EARLY GREEK VASES AND AFRICAN COLONIES.

UNDER the above title are included a few remarks upon certain classes of early Greek vases which have been, rightly or wrongly, associated with Naucratis or other Greek colonies in the north-west of Africa. If some parts of the discussions which follow are somewhat controversial in tone, I can only plead the nature of the subject in excuse.

A familiarity with the vase-fragments from Naucratis such as could only be gained by handling them and examining them repeatedly has induced me to distinguish with some confidence classes of vases that were made at Naucratis from those that were not: and I therefore wish to correct or confirm certain views that have been expressed upon this question before they pass into hand-books as accepted facts.

I. *The Polledrara Vase.* Micali, *Mon. Ined.* Pl. IV.

It is a strange misunderstanding that has led to the attribution of this vase to Naucratis; but the attribution has gained so much acceptance, and has been repeated by so excellent authorities,¹ that it seems likely to become generally regarded as an established fact unless a timely protest be entered against it. Such a protest I now wish to make, and to support it by a short examination of the grounds that have led to the connexion of this vase with Naucratis, and of the facts that seem to me conclusive against this connexion.

The first suggestion is due to Mr. Cecil Smith, who writes as follows of the pottery discovered by Mr. Petrie in the first season at Naucratis, 1884—5 (*Nauk.* I. p. 49): 'There is, however, one class of undoubtedly early ware which I am particularly interested to find at Naucratis: in the *Hellenic Journal*, vol. vi. p. 188 and note 2, I mentioned a series of vases from Rhodes of which the clay is black all through, with particles of some shiny mica-like substance in its composition; these are covered with a metallic brownish-grey glaze, and are painted with decorations in scarlet or purple and a colour which has usually faded, but which seems to have been white: thirteen of these were included in the recent Biliotti sale of antiquities from Rhodes, and are briefly described in my catalogue of that collection, Nos. 2—8. I there ventured to call them the 'Polledrara' style, because the great Polledrara

¹ E.g. Dümmler, *Mittheil. d. deutsch. Inst. Vasenkunde*, p. 1957 (v. R.).
Rom., 1888, p. 165; Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, art.

hydria in the British Museum (Micali, *Mon. Ined.* pl. iv.) may be considered as the most important type of that style; on it we have represented in polychrome colours, and in an evidently Egyptian dress, the Greek myth of Theseus and the Minotaur; the usual patterns on the other vases of this style are the lotus and Maeander; and when we remark the tendency everywhere prevalent at Naucratis to polychrome decoration, and the Egyptian character of the 'Polledrara' ornament, I think we have fair ground for assigning this fabric to a Naucratican origin. From the Diary of Excavations in Rhodes I gather that this ware is usually there found with early objects of Phoenician workmanship; judging from this and from the archaic character of the other objects from the Polledrara tomb, I should say that this is the earliest of the fabrics represented at Naucratis.'

Such is Mr. Cecil Smith's argument; but it seems that those who have followed him in attributing the 'Polledrara' ware to Naucratis have been chiefly influenced by the polychrome decoration on a black ground which is found on the inside of Naucratic vases (as in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1887, pl. LXXIX.). We have then three points to consider: (1) the ware, (2) the colours used, and (3) the subject and style of the representations.

(1) The ware, which is black throughout, and not only on the surface, need cause no surprise when it is found in Etruria. The Etruscan ware, black throughout, is well enough known with decorations and figures in relief; and there is no essential difference in its nature because the decoration is applied in painting. We need not then necessarily suppose the vase found at Polledrara to be an importation from the East because the ware is black. On the other hand the nature of the ware does not preclude an Eastern origin, though I think it does preclude a manufacture at Naucratis.

The number of the black fragments found by Mr. Petrie in 1884—5, and described in the above paragraph by Mr. Cecil Smith, was very small; the similar vases found in Rhodes seem to be comparatively numerous. Now of vases we know to have been made in great quantities at Naucratis extremely few have been found in Rhodes.¹ If therefore a class of pottery found in considerable numbers in Rhodes is found only in a few fragments at Naucratis, we may fairly conclude that this class was not made at Naucratis, but either in Rhodes itself or more probably in some place that had more traffic with Rhodes than with Naucratis. Such seems to me the natural conclusion from the discoveries of 1884—5, which were before Mr. Smith when he wrote. In 1885—6 I obtained new evidence, which seems to tell us what the place was whence the export to Naucratis, and perhaps also to Rhodes, must have been made. In *Naucratis* II. p. 47 I mentioned several fragments and some almost complete vases or jugs of this black ware dedicated to Aphrodite; some of these bore inscriptions, all in the same alphabet and dialect, apparently Aeolic, and certainly not that of Naucratis itself: in two or three cases

¹ I know only of two in the Louvre, perhaps one in the British Museum, and one at Berlin. Perhaps others exist; but they cannot be many. Fragments of a Naucratic vase have

also been found by Dr. Gräff among the pottery on the Acropolis at Athens; otherwise I do not know of exported examples.

the dedicator actually describes himself as a Mytilenaeon.¹ Since all these black fragments are clearly incised by people from the same place, and that place is fixed by some of the dedications as Mytilene, we can hardly be wrong in believing that the ware itself must be of Mytilenaeon manufacture; otherwise it is hard to explain why these Lesbians should have dedicated this ware and no other, and why none but Lesbians dedicated this ware. Herodotus expressly states that Mytilene was the only Aeolian state that took part in the colonisation of Naucratis. Assuming then that these black fragments from the temenos of Aphrodite are of Lesbian origin, we must next consider the other black fragments from Naucratis and the vases from Rhodes in the new light we have gained from later discoveries.

It must in the first place be recorded that few if any traces of colour were to be found upon the fragments dedicated by Lesbians to Aphrodite; while those found in 1884—5 had decorations in white and red, like the similar vases from Rhodes. But the presence or absence of colouring in purely decorative designs is an accident, possibly merely due to conditions of preservation, which is of small importance compared with the identity of the very peculiar black ware, unparalleled, to my knowledge, in the East in this period. I think then that we are justified in regarding all the black fragments from Naucratis, and probably also the vases from Rhodes of similar fabric, as the products of a single Eastern factory, and in applying to all alike the evidence we have found to help the attribution of one set of them to its true origin.

Without the new evidence of 1885—6, we were led to the conclusion that this black ware 'was not made at Naucratis, but either in Rhodes itself or more probably in some place that had more traffic with Rhodes than with Naucratis.' Our new evidence leads us just one step farther, and tells us what that place was. Of the traffic between Mytilene and Naucratis we know both from the statement of Herodotus already referred to and from the stories about Sappho and Rhodopis: Rhodes is a natural stopping-place between the two, and so Lesbian vases need cause us no surprise if they are found both in Rhodes and in Naucratis. In the recent excavations on the Acropolis at Athens a few small vases of the 'askion' shape have been found without colour, but showing a black ware practically identical though of somewhat coarser fabric; the clay when broken is black throughout: to these vases my attention has been called by Dr. Brückner. I see no reason why these should not also have been imported from Lesbos: no such black ware is known as Attic; and the rivalry between Athens and Mytilene on the Asiatic coast may probably imply some traffic between the two.

We have now the facts pretty clearly before us as to the discovery of this peculiar black ware in the Levant; and we see that if the great Polledrara hydria really were an importation from the East, we should have to assign it not to Naucratis but to Mytilene, judging merely from the nature of the ware of which it is made. Taking this as the result of the first section

¹ *Naucratis II*. Pl. xxi. 786—793, p. 65.

of our investigation, let us now proceed to the second section, and consider the colours used.

(2) If we confined our investigation on this point of polychromy to the colours we find on the black ware, it would be a comparatively simple matter: the decorative designs we find on the Lesbian ware are in white and red only, the latter varying from scarlet to purple. But it is clear that those who have been induced by the remarkable polychromy of the Polledrara hydria to connect it with Naucratis, have had in view not merely the purely decorative designs in red and white that we find upon the black ware, but also the polychromatic figure-painting of the real Naucratis vases. We must therefore include in our present comparison those vases, made at Naucratis itself, of which specimens are reproduced in colour on Plate LXXIX. of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1887; and in black and white only in the Plates of *Naucratis*, part II. The polychromy of these vases has a character of its own; and it is of a different nature on the inside and on the outside. On the inside it is invariably on a black ground; hence the comparison with the painted black ware is obvious. The designs are purely decorative, mostly lotus and palmetto, and are always in red and white; thus they certainly show a distinct resemblance to the black Lesbian fragments, and it is very probable that an influence is to be inferred either of Mytilene upon Naucratis or of Naucratis upon Mytilene, an influence probable from the relations we know to have existed between the two. But the blue, brown, red and white figure-painting of the Polledrara hydria is quite another matter, and I fail to see any resemblance in style or appearance. The figure-painting which we find occasionally on the outside of Naucratis vases is on a white or cream-coloured ground in brown, white and red; but blue is never used; and it is the appearance of blue that is the most remarkable feature of the Polledrara hydria. Here again, then, no real analogy can be found.

I must mention here some other fragments found at Naucratis which show painting in white and possibly other colours on a black ground, the ground being a black glaze applied over ordinary red pottery, and not the natural colour of the ware. Only two or three fragments were found (my type J, *Nauk.* II. p. 47), and there is not the slightest reason for supposing them to have been made on the spot. The subjects seem to be in some cases animal forms, the technique most closely resembles that of some similar vases that have been found on the Acropolis. This pottery however, but for the application of white and other colours on a black ground, does not show any connection with the style either of Naucratis or of Lesbos or of Polledrara.

So far then as concerns the colours used, the evidence for connexion between Polledrara and Naucratis is no more conclusive than that from the nature of the ware: in particular we note the absence of blue at Naucratis, and its presence on the Polledrara vase; and the appearance and manner of application seems totally different.

(3) We must next proceed to the style and nature of the representations; and this consideration must finally decide the question, especially when the technical evidence is so inconclusive. Here too we have two divisions to

discuss, the decorative treatment and forms, and the figures, human and other. I do not believe that in either of these it will be found possible to find any essential characteristic upon the Polledrara hydria which occurs also upon the pottery we know to have been made at Naucratis.

The purely decorative forms on the Polledrara hydria consist of lines in red, white, and blue, rays in red, maeander and lotus in red, white, and blue.

But the maeander when it appears is only in isolated members, not in a continuous band; and these isolated members are in red and blue alternating, or in white and blue alternating—an arrangement absolutely unknown at Naucratis. The lotus band has only buds, no alternating flowers or palmettos, such as we find invariably on Naucratis pottery, and it has dots above and below, also unknown at Naucratis. But it is in the use of the colours here that the contrast is greatest: while in the Naucratis ware the decorative effect is carefully calculated, the white and red on the black ground having distinct organic parts assigned to them in the composition, on the Polledrara vase we find an indiscriminate use of red, white, and blue which gives a confused and ill-assorted appearance to the whole—the connecting stems are white, the buds white and blue alternately, and the dots above are red, those below blue. The lotus is also scattered indiscriminately about the field—a thing we never see at Naucratis, where the ground is filled with the conventional rosettes, swastikas, &c. of the 'oriental' style, but no distinctly floral form is ever met with. On the other hand, flowers in the field are common enough in some early vases, those for instance of Melos and Phalerum, and the lotus especially in the Caere vases quoted by Dr. Dümmler, and the imitations made in Etruria.

Another peculiarity of the Polledrara ware, the grotesque faces on each side of the handles, is unlike anything at Naucratis, where harmony of colour and design was clearly thought more of than any such quaint devices.

But it is in the figure scenes above all that the essential difference of the Polledrara vase shows itself. At Naucratis we have no mythical scenes, no chariot groups, no horses, hardly any human figures: we have simply in their most elaborate decorative forms the beasts and fantastic creatures, sphinxes, gryphons, &c., in which the 'oriental' style of vase-painting delights. Now on the Polledrara hydria we have these subjects only incidently introduced, as on all early vases: the main subjects are horses and chariots, and men and women—the same subjects that occur on the later Dipylon vases and on that large class of early Greek vases that does not draw its subjects from the fantastic oriental types, but from life and mythology. This distinction is, to my mind, essential and final; and we may accordingly assert without any hesitation that the Polledrara hydria was not made at Naucratis, and shows no affinity with Naucratis fabric, colouring, decoration, or subjects. For the black ware there is no need to go outside Etruria; and for the figures and decorations represented upon it we have to seek elsewhere an analogy.

II. *Vases from Caere.*

In an article published in the *Mittheilungen* of the German Institute at Rome for 1888, Dr. Dümmler discusses, in commenting on some fragments of a vase from Cyme in Asia Minor, a whole class of vases found at Caere which show similar characteristics. He then proceeds farther to infer that these vases found at Caere are imported from Asia Minor, and to mention a class of vases made in imitation of them by local vase-painters in Etruria. It is not my wish at present to enter upon the difficult discussion of the distinction between the Italian imitations and the Greek models from which they are copied, nor even to consider in general the origin and affinities of those models; Dr. Dümmler has made out a strong case for their connexion with certain Ionic vases, with which they have many peculiarities in common. His suggestion also, that the channel by which this influence reached Etruria is to be sought in the flight of the Phocaeans, and their foundation of the colonies of Velia and Massilia, also appears highly probable. The first and best known of this series of vases, which Dr. Dümmler regards as an importation from the East, is the famous hydria from Caere with Heracles and Busiris. On this and other vases are noted traces of a familiarity with Egypt which seems to prove an intercourse between that country and the Greek town where the vases were made, and by all these considerations Dr. Dümmler is led to propound two alternative hypotheses,¹ as follows:—

‘(1) The Caere vases come from Phocaea; thus will be explained alike the Rhodian elements, and the familiarity with Egypt through participation in the colonisation of Naucratis. In that case the fragments from Cyme will show a local variety of the style, and the Italian group quoted will show the decadence of this same style, which may probably have been transported by means of the Phocaeans at Elea.

‘(2) The fragments from Cyme are an importation from Phocaea. In that case the hydriae from Caere will represent an impetus of the same style in the colony of Naucratis; we must hold the same view of the Italian vases as in the former case.’

Against the first of these hypotheses I have no definite objections to raise, though it does not appear in all respects convincing: it is against the second that I wish to enter a protest. In our excavations at Naucratis we have found an extremely large number of vase fragments, both of pottery made at Naucratis and of imported ware, and among these were no specimens at all of vases like the hydriae of Caere. It may be objected that the vases we found almost all belong to an earlier period, or at least to an earlier stage in the history of vase-painting. But in this earlier stage we saw no trace whatever of any tendency towards the style and character of representations

¹ *Art. cit.* p. 179.

which we see on the vases from Caere. And moreover we had very strong negative evidence against the manufacture of any class of local vases at Naucratis after the end of the sixth century: the Persian invasion of Egypt in 525 B.C. seems to have been a fatal blow to the prosperity of the town; and after the destruction of its temples, which is almost certainly to be assigned to this time, it is hardly possible that other and quite different styles of vase-painting can have arisen; no examples were found of any distinct local class belonging to the period after the Persian invasion; and hence it is highly improbable that any existed—much more that a remarkable class exported in such numbers to Italy was manufactured at this time in Naucratis. But Dr. Dümmler's suggestion, thrown out only as one of two alternatives, and not supported by any definite evidence, would probably not be insisted on even by himself in the face of the facts just adduced, and I have no desire to carry this controversial argument any farther; my only desire is that if any archaeologists wish to pursue the subject farther, and to argue from his results, they should at least set aside this his second alternative as in the highest degree improbable.

Another affinity, however, is worth mentioning. The grotesque dancing satyrs of the Caere vases have as little in common with Naucratis as with several other classes of early vases. The type of dance which we see for instance on Pl. xi. of *Naucratis*, II. is no more like those on vases from Cyme or Caere than are similar representations on vases of Corinth, Cyrene, &c. But I think a closer resemblance to this Asia Minor type of satyr may perhaps be seen on the vases found by Mr. Petrie at Daphnae, in Egypt, and reproduced in the plates of his volume on Tanis II., Nebesheh, and Defenneh. If we are searching for the origin of the Egyptian subjects and characteristics sometimes met with on the Caere hydriae, it seems that the Asiatic Greeks who held, as mercenaries, the military post of Daphnae, must be regarded as supplying a more probable channel of influence than the colonists of Naucratis. I would not go so far as to suggest that the Caere hydriae were made at Daphnae: but the affinity between the two styles is, I think, close enough to justify the assumption of some connexion and influence. It is remarkable that the two Greek centres of the Delta, Daphnae and Naucratis, seem to have so little in common in the style of their vases. At Daphnae the potters seem to have been more given to reproducing Egyptian forms and subjects; thus even from this point of view it offers a more likely channel than Naucratis for the influence we see in the Caere vases; and when the affinity in the treatment of Asiatic Greek subjects is also considered, the evidence becomes extremely strong for the connexion. For intercourse between Daphnae and Phocaea, or whatever place the Caere vases were made at, I do not know of any positive evidence, apart from that of the vases. But I think the probability is strong enough to be worth suggesting: else the Egyptian influence on the Caere hydriae is by no means easy to explain.

III. *Cyrenaic Vases.*

As regards the Cyrenaic vases, I wish to make an important addition to my statement on p. 51 of *Naukratis*, vol. ii. I there pointed out the essential difference between the Cyrenaic pottery and that which we know to have been made at Naucratis; and I also stated that I believed there was no evidence for assigning the fabrication of the Cyrenaic pottery to Naucratis; while the evidence for the attribution to Cyrene was increased by later discoveries. I regret that I was not aware, in time for insertion in my book, of another fact which seems to finally decide the question. So long as the only positive evidence for the connexion of this pottery with Cyrene was the cylix with Arcesilas and his silphium, the subject might be regarded as an accident. But another distinctly Cyrenaic subject would decide the matter; and such a subject has been both ingeniously and, I think, rightly identified by Dr. Studnicska¹ in the inner design of the cylix found by Mr. Petrie, and reproduced in *Naukratis*, i. pl. viii. and ix. Dr. Studnicska shows that we have in the middle not a tree, but a female standing figure with long hair, holding in her hand the silphium and a branch of the apple-tree of the Hesperides—both symbols known on coins of Cyrene. This figure is doubtless the nymph Cyrene herself; and so we have another and even more certain proof that the vases belong to her town. I believe Dr. Studnicska intends to publish both this and other arguments in his forthcoming work on Cyrene, a work awaited with great interest by scholars. Meanwhile I only desire to rectify an omission, and to acknowledge at once the correctness of an interpretation which I only passed over before because it had not, unfortunately, come under my notice.

ERNEST ARTHUR GARDNER.

¹ Meeting of the Arch. Gesellschaft in Berlin, 24 Dec. 1887, p. 1646.
2 Nov. 1887. Cf. *Berlin. Philol. Wochenschrift*,