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1. Introduction and previous treatments

From the beginning of the excavations at Naukratis pots made in Athens or Attica have been found in good quantities. This chapter attempts to put these finds in context and give a fuller picture of the material than has hitherto been possible, now that the scattered fragments have been reunited, at least electronically, by the Naukratis Project.1

Abbreviations

BF black-figured
RF red-figured
BG black-gla(ze)(d) (or -gloss)

ABV Beazley, J.D., Attic Black-figure Vase-painters, Oxford 1956
BA introduces catalogue number in the Beazley Archive

An overview of previous discussion of the relevant material coming from Naukratis is readily made; however it would be a far too long a task to cite all references to individual pieces from the site, which are well covered in the entries for items in the online catalogue. The finds are largely fragmentary, since intact pots - small bowls, lekythoi and the like (Fig. 1) - were only found in tombs; most Attic sherds were kept by the early

---

1 This chapter is based on the work of several colleagues who have contributed in various ways to the cataloguing of the Attic material, in particular Giorgos Bourogiannis, Valerie Smallwood, Alexandra Villing, Dyfri Williams and Susan Woodford. Members of staff at various museums have been of essential assistance; the present author has reviewed the pottery and takes responsibility for the finished text. All images are © Trustees of the British Museum unless otherwise indicated.
excavators, as with the products of other centres, because they were either figured or stamped, or bore inscriptions.

The original excavation reports (Petrie 1886, Gardner 1888, Hogarth 1898/9 and 1905) did contain Attic material, though a very restricted choice. Red-figured pieces (hereafter RF) have received little attention save as individual items, and indeed even there the coverage is thin; black-figured (BF) has been more fully (or less scantily) covered, most notably by Beazley and Payne 1929, which contains perhaps 9% of the BF sherds now known to us. Early BF has always been mentioned in accounts of the ‘foundation’ of Naukratis (e.g. Möller 2000, 122), and the rich series of BF cup fragments has been noted among others by Beazley 1932 and Robertson 1951, Brijder 1983, 1983a, 1991 and 2000, and Heesen 2011. Möller (2000, 122-4) has a useful overview of all Attic Archaic categories, and we have also the valuable listing of Attic material by Venit 1981 and 1982, and her survey of Attic material in museums in Egypt (1988). Alexandridou 2011 has also listed the early material (see Appendix 1), while Kraiker 1978 and Piekarски 2001b include most of the relevant sherds in Heidelberg and Bonn. Schlotzhauer 2006b pinpointed some previously unsuspected Attic material in the form of black-glazed dinoi, though the BG material as a whole has scarcely had a mention per se, apart from the graffiti they carry. In the latter respect Johnston has reviewed the inscribed material in the Chapter on Ceramic Inscriptions, and included relevant Attic pieces both there and in the Chapter on Vase Inscriptions. The recent British Museum excavations at Naukratis have confirmed the omnipresence of Attic black-glaze in fifth to early fourth century BC contexts, a situation not reflected by the material preserved from the early

2. Totals, current location and chronological distribution

With the caveat that some BG pieces are of doubtful origin, whether from Attica or elsewhere, the total corpus of Attic material from the early excavations amounts to some 2550. BF are 1130, RF 440, white ground 15, and BG 825. It is important to note that these figures are skewed, but in two different directions, in that on the one hand many of the BG sherds, especially from cups, may well have belonged to figured pots, and on the other that it is clear that most excavated sherds which only had black preserved were discarded unless they bore graffiti (though the well preserved pots from the tombs may mostly have been kept). The recent British Museum excavations at Naukratis have confirmed the omnipresence of Attic black-glaze in fifth to early fourth century BC contexts, a situation not reflected by the material preserved from the early

---

2 They do note that they are publishing only a selection. They add that their numbers 11 and 50 are not from Naukratis, but 11 surely is (1886,0401.1279, not 1229 as there). For reference, their number 39 (1888,0601.592) is also British Museum B601.30.

3 Relevant volumes of CVA do include a percentage of the holdings of Attic BF and RF from Naukratis, varying between museums, e.g.:
   BF: Ashmolean, 30%, Fitzwilliam 55%, Boston 0%
   RF: Ashmolean, 85%, Fitzwilliam 50%, Boston 45%

4 There is a residue of some 150 pieces which have not been classified for a large number of reasons, e.g. because, although registered, they have not been relocated, or since they are fragments of column-kraters in black or with subsidiary decoration, vegetal or animal, in black silhouette. Inevitably the count of objects referred to in this chapter includes individual listing of sherds from the same vase, whether joining or not; ‘piece’ therefore normally refers here to a registered item, which itself may be made up of several sherds. The figures differ substantially from those used by Sørensen 2001, making a number of her observations redundant.

Figure 2 Fragment of large open vessel. Silhouette figure of runner; 520-480 BC. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum AN1896-1908. G.137.11. Photograph © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford. Photography by British Museum staff.
work, though confirmed in Coulson’s survey (see Appendix 2).\(^5\) Also to be borne in mind is the fact that a good number of sixth century cups have some figural decoration, whether vegetal or animal, in glaze but with no incision preserved; some, about 35, are clearly in silhouette style (Fig. 2), but others are too fragmentary for any final judgement on that issue to be made.

The material discussed in the present chapter is to be found in the following museums (whether distributed from the Petrie/Hogarth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Museum</th>
<th>741</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Ashmolean Museum</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Louvre</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Museum of Fine Arts</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg University, Antikenmuseum</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiden University, Faculty of Archaeology</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels, Royal Museum of Art and History</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo, Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, University College, Classical Archaeology collection</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading University, Ure Museum</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto, University</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champagne, University of Illinois, Spurlock Museum</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildesheim, Roemer and Pelizaeus Museum</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin, University College</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, University College, Petrie Museum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton, Royal Pavilion and Museums</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Mawr, The Art and Artifact collections</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Oriental Institute</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin, National Museum of Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenock, McLean Museum of Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Museum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton, Hamilton College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh, National Museum of Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, Brooklyn Museum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British School at Athens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chart (Fig. 3) giving the chronological breakdown of the material by decade in a sense speaks for itself. Assignment of pieces to a particular decade, using the accepted absolute dating, e.g. that based on 566 BC for the first Panathenaic amphoras and c.525 BC for earliest red-figured ware, was readily done for a small percentage of sherds;\(^6\) but for most a date spanning more than one decade was allotted, and in not a few cases, e.g.

---

5 Already Coulson catalogued 306 BG, 14 RF and no BF – though one piece probably is BF (Coulson 1996, pl. X.6, cat.1344, a volute-krater handle fragment). One can make a rough comparison with Gravisca; of the c.1600 BG sherds taken as Attic (Valentini 1993, 11) 150 at very most would have been retained using Petrie and Gardner’s criteria.

6 There are pressures to lower the latter date a little; see Rottroff 2009 and Gaunt 2017, 85, though on the evidence from Miletos and Klazomenai any lowering should be slight (Kunisch 2016, 69-70; Tuna-Nörling 1996, 27-9). In this chapter dates given are generally broad, to avoid the impression of a fixed chronology.
small black sherds with a graffito letter or two, a much wider range was required. The latter are included in the red columns in the chart, with their date range distributed pro rata equally over the relevant decades.\(^7\)

Figure 3 Chronological breakdown of Attic imports, 600 – 350 BC, by decade. In blue the more closely datable material, in red with less datable pieces proportionately added.

The result shows a very clear concentration of material from Athens in the second and third quarters of the sixth century BC, with a lesser peak in the last quarter of the fifth; throughout one must bear in mind the disregard of black-glazed pots by the early excavators (see further below and Appendix 2, on finds from Coulson’s survey) Red-figure persists into the fourth century but there is little that belongs to its final period, after the foundation of Alexandria,\(^8\) a situation reflected in the pattern of black-glazed material emerging from the recent excavations.

Although Attic does appear early in the record, its presence is swamped by the amounts from all known East Greek centres during the first half of the sixth century. Corinthian ware in this period is found in roughly the same numbers as Attic, though it is more frequent in the years either side of 600 BC. The picture changes decisively after c.540 BC, though it is not easy to put close dates to much East Greek semi-decorated ware, most notably banded cups and jars.

---

\(^7\) The result of their inclusion, not surprisingly, is a clear increase of material per decade throughout the fifth century BC but only a slight one in the sixth. Outside the range of the chart are one or two sherds earlier than 600 and an uncertain but not large number after 350, uncertain because provenance of BG pieces is sometimes unclear.

\(^8\) For a terminal date slightly later than often previously accepted for Attic RF production, down to c.310 BC, see Morgan 2004, 161-171, Eschbach 2016a and 2016b. Only one Attic red-figure fragment from Naukratis seems to be from later than c.340 BC but is very small, Bonn 697.117 (Piekarski 2001, no. C28). For overall production figures of RF in the fourth century see Langner 2016, 773.
3. Shapes, and their findspots and use

3.1. Shapes

Distribution of shapes springs no surprises by way of awkward absences or strange peaks.

The number of sherds where no form of attribution to shape has been made is relatively small, around 50; of those for which descriptive details are available 6 are RF open vases, 10 BF open and 19 BF closed; the latter include two joining sherds, in the British Museum (1886,0401.1253) and Bonn (697.99) of an unusually small pot near the Affecter (ABV 248,1). Most of the rest are known only from slight notes in museum registers.

For black-figure, in round figures, cups of all kinds, excluding skyphoi, amount to some 440, kraters and dinoi 185, amphoras and hydrias 175, jugs 70, lekanides 55, skyphoi 40, lekythoi 20, kantharoi 20, plates 15; distribution over time varies and will be treated below.

For red-figure, cups amount to 95, skyphoi 15 and lekanides 15, while there are 215 kraters, 15 amphoras, pelikai, stamnoi and hydrias, 5 jugs,
and 2 ordinary and 35 squat lekythoi. It is highly likely that the minimum actual number of kraters will have been much smaller, though it is not easy to judge whether sherds from disparate parts are from one and the same pot.

However, despite this, the most striking statistic is perhaps the far different ratios of cups to mixing bowls in the two techniques, (approximately) 2:1 (BF) and 1:2 (RF); while it should be noted that during the black-figure period good numbers of shapes from different production centres were being used at Naukratis, they are preserved seemingly in much the same ratio of drinking cups to mixing bowls as Attic, and so it was not the case that kraters from any particular centre were being used in preference to Attic. If one argues that in later periods black-glazed drinking vessels were in extremely widespread use, as suggested by the recent excavations, we must assume that also in the sixth century BC plainer cups (e.g. Ionian bowls), such as would not have been kept in the early excavations, were favoured, in order that we can create a reasonable (or minimum?) ratio of drinking vessels to mixing bowls of 10:1, rather than that which is preserved. At Olympia (Bentz 2009, 10-11) the ratio is even less ‘reasonable’ for the fifth century BC, but Bentz points out, from evidence that is only partly available for Naukratis, the preference there for black-glaze drinking vessels and metal services.

There are of course variations in the type of mixing bowl or drinking vessel that should be considered. With regard to the former it is very evident that the use of the dinos, whether Attic or East Greek, was a major aspect of commensality before the mid-sixth century BC. Early kraters are not unknown (Fig. 5), and so there was no sudden change from the dinos/lebes to the krater, though whether there may have been one in specific sanctuaries use of the column-krater is well attested with around 110 registered items, though almost certainly fewer individual pots; handle-plates make up a good proportion, especially from c.580 to 540 BC; the Komast group and the circle of Lydos are well represented. Some twenty fragments are of the period after 530 BC, none attributed. RF examples are fewer, around a dozen sherds, six of which preserve only secondary decoration; two may be from the same piece, Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum, 9388 and Boston MFA 86.581 (Fig. 6), but the rest are spread through the fifth century. In addition, eleven rims and necks with only black silhouette florals or animal friezes preserved should also belong to that century.

As noted by Mary Moore (1997, 16) sherds of column-kraters are not always distinguishable from those of stamnoi, and a few of the five fragments from Naukratis tentatively taken as stamnoi rather than kraters should be considered in this light (Fig. 7).

---

9 Metal pots are not preserved at Naukratis, but one assumes that they were not used in very different numbers in either period. A complicating issue could be the possibility that numbers of later Archaic, uninscribed, black Lakonian kraters were not retained, save one inscribed foot (British Museum 1910.0222.165); an incidental corollary is that we are therefore powerless to check Bentz’s remark of material from Olympia (2009, 15) that ‘the bottoms of kraters preserve the typical scratch marks caused by bronze ladles’.

10 A similar ratio to Olympia is found at the Demeter sanctuary at Cyrene (Moore 1987) which has very few cups to accompany the krater fragments of c.560-530 BC.

11 The list of possibles is larger, but perhaps five is a plausible total; all are RF save where stated: British Museum 1886.0401.603 and 1322, 1965,0930.850 (BF), Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 6709, 711, 712 (less likely) and 725, Louvre AM 1373(9) (possibly), and Kyoto University 639.1c.
Two psykter fragments stand by themselves; neither are readily paired with known fragments of calyx-kraters; one is in black-figure (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum GR179.1894), the other a mere rim fragment (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1885.448, Fig. 8).\(^\text{12}\)

The volute-krater appears in small numbers, between c.525 and 490 BC; one is RF, the rest BF. The former is discussed in detail by Williams 2015, while the fuller corpus is treated in Johnston 2017. While restricted in time their appearance indicates a flourishing site in the last quarter of the sixth century BC. The iconography has little that is unusual, though the lively komos-cum-symposium scenes on the RF piece are entertaining.

We may note also an early RF fragment probably of a calyx-krater, Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum, 9558 (Fig. 9). In the state in which they are preserved it is not always possible to distinguish between fragments of bell- and calyx-kraters; at least there appear to be no BF examples of the latter. Of the 200 fragments in the range 70 are from bell-kraters, 12 calyx-kraters, the rest undiagnostic (a very few perhaps not kraters at all).

Decorated storage jars are limited in number. A few sherds may be from stamnoi, though see above regarding the difficulty of identification. The pelike is represented by seven possible examples, two or three black-figured. One RF piece has only the panel border preserved, two have the top of a female head as well (one attributed to the Meidias painter’s circle, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.718), while the final piece (Fig. 10), with dull surface, has been attributed to the Pig painter (British Museum 1886,0401.1318, ARV 565, 31); there are none of the large production of Group G in the mid to later fourth century BC.

BF amphoras are frequent, though precision is impossible since with body sherds it is not always possible to distinguish them from oinochoai. Much of the earlier material, pre c.540 BC, is decorated with animal friezes. Numbers drop off after c.530 BC, after a few pots by the Amasis and Swing painters and the Affecter. Of iconographic interest are a piece by or near Sophilos (Fig. 11) with a satyr playing aulos (1888,0601.582 and UCL-401; see Kunze 1934, 96, n.1 and Beil. X.1, and Carpenter 1986, 91 and pl.18.B), a ransom of Hektor (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.131.30a-b), and a small amphora by the Deianeira painter, with sherds in four different museums, showing Herakles and Nereus (Williams 1986, to which a scrap in Brighton Pavilion, HA281450.1, can be added). A small fragment, British

\(^{12}\) See Williams 2015, 195.
Museum 1886,0401.1340, may be from a very early type A amphora of the mid-sixth century BC (Johnston 2017, 81-3). Of the thirty or so later pieces, seven preserve merely florals and only one is datable to the end of the century or after; several sherds have bits of chariot scenes, one (British Museum 1886,0401.1242) a very complex one, with the car in frontal to three-quarter view; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.131.34 has a scene with probably an early example of a female pyrrhic dancer (Fig. 12).

Four fragments of Panathenaic amphoras are treated in the chapter on Vase Inscriptions, while the total number is eight (just one with a known provenance, the Hellenion (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum AN1896-1908-G.137.7). They range from c.550-40 (1911,0606.42, with a probably dedicatory inscription) to the mid fourth century BC (Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 17269). None belongs to a B side and it is just possible that British Museum 1911,0606.42 and the late Archaic fragment, Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum, 17269 (Venit 1988, no. 246) could be from non-prize vases. Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology NA239, c.450 BC, poses a problem regarding provenance; it presents part of Athena’s shield, on which is cut a modern graffito, one of a large group treated by Corbett and Woodhead 1955; as most of these were acquired in Athens, they are dubious (p. 255) about the alleged Naukratis provenance of the sherd.

RF amphoras are few. There is a significant Pioneer Group amphora of type A, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.138.23 (Williams 2015, 188, fig. 11); an intriguing piece, Leiden T2958, perhaps from an amphora, with a snatch of Doric architecture (Fig. 13); Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology NA247, with enigmatic decoration (Fig. 14), and, perhaps an amphora, Leiden T.2960 with a youth seated on a klismos.

Oinochoai also are frequent before 550 BC, with nearly 40 sherds, mainly from olpai, though probably belonging to a rather smaller number of individual pieces (taking due note of the background difficulty of distinguishing sherds from those of amphoras). The Gorgon painter or his workshop has been given eighteen of these, but seemingly all from different pieces. The number has been remarked by both Möller (2000) and Alexandridou (2010). Among later material there are at least six pieces by or near the Amasis painter.

By contrast assured RF oinochoai are very rare: Louvre AM1373 (10) (Fig. 15), and AM1372 (a fourth century BC piece not surely from Naukratis), and Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.138.21, probably from an oinochoe, with puzzling iconography (Fig. 16). Also rare are BG jugs, of whatever kind,13 with one certain (a small olpe, Boston MFA 88.812), three probable and one possible piece (British Museum 1965,0930.701); one is of the sixth century BC, two of the fourth, and one handle not closely datable. Mugs are represented by a common enough RF example from the Painter of Berlin 2268 (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1928.25; ARV 157, 80) and a foot bearing the graffito with obscure ending, Κωμαιος.. (Oxford G141.27; Herda 2008, 46–8, with n. 271).

13 Coulson has eleven from his investigations, though it is not clear whether the identifications are always correct.
A possible *kyathos* body fragment is Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1912.37(26), previously unpublished.

There are 14 BF *lekythoi*; two are late with palmettes, while the rest are very varied; of four fragments with white ground two preserve some outline drawing, Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology NA243 (Fig. 17) with probably a flying Nike, c.460 BC, and British Museum 1937.1026.1 preserving a pair of feet, by the Achilles painter. There is but one fragment of an ivy-patterned *lekythos*, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.121.13, and of a regular red-figured *lekythos*, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1966.511 by the Bowdoin painter, though two other fragments may be from such *lekythoi*, Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology NA241, c.470-60 BC (Fig. 18), and Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 19853, with probable multi-level decoration, of the late fifth century BC. A red-figured acorn *lekythos* of the early fourth century BC, British Museum 1888,0601.716, stands out in particular.14

Squat *lekythoi* are much more common, at least 33; eight have figural decoration, 15 palmettes only, seven net pattern and one only bands, while two are merely bases with graffiti. Four (three with palmette and the one with bands) are known to be from the cemetery and two (1885,1101.56 and 70), one net-patterned, the second late RF (Fig.19), from the house of the cache of bronzes (Masson 2015, 73, figs 3.2 and 3.3).15

---

14 For the shape see Camponetti 2007, 18, n.7.

15 The percentage of finds of squat *lekythoi* from Olympia, surely not from graves, indicates a use for them in daily life there (Bentz 2009, 13). One wonders why simple black squat *lekythoi* are comparatively so rare.
A BF fragment of c.575 BC, Brussels A.1862 (Fig. 20), may be from an aryballos. There is just one alabastron (probably a regular, not a Columbus alabastron with flat base) Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.121.18, of the second quarter of the fifth century (Fig. 21).

There are no identified pinakes or epinetra.

Most lids are from lekanides or pyxides and are discussed with them below; but there is a residue from larger pots:
- British Museum 1888,0601.592, diameter c.20 cm;
- British Museum 1886,0401.1189, and perhaps from the same lid, 1886,0401.1183;
- Louvre AM1371(16) (Fig. 22) with an original diameter of c.15 cm; British Museum 1888,0601.783, 1924,1201.29 and Boston, MFA 88.1078 (three fragments from the same lid by the KY Painter), with a diameter of c.20 cm;
- Bonn 697.87 (Fig. 23), which has been taken as a plate by Piekarski and attributed to the Leagros group; but its identity as a plate is uncertain; the plate is not part of that group’s repertoire, and one could consider it part of an amphora lid, as one of the comparanda cited by Piekarski (San Francisco 243/24878, ABV 367, 92);
- finally, Boston MFA 88.847 is a complete lid, not from a lekanis or pyxis, but with a diameter of 9.3 cm, and so not from a large pot.

Some lid fragments nonetheless cannot be assigned to a given shape.

**Drinking vessels**

It is not easy to find any form of Attic cup that is not represented at Naukratis (Merrythought and rattling cups are not surely attested), and most varieties appear in good numbers, from the Komast cup to the Haimon group in BF;\(^\text{16}\) also for later periods the black-glazed range would appear to be broad, to supplement a rather thin number of later red-figured pieces, which amount to about thirty later than 450 BC, only four being clearly of the fourth century. One should also note the bilingual lip-cup, British Museum 1888,0601.609 (Fig. 24), not for its artistic merit but the chronological significance of the co-existence of shape and technique.

There is a particularly large showing of material of the second quarter of the sixth century BC, notably the works of Kleitias and Sondros. Among rarer types are two covered cups in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford,

---

\(^\text{16}\) But not the huge quantities of late BF cups found at Gravisca, or comparatively large amounts from Palagruža (unpublished).
G137.30a-b + 43 and G1005.1-4 (Fig. 25), each of four non-joining sherds, with pursuit scenes of hare and females respectively.

The *kantharos* also appears early, c.575 BF, and in good numbers and style, in contrast to most other sites beyond Attica, as has often been noted.\(^{17}\) There are perhaps 15 pieces, all datable between 575 and 540 BC. The shape is then rare, as in Attic production in general, until the fourth century, with only a probably Attic head kantharos (British Museum 1888,0601.1324) and a Boston sherd (MFA 86.615, Fig. 26) perhaps from a kantharos of c.480 BC in between. Compare and contrast Gravisca, different in providing only one BF example, of c.540, but similar in yielding one RF and one BG kantharos of the fifth century BC.\(^{18}\) Black kantharoi, sixteen in all, are of various types, plain, ribbed (one a cup-kantharos, British Museum 1888,0601.719), stamped and with added colour, and continue perhaps into the third century BC (e.g Heidelberg I148 and British Museum 1909,0224.1, Fig. 27).

Skyphoi appear well spread from c.580 BC to the early fourth century. Many BG fragments (some of which could have belonged to decorated pieces) were kept because of their graffiti and amount to a little over 30, seven of which are earlier than c.450 BC. Of 45 BF examples, 11 belong to the Komast group, while only a few others have been attributed; there are about twelve cup-skyphoi or Hermogenean skyphoi, and one eye-skyphos (Toronto 910x234.37, Fig. 28). Ten or so are of the fifth century BC. RF skyphoi are uncommon, fourteen, and mostly later than c.425 BC. They include a nearly intact piece from the cemetery by the Millin painter (British Museum 1978,0403.1, Fig. 29) and a fine fragment by the Marlay painter in Bonn (697.112, Fig. 30). Owl skyphoi were not found, though common on Palagruža and at Gravisca and Pyrgi. While Bentz (2009, 15) wonders whether there was a particularly Athenian aspect to their acquisition and use, with respect to the example at Olympia, this would not apply to the contemporary St. Valentin Class skyphoi and kantharoi, very rare at

\(^{17}\) E.g. Beazley and Payne 1929, 258: ‘that such kantharoi should be common at Naukratis is natural: [sic!] ‘they must have been meant to replace the ‘chalices’ of Ionian ‘Naucratite’ fabric’. One might well ask ‘meant by whom’?

\(^{18}\) RF, Huber 1999, 126, no. 674; BG, Valentini 1993, 31, no. 70; the BF piece is the fine Gigantomachy kantharos, Iacobazzi 2004, 53-5, no. 57.
Naukratis but also frequent at the other sites. Both owl skyphoi and St. Valentin class pots are also found in numbers in Palestine (Klinger 2003, 141) and elsewhere in Egypt (Defernez 2001, 165-74).

Other smaller pots, open

Attic phialai are nearly absent, which puts the relatively large number of earlier Chian examples in perspective. Two added colour fragments (one not surely from Naukratis – Heidelberg S74; the other British Museum 1888,0601.568, Fig. 31) are of c.550 BC, while there are no clear BG examples (Tsingarida pers. comm.). Attic phialai are present at comparable sanctuaries, Palağruza, Pyrgi and Gravisca, but in restricted quantity.

Plates are rare except for black-glazed examples, mainly of the later fifth and fourth centuries BC, with a modest number of fish-plates. There are none in RF, save a Paestan or Campanian fragment (Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum, 17058), while BF examples are confined to several scattered fragments of a fine, large piece by the Gorgon painter and several not fine ones by the Polos painter or his artistic peers.

Other shapes

Three askoi are known, one BG (British Museum 1910.0222.100) and two RF (Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 19948+19851 and Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.138.42, Fig. 32), all of the fourth century BC. The pyxis is sporadic. One early piece, Alexandria 17179 (Venit 1988, no. 274) is from a tripod-legged example, while eight or nine sherds are from BF pyxides of Nikosthenic type, whether body or lid (seemingly belonging to different vessels – British Museum 1888,0601.437, 1167, 1187, 1189 1289 (Fig. 33), Louvre AM1371(24), University College London UCL-5, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum GR197.1894, and Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.137.32). Two BG scraps, one lid and one box (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1912.40(3) and1912.40(T)), have graffiti, while there is an intact box of type D pyxis in Boston, MFA 88.816, and an RF lid in London, British Museum 1888,0601.718 (Fig. 33). A further RF fragment, Leiden T.2968, has been suggested to be from a pyxis (van der Wiel 1968, 12, N41), but could perhaps belong to a lekanis.

The lekanis, lidded or otherwise is frequent in the early period; it is one of the staples of early Attic production, and at Naukratis it supplements the good numbers of East Greek shallow bowls. 60 black-figure examples include perhaps ten later than c.550, one possibly as late as 510 BC (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.555, Fig. 35). Assured flat-rimmed, i.e. lidless example are 22 (with one black-glazed piece (British Museum 1888,0601.205 + 226); ten are by the Polos painter; only two sherds in fact preserve part of the vertical rim for the fitting of a lid, compared with a minimum 26 fragments of lids for BF lekanides. Bowls of any kind seem

---

19 Probably not totally absent; Coulson 1996, 129, no. 1217, pl. XI.2, is almost certainly from a St. Valentin open vase.
20 Four of these are listed by Lyons 2009, 176, nos 19, 20, 26 and 91. It seems possible that British Museum 1886,0401.1187 may be from the lid of 1888,0401.1289, both being from large examples See below for the distribution of the shape.
rare in the earlier fifth century BC, but they are found in quantity from the third quarter onward, mostly in BG, but the lekanis appears only in red-figure, with perhaps a dozen examples dating from c.430 BC (Edinburgh A.1886.518.3, Fig. 36) to the later Kertch phase (Heidelberg S74). One has an animal frieze, seven have females in various activities, and three have the triangular palmettes of the Otchet group. The iconography of Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.747 is worthy of note, a female running with a large sash in hand, looking back at a running male holding a torch (Fig. 37).

As noted, lids overall mainly come from lekanides, whether BF or RF; 52 of the 70 or so lid fragments have been so identified, some tentatively; 26 are assuredly BF, 14 RF (3 from same piece; two with only florals preserved). Probably or certainly not from lekanides are the pyxis lids noted above and various further fragments, five of them RF, a dozen BF, while more substantial are a complete lid with black ornament Boston MFA 88.847, and two fairly well preserved, Louvre AM 1371(16) (Fig. 22 above) and British Museum 1888,0601.592. As with other shapes lids too are rare in the later sixth century BC, where five examples may be located.

**Plastic vases**

Plastic vases in any animal or human form are rare; there are perhaps three Attic examples: the satyr head British Museum 1886,0401.1324 of the later sixth century BC, a RF piece Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.708 (CVA 2 pl. LXVI 5, Fig. 38), which has bits of barbotine decoration but whose diameter is large for a rhyton, and Leiden T2978, a small fragment preserving part of a lion’s paw. There are in addition three plastic vases of the later Classical period in the shape of an almond, one (British Museum 1888,0601.717) known to be from the cemetery; the provenance of British

---

21 A non-Attic, perhaps South Italian piece, British Museum 1886,0601.1432 plus non-joining Oxford, Ashmolean Museum E.4656, may be noted for the sake of completeness; it depicts an African figure; Schmidt 1997, 113-4, no. 158, pl. 51 is from the same mould.
Museum 1886,0601.1472 and Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 9324 is unknown.

3.2 Find spots

Few individual pieces have specific find-spots preserved, but it is important to note that in general terms there is evidence of the amount of pottery that was found in specific contexts in the shape of Petrie and Gardner’s comments and the lists of contents of boxes sent back from the site; from these we can conclude that much from the second season came from the Aphrodite sanctuary (Gardner 1888, 38-48). As it is, we have assured evidence of the particular provenance of only 222 pieces from the sanctuaries and town.

From these 222, 110 are BF, 72 of which are from the Apollo sanctuary. From all sanctuaries there is a mix of shapes and no obvious absences; all have at least one krater, amphora, cup and lekanis, save that there is no amphora from the Hera sanctuary and only two such pieces from the Hellenion – a Panathenaic amphora of c.500 BC (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.137.7), and the foot of an amphora by the Affecter (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.141.32). The most striking piece is perhaps the probable lebes gamikos (British Museum 1888,0601.441-2, Fig. 39) with an Amazonomachy by the Painter of Akropolis 601, one sherd of which is recorded as from the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi.

RF material (details can be found in the on-line catalogue):

- six sherds are from the Apollo sanctuary, four krater rims of c.480-460 BC (two from same krater), and two cup fragments of c.430 BC;
- two krater rims, c.450-425 BC from the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi;
- five late Archaic pieces were found in the same area just outside the Hellenion (Hogarth 1898/9, 32), some belonging to the same volute-krater, c.510-490 BC, and all dedications to Aphrodite;
- from the cemetery there are four squat lekythoi, one banded and three with a palmette, an early fourth century BC skyphos and a probably early fourth century pyxis, as well as the unusual acorn lekythos with scene of the Adoneia (British Museum 1888,0601.716, Fig. 40).22

With respect to black-glazed material, the Hellenion is the find-spot of 34 inscribed pieces, There are two pieces that seem to be of the range 550-40 BC (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.141.31 and 52), while the rest span the period from c.510 perhaps as far as into the third century BC (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.141.22 with a list of names, Fig. 41). The inscribed dedications comprise roughly half and half to Aphrodite and the Gods of

---

22 Brussels 2078, 2079 and 2080 (CVA II pl. 10; ARV 1043, 4, 1104, 3 and 674, 6) are fragmentary and restored kraters of 450-425 BC which are said to be from Naukratis, presumably the cemetery, but no comparable material has been found in the excavations.
the Greeks. Fifth century sherds from the Apollo sanctuary (20 pieces) are mostly type C cups or variants; most other shapes have owner’s marks rather than dedications, and date 460-430 BC. The 11 post-500 BC pieces known to be from the Aphrodite sanctuary are widely spread chronologically; the dedication by a Syracusan is the latest at c.320 BC (British Museum 1888.0601.240), though two intact bowls of the later fourth century, if Attic, are finds from well 1 at the entrance to the sanctuary (British Museum 1888.0601.699, Fig. 42, and 700). From the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi are twelve post-500 BC sherds, ranging from c.500 to the late fourth century BC or after (Boston MFA 86.659, a late stamped bowl); many of the nine graffiti on these are abbreviated owner’s names and one a commercial notation (British Museum 1888.0601.415). A repaired kantharos in Boston, MFA 88.928, is allegedly from the sanctuary of Hera, but its fourth century date and tolerable state of preservation suggests it is a cemetery find.

From the cemetery comes a variety of small black-glazed pots, the earliest the Attic type skyphos of mid-fifth century BC date with commercial graffito, noted above (British Museum 1888.0601.775); they include a slightly later cup-skyphos (Boston MFA 88.1067, Fig.43), an olpe (Boston MFA 88.812), a feeder (Boston MFA 88.818) and a pyxis (Boston MFA 88.816). While this is a small total when set beside Gardner’s short review of pottery finds from tombs (Gardner 1888, 27-8), one can argue a strong case that over thirty other intact pieces in a wide range of museums, from Greenock to Chicago, also come from the cemetery though are not specifically known to be so. Twenty belong to the range 'salt-cellar', via bowl, to one-handler, some with stamped decoration. Among other shapes are a further feeder in Hildesheim, one cup in the Oriental Institute, Chicago, two kantharoi (in Boston and Greenock) and two amphoriskoi (Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 17150 and Cairo JE26748).

---

23 Most of the known owner’s graffiti that are written in full come from here also, and so perhaps such an interpretation is more plausible for variously disputed dedications to Artemis (one, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G141.53 (Bernard 1970, no. 588) most probably a dedication by Artemidoros), Herakles (see Höckmann and Möller 2006 16) and Poseidon (Oxford G141.52, again probably a dedicatory’s name); Demetriou 2017, 61 retains the interpretation as deities.
3.3. Signs of use or reuse

No full study has yet been made of the corpus, whether the entirety or the Attic section, for wear or other signs of use or re-use, such as scratches or cuts from contact with metallic instruments. Repair is the most obvious of such signs, and these have been noted. There are some 60 Attic pieces, i.e. between 2 and 3% of the total, - 39 BF, 13 RF, 2 surely BG, 1 silhouette style, 1 West Slope ware and 3 not sufficiently well-preserved to categorise. Of the RF 7 are cups, 6 kraters, but three of the pieces from a single vase. Whether the head kantharos 1886,0401.1324 had BF or RF decoration is not clear; it has been of disputed origin, whether East Greek or Attic, hence today features a modern drill hole for analysis in addition to the ancient repair. For BF the count is 27 cups and 5 kraters, plus a range of other shapes, including the fine plate by the Gorgon painter; for four of the cups there exist more than one fragment (in a single registered piece) with repair holes. Two probably joining fragments of a Siana cup by the C painter each have a hole (Boston, MFA 86.591 and British Museum 1965,0930.858, Fig. 44a-b).

Some fragments were inscribed as ostraca after having been cut down (see chapter on Ceramic Inscriptions, section 7.1.4), and it is clear that others were cut to form discs, for whatever purpose, e.g. British Museum 1888,0601.721 (ibid. p.75) or Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.712 (Fig. 45; cut down as a gaming piece?) and perhaps Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology NA216 (Fig. 59 below).

The neatly sawn-off break on the rim of the red-figured volute-krater dedicated to Aphrodite Pandemos (British Museum 1900,0214.6) demonstrates some later usage; one notes that the volute-krater handle fragment British Museum 1888,0601.601b, which Williams (2015, 175, n.10) suggests could be from the same vase, has two large repair holes, which would add further to the piece’s complex biography (Figs 46-47).

---

24 E.g. the ‘normal’ scratch marks from metal ladles on the floor of kraters (Bentz 2009, 15) or the knife marks visible on the floor of East Greek plates from Rhodes and Naukratis in the British Museum, e.g. the plain example 1888,0601.608 (see also Villing and Mommsen 2017, 115). Astrid Lindenlauf is undertaking a full review of the material from Naukratis from this perspective.


26 A total somewhat higher than that at Miletos, 1.2 to 1.7% (Kunisch 2016, 41).

27 For an Attic origin see Schlotzhauer 2006b, 240-1, reporting the analysis by Hans Mommsen.
4. Iconography

4.1 Mythology

The range of mythological scenes on material from Naukratis very much reflects the overall pattern of Attic production, with little that is striking. In part the fragmentary nature of the material may account for our inability to detect unusual iconography; do the many snatches of scenes of battle or chariots hide such possibilities? There are a number of enigmatic pieces in need of explanation, as noted below.

By far the most common subject is the range of Dionysos, satyrs and maenads, plus or minus Ariadne, appearing on about 60 occasions over two centuries; perhaps the most noteworthy feature here is the greater proportion of maenads found on the later, red-figured pots.

Herakles is seen merely in part on five or six pieces, while a specific myth can be added on 11 occasions with more or less confidence – three Nemean lions, two Amazons and Hydras (LIMC V Herakles 2032a, Alexandria 9383, and probably Alexandria 17128, Venit 1988, no. 327), one each of Delaneira (British Museum 1888,0601.597; Beazley and Payne 1929, 267, no.46), Nereus (ABV 14, 35; Williams 1986, 62-5), Triton (British Museum 1886,0401.1189 perhaps; Fig. 48), and Delphic tripod (British Museum 1888,0601.760; Beazley and Payne 1929, 260, no.23). He is little more than glimpsed on red-figure pots. Theseus slays the Minotaur four times, in a variety of poses, all black-figured. Amazons further appear, with no identifiable male opponent(s), on four BF (one early, British Museum 1886,0401.1182, Fig. 49, and 1241; Venit 1982, B195 and 196) and three RF pieces (discounting Brussels A2079; see note 23).

From the Trojan cycle RF provides just one Judgment of Paris (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum GR151.1899; CVA II pl. 27, 13); there is also one in BF (British Museum 1885,0806.1; Beazley and Payne 1929, 261, no.29), along with single examples of Achilles with Thetis (British Museum 1886,0401.1223; LIMC Achilles 198), Priam (British Museum 1886,0401.1258; Beazley and Payne 1929, 258, no.15), Patroklos (1888,0601.444; Beazley and Payne 1929, 258, no.14), the ransom of Hektor (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.131.30a-b, Fig.48) and perhaps Menelaos and Helen (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.137.54, Fig. 49).

Figure 48 Fragment of black-figured lid; Triton and Herakles? 550-525 BC. British Museum 1886,0401.1189

Figure 49 Fragment of black-figured column-krater with Amazonomachy; 570-550 BC. British Museum 1886,0401.1182

Figure 50 Joining sherds of a black-figured closed vase with the ransom of Hektor; 575-550 BC. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum AN1896-1908-G.131.30a-b. Photograph © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford. Photography by British Museum staff

Figure 51 Fragment of black-figured neck-amphora; Menelaas recovering Helen? 550-525 BC. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum AN1896-1908-G.137.54. Photograph © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford. Photography by British Museum staff

In BF we also have one Kalydonian boar hunt (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.128.35) and Eriphyle beside a frontal chariot (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.137.53; LIMC I, Amphiarao 19). Arimasps on RF pots are all in keeping with fourth century parallels. Other such later Classical trends are seen in probably two renderings of Marsyas (Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 9534 and Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.138.46) and one of Plouton (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.544, Fig. 52); Tyndareus may be present, with Zeus' eagle, on Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum GR152,1899.

Uncertain

Many sherds of course have small fragments of persons or objects that challenge attempts at identification. Others present more, but are still enigmatic. BF:

- curious headgear of Dionysos(?) on Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology NA231 (Fig. 53);
- ‘banausic’ head on a fragment of a cup, c.550, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1922.37(13);
- ‘floating’ eidolon figure, in silhouette, on Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.137.11 (Fig. 2 above);
- fully enigmatic scene on Louvre AM1371(15), Fig. 54.

In RF problematic are:

- the child on Boston MFA 86.607 (Fig. 55);
- a figure on Heidelberg I87 (Fig. 56);
- and two architectural representations - a plain column on Leiden T2958 (Fig. 12 above);
- and a very non-vertical one on Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.138.21, Fig. 15 above), bringing to mind Herakles’ rampage in the house of Nereus, though in other examples he confines himself to destroying crockery not architecture.

4.2 Animals

A very considerable number of BF pieces present animal friezes or single animals, from the Gorgon painter down to later band-cups; there is little here that is out of the ordinary. The octopus on the lip-cup Oxford,
Ashmolean Museum G.1000 is a well-known oddity, less so the pair of octopodes on a larger pot of uncertain large, open shape, Boston, MFA 88.566 (Fig. 57). The fauna as usual mixes actual and mythical; sphinxes and sirens, with gorgoneia, are common enough in the tondo of plates and cups throughout the sixth century BC.

In addition there are a couple of plastic vases, as noted above, with certain or possible animal features - merely a lion's paw in Leiden and a problematic sherd in Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.708 (Fig.38 above).

4.3 ‘Everyday’ scenes

We find much hoplite fighting, occasional athletic activity, and also symposia, especially in RF. Chariots (if they can be included under this heading) are also frequent, with a noticeable number of frontal renderings, one surely mythological, with Eriphyle named (above). More rare are a couple of scenes of wedding processions in BF (Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 9369 and Boston, MFA 88.836, Fig. 58), and a hare hunt on the black-figure covered cup, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.137.30a-b (Fig. 25 above), where the animal escapes into the hole of the mouth of the cup, which was flanked by eyes. Four BF cups present scenes of sexual activity, homosexual on British Museum 1886,0401.1222, Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology NA216 and the repaired and worn Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.1112 (Figs 59 and 60), heterosexual on the covered cup Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.1005.

Connections with cult are to be found in the sporadic fragments of prize Panathenaic amphoras, frequent finds at non-Attic sites. There are two RF sherds with echoes of the lampadodromia (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 157.1899 and Leiden T.2962, Figs 61 and 62); there seems to be a likelihood they are from the same krater, by the Painter of Vienna 1069, which would be unusual in that they have completely different acquisition histories.

While there is no strong evidence to support an argument that any of these pieces belonged to owners to whom the iconography had personal meaning or that had any particular relevance to their consumption in Egypt, the Adoneia scene, possibly chosen for its reminiscence of Osirian ritual, on an acorn lekythos from the cemetery, 1888,0601.716 (Fig. 40 above), and a rare example of the shape outside Greece, might point in that...
direction, as do, from their shape, the probable stands for lebetes gamikoi, Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 9370 and Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum GR.P.13 (Fig. 62, and the possible lebes from the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi, British Museum 1888.0601.441-2 (Fig. 39 above).

5. Attribution

Of the 1116 BF pieces 270 have been attributed, roughly one quarter. The great majority can be dated before c.540 BC, and virtually all painters of that period whom we know from a reasonable number of pieces are represented, from the Gorgon painter to the Affector. While the number of BF sherds of the later period does decline, the number of ‘quality’ sherds is low, a very large number being from late band-cups or other cups. There are few pieces from larger vases, but nothing of the Antimenes group (though there are two Lysippidean cup sherds, British Museum 1886.0401.828 and Boston MFA 88.846) and no Leagros group. About one in five of the RF pieces have been given some form of attribution; the percentage is relatively high considering that so many pieces survive only as part of subsidiary decoration (unlike the case with black-figure). Rarely has more than one piece been given to a single hand; a list will demonstrate the rather patchwork nature of such distribution at the site (all are cups unless otherwise stated):

- Pithos painter. Alexandria 17343 (stemless cup, not in ARV); Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum GR 137.1899 (ARV i 118).

Irma Wehgartner notes that acorn lekythoi in the fourth century BC have a wider distribution than earlier, but the iconography of our piece is rather more specific than the other seven of that period which she lists (1992, 286-7 and pl. 63.1-2. The white-ground lekythos fragment of the Achilles painter, British Museum 1937.1026.1 has no specific provenance and it would be hazardous to attach any particular biography to it, as is done for the similar singleton piece from Gordion (Lynch and Matter 2014, 111).

Beazley notes a further piece, in Oxford, in ARV i 118, ‘youth at krater’, which we have not identified.
- Villa Giulia painter. Lebes stand (for dinos or lebes gamikos?), Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum GR.P.13 (ARV 623, 37, Fig. 63) and, recalling the painter, bell-krater, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G.713.


In sum we rarely have more than two pieces by the same hand, and the evidence is a) spread throughout the RF period and b) mostly from very productive workshops.

6. The broader setting

As most undecorated pottery was not retained from the early excavations it is necessary to depend on decorated (or inscribed) Attic pots when comparing the record from the early excavations at Naukratis with that from comparable sites. Results from the recent fieldwork at Naukratis will provide a broader picture, as occasionally noted above. Here the focus is on (a) other ports and emporia, Gravisca, Al Mina (only partly published) and Palagruža (largely unpublished), (b) other sites in Egypt, and (c) the home poleis of those participating in the settlement of Naukratis, although there is little or no material available from Phaselis, Teos, Knidos, Halikarnassos and Mytilene, largely also Chios, despite the full publication.
of the Emporio sanctuaries. While other sites with fuller statistics are no doubt worthy of surveying, here there is just a brief look at the Athenian acropolis. Nonetheless, comparison is a very inexact science, as best laid down in Catherine Morgan’s introduction to her catalogue of Attic pottery from Phanagoria (Morgan 2004, 1-11), and in most cases statistical differences are likely to be mere ripples when the nature of the relevant excavated area and its chronology (to mention but two parameters) are taken into account.

An example. Reviewing Attic BF from Rhodes Anna Lemos states that all the material is from tombs (Lemos 1997, 458); the range of shapes therefore contrasts somewhat with Naukratis, though we should still note the near lack of Attic imports in the first quarter of the sixth century. However, she ignores the Athena sanctuary of Lindos (and that at Ialysos which remains substantially unpublished). Lindos, where Pharaoh Amasis made dedications, is also thin on early sixth century BC material but has rather more of the kraters and cups that are only slightly represented in the tombs, and also good numbers of lekythoi, especially late BF. As noted by Blinkenberg 1931, cols. 634-669, the RF at the sanctuary is sporadic, though it includes the epinetron, absent from Naukratis.

From Aegina we have material from both the Apollo temple in the town (Felten 1982) and the Aphaia sanctuary (Moore 1986, Williams 1987); the former has a similar record for the early sixth century BC to that at Naukratis, but Aphaia provides very little of that period; both have good amounts of latest Archaic and early Classical.

Comparative figures for Attic imports at East Greek sites have been treated by Tuna-Nörling 1995 and Slawisch 2013, and one may note that there is a general dip in the presence of material in that same period, c.490-460 BC. Sanctuary material also figures very prominently in the record from Samos (Kreuzer 1988, black-figure material) and Miletos (Kunisch 2016), and the general similarities with that from Naukratis have been well noted, even if the earliest material from Miletos is slightly later than that from Samos and Naukratis. All have plenty from the Komast group, though on Samos they are more frequently of larger shapes.

Among the black-figure material from Naukratis the Nikosthenic pyxis is perhaps unusually frequent; but the shape is found in even higher quantities at the Heraion of Samos and in the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Miletos (Kunisch 2016, 49-55), where there is a strong element of female cult scenes on them, lacking on any of the Naukratis sherds, three of which are known to be from the Apollo sanctuary; and while the Ionian finds may signal their use as a container for substances used or offered in cults of female deities, it should be noted that the graffito on one piece from the Aphrodite sanctuary at Miletos with such a scene is a dedication by a male (Kunisch 2016, no. 183), though perhaps made on behalf of a female or male.

31 Boardman 1967 notes the meagre amount of material from Emporio and adds references to that from elsewhere on the island; there are good amounts of black-glazed material and a little red-figure from various sources in Chios town in the Museum reserves.

32 The amount of material is more substantial than may at first sight appear; there are 192 miniature skyphoi - if they are Attic - entered as 2599 and 2600 in Lindos II and 306 BF and 51 RF fragments, plus 327 BG and 69 sherds with graffiti. From available evidence similar or more such material was found at the Ialysos sanctuary.
family. Whatever the case, their presence at Naukratis may well have been the result of Samian, Milesian or perhaps broadly Ionian choice. Regarding the kantharos, its absence from the Aphrodite sanctuary on Zeytintepe at Miletos can scarcely be explained by lack of a cult of Dionysos (as Kunisch 2016, 24), in view of their relatively high number at Naukratis, none from Dionysos sanctuaries, nor any with Dionysian imagery.

The red-figured material from Miletus and Samos have a similar profile, of good quality early pieces until the destruction of the former and its slow revival later in the Classical period. On Samos a gap appears later, in the second half of the fifth century BC, and there is an overall lack of kraters in the whole century; Kreuzer (2017, 51-58) attributes the former to local social pressures – a demise in the use of the Hera sanctuary after the Samian revolt in 441 BC and a preference for the cults associated with Athens installed nearby, and for the latter the use of metal equivalents (but see n. 9 above).

From Klazomenai (Tuna-Nörling 1996) the bulk of material, from habitation and cemetery sites, fits the mould of Samos and Miletos, though little is before 550 BC; the mainland site there as at Miletos has a very plausible cut-off date of 494-3 BC. There too are good number of black-figure lekanides and lids, several of Nikosthenic pyxes, although they are from habitation, not cemetery contexts (Tuna-Nörling 1996, 24-5). The RF material is for historical reasons mostly of the fourth century BC; the balance is unusual – no pelikai, few skyphoi, but many askoi and lekanides; however the black-glazed material is not included in the publication.33

There are some striking contrasts with the material from the Athenian acropolis, a corpus whose preservation will have been guided by criteria similar to those applied at Naukratis.34 Five shapes are particularly worthy of comment. While the lekanis is frequent at Naukratis into the second half of the sixth century BC, only two are published from the Acropolis; and only one oinochoe is found there earlier than c.525 BC, compared again with substantial numbers from Naukratis. However the decorators of both shapes are represented by other vase types on the Acropolis. Much the same, but in reverse, can be said of plates and loutrophoroi, rare and non-existent respectively in sixth century BC Naukratis but frequent on the Akropolis. The kantharos is a more delicate matter, and vase; at Athens they amount to about 2% of the total for cups, with 13 BF examples; at Naukratis there are 22 sherds (none later than c.540 BC), perhaps 5% of the total of cups before that date. There does seem a discrepancy here, not least if one eyes the single BF kantharos from Gravisca in Etruria, in most senses the home of the shape; however, perhaps a more substantial point is that no direct connection of the shape with Dionysos is to be seen neither in the cults involved nor in the iconography of the material at any of the sites.

A substantial difference between the records of Naukratis and Gravisca as regards RF is the large number of late Archaic cups at Gravisca, consonant of course with the record in Etruria as a whole, as indeed that

33 At Naukratis several askoi have been found in the rubbish levels from the town in the recent excavations
34 I use the figures in the table in Pala 2007, 187.
for the totality of early RF. The situation at Naukratis is far more like that in Ionia and Cyprus where RF is thin till near the mid-fifth century highlighting the presence of much poor, late BF (Slawisch 2013, 195-6, with a resumé of generally unconvincing reasons that various scholars have put forward for the absence). A further striking disparity is the lack of owl skyphoi and St. Valentin class drinking vessels at Naukratis compared with Gravisca, Pyrgi, Adria and Palagruža (Huber 1999, 18, Weil-Marin 2005, 194-7, 235-40 and 260-8), and indeed, as noted above, with sites very much nearer (Tell el-Herr, Defernez 2001, 165-74 and Palestinian sites, Klinger 2003, 141).35

RF oinochoai and amphoras are rare everywhere (Gravisca has only choes, interestingly, and type VIII mugs). The two early RF amphora fragments from Naukratis show that such pieces were not a fully Etruria-bound category.36

With respect to sites in the SE Mediterranean, at Al Mina Beazley (1939, 1) sums up the slight amount of BF: ‘The black-figure … is scanty, poor and no older than the earliest red-figure sherds’. For RF there are c.25 pieces pre-460 BC, including nine Pithos painter cups and a volute-krater by the Syleus painter. Thirteen squat lekythoi seem to have been stored as a single consignment in some form of warehouse (Woolley 1938, 24). Only one piece, a calyx-krater, is as late as 375-50 BC. Including unpublished material in the British Museum and the Ashmolean Museum, the amount of BG is high, though mostly post-450 BC, with skyphoi predominant (there are very few kylix feet). Contrast perhaps, for RF, the record at Kition, with rather more material of the fourth century BC, though Robertson noted the general similarity of the two corpora (Robertson 1981, 71).

Attic pottery from Palestine was assessed by Sonia Klinger (2003), largely based on Wenning 2000; she stressed then that the range of shapes had been underestimated, perhaps because of the very fragmentary nature of the largely habitation material. The pattern overall seems to vary little from that at Naukratis, save for a lack of pieces before 550 BC and rather thin coverage before 500 BC. The character of find spots may account for the relatively large numbers of lekythoi.

Comparisons with Cyrenaica are difficult for the Classical period in view of the current, scattered state of publication. With respect to earlier material, the record at the Demeter sanctuary at Cyrene (Moore 1987) is close to the pattern at Naukratis, with higher percentages of amphoras, plates and seemingly cup-skyphoi, but fewer little-master cups; the ratio of drinking vessels to craters and dinoi appears similar, and the range of identified painters broad.37 Tocra’s Demeter sanctuary, rather to the contrary, has a fuller range of cups and very few kraters, even when other fabrics are included (Boardman and Hayes 1966, 96-7 and 1973, 41-4).

35 A single St. Valentin class fragment is known from Naukratis, n.21 above. Regarding statistics from Gravisca, it is important to work from the total numbers listed in the relevant volumes, not the pieces catalogued – even if the latter are more suited for comparison with the retained Naukratis sherds.
36 One assumes a type A amphora from Vix reached the site via Italy, though whether it took a Tyrrhenian or Adriatic route, in whole or part, is a nice question (Chazalon 2015).
37 The use of a vertical band of palmettes on a lid appears at both sites (Fig. 48 above) but from different painters.
With regard to Egyptian parallels, the BF material is treated in Weber 2012; apart from Tell Dafana no site has yielded anything that can be termed a statistical sample; the comparatively large number of large closed Attic vases from Dafana contrasts with the record at Naukratis, while material from Memphis is thin and spread both in date and type. Much the same applies to the fifth and ‘pre-Alexandria’ fourth century BC material – no site with any substantial amount, while sanctuary finds are virtually unknown outside Naukratis. Defernez (2001) has surveyed the material, though with her focus on Tell el-Herr with its St. Valentin group material, many patterned white-ground lekythoi and squat lekythoi, accompanying as many non-Attic transport amphoras. Herakleion has yielded similar material, though without the white-ground pieces and with few RF kraters (Grataloup and McCann 2008, 248; Grataloup 2010, 153-5; Grataloup 2015, 140-3).

The agents who transported the Attic pots are virtually invisible, but certainly for the sixth century BC would have been Ionians; the traders’ marks on the feet of some Attic pots from Tell Dafana give a little evidence for that view (Johnston 2014, 127-8). Venit 1981, 154, suggests that ‘Athenian entrepreneurs’ saw a useful market in Egypt, where the Corinthian Kerameikos was not exporting; this rather overlooks the fact that many East Greek producers were so doing, and posits on little if any evidence (rather than Solon’s alleged visit?) that there was an Athenian merchant network liaising with potters.

Evidence for the fifth century BC or later is confined to one probable trader’s mark, dipinto EV under the foot of British Museum 1910,0222.248, and three numeral notations, two with apparent drachma signs, on a black-glazed bolsal and two skyphoi (British Museum 1965,0930.876, 1888,0601.415 and 1888,0601.775), common usage for the period.

One aspect that seems clear is that the iconography of the figured material provides no evidence of trade directed to Egypt.\textsuperscript{38} The range and amount of the material is indeed impressive, and not replicated anywhere else in the zone between Cyprus and Cyrene. Similarly, the range of shapes is broad, even if fragments do not easily allow one to decide between allotting a sherd to a frequent or a rarer shape, especially with larger pots. Assessing usage within Naukratis itself is hampered by lack of precise provenance of most material, but little in the Attic record points to differentiation of equipment at the various sanctuaries. Some substantial patches of material can be seen which do not occur at other sites- early olpai, Gordion cups, kantharoi, perhaps the type C BG cups dedicated to the Gods of the Greeks. Such patches, however, do not appear to be related to the demands of any particular cult, nor a fortiori to the strategic policies of their Athenian makers; they did occasionally make special commissions for external purchasers, but numerically these are insignificant compared with regular production.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{38} Even, I think, when we include some pieces which are problematic to interpret, for the most part noted above.

\textsuperscript{39} The point is also made by Slawisch 2013, 195, n.25. It can be noted that the type C cup was also the vehicle for dedications to other, individual deities, a few denoted by abbreviated texts prominently placed (Johnston and Chirpanlieva 2017).
Appendix 1

Notes on Naukratis pieces in Alexandridou 2010

There is a problem with using this useful survey with respect to Naukratis because of the referencing system, most notably in the use of plate numbers to refer to Venit, while only rarely giving catalogue numbers. There is also confusion between the two Cambridge collections - the pieces in the Museum of Classical Archaeology being subsumed under the Fitzwilliam Museum. The following list provides supplementary information, corrections and updates based on the work of the British Museum’s Naukratis Project.

A(lexandridou cat. no.)180 registration number Fitzwilliam 128.1899
A182 173.1899
A542 272.1894
A595 131.1894

A360. ‘London B103.20E’ is B103.20.5.
A454 and 455, unnumbered London pieces, are 1888,0601.594d and 584a.

While one may always have differing views on shapes of fragmentary pots, a few ascriptions seem definitely wrong:
A1247, Toronto, ROM 234.20 should be a dinos or krater, not lekane/is.
A1325, London 1965,0930.843 is not a lekythos (the only one listed by Alexandridou from Naukratis), but is also listed twice, once more correctly (A366) as an amphora (a handle scar is preserved).
A1310, Brussels A1862, is scarcely a stemmed plate, but its shape is not easily divined.
A1103, London 1888,0601.570 and related sherds are from a stand, not a loutrophoros.
A1528, Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum 19866, is from a stand.

Two pieces are Corinthian, A109 and 180.
Two are not known to be from Naukratis - Cairo 26.169 and 172 (A112 and 101 respectively).

Without these last four, two duplicated entries A858 and A1325, as well as A859, which seems later, A. lists 85 pieces earlier than c.560 BC from Naukratis. Naturally the efforts of the Naukratis Project have increased the number substantially (though some known material was omitted by Alexandridou probably because it was unattributed to any painter); in sum, about 60 further pieces should be added, not counting black-glazed material (which for this period amounts to only a few dinos and SOS amphora sherds).

As ever, it should be stressed that these figures often include sherds from the same vase, and so should not be taken for the minimum number of individuals.
Appendix 2

Material from Coulson’s survey at Naukratis

The nature of the publication of Coulson 1996 means that extracting information about Attic material is not easy. A review has to some extent been facilitated by consulting unpublished photographs in the W.D.E. Coulson Archives in the University of Thessaly at Volos, but for much no such aid is available. The quality of the profile drawings is variable, and the verbal descriptions concentrate on the nature of the fabric at the expense of details of shape or decoration (especially with respect to the use of ‘red’ for what often seems to be glaze, and treatment of the inside).

To an extent the preliminary report, Coulson and Leonard 1981, is more user-friendly; it includes several of the RF pieces on p. 52, but the treatment of the BG on p. 53 needs correcting. The rims cited at the top (fig. 16) are all of kantharoi, and the bases of ‘these bowls’ (fig 17) are mostly of skyphoi. Their fig. 15.3 (= Coulson 1996, no. 787) is from a probably BF oinochoe, not a Hadra hydria, and pl. 6.4 (Coulson 1996, no. 55) is the earliest piece from their work, a Chian tripod bowl leg, not late Hellenistic (as already noted by Gill 2003, 279).

There are a few other East Greek pieces – Coulson 1996, nos 19, 22, 74, 572(?), 653(?), 926, 940, 954, 1087, 1293, 1338, 1342, 1573, 1809 (mostly cups and bowls from the northern part of the site area), but little in the Attic that clearly looks to the sixth century BC. Most would appear to be from between 450 BC and 300 BC, but many can only be given a very broad date. The balance would seem to be one third pre 400 BC, two-thirds later.

Of the c.320 Attic pieces, one is probably BF (no. 787, noted above), and 16 RF (if the volute-krater handle, no. 1344 is from a RF not BF piece); the shape of many remains unclear, but six are kraters, and one each pyxis (no. 481), lekanis (no. 1152) and cup-skyphos (no. 571). The majority of the remainder are probably BG.

In the catalogue the use of ‘skyphos’ for open shapes is liberal; some such pieces are clearly plates or shallow bowls, while the reverse procedure is also attested – ‘plates’ with steep walls. The assignment of specific shapes to many sherds is by no means easy, but it is at least clear that the number of later fifth century or fourth century BC bowls and plates is high, as for example at Al Mina; at least 130 pieces can be put in this category, while fully assured skyphoi are about 10, though a further 50 sherds are generically cup or skyphos. More specifically, there are 5 bolsals, 2 cup-kantharoi (Fig. 67a-b), 7 kantharoi, 1 fishplate (no. 1172), 5 one-handlers, 4 stemless cups (but assured kylikes are very few indeed), 6 salt-cellar, 5 lamps, 1 squat lekythos (no. 925, probably originally RF) and 1 possible hydria (no. 719, most likely from a figured vase, Fig. 68a-b). There are 9 sherds which could perhaps be from oinochoai, which would be an unusual percentage, but as four each are merely handle or base fragments, caution is required, especially as the treatment of the inside of the bases (nos 109, 10781, 1376 and 1544) is not stated; the remaining piece is a rim, no. 604.

40 The numbering system for the sherds in the archival documents unfortunately differs from that used in the publication, compounding difficulties of identification.
which, while certainly not a cup or skyphos, as in Coulson, is difficult to assess as the profile drawing does not fully reflect what is visible in the archive photograph (Fig. 69a-b).