

Aphrodite Pandemos at Naukratis

Andrew Scholtz

FROM NAUKRATIS, the Greek *emporion* in the Nile Delta,¹ comes a little-noticed trio of dedicatory inscriptions showing the name “Pandemos” in the dative case.² Two of these were brought to light by Ernest Gardner while excavating the *temenos* of Aphrodite during the second season of digging (1885/6) at the site.³

Πανδήμωι

(Ionian cup ostrakon, inscription incised, *Naukr. II* 66 no. 818 and plate 21)

[Π]ανδήμωι

(Ionian cup sherd, inscription incised, *Naukr. II* p. 66 no. 821)

When in 1898 digging resumed under D. G. Hogarth, a third dedication was found, this time, in an area—one evidently given over to Aphrodite—within a building Hogarth identified as the Hellenion (*cf.* Hdt. 2.178.2–3), in the northeast corner of the excavations:⁴

¹I use the following abbreviations: D. G. HOGARTH, “Excavations at Naukratis,” *BSA* 5 (1898–9) 26–97; A. W. JOHNSTON, *Pottery from Naukratis* (London 1978); A. MÖLLER, *Naukratis: Trade in Archaic Greece* (Oxford/New York 2000); *NAUKR. I*, W. M. F. Petrie, *Naukratis. Part I, 1884–5* (London 1886); *NAUKR. II*, E. A. Gardner and F. L. Griffith, *Naukratis. Part II* (London 1888); M. S. VENIT, *Painted Pottery from the Greek Mainland found in Egypt, 650–450 B.C.* (diss. New York Univ. 1982).

²Outside of excavation reports and the like, occasionally cited, though without comment (*e.g.*, Möller 162 n.595).

³For the Aphrodision, see Möller 102–104; *Naukr. II* 11–15, 33–59, 62–67 plates 2–3.

⁴For the Hellenion, see Möller 105–108; H. Bowden, “The Greek Settlement and Sanctuaries at Naukratis,” in M. H. Hansen and K. A. Raaflaub, edd., *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart 1996) 22–24; F. W. von Bissing, “Naukratis,” *BSRAA* 39 (1951) 75–80; D. G. Hogarth, H. L. Lorimer, *et al.*,

[Ἄφροδι]ίτηι : Πανδήμ[ωι]

(Attic rf volute-krater, London BM 1900.2–14.6, inscription incised, text as in Johnston case 1 no. 40, Möller 237 no. 22. τῆι : Πανδήμ[ωι in Venit 484–485 no. C5 and plate 244; Hogarth 56 no. 107 and plate 4)

For all three inscriptions, a late archaic, possibly very early classical date is reasonably secure.⁵ We are, then, dealing with the earliest attested instances of the epithet⁶—instances seemingly uninfluenced by Athens,⁷ home to a Pandemos whom scholars often treat as paradigmatic for Aphrodite as sponsor of civic unity at *poleis* throughout the Greek world.⁸ Yet context suggests that this model will not work for Naukratis, a locale, as we shall see, more congenial to Pandemos in a non-civic, “general-access” capacity with respect to her clientele and her connection to economic activity at the site.

Civic Pandemos?

We surmise from the shared formulary, yet varied find-context and character of these dedications (an unevenly incised ostrakon, a fairly typical Ionian cup dedication, a fine Attic vase), that the epithet in question, the only one attested for Aphrodite at the site, had achieved some degree of currency

“Naukratis, 1903,” *JHS* 25 (1905) 110, 112–118; Hogarth 28–39. Bowden doubts Hogarth’s identification.

⁵For the archaeological data (find contexts, pottery type), see Möller 90–92, 102–104, 142–143, pl. 8; J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*⁴ (London 1999) 119–120; A. Leonard, *Ancient Naukratis: Excavations at a Greek Emporium in Egypt. Part I: The Excavations at Kom Ge’if* (Atlanta 1997) 9; Venit 484–485; Johnston case 1 no. 40; von Bissing (*supra* n.4) 64; H. Prinz, *Funde aus Naukratis* (Leipzig 1908) 81–84; *Naukr. II* 33–37, 42–43, 48–53, 55–57, 66, pl. 3; *Naukr. I* 18, 20. Lettering for all three dedications is consistent with late archaic/early classical Ionic; cf. L. H. Jeffery and A. W. Johnston, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*² (Oxford 1990) 325–327.

⁶The next attestations are early- to mid-fourth century: Pl. *Symp.* 180D–181C; Xen. *Symp.* 8.9–10; *SEG* XXXVI 1039 (Ionian Erythrae).

⁷Little indication of Athenian involvement at early Naukratis: Möller 47, 123.

⁸For civic Pandemos, see 233–234 and n.14 *infra*; for Athenian Pandemos, V. Pirenne-Delforge, *L’Aphrodite grecque* (Athens/Liège 1994) 26–40.

there by the later archaic period.⁹ As for the role played at Naukratis by an Aphrodite so designated, we need to bear in mind the situation in which she would have found herself, a situation offering scant indication of laws, coinage, assemblies, military—the usual concomitants of Greek statehood. Nor can political autonomy be confirmed for the *emporion* until, at the earliest, the late fourth century B.C.E.¹⁰ Though Herodotus calls it a πόλις (2.178.1), that term is also used by him for various other Egyptian towns and urban centers subservient to royal authority, and lacking civic identity as the Greeks would have understood it.¹¹ Indeed, the Stela of Nektanebis I (380 B.C.E.) suggests that Pharaonic overlordship, *status quo* for the early fourth century, had already had a long history at the site.¹² Thus the “political” context will be difficult to reconcile with explanations like the following:

Both names of Aphrodite [*viz.*, Ourania and Pandemos] are old and widespread cult epithets, but the original meanings were quite different. The heavenly one is the Phoenician Queen of Heaven, and *Pandemos* is literally the one who embraces the whole people as the common bond and fellow feeling necessary for the existence of any state.¹³

This civic-integrative explanation of Aphrodite Pandemos (*i.e.*, as sponsor of synoecism and/or political cohesion), and

⁹Cf. Hogarth 56 on no. 107.

¹⁰See Möller 184–191; Bowden (*supra* n.4) 29–30; T. J. Figueira, “Karl Polanyi and Ancient Greek Trade: The Port of Trade,” *AncW* 10 (1984) 25–26; A. Bresson, “Rhodes, l’Hellénion et le statut de Naukratis,” *DHA* 6 (1980) 291–349; for views *contra*: M. M. Austin, *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age* (Cambridge 1970) 27–33; C. Roebuck, “The Organization of Naukratis,” *CP* 46 (1951) 212–220.

¹¹Möller 184; M. H. Hansen, “The ‘Autonomous City-State’: Ancient Fact or Modern Fiction?” in M. H. Hansen and K. A. Raaflaub, edd., *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart 1995) 21–44.

¹²For the Stela, see Möller 207–208; M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature* (Berkeley 1980) III 86–89.

¹³W. Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, John Raffan transl. (Oxford 1985) 155.

the etymology on which that explanation is based (παῶς “all/whole/every” + δῆμος “body politic/deme”), present obvious attractions and can even seem to capture the epithet’s essence; it has often been adduced with reference to Pandemos’ cult at Athens and elsewhere.¹⁴ Yet in the absence of a formally constituted *demos*, any narrowly civic reading of the epithet proves less than satisfactory.

Commonality

If context is to serve as any sort of guide, the place to begin is Herodotus (2.178.1–3):

Amasis, having become friendly to the Greeks, showed it in various ways to certain of them. In particular, he granted Naukratis as a *polis* to settle for those who came to Egypt. But to those of them who sailed but did not wish to settle there, he granted land for the establishment of altars and *temenē* to the gods. (2) Now the largest, most renowned, and most used *temenos* among them, the one called the Hellenion, was established by the following *poleis* in common: Chios, Teos, Phocaea, and Clazomenae among the Ionians; Rhodes, Cnidos, Halicarnassus, and Phaselis among the Dorians; and Mytilene alone among the Aeolians. (3) This is their *temenos*, and these are the *poleis* that provide *prostatai* for the *emporion*. All other *poleis* that claim a share do so though having none. Apart from that, the Aeginetans have established a *temenos* to Zeus under their own administration, the Samians, another one to Hera, and the Milesians, one to Apollo.

¹⁴Cf. M. P. J. Dillon, “Post-nuptial Sacrifices on Kos (Segre, ED 178) and Ancient Greek Marriage Rites,” *ZPE* 124 (1999) 69, on “the true nature of this divinity”; Pirenne-Delforge, *Neue Pauly* I 840; *OCD*³ 120. For civic Pandemos, see, e.g., R. Parker and D. Obbink, “Aus der Arbeit der ‘Inscriptiones Graecae’ VI. Sales of Priesthoods on Cos I,” *Chiron* 30 (2000) 415–449; Pirenne-Delforge (*supra* n.8) 450; R. Merkelbach, “Volksbeschluss aus Erythrai über den Bau eines Tempels der Aphrodite Pandemos,” *Epiq Anat* 8 (1986) 15–18; E. Simon, “Aphrodite Pandemos auf Attischen Münzen,” *SNR* 40 (1970) 5–19, plates; Sokolowski *ad LSCG* 172, and “Aphrodite as Guardian of Greek Magistrates,” *HTHR* 57 (1964) 1–2; Kruse, “Pandemos,” *RE* 18 (1949) 509–510. Literary evidence for civic Pandemos: Paus. 1.22.3; Apollodorus *FGrHist* 244 F 113. For civic-sexual interpretations, see Pirenne-Delforge (*supra* n.8) 35–40; D. M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York 1990) 104–105; cf. Philemon fr.3 PCG; Nicander *FGrHist* 271–272 F 9.

This first-hand account, though defective in some respects (we read nothing of the Aphrodision), is generally held to reflect arrangements in place from the time of Amasis (ruled 570–526) until Herodotus' day. Noteworthy is the prominence given to *polis-temenos* affiliations. Thus we read of three *poleis* (Aegina, Samos, Miletus), each possessing its own *temenos*, and of nine additional *poleis* (Chios, Teos, Phocaea, Clazomenae, Rhodes, Cnidos, Halicarnassus, Phaselis, Mytilene) that had founded a *temenos* in common (κοινῆ), the Hellenion, control of which was, evidently, a sticking point for *poleis* trading at the site.¹⁵ Interestingly, this attention to affiliations and connections carries over into dedicatory formulae. Thus from Apollo's *temenos* come several dedications (*Naukr.* I 60–62) carrying the epithet *Milesios*, attesting to that god's specifically Milesian associations (cf. Hdt. 2.159.3, 2.178.3). From the Aphrodision comes a dedication "to the Aphrodite at Naucratis" (Ἀφροδίτη τῆ ἐναυκράτι, *Naukr.* II 64–5 no. 768), a phrase particularizing the goddess in local terms. Even the catch-all "to the gods of the Hellenes" (several examples from the Hellenion),¹⁶ though quite general in its field of reference, nonetheless connects divine recipients to the nationality of worshippers.

How would all of this have translated into cult *praxis*? While it is possible that *polis*-affiliated *temenē* imposed certain limits on "non-member" (*i.e.*, non-citizen) participation in temple ritual,¹⁷ so far as we can tell, nothing seems to have deterred the faithful from leaving offerings at any sanctuary of their

¹⁵For the nexus of trade and cult at Naucratis, see Bowden (*supra* n.4) 31–36.

¹⁶Hogarth (*supra* n.4) 116–117, though Bowden (*supra* n.4) 23–24 is skeptical as to restoration.

¹⁷Bowden (*supra* n.4) 28–29; see also C. Sourvinou-Inwood, "What is *Polis* Religion?" in R. Buxton, ed., *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (Oxford/New York 2000) 13–18, and "Further Aspects of *Polis* Religion," 47–51; P. A. Butz, "Prohibitory Inscriptions, Ξένοι, and the Influence of the Early Greek *Polis*," in R. Hägg, ed., *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis* (Stockholm 1996) 75–95.

choosing. Still, it is likely that the single-*polis* foundations mentioned by Herodotus were intended to serve as “branch offices” with a special mission to minister to affiliated citizenries,¹⁸ while the Hellenion could have similarly served its affiliated cooperative much like an amphictyonic sanctuary.¹⁹

As to Aphrodite, her special area within the Hellenion presumably fell under the purview of the *prostatai*, the *emporion* overseers Herodotus mentions.²⁰ But her epithet also carried weight at the Aphrodision, the oldest sanctuary at the site,²¹ and one arguably connected to Chios from an early date.²² Yet Chios provides scant evidence for private cult, and even less for public cult, to the goddess.²³ Whatever that island’s connection to the sanctuary, Aphrodite’s perceived connection to the island likely would not have been as strong as, say, Apollo’s to Miletus, or Hera’s to Samos. On the other hand, Aphrodite’s *temenos* was clearly popular with visitors from a number of localities,²⁴ certain of which accorded the goddess pride of place in cult back home.²⁵

Indeed, at a site as involved in international seafaring and sustained, multicultural contact as was Naukratis, the possibility of a goddess possessing certain “cosmopolitan” traits, and

¹⁸Cf. Egyptian and Kitian *temenē* in the Piraeus (R. Parker, *Athenian Religion* [Oxford 1996] 160 and n.29); Heracles Thasios at Tyre (Hdt. 2.44.3; A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II* [Leiden 1975] II 207–208); the Greek quarter (with temples) at Gravisca, port of Tarquinii (Boardman [*supra* n.5] 206).

¹⁹Bowden (*supra* n.4) 32–33.

²⁰For the *prostatai*, see Möller 193–196.

²¹Möller 104 and nn.108–109, 195; *Naukr. II* 38–54. The *temenos* can now be dated to the late seventh century.

²²Judging by the quantity and antiquity of Chiot material found there: Möller 195 and n.100; Austin (*supra* n.10) 25.

²³For the evidence, see F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte* (Rome 1985) 64–67.

²⁴Besides Chios: Teos, Phocaea, Rhodes, Cnidos, Mytilene, Samos. See Möller 167–176; R. M. Cook and A. G. Woodhead, “Painted Inscriptions on Chiot Pottery,” *BSA* 47 (1952) 161–164.

²⁵For Aphrodite at Cnidos, see E. Miranda, “Osservazioni sul culto di Euploia,” *MGR* 14 (1989) 123–144; for other localities, Tümpel, “Aphrodite,” *RE* 1 (1894) 2748–2751, 2754–2756.

operating within more or less “cosmopolitan” surroundings, needs to be considered. As we shall see, Aphrodite’s presence at the *emporion* had much to do with seafaring. And though I would not press a reductively orientalist view of the goddess, when dealing with maritime Aphrodite in the early period, one cannot simply ignore her eastern counterparts, deities who began to enter the Greek consciousness via trade contacts and immigration,²⁶ and whose maritime significance for Greeks would have been reinforced by repeated voyagings between Greek and Levantine ports.²⁷ Noteworthy therefore are older finds at the site (including those connected with our goddess) which suggest a mix of influences—East Greek, Cypriot, Phoenician, Egyptian—reflecting the situation of Naukratis in relation to Mediterranean trade networks.²⁸ Yet for all that, one would not assign to Phoenicians or Egyptians, or even to Cypriots, a foundational role for “the Aphrodite at Naukratis.”²⁹ Even given the impact of broadly Mediterranean influences, those

²⁶For early Levantine-Greek contacts, see, e.g., Boardman (*supra* n.5) 56–62, 210–216, 273–274; I. Strøm, “Evidence from the Sanctuaries,” in G. Kopcke and I. Tokumaru, edd., *Greece between East and West: 10th–8th Centuries BC* (Mainz 1992) 46–60; J. N. Coldstream, “Greeks and Phoenicians in the Aegean,” in H. G. Niemeyer, ed., *Phönizier im Westen* (Mainz am Rhein 1982) 261–275.

²⁷Astarte *et al.* as concerned with the sea and seafaring (including early evidence): C. Bonnet, *Astarté: Dossier documentaire et perspectives historiques* (Rome 1996) 36, 46, 79; M. Giuffrida, “Afrodite Euploia a Cipro?” *Kokalos* 42 (1996) 342 and n.5; E. Lipiński, *Dieux et déesses de l’univers phénicien et punique* (Leuven 1995) 72, 131; M.-F. Baslez, “Cultes et dévotions des Phéniciens en Grèce: Les divinités marines,” *Studia Phoenicia* 4 (1986) 300–302.

²⁸For this diversity of finds, see Möller 104, 148–166; *Naukr. II* 58 and plates XIV.7, XV.4. Cf. Samos, Rhodes, Crete for diversity of finds and contacts: Möller 83–84; N. Marinatos, “Cult by the Seaside: What Happened at Amnisos?” in R. Hägg, ed., *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis* (Stockholm 1996) 135–139; H. Kyrieleis, “The Heraion at Samos,” in N. Marinatos and R. Hägg, edd., *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches* (London/New York 1993) 125–153.

²⁹Probably no more than a marginal Cypriot presence at Naukratis: Möller 161–163, *pace* W. M. Davis, *GM* 41 (1980) 7–19. No direct Phoenician role there: Austin (*supra* n.10) 28–29, 65 n.3. J. Yoyotte, “Résumé du cours de l’année 1991–1992,” *Annuaire du Collège de France* 92 (1991–1992) 642–644, argues for a settled Egyptian (Egyptianized Greek?) presence at archaic Naukratis; Möller demonstrates the *emporion*’s predominantly Greek character.

influences will have been mediated by a predominantly East Greek clientele.

To connect these data to the epithet under consideration, we should bear in mind that the noun δῆμος did not always carry the political force that it regularly does in classical and later Greek (senses III.–IV. in LSJ). Thus in Mycenaean, it seems to have referred to agricultural districts or the inhabitants thereof, a usage related to that of “land” or “territory” often encountered in Homer (e.g., the πῖονα δῆμον Boeotians inhabit in *Il.* 5.710).³⁰ Yet even Herodotus, referring to the Lydian δῆμος, employs the noun in a sense synonymous (more or less) with χώρα (so Grene’s translation), or else with ἔθνος (1.7.3). As for our epithet, Harpocration (*s.v.* Πάνδημος) glosses that as πάγκοινος, “common to all,” a meaning attested for the common adjective πάνδημος in civic contexts,³¹ non-civic contexts,³² and even “extra-civic” contexts, where the “all” in question extends beyond the *demos* of any single *polis*.³³ Interestingly, the adjective carries this last sense in at least one instance with cultic resonances (σὺν Ἑλλάδος ὀλβίας πανδήμοις ἰκετείαις, “with the general prayers of blessed Hellas,” Philod. Scarph. 113–114; cf. Diod. 4.24.6). So too in Euripides’ *Alcestis*, Heracles claims to have competed in an ἄγων πάνδημος, a “contest open to all,” even, it would seem, to outlanders like himself (1026).

For the question at hand, I would suggest that the evident concern for cultic affiliations at Naukratis, together with what

³⁰See generally *LfggrE s.v.* δῆμος; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique I* (Paris 1968) 273 *s.v.* δῆμος.

³¹πάνδημος ἐκκλησία (“general assembly”) frequent at Roman Olbia: *IosPE* I² 40.6–7, etc., Imperial period. Cf. Plut. *Cor.* 26.3; *Sert.* 16.5; *Demetr.* 38.10; aetiology (Athenian Pandemos) in Apollodorus F 113.

³²πανδήμιος beggar in *Od.* 18.1. Pejorative πάνδημος (“common,” “vulgar,” “indiscriminate”): Aristox. fr.124 Wehrli; Polyb. 3.20.5, 14.7.8; Plut. *Mor.* 96A.

³³ἐκκλησίας δὲ πανδήμου Συρακουσίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων γενομένης, stressing an *ekklesia* including allies in Plut. *Nic.* 28.1 = Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 100.b.1. Cf. instances of πανδημεῖ (“*en masse*”) not confined to the *demos* of a single *polis*: Hdt. 8.40.2; Thuc. 2.31.1, 4.90.1, 5.57.1; Andoc. *De pace* 18.

could be termed the cosmopolitan character of both cult site and cult object, created circumstances under which Aphrodite would have been identified as “common to all” in terms of her perceived community of devotees. Though she was but one of several gods serving the needs of visitors and settlers, her *temenos*, evidently the oldest at the site, lay alongside the Canopic branch of the Nile near what was, arguably, the original landing area for ships.³⁴ Early on, then, she will have carried special associations with a notably fluid and open-ended group of potential worshippers, thus expressing what Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood calls an “open system.”³⁵ Suggestive of cultic patterns is the story told by Athenaeus of how the Aphrodite of Naukratis once received sacrifice and the gift of a statuette from a merchant whose ship she had saved (Ath. 675F–676C = Polycharmus *FGrHist* 640 F 1). While none of the surviving dedications explicitly cites Aphrodite in her otherwise well-attested role as protector of seafarers,³⁶ we do know of one statuette that was offered by its dedicator “upon arrival in Naukratis,”³⁷ and it is likely that that dedication, along with others,³⁸ will have been presented to the goddess in gratitude for, or hopes of, a safe and successful voyage.³⁹ But the point is not that the epithet would have labeled Aphrodite as a distinctively maritime goddess; rather, it is that the “commonality” that is conveyed by the epithet should not be considered apart from the economic life-blood of the *emporion*: seafaring.

³⁴Möller 118.

³⁵Sourvinou-Inwood (*supra* n.17) 47–51.

³⁶For maritime Aphrodite, see Pirenne-Delforge (*supra* n.8) 433–437.

³⁷*Naukr. II* 66 no. 795, offered by Kaikos εἰς Να(ύ)κρατιν [ἀφικόμεν]ος.

³⁸*Naukr. II* 63 no. 717, perhaps from the same Kaikos (similar writing). Cf. Charmes’ two εὐχολαί (“ex-votos”): *Naukr. II* 65 nos. 776, 777.

³⁹Cf. Cook/Woodhead (*supra* n.24) 162 on such dedications “as a kind of insurance with the gods.”

Prostitution

If, as I am arguing, the epithet “Pandemos” emphasized Aphrodite’s broad-based appeal in connection with economic activity at the site in question, then one particular arena for such activity should not be overlooked. For Naukratis was renowned for its prostitutes, whose role in the *emporion* economy is suggested by traditions concerning the celebrated Rhodopis, or Doricha, as Sappho calls her. Thracian by birth, she was herself a commodity transported by sea to Egypt (*i.e.*, to Naukratis). We are told that Charaxus, Sappho’s brother, bought her freedom at considerable cost; Charaxus, according to Strabo, had himself sailed to Naukratis with a cargo of wine. But Rhodopis did not accompany her admirer back to Lesbos; rather, she stayed on at the *emporion* to earn a fortune.⁴⁰

We should expect Rhodopis and others like her at the site to have numbered among Aphrodite’s votaries; that such was the case receives support from the archaeological material. Thus archaic and early classical finds include nude figures of Astarte-type reclining on cushions; these Astrid Möller suggests could be connected to prostitution.⁴¹ Promising as evidence is a dedication from one Iunx, plausibly employing a prostitute’s erotically inflected *nom de guerre*.⁴² Doris labeled her dedication *philtron* (“love potion,” so restored by Gardner, *Naukr. II* 66 no. 798);⁴³ Archedikē, a dedicator at the Hellenion (Hogarth 56 no. 108),

⁴⁰ Hdt. 2.134–135; Strab. 17.1.33. Cf. Sappho 5, 7, 15; Ath. 596B–D; Ov. *Her.* 15.63–70; *P.Oxy.* XV 1800 fr.1. See N. Biffi, “Le storie diverse della cortigiana Rhodopis,” *GIF* 49 (1997) 51–60.

⁴¹ Möller 139 and n.392, 159 and nn.569–570.

⁴² *Naukr. II* 63 no. 712. For *iunges*, see C. A. Faraone, “The Wheel, The Whip and Other Implements of Torture: Erotic Magic in Pindar *Pythian* 4.213–19,” *CJ* 89 (1993) 1–19; for prostitute names, H. Herter, “Die Soziologie der Antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums,” *JAC* 3 (1960) 77.

⁴³ Cf. J. N. Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (London 1997) 197 for the accouterments of sex as a prostitute’s *ex-votos*.

could perhaps be the same as the famous courtesan of that name.⁴⁴

Might then the epithet under consideration have held special meaning for the local Aphrodite in connection with prostitution? While that is not immediately apparent from the physical remains, we at least note the parallel offered by literary sources—notably Plato and Xenophon—employing the epithet to evoke the element of publicity and commonality in *porneia*.⁴⁵ Still, prostitution by no means exhausts possible resonances for a site like ours. Indeed, from Hellenistic Cos comes the intriguing example of an Aphrodita worshipped by brides and seafarers under the dual aspects of Pandamos and Pontia.⁴⁶ But more than that, it remains unclear how, at a place like Naukratis, Aphrodite's commonality would have mattered more to prostitutes than it would have, say, to merchants and ships' captains. For we can expect that the symbiosis of prostitution and overseas trade (*cf.* Rhodopis' career) at the *emporion* would have made Aphrodite's commonality there as much a matter of concern, and along similar lines, to the service sector as to harbor traffic.⁴⁷

Conclusions

Though civic readings of Aphrodite Pandemos may well suit

⁴⁴ Hdt. 2.135.5, Ael. *VH* 12.63, Ath. 596B–D. See Pirenne-Delforge (*supra* n.8) 428–430 for Aphrodite as sponsor of prostitutes.

⁴⁵ Pl. *Symp.* 180D–E; Xen. *Symp.* 8.9–10; Nic. *FGrHist* 271–272 F 9; Theoc. *Anth.Pal.* 6.340; Paus. 9.16.4; Artem. 2.37; Lucr. 4.1071 (*Venus Vulgiuaga*). Publicity and *porneia*: A. J. Graham, "The Woman at the Window: Observations on the 'Stele from the Harbour' of Thasos," *JHS* 118 (1998) 22–40; L. Kurke, "Inventing the *Hetaira*: Sex, Politics, and Discursive Conflict in Archaic Greece," *ClAnt* 16 (1997) 106–150, plates. Pandemos on a medallion from a brothel in the Athenian Kerameikos remains speculative (Pirenne-Delforge [*supra* n.8] 34–40, *pace* U. Knigge, *AM* 97 [1982] 153–170).

⁴⁶ As Pontia by seafarers: Parker/Obbink (*supra* n.14) 429–430; Dillon (*supra* n.14); M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (Rome 1993) ED 178. Coan officials also sacrificed to Pandamos.

⁴⁷ *Cf.* C. Reinsberg, *Ehe, Hetärentum und Knabenliebe im antiken Griechenland* (Munich 1989) 161, for the trade-Hetärentum connection in the early period.

other sites, they cannot easily be made to fit Naukratis. Nor should we reduce Pandemos to some Panhellenic essence, for instance, by privileging civic analyses of the epithet's semantics. Even Plato and Xenophon, however much their preoccupation with Pandemos' sexuality suppresses her political aspects, need not have fabricated a "groundlessly" meretricious Pandemos out of whole cloth.⁴⁸ Although we know too little to draw definite or detailed conclusions about the origins and diffusion of the epithet and associated cult, consciousness of an Aphrodite under the aspects explored above could have found access to port towns via sea-borne trade, with Naukratis and its extensive trade contacts playing a key role in the process early on.⁴⁹

March, 2003

Dept. of Classical & Near Eastern Studies
 Binghamton University
 State University of New York
 P.O. Box 6000
 Binghamton, NY 13902
 ascholtz@binghamton.edu

⁴⁸ As, e.g., claimed by Pirenne-Delforge, *Neue Pauly* I 840. For "vulgar" Pandemos as philosophical foil to Ourania, see further Pirenne-Delforge, "Épithètes cultuelles et interprétation philosophique: A propos d'Aphrodite Ourania et Pandémos à Athènes," *AntCl* 57 (1988) 142–157. V. J. Rosivach, "Solon's Brothels," *LCM* 20 (1995) 2–3, proposes that meretricious Pandemos could have originated in a joke in Old Comedy.

⁴⁹ To the editors, the anonymous reader, Victor Bers, Saul Levin, and to Deborah Boedeker and Kurt Raaflaub, former directors of the Center for Hellenic Studies, where much of the research was done under the Center's sponsorship, χάριν οἶδα.