POTTERY, PEOPLES AND PLACES

STUDY AND INTERPRETATION OF LATE HELLENISTIC POTTERY

Edited by Pia Guldager Bilde and Mark L. Lawall

POTTERY, PEOPLES AND PLACES

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

BLACK SEA STUDIES

16

THE DANISH NATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION'S
CENTRE FOR BLACK SEA STUDIES

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

POTTERY, PEOPLES AND PLACES

Study and Interpretation of Late Hellenistic Pottery

Edited by
Pia Guldager Bilde and Mark L. Lawall

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

POTTERY, PEOPLES AND PLACES

© Aarhus University Press and the authors 2014

Cover design by Narayana Press
Front cover photos: Amphoriskoi, jug and plate from Kedesh excavations: Berlin, Herbert and Stone, Fig. 9. Background: profiles of mouldmade bowls from Mesambria and Apollonia, A. Petrova.

Ebook production Narayana Press, Gylling

ISBN 978 87 7124 424 3

AARHUS UNIVERSITY PRESS
Langelandsgade 177
DK-8200 Aarhus N

White Cross Mills
Lancaster LA1 4XS
England

70 Enterprise Drive
Bristol, CT 06010
USA

www.unipress.dk

The publication of this volume has been made possible by generous grants from the Aarhus University Research Foundation

Danish National Research Foundation's
Centre for Black Sea Studies
University of Aarhus
DK-8000 Aarhus C
www.pontos.dk

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

CONTENTS

Preface 7

Pia Guldager Bilde and Mark L. Lawall
Introduction 9

PART 1. CHRONOLOGIES **15**

Nathan Badoud
The Contribution of Inscriptions to the Chronology of Rhodian Amphora Eponyms 17

M.L. Lawall, P. Guldager Bilde, L. Bjerg, S. Handberg, J.M. Højte
The Lower City of Olbia Pontike Occupation and Abandonment in the 2nd Century BC 29

Sarah James
Bridging the Gap: Local Pottery Production in Corinth 146-44 BC 47

Guy D. R. Sanders, Yuki Miura & Lynne Kvapil
A Re-examination of some of the South Stoa Wells at Corinth 65

Susan I. Rotroff
Sulla and the Pirates 83

PART 2. TYPOLOGY **111**

Christine Rogl
Mouldmade Relief Bowls from Ephesos – The Current State of Research 113

Nina Fenn
The Hellenistic Mouldmade Bowl Production at Priene –
A Case Study Concerning the Reception of Ephesian Examples 141

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

Patricia Kögler
Table Ware from Knidos: The Local Production during the 2nd and 1st centuries BC 157

Georgij Lomtadze & Denis Žuravlev
Hellenistic Pottery from the Necropolis of Olbia Pontike 175

Anelia Bozkova
West Slope Pottery from Mesambria Pontike 199

Aneta Petrova
A Pontic Group of Hellenistic Mouldmade Bowls 215

Vasilica Lungu & Pierre Dupont
Imports and Local Imitations of Hellenistic Pottery in the Northwest Black Sea Area: Hadra and Pseudo-Hadra Wares 233

Denis Žuravlev & Natalia Žuravleva
Late Hellenistic Pottery and Lamps from Pantikapaion: Recent Finds 255

Valentina V. Krapivina
Late Hellenistic Red-Slip Ware in Olbia 287

Part 3. Ceramics and Culture **295**

John Lund
Pots and Politics: Reflections on the Circulation of Pottery in the Ptolemaic and Seleukid Kingdoms 297

Andrea Berlin, Sharon Herbert, and Peter Stone
Dining In State: The Table Wares from the Persian-Hellenistic Administrative Building at Kedesh 307

Jean-Paul Morel
Les campaniennes A et B, deux aspects d'une 'globalisation' économique et culturelle des céramiques tardo-hellénistiques 323

Bibliography 337
Index 371
List of Contributors 385

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

Preface

The papers in this volume were delivered at a conference held in 2008. In the intervening years, the editors' scholarly efforts were often distracted by other projects. This is a common enough occurrence, and in most cases the resulting delays are simply regrettable. In the present case, however, the delays meant that our colleague Pia Guldager Bilde was never able to see the final results of her efforts.

Pia passed away on January 10, 2013, after a prolonged struggle with cancer. She knew that much progress had been made in editing the present volume; indeed, she had carried out the initial formatting and editing of many of the papers. The contributors to this volume, much like those of other volumes in the Black Sea Studies series, represent a coming together of Pontic and Aegean/Eastern Mediterranean scholars. The Sandbjerg conference epitomized the impact of Pia's energy and determination to break down the linguistic, cultural, political and academic divisions that had so long isolated Pontic scholarship from the Greco-Roman mainstream. The Olbia project – the reason why I became involved with the organization of this conference and the editing of this volume – likewise demonstrated the depth and success of academic collaboration that could be achieved under Pia's guidance.

The contributors to this volume join me in expressing our deepest gratitude to Pia for bringing us all together. We have all lost a dear friend and guiding spirit.

Winnipeg, June 2013

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

Introduction

Pia Guldager Bilde and Mark L. Lawall

The papers published here were presented at a conference held at the Sandbjerg Manor, Denmark, in late November 2008, focused on the study of ceramics in the Mediterranean and Pontic regions in the 2nd century BC. The host of the conference, the Danish National Research Foundation's Centre for Black Sea Study, was in the process of finalizing the manuscript on the Lower City excavation at Olbia Pontike where the 2nd century BC was a period both of great activity and of significant decline. Though not the only artefacts attesting to this tumultuous period of Olbia's history, the ceramic remains provided, by far, the most compelling evidence for the chronological sequence of events and for the cultural contacts shaping Late Hellenistic life at Olbia. The Centre's work at Olbia and the thriving network of scholars that developed around that work, whether working in the Pontic region or in the Aegean/Mediterranean worlds more generally, created the opportunity to open new discussion on the ceramic record of the Greco-Roman world of the 2nd century BC.

The resulting conference addressed three main themes: (a) chronologies; (b) production, distribution and influence of selected ceramic types; and (c) broader socio-economic interpretations based on the ceramic record. Many of the papers fit neatly into one or another of these themes, so they fall easily into place in this volume. Others address multiple themes; and some element of editorial decision was needed to align these papers with those most kindred to them within the volume. Indeed, it is very much in the spirit of the Sandjerg conference that papers whose primary focus is chronology or typology should also consider broader interpretive problems.

Chronology

First, given recent advances in and critical reconsiderations of Hellenistic artefact chronologies, the program included papers directly addressing chronological 'fixed points' and methodological considerations of how we build chronologies for ceramic types. In the first paper in this section, Nathan Badoud provides a fundamental deconstruction of the past scholarship that built the Rhodian eponym chronology without sufficient attention to the epigraphical record of the island. The corrections he proposes here, based on closer attention to patterns in the Rhodian calendar and Rhodian prosopography, make clear earlier erroneous assumptions about larger groups of stamps with terminal dates as provided by destructions and abandonments. Even

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

so, such archaeological 'fixed points', remain very important in building ceramic chronologies. Indeed, the Olbia publication project struggled greatly with the date of the Lower City's abandonment in the late 2nd century. This abandonment is not explicitly attested in any textual source, so the ceramic and numismatic evidence figured heavily in any argumentation. The paper by members of the Olbia project derives a chronology of abandonment from intersecting patterns of present and absent datable artefacts in the ceramic and numismatic records of the Lower City. Even at sites for which there is a richer textual tradition, interpretation of the ceramic record in terms of the attested abandonments/destructions can prove difficult. Corinth's destruction by the Romans in 146 BC may be the most significant – and most debated – fixed point in Hellenistic archaeology, and two papers from that site highlight the detrimental impact of uncritical acceptance of traditional interpretations. Sarah James, having drawn renewed attention to the problems surrounding the view of Corinth as utterly abandoned between ca. 146 and 44 BC, argues for the continuation of Corinthian local pottery production shortly after 146 BC. Guy Sanders, Yuki Miura and Lynne Kvapil revisit the excavation records and material found in wells in the South Stoa at Corinth to reconsider both the filling-dates of the wells and the morphological developments of Corinthian pottery types as determined from finds in those wells. In her contribution, Susan Rotroff seeks to distinguish two, textually attested attacks on Delos in the early 1st century BC through the evidence provided by finds from the French and Greek excavations.

Typology

The second major theme of the conference was to provide overviews of evidence for production and typological developments of various major classes of Late Hellenistic pottery. These surveys of material provide fundamental evidence for the transmission of material culture around the Hellenistic world wherever such ceramics were found. Papers in this volume, however, place most emphasis on Asia Minor and the Black Sea regions. The mouldmade bowls of Ephesos represent a late Hellenistic type of wide distribution. Hence, Christine Rogl's paper covers a wide range of topics related to these bowls from details of manufacture and decoration to their chronological developments. In doing so, she provides a significant reference point for researchers throughout the late Hellenistic world and highlights the complexity of this class of ceramics even before one enters the further problems of types imitative of Ephesian products. Ephesian mouldmade bowls comprise the most common class among the bowls found at Priene, and these imports are one focus of Nina Fenn's paper. Fenn, however, also introduces the mouldmade bowl production of Priene itself and in doing so highlights the very strong cultural influence of Ephesian ceramic production. A similar combination of, first, typological and chronological documentation and, then, socio-economic

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

interpretation is found packaged into one paper, here, by Patricia Kögler dealing with late Hellenistic table wares at Knidos. While the stamped transport amphorae from this city figure significantly in many studies of late Hellenistic economies and the city's export interests, Kögler's focus on changes in the local table wares refocuses attention on the tension between longstanding local traditions and external (especially Pergamene and Italian) influence.

Changing ceramic assemblages and typological developments within selected classes of late Hellenistic ceramics provide the focus for a series of papers on material found at sites around the Black Sea. Georgij Lomtadze and Denis Žuravlev provide a survey of the changing ceramic types included in a series of early 3rd through early 1st century BC burials at Olbia. The paper highlights the wide range of sources contributing ceramics to the market at Olbia and ultimately to use as grave goods. Anelia Bozkova's paper surveys finds of imported and locally produced pottery with West Slope style decoration at Mesambria Pontike. Many of the imported examples find their best parallels in the products of Asia Minor, and the local imitative types show some degree of inspiration from these imports; however, other local(?) products downplay or even reject the West Slope decorative style. Aneta Petrova's article on mouldmade bowls of a grey-ware group commonly found at Mesambria, as well as other sites along the western and northern coasts of the Black Sea, likewise highlights the immense geographical range of sites providing comparanda whether for the decorative schemes or details of the shapes of these bowls. As a result, a specific point of origin for the group cannot be determined at this point, but in terms of how we think of late Hellenistic 'global' culture (see more on this idea below), the very difficulty Petrova encounters might be indicative of the increasingly integrated world of the 2nd century BC. Such integration, however, does not preclude local choices. Thus, Vasilica Lungu and Pierre Dupont's contribution on Hadra style pottery imported to and produced in the Pontic region draws a distinction between, on the one hand, the clear debt of Pontic potters to Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean examples for the decorative schemes on their own 'pseudo-Hadra' vases and, on the other hand, the apparently independent choice of vessel shape to be decorated in that style. A further view of late Hellenistic Pontic ceramics is provided by the report by Denis Žuravlev and Natalia Žuravleva on the fine wares and lamps, both imported and locally produced, at Pantikapaion. As in the previously noted studies on specific classes of fine wares, Žuravlev and Žuravleva's contribution highlights the importance both of imports from Asia Minor and the selective, yet extensive, use of these imports to develop local versions. Their paper also brings the discussion even further into the late 2nd century and into the 1st century BC with its discussion of Eastern Sigillata A, Bosporan sigillata and, later still, Pontic sigillata. A brief view of such red-slipped types, this time from Olbia, is provided by Valentina Krapivina. While her contribution, and many of the others in this section, laments the lack of attention to certain classes of late Hellenistic ceramics in earlier eras

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

of Pontic scholarship, the papers offered here (and the many recent publications by these and other scholars) make clear how much has changed in this region in recent decades.

Ceramics and Culture

While these papers focused primarily on typologies introduced an increased level of understanding of certain late Hellenistic wares and types, the papers falling into the third and final theme of the conference sought to draw new interpretations from already well-known ceramic types. Hence, John Lund uses a range of different ceramic classes including Rhodian amphorae, Eastern Sigillata A, and Hadra vases, to differentiate between those ceramics often circulating within Seleukid controlled areas, those ceramics often circulating within the Ptolemaic sphere, and those which successfully crossed over such political boundaries. The fact that some ceramics appear clearly to have been affected by political boundaries (or at least sharply restricted in their circulation by other factors) while others were not may not be much of a surprise, but it does highlight the point that not all ceramic distribution followed the same 'rules'. Perhaps most striking in Lund's results is the patterning of Rhodian amphora distribution – surprisingly limited in Seleukid areas despite the seemingly global, or at least pan-Mediterranean, reach of Rhodian commerce. The contribution by Andrea Berlin, Sharon Herbert and Peter Stone provides a fitting case study for Lund's results. At Kedesh, ceramics recovered from the administrative building show the changing sources of table wares between the earlier Ptolemaic use of the site and the later Seleukid occupation. While, as Lund's study might predict, the later assemblage emphasizes wares related to Eastern Sigillata A (and here the paper makes significant contributions, too, to the themes of chronology and typology), nevertheless the Seleukid phase also saw significant presence of Rhodian amphorae, in some cases imported very shortly before the abandonment of the building. The two papers, that of Lund and that of Berlin et al., however, address themselves to two different levels of inquiry. Lund is considering the 'global' picture; Berlin et al. address the details of one site; and the results indicate the importance of both approaches. We return to this intersection between local circumstance and global pattern shortly. Jean-Paul Morel's paper explores this concept of globalisation more directly and critically. His comparison of the evidence for production and distribution of Campana A and Campana B wares highlights not only the geographical limits of their global reach (though both were extensive) but also the contrasts in the global nature of their production. While Campana A's production remained limited to the region of Naples, Campana B workshops spread over time much as we might expect from global industries today.

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

Globalisation and the 2nd century BC

Indeed, as Morel notes, our introductory comments to the conference emphasized the concept of globalisation as one perspective from which to consider the nature of and changes in material culture in the 2nd century BC. We noted the global spread of Coca Cola, Starbucks coffee, and Nike sportswear. At the same time, however, we also noted that there were limits to globalisation even in 2008 as exemplified by the brand strength of Hummel, a formerly German but now Danish, outfitter of football and, particularly important in Denmark, handball.[1] The concept of globalisation, in all of its complexity – even uncertainty – of meaning and history,[2] does provide one framework for evaluating the spread of ceramic types (and the other practices for which the ceramics act as proxy evidence such as food preparation, storage and consumption, as well as trade, etc.). Hence, as discussed in papers in this volume, Hadra hydriai might show a concentration of distribution in areas under Ptolemaic control (Lund), thereby remaining within one politically defined territory, but the few pieces that were exported as far as the coasts of the Black Sea had a clear, 'extraterritorial', impact on local pottery production (Lungu and Dupont). The use of West Slope style decoration and, later, the production of mouldmade bowls seem to cross over territorial boundaries (fluid though these may be) throughout the history of their spread in the Hellenistic period. Though in the case of the mouldmade bowls, the technique is spread globally, but their morphology and style followed regional trajectories.

The spread of material culture within a politically definable unit can be considered simply the effects of imperialism; with globalisation – though certainly not lacking political elements – territorial boundaries must be crossed.[3] This is clearly a smaller-scale definition of globalisation than is used by those who see globalisation as starting only with the consistent opening up of truly global trade between the eastern and western hemispheres in the 16th century.[4] But as a paradigm for considering the extent to which material culture spread and the extent to which that spread slowed, stopped or was modified, this more limited definition of globalisation could prove very useful for the archaeology of the 2nd century BC.

And yet, the question could be asked, are we simply replacing the less fashionable terms Hellenisation/Romanisation with a more 'neutral' term, globalisation, much as one could equate the more modern episodes of globalisation with Americanisation? One objection to terms like Hellen/Romanisation has been the implicit directionality of the influence and the resulting influence on scholarship to look for cultural change only in terms of becoming more Greek/Roman. One could note, for example, that even papers here addressing local Pontic imitations or adaptations of Greek forms start from the imports, the 'real' examples, and then present the local versions. The alternative would be to present the local ceramics preceding the arrival of the Aegean types and then delineate how the local assemblage changes. To a great extent, it seems,

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

we are seeing the impact of the history of Classical Archaeology and the primacy it gives to Greece and Rome. Local, non-Greek, pottery tends to be studied by 'other' archaeologists, and this situation complicates any attempt to see 'Hellenisation' from a local perspective. And then there are the various sites discussed in papers here, such as Corinth and Ephesos, that clearly did experience changes in their ceramic culture in the Hellenistic period, yet were already Greek – how should we conceive of, or describe, such changes? Finally, the 2nd century in particular presents a challenge to the terms Hellenisation and Romanisation in the sense that Roman cultural and political influence in the eastern Mediterranean was undeniably on the rise while Greek influence was still prominent. Therefore, to speak only of Hellenisation we risk missing the Roman element (and vice versa). Globalisation, considered alongside the local responses and localized interactions (termed 'glocalisation' by some[5]), alleviates many of these difficulties. The very obvious fact that the 2nd century BC was not a period of truly worldwide glocalisation on a modern scale immediately raises the challenge of defining the limits of the term. Such a challenge serves as a productive and valuable force in Hellenistic ceramic studies.

Notes

1 For the history of Hummel, see http://www.hummel.net/en-AA/content/about/heritage/. Undeniably, even Hummel has global aspirations.
2 E.g., Scholte 2008; Wesseling 2009.
3 On 'supraterritoriality' see Scholte 2008.
4 Even this period as seeing the origins of globalisation is debated, see McCants 2007; Jennings 2011.
5 Knappett 2011, 10.

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

PART 1. CHRONOLOGIES

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

The Contribution of Inscriptions to the Chronology of Rhodian Amphora Eponyms

Nathan Badoud

From Morocco to India, and from the Strait of Dover to Ethiopia, Rhodian amphora stamps are one of the main "*fossiles directeurs*" of the Hellenistic period.[1] They particularly abound in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea regions: one can estimate that more than 200,000 specimens have been unearthed so far. Since the end of the nineteenth century, the chronology of these amphora stamps has been patiently developed in order to re-establish the line of succession of the eponym magistrates named upon them. In Thasos, Sinop and many other centres, the amphorae were dated by a minor magistrate responsible for the stamping (an astynomos or agoranomos, for instance), who may have been qualified as a "false eponym" by Louis Robert.[2] However, in Rhodos, a magistrate who bore the title of priest (ἱερεύς) dated the amphorae. John Stoddart was the first to recognize the priest of Halios (ἱερεὺς Ἁλίου), attested in the Rhodian inscriptions as the city's eponym: this particular clue, among others, allowed him to determine the origin of the Rhodian stamps.[3] The purpose of this paper is three-fold: first, to explain why such a necessary and incontestable identification was called into question by the best specialists, and how a chronology of the amphora eponyms could be developed independently, and sometimes backwards, from the epigraphic data; second, to study the ways of improving the dating methods as currently applied to the Rhodian stamps, and to identify their intrinsic limits; third, to show how the monumental inscriptions can help to exceed these limits and develop new dating methods.

The priests of Halios versus the amphora eponyms

For a long time, the chronologies of amphora stamps were uncertain or even contradictory, because they were based on a prosopography and a paleography that were still uncertain. Carl Schuchhardt was the first to date these documents with a relative accuracy. Publishing nearly 800 stamps, mainly Rhodian, from the "Pergamon deposit", he attributed the accumulation of the amphorae upon which they were impressed to some particularly favourable political circumstances. Rhodos was an ally of Attalos I, king of Pergamon, during the Second Macedonian War (200-197 BC), and then against Antiochos III (192-188 BC); but the friendship between the two states had ended under

CONTENTS INDEX
This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed

the reign of Eumenes II (197-159 BC), because of their rivalry in Asia Minor. Thus, the deposit was apparently built up over a few decades, at most, at the turn of the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC.

In 1896, young Adolf Wilhelm published an inscription from Seleukia on the Kalykadnos honouring Εὔδημος Νίκωνος, a diplomat from the city who had travelled through the Greek world to promote the interests of Antiochos IV, who had become king at the end of 175 BC. The inscription included a number of foreign documents about the diplomat's activity, among which was a decree from the Boiotian Koinon (dissolved in 171 BC) and a Rhodian proxeny file dated by the priest of Halios Δαμοκλῆς Δαμέου (= Δαμέα), which was itself narrowly connected to the Third Macedonian War (172-168 BC) or its preparations. Therefore, the priesthood of Δαμοκλῆς had to be dated between 175 and 171 BC, which confirmed and made more accurate the chronology of the Pergamon deposit, where many stamps attested the eponym.[4]

As only ten inscriptions seemed to mention the same priests of Halios named on the amphora stamps, it quickly became important to develop a proper methodology for this second category of documents. One of the features of Rhodian amphorae is that eponyms and fabricants generally appear on two different stamps, each on a different handle. Pairs of handles, however, are rarely found intact. In his thesis on Rhodian amphora stamps, published in 1907, Friedrich Bleckmann tried therefore to restore as many connections between fabricants and eponyms as possible, in order to gather more or less contemporary magistrates in "packets". Moreover, he attached great importance to the site where the amphorae were unearthed. Following Schuchhardt's idea, he registered the eponyms attested in the "Pergamon deposit" (41 according to the *editio princeps*) in a period when, he believed, good relations existed between Rhodos and the Attalid kingdom, i.e., between 220 and 180 BC. The contradiction with Wilhelm's dating of Δαμοκλῆς, between 175 and 171 BC, was obvious. Nevertheless, when Hendrik van Gelder published his study of the Εὔδημος monument in the *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften* (1899), he had presented it merely through a slip of the pen as a decree passed "in favour of a friend of Antiochus III of Syria", king from 223 to 187 BC.[5] Without any consideration for the arguments in the subsequent commentary, which showed clearly that Εὔδημος had in reality served the cause of Antiochos IV (175-163),[6] and through over generalizing, Bleckmann was able to put forward a document "which the editors attribute to the early 2nd century BC" as totally conforming to his – wrong – dating of the Pergamon deposit.[7] The foundations of Alexandria (in 331 BC) and Phintias (in 281 BC) happened before the Pergamon deposit and gave a *terminus post quem*; the destructions of Corinth and Carthage happened after, in 146 BC, giving a *terminus ante quem*, the importance of which Schuchhardt had already underlined.[8]

Van Gelder was the first, and for a very long time the only one, to contest his predecessor's conclusions, without realizing that they were a consequence

This page is protected by copyright and may not be redistributed