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1. Discovery of the pottery

The amount of Late Period Egyptian pottery from Naukratis in museum collections is surprisingly small, in spite of considerable quantities having been encountered in the excavations of Petrie and Hogarth. Coarse red Egyptian wares could not match the attractiveness and interest of the fine Greek painted pottery that covered the site, and consequently most of the Egyptian material was left behind. Incidental comments by the excavators show that local Egyptian pottery was abundant. Petrie mentions ‘native pottery of the same period over the whole place’ (Petrie 1884–5, 63), and also remarks on the presence of ‘very coarse, thick, red pottery’ in the deep burnt stratum which constitutes one of the oldest levels in the town (Petrie 1886a, 21). Hogarth initially dismissed this layer, which contained much plain Egyptian pottery, as ‘a burnt stratum of charcoal and ash containing no sherds but rough kitchen ware’ (Hogarth et al. 1905, 107). Nevertheless, a few vessels from his work were actually illustrated (see below Fig. 9). Both Petrie and Hogarth believed that the earliest part of the site, perhaps predominantly Egyptian in character, lay at the south (Petrie 1886a, 21; Hogarth et al. 1905, 107). This seems plausible given that we now know this area was the location of the Egyptian temple. Nevertheless, the Egyptian Late Period pottery was not restricted to this area, having also been found in deep levels around the Apollo sanctuary (Petrie 1886a, 19, 20). The dating of the ceramics in both these locations to the Late Period is reinforced by the presence of examples of contemporary Cypriot basket-handled amphorae, which according to Petrie were very common at Naukratis (Petrie 1886a, 23; for these vessels, see the chapter on Transport amphorae).

The more recent discovery of Late Period pottery in the fieldwork by Coulson and Leonard in the 1970s and 1980s long remained unnoticed owing to the true significance of the material not being recognized. This pottery, mostly from deep levels in the South Mound associated with remains of the enclosure wall of the Egyptian temple of Amun-Ra, was included with the pottery from later periods in the publication by Andrea Berlin, but not all of the early sherds were correctly dated and some were simply drawn without any comment (Berlin 1997a, 151, 153, figs 6.1 and 6.2). The case for an early date for this group of pottery has been made more extensively in an earlier article (Spencer 2011).

2. Discussion

Despite the small size of the extant sample of Late Dynastic pottery, there are within it some very typical shapes for the period. These diagnostic pieces are key to dating the assemblage, although some of the other sherds are so small as to reveal little of the shapes of the vessels from which they came.

1 Unless otherwise indicated, all images in this chapter are © Trustees of the British Museum.
2.1 Platters

Although thick, circular platters are common among Egyptian pottery of the Late Period, hardly any were recorded or collected at Naukratis. The majority of these objects are made of very coarse Nile silt clay and, particularly when found broken up, must have seemed deeply unattractive when set beside fine Greek painted ware. It is likely that examples were present among the ‘red ware’ and ‘rough kitchen ware’ mentioned by Petrie and Hogarth, but left on site. A single possible platter-fragment was brought back to the British Museum (1886,0401.95), probably on account of it bearing part of a graffito. This fragment consists of Nile siltware with a pink slip on the upper surface only, and has a low, rounded rim (Fig. 1). There is always a possibility that apparent fragments of platters may have come from lids, although in the case of this particular piece the completely flat underside makes identification as a platter more likely. Another platter is illustrated from Leonard’s excavations (Berlin 1997a, 151, fig. 6.1.10); this piece is thick and heavy with a flat top and plain edge, but platters with a distinct outer rim (like the British Museum piece described above), shaped in a variety of ways, were more usual (Spencer 1996, pl. 61, range of type A.1). They were usually manufactured on the ground, from which the underside acquired a rough imprint. The discovery of numerous examples in proximity to ovens suggests that they may have been used for laying out bread as it was removed from the oven (Spencer 1993, 47; Wilson 2011b, 172, pl. 75).2 One large open vessel excavated by Leonard at Naukratis (Berlin 1997a, 153, fig. 6.2.9) had a pronounced rim and could be regarded as a bowl, but the fact that it was made in silt clay and is described as ‘hand-made’ suggests that it belongs with this group.

Better-made platters were produced in cream-coloured marl clay or in silt clay with a pale surface slip, as finer pieces for probable indoor use. There are no good examples recorded from Naukratis, only a rather irregular one of fairly modest diameter, now in the Spurlock Museum, Champaign, Illinois (inv. 1912.01.0014). This is made of pale silt clay. Examples of larger diameter were found at Tell Dafana (Leclère and Spencer, 2014, 99, nos 23867, 23686, pl. 31). These have a very low ring-foot and their upper surfaces may be either truly flat or slightly concave, while other versions existed with a raised rim (Fig. 2).

Distantly related to the platters, but with a distinct and different function, are mortaria, thick-walled wide and shallow grinding-bowls, which occur frequently in Late Period Egypt.3 The shape originated in Cyprus (see Villing 2006; Spataro and Villing 2009), and the examples found in Egypt include both imports and local copies. For the latter, the Egyptian potters used yellowish marl clay to imitate the appearance of the Cypriot fabrics. Of the 20 fragmentary mortaria of Cypriot, flat-based type from Naukratis now in the British Museum (see Villing 2006 and the chapter on Local pottery production), at least one example was shown with the help of NA analysis to consist of Egyptian marl fabric. 6th century BC, (Monsen sample Nauk 18: NAA group Marl). British Museum, 1910,0222.15

---

2 Bread trays have a long history and continued to be made down to Roman times (Tomber 2013).
3 On the use of mortaria, see Villing 2006; Villing and Pemberton 2010. For examples, see Petrie 1915, pl. xi, no. 2; Holladay 1982, 109, pl. 16, nos 7, 9; Oren 1984, 18, fig. 21, nos 9–10; Spencer 1996, pl. 62, no. 55; pl. 86, no. 15; Deferez 1997, pl. II, fig. 5, nos 23–4; Aston 1999, 238, pl. 75, no. 2082; Hummel and Schubert 2004, 172, pl. J, nos 2 and 5; Aston and Aston 2010, pl. 49, no. 464; Leclère and Spencer 2014, 100, nos 23685, 23706, pl. 31; Thomas 2014a, 183, fig. 124, C.2022, 2263–4, 2376, 3058; Marchand 2014, 187, figs 18–19.
analysis to have been locally produced (Fig. 3 here, and see Villing 2006, 40–1, no. 17, fig. 23). All these examples bear votive inscriptions that were doubtless the reason for their retention. One more coarse marl clay mortarium has been published from Leonard’s excavations at Naukratis (Berlin 1997a, 153, fig. 6.2.1).

2.2 Dishes and shallow bowls

The dishes and bowls recovered or documented from Naukratis are more numerous than the platters. The fact that some of the small examples were found complete may explain why they were collected, as an intact vessel is far more likely to be kept as a potential museum object. There are five examples of miniature dishes (or possibly lids), four in the British Museum (1888,0601.735,a–d) and one in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (RES.87.239). All these pieces are very similar to one another, with diameters of about 7cm, rounded, plain rims and rough bases. Saite parallels are known from Mendes (Wilson 1982, pl. xx, nos 1–2) and Tell Dafana (see M. Abdel Maksoud in Leclère and Spencer 2014, pl. 82). A slightly larger dish of similar type is kept in Warrington Museum and Art Gallery, under number 1888.57.154. It has a flared shape and a string-cut base (here Fig. 4, cf. Leclère and Spencer 2014, 103, no. 23680, pl. 33).

More substantial bowls begin with an example in the Fitzwilliam Museum (E.20.1909), which has a rounded base, concave sides and a plain, rounded rim. The vessel is rather irregular, a not uncommon feature of Late Period pottery manufacture (cf. Spencer 1993, pl. 47, type A.3.10; Aston 1999, 222, 225, pl. 69, fig. 1980). In addition to the use of plain, uncoated fabrics, Late Period bowls were frequently red-slipped, as with the two fragmentary bowls (British Museum, 1965,0930.501 and .502). These two vessels are simple open bowls of very common type. The red slip has been pebble-burnished to create a striated effect, a well-attested feature of the Saite Period (Leclère and Spencer 2014, 100, no. 23664, pls 32, 58; 101, no 23663, pl. 32). Another possible example was found in Hogarth’s excavations (Hogarth et al. 1905, fig. 3, centre of 1st row).

Similar open bowls occur among the published material from Leonard’s excavations (Berlin 1997a, 151, figs 6.1.3 and 6.1.12; cf. Spencer 1996, pl. 63, type A.5.38) and in the recent fieldwork by the British Museum (below Fig. 14). Another bowl in Berlin’s figure 6.1.11 is of the same basic shape but with thicker sides and rim. Somewhat finer products are illustrated in her figures 6.1.9, a steep-sided bowl with an external rim (cf. Spencer 1993, pl. 54, type A.4.49), and 6.2.5, a carinated bowl made from pale marl clay.

Among the dishes and bowls are some special products, comprising a few vessels with separate interior compartments. The first of these (British Museum 1886,0401.1546) is a rough, oval tray with the interior space divided into two parts by a central partition. A similar vessel of larger size is recorded from a 5th-century BC context at Tell el-Balamun (Spencer 1999, 44 and pl. 103, 3). The others are more complex circular vessels with multiple interior compartments (British Museum 1888,0601.736 and 1909,1201.22, see Fig. 5). Another very similar example from Naukratis was discovered by Hogarth (Hogarth et al. 1905, fig. 5, no. 4. The type is also noted at Elephantine with a date of the 7th century BC (Aston 1990,
Deep bowls

Egyptian bowls of greater depth or diameter are also attested from Naukratis, again chiefly in silt fabrics. Drawings of several varieties from the Coulson–Leonard fieldwork have been published, and these may be rearranged by type for consideration in the following sequence:

Berlin 1997a, 151, 153, figs 6.1.6 – 6.1.2 – 6.1.8 – 6.2.10 – 6.2.4 – 6.1.4 – 6.1.5 – 6.1.7 – 6.2.3 – 6.1.1 – 6.2.2 – 6.2.15.

The first of these, Berlin’s figure 6.1.6, is a flared bowl with an external rim (cf. Spencer 1993, pl. 45, types A.2.25, A.2.28). The vessel in figure 6.1.2 has a slight external rim, and may be compared with Late Period examples from Mendes and Elephantine (Wilson 1982, pl. xvii, no. 4; Aston 1999, 211–12, pl. 65, fig. 1909). The bowl in figure 6.1.8 has slightly convex sides and a grooved rim, while that in figure 6.2.10 has an incurved rim (compare Wilson 1982, pl. xvii, no. 2). In Berlin’s figure 6.2.4 the sides converge to an external roll-rim. All these shapes are within the range of known types for the Egyptian Late Period. Another bowl of this class was found by Hogarth (Hogarth et al. 1905, fig. 5, no. 6).

The vessels in Berlin’s figures 6.1.4 and 6.1.7 are all deep bowls with plain rims, a very common utilitarian form. The bowl in her figure 6.1.5 is similar, but had an internal ledge within the mouth. This was broken off, apparently, so its function remains unclear. Figure 6.2.3 shows a deep vessel with a broad, external rim, which resembles a simplified version of the moulded rims on the deep vessels shown in figures 6.1.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.15. These three are all examples of a common type that seems to have appeared in the 7th century BC and continued to be produced with little change through the 26th dynasty, on into the Persian period and down to Ptolemaic times (Fig. 6). Such longevity of form is also apparent in other Late Period vessels, from bowls to jars, the styles of which were not totally replaced until the end of the 3rd century (Marchand 2013, 243–6, figs 9–14). The characteristic rim profile of deep vessels like those in Fig. 6 shows a range of minor variation (Spencer 1996, pl. 65, type C.4).

Complete specimens, such as British Museum EA22347 from Tell Dafana, show that at least some vessels of this type were open at the base, so Petrie thought they might have functioned as sinks (Petrie 1888, pl. xxxiv, 37; Leclère and Spencer 2014, 107, no. 22347, pl. 36), while Aston has suggested use as funnels (Aston and Aston 2010, pl. 3, no 38; pl. 22, no. 181) and Thomas considered them to be pigeon-pots (Thomas 2014a, 182). This may have been their original purpose before re-use as sinks. Peter French (2004, 94) rejected their use as sinks, saying that such drainage would only work on sandy sites, but this seems to be applying too European an attitude to drainage. In fact, Petrie found some examples at

---

4 The persistence of Late Period types, including jars of the kind in Fig. 6 here, has also been discussed in Masson 2011a, illustrating Late and Ptolemaic versions (ibid., 271, fig. 4). Ptolemaic examples have also been found at Tebtynis (Ballet and Poludnikiewicz 2012, 272, figs 338–9), but the authors admit that such vessels are usually Late Period, so perhaps the possibility of their being residual should not be dismissed.
Tell Dafana in-situ as sinks, choked with fish-bones from kitchen debris (Petrie 1888, 57). Vessels of this type have been found in Late Period contexts at a wide range of sites.\(^5\) It seems likely that the rim sherd from Naukratis in Cambridge (Museum of Classical Archaeology NA782) came from this kind of jar.

Finally among the deep bowls, there is the curious vessel of red siltware with a projecting horizontal boss attached to one side of the interior wall and a perforation through the opposite side (British Museum 1974,1119.1, here Fig. 7). Another example with interior boss and perforation, also from Naukratis, is documented (Hogarth et al. 1905, 125, fig. 5, no. 5), and two similar vessels (with the boss but lacking the perforation) were found at Tell Dafana (British Museum EA23720, Petrie 1888, pl. xxxiv, 26; Leclère and Spencer 2014, 103, pl. 33; also Boston MFA 87.637). Another was recorded at Heliopolis; for this one the drawing shows the internal boss but no perforation (Petrie 1915, pl. x, no. 5). A similar vessel has also been discovered in 26th dynasty settlement layers at Tell Faraon (Mostafa 1988, 20–1, fig. 3). In this example the perforation is of a smaller diameter, and although it is likely that there was an internal boss, it is not mentioned. The purpose of this type of vessel remains unclear. Their manufacture in very coarse silt clay suggests a routine domestic function, but the examples with perforations indicate that they were not designed to hold liquids, whilst the lack of scorch marks shows they were not used as braziers. An explanation must await the discovery of further examples from well-preserved contexts.

---

\(^5\) Especially Tell el-Balamun (Spencer 1996, pl. 65, range of Type C.4); Mendes (Wilson 1982, pl. xvii, no. 6; Hummel and Schubert 2004, pl. M, no. 8); Kom Fīrin (Smolářková 2008a, 150, fig. 43, types C.051, 131, 139, 214; Thomas 2014a, 182, fig. 122, types C.3079, 3145–9).
2.4 Cups and beakers

This class is not particularly well represented among the documented Egyptian pottery from Naukratis. There are three tall beaker-shaped vessels in the British Museum (1888,0601.732–734, see Fig. 8), all very similar to one another and of a recognized Late Period form. Parallels are known from various sites, dating from the 7th to 6th centuries BC.6

Apart from these conical vessels, there are two siltware cups in Penn Museum, Philadelphia, inv. E89 and E171. The first of these items is a rim-to-base fragment of a small conical cup, which resembles a vessel dated to the late Third Intermediate Period, around the early 7th century BC, from El-Ashmunein (Spencer 1993, pl. 56, type B.2.9). The other appears to have been a taller cup with a plain rim and pointed base (rather than the base of a jar); if indeed a cup as suspected, it would conform to a common shape known from the late Third Intermediate Period to the Late Period (8th–6th century BC; compare Petrie 1906, pl. xxxvi, no. 16; id. 1923, pl. lix, type 24S; Aston 1999, 203, pl. 62, no. 1841).

2.5 Jars

Tall siltware jars, often red-slipped, are characteristic of Egyptian Late Period pottery, so it is surprising that only a few are documented from Naukratis, especially since many were recovered at the contemporary site of Tell Dafana (Petrie 1888, pl. xxxiv, 19–25; Leclère and Spencer 2014, 94, figs 12–13, pl. 35). A typical example is shown in a photograph of a group of vessels recovered from a well in the 1899 excavations at Naukratis (reproduced in this chapter as Fig. 9 – the jar is the second vessel from the left in the front row, no. 10). Jars of this type must have been found frequently in the excavations, but probably in a broken condition and so discarded; the fact that the one in the photograph is intact must be the only reason it was illustrated. At the right end of the picture (no. 8) is another good Late Period type, a jar with a convex body and cylindrical neck.7 The tall, handled jar in the centre of the second row of the photograph in Figure 9 (no. 6) has exterior Bes face decoration (see further below); flanking this jar are two others of similar shape, but with plain surfaces (nos 5 and 7). Additional jars discovered by Hogarth comprise two flat-based vessels with convex sides and slightly flaring rims, a globular jug with a narrow neck and a small loop-handle (Hogarth et al. 1905, fig. 5, nos 1–3) and a smaller jug with a rounded base (Fig. 9, left end of front row, no. 9, compare the example from Tell Dafana in Leclère and Spencer 2014, 107, EA23716, pl. 37).

---

6 Petrie 1915, pl. xxxiii, nos 26–8 (shown inverted); Petrie 1923, pl. lix, nos 13B–13K; Wilson 1982, pl. xv; nos 3–4; López-Grande et al. 1995, 82, 99, type VII.F, pls 36, a–e, 56, o–p (the examples on pl. 36 are dated to the Third Intermediate Period, but the reference to Spencer and Bailey 1986, fig. 17, no. 45 is not appropriate as the vessel there is of a different, more squat, type). Additional examples were found in the 2009 SCA excavations at Tell Dafana (M. Abdel Maksoud et al. in Leclère and Spencer 2014, pl. 82).
7 Cf. Smoláriková 2008b, 168, fig. 49, 7; Aston and Aston 2010, pl. 52, nos 88–220, and similar, Petrie 1915, pl. xxiv, no. 57). At the back of the group are two Phoenician amphorae, which are so commonly found at sites all over Egypt. For these and other imports, including the ubiquitous basket-handled jars, see the chapter on transport amphorae.
Another large jar is likewise recorded only from a photograph, taken on site at Naukratis by Petrie. This shows the upper half of a large vessel, with the lower part still embedded in the ground (Fig. 10). The jar has a pair of loop handles set on opposite sides below the rim. The diameter of the jar expands from the rim downwards but must have converged again to a pointed base, hidden in the ground. It was discovered at a low level in the southern part of the site. A close parallel was found in 5th-century BC deposits at Tell el-Balamun (Spencer 1994, 33, colourplate 2a and pl. 55), but this style of two-handled jar has a long history, already common in the Third Intermediate Period and continuing into the Late Period.

Some other Late Period jars of various sizes and styles were actually brought back from Naukratis for distribution to museums, and a few more are documented from Leonard’s excavations, as described below.

The first item is a miniature jar of red silt clay in the Department of Greece and Rome, British Museum (1888,0601.731). The upper part of the vessel is missing, but the shape is similar to a Late Dynastic jar from Mendes (Wilson 1982, pl. xv, no. 5). Also present among the Naukratis pottery are several fragmentary Bes jars, very common products in Egypt during the Third Intermediate Period and the Late Period. In Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, are three sherds with Bes decoration, two showing parts of faces and the other an arm and hand (inv. 86.387, 86.467 and 86.661). These three items are all made of marl clay so are likely to have been imported from Upper Egypt. It has been suggested that inv. 86.387 belongs to the earlier style of Bes jars, dating from the 7th to 6th centuries BC (Schlotzhauer 2012, 67–8, no. Nau 174, pl. 39a), but the use of marl clay and the details of the Bes features make a date in the 5th century BC more likely for all three of these fragmentary pieces (Aston and Aston 2003; Defernez 2009, id. 2011, 323, table 1). Another fragment of the same period is in Cambridge (Museum of Classical Archaeology, NA736). This also shows an arm and hand, holding a palm frond (cf. Petrie 1906, pl. xxxix f, no. 177). Also in Cambridge is a miniature Bes jar in pink marl clay with very abbreviated decoration (Museum of Classical Archaeology,
NA744), the face of the god having been reduced to a few applied blobs of clay. Such reduction is well attested. A larger vessel from Naukratis with abbreviated Bes decoration is the siltware jug from Hogarth’s excavations, shown in the photograph in Fig. 9 (centre of the second row). Finally, there is a more unusual double Bes jar, comprising one decorated jar set into the mouth of another, the whole having been produced as a single object (Fig. 11). The decoration is quite detailed in low relief and the whole of the exterior was originally coated with a bright red slip, although much of this has been lost. The use of this red slip over a coarse Nile silt fabric is consistent with Egyptian Late Period pottery manufacture. It is possible that Schlottzhauer is correct in his suggestion that the design of this vessel was influenced by Greek double and triple vessels such as eye-cups (Schlotzhauer 2012, 67–8, 192–3 no. Nau 175, pl. 39b–c), which may explain why this vessel appears to be quite unique.

Two small alabastron-shaped jars from Naukratis are Bristol City Museum, H2225 and Warrington Museum and Art Gallery, 1888.57.153 (Fig. 12). The form is attested at Tell Dafana, but without a precise context – see British Museum, EA22310, Leclère and Spencer 2014, pl. 38; and at Tell el-Balamun, as a surface find (Spencer 1996, pl. 84, no. 29), so neither of these examples is particularly helpful for dating. There is also an example from Tell el-Faraon, reported to have been found in a Ptolemaic level (Mostafa 1988, 15, fig. 2). Another from Tell er-Rotab is grouped with ceramics described as ‘undated’ in the publication, but which are clearly of the late Third Intermediate Period and Late Period (Petrie 1906, pl. xxxvi b, no. 65). The discovery of more pottery alabastra at Suwa (ibid., pl. xxxix f, nos 201–3) suggests that the type was already produced in the Late Period. An example found at Saqqara has been dated to between 550 and 400 BC (Aston and Aston 2010, pl. 45, no. 407), so probably the type originated in the 26th dynasty and continued to be produced down to Ptolemaic times, imitating the popular calcite alabastra over this period. The jar in Warrington and that found at Tell el-Balamun had exterior red slips, polished horizontally to create a striated effect, typical of Egyptian Saite pottery.

A miniature amphora in Nottingham Castle Museum (NCM 1888-21) is paralleled by an example from Tell Dafana (British Museum, 1888,0208.164, Leclère and Spencer 2014, 106, pl. 60). Another fragmentary vessel of this type is in the British Museum (1965,0930.981). These models most probably date to the 6th century BC like the full-size jars on which they are based.

The remaining Late Period jars from Naukratis are those recorded from Leonard’s excavations (Berlin 1997a, 153, figs 6.2.6–8, 6.2.12–14). Only the upper parts of each vessel were preserved and drawn, which makes the identification of parallels difficult, although all these pieces came from contexts in which more diagnostic Late Period ceramics were found. The jar neck in fig. 6.2.6 is typical of the 26th dynasty, both in silt and marl clays, similar to examples from Tell el-Balamun (Spencer 1996, pl. 68, type

---

8 British Museum, EA22304 and EA22297, 26th dynasty from Tell Dafana (Leclère and Spencer 2014, pls 36, 60); same period from El-Ashmunein (Spencer 1993, pl. 67, types G.1.5, 6 and 10); cf. Petrie 1906, pl. xxxix f, nos 178–84.

9 See also Aston 2011 for additional comments on the dating of the Saqqara pottery.
D.1.10), El-Ashmunein (id. 1993, pl. 63, type D.1.79) and El-Amarna (French 1986, 183, fig. 9.17, MJ.2.1.3). The vessels in figures 6.2.8 and 6.2.12 were of marl ware, used much more rarely than red silt Nile clay in the Delta.

2.6 Flasks

Although flasks, especially the flattened variety, were common products of the Late Period, only two pieces from Naukratis have found places in collections. A small fragment from the top of the neck of a flask is in Bonn (Akademisches Kunstmuseum, 697.60) and a complete flask is kept in the Department of Ancient Egypt and Sudan at the British Museum (Fig. 13). The latter was made of Oasis clay with an external red slip. For typical flasks of the Late Period, see Spencer 1993, pl. 72, type K.1; Leclère and Spencer 2014, pls 38, 62, no. 22340; Wilson 1982, pl. xviii, no. 7.

2.7 Miscellaneous items

A pot stand of common type, with concave sides, is documented from Hogarth’s work and is shown in his photograph in Fig. 9 (3rd item from the left, front row). More unusual is a vase in the shape of a bird, the head of which is missing (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, E.P.273, cf. Wilson 1982, pl. xxi, no. 6). A siltware brazier of Late Period type was found in the surface survey at Naukratis directed by Coulson (Leonard 1997, 295, fig. 7.8). For parallels from Tell Dafana in the British Museum and in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, see Leclère and Spencer 2014, 111, no. 23677. Another example was found at Mendes (Wilson 1982, pl. xx, no. 9). A few minor sherds of Late Period pottery were also brought back from Naukratis to museums, but, as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, they are too fragmentary to provide useful information.

3. Concluding remarks

The limited selection of Late Period pottery brought back or recorded from early fieldwork at Naukratis gives only a small indication of the range of possible material which may have been present at the site. Nevertheless, the presence of some very characteristic types among the assemblage, well documented for the period from other locations, together with certain comments by the excavators, leaves no doubt that the deeper levels of the archaeological mound must, indeed, have been full of Late Period pottery fragments. The fact that these were not regarded as a priority for recording, with the presence of so much finer imported material, is one of the factors that gave rise to the view of Naukratis having been more Greek than Egyptian. The discovery of substantial quantities of Egyptian Late Period pottery (Fig. 14) during the current exploration of the site by the British Museum (see chapters on Material Culture and Topography) promises to redress this imbalance.

10 I wish to acknowledge the assistance of Alexandra Villing for many helpful comments on this essay, and Peter French for help in locating parallels for certain vessels discussed.