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Stamped amphorae

Alan Johnston
This chapter must commence with posing, and nearly solving, a problem. The study of the amphora stamps from Naukratis has to be based on material from the site, but is complicated by the difficulty of determining which stamps are actually involved. We must therefore commence with an explanation of the factors involved.

1. Which stamps?

Only one small set of stamps from the site has previously been published, that from the Coulson-Leonard campaigns (Rehard, in Coulson 1996, 147–61). They are included in this chapter, as well as a few pieces found during the British Museum team’s fieldwork in 2012–14. The Naukratis Project has also been able to locate handles distributed by the Egypt Exploration Fund to a large number of institutions beyond the British Museum. Some of these small groups were previously known to Virginia Grace (who also advised Rehard, hence the inclusion of the stamps in the Ashmolean Museum in Coulson 1996, 156–8), and whose notes are filed in the Archives of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. Together these minor collections amount to some 125 pieces. Some other material has been included sporadically in publications, for the most part Thasian stamps (Bon and Bon 1957; Garlan 1999).

A far greater number are preserved in the British Museum. Overall, the British Museum holds some 3,650 stamped handles in its collection (including a very small number of larger pieces or fully intact stamped jars). These were mostly acquired in the 19th century, and some were registered and marked with registration numbers around the time of acquisition. However, a substantial number were not and herein lies the problem. At some stage many were marked, initially in pencil and then in some form of stencilled ink, with the numbers given to them in Inscriptiones Graecae XII 1 and 2 (Fig.1). Most of those marked in this way did not have a registration number, although there was often some written indication on them that they had been found by Charles Newton. It seems that such indications were written before the IG numbers were applied, though further study of the question is required. For example, not all the IG marking is correct, even if obvious errors are few, Doubt can also be thrown on some of the more precise provenances cited in IG when a different one is written on the handle. Almost all such previously unregistered handles marked with IG numbers were eventually given Museum registration numbers by 1987–9, leaving only four or five unregistered.

However, there remained many handles with neither IG nor registration number. Some had similar ‘Newtonian’ markings, but these were a modest proportion of the total. Here other evidence for provenance has to be deployed to prove provenance, which is various and of differing strength:

---

1 All photographs in this chapter, unless otherwise indicated, are © Trustees of the British Museum; all reproductions of Petrie’s drawings are © Egypt Exploration Society.

2 Only one stamp from Naukratis was registered at the time of acquisition (and perhaps for that very reason has been overlooked!), 1888,0601,738 (Fig. 17).

3 It is self-evident that our problems would have been averted had all handles been registered on acquisition. The marking with IG numbers was perhaps taken as sufficient ‘registration’, but such marking was done later than acquisition; how much later is difficult to discern, but may be discovered by closer scrutiny of the script employed. The sequence is certainly: marking with Newton information (if any), publication of IG marking with IG numbers.
1. Virginia Grace visited the British Museum in 1955 and counted all the stamps, giving totals for each variety, and specifically catalogued those unregistered pieces that attracted her attention (registered as 1955,0920.1-333); these comprised essentially all but ‘mainstream’ Rhodian stamps and stamps with short abbreviations, ligatures etc. She also noted the trays in which the handles were located, before and after her visit, with the provenances (often mixed) of the pieces in each tray. Here, regrettably, the scent grows cold since the material has since been moved to new accommodation. However, of the 333 stamps which she did catalogue, she noted that the first 196 were from Naukratis, and further evidence for this appears in a letter of 14/1/1956 to Bernard Ashmole where her suggestion that they are from Naukratis is glossed by ‘(Peter Corbett says no question mark is to be used following Naukratis; this is the provenance)’. It is interesting that her final count of pieces from Naukratis is 626 (letter to Ashmole 18/11/1955; see further below). She wonders whether many went to Oxford and on 14/1/1956 informs Ashmole that Peter Fraser had told her that there were about 12,000 handles in the Ashmolean.

2. Grace had not seen the journal that Petrie kept in the first year of the excavations at Naukratis, now housed in the Egypt Exploration Society and the Griffith Institute, Oxford University. This is the prime document for identifying the stamps, both directly and indirectly. Most importantly, Petrie made good drawings of 1,110 stamps (Fig. 2). This is copper-bottomed evidence, even if he omitted to draw the rest of the ‘1,200’ which he says he sent back to London. It is possible to identify a large number of those he drew in the British Museum, plus a very few now elsewhere, though the alarmingly large number of about 330 remain elusive. A rider should be added here that it is aleatory whether the more common stamps that he drew should be equated with examples in the holdings of the British Museum.

---

4 In a letter to Bernard Ashmole of 18/11/1955 she notes a total of 3,538: Rhodian 2,511, Knidian 274, Koan 91, Thasian 51, Italian 49, ‘Cretan’ (prow stamps) 28, Chian (including lagynoi) 29, Pontic 19, Parian 1, miscellaneous 494. There are in fact more (approximately 3,650), but a full breakdown is not yet available (nor an explanation as to why some were lacking in her count).

5 While there is no further evidence for this statement, he was not a person to be positive unless there was a very full reason to do so.
Museum, though there are further clues available. At any rate it would seem that 130 of Grace’s 196 can be identified in Petrie's drawings, but so can some 10 of her non-Naukratis sequence 197-333, not known in 1955 to have provenance, with the exception of those marked 'C.T.N.'.

3. Apart from giving a total number of finds higher than the number he drew, Petrie notes that he would have to trim the stamps to fit them into the cases for transport back to London. Proof that he did this is clearest in the case of four stamps which have been accidentally cut back after being drawn (Fig. 3).

So we can use modern trimming as a good criterion of provenance, particularly in light of:

4. Comparative condition of the handles in the British Museum. The 196 examples catalogued by Grace and the other stamps surely identifiable from Petrie's drawings all have a clean, if often worn, surface, and no inked notes on them. This aspect separates them from the vast majority of the other handles which had not been registered at the time of acquisition (whether later marked ‘IG’ or not), which are often accreted and bear a variety of ink (and pencil) markings. Not only this, but the great majority of these clean pieces have clear signs of modern trimming and are substantially smaller than the other unregistered material. While there are a limited number of cases where it is difficult to assess whether there is trimming or not, I note that of the approximately 3,200 handles in the British Museum catalogued by myself by March 2014, 1,800 are untrimmed, and of these 210 measure less than 8cm as the largest dimension, while 1,350 are trimmed, with 1,170 under 8cm.

5. A question that can reasonably be asked is from where other than Naukratis could the uncatalogued stamps have come? There is no evidence that any substantial number of handles was acquired by the British Museum before 1925 (the date shortly to be explained) other than from Petrie and Newton. Not all the material from Newton's work was inked 'C.T.N.' or 'Rhodes' or the like, as some unmarked pieces are clearly identifiable from /G and are in the same calcined condition as marked pieces; but no marked Newton handle has the 'clean and trimmed' appearance of undoubtedly Petrie material.

---

6 There are pencil marks on some 45 Naukratis pieces (or 90 in the broader total explained below). Some are clearly marking stamps of the same type, though this does not cover all cases.

7 Many discrete sets of acquisitions were registered on acquisition between 1848 and 1900, as well as a few stamped handles among larger groups of material, e.g. from Cyrenaica and Cyprus.
These various lines of enquiry lead us to reach the following conclusions regarding those pieces not registered on acquisition by the British Museum:

- General condition is a strong pointer to provenance from Naukratis, as all pieces surely identifiable with Petrie's drawings are ‘clean and trimmed’ (with the exception of a few intact handles, and just one near complete top, untrimmed).

- A very large group of 891 items registered in 1925 (Grace notes ‘Miss Hutton’s 1925 1–19 series’ in a letter to Ashmole, 13/10/1955) as from Newton's work in the Levant is wholly mixed, even if the first 125 or so are indeed largely ‘Newtonian’. A maximum of 275 can be equated with Petrie drawings and 505 can be classified as trimmed.

- The 1955 series said by Corbett to be from Naukratis contains only eight untrimmed examples. They are all smaller than 10cm, with the exception of two ‘extra-large’ pieces, presumably not trimmed because of inherent interest (one Koan and one Knidian). There are a mere eight trimmed pieces over 10cm in the same series: four Brindisi handles, two Knidian, a Rhodian and a Lamboglia 2 shoulder fragment with impressed SPE (1955,0920.169, Fig. 4).

- The question of how many handles Petrie brought back to London is not easy to assess. In round figures we must remember the 330 which he drew and have not been identified. We can then add the identified pieces, and the unidentified ones in the 1955 sequence, plus those distributed to other museums with the known provenance. In addition we can add those that are trimmed but neither identified with Petrie’s drawings nor in the 1955 series. The total is substantially in excess of Petrie’s estimate of 1,200.

- One large gap in our knowledge, about which nothing can be done, is whether handles were kept from the later campaigns. We have only one, general, contemporary remark on the topic (Hogarth 1898/1899, 34 merely mentions ‘amphora handles’), plus the likelihood that the cartouche stamp (1888,0601.738, Fig. 17) was a find from 1885-6; there is also the possibility, no more, that some pieces in museums other than the British Museum may fall into that category.

1.1 Figures

The only fully watertight figure here is of course from Petrie’s own drawings. We rely on Corbett’s pronouncement for some others, and my own judgement of trimming for many more.

What can be stressed is that dubious or exceptional cases are extremely few. Overall the figures will be correct, though it could be argued whether a
few particular cases should be included or not. One trimmed piece, 2011,5003.165, has ‘12’ on it in what appears to be ink, not pencil. Another, 1925,0119.667 (Fig. 5), definitely has an ink mark, ‘381’; neither can be equated with a Petrie drawing. One piece which I first believed to be trimmed turned out to be a Newton acquisition that had split, and whose Newton-marked lower half has been discovered. Perhaps a dozen handles of larger size have fairly clean breaks on the handles, which can appear on marked Newton pieces, albeit rarely.

One can give a provenance of ‘Naukratis’ for the first two sets and ‘Naukratis?’ for trimmed pieces not drawn by Petrie. A difficulty arises with the more common stamps on trimmed pieces; is any particular one to be equated with that (or, normally, any of those) drawn by him? While the number of such pieces is not large, this does make it impossible to give a precise number of examples for which the provenance is ‘Naukratis’ or ‘Naukratis?’.

So some ‘overall’ figures, including material found after 1903 by Coulson and Leonard and by the British Museum’s Naukratis Project (a total in 2014 of 52) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In British Museum</th>
<th>Other museums</th>
<th>Petrie drawn but unlocated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all above categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodian</td>
<td>661 (243)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knidian</td>
<td>71 (28)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koan</td>
<td>119 (29)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasian</td>
<td>34 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>47 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prow</td>
<td>42 (12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikandros group</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chian</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samian?</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenon group</td>
<td>16 (6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>24 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>312 (130)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>1,354 (477)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in brackets = ‘identified by trimming only’. Those for Rhodes, Chios and other include lagynos stamps, up to 27 in total.

There is a residual problem in identifying which pieces Grace counted in her 626 examples ‘from Naukratis’ in 1955. 196–7 will have been those registered in 1955, while the rest must have been among the unregistered pieces at the time (now the 2011 series), since she was told the 1925 series was from Newton’s work. I count 632 trimmed pieces in the 2011 material, or between 300 and 385 (the latter figure including all possible equations of common Rhodian stamps) for those that can be equated with drawings by Petrie. I see no easy way of solving this mystery and getting near a suitable set of approximately 430 pieces here.

---

9 There is minor problem with 1955,0920.197; Grace originally noted it as being from Naukratis, but then deleted the word. However it is trimmed, therefore ‘Naukratis?’. It is an interesting early Rhodian piece, naming Agesandros and Damo…. (see 2.2.14 below).
It is at least to be noted that very few indeed can be described as belonging to an obvious non-Rhodian type, as indeed we would expect from Grace’s choice of material to be registered in 1955.

2. Discussion

In the light of the above remarks there are obvious difficulties in compiling precise statistical figures for the body of material found at Naukratis. In the following discussion I base all figures on a corpus that contains all trimmed pieces in the British Museum, all handles found in more recent fieldwork and all handles drawn by Petrie but not as yet identified, together with pieces distributed to other museums with the assured provenance of Naukratis. I immediately note here some ‘Naukratis?’ pieces which are rare or unusual, and for which the slight doubt surrounding provenance is of some relevance (more details are available in the catalogue):

- 1925,0119.112, Rhodian fabricant(?), Eukratidas (Fig. 6)
- 1925,0119.394, Rhodian eponym and fabricant, Damo... and Theu(ly)tos (present also in the Benaki collection)
- 1925,0119.410, Nikandros group, retrograde Διοδωρ (a parallel in Kavalla)
- 1925,0119.435, Pamphylian(?), Ευ.υκρ. with retrograde ρho and difficult third letter
- 1925,0119.555, Rhodian eponym and fabricant, Δαμω| Τιμαρ with assured omega (Fig. 7)
- 1925,0119.678, Knidian round stamp, grape cluster and spiralling text, υ...ιδιο (Fig. 8)
- 2011,5002.74, Rhodian fabricant, Μουρσιου
- 2011,5003.233, Chian, [υρυκρ (Eurykrates)
- 2011,5003.242, unknown origin, Ουρυκρος; no sign of a vowel at end of line 1.
- 2011,5003.269, unknown origin, Επικρατ [r, retrograde.
- 2011,5003.286, unknown origin, Ερασιο, retrograde with lunate sigma. The name Erasios is known from a different die in the Benaki collection
- 2011,5003.294, Nikandros group, Καυστρ; lunate sigma and possible iota at end. A new die (Fig. 9)
- 2011,5003.305, Milesian, Αυξη. See Jöhrens 2009, 213
- 2011,5003.441, Rhodian fabricant and eponym, Ευκρ| Απσαγο. See Finkiel'sztejn 2001, 184, n. 81 (Fig. 10)
- 2011,5003.480, Mendean, amphora symbol (Fig. 11)
This cannot yet be a complete study of the material which must await further consideration of dies and of comparanda, especially for the material not (yet) ascribed to a given source.

I stress here that my thoughts are largely based on the material gathered by Virginia Grace and preserved in her Papers in the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. The citing of unpublished comparanda and indeed the probable provenance of many is particularly based on this material. For Thasian stamps I am most grateful to Chavdar Tchokev for help regarding dating and Daniele Manacorda has offered me valuable suggestions for the Brindisi area. Others to whom I am indebted are John Lund, Gerard Finkielsztejn and Gloria Olcese. All dates given in the following are BC unless otherwise indicated.

The handles from Naukratis form the second largest set known from an Egyptian site, though they pale in comparison with those from Alexandria. Regrettably it is not known how many handles in the vast Benaki collection were found outside Alexandria, for example at Naukratis, but one must assume that the bulk is Alexandrian. It also must be noted that we have no precise provenance in Naukratis for any of the stamps from the early excavations, the vast bulk of which were ‘brought in’ to Petrie by locals or workmen digging the site.

At the outset it is worth noting which series of stamps are not (yet) or minimally attested; the list is largely confined to the Black Sea area producers. One possible stamp of the North Greek Parmeniskos group (see Tsigarida et al. 2013, 385) is Petrie Journal 80, 8, with an apparent *eta-omega* ligature (however unlikely lexically), and one from Cyrenaica is 1925,0119.591 (Johnston 2014b, 120–1). Substantial users of stamps that are only slightly more rarely attested at Naukratis include the general Cypriot area and Italian production outside Apulia; the latter are in the large part of a date later than the mid 1st century BC, when any material remains from the site are in any case scanty.

### 2.1 Earlier stamps

Chronologically, Naukratis provides only a small number of stamps of an assured pre-Alexandrian date. The British Museum has some pieces with simple circular or ring stamps that are highly likely to be from Naukratis and of Archaic and perhaps Classical date. Several are impressed at the base of handles, but are of no good diagnostic nature, and could well be Hellenistic, though three are more forthcoming, two with a pair of circles on the neck of Klazomenian amphorae (small circles on British Museum, 2011,5003.544 (Fig. 12), large on 2011,5003.501), and the handle root of a Cypriot basket-handled amphora (British Museum 2011,5003.495, Fig. 13). None have any parallel known to me, though circular marks of all kinds are not infrequent on Archaic jars.

---

The collection is gradually being put online at The Alexandria Centre for Amphora Studies, [http://www.amphoralex.org/](http://www.amphoralex.org/). The collection is also the foundation stone of Virginia Grace’s archival material.
Among the stamps more assuredly from Naukratis, a small number date from before c. 325, most notably about a dozen Thasian pieces, probably two Mendean, one Akanthos (British Museum, 1925,0119.500, Fig. 14) and ten stamps with the ligature ‘aphu’ (fig. 15), from several dies, datable from deposits in the Athenian Agora to approximately the mid-5th century, although examples have been found at Kabyle, probably no earlier than 350. One extraordinary piece (British Museum, 1925,0119.815, Fig. 16) belongs to the Classical or possibly late Archaic period, a short-stemmed
toe, of possibly South Ionian origin if the possibly Ionic style of the stamps is considered. On the underside there are four ovoid stamps, two each from a gem-like die; one shows a racing two-horse chariot, the other (not fully preserved in either instance) is probably a hybrid creature. Another curiosity is the one stamp catalogued as British Museum, 1888,0601.738 (Fig. 17), a straight fragment of a handle of slightly amygdaloid shape and of Egyptian clay. It presumably comes from a local imitation of a Greek-style amphora. While what little can be said of the shape points to a Classical or later date, the stamp, a plumed cartouche lightly impressed and incompletely preserved, is a cartouche more in keeping with Amasis, or of course earlier.

2.2 The Hellenistic period

For the Hellenistic period the corpus concurs with the record known from Alexandria and elsewhere in Egypt. When consulting the Grace Papers, I regularly noted ‘example in Benaki collection’ or ‘same die as Benaki piece’.

The earlier pieces of the Hellenistic period comprise a modicum of Thasian, good numbers of arguably Knidian ‘prow’ stamps and a range of early Rhodian. No doubt other material of a more sporadic nature belongs here too.
In this section I will put forward the usable statistics for the Rhodian,\textsuperscript{11} and to some extent, Knidian stamps, as regards volumes and pace of imports, and note some of the unusual stamps that Naukratis has yielded. It is now perhaps unnecessary to stress that these figures should not be taken to reflect any overall pattern of trade in view of the uneven use of stamps in various production centres (Lawall 2005). Only the difficult task of identifying (after retaining) all amphora sherds from a given context can contribute to that aim, and a start was made in that direction by Coulson and Leonard. It is therefore the comparative statistics that will currently be of some use, along with the more quirky relevance of various unique or nearly ‘unique’ pieces. In perhaps a break with previous publications, I start with the smaller sets. However, I cite individually a mere selection of the approximately 300 types that are of unproven origin, mostly those of more frequent occurrence or with ‘longer’ texts.

\subsection*{2.2.1 Kerkyra}

A few Corcyrian stamps are attested, although the precise origin cannot be demonstrated for all since there are problems distinguishing Corcyrian from Corinthian fabric; Grace noted unpublished parallels for some found on the island. One with A (1925,0119.627) has such parallels but not with the same curving cross-bar; the one with B (1925,0119.641a) is the same as two unpublished Agora examples, SS5225 and 2827. The most interesting belongs to a group with the symbol of a wheel in three-quarter view, though the one in the British Museum (1955,0920.164, Fig. 19) is more complex than others in having lettering, regrettably worn, both within the spokes (\textit{nu} and perhaps retrograde \textit{gamma}) and to either side (\textit{iota} and \textit{delta}).

\subsection*{2.2.2 Corinth}

Corinth is represented by a few more or less assured pieces, to add to a stamped loomweight noted in the forthcoming chapter on Inscribed Varia:

- 2011,5003.481, a very worn motif
- 2011,5003.375, an eight-ray star
- 2011,5003.445, a ligature, TAME or similar (Fig. 19)

Fabric points to a Corinthian origin, though an origin from further west cannot be ruled out.

\subsection*{2.2.3 Thasos}

The total of Thasian stamps, including a few of dubious pertinence is 44.\textsuperscript{12} Approximately a third of those that are datable to before c. 330, the rest between c. 330 and 280, with just one later outlier, 1955,0920.59 (Philonides, Fig. 20) of c. 250–40.

\textsuperscript{11} Dates are based on Finkielsztejn 2001; therefore some tolerance should be allowed for reworking, as in Lund 2011b.

\textsuperscript{12} I include two stamps of the known type \textit{alpha} inscribed in \textit{theta}, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1888,199f, and British Museum, 2011,5004.126.
2.2.4 Chios

Naukratis has a small group of eight or nine Chian stamps, probably all of the 3rd century. The common stamps of Egesios and Iklesios are joined by one each of Eurykrates (2011,5003.233, Fig. 21), paralleled in an unpublished example from the Athenian Agora, and Timakles (1955,0920.162), from the same die as an example from Pergamon (Börker and Burow 1998, 123, no. 609, noting this stamp).

2.2.5 Samos

Virginia Grace noted two Samian stamps (British Museum, 1955,0920.70 (Fig. 22) and Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 1888.199g), with the epichoric lion mask symbol and ‘TA’, in her article ‘Kouriaka’, Studies Presented in Memory of Porphyrios Dikaios, Nicosia 1979, 183, n. 2. She also suggests (archival notes) that the heart-shaped stamps with ligature of eta-rho and scallop shell symbol may be Samian (British Museum, 2011,5003, 486 (Fig. 23) and 487, and Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 1888.199h), which, to judge from the clay, take with them two rectangular stamps with the same ligature, one with distaff symbol (British Museum, 1925,0119.608b, Fig. 24) and the other without a symbol (British Museum, 1925,0119.608a).

2.2.6 Miletos

Milean stamps have recently been addressed by Gerhard Jöhrens (2009, 208–17) and two Naukratis examples fall readily into his types; 2011,5002.22 (Fig. 25), with the stamp (over-trimmed by Petrie) Βότρωνος, rather curiously with a cleft in the centre of the tau, and not from the same die as his numbers 10 and 11; and 2011,5004.305 with Αὐξη, dated by Jöhrens (ibid. 213) to 225–175 BC. The latter may be the same as a piece drawn by Petrie as having Αὐξη.

2.2.7 The Nikandros group

This group was probably produced in the Ephesos area (Lawall 2007, 48–53) in the later Hellenistic period; five Naukratis stamps give five different names:

- 2011,5003.316, Χαρπος, has a parallel from the same die in the Benaki collection
2.2.8 Pamphylia

Pamphylian stamps have also received thorough publication of late (Brixhe 2012). Four Naukratis stamps belong or probably belong to the series:

- 1925,0119.515, Νικω, retrograde with cursive omega, as Brixhe (2012) 323
- 1925,0119.542, Σιμι, similar to Brixhe (2012) 381, but not retrograde
- 2011,5003.309, Σιμια, with lunate sigma; Brixhe (2012, 17) rejects this as a Pamphylian type (Fig. 27).
- 1925,0119.435, Ευ.υκρ. , retrograde, the third letter not easily discerned (Fig. 6)

The material probably belongs to the mid-Hellenistic period.

2.2.9 Cyprus

There are perhaps two Cypriot stamps to add to the stamped circle on the basket-handled jar noted above and one curiosity that Grace and myself have fondly, but no doubt wrongly, thought of as Cypro-syllabic:

- 1925,0119.595a, square motif with single diagonal (Fig. 28)
- 2011,5003.318, two letters, perhaps alpha above theta
- 1955,0920.78, a series of squiggled marks, not seemingly the remnants of a ruined die (Fig. 29)

2.2.10 Egypt

Stamps on amphorae of Egyptian production are a varied and again small set, although they should be matched against a very low percentage of marks on Egyptian amphorae overall. The cartouche impression has been noted above (Fig. 17). In addition we have:

- 1925,0119.527, Petos group
- 2011,5003.402, neck fragment of probably Mareotic clay, with circular stamp displaying a symbol that appears to be a cross between a camel and a reclining symposiast, in a somewhat rough style. Presumably from Naukratis, though not clearly trimmed in the manner of the usual handles.
- 1925,0119.528, Πτολεμαίος, lunate sigma (Ptolemaios).
- 1955,0920.76, Bes stamp (Fig. 30).
- 1925,0119.611, within a frame, possible epsilon before kappa digamma. The first sign is not the year symbol ‘L’, but the stamp must have a numerical meaning, 26 (plus?). The clay is very rough, almost certainly of manufacture close to Naukratis (Fig. 31).
- Only known from Petrie’s drawing is a rather different piece. He notes it in his Journal for 1884–5, p. 72: ‘but the most interesting handle of all is one with an incuse stamp in hieroglyphics. It is the first hieroglyphic stamp I have found’. There is unfortunately no indication of the type or clay of the handle. The stamp is a
cryptographic writing of the name Amun-Ra, and should indicate local production of such jars in the Great Temenos.

Four further series are represented by far more substantial numbers of stamps. In this text some general points are made and specific individual stamps noted where they are unusual. The three first series are more or less dependent on unpublished corpora based on the work of members of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. The corpus of Italian material by the late Elizabeth Lyding-Will is to a large degree compensated for by recent work from Olcese 2010 and 2012, Manacorda 2012 and Palazzo 2013. Grace's typologies of Knidian material (KT numbers) are a standard point of reference and included in the catalogue, while Jefremov (1995) has produced a corpus based on material from the general Black Sea; for Kos, Grace and Savvatianou-Petropoulakou's corpus is the only resumptive treatment to date and their type numbers are again cited in the catalogue. With respect to the fourth series, that of Rhodes, published work is more fully available (though none is a complete synthesis), in particular Finkielsztejn 2001 whose chronology is followed in the catalogue and here.

### 2.2.11 Italian stamps

The Naukratis material reflects that from other Egyptian sites in containing a fair proportion of stamps from amphorae of Italian production, most notably the Brindisi area, of c. 150–50 BC. There is a near lack of material from the later part of this period and thereafter, i.e. very little is seen of the later production of Dressel 1 jars, which are found in Alexandria (Gs. Şenol 2013, 390–2). The stamps of L. Lucius are the most frequent, although those of the major producers Aninius and Visellius are well attested. Of the more unusual stamps one may note:

- 1925,0119, 706-7, two example of M. Tucci, L. f. Tro Galeonis
- 1955,0920.171, Q.Alli, only known from one other stamp, in Taranto, Museo Archeologico 210909 (Manacorda, pers.comm.; L.Viola, Notizie degli Scavi 1885, p. 284, n. 237) (Fig. 32)
- 1925,0119. 694, Caec (ae in ligature) and caduceus
- 1925,0119.704, Luka.[
- 1955,0920.173, AJSC•BETIL (BET in ligature), with a second stamp lower on the handle, M.S. A new slave name of M. Betilienus (see Desy 1989, 166) (Fig. 33)

---

13 Despite Lawall's complaint on the earlier corpus, 'So, why refer to an unpublished, and clearly incomplete, corpus?' (Bryn Mawr Classical Review 2004.07.46), there is some use here in judging from it the frequency of types and their provenance.

14 Some mostly minor changes in his dates are suggested by Lund 2011b, on the basis of a seriation study of jars preserving both eponym and fabricant stamps.
Other stamps of less certain Apulian origin are:

- 1925,0119.695, double barrel handle, C. Livius (us in ligature) (Fig. 8).
- 1955,0920.129, double barrel handle, considerably larger than Koan handles. P ANT.OVI.F. Clay has volcanic inclusions.
- 1925,0119.696, rim of amphora, C. ANT (leaf) OVI(?). There is another example in the Benaki collection.
- 1955,0920.169, incuse SPE on shoulder (cf. Desy 1989, no. 67) (Fig. 4).
- 1955,0920.91, rim fragment, text in frame, LRVBM. (final letter possibly E).
- 1925,0119.708, stamped rim, of difficult reading; Lyding-Will read PIQON, though the final two letters are scarcely visible and Q not fully clear.
- Finally, one stamped amphora stopper of unique type belongs to this section:1886,0401.1572, PLATOR set on round stamp with radiating ribs and two cup-shaped marks (Fig. 34).

2.2.12 Kos

Koan stamps total nearly 145 examples, including 20 drawn by Petrie but not yet identified, and about 10 which are not assuredly Koan. Outside the British Museum, two come from recent work of the project and one each are found in Boston, Brussels and Montreal. They form a substantial contribution to the corpus of Grace and Savvatianou-Petropoulakou (42 being chosen for the plates) yet of themselves add little to the ‘story’ of Naukratis. Most are only broadly datable to c. 200–50 BC on published evidence (Zopyros and Boiskos are mid-3rd century because of find context in the Athenian Agora) and so their interest lies mainly in aspects of onomastics, distribution and epigraphy. While most are readily identifiable by the double handles of c. 4.5 x 2.2cm, the stamps are very heterogeneous and often poorly applied. They follow all those series already discussed (unlike the two to follow) in giving no information at all about the context of the stamped names and symbols; the crab of Koan coins is far rarer as a symbol than the club or lyre.\(^\text{15}\)

The material is all available in the catalogue and as in other sections of this chapter I merely point to some aspects. While most are double-barrel handles, 16 are non-double (Grace’s ‘KND’) or may well be Koan, according to Grace. Two have the common Koan name Sopatros, though two others may rather be South Ionian:

- 2011,5003.319 (which, in a separate note, Grace writes is missing from the corpus), Eoʊdο, with Ionic spelling (Fig. 35); there is an unpublished parallel, Agora SS11337, not from the same die; Grace notes that a stamp from the same die is on a Koan (double?) handle from Miletus, not in Jöhrens 2009
- 2011,5003.304, Ζ νυνόδωρου (Fig. 36); compare the double handle from Miletus, Jöhrens 2009, no. 38

\(^{15}\) There is reason to think that those named in the stamps are not civic officials in the light of the lack of fit with known ‘magistrates’; see Yiannikouri, Stefanaki, and Georgopoulou 2011 894–5. The considerable variation in shape and size of stamps could also have been determined by ‘in-house’ production.
I note two double-handled pieces not seen by Grace in the British Museum, and not otherwise included as a type in the unpublished catalogue:

- 2011,5003.425, Φ and two symbols, club and crab, with parallels in the Benaki collection and from Kition
- 2011,5003.354, IE, known from Olbia (Levi 1964, pl.24, no. 399)

Some of those noted by Petrie as double handles are also not otherwise known (for the purposes of identification they are catalogued here by Petrie’s Journal (Petrie 1884–5) and page number, with the number of stamps on the page added by the present writer):

- 51,6 Dori
- 52, 11, epi Taprōu; the reading seems clear, though it may be surmised that it is a misreading or was an originally garbled form of Sopatrōu
- 200,53, Isidorou (not to be equated with British Museum, 1925,0119.541)

One double-barrel handle is definitely not Koan, 1955,0920.129, noted just above (2.2.12), with its Latin text. The handles are larger than Koan examples, but that is not the case with the other double-handled piece with Latin text, 1925,0119.695 (Fig. 8).

The balance of the rest would seem to follow the general pattern of Koan production with the stamps of Sopatros, Lochos and Minnion being more frequent than others.

2.2.13 Knidos

The record of Knidian stamps at Naukratis is perhaps most noteworthy for the large number (probably 54) of ‘prow’ stamps, now with some confidence taken as of Knidian production on the period c. 325–275 BC (Börker 1986). The later material (c. 147 stamps) is chronologically spread, with no clearly discernible peaks or troughs, although the percentage of very late pieces is small compared with that of the total holdings in the Museum. Again the material is mainly in the British Museum, with the exception of those pieces drawn by Petrie and not identified (17, including 4 prow stamps) and 14 in other museums (prow: 2 in Oxford, 2 in Alexandria from Coulson-Leonard work, one each in Boston, Warrington and (once) the Chautauqua Institution; others: 3 in Boston, 2 in Alexandria from Coulson-Leonard work, one in Montreal and one from the work of the Naukratis Project).

The prow stamps present virtually the whole range of known names: Apollonidas (6), Archekrates (1, Petrie journal 96, 18), Archemachos (4), Aristophon (1; Fig. 37), Theukles (1), Moschion (1), Xeno... (1; Petrie journal 102, 32) Pasikrates (4), Pausimachos (10), Sosikrates (4), Phainokles (1), Phlinos (2, Philiskos (1), Philokrates (3), Philon (1; Fig. 38), Philtatos (3), ....]sidamos (1, Petrie 55, 43).

With respect to the main Knidian series, the vast majority were either given KT numbers or otherwise commented on by Grace; a few additional KT
numbers can be added, leaving a very small residue of pieces otherwise unallocated, some not surely of Knidian provenance:

- 1955,0920.72 was noted by Grace as ‘early Knidian’, Διογονίκλέους and lion’s scalp symbol (Fig. 39)
- 1955,0920.97 and 98 are late, circular stamps, with ΣΓ (with serifs) to either side of a caduceus
- 2011,5003.34 is another circular stamp, with bucranium symbol and Σωριδα (retrograde rho)
- 1925,0119.649b has a youthful head to the right
- 1925,0119.473 has a prow symbol on a circular stamp, not as the main group of prow stamps, and Αδ (Fig. 41)
- 1955,0920.250 is not dissimilar to the main ‘prow’ series, with Ακ, retrograde above the prow (Fig. 40)
- Only one of the Naukratis stamps includes reference to a civic magistracy (damiourgos); such names have been of basic use in structuring the grid of names on a historical framework, as can be seen in Grace’s fundamental publications on the Knidian series (notably 1979, 317–24)

2.2.14 Rhodes

As noted above, the Rhodian series is by far the most substantial. Petrie was pleased to find the intact upper half of such a jar, but regrettably the stamps, both circular with rose, are worn (2006,0331.31). The fabricant’s name stamp is irretrievable, while both Petrie and I read epi Phili and Petrie added adou or daou on the eponym stamp, which does not fit with known names; Philinos is probably the only possibility, though the profile of our piece is perhaps late for the period of activity of the known Philinos (c.250-225 BC). One near complete handle, of the fabricant Aristokrates, was brought back and is now in the Petrie Museum, 19357. The overall breakdown is as follows:

- 661 in the British Museum
- 84 in other museums
- 156 drawn by Petrie, not identified

The number of early stamps to c. 300–240 BC is substantial, especially if we include the piece of the Zenon group. Close dating is not yet possible as it is for later material. The Τιμαρ stamp is the most common of all from Naukratis (Petrie may have been thinking of this when he writes about ‘yet more of them’, and other frequent ones are Ιω, Αγέλω.. Fig. 41), Νκα, Μκαθα, ΑΠΟ in ligature, Λυσι (Fig. 42) and, again if Rhodian, Σι. Some pieces with two abbreviated names, presumed to be eponym and fabricant, are important in tying in names into a comparative chronology – Δαμο| Κώρος (Damo/Theulytos, 1925,0119.394), Δαμω| Τιμαρ (Fig. 7), Ιω, Ιον

---

16 Petrie drew many common Rhodian fabricant stamps. There are difficulties in demonstrating how many of these are now identified. In the statistics I give a ‘best case’ scenario, i.e. assuming that there are large numbers of matches.

17 Sometimes quoted as ‘ΠΑΘ’; the possible theta seems to have a central dot on very few dies.
Δαμο (Agesandros/Damo, 1955.0920.197), Μοσ| Διο (Mos(chos)/Dio, 1925.0119.411), Νικα/Αλεξ (1955,0920.93), Νικα/Τιμο (1955,0920.7), Ζημου and Ευ. (1925,0119.543, two stamps on same handle. Fig. 43), Ευκρ| Απατο (Eukr/Apato, 2011,5003.441).

From the later period there is perhaps only one rare stamp that deserves separate mention. The title of the fabricants is only preserved in one case (if indeed all fabricants did have such a title) and is that of Aeneas. The best preserved of these few stamps is the one in the British Museum, 2011,5003.50, ἑργαστηριαρχας [A]ι[λ]ι[α]ς (Fig. 44) which Petrie drew relatively accurately. As has been noted by many authors, the title is of itself ambiguous: ‘workshop manager’ – one workshop or more? Overlord or only in charge of production? Lack of any parallel in the body of civic officials on Rhodes certainly points to it being a local title, and the single appearance might indicate it being an ill-received one. It is strange that it is probably the only unfinished stamp in the Rhodian record, hinting that it was a hasty and short-lived experiment, born perhaps of pomposity.

There are 19 secondary stamps on jars from Naukratis; six belong with worn main stamps, and only seven with eponym stamps – Aristogenes, Klenostratos, Leontidas, Pausanias III and Polyaratos (twice, for months Artamitios and Panamos); none to my knowledge is unparalleled elsewhere. An exception (Fig. 45a–b) is a small round Helios head stamp on 1925.0119.250 from the year of Ippokles, c. 260–250 BC (on a handle of suitably early shape). The three examples of the citation of the intercalary month, Panamos deuteros, 2011,5002.122 (Pausanias, c. 152 BC), 2011,5002.107 (Astymedes, c. 144 BC) and 1925,0119.240 (Tharsipolis, c. 196 BC) are not new (Nathan Badoud, pers.comm.; examples of the first two (from the same dies) are in the Benaki collection).

Rhodian jars are more readily datable to a given year than contemporary Knidian and certainly Koan. We approach a fixed dated list of the eponyms for the period c. 220–85 BC, though some leeway has to be given at the ends of that span (Finkielsztejn 2001; Lund 2011b). This enables us to plot annual, or at least quinquennial, movement of Rhodian jars around the Mediterranean and beyond. This has been done for Alexandria by both Lund (2011a, 289, fig. 13.40 and Senol (2007, 49, diagram 1), and a comparison of their figures with those for Naukratis is of interest. Using Finkielsztejn's dates, Fig. 46 shows the Naukratis figures with the normal increase in the early 2nd century, followed by a dip in the middle of the century and a brief flourishing c.140–110.
The chart tends to hide two substantial troughs; between 165 and 155 BC, only one stamp can be positively dated to 165–160 BC and four to 159–155 BC, while seven are to be placed between 150–146 BC. It is difficult not to see here the effects of political changes starting with the Roman downgrading of Rhodes in 167 BC and ending with the Roman destruction of Carthage and Corinth in 146 BC.

Problematic Rhodian stamps
- 1925.0119.497, Rhodian, rectangular stamp with rose symbol, Δαμοσ[2-3]νο. [max. 4]. Damosthenes is otherwise not known to use a rose symbol
- 1925.0119.236, Rhodian, badly cut or perhaps re-cut die, επι Ευκλη, retrograde (Fig. 47)
- 2011.5003.44, Rhodian(?), circular stamp, rose symbol, vac. Καρτος c.3 ρος; does not conform to any known Rhodian fabricant or eponym (Fig. 48)
- Petrie 37, 6, επι Αυγοκριτος, seemingly clearly preserved. This would be a new eponym, if Rhodian; the name is very rare, appearing only once at Athens and twice, within the same family of ieropoioi at Kamiros, which does point to a Rhodian provenance, almost certainly in the early period of the use of the epi formula

See also 2006.0331.31, noted at the beginning of this section.

Appendix, unattributed material

In the above discussion some remarks have been made regarding ‘homeless’ stamps, with some more or less tentative attributions to Samos, Cyprus and Rhodes. Here I add a selection of singly (occasionally doubly) attested pieces, whether in the British Museum or known only from Petrie’s drawings. Their number is substantial, around 430. Clearly such a selection fails any form of statistical test, but the totality of such pieces can

---

\[18\] Using the hypothetical dates of Lund’s (2011b, 276) seriated sequence we get different figures, marginal for the two last periods and more substantial (five rather than one) for 165–160.
be found in the catalogue, where all further details of those which I do list can be found.

Some symbols

- Petrie 55, 27, text only with no drawing – ‘illegible circular stamp with a chariot (quadriga)’ brings to mind the fine stamps of the eponym Eukratidas, of which the British Museum has two examples, not from Naukratis (1874.0805.98 and 99)
- Petrie 101a,44, owl and, at least E. Perhaps from same series as an example from Amphipolis with K and A in opposed corners (Fig. 49)
- 1955,0920.68, perhaps early Rhodian, Λ, the letters to either side of the base of an amphora symbol
- 1925,0119.811, gem impression, at least a kneeling figure
- 1925,0119.685, a striding figure set on a disc
- 1955,0920.75, N and goat facing right to a herm (Fig. 50)

Some with parallels from the same dies (almost all currently unpublished):

- 2011,5003.351, ligature of mu and alpha, as Agora SS13517
- 2011,5003.407, ligature as an example from Samos (Fig. 51)
- 2011,5003.483, ligature kappa-alpha, as example from Samos
- 2011,5002.42, α|δ as in Benaki collection
- 2011,5003.483, ligature kappa-alpha, as example from Samos
- 2011,5002.42, α|δ as in Benaki collection; also known from Akoris
- 2011,5003.278 (also 1925,0119.422), stamped below join of handle to belly, Ελασιος, as in Benaki collection (Fig. 52)
- 2011,5003.378, ligature theta-epsilon, as in Benaki collection
- 1925,0119.122, Κάσιος; Athens, Kerameikos, from same die
- 1925,0119.581, ‘HA’ ligature, from same die as an example from Miletos (Jöhnrens 2009, 219, no. 43)
- Petrie 32, 28 has alpha-tau ligature; the stamp is common, but otherwise not known to me from Egypt

Others with some parallel from Egypt

- 2011,5003.251, NI with torch, or phi to left, as a piece from Gezer
- 2011,5003.286, Επανος (lunate sigma), retrograde; orthograde Erasios is found on a stamp in the Benaki collection (Fig. 53)
• Petrie 206, 6, ligature pi-alpha-upsilon plus; example in Benaki collection

*Pieces with fuller names*

- 1925.0119.386, Ανδρος with reversed rho and lunate sigma (Fig. 55)
- 1955.0920.77, Ανδρων, stamped on outside of handle
- 1925.0119.693, Βουμο; Greek or Latin? (Fig. 56)
- Petrie 163, 2, Δεκαμο
- 1925.0119.409, Διοδοτο
- 2011.5003.269, επτ. Φιληρατ[], retrograde; not to be identified with Petrie 101a, 13, above
- 1925.0119.449, Θεοφαν
- 2011.5003.234, Κλεφμβρο

- 2011.50003.239, Ανουνγου, retrograde. One barrel of large double-barrel handle. Cream-slipped coarse fabric, fired dark grey. Further letter or symbol to right (Fig. 57)
- 1925.0119.485, Μανους
- Petrie 128, 6, νοσο, retrograde, and 'bambi' symbol (Fig. 58)
- 1925.0119.400, Ξεγκριτου
- 2011.5003.242, Ουγιορας
- 2011.5003.246, Ονδ[, with possible iota at end, and uncertain symbol
- 2011.5003.29, ΧΑΒΠ, Chabrias?, stamped on the turn of the handle. Unclear whether complete fore (Fig. 59)