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1. Preface

1.1. This review is part of an ongoing project which has had a long incubation period, but gathered pace from 2010. For my own part, I have previously studied a certain number of pieces in the British Museum and elsewhere in connection with my work on trademarks and letter forms, mainly in the early 1970s. The current re-study commenced in 2006 and has included personal inspection (or re-inspection) of over 95% of the published material, and probably 99% of those examples whose current whereabouts are known. Not included in this chapter are four sets of material:

a) A relatively small number of texts on non-ceramic surfaces, all but two on stone; they are noted where relevant, but will appear in a separate chapter of the Catalogue, in addition to:

b) Stamped texts, all but five on amphorae or lagynoi. A small number of graffiti on transport amphorae, some of uncertain provenance, are discussed in 8.6.1.

c) 'Vase inscriptions': signatures, labels and so forth; virtually all are on Attic pottery, apart from the bespoke dedications on Chian kantharoi and chalices, which are included here.¹

d) A very small number of late Roman/early Byzantine stamps and dipinti.

1.2. The aims of the study are varied. The primary goal is to establish correct readings of all the texts and their relation to the pot concerned, followed by the categorization of the pot. Seriation is an important feature of course in establishing patterns of use and identifying possible anomalies and this aspect has been considerably facilitated by the work of others in the Naukratis Project, as reflected in this catalogue. Therefore, while a ‘philological’ discussion of the texts is an important element of the study, the contextual framework of the material will be of central concern in relating it to broader issues such as cult and trade.

1.3. For the purposes of this publication all references and statistics apply to inscriptions on pottery, not to the pots themselves.

Some abbreviations are used throughout the chapter and are noted here at the outset:

a) followed by catalogue numbers:


¹ There are possible Chian ‘labels’: 1888,0601.504, CW 59, Wachter 2001, 215, N (a), Jrn[Bo]; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 1894.72, CW 30; Wachter 2001, M (a), ΤΟΘΟΚΟΟ; 1924,1201,390, CW 61, Wachter 2001, M(b) – ηυς ολο, or less likely Μουσα. All are discussed by Wachter; none can be assuredly taken as ‘vase inscriptions’ in the Attic sense, though strong arguments can be put in favour of this with respect to the last of the trio. There are few known to me on other fabrics, and I comment here on only one – the Middle Corinthian krater 1886,0401.789, see below 13.1.


TM = A.W. Johnston, Trademarks on Greek Vases (Warminster, 1979).

b) followed by page numbers:

M A. Möller, Naukratis; Trade in Archaic Greece (Oxford, 2000).

c) other abbreviations:

‘British Museum, Department of Greece and Rome’ is omitted before registration numbers of pieces in the Museum; unless otherwise stated, all objects are in the British Museum collection.

EG = East Greek

ABV = J.D. Beazley, Attic Black-figure Vase-painters (Oxford, 1956)

CVA = Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum

LGPN = Lexicon of Greek Personal Names (Oxford, 1987–)

SEG = Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum

In the tables derived from my own database the following abbreviations are used:

bg = black-glazed

g = graffito

d = dipinto r(ed) or b(lack)

l = lip

b = body

f = foot

i = inside

u = under

‘Cup’ is used for drinking vessels with offset rim, such as those termed ‘Knickrandschale’ in recent work on East Greek pottery (see Schlotzhauer 2000).
‘Bowl’ indicates a small open vessel without a separate rim, with or without handles.

All dates are BC.

1.4. This chapter includes a limited number of images, mostly illustrating pieces of either an individual or problematic nature, or ones not previously published elsewhere. However, the complete set of material is included in the catalogue section.

My work has been facilitated considerably by those in whose keeping the material lies: Lucilla Burn (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge), Susan Walker (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford), Cécile Evers (Musée du Cinquantenaire, Brussels), Udo Schlotzhauer (Berlin), Marjorie Venit (re: Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria and Egyptian Museum, Cairo), and especially Alexandra Villing and other members of the British Museum’s Department of Greece and Rome.

2. Background

The reader will find here a new study of the inscribed Greek pottery found mostly in the excavations at Naukratis on the Canopic branch of the Nile between 1884 and 1903. It remains the largest corpus of such inscriptions from a single site, a fact that has tended to be overlooked perhaps in the search for items of individual interest. The material, dating largely to the 6th century BC but with a long later ‘tail’ into the Hellenistic period, will be approached here as both inscription and pot (different from most earlier work that relied almost exclusively on line drawings of the inscriptions – Fig. 1) and will be put into broader Mediterranean contexts where possible. However, there will be little on stratigraphy or overall statistics, for the sound reason that the former is at best difficult to interpret and the latter have to be very carefully treated because of the initial discarding of a great deal of the excavated material.

There are in the region of 2,800 inscribed ceramic pieces from Naukratis, not including stamped amphora handles. It will be shown below that a precise number cannot be given, whether ‘pieces’ is taken to mean ‘pot’ or ‘sherd’. The range of these texts is wide and this introduction gives an overview of the character and dating of the material. Notes on the presentation of the material and an account of previous study are given, followed by individual sections on the manifold aspects of such study. Most of the texts for which we have evidence of provenance come from sanctuary areas and so here it is proper to consider first the basic features of votive and non-votive inscriptions.

2.1 Dedications

Classifying marks is not easy when they are in a fragmentary state; it would be useful to say how many surviving pots with an inscribed text were given to any one deity, but this is impossible for numerous reasons, the most substantial being the lack of any part of the dedicatee’s name on
numerous sherds which contain other aspects of dedicatory formulae. At either end of the scale we could count either all the alphabetic texts which look dedicatory and appear to have been found in a given sanctuary or only the texts where the dedicatee’s name is well preserved. The choices are made more individual at Naukratis by the clear preference for giving Apollo drinking vessels with his name in the genitive, and for Aphrodite Chian chalices or kantharoi with dedicatory texts applied before firing (Fig. 2). In the former case should we count all sherds with only two letters of Apollo’s name preserved? And what about the few cases where Chian vessels have a bespoke dedication to other deities? In the figures I provide below, I do not regard the text ἴος or ἴος vac as sufficient to prove Apollo’s name in the genitive, but ἴς ε for 615 included, as are most fragmentary examples of Aphrodite’s name (including ἴι, on the assumption that this is unlikely be the end of a dedication to Hera). The texts ἴος or ἴος unfortunately may refer to either the Dioskouroi or the ‘Gods of the Greeks’. The distinction between ‘dedicatory’ and ‘others’ is often blurred when only part of a personal name is preserved (dedication or owner’s inscription?), and my partition of them is often arbitrary. The few Chian texts which may be labels of figures on the pot rather than part of votive texts scarcely affect overall statistics (see n. 1 above).

In view of these uncertainties, figures above 30 are rounded to the nearest five in the following lists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apollo (c. 460 in total)</th>
<th>Aphrodite (c. 285)</th>
<th>No evidence for dedicatee (615)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘East Greek’</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mortaria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinthian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakonian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeolian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gods of the Greeks: 8 East Greek, 4 Chian, 15 Attic
Dioskouroi: 11 East Greek, 4 Chian, 1 Aeolian, 1 Attic, 1 Corinthian, 1 local, 3 unknown
Hera: 16 East Greek, 1 Lakonian, 1 unknown (but almost certainly East Greek)
Herakles: four pieces could reflect a cult of Herakles, although two are equally as likely to be owner’s marks (BSA 3, not located, and Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 101.1899 (BSA 63), with vac Ηρακ[ and ]Ηρακ[ respectively). More plausibly referring to a cult (see Höckmann 2010, 26–8, not noting the damage to the first piece) are two examples, one an East Greek cup (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.58 (BSA 33, the text now partly lost), with genitive ]Ηρακ[ε(ος)], and an Attic type C cup, 1900,0214.16, ]Αρτεμιών Ηρακ(λ)ε[.
Zeus: see 9.2 below for three sherds that do, or may bear, his name.
2.2 Not dedicatory

There are about 1,330 non-dedicatory texts, and it might be thought possible to break down this large group into smaller categories; I have indeed tried to do so. There are a reasonable number of marks on transport amphorae (c. 55) and decorated pots (c. 110) that can broadly, and perhaps sometimes optimistically, be designated as ‘commercial’, as well as a small number that are obviously owner’s marks (12, mostly on Attic open pots and all under foot (with the exception of Teos’ ostrakon, 1900,0214.15; BSA 112). For the remaining 1,170 or so examples, however, no definite designation is possible, other than ‘probably owner’s mark’, ‘perhaps dedicatory’, ‘symbol’ and so forth. They comprise:

East Greek 375
Chian 276
Aeolian bucchero 42
Attic, all 315
Corinthian 12
Lakonian 7
Cypriot mortaria 6
non-Attic black-glazed 28
local black-glazed 22
local kiln furniture 4
other local 4
West Slope 1
Etruscan bucchero 1
Eastern sigillata 1
lamps 3
various closed 27
various other 8
not found 40

2.3 Shapes

Details are given elsewhere in this catalogue, but below are some overall figures for the shapes of the vessels with dedicatory texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Apollo (c. 460)</th>
<th>Aphrodite (c. 285)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chalice</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phiale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kantharos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krater</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dinos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mortarium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other open, large</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other open, small</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oenochoe</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large, closed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These figures show a roughly similar distribution of drinking vessels to service pottery in each sanctuary, although the variety of specific types differs, most notably with the balance of cups or bowls and chalices. The most striking differences undoubtedly appear in the mortaria for Apollo (plausibly because they were earlier than most Aphrodite dedications, even if this does not explain their demise; Fig. 3), the oenochoai for Apollo and the phialai for Aphrodite, neither of which can have a chronological explanation.

If one looks at the pattern in the period from 550–350 BC, after when dedications disappear, the vast majority of pots are drinking vessels; there are, crudely speaking, one krater and half a jug per generation and merely one amphora, phiale, lekanis, stand and askos for the entire period.

### 2.4 Chronology

At Naukratis the overwhelming number of dedicatory texts are on pots datable to the period c. 610–c. 550 BC, and in most cases closer dating concentrates on 580–550 BC. The same applies to most non-votive texts on East Greek, Corinthian and Lakonian pots, as well as on transport amphorae. Texts of the Hellenistic period consist largely of marks on local black-glazed pots, and rare ‘one-offs’. The intervening period, c. 550–300 BC, is represented almost entirely by inscriptions on Attic vases. This is not surprising in view of the take-over of pottery markets across the Mediterranean by Athens, nor indeed is the distribution of inscriptions within the period inconsistent with the rise and fall of Attic exports in general terms; the bulk are from the period c. 530–450 BC, with some examples down to the late 4th century. Since many fragments are only broadly datable, closer analysis is problematic especially in the late Archaic to mid-5th century period when a large number of pieces exist as black-glazed cup or bowl fragments. However, it is clear that in the ‘boom’ years of c. 600–550 BC only between a dozen and twenty Attic pots of various shapes were given dedicatory texts. The number of Attic cups increase from c. 550 BC until they form almost the totality of inscribed pots in the late Archaic and early Classical period. It is also on Attic pots where we find the latest dedications to the major deities, Apollo (only one assuredly later than c. 450 BC) and Aphrodite (five or six post 450 BC), and over half of those to the Gods of the Greeks (with one example, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.50, BSA 72, probably of the 4th century); however, only one possible example to the Dioskouroi (1888,0601.231) of the period 500–450 BC is so late.

### 3. Previous work

Prior to the present catalogue, some 1,300 ceramic ‘texts’ from Naukratis had been published (mostly as line drawings only, see above Fig. 1), mainly in the following primary publications, the first four being general excavation reports:


In addition, Bernand (B) included in his corpus some 170 unpublished pieces in the British Museum and 5 in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, with 103 of them merely as illustrations without any textual comment. One should note the remark of Hogarth and others that ‘about forty other inscribed sherds were found, many of them scraps with only a letter or two. These it is not worthwhile to publish’ (Hogarth 1905, 118). It is highly probable that they are among the previously unpublished material in the Ashmolean Museum, where the rest of the inscribed pieces of Hogarth’s 1903 season were sent and where the Phoenician dipinto (AN1896-1908-G.124), mentioned immediately afterwards by Hogarth, is to be found.

Smaller numbers were first published in a variety of publications: Furtwängler 1889, 93 (Berlin); Hutton 1893, 82–3 (British Museum); Edgar 1907 (Alexandria); Fairbanks 1928 (Boston); Johnston 1979; and in CVA volumes: British Museum 8, Brussels 3, Cambridge 2, Dublin 1 and Reading University.

Donald Bailey published some results of a review of material in the British Museum in *BSA* 65 (1970) 3–4, as well as registering in 1965 a large number of previously unregistered sherds. The present writer has added some notes in two articles in the *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, ‘Naukratis: more light no ΣΟΝ’, *BICS* 21 (1974) 96–8, and ‘Fragmenta Britannica, II. Sherds from Naukratis’, *BICS* 29 (1982) 35–42. Astrid Möller (2000a) has commented on a very broad range of texts.

More recently a number of scholars have contributed and are continuing to contribute to Naukratis studies; see especially the proceedings of the British Museum Colloquium in 2004 (Villing and Schlotzhauer 2006a). The ceramic review of Naukratis pottery by Udo Schlotzhauer (Schlotzhauer 2012) includes relevant epigraphic comment, largely using my own readings, except in a few cases where they had not yet been posted on the British Museum’s website.

### 4. The totality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Museum, London</th>
<th>2,420</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashmolean Museum, Oxford</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvre, Paris</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Fine Arts, Boston</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College London</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian Museum, Cairo</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikensammlung, Berlin (lost)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College, Dublin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The large number of inscribed pieces that were not published in any of the works noted above is in the region of 1,400. Amongst so many, a few are bound to be of considerable interest; it should be noted, however, that very many were already carefully recorded in the Register of the Greek and Roman Department of the British Museum, and it is surprising that fuller use has not been made of that record. The search for joins remains a matter of interest and should continue. I have made a few new joins, almost all among East Greek cup fragments, but they are not specifically noted as such in the text.

4.1 ... and some problems

The figures quoted above are generally for inscribed sherds; however, many joining sherds were united before reaching their eventual homes and were then given a single inventory number, while joins have been made later between individually registered sherds (occasionally in different museums). Some 60 of the 2,420 in the British Museum are known to fall into the latter category.

Some published pieces have not been re-located, but their number is relatively small, amounting to about 60. Most of these examples were first published either in Gardner 1888 or in Hogarth 1898–9. They do, however, include some pieces whose full nature would be interesting to know.²

A small number of unpublished pieces that have been registered in the British Museum have not yet been located there.³ Six texts published correctly in Naukratis 1 and 2 under a single catalogue number were registered with more than one British Museum registration number (N6, 83a, 149, 234, 331, 806); the reason for this manner of registration in 1886 is not clear. N814 erroneously comprises parts of two vases, and there is one case of two N entries (332/333) being given a single British Museum registration number; N782 (Leodamas’ dedication) causes particular problems in this respect of fitting the N to the British Museum registration numbers (see Johnston 2010).

---

² The short note by Hutton 1893, 82–3 has caused a particular problem of identity of one piece (see below 9.3). It seems unlikely that further material in Cairo has yet to be rediscovered, while all in Alexandria has been published (Venit, pers. comm.).

³ All those previously unpublished examples preserve only a single letter or sign, except 1886,0401.689 which is clearly the upper part of N331 (1888,0601.867), even though the entry in the British Museum Register, suggesting the reading ‘?Zoïlos’, might indicate otherwise.
Eleven numbers in *Naukratis* 1 and 2 are ‘extra’ (1a, 1b, 83a, 344a, 397a, 397b, 581 (two entries), 697a, 738*, part of 814 and 814a; BSA 116 has no illustration. A few pieces have lost parts of text since publication (1886,0401.87, 108, 117, 140, 408, 505 and 1888,0601.188; 1911,0606.8; 1924,1201.689; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 100.1899; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.13 and 58); 1886,0401.681-2 and, seemingly, 1888,0601.546 have lost sherds. N418 does not appear to have ever existed.

In view of such matters, it should be noted that anywhere where total numbers are cited such figures are accurate, though often not precise.

4.2 Various other observations

1924,1201.9a and 10a (N394 and 396) have had their entries erased from the Register, for some unknown reason.

In the second campaign the excavators occasionally incised the find-spot on sherds; to my knowledge, just one of these has been published as an ancient text (Cook 1933–4, 43; 1888,0601.546, Fikellura fragments from the Dioskouroi sanctuary).

Two Oxford sherds in Bernand’s plates have not been securely identified (pl. 25, 14 and 17) and so should perhaps be added to the total; it is difficult to read either text from the photographs.

5. Revised readings

Of significance are the comparatively few texts where the reading given in the primary publications is incorrect. Some of these ‘errors’ are trivial, mainly concerning spacing of letters and indications of the breaks and they comprise the bulk of the 180 or so pieces where I have felt it necessary to note in my own lists that the published reading is incorrect. While the crowded format of the plates in *Naukratis* 1 and 2 tends to blur the identity of individual pieces, on the whole the texts are accurately rendered. What is rarely mentioned, however, is the position of the text on the pot, and naturally the 19th-century typology of the vases is not in line with present knowledge. It should also be stressed that in the line drawings in JHS no breaks are indicated at all.

I note two examples where the accuracy of the report in N might be questioned by a reader, but incorrectly. The first is 1888,0601.176 (N722; Fig. 4) where the spacing of the letters looks odd but is correct, since at the beginning the inscriber avoids decorated parts of the vase but then has a change of mind and the second is 1886,0401.812 (N308), where the complexity of a re-cut letter is rendered as well as could be expected in a black-and-white line drawing.

As noted above, this survey does not include Attic ‘vase-inscriptions’. However, it does embrace one Corinthian example (see 13.1 on Corinthian pottery) since it has so far been overlooked by all who have treated that corpus and it does also involve a graffito text.

Occasionally the question arises whether cuts on a pot are part of a deliberate alphabetic text or otherwise intended symbol, or rather part of
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black-figure incision work, as is the case with N243 (1886.0401.637, B204) and two pieces noted as having graffiti in the British Museum Register, 1886.0401.429 and 783 (respectively a small scrap with probably black-figure incision rather than lettering, and an East Greek bowl with most probably an incised sphinx). See also the possible Phoenician lettering on 1886.0401.96, noted immediately below.

Ernest Gardner’s first review of the material is remarkably thorough. He notes a range of letter forms and their development (a treatment which is still very largely acceptable) and suggests some reasons for inscribing on various parts of the pot or for avoiding ‘spoiling’ the decoration (reasons which are largely unacceptable) and occasionally gives an interpretation that ‘improves’ on Petrie’s drawings.

6. Language

Where texts appear to be alphabetic rather than symbol-based there is only one absolutely clear example of the use of any language other than Greek — a single Phoenician letter, mem, painted on a Greek amphora neck (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.124; Fig. 5)

We do have two texts cut in the Cypriot syllabary, 1900.0214.17 and Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1912.29 (Höckmann and Möller 2006, 13). It is possible to envisage in four other cases that a non-Greek language is being used, but none, for various reasons, is fully assured:

1886.0401.96, an East Greek cup with profile fully preserved (N244, B205, S 134); there is a graffito cut vertically under the handle, already accurately recorded in N, though visually set too close to the drawing for N238. The cutting seems intentional and has some resemblance to Phoenician script, as has been argued in detail by Schlotzhauer (with W. Röllig) 2006a, 301–7.

1965.0930.454 (Fig. 6) is a large flaring foot of an open vase, akin to that of a Corinthian krater; the diameter is c. 19cm. The clay is not that of any regular fabric found at Naukratis; the surface is ‘Corinthian’, but the biscuit is rather coarse, non-micaeous and fired various shades of pink and grey-brown. The underfoot graffito is cut orthograde in tall lettering, with four letters probably preserved. The easiest readings are ἐλαβά τοι or ἐλαβαῖς, neither of which are persuasively Greek. One could perhaps fall back on the assumption of an error and a slip of the graver in a rendering of Ἄπολλι, with a confusion of πι and ομικρόν, but the ‘nu’ seems totally intentional (and is probably not lambda-iota run together). The sequence of letters is seemingly not paralleled in Lydian, Carian or Lycian (for Lydian see also 10.1).
Two examples of Carian graffiti should be added, although the provenance of Naukratis is not assured for one, an inscribed olpe in Berlin, made of Nile clay with parallels from Naukratis, although with a Greek inscription (see 9.3). See Masson and Yoyotte 1956, 12–13 and pl. 8c, with earlier references; O. Höckmann 2008/9, 105; Herda and Sauter 2009, 96–7, with n. 272; Schlotzhauer 2012, no. 139.

The graffito (Fig. 7) published in by Sayce (Sayce 1893, 153, pl. 5; cf. Herda and Sauter 2009, 97, n. 274) is more difficult. The piece has not been yet found among the extant material, and Petrie seemingly gave Sayce no indication of the type of pot. While Adiego rejects it as an assuredly Carian text, Herda argues for such an interpretation; certainly the second and third signs can easily be read as such, but the first appears much like a common Greek lambda-epsilon ligature, known from other graffiti at Naukratis as well as widely elsewhere. The possible usage of ligatures in Carian which Herda suggests, based on the sign in the graffito published by Piras 2009, 242, fig. 21, is fragile.

7. Technical points

7.1 Physical

7.1.1 Repairs

I have noted ancient repairs on eight inscribed pieces. The inscription itself is closely involved in one case:

1886,0401.915, East Greek oenochoe neck, Ἐ...ἐ [‘I belong to Apollo’]. Extremely worn, including the letters to the left. But the repair hole seems to go through the already cut letter μ. We can contrast the graffito supplement of a damaged dipinto text on the Chian chalice 1888,0601.495. Both pots have an interesting history, of which the inscriptions form various parts (see Johnston 2008, 116).

Two further repaired pieces are pots of a similar type:

1888,0601.243 (Fig. 8; N854), large Attic lip-cup, lip. M 180 (but not known to her to be in BM). νακ Υβλη[.
1888,0601.214 (B pl. 22), lip of large Attic band-cup. One may ponder whether this could have been another dedication by Hyblesios, parallel to his big band-cup from the sanctuary at Gravisca (Johnston 2000c, 17, no. 9).

The rest are a very mixed collection:

- 1888,0601.182 + 1924,1201.15, Chian heavy chalice. See Fig 32.
- 1910,0222.17 (N401; repair hole noted there), mortarium rim. \( \text{\textnuv} \).
- 1910,0222.232a. (S 140, with an alternative registration number), East Greek olpe with three repair holes on neck. \( \delta\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa \). (see 9.3).
- 1910,0222.248 (below, Fig. 68), foot of Attic Nolan amphora or oenochoe, EV in black paint (TM 9B.20).
- 1911,0606.61, lip of East Greek bowl. \( \lambda\lambda\omega \) in large deep-cut letters.
- 1965,0930.639, East Greek cup foot, retrograde M under.

7.1.2 Dipinti

Painted marks are attested some 290 times. Approximately 260 are on Chian drinking vessels and a very few larger shapes, and where there is clear evidence bear dedications to Aphrodite, with the exception of six examples: two to either the Dioskouroi or the Gods of the Greeks (1924,1201.815 and 817), two to the latter (1924,1201.811 and 833) and two to Zeus Hellenios (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.114.6 and AN1888.218 (6) and British Museum, 1924,1201.840). I merely repeat here the oddity of the post-firing ‘repair’ to the text on 1888,0601.495 (Johnston 2006, 25). There are no dipinti among the dedications to Apollo.

There are two dipinti preserved in white paint, the dedicatory text on the North Ionian large Wild Goat style bowl, 1888,0601.531 (Fig. 9; N768, B459, M178, Villing 2013, 85, fig. 9) with the text painted on the inside of the lip, and the untraced, probably Chian, amphora (N pl. 16, 4 and p. 21), with a single ‘\( \text{psi} \)’ mark.
One brown-fired dipinto stands out from all other examples (Fig. 10). Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.19 (JHS 28), the wall of an East Greek, not Chian, closed vase, with the letters ρεμο: εμι[ in a band on the shoulder. The suggested restoration in JHS, [εμο: εμι[ ἐνθηκε, must be doubted, since εμι is not otherwise used; the ‘obvious’ restoration [εμο: εμι[ is best referred to as a mortal, not divine, owner of the piece, although parallels for such usage are not much more easily discoverable.4

The rest of the dipinti are red and consist of some underfoot marks on East Greek cups and bowls, and a broad scatter on other pieces, ranging from the wall of a Corinthian aryballos (a unicum) to some lettering on amphorae of various dates (for abbreviations see 1 above):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum registration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Type of pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1910,0222.260</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>parts of 3–4 letters</td>
<td>amphora, shoulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1910,0222.253</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>amphora, wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1910,0222.251</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>τττ</td>
<td>small closed vase, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1910,0222.250</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ἦν vac</td>
<td>Corinthian amphora, lip and neck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA188</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>Ν</td>
<td>Corinthian aryballos, wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1886,0401.721</td>
<td>369 fu</td>
<td>symbol</td>
<td>EG closed vase, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1965,0930.679</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>καππα-ρο</td>
<td>EG closed vase, foot and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1910,0222.252</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>EG closed vase, large, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 1910,0222.254</td>
<td>660 fu</td>
<td>Χ (now not too clear)</td>
<td>EG cup, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1965,0930.638</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>symbol?</td>
<td>EG cup, foot and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 1886,0401.1026</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>ΑΙ</td>
<td>EG cup, profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 1922,0508.13</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>Μ</td>
<td>EG olpe, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 1924,1201.339</td>
<td>774  bi?</td>
<td>ΗΟ</td>
<td>EG plate, foot and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 1965,0930.744</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ΩΟ vac?</td>
<td>EG(?) closed vase, shoulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ashmolean, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.124</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Phoenician mem</td>
<td>Greek amphora, neck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 is the one underfoot dipinto not included in Johnston 1979, a cup of delicate make (diam. foot 4.3). It is not easy to judge what is the top and which the underside of 13. 1–4 are miscellaneous later pieces; 14 is an unusual, although regrettably fragmentary, red dipinto on a banded closed vase; and the rest are various ‘trademarks’. 15 has been noted above in 6.

7.1.3 Pre-firing graffiti

These are usually easy to detect, although there will always be some borderline cases; at Naukratis I have not noted many such difficult pieces, although one is significant: the dedication to Aphrodite Pandemos on the top of the rim of an Attic krater in London (1900,0214.6), Heidelberg and Bonn. The ‘lapidary’ text is extremely carefully cut, and gives few clues as to the time of inscribing; on balance a post-firing application, in Ionic script,

---

4 Even dedicatory texts are rare. Some dedications to Aphrodite from Miletus (Birzescu 2009, 128–9, cat. 7); some pieces from Athenian Acropolis; MFA, Boston, 03.852 is a bespoke dedication to Apollo on an Attic cup from Boeotia by the C painter (ABV 51, 2), in addition to a curious, perhaps half-jocular, half-misunderstood use of anetheken on a Pan painter lekythos from Pydna (Misailidou-Despotidou 2012). Add Muccigrosso and Higginbotham 2011.
would be preferable, which would contribute little to the question of the origin of the cult title at the site – whether Athenian orIonian – already in part treated by Scholtz 2002–3 and especially by Höckmann and Möller 2006, 16–17. A possible further dedication to Pandemos may be noted, 1922,0508.10 (Fig. 11), the wall of an Attic black-figured cup with Ἀφροδίτη πτ[...], not necessarily earlier than any of the other trio of pieces, all of which are also Attic,5 with graffiti in the Ionic alphabet; one indeed is very post-firing in that it was inscribed as an ostrakon, presumably used as a label for a dedicated object.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum registration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Type of pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1886,0401.1291</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>zeta, and dipinto</td>
<td>Samian amphora, intact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1910,0222.5</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>Cypriot amphora, handle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1910,0222.8</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ΙΧΧ</td>
<td>EG amphora, handle &amp; neck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1886,0401.92</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>zeta</td>
<td>EG amphora, shoulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1910,0222.246</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>‘arrow’ delta</td>
<td>amphora, shoulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1910,0222.242</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>trident?</td>
<td>amphora, shoulder &amp; neck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1910,0222.247</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>‘arrow’ delta</td>
<td>amphora, shoulder/neck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1910,0222.244</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>amphora, wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 1886,0401.1338</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>amphora, wall &amp; handle root</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1910,0222.234</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>E, four bars</td>
<td>EG closed vase, larger, wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 1886,0401.91</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Ligature(?) plus E</td>
<td>EG closed vase, shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 1886,0401.518</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>swastikoid</td>
<td>EG large open vase, wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 1886,0401.968</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X, pre-firing</td>
<td>EG?, amphora?, wall &amp; handle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 1910,0222.240</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>μ vac</td>
<td>closed vase, large, wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 1910,0222.245</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>closed vase, vertical handle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 1910,0222.238</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>closed object, wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 1886,0401.829</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>EG cup, foot &amp; wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 1910,0222.233</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>vac Αχιλ vac</td>
<td>kiln furniture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 1910,0222.239</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>ιμελ[ ?]</td>
<td>foot, large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 1910,0222.235</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>f?</td>
<td>ιεσ[ ]</td>
<td>pedestal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 1886,0401.969</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>vac τόλ [ ]</td>
<td>local, plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 1910,0222.237</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>Λ[ ]</td>
<td>open vase, foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 1910,0222.243</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>ιπΟΛΛΟΣ[ ]</td>
<td>kiln furniture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 1910,0222.241</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>ιμ vac</td>
<td>kiln furniture?, profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 1900,0214.18</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ιεσιος Διοσκόροις vac</td>
<td>lamp, wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 1910,0222.236</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>ΛΙΗ</td>
<td>ΑΞΔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 1910,0222.247a</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Louvre AM1383</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>vac ττολ vac</td>
<td>kiln furniture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 1910,0222.255</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>zeta</td>
<td>kiln furniture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 1910,0222.256</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>ΖΩ</td>
<td>kiln furniture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 1910,0222.257</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>ιναου</td>
<td>kiln furniture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 1910,0222.258</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>ΑΘΗ</td>
<td>kiln furniture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5Scholtz takes N821 (1888,0601.212) and N818 (1888,0601.211) as East Greek, but the first is the lip of an Attic type C cup and the second the wall of an Attic black-glazed cup.
Of the rest, there are thirty-two in total, one of which, 27, has not been found. The bulk are N342-344, 389, 392 and 638-653, in addition to BSA 57 and five others which have not been previously published (25 is in Johnston 2006). Three readings in N are inexact: 342 (11), whose ligature is more complex than indicated; 640 (20), where an iota at the end is omitted; and 644 (19), on which I saw no final stroke as given in N; N also omits a break to the immediate left of 648 (23).

They fall mostly into two groups, amphorae and locally produced material. Excluding some body sherds and a handle, all perhaps from amphorae, only three pieces fall outside those categories:

10. Semi-decorated large vase, probably amphora; highly micaceous.
11. (Fig. 12) Shoulder of small East Greek, micaceous, closed vase with, retrograde, epsilon preceded by either ],βλ or a complex ligature not readily disentangled. The lettering points to an early date.
17. Lambda cut on stand-ring of a cup.

I have discussed pre-firing marks on amphorae elsewhere (Johnston 2004 and 2006, and see 8.6 below), and have little to add here with the exception that the material from Naukratis comes, to judge from the variety of clay, from a number of provenances. A purely technical note is that on 4 there is an unusual flow of the clay gouged out by the graffito, as if it were marked very soon after being thrown.

The marks on locally produced pottery, however, are a more interesting and diverse set. Eight pieces (18, 23, 24 and 28 to 32), would appear to be kiln furniture and of Hellenistic date (see below); the lettering of 19 and 21 is also of that general date, with 22 being virtually undatable (Schlotzhauer and Villing 2006, 65; Schlotzhauer 2012, 182–4, nos 157 and 158). 26 is sui generis and is the only graffito from the site which actually gives its date of manufacture (see below 8.7).

We have a dedication on the lamp 25, which should be dated to around 540–500 BC (see Johnston 2008, 116). It should also be noted that the lamp has seen use, as already noted in BSA. This object is therefore excellent evidence of an object specifically marked as a dedication being used in the sanctuary, with the added two points of interest that it was so marked before its manufacture was complete (as the Chian kantharoi with bespoke dipinti) and that it is of clearly local clay. In addition, the object 20 can be closely associated by clay, script and text; it is best taken as some form of pedestal, even if the text would then be upside down, and was presumably part of the dedication made by ]σωρ, perhaps some form of lamp-stand or hood. Regrettably the letter before the epsilon on 20 is preserved merely as a speck at the break; its height does rule out many letters, but not enough to point to any specific reading. Nor do we have the verb preserved as evidence of what word might have been used in such a context, ἀέθητικς or ἔσωκς. The fact that the two pieces were found in different seasons can be noted, although the significance of that cannot be properly ascertained (Edgar notes that ‘it is unnecessary to state the provenance of each separate inscription’ (1898/9, 53)).

‘Kiln furniture’ is a title that can be given to a set of some eleven inscribed pieces in Nile silt clay, seven in the BM, one in the Louvre and three from...
the survey and excavations of Coulson and Leonard. Six Seven are roughly wheel-made, and might have been considered to have had some other use apart from kiln supports, were it not for their close association by clay and form of graffito with the remaining four, which are handmade, somewhat ovoid torus ‘doughnuts’, in size varying from an estimated maximum dimension of between 8 and 14cm.

The wheel-made examples are bowl shaped and in the majority of cases are without a floor (in others that part is lost, but we may assume a hole existed). On at least four pieces there is a smoothed ring surrounding the hole in the floor, a ring of varying width; on number 23 this feature is not flat, i.e. if stood with the ring as a foot, only the inner part would have touched the ground. This encourages the conclusion that the pieces should not be so viewed, but rather seen from the other way up, as splaying supports, with a height of between 3.5 and 5cm where measurable. The inscriptions, made before firing, tend to be on the underside if we take them as supports. Berlin (2001, 43) suggests that they were amphora stands, but the slight height compared to the width of the hole would not fit most types of jar being produced in the mid-Hellenistic period. In addition the idea does not fit the highly probable pertinence of the ‘doughnuts’ to the same ‘series’ of objects.

The interpretation of the inscriptions is not clear-cut, but the only category that covers all examples is the personal name. On 24 we find ḫmḥ śḥ, encouraging the view that the texts mark possession. While eīmī is frequent with the names of deities in dedications from Naukratis, this practice had disappeared long before the rings/supports and doughnuts were manufactured. Therefore it is difficult to see Apollo’s name on 23. When placed beside the other texts it is plausible to take it as a personal name, although Achīl and Ptol (18 and 28) might suggest a more ‘heroic’ interpretation.

7.1.4 Ostraka

A very few pieces seem to have been inscribed as ostraka. Three are discussed elsewhere: 1965,0930.747, ‘market’ label (see below 13.3.3, S 170, with not fully accurate drawing); 1888,0601.211, dedication to Pandemos (noted above); and 1888,0601.721, a caricature with added comment (see 17).

1900,0214.15 (BSA112, B635), Τήως : τό ἐστι τούτουρακον in 7 lines.

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.32 (Fig. 13), the foot of neck-amphora by the Affecter (Gill 1986, 185, n. 5; Johnston 2008, 115–16). The third stroke of the three-bar sigma is clearly cut on a broken surface, and the identification of the piece as an amphora confirms that the text was inscribed on the inside after breakage. Beyond that, there are some problems with the reading and its interpretation, for which there is no simple solution (whether one or two letters are lost in the middle, which horizontals are intentional and the value of the Λ); however the use of the three-bar sigma, combined with a presumed lambda of ‘Ionic’ shape, is not

---

6 See Coulson 1996, 82 and 85, fig. 47, no. 1639 and Leonard 2001, 191–2, fig. 3.6, nos 32–2, all preserving only short sections of text. Other uninscribed pieces are noted in Leonard 2001, 191 and Coulson 1996, 79, and several further uninscribed examples were noted during the recent British Museum fieldwork at the site.
what one would expect at Naukratis where the ostrakon was presumably inscribed, regardless of the reason for the text. The potting suggests a late date in the Affecter’s career, as does the decoration of the neck sherd of his amphora, 1886.0401.1176, found in the first campaign; the chances of these two and the other figured fragments in London, Oxford and Bonn (Mommsen 1975, nos 4, 16, 16a, 37, and p. 115, two near his hand) belonging to one vase seems statistically unlikely, although as the pot was broken before deposition we would not expect retrieval from the same context.

1910,0222.43 (Fig. 14; N428, with an accurate drawing) is an amphora wall, with possible glaze traces. κλεόνευτιον, where the dotted letter probably is an omicron. If this is the complete text (and although very worn the sherd does seem to be an ‘intact’ ostrakon), a possible reading is Κλέωνεύτιον ἐὰν ἔδω, or a variant, in a non-Ionic script, but one using Ionic lambda. The date would appear to be Archaic.

1886,0401.957 (N698) is a foot fragment of a late Archaic Attic cup with the text, vac Ξένωφερ, cut on top; this would have been extremely difficult to cut had the stem been in place, unless the inscriber cut it upside down.

One small serpentine stone fragment also seems to have been used as an ostrakon, 1886,0401.5 (N I pl. 31, 11; B2), on which I read Ἡρακλείδης Καλλίχω.

7.1.5 Varia

A few other technical points may be briefly noted. With respect to the actual inscriptions, 1888,0601.495 is noted elsewhere for its ‘repair’ in the inscription (Johnston 2006, 25), graffito lettering replacing dipinto letters that had peeled off the surface, and 1924,1201.546 (with 1965,0930.260, almost certainly from the same Chian chalice) has the graffito cut most awkwardly along the angle of the inside of the lip. 1965,0930.423 is a wall fragment of an Aeolian bucchero vase with traces of red pigment, such as that found in the lettering of another bucchero piece, 1888,0601.620, but clearly over broken edges. For non-epigraphic aspects it is worth mentioning the Lakonian krater foot 1910,0222.165 (Johnston 2013 104), which has a hole drilled through the base and 1888,0601.395*, a plate with suspension holes cut both before and after firing.

It is not a part of this report to comment extensively on clays, but it is important to note particular features. One such element is the appearance of reddish non-micaceous clay in a few Chian fragments, notably 1924,1201.841 (CW pl. 34,9) and 1924,1201.794+ (Bailey 1970, n. 10).

7.2 Locational

7.2.1 On open pots that do not have an offset lip, it is not always possible to judge whether the text is cut on the lip or the body; however, given that uncertainty, the texts break down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outside of lip</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside of lip</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside of body</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside of body</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neck</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some pieces have two texts and therefore two entries. Uncertain pieces are almost all either very small or possible lids.

7.2.2 Upside down?

Some 49 texts are clearly or possibly cut upside down to the normal position of the vase. The great majority of these are previously unpublished, and of the twelve that are published five have questionable readings – the set 1886.0401.263, 264, 266 and 272 (see below 12), and 1910.0222.235, which was cut upside down if the sherd is a pedestal (and where the final stroke of the text as presented in N is doubtfully intentional; see Johnston 2008, 116, n. 4). Similar uncertainty about the nature of the sherd, and therefore the orientation of the text occurs with some previously unpublished pieces: 1910.0222.71 (below, Fig. 51; N460), a possible stand of Aeolian bucchero; 1886.0401.1311, wall of perhaps a situla of very difficult reading; 1886.0401.557, East Greek cup wall scrap; 1965.0930.65, 91 and 194, Chian scraps. 1965.0930.577 is an Attic fragment that is hard to place, but it has two texts, one of which must be upside down, although which one is debatable. 1911.0606.52 is probably an East Greek bowl, with an upside-down text, but it is not impossible that it is a lid; the same possibilities exists for the larger Chian vase, 1888.0601.173 (CW 58; Johnston 2000a, 164–5).

Nine of the total are cut on the inside of the vase, with a variety of ceramic types; here I exclude texts on the floor of open pots, facing out, although the point on the wall where these turn into ‘upside-down’ texts is problematic and therefore the distinction involves a very grey area. I have defined some 114 texts as being on the inside of the lip or upper wall, rather than the floor; therefore the percentage of upside-down texts is fairly low at some 8%. However, if we compare that figure with texts on the outside of the lip (876 upright, 11 upside down) we find only 1.3%. It would be fair to argue from this a tendency to view the inside slightly differently; the greater ease of cutting an upside-down text on the inside is the most plausible explanation, while it is worth observing that such texts on the outside would not have been easily read were the pots hung up inside the sanctuary building.7

7.2.3 Foot

There are about 450 marks cut under the foot of pots, most of them either of a very broadly ‘commercial’ character or an abbreviated owner’s name. At least 40 do not belong to either category, because their longer content shows them to be dedications or various types of ‘bon mots’, but it is not easy to categorize any such text if it is fragmentary; approximately half of the total are on Attic vases. Thirteen dedications are so placed on Attic

---

7 Schlotzhauer 2012, 67 lists such instances on East Greek cups; in n. 316 1886.0401.217 does not belong to the group, 1888.0601.246 and 248 join and rims in University College London (UCL-402) and Oxford (AN1912.41(45)) can be added.
pots (of 140, c. 10%), nine on Chian (of c. 600, c. 1.5%) and five on other East Greek (of c. 650, c. 0.75%).

Marks on the outside of the foot proper (to be distinguished from the floor or the inside) are more unitary in type – 3 bucchero stands, an Attic oddity and some 45 Chian chalices. With respect to the visibility of feet of Greek vases this is not a surprising matter, since the tall conical foot of the Chian chalice is a good recipient of text; not that this stopped dedicators of chalices cutting their texts as frequently on the lip/wall or cul (bowl). Four of these chalices also have trademarks under the foot (TM 50-53) while on a fifth an apparently botched attempt at Aphrodite’s name is found underneath (1888.0601.421; N750, Johnston 2013, 105, fig. 4); the circumstances of such marking can only be guessed.

7.2.4 Retrograde texts

Apart from three single letters apparently cut retrograde, there are some 26 retrograde inscriptions in the whole corpus, over half of them previously unpublished. Six of these are on mortaria, two dipinto on Hera cups and three on Aeolian bucchero pots; all of these will be fairly early in the history of the site. 1886.0401.82 (N3; Schlotzhauer 2012, 157–8, 130 – illustrating only one of the two joining parts), with a boustrophedon text, is a problematic pot, but East Greek and also fairly early, and 1886.0401.941 (N683), a fragment of a Chian ‘bobbin’ amphora, not necessarily later than c. 570 BC if its unusually thick wall is any criterion. A black-figured lekanis rim (1886.0401.1043), perhaps Corinthian, has a three-bar sigma in the preserved text, ]...οϲ vac, probably therefore neither an Ionic nor Corinthian text. One brief text is on a clearly ‘late’ piece, a plain Attic kylix foot (1910.0222.129 (N519)), and one more substantial, and indeed later one on 1911.0606.41, a krater rim certainly no earlier than c. 450 BC (see below 8.5). Even later is the black-glazed fishplate 1911.0606.19 (below, Fig. 18). The remaining seven are a mixed set:

- 1888.0601.541, Wild Goat dinos. ιοδηγη vac.
- Oxford, Ashmolean Museum AN1912.41(4), East Greek cup lip, though not surely a retrograde text.
- BSA 23, not located, deep bowl. vac εψ[.
- N785, not located, dinos, μουανν, δηνημ[.
- 1886.0401.912, very difficult text on an East Greek bowl wall, seemingly retrograde.
- 1965.0930.92, Chian chalice or kantharos lip with graffito :ευ[.

---

8 Attic, 1886.0401.957 with the text cut upside down, presumably in view of the space available to the inscriber, on the top of the foot of a kylix. I discount a couple of Chian sherds that may or may not be from a foot.
8. Types of inscribed pot

Because of the collection regimes of the excavators it is now extremely difficult to judge matters such as the percentage of pots that were inscribed, especially with respect to plainer wares. What can be stressed, however, is the very broad range of shapes and styles that carry inscriptions, be they pre- or post-firing, graffito or dipinto (although the latter, beyond the Chian chalices and kantharoi, are rare as we have seen above). This applies as much to the Classical-Hellenistic material as to the Archaic, although the character of the texts does develop, with a much larger percentage of the later material being of the ‘owner’s mark’ variety.

The discussion is basically concerned with shapes, although it includes East Greek material in particular. Further treatment of mainland pottery will be found in 13.

8.1 Statistics and previous publications

As noted in the introduction, the overall figure for the ceramic inscriptions is c. 2,800 (there are 2,870 including duplicate entries, mostly joining fragments or pieces that have had two inventory numbers); of these 1,600 (59%), are not in the main earlier publications; as noted above, Bernand lists or illustrates some 170 of these otherwise unpublished texts, and some 60 published pieces have not (yet) been relocated.

Regarding the ceramically larger bodies of material, we can note that, excluding ‘trademarks’ on amphorae and small pots, there are about 540 fragments of Chian vases which bear graffiti, a number of which are no doubt from the same pot. A striking feature here is that only 90 of these (16%) were previously published (in N, CVA Cambridge 2 or Fairbanks 1928); in fact, a far greater percentage (about 60%) of the trademarks are illustrated in Naukratis 1 and 2. Bernand does illustrate on pls 20–1 some 46 previously unpublished Chian graffiti in the British Museum, but without comment.

There is a clear contrast here with a total of approximately 260 Chian dipinti, only 47 of which are previously unpublished, virtually a reversal of percentages.9

We should compare the published figures for the other major Archaic group, East Greek cups and bowls. Graffiti on East Greek cups (together with fragments which may be from either cups or bowls) amount to c. 670 in total (plus two dipinti), or c. 630 not counting trademarks; of these c. 245 (39%) are in the main publications and c. 300 are listed in Bernand (with a further 13 not commented on in pls 22–3); for East Greek bowls, not counting those with trademarks, the figures are c. 145 in total, with 50 in publications (34%) and only 46 in Bernand. Where texts are sufficiently well preserved on these East Greek cups and bowls the vast majority are dedications to Apollo; only 17 or so standard East Greek cups have assured dedications to Aphrodite.

---
9 The figure is not exact because a few of the ‘uninventoried’ British Museum fragments noted in CW are only tentatively identified in the series that was registered in 1965.
Therefore while over a third of graffiti on East Greek cups and bowls have been published in addition to nearly 85% of dipinti on Chian vases, only about 17% of graffiti on Chian vases have been properly published. Other groups of unpublished material that stand out are Aeolian bucchero (70; with only 13–14 published) and Attic (255 published and 195 unpublished).

8.2 East Greek

It is scarcely necessary to say that a very wide range of shapes and workshops are present in the large corpus of generically East Greek material. A great deal has already been written on the topic, from Ernest Gardner’s first classifications onwards, and clay analysis is now beginning to add precision (and occasionally caution) to our understanding (see Schlotzhauer 2012 and Hans Mommsen’s analytical results in the same volume, with references to their and Michael Kerschner’s earlier publications).

With respect to East Greek cups (and bowls) I single out just one variety for comment.

8.2.1 A distinctive East Greek cup

These low-rimmed, full-bodied and generally soft-fired cups, with orange-red to brown paint, and normally with some to much mica, form a distinct sub-group, with the occasional borderline case. I have noted rather more examples than listed by Schlotzhauer (2012, 52–3), who did not include material in museums other than the British Museum, but agree with the bulk of his corpus.

Half of the inscribed examples are previously unpublished. Two are inscribed under the foot, and four on the low lip, but most have the text on the body, and some 90% have the simple Apollo dedication in the genitive, with or without the definite article or e(i)mi; while no dative ending is preserved, three pieces have ἄνεθηκε, and on one of them, 1886.0401.669 (Fig. 15), it is inevitable that iota was the next letter at the end – Σληύς μ’άνεθηκε τωπόλλωνι.

Figure 15 East Greek cup, 600–550 BC. British Museum, 1886.0401.669. Drawing Denitsa Nenova

---

10 I include here a total of 50 ‘probably Attic’.
11 Basically Schlotzhauer 2012 type 10 and 11; Boldrini 1994, 142, fabric M; Boardman and Hayes 1966, type IX, but with broader reserved areas on the wall outside. For an overview of the type see also Kalaitzoglou 2008, 85, table 4, with accompanying text.
The range of texts is of interest with respect to the minimal number of dedications of these cups to Aphrodite, now that the core type has been plausibly attributed to Miletus through clay analysis.\textsuperscript{12}

In the set 1886,0401.385 (Schlotzhauer 2012, 53) is an odd-man out dialectally, with no omega and probably three-bar sigma, but it is also typologically a variant, with much finer build than normal and a reserved line at the top of the lip inside. Typologically further removed, 1888,0601.343 also has three-bar sigma and a variant text, which is not easily construed – θεος ζι – while non-formulaic remnants of texts are found on two scraps, \[\delta\], 1965,0930.682, and 1911,0606.63, \[\rho\] vac or vac η[\textsuperscript{\varepsilon}]\, while on 1965,0930.873, \[\lambda\omega\] may have a mis-spelling of Apollo’s name, with single lambda, although the reading is hardly secure; two assured mis-spellings are seen in 1886,0401.374 (double pi) and 1886,0401.407, \[\tau\pi\lambda\nu\zeta\] (omitted omicron).

8.3 Plates

There are some 45 plates or probable plates in the corpus, half previously unpublished, mostly falling into three distinct groups:

a) East Greek, 6th century BC
b) Attic black-glazed, including fishplates, mainly 4th century BC
c) Local ware, probably dating from a broad time span

Some outliers from these groups (ignoring a few small fragments that may belong either to the first group or to vases of perhaps a different shape):

1. Two Aeolian bucchero pieces, previously unpublished: 1886,0401.916, plate or dish, heavy rim, \[\mu\] vac cut on top; and 1965,0930.438, rolled rim, \[\tau\rho\alpha\iota\iota\], cut on underside, facing out. The former is perhaps a typical Apollo text, the latter a suitably Aeolic, but otherwise standard, Aphrodite dedication.

2. The shallow bowl 1886,0401.671 (Fig. 16), puzzling both for its text, \[\epsilon\κα\alpha\nu\kappa\lambda\epsilon\psi\iota\], and its problematic place of manufacture (Johnston 2006, 24–5, fig. 11 and Schlotzhauer and Villing 2006, 55).

3. 1886,0401.924 (Fig. 17) is a foot, perhaps of a shallow bowl, in non-micaceous pink clay, with \[\kappa\iota\lambda\lambda\iota\] cut on the stand-ring. Previously unpublished.

\textsuperscript{12} Schlotzhauer and Villing 2006, 61 have the attribution ‘Type 10 (Group D)’ – i.e. Milesian, though immediately add more cautionary remarks, while the sparse details in Schlotzhauer and Weber 2012, esp. 453–4 only include a reference to one cup of the related type 11 in that group.
The graffiti on the later black-glazed pieces, whether Attic or local, or indeed from elsewhere, are cut underneath the foot, with very few exceptions. Most notable is the Cypriot syllabic text on Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.29, probably not an Attic piece (Höckmann and Möller 2006, 13, fig. 6). 1911,0606.19 (Fig. 18), a probably Attic fishplate, has a ‘long’ underfoot text, vac? ηυκαρτιν vac; a scar before the initial alpha could hide a vertical stroke and the piece is very worn.

8.4 Dinoi

About 20 inscribed pieces are certainly or most probably from dinoi/lebetes; 13 are previously unpublished, while unusually of the seven published pieces readings need to be emended for three, all East Greek. It might be thought that the top of the rim would be the favoured place for the texts, as on bronze equivalents, but only eight are so marked, the rest being inscribed on the body. On two of the latter we find early epigraphic aspects, retrograde text on 1888,0601.541 and a closed heta on 1888,0601.546. One piece is of local production, 1965,0930.739, with vac τι. All pieces probably date from between 600 and 560 BC. There would appear to be a preference for the shape in the Aphrodite sanctuary; six have a text that specifically names Aphrodite, as against two for Apollo, and in addition, if we take into consideration the year of registration in the British Museum only the two with Apollo dedications were registered in 1886, with ten in 1888. Of the total of sherds registered in 1888 with known specific provenances, pieces from the Apollo temenos represent a mere 2% of those from Aphrodite’s (although the great majority have only a generic ‘Naukratis’ origin).

I have not been able to tease out the full reading for one of the six Aeolian pieces, 1888,0601.635 (N789), Διοκ...ε ηθεκε ο [, but it should be noted that N does not have the slight remains of a circular letter at the end, nor part of the horizontal of the delta at the start. 1888,0601.393 393a is a very large late Wild Goat piece with more now added since N: vac Ἐρμοφάνης ἄνθητης τήι Α[........]; ὁ Ναυσιπτ. 1888,0601.190 (Fig. 19) is also later Wild Goat, dinos or krater, with a short text on the body, Ἄτυν vac, visually difficult to disentangle from the incision work of the figured scene.

8.5 Kraters

Including two fragments which I class as ‘dinos or krater’, 45 examples have graffiti, distributed as follows:

18 East Greek
11 Attic, three from the same pot
9 Corinthian, three from the same pot.
4 Lakonian
3 uncertain
About a half have texts that are votive or strongly suggest it. Dedicatees are varied, four or five to Apollo, six to Aphrodite, one to Hera and the Dioskouroi, and seven are unknown.

The placement of the graffito is on the lip (twice inside it) in half the cases and on the body in most of the rest; three are underfoot and one on the handle. About half were previously unpublished.

Of the Attic pieces all but one are red-figured, with the text on some part of the lip. The one Attic black-figured piece has it inscribed on the body (1888,0601.394, N799; it is Attic, pace M 241); Bernand erroneously gives 1886 as the year of its registration at the British Museum, which gives the opportunity of pointing out that of the Attic kraters only 1886,0401.942, a lip probably of the later 5th century, was registered in the British Museum in 1886, but it has the text ἵππος ζαῦκ, almost certainly therefore an Aphrodite dedication. 1911,0606.25 (Fig. 20; BSA 105) is from a bell-krater, and has the reading ἦς ραί; the first preserved letter is unfortunately not clear, since ιυ and σιγμα could be added to the possibilities suggested in BSA.

1911,0606.41 (Fig. 21) has a retrograde text, inside the lip, ἰκεα in careful squared letters; it is from the lip of a large Attic calyx- or bell-krater, with a diameter of 52cm, dating from around the middle of the 5th century or somewhat later. The shape and decoration however are not easy to parallel. The text, one might hazard, is part of a dedicatory formula, ἀνεδήθη ηκεα υ. As noted above, the retrograde direction certainly stands out at such a date.

Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 157.1899 is from the wall of a krater of late in the 5th century. ιλ[ is inscribed at an unusual angle on the inside; ancient?

1888,0601.607 has ἸΟΣ ΆΠ[ on the inside of the rim, and although it is marked as ‘temenos of Dioskouroi’ it would appear to be the only Apollo dedication in the Attic set.

The Corinthian pieces are treated in 13.1 on Corinthian pottery. Only one (1924,1201.1220 (N459)) is cut on the lip, with ἸΙΜΗΞ Μ[; the first letter may be an epsilon, but the traces are not surely deliberate. One graffito is underfoot (1886,0401.1303), with a single letter, μυ, or possibly σαν.

East Greek pieces all seem to be part, if often minimal, of dedicatory texts except 1910,0222.49 (N435), with a possible ligature, βετα-υπσιλον, on the handle plate.

For the very varied Lakonian quartet see Johnston 2013, 104.
8.6 Amphora/hydria and other closed vases

The shapes cannot often be separated in their fragmentary condition.

- 60 ‘transport’ amphorae (see below 8.6.1, and for most, Johnston 2006).
- 5 hydria/amphora.
- 53 oenochoai and 2 probable oenochoai; 45 of them are East Greek and three local.
- 116 ‘closed vases’, the great majority are Aeolian or East Greek; 10 are Attic, of very varied character, epigraphically and ceramically.
- 17 smaller closed vases, a few identifiable as aryballoi.

The striking feature about this set of material is the imbalance of dedications to Apollo and Aphrodite; the latter is clearly mentioned in just 5 texts (on pots of undetermined closed shape), while Apollo is found in 40, half of them oenochoai or olpai.

Apart from the above, the range of texts cannot easily be judged as the great majority of them contain only one or two preserved letters. No doubt most are fragmentary dedications.

8.6.1 Transport amphorae

A list of inscribed transport amphorae from Naukratis was given in Johnston 2006, 28–9, to which some additions can be made.\(^{13}\)

A small number are clearly from the later period:

- MFA, Boston, 1888.1109: handle of some size, 20cm high, graffito τό on top of handle.
- Unlocated (BSA p. 35 and JHS p.124, fig. 3): torpedo jar with dipinto ςφω.
- Unlocated (JHS p.126): ‘remains of letters’.

The rest are from the 6th century, although the date of a few could be later:

- 1886,0401.90 (N339, B300): shoulder of jar of uncertain origin, \(Theta\)?
- 1886,0401.92 (N344, B305): shoulder of Samian jar, pre-firing, \(zeta\).
- 1886,0401.941 (N683): shoulder, probably of Chian ‘bobbin’ jar, retrograde \(E\).
- 1886,0401.951 (N693): handle, East Greek, perhaps Samian, \(X\) or \(\Lambda\).
- 1886,0401.959: shoulder of à la brosse jar, various lines, part of a longer text.

\(^{13}\) The registration numbers of 44, 45 and 47 in that publication need correction: 44 is 1910,0222.8, 45 1910,0222.8 and 47 1886,0401.1291. 1910,0222.14 and 34 are of local Egyptian manufacture, while 1910,0222.22 is probably too thin to be from a transport amphora.
- 1886,0401.968: strap handle of Samian jar, early 6th century, pre-firing X. Fig remains are found inside the rim (see Stacey et al. 2010, 20, figs 1a and 22).
- 1886,0401.982 (Fig. 22): probably East Greek jar, shoulder, crude M under handle root, and ᾱς vac, on shoulder to left. Quite possibly the only transport jar with a dedicatory inscription.
- 1886,0401.1338 (Fig. 23): wall and handle root of Samian jar, pre-firing zeta.
- 1910,0222.42: wall of a coarse, non-micaceious fabric with white slip, vac καλλι cut vertically. The clay may be Mareotic; if so a post-Classical date is likely, although the script does not support it.
- 1910,0222.43: fragment inscribed as an ostrakon (see 7.1.3 above).
- 1910,0222.244: wall fragment, hard fired with light grey core and cream surface, pre-firing, X.
- 1910,0222.246: probably Samian shoulder fragment, pre-firing 'arrow' delta.
- 1911,0060, 67: shoulder fragment, possibly East Greek, Μ, at least.
- 1965,0930.170: wall fragment of Chian bobbin amphora, only part of a curving line preserved.
- 1965,0930.746: East Greek shoulder and handle (see 15.2 below on digamma).
- Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 1912.41(23): wall of probably Chian jar, parts of three letters preserved, in two lines.
- Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA108. Wall fragment of banded jar, probably Chian, X.

Most of the above belong to classes of both amphora and graffito exemplified in Johnston 2006. Pre-firing marks on Samian or Samian-type jars and various post-firing graffiti on Chian bobbin or later Archaic examples predominate, although there are a good number of pieces difficult to pin down. The possible dedicatory text on 1886,0401.982 is intriguing; it is difficult to read the lettering other than as a dative plural, although the first preserved letter could just be a theta, not an omicron.

Obviously the fragmentary nature of many sherds hides what may have been more meaningful texts, although the corpus of amphora graffiti and dipinti contains few 'long' messages.

In addition, a number of amphora sherds in the British Museum with graffiti which remained unregistered until 2011 may well be from Naukratis, although there is little evidence other than that they are unlikely to be from elsewhere to support the case. Many are merely impressed circles, on the neck or handle, or X. Six are different and have a much greater chance of being from Naukratis:

- 2011,5003.495: fragment of handle of Cypriot basket-handled jar, impressed dot-and-circle.
- 2011,5003.501: upper neck of Klazomenian amphora, two deeply impressed O.
- 2011,5003.502 (Fig. 24): lower handle fragment of East Greek jar, thumb mark and two dot and circle marks preserved.
- 2011.5003.560: handle of Milesian(?) amphora, two very deeply impressed circles.
- 2011.5003.571 (Fig. 25): fragment of strap handle, oatmeal fabric, pre-firing ligature, chi-epsilon.

8.7 Lamps

Marks on lamps form a small, totally heterogeneous group, whether viewed typologically or epigraphically. One is the only dated piece in the corpus (Fig. 26), although the computation of the date is by no means easy: 1910,0222.236 (N641, Lamps Q553), dated by Donald Bailey to ‘probably the second century BC or even earlier’.

The text reads ‘Year 18, .64’; this is presumably a Ptolemaic regnal year followed by a further numeral; the dotted letter is a cursive sign, which Peter Fraser, apud Bailey, took for numerical alpha, one thousand. It is by no means easy to give a plausible interpretation for such a uniquely isolated phenomenon; Bailey suggests an inventory number. Epigraphically this interpretation is persuasive, but is difficult to accept in actuality; a much smaller number would yield greater sense, for example the notation of a batch.

The other examples are:

- 1900,0214.18 (BSA 57, B580, Lamps Q513): see below 9.4.2.
- 1910,0222.62 (N449, Lamps Q20): Late Archaic, graffito on lip, vac Αρ[.]
- 1910,0222.166 (N560, Lamps Q90): c. 300 BC, perhaps East Greek, ligature, AP.
- 1911,0606.21 (BSA 10, Lamps Q52): drilled hole in the wall, Attic, c. 450–400 BC, inscribed to right of handle, vac Καλι[.
- 1924,1201.1145 (previously unpublished): foot; glazed disc and nipple inside; underside reserved, graffito under foot, καρπα?

9. Dedicatory formulae

An overview of dedicatory texts is given in 2 above on background. Here are discussed further details of both the texts and the deities involved.

9.1 Apollo and Aphrodite

The dedications to these deities are well discussed in previous publications and there is no need to repeat the whole topic here.14 There are few exceptions to the two major formulae, genitive of the deity’s name + eimi

---

14 See especially Lazzarini 1976; in many cases the particular form she cites is not actually preserved on the sherd, especially with respect to the beginning of the formula, Άπο- or τωπο-.
and x dedicated to the deity. It is however noteworthy that the former is far more frequent than the latter in dedications to Apollo, while the statistics are reversed for Aphrodite; while there may be a chronological development here, it is by no means overarching.

9.1.1 For Apollo we may note two points:

i) 1886,0401.790 (N77, Villing 2006, 41, 1) is the only mortarium with the dative, and seemingly included just that, with no dedicator’s name or verb unless they were peculiarly positioned.

ii) of the examples with enough of the text for dialect or alphabetic usage to be judged, the following have features irregular for Ionic.

1886,0401.681-2 (N237, B198) is in clear Knidian script, while another nine or ten have various non-Ionic features:

a) Single lambda, without omega

The first three below were taken as Aeginetan by Möller (2000a, 175); some qualifications are made in Johnston 2013 (107–8).

- 1886,0401.310 (N250, B211, Johnston 2013, 108, fig. 12, which has wrong caption): standard East Greek cup, cut on handle zone, vac Απόλλονις.
- 1886,0401.657 (N258, B219, Johnston 2013, 108, fig. 11): cup with carinated wall, as with 1886,0401.402, Ἰπόλονο[ς]. Three-bar sigma.
- 1886,0401.876 (Johnston 2013, 106, 10): East Greek bowl, wall, ἸΑρόλον vac? Only the lower parts of most letters are preserved, but this seems to be an unusual version.
- 1888,0601.313 (Johnston 2013, 108, 11): East Greek cup, lip, Ἰολο[ς, however the last letter does not appear to be νυ.

b) Others without omega

- 1886,0401.385 (Johnston 2013, 108, 12): Schlotzhauer type 10 cup, variant; fine-walled, with reserved band at top of lip inside, cut on wall, Ἰονος, omega seems unlikely and three-bar sigma probable.
- 1886,0401.373 (N275, Johnston 2013, 106, fig. 13 (which has wrong caption): Ἰανονος ἧμι.

c) Non-Ionic crasis

- 1886,0401.580 (N158, B119): East Greek cup, lip, Ἰαντη[. Pace N, which omits the break to left, a trace at the left edge may be an intentional letter; the alpha is clear but the horizontal of πι not.
- 1886,0401.1029 (B765, pl. 23, 1; Johnston 2013, 108, 13): standard, small East Greek cup, inscribed on body, vac τοπολ[. Note long tau and πι.
For Aphrodite, genitives are extremely rare in the preserved record.\(^\text{15}\)

1924,1201.27 (Fig. 27) and 600, and 1888,0601.296 are previously unpublished Chian or East Greek open vases, and there are three Attic cups, 1888,0601.207 (Fig. 28, previously unpublished), Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 106.1899 and Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.54, BSA 86 and 88 respectively).

1888,0601.182 (B pl. 32,3) is a large Chian chalice, while the most worthy of note are two pieces with both formulae:

- 1888,0601.421 (N750, B401, Johnston 2013, 105, fig. 4), given by Hermagathinos, with a botched genitive under the foot and fuller datival dedication outside.

- 1888,0601.420 (Fig. 29; N752, B403), a Chian chalice which not only has a ‘trademark’ under foot but both types of formula on its outside, τῆς Ἀφροδιτῆς εἰμί ὁ[νὲ]θηκεν Ἐρμογένης.

It is probable that 1888,0601.588a, an unpublished Attic black-figured stand, c. 550 BC, has both, although only [εμὶ ὁ] is preserved in what may have been two lengthy lines.

1965,0930.21 (Fig. 30) consists of two joining fragments of a Chian chalice lip with retrograde graffito Ἰρωφό[. Did the dedicating momentarily forget that he was offering the piece to Aphrodite and reverted to the Apollo formula? \(^\text{16}\)

\(^{15}\) Approximate figures are 133 datives, 8 genitives, 94 uncertain. These figures are of course for texts with Aphrodite’s name, or a sufficient part of it, preserved.
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9.2 Cult epithets

*Milesios* is common enough as a title for Apollo, but other examples are rare indeed: *Didymos* (Ehrhardt *et al.* 2008, 167–70) and perhaps *Komaios* (Attic pyxis(?)) foot (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.27, JHS 35, B678; see especially Ehrhardt *et al.* 2008, 170, n. 81; Herda 2008; and see below 11.3.8 on Komaios).

*Zeus Hellenios* is attested by perhaps three texts (supplementing M 104), although none has the complete title:

- East Greek cup, 1886,0401.261 (Fig. 31; M 104; Johnston 2006, 26) with Ὠ τῶν Ἑλληνίων; the lettering not very diagnostic; I suggest Cycladic, but there is also a possibility that an Aeginetan could have used the Ionic form *Zeni*, rather than *Zani*.


- Chian fragment, lost, formerly Antikenmuseum, Berlin, 3150.8, dipinto (Furtwängler 1889, 93; CW 17), ἤ τῶν Ζηνίων.

Three ἤ τῶν fragments (see below 11.3.14 on Pyth) are likely to be part of a personal name rather than the epithet Πολύθιος.

[Ἀφροδίτη ἐν Ναυκράτει (1888,0601.531, N768, B419 fig. 9) is scarcely a diagnostic cult epithet, whatever its other interest. The wording has also been assumed for 1888,0601.182 + 1924,1201.15 (Fig. 32; see 9.3.4 below).

The scrap 1965,0930.592 (Johnston 2013, 109, fig. 14), from a standard East Greek cup, reads ἄνωτρος, which on statistical grounds may well be part of ἄλληνα[... , and a further epithet of Apollo. The case is similar to *SEG* 53 788, 11), where the text also breaks after the alpha, not allowing us to conclude whether it is ‘weak’ Ionic Αἴλιννα[τος (for Αἴλιννητος) or Doric Αἴλιννα[τος.

---

Figure 31 East Greek cup, 575–525 BC. British Museum, 1886,0401.261

Figure 32 Chian heavy chalice, 610–580 BC. British Museum, 1888,0601.182 and 1924,1201.15
9.3 Other dedicatory wording

9.3.1 On three Aeolian bucchero pots we find, as expected κάθ(θ)σκεβ-, or part of the word, not ἀνέθηκεν. No ethnic is preserved on these pieces, nor on one 'bucchero' oenochoe of fine fabric where ἀνέθηκε is used (1886,0401.690 (N327, B288)). Comparable is the use of kata taxis rather than anataxis for public financial disbursement at Methymna and Eresos, though interestingly both forms are found at Miletus (Migeotte 2006, 85–6).

9.3.2 Examples of εὐχώλην as a complement of μὲ were discussed long ago by Hutton (1893, II), citing a now lost piece, for which hers seems the only citation, together with 1888,0601.557 and 395* (N776 and 777). One can now add the previously mis-read example Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.23 (Fig. 33; JHS 1, B644, pl. 25, 8), 16 which spoils the symmetry of the other three, all of which are plates dedicated perhaps by the same man to Aphrodite, by being a large closed vase offered to 'the gods'.

9.3.3 Schlotzhauer (2012, 172) has plausibly suggested that two locally made quasi-Phoenicianising small olpai (1910,0222.232a-b, N636-7, S 141 and 142) with vac δέκα vac present an abbreviation of deka(te/ten); a numerical interpretation is certainly difficult to sustain, despite Gardner’s ‘clearly an indication of measure’ (N I p. 62) and my own previous opinion (Johnston 2013, 109). Nonetheless, they would constitute the only attested examples at Naukratis of the otherwise common dedicatory formula, with the exception perhaps for a marble fragment with, in its secondary use of perhaps c. 500, ]ος vac[ ]δέκα[ (2012,5021.1, BM 1082, B43). 17 The lettering on the olpai gives nothing away concerning the origin of the inscriber. Parallels for the use of deka as an abbreviation of dekaten do exist, a slightly later example from Cyrene (Maffre 2007, 181–2, no. 51) and unpublished pieces from the Athena sanctuary at Ialysos on display in Rhodes Archaeological Museum. We may be tempted therefore to see inspiration from one of those directions.

9.3.4 ἰρή is used as a complement for the dedicated pot (pace Demetriou 2012, 140) on 1888,0601.422 (N753, B404), a small Chian chalice foot. ἰρή (complete) appears on an unnumbered piece in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, an Attic cup or phiale rim (Fig. 34).

The word is also the most likely restoration for the initial word on a big Chian chalice dedicated to Aphrodite possibly termed ‘at naukratis’, ]η ιειτ[....] κρα...[ (1888,0601.182 + 1924,1201.15). It is probable that ‘vac IE vac’ on the lip of an East Greek cup 1886,0401.331 should be included. ἰρός is also one possibility in the final line of the text on the limestone horse and rider, 1900,0214.26 (BSA 58). The usage remains rare, although it is a little more common at Naukratis than noted by Lazzarini (1976, no. 262).

---

16 Höckmann and Möller 2006, no. 22 have the wrong number, date and reading; it is the wall of an East Greek closed vase, perhaps early 6th century.
17 Also Lazzarini 1976, 90, n. 139. There is one other possible example from Naukratis: Cook 1954, 9, suggests the supplement for 1886,0401.89, which is plausible, but only the first two letters are preserved; the piece is, incidentally, also unusual in having a relatively late closed eta.
9.3.5 Varia

Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 107.1894 (Fig. 35; Gardner 1897, no. 75), Attic cup foot, which has on the underside an awkward text, ἀφρ [ ; the most obvious reading is clumsy, but plausible, κύλλῃ καλῆ ἀφρ[οδίτης].

Figure 35 Attic cup foot, 5th century BC. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 107.1894. Photograph © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

1888,0601.205 + 226 (N800, B448) is an Attic lekanis rim or similar, inscribed on top, ἄρτατον μὲ κε, which has a non- Ionic air; I divide it thus as words in μὲ- are non-existent and none in μὲ- seem at all relevant. μὲ κάθηκεν would be plausible (μὲ κήνε unlikely), but the preceding ἄρτατον causes difficulty as no personal name has such an ending. A use of the rare δρ(π)ατον (‘stubborn’) or an unlikely Doric or Aeolic δρ(π)ητον (‘unsoken’) could be envisaged, although the positioning of such a complement before the με would be odd; an error for the attested Dodecanesian personal name Ἀρτέτων is even less attractive.

1928,0728.230 (BSA 116) is a rare case of a reasonably fully preserved text on an East Greek cup, ἱς τίμη. ἐδώκε δὲ μὲ Ἱ[ . 1924,1201.852 (N744, CW 197, B395), Chian chalice lip, has Ἰδωκε[. A possibly near parallel is 1886,0401.302 (Fig. 36), East Greek cup, with ἧς ἀτεδ[. 1922,0508.9 (previously unpublished) is the wall of an East Greek cup or bowl with ἴτοτης, possibly antidoron, but other readings, such as ἴτο άρ [ are not impossible.

There are no obvious examples of aparchen or euxamenos; we may note in any case the very Athenian concentration of the use of the former (see Lazzarini 1976, especially 262–71), while a good case can be argued for the latter having been incised in the handle zone of an East Greek cup, 1965,0930.669, with ἱκανο[; the handle was immediately to the right, but the text, whatever the reading, must have continued beyond.

9.3.6 There are three examples where reconstruction of a dedicatory text is more hazardous.

- 1886,0401.274 (Fig. 37; N248), a highly micaceous non-standard East Greek cup with ἴτοτης, brings to mind a formula discussed elsewhere, where a dedication of two offerings has followed the breaking of a vase originally intended as an offering (kataxanta?), as exemplified in several better preserved graffiti (Johnston 1992).

\[\text{For a parallel see a piece from Posidi in the Chalkidike (Panayotou 1996, 157, no. 24, see also 11.3.4 below on Ardyss).}\]
The preserved text allows the possibility, but certainly does not require it. A similar text may have been cut on a ‘Samian’ lekythos (a rare shape in the preserved material) in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (AN1896-1908-G.141.30), with \( \varepsilon \delta \upsilon \omega \) vac., which can only be read as \( \varepsilon \delta \upsilon \omega \), most probably giving us the verb and its object. As preserved, the text ends under the handle, and so presumably was of some length and ran around the entire shoulder.\(^{19}\)

1911,0606.38 (BSA 82, B605) is the wall of an Attic black-glazed open vase, with the handle root to the left; the text begins presumably to its right: \( \upsilon \alpha \rho \alpha \varepsilon \). Bernard's reading with an initial \( \varepsilon \tau \) cannot stand unless that letter is taken as a correction and placed in angled brackets. One may wonder whether the Ionic use of iota for \( \varepsilon \tau \) would occur firstly in Hera's name and secondly in a seemingly non-ionic text using \( \alpha \rho \alpha \varepsilon \). However, the personal name Heraieus is extremely rare (one example, from Lesbos, in LGPN) and explanations that involve the adjective \( \mu \iota \rho \sigma \sigma \) are equally problematic, in that we have either an unaspirated feminine plural, or a neuter plural followed by an uncontracted \( \rho \), or some combination of these elements.

1924,1201.688 (Fig. 38; B pl. 21, third row, not in his catalogue) is a Chian chalice lip, the top lost; the text reads \( \lambda \omega \sigma \), which, if correct, can scarcely be construed other than as the aorist participle of \( \epsilon \lambda \varepsilon \omega \). The wreck of a text cannot give us more than the general drift of the presumed dedication, the dedicator referring at least to his (successful) departure from a port. The word brings to mind concerns regarding safety on the seas from a later date, in texts from Aliki on Thasos, Grammata on Syros, and from Prote and Albanian Grammata further west (see below 9.4.1), and it is regrettable that little more can be made of this mention. A later fragmentary text from Palagruža (Fig. 39) preserved virtually the same lettering.\(^{20}\)

9.3.7 Excursus. Apollo at Cyrene

As noted above, Maffre 2007 publishes a large group of 51 graffiti from the sanctuary of Apollo at Cyrene and it is instructive to compare them with the largely contemporary material from Naukratis, although the bulk belongs to the period c. 520–450 BC.

What is striking is the number of examples of ‘dekata’, which appears in nearly half of the texts. Here there is a clear difference from dedicatory practice at Naukratis, except as discussed above, in the very interesting case of Maffre 51, where the original complete text seems to have been \( \text{deka} \), therefore giving some comfort to Schlotzhauer’s interpretation of the same lettering on two plain jugs of local ware from Naukratis as an abbreviation of \( \text{dekata/e} \); we should note, if that is the case, that the graffiti 19 For \( \delta \upsilon \omega \) see also a dedication on an eye-cup from Histria, regrettably broken before the presumed verb governing the word (SEG 55, 806.3; Avram et al. 2008, fig. 6b–c).
20 See most recently Hajdari et al. 2007; Sandberg 1954 discusses most of the material, while Aliki is noted in Grandjean and Salvat 2000. A later text from Palagruža presents very similar lettering (Kirigin et al. 2010, fig. 14, 7. Fig. 39). The graffito \( \varphi \upsilon \rho \zeta \mu \omega \varepsilon \) on the lip of a Chian chalice (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1912.32b(4), BSA 29, B551), must end in \( \text{naut} \), the only other clear ‘nautical’ reference in the corpus.
are pre-firing, and so the dedicatory function of the small jugs was known before, or during, their manufacture.

In other respects there are similarities and differences, apart from those of the respective local scripts. As far as is preserved, a crasis is found at Cyrene in 18 cases, not too far from the ratio at Naukratis, although the result is in three cases alpha, not omega, as against the single alpha at Naukratis. Double lambda is normal (11), but single is much more common than at Naukratis (6 examples). There is one unusually late use of omicron, not omega, Maffre 43, with top, on a piece of the later 4th century. The use of the genitive or dative is often not clear, but there are at least 14 of the former, 5 of the latter; as 3 of the latter are on larger pots, and not under the foot, its use may simply be connected with the fact that the text was placed in an area where there was more room for a fuller text. Nonetheless, the rarity of dedicators’ names is similar to Naukratis; only one is published by Maffre.

9.4 Other deities

9.4.1 Dioskouroi

The 22 or 23 Naukratis inscriptions reveal little by way of recognition of the power of the twins in maritime affairs; there is not even an epithet for any of the deities thanked at Naukratis to indicate this, although it can and has been persuasively argued that the Dioskouroi filled such a role (Höckmann and Möller 2006, 15 and n. 61).

The two are clearly seen in this role elsewhere, notably at Grammata, Albania (Hadjari et al. 2007), Prote (IG V i 1538-1555) and probably at Aliki on Thasos (Grandjean and Salvat 2000, 164), sites where the dedicator was holing up before or after a difficult journey and giving thanks or prayers for euploia (fair sailing). Such evidence is later than the floruit of Naukratis however, as is that from the fourth set of relevant material so far published from Grammata on Syros (IG XII 5, i, 712) (see Sandberg 1954 for a review of much of this material). One graffito only hints at such matters (see above, n. 21).

A few epigraphic notes can be added with respect to dedications involving the Dioskouroi, beyond the regrettable fact that two (N834–5) have not as yet been re-located. It could be questioned whether the fact that a lamp dedicated to them (1900,0214.18; Johnston 2008, 116) necessarily reflects such a maritime cult.

1888,0601.297 (N843, B492), a heavy variety of East Greek cup; ]Hpn[ cut in handle zone. Modern ‘Diosk’ on the lip raises questions of provenance – could a Hera dedication have been found in the Dioskouroi temenos? The sequence of letters is not easily explained other than as a dedication to Hera.

1888,0601.413 (Fig. 40; N873), Attic kylix foot, diam. c. 10cm, probably before c. 500 BC; two texts, ΧΕΓ and Δο[ cut under; N omits the second text. It is a possible further dedication to the Dioskouroi since the piece was found in their temenos. The first is odd, with an apparent horizontal epsilon, although neither epsilon nor sampi give any plausible transliteration.
9.4.2 Gods of the Greeks

The nature of this cult and its regulation in the ‘Hellenion’ has been discussed several times recently (esp. Polinskaya 2010; Höckmann and Möller 2006; Malkin 2003b; Bowden 1996), and here I merely add a few epigraphic observations. While the phrase, οἱ θεοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, is presumably used, pace Polinskaya, to contrast it with ‘the gods of another etnos’, akin to the use of Syrian Aphrodite (Dubois 1996, nos 73–4; Hermary 2013), the fuller context of its coining and indeed the identity of the deities concerned are far more difficult issues. Bowden rightly points out that the phrase Hellenioi theoi does not appear in the texts, while Höckmann and Möller (2006, 19) give a consolidated list of the relevant texts. A few addenda and corrigenda can be made and below is a list ordered by their catalogue numbers:

- 5. 1886.0401.948: neck of East Greek closed vase, c. 550 BC, a final sigma is discernible.
- 22. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.1 (now re-numbered G141.23): East Greek closed vase, wall, c. 600–575 BC? ἱσσ | ἕχον | ἔλλην | με ...[ (see above, 9.3.2 and Fig. 33). It is not easy to see an alpha after the epsilon in line 3 of 22, although a nu can be discerned in the next letter space. Unfortunately there is no way of assessing how much of the text is lost.
- 23. 1900,0214.8 (Fig. 41). The final iota does not exist; the final letter is probably a mu; but there are clear remains of epsilon, not lambda at the start.

In sum, only one piece (23, 1900,0214.8), assuredly combines the dative θεοὶ(ν) with the genitive τῶν Ἑλλήνων, although one may reasonably assume its use in other examples.

The earliest piece in the set (22), with its new reading, may be such, but we cannot be sure of that in the present condition of the text; if it is, it would probably raise the currently stated date of the foundation of the ‘Hellenion’ by a decade or two;21 as it is a plain body sherd that conclusion should not be pressed too hard, and it is by no means assured that it is earlier than the unlocated figured sherd (BSA A 51) with a dedication to Apollo, cited by Höckmann and Möller 2006 (13, n. 17) as the earliest inscribed find from the area of the Hellenion.

It is curious to see that, although the sample is small the proportion of dedications using single lambda in the ‘ethnic’ Ἑλλήνων is far higher than is the case for Apollo’s name; it appears on the Attic cup floor, 1900,0214.8 (noted above) and probably on the unlocated cup, BSA 18. There is also

---

21 Höckmann and Möller 2006, 13 are equivocal about where they would place the earliest offerings within the second quarter of the 6th century.
single \textit{lambda} in the cult title, \textit{ἲ τοι Ἑλληνιώτης} on the Chian kantharos rim (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1888.218(6), (CW 220)).

9.4.3 Zeus

See above 9.2 on cult epithets

9.4.4 Hera

When fragmentary, dedications to Hera are not easy to confirm, and so a total number of preserved dedications to her cannot be given, however 19 is a plausible figure. Of these, six are dipinto, although none are fully preserved, on ‘Samian’ mugs of the kind made specifically, it would seem, for sanctuary use (Schlotzhauer 2012, 124–9). The rest are on East Greek cups, with the exception of one closed vase, 1888,0601.298 (N846, B495) with \textit{Ηρώ 
ἀπίω}, a Lakonian krater rim with \textit{Ηρώ}; \textit{Ηρώ} Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.17, JHS 7, Johnston 2013, 105, fig. 7) and perhaps an Attic Panathenaic amphora, 1911,0606.42 (Fig. 42) with \textit{πν ἡρά}, although this is just as likely to read \textit{ἱ ῥή}.

One may note that the texts were probably all short, with Hera’s name in the genitive or dative, as at Gravisca. Only three preserve what is, or seems to be a dedicatory’s name:

a) the Lakonian krater mentioned above;

b) Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 227.1899 (Fig. 43; BSA 20, B542; inaccurately recorded in Schlotzhauer 2012, pl. 17a–b, no. 80), \textit{λαυκός μ’ανεθ...πνης};

c) 1888,0601.255 (N857, B505 and pl. 23), \textit{ν ἤρα} in very small letters on East Greek cup lip.

For one further possible dedication see below 10.2 on ethnics.

9.5 Abbreviated deities?

There can be little doubt that in some cults the deity’s name was sometimes cut or painted in abbreviated form on ceramic dedications, while the practice has been argued to have been widespread enough for the discovery of such abbreviations to be taken as identifying the cult in question at a given site.\textsuperscript{22} Naukratis does little to comfort that approach. There are perhaps three such texts, two for Apollo and one for Aphrodite that could be so interpreted (ignoring of course apparent ‘abbreviations’ which originally were part of longer texts):

Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 259.1894 (Fig. 44), foot of a possibly Chian cup; incised underneath, a ligature of \textit{alpha} and \textit{phi}, possibly including \textit{rho} as well, date uncertain.

\textsuperscript{22} The abbreviation \textit{Aphr} is found as early as the later 7th century, painted before firing on an amphora from Miletus (Bîrzescu 2009, 128–9, cat. 7). Histria has also produced some highly probable examples of abbreviated deities names (Bîrzescu 2006, 169), as has Cape Bejuška where \textit{Ax} and the like is attested several times as an obvious abbreviation of Achilles (Bujskich 2006, 142). Further examples are cited by Tesle 2013, 59 and 62, and by Ampolo 2007, 47.
1888,0601.218 (Fig. 45; Bernand pl. 21, 2 10), Castulo cup. Ἀτόλ vac.on the lip. Here it is difficult to decide between dedicatory text and owner’s inscription, but it is perhaps the former that is more likely.

1910,0222.86 (N475), ΑΠ cut on the floor of an East Greek bowl or plate. No other alpha-phi abbreviation is known to me, while alpha-pi is rare and otherwise always underfoot (3 or 4 examples, in table below), rarer than alpha-rho or alpha-rho-iota (7 or 8), but in a ratio that is consistent with the relative percentage of attested Greek personal name commencing thus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum registration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Type of pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910,0222.109</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>alpha-pi? Incomplete</td>
<td>Attic kylix, foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910,0222.164</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>alpha-pi</td>
<td>Attic bg bowl, foot, 4th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910,0222.165</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>alpha-pi</td>
<td>Lakonian krater, foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965,0930.566</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>alpha-pi</td>
<td>Attic bg bowl, floor, 400–375 BC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eta-rho (if we extend the search to Hera/e) occurs just once under a 4th century black-glaze bowl, possibly Attic (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 336.1899).

ΔΙ (Dioskouroi?) has perhaps four, disparate examples, again what one might expect from a roll call of personal names. Only one is from the second excavation season, 1888,0601.209, a previously unpublished rim of an Attic black-glazed skyphos, with ΔΙ or ΔΙ by the handle. The rest are from the 1885 season, all black-glazed pieces, one Attic (1910,0222.112, N502), one non-Attic (1965,0930.568, perhaps N568) and one late ‘grey ware’ (1910,0222.224 (N624)).

10. Ethnics

The search for ethnics in the corpus has been pursued very fully by earlier commentators, most recently by Möller (2000a). My review has confirmed all previous readings, although there are more examples that can be added. Before looking at the material however, there are some basic difficulties in ensuring that we are dealing with ethnics in instances where: a) a personal name may also be considered; b) a cult title is concerned, as applies especially to Apollo Milesios. In that particular respect I have little to add to Möller, nor to Ehrhardt et al. 2008, with the exception of Ἄγιος.[, 6 in the list below; and c) where there can be no decision made whether in a fragmentary text an additional gloss to a personal name refers to a patronymic or an ethnic.

I do not in this section address Möller’s further considerations regarding evidence for the polis of origin of inscribers who do not specifically use an ethnic, either by the use of a particular script, or in the particular case of the epithet Milesios applied to Apollo (with a plausible parallel in the ‘ethnic’ applied later to the same god claimed as Aeginetan by Sostratos at
Gravisca), or sometimes by some other specific individual details. See below 14.1.2–3 for comment on such aspects of script and dialect, although I add here that texts in Knidian script, as noted by Möller 2000a, 171–2, are mostly on a distinct type of cup, shown by analysis to come from the Knidian peninsula (Schlotzhauer 2012, 161; see also Johnston 2013, 107–9).

Turning to the ethnics, we may note that ’Chios' predominates, with 16 examples; 7 certain or probable cases can be added to the previously known corpus. 23 Seventeen of the possible 43 texts with ethnics are on Chian pots, and 14 of these are or may well be ’Chios' (10 of which are in Möller) 24 . Non-Chian vases with the ethnic are BSA 51 (M 244, present location unknown), most likely a Klazomenian vase, and two Attic examples, one a later piece, the red-figured column-krater Brussels A1810 (CVA 3, 20, pl. 28.2. M168 and 238), the other not far in date from the bulk of the Chian chalices, an Attic band-cup, 1900,0214.7 (Fig. 46; BSA 60, B583). Note that BSA 51 is the only assured, even if mis-spelled, dedication to Apollo among the whole set with ethnics, although 1886,0401.271 (N 209, B170) is most likely another.

For the rest only Teos and Mytilene preserve more than one example. We may stress the great variety of fabrics and shapes of the pieces dedicated by Teians:

- 1886,0401.271 (M 169, 4, but an East Greek cup, not a bowl).
- 1888,0601.360: a Chian chalice (M 169, 5).
- 1888,0601.546 and 1886,0401.1261: two late Wild Goat pots (M 168-9, 1 and 3), a dinos and a bowl.
- Cairo 26152: a Fikellura amphora (M 169, 2).

The set from Mytilene has been increased to three with the addition of 1965,0930.429 (Fig. 47), with ὀ Μυτ ... ; all are cut on presumably local bucchero vases, the other two being 1888,0601.612a-c and 634, a stand and dinos respectively.

The Phokaian (1886,0401.946, large East Greek closed vase), Rhodian (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.13, Attic cup or bowl foot) and Syracusan (1888,0601.240a-c, Attic black-glazed, stamped cup-kantharos) remain unique; the last pair are relatively late pieces, it should be noted, the Syracusan example being one of the last graffiti on imported pots at c. 350 BC (pace Herda 2008, 49, n. 281). The earlier Rhodian noted by Hutton 1893 (II) remains elusive since it has not been possible to identify the piece, although her remark that only the top of the rho was visible makes it a dubious example.

More unexpected is the probable Lydian in the Greek graffito on two joining fragments of a Chian kernos base, 1924,1201.519 and 1965,0930.293. The text as preserved is brief, ὀ λυ... , and the beginning of the preserved part is uncertain, but it can be argued that there is no good alternative to reading the ethnic here (Johnston, forthcoming b).

The following pieces may also be considered as possible examples of the inclusion of an ethnic:

23 Schlotzhauer 2012, 71 'weder...noch finden sie unter den Inschriften Athener oder Chioten in bemerkenswerter Anzahl' misleads.
24 Possible non-Chian ethnics cut on Chian vases are all questionable, but should be noted: ὀ τι [ on 1888,0601.453; merely o on 1924,1201.771 (noted by Möller in n. 640. on p. 168), and ὀ Τ, with Τ being the probable reading of the last preserved letter, on 1888,0601.360 (N758, B409, M. 169, 5. Fig. 80)).
1. Possible reading Ἡρὶ Σώμη on 1888,0601.302 (Fig. 48; N808): an East Greek cup without any specific Samian traits, and where the two μυς would be of different shapes; the alternative reading Ἁλίς ανήρ would add a further female dedicator to our list (11.3.3 below). It would be best construed, if read in the former way as Ἡρὶ Σώμη, Ἡρὶ Σώμη, even if there is no other qualification to her name in the rest of the dedications to her at Naukratis.

2. Attic red-figure cup fragment (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 341.1.899 (BSA 93)): Doric Τὸδίταξ ἡ. The date seems to be mid- or late 5th century, when the aspirate would be of restricted use. M. 172 suggests Knidian script, but the omicrons are full; at this date it might be a dedication from anywhere in the Dorian Hexapolis.

3. 1888,0601.529 (N767, M 418, Johnston 2013 104): a Lakonian cup rim with perhaps an ethnic in its Φ.[

4. similarly the Attic lip-cup rim, 1888,0601.249 (Fig. 49: previously unpublished), with Σαγόρης ὃ Α.[

5. 1911,0606.33 (BSA 68, B591): Attic cup lip, ἦμ Εφ., might be added as a possible Ephesian, although the formula would be unusual.

6. 1965,0930.400 (Fig. 50; previously unpublished): consists of five joining fragments of a rare Chian cup with the profile almost wholly preserved;25 400a must be a non-joining fragment with ναττί, and MFA, Boston, 1888.1081 (N738) is another loose fragment with ναφνή. The text ναμούμι can be variously construed and is not easy; the final letter should be either alpha, delta or lambda, if part of an intentional line is preserved at the break. A reference to a Milesian, or to Milesian Apollo is possible, but this would leave a very difficult νς or νς; names in –νεος or –νειος are very rare, and a verbal ending in –νε or –νει does not come to mind; nor is there a parallel for the dative of Apollo’s name in –νε. The only alternative however would seem to be the name Noumenios; but this is epigraphically implausible as some trace of the horizontal of the eta should be preserved at the end. The initial ταυ, on 400a is most likely the definite article attached to the deity’s name, whether in the genitive or dative; examples of a dedicator’s name following that of the deity are very rare, but do occur with both Apollo and Aphrodite – Neilomandros (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1888,0601.1325, N766), Phortylus (1888,0601.419, N749), Ardys (1886,0401.268, N212), Telestratos (1911,0606.11, BSA 52). However, if we accept the reading ‘Milesios’, we should note one more oddity – the ‘cross-cultural’ use of a Chian vase by a Milesian, or at least for Apollo Milesios.

7. 1948.8-15.5 (N446, B335): Attic Gordion cup, with one or more words after the dedication formula, ending in σίγμα; this could be a patronymic or ethnic.

8. ἦμ Κε[ on 1888,0601.352 (N814, B462): East Greek bowl, Ν has ‘extra’ letters tacked on, which are actually on another pot, an East Greek cup (1888,0601.343).

---

25 Clay analysis has confirmed a Chian origin (Hans Mommsen, pers. comm.). The Boston sherd has the same, worn red and white decoration; it is to be placed somewhere between 400 and 400a. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum AN1925.608e(3), uninscribed, also belongs.
9. 1910.0222.71 (Fig. 51; N460, B337): fragment of Aeolian bucchero fenestrated pot, perhaps a stand, although the graffito would have been cut upside down if so; ἱστοκορ δε τ.ν, where the penultimate letter is certainly a gamma, although the inscriber was not sure what form to cut, with horizontal or sloping second stroke – an interesting quandary in its own right. A possibility is that this little noticed potter's signature may have an ethnic, ἐκ Μ[ενδρία?].

11. Personal names (including females)

Of the approximately 500 pieces on which more than a single letter or the -os/-es termination is preserved in what is likely to be a personal name, some 25 have not been personally studied, while 180 are unpublished previously; 30 are presented in the primary publications with slight errors, and 45 of the published readings have more substantial errors.

11.1 The most frequent personal name is Zoilos, which may appear 18 times. Fourteen are dipinti on a range of Chian shapes, very largely discussed in all aspects in CW. The remaining 4 are graffiti; two, previously unpublished, are on Chian chalice rims (1924,1201.657 and 1965,0930.202), where the reading is possible but not watertight; this is unfortunate since, if clear, the reading would contribute (although not definitively) to the debate over the actual presence or not of Zoilos at Naukratis. The other two are on non-Chian vases – merely Ἰος on a Gordian cup by Kleitias, 1888,0601.237, and fully preserved on a published East Greek little-master cup, 1888,0601.247 (Fig. 52; N827, B473), with an intriguing text, Ἰηνες Ζωιλος ωι[i]. The name here follows the verb, and after it we have omega iota and part of a diagonal, from an alpha, lambda, mu or nu. Unless cut in error, this is best resolved as a crasis ὀ Ω ι or ὀ Ά ι... which could be Zoilos' patronymic or ethnic. As a gamma is highly unlikely to be the part-preserved letter, various thoughts about Aigin... or Aigyp... can be excluded; the remaining range is broad and it would be hazardous to suggest a connection with the Chian possession, Oinoussai. Whether we are dealing with only one Zoilos here cannot be finally decided; the name is also found at Gravisca on an Attic cup possibly of 'the next generation' (Johnston 2000c, 21, no. 83). The name is par excellence Samian, and in at least the realm of onomastics does create a link between Chios and Samos in the Archaic period, or earlier. It (and possibly Antiochais below) therefore weakens the case argued by Kyrieleis 1986 of restrained contact between the two during the period.

26 CW 231 is in the Louvre, E8056bis; Bernand has it as his 894, but this is 1888,0601.247.
27 Crasis of ὀ Ά... to ὀ Ω... can be found in Pedon's dedication (see 11.3.11 below on P]edon).
11.2 At Naukratis there are but traces of the main dedicators of bespoke kantharoi at the Aphaia sanctuary on Aegina, Aristophantos and Damonidas. Williams (1983 184) has pointed to two dipinti on kantharoi (CW 170 and 179; 1924,1201.821 and 830), and I have argued (Johnston 1982, 40–1) that UCL-742 is another such kantharos.\textsuperscript{28} One unpublished Chian chalice with the graffito sequence ]σφ [ (1665,0930.58) suggests a further example, to add to two graffiti cited by Williams (n. 54) on an Attic cup by the C painter and a mortarium (1888,0601.391 and 398). The latter merely has the sequence ]ωσ[ not necessarily at the beginning of a word; the same applies to an East Greek cup, 1888,0601.312. However, if we do take it as the beginning, it is worth noting that no name beginning Ari- other than Aristophantos is known from the corpus of material. Internally however the letters do appear, if only once, in the name Charidion (1886,0401.986-8). 1924,1201.702, graffito on a Chian chalice rim, has a two- or more) line text, with ]ωφ[ almost certainly part of a dedicator’s name in line 1. As for further examples of Damonidas, there is just a Chian chalice or kantharos rim, 1965,0930.144 (Fig. 53), with graffito ]φμ[ not an assuredly secure reading, and ΔΑ[ cut on the floor of a chalice (1910,0222.55).

11.3 Some other names

11.3.1 Antiochais 1965,0930.732 (CR 1893 82 I): eight joining fragments of bowl of Chian chalice with handle, vac Αντιω[.?2[,]ς Οιο[.....]κεν Αφροδι]. The current restoration of the pot needs examination; the leftmost fragment may not need to be as close to the next one. The rare name Antiochais would probably fit; it has been suggested on an early 4th century Samian coin in the Heberden Coin Room, Oxford (Barron 1966, no. 150), but the reading is extremely difficult and other possibilities are many.\textsuperscript{29}

11.3.2 (H)arpale: 1886,0401.791 (Fig. 54) is a large Chian chalice with the dedicatory inscription, vac Ἀρπά[.] με ὀνέθηκε vac, fully preserved under the foot, the verb without the terminal μυ (N33, B28).

\textsuperscript{28} Wachter 2001, 217 is not persuaded \textit{a priori} that the fragmentary bits of names noted should be part of the name of the Aristophantos known on Aegina, but he does not consider the positioning of the letters on the UCL sherd.

\textsuperscript{29} My thanks to Volker Heuchert for autopsy report and photos.
The piece has been scarcely mentioned in the context of females at Naukratis, mainly because of the poor transcription of the text in N. However, a similar, rare name, Alpale, appears at another sanctuary of Aphrodite, on Zeytintepe at Miletus (published by Herrmann 1995, especially 282–4). He dates it hesitantly to 550–25 BC, while the Naukratis sherd is more likely to be c. 575, although there is no solid reason why they should not be roughly contemporary. However, he also notes a philological difficulty in equating the names, Alp- deriving probably from elp-, Arp- from harp-. Is there enough archaeological evidence here to override that objection?

11.3.3 This leads on to a consideration of other females. They have been noted most recently by Scholz 2002–3, 240–1, although without a full list (see also Williams 1983, 185; and Villing 2013, 86–7, fig. 12). Athenais has recently been recovered, and note a further possible example in the discussion of 1888,0601.302 in 10.2.1. The spread is broad, in chronological and ceramic terms:


Mikis: 1924,1201.824, Chian chalice, dipinto (CW 173), ᾿Μικίς ἄν[ (and others, see CW p. 161).

Arpale: 1886,0401.791, Chian chalice (N33), νας Ἀρπάλη με ὀνέθηκε vac.

Iunx?: 1924,1201.621, Chian chalice (N712), Ἰύνξ[.

.....idore?: 1924,0222.859, Chian chalice (CW 200, B920), Ἰδωρὴ[.

...andris: 1888,0601.400, Attic band-cup, 540–520 BC, Ἀνδρὶς φιλη[.


Djoris?: 1888,0601.202, Attic type C cup (N798), c. 475–450 BC, Ἰωρὶς φιλη[.

J.ris: 1910,0222.89 (N478), Attic bowl, c. 450–400 BC, ῾Ρις νας. The first letter not omega.


30 The list of females given by Demetriou 2012 (141, n. 193), is incomplete and somewhat misleading; two names are the result of hazardous emendations, one, Philis, is male and two remain, Mikis and Doris The gender of some of those with names in -iς can be, and has been disputed, although Mikis and Aigyptis are most likely female, and the context of Doris suggests likewise.

31 See Williams 2013, 44, who cites further bibliography and illustrates the first piece.
Johnston, Ceramic inscriptions

**Athenais** (Fig. 55): Louvre AM1382, local bowl, 300–100 BC, Αθηναι. The material falls into two chronological groups, whatever the precise date of two of the more unusual Attic pieces, with a gap of c. 550–500 BC clearly evident, with the exception of ...andris. In addition, two of the later pieces (Doris and Tamynis) are comments regarding females, not dedications by them; together with ...andris they refer to more emotional aspects, certainly in the case of Tamynis (an Egyptian name), whom Gorgias loves and writes, reciprocally, that Tamynis loves him, while the other two are probably addressed as philate, dearest. Archedike's graffito is at least amphoteral as to whether it is a dedication, and the same might be said of lunx in the earlier group; the letter following the ξι may be epsilon or alpha. However, three female dedicators seem assured. Harpale is treated above; I merely add that her chalice is probably earlier than the bespoke series dedicated by Aigyptis and Mikis. Together with the probable Pedon graffito (below) they urge caution in taking all dedicators at Naukratis as ‘merchant venturers’; these others were more likely selling their bodies, whether in love or war.

11.3.4 Ardyx (Fig. 56): this name has been noted in the plates of Naukratis 1, but the correct reading has not been noted by all commentators, largely through an error in transcription of N214 and a misleading transliteration of N212 (both standard East Greek cups, 1886,0401.273 and 268 respectively; inscribed in handle zone).

However, there can be no doubt about the correct version of both, already noted by Kretschmer (1894, 4, n. 5) for N212. The personal name Ardyx is otherwise unattested before the Roman period, with the exception of course for the name of the Lydian king recorded first by Herodotos, and a son of Antiochos mentioned by Polybios, V, 53 and 60, in 222–220 BC. Here we have a relatively minor figure, one supposes, who dedicates in Greek at Naukratis, but who has a ‘good’ Lydian name. One is irresistibly reminded of the wealthy Kroisos, the Alkmeonid, in Attica of the next generation.33

---

32 1911,0606.17 is ceramically difficult; it is the foot and lower wall, similar, as far as preserved, to early examples of the large stemless cup (e.g. Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 469); however, it is substantially larger, and preserved is a snatch of what seems to be the end of a floral strip on the lower wall, hence a decorated piece. Remains of dilute glaze are visible in the groove at the top of the side of the foot. 1888,0601.202 is closer to Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 471, and presumably dates towards the middle of the 5th century.

33 *Inscriptiones Graecae* I 1240 with references to the base and kouros statue.
A further ‘non-Greek’ may be found in 1886,0401.302 (above, Fig. 36; N104, B66), a standard East Greek cup with the inscription on the inside of the lip (see above section 9.3.1 on varia). The first preserved letter is almost certainly a sampi, not pi as in N, while the final one is delta or lambda, [?]γς ἄπτεο[. The personal name would then be of ‘Carian’ type in -δης, while the rest of the text is also not without interest in certainly giving a word not attested elsewhere in the corpus, whether it be ἄπτεοδωκος ‘gave’ (see 9.3.5 above), to whichever deity, or ἄπτελευθέρους ‘freedman’, as found a little later on Chios. There appears to be only one other ceramic text in which a sampi could possibly have appeared had the inscriber had it in his alphabet, 1888,0601.327, a previously unpublished lip of a standard East Greek cup with [?]πω[. the final letter probably a nu.

11.3.5 Epizelos: a misreading of the text on 1965,0930.734 (Fig. 57; N709, B360 with pl. 30) produced Epitelos, an otherwise unattested personal name. Epizelos uses ionian script, not the Euboean of the majority of holders of that name (see LGPN). The shape of this Fikellura vase is puzzling.

11.3.6 Hermagathinos: among the inscribed Lakonian sherds, 1886,0401.650-652 are of interest in that they are earlier than the rest of the Lakonian set and probably represent a single dedication to Apollo Milesios by a certain Ermagathinos, whose three other dedications are of debatable ceramic origin, Chian and possibly Samian. Stibbe (1997, 129–30) argues well enough that the pieces are from one cup, and we can note that the text started above a handle, perhaps a little further left than is the norm. None of Hermagathinos’ dedications is cut with great competence, and the fact that all have an irregular gamma encourages one to take them all as cut by one person, however much the alphas might vary; regarding competence, the Chian foot also has an unpublished and complete graffito underneath, Αρ[... and a further joining sherd not in has more of the normal dedicatory formula). Whether one accepts a single hand or not, it is to be stressed that in this case a single person dedicated pots from three or more production centres.

11.3.7 Hermokrates: N773, Ἐρ[... has not been located; Möller 2000a 177 notes a possible family connection with an early 5th century stephanephoros at Miletus, whose son she implicitly connects with Hekataios, stamped on a much later brazier lug from Naukratis. Both names are common enough for such relationships to be hazardous, and the stamp is found widely spread throughout the Mediterranean. We should note that N has a second line, ep[ – whether beginning with a vacat or not is not clear. It could be part of the patronymic of Hermokrates.

The large number of names including the element H/h)erm is worth stressing

---

34 See Johnston 2013, 104–6 for further comment. The name is fully preserved as dedicator on a Chian chalice foot, 1888,0601.421; BSA 22, from an East Greek deep cup is one of the many sherds registered as Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1912.41, and N762 remains unlocated.

35 One doubts whether an unnumbered text has crept into the plate (cf. N814 in 2 above), since the only relevant previously unpublished texts, [çç] or çç known to me are unlikely to have got into this section of the publication with East Greek plates: Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, unnumbered, Attic cup, 1965,0930.62, Chian chalice and 1965,0930.585, East Greek cup.
11.3.8 Komaios: Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.27 (JHS 32) is the foot of a non-Attic black-glazed semi-closed or open vase, with dull interior paint and a diameter of 7.4cm; it has been repaired. The inscription under the foot is largely uncontroversial, but after Κω descends into a few squiggles, inaccurately rendered in JHS, which does give the right tone. There is some discussion as to whether this text refers to the cult title of Apollo, known only from Athenaios, but as a local Naucratite feature, or is an otherwise unattested personal name.36 The intended termination to the text perhaps weighs little in this debate. A few details suggests that it is preferably a personal name – the underfoot position, the lack of a reference also to Apollo and the probability that the piece was not found in the Apollo sanctuary; individually these are not strong arguments, but together they have some weight.

11.3.9 Le/athaios: this name is rather new to the world, despite one probable and one possible example being published already in N, and would seem now to be attested on four or five occasions (Johnston 2010, 470–4, the argument slightly abbreviated here):

1. 1910,0222.120 (N510): foot of an Attic kylix, c. 500 BC, ] Λαθαιο[.  
3. Tarquinia, from Gravisca (Johnston 2000c, no. 24): Attic eye-cup, cut under foot, Λήθαιος Ἤρη.  
4. Villa Giulia Museum, from Veii (most recently, Colonna 2006): Etrusco-Corinthian fragmentary phiale. One graffito records the offering of the piece by Lethaie – mini (m)uluvanice iar is leθaias.

It will be immediately objected that we have here four different names: Lathaios, Lethaios, Lethaos and Lethaie. However, there can be little doubt that Lethaos on 3 is a simple error for Lethaios, and that Etruscan Lethaie is a perfectly regular formation from the same name. The example in 1 is perhaps more difficult to associate with the rest, but it is a perfectly regular form, this time Doric, of the name; it also raises further interesting questions.

The date of the pieces is rather spread, even if we cannot be overprecise; 4 is unlikely to be later than 560, while 2 is a developed stemmed cup of c. 550–540 BC; 3 is reasonably dated by Iacobazzi 2004, no. 582, to 530–510 BC (who takes the piece to be a ‘regular’ stemless cup, not an eye-cup as I myself thought). 1 is not so readily datable, but the solid build and relatively large stand-ring suggest a date before rather than after c. 500 BC.

Epigraphically there are further differences in the set; while 2 has double dot punctuation, which may have been used on 1, the latter has crossed theta unlike the other three; 2 is also unusual in having eta in the name of Lethaios, but not in the anetheke[ that follows. 1 also probably employed three-bar sigma; the syntax of the text is not clear, but it could well be personal name + patronymic, thus raising the possibility that the father may be the same person as seen on 2 and/or 3.

It is the rarity of the name that urges some familial unity behind the set. Etruscologists have rather, and with good reason, regarded the later name ‘Lethe’ as indicative of a servile or freedman status of the individual, an unlikely derivation perhaps from our Greek name. We need not think that

36 The case for a cult title is most recently put by Herda 2008, 46–8, with n. 271.
Lethaie was some latter-day Demaratus, a lieutenant of Tarchun in Veii, but let us at least note this further example of interconnectivity between the two cultures.

One might have expected the form ‘Lathaie’ had the man or his family come from Corinth or another Dorian-speaking area, and it is intriguing to consider why the Doric form appears at Naukratis. The alphabet of 1 certainly points to Aegina, if we assume three-bar sigma is used, although other areas cannot be wholly ruled out. We are reminded here of that odd mix of script and dialect in the bespoke dedications of Aristophantos and Damonidas, and of Torelli’s surmise (1982, 318) that Herodotos’ Sostratos may have been descended from an Ionian (Chian?) family. The epigraphy of this ‘set’ does suggest some locational uncertainty – not only the mis-spelling on 3, but the inconsistent use of eta on 2.

One may go a step further:

5. 1886,0401.112 is a lip and wall fragment (N178, B139, pl. 23) of a standard East Greek cup, with the text .LoggerFactory lambda; the second epsilon is cut over a vertical line, not noted in N. On the assumption that the individual letters can only be transcribed in a broadly ‘Ionic’ fashion, the only feasible way forward to an interpretation is lambda lambda, which, especially in context, should be transcribed as lambda sigma lambda. The second part perhaps in general order of possibility could be lambda lambda, lambda lambda or lambda lambda; however in the dedicatory context here, and in the light of the mis-cutting, the capital letter and the long vowel would seem preferable. Certainly there must be at least the strongest possibility that this is another text in Ionic script without the use of eta, and a citation of a name in Le... . If (a) Lethaios is mentioned here, he would presumably be the father of ....]les, and in our ‘stemma’ possibly be equated with the man from Veii, although not so readily placed beside any other of the set.

The name is presumably a potamonym, of a type recently treated by Thonemann 2006. Such names are very much at home in Asia Minor, and of the known rivers named Lethaios the tributary of the Maeander is in any case a far more plausible ‘home’ for our ‘family’ than the other two candidates, the Mesara and the Trikka area in Thessaly. Certainly there is no Aeginetan connection in this particular respect, and one may still worry about the variety of alphabetic use, if the name comes from the Ionian heartland, rather than, say, Aeolis or Rhodes. To go further would strain the evidence.

11.3.10 [Ma?]ndrippos: 1886,0401.503 (Fig. 58) is the shoulder of a closed vase, possibly Chian with a worn text, but one where N is substantially in error, and even ‘corrected’ readings are wrong (see M 180, 9). I read it as lambda gammata (pi) mu, thus giving us what would appear to be a further example of a rare personal name, recently paralleled in a somewhat later dedication from the temple of Athena at Ialysos (SEG 53 818), and known also from Miletos.
11.3.11 **Pedon**: 1965,0930.26 (Fig. 59) is a scrap of the rim of a probably Chian chalice (N730) that has a possibly significant personal name. Unfortunately, the reading cannot be secure; the third preserved letter does have a light horizontal, not in N, that would create a *delta*, but it is not possible to affirm that it was intentional; I would merely take it as more probable than N’s *lambda*. If so, we may note a rarity of names in *-pedo(n)*, (or *-pelo(n)*); Sarpedon appears sporadically, but otherwise Pedon seems to be the only candidate. Apel(l)on, as a variant of Apollo, seems a very remote possibility in this Ionic environment.

One is very tempted to see here our only known Pedon, the mercenary operating in Egypt under (a) Psammetichos (*LSAG* 481; most recently, Agut-Labordère 2012b, 293–4). However, proof is lacking; the date is perhaps not impossible, since Pedon was alive c. 600 BC, and the pot could perhaps be not much later. However, a fuller reading is needed before pressing the case that a probably military man in the service of the Pharaoh also took trouble to offer a deity at Naukratis a ritual vessel, after making a dedication for that service in his home town. Gardner proposed another military connection (1888, 64, no. 759) by suggesting a dedication ‘from an expedition’, but Bailey’s join (1970, 3) proved this a normal text (1888,0601.363 + 381).

11.3.12 **Phanes**: the name is found on the Elephantine palimpsest (Porten and Yarain 1993, C3, 7; Briant and Descat 1998), although no other name therein seems to appear in the graffiti. At Naukratis Phanes, son of Glaucos dedicated the Attic black-glazed dinos, 1888,0601.677, and Schlozhauer (2006a, 300–1) supports the identity of the dedicator with the Halikarnassian mercenary known from Herodotus. However, one must be cautious in identifying individuals of this name, which is of common occurrence, as is:

**Sostratos** who dedicated the well-preserved ‘Aphrodite bowl’, 1888,0601.456 (N701, B355). Mario Torelli (1982, 318) suggested that this man was the grandfather of Sostratos, son of Leodamas, the rich Aeginetan trader cited by Herodotus. I have argued that the conclusion is vitiated by problems with the piece that Torelli uses as the link between the two Sostratoi, 1888,0601.546, in that its possible readings do not support the suggested genealogy (Johnston 2010, 474–7 and see above 11.3.9). It should be noted that there is the possibility that a second Chian lekane, 1888,0601.460k (N704, part) close to the ‘Aphrodite bowl’ has a previously unpublished text, *Σω vac*, which could well refer to Sostratos; its incomplete nature, however, is puzzling – even the *omega* is incomplete; what is written could be in the same hand as on the bowl.

11.3.13 **Herodotos** is also a relatively common name. David Gill (1986) has demonstrated that its two occurrences in the Naukratis corpus (Oxford AN1896-1908- G.141.2 and 15) belong on either side of the historian’s lifetime.

11.3.14 **Phoinix** is given as a Chian name in *LGPN*, but as neither of the vases on which the name appears (1888,0601.311, N823 and 1911,0606.30, BSA 44) is from the island the suggestion should perhaps be withdrawn.

---

37 I merely note that TMKT there could represent Thymogethes, as well as Timokrates etc.
38 On this topic see also Gill 1986, 185.
11.3.15 **Pyth....** A trio of pieces present such a name, previously unsuspected: 1886,0401.639 (Fig. 60; N347, B308) is the wall of an East Greek cup. The lettering is not well presented in N, since the third letter is clearly *theta* - [πυθ]. 1886,0401.814 (N313, B274) is also the wall of an East Greek cup, with part of a probable rosette; the text is printed upside down in N and B. 1888,0601.190, previously unpublished, is the shoulder of a Wild Goat dinos or krater, with the text Πυθ vac cut at the top of the panel (above, Fig. 19); the incisions of the rosettes are not immediately set off from those of the short text.

There is a nice problem in choosing whether these examples reflect a personal name or a cult title, or some of each; the second is more obviously part of a personal name, while the first is scarcely to be categorized of itself. The third example, despite the difficulties of the reading, seems to be a complete text; it has been almost customary to see such abbreviated texts *(see 9.6 above)*, especially when placed in a prominent position, as denoting a deity not a dedicatory, and if we follow that line of reasoning we might well have a reference here to Pythian Apollo.

11.3.16 **Hyles...?**: 1965,0930.725 (Fig. 61), previously unpublished neck and shoulder of a Wild Goat amphora. Floral on neck; part of black-figured lion on shoulder; to the right, *vac υλησ*.; the last preserved letter, a not quite vertical stroke, should be from an *io ta* or, less likely, *kap pa* or *eta*. The text should be giving a personal name; Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria, 28818 (ex-Cairo 26156), N822, is an East Greek stemmed cup with a dedication, *Υιλος* ὁ Μυλήρος Ἀφρόδητι, by Hyles, a personal name unattested elsewhere (and with a father whose name is equally unknown, Myleros). If we accept Hyles on 1965,0930.725, it would be difficult to construe the word following his name, especially if beginning with *io ta* or *eta*. Alternatively, one might assume an error, or an assimilation, on the analogy of Som(b)ratidas, for:

**Hyblesios**, who is found both at Naukratis (Fig. 62; 1888,0601.243) and at Gravisca (Fig. 63; Johnston 2000c, no. 9).

A difficulty here would be to date this late Wild Goat piece close to the two large, fine Attic cups dedicated by Hyblesios, although a date of c. 560 for the amphora and c. 545 for the cups would be possible. Regrettably no

---

39 1888,0601.384, Chian chalice foot, has *vac Υιλος* vac graffito on the outside, another possible example; it also has a red dipinto under (TM Chian 50).
decoration is preserved on 1888.0601.243, although the repair is worth noting; the Gravisca cup is convincingly attributed to the Amasis painter by Iacobazzi (2004, no. 5). One wonders whether another big Attic band-cup, with merely the final sigma of the dedicator’s name preserved, may have been another dedication by Hyblesios (1888.0601.214, B pl. 22.2 top). One may also speculate whether our man may be the Samian Hyblesios buried at Kyme some years later (Savalli-Lestrade 2013).

11.4

The following names or part-names are attested in the corpus. Most fragments preserving only two letters are not included, nor those preserving only central parts of names or common nominal terminations. Only one example is cited of names that occur more than once. The museum names and registration numbers are mildly abbreviated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agores</td>
<td>Ashmolean</td>
<td>M. 141.8, lip of a large Attic lip-cup, JHS 18, has Λ σ vac, which could be the genitive of the name, rather than the Μ λ σ ι suggested in JHS, which would be an unusual formula on such a vase at this date. For a western origin of the name see Barron 2004, 263; see also for discussions of the name Curbera 2004, 4 and Demetriou 2012, 79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaukos</td>
<td>1886.0401.357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorgias</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashmolean G141.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heragones</td>
<td>1911.0606.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleitos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashmolean G.141.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes</td>
<td>Cairo 26152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermesiphanes</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam 54.1894</td>
<td>Ashmolean G.141.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermokrates</td>
<td>1888.0601.388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermophanes</td>
<td>1888.0601.393/393a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermothemis</td>
<td>1888.0601.396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyblosios</td>
<td>1888.0601.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikos</td>
<td>1888.0601.188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall[i]</td>
<td>1911.0606.21</td>
<td>Kalli[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kar[</td>
<td>1965.0930.205</td>
<td>Kle[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klearchos</td>
<td>1924.1201.794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komaios?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashmolean G.141.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakris?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashmolean G.141.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megakles</td>
<td>1888.0601.315</td>
<td>-mides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikes</td>
<td>1924.1201.824</td>
<td>Mnes[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelomandros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipaios?</td>
<td></td>
<td>University College, Dublin 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphaios</td>
<td>1886.0401.1769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanes</td>
<td>1886.0401.677-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaios</td>
<td>1888.0601.562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoinix</td>
<td>1911.0606.30</td>
<td>Phortylos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyarkides</td>
<td>1886.0401.127</td>
<td>Pose[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro[i]</td>
<td>1965.0930.157</td>
<td>Protarchos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protogenes</td>
<td>1888.0601.750</td>
<td>Pyrrhos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pytho[i]</td>
<td>Ashmolean G.141.22</td>
<td>Rhoikos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simias</td>
<td>1888.0601.417</td>
<td>Sleues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smik[r]</td>
<td>1888.0601.356</td>
<td>Smikythos[?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosik[r]</td>
<td>1888.0601.201</td>
<td>Sostratos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strato[i]</td>
<td>1888.0601.363</td>
<td>Straton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphoros</td>
<td>1911.0606.12</td>
<td>Tamynos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teisa[i]</td>
<td>1888.6-1.305</td>
<td>Teise(as)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleson</td>
<td>Ashmolean G.141.13</td>
<td>Telestratos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teos (genitive)</td>
<td>1900.0214.15</td>
<td>Theodoros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theotimos</td>
<td>1888.0601.395</td>
<td>Thymogathes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timo[i]</td>
<td>Ashmolean G.141.9</td>
<td>Tycho[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenopho[i]</td>
<td>1886.0401.957</td>
<td>Zen[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenon</td>
<td>1910.0222.179</td>
<td>Zoilos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. A set of symbols and some nonsense

Two small groups can be readily isolated among the many graffiti on East Greek cups. The first consists of individual isolated symbols on the lip; some are certain examples, others fragmentary (Fig. 64):

- 1886,0401.928: trident.
- 1888,0601.316: ‘tuning fork’.
- 1886,0401.950: ‘swastikoid’.
- 1886,0401.255: ‘butterfly/figure-of-eight’.

And possibly:
- 1886,0401.361: part of a very worn but seemingly non-alphabetic sign.
- 1886,0401.822: incomplete signs, perhaps non-alphabetic.
- 1888,0601.325: two symbols, or perhaps upside-down chi and psi?

All are standard cups, although the fragment 1886,0401.822 is too small for one to be fully confident of the shape. What is unique to my knowledge is such a prominent use of a range of symbols, without any known repetition, regardless of their purpose. It is as if they are a set of ‘numbered’ pieces offered by an innumerate, or unusually sophisticated?, dedicator.

The second set consists of four East Greek cup fragments, with very little mica and well-everted, low lip, 1886,0401.263, 264, 266 and 272, from perhaps a single cup (Fig. 65).

The texts are apparently nonsense now consisting of parts of the same sequence of letters, ιμωξοι, cut upside down in the handle zone; none has a vacat at the beginning of the sequence, which therefore may not start with the upsilon, but if they are all from one cup there would not be much room for more. The text defies analysis.

---

Figure 64 Symbols on East Greek cup rims, 600–550 BC a) 1886,0401.928；b) 1888,0601.316；c) 1886,0401.950；d) 1886,0401.255；e) Ashmolean Museum, Oxford AN1912.41(10).
Photograph © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford

Figure 65 East Greek cup, or cups, 600–550 BC. British Museum, 1886,0401.264 and 266

---

41 Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1912.37(a) probably does not belong here; it has digamma before a break on the lip, but a blob of glaze on the lip indicates that a handle is near, and so the sign is not central on the lip as most of the rest. Perhaps the letter is an incomplete epsilon.
13. Mainland pottery

13.1 Corinthian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum registration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Type of pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1910,0222.250</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ίμο vac</td>
<td>amphora, type B, lip and neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1888,0601.194</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ev vac</td>
<td></td>
<td>aryalballos, base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA188</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>aryalballos, body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1910,0222.66</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>delta</td>
<td>closed vase, wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1888,0601.751 etc</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ίσσοκώροιοι</td>
<td>column-krater, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1924,1201.1220</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>μυς μ[</td>
<td></td>
<td>column-krater, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1886,0401.10-5.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ι</td>
<td>vac Απόλλωνος</td>
<td>column-krater, shoulder and neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1886,0401.672-3 and 1924,1201.1306</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>195, 299</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>vac Απόλλωνος</td>
<td>column-krater, wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 1886,0401.1103</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ίσι[</td>
<td></td>
<td>column-krater wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1886,0401.789</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ίστρυς and ίελος</td>
<td>column-krater, wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 1886,0401.674</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ίεθη</td>
<td>column-krater, wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 1886,0401.1303</td>
<td></td>
<td>fū</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>krater, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 1886,0401.723</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>fū</td>
<td>opposed crescents</td>
<td>skyphos, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 1886,0401.1337</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>symbol</td>
<td>skyphos, foot and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 1924,1201.1189</td>
<td></td>
<td>fū</td>
<td>ή[</td>
<td>skyphos, lip and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Ashmolean, Oxford, AN1896-1908.G.121.14</td>
<td>BSA 41</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>fū</td>
<td>χιτέλεως</td>
<td>skyphos, foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Louvre, Paris, AM1365</td>
<td>fū</td>
<td></td>
<td>square with extra lines</td>
<td>skyphos, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are only some 17 assuredly Corinthian pots with graffiti and dipinto, but they are a very mixed lot indeed, with scarcely two pieces belonging to anything that might be called a category – perhaps four are dedications. Most have had some sort of previous publication, although few of them as Corinthian pots. Both smaller and larger pots bear dedicatory texts, while shorter marks are more common on the former. One transport amphora is separable also by date, being of the 4th century. A further seven pieces, six small open pots and one krater are questionably Corinthian.

Among those texts that exhibit any distinctive epigraphic features, Ionic script predominates. The partly preserved letter on the navel of the krater foot 1886,0401.1303 has splayed hastae, therefore a mu rather than a Corinthian san.

Even in this mix one sherd stands apart, 1886,0401.789 (N330), with two inscriptions, ίαρυς post-firing graffito and ίελος pre-firing dipinto. The piece is from the body of a krater, catalogued as B102.5, with a swan to the left and pairs of legs to the right: outline female legs, down the thigh of

---

42 The six are 1886,0401.391, 646, 666, all with fragmentary dedications to Apollo, as perhaps 1888,0601.1043; 1910,0222.81 with ΦΙ, and 1910,0222.97 with a doodle. The krater is 1886,0401.919, with χιτέλεως, probably an Apollo dedication. A transport amphora neck fragment, 1910,0222.85 (N420), with a lambda epsilon ligature may be Corinthian, with fine light brown clay. Möller (169) has 1886,0401.946 as a possibly Corinthian krater, but there is no reason to doubt that it is East Greek.
which the first text is cut, and legs of a padded dancer to right, with the painted inscription to its right. Lettering, especially san, demonstrates that the script of both is Corinthian. While the supplementation of the painted name could take many forms, the graffito is less amenable to restoration, with no personal name in -atrus currently listed in LGPN; the only plausible interpretation that comes to mind is μητρίος, as a previously unattested form for ‘stepmother’ – a somewhat desperate suggestion. At any rate the graffito should have reference to the figure on which it is scratched. It is one of few such graffiti on Corinthian pots (for a fuller discussion see Johnston forthcoming a).

### 13.2 Lakonian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum registration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Type of pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ashmolean, Oxford, AN1888.1325</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>Ἀφροδίτη Νελόμανδρος</td>
<td>cup,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1886.0401.650</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>ἔρμαγ[</td>
<td>cup, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1886.0401.651</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>ἰλ[</td>
<td>cup, lip and turn of wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1886.0401.652</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>ἴγ[</td>
<td>cup, lip and turn of wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1888.0601.528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>νακ ν[</td>
<td>cup, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1888.0601.529</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>ῥη ο Φ[ and ]υ[</td>
<td>cup, rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1888.0601.527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>αβρο[</td>
<td>cup, wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ashmolean, Oxford, AN896-1908-G.141.17</td>
<td>JHS 07</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>νης ἷη[</td>
<td>krater, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1910.0222.165</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>alpha-pi</td>
<td>krater, foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1910.0222.195</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>non-alphabetic?</td>
<td>krater, foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1965.0930.518</td>
<td></td>
<td>518</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>krater, lip and handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1910.0222.213a</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>non-alphabetic</td>
<td>oenochoe, lip and handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1888.0601.721</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>see 17, below</td>
<td>Lakonian? cup, foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1965.0930.693</td>
<td></td>
<td>693</td>
<td>ιποδ[</td>
<td>Lakonian? cup, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1910.0222.187</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Lakonian? open vase, foot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inscriptions on Lakonian pottery are more fully discussed in Johnston 2013, 103–6.

The Lakonian pottery from Naukratis has been treated most fully by Marjorie Venit (1985a), although she only includes decorated pieces. Stibbe (1997, 130–1 and 2004, see index) has made a few additions to the list. It is not my intention to offer a further treatment, merely to note that there is still previously unpublished material in the British Museum, three items of which are included in the above table. Thonemann (2006, 13–14) has discussed the text of 1 in the table above at length recently and there is little to add to his thorough discussion of the dedicator’s highly unusual name. For 2, see ‘Hermagathinos’ under ‘Names’. The readings of 4 and 5 are worth comment: on 4 the letter following the mu is either mu or nu, and I would not like to say more than that the latter seems more possible (Dugas 1907, 401, fig. 15 is very nearly precise), and so a wider range of names is opened up. 43 5, or rather its avatar 1888,0601.739 (N765), has had an unfortunate history; Bernard,

---

43 Thonemann (2006, 11–12) has also buried the ambitious reading of the dedicant of 4 as Philammon; for that name see Fraser 2007, 79–80.
Venit and Thonemann all give the reading of the latter, a Nile-clay bowl, for this Lakonian cup, whose reading is given correctly by Dugas 1907, 402. This is therefore not an assured dedication to Aphrodite. 11 is, but its status as Lakonian can be debated; it is part of a lip only, white-slipped on the outside. 6 (Fig. 66) has not been recognized as a Lakonian pot, nor perhaps fully as a dedication to Hera because of its curious presentation in JHS 116, fig. 2; there is double-dot punctuation after the sigma and a larger gap, chipped, before the following eta; in a sense therefore it is a monumental dedication akin to the hydria graffito from Gravisca, Johnston 2000c, no. 118. The other six graffiti are mixed and not dedicatory, but are important in the sense that these pieces were kept because they were inscribed, therefore preserving for us a touch of the undecorated Lakonian material which one assumes may have been fairly substantial. 11 is a later piece, discussed more fully below in 17 on some perplexing or individual texts.

13.3 Attic

13.3.1 Overview

Discounting painted ‘vase-inscriptions’, the corpus contains some 400 inscribed Attic pieces, and 50 more that are probably Attic; they cover a very wide range of dates and shapes, as well as types of text, and can scarcely be treated as a unified body. A major problem of classification along traditional ceramic lines is the fragmentary nature of the material, since in many cases one can merely conjecture that a ‘black-glazed’ piece had figured decoration, whether black-figured or red-figured, when none is actually preserved on the sherd. Not all 450 pieces can merit comment here beyond generic description. Some 150 fall into the general categories of dedications or full owners’ inscriptions; unfortunately it is scarcely feasible to separate the two categories, or at any rate a very substantial body of dubia would remain if one tried. Another 150 are short, abbreviated texts, either owners’ marks or some form of trademark; the same comment applies. For well over 130 fragments no serious attempt at categorization can be made, and there is a small residue, very mixed, that might be termed ‘other’.

Position of marks varies, although about half are under the foot and a quarter on the lip. Assured abbreviated owners’ marks appear only twice on the lip, while there are rather more (12) assured dedications under foot.

13.3.2 Closed vases

The number of marked closed vases is very small, a mere ten in total; in the very broad ‘dedicatory’ category there are two larger and four smaller pieces:

- 1911,0606.42 (above, Fig. 42): previously unpublished echinus rim and neck fragment probably of an amphora, ἴπν vac cut on top of lip in big letters (see above 9.4.5 on dedications to Hera). Mid-6th century BC, earlier than the inscribed hydria for Hera from Gravisca, Iacobazzi 2004, no. 1265.
• Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.32 (above, Fig. 13; JHS 37, B680): foot of neck-amphora by the Affecter; probably from same vase as the neck fragment 1886.0401.1176 and body fragments B600.46 and 49, c. 530 BC (see Johnston 2008 115–16 and 7.1.4 above). The graffito is not easy to read or interpret, but as it is cut on the floor of the pot, it must have been applied after breakage; the fact that the final letter, a three-bar sigma, appears to be cut across a break, merely complicates the history of the piece. The first preserved letter may be a rho, but has an additional line cut through it. Gill (1986, 185, n. 5), has seen the significance of the piece, although the printed version of his reading is misleading.

1886.0401.737 and 738 (Fig. 67) (N 219 and 223; B180 and 184; BMC Vases B102.2 and 3; ABV 15, 25 and 14, 13); two fragmentary early olpai, with dedications to Apollo on the body. On the former there are two isolated letters, ΩΛ, cut to the right of panel, not noted in the text of N, but included on pl. 6.1, while on the latter there are poor traces of a letter preserved before κεστος, perhaps αιπ, the text is carefully cut around the figured scene (N pl. 6.2). Approach and date are similar to that of the olpe from the sanctuary of Zeus on Mt. Hymettos (Langdon 1976, 12–13, no. 1).

• 1910,0222.104 (N493, B338 and 317), oenochoe foot. vac Θωρυ under foot, Late Archaic.

• 1888,0601.396 (N819, B468): four nearly joining fragments of wall probably of oenochoe, with part of a panel, in which is cut ρ|τιρφρ, a dedication to Aphrodite. Some fragmentary letters are not recorded in N, but add little of substance. Datable largely by letter forms, perhaps later 6th century.

A mere four pieces belong to other categories of text:

• Two are ‘unknown’: 1910,0222.145 (N537), foot and wall of perhaps an oenochoe, diam. 8.1cm; stand area worn, part of a single graffito letter preserved; and MFA, Boston, 1888.0601.1068 (Fairbanks 373.3; B100), closed vase inscribed on wall, [ο]φρ[σ], possibly a dedication.

• Two are ‘commercial’: 1910,0222.248 (Fig. 68; N654; TM type 9B, 20), foot of Nolan amphora or oenochoe, repaired, black dipinto EV; and 1910,0222.100 (N489), foot and wall of an askos, late 5th century, graffito N and red dipinto traces underfoot.

13.3.3 ‘Merchant’ marks

The number of obvious examples is also thin in this category. Added to 1910,0222.248, immediately above, we have:

• 1888,0601.718 (E771; TM subsidiary list 4, 2), box and lid of pyxis with matching graffito, unusually for such matching marks, however, that on the lid was certainly cut after firing.
13.3.4 Dedications to Apollo

Two early olpai have already been noted, and to this fairly early group can be added Phanes’ dinos (1886,0401.677, S 167).

A set of type C cups are largely published, and need little comment; all inscribed on the lip. They are as follows:

- 1886,0401.559-64 (N94, 89, 96, 99, 254 and 95 respectively): on 560 one dot of double-dot punctuation is preserved; 562 is Attic, pace M 177 and 261; for 563 see 15.6 below. I omit 558 (N92) since I am not sure the second letter, partly preserved, is pi.
- 1886,0401.567 (N97): ; and 568 (previously unpublished; ) possibly from the same cup.
- 1886,0401.330: (previously unpublished) two joining fragments of lip with \( \Lambda \omega \nu \).
- 1886,0401.606 (N91): probably Attic; red band at base of lip outside, \( \Lambda \omega \nu \omega \).
- 1886,0401.831: (previously unpublished), lip and wall, \( \Lambda \nu \).
- 1910,0222.84 (N473): \( \Lambda \nu \nu \) (the breaks omitted in N).
- Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, unnumbered 27 (Fig. 71): \( \Pi \omega \lambda \omega \nu \).

Other shapes are more sporadically represented:

- 1886,0401.828: BF type A cup, \( \nu \alpha \Lambda \nu \).
- 1886,0601.218 (Bernand pl. 21, 2 10): Castulo cup? \( \Lambda \nu \nu \lambda \) vac, less likely to be an owner’s inscription (see above 9.5 on abbreviated deities).
- 1888,0601.607 (Fig. 72): lip of RF krater, c. 450 BC, \( \nu \zeta \Lambda \nu \) on inside of rim.
- 1910,0222.110 (N500): foot of kylix (diameter 7.5 cm), \( \zeta \Lambda \nu \nu \lambda \) underneath; the reading in N is not quite correct at the start.
- Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1912.40(P): Skyphos, foot and wall, c. 400–375 BC, \( \Lambda \nu \nu \) foot.
- Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, unnumbered: sliver of wall of open vase, \( \Lambda \nu \nu \).
These are assured or highly probable dedications to Apollo. It may be thought that the total could be increased considerably by texts on similar Attic fragments which do not preserve any part of the deity’s name but only that of a dedicator. However, this is not so, since the likely list of candidates is extremely small, especially for cups with a concave rim, of general type C, found in the 1884–5 season in the area of the Apollo sanctuary; and indeed the list is not much larger if the net is cast more widely. Sixteen of the 19 inscribed Attic pieces registered in the British Museum in 1886 are included above, and none of the remaining three are immediately relevant – a possible Aphrodite dedication, 942 (N684, later 5th century RF krater rim), 957 (N698) with vac Ξνοφ( cut on top of foot of a late archaic kylix, and 944 (N686) cut under the foot of later 5th century plate (vac ap.). There are some 15 fragments of Attic concave cup lips registered at other times that could carry part of dedications to Apollo, but most are almost certainly from the Aphrodite sanctuary. One could conclude that the set of Apollo dedications on such cups were largely of the simple format ‘Ἀπόλλωνος’.

This argument applies also to the mostly earlier East Greek material. There are about 50 cups and bowls on which the name or probably part of the name of a dedicator is preserved, while the number of fragments of similar pots with the simple Ἀπόλλωνος ἐμί formula amount to around 400.

13.3.5 Dedications to Aphrodite

The Aphrodite series is fuller and longer, with some 50 examples, including those with the title Pandemos. Here I merely isolate a few pieces. In chronological terms the range is from the Siana cup to stamped bowl and cup-kantharos, while the majority are black-glazed cups; on a few black- or red-figure decoration is preserved. More unusual, for the 5th century, are the two red-figured kraters, a ‘regular’ column-krater of the middle part of the century in Brussels (A1810; CVA Brussels 3, 20, pl. 28,2; M168 and 238) with the dedication of a Chian, and the much finer volute krater in London (1900,0214.6), Heidelberg and Bonn, dedicated to Aphrodite Pandemos (most recently Höckmann and Möller 2006, 16–17).

We may note that mis-spellings of the name do not appear on Attic pots; one may tentatively suggest that this is a chronological feature.

14. Dialect and grammar

14.1.1 Where there is clear evidence, the overwhelming majority of texts are in Ionic dialect, as well as Ionic script. We may hazard that one or two pieces not in Ionic script may be Cycladic: 1888,0601.309 + 310 (Fig. 73; B pl. 23), two joining sherds of lip and bowl of probably East Greek cup of unusual type. On lip, [γήθεκη], the ‘reversed’ use of epsilon and eta is typical of some of the central Cyclades (LSAG 289).

Possibly Cycladic, but also attributable to other areas is 1886,0401.261 (above, Fig. 31; N122, B84), non-micaceous, possibly East Greek cup, cut on lip, Ζενιτζεντία. Möller (2006a, 104) comments on this piece, suggesting Aegina or Mytilene as possible origins of the inscriber; the use of ζενι, not
Zani, might cause us to pause, although usage of the two forms is not as well attested as we would like, Δι being the far more frequent. The Cyclades remain a possibility.

14.1.2 Doric and Aeolic dialect has been noted where expected in texts with Knidian script and on ‘Aeolian’ bucchero pots, while some dedications to Apollo may be in Aeginetan script, or rather that of the non-Knidian area(s) in the Doric Hexapolis (Johnston 2013, 109–11, which erroneously has Roman for Greek script at the top of the right column on 111).

14.1.3 Other pieces not in those categories are as follows:

- Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1912.41(28) (Fig. 74): previously unpublished, East Greek cup wall, has τ' ho[, where the final letter, despite a very chipped surface, would seem to be C, not a full circle, and therefore a Knidian omicron; this would greatly assist the interpretation of H, which would only with great difficulty be interpreted as Ionic eta.
- 1886,0401.253 (N103, B65): tall-lipped East Greek cup, vac τρ.ατ[, cut on inside of lip. Second letter not quite as in N. It is not clear whether the third ‘letter’ is such; if it is a phantom the text might well be Doric.
- 1886,0401.1261 (N700, B352, M pl. 2a): late Wild Goat bowl, ]κεν: τάρφο[ ][ ]: o Της[ ] cut over decoration. The crasis with alpha is otherwise unparalleled in our corpus, but should clearly be considered a possibility in Ionic in the light of this example with the ethnic preserved.
- 1922,0508.11 (Fig. 75; previously unpublished): vac? τας[ on lip of East Greek cup.
- Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 100.1899 (BSA 85b, B608): Attic black-glazed skyphos lip and wall, ]ρας[ Αρτ[; two letters included in the BSA drawing are now lost. Doric, whatever the original text.
- Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 341.1899 (BSA 93, B616, M 172 and 238): Attic RF cup wall, ]διρα ho[; see 10.2 on ethnics.
- 1888,0601.721 (N882, B515): Lakonian cup foot, see 17. Doric.

14.2 Final nu

The use of ephelcistic nu, or the lack thereof, is attested approximately 125 times, the word normally involving being anetheke(n) (there are few exceptions and some instances where it is not possible to judge). Eighty-five display the nu, 40 do not, and the character of the following letter appears to have little relevance to the choice; in both cases the majority appears before ταυ. -e is followed by another consonant on five occasions and a vowel on seven, with a vacat following it on four occasions; -en appears before vacat eight times, a vowel eleven times and a consonant, other than ταυ, only once (MFA, Boston, 1888,0601.1072, Fairbanks 318,4, B1003).
There are some nuances of use. The BM 1886 series from Petrie’s first season, largely in the Apollo sanctuary, presents 12 -ε and 5 -en, while from the second season (the 1888 series), mostly from the Aphrodite sanctuary, there are 13 -ε and 24 -en; of the 13 -ε, three are on Aeolian pots, two may be dedications of Samians – Zoilos and Rhoikos – and three others are comparatively early pieces (1888.0601.181, Chian Wild Goat, 279 with closed eta and 392 with three-bar sigma). There would seem therefore to be a tendency towards a wider use of nu, as well as perhaps a wider use of it on Chios.44

14.3 With regard to dative plurals in -ois or -ois the picture is very uneven; where the full reading is clear we have 6 of the former and 11 of the latter,45 and the spread of dates and fabrics is wide. tois theois appears with both word endings preserved only once (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.23, see 9.4.2 above), or twice if we accept Höckmann’s reading of 1911.0606.13 + 36.

14.4 Dative singular

Deficient or variant datives, include 1888.0601.779+283 (Fig. 76; previously unpublished East Greek little master cup) with Ἀφρο[ in large letters on the lip, 1924.1201.710 (CW 72, B794), Chian chalice rim with dipinto ]rε[ (see Wachter 2001, 216), 1888.0601.356, unpublished Chian chalice foot with ΣΦρ[.....], and perhaps UCL-742, seemingly lacking final iota.

A comparable use of epsilon for iota may be found on 1888.0601.183 with the joining fragment 1965,0930.207; 1965,0930.211 is a floating fragment of the same large open vase, perhaps Chian, not closely datable in the period 600–550 BC (Fig. 77). The last has a text in two lines, cut on two glazed bands, Περίοδος Πανθέων . Its reading is uncertain; 1900.0214.8 (their 23) has ois, since the partly preserved following letter is either kappa or lambda.

44 With respect to parallels in Ionic script from outside Naukratis, regrettably Gravisca has only yielded five examples, split 3/2, not a diagnostic sample (from material in Johnston and Pandolfi 2000 and Iacobazzi 2004); from Olbia Pontica there are four examples in Dubois 1996 – one -ε before a consonant in the ‘Fikellura letter’ (Ns 24), and three -en in dedications, 2 before vowel, 1 terminal.

45 Many of these are in the list of Höckmann and Möller 2006, 19, but I do not include in my count 1911.0606.13 (their 3), whose reading is uncertain; 1900.0214.8 (their 23) has ois, since the partly preserved following letter is either kappa or lambda.
The joined sherds also give a difficult text, ἰανὴς τεκαε [., the last letter being either καρπα or eta, or, less likely, iota since there appears to be a trace of a horizontal. The possibilities for the joining sherds are few; perhaps the simplest is ἰανὴς τε κατ Κ[, a joint dedication, although the use of τε is otherwise unattested in our material.

14.5 εἰμι

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum registration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Type of pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1888,0601.420</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>vac τῆς ἀφροδίτης εἰμὶ ὅνεθηκεν Ἐρμογένης</td>
<td>Chian chalice, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1886,0401.444</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ἱος εἰμ[</td>
<td>Chian chalice, lip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1924,1201.757</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ἡ εἰμ[</td>
<td>Chian kantharos?, lip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1886,0401.816</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>εἰμί νας</td>
<td>EG bowl, foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1886,0401.812</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>τωπόλ[ ἱνος εἰμ[</td>
<td>EG bowl, lip and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1886,0401.676</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>πόλλωνος εἰμε[</td>
<td>EG bowl, lip and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1886,0401.502</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ς εἰμ[</td>
<td>EG closed vase, wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1886,0401.329</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>λύωνος εἰμί</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 1886,0401.269</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>εἰμί [</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1886,0401.233</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ς εἰμί νας</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 1928,0728.230</td>
<td>BSA 116</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ἱος εἰμ. ἔδωκε δὲ μὲ α[</td>
<td>EG cup?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 1886,0401.544</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ἱος εἰμ νας</td>
<td>EG olpe, wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 1886,0401.805</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>εἰμί [</td>
<td>EG small closed vase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 1886,0401.430</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>εἰμ[</td>
<td>open vase, wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N has the text of 13 in the above table the wrong way up, while B has ἱαυξ[ highly implausibly; the ‘cross-bar’ of the alleged alpha is accidental; Möller follows B’s reading (179).

Add the limestone horse, later Archaic or Classical, 1900.2-14.27 (B581, BSA 58); εἰμί is clear, whatever the other difficulties of the text.

These constitute about 20% of the total of uses of the first person singular present, compared with εἰμι, just about what might be termed a substantial minority, although there is no discernible pattern to the use. 6 and 12 are oddities, both presumably ‘simple’ errors. ἦμι appears as expected in the Knidian text 1886,0401.684, N764.

15. Script

The variety of letter forms used in the material, especially the Archaic material, were given close attention by Gardner and Edgar and there is little of substance to add beyond the interpretation of some debatable letters, discussed in this report. For the very great part the alphabet used is Ionic and displays both ‘development’ in time in certain letters — eta, theta and sigma especially, and considerable variation in what might be termed...
personal style. I append some discussion of individual letter forms to supplement previous work.

15.1 Gamma

The letter is largely covered in Johnston 2006 (25), although without a full listing of its occurrences on non-Attic pots, which amount to some 32 rather than the 17 cited there. Most of the additions are in the normal Ionic shape (1886.0401.357, 677, 718, 719 – cup, dinos, two cups, all East Greek), 817, 877 (East Greek bowls), 958 – East Greek hydria? – 1888.0601.315 (East Greek cup), 750 (Chian chalice), 1924.1201.664 (Chian chalice), 897 (TM 219, East Greek cup), 1965,0930.41 (Chian chalice) and 515 (foot of a small closed vase). 1965,0930.52 (Fig. 78; Chian chalice) has the ‘rising’ form discussed in Johnston 2006, and on 1965,0930.586 (East Greek cup) there is preserved a single, lunate letter which could be a gamma.

15.2 Digamma

Not unexpectedly the letter is all but absent from our material, since it was not used alphabetically in Ionia. One probable occurrence is on 1965,0930.746 (Fig. 79), a shoulder fragment of a micaceous amphora of brown clay, probably Samian, with a retrograde mark, consisting perhaps a very archaic digamma and open (h)eta.

It is not impossible that the ‘digamma’ is part of an alpha in ligature, but the whole is a very unusual mark. The letter also appears, regretfully before a break, on an East Greek cup lip, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1912.37a; it is unlikely that it belongs to the ‘symbol’ group of unusual signs on such cups, as discussed above (see n. 42).

15.3 Closed eta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum registration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Type of pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1888,0601.360</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>ꞏ但我们 [ ḕ 'ο Xioç [ ]</td>
<td>Chian chalice, foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1886,0401.481</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>ꞏ但我们 [ ḕ 'ο Xioç [ ]</td>
<td>Chian chalice, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1888,0601.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ꞏ但我们 [ ḕ 'ο Xioç [ ]</td>
<td>Chian chalice, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1888,0601.351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ꞏ但我们 [ ḕ 'ο Xioç [ ]</td>
<td>Chian chalice, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ashmolean AN1912.41(41)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>ꞏ但我们 [ ḕ 'ο Xioç [ ]</td>
<td>Chian chalice, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1888,0601.89+688</td>
<td>CVA 8,</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>ꞏ但我们 [ ḕ 'ο Xioç [ ]</td>
<td>Chian chalice, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1888,0601.546</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>ꞏ但我们 [ ḕ 'ο Xioç [ ]</td>
<td>Chian chalice, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ashmolean AN1912.41(28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ꞏ但我们 [ ḕ 'ο Xioç [ ]</td>
<td>Chian chalice, lip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a rare letter indeed, appearing assuredly in a text on only 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 in the list above; with the exception of 7, the pieces are certainly ‘earlier rather than later’. 3 has a single preserved letter or sign, with vacat
to the right, clearly not the end of any normal text. It is argued above, 14.1.3, that 9 may be in Knidian script.

The interpretation of the relevant letters in 1 and 2 is debatable. I include 1 merely as a precaution, since there is not enough of the letter preserved in the published drawing to be sure whether it is open or closed.

2 (Fig. 80) is difficult; a sherd has been added since the publication in N. Line 1 has a break between the two sherds which causes problems; the first preserved part-letter is a near vertical, then a probable vertical, obscured by the break, followed by the rest of either epsilon and iota, joined, or of closed eta. If there is a closed eta here, however, we should note the open ones following in lines 2–3. There is little room for a crossbar if the first letter was a tau (see M169 and 252 for previous discussion of the text). The last letter of line 1 has part of the second stroke preserved, lambda, mu or nu being the most likely original. Unfortunately the text does not follow any regular formula, and Gardner’s suggested placing of a patronymic at the start (N p. 64) is as unusual as the reading of a single closed eta - e.g. -es an[etheken kai ....]okles[ tei Aphrodi]tei o . The reading of the final letter in line 3 is probably T but X cannot fully be excluded. If it is T, the ethnic Teios is a highly probable reading, and it is interesting that 8 is another Teian dedication, of roughly the same date as 2, with both forms of eta (Johnston 2010, 476–8). Whatever the reason for such usage in 8, it does go some way to supporting the reading of eta for 2, line 1.

In this set 7 is clearly isolated by date, as well as being a frustratingly fragmentary text.

One can add five examples where the sign occurs underfoot by itself. Egyptian Museum, Cairo, 26146, 1888,0601.198 and 1886,0401.695, East Greek plates and cup respectively, and two Chian chalice feet, 1886,0401.743 and 734. The first set are all earlier. On the Chian chalice, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.47, the sign is large, but the fragment is broken either side and it is not possible to say whether it was part of a longer text, as might be the case with 3 above.

15.4 Theta

Some 16 texts employ dotted theta, and there are a very few uncertain examples. Twelve of the texts are on Chian vases, 8 chalices, 1 phiale, 1 cup and 2 uncertain; 7 of these are dipinto inscriptions. The ceramic type of BSA 46 remains uncertain, while the other three pieces are a probably Attic phiale wall (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 108.1899), a Fikellura amphora (Egyptian Museum, Cairo, 26152, N876) and an East Greek cup, 1965,0930.457 (if the sign is not decoration). The bulk of the material here is Chian and not likely to date earlier than c. 575 BC on available evidence.

By comparison the number of cartwheel thetas is very considerable, c. 230, from a broad chronological range; about 100 are Chian and there are three Fikellura pieces. The chalice lip 1924,1201.717 (Fig. 81; N740, CW 79) may provide a close link between dotted and cartwheel forms; the preserved text, ἰνθςς ς ς, encourages one to think that this is the second preserved dedication by Thymogethes (in addition to 1886,0401.173 + UCL-736, Johnston 2006, 164–6); if so, we may may note that the latter has cartwheel theta, the former dotted, an indication that the dotted form was easier to paint.
15.5 Tailed ρο

The Aphrodite dedications naturally present many uses of ρο, but overall the tailed version appears extremely rarely:

1. 1888,0601.395 (N777): East Greek plate with whole profile preserved. N does not have the tail to the ρο or the full length of the vertical of the χι; we may also note the three-bar σίγμα. ἱμην τῶν ἀνατολάκης τῆς προδίτης εὔχυλην vac.

2. 1888,0601.452 (N756, B407): cut on the foot of a large Chian chalice, Ἱ Ἀφροδῆ[. N does not have the tail quite right.

3. 1888,0601.545 (Fig. 82): previously unpublished East Greek bowl, wall, late Wild Goat, cut on inside Ηρφρι[. 

4. Later, but not more closely datable than 490–460 BC, is Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 106.1899 (BSA 86), an Attic black-glazed Vicup foot, Ἱρφριτης vac underfoot, as in BSA.

5. 1965,0930.747 (TM fig. 12c): separable in many respects from the rest, a wall fragment of a possibly Attic closed vase, probably cut as an ostrakon, with 7 drachma signs above ἀγορα;[. the ρο is probably tailed.

And a possible candidate:

6. 1965,0930.164: Chian chalice lip and bowl fragment, what remains of the ρο in Ἱροδη[ seems tailed.

The usages are not closely grouped in any way, and one can say little more than that some are among the earliest appearances of the letter form, appearing on both Chian and generically East Greek pots. 1 also presents an unusually late three-bar σίγμα for Ionia. It is relevant to note that if Charmes was the dedicator of 1, he does not use tailed ρο on two other pieces which he dedicated, 1888,0601.521 (N771) and 557 (N776), although the only other σίγμα preserved on those two may be three-barred (pace Johnston 1974, 97); while the form on 1 is not as clearly three-barred as is shown in N, it can scarcely be said to be a confident four-bar version. One may also note that N fails to record the slight traces of Aphrodite’s name on 771 and of the χι and letter following the νυ at the end of 776.

I have argued (TM p. 210) that this form of ρο may have been introduced in some areas to distinguish the letter not from δελτα but from exaggerated forms of αλφα such as those that can be found in good numbers amongst the Naukratis material; an extreme example is 1886,0401.417 (N284), a wall fragment of a standard East Greek cup.

15.6 3-bar σίγμα and ΣΩΝ

The use of three- or four-bar σίγμα has in large part been treated in Johnston 1974. A fuller count gives some 35 examples using three-bar σίγμα, with a number of cases unclear. The great majority are on East Greek wares, ranging from Chian to early Fikellura; two or three are on mortaria (1886,0401.71, 76 and probably 81), while there is a small residue of two Attic pieces, one of them probably the latest example in the set (1910,0222.120, Johnston 2010, 470–1) and Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
AN1896-1908.G.141.32, (Johnston 2008 115–16), one possibly Corinthian lekanis lip (1886,0401.1043, retrograde ]...ος vac) and a local cup, 1886,0401.777 (S 146). Three of the East Greek cups display non-Ionic dialect or orthographical forms, as do the Attic pieces, but most of the rest are fully Ionic. With respect to the numbers of hastae used for letters, we should note two examples of ‘two-stroke’ epsilon, combined with three-bar sigma, 1886,0401.247 (below, Fig. 91) and Egyptian Museum, Cairo, 7.4.22.2 (N877, B513, Venit 1988, no. 193, pl.45), the two almost certainly dedicated by the same man, Pyrrhos.

The discussion in 1974 involved the argument that we do not have among these examples uses of the vocative and second person singular in the dedications to Apollo, for example ‘I am yours, Apollo’, as argued by Gardner. A few more points may be made, based on the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration number</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Type of pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1886,0401.563</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>λλωσος .[ ]</td>
<td>Attic cup, C, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1886,0401.801</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>ύπτολλωσο[ ]</td>
<td>EG bowl, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1886,0401.797</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>τ.πολλωσον εμι vac</td>
<td>EG bowl, lip and handle root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1886,0401.795</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>ύπτολλωσον[ ]</td>
<td>EG bowl, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1886,0401.806</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>λλωσο[ ]</td>
<td>EG bowl, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1886,0401.102</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ύπτολλωσος ε[ ]</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1886,0401.304</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>ολλωσο[ ]</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and turn of wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1886,0401.306</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>155, pl. 23</td>
<td>νεμ[ ]</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and turn of wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1886,0401.625</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>87bis</td>
<td>[.ν εμ[ ]</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1886,0401.602</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>ολλω[ ]</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1886,0401.640</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>ολλω[ ]</td>
<td>EG cup, wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1886,0401.736</td>
<td>1b/1b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ολλω.ο. εμι vac</td>
<td>EG? oen, neck and shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1886,0401.084</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>λλωσο εμ[ ]</td>
<td>hydria or amphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1886,0401.083</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ύπτολλωσο εμι[ ] retrograde</td>
<td>hydria or amphora, neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1886,0401.071</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29, pl. 19,1,3</td>
<td>τωτολλωσο[ ] retrograde</td>
<td>mortarium, profile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under ‘transliteration’ in this table an ‘instinctive’ reading of the disputed letters, sigma/nu is given; on 1886,0401.602 for example, the final preserved letter approximates to a retrograde nu more than to a three-bar sigma.

The fabric of these pots with ‘ΣΟΝ’ texts fall mainly into three clear groups, a trio of closed vases, a set of bowls and a wider range of cups; one mortarium and an Attic cup are clearly different, in more than one respect; the latter is substantially later than all others, while many of the set of texts on mortaria are epigraphically separable from the ‘rump’ of dedications, probably largely because they are early (here Edgar’s consideration that the mortarium (N68, not 67) should not be early can be overridden); N1b is also early. Some of my case rested on the unexpected use of three-bar sigma in most of the ‘SON’ texts, but this should be modified for the earlier pieces, which were cut at a time when the three-bar form was still being used in some parts of Ionia. The four bowls (three lotus bowls, the fourth, 1886,0401.806, a rosette bowl) could be said to belong to this period. They

---

[46] Regarding my previous thoughts, some corrigenda should be noted for Johnston 1974, 96–8: at the end of the second paragraph read ‘all’, not ‘both’. In the list of 3-bar sigmas, 1a is BM 1886,0401.70, and BM 1886,0401.269 should read 373, which is Naukratis 275. In note 1, N 149 is 1886,0401.192=334; N157 is 1886.219 and N192 (+ 208a) is 1888,0401.116. Nor did I mention Edgar’s critique of Gardner, (1898–9, 52, n. 1) where some similar points to mine were already made.
may all have been inscribed by the same hand; 1886.0401.795 and 801 certainly would seem to be, therefore suggesting that a tau once preceded the omega, as on 1886.0401.797; as one text clearly has the genitive of Apollo’s name (just as on the mortarium) the rest should follow. One of the three closed vases has been analysed (1886.0401.83, Schlotzhauer and Villing 2006, 63, fig. 38) and found to be of local clay, and 1886.0401.84 is of identical fabric; there may only be one inscriber here, and as he clearly is not at ease with writing one should certainly not press the case for ‘son’ here. 1886.0401.602 is a possible candidate for the group; the ’nu’ is odd and seems retrograde; on 1886.0401.640 the last letter is also not a canonical nu.

The cups overall belong to the later period when four-bar sigma is to be expected in an ionic text, as best demonstrated by the rest of the dedications on similar cups from the same site.

The case for arguing that these are second-person invocations to Apollo is therefore still very weak, in epigraphic as well as ceramic terms. I am not aware that the dedicatory formula has come to light elsewhere, and on no piece from Naukratis can the first omega in Apollo’s name be shown to have a vacat before it. I return to a major aspect – inscriptive errors – later. However, one should add 1886.0401.307 (Fig. 83; N118), a standard East Greek cup, which has a sequence of letters akin to the SON group, with four-bar sigma; the final letter seems to have traces of a central hasta, making it epsilon – [ελωσ]; is the conservative reading. Here if anywhere the reading Απόλλων[ε] does seem the easier; while it is not best practice to posit errors, one wonders whether the intention was not Απόλλωνες είμι.47

47 One may also point to 1886.0401.371 (N120, B82), a standard East Greek cup with Απόλλωνες είμι cut upside down on the lip, with a near horizontal nu that verges on the ‘three-bar’ sigmas of this set (not cited in Edgar).

Figure 83 East Greek cup, 575–550 BC. British Museum, 1886.0401.307

15.6.1 Reversed sigma

The sign is very rare, and all possible examples appear to be in final position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum registration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Type of pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1886.0401.194</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td>[λλωνος]</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1886.0401.777</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[λλωνος νας]</td>
<td>EG cup, lip, wall and handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1886.0401.184</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td>[γος]</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1924.1201.695</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ης μ'αν]</td>
<td>Chian chalice, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888.0601.4-1</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[λονος εμι]</td>
<td>EG cup, lip and wall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first has traces of a final letter, not in N, either a three-bar or a reversed four-bar sigma. On the second the final letter, close to the handle, seems to be a reversed three-bar sigma; B has a longer text, erroneously.
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Note the lack of \textit{omega} in the last piece (Johnston 2013, 108, fig. 12); the pertinent letter is much worn, but there is no sign of the struts of an \textit{omega}.

15.7 \textit{Phi}

The shape of \textit{phi} can be roughly broken down into those with long (type 1) and those with short (type 2) vertical, although a dozen or so take up what can only be described as an intermediate position (type 3) and the precise shape of some ten I have not (yet) recorded. Type 2 is regarded as in use earlier in East Greece than the mainland by Wachter (2001, 28 and 102), arguing that type 1 on Chian sherds from Aphaia is a sign that they were painted on Aegina. In a sense statistics bear this out; of the Naukratis material, 144 pieces have one or more \textit{phi}; type 1 appears on 41 pieces, type 2 on 79 (only 30 of which are previously published), and the East Greek component of these totals are 15 or 16 for type 1, and 58 for type 2; the former include 9 probably or certainly Chian pieces, the latter 34. These 9 are all graffiti and only two have been previously published, one not fully correctly (1888,0601.175 and 179, N707 and 729). Therefore the examples of type 1 on Aegina are distinctive in that there are no \textit{painted} parallels in the Naukratis corpus, even if five fall into the ‘intermediate’ type 3.

15.8 \textit{Sampi} see above 11.1.

15.9 \textit{Qoppa} is used sporadically in dedications to the Dioskouroi. Five have it, while 4 have \textit{kappa}, and no clear pattern emerges; one of the four is a local lamp, another a Corinthian column-krater (1888,0601.751), but with an Ionic text; the third is a regular East Greek cup (1888,0601.707) and the fourth is a Chian chalice (1888,0601.355); of the five using \textit{qoppa}, three have not been re-located (N834-6), while 1888,0601.270 and Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.49 are East Greek cups.

The letter appears in five other texts, all before \textit{omicron}, two East Greek cups, two East Greek bowls and an Attic dinos. On the other hand, \textit{kappa} is used before \textit{omicron} also on five occasions, two East Greek cups, two East Greek bowls and a Chian chalice. Glaukos is spelt both ways, with \textit{qoppa} on Phanes’ dinos, 1886,0401.677-8, and with \textit{kappa} on the Hera cup, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 227.1899 (above, Fig. 43; BSA 20, S 80) and an East Greek bowl, 1886,0401.813 (N309, B270). It is impossible to see any patterning here.\textsuperscript{48}

15.10 Punctuation

The published record of punctuation in the texts leaves much to be desired. Some 38 pieces display punctuation, of which 11 were previously unpublished and 8 need emendation, while one has not been found (BSA 9). Two dots after numerals on the amphora 1910,0222.9 (N393) are probably to be explained as a fractional notation.

Two and three dot punctuation predominates. Little discernable pattern emerges, although there is a tendency away from three dots; only one

\textsuperscript{48} The letter also appears on the limestone fragment N795, present whereabouts unknown, and by itself on the strap handle of an Aeolian bucchero closed vase, 2011,5003.573 (for this series see above §8.6.1 on transport amphora). For a recent overview of the use of the letter in Ionia see N. Ehrhardt in Schlotzhauer 2007, 287–8.
A Lakonian krater (above, Fig. 66; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN-1896-1908- G141.17, JHS 7, B650, Johnston 2013, 105, fig. 7) has double dot punctuation, not noted in JHS, Ἑρη: The monumentality of this text, atop a krater rim, may account for this usage; compare the East Greek dinos 1888,0601.393 + 393, and the Attic krater 1900,0214.6.

The record from other sites could be said to be fairly consistent with that at Naukratis, where punctuation is found in about one in seventy texts. From Palagruza (personal study) two uses of punctuation are known in a corpus of about 200 pieces, both on Attic pots of the 5th century; however, no punctuation is known to me from Gravisca, a corpus of over 350 texts. Interestingly, Lethaios does not have punctuation in his Gravisca dedication, but uses it at Posidi, and his namesake also has it at Naukratis (1910,0222.120; Johnston 2008, 471–2).

The Chian dipinti from the Aphaea sanctuary on Aigina also have use of three dots, all being dedications of Aristophantos and Damonidas; there is no assured or even probable example from Naukratis to place beside these (see above 11.2). At Athens we can note seven examples among approximately 350 Archaic to Classical graffiti published in Lang 1976 (see p. 4), and 19 on the 1337 ostraka in Lang 1990 (see p. 10), all but one of the 480s – one in 50 and one in 70 respectively, although seven of the total of 26 consist of markers at the end of texts inscribed in a circle under cup feet. Two of the 51 dedications to Apollo from Cyrene have punctuation (two dots; Maffre 2007). We may note a blank in the material from Gela published by Manni Piraino 1980), and also in the 370 texts from Segesta (Agostiniani 1977). In a sense all these are comparable corpora, consisting of both short and long informal texts on pottery. The material in Dubois’ corpus (1996) from Olbia Pontica is more varied, but if we exclude texts on

---

49 1888,0601.315, an East Greek cup inscribed on the body, may have punctuation, not an epsilon as the first preserved sign. Finally, 1886,0401.809, another bowl, is a difficult text, but the “punctuation” in the version N305 is a dribble of glaze matter.
stone we have six examples of two-dot punctuation on some 75 pieces, spread over a broad period, into the 4th century. This points to a rather different regime. In Attica, Threatte has published exemplary details of usage (1980, 73–84; see also Immerwahr 1990, 168). We should note that in private texts usage is far more common than in the places discussed above, especially in the Archaic period, while the usage of triple-dot punctuation tends to give way to double-dot in the late Archaic period, but does not disappear entirely.

15.11 Various letter forms

- 1886,0401.234 (Fig. 85; B729): standard East Greek cup lip, Ἴζ in large letters including a rare sinuous sigma. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1912.41(15), BSA 19, wall of an East Greek cup, inscribed inside may also have such a sigma at the end.
- 1886,0401.107 (Fig. 86; N245): , East Greek cup lip and wall, low-lipped with added red lines. Ἑπόλλυνος Ἴμι. Note ‘late’ forms of pi with long second vertical and of sigma with horizontal top and bottom hastae.

16. Corrections and mis-spellings

While the definition of ‘mis-spelling’ is by no means easy and raises very interesting social questions, we may note on a more pragmatic front that what may be conceded by all as errors are to be found in about 5% of our dedicatory texts of the Archaic period. By comparison, the percentage is virtually the same, with 52 examples in 1000 texts for the whole Greek world gathered in Lazzarini 1976 (if we include five examples where iota is missing in the dative singular).

Some more striking (and obvious) examples:

- N738*, ἴνδυ(v)ῆθη(κ)ε Ἀρδοπη (probably = 1924,1201.689, below).
- 1888,0601.421 (N750, B401, pl. 21, Johnston 2013, 105, fig. 4): foot of Chian chalice, ἴΕρμαγαθίνος μ’ἀνένθηκεν τῆ[ν] Ἀφροδίτη; under, vac Ἀρδοπη vac.
- 1888,0601.246 + 248 (Fig. 87): standard East Greek cup, Ἰθηκεν τριφροδήτη vac cut on inside of lip.
- 1922,0508.3: Attic type C cup, lip, Ἰ Αφροδί[...
Johnston, Ceramic inscriptions

- 1965,0930.48: ιριαο[, on neck of East Greek closed vase may be an excessively poor attempt.

Other

- 1886,0401.676 + 1924,1201.865 and 867 (N325, B286): East Greek rosette bowl, τπόλλωνς ειμε[ cut on inside of rim.
- 1888,0601.245 + 301: standard East Greek cup; ἕτροτης μα q[, scruffily written in handle zone; tau with minimal horizontal and mis-spelling.

Corrections

- 1886,0401.812 (Fig. 88; N308, B269), τπωπόλ[ .νος ειμ[, The epsilon is very complex, perhaps a third attempt after an omicron and a ιμ or μu.
- 1886,0401.445 (N23, B25, pl. 20-1), Chian chalice lip, vac ἀπόλλωνι[ Omicron incomplete; ομεγα inserted later.
- 1886,0401.480 (B754): Chian chalice lip, ἕτροτηθ[ , text corrected.
- 1886,0401.667 (N198, B159): standard, fine, East Greek cup, vac ἀπόλλωνος vac cut centrally in handle zone. Last letter corrected from iota.
- 1888,0601.271: standard East Greek cup, ϕροδ[ cut in handle zone, phi corrected from/into omega, previous letter not clearly alpha.
- 1924,1201.536: Chian chalice lip, ἕτροθη[ , νυ squeezed in as correction.
- 1924,1201.548 (Fig. 89): Chian chalice lip, ηκε[, the eta corrected from an epsilon.
- 1965,0930.16: wall of Chian open vase, νε[ ; alpha seems to have been altered into epsilon.
- 1965,0930.67 (Fig. 90): lip of Chian chalice or kantharos, ροδ[. Rho added.
16.1 Incomplete texts

Whether created by design or accident we may note the following lacunose texts (I do not include under that heading ‘deficient’ datives, for which see above 14.2 on dative singular):

- 1886,0401.123+370 (N155+118, B116+80): low-lipped East Greek cup. There are no lower parts to two letters, epsilon and kappa, possibly because of restricted space? Probably not a conceit like the half-painted frieze on the KX painter’s frieze from Samos (Kreuzer 1998, no. 208), since many letters are complete.

- 1886,0401.247 (Fig. 91; N132, B93), standard East Greek cup, μυρος με ανι[ inscribed on lip has incomplete sigma and epsilon. The name of the dedicator is almost certainly Pyrrhos, as on another East Greek cup inscribed on the lip with apparently the same ‘defects’ in both letters, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, 7.4.22.2 (N877, B513, Venit 1988,193).

- 1886,0401.309 +1024 (N162, B123): standard East Greek cup, whole profile preserved, cut on lip νας τωπολλων νας.

- 1886,0401.540+544 (N351, B312, part): East Greek olpe wall, dull paint on shoulder, reserved below; cut on shoulder, ιος ειμ νας. Sigma, damaged in break, probably three-bar.

16.2 Varia

- 1924,1201.695 (CW 67, pl. 35,18; B789): Chian chalice lip. Dipinto ης μ’αν[; reversed sigma; crossbar of alpha omitted.

- 1888,0601.188 (N717, B368, pl. 20–1): Chian chalice lip and cul. νας? (κα)ος μ[...]θηκην[.

- 1886,0401.407 (N265, B226): Schlotzhauer type 10 cup, ἁπτλω[ (sic) cut on bowl; note ‘late’ omega.

- BSA 51: [ωτοΧιτοἈλλον[.

16.3 Excursus

‘Irregular’ spelling of Apollo

Most of this material is discussed in 13.3.4 above on dedications to Apollo and in Johnston 2013, and therefore the following largely takes the form of a list and is ordered by the character of the unusual orthography.

16.3.1 1886,0401.82a-b (N2, B4) and BSA 51 have partial use of omega.

16.3.2 Single lambda, with omega

- N7: ἄπτλω[.
- 1886,0401.123 (N115, B116): νεθηκε τη Απολλω[.

---

50 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, 26155 (N 881), East Greek bird bowl, is a dubious case; Gardner’s drawing shows a hesitant double lambda, while the photograph available would indicate a single sign.
1886,0401.601 (N130, B91; Johnston 2013, 106, 6): East Greek cup, cut on lip, Απτόλω[. N misses a diagonal to the left of the initial vertical – close-set alpha and π?]

1886,0401.419 (N286, B247; Johnston 2013, 106, 7): worn East Greek cup wall, τπόλων[.

1886,0401.646 (previously unpublished; Johnston 2013, 106, 8): wall of skyphos, possibly Corinthian, όλω[, although the reading of the first letter is by no means certain.

16.3.3. Single lambda, without omega

1886,0401.310 (N250, B211, Johnston 2013, 108, fig.12, which has wrong caption): standard East Greek cup, cut on handle zone.


1886,0401.657 (N258, B219, Johnston 2013, 108, fig. 11): cup with carinated wall, as 1886,0401.402.

1886,0401.876 (Johnston 2013, 106, 10): East Greek bowl, wall, Απτόλω vac? Only the lower parts of most letters are preserved, but this seems to be an unusual version.

1888,0601.313 (Johnston 2013, 108, 11): East Greek cup, lip. ολο[, but the last letter does not appear to be nu.

16.3.4 Others without omega

1886,0401.385 (Johnston 2013, 108, 12): Schlotzhauer type 10 cup, variant; fine-walled, with reserved band at top of lip inside, cut on wall.

1886,0401.373 (N275; Johnston 2013, 106, fig. 13, which has wrong caption).

16.3.5 Unusual crasis

1886,0401.580 (N158, B119): East Greek cup, lip.

1886,0401.1029 (B765, pl. 23, 1; Johnston 2013, 108, 13): standard, small East Greek cup.

16.3.6 Others

BSA 51: ωνος το Χιο τοι Άππλλ[ (see above).

1886,0401.1292 (N5 and pl. IV, 1, B7 – omitting a π); plain, non-micaceous pink-buff krater, lip, wall and handle, ναυ Παραμένυν μ με άνεχθε κε τωπόλλωνι cut on lip.

1886,0401.411 (N271, B232): cup with carinated wall, rather more elaborate and with better fired paint than 1886,0401.402 and 657 above; ναυ Άππλλ[.

1886,0401.407: see above 8.2 on East Greek cups – Ππλω[.

1886,0401.83: ωπόλλω[ν έμι[ retrograde.

1886,0401.102: οπόλλω[ος έι[.

1886,0401.795: οπόλλω[ον[.

1886,0401.801: οπόλλω[ον.

The final four belong to the ‘SON’ group (see above 15.6.2). It may be noted that there is only one example of the preserved sequence -λλω- (BSA 51), and that is in a text where an omicron had already been omitted.
17. Some perplexing or individual texts

Numerous individual texts have been commented on in the appropriate sections above. Here some more are added, which are either very difficult to place in any of those broader contexts, are examples of particular types of minor text, or display some highly individual quirk. They are presented in order of registration number:

- 1886,0401.260 (N117, B79): East Greek cup lip with ιουμπυ. Enough of first letter is preserved to guarantee alpha; the last trace is not as N – a small area of circular letter. A difficult sequence of letters.

- 1886,0401.734 (Fig. 92; N383): Attic black-glazed bowl, foot and wall; inscribed underneath, πρω, ΕΛ and other signs, the first text omitted in N. An example of the occurrence of several texts, in different hands on the same pot, normally under the foot.

- 1886,0401.809 (N305, B266): East Greek cup, inscribed on body. N's reading is nearly right; the lower dot of ‘punctuation’ is a drip of glaze. Odd scrawl; Gardner and Bernard have ξο εμλ, which is viable Greek, but epigraphically difficult to accept, even if a horizontal epsilon is not out of the question; Gardner rightly compares the relatively early examples on the closed pots N1b and 3 (1886,0401.736 and 83) (see above 15.6.2 on 3-bar sigma and ΣΟΝ). The cup is of an earlier type with red and white bands inside; the lip zone outside is reserved as far as is preserved.

- 1886,0401.958: neck and shoulder fragment of an East Greek closed vase, perhaps hydria. Glaze at bottom of neck, part of ‘moustache’ ornament on shoulder. Two bands preserved below. Cut on shoulder, ἡστίγγ[, a text which is resistant to analysis, but very clear.

- 1888,0601.162 (CW 47, pl. 34.2; B770): Chian kantharos wall, with dipinto ἦμμιτμο. Perhaps the most puzzling of the ‘residual’ Chian dipinti. The reading of the eta is assured by part of the horizontal preserved on the break. eimi with an initial eta? Or, as Wachter suggests (2001, 217, La), crasis of eta (ier|h?) and eimi.

- 1888,0601.203 (N810, B458): East Greek cup. Difficult set of letters, but πα seems assured, flanked by some combination of lambda, μυ or νυ.

- 1886,0401.621: East Greek lip fragment with yoς[; the omicron seems to have a central dot, deliberately cut.

- 1888,0601.359 (N754, B405): Chian chalice foot, inscribed around the outside in two lines ξυνδ’ [ ] ο ανθ[ . One is tempted to see egrapsen here, but the space available for statement of both decoration and dedication seems too limited.
1888,0601.386+387 (Fig. 93; N761, B412): two joining fragments from the foot of a Chian krater, inscribed in two lines under, \( \omega λι\alpha\sigma\rho\varepsilon\alpha | \) \( \delta\omicron \nu\omicron \upsilon \) vac. Another very difficult sequence of letters. The reading of the first letter is difficult, only a quavering upright being preserved. The lambdas are also uncertain; the first could just be a gamma, the second, for example, mu. In any case, a reading as a dedication to both Apollo and Aphrodite would be hazardous.

1888,0601.721 (Fig. 94; N882, B515, both with incomplete readings), disc foot of small open vase, inscribed under, \( \alpha\pi\tau\epsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\epsilon\omicron\nu\) | \( \tau\nu\theta\alpha\kappa\omicron\omicron\mu\omicron\eta \upsilon \) εκνε, around a cartoon of a bearded satyr-like head.

Figure 93 Chian krater foot, c. 610–570 BC, British Museum, 1888,0601.386+387

The profile is typical of Lakonian cups or mugs of the Classical period, with slightly raised disc base (Catling 1996, 55, c, ‘possibly extending into the 4th cent.’). However, fabric and quality of the paint are at the edge of the Lakonian range, and these cups are normally painted underfoot. Closer dating would be dependent on the epigraphic and ‘art-historical’ clues offered by the graffiti, and these are not many. While the cartoon has some features that might be thought modern, it is clear that the lettering was fitted around it, and the text gives every appearance of antiquity. Otherwise it can only be said to have a ‘post-Archaic style’. The dialect would seem to be Doric, with the first word(s) based on Apella/Apollo, and the \( \alpha\pi\tau\omicron\nu\alpha\omicron\omicron\) in \( \pi\theta\alpha\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\) (not \( \pi\theta\alpha\kappa\omicron\omicron\) as given by Gardner); the general sense is that a person identifiable by the first word(s) has a resemblance to a monkey (as in the cartoon); this would require taking \( \pi\theta\alpha\kappa\omicron\omicron\) either as dative, without \( \omega\omicron\gamma\alpha\omicron\) \( \omicron\nu\upsilon\omicron\nu\upsilon\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon\omicron\)  or as a misspelt genitive. The final letters, \( \epsilon\kappa\omicron\nu\epsilon \), make little sense unless either the remarks are incomplete, \( \epsilon\kappa\omicron\nu\epsilon \) (....), as is possible since the writer was clearly cramped for space, or if we accept the general sense of \( \kappa\nu\alpha\omicron \), ‘scratch’, in a sense relevant; but the verbal ending -e is difficult to accept in a Doric milieu. If both cup and text are Lakonian (by no means an assured hypothesis), there could be some reference to the Spartan \( \alpha\pi\tau\epsilon\alpha\omicron\omicron\) assembly. Overall, a text that bristles with problems.\footnote{It would be tempting to see an artistic joke, with reference to \textit{mimesis} and the painter Apelles (of Dorian Kos), although the pot can scarcely be as late as the final third of the 4th century, even if the graffiti could have been applied later.}
• 1900.0214.13 (BSA 102b, B625b): wall of an Attic open vase, perhaps a large kylix. The preserved letters, υστ, are only found in one attested personal name, Philomustes, an Italian name of Imperial date, clearly based on the component referring to some mystery cult. It would seem unlikely that there is any such reference here, and so it is preferable to see a bon mot, with the word amustin, of the type whose fullest example is found on a possibly slightly earlier Attic cup from Xanthos, included in a discussion of the topos by Dubois 1996, 68–71.

• 1910.0222.125 (N515): Attic cup-sklyphos foot, inscribed under, ἐπέπον vac, and N. Another piece with more than one text, the longer being a curious abbreviation of some kind.

• 1910.0222.57 (N443): cup foot, perhaps Chian. Underneath, graffito resembling a beta of Corinthian shape. This sign appears sporadically in unexpected places, for example on an Attic transport amphora of c. 590–570 BC from Histria and under an unlocated foot from Tell Dafana.52

• 1910.0222.141 (N533): on inside of wall of black-glazed open vase, 4th century, τυρρ, an intriguing sequence. Names in Tyrр- are rare, but there is probably no need to explain this as an ethnic ‘Etruscan’.

• 1922.0508.15 (N801, B449): East Greek deep bowl. Graffito in handle zone, σβιο. One dedicant at Gravisca was Ibiogenes, but this is probably not him, as the sigma would be difficult to construe. Either a dedication by Bio... to the Gods of the Greeks or Dioskouroi, or part of a name such as Telesibios.

• 1965.0930.167 (N737, B388): bowl of Chian chalice, inscribed on wall, ρβαξ. The text is worn, but there seems to be no trace of the upper diagonals of the ‘beta’. If we read beta it is a further intriguing sequence, and while many solutions are possible, most would be in non-Ionic dialect.

• 1965.0930.515: Graffito under foot (diameter, c. 7cm) of small closed vase, of undetermined date and origin, vac γνα vac.

• Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE38359 (Edgar 1907; Venit 1998, 6): East Greek bowl, abecedarium graffito on wall, ΑΒΓΔΕΖ. The only example known from Naukratis. The apparent doubling of the epsilon, in lieu of digamma is intriguing; the available photograph however suggests that a digamma may have been intended. At a date in the 6th century digamma was at least ‘live’ in Ionia, as a numeral.53

---

52 Histria, Bîrzescu 2012, 344, no.1360, with earlier bibliography; Dafana, Petrie 1888, pl. 32.5. The shape of this mark is highly distinctive and must surely represent this letter, used in Corinth and Megara, and their colonies. 53 An unusual parallel for apparent doubling of epsilon is an abecedarium under a foot from Adria, not found since it was recorded in the 18th century (SEG 55, 2122, Baldassarra 2013, 130).
• Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE38360 (Fig. 95; Edgar 1907; Venit 1998, 397), Attic skyphos foot. A large mark akin to TM type 25B or 26B is accompanied by an intriguing, somewhat overlooked, text (or texts). Around, an outer circle, Ἄριστονος[ ------]·μ’όνυμα, and within ίομεν ἐτὶ λοιμά σφόδρα ς'[ . While the completion of the outer text is not easy, the inner presumably says ‘let’s go to the baths, to the f-------s’, if the dative is acceptable, although even if not, the basic concept seems to be there. The script and dialect are of interest; the former points to a date no later than 450 BC (and Venit would date the piece c. 470–460 BC), with seemingly a tailed rho, tailless phi, no omega or eta); the dialect seems Doric, with onuma. In sum, the whole fits well with Aeginetan script. We therefore have an early reference to loutra, and their social environment.

• Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, GR 104a.1899 (BSA 111, B634, Lazzarini 1973-4, 369, no. 34): Attic black-glazed one-handler. Graffito under foot, vac Αριστονος το κανασθον τοτο. One of the rare fully preserved owner’s texts, presenting an unusual vase name, kanasthon, and a ‘defective’ spelling of τοτο, with omicron instead of υ for the original diphthong.

• Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.22 (JHS 33, B676): probably Attic bowl, inscribed on wall, later 4th century. Πυθυνυ[ ] | Αγιοπιτο[ ] Ποχος[ ] Σολλυ.. The only assured list of names in the corpus; there are probable numerical strokes at the end of line 1 and perhaps 4.

• Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.38 (JHS 36, B679): lip of East Greek cup, thicker fabric than normal and lower lip. The JHS reading is correct, conservatively ]...σα vac, there being a clear vacat after the alpha. The first two letters are poorly preserved and the third difficult to interpret; the second may be alpha, delta or lambda, while the third is a clear angled κ. Its position before a sigma exacerbates any attempt at interpretation, since the - σα termination itself is puzzling. An angled Knidian omicron would yield some sense — ? δουα — although speculative; equally so is the possibility that we have a crooked iota, giving ]·γα, in a script that could be, for example, Corinthian, Byzantine or Cyrenaic.

• Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1896-1908-G.141.42 (Fig. 96; B pl. 26, 8), wall of closed vase, probably East Greek, with dull, dark glaze. [ηυω[. Another difficult sequence.

18. Final words

It will be clear from the above discussion that there are no general conclusions to be drawn from this corpus of material, other than that Ionian Greeks were responsible for the vast majority of the texts presented, prior to the general acceptance of the Ionian alphabet in the 5th century, after which only dialect, not alphabetic forms, can categorize individual writers.
In that respect only one graffito would seem to retain Doric features, 1888.0601.721, in the section above. This piece has no assured context, and lack of context does inhibit interpretation of our texts. However, it can be assumed from the original excavation reports that the vast bulk of them were found within sanctuary areas, and therefore should give a good picture of ceramic texts from such a context.

It is more in its individual details that this study has yielded previously unsuspected or unknown results. The overall picture is emended in two different ways; by the additional numbers of both minor texts, abbreviated or fragmentary, on Attic or other black-glazed pots of the broad period c. 525–325 BC, and by the very substantial number of graffiti on Chian drinking vessels of c. 600–550 BC. While the former are extremely varied in character, the latter may be assumed to be very largely dedicatory texts, to set against the far better known pre-firing dipinti on Chian vases.

There has again been agreement on the general character of the dedications to the various deities and demigods (Herakles and the Dioskouroi). The pattern of these has been fully discussed above, while several fragmentary texts now indicate that a broader dedicatory vocabulary was used, if only occasionally, than previously suspected.

There is no body of graffito texts from one site larger than ours, and it is therefore no surprise whatsoever that the range of texts is so broad. It may be that some pieces were found outside the sanctuary areas. However, it would be difficult to say for example that numerical graffiti must come from habitation zones, since parallels can be found from other sanctuary deposits for these and other ‘secular’ inscriptions.

The texts show limited connection with those found elsewhere. We can point to only a very few individuals who appear both at Naukratis and elsewhere, perhaps indeed only Hyblesios, Zoilos and in a sense Pedon. Lethaios may have followed his father’s trade. Trademarks on East Greek cups and bowls are occasionally reflected elsewhere, notably at Tocra, but the few such marks on Attic pots do not match up with the record of their export to Etruria, with the exception of some tally marks, one or two with indications of price, on smaller open vases of the later 5th century. Evidence of non-Greek and non-Egyptian presence is finally extremely thin.

In summary, the corpus remains the largest collection of ceramic texts from any site, and presents a wider variety of texts than has usually been recognized. The hey-day is the period of c. 600–525 BC, but there is a long ‘tail’ into and beyond the 4th century, the period when the other large body of inscribed material commences, the amphora stamps.