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Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine pottery

Ross Thomas
Pottery is by far the most common artifact group found at Naukratis and Byzantine Egyptian and imported pottery.

Byzantine Egyptian and imported pottery.

This chapter is intended as an introduction to this large and varied assemblage.

Although pottery sherds of full vessels only account for 5.8% of the total artifacts extant from Peirene, Gardiner, Coulson and Leonard's combined excavations; 2% vastly underestimates the true volume of pottery encountered at the site. From Coulson and Leonard's 1977–82 surveys and excavations, 96.6% of the published finds are pottery, although this too may underestimate the proportion of pottery sherd.

1.1 The Naukratis assemblage

This chapter discusses Ptolemaic (Egyptian) pottery, Hellenistic imported pottery, Early Ptolemaic and Egyptian pottery, and Byzantine Egyptian and imported pottery. However, there is an inevitable small overlap with earlier periods. Also there are related terracotta and faience industries, especially during the Ptolemaic period when a range of mould-made pottery, lamps, and figurines were made that share stylists influences, technique, and were concentrated within the cosmopolitan communities of Naukratis.

The abundance of pottery at Naukratis enables us to investigate the primary pottery questions often asked of such assemblages: 1) dating; 2) the origins of pottery supply; and 3) identity of functional variation. This chapter is intended to provide the reader with a good understanding of these broad questions, whilst also investigating, where possible, the complicated and nuanced role of pottery use in the expression of identities within the cosmopolitan communities of Naukratis.

1 Because the subject (and the bibliography of this subject) is vast, the limited space afforded to this introduction demanded that research concentrated in reviewing the regional production (which requires further research in the western Delta) and an assessment of the character of the assemblage as a whole. All images are © Trustees of the British Museum.

2 Also known as Late Roman, broadly of 4th to 7th century AD date, specifically AD 330–642.

3 Broadly of late 1st century BC to 3rd century AD or early 4th century AD date. See for example (Tomber and Thomas 2012: 729 of 22: 412 objects from the 1977–82 field seasons, which included all body sherds.

4 Also known as Egyptian Late Period pottery, Greek painted pottery. Greek household wares and Cypriot and Levantine pottery.

5 Broadly of early 1st century AD.

6 Also known as Egyptian Late Period pottery and forthcoming chapter on Greek painted pottery, Greek household wares and Cypriot and Levantine pottery.

7 Broadly of late 4th to mid-5th century AD date.

8 Broadly of c. 306 BC–c. 305 BC, whilst the term Ptolemaic is used for objects made in Egypt post 305 BC.

9 See chapter on Egyptian Late Period pottery and forthcoming chapter on Greek painted pottery, Greek household wares and Cypriot and Levantine pottery.

10 Broadly of late 1st century BC to 1st century AD.

11 By the 3rd century AD, 99.6% of the total finds at Naukratis are Egyptian Late Period pottery, Greek painted pottery, Greek household wares and Cypriot and Levantine pottery.
same industrial area of Naukratis. On occasion Ptolemaic, and more rarely Roman, pottery was inscribed with graffiti.

The chapter concentrates on the material collected during the excavations of Petrie, Gardner, Hogarth, Leonard and Coulson, a relatively small assemblage of just over 3,700 sherds. This is complemented by c. 2,300 imported and local amphorae sherds, reaching a total of nearly 6,000 as a sample of all Ptolemaic to Byzantine pottery from Naukratis. The majority of the material comes from the excavations of predominantly 2nd century BC to 1st century AD levels excavated by Leonard and survey material collected by Coulson. Unpublished material from the rescue work undertaken by the Supreme Council of Antiquities (now the Ministry of State for Antiquities) and the subsequently survey and excavations undertaken by the British Museum since 2012 have informed this study.

A wide variety of different excavation and collection methods were undertaken at Naukratis, which have produced distinctly different dataset samples for each project. For example, Petrie, Gardner and Hogarth collected mainly amphorae (79.9%, mostly stamped handles) and decorated table-wares (16.5%), with few cooking wares (0.2%) and utility wares (3.4%). Leonard’s excavations yielded few amphorae (7.9%, mostly local), many local table-wares (49.8%), cooking wares (10%) and utility wares (32.3%). Coulson’s field survey discovered many amphorae (20%, mostly imported), many local table-wares (34%), cooking wares (27.3%) and utility wares (18.7%). The variety of sampling strategies makes it difficult to compare the results from each project.

1.2 Previous studies

The work undertaken by Coulson and Leonard at Naukratis and the surrounding area has been both influential to, and complemented by, subsequent surveys and excavations in the region. The pottery corpora published by Coulson, Leonard and Berlin from Naukratis, which today remain widely used by scholars working in the region and beyond, however, are in need of revision. Comparison with subsequent synthetic

---

11 See chapters on Lamps, Portable stoves, Ptolemaic and Roman faience vessels and Ptolemaic and Roman figures.
12 See the chapter on Ceramic inscriptions.
13 Excluding amphorae, the assemblage comprises only c. 540 examples from Petrie, Gardner and Hogarth (many more were recorded in Coulson 1996 and Leonard 1997; 2001; Berlin 1997; 2001). The assemblage consists of c. 194 Ptolemaic pottery sherds, c. 131 imported Hellenistic pottery sherds, c. 80 Roman Egyptian pottery sherds and c. 134 Imported Roman pottery sherds.
15 Of the c. 29,000 sherds discovered during the British Museum excavations in 2012–6 the majority came from excavated deposits dating to the Late Period (c. 630–330 BC). The vast majority were from excavations of the river front at the west end of the settlement (64%) or from the Hellenion and Dioskouroi sanctuary to the north (31%), from primarily 550–325 BC and 610–500 BC contexts (respectively). Excavations have revealed Ptolemaic and Roman phases in small areas of the ‘South Mound’ within the south-west corner of the Amun-Ra sanctuary, and also a c.150–30 BC pottery dump (preparation for building over reclaimed land) over the river front area to the west. This is supplemented by limited surface survey finds and the disturbed surface deposits from cleaning the trenches.
19 On Kom Firin see Spencer 2008; 2014; specifically Thomas 2014a on the Late Period area. On the Ptolemaic areas and other residual finds see Smoláriková 2008; 2014.
research on the dating of Egyptian amphorae\textsuperscript{20} and other wares from securely dated contexts across Egypt,\textsuperscript{21} including recent excavations at Naukratis,\textsuperscript{22} demonstrates, for example, that there are problems with the dating of ‘Ptolemaic’ phases at Naukratis;\textsuperscript{23} those concerning the incorrect dating of Late Period phases as Ptolemaic have already been outlined elsewhere.\textsuperscript{24} Some forms previously identified as Ptolemaic, however, need to be revised as the Persian Period precedents appear in earlier levels and as residual finds (see Persian period square rimmed bowls, Figs 1–2, and lidded cooking pots Figs 3–4).

It is increasingly obvious now that the dating of subsequent Ptolemaic phases also requires some adjustment, with some phases being down-dated, even into the 1st and possibly the 2nd centuries AD (see Table 1 below); this has a considerable effect on the production date and use of many utility, cooking and table-ware forms. It is also clear from the work of Dixneuf that the nearby kiln at Kom Dahab was operating between c. 275–50 BC, possibly specifically 200–100 BC,\textsuperscript{25} as originally suggested by its excavator,\textsuperscript{26} rather having been in use only in the 3rd century BC production as suggested by Berlin.\textsuperscript{27} This is significant because the excavations of the kiln at Kom Dahab produced amphorae, utility wares, coarse wares and table-wares that are distinctive of mid-Ptolemaic period Naukratis; this re-dating has significant historical implications. Corrected by these and other chronological emendations, Berlin’s typology can continue to function as a reliable reference point of scholarship.

\textsuperscript{20} Dixneuf 2011.

\textsuperscript{21} For example the material found at Mons Claudianus and Mons Porphyrites (Tomber 2006; 2008). The Mons Claudianus material can often be precisely dated within the period c. AD 50–235, with the earliest papyri/ostraka dating to AD 68, alongside Neronian coins. The latest papyri/ostraka are dated c. AD 222–35.

\textsuperscript{22} Thomas and Villing forthcoming.


\textsuperscript{24} Spencer 2011, 39 (see also 2015, 2–5 in chapter on Egyptian Late Period pottery); Thomas and Villing 2013. Note, however, Berlin 1997, fig. 6.2.11 was incorrectly identified as Ptolemaic by Berlin, and subsequently Spencer (2011, 39), when it is Persian period in date (explained below).

\textsuperscript{25} Two amphorae forms were produced in this kiln: types AE2-1, AE2–2.1 and AE2–2.2. The former were produced in c. 275–125 BC and the latter two in c. 175–50BC (Dixneuf 2011). Production at the kiln may have started before forms AE2–2.1 and AE2–2.2 were produced.

\textsuperscript{26} Coulson, Leonard and Wilkie 1982. This material is currently being reappraised by Aurélie Masson-Berghoff as part of a British Museum project (The Western Nile Delta: The American Survey in the Region of Naukratis and Kom Firin, led by Alexandra Villing and Neal Spencer).

\textsuperscript{27} Berlin 2001, 45–6. Example E11.124.10 (Coulson and Wilkie 1986, fig. 19) cited by Berlin as evidence for Late 3rd century BC production at the Kom Dahab kiln is of form not produced until c.175–50 BC (Dixneuf 2011, form AE2-2,2).
Table 1 New dating for Leonard’s phases at Naukratis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Berlin/Leonard date</th>
<th>Corrected date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW1A</td>
<td>500–350 BC</td>
<td>c. 620–500 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW1B</td>
<td>500–350 BC</td>
<td>c. 620–400 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW1C</td>
<td>500–350 BC or 300–250 BC</td>
<td>c. 500–350 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW2A</td>
<td>300–150 BC</td>
<td>c. 400–300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW2B</td>
<td>300–150 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW3</td>
<td>275–150 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW4–5</td>
<td>175–125 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW6A</td>
<td>150–100 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW6B–8</td>
<td>150–100 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Hiatus A–B</td>
<td>75–25 BC</td>
<td>100–1 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW9</td>
<td>75–25 BC</td>
<td>50 BC–AD 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW10</td>
<td>75–25 BC</td>
<td>AD 100–200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>300–150 BC</td>
<td>400–200 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>300–150 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3–5</td>
<td>175–1 BC</td>
<td>50 BC–AD 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1A</td>
<td>300–50 BC</td>
<td>620–500 BC or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1B</td>
<td>300–50 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2–8 (II)</td>
<td>AD 1300–1880</td>
<td>AD 1300–1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kom Hadid A (structure)</td>
<td>200–50 BC</td>
<td>150–1 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kom Hadid B (kiln waste)</td>
<td>200–50 BC</td>
<td>50 BC–AD 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Summary of the main wares and production centres

The Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine pottery found at Naukratis was largely locally produced in a Nile Delta silt ware, although pale yellow desert marls and pink Aswan marls are also represented, as are Nile silts

---

28 Leonard (1997, 38) correctly dates this phase to the 5th or early 4th century BC. Berlin subsequently subdivides phase IC, providing an early 3rd century BC date for some forms from this context (2001, 32, 37).

29 Spencer (2011, 39), as Berlin (2001, 32) previously, incorrectly identified the rim of a Classical Greek chytra or lopas form (Berlin 1997, fig. 6.2.11) as a later Ptolemaic variant. This was a local copy of the Classical Greek lidded chytra or lopas dating to c. 450–330 BC.

30 Phase NW2B comprises contexts with mainly 4th century BC material, some earlier residual material and, in the case of loci 1020 and 2031, early Ptolemaic table wares. Locus 2031 includes one sherd of an Egyptian amphora made in 175/150–50 BC (Dixneuf 2011, form AE2-2.2), but this may be contamination from the context above.

31 Including material certainly of the late 1st century BC to early 1st century AD, but possibly also later.

32 Including material certainly of the 1st century AD and probably also the 2nd century AD and possibly later.

33 All phases include significant quantities of residual late Persian Period ceramics dating to the 5th or 4th centuries BC.

34 But mostly 4th to 1st century BC residual material. Spencer (2011, 40) identifies some 6th century BC material within this level.

35 Unpublished ceramics from the Couls Archive (Volos, Greece) allow a reassessment of the dating of Trench 12 loci 1254, 1271. Trench 15 loci were not labelled.

36 Unpublished ceramics from the Couls Archive (Volos, Greece) allow a reassessment of the dating of Trench 12 loci 1229 and Trench 15 loci 1542 and 1507.

37 The latest material appears to be Late Ptolemaic in date, however early Ptolemaic material may also have been found within this phase.

38 The earliest phases contain material dated from the late 2nd century BC and residual material that may be earlier. However, the bottom of the structure was never reached.

39 No phasing was distinguished by Leonard for the excavations at Kom Hadid, who dated the area to c. 200–500 BC (Leonard 2001, 11). However, distinct phases can be recognized on the basis of ceramic forms. Above a series of a series of Ptolemaic structures, were a sequence of Roman robber pits and kiln waste dumps. These included distinctive Roman amphorae (AE3–1.1 rim and handle fragments), flanged rim jugs, and folded lip casseroles forms within loci 4803, 4807, 6202–3, 6209, 7602–6, 7609–10, 7617, 13002 and 13006.
from Middle and Upper Egypt. We see a significant reduction in the proportion of imported wares, particularly table-wares, from the preceding periods. The main wares can be subdivided into local Nile silts (and other Nile silts), Mareotic kiln products (from the Alexandria region), Abu Mina fabrics and other marl fabrics, Aswan kaolinite fabrics and imported ware. The main Egyptian fabric wares are discussed below to save repetition, and the imported wares are discussed when encountered.

1.3.1 Naukratis and Kom Dahab Nile silt fabric
Nile silt is a common Egyptian fabric, comprising fine, micaceous, alluvial clay, red-brown to dark chocolate brown in colour. It is usually very organic rich at Naukratis, although the texture varies greatly depending upon the temper added. This fabric is represented by wasters across the site, near workshops and kilns identified by Petrie and other previous excavators, and also where geophysical results suggest the presence of kilns. There is no clear distinction in appearance between Ptolemaic and Roman fabrics, although they are noticeably different from the Late Period fabrics which preceded them. Nile silt was used to produce a variety of Black (reduced), white, or, most frequently, red-slipped or unslipped wares.

1.3.2 Mareotic and Alexandrian calcareous fabric
Ceramic production around the shores of Lake Mareotis is well documented. The Ptolemaic fabric is generally red or brown with yellow to pale green surfaces and abundant limestone inclusions visible as reaction rims on the surface, with fine quartz, ironstone, voids, shell and mica inclusions. The Early Roman fabric is red-brown, with less common limestone, but more frequent and coarser quartz, ironstone, voids, shell and mica, being macroscopically similar in appearance to a Nile silt. There are noticeable variations, perhaps due to firing conditions, between kilns surveyed at Mareotis. It is possible that some Byzantine red-slipped wares were also produced within the Alexandrian region.

1.3.3 Abu Mina marl fabric
Pottery production at Abu Mina has recently been confirmed. The sandy marl fabric is orange-brown usually with a cream-yellow surface, occasionally light green, with common large limestone inclusions. The fabric resembles some Mareotic wares which also produced identical amphora and utility ware forms during the Byzantine period.

1.3.4 Egyptian marl fabric

---

40 Not all of the sherds have been identified by the author in person, it was often necessary to work from photographs, drawings and notes. Often only broad fabric descriptions are available. Never the less, the range of Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine pottery was often distinctive and matched closely those forms commonly encountered in Alexandria (see methodology in Tomber and Thomas 2011).
41 Petrie 1886, pl. XL; Leonard 1997, 22–26
42 Thomas and Villing 2013, 95, fig. 17.
43 El-Fakharani 1983; Empereur and Picon 1986; Empereur and Picon 1998, who recorded 28 workshops; Tomber and Thomas 2011, two Ptolemaic amphora kilns at sites 39 and 125, Early Roman amphora kilns sites 32 and 124.
44 Tomber and Thomas 2011.
45 Variant C of the Egyptian Red Slip ware (ERSC) is distinct from the usual Egyptian Nile silt Red Slip ware variant B (ERSB), being less micaceous. ERSB is orange or red-brown with limestone and quartz inclusions. Hayes (1972, 399) suggested it might be a desert ware, near Abu Mina. Engemann prefers somewhere on the coast (1992, 156). It was most common in Alexandria and Mareotis (Tomber and Thomas 2011).
Marl fabrics comprise a calcareous clay with a pale brown or orange core, cream-yellow surfaces and large limestone inclusions. These were used throughout the period, continuing from the Late Period production and were produced in a number of places across Egypt. It is likely that the majority of Byzantine marl sherds were Abu Mina products, although it is not always possible to identify them with certainty beyond a general Egyptian provenance.

1.3.5 Aswan pink kaolinite fabric
Aswan table-wares made from fine pale pink kaolin clay with voids and fine white inclusions and pale buff or slipped surfaces are relatively rare at Naukratis.

1.4 Summary of the main forms
The forms can be broadly divided into table-wares, cooking wares, utility wares and amphorae, each of which had specific production centres or industries that are treated separately below. The majority of forms are distinctive, particularly because they were often saved or illustrated by the past excavators because they were nearly complete or diagnostic. Berlin’s typology is still the most relevant for much of this material and is used where possible here. For this reason Berlin’s terminology is used, whilst recognizing that a different terminology is commonly used for the earlier Classical Greek precedents and Hellenistic parallels in Greece. For example ‘cooking pots’ (including ‘stew pot’ variants) in earlier periods would be called ‘common chytraí’ (cooking pot forms 3, 4, 5 and 6, Fig. 5) or ‘lidded chytraí’ (cooking pot forms 1 and 2, Fig. 4), whilst casseroles are known as lopades (casserole-dish forms 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7, Fig. 6) and ‘pans’ or (casserole-dish forms 3 and 4). The re-dating of phases required a revision of the dates and a subdivision of some forms as displayed in Table 2 below.50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 The date of Berlin’s form</th>
<th>Berlin date</th>
<th>Corrected date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim Saucer</td>
<td>300–250 BC</td>
<td>620–200 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickened rim fish-dish</td>
<td>250–100 BC</td>
<td>300 BC–AD 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropping rim fish-dish</td>
<td>150–100 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevelled rim fish-dish</td>
<td>150–1 BC</td>
<td>150 BC–AD 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine square rim hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>500–300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus (incurved rim) bowl</td>
<td>300–250 BC</td>
<td>300–1 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 Treated separately, see forthcoming chapter on Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine amphorae and amphora stoppers. A brief synthesis is discussed within the conclusions of this chapter.
48 Only the full publication of the full data from the British Museum 2012–16 excavations can provide an accurate breakdown of wares by period for those areas excavated by the team, as all sherds (including body sherds) were quantified from excavated contexts.
49 Pans were known as Týnýrov in Greek. Some variants of Casserole 4 resemble Roman ‘oró bifido pans’ of c. 140 BC – AD 100 date (Rotroff 2006, 192).
50 However, just because the contexts within which these Naukratis examples were found are now understood to be later in date does not mean that earlier parallels do not exist elsewhere or that some Naukratis examples may not be residual within later contexts.
51 Earliest attested at Naukratis.
52 Full range suggested.
53 No distinction is made here between black and red slip as they are contemporary for these forms.
54 Roman date is uncertain, as this could be residual.
55 Omitted or conflated by Berlin. Examples have been found with a white, red or black slip.
56 Replaced by Hemispherical and carinated bowl types that were conflated together by Berlin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Type</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everted rim bowl</td>
<td>300–1 BC</td>
<td>300–1 BC&lt;sup&gt;57&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl&lt;sup&gt;58&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>200–100 BC</td>
<td>50 BC–AD 200 or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinated bowl&lt;sup&gt;59&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>L1st BC – 2nd AD or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinated cups</td>
<td>250–200 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pot 1 Angled rim cooking pot A&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>300–250 BC</td>
<td>450–300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pot 2 Angled rim cooking pot B</td>
<td>300–250 BC</td>
<td>300–1 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pot 3 small ledge rim</td>
<td>250–200 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pot 4 tall ledge rim</td>
<td>250–200 BC</td>
<td>175 BC–AD 50&lt;sup&gt;61&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pot 4B tall ledge rim</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>AD 1–300&lt;sup&gt;62&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pot 5 plain rim</td>
<td>200–100 BC</td>
<td>M2nd–E1st BC&lt;sup&gt;63&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pot 6 'stew pot' A recessed lip</td>
<td>200–100 BC</td>
<td>120 BC&lt;sup&gt;64&lt;/sup&gt;–AD 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pot 7 'stew pot' B folded lip</td>
<td>200–100 BC</td>
<td>120 BC&lt;sup&gt;64&lt;/sup&gt;–AD 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casserole dish 1 Angled rim</td>
<td>300–200 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casserole dish 2 bevelled lip</td>
<td>300–200 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casserole dish 3 inset rim</td>
<td>150–100 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casserole dish 4 inset rim single carination&lt;sup&gt;65&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>150–100 BC</td>
<td>L1st BC – 1/2nd AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casserole dish 5 squared rim</td>
<td>150–100 BC</td>
<td>L2nd–E1st BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casserole dish 6 folded lip</td>
<td>100–1BC</td>
<td>L1st BC–1st/2nd AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casserole dish 7 folded lip (ribbed body)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>AD 100–300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baking dish</td>
<td>150–100 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lids</td>
<td>300–200 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug 1 long, delta rim</td>
<td>300–250 BC</td>
<td>400–300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug 2 Folded rim</td>
<td>300–250 BC</td>
<td>400–300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug 3 Narrow ledge rim</td>
<td>300–100 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug 4 Rolled rim</td>
<td>175–125 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug 5 Long, square rim</td>
<td>300–200 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug 6 long, flattened rim</td>
<td>300–200 BC</td>
<td>400–200 BC or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug 7 Lagynos</td>
<td>250–200 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug 8 Flanged rim</td>
<td>100–1BC</td>
<td>50BC–AD 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydria with flanged rim</td>
<td>150–100 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krater 1 Short squared rim</td>
<td>300–200 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krater 2 Overhanging rim</td>
<td>200–100 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krater 3 Nail head rim</td>
<td>330–30 BC</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>57</sup> But followed by Roman variants.

<sup>58</sup> The majority of hemispherical bowls were conflated by Berlin with echinus bowl types.

<sup>59</sup> Distinct from carinated cups. Omitted or conflated by Berlin.

<sup>60</sup> Previously conflated with later Ptolemaic variants (see Cooking Pot 2, Fig. 26).

<sup>61</sup> This vessel form was also found within late 1st century BC to early 1st century AD contexts at Berenike (Tomber 1999, 128–9, fig. 5-2.18–19).

<sup>62</sup> Roman forms developed out of these (Tomber 2006, 76–80, nos 25 and 34–5).

<sup>63</sup> Recessed cooking (stew) pots can now be distinguished from the slightly later folded lip variants of stew pots, which were conflated by Berlin (2001). They first appear stratigraphically within Phase 4B in the south mound (175–50BC), but are also found within Early Roman layers (where they may be residual). Recessed cooking pots were found in Ptolemaic (loci 6301) and Roman layers in Kom Hadid (Berlin 2001, 86–8). Parallels are known from c.120 BC onwards in Alexandria (Hayes and Harlout 2002, 106, fig. 32; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 45).

<sup>64</sup> “Stew pot” = “stew pot” or “stew pot” with a ribbed body.

<sup>65</sup> Examples from the south mound come from Late 1st century BC to 1st century AD levels, however the form persists into the early 3rd century AD (Tomber 2006, 102).
2. Ptolemaic pottery

Ptolemaic pottery was rarely collected by Petrie, Gardner and Hogarth, unless complete, decorated or inscribed. This contrasts with the work subsequently undertaken by Coulson and Leonard and the British Museum. Large quantities of Ptolemaic (and Roman) material were excavated and collected on survey by both projects. The excavations at Kom Hadid and Kom Geif (South Mound) led to the publication by Berlin, which remains the most useful text on utility wares and cooking wares from the region. Coulson and Leonard’s fieldwork provided a large volume of material with which to correct the earlier excavations at Naukratis by Petrie, Gardner and Hogarth that concentrated on the Late Period deposits. However, the scale and location of the excavations were limited. And this means that there is a rather limited variety of ceramics from these excavations. British Museum excavations have revealed the development of a local Greek ceramic tradition (produced by the local Greek community inhabiting the site since the Saite period) during the Late Period, resulting in the development of forms during the Persian period that have previously been mistaken for Ptolemaic production. Subsequently the material developed into Early Roman forms, showing remarkable continuity for an apparently rather conservative community.

### 2.1 Ptolemaic table-wares

Ptolemaic table-ware\(^{67}\) (Figs 7–15) found at Naukratis are made of two local wares: red- and black-slipped variants, commonly known as ‘colour coated ware’.\(^{72}\) Red-slipped wares are most common, having a red-brown micaceous and organic fabric, sometimes with a grey core. Black-slipped wares, also known as ‘Grey wares’ or ‘Terra Nigra’, have a dark grey or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Earliest</th>
<th>Latest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dinos 1 Ledge rim</td>
<td>300–200 BC</td>
<td>175–1 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinos 2 Thickened rim</td>
<td>150–100 BC</td>
<td>150–1 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar 1 Small holenmouth</td>
<td>200–100 BC</td>
<td>175–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar 2 Large holenmouth</td>
<td>100–1 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basins handmade</td>
<td>300–200 BC</td>
<td>620–200 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basins deep (pigeon pots)</td>
<td>300–200 BC</td>
<td>600–200 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphora AE2–1 Squared rim (short rim, long handles)</td>
<td>250–200 BC</td>
<td>275–125 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphora AE2–2 Squared rim (long rim, short handles)</td>
<td>250–200 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphora AE2–2 In-thickened rim</td>
<td>100–1 BC</td>
<td>150–50 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphora AE3–1.1 Concave rim</td>
<td>100–1 BC</td>
<td>50 BC–AD 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 Found only within Roman phases, but possibly residual.
68 Found within late Ptolemaic levels also containing residual early Ptolemaic pottery.
69 Thomas and Villing 2013.
70 See chapter on locally produced Greek pottery.
71 The term table-ware is preferred here to describe vessels used in the presentation and serving for food and drink. It is used in preference to fine-wares, which based on the highly variable quality of table-wares found at Naukratis, may be confusing or misleading for the reader.
72 Élaigne 2000b.
black slip and fabric, being produced in kilns in a reduced atmosphere (oxygen free) producing a poor copy of the Attic black-glazed pottery that was fashionable at the beginning of the Ptolemaic period.

Black-slipped wares are relatively common at Naukratis (unlike the hinterland around Naukratis) and comprise almost entirely table-ware forms. The majority were probably made locally, although some black-slipped grey wares may have come from Memphis, a renowned production centre for ‘Memphite black ware’. One example is a Memphis black ware mould-made lentoid flask with impressed floral designs on both sides dated to the 3rd to 1st centuries BC (Fig. 12). Their popularity at Naukratis is unlikely to be chronological, as they are found throughout Ptolemaic levels, but instead represent local tastes in Naukratis.

Ptolemaic table-wares from Naukratis are found in a limited range of forms that developed out of late Classical Greek black-glazed table-ware forms. The main Ptolemaic forms are fish-plates (a plate or shallow dish with a thickened, drooping or bevelled rim, Figs 7, 10–11), echinus bowls (with an incurved rim, Figs 9, 15) and everted rim dishes (Figs 8, 13–14). Many 2nd to 1st century BC parallels are known from the Alexandria and Mareotis region, though variants of these wares and forms are known from across Egypt, including Tell el-Fara‘in, Coptos, Tell Timai and Karnak.

Fish-plates were common, particularly those with a thickened rim. Squared-off bead rim, grooved internally or internally flattened bead rim, although drooping (overhanging) and bevelled rim forms were also known.

Everted rim bowls were less common, but remain popular through the Roman period, when they became deeper and with a more pronounced ledge rim and carination.

Echinus bowls – small, rounded bowls with low footing bases and a well-defined in-turned incurring rim – have abundant parallels dated 2nd–1st centuries BC, and continued to be used into the early 1st century AD.

---

73 Shows remarkable similarity with ‘Memphite ware’, which was contemporaneous.
74 Bailey 2008, nos 3648–3651. Bailey dates this type to the late 3rd or 2nd century BC, citing Ballet who suggests these may go on into the 1st century BC or even the early 1st century AD, based on a mould find.
75 Berlin suggests black-slipped forms appeared during the 2nd century BC (Berlin 2001, 28). However, the re-dating outlined in Table 1 suggests only a few late 4th or 3rd century BC contexts were excavated by this team. There is not the data to confirm when black-slipped ware was introduced, or when it was most popular at Naukratis within that data set. Subsequent British Museum excavations have revealed black-slipped Nile silt pottery wares within 4th and early 3rd century BC contexts (Thomas forthcoming).
77 Seton-Williams 1967, figs. 2.5–10, 3.1–3, 5–8, 10–12, 7–19; 1969; Charlesworth 1969.
78 Berlin 2001, 28–30; Ochsenschlager 1967, figs. 12, 27.
79 Berlin 2001, 38–40; Grataloup 1991, fig. 1.1; Mostafa 1988, fig. 1.7.
80 Produced at Tell el-Haraby, west of Alexandria, in c.200–1BC (Majcherek and El-Shennawi 1992, 136, fig. 4c). Also into early 1st century AD (Hayes and Harlaut 2002, 105, fig. 23, c. dated 120 BC; Élaigne 2000a, 19, 12, fig. 1, no. 6, dated 50 BC–AD 50; Élaigne 1998, 81, figs 15–6).
81 Dated 2nd to 1st centuries BC (Élaigne 1998, 78, fig. 5; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 48–9, no. 56).
82 Tomber 2006, 102–3, no. 22.
83 Dated 2nd to 1st centuries BC (Majcherek and El-Shennawi 1992, 136, fig. 4b; dated c. 120 BC by Hayes and Harlaut 2002, 104, figs 16–18).
2.2 Ptolemaic mould-made table-wares

A group of 50 sherds from highly decorated goblets and table amphorae were found at Naukratis (Figs 16–20). The relief and painted decoration meant they were collected by Petrie, Gardner and Hogarth, and they represent a disproportionately high proportion of the Ptolemaic table-wares collected during these early excavations at Naukratis.

The goblets usually have mould-made additions applied over the wheel-made body (Fig. 16). The vessels came in two distinct fabrics. The first is a light buff silty fabric, with little visible mica and a cream coloured slip (assumed to be from Alexandria). The second is a coarser Nile silt, red-brown in colour with organic inclusions and abundant mica (assumed to be from Naukratis). All were painted with a slip and covered with black, brown, red, cream and white paint (Fig. 17).

The subjects comprise people carrying wine amphorae, reclining and drinking wine and couples copulating (Fig. 18), people praying, dancing and playing music. They also include Egyptian deities in Egyptian shrines, (Isis, sometimes pregnant, Harpocrates, Figs 19–20), and their protector Bes as well as fantastic characters (Eros or cherubs, satyrs and maenads). These groups may seem strange and somewhat grotesque, and it is difficult not to interpret the design as intentionally humorous or mischievous. The bizarre, yet repetitive, mixture of symbols could, however, have had a very specific, meaning to their intended audience. Individually the scenes make no sense, but together they represent the story of the return of Isis, the conception of Horus-the-child (Harpocrates), and his birth, which connected state religion and ruling dynasty with the (god given) fertility of the Nile inundation.85

This group was previously published by Donald Bailey as part of an Alexandrian production of goblets, amphorae and other forms dating to the 2nd century BC, found at Alexandria and Naukratis.86 Parallels have been

---

84 Élaigne 2000a, fig. 1, no. 8; Élaigne 2000b, fig. 2.
85 See chapter on Egyptian Late Period figures in terracotta and limestone.
86 Bailey 2011, 71–93, pl. 9: Goblet 1A 74–77, pls 2–8; Goblet 1B 77–81 pls 9–11; Goblet 1C 81–2, pl. 11; Table Amphora 2 82–4, pls 12–5; other form 84–5 pl. 15.
given a wide variety of dates: Nenna dates them broadly between the 2nd century BC and the 1st century AD, whilst Bailey dates the table amphorae and goblets group primarily to the 2nd century BC, based upon parallels from known contexts. Parallels dated to the 2nd to 1st centuries BC are known from Athribis and Alexandria. Four fragments found at Naukratis were erroneously published by Leonard as of ‘Late Roman’ date ‘Ballana ware’. All four fragments were found within locus 7603, which contained one Late Period sherd and 26 Ptolemaic sherds, the latest dating between the 2nd century and the early 1st century BC.

It is likely that Naukratis was producing this mould-made pottery since a series of terracotta moulds was found at Naukratis (Figs 21–2). The moulds depict figures from festival scenes – maenads, a dancing Bes and the head of a bearded god, possibly Zeus. These are all subjects also depicted on terracotta vases of this period. However, the moulds could have been used to produce faience vessels. Although plaster moulds were usually used for faience production, the quality of some of the moulds exceeds that of the moulded pottery.

Here there is a close similarity with mould-made Ptolemaic faience vessel production. Faience moulded vessels produced in Athribis (Tell Atrib) had a distinct peak in the mid-3rd century BC and were associated with very fine quality production of mould-made pottery vessels, in a thin white (marl?) clay during the reign of Ptolemy IV. It is possible that both faience and pottery moulded vessels in the form of goblets and table amphorae may have functioned as festival drinking sets.

The symbols represented on these vessels suggest a close relationship with other ritual or votive objects connected with (and often depicting) the inundation festivities, such as stone and terracotta figures, lamps and...
faience vessels of the Ptolemaic period. This would also suggest a certain amount of overlap with the early to mid-Ptolemaic faience vessels and figurines as already suggested by Bailey. Similarities with other industries in style, manufacturing technique and material, suggest this production was distinct from that of the wheel-made table-wares and utility pottery discussed above, having more in common with lamp, stove, figurine, coffin-fitting and faience workshops.

2.3 Hellenistic imported pottery

Hellenistic imported pottery is a relatively large group of material collected at Naukratis consisting mainly of (Attic) Greek black-glazed pottery of the late 4th and early 3rd century BC, and a number of stamped lagynoi from Kos, Rhodes and Cyprus. Fine Greek and East Greek black-glazed table-ware variants include West Slope style painted pottery (c. 325–250/200 BC) and the related contemporary South Italian ‘Gnathian’ kantharoi and skyphoi from Apulia. A small group of 8 fragments of mould-made black-glazed hemispherical bowls, commonly known as Megarian bowls, has also been identified. All were probably made on the west coast of Asia Minor, possibly at Knidos. Unlike the other imported finewares, which are early Hellenistic in date, Megarian bowls (Fig. 23) were imported from the mid- to late-Hellenistic period. The remaining small group include some painted oinochoae and lagynoi, small unguentaria, flasks and amphoriskoi, and a few plain Cypriot or Levantine fish-plates and jugs (Fig. 24) which are also predominantly of early Hellenistic date.

2.4 Ptolemaic cooking wares

Cooking wares account for 26% of all pottery from Ptolemaic levels excavated in Naukratis. They comprise a variety of pots of varying depth often identified as stew pots, casseroles and baking dishes. Eleven different forms of cooking pots, stew pots, casseroles, baking dishes and their lids were found, and their typology was developed by Berlin. Many forms developed out of Classical Greek chytrai and lopades forms, whilst Roman pans were copied in the late Ptolemaic period. Good 2nd to 1st century BC cooking pot and casserole parallels exist, from Alexandria and the Mareotis region.

Ptolemaic cooking pots typically have neat detailing with a location lip or inset for the lid and strap or flat handles. Five main, chronologically distinct but overlapping forms are recognized: angled (lid-seated) rim, small ledge rim, tall ledge rim, plain rim and ‘stew pot’ forms.

Early Ptolemaic cooking pots (Cooking pot forms 1 and 2, Figs 3, 4, 25 and 26) have angled, lid-seated rims. This form developing from the Greek
wide-mouthed and lidded Chytra established in c. 475–425 BC.\textsuperscript{106} It is now clear from the British Museum excavations at Naukratis that the local production of these Classical Greek forms started already before c. 420–400 BC (Cooking pot 1, Figs 3–4),\textsuperscript{107} if not before. Ptolemaic variants are common from the 3rd century BC onwards.\textsuperscript{108}

Small ledge rim (Cooking pot 3, Fig. 27) and tall ledge rim (Cooking pot 4, Figs 4 and 28) cooking pots were both common in mid-2nd century BC and later contexts.\textsuperscript{109} The small ledge rim forms developed from common chytra forms,\textsuperscript{110} as did the simpler plain rim variant (Cooking pot 5, Fig. 29). The plain rim appears slightly later in the Naukratis sequence, from the mid-2nd century BC onwards.

Tall ledge rimmed forms developed during the 2nd century BC from older necked chytra variants.\textsuperscript{111} A distinctive late Ptolemaic narrow necked chytra variant known as a ‘stew pot’ (Cooking pot 6, Fig. 30) appears in the mid- to late-2nd century BC. It has a tall neck, with a sharp, enlarged, folded and flattened rim, with a recessed groove for a lid and vertical flat handles. These were popular in the 1st century BC, and distinctive for the end of the Ptolemaic period, and continued into the Augustan period.\textsuperscript{112} The earliest forms of the mid- to late-2nd century BC have a distinct lid seat recess,\textsuperscript{113} which becomes a shallow internal groove by the end of the 2nd and early 1st century BC.\textsuperscript{114} This internal groove becomes so shallow that it is impractical, and the folded lip supports the lid in the later variants of the 1st century BC onwards.\textsuperscript{115}

Casseroles were a very common form in mid and late Ptolemaic levels, with five main variants, that developed from two forms: the Classical Greek lopas and the Roman orlo bifido pan. The lopas was developed in c. 475–450 BC as a shallow version of the wide mouthed, lidded chytra and could be used for frying and stewing. Ptolemaic Naukratis examples are similar to Greek parallels (dated c. 285–110 BC and 220 BC–Roman) with engaged handles that hug the wall and do not project far above the rim.\textsuperscript{116} Angled rim casseroles (Casserole 1, Fig. 31) appear in the latter 3rd or 2nd century BC contexts at Naukratis,\textsuperscript{117} which were replaced by later beveled lip and square lip forms (Casserole 2 and 5, Figs 32–3) that appear in the

\textsuperscript{106} Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 225.

\textsuperscript{107} A common form found in both local Nile silt and imported fabrics within contexts dated to the period c. 420–330 BC (Thomas and Villing forthcoming). See also from Leonard’s excavation at Naukratis the c. 450–300 BC lidded lopas or chytra forms have been incorrectly identified as Ptolemaic forms (Berlin 1997, fig. 6.3.15; fig. 6.2.11) that developed out of the Classical Greek forms.

\textsuperscript{108} Berlin 2001, 32; Tomber 1999, 137–41, fig. 5–7.72.

\textsuperscript{109} They are not represented in earlier contexts at Naukratis, although some examples of these forms may represent 3rd century BC residual finds within 2nd century BC contexts.


\textsuperscript{112} Berlin 2001, fig. 2.19; Tomber and Thomas 2011, fig. 4.7 no.45; c. 120 BC; Hayes and Harlaut 2002, 106, fig. 32.

\textsuperscript{113} Berlin 1997, figs 6.12.8, 9, and 11.

\textsuperscript{114} Berlin 1997, fig. 6.22.9.

\textsuperscript{115} Berlin 1997, fig. 6.26.3; figs 6.29.4–5.


\textsuperscript{117} Berlin 2001, 2.22.9; Tomber 1997, 140–1, fig. 5-7.73.
late 2nd century BC. These in turn were replaced by folded lip casseroles (Casserole 6, Fig. 68) at the end of the Ptolemaic period.

Distinctive inset lip casseroles with a double carination (Fig. 34) appear in the mid-Ptolemaic period during the mid- or late-2nd century BC. By the end of the Ptolemaic period these had been replaced by simpler single carinated types (Fig. 35) that copied the Roman orlo bifido pan form introduced to Athens in c. 140 BC (with the expansion of Roman fashion). Thicker walled pans known as ‘baking dishes’, often without a recessed rim, are found in the late 2nd or early 1st century BC contexts at Naukratis, with contemporary parallels from Athens.

2.3 Ptolemaic utility wares

Utility vessels are relatively uncommon, despite representing a highly varied group of objects used for storage, transport and preparation of food and drink. Ptolemaic and Late Ptolemaic forms include hole mouth jars (Figs 36–7), thickened rim dinoi (Fig 50), ledge rimmed dinoi (Figs 49), nail head kraters (Figs 39), overhanging rim kraters (Figs 40–1), square rimmed kraters and hydria (Fig. 38). To this number unidentifiable generic ring footed bases of jug or jar forms can be added.

Fragments of numerous locally made Ptolemaic kraters and dinoi have been found in Naukratis. The few early Hellenistic kraters are in an Upper Egyptian marl fabric, with parallels from Coptos. Other krater variants are more common in 2nd and 1st century BC deposits, again with parallels from Coptos, Maskhuta and Tell el-Herr. The two forms of dinoi found include the earlier and common ledge rim dinos (Fig. 44) and the slightly

---

118 Berlin 2001, 2.23.2 and Berlin 2001, 2.27 respectively; c. 120 BC Hayes and Harlaut 2002, fig. 30; present into the Early Roman period (Ballet 2007, 117).
119 Berlin 2001, 2.28.2.
120 Berlin 2001, 2.24.9.
121 Berlin 2001, 2.24.11 the two variants were conflated by Berlin.
122 Rotroff 2006, 190–2 Pan form 6, see also pan form 2, dating from c. 180 BC onwards.
123 Berlin 2001, 2.32.
125 This broad category is used here to include all vessels except transport amphorae, tablewares or cooking wares.
126 Berlin 2001, fig. 2.50.1.
127 Berlin 2001, fig. 2.48.
128 Berlin 2001, fig. 2.48.
129 Berlin 2001, fig. 2.48.2.
130 Berlin 2001, fig. 2.44.4. See similar krater forms persisting through the Roman period into the 2nd and early 3rd century AD at Mons Claudianus (Tomber 2006, 94, no. 90).
131 Berlin 2001, fig. 2.40.1.
132 Berlin 2001, fig. 2.43–2, 6–8.
133 Ibid.
134 Berlin 2001, fig. 2.48. Berlin dates these to the 3rd century BC, although the contexts in which they were found should be revised down to the 2nd century BC.
later thickened rim dinos (Fig. 45), with parallels from Tell el-Herr and Coptos.\textsuperscript{135} Most examples were locally made.

Numerous fragments of hydriai and table amphorae have been found with a cylindrical neck and wide flanged rims (Figs 42–3).\textsuperscript{136} The variants are often difficult to distinguish and the forms are reasonably common in Egypt, with close parallels from Ptolemaic Alexandria.\textsuperscript{137} Jugs have been found in eight distinct forms within the Ptolemaic levels excavated at Naukratis, dating from the 3rd to the 1st centuries BC (Figs 46–9). Most were locally produced,\textsuperscript{138} including laganoi (possibly) made in nearby Kom Dahab (Fig. 50).

A range of handmade crude basins (Figs 51) and pithoi, made of local (very coarse) organic Nile silt could be Ptolemaic or residual finds of an earlier date.\textsuperscript{139} They were found in late Ptolemaic levels at Naukratis, with parallels from Tel Anafa,\textsuperscript{140} suggesting the long-lived continuation of these forms. Other forms include unguentaria with 3rd to 2nd century BC parallels from Hadra, Alexandria.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{135} Berlin 2001, fig. 2.49. Berlin dates these to the 2nd century BC, although the contexts in which they were found should be revised down to the 2nd and 1st centuries BC.

\textsuperscript{136} Berlin 2001, 40, fig. 2.40.

\textsuperscript{137} Adriani 1940, fig. 48.1, 2, pls. 47, 48.5, 7; Adriani 1952, figs. 13, 16.

\textsuperscript{138} Berlin 2001, 38–9.

\textsuperscript{139} Thomas 2014a; see chapter on Late Period pottery.

\textsuperscript{140} Berlin 1997, 156, fig. 6.36, PW 484–57, pls. 58, 89, 90; 2001, 42–3.

\textsuperscript{141} Enklaar 1998, 23, fig. 20.
3. Roman pottery

Like pottery from the preceding Ptolemaic period, Roman pottery found at Naukratis, as elsewhere in the western Delta, was largely locally, consisting of cooking pots, casseroles, dishes and bowls with a drab red slip. Over the first two centuries AD changes in the form of coarse-ware cooking pottery and the form, decoration and source of table-ware pottery followed wider fashions in the Roman world concerning the preparation, presentation and consumption of food and drink. 142

3.1 Roman-Egyptian table-wares

The Early Roman table-wares of Naukratis developed out of Late Ptolemaic traditions with fish-plates, everted rim and echinus bowls continuing into the Augustan period (Figs 52–4), 143 while cruder, often unaslipped and larger incurved rim echinus bowls continued to be used into the 1st century AD (Fig. 54). 144 During the 1st century AD echinus bowls were gradually replaced by hemispherical bowls (Figs 55–6) with a simple rim and a less defined ring foot base (although distinguishing between types can be difficult with sherds). 145 Within the 1st to 2nd century AD contexts at Naukratis Roman bowl and dish forms sometimes have a pronounced carination (Figs 57–60) 146 or a simple flat base. 147 Over time Egyptian table-wares began clearly to copy Terra Sigillatae from Italy, Syria and East Greece. A more obvious imitation of Late Roman Red Wares occurred from the 3rd century AD onwards, with emulation of Cypriot and North African finewares.

Egyptian faience wares became increasingly important in the late 1st and 2nd century AD. This Roman production is quite distinct in glaze colour and thickness, decoration and form from the preceding Ptolemaic period. They copied fashionable Roman red-slip table-wares such as Italian and Eastern Terra Sigillatae forms 148 and were probably produced at the Memphis workshops at Kom Helul. 149

A small group of contemporary Aswan thin-walled wares was found at Naukratis, with barbotine decoration (Fig. 61). 150 They have close parallels from Mons Claudianus, dating mainly from the Trajanic period (after 106 AD) continuing into the Severan period. 151

3.6 Roman imported table-wares

The relatively small assemblage of Imported Roman table-wares found at

142 Thomas 2007, 149–60.
143 It is unclear to what degree fish-plates in the Roman levels at Naukratis are residual.
144 Hayes and Harlaut 2002, 108, fig. 45, c. AD 100; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 48–9, no. 60.
145 The scarcity of echinus bowl types at Mons Claudianus may suggest that they had declined significantly by the mid-1st century AD, or this could be a regional difference.
146 Tomber 1997, fig. 6.43.6; see parallels from Mons Claudianus dated AD 50–235 (Tomber 2006, 103, nos 15, 18).
147 Tomber 1997, fig. 6.43.5, 6.45.13, 6.50.9; see parallels from Mons Claudianus c. AD 50–235 (Tomber 2006, 122–3, nos 90–99).
149 See chapter on Ptolemaic and Roman faience vessels.
150 Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, AN1886.185; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 88.894.
151 Tomber 2006, 25, forms 15–6).
Naukratis is almost exclusively of red-slipped ‘Terra Sigillata’ wares from Syria, Ephesus and Italy and Late Roman Red-Wares from Tunisia.\textsuperscript{152} Whilst Syrian Terra Sigillata A ware was first produced at the end of the 2nd or the early 1st century BC and persists into the early 2nd century AD, at Naukratis they are exclusively of 30 BC – AD 125 forms. Eastern Terra Sigillata A, from Syria (Fig. 62), seems to have been the earliest to arrive, but this was replaced by much more popular Arretine, or Italian Terra Sigillata (Fig. 63) in the Augustan period.

Nineteen sherds\textsuperscript{153} of Eastern Terra Sigillata A (henceforth ESA) ware from Syria have been found at Naukratis. All have a fine glossy red slip and a fine yellow pottery fabric. The majority of the sherds fall within the period of 20 BC until AD 100.\textsuperscript{154} One ESA sherd has previously been dated to the end of the 2nd century BC or the 1st century BC,\textsuperscript{155} although the form is probably Augustan or 1st century AD later on the basis of parallels and the context in which it was found.\textsuperscript{156} The latest ESA form is the ledge-rimmed dish of the early 2nd century AD.\textsuperscript{157} A single contemporary fragment of a Syrian green lead glazed skyphos (kotyle) with moulded floral decoration was also found.\textsuperscript{158}

Only three sherds\textsuperscript{159} of Eastern Terra Sigillata B (henceforth ESB) ware from Ephesus have been found. All have a fine glossy red slip and a brown highly micaceous pottery fabric and fall within the date range of 10 BC–AD 75.\textsuperscript{160}

Fifty-nine sherds of Italian Terra Sigillata, also known as Arretine ware (henceforth ITS),\textsuperscript{161} with a fine glossy red slip and a fine light red pottery fabric were found. All fall within the date range of c. 30 BC–AD 100;\textsuperscript{162} the earliest are dated 30 BC–AD 20,\textsuperscript{163} and the latest c. AD 25–100.\textsuperscript{164} The majority comprise cups, platters, dishes and bowls dated 20 BC or 10 BC–AD 40.\textsuperscript{165} It is possible that the importation of Italian finewares into Naukratis reduced significantly following the Vesuvian eruption in AD 79, as the Campanian wine trade represented the majority of Italian imports.

\textsuperscript{152} Many of the established dates for these fine-wares have been recently or are in the process of being reassessed (e.g. Meyza 2007).

\textsuperscript{153} Excluding numerous new examples from British Museum excavations since 2012 (Thomas and Villing 2013).

\textsuperscript{154} (Hayes 1985, forms ESA47, 35, 45, 45/50 and 39).

\textsuperscript{155} Berlin 2001, fig. 2.5.8. citing parallel from Hayes (1985, form ESA3), dated c. 110 BC–1 BC.

\textsuperscript{156} Closer parallels include Hayes forms ESA4, 14 or 38 (Hayes 1985, 16, pl.1, nos 9–23; 20, pl.2, no. 13; 32, pl.5, nos 14–15), comprising Augustan, early 1st century AD and mid-1st century AD dates. The context can now be dated c. 50 BC–AD 100 (see Table 1).

\textsuperscript{157} Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 88.940 (Hayes 1985, no. 57/59) and British Museum, 2011,5009.51 (Hayes 1985, no. 40/53/54).

\textsuperscript{158} Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, RES.87.222.

\textsuperscript{159} Excluding numerous new examples from British Museum excavations since 2012 (Thomas and Villing 2013).

\textsuperscript{160} British Museum 1888,0601,690; Akademisches Kunstmuseum, Bonn, 697.61; 697.64 (Hayes 1985, form ESB57/59).


\textsuperscript{162} Ettlinger et al. 1990.

\textsuperscript{163} British Museum, 2011,5009.32 (Ettlinger et al. 1990, form ITS15.1).

\textsuperscript{164} British Museum, 2011,5009.39 (Ettlinger et al. 1990, form ITS2.2).

\textsuperscript{165} British Museum, 2011,5009.48; 2011,5009.53; 2011,5009.68 (Ettlinger et al. 1990, forms ITS223.1; ITS33; ITS17.1); 2011,5009.35; 2011,5009.34; 2011,5009.27 (ibid. form ITS18.2); 2011,5009.36; 2011,5009.53; 2011,5009.56; 2011,5009.31 (ibid. form ITS33.1).
reaching Naukratis until this date and Roman finewares often piggybacked on amphi-ora shipments.

Three North African Red Slipped ware (henceforth ARS) sherds made in Tunisia may be of 2nd century AD date. However, the majority of ARS and other Late Roman Red-Wares fall into the Byzantine period (Fig. 64) and are discussed below.

### 3.3 Roman-Egyptian cooking wares

The cooking pots, stew pots, casseroles and baking dishes of the Augustan period are indistinguishable from late Ptolemaic forms. The distinctive ‘stew pot’ with an internal groove, folded lip and ledge rim continued to be popular through the Augustan period into the 1st century AD (Cooking pot 6B, Fig. 65). The tall ledge rim cooking pot (Cooking pot 4B, Fig. 66) forms also continued into the 1st century AD, whilst a range of angled and plain rim forms continued through into the Roman and Byzantine periods, the rims and handles noticeably less even, detailed and standardized over time. A diagnostic feature from the 2nd century AD onwards is the presence and then predominance of ribbed bodies, distinguishing them from similar Ptolemaic and Augustan period forms.

The two main Ptolemaic casserole forms (inset rim pans, and ledge rim *lopades* variants, see above) developed into locally produced Roman period variants. Ledge-rimmed casseroles developed in the later 1st century BC, into the early Roman ‘folded lip casseroles’ with a reeded rim (Fig. 68). Later mid-Roman variants have a simpler, sometimes grooved ledge rim, with pronounced ribbing on the body during and after the 2nd century AD. This ribbing continued to be a feature into the Byzantine period.

Inset lip casseroles lost their double carination typical of the Ptolemaic period, with the single simple carinated types (Fig. 67) that appeared during the 1st century BC resembling Roman pan forms, continuing to be produced in Egypt throughout the first to mid-third centuries AD. The other pan form, the ‘baking dish’, is also distinctive from its late Ptolemaic predecessor. These develop into a distinctive late 1st century BC–early

---

166 See forthcoming chapter on Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine amphorae and stoppers.
168 Berlin dates these to the 2nd century BC, but they appear first in Phase 9, an Early Roman context of the 1st century AD, which also contains late Ptolemaic period material (Berlin 2001, 2.19, see reappraisal of phasing above). In Alexandria, these are already identified within contexts dating to 120BC (Hayes and Harlout 2002, 106, fig. 32; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 45, no.45).
169 Tomber 1999, 128–9, fig. 5.2.18–19.
170 Tomber 2006; Tomber 2007.
171 Berlin 2001, 2.28.2; Hayes and Harlout 2002, 110 fig. 55, dated c. AD 100; Tomber 2006, 113, fig. 1.43, Mons Claudianus Casserole Type 50, dated 2nd century AD; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 46–7.
172 Tomber 2006, forms 51 and 66.
173 Tomber 2007, 247.
174 Berlin 2001, fig. 2.24.9.
175 Berlin conflates both Ptolemaic and Early Roman variants (Berlin 2001, 2.24.11).
176 Tomber 2006, forms 102 and 43.
177 Berlin 2001, 2.32. Phase 8 is now dated to the late 2nd or early 1st century BC.
1st century AD Augustan form and subsequently a mid-1st century AD–early 3rd century AD form.  

3.4 Roman-Egyptian utility wares

Utility wares were rarely brought back from Naukratis by Petrie, Gardner or Hogarth, unless they were complete examples as is the case for some Egyptian Nile silt jugs and juglets (Figs 69–71), or unguentaria.\(^\text{179}\) The immediate successors of Ptolemaic square rimmed kraters were also found at Naukratis, in Augustan period levels.\(^\text{181}\) Other utility wares from the Roman period include Abu Mina ware ledge rimmed basins,\(^\text{182}\) Saqiya pots\(^\text{183}\) and pie crust wares.\(^\text{184}\) Identified rim forms include the flanged rim jugs\(^\text{185}\) of the Augustan or later Roman period.

4. Byzantine pottery

No Byzantine pottery has been excavated at Naukratis from undisturbed contexts since Petrie and Hogarth excavated at the site, and neither of these early excavators were interested in investigating the areas of that period. Also, Petrie, Gardner and Hogarth all struggled to accurately distinguish between Byzantine, Roman and Ptolemaic pottery.\(^\text{186}\)

Late Roman Naukratis and the Nile Delta experienced a significant change in the form and origin of pottery used, related to major changes in dining practices and consumption patterns at this time. Imports from Italy and North Africa declined. These were replaced with imports from the Levant, Turkey and Cyprus, which eclipsed all other imports to Egypt, the trade evidently piggybacking on the grain tribute to Byzantium, as it had previously with Rome. This situation is particularly clear in Naukratis, Maretotis and Alexandria, where imports accounted for c. 50% of all pottery. In the case of Naukratis, 79% of identified Byzantine transport amphorae were imported and 38% of all Byzantine pottery.

4.1 Byzantine-Egyptian table-wares

Byzantine table-wares were produced in a variety of bowl, dish and plate forms copying the most popular forms from North Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean. Locally produced table-wares,\(^\text{187}\) produced in the northwestern Nile Delta or the region around Alexandria, copied the most

---

\(^{178}\) Augustan (Tomber 1999, 130–1, fig. 5.3-24), Early Roman (Tomber 2006, form 100).

\(^{179}\) With parallels from Roman Memphis, probably dating to the 2nd century AD (French 2013, 165, 168, 177, fig. A2.8d–e) and 2nd century AD Mons Claudianus respectively (Tomber 2006, 52, type 4).

\(^{180}\) Bristol Museum, H920; H3621.

\(^{181}\) Tomber 1999, 128–9, fig. 5.2.12.

\(^{182}\) Tomber and Thomas 2011, 49.

\(^{183}\) Trajanic to Severan periods (Tomber 2006: 95); the form continues into the Late Roman period (Bailey 1998, 75–6; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 43–5).

\(^{184}\) Tomber 2007, 256, 301.

\(^{185}\) Berlin 2001, fig. 2.39.9.

\(^{186}\) See Bailey 2008; Thomas and Villing 2013; Thomas 2014b.

\(^{187}\) Most would be classed as ERSB or ERSC Nile silts, with a few ERSA fabrics from Aswan recognized (Hayes 1972; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 47–9).
popular Cypriot (henceforth CRS)\textsuperscript{188} Phocaean (henceforth PRS)\textsuperscript{189} and Tunisian red-slipped wares (ARS) of the time.\textsuperscript{190} The dating of these Egyptian copies is related to the imported prototypes. They were produced across Egypt at this time, including Aswan, Alexandria and the Nile valley. However, it is the Nile silt fabrics that are most common at Naukratis, known as ERSB or ERSC (when distinguishable). They were usually of red-brown micaceous and organic Nile silts with a thick dark red-brown slip. The main forms represented at Naukratis,\textsuperscript{191} as at Alexandria and Mareotis,\textsuperscript{192} are copies of: ARS67 dish (Fig. 73),\textsuperscript{193} ARS75 dish,\textsuperscript{194} ARS84 dish,\textsuperscript{195} ARS91A bowl,\textsuperscript{196} ARS91D bowl,\textsuperscript{197} ARS96 bowl,\textsuperscript{198} ARS99 bowl,\textsuperscript{199} ARS104B dish,\textsuperscript{200} ARS104C dish,\textsuperscript{201} CRS9B or 9C bowl.\textsuperscript{202}

4.2 Byzantine imported table-wares

Imported Late Roman Red-Slipped wares were common in Byzantine Naukratis, where CRS,\textsuperscript{203} PRS\textsuperscript{204} and ARS\textsuperscript{205} dominate. Imports from Tunisia, as with the transport amphorae, slowly declined over time, being replaced with Cypriot imports.

\textsuperscript{188}Hayes 1972, CRS2, CRS9; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 47–9.
\textsuperscript{189}Hayes 1972, PRS3C, PRS3D, ‘Late Roman C’; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 47–9.
\textsuperscript{190}Hayes 1972, ARS67, ARS99, ARS104, ARS 84, ARS91A, ARS76; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 47–9.
\textsuperscript{191}Copies of CRS1, 2 and 9 (Coulson 1996, 1677, 1498, 1812, 1444, 976, 781, 844, 1617), Copies of ARS75, 104 and 96 (Coulson 1996, 972, 1128, 1167, 408, 259, 239, 1763). Copies of PRS3D (Coulson 1996, 1751, 1336, 971).
\textsuperscript{192}Tomber and Thomas 2011, 47–53.
\textsuperscript{193}Dated mid-4th to early 5th centuries AD (Hayes 1972, 116; Gempeler 1992, 67, Abb. 10, nos 10–12, Abb. 11, nos 1–4, T211a).\textsuperscript{194}Dated c. 420–550 (Hayes 1972, 124; Tomber and Thomas 2011, no. 64).
\textsuperscript{195}Dated early to late 5th century AD (Hayes 1972, 133) to third quarter of the 6th centuries AD (Gempeler 1992, 73, Abb. 18, nos 1–4, T228; Tomber and Thomas 2011, no. 65–6).
\textsuperscript{196}Dated mid-late 5th century AD (Hayes 1972, 144), may continue through the third quarter 6th century (Gempeler 1992, 94, Abb. 36, nos 12–15, T319; Tomber and Thomas 2011, no. 67).
\textsuperscript{197}Dated c. AD 600–650 (Hayes 1972, 144; Tomber and Thomas 2011, no. 68).
\textsuperscript{198}Dated c. AD 490–540 (Hayes 1972, 150), until the 7th century AD (Gempeler 1992, 96, Abb. 36, nos 7–17, T324; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 47).
\textsuperscript{199}Dated late 5th to early 7th centuries AD (Hayes 1972, 155; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 47).
\textsuperscript{200}Dated c. AD 570–600 or later (Hayes 1972, 156, 400; 89; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 47, nos 69 and 72).
\textsuperscript{201}Dated c. AD 550–625 (Hayes 1972, 166; Tomber and Thomas 2011, nos 70–1).
\textsuperscript{202}Dated c. AD 580–700 (Hayes 1972, 382; Tomber and Thomas 2011, no. 76) until AD 660/65 (Meyza 2007, 67–70), AD 600–700 (Gempeler 1992, 105–6, Abb. 50, nos 6–10, T 356a–b).
\textsuperscript{203}Hayes 1972, CRS2, CRS9; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 52–3.
\textsuperscript{204}Hayes 1972, PRS3C, PRS3D, ‘Late Roman C’; Tomber and Thomas 2011, 53, Phocaean Red Slip: 697.58 (© Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum).
The range of ARS bowls and dishes found in Naukratis date mostly to the period AD 350/400 until AD 570/600.\textsuperscript{206} This is a similar to the distribution recognized in Alexandria, where popular Tunisian fineforms ARS67 dish,\textsuperscript{207} ARS104–6 (Fig. 73)\textsuperscript{208} were also found. However other popular contemporary ARS forms are not yet known from Naukratis.\textsuperscript{209} Cypriot forms\textsuperscript{210} included the popular rouletted dishes CRS2 (Fig. 73),\textsuperscript{211} CRS5,\textsuperscript{212} CRS7,\textsuperscript{213} CRS8\textsuperscript{214} and CRS9 (Fig. 73).\textsuperscript{215} Phocaean forms identified include the popular dishes PRS3C and 3D (Fig. 74),\textsuperscript{216} and possibly CRS9 copied in the PRS fabric.\textsuperscript{217}

4.3 Byzantine-Egyptian cooking wares

Cooking wares were common in the Byzantine period. Cooking pots were predominantly ribbed, with angled, ledge rims, or plain rims. However, the range of uneven handles and non-standard forms produced in Egypt from the 2nd to the 7th centuries AD can hinder the precision of dating Roman and Byzantine sherds without a secure archaeological context.\textsuperscript{218} A range of ledge rimmed casseroles, which developed from Ptolemaic and Roman forms, were also predominantly ribbed.\textsuperscript{219} From the late 4th century AD and continuing until the 7th century AD, globular ribbed casseroles with a simple flat, internally bevelled, rim and horizontal handles, replaced the long tradition of ledge-rimmed casseroles (Fig. 75).\textsuperscript{220}


\textsuperscript{207} Dated mid-4th to early 5th centuries AD (Hayes 1972, 116; Tomb and Thomas 2011, 99).

\textsuperscript{208} Dated collectively to c. mid-6th to mid-7th centuries AD (Hayes 1972, 166–71; Tomb and Thomas 102). Specific form variants are dated c. AD 570–600/625 or later (Hayes 1972, 166), c. AD 530–600/625 or later, (Hayes 1972, 166; Tomb and Thomas 2011, no. 101), c. AD 580/600–660 or later (Hayes 1972, 169, fig. 32).

\textsuperscript{209} Through comparison with Alexandria, one would expect to also see dish and bowl forms ARS99 (dated AD450–650, Hayes 1972, 155; Tomb and Thomas 2011, no.100), ARS103 (dated AD450–575, Hayes 1972, 160, fig. 29), ARS107 (dated c. AD 600–660 or later, Hayes 1972, 171, fig. 33), ARS108 (dated AD600–650, Hayes 1972, 171, fig. 33), and ARS32/58 (dated AD290–350, Hayes 1972, 96, fig. 14, no. 22).

\textsuperscript{210} Likely CRS sherds from the Coulson survey from Naukratis include (Coulson 1996, 1139, 1640, 937, 905, 906, 1259, 1716, 1552, 1588, 137, 1382, 871, 872). Because the author was not able to see the sherds, Egyptian copies of these forms could also be represented within this group.

\textsuperscript{211} Dated c. mid- 5th to mid- 6th centuries AD (Hayes 1972, 375), c. mid-5th to mid or third quarter of 6th centuries AD (Meyza 2007, 53; Tomb and Thomas 2011, no. 103–4).

\textsuperscript{212} This form is conventionally dated mid-late 6th century AD (Hayes 1972, 377, fig. 81); a date between the early 6th and early 7th centuries AD is proposed by Meyza (2007, 56).

\textsuperscript{213} This form is generally dated mid-6th to early 7th centuries AD for most examples (Hayes 1972, 379, fig. 81). Meyza (2007, 58) suggests the form started shortly before AD 450 and continued until the late 6th or early 7th century AD.

\textsuperscript{214} This form is conventionally dated to the 6th century AD (Hayes 1972, 379, fig. 81). Meyza (2007, 60–1) charts an evolution starting in the 5th through the early 7th century AD.

\textsuperscript{215} Dated mid- 6th to late 7th centuries AD (Hayes 1972, 382; Tomb and Thomas 2011, nos.105–6), from AD 530, with variants explained (Meyza 2007, 64–70).

\textsuperscript{216} Dated mid- 5th to mid- 6th centuries AD (Hayes 1972, 336–8; Tomb and Thomas 2011, nos.108, 109).

\textsuperscript{217} Dated mid- 6th to late 7th centuries AD (Hayes 1972, 382; Tomb and Thomas 2011, no. 107).

\textsuperscript{218} See for example Tomb 2007 and Tomber 2006.

\textsuperscript{219} Tomb 2007, 247.

\textsuperscript{220} Tomb and Thomas 2011, fig. 4.7, nos 49–51; Egloff 1977, 100, pl. 47, nos 110–16, dated to the 4th and 7th centuries AD.
4.4 Byzantine-Egyptian utility wares

A small group of vessels made of a light yellow calcareous Egyptian marl clay fabric could have been brought to Naukratis by early Christian pilgrims from the Monastery of Saint Minas in the western desert near Alexandria. Two complete jugs of pale marl ware (Figs 76–7) found at Naukratis were produced in Abu Mina between the 5th and the 7th century AD. Distinctive Byzantine basins comprise marl fabric carinated basins with dropped ledge rims and a footing bases, and Nile silt basins with broad, sloping ledge rims. Marl fabric vessels produced in Abu Mina, the settlement associated with the pilgrimage site and Monastery of Saint Abu Minas, can be confirmed for some objects by the identification of the fabric and parallels from the same mould series as lamps and Abu Minas flasks made for the cult of that saint at that site.

Three ampules associated with the cult of Abu Minas attest continued occupation by Christians at Naukratis until the 7th century AD (Fig. 78). Other Christian artifacts include a marl juglet (possibly also from Abu Mina) with the Greek ‘eulogia’ (blessing) written on it (Fig. 79) and a series of Christian symbols on amphora stoppers and lamps.

The best preserved example is a complete painted vase (Fig. 80). It is mould-made and in the likeness of the head and shoulders of the saint. It is dated AD 480–650. Comparanda cited by Bailey have been found at Abu Mina, Alexandria, Canopus, Memphis and unprovenanced. Close parallels acquired by the British Museum from Alexandria are dated from the 5th to the mid-7th century AD.

5. Conclusions on pottery use in Naukratis 330 BC–AD 641

Naukratis: Greeks in Egypt | 23
The pottery sample collected during Petrie, Gardner, Hogarth, Coulson and Leonard’s combined excavations vastly underestimates the true volume of pottery encountered at the site. However, the data presented here shows the ceramic record of changing domestic, industrial and economic activity at Naukratis during the period 330 BC–AD 641. The ceramic material lends itself to quantification and the data can be interrogated to explore more complicated questions concerning past societies, such as changing consumption practices determined by fashion or diet. Some classes of pottery clearly signal ascription to a certain way of life. For example, it is clear that the inhabitants of Naukratis were already producing and using Greek cooking wares before the Ptolemaic period. However, whilst Naukratites were early adopters of Greek influenced cooking and table wares, the later (Ptolemaic and Roman) assemblages follow wider (cross-Mediterranean) fashions in Egypt. Over time, the somewhat atypical Naukratis assemblage becomes much more typical of the north-western Nile Delta region of the late Ptolemaic and Roman periods, following Alexandrian fashions. Over the course of the Ptolemaic period, there was a significant drop recognized in the amount of imported ceramics reaching Naukratis. This seems to be particularly low in the 2nd to 1st century BC contexts excavated by Leonard (Fig. 81). This trend may be explained by Naukratis losing its privileged position as Egypt’s main port of trade to Alexandria.

Roman material uncovered by Petrie’s excavations and Coulson’s survey, suggests the inhabitants of other areas of Roman Naukratis imported Roman style table wares (as well as wine amphorae) from Italy and Tunisia, but also some copies from Syria and Ephesus. This represents a shift in the focus of trade towards the central Mediterranean, expanding the limited trade with Campania and Puglia over the course of the period 360–

---

238 Only 55.8% of artefacts collected during the 1884–1886, 1898–1903 and 1977–82 field seasons were pottery, when ceramics should account for 96.6–99.6% of all artefacts found at Naukratis (based upon 1977–82 and British Museum 2012–16 excavation data).

239 When a statistically significant data set is available for study.
30 BC, represented by Italian black-glaze wares from Apulia, Paestum and transport amphorae from Brindisi and Campania.

An increase in imported pottery during the Byzantine period (Fig. 81), particularly after the late 4th century AD, shows a shift in the main source of these imports to Cyprus, the Levant, Cilicia and (to a lesser degree) Phocaea. This follows identical patterns recognized in Alexandria and its hinterland. This was probably determined by the changing trade and political situation following the founding of Nova Roma in AD 324/330 and the subsequent rift that followed the death of Theodosius I (AD 395) that resulted in the movement of trade away from the western Mediterranean and back towards the north-east – with East Greece and Cyprus as the main trading partners of Naukratis – as was the case when Naukratis was founded in c. 620 BC.

It is not currently possible with the small sample of ceramics (with suitable contextual data) to distinguish the domestic assemblages of different communities at Naukratis. The broader Greek, and subsequently Roman, fashions seem to be found across the site. However, better data from a range of different areas of the town may in the future enable one to distinguish within the ceramic assemblage the role of different identities based on class, religion, vocation and ethnicity, as has been identified in other contemporary Egyptian settlements.

Some observations can be recognized concerning common religious change across Egypt, as some pottery was made to intentionally and clearly communicate certain religious beliefs and practices. Egyptian religious festivals and gods were depicted on Ptolemaic pottery, and Christian symbols and saints were depicted on Byzantine pottery. The shift from Pagan to Christian is well documented and expected, but both productions show close ties between Naukratis and Alexandria (and in the Byzantine period, Abu Minas), the centres of important pagan and subsequently Christian ritual activity and their associated communities.

---

240 Apulian black-glaze sherds: Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria, 9561; 17140; Leiden University Faculty of Archaeology, XI.2; Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, NA149; British Museum, 1914,0317.13.
241 Campanian black-glaze sherds: Spurlock Museum, Champaign, University of Illinois, 1911,02,0014; Antikenmuseum, Heidelberg, I123.
242 See chapter on Stamped amphorae.
243 British Museum, 1925,0119,695.
244 Thomas 2014b, 203.
245 For example the Red Sea ports of Egypt were populated with communities with very different consumption practices (and ceramic assemblages) depending upon their ethnic group, role within the settlements and access to food and pottery (Thomas 2012, 166–99).