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**ABSTRACT (English)**

In this paper, I discuss the advertising model of the Leafless Group (ca. 510–480 BCE), a large workshop of hastily decorated black-figured open shapes. Following a strategy of tight product definition, this workshop’s artisans communicated effectively the visual and functional qualities of their ceramics. I examine the surfaces of a fragmentary *kylix* at the University of Reading, in order to highlight how the Leafless Group was distinct from the Haimon Group, another large-scale producer of black-figured pottery. Although the *kylix* bears figural decoration—a satyr and the eye motif, which may both point to the realm of the wine god Dionysos—here I have not treated these either as a component of a pictorial narrative or as a semiotic unit that served the pot’s symbolism. Instead, I have considered the two images, regardless of their interrelation, as integral aspects of the pot’s visual impact, and of potters’ and painters’ efforts to brand their product in such a way as to make reference both to the workshop (and its business model) and to other earlier and contemporary Athenian figured wares.

**ABSTRACT (Deutsch)**

Der Beitrag untersucht das Werbemodell der sogenannten ‘Leafless Group’, einer Keramikwerkstatt (ca. 510-480 v.Chr.), deren dekoratives Programm aus schnell ausgeführten schwarzfigurigen Formen besteht. Die Werkstatt bediente sich eines genau festgelegten und eng gehaltenen Stils, der die visuellen und praktischen Qualitäten der von ihr dekorierten Keramik deutlich machte. Der Beitrag untersucht die Darstellung auf einem *kylix*-Fragment, welches an der Universität Reading aufbewahrt wird und arbeitet
On Show and on the Go: The Advertising Language of Athenian Pottery
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I. Introduction

Ancient historians, Classical archaeologists, and other academics have paid considerable attention to ancient vase trade, discussing issues such as market targeting, the clients’ acceptance of imports, and maritime and overland connections. There exists, however, little consideration, if any, of how Athenian pottery may have been advertised. Vase scholars seem to refrain from using ‘advertising’ and ‘marketing’, since these terms resonate with modern capitalism. In addition, there has been an underlying assumption that advertising was unnecessary, given the superior qualities of Athenian wares. In technical and stylistic studies there is steadfast admiration for the pots’ light, well-prepared, and durable clays, for the varied repertoire of shapes and sizes, for the shine of the black glaze, and for the accurate draughtsmanship, artistic value, and story-telling potential of the figural decoration. To an extent, scholars have focused on the high aesthetics of finely painted pottery, denigrating pieces that were produced under economies of scale and which featured unrefined and repetitive iconography. What accounts for the
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1 I am indebted to Marta García Morcillo and to Filippo Carlà-Uhink for their long patience with my manuscript, and for their and an external reviewer’s invaluable edits. I presented versions of this paper at workshops in London (May 2015) and Cambridge (June 2017), and I am thankful to audiences there for their feedback. For reading and commenting on earlier drafts, I am extremely grateful, first and foremost, to Amy Smith, as well as to Emma Aston, and to Diana Rodríguez-Pérez, Sally Waite, and other participants of the Ancient Figure-Decorated Pottery interest group. For useful discussion, I would like to thank Athina Chatzidimitriou, Georg Gerleigner, Alastair Harden, Simonetta Menchelli, Mark Stansbury-O’Donnell, Michael Padgett, Melpo Pologiorgi, and Michaela Stark. My thanks extend to Amy Smith, Guja Bandini, and Victoria Keitel (Ure Museum, Reading), to Evangelos Vivliodetis (National Archaeological Museum, Athens), to Lucilla Burn (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge), and to Ann Blair Brownlee (University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia) for allowing me to study pottery in their care. All URLs are correct as at 31 January 2018.

2 See Osborne (1996); De La Genière (2006); Williams (2013); Walsh (2014); Carpenter/Langridge-Noti/Stansbury-O’Donnell (2016).

3 See Lapatin (2008); Padgett (2017); Smith (2017).
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presence and endurance of lesser wares, however, remains underexplored in scholarship.

In this paper, I investigate the advertising language of ceramics decorated hurriedly with black figure that were produced in Athens in the late sixth and early fifth centuries BCE. The low artistic quality of this pottery is evident from the quick brush strokes for the black glaze, from the imprecise and scant incisions, and from iconographic repetition. The advertising language may have played a role in this pottery’s existence and social acceptance. In my discussion, I employ business terminology for analytical purposes only, irrespective of its relevance to the ancient economy. I draw from the research of anthropologist Constantine Nakassis, who has applied Judith Butler’s terms of ‘citationality’ and ‘performativity’ to the study of modern brands, and their imitations, in the Indian apparel industry. Nakassis’ work is enriching and influential within anthropology and sociology. While any direct comparisons with Athenian ceramic production may not be pertinent, Nakassis’ convincing arguments about the power of brands to draw attention to each and every object, regardless of its originality, and to the brands’ manufacturer(s), in India and abroad, can revitalise the study of ancient figured pottery of low artistic merit.

Firstly, I present a case study in product definition by examining closely the surfaces of a fragmentary black-figured eye cup, which is displayed in the Ure Museum of Greek Archaeology at Reading (Fig. 1; 2). I consider visual standardisation to have been at the core of the business model of this cup’s stylistic workshop, probably the Leafless Group (ca. 510–480 BCE). John Beazley coined the ‘Leafless Group’ in 1956 to refer collectively to at least five painters — the Caylus Painter, the Painter of Oxford 237, the Whitworth Painter, the Painter of Oxford 236, and the Painter of Brussels R 245—who, usually but not always, drew branches devoid of leaves in the pictorial field (Fig. 3). Secondly, I examine the distribution of pottery of the Leafless Group, based on current data in the Beazley Archive. Distribution is

4 Nakassis (2012a); (2012b); (2013).
5 Sherlock (2014); Agha (2015).
6 Reading, Ure Museum, 14.9.86; B-APD 331683; http://uredb.reading.ac.uk/cgi-bin/ure/uredb.cgi?rec=14.9.86
7 For the Leafless Group, see Beazley (1952) 157; ABI’s 632-653, 711-713, 716; Para 310-314, 520; Beazley Addenda 145-146; Boardman (1974) 150-151; Moore/Pease Philippides (1986) 96; Brijder (1996) 132; Malagardis/Tsingarida (2008) 79-80.
8 ABI’s 632; 649-653.
particularly wide, with concentrations both in eastern and western Mediterranean markets (Tab. 1; Map 1; Chart 1). The trade and other mechanisms that conditioned the circulation of this pottery may have spread not only ceramic objects but also the brand of the Leafless Group. Distant, and perhaps also random, distribution may have affected these artisans’ production model, especially their persistence with visual standardisation.

I assume that the visual impact of the cup served as an advertisement for the workshop. I consider each piece of pottery therefore not as a single artistic entity, but as an item of ‘affective material culture’ that prompted a psychological and reflexive response on the ancient user. Visual standardisation advertised the Leafless Group both as a stylistic approach to ceramic design and as a physical workshop that existed in time and space. By resembling, and hence referencing, other pots, the cup advertised this workshop and its specialised production. In a way, standardisation contributed to the brand’s creation and recognition.

The organisation of production within this workshop escapes us and, on the whole, there are many gaps in our knowledge about the operations of Archaic and Classical Athenian potteries. Yet we can make inferences about production from the ceramics, which look fairly consistent and repetitive in terms of shape, size, and iconography. It is plausible that ancient vase buyers may have also made similar inferences. Evidently, the potters and painters in the Leafless Group worked as craft specialists, following repetitive procedures in throwing and decorating. Disinterest in innovation and variance may have pertained to the artisans’ calculated efforts to define and defend the brand of the Leafless Group, and to maintain their niche in the vase market. Selling pottery in different locations, mostly far away from Athens, may have acted as an additional impetus for tight product definition, and for persevering with visual standardisation as a self-promotion strategy.

II. Product definition: connoisseurship and branding

9 Robb (2017) 591-592. Archaeologist John Robb uses the concept ‘affective material culture’ as an approach to the study of ancient objects that goes beyond an excessive valorisation of their artistic qualities.

For Beazley and other scholars, connoisseurship has served both as a philosophy and a methodology for defining a pot by grafting authorship onto it.\textsuperscript{11} Following Giovanni Morelli, who was a nineteenth-century connoisseur of Italian painting, the reason for studying meticulously a vase scene has been the identification of the ancient painter’s idiosyncratic drawing habits.\textsuperscript{12} Morellian principles seem to apply, since any vase painter exhibits a unique style of rendering the anatomy and clothing of the human figures within the scene and of adding ornaments within and beyond the pictorial zone.\textsuperscript{13} As a consequence, vase painters who drew in a cursory manner have posed a challenge for connoisseurs. Beazley was perplexed with pottery that dated to the late phases of black figure, specifically to the late sixth and early fifth centuries BCE.\textsuperscript{14} The cup in Reading falls within the class of such difficult-to-attribute specimens.

The fragment originates from the bowl of a black-figured \textit{kylix}, an Attic shape for drinking and playing with wine at the \textit{symposium}.\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Kylikes} were versatile in their display and utilitarian functions. They were used in houses, sanctuaries, and funerals, and sometimes even re-purposed from one domain to another.\textsuperscript{16} The figural side of our fragment shows a hastily-drawn satyr—the quintessential companion of the wine god Dionysos—and, schematically, a staring eye. The painter drew the eye on a larger scale than the satyr and before the satyr, whose knee overlaps the sclera’s outline.\textsuperscript{17} The eye is the left one of a pair of eyes that routinely adorns the two areas bounded by the handles in the flaring walls of a \textit{kylix}. The term ‘eye cup’ usually refers to such \textit{kylikes} bearing large eyes and figural or floral decoration on the outside of the bowl.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} See Lynch (2017) 125-126.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Note, however, the multiple styles by the same painter: Smith (2014).
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Kurtz (1985) 238, 249.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} von Bothmer (1985) 15.
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Richter (1953) iii; Sparkes/Talbot (1970) 88. The game \textit{kottabos} is shown, for example, on a red-figured \textit{kylix} by the Colmar Painter (ca. 500 BCE), on which a reclining \textit{symposiast} flicks a \textit{kylix} with his index finger. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Museum, MS 4871; B-APD 203717. See Beazley (1919) 87.
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Volioti (forthcoming).
  \item \textsuperscript{17} See Frontisi-Ducroux (1989) 153-154.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Eyes also appear, but neither as frequently nor as consistently, on \textit{kyathoi}, mastoids, \textit{skyphoi}, \textit{hydrai}, and \textit{lekythoi}. See Jordan (1988) 332-343.
\end{itemize}
from ca. 530 to 500 BCE. Remarkably, eye cups had non-Attic predecessors, such as Chalcidian kylikes. Starting with Exekias’ ground-breaking eye cup from the 530s BCE, which was innovative in terms of shape, coral-red interior, and poetic composition, eye cups became particularly popular in the repertoire of Athenian pottery makers. Our piece featured familiar iconography, relating visually to wider ceramic trends. I shall return to this point below.

Although the tear duct does not survive, the vertically running contour near the tear duct suggests a male eye. Female eyes are rarer, smaller, and their tear ducts run horizontally. As on our cup, the large eyes with dilated pupils are unrealistic, possibly resembling the eyes of animals, monsters, and Dionysiac and theatrical masks. Multiple, and not necessarily exclusive, interpretations exist in scholarship as to the meaning of the eyes. The eyes may have been prophylactic, apotropaic, while also warning against the excessive consumption of alcohol. In all interpretations, scholars, including John Boardman, Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux, and Gloria Ferrari, are right to stress that the eyes are the eyes of the object, prompting the vase user to engage with the pot and its figural decoration.

Hence, the eye motif emerges as a potent image in terms of advertising the object, strengthening a pot’s self-referential capacity.

20 One such kylix (ca. 530-515 BCE) that I examined in Philadelphia shows long eyebrows, a nose, and ears, all rendered with accurate brush strokes. University of Pennsylvania Museum, MS 4863; Schaus (1995) 33-34, pl. 18.1-4; B-IPD 1002183.
21 See Osborne (2014); Bundrick (2015).
22 Ferrari (1986) 11-12; Jordan (1988) viii, 306-316. An unattributed kylix: University of Missouri-Columbia, 57.4; Biers/Benson (2002) 25, pl. 23.5-6, 24.2-5; B-IPD 9023374.
Our eye cup has not been formally published. It appears in Beazley’s 1956 vase lists, where Beazley assigned it to the ‘Manner of the Haimon Painter’.26 Emilie Haspels, in her seminal classification of black-figured lekythoi of 1936, named the Haimon Painter after a lekythos showing the Theban sphinx’s last victim, Haimon.27 Beazley used the terms ‘Manner of the Haimon Painter’ and the ‘Haimon Group’ interchangeably, denoting the painter’s associates rather than the master himself.28 The Haimon Group (ca. 500/490-460/450 BCE) stands for the last and most prolific workshop in black figure, the extremely unrefined drawing style of which was emulated in non-Athenian potteries, in Boiotia and in other places.29

Understandably, Beazley was careful with attributions to the Haimon Group. For instance, he recorded in his notebooks that a cup from Rhodes was of the Haimon Group, but he left it unattributed in a subsequent publication.30 While Beazley conceptualised the Leafless Group and the Haimon Group as two distinct stylistic workshops, he found it hard to disambiguate between the two. For a kylix in Brooklyn, Beazley revised his own attribution from the Leafless Group to the Haimon Group.31

A question may arise, namely, whether connoisseurship should be abandoned when faced with carelessly and cursorily executed decoration. Besides, our eye cup does not preserve much detail, since it survives as a small fragment that measures just 5.2 by 12.8, and 0.5 cm in thickness. Critiques of connoisseurship abound in scholarship, stressing, most poignantly, its failure to address ancient society.32 Our fragment could be used as a case in point. On the one hand, it could expose the limits of connoisseurship and of

26 ABV 564.587.
31 New York, Brooklyn Museum 33.399; ABV 646.202; Para 284, 310; B-APD 331971. From studying a photograph in the Beazley Archive, the kylix exhibits two traits of the Haimon Group. Firstly, the heavy drapery has been rendered with broad brush strokes and long incisions. Secondly, the figures’ feet and arms are very thin.
epistemological positivism. On the other hand, our piece could call for scholarly approaches other than stylistic analyses. Indeed, the founders of the Ure Museum, Percy Neville Ure and his wife Annie Dunman Ure, valued figured pottery of a lesser artistic merit for its potency to reveal facets of ancient industry and commerce.

Here, I take a slightly different approach. I assume that the detailed study of ceramic surfaces, which falls largely within the legacy of connoisseurship, can assist us in addressing the ancient definition of ceramic products. I consider the pot’s drawing style as integral to the technical and economic aspects of ceramic production, regardless of the style’s relation to ancient aesthetics. My close observations aim to outline the pot’s ancient visuality, that is, the combined visual impact of shape and image. The visual impression of a pot was not only confined to that of the iconography, and its artistic, symbolic, and narrative qualities that were appreciated by viewer-readers who may have treated the pictorial field like a text. Instead, I assume that the effect of the figural decoration combined with that of the pot’s additional visual aspects, such as shape, size, and putative contents.

Of course, ceramic production was a profit-making business. Various individuals, including proprietors, middlemen, and merchants, had a stake in the vase market and promoted ceramics and workshops. We can assume that the details of a ceramic surface that are observable today may coincide with the visual affordances that were communicated by pottery sellers in ancient times. Thus, a pot’s visuality could be suggestive of potters’ and painters’ efforts to endow pottery with selling attributes, whilst also defining themselves and their creations in a consistent fashion in a process that could be compared to modern branding and advertising. Beyond our present-day subjective (in)ability to ascribe authorship at the level of a painter and group, the detailed study of a pot may help in addressing its ancient advertising language.

I argue that our eye cup can be assigned to the Leafless Group and not the Haimon Group as Beazley claimed. I highlight how the artisans of the Leafless Group differentiated themselves from other makers of late black figure with whom they overlapped chronologically and, quite possibly, also spatially. Preliminary publication of a potters’ quarter in the district of Kolonos Hippios
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34 Ure/Ure (1954) v.
35 See Arrington (2017) 36.
suggests that potteries of both the Leafless Group and the Haimon Group operated there.\textsuperscript{36} On the whole, vase painters were mobile and changed workshops during their careers. The Pan Painter (ca. 480-460 BCE), for example, is best understood as a freelance painter, who moved between workshops and decorated shapes by different potters during his lifetime.\textsuperscript{37} One might expect, therefore, the flow of ideas across the workshops of the Leafless and Haimon Groups, and either the homogenisation or hybridisation of their ceramics. Cross-fertilisation between the two groups does not appear to have taken place, judging from published pottery from this quarter.\textsuperscript{38} Product definition within the Leafless Group was remarkably tight. Its artisans seem to have pursued a branding and advertising strategy that imprinted pottery of a particular visuality in buyers' hearts and minds. Additional ceramic producers could have followed a similar strategy, not least because of considerable craft specialisation in the Athenian pottery industry.\textsuperscript{39} The Leafless Group, nonetheless, manifests itself as a coherent group, especially when contrasted with the Haimon Group. Even a genius such as Beazley refrained from sorting out the multitude of different hands within the Haimon Group, let alone in its imitations. Using our fragment in question, I will now discuss how the Leafless Group was distinct in terms of materials and shapes, drawing techniques and styles, and iconographic choices.

IIa. Citing the Leafless Group

The strong brown colour of the clay (\textit{Munsell} 7.5YR 5/6) and its fine composition, which includes some mica, indicate Athenian production. By contrast, pottery of the Haimon Group usually exhibits either more reddish/pinkish tones or non-Attic clays. Artisans in the Haimon Group used different raw clays and firing techniques. Shape specialisation held true for both workshops, with \textit{kylakes} being the prevalent shape in the Leafless Group and \textit{lekythoi} and cup \textit{skyphoi} in the Haimon Group.\textsuperscript{40} In terms of modern

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{36} Baziotopoulou-Valavani (1994) 51. See Williams (2017) 151.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Smith (2006) 450.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Zachariadou/Kyriakou/Baziotopoulou (1985) 45, fig. 6; Malagardis (2008) 23, with references.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Sapirstein (2013).
\item \textsuperscript{40} A fragmentary \textit{lekythos} [Washington, National Museum of Natural History, 440265; Schwarz (1996) 26; \textit{BAPD} 19565] is said to be near both the Leafless and the Haimon
\end{itemize}
typologies, the shape of our kylix, like that of most eye cups, is probably of Beazley’s Type A, which is characterised by a non-offset lip, a fillet at the bowl/stem junction, and a concave edge of the foot. A definitive differentiation from Beazley’s Type sub-A is impossible, given that the underside of the bowl, stem, and foot are all missing. In any case, a peculiarity of the handle excludes our kylix from categorisation as Beazley’s Type B, the dominant shape of the Haimon Group. For our piece, the handle forms an angle of ~35° with the bowl, curving upwards and rising ~1.2 cm above the rim. The handles, therefore, lower the centre of gravity, increasing the stability and functionality of the kylix. For kylikes of the Haimon Group the handles are more horizontal and seldom extend higher than the rim.

With regards to drawing techniques, to render the eye, our painter drew a fine disc by means of wet clay that would turn black upon firing. Next, the painter articulated the iris and pupil by incising with a compass three concentric rings, which measure 2.0, 2.9, and 3.6 cm in diameter respectively. While compass-drawn objects are rare for pottery of the Haimon Group, they appear commonly on specimens of the Leafless Group. For instance, the box and lid of a pyxis of the Leafless Group at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, bear multiple identically sized warriors’ shields in frontal view. A compass was used to draw the shields on this vase and incise the concentric rings on them.

The drawing style of our fragment is atypical of the Haimon Group for three main reasons. Firstly, the satyr does not have the slim, elongated, and

---

41 Beazley (1951) 67; Moore/Pease Philippides (1986) 66; Clark (1990) 61; Fellmann (2004) 13. Our piece compares to two kylikes of the Leafless Group in Athens [National Museum, 657; ABV 646.194; BAPD 331962] and in Paris [Louvre, CA3097; ABV 639.89; Villard (1946) 179, pl. 3.15; BAPD 331857].

42 Moore/Pease Philippides (1986) 67. Kylikes of the Haimon Group are of Ure’s Type E. Ure (1915) 124-126; Cheliotis (1978) 137-141.

43 See Cheliotis (1978) 135, fig. 81.

44 Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, GR 86.1906; ABV 649.248, 652; Beazley Addenda 2 146; BAPD 332016.

45 Note the birds and deer on compass-drawn shields on an elaborate kylix of the Leafless Group: Schwerin, 730; BAPD 331951.
anatomically inaccurate bodies known from the Haimon Group.\textsuperscript{46} Notwithstanding his thin left forearm, the satyr has a fleshy body, with curved contours at the right elbow, buttocks, left knee, and left calf. Our painter appreciated anatomy, differentiating between the buttock and hamstring muscles when applying the slip for the black glaze. Incised anatomical details, such as the lines for the satyr’s hair/face divide, eye, and eyebrow, are more numerous than those shown by painters of the Haimon Group. For example, when I studied a \textit{kylix} of the Haimon Group in the National Archaeological Museum, Athens, which depicts Poseidon and Triton, I noticed minimal incision for facial characteristics.\textsuperscript{47} The satyr exhibits two further stylistic characteristics of the Leafless Group, namely, a tuft of hair projecting from his forehead and a large beard that completely hides the mouth.\textsuperscript{48}

Some visual elements, although surviving only fractionally, fit better within the Leafless Group, rather than the Haimon Group. To the far right of the fragment, the slanting lines may denote branches without leaves, the ultimate identifier of the Leafless Group. The black blob over the eyebrow bears faded dots of accessory white, perhaps indicating a grape cluster.\textsuperscript{49} A black line that measures just 0.7 cm in length appears at the root of the handle. This line could have formed part of a dolphin, a habitual ornament for the handle area in the Leafless Group.\textsuperscript{50} The leftwards tilt of the line and its proximity to the right arm of the handle may suggest either the fin or the degenerate wing of a dolphin facing right.\textsuperscript{51} The line is too pointed to form the tip of an ivy leaf, which was favoured by the Haimon Group.\textsuperscript{52} The band in reserve at the rim

\textsuperscript{46} See \textit{ABL} 131.
\textsuperscript{47} Athens, National Archaeological Museum, 357; \textit{ABV} 561.541; Ghali-Kahil (1950) 60; B-\textit{APD} 331635.
\textsuperscript{48} Malagardis/Tsingarida (2008) 80.
\textsuperscript{49} Contra Eisman (1980) 247: white dots on grape clusters are atypical of the Leafless Group.
\textsuperscript{50} See Vidal (1997) 75.
\textsuperscript{51} For winged dolphins, and their allusion to Perseus fleeing through the sea after killing the Medusa, see Heesen (1996) no. 48, 183.
\textsuperscript{52} For a pointed tip of a leaf near the right handle on a Leafless \textit{kylix}, see Ohio, Toledo Museum of Art, 28.168; Boulter/Luckner (1976) pl. 39.2; B-\textit{APD} 331795. The dolphin and the ivy were not exclusive to the Leafless and the Haimon Groups. Note a dolphin on an unattributed black-figured \textit{kylix} (ca. 530-520) in a private collection [Heesen (1996) no. 48] and an ivy on a \textit{kylix} (ca. 490-480) of the Group of Delos 555 [Beazley] from Rhitsona [Thebes, Archaeological Museum, 17103; Sahetai (2001) 49, pl. 39.4-5].
occurs customarily on *kylikes* of the Leafless Group, whereas those of the Haimon Group usually bear a black line.\(^{53}\)

A re-attribution to the Leafless Group is supported by *comparanda*. Given the high degree of iconographic repetition within the Leafless Group, it becomes relatively easy to find parallels amongst extant pieces. *Comparanda* include a *kylix* in Mainz, on which, except for an all-black sclera, the shape and large size of the left eye are reminiscent of our piece.\(^{54}\) Also similar to our fragment is a *kylix* from Elaious, Thrace, in the Louvre, on which the eye is articulated by a dot incision engulfed in purple, by three discs, and by a sclera in reserve.\(^{55}\) Further parallels are a *kylix* in Rennes, which shows a dolphin facing to the right below each handle, and a *kylix* in Munich that could be by the same hand as the one in Rennes.\(^{56}\) Within the Leafless Group, the *kylix* in Rennes recalls either the Painter of Brussels 245 or the Whitworth Painter.\(^{57}\) These painters’ styles, nonetheless, are more accurate and ornate than that of our cup.

Our painter did not add details, such as purple for the satyr’s beard. Such carelessness is known from further examples of work within the Leafless Group. An eye cup from Sindos, Thessaloniki, for example, shows a bird with incisions below one handle, and a bird in silhouette below the other handle.\(^{58}\) Alternatively, our painter may have abandoned decorating the cup since, when incising the first ring in an anticlockwise direction, the tip of the compass slipped and scratched inside the pupil, compromising the visual salience of the eye. In view of the absence of detail, I would refrain from attributing our fragment to any of Beazley’s five painters within the Leafless Group.

The undetailed drawing style, regardless of whether or not it resulted from a painter’s idiosyncrasy, negligence, or technical fault, need not imply a low
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53 For a broad black line, see a *kylix* of the Haimon Group in Thessaloniki: Aristotle University, Cast Museum, 78; Saripanidi (2012) 52, pl. 27.3.
54 Mainz, Johannes Gutenberg University, 92; Hampe/Simon (1959) 47, pl. 46.6; *B-APD* 19894, attribution, in error, to the Haimon Group.
55 Paris, Louvre, EL14; Villard (1951) pl. 112.5, 112.8, 112.11; *B-APD* 1008006.
57 Laurens/Touchebeu (1979) 24.
58 Thessaloniki, Archaeological Museum, 7820; Tiverios (1985) 232; *B-APD* 15120.
date, as style did not deteriorate consistently with time in late black figure. Neither can archaeological evidence support a date in the late 480s. In the Athenian Agora, a single pot of the Leafless Group, a kylix found in the Stoa Gutter Well, dates to 500–490 BCE. In the Acropolis, fragmentary cups of the Leafless Group from a construction fill south of the Parthenon predate a podium of the early 480s. Scholars tend to date eye cups earlier than other cups of the Leafless Group. Yet, I would leave the date of our fragment unresolved.

In terms of iconographic choices, painters of the Leafless Group had a preference for combat scenes, while those of the Haimon Group favoured chariots. An overlap in subject matter, however, is also known. Herakles fighting the lion appears on two similar kylikes. Beazley assigned one to the Leafless Group and the other to the Haimon Group, possibly basing his decision also on the higher density of incisions for the former.

Parts of the iconography are equally repetitive across the two groups, and beyond them. To use Beazley’s exact wording, our cup shows a ‘satyr with drinking-horn’. Beazley compared our eye cup with two kylikes of the Haimon Group in Orvieto and the Louvre. As these are not eye cups but both show dancing maenads and satyrs, Beazley may have likened the satyr on our piece to satyrs on the two kylikes. A horn-carrying satyr, nonetheless, is found on countless pots. Specimens include a skyphos of the Haimon Group (ca. 490-480 BCE) depicting a satyr and a maenad, a column krater of the Leagros Group (ca. 525-500 BCE) portraying the return of Hephaistos, and a lekythos by the Edinburgh Painter (ca. 500 BCE) featuring a chariot.

---

59 See ABL 140.
60 Athens, Agora, P 24117; ABV 716; Roberts (1986) 22, no. 31; B-APD 307012.
63 Leafless Group: Nostell Priory, 36; ABV 646.197; Para 312; Beazley Addenda 2 146; B-APD 331965. Haimon Group: Louvre CA 3103; ABV 564.588; B-APD 331684. From studying a photograph in the Beazley Archive, the layout is identical to the kylix at Nostell Priory. Yet, Heracles’ waist is slim and the draped female behind Heracles has a typical Haimonian posture.
64 ABV 564.587.
65 ABV 564.585; 564.586; B-APD 331681 and 331682; photographs in the Beazley Archive.
66 Thessaloniki, Archaeological Museum, 9410; Sismanidis (1998) 47–48, pl. 63.1-2; B-APD 24481.
67 Agrigento, Museo Archeologico Regionale, C1535; Calderone (1985) 8, pl. 5.1, 6.1; B-APD 15675.
procession. The satyr, as a popular visual unit, could enter different pictorial narratives. What is distinct for the painters of the Leafless Group, however, is their tendency to place a satyr by the handle, and between the handle and the eye in the case of eye cups. Apparently, the painters of the Leafless Group appropriated a familiar unit and standardised its presence on their creations, shaping viewers’ expectations as to where to look for a satyr.

The eye motif is scarce for pottery of the Haimon Group, but prevalent for that of the Leafless Group. A search in the database of the Beazley Archive for *Haimon* under ‘Artist Name’ and for *eye* under ‘Decoration Description’ returned only five records, inclusive of our eye cup. The remaining four pieces are three *kylikes* from Adria, Spina, and Crimea, and a mastoid in the auction market. The two small fragments from Adria, both of a left eye, feature, like our cup, a sclera in reserve with a smooth continuous curve at the top right for the sclera’s outline. The *kylikes* from Spina and Crimea depict eyes with all-black scleras, which became fashionable later than scleras in reserve. Typically for the Haimon Group, the specimens from Spina and Crimea also show a chariot procession and gesticulating maenads respectively.

Despite their large corpus and iconographic diversity, *lekythoi* of the Haimon Group do not seem to favour the eye motif. As it emerges from a search of the Beazley Archive, eyes decorate 127 *lekythoi* of the Hound-and-Hare Group, Phanyllis Group, Cock Group, Little Lion Class, Class of Athens 581i and 581ii, by the Gela Painter, and in Six’s technique. All these makers of *lekythoi* were active at the sixth/fifth century turn, and, hence,
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contemporaries of the Leafless Group (ca. 510 to 480 BCE) but earlier than the Haimon Group (ca. 500/490-460/450 BCE). With the depiction of eyes, the painters of the Leafless Group followed fashionable themes.

Thus, our fragment should be assigned to the Leafless Group, which was considerably different from the Haimon Group in terms of materials, shape details, drawing techniques, painting style, and iconographic choices. The Leafless Group emerges as a workshop that catered for well-defined products, which guided vase buyers’ attention to the pots and their makers. Our cup resembled, and hence pointed to, other pieces within the Leafless Group and beyond it. The pot’s visuality became influential also through a broader context of ideas about throwing and decorating ceramics. I turn to examine how artisans of the Leafless Group may have branded their creations with reference to established technical, stylistic, and iconographic trends.

IIb. Citing Ceramic Conventions

The interplay between the specific and the general in our fragment’s advertising language becomes apparent when we discuss further the cup’s function and drawing conventions. In envisaging the active use of material culture, any distinction between viewing and using pottery could be deemed unnecessary. The handling of *kylikes*, such as during their stacking for transport and their inspection when deciding on a purchase, facilitated the appreciation of the pots’ distinct visuality.

Our piece is hard fired and sturdy, even though the clay has air pockets that suggest insufficient kneading prior to throwing.\(^{78}\) In making and firing *kylikes*, the handle/bowl junction could result in cracks and other failures.\(^{79}\) The handle is firmly attached. The rim’s edge is smooth and suited for drinking, as it is covered with a transparent slip and with black glaze.

The pot’s function called to mind also broader trends in the pottery industry. Based on the arc formed by the rim, the diameter of the complete cup can be estimated as 22.6 cm. If filled up to the rim, our cup may have held approximately 1.1 litres, which is the capacity of another black-figured cup of Beazley’s Type A measuring 22.4 cm in diameter (as opposed to \(\sim 22.6\) cm.

\(^{79}\) See Aloupi-Siotis (2008) 123.
for our *kylikes*. Modern coffee mugs fit ~ 0.225 litres, approximately one fifth of such *kylikes*. Our pot’s small size is typical for late black figure, for which most pottery was destined for personal rather than communal use. Likewise, the diameters of small red-figured *kylikes* that date to ca. 525-480 BCE show a median at 23 cm. Our potter, then, may have been knowledgeable about dimensional standardisation both in black figure and in red figure. Throwing a cup as a distinctive product of the Leafless Group did not mean that it was so unique that it could not compare visually and functionally to other pots. Comparisons may have been desirable, as indicated by the sets of drinking cups in different techniques that were used concurrently in a late Archaic household in the Athenian Agora.

If we examine further the rendering of the satyr and of the eye, it is possible to identify how our cup capitalised on established drawing conventions. The satyr’s tail is partially buried beneath the handle, as if the potter appended the handle after the painting of the figures. The painter may have wished the vase buyer to consider the handle as an integral part of the scene, and not as an obstruction to viewing. In addition, the painter may have hinted at an earlier tendency of placing the figural decoration near the handle area of eye cups, as also exhibited in Exekias’ masterpiece in Munich.

For the eye, the black of the second iris ring is less shiny when studied under electrical light. The matt appearance would suggest that, as on other eye cups, this ring was originally covered by a layer of accessory white. Indeed, a trace of slip, possibly white, fills a small section of the groove separating the first from the second ring. The dot incision at the eye’s centre, left by the tip of the compass, is surrounded by a thin purple line. Such a purple blob may derive from sixth-century red-figured eye cups.

---

80 Munich, Antikensammlungen, 2057; Fellmann (2004) 78, pl. 45.1-7; Clark (2009) 96, table 1.
81 See Beazley (1951) 87.
82 Tsingarida (2009) 186, fig. 2.
84 See Tiverios (1981b) 35.
85 Munich, Antikensammlungen, 8729 (2044); Para 60.21; Cohen (1978) 244-245; Fellmann (2004) 13-19, pl. 2.1-2; B-APD 310403.
86 Munich, Antikensammlungen, M 1042; Fellmann (2004) 94; B-APD 9031572.
The use of attributes from ceramic traditions could have served the purposes of advertising, and it would have benefited from vase buyers’ familiarity with such attributes. I have explored the potentially pleasing psychological effects of repetitive iconography in another paper about late black figure. A parallel could be made with modern times. Consumer research has revealed that people tend to engage repeatedly with enjoyable and familiar experiences, such as reading their favourite books again and again. Volitional re-consumption is not only emotionally reassuring, but it also allows people to creatively form links between past and present experiences.

Here, in unpacking the business model of the Leafless Group, I postulate that the visual citation of earlier trends in Athenian ceramic production may have mattered also for strengthening this workshop’s place in the vase market. On the one hand, the artisans of this group positioned themselves vis-à-vis their contemporaries by defending the distinct visuality of their pottery. On the other hand, the sequence of Athenian eye cups that started with Exekias’ κύλις from the 530s BCE, as well as wider ceramic traditions in black figure and in red figure, provided a pool of visual references that could be re-used and re-cited again for the purposes of advertising. No vase scholarship exists that traces the extent of loyalty and stability in consumption patterns. Scholars have argued convincingly, however, that iconographic repetition facilitated the recognition of an image in foreign markets by structuring and imprinting the exchange of visual information in vase buyers’ minds.

In effect, the Leafless Group’s ceramics might be likened to modern consumer goods that are classed as cash cows in business parlance. Although such goods are unoriginal and unspectacular, they generate much of a company’s revenue. Returns from cash cows can be particularly high, notwithstanding low, or even zero, growth in their market. Computer giant IBM, for example, has been supporting old-fashioned mainframe computing systems as cash cows, since many financial institutions worldwide rely upon these systems. For the Leafless Group, visual consistency, and the craft

88 Volioti (2017).
89 Russell/Levy (2012).
90 Ibid.
specialisation that sustained it, may be conceptualised as strategies for maximising profit. While the artisans in this workshop were skilful and knowledgeable, if they introduced innovations and variability in their pottery that would not necessarily guarantee higher returns. To investigate further this workshop’s business model, I turn to discuss the geographical distribution of its pottery.

III. Distribution Patterns: Branding for Distant Trade

In the late sixth and early fifth centuries BCE the presence of Athenian pottery increased substantially in local and distant markets, in mainland Greece, the Aegean, and across the shores of the Mediterranean and the Black Seas. Hurriedly made black-figured wares account by far for this sharp rise in Athenian ceramic exports. During this time, red-figured pottery was finely decorated and produced in small quantities, perhaps owing to red figure being labour intensive and not easily replicable. The cursorily executed scenes on black-figured pottery were, predominantly, generic and ambivalent as to the identity of the portrayed characters. Painters may have favoured this ambiguity so that pottery appealed to customers in different places. Vase viewers could interpret the meaning and narrative of the scene differently, depending on their local cultural contexts. Pictorial ambiguity may have served also as a form of stylisation. Beyond an interpretative approach and an emphasis on iconographic meaning, I assume that the visuality of late black-figured pots may have conveyed simple messages about what these ceramics stood for in terms of display, function, and monetary or other value. Trading pottery of the Leafless Group also pertained to disseminating this brand.

Pots of the Leafless Group were distributed widely, which is typical for late black figure (Tab. 1 and Map 1). Existing studies have suggested that this workshop targeted eastern markets. Charlotte Scheffer, based on Beazley’s vase lists from the early 1970s, identified a concentration in Greece and the Aegean. Yasemin Tuna-Nörling analysed archaeological evidence

---

93 Paleothodoros (2009).
94 Volioti (2007).
and drew attention to a clustering in Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{98} To evaluate this workshop’s markets, I examine current data in the Beazley Archive.

At the time of writing, the Beazley Archive lists 660 pieces that are said to be of the Leafless Group. But the total comes down to 659 by discounting a double entry for a kylix from Thera.\textsuperscript{99} This dataset should be treated with caution. There might be additional pottery of the Leafless Group that scholars have wrongly assigned to the Haimon Group.\textsuperscript{100} In addition, a large amount of late black figure, the volume of which is difficult to estimate, remains unpublished in museum and other collections. The 659 specimens, therefore, are indicative, but not necessarily representative, of ancient distribution patterns.

A plot of the 424 pieces with known provenances (64\% of 659) reveals a dispersed pattern (Map 1). Findspots are scattered widely from Iran to Spain and from Egypt to Ukraine. Both maritime and overland connections would have enabled this distribution, as manifested by locations far inland, such as Susa. To discuss the pattern, I review the home market of Athens and Attica. Next, I envisage trade routes from Athens in an eastern, western, northern, and southern direction.

Given the workshop’s operations at Kolonos Hippios, one could expect a considerable circulation of its pottery locally. Only 51 kylikes (12\% of 424) come from Athens, including 26 from the Agora, where black-figured stemmed cups are scarce.\textsuperscript{101} A low occurrence, 26 kylikes (6\% of 424), holds true also for Attica. Pots from Athens and Attica that are not recorded in the Beazley Archive are few, and these include a fragmentary kylix from a disturbed non-burial context in central Athens and a kylix from a grave at

\textsuperscript{98} Tuna-Nörling (1995) 146, fig. 31.
\textsuperscript{99} BAPD 5413 and 8745 for the same pot. A piece from Ampurias in Beazley’s lists (\textit{ABV} 641.123) is missing from the online database.
\textsuperscript{100} Dräger (2007) 88: a kylix of the Leafless Group [Taranto, 143472; Lo Porto (1998) 14, pl. 15.1-4] has been attributed in error to the Haimon Painter.
Like other Athenian potteries, the Leafless Group catered for distant rather than local markets.\(^{103}\)

To the East and Southeast of Athens, the Beazley Archive records 137 pieces (32% of 424), all kylikes except for a skyphos from Chios. Concentrations are noted in the islands by the Ionian coast, especially at Samos and Rhodes, as well as at urban centres in Asia Minor (Klazomenai, Smyrna, and Xanthos).\(^{104}\) Local commercial networks may also have affected the (re)distribution of pottery and its dispersal further afield as shown by low occurrences in Ionia (Larissa, Myrina, Pitane, and Sardis) and the Levant (Cyprus, Al-Mina, and modern Israel).\(^{105}\)

In a westwards direction from Athens, there are 134 pieces (32% of 424), mostly kylikes, but also a few skyphoi, mastoid cups, kyathoi, and a non-diagnostic fragment.\(^{106}\) A sizeable amount (55) has been excavated in Etruria, inclusive of a concentration of 23 kylikes at Adria. Despite high Etruscan demand, no specimens are reported from Spina, where kylikes of the Haimon Group have been found.\(^{107}\) It is possible that the workshops of the Leafless and the Haimon Groups used merchants who were active in different areas. Outside Etruria, the distribution is fairly dispersed. Only 12 pieces have been found in Sicily, where black-figured lekythoi were preponderant.\(^{108}\) Further west from the Italian peninsula, low occurrences are noted in Sardinia (3), south France (4), and Spain (7), suggestive of non-bulk trade.

In my analysis, the number of findspots eastwards and south-eastwards from Athens (137) is comparable to that from western destinations (134) (Chart 1). Whether merchants targeted primarily eastern markets becomes

---

102 Athens: unpublished fragmentary kylix from the metro excavations in central Athens (Dr. Pologiorgi, pers. communication, January 2014). Glyka Nera: Athens, 2nd Ephorate, Koropi, AK 182; Chatzidimitriou/Papafloratou (2008) 419, 432, fig. 19. I note a further find from Kallithea, southern Athens, which is said to be of either the Leafless or the Haimon Group: Petritaki (2000) 103, figs. 13-14. Judging from the illustration, I would leave this piece unattributed.


105 Eriksson (2011) 186: 7 kylikes of the Leafless Group from Cyprus. I am grateful to Dr. Eriksson for permission to cite her thesis.

106 See Bruni et al (1993) 279; BAPD 43754. I am grateful to Dr. Menchelli for information about this piece.


questionable. Etruria emerges as another strong market, possibly owing to preferences for Athenian sympotic pottery there.\textsuperscript{109} Despite concentrations in major towns and trading ports, such as Smyrna and Adria respectively, findspots are dispersed within Ionian and Etruscan territories. Possibly, market targeting and formal trade operated alongside other mechanisms, including interpersonal and gift exchange, yielding a spread-out pattern.

To the North of Athens, there are no entries for central Greece in the Beazley Archive. Finds include two kylikes, one from a site near the Temple of Apollo Daphnephoros in Eretria and one from the Sanctuary of Apollo at Kalapodi.\textsuperscript{110} All 62 kylikes from northern locations (15% of 424) originate from places far away from Athens, such as the North Aegean, the Hellespont, the Sea of Marmara, and the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{111} The concentration at Olbia, 18 pieces (4% of 424), could indicate yet another target area, and perhaps it reflects the entanglement of pottery trade with that of foodstuffs and wine.\textsuperscript{112}

A few pieces, 12 (3% of 424), relate to southwards journeys from Athens, 10 kylikes, a skyphos, and a fragment from an open shape.\textsuperscript{113} In fact, the find from Tiryns may have resulted from westwards journeys circumnavigating the Peloponnese.\textsuperscript{114} The remaining findspots (Knossos, Naucratis, Cyrene, and Tocra) are, again, far away from Athens and quite dispersed.

While some market targeting and bulk trade may have taken place in the eastern Mediterranean, in Etruria, and in Crimea, pottery of the Leafless Group reached a variety of locations in small quantities. Distant trade may account, to a certain extent at least, for visual standardisation. Since the artisans of the Leafless Group were not in direct contact with customers, they relied on salespeople who communicated with buyers in far-away places. With visual standardisation the potters and painters of the Leafless Group may have

\textsuperscript{111} I would tentatively attribute a further kylix from Thessaloniki to the Caylus Painter: Karabournaki, excavations, K2000.113; Manakidou (2012) 97, fig. 5a. Kylikes of the Leafless Group are displayed in the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros (seen April 2008). For another 11 fragmentary kylikes from Phanagoria, see Morgan (2004) 94-97, nos. 233-243.
\textsuperscript{112} See Osborne (1996); Tiverios (2016) 22, with references.
\textsuperscript{113} Moore et al (1987) 41; BAPD 28714. From the illustration, I believe this is a kylix.
\textsuperscript{114} See Pettegrew (2011).
aided salespeople in their sales pitch, since the distinctive characteristics of the pottery were easily recognisable and talked about. The ways in which each piece cited the workshop and other contemporary or earlier pottery offered additional opportunities for advertising. Trade also meant the wider spreading of a brand, that of the Leafless Group and of Attic pottery more generally. Salesmen’s feedback to the workshop back in Athens meant that its artisans had reasons to persist with standardisation, and not to embrace change. In addition, by specialising in the production of small wine cups for personal use, the artisans of this group addressed demand in diverse sympotic cultures, such as in Cyprus and the Middle East.115

IV. On Show and on the Go

In this paper, I have presented a case study about the Leafless Group, a late Archaic Athenian workshop of hastily decorated black-figured open shapes. This group’s advertising model may apply to additional producers of figured pottery, who competed with each other for similar markets. I have argued that the practices of the potters and painters of the Leafless Group imprinted a unique ceramic visuality in vase buyers’ minds. This visuality was made up of the combined visual impact of size, shape, and iconography, all of which were standardised within the Leafless Group. I have linked the workshop’s production model to an advertising model that centred on promoting the Leafless Group through visual standardisation. Following a strategy of tight product definition, this workshop’s artisans communicated effectively the visual and functional qualities of their ceramics. The simple and repetitive communication messages might be likened to those employed in successful modern advertising.

I have examined the surfaces of a fragmentary kylix at the University of Reading, in order to highlight how the Leafless Group was distinct from the Haimon Group, another large-scale producer of black-figured ceramics. With its distinctiveness, the Leafless Group defined and defended its brand, as well as its place in the vase market. Although the kylix bears figural decoration—a satyr and the eye motif, which may both point to the realm of the wine god Dionysos—here I have not treated these either as a component of a pictorial narrative or as a semiotic unit that served the pot’s symbolism. Instead, I have

115 Cyprus: for the preponderance of wine cups at Marion, see Padgett (2009) 221. I am grateful to Dr. Padgett for this reference. Middle East: de Vries (1977) 545.
considered the two images, regardless of their interrelation, as integral aspects of the pot's visual impact, and of potters' and painters' efforts to brand their product in such a way as to make reference both to the workshop (and its business model) and to other earlier and contemporary Athenian figured wares. The duality of the advertising language, which capitalised on both the Leafless and the Attic brands, could have been particularly effective in selling pottery to a wide clientele in target markets in Etruria, south-eastern Aegean, and Crimea, as well as in dispersed locations that stretched from Iberia to Persia and from North Africa to the Black Sea.
Katerina Volioti
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Illustrations

Figure 1: Ure Museum of Greek Archaeology, Reading, 14.9.86. Fragment showing a satyr and an eye. Findspot: unknown. Photograph: courtesy of the Ure Museum. © University of Reading. See http://uremuseum.org/cgi-bin/ure/uredb.cgi?rec=14.9.86
Figure 2: Scale drawing of fragment in Figure 1. Drawing: Chloe Maddock.
Figure 3: Ure Museum of Greek Archaeology, Reading. 22.3.1. Pot by the Caylus Painter that depicts Athena combating a giant. Findspot: perhaps near Ruvo. Photograph: courtesy of the Ure Museum. © University of Reading. See http://uremuseum.org/cgi-bin/ure/uredb.cgi?rec=22.3.1
Table 1: Findspots of 424 pieces with known provenances in the Beazley Archive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region / trade route</th>
<th>Number of pots</th>
<th>Findspot</th>
<th>Number of pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Agora</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athens, unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eleutherai</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glyphada</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nea Makri and Marathon</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trachones</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draphi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwards and south-eastwards from Athens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East from Athens</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Karystos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Myrina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pitane</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Klazomenai</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sardis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast from Athens</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Thera</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xanthos</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Al-Mina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gezer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hebron</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region / trade route</td>
<td>Number of pots</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Number of pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West from Athens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth and surroundings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Perachora</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corinth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isthmus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Italy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruvo</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gioia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rutigliano</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metaponto</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cavallino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and northern Italy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Montebello di Bertona</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colfiorito di Foligno</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Severino Marche</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senigallia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Martino, Gattara</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Himera</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Messina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monte San Mauro</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabucina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sicily, unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monte Iato</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selinus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pyrgi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravisca</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Falerii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saturnia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scansano</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tarquinia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region / trade route</td>
<td>Number of pots</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Number of pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marzabotto</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiusi</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulci</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruria, unspecified</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adria</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Naples and surroundings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baiac</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzuoli</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nola</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fratte di Salerno</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suessula</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sardinia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palattu</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharros</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South France</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Pierre, Martigues</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseilles</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensérune</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampurias</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ullastret</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleyl</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwards from Athens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Aegean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindos</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalcidice</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oisyme</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hellespont and Sea of Marmara</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaiious</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daskyleion</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Sea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia Pontica</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histria</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berezan</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nymphaion</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panticapaion/Kerch</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taman</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Advertising Language of Athenian Pottery

#### Chart 1: Distribution in the home and distant markets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region / trade route from Athens</th>
<th>Number of pots</th>
<th>Findspot</th>
<th>Number of pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South from Athens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer South from Athens</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Argolis, Tiryns</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knossos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naukratis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyrene</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tocra</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Home market
- East and Southeast from Athens
- West from Athens
- North from Athens
- South from Athens
Map 1: Distribution of 424 pots of the Leafless Group. Sketch map: author.