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ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

Errors in the text:

p. 22, line 9: “although it omits” should read: “although it largely omits”
p. 23, note. 68: “(ref till kapitel)” should read: “(Chapter 3)”
p. 36, line 6 from the bottom: “was constructed around the area” should read: “was constructed around part of the area”
p. 38, Fig. 7: “showing all current” should read “showing current”; “(Wilson et al. 2002)” should read “(Wilson et al. 2002, fig. 11)”
p. 131, line 6: “(see XXXX above)” should read: “(see pp. 103-104)”
p. 200, lines 9-10: The sentence “These will be discussed…” should be deleted.
p. 221, final line: “from the Punic imports” should read: “from the Punic world”
p. 223, lines 5-6 from the bottom: “was discussed in Chapter 3” should read: “was discussed above”
p. 246, line 2: “Aarhus 2004” should read “Aarhus 2005”.

Errors regarding the amphorae:

Cat. Nos. 117-119 are dated to the 5th century BC or earlier and are residual
Cat. No. 129 is dated to the 5th century BC and is residual
Cat. No. 183-184 are dated to the 5th century BC and are residual
Cat. No. 254 is Mendean, not Thasian
Cat. Nos. 262-268 are Mendean, not Thasian
Cat. Nos. 272-274 are North Aegean, but not Mendean
Cat. Nos. 275-276 are probably from the Knidos area
Cat. No. 281 is a Late Archaic amphora from Lesbos
Cat. Nos. 283-284 are Thasian, not Chian
Cat. Nos. 286-288 are dated to the 5th century BC and are residual
Cat. Nos. 282, 285, 291 and 292 are Aegean amphorae but not Chian
Cat. No. 293 is dated to the late 7th century and is residual
Cat. Nos. 296-297 are dated no later than 480 BC and are residual
Cat. Nos. 301-303 are Chian, not Koan
Cat. Nos. 310-315 are North Aegean, not Knidian
Cat. No. 320 is Chian, not Knidian
Cat. Nos. 323-325 are Chian, not Knidian