, LIMITED
ST. JOHN'S WOOD, LONDON, N.W.4

TO

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

Ὄνομα σὸν μακαριστὸν, ὦ Ναύκρατις ὦδε φυλάξει
ἔστ' ἂν ἔη Νείλου ναῦς ἔφαλος τενάγη.

Posidippus ap. Ath. 596 D.

PREFACE.

WHEN a work begun by one hand is continued by another, an explanation or apology seems to be required. I trust however that in the present case some degree of continuity may be found in the reports of the excavations we have conducted at Naukratis for the Egypt Exploration Fund. For I was by Mr. Petrie's kindness enabled to study the yet unpublished results of his first season's exploration, and to have my conclusions incorporated in his report; and the excavations of the subsequent season were begun under his direction and after his system. The present volume also contains some of his handiwork, in the plates signed with his initials and the description of the articles contained therein. But above all, both in the introductory narrative and in the dedication I have endeavoured to show my sense of obligation to one whose discoveries have led to the results recorded in this volume as well as in Naukratis vol. I.

Mr. Griffith also was with us for a short time at Naukratis. The results of his special work will be found in the Appendix of this volume, and in the plate which he has drawn (XXIV.). For another plate (XXIII.) we are indebted to the kindness of Mme. Naville.

In preparing the plans of the temples, I have met with the greatest assistance from Professor Middleton, by whose advice I have given them the form in which they now are seen. The general plan (Pl. IV.) is reduced from one made by Mr. Chapman of the Fitzwilliam Museum, which was based upon Mr. Petrie's plan, with such modifications and additions as our later excavations had rendered necessary.

The photographic plates have been executed under my supervision by Mr. Griggs; as they are collotyped directly from photographs of the originals, their accuracy may be relied upon.

I have in the narrative of our season's work referred to the help and kind-

ness with which I have met on every side during my stay in Egypt; it is my pleasing duty to acknowledge especially the consideration I received from Mr. Maspéro and others holding official positions in Egypt, and from Dr. R. S. Poole and other officers of the Egypt Exploration Fund in England.

To the University of Cambridge I am indebted for the grant from the Worts Fund which enabled me to undertake the excavations in Egypt. I have therefore to lay before the University the present memoir as a report of the work for which it equipped me.

Last, but not least, I would acknowledge my obligations to my brother, Professor Percy Gardner of Oxford. To him I owe alike my first impulse to the study of archaeology and the first suggestion of the particular piece of excavation of which this volume is the record. I have also been indebted to him for advice and assistance both during my work in Egypt and during my preparation of its results for publication. I therefore feel that his name fittingly concludes the list of acknowledgments with which I would preface this book.

ERNEST ARTHUR GARDNER.

CAMBRIDGE, 1888.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.—General narrative of the season's work, 1885-6.

SECT.	PAGE
1. Results of the previous season	9
2. Arrangements for continuance of work	9
3. Arrival at Naukratis	10
4. Division of labour	10
5. Discovery of the temple of the Dioscuri	11
6. Discovery of the cemetery	11
7. Discovery of the temple of Aphrodite	11
8. Discovery of the temenos of Hera	13
9. Trial-Trenches	13
10. Sphinx near the Hellenion	13
11. Great walls on N.E. of city	14
12. Alterations in superintendence of work	14
13. Richness of the yield from the temenos of Aphrodite	14
14. Trial pits at Neqrash	15
15. Houses in the town	15
16. Independent diggers	16
17. System of work	17
18. Manner of life	17
19. Packing and despatch of antiquities	19
20. Their condition and later fate	19
21. Previous publication, &c	20

CHAP. II.—The Cemetery.

22. Importance of the cemetery; its probable site	21
23. Its discovery; monuments above ground	21

SECT.	PAGE
24. Nature of graves	23
25. Earthen coffins	24
26. Stone and wooden coffins	25
27. Contents of graves	26
28. Various objects found	27
29. Results	30

CHAP. III.—Temple of the Dioscuri.

30. Plan of temple	30
31. Its decoration and painting	31
32. Objects found	31
33. Age of the temple	31

CHAP. IV.—Temple and Temenos of Aphrodite.

34. Explanation of Plans	33
35. Earliest temple and its appurtenances	33
36. The contents of the earliest temple, and their fate	35
37. Second temple	36
38. Third temple	37
39. Chronological relations of the three	37

CHAP. V.—Pottery from the temenos of Aphrodite.

40. Circumstances of discovery	38
41. Classification of the pottery	38
42. Remarks and conclusions	48

CHAP. VI.—Statuettes from the temenos of Aphrodite.

43. Circumstances of discovery	55
44. Origin and traditions	55

SECT.	PAGE	SECT.	PAGE
45. Male type and variations . . .	56	53. From the temenos of Hera . . .	67
46. Female type and variations . . .	57	54. From elsewhere, on pottery, incised, &c.	67
47. Seated figures, &c.	57	55. From elsewhere, on stone . . .	68
48. Their place in the history of sculpture	58		
CHAP. VII.—Temenos of Hera.		CHAP. IX.—Conclusion.	
49. Temenos and temple	60	56. The age of Naukratis	70
50. Objects found	61	57. The inscriptions of Naukratis . . .	72
CHAP. VIII.—Inscriptions.		58. Results and prospects	74
51. From the temenos of Aphrodite . .	62		
52. From the temenos of the Dioscuri .	67	APPENDIX.	
		Kûm el Hisn, by F. Ll. Griffith . . .	77

CHAPTER VIII.

INSCRIPTIONS.

(51) It will be as well to state at once that the inscriptions found in 1885-6 are not, in importance and antiquity, comparable to those produced by the previous season's excavations: and that they do not throw any light upon the questions that have given rise to some controversy. That controversy cannot be ignored or passed over; but since no new facts are forthcoming which bear directly upon it, to deal with it here would only complicate its issues, and confuse the discussion of the new matter now before us. In the final chapter a few words will have to be said as to the details of the epigraphic evidence, and as to the light they throw on the age of the Greek colony at Naukratis. But at present we are only concerned with the interpretation and the transcription of the inscriptions found in the course of the last season. Here again the temenos of Aphrodite has yielded by far the most interesting and numerous collection. The circumstances of their discovery and the pottery on which they are incised have already been described. The inscriptions themselves will be found upon the large folding plate (Pl. XXI.).¹ They are mostly in the Ionic alphabet; the only exception that calls for special notice is that of the inscriptions 86-93, which are, as we shall see, in all probability Lesbian. If so, they are of great interest, and are by far the most important epigraphical discovery of the year at Naukratis: for hitherto no Lesbian inscription has been known previous to the

general adoption of the Ionic alphabet. Hence both the letters and the dialect are important. But all such matters can best be discussed in immediate connection with the inscriptions to which they refer; I will therefore proceed at once to the transcription of these, adding such notes as may seem necessary or desirable in each case. I do not think I have omitted any inscriptions that are of interest either from their substance or the forms of their letters. Mere repetitions of ἀνέθηκεν and τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ were obviously not worth recording.

INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE TEMENOS OF APHRODITE.

Ornate bowls, painted both inside and out with animals in red on a white ground. (Pl. VI.) 701-705.

701.² Σώστρατος μ' ἀνέθηκεν τῇ ἀφροδίτῃ.

The inscription is also visible on Pl. VI. We find that between the article and noun hiatus, crasis, and prodelision are all allowed; here the second is found (ΤΗΦ); we might equally well have τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ (ΤΗΙΑΦ), or τῇ ᾠφροδίτῃ (ΤΗΙΦ). I shall not again notice these varieties when they occur.

702-5. These may all be parts of a dedication precisely similar to 701; they are all from different fragments of the same bowl, of which only a few scattered pieces were found. 705 is on the outer rim, the rest inside. 702 has much older forms than 701; but the bowl was similar, and the name of the dedicator seems to have been the same in both cases. But we cannot

¹ The inscriptions have, with a few exceptions mentioned, been traced directly from the originals, and then copied by a photographic process. The forms of the letters may therefore be relied on as accurate.

² I begin with this number in order that these inscriptions may be consecutive with the series in Nauk. I., numbered 1-700.

believe that the same man dedicated both at the same period. The complete bowl, which is more careful and ornate in its style, may have been a later offering from the same man, to supersede his earlier gift.

White-glazed Naukratite ware; inscriptions incised on the body of the vase. 706-738.

706. . . . ης ὁ Χῖος. The Chians were among those who shared the privileges granted by Amasis to Naukratis. Her. ii. 178; cf. 757.

707. . . . ιθε(σ)τος ἀνέθηκε[ε τ]ῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ[ι]

708. . . . (μ)αιος ἀνέθηκε

709. . . . ος μ' ἀνέθηκε τῇ[ι Ἀφροδίτῃ] ἐπὶ τῇ. . . .

710. ὁ δέινα ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ

711. Part of a name?

712. Ἰ]υνξ ἀνέθηκε. As that of a daughter of Peitho (see Pape) this name may have been assumed by a Naukratite hetæra.

713, 714. Parts of names?

715. Σ[. . . ἀνέθηκεν τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ. On the bottom of a lamp of the central tube pattern, of white Naukratite ware.

716. Ἐρμό[τιμος ἀνέ]θηκε [τῇ Ἀφρ]οδίτ[ῃ]. This bustrophedon inscription is incised in the body of an ibex painted on this ware; it thus makes a pattern like the natural spots of the beast's skin.

717. Καὶ Ϝος μ' ἀνέ]θηκεν. Ϝ is here used, before ο; the H may be a mere mistake, but we find a peculiar use of this letter at Naxos (I.G.A. 407) and elsewhere.

718, 719. Parts of names?

720. . . . ορος μ' ἀνέ]θηκεν

721. Part of name?

722. Μυσός μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ὀνομακρίτου [τῇ Ἀφρ]οδίτ[ῃ]

723. Ἀσος μ' ἀνέθηκεν. This name is only known as that of a town in Crete.

724, 725. Part of name?

Καλλ]

726. Θαλλ]ίαρχος ἀνέθηκεν

727. Part of name?

728. Τύχων ἀνέθηκεν

729. Ἀρχαῖος ἀνέ]θηκεν τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ. Ἀρχαῖος as a name is new. The ι of the article here seems to be merely elided; if so, we have a fourth variety, beside the three mentioned on 701.

730. Part of name.

731. . . . λέω[ν ἀνέθηκεν

732. Πρωτογέ[νη]ς ἀνέθηκεν

733. Ἀνέθηκεν. This and 738 are given, to show side by side the older and the later form of θ.

734. . . . ναξ μ' ἀνέθηκεν

735. . . . πρῶτον . . . ?

736. . . . ὦν με ἀνέ]θηκεν

737. Ἀράβα[ρχος or Ἀραβα]γύπτιος?

738. See 735.

738*. In any case confused, the consonants being omitted. Perhaps the writer meant μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ἀφροδίτῃ.

White-glazed Naukratite ware, inscriptions painted in brown. 739-747.

739. Ἀφοδίτῃ (sic); the omission of the ρ is a common error, proceeding doubtless from its similarity to half of φ.

740. Ἀφροδίτῃ[ι Θήσαν]δρος. The name is new, but not impossible; or we may restore Διοπε]ίδης ἀνέ]θηκεν.

741. Αἰγύπτι[ος]. This is interesting, if indicating the nationality of the dedicator; cf. the second suggestion for 737. There is no authority for restoring Ἀφροδίτῃ[ι Αἰγυπτί]α; the epithet is, however, applied to Zeus and Dionysus, but only late. See Pape.

742. . . . ηλος μ' ἀνέθηκεν.

743. Ζωίλος or Ζωῖλος; the reading can hardly be doubtful, but the spelling is peculiar: cf. Τύλιος or Τηῖος, Nauk. I. Pl. XXXV. No. 700; the first ι must represent a kind of y sound preceding the vowel.

744. Ὁ δέινα εἰ]δωκε. Such a form of dedication is here unusual; but it seems the simplest restoration.

745. Μικὺς ἀνέθηκεν. This feminine name will bear the same relation to Μίκων and Μικίων as, e.g., Παρμενὺς to Παρμένων and Παρμενίων.

746. . . . ἐπισ ἀνέθηκεν

747. Γα]ληνίω[ν or Γ]ληνίω[ν

Naukratite vases ; inscriptions incised on bottom.

748-761.

748-753 (except 751) are copied, not traced, since the curvature of the bases made it almost impossible to employ the latter process with satisfactory results.

748. Ἑρμῆσιφάνης μ' ἀνέθηκεν τῆφροδίτη. This coils right round the base ; a double stroke is placed between ν and ε, where the second line comes beneath the first.

749. Τῆφροδίτη Φορτύλος ἀνέ[θηκεν.

750. Τῆ Ἀφροδίτῃ Ἑρμαγαθῖνος μ' ἀνέθ[ηκεν ; in the second α the third stroke is probably a mere accident. The first part of a similar name may be seen in 762.

751. Δέρκης [ἀνέθηκε]εν τῆ Ἀ[φροδίτῃ ; cf. Δερκύλος, &c.

752. Τῆς Ἀφ[ρ]οδίτῃ[ς ἀνέθ]ηκεν Ἑρμογένης. The first σ is turned backwards, as sometimes happens in early periods, while the direction of writing is still undecided. The Γ here approaches very near to the Ι form which we know at Corinth, and shows clearly how that form arose.

753. Εὐκλῆς ἀνέθηκεν ἱερὴν τῆφροδίτη. The inscription is continuous round the base, the two asterisks coinciding. The closed η is in one case quite clear : beside the later forms of the same letter and of θ this is very remarkable, and shows how little reliance can be placed on a single form of one letter, apart from other evidence of date. But the form is normal and well known ; it preserves historical characteristics ; and so its appearance here in no way weakens the evidence of other abnormal forms.

754. Ψενδε. . . . ὁ . . . ου ἀνέθ[ηκεν. Ψεν . . . is very common in Ægypto-Greek names ;

it means *the son of*, usually before the name of a deity.

755. Πολύκαρ[πος ἀ]νέθηκεν.

756. Probably a mistake for τῆι Ἀφροδ[ίτῃ.

757. . . . ὁ Χῖος. cf. 706.

758. . . . Τ]εῖσα[μένου υἱός. . . .] κλῆς [ἀνέ-
θηκεν τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ]ι ὁ Τ[ύσιος

759. ? ἐ]κ στρα[τείας ἀνέθηκε]εν ?

760. ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκε]ν ὁ Πει[. . . .φαιδ](ρ)υν-
τῆς ? The last word is no more than a guess. It is known as the title of the officers who had charge of the statue at Olympia, and may have previously been used for temple servants elsewhere.

761. Ἡ δεῖνα Πυλία ἀπὸ [Ἀ. . . . τῇ Ἀφρο-
δίτῃ

Various rough ware ; inscriptions incised.

762-765.

762. Ἑρμαγαθῖνος. This is on a cup like those often dedicated to Hera at Naukratis ; for the name, cf. 750.

763. . . . τιᾶδης. On a jug, rough black glaze.

764. On the handle of a large light yellow amphora, of early type.

765. Ἀφρο[δίτῃ. On a piece of rough red ware.

Cyrenaic vases ; inscriptions incised. 766, 767.

766. Ἀφροδίτῃ Νεγόμεανδρος [ἀνέθηκεν. The name Negomandrus has a Græco-Egyptian look.

767. Ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκεν Ἀφροδ[ίτῃ ὁ Φ[ιλά]-
μ[ωνος] ? The name seems probable for a Cyrenean.

Large bowls, descended from eye-bowl type.

Friezes of animals outside, inside black or red glaze with circles of white and red. 768-770.

768. . . . $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ου} \\ \text{οχ.} \end{array} \right. . . . \text{Ἀφροδίτῃ τῇ ἐ(ν) Nav-}$
 $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{οψ} \end{array} \right\}$

κράτι. This is painted in white letters on the red glaze inside the bowl. It is of the utmost importance, since it proves beyond a doubt

that the pottery of this class was made at Naukratis.

769. Here again we see a closed η ; but 750 is a warning against using it as evidence of date. This and the next are incised.

770. . . . $\mu\eta\varsigma$ με ἀνέθηκε τῇ φροδίτῃ

Flat plates with edges raised, usually painted with animals inside; inscriptions incised, except 774. 771-777.

771. Χάρμ[η]ς με ἀνέθηκεν

772. This and 773 are on a similar light-coloured ware, and may be parts of the same plate. Thus we may read: Ἐρμοκράτης ἀνέθηκε τῇ φροδίτῃ. The writer seems to have made a false start with the first two letters.

774. These letters are painted in light red on the bottom of a plate.

775. Κλεόδημός με ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ.

776. Χάρμ[η]ς με ἀνέθηκε τῇ εὐχολῇ. εὐχολή is especially used for an offering made in fulfilment of a vow. So frequently in Homer; cf. Herod. ii. 63, εὐχολὰς ἐπιτελέοντες. Cf. also C.I.A. 397, &c.

777. Χάρμης με ἀνέθηκε τῇ φροδίτῃ εὐχολῇ.

Χάρμης seems to have dedicated three similar plates—unless, indeed, some of the pieces belong to the same; they are much broken.

Eye-bowl, of more elaborate design than usual; see Plate VII. 1.

778. Ροίφος με ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ. Probably the famous early sculptor, Rhœcus; see chap. vi. § 46.

Large bowls, narrowing towards the top, and with a flat rim, on which the inscription is often incised; sometimes it is incised on the body of the bowl, just below. 779-785.

779. Ὁ δέῃα ὁ . . .] χιδέω ἀνέθηκεν τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ ὁ Τήϊος.

780. Φίλις μ' ἀνέθηκε οὐπικά[ρ]τους τῇ εὐχολῇ. The surface is much worn. Ἐπικάρτης seems a possible variation on Ἐπικράτης.

Apparently τῇ is written twice. The writer made the common slip of omitting the ρ of Ἀφροδίτῃ, and corrected it after writing the σ . For the bowl on which this is inscribed, see Pl. X.

781. Θούτιμός με ἀνέθηκεν

782. Λεωδάμας.

783. Τελοφάνης? I know no other compound name beginning Τελο-. It is difficult to suggest a more satisfactory restoration.

784. Ἐρμοφάνης ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Ναυσίτε[λους].

785. Ὁ δέῃα μ' ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ. Written from right to left.

A very peculiar ware, black throughout, and very highly polished on the surface; decorated tripods, &c., large conical bases, and bowls with a flat rim are the most usual forms; inscriptions incised. 786-793; cf. also 840.

786. Ὁ δέῃα ὁ Μ[α]λοῖς Ἴο. . . . See after 793. Maloeis is an epithet, perhaps local, of Apollo in Lesbos; may it be also used of one who lived by his sanctuary at the place named after him?

787. Τᾷ Ἀφροδίτῃ

788. Ὁ δέῃα κάθ[η]κε τᾷ Ἀφροδίτῃ ὁ Μυτιλήναιος

789. Ὁ δέῃα { (με κά) } { ἦκε ὁ [Μυτιλήναιος] } { (μ' ἀνέ) }

790. Ὁ δέῃα μ[ε] κάθ[η]κε [κε] ὁ Μυτιλήναιος

791. Ὁ δέῃα κ[α]θ[η]κε

792. . . . λη ἐμ[ε] κάθ[η]κε

793. . . . ων ἔ. . . ?

In this series of 8 inscriptions, distinguished from all the rest by the ware they are incised upon, we notice at once some striking peculiarities. Two are almost certainly dedicated by Mytilenæans; a third, 786, by a man of Μαλοῖς,³ a harbour in Lesbos with a temple of Apollo Maloeis, as we learn from Thucydides. All the inscriptions seem to be in the same alphabet and dialect; a dialect which in every

³ The first letter of this word is hardly doubtful; it must be either μ or λ , from the traces left.

way corresponds to what we know of the Æolic of Lesbos. Twice also a peculiar formula of dedication, *κάθθηκε*, is found. Putting all these facts together, we may without rashness conclude that we have here specimens of the Lesbian dialect and alphabet. These are of the greatest importance, as no inscriptions were before known from that island of a date prior to the prevalence of the Ionic alphabet. We may now thus record the Lesbian alphabet; it seems to have no peculiar forms.

α δ ε η θ ι κ λ μ ν ο ω ρ σ τ φ
Α . Δ Ε Ε . . Θ Ι Κ Μ Ν . Ο . Ρ Σ Τ . Φ Φ

As regards dialect, the most important fact to notice is that a double aspirate is used wherever possible; thus we should probably write in Sappho's poems *Σαφφώ* (or *Ψαφφώ*), *καχχέεται*, &c. For these inscriptions are, perhaps, within 50 years of the date of Sappho's writing, and so supply by far the most trustworthy evidence now to be found as to her orthography. It is very remarkable that no *ϕ* appears; we should certainly have expected one in *Μαλόεις*; cf. Maleventum.

Stone; inscriptions incised. 794, 795.

794 is on the back of a limestone statuette, representing a female figure. *Πολύερμος* μ' ἀν[έθηκε] τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ.

795 is on the edge of a limestone dish, found just outside the temenos on the west; the third line is inside the dish.

Εὔ[ς] Ν[ύ]κρατον [ἀφικόμην]ος [Ἀφροδίτῃ]ι Καὶ Φ[ος] ἀνέθηκεν. This is of great importance, from the scarcity of inscriptions that mention the name of the town.

Black and red bowls, mostly plain; inscriptions incised. 796-826.

796. Ἀνέ[θηκε]ν

797. Τῇ φροδίτῃ

798. Δωρὶς φίλτρ[ον] (?) Ἀφροδίτῃ.

799. Ὠχίλος (?) μ' ἀνέθηκε. It is doubtful whether the name is complete or not; in any case it is curious.

800. . . . βράτων με κ[άθηκε]. This is not Ionic, if rightly read; it resembles the Mytilenæan we recently met with.

801. Ἐλε[σ] [σίβιος.
'Ηγη]

802. Ἀφρο[δί]ται. Again non-Ionic.

803. Part of a name?

804. Ἑραγορέ[υς] | τῇ φρο[δί]τῃ | ἡ ό. . . This was found near the top of the excavations, and probably does not belong to the remains of the first temple; but it can hardly, from the forms of the letters, be later than the fifth century, B.C. If so, it is interesting, as showing, perhaps, the earliest known example of true ligatures. (Those of Amorgos are, at least, doubtful, and even if the connecting lines be part of the inscription as intended, they do not produce true ligatures, since the letters combined do not become integral parts of one another.)

805. Τεισά[μενος]

806. Ἰστ[ρία]ιος ἀ[νέθηκεν] . . . ?

807. Ἀφροδί[τα] ό Μ. . . . Non-Ionic.

808. Φυ[λλ]ις ἀν[έθηκεν].

809. Part of a name?

810. . . . λπα ἀ[νέθηκεν].

811. Part of a name?

812. Ἀφροδίτ[η]

813. . . . ποσ Διο. . . .

814. Ἀφροδί[τα] ό Κε[. . .]—not ό Κείος; the dialect precludes such a restoration.

814*. . . . όνης τ[ῇ] Ἀφροδίτῃ

815. Μεγακλῆς

816. Τρωίλος

817. Ὁ δέινα καὶ Χ[ρυσ]όδωρος με ἀνέθ[ηκε]αν.

818. Πανδήμω; sc. Ἀφροδίτῃ. This dedication is arranged on a fragment in such a way that it appears to have been incised after the vase was broken. Perhaps the sherd was used as a label for some articles that would not themselves bear an inscription.

819. Ἀ[ἀκρ]ι[το]ς μ' | ἀνέ[θη]κε | ούρμο-
[θ]ιμ | [ιος] τῇ φροδί | τῃ

820. Ὁ δέινα ἀνέθηκε[ν] τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ.

821. Π[ανδήμω]; cf. 818.

822. Ὑλης ὁ Μυλήρου Ἀφροδίτη. On a black and buff bowl left at Bulak, ornamented inside with concentric circles.

823. Φοῖνιξ

824. Part of a name?

825. Ἀνέθηκε Ζωῖλος Ὡι. . . .

826. Ὅνηαθα? Incised on a vase with male and female dancing figures; in small letters, from r. to l. It may have some connection with the scene.

Black and red; inscriptions painted. All probably Attic, of second half of 6th century, B.C.

827-832.

827. . . . ας ἔγραψεν.

828. Ἐργότιμος ἐποίησεν

829. . . . ἰας ἐποίησεν

It is tempting to join these two, 828 and 829, together, and refer them to Klitias and Ergotimus, the famous artists of the François vase.

830, 831. . . . ἐποίησεν

832. . . . ἀνέθηκα

(52.) INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE TEMENOS OF THE
DIOSCURI.

These do not, for the most part, call for much attention; they are of use to confirm the identification of the site on which they were discovered. See also *Nauk. I.* 665-682.

Black and red ware; inscriptions incised.

833-839.

833-836. Διοσκούροις

837 and 839. Διοσκούροις

838. Ἀλεξιδήιος ἀνέθηκεν. For the name, cf. *Nauk. I.* 667.

Black ware, similar to that on which 786-793 are incised.

840. Νεάρχος με κατέθηκε τοῖς Διοσκούροις. It is curious to find the formula κατέθηκε recurring on this black ware; but the dialect here seems not to be the Lesbian Æolic, which does not drop the final ι of the dative plural, τοῖς being accusative. There are hardly grounds

for attempting such a restoration as would bring this inscription into harmony with that dialect.

(53.) INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE TEMENOS OF HERA.

These again are only of interest as identifying the site.

Black and red ware; inscriptions incised.

841-845.

841-844. Ἡρη

845. Ἡρη

Cup; inscription incised.

846. Ἡρη. If this be the true reading, the inscription is from right to left, and the ρ is inversed. But the first stroke may be accidental, and if so we should read Ἡρη.

Cups; inscription painted.

847. Ἡρη

848. Ἡρη (?)

(54.) INSCRIPTIONS FROM OTHER SITES, INCISED
ON POTTERY.

Painted on black and red ware (Attic).

849-852.

849, 850. Σάνδρος ἐποίησεν.

852. ἐποίησεν.

853, 854. The first painted, the other incised, on the same bowl.

853. Χαῖρε καὶ πίει.

854. Ὑβλης.

855. Φιλιοξένης Διοσκούροις

856. . . . ος Ἀπ[όλλωνι

857. . . . ων Ἡρη

860. Στράτω[ν

861. Σιμία. Late.

862. Ἐρμία[ς]? Late.

862-874. On the bottoms of various vases, mostly black and red.

863. Ἀμεινοκλῆς

864. A Cypriote character like this need not cause any surprise at Naukratis.

865-868. These numerals may have in-

icated measures, but more likely the number of vases in the lot to which they belonged; they denote 50, 10, 6, 10.

874. . . . *Συρακόσιος*. This is on a late vase, with a ribbed surface, and stamped ornaments inside. Hence it can hardly be earlier than Ptolemaic times; thus it indicates that punctuation such as that used here is not necessarily a proof of early date.

875. *Φιλίππου*. This is the owner's name, incised on the body of a large jug; the characters are not earlier than Ptolemaic.

On Pl. XX. will be found the following inscriptions, found in the season 1884-5, and left at Bulak. They are from Mr. Petrie's copies.

876. On the shoulder of a vase, with the pattern given below it. *Ερμαγόρης μ' ἀνέθηκε ὁ Τ[ήσιος] τῶπόλλωνι*

877. *Πύρ(ρ)ος με ἀνέθηκε*. On the rim of a black and red bowl.

878. *Τῶπόλλωνός [εἰμι]*. On a bowl with birds.

879. *Ἀπόλλωνός εἰμι*. On a bowl with birds.

880. *Ἀπολλω*. . . . In a red band of a black and red bowl.

881. *Ἀπόλλωνός εἰμι*. On a scarlet and red (?) eye-bowl. The second λ has been at first omitted, and afterwards inserted.

882. On Pl. xvii. 3, will be found a curious caricature, scratched on the bottom of a vase; round it runs the inscription *Ἀπελλαμονεῖον* and **ΠΙΘΑΚΟ ΜΙΜΗΜΑΙ** *πιθάκου μίμημ' Ἐ*. . . . Thus the satyr-like head, the "image of an ape," is doubtless described as the likeness of some one whom we may suppose to be Apellamon.

(55.) INSCRIPTIONS FROM VARIOUS SITES; ON STONE.

12 and 13.⁴ Two sides of one thin marble tablet. The first is much earlier than the second, and it seems that the tablet may have been reversed and used a second time in the

⁴ This numbering, as well as that of the inscriptions on pottery, continues that of Nauk. I.

fifth century, B.C., the older inscription being no longer wanted. The inscription was found about 100 yards east of the temenos of Aphrodite; but a search in the neighbourhood revealed no further indications of a sacred enclosure.

13. . . . *ος* | *δεκά[την]*; the first letter of the second line must be λ, μ, or α; probably the last; if so, we may read *ἀνέθηκα*.

14. *Ἱερὸν Δ[ὸς] | ἀποτροπ[αίου]*. This has already been referred to as being found in the temenos of Hera.

15. . . . *Ἀ]μμωνίου*. . . . *ἐν σ]υνόδῳ Σαμβαθικῇ (?)*.

. . . . *Καίσαρος φαμενὸς ζ'*.

16. . . . *πολυμόρφ[ω]*.
-*εἶαν ἐδώλην*

Apparently from the basis of a statue, perhaps of Artemis Hecate, whom the epithet fits.

18. *Πολ[εμ]ίαον | Φιλοπάτ[ο]ρα Φι[λάδελ]φον*. Ptolemy X., Anletes, or Neos Dionysus, used these two titles together.

19. *Spes in Deo*. A plaster Amphora stopping, of Christian period.

It will be convenient to notice here one or two inscriptions found at Naukratis previously, and as yet either unpublished, or not included in what has already been published as the product of Naukratis; these I will number in accordance with the plan already adopted.

20. Unpublished; from a copy made by Mr. F. Ll. Griffith.

**ΕΝΘΛΔΕΔΝΜΕΛΙ ΧΕΙΧΩΩΝΠΟΥΛΥΒΟ-
ΤΕΙΡΑ**

**ΤΗΙΟΝΟΣ ΠΑΣΗΣ ΕΥΣΕΒΙΑΣ . ΕΤΟΧΩΣ
ΙΔΕΑΡΕΤΗΣ ΚΛΕΟΣΕΣΘΔΟΝΑΕΙΜΝΗΣΤΟ-
ΝΛΕΤΟΔΕΛΥΤΩΙ
ΜΝΗΜΕΙΟΝΦΑΝΕΡΟΝΤΟΙΣΕΠΙΓΙΝΟ-
ΜΕΝΟΙΣ**

*Ἐνθάδε δ(ῆ) Μελλά[ν] κατε[χ]ει χθὼν πουλυβό-
τειρα*

*Τήιον, ὃς πάσης εὐσεβείης [μ]έτοχ(ο)ς,
(ῆ)δὲ ἀρετῆς κλέος ἐσθ(λ)ὸν ἀείμνηστον (δ)ὲ
τόδε αὐτῷ*

μνημείον, φανερόν τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις. Or in the first line we may read $\Delta(\eta)\mu\acute{\epsilon}(\alpha)[\nu \text{ κατέ}] \chi \epsilon \iota$; with an epigrammatic licence of scansion; thus the too short gap mentioned by Mr. Griffith will suffice.

Mr. Griffith adds the following note: "The inscription is badly cut in soft limestone, letters rather small. The Δ 's seemed to be without the cross-line, but generally the top corner of the Δ was chipped out. A letter has been begun incorrectly after the first E of $E\nu\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$. Four is the number I have put in my note-book as being lost between $MEAI$ and XEI , but the sense seems to require more." The inscription, so far as I can judge, seems to be of good period, neither very early nor very late; there are no data for any more exact statement; the third or second century B.C. is a not improbable period for it. The grammatical construction is possible, if we take $\delta\varsigma$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$ as a parenthesis, and make $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\lambda\omicron\nu$, in l. 3, agree with $Μελίαν$; or it is possible to take $\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ closely with the line before, and make $\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\lambda\omicron\nu$ in apposition to the sentence.

21. Published in the *Academy*, January 3, 1885, from a copy made by Mr. Griffith.
 $\text{Νειλούσσης ἀλόχου τήνδ' εἰκόνα Παρθενοπαΐου}$

$\mu\eta\tau\rho\varsigma \delta' \eta\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma \sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$
 $\omicron\upsilon \phi\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \zeta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\omega\nu$
 $\omicron\iota \sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu \gamma\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu \epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu$

It is not known in which temenos the statue of Neilussa was set up by her sons.

22. Mr. Augustus C. Merriam has published in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. II. No. 2, an inscription in the collection of Mr. Joseph W. Drexel, obtained from Thebes. It runs as follows in Mr. Merriam's transcription:—

$\Upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho \beta] \alpha\varsigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma \Pi\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon[\omicron\upsilon$
 $\mu] \epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\nu \Phi\iota\lambda\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma \sigma\omega\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\omicron\varsigma$
 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \nu\iota\kappa\eta\phi\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\nu, \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\upsilon \nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon \Pi\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\omicron\upsilon,$
 $\Upsilon\iota\sigma\iota\delta\iota \Sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\delta\iota \Upsilon\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$
 Κόμων Ἀσκληπιάδου
 $\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha} \text{Ναύκρατιν.}$

It is doubtful, as Mr. Merriam observes, whether Komon dedicated this tablet at Thebes or at Naukratis. It is no argument against the latter view that no trace was found in the excavations at Naukratis of an association of Apollo with Egyptian deities; for little or nothing was discovered in his temenos that came from Ptolemaic times. For further remarks on this inscription, see Mr. Merriam's paper