Pia Guldager Bilde – Mark L. Lawall (eds.), Pottery, Peoples and Places. Study and Interpretation of Late Hellenistic Pottery, BSS 16

(Aarhus University Press, Aarhus 2014) 387 pages, ill.; ISBN: 978 87 7934 532 4

Kathleen Warner Slane

The papers in this volume are about half of those delivered at a conference in November 2008, sponsored by the Danish National Research Foundation's Centre for Black Sea Studies. The conference focused on ceramics in the eastern Mediterranean and Pontic regions in the 2nd century BCE, and the event coincided with the finalization of the manuscript on the lower city of Olbia Pontike, an area of the city that suffered a significant decline in the later 2nd century BCE. The range of topics is very well chosen, illuminating both the sources of imports and their consumption on major Black Sea sites. Several of the papers include bibliography as late as 2011[1].

The book is organized into sections on questions of chronology (5 papers), on our current knowledge of specific ceramic types (9 papers), and on historical-cultural interpretations of Hellenistic pottery (3 papers). Papers in the second section are straightforwardly typological. Three, on the workshops and phasing of moldmade bowls from Ephesos by C. Rogl[2], on imitations of such bowls from Priene by N. Fenn, and on three phases of the tableware made in Knidos from ca. 200 BCE into the 1st century CE by P. Kögler, represent some important imports into the Black Sea region that are also widely disseminated elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean. The other four papers focus on finds in the Black Sea: five grave-groups well-furnished with decorated vessels from 19th-century excavations in the Hellenistic cemetery of Olbia Pontike by G. Lomtadze and D. Žuravlev; A. Božkova presents West Slope pottery from Mesambria Pontika convincingly subdivided into imports from Asia Minor, close local imitations, and some distinctive Pontic adaptations; A. Petrova gathers a homogeneous group of gray ware moldmade relief bowls from western and northern coastal sites on the Black Sea, and V. Lungu and P. Dupont discuss a few Hadra vases and their more popular imitations. D. Žuravlev and N. Žuravleva have provided an overview of the imported pottery and lamps from Pantikapaion. Many come from burned destruction layers in the acropolis associated with Pompey's siege of the site in 63 BCE; when fully published these deposits will provide a valuable cross-check for other contexts datable to the 70s, 60s and 50s BCE. The last paper in this section, by V. Krapivina, presents the red-slipped vessels from sector NGS at Olbia. Although she doesn't quite say so (the presentation is by shape) several groups can be identified including Pergamene, Knidian and other SE Aegean products and imitations[3], and that is born out by fabric descriptions: there are wide variations not only in color but also in inclusions in

1 Of such recent additions the most important is N. A. Lejpunskaja (ed.), The Lower City of Olbia Northern Sector (Sector NGS) in the 6th Century BC to the 4th Century AD (Aarhus 2010), which is cited throughout the bibliography as ›NGS 2010‹ but only separate chapters are listed.

2 I note in passing an example from the Tiberian floor deposit at Corinth, whose dimensions and decorative scheme (not the patterns) match those of the bowl of Dionysos shown on fig. 7; see K. S. Wright, A Tiberian Floor Deposit from Corinth, Hesperia 49, 1980, 135–177, 48 no. 36 pl. 29. The circumstances of its context (mended, nearly complete vessels in use together at the time of a Tiberian earthquake) show it is contemporary with the other pottery. At Ephesos, too, such bowls are reported in Augustan and Tiberian contexts, and one suspects their production continued that late, rather than ending in the mid-1st century BCE.

3 Fig. 2, 3 appears to be ESA.

the clays, some vessels are partly slipped and others completely covered. The Žuravlevs' and Krapivina's papers thus provide a good balance for the earlier papers on Asia Minor products. Both Rogl's and the Zuravlevs' papers are well illustrated with color photographs as well as drawings.

The papers in the first section deal with some fundamental lynchpins of Hellenistic chronology, and they illustrate several methods. In discussing the contribution of inscriptions to the chronology of Rhodian eponyms, N. Badoud reviewed the controversy around the chronology of the Pergamon Deposit, adding an epigraphic argument to Finkielsztejn's and Lawall's proposals to lower the transitional date between Periods IVa and IVb to ca. 165–161 BCE. While the general chronology of Rhodian stamps between ca. 270 and 108 BCE can now be regarded as settled[4], Badoud's work on intercalary years in the Rhodian calendar and on the previous offices of the men who became priest of Halios promises to produce more finely tuned lists. In the second paper in this section M. Lawall and P. Guldager Bilde, the two editors of this volume, and colleagues present a range of dating evidence of independently dated kinds (Rhodian eponym stamps, coins, amphoras, molded relief bowls, and Campana A and other black-glazed wares) for the abandonment of the lower city of Olbia Pontike in the 140s BCE and its refurbishment ca. 100 BCE (in part by comparison with other areas of the excavation). There follow two papers on Corinth. That by G. Sanders, reexamining the ›wells‹ in the South Stoa at Corinth, sets the stage, archaeologically speaking, for that of S. James. He and his students accept arguments discussed informally since the mid-1970s that O. Broneer's date of ca. 330 BCE for the stoa was at least a quarter of a century too early; they argue further that the Peirene system under the stoa, which fed the ›wells‹, was not an original feature of the building and was regularly cleaned out, thereby undermining the basis of R. Edwards' Hellenistic pottery chronology (exemplified by the date of the cyma kantharos, of which the date changes from ca. 325–225 BCE to 225–175 BCE)[5]. S. James' paper carries the iconoclasm further by postulating that pottery continued to be made at Corinth through much of what has been termed the ›interim period‹ between the destruction of the city in 146 and the founding of a Roman colony on the site ca. 44 BCE. It originated in study of what was taken as an undisturbed post-Mummian deposit in the Panayia Field dated by the presence of ESA (identified by me in 2006) and of a Broneer Type XIV lamp (a type formerly dated in the first half of the 2nd century BCE)[6]. The final paper in this section is a thought-experiment by S. Rotroff. In an attempt to distinguish destructions of 88 from those of 69 BCE she assigns published contexts from the Athenian agora and from Delos, which contain coins or amphora stamps and which were bounded by a layer of earlier or later date, to 88 or 69 and compares

4 There is still room to improve. J. Lund has recently made more adjustments in the first half of the 2nd century BCE by applying seriation to eponym-fabricant pairs; see J. Lund, A New Sequence of the Eponyms Named on Rhodian Amphora Stamps in the First Half of the Second Century BC as Established through Seriation, ActaArch 82, 2011, 271–290 (in Badoud's bibliography).

5 The implications of Sanders' work were explored by James in her 2010 dissertation. A summary of her revised chronology for Corinthian Hellenistic pottery has appeared since the conference: S. James, Νέα χρονολόγηση τησ κορινθιακής ελληνιστικής επιτραπέζιας κεραμικής. Ο *αγρός* της Παναγίας, EllKer 8, 529–534. These results, based on the seriation of deposits, have met with skepticism among scholars working in the Corinthia.

6 The deposit was cut into in the early Roman period and some of the material was redeposited beside the new walls of the successor building. Reexamination in 2016 has shown that the two inturned rim bowls identified as ESA lack the standard foot, the double-dipping streak and overall, smooth, lustrous glaze of ESA. The bowl illustrated here in Fig. 2 (C-2006-37) is only partly glazed and shows clear brush marks on interior and exterior; it has a straight outer profile on the foot rather than a marked convexo-concave profile, and darker color (from stacking) below the rim. It could belong to what S. Élaigne has called RSP in Beirut and what A. Berlin elsewhere in this volume termed North Coastal Fine ware, therefore plausibly dated before 146. For RSP see S. Élaigne, Les importations de céramiques fines hellénistiques à Beyrouth (site BEY 002): aperçu du faciès nord levantin, Syria 84, 2007, 107–142, esp. pp. 111. 113–114 and fig. 13. I thank Sarah for discussing the material with me in 2006 and in 2016. ESA was of equal (or nearly equal) importance to Italian sigillata throughout the Augustan period at Corinth.

them. Unfortunately for all of us, her conclusion is that there is considerable ambiguity in the material, that for many objects a case can be made for either date. Her method is more rigorous than most of us can manage. *Caveat emptor*! Or in this case historians and ceramic specialists take heed. It might help us all to stop using these historical dates for the pottery and simply say »first half of the 1st century BCE«.

The final section provides three interpretations of Hellenistic pottery, historical, archaeological, and cultural, respectively. In a short paper J. Lund asks whether the political boundaries between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms could account for some pottery distribution patterns. His eight case studies (Antiochene molded bowls, ESA, faience oinochoai with portraits of Ptolemaic queens, Cypriot sigillata, Gnathia ware, Hadra vases, Greco-Italic (Will Type 1A) amphoras, and Rhodian transport amphoras) provide very mixed results, particularly because some of these wares circulated far beyond the boundaries of the two kingdoms. Perhaps if the studies had been arranged chronologically rather than geographically the results might have been more revealing? Next A. Berlin, S. Herbert, and P. Stone, in a paper on tablewares from Tel Kedesh (inland from Tyre, across the valley from Tel Anafa), present successive wares associated with the Ptolemaic, Seleucid, and post-Seleucid levels of the site. They identify semi-fine (subdivided into two groups, attributed to Tyre and to Akko-Ptolemais), a 3rd-century red ware (Central Coastal Fine), and two wares that were introduced in the first half of the 2nd century and were current at the time of the destruction of the site in 144/143 BCE (North Coastal Fine[7] and the black-slipped predecessor of ESA, BSP, identified at Tel Anafa); they add that ESA was not found in these destruction levels, but only in the squatting phase that succeeds it. Berlin's attempt to relocate BSP to Tyre on the basis that it is more commonly found in the southern Levant and that ESA appears ca. 150 BCE at Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates, earlier than in the south, failed to convince me[8]. BSP was found in surveys of the Amuq plain as well as of the area around Aleppo, and it has since been identified not only in Beirut but also in Alexandria. Furthermore, as Berlin pointed out in a review of the pottery from Jebel Khalid, the date of ca. 150 BCE is a *terminus post quem* provided by coins for the appearance of ESA at Jebel Khalid[9]. The site also produced stamped Rhodian amphora handles that come to an end in the 150s BCE, but they seem to have been replaced by locally produced stamped jars, apparently an example of import restriction

7 The name was given because the authors wish to attribute it to Kinet Hüyük north of Antioch, where I have been told ESA is overwhelmingly present in the Hellenistic phase. But that was also the case at Tel Anafa, and excavations by M.-H. and C. Gates over the past 20 years have demonstrated that after Phase II (ca. 175–50 BCE) the site of Kinet Hüyük was abandoned for over a millennium; see M.-H. Gates – C. Gates – S. Redford – A. Eger, Excavations at Kinet Hoyuk and Hisn al-Tinat, in: A. Özfirat – C. Uygun (eds.), Hatay arkeolojik kazı ve araştırmaları (Antakya 2014) 157–171, esp. p. 166. It is thus not a good candidate as a source of ESA; another recent candidate is Rhosus (D. Malfitana – J. Poblome – J. Lund, Eastern Sigillata A Found in Italy, BABesch 80, 2005, 199–212). For the moment it would be wisest to retain the previous suggestions of one of the ports of Antioch or inland in the valley of the Orontes (if the mode of distribution resembles that of Italian sigillata or Campana B).

8 It flies in the face of the results of NAA that its source is the same as that of ESA, now confirmed by lead-isotope analyses. In the initial report, K. W. Slane – J. M. Elam – M. D. Glascock – H. Neff, Compositional Analysis of Eastern Sigillata A and Related Wares from Tel Anafa (Israel), JASc 21, 1994, 51–64, ESA and BSP were shown to be closely related, and we interpreted the results of the analysis of semi-fine from Tel Anafa as showing that it also came from the same source. Recent work examining the lead isotopes in these samples confirmed the identity of the clay of ESA and BSP but showed that semi-fine is different; see V. Renson – K. W. Slane – M. L. Rautman – B. Kidd – J. Guthrie – M. D. Glascock, Pottery Provenance in the Eastern Mediterranean Using Lead Isotopes, Archaeometry 2015, doi: 10.1111/arcm.12217. Separating BSP from ESA to attach it to semi-fine fails to acknowledge the strength of the scientific evidence.

9 A. Berlin, review of H. Jackson – J. Tidmarsh, Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates 3. The Pottery, MedA Suppl. 7 (Sydney 2011), in: BMCR 2012.10.09.

rather than site destruction[10]. In the volume's last paper J.-P. Morel addresses some cultural implications of expanding markets (globalization) by comparing Campana A and Campana B, and placing them against the broader context of Classical Attic wares and later Italian and Gaulish sigillata. Although the comparison is sometimes strained (Campana A is ›Greek‹ and ceramic and Campana B is ›Etruscan-Roman‹ and metallic[11]), his points about their types of provenance (single source vs. clustered sources, coastal vs. inland but connected to the sea by a river) as well as the organizational structure that produced and distributed them deserve attention. The paper draws heavily upon his publications of the 1980s and 1990s, and more recent publications that have begun to recognize these Italian wares much more widely in the East and the Black Sea (Athens, Corinth, Tel Anafa, Alexandria, Beirut, not to mention Olbia Pontike in this volume) may modify his conclusions. More seriously, his view that Italy »vit sa vie« (short for, ignored ceramic developments in the Hellenistic East) and that its expansion was directed primarily to the western Mediterranean is out of date. Both Italy and Carthage (where the 146 BCE date for the end of Rhodian Period IV originated in early 20th century publications) could have been more profitably involved in this conference.

What is missing from most publications of conference proceedings is a record of the discussion that followed the papers, and that is the case here. Few of the authors seem to have modified their papers as a result of what they had heard, which is disappointing because the conference was clearly designed to provide resonances among the papers, and it works very well in the volume. Several of these papers seem to exist in an historical and cultural vacuum, a criticism leveled all too frequently at ceramic papers that could have been alleviated by adding a summary paragraph acknowledging the interconnections. Yet Lund's question about the constraints that Ptolemaic and Seleucid political control exercised over the circulation of luxury products or staples like grain and wine might profitably have been extended to the kingdom of Pergamon. As is clear from the central section of papers the west coast of Asia was closely involved in Black Sea trade. By the end of the 3rd century BCE the rulers of Pergamon were surely players in the Aegean and the Black Sea, joined soon after the middle of the 2nd century (no later than 129) by Rome[12]. Neither is mentioned sufficiently here.

A term used in the invitation to the conference, in the introduction to this volume, and by Morel is ›globalization‹, defined in a narrow sense as the passage of material culture across territorial boundaries (p. 13) and in a broader sense to include local adaptations of such material culture. Just as the kingdoms and island-powers of the Hellenistic world were much larger and more interconnected than the city-states of the Classical period, so the markets for some kinds of goods became regional – and eventually superregional, until by the late 1st century BCE, both government and markets had become Mediterranean-wide. The later 2nd century BCE witnessed the first steps into superregionalism, and the experience of the Black Sea sites discussed in this volume illustrate the effects.

10 G. Clarke, Jebel Khalid. Stamped Amphora Handles, 2000–2005, JMedA 18, 2005, 175–191, with summary including Rhodian stamps found in the earlier campaigns of 1986–1996 on p. 184.

11 Such terms can be relative. Students of Hellenistic pottery might not realize that the foot profiles he considers metallic, those of Campana B (his fig. 6), are also characteristic of the earliest Italian sigillata and that those of Campana A are close to later Augustan sigillata forms; but in sigillata, the later profiles are related to silver vessels, while the earlier ones are derived from Campana B, i.e. they are ›ceramic‹.

12 My impression from a Fautores congress at Ephesos in 1998 is that effects of Rome's control of Asia were manifest within about a generation, ca. 100 BCE, and also that Bosporan products eventually make their way into the Aegean (in the 1st century BCE? and certainly after 50 CE).