the same field – and particularly those publishing in the same volume – will be only too happy to iron out problems with English for them so as to make their meaning comprehensible?)

What we are offered here is a miscellany of papers that range over 13 or so centuries of time (from Protogeometric to the third century A.D.) and over various different Greek cities or regions (Thessaly, Knossos, Argos, Thera, Lindos, the Peloponnese, Sparta and Kos (2 papers) as well as Athens and Attica (4 papers)). They variously concern scientific analysis to determine the different geographical origins of those buried in the same place (protogeometric Pharsala), scientific analysis to determine health (in Roman Knossos), the range of burial practices in a particular local area (around Marathon and in the southern Mesogaia in Attica, in Roman Sparta), particular burial practices in a single period (eighth-century cremations in Attica, pot burials in archaic Thera, columbaria monuments in the Roman Peloponnese), particular objects from burials that might indicate social identity (lebes gamikoi and terracotta statuettes), the burial treatment of a particular group over a more or less long period in the same place (child burial in archaic Thera and in Classical and Hellenistic Attica), the range of ways in which graves were marked in a particular place (Hellenistic and Roman Kos), the publication of a particular cemetery (Psalidi, Kos) and the analysis of a single memorial monument (at Lindos).

Those with particular interest in these places will want to consult these papers, many of which publish material that has never been published or never illustrated as well, but the papers do not address mortuary variability or social diversity (never mind the links between the two) as their problem, and do not constitute a volume with any significant thematic coherence. A paper that reveals an extraordinary variety of mortuary practice in rural Attica sits next to a paper that reveals an extraordinary uniformity of mortuary practice in Argos without either author drawing attention to the contrast, l*et a*lone attempting to establish the factors that made for diversity or uniformity. Two papers on child burials, one of them by one of the editors, sit next to each other but make no reference to each other and no attempt has been made to organise the papers in parallel ways to enable comparison. The absence of an index adds to the reader's frustration. It is very unclear what the editors thought the job of an editor was.

Robin Osborne
Faculty of Classics
University of Cambridge
ro225@cam.ac.uk

John W. Hayes and Kathleen Warner Slane, *Late Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman Pottery* (Isthmia XI). pp. xxxii + 266, 7 plans (1 colour), 93 figures, 37 plates. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2022. ISBN 978-0-87661-916-2, hardback £130.

On the first day of the Rei Cretariae Romanae Fautores' 32nd Congress, which was held in Athens from 25 to 30 September 2022, Philip Kenrick – long-standing member and former treasurer of the Fautores – shared with the audience a personal account of John Hayes' declining health. This very much emphasised the fundamental role that Hayes has played in the field of Hellenistic to Late Antique pottery studies in particular across the Mediterranean and Pontic areas for more than five decades.

Development and summary of the book

The monograph under review here captures Hayes' lengthy – a prerequisite for thoroughly understanding the pottery from a site or region – involvement studying the Late Classical to Late Antique pottery from the American excavations at the sanctuaries at Isthmia, first those led by Oscar Broneer, later – after a considerable hiatus – those under the directorship of Elizabeth Gebhard. As the crow flies, the complex of sanctuaries at Isthmia is located some ten kilometres east of ancient Corinth and about four kilometres north of Kenchreai, Corinth's eastern harbour on the Saronic Gulf. The book consists of multiple shorter and longer chapters, appendices and other parts; Chapters 2 to 4 form the core of the book, and respectively discuss pottery finds of Late Classical-Hellenistic date and of Roman-Late Antique date from the Sanctuary of Poseidon, and those from the Palaimonion (the Sanctuary of Palaimon). Whereas the manuscript is the result of Hayes' study, another eminent pottery specialist, Kathleen Slane, was invited to edit and amend it for publication. The book still very much embodies Hayes' work, respectfully shown for example by the fact that the bibliography was only minimally updated with references which appeared after Hayes last worked on the text in 2006.[1] While some of Slane's interventions and additions can be easily spotted, Hayes' admirably concise and consistent writing style can be seen and enjoyed

[1] Further (key) publications concerning Isthmia which appeared after 2006 could nonetheless have been included in a bibliographic addendum, e.g. Lindros Wohl 2017 and Frey and Gregory 2016.

throughout, as are many of his distinctive line drawings.

In consideration of the key role that religion played in the daily lives of ancient Greeks and Romans, we know comparatively little about the various kinds of *instrumentum religicum* that people brought, offered, used, dedicated and left behind within sanctuaries. Whilst the term sanctuaries encompasses a broad array of smaller and larger, monumental and more mundane edifices and spaces (natural (including modifications to natural features) and purpose-built), this book amply shows the kinds of ceramic material culture that were in use at a more monumentalised, pan-Hellenic sanctuary, and one can particularly appreciate the diachronic presentation (changes in material culture are addressed, see e.g. p. 3-4, 11) and discussion of the ceramic material culture. This makes it an important addition to a slowly growing corpus of published material culture from sanctuaries, thus furthering our understanding of the role of objects in and between different spheres of life in antiquity.

The book opens with forewords/prefaces by Gebhard (p. vii-viii) and Hayes (p. ix-xi), the latter followed by an addendum written by Slane (p. xi), then come the acknowledgements by both authors (p. xiii-xiv). Hayes' long-running involvement with the study of the Isthmia pottery finds harks back to the early 1960s, a time when the study of Roman pottery in particular was still fairly clear, a time also in which Hayes began to make fundamental, pioneering contributions to the discipline, the first being *Late Roman Pottery*, or *LRP*.[2] The Table of Contents (p. xv-xvii) makes clear that much of the book is fairly traditionally structured, focusing on descriptions of ceramic categories and wares followed by a series of deposits, each of which represented by a number of catalogued finds. Lists of illustrations (illustrations, plans, figures and plates) and tables (p. xix-xxi, xxiii) are followed by the bibliography and bibliographical and typological abbreviations (p. xxv-xxxii). The reasonable decision not to add bibliographical references which postdate Hayes' last work on the text (in 2006) – there are some exceptions, see p. xxv – which would have meant "redoing the whole study" (p. xi), nevertheless resulted in omitting some recent nomenclature and new findings, including from the Isthmian sanctuaries proper.[3] Chapter 1 (p. 1-10) introduces the reader to the setting and history of the site – particularly useful are Tables 1 and 2 (p. 2-3) which summarise relevant information per deposit (e.g. location, date), though one would have liked to see absolute dates included in Table 2 as well, rather than references to phases I-V. The section "Notes on the Catalogue" (p. 5-7), especially its first half, deals more with historical and interpretive matters and therefore feels somewhat out of place. Most useful is the "Conspectus of the Pottery" (p. 8-10) which lists all catalogued items per functional or ware group and is thus of particular interest to those who wish to look up specific categories.

Late Classical and Hellenistic pottery

Chapter 2 (p. 11-72) discusses the Late Classical and Hellenistic pottery, comprising a total of 395 catalogued items; items 1-237 pertain to Deposits 1-14, 238-395 to "Other Contexts". Useful is the introduction that precedes *all* – so Late Classical to Late Antique – numbered deposits. The deposits in Chapter 2 range in date from the (late) fifth to at least the late second century BC and present no stratigraphic gap of any significance, if at all. Furthermore, there are small quantities of finds datable to the period of ca. 100 BC to AD 25/50 (p. 73) which thus bridge the Late Hellenistic to Early Roman Imperial period, interpreted as "two centuries of neglect" (p. 75), a period which in pottery terms more generally remains comparatively problematic, at least given the published record. Quantities vary greatly from one deposit to the next, with a minimum of three (Deposit 3a) and a maximum of 48 (Deposit 14) items. Following introductory paragraphs there are useful summaries for the "Classes of Pottery", particularly those that are (considered as) Corinthian or northeast Peloponnesian. Here, as well as in Chapters 3 and 4, one clearly observes the advantages of a long-standing and continuing tradition of regional ceramic research, here at key places in the Corinthia (e.g. Corinth, Kenchreai) as well as eastern Central Greece more generally (e.g. Argos, Athens); this regional contextualisation is underlined earlier (p. 4-5). The specific regional context also permits one to associate archaeological evidence with historical events, in particular the destruction of the Rachi settlement (198 BC) and the destruction of Corinth by Mummius (146 BC), as is the case with Deposit 12 (p. 46-47).

Two observations are worth highlighting. The first is "a major interruption in cult activity" towards the end of the fourth century BC, if not a little later (p. 12). While various, more localised explanations are considered, evidence from Corinth points to a reduction in religious as well as burial activities around the same time (p. 12), which suggests that the changes observed at both sites plausibly were

[2] Hayes 1972.

[3] E.g. Reynolds' work on amphora (2005) and tableware (2011) typologies, chronologies and distribution (2010), or Petrídis' (2010) study of local pottery manufacture at Delphi.

the result of broader developments. The sanctuary was not abandoned after the decades around 300 BC, however, as shown for instance by the presence of mouldmade ('Megarian') bowls, which are in fact thought to have been used in ritual practices (p. 49). The second observation concerns "[a] trend towards increasing numbers of imports" that picked up in the second century BC and "is visible [...] throughout the eastern Mediterranean and Italy" (p. 15). Hayes, as well as Slane, was of course more than aware of an increased internationalisation in the circulation of pottery. Whilst the long-distance movement of pottery throughout the Mediterranean and Pontic areas was not at all a new phenomenon,[4] it does seem to have picked up quantitatively and geographically during the Middle Hellenistic period. This (also) needs to be understood against the wider historical background of the Roman Republic's growing presence and meddling in political, military and economic affairs in the (Eastern) Mediterranean, changing existing as well as expanding patterns of connectivity in the process. As always, more uniformly quantified data is necessary not only to substantiate this phenomenon, but also to study it from a *longue durée* perspective.

Roman-period pottery

Chapter 3 (p. 73-151) discusses the Roman-period pottery based on ten deposits (Deposits 15-24) which range from the mid-first into the fifth century AD, though two gaps can be noted: the second century AD, and the period ca. AD 225/250-350/375. There are pottery finds that attest activity/occupation during Late Antiquity – perhaps (also) related to the construction and subsequent use of the Hexamilion, which affected the functioning and layout of the sanctuary[5] – and the transitional (early) 'Dark Ages' (p. 74-75) though these mostly come from disturbed contexts, and hence are dated typologically. A total of 514 items are catalogued: 396-554 from the ten deposits mentioned, while items 555-909 again derive from "Other Contexts". Here also the quantity of catalogued items varies greatly amongst the ten main deposits, from four (Deposit 17) to 44 (Deposit 22). The chapter also introduces the main ceramic categories (p. 75-85), namely: various kinds of tablewares, cooking wares, plain wares and amphorae. Contrary to Chapter 2, here, following the logic that in Roman times imported pottery played a more significant role, imported categories are presented first, then followed by Corinthian and regional products.

Hayes concluded that cultic activities at Isthmia came to a halt by the middle of the third century AD (p. 73). Being indeed (remarkably, but not impossibly) early, Slane (p. 73, footnote 1) hints at a considerably later date, which would be more in line with literary evidence that has been interpreted to suggest that religious activities at Isthmia still took place in the third quarter of the fourth century AD.[6]

While the pottery is generally similar to that which has been published from Corinth, it remains a rich source of information. Of note for example is the presence of moulded vessels in South Gaulish terra sigillata, Pontic sigillata and various Knidian types (p. 75, 77). While these three categories have been recognised elsewhere (including at Corinth), the quantities in which they appear are considered to be higher than what one would generally expect to find. Perhaps these reflect the international character of the crowds that were drawn to Isthmia? Moreover, the observation that all fragments *in casu* vessels in South Gaulish terra sigillata concern moulded specimens, seems to hint at specific behaviour: at Libyan Berenice, besides moulded vessels also plain South Gaulish terra sigillata was found.[7]

The near absence of identifiable cultic vessels (p. 82) at the Sanctuary of Poseidon is intriguing. Since cultic activities are nonetheless thought to have taken place between the mid-first and mid-third century AD, this tentatively suggests that votives and other items that people brought to the sanctuary were more 'ordinary' in appearance. Indeed, on a general, perhaps partly theoretical level, much of the catalogue embodies a functional and morphological assemblage that would not look out of place in 'a' house. Naturally this does not exclude a cultic use of such 'mundane' vessels: the fact that shapes were interchangeable between different cultural spheres – taking a vessel from one's household to a sanctuary meant the vessel acquired an altered if not in fact a completely new role – underlines the significance of context, both in the archaeological and in the ancient architectural-cultural sense, as illustrated by finds from the Palaimonion (cf. infra). Unless functional repertoires included specific shapes such as miniatures, this phenomenon also emphasises the problem of recognising (Roman) cultic and other specific functional zones (e.g. necropoleis) within urban survey assemblages.

This aspect is indeed different at the adjacent Palaimonion (Chapter 4, p. 153-202) where identifiably cultic vessels are more common,

[4] E.g. Sáez Romero 2022; Malfitana *et al.* 2005.
[5] Gregory and Mills 1984.
[6] Rothaus 2000: 84-87.
[7] Kenrick 1985: 219-222.

and where also the stratigraphy tolerated more advanced interpretation. A total of 360 items was catalogued, each entry number preceded by a 'P' for Palaimonion: P1-P59 are from "sacrificial" Pit A, P60-P110 from Pit B and P111-P189 from Pit C. These three pits were excavated by Broneer in 1956 and 1958 and, noteworthy for the time, he did not fully excavate the fill in each pit but left a portion ("martyra") for future excavators. Broneer's archaeological sensibility indeed allowed his successors to complete the excavation of Pits A and C in 1989 under Gebhard's directorship, while the *martyra* in Pit B remains untouched (p. 153). The remainder of the catalogue, P190-P297, comprises finds from various deposits and which are organised by Palaimonion phase (I to V). Again, a clearer indication of the absolute ranges for these five phases (also see p. 3, Table 2) would have been helpful.

Pottery finds from Pits A, B and C allowed one to distinguish "both specially made and quotidian vessels that were used in rituals in the Palaimonion" (p. 154). Indeed, the so-called 'Palaimonion lamp', paterae, one-handled mugs and pitchers, a bowl type and a tray type (rather a shallow dish or plate) form the core of this cultic ceramic repertoire. Whereas diachronic changes in the use of different vessel types (and functions?) are observed (p. 154), which could hint at changes in the cultic behaviour of visitors to the Palaimonion, the ceramic evidence did not contain clues that allowed one to reconstruct "sets for communal dining". However, votive bowls and one-handled mugs could very well have been used in food and beverage consumption (p. 154). Despite being essentially theoretical, the idea of (a) functional set(s) is tempting, in which also the aforementioned trays as well as the characteristic oil lamps played key roles in cultic and dining rituals observed by visitors to the Palaimonion.

In the "Concluding Remarks" (p. 203-206), Hayes makes two important observations that deserve further comparative research: (1) the largely "local and regional", i.e. northeast Peloponnesian "nature" (p. 205) of the pottery as a whole; and (2) that there is no "special ceramic identity" during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, except for the Palaimonion (p. 206). Hayes never was one for precise quantitative data; see for example the various quantification tables in his article on the Villa Dionysos at Knossos.[8] It slowly becomes clear that a regional character regarding both actual manufacture as well as style was very much embedded in the workings of ancient societies, and certainly not limited to pottery alone. One would nonetheless have appreciated some quantitative indications if not actual data that would underpin this "local and regional" character. Hayes' second observation suggests different patterns of behaviour and/or cultic practices between the Sanctuary of Poseidon and the Palaimonion, at least as far as the ceramic repertoires suggest. One also wonders how cooking pots – present throughout the sanctuaries' duration – may have been used: to bring prepared food and/or prepare it on the spot? While their use in an early phase (Deposit 2) seems evident, the presence of cooking pots in the Palaimonion for example could signal different functions, whereby their role in communal dining cannot be ruled out.

The corollary of the largely local and regional character of the pottery is that small numbers of vessels were imported from further afield. This concerns, for instance, various Pontic (e.g. Zeest 94, Sinopean(?) B I-II) and Cilician (e.g. Agora M 54, Pompeii V) amphora types, as well as various kinds of terra sigillata/red slip wares (e.g. Eastern Sigillata B and C, African Red Slip Ware). Of particular interest – certainly to the reviewer – is the presence of several vessels that Hayes identified as Boeotian, thus from opposite the eastern part of the Corinthian Gulf. Even if knowledge of local pottery manufacture at various sites in Boeotia has increased substantially – and is turning into a complex matter – since Hayes' study, it is safe to assume that his identifications are (mostly) correct. Hayes in fact had first-hand knowledge of Boeotian pottery, in particular that from Thespiae and Askra,[9] as a result of his years-long involvement with the Ancient Cities of Boeotia Project from 1984 to the early 1990s. This project continues to build upon and learn from his work – the region was a blank spot at that time concerning Roman-period pottery – as the pottery that the project has collected between 1979 and 2011 is gradually being restudied and published, thereby making use of, as well as acknowledging, Hayes' work. Previously, Hayes published several fragments of Boeotian pottery from Athens,[10] and it has been identified at Corinth.[11] Whilst this only concerns a dozen vessels or so, they represent different functional categories: mouldmade bowls (cat. nos 315-318, perhaps also cat. no. 314, p. 62-63), a beehive (cat. no. 366, p. 69), tablewares, including the characteristic 'Askra dish' (cat. nos 766-768, P274, p. 132, 193) and closed vessels (cat. nos 414, 548, 554, 896, p. 89, 107-108,

[8] Hayes 1983, *passim*.

[9] Bes and Poblome 2017; Bes in press; Peeters 2023, *passim*.

[10] Hayes 2008: 94, 255, fig. 44.1475-1476, pl. 72.

[11] Slane and Sanders 2005: 262, 270, 284, figs 5, 8; Hammond 2018: 683-684, fig. 12.

150 – no. 548 possibly is from Koroneia)[12]. Another vessel (cat. no. 878, p. 148) bears a strong similarity to vessels from Delphi, as noted in the entry, where local production is attested, even if production of similar vessels elsewhere cannot be ruled out.[13] These vessels were surely part of more varied and extensive exchange mechanisms, shedding light on a kind of intermediate geographical level of exchange, somewhere between local/regional and long-distance. Indeed, small numbers of Corinthian oil lamps as well as other categories which were manufactured in the northeast Peloponnese (e.g. cooking vessels) and the Argolid (e.g. amphorae (Late Roman Amphora 2) and basins/*lekanai* in Southern Argolid Ware) are identified at various Boeotian sites. The Corinthian Gulf will more generally have functioned as a 'binding agent' connecting areas and sites that surrounded it, a system in which Corinth (and its harbours) must have played a considerable role regarding the redistribution of raw materials and goods. However, Hammond has pointed out that the arrival of Boeotian pottery appeared "only when a variety of networks were already supplying Corinth. Thus it appears that geographic proximity alone was not enough to stimulate distribution between neighbouring regions, with Corinth's import of ceramics from regional centres in Attica and Boiotia seemingly facilitated by the presence of long-distance routes with Africa".[14] In other words, Boeotian workshops benefited from the intensification of exchange lines between Central North Africa and Central Greece in the later part of Late Antiquity, seeing opportunities to market their products, with the current state of evidence suggesting that this took place on a limited scale.

Prior to the concordance (p. 251-264), indices (p. 265-267) and plans, figures and plates, the text of the book concludes with four appendices. The first (p. 207-213), by Elizabeth Gebhard, discusses the phasing and stratigraphy of the Palaimonion. This is structured somewhat oddly, as it starts with a summary followed by a discussion of (most of) the five phases, and focuses on the three sacrificial pits A-C. The second (p. 215-222), by Hayes, presents further thoughts on selected oil lamps, those of Broneer Type XXVII and of the Palaimonion type. This adds a brief albeit significant chapter to the already rich corpus of oil lamp publications from eastern Central Greece.[15] Appendix 3 (p. 223-245), by Slane yet based on notes by Virginia Grace and Carolyn Koehler, presents and discusses 95 amphora stamps, mostly from Greek and Aegean sources, which reflect the amphora assemblage more generally, regardless of chronology. Last, Appendix 4 (p. 247-249) is a brief contribution and catalogue of 'Slavic' as well as Byzantine and later pottery finds.

Textually, the book is near-spotless: a "Cornith" instead of Corinth (cat. no. P231, p. 188) was spotted, and once the older designation "West Waterworks" (p. 82) was accidentally retained – preference is given to "Southwest Reservoir" (p. 37). Cat. no. 410 is mentioned to have been "reconstructed from an astonishing 186 joining fragments" yet lacking its rim and neck; its entry (p. 88, fig. 29), however, in fact mentions and illustrates *only* a rim and handle. There are a few further inconsistencies, which partly can be traced to unidentified entries or the bibliographic *terminus*. For example, the identified Roman-period amphorae are essentially considered to have been used for the shipment of wine (p. 84-85). While this may be largely true – no *garum* amphorae were identified, for instance – there are a few types that could have contained olive oil as their primary content, if of course we ignore reuse, which we should not. Cat. nos 525-526 (p. 104) belong to type Zeest 80 (or similis, i.e. Knossos 39; it is catalogued as Agora K 115), a large-capacity amphora that may have carried oil or a fish product. While it is considered to be Pontic, it remains unprovenanced; a (north(west)ern) Aegean provenance seems equally, if not, more plausible. The same wine-olive oil-fish product discussion concerns the possible Sinopean B (or B-style) amphora (cat. no. 888, p. 149). The arrival and use of olive oil is noted in earlier times, in fact, with the attestation of Archaic-Classical Corinthian A amphorae (p. 229). The provenance of another amphora type that is attested, Kapitän II (cat. no. 871, p. 146-147, catalogued as Niederbieber 77) is regarded as eastern Aegean in origin, yet its provenance remains unresolved, and whilst it occurs in multiple fabrics a Pontic source cannot be excluded for the bulk of finds of this type. Cat. no. 893 (p. 150), an unidentified amphora, can almost certainly be identified as an Agora M 273, an amphora class that is nevertheless in need of more scrutiny regarding typology and fabrics.

The no more than minor typographical and other shortcomings should not distract the reader from the significance of this monograph. Not only is it a worthy display of Hayes' knowledge and fundamental contribution to the study of Greek- and above all Roman-period pottery. First and foremost, it is a valuable pottery-oriented book, yet one that does serve various other scholarly audiences: as

[12] Bes and Van der Enden accepted. Similar vessels were manufactured at Delphi, though it appears with different bases, see Petrídis 2010: 52, 201, fig. 35, pl. 13.
[13] Petrídis 2010: 47-49, 198-199, figs 25, 27, pls 10-11.
[14] Hammond 2018: 684.
[15] For a recent addition to this corpus, see Lindros Wohl 2017.

said, above all, those studying Classical, Hellenistic and Roman to Late Antique pottery, but also scholars who take a keen interest in the long-term history of the Corinthia or indeed the functioning of Greek and Roman sanctuaries, will find aspects relevant to their research. This latest volume in the Isthmia series, together with the recently published monograph on Kenchreai,[16] contributes significantly to the Corinthia's long-standing role as a well-studied region from archaeological as well as ceramic points of view.

PHILIP BES
AUSTRIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE – AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, VIENNA
philip.bes@oeaw.ac.at/philipmbes@gmail.com

Bes, P.M., A Beehive of Activity. Thoughts on Pottery Manufacture at Late Roman Askra (Boeotia, Central Greece), in: D. Zhuravlev and U. Schlotzhauer (eds) in press: *Late Hellenistic and Roman Tableware in the Black Sea, Eastern Mediterranean and in the West (150 BC-250 AD)*. Berlin.

Bes, P.M. and J. Poblome 2017. Urban Thespiai: the Late Hellenistic to Late Roman Pottery, in: J.L. Bintliff, E. Farinetti, B. Slapšak and A.M. Snodgrass (eds) *Boeotia Project, Volume II: the City of Thespiai: Survey at a Complex Urban Site:* 317-349. Cambridge.

Bes, P.M. and M. van der Enden, Pottery Manufacture at Hellenistic to Late Antique Koroneia (Boeotia, Greece), in: C. Viegas (ed.) accepted: *Rei Cretariæ Romanæ Fautorum Acta* 48. Oxford.

Frey, J.M. and T.E. Gregory 2016. Old Excavations, New Interpretations: the 2008-2013 Seasons of The Ohio State University Excavations at Isthmia *Hesperia* 85: 437-490.

Gregory, T.E. and H. Mills, 1984. The Roman Arch at Isthmia. *Hesperia* 53.4: 407-445.

Hammond, M.D., Late Roman (Late 4th to 7th Century) Ceramics from the Panayia Field in Corinth, Greece: the Local and Regional Networks of a Globalized City, in: S. Biegert (ed.) 2018: *Rei Cretariæ Romanæ Fautorum Acta* 45: 675-684.

Hayes, J.W. 1972. *Late Roman Potter.* London.

Hayes, J.W 1983. *The Villa Dionysos Excavations, Knossos: the Pottery*. *The Annual of the British School at Rome* 78: 97-169.

Hayes, J.W. 2008. *Roman Pottery. Fine Ware Imports: Typology* (The Athenian Agora 32). Princeton.

Kenrick, P.M. 1985. *Excavations at Sidi Khrebish Benghazi (Berenice) 3,1. The Fine Pottery* (Supplements to Libya Antiqua 5). Tripoli.

Korka, E. and J.L. Rife (eds) 2022. *On the Edge of a Roman Port: Excavations at Koutsongila, Kenchreai, 2007-2014* (Hesperia Supplements 52). Princeton.

Lindros Wohl, B., 2017: *Terracotta Lamps II: 1967-2004* (Isthmia 10). Princeton.

Malfitana, D., J. Poblome and J. Lund 2005. Eastern Sigillata A in Italy. A Socio-Economic Evaluation, *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 80: 199-212.

Peeters, D. 2023: *Shaping Regionality in Socio-Economic Systems. Late Hellenistic-Late Roman Ceramic Production, Circulation, and Consumption in Boeotia, Central Greece (c. 150 BCE–700 CE)* (Roman and Late Antique Mediterranean Pottery 18). Oxford.

Petrídis, P. 2010. *La céramique protobyzantine de Delphes: une production et son contexte* (Fouilles de Delphes V, 4). Athens: École Française d'Athènes.

Reynolds, P. 2005. Levantine Amphorae from Cilicia to Gaza: a Typology and Analysis of Regional Production Trends from the 1st to 6th Centuries, in: J.M. Gurt i Esparraguera, J. Buxeda i Garrigós and M.A. Cau Ontiveros (eds): *LRCW 1. Late Roman Coarse Wares, Cooking Ware, and Amphorae in the Mediterranean: Archaeology and Archaeometry* (British Archaeological Reports International *Series* 1340): 563-612. Oxford.

Reynolds, P. 2010. Trade Networks of the East, 3rd to 7th Centuries: the View from Beirut (Lebanon) and Butrint (Albania) (Fine Wares, Amphorae and Kitchen Wares), in: S. Menchelli, S. Santoro, M. Pasquinucci and G. Giuducci (eds) *LRCW 3. Late Roman Coarse Wares, Cooking Wares and Amphorae in the Mediterranean. Archaeology and Archaeometry. Comparison between Western and Eastern Mediterranean* (British Archaeological Reports International Series 2185.I): 89-114. Oxford.

Reynolds, P. 2011. Fine Wares from Beirut Contexts, c. 450 to c. 600, in: M.A. Cau Ontiveros, P. Reynolds and M. Bonifay (eds) *Late Roman Fine Wares. Solving Problems of Typology and Chronology. A Review of the Evidence, Debate and New Contexts*, (Late Roman Fine Wares 1. Roman and Late Antique Mediterranean Pottery 1): 207-230. Oxford.

Rothaus, R.M. 2000: *Corinth, the First City of Greece: an Urban History of Late Antique Cult and Religion*, Leiden (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 139).

Romero, A.S. 2022. Wine and Fish? A Preliminary Report on the Punic Amphorae from a Specialized Tavern of the Classical Period at Corinth, in: M.L. Lawall (ed.) *Assemblages of Transport Amphoras: from Chronology to Economics and Society*,

[16] Korka and Rife 2022.

Heidelberg (Archaeology and Economy in the Ancient World 36): 11-26.
Slane, K.W. and G.D.R. Sanders 2005. Corinth: Late Roman Horizons. *Hesperia* 74.2: 243-297.

Sir John Boardman, James Hargrave, Alexander Avram, Alexander Podossinov, *Connecting the Ancient West and East: Studies Presented to Prof. Gocha R. Tsteskhladze*. pp. xliv, 1525 Leuven: Peeters, 2022. ISBN 9789042944138. €380.00.

Given the frequency with which his name was butchered (even, apparently, on departmental certificates recognising his achievements), it is little surprise that Gocha Tsetskhladze, who passed away in September and to whom this Festschrift is dedicated, acquired a variety of nicknames over his peripatetic career. 'Mr Colonisation' was perhaps the most common, given his long-standing interest in and substantial contribution to the study of the processes of Greek colonisation, but such a name also obscures the catholic nature of his academic interests, which ranged widely from Chersonesean numismatics to the Achaemenid Empire.[1] The 'Modern-day Minns or Rostovtzeff', on the other hand, perhaps mischaracterises his individual process, given that, contra those scholars, Tsetskhladze rarely published single-authored monographs, while I leave it to the people of north-eastern Anatolia to confirm if Gocha was ever officially installed as 'King of Pontos'. Rather, as one reads through the eighty-five articles that compose this collection, the epithet 'one-man Republic of Letters' emerges as the only apt title for this most collaborative of scholars. With contributions from over twenty-five countries and fifty institutions, representing a breadth of topics from the Caucasian Bronze Age to the modern Australian university sector (a self-avowedly eccentric insertion by co-editor James Hargrave, pp. 1487-1505), what this monster two-volume collection lacks in focus it gains in scope and ambition, ultimately serving as a fitting reflection of the life and work of the man himself.

Tsetskhladze was born in the then Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic in the early 1960s, close to the Colchian site of Pichvnari, latter-day home of the pioneering Anglo-Georgian excavation (1998-2009) and a site he himself would later devote several articles and a book to in the 1990s.[2] As Oswyn Murray illustrates in an entertaining and emotional reflective piece (pp. 1477-1486), scholarly communication across the Iron Curtain was near impossible during the Cold War, and indeed, in this context, the potted biography (pp. 3-25) and achievements of the honorand seem almost miraculous. Barred from university in his native country, he undertook his first degree at the University of Kharkov in Ukraine, before moving to the Institute of Archaeology in Moscow for doctoral research. But as the Soviet Union stumbled and then collapsed in the late 1980s and early 1990s, opportunities in the West opened for Eastern European scholars, and Tsetskhladze joined the University of Oxford in Sept 1990 on a Soros Foundation Scholarship. There he met Sir John Boardman, whose interests in *The Greeks Overseas* (1999) aligned well with Gocha's own, and the former was soon to become primary supervisor of a second doctorate, completed in 1998. By then he was working at Royal Holloway, University of London (1994-2004), before moving to the University of Melbourne, where he stayed until 2015. He latterly moved to (old) south Wales. As an archaeologist, he oversaw projects in Georgia, at Phanagoria on the Cimmerian Bosporus and at Pessinus in Turkey, and as an academic, supervised the PhD theses of several students, some of whom author papers collected here. But beyond his individual achievements, his lasting legacy is best shown by the collaborative ventures he established, several of which are now at the heart of the research culture of Pontic antiquity. *Ancient West and East*, begun in 2002, serves as one of the foremost journals in the study of the periphery regions of the ancient world, while the *Colloquia Pontica* (latterly *Antiqua*) series has been the platform from which some of the most important works on the Black Sea of the last thirty years have been published (not least his own edited volume *North Pontic Archaeology. Recent Discoveries and Studies* (2001)). Moreover, The International Pontic Congress/Congress on Black Sea Antiquities he established (alongside Alexandru Avram, another editor of this Festschrift and whose own untimely death preceded Gocha's by a year), has served as the preeminent venue for the presentation and discussion of the latest discoveries in the field of Pontic Classical Archaeology since its inception in 1997, having been held (exempting a

[1] The former the subject of the earliest publication listed in this work: 1989 'Coins of the Dioscurides from Tauric Chersonesus' *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* 4, 91-95; the latter a fixture of his later work: for example, 2021 'Passing and Conquering: The Achaemenids in Colchis' In S. Skory and S. Zadnikov (eds.) *The Early Iron Age of Eastern Europe: Studies Presented to Irina Shramko* Kharkov/Kotelva, 297-311.

[2] 1999 *Pichvnari and its Environs, 6th c. BC - 4th c. AD* Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Franche-Comté 659. Paris/Besançon.