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<table>
<thead>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADelt B</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Archäologische Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agora</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgoraPB</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA</td>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Ist It Num</td>
<td>Annali. Istituto italiano di numismatica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANRW</td>
<td>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthr A Chron</td>
<td>Ανθρωπολογικά και Αρχαιολογικά Χρονικά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntK</td>
<td>Antike Kunst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeometry</td>
<td>Archaeometry. Bulletin of the Research Laboratory for Archaeology and History of Art, Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchCl</td>
<td>Archeologia classica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Eub Mel</td>
<td>Αρχαίον Ευβοϊκών Μελετών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchPF</td>
<td>Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAE</td>
<td>Annales du Service des antiquités du l’Égypte</td>
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<tr>
<td><strong>ASAtene</strong></td>
<td>Annuario della scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in Oriente</td>
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<tr>
<td><strong>Atiqot</strong></td>
<td>'Atiqot. Journal of the Israel Department of Antiquities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AtiqotHeb</strong></td>
<td>'Atiqot. Journal of the Israel Department of Antiquities. Hebrew Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atlante</strong></td>
<td>Atlante delle forme ceramiche. Enciclopedia dell’arte antica classica e orientale, suppl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AvP</strong></td>
<td>Allertümmer von Pergamon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAAL</strong></td>
<td>Bulletin d’archéologie et d’architecture libanaises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BABesch</strong></td>
<td>Bulletin anteke beschaving. Annual Papers on Classical Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAngloIsrASoc</strong></td>
<td>Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAR</strong></td>
<td>British Archaeological Reports. British Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARIntSer</strong></td>
<td>British Archaeological Reports. International Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASOR</strong></td>
<td>Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCH</strong></td>
<td>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BdA</strong></td>
<td>Bollettino d’arte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BerlMus</strong></td>
<td>Berliner Museen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIFAO</strong></td>
<td>Bulletin de l’institut français d’archéologie orientale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMCR</strong></td>
<td>Bryn Mawr Classical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boreas</strong></td>
<td>Boreas. Münsterische Beiträge zur Archäologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BSA</strong></td>
<td>The Annual of the British School at Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BSR</strong></td>
<td>Papers of the British School at Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BSS</strong></td>
<td>Black Sea Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CahPEg</strong></td>
<td>Cahier de recherches de l’institut de papyriologie et d’égyptologie de Lille. Sociétés urbaines en Égypte et au Soudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCÉ</strong></td>
<td>Cahiers de la céramique égyptienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEFR</strong></td>
<td>Collection de l’École française de Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENiM</strong></td>
<td>Cahiers »Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corinth</strong></td>
<td>Corinth. Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ChronEg</strong></td>
<td>Chronique d’Égypte. Bulletin périodique de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ClQ</strong></td>
<td>The Classical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dacia</strong></td>
<td>Dacia. Revue d’archéologie et d’histoire ancienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Délos</strong></td>
<td>= EAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DNP</strong></td>
<td>Der Neue Pauly. Encyklopädie der Antike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DossAParis</strong></td>
<td>Les dossiers d’archéologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dura-Europos</strong></td>
<td>The Excavations at Dura-Europos Conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAD</strong></td>
<td>Exploration archéologique de Délos faite par l’école française d’Athènes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EllKer 1</strong></td>
<td>Α’ Επιστημονική Συνάντηση για την Ελληνιστική Κεραμική, Ιωάννινα 6 Δεκεμβρίου 1986 (Rhodes 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EllKer 2</strong></td>
<td>Β’ Επιστημονική Συνάντηση για την Ελληνιστική Κεραμική, Χρονολογικά προβλήματα της ελληνιστικής κέραμικής, Ρόδος 22–25 Μαρτίου 1989 (Rhodes 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EllKer 3</strong></td>
<td>Γ’ Επιστημονική Συνάντηση για την Ελληνιστική Κεραμική, Χρονολογικά σύνολα – εργαστήρια 24–27 Σεπτεμβρίου 1991 Θεσσαλονική (Athens 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGS</td>
<td>Journal of Glass Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHP</td>
<td>Journal of Hellenistic Pottery and Material Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHS</td>
<td>The Journal of Hellenic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMedA</td>
<td>Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPOS</td>
<td>The Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRA</td>
<td>Journal of Roman Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>The Journal of Roman Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerameikos</td>
<td>Kerameikos. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klio</td>
<td>Klio. Beiträge zur aten Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokalos</td>
<td>Κώκαλος. Studi pubblicati dall’Istituto di storia antica dell’Università di Palermo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSIA</td>
<td>Kratkie soobsčenija o dokladach i polevych issledovanijach Instituta archeologii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LibyaAnt</td>
<td>Libya antiqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMC</td>
<td>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonika</td>
<td>Μακεδονικά. Σύγγραμμα Περιοδικόν της Εταιρείας Μακεδονικών Σπουδών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MatIsslA</td>
<td>Materialy i issledovanija po archeologii SSSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MedA</td>
<td>Mediterranean Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFRA</td>
<td>Mélanges de l'École française du Rome. Antiquité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MelBeyrouth</td>
<td>Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MemAmAc</td>
<td>Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetrMusJ</td>
<td>Metropolitan Museum Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemosyne</td>
<td>Mnemosyne. A Journal of Classical Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MonPiot</td>
<td>Monuments et mémoires. Fondation E. Piot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGWG</td>
<td>Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikephoros</td>
<td>Nikephoros. Zeitschrift für Sport und Kultur m Altertum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSc</td>
<td>Notizie degli scavi di antichità</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthus</td>
<td>Excavations at Olynthus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OxfJA</td>
<td>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCZ</td>
<td>Papyri Cairo Zenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFQS</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Pergamenische Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakt</td>
<td>Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Papyri greci e latini. Publicationi della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDAP</td>
<td>The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Revue archéologique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue Biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRFActa</td>
<td>Rei Cretariae Romanae Fatorum Acta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Paulys Realencyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>Revue des études grecque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScrClIsr</td>
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<td>SEG</td>
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</tr>
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<td>SHAJ</td>
<td>Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SovA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>StAnt</td>
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<td>Tάλαντα. Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society</td>
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</tr>
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<td>TelAvivJA</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association</td>
</tr>
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<td>Transactions of the American Philosophical Society</td>
</tr>
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<td>Xenia. Konstanzer althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCE</td>
<td>Before the Christian Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bibl.</td>
<td>bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. / cent.</td>
<td>century/ies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cat.</td>
<td>catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Christian Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed(s).</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>est.</td>
<td>estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>et cetera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fasc.</td>
<td>fascicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fig(s).</td>
<td>figure(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr.</td>
<td>fragment/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr.</td>
<td>gram/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
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</tr>
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<td>min.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>no(s).</td>
<td>number(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl(s).</td>
<td>plate(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp.</td>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>review</td>
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<td>sub voce</td>
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<tr>
<td>Th.</td>
<td>thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us.</td>
<td>unstratified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td>width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wt.</td>
<td>weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol(s).</td>
<td>volume(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhodian Amphoras from Butrint (Albania):
Dating, Contexts and Trade

Nadia Aleotti

The paper focuses on Rhodian amphoras from the Butrint Roman Forum Excavations Project 2011–2014, carried out under the direction of the Notre Dame University (Indiana, USA) in collaboration with the Albanian Institute of Archaeology in the ancient city of Butrint (southern Albania). Considering their great informative potential, Rhodian amphoras are studied in terms of both dating and trade, focusing on the contexts they come from, on precise dates given by stamps and on the contribution of Rhodian amphoras to investigate and assess the commercial trade of Hellenistic Butrint.

The Butrint Roman Forum Excavations Project was carried out in the ancient city of Butrint (southern Albania) from 2011 to 2014 by an international and multidisciplinary team under the direction of the Notre Dame University (Indiana, USA) in collaboration with the Albanian Institute of Archaeology. The project was mainly designed to investigate the Roman forum, but the excavation deepened under the level of the forum pavement reached pre-Roman contexts as well, adding new important data to our knowledge of Archaic and Hellenistic Butrint.

Despite the involvement of Butrint in the Trojan saga, the Mycenaean frequentation still remains archaeologically unknown, while recent excavations confirm that the first settlement was strictly connected to the Corinthian colonisation. The strategic position of the headland on the Lake of Butrint, connected by the Vivari Channel to the Ionian Sea just in front of the Island of Kerkyra, was the reason for the growing interest of the Corinthian colony of Kerkyra towards the mainland during the 7th century BCE and also determined the destiny of the settlement until the Venetian period. Corinthian influence gradually decreased during the Classical period and starting from the 4th century BCE, Butrint was instead totally involved in the Epirote events, as independent settlement, as part of the koinon of Epirotes and then at the head of the koinon of Prasaiboi, until the foundation of the Roman colony in 44 BCE.

Thanks to the Butrint Roman Forum Excavations Project 2011-2014, very important archaeological data connected to all these phases came to light. For the first time, Archaic and Classical contexts were reached in the lower part of the headland and connected to previous finds from the acropolis of Butrint. Passing to the Hellenistic period, the continuation of the

---

1 I take this opportunity to thank all the team, and in particular the directors of the project, Prof. D. R. Hernández and Prof. Dh. Çondi, and the Editorial Board of the JHP for the great opportunity to publish here this paper. All the drawings and the photos were made by the author. Fig. 1 was prepared by Prof. D. R. Hernández.
Fig. 1: Butrint Roman Forum plan.
South Stoa, identified in the 2007 excavations of the western part of the forum, was found, confirming the location of the Greek Stoa, supposed to have been replaced by the Roman Forum in the same area between the end of the 1st century BCE and the beginning of the 1st century CE. Finally, the extension of the Roman Forum was definitely identified, with most of the limestone slabs still in situ: measuring ca. 20 x 70 m., it extended from the eastern side of the complex of the Sanctuary of Asclepius until the Eastern Building (fig. 1). Hellenistic pottery came to light in soundings deepened under the Roman Forum in different areas: from Units 16, 17 and 19 under the Forum pavement, from Unit 21 under the pavement of the Basilica and from Unit 29 just outside the southern limit of the forum (fig. 1). Rhodian amphoras were retrieved in all of the investigated areas, and they can be considered as some of the most diagnostic indicators of the Hellenistic period. Their great information potential derives from their dating value, especially when stamped, and from the study of the trade route connecting the eastern and western Mediterranean Sea, by-passing Butrint.

**Dating**

Before analysing Rhodian amphoras in the framework of the contexts they come from, each single diagnostic fragment is presented here, together with technical features and the dating suggested by stamps and comparisons 3.

2403 111 (fig. 6, 1)
Knob toe with conical depression at the base; part of the slightly flaring wall preserved.
Fabric: Micaceous fine orange-pink clay (7.5YR 8/4) on the exterior, two layers on the interior: one brownish red (5YR 4/6) and one darker (7.5YR 4/2).
The toe can be compared to the Monachov’s type II ›short necked‹ dated to the early 3rd century BCE 4; Empereur and Hesnard published a similar toe dated to the end of the 4th century BCE 5 (similar to Monachov’s ›Kyrenian variant‹ 1a type, dated to the late 4th – early 3rd century BCE, but it has a more elongated body and less flaring walls 6). In the evolution of the profile of Rhodian amphoras suggested by Finkielsztejn the knob toe with conical depression belongs to early Hellenistic variants as well 7.

1602 258 (fig. 12, 1)
Fr. of vertical thick-strip angular handle; ivy leaf stamp on the upper face.
Fabric: Smooth, light beige fine clay.
According to Finkielsztejn, the ivy leaf stamp is mainly used by the fabricant Επίγονος Ι, Period IIb and IIc (219–199 BCE) 8, yet no letters were preserved on the stamp found.

2341 324 (figs. 2 and 14, 1)
Fragment of a vertical strip handle; only the upper part with the attachment to the wall preserved; on the upper face stamp in rectangular field (3.7 x 1.9 cm.):
ΕΠΙΦΙΛΟΛΑΜΟΥ
Y[AKINΘΟ]Y


3 Only diagnostic fragments (rims, handles and toes) are presented here, and all the comparisons with other amphoras types are based on diagnostic parts as well.

4 Monachov 2005, 86–88 fig. 9, 1.

5 Empereur – Hesnard 1987, pl. 2 no. 7.

6 Monachov 2005, 72–73 fig. 1, 1.

7 Finkielsztejn 2001, pl. A no. 2, more elongated body, but similar toe, end of 4th / beginning of 3rd century BCE.

8 Finkielsztejn 2001, 103.
Fabric: Fine light beige clay (7.5YR 6/4) with lighter exterior surface (5Y 8/2), but partially altered in section (dark gray)^9. Finkielsztejn’s period IIIb, he suggests 183 BCE^10; the same eponymous was dated in Pergamon to period III (205–175 BCE)^11, while it is attested in Albania in a Rhodian amphora from Shkodra, from a context of the second half of the 2nd century BCE^12.

2349 285 (fig. 13, 1):
Vertical thick rim, slightly sloping internal face; small section of the vertical strip handle attached below preserved.
Fabric: Light brown fine clay (10YR 8/4).
The rim is similar to that from context 2278 (see below), but this one has a more sloping internal face and the handle seems to be more angular; similar to Monachov’s Type I-E-1, dated to the mid- and second half of the 3rd century BCE^13 (but his typology is based especially on handle and bottom, the rim is considered less). A similar rim is attested in Apollonia, Albania, dated to the beginning of the 1st century BCE^14.

2349 293 (fig. 3)
Fragmentary vertical thick-strip angular handle, with a stamp in circular field on the upper face. Rose? Stamp illegible.
Fabric: Light brown fine clay

2278 397 (figs. 4 and 16, 1)
Vertical rim, thick on the external face, with flat upper face; angular vertical strip handle attached below the rim. Rim diameter 12 cm.
Stamp in rectangular field (3.9 x 1.7 cm.) on the upper part of the handle:

ΕΠΙΑΓ[ΕΜΑΚΟΥ]
ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΥ
ΠΑΝΑΜΟΥ

Fabric: Light orange fine clay (5YR 7/6) with lighter external surface (10YR 8/2).
Finkielsztejn’s period IIIc, he suggests 181–179 BCE^15. Börker’s and Burow’s period III (205–175 BCE)^16.

42278b (figs. 5 and 16, 3)
Fragmentary angular vertical thick-strip handle, only in the upper part preserved. Stamp on the upper face only partially legible, with rose, in circular field:

[Δ]ΑΜΟΘΕΜΙ[Σ]----ΑΔ?

Fabric: Light brown fine clay, lighter on the external surface.

---

9 The waterlogged nature of the deepest contexts and the micro-environmental conditions of the subsoil with water and organic substances, have sometimes altered the fabric of pottery, in some cases partially or totally gray, both in surface and section. This occurred especially in the deepest Archaic-Classical contexts, but as well in some deep Hellenistic contexts as well.


12 LAHI 2009, 70 no. 30.

13 MONACHOV 2005, 77 fig. 3, 6.

14 LAHI 2009, pl. 2 no. 20.


16 BÖRKER – BUROW 1998, 18 and pl. 1 no. 20 (associated with the adjectives second Δεύτερος and month Παναμος), and pp. 79–80 nos. 11–21 from Pergamon.
Fig. 6: Context 2403.
Finkielsztejn’s period IIIa, he suggests 191 BCE\(^1\). Börker’s and Burow’s period II–III (240–175 BCE)\(^2\).

1552 68 (fig. 18, 1)
Cylindrical solid peg toe.
Fabric: Light pink fine clay (5YR 7/4)
»Le pied à la forme du cylinder plein «typique» de l’amphore rhodienne«\(^3\) can be dated to the 2nd century BCE\(^4\).

2324 571 (fig. 19, 1)
Cylindrical solid peg toe.
Fabric: Light pink fine clay (5YR 8/4); internal resinous coating.
For comparisons and dating see 1552 68.

**Contexts**

Passing to the analysis of the fragments together with other materials they are associated with, the earliest Rhodian amphora found is the knob toe from context 2403 (fig. 6, 1), its diagnostic pottery suggests a 3rd century BCE consistent and homogeneous dating. Together with the Rhodian toe dated to the early 3rd century BCE, we found Corinthian A1 and B Hellenistic types (fig. 6, 3–4)\(^5\), as well as the earliest variants of the Greco-

---

\(^1\) Finkielsztejn 2001, 190–193 tab. 19.
\(^2\) Börker – Burow 1998, 27 pl. 7 no. 166, with rose, from Pergamon.
\(^3\) Finkielsztejn 2001, 50.
\(^4\) Finkielsztejn 2001, pl. C no. 15.
\(^5\) The same Corinthian types are attested in Apollonia, Albania (Lahti 2009, pl. 1 no. 4 – with a more pronounced bevel – and no. 8, from first half of the 3rd century BCE) and in Phoinike (Gamberini 2015, 92 no. 20; Gamberini in press, pl. 6, 3, 3rd century BCE).
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Italic type (fig. 6, 5–6; 6, 9). The type of a small toe from the same context remains uncertain (fig. 6, 2), but the best comparisons (Corinthian type A1 and an amphora from Knidos) are dated to the same century.22 Passing to black-glazed pottery, a skyphos is the best preserved shape confirming the early Hellenistic dating of the context (fig. 6, 7)23, together with a little cup (fig. 6, 8)24 and potsherds of cyma kantharoi, Epirote fish plates, small plates with vertical rims (figs. 8–9)25, and a fragment of the wall of an Epirote small amphora of one of the earliest variants (first half of the 3rd century BCE) (fig. 10)26. A black-glazed lamp is the latest diagnostic fragment, dating from the late 3rd century BCE (fig. 11)27. Finally, in context 2403 the 3rd century BCE Rhodian toe is associated with a mortar, a chytra and a lekane with internal banded decoration (black bands on the red internal surface) that can all belong to the same century (fig. 7, 1–3)28.

22 For the Corinthian type A1 compare Koehler 1992, pl. 2c, and for Knidos Doksanalti 2014, 333–334 pl. 17 no. 27.
23 Skyphos 'Corinthian type' from a late 4th century BCE grave from Phoinike, Gamberini 2016, 62–63 pl. 4 no. 53, similar shape but slightly different banded decoration.
24 The cup is very similar to some 2nd century BCE regional cups, Gamberini 2016, 317–319 pl. 33, but no precise comparisons have been found. It can be also compared to small saltcellar from 3rd century BCE contexts at Phoinike, Gamberini 2015, 92 no. 7–8.
25 All these black-glazed shapes are among the most wide-spread in regional production. In this context they are attested respectively by the characteristic strip vertical handles with rectangular tongue (‘cyma kantharoi’), the ring on the inner bottom (Epirote fish plate) and the short vertical rim (small plate with vertical rim, see fig. 13, 8 and fig. 14, 4). The best summary of the evolution of these regional shapes is the recent typology of the black-glazed local production in Phoinike, Gamberini 2016, the main reference for this paper.
26 Gamberini 2016, 70–74 pl. 7 no. 77.
27 Ag. 34 A type, late 3rd – 2nd century BCE, Howland 1958, pl. 42, 449 and pl. 16, 448–449.
28 Similar chytra from Phoinike, Gamberini 2015, 92 no. 35, 3rd century BCE. The shape of the lekane is very similar to the Athenian lekane form 2 (shallow, Rotroff 2006, 110–111 fig. 42, 251–253, dated to the late 4th – 3rd century BCE), but they have different handles and they have no internal red glaze; there is a similar vestigial handle on a lekane from Ephesus, similar downturned rim as well, but different wall profile, dated 3rd – 2nd century BCE (Gassner 1997, 90–91 pl. 22); profile similar to a late 4th century BCE lekane from Athens, with black-glazed banded internal decoration, but very different handles (Sparkes – Talcott 1970, 213–214 fig. 15 no. 1820).
Fig. 12: Context 1602.

Fig. 13: Context 3349.
The dating of the not explicit Rhodian handle with ivy leaf stamp (fig. 12, 1) remains uncertain, but it comes from a context that does not seem to pass the 3rd century BCE (Context 1602 Unit 21). This is mainly suggested by Corinthian type B Hellenistic amphoras (fig. 12, 2–4) and black-glazed one handler bowls of the second half of the 4th century BCE (fig. 12, 5–6), together with a mortar that has comparisons in the 3rd century BCE (fig. 12, 7).

Three Rhodian amphoras come from contexts 2349 (rim and illegible stamp with rose in circular field, fig. 13, 1 and fig. 3) and 2341 (handle with stamp, fig. 14, 1), both fluctuating between the 3rd and the 2nd centuries BCE. Here, Rhodian amphoras are still associated with Corinthian types A1 (fig. 14, 2) and B Hellenistic amphoras and with 3rd century BCE local black-glazed shapes, as cyma kantharos (fig. 13, 2), conical and hemispherical cups (fig. 13, 5–6 and fig. 14, 3), echinus

Even when the handles were not preserved, the shape has been recognized by the profile of the bowls, very similar to a local one-handler bowl from Phoinike, dated to the second half of the 4th century BCE, Gamberini 2016, 102–104 pl. 29. For comparisons of Corinthian type B Hellenistic amphoras see note 21 and for the toe on fig. 12, 2 see Preka-Alexandri 1992, 51 fig. 13 from Corfu, second half of the 3rd century BCE.

Hellenistic Corinthian raised-lip mortars, see Villing – Pemberton 2010, fig. 23, 56, dated to the first half of the 3rd century BCE. Athenian Hellenistic mortar Form 1, Rotroff 2006, 99–102. Similar mortars from Phoinike are dated to the 3rd – beginning of the 2nd centuries BCE (Gamberini in press, pl. 5, 5–6). A similar mortar is associated with Corinthian type B amphoras in Phoinike as well, in a context dated to the 3rd century BCE, Gamberini 2015, 94 no. 37.

Fragments of Corinthian type B Hellenistic amphoras from context 2349. For the comparison of the Corinthian type A1 from context 2349 see note 21.

For comparisons see Gamberini 2016, 247 no. 13 pl. 2, and pp. 54–57 for the evolution of the shape.

For comparisons see Gamberini 2016, 251 nos. 67, 68, 72 pl. 6 and pp. 66–69 for conical cups. The hemispherical cup can be compared for both shape and decoration to a hemispherical cup from Athens, dated 270–250 BCE, Rotroff 1997, no. 327; the same decoration on an Epirote fish plate from Phoinike and on a plate from Itaca, both dated to the 3rd century BCE, Gamberini 2016, 264 no. 157 pl. 19, with related bibliography.
bowls (fig. 13, 7) and a fragment of a lion-head spout of a guttus (fig. 15), together with kantharoi with ear-shaped handles (fig. 13, 3–4), small plates with vertical rim (figs. 13, 8; 14, 4), lamps (fig. 13, 10–11) and a cylindrical pyxis (fig. 13, 9) that continued to be locally produced during the 2nd century BCE as well.

Two Rhodian handles with stamps dated from the late 3rd century to 175 BCE come from the late Hellenistic context (fig. 16, 1.3), where few 3rd century BCE fragments (local hemispherical cups, fig. 16, 7–8) are associated with more consistent 2nd – early 1st century BCE vessels. The most interesting fragment among them is the Punic amphora.

Fig. 16: Context 2278.

---

34 For comparisons see Gamberini 2016, 106–107. 276 no. 298 pl. 31.
35 A similar lion-head spout is attested in Phoinike, from a context dated late 4th – 3rd century BCE, Gamberini 2016, 281 no. 350 pl. 36.
36 For fig. 13, 3 the best comparisons come from Phoinike, Gamberini 2016, 58–62 pl. 4, 43–44. The concave-convex body and the features of wall, rim and handles (higher than the rim?) of fig. 13, 4 seem very similar to a kantharos of the local production of Ambracia, from a grave dated in the third quarter of the 2nd century BCE (Angeli 2009, 168 fig. 11); only photographic comparisons, no drawing. See also Bereti 1997, 118 nos. 4Le. 5Le pl. 84, from Amantia, 2nd century BCE.
37 For the plate with vertical rim and its dating to the 3rd – 2nd century BCE see Gamberini 2016, 100–101 pl. 27–28. For the lamp see Howland 1958, pl. 14, 396, Type 27 Variants (fig. 270) and Gamberini 2005, fig. 8.55 no. 12, Agora 34 type (fig. 269). A very similar pyxis from a grave of Phoinike, used as a lid of an amphora, compares to a pyxis from Ioannina, date 3rd – middle 2nd century BCE, Gamberini 2016, 205 pl. 42 no. 407.
38 For the shape see note 33.
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Fig. 17: Fragments of black-glazed plates from context 2278.

rim (fig. 16, 2), which is one of the very rare attestations of western imports to Butrint. A similar dating is suggested by the Lamboglia 2 rim (fig. 16, 4) and by the decorated rim plate both local and extra regional late Hellenistic comparisons (fig. 17). Other black-glazed shapes from the same contexts are the kantharos with ear-shaped handles (fig. 16, 5) and the rim that could belong to an unguentarium with cylindrical body, well attested at other regional sites in late Hellenistic contexts as well (fig. 16, 6). Finally, three enigmatic rims with banded decoration (fig. 16, 9–11) come from context 2278. They are not of the typical local fabric, but their origin remains uncertain. In the Albanian territory, Hellenistic banded pottery is attested at Apollonia, and amphoras with banded decoration come from the Hellenistic cemetery of Lubonja (near Amantia). For all these items, better comparisons come from Lubonja, where amphoras with similar rims and decorations are dated to the middle of the 2nd century BCE. Two 2nd century BCE Rhodian toes were found in contexts 1552 (Unit 19, fig. 18) and context 2324 (Unit 29, fig. 19). The first context is still associated with many 3rd century BCE fragments (conical cups – fig. 18, 2–3 – and Epirote fish plates of the earliest variant – fig. 19, 4–7), and among other diagnostic fragments from the same context, only a black-glazed bowl seems to belong to the 2nd century BCE (fig. 18, 8). Context 2324 yielded more 2nd century BCE fragments, like Lamboglia 2 amphoras of the late 2nd century BCE (fig. 19, 2–3), fragments of rims of kantharoi with ear-shaped handles and mold-made bowls, a pyxis with diluted black glaze (fig. 19, 7), a plate with rolled rim of uncertain origin, yet very similar in shape to an Athenian plate with rolled rim with the same external groove, dated to the first quarter of the 2nd century BCE (fig. 19, 4) together with two well preserved Hellenistic mortars (fig. 19, 8–9) and a chytra (fig. 19, 6). Finally, from context 2324 comes one of the most beautiful fine ware fragments from Butrint Roman Forum Excavations Project 2011-2014. It is the rim of a West Slope Compactor red-brown paste (5YR 7/6), with very few traces of a lighter external coating (10YR 8/3). For the shape see Ramon Torres 7.6.2.1 type, see Ramon Torres 1995, 218 fig. 182 no. 295. Together with other two Punic rims of Mana C2 amphoras (from contexts 2276 and 2277, Unit 21) and one Pascual 1 amphora (from context 1592, Unit 21) they are the only western amphoras from Hellenistic contexts of Butrint. For the shape see local ›piatti con orlo a tesa rialzata‹ from Phoinike, compared to late Hellenistic regional finds and Athenian offset rim plates, Gambarini 2016, 94–95 pl. 23 no. 194–198.

For the kantharos with ear-shaped handles see note 36. For the rim of the unguentarium there are no precise comparisons, but the shape is provided by the preserved shoulder/wall, suggesting a cylindrical body. For the regional diffusion of cylindrical unguentaria see Gambarini 2016, 124–125, and in particular for those from late Hellenistic contexts see Stavropoulou-Gatsi 2009, 259 fig. 1 and Serpetti et al. 2009, 233–235 fig. 2.

Compact red-brown paste (5YR 7/6), with very few traces of a lighter external coating (10YR 8/3). For the shape see local ›piatti con orlo a tesa rialzata‹ from Phoinike, compared to late Hellenistic regional finds and Athenian offset rim plates, Gambarini 2016, 94–95 pl. 23 no. 194–198.

For the shape see local ›piatti con orlo a tesa rialzata‹ from Phoinike, compared to late Hellenistic regional finds and Athenian offset rim plates, Gambarini 2016, 94–95 pl. 23 no. 194–198.

For the evolution of the shape of the local Epirote fish plates see Gambarini 2016, 90–94; the earlier variant is characterized by the groove on the upper internal rim, see pl. 18 nos. 148–151, while in the later variants the rim is downturned. For the local conical cup of the 3rd century BCE see note 33.

A similar bowl comes from an Augustan context from Phoinike, but the shape in local production is dated from the 2nd century BCE, Gambarini 2016, 107–108 pl. 32 no. 308.

Retroff 1997, fig. 48 no. 676.

Similar to Corinthian raised-lip mortars, see Villing – Pemberton 2010, fig. 23. The chytra has a more horizontal rim than those dated to the 3rd century BCE, see fig. 7, 2.
amphora (a non-joining wall fragment was found in context 2278 just above 2324, fig. 19, 5 and figs. 20–21). It has spearhead necklaces with traces of white glaze on ribbons, incised links and white pendants on the neck, while the shoulder is decorated with incised ivy tendrils with leaves added in red, between two unglazed grooves. Under the lowest groove, traces of ribbed decoration are visible. Fabric, rim-shape and decoration can be compared to Athenian West Slope amphoras of the 3rd century BCE, suggesting that the fragments from the Butrint contexts are residual 48.

Trade

After presenting the Rhodian amphoras from Butrint, their dating and the contexts they come from, the third step in the study of the Rhodian amphoras from the Butrint Roman Forum Excavations Project 2011-2014 comprises the evaluation of the Rhodian amphoras in the overall framework of the trade in which Butrint was involved in the Hellenistic period.

Except for the 3rd century BCE toe from context 2403 and the uncertain ivy leaf stamp, all other Rhodian amphoras found in Butrint belong to the 2nd century BCE, a crucial century for Butrint. From the study of Butrint Hellenistic pottery, striking differences clearly emerge between the early (late 4th – 3rd century BCE) and the late Hellenistic period (2nd – 1st centuries BCE), and Rhodian amphoras are among most important indicator of this change. From the late 4th and throughout the 3rd century BCE, amphoras reveal a certain restricted circulation of goods, attested by the predominance of local / regional types and in

48 Fabric: Light orange fine clay (5YR 7/6); lustrous black glaze int./ext. The rim is similar to Athenian amphoras, but the preserved wall seems more flared (see Rotroff 1997, fig. 25, no. 414 for outturned rim and similar decoration, and no. 415 for similar rim, both dated to the middle 3rd century BCE). Similar decoration occurs on other Athenian West Slope vases, yet very close parallels for the decorative scheme and the style of the amphora from Butrint (necklaces, pendants, ivy leaf and ribbed wall) are attested in some eastern West Slope productions (imitating the Athenian models), and in particular at Pergamon, see Rotroff 2002 (in particular fig. 1.1 and 1.2 for the comparison between Athenian and Pergamene shapes) and Rotroff – Oliver 2003, 43 for the discussion of the shape and eastern imitations, and Schäfer 1968, fig. 3 pl. 18 for Pergamene decoration.
Fig. 19: Context 2324.
particular of the Corinthian type B Hellenistic type (79%), probably locally produced49. During the entire 3rd century BCE they are associated virtually only with Greco-Italic amphoras of local/regional or at most Adriatic origin (20%), and the 3rd century BCE Rhodian toe from context 2403 (fig. 6, 1) is the only Eastern import. These data suggest that the the city of Butrint was self-sufficient in wine provision and that the volume of the regional wine production met the requested needs, with a surplus for export as well, marketed in Corinthian type B Hellenistic amphoras. The same self-sufficiency can be assumed for olive oil, in this case without a surplus for export, since the few Corinthian Type A1 amphoras (3rd century BCE) are the only oil amphoras attested. This early Hellenistic agricultural development of the region is primarily connected with the definition and the strengthening of the political and commercial autonomy of Hellenistic Butrint, which integrated itself into a Ionic-Adriatic commercial circuit. However, starting from the 2nd century BCE and continuing throughout the late Hellenistic period, local pottery (both amphoras and fine ware) become predominant, and the best attested types are the regional/Adriatic types like Greco-Italics and Lamboglia 2 (80% of 2nd – 1st century BCE). Among the now attested imports, Rhodian amphoras are predominant (almost 15% of all the amphoras attested), confirming the importance of the spread of the excellent Rhodian wine far beyond the need of a region that must have continued to make wine and to meet its regional needs. Moreover, the trade engaged in eastern imports is documented by the great quantity of mold-made bowls of Ionic origin, well attested in late Hellenistic contexts, after the almost absolute presence of local fine wares in the early Hellenistic period (from the late 4th century and during the 3rd century BCE). Furthermore, the low but very important percentage (almost 5%) of Punic amphoras from the late Hellenistic contexts can be considered the first western contact evidence in an almost closed Ionic/Adriatic system with only eastern imports. The change is part of the development of trade in which Butrint became involved, starting at that moment and continuing throughout the Roman period. The trade openness witnessed in the pottery from the 2nd century BCE and throughout the late Hellenistic period, poses a strong contrast to the almost absolute prevalence of local/regional amphoras of the 4th – 3rd century BCE and reveals the involvement of Butrint in the new political trade dynamics resulting from the growing success of Rome in the Mediterranean Sea and the resulting new economic and commercial balances.

49 For the hypothesis of a local production of the type and for the problems in defining production centres in the region see GASSNER 2011 and GASSNER 2015. I suggested the local production of most of Hellenistic Corinthian type B amphoras from Butrint and its connection with the definition of the political and commercial autonomy of Butrint in a poster presented at the 6th International Meeting on Southern Illyria and Epirus in antiquity, ALEOTTI – BOLZONI in press.
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Imported Hellenistic Stamped Amphora Handles and Fragments from the North Sinai Survey

Donald T. Ariel

Introduction
The 1972–1978 archaeological survey of North Sinai (‘The North Sinai Expedition’) encompassed an area of ca 2000 square km, which included the ‘Ways-of-Horus’, part of the all-important long-distance trade route, the ‘Via Maris’. Consequently the recovery of quantities of fragments of transport amphoras was to be expected. This is especially true of the

1 I would like to thank Eliezer D. Oren for his invitation and support to study this material towards publication. My research continued from 1993 through April 2007, when the comprehensive opus of Herbert Verreth (Verreth 2006) became available to me. Some of the amphora material, added here, used Verreth’s work, despite the fact that I had no opportunity to locate a few of the original articles which he cited. Like Verreth, who completed his work in 1998, and continued to add to it, but ultimately realized that publication was preferable to perfection, my research on the Hellenistic stamped amphora handles and fragments from the North Sinai Survey was first completed in 1993, but continued to undergo revision. The latest significant revision, in 2007 as noted, was followed by the addition of some comments on the coin finds from the North Sinai Survey, when a draft of Robert Kool’s unpublished report appeared on the internet, it itself having been completed in 2007.

It is appropriate to cite some newly-published key research that was not consulted here. In addition to the few items appearing as non vidi in the bibliography (these are partially ‘covered’ by Verreth 2006), the main book that was not consulted is by Ino Nicolaou (Nicolaou 2005). Also not examined were the four volumes of the ‘Lexicon of Eponym Dies on Rhodian Amphora Stamps’ by Gonca Cankardeş-Şenol (Cankardeş-Şenol 2015–2017). As a result, die identities for the eponym stamps were not checked. Nathan Badoud’s important work, since 2007, on Rhodian amphoras, culminating in his magnum opus (Badoud 2015), which included discoveries that impact on the Rhodian stamping practices, is not used here. It will take quite some time before Badoud’s results will be properly digested. As the key works of Finkielsztejn (esp. Finkielsztejn 2001) have been used, one can rest assured that the dates provided here are quite well founded, even for 2017.

Most references here to information from the files of the Athenian Agora project were culled during a visit there by the author in October 1993. The visit was supported by the Athenian Agora Project and the Tel Anafa Project. Thanks to Carolyn G. Koehler, Maria Savvatianiou-Petropoulakou, Andreas Dimoulinis, and Sharon C. Herbert. All references in the following catalogue to information provided by the late Virginia R. Grace (where not otherwise noted) date to that visit. I also benefited from the physical examination of some of the finds by Gérald Finkielsztejn. Thanks are also due to Yaffa Vaknin-Naftalovitch for her administrative assistance, Patrice Kaminsky for arranging the images and making the plates, and Finkielsztejn again for his significant support during the revision periods.

Fig. 1: Map of North Sinai Survey (from Oren 1993a, 1387).
major coastal stations known from ancient written sources. In fact, out of 1,300 settlement sites recorded, and more than three hundred of these with »Hellenistic and principally Roman« remains, most of the stamped material come from three of these stations, Pelusium (T-300), Tell el-Her (T-58D) and Qasrawet (D-50 to D-54) (fig. 1).

The amphoras in this report comprise the Hellenistic transport amphora material which was considered to be imported. Much if not most of the amphora material found in the survey was probably imported to the North Sinai, and not produced there, being the vessels containing the perishables (generally liquids) carried by the traders plying the ›Via Maris‹. This assemblage consists of the amphoras broken during transport, or left behind by traders for any of a number of other reasons. This report is divided into two sections. The first deals with stamped amphora handles. The second relates to unstamped amphora fragments.

Although we noted that much if not most of the amphora material was probably imported, the fragments which, based upon their ware, appear to derive from the Delta, or elsewhere in Egypt, west of the Sinai, have been considered by us also to be local. Consequently, the material treated here is actually the imported amphora finds excluding the Egyptian material, the latter having been included in the local category. This imported amphora material comes from further afield: notably from Italy, the Northern (Black Sea?) region, Anatolia and especially its nearby islands: Kos, Chios (?), Rhodes and Cyprus. Preliminary reports of the survey and its associated excavations have also come mentioned material from Athens, Samos, Lesbos, Knidos, Corinth and Tripoli. The first three may be references to pre- or post-Hellenistic amphoras, as material of those classes have not been identified in the material seen by us. The last two sources, Corinth and Tripoli, are explicitly designated as Hellenistic, but again, were not identified by us. The amphoras in this report are Hellenistic. One stamped handle, dates to the 4th century BCE, and so could also be Persian. The chronological range of other (unstamped) fragments may continue into the 1st century CE.

Earlier amphora finds from the area of the North Sinai Survey have been read and reported. Clédat published six stamped Rhodian handles from excavations at Qasrawet (D-50 to D-54 in the survey). Petrie and Ellis’ Anthedon, Sinai produced amphora material from Tell el-Zuweid.

Amphora material found in Franco-Egyptian researches after the North Sinai Survey have also been published. Carrez-Maratray, Wagner, el-Taba’i and el-Gindi published 67 Hellenistic amphora stamps from the area of Pelusium (T-300), 59 from Tell el-Farama and 8 from Tell el-Her. Most are Rhodian, but a certain number came from Egypt or Italy. Excavations at Tell el-Mufariq near Tell el-Her in northwestern Sinai yielded 32 stamps with

3 Oren 1993a, 1394.
4 Oren 1993a, 1394.
5 Oren 1993a, 1394.
6 Oren 1993a, 1394; Oren 1993b.
7 To roughly gauge the relationship between what I am calling the actual imported amphora finds and the Egyptian material, at Tell el-HER (T-58D) Verreth cited (general) pottery percentages of >other imports< at 53 % and >Egyptian imports< at 47 % (Verreth 2006, 776).
8 Anonymous 1977, 56.
12 Petrie – Ellis 1937. Tell el-Zuweid = Tell Temilat or Tell Abu Selima; Verreth 2006, 227–231, nos. 4–26; a single find there is noted by Clédat (Clédat 1915, 48 no. 42) and noted in Verreth 2006, 231 no. 27; R-51 in the North Sinai Survey; Oren 1993a, 1393.
14 Carrez-Maratray et al. 1996.
Greek inscriptions, most from Rhodes\textsuperscript{15}. Additional amphora fragments are noted from the excavations after 1985 in the region\textsuperscript{16}. In those excavations it is likely that stamped amphora handles also were found.

\section*{I. Stamped Amphora Handles}

In the North Sinai Survey Hellenistic amphora fragments were found in 163 sites, out of a total of some 1300 sites of all periods. Some 28 sites were excavated and in a further 21 sites more intensive surveys were conducted. These latter two operations yielded most of the 76 stamped handles, which were found in nineteen sites\textsuperscript{17}. Sixty-four stamped amphora handles belonged to the Rhodian class. Of these 38 were well identified. The other classes represented were Koan (65–67), Kourio (68), Zenon Group (69), and Latin (mostly Brindisian; 70–76)\textsuperscript{18}. In this report no attempt is made to grapple with the question of the spatial distribution of the different classes, or even of the different chronological ranges of the finds, over the many sites in the survey in which they were found. Some remarks may be found on this issue in Arthur – Oren 1998, 197 and 209.

A full 60\% of the stamped handles derive from seven excavations that were conducted – at six sites – in conjunction with the survey. In five sites only one stamped handle was found: BM-010 (76), R-10 (64), R-21 (48), R-51 (1), and T-150 (60). In the sixth site (T-58D / T-58E) 41 stamped handles were excavated. Of these, all but one (8 in T-58E) were uncovered in T-58D (Tell el-Her, 3–6. 9–10. 12–18. 20–32. 36. 39–40. 50–56. 66. 68. 70. 75). In other words, while the first section of this report purports to relate to surveyed material, most of the stamped handles in fact derive from one site. A similar example of this was seen in the survey of the Western Galilee\textsuperscript{19} where more than 35\% of the material derived from one site (Tel ‘Emeq, Site 34). In both cases, in the great majority of the surveyed sites which yielded stamped handles, only one handle was found. Standard archaeological surveys rarely yield large numbers of such finds. Consequently the numbers of eight handles from Pelusium (T-300) and nine from Qasrawet (D-50 to D-54) should certainly be viewed as significant. In the Tel ‘Emeq site noted above, the disproportionate number of stamped handle finds did not derive from the survey per se, but were found at the site over a period of years, and added to the other surveyed material. In the case of the North Sinai Survey site T-58, excavations were conducted in the wake of the survey. For the latter site, therefore, a great deal more may ultimately be able to be said about the handles, when the details of their contexts are published.

The 40 stamped handles from Tell el-Her (T-58D) derived from twelve contexts (100. 300. 301. 302. 303. 400. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505). These were designated loci, but the question of their specific definitions, and the stratigraphic ranges of the dates of those finds are great, at least 65 years for L. 302, and at least 32 years for L. 40020. A third case, L. 505, is more promising

\begin{thebibliography}
\bibitem{Abdallah et al. 1996 = Verreth 2006} 784.
\bibitem{Arthur – Oren 1998} 194 note 5.
\bibitem{We included in this number the stamped handle of a lagynos (63) which, although not deriving from an amphora, is generally studied with amphora finds. Unstamped lagynoi are also considered (below).}
\bibitem{An additional handle, never seen by us, may be pl. 5, 9 below.}
\bibitem{Ariel 2001.}
\bibitem{I also examined Kool’s conclusions about the coins from Tell el-Her (Kool unpublished), because of the disproportionally high number of stamped amphoras from there. In general, almost 30\% of the coin finds of the North Sinai Survey date to the Hellenistic period. Almost 90\% (62 coins) of these come from the nearby sites in the Pelusium area (Pelusium [T-300] and Tell el-Her [T-58D]), which, in fact, are 10 km apart. Kool found that the Hellenistic coins from Tell el-Her had the broadest chronological range possible: from the reign of Alexander the Great (no. 4), through a full range of Ptolemaic coins (Ptolemy I – X). Incidentally, Ptolemy X was a contemporary of the Judean King Alexander Jannaeus (104–76 BCE), and, remarkably, a coin of that king was also found at that site. Therefore, both the stamped amphora handles and the coins from Tell el-Her exhibit particularly long chronological spans.}
\end{thebibliography}
(3. 13. 15. 22. 25). The dates for the five stamped handles from that context fall in Periods II and IIIa (ca 134–190 BCE), but may date to as short a range as ca 205–197 BCE. Unfortunately, no eponym-fabricant combinations were possible for these handles.

It is the excavations conducted at Tell el-Ḥer which created the uneven distribution between the nineteen sites with stamped handles. The finds from there are over five times the quantity deriving from the site with the next largest number (Qasrawet, 9 handles). The three largest sites (Pelusium, Tell el-Ḥer and Qasrawet) produced roughly three-quarters of the stamped amphora handles found in the survey.

Two classes may have items falling outside of the Hellenistic period. They are the Kouriote class (in our case 4th [-3rd?] century BCE)\(^21\), and the Latin class, where stamps of course also date from the Roman period. In the latter case, all of the better identified stamps are Brindisian, i.e., date to the 1st century BCE. This too straddles the Hellenistic period, at its lower limit.

The predominance of Rhodian stamps vis-à-vis the other classes is in keeping with the plentiful finds of stamped amphora material in Egypt (especially Alexandria) and Syro-Palestine\(^22\).

For the Rhodian class, Virginia R. Grace’s chronological frameworks have long provided a quite secure basis for dating, including dating of sites and other classes. Grace’s 1974 refinement\(^23\) heralded the introduction of – within a small range of error – exact years (for eponyms) or ranges of years (for fabricants) into discussions of specific stamps. G. Finkielsztejn’s researches raised a problem with Grace’s framework vis-à-vis her Period IV\(^24\). This problem has brought Finkielsztejn to propose a revised chronology, changing in effect Grace’s dates for Periods I through IV. Grace’s published datings for names (until and including Period IV) are roughly eleven years earlier than Finkielsztejn’s chronology. Finkielsztejn’s chronology has been adopted here. All dates given as specific years derive from summary tables in Finkielsztejn 2001,188–195, unless otherwise noted.

**Chronological Distribution**

The value of surveyed material is enhanced by the quantities involved. This assemblage of stamped amphora handles and other amphora fragments, while not small, is not large enough to draw any far-reaching conclusions, especially when considering the fact that they derive from a large number of far flung sites in a region with not a small amount of geographical diversity. Additional complexity is added by two factors: the strategy of artefact recovery (only diagnostic sherds were ultimately saved), and the current level of knowledge of the typology of Hellenistic amphoras and wares, at least on the part of the author. The surveyed ceramic material was first sorted to separate the amphora material. Afterwards, the imported amphora fragments were separated from the local material, and a typology was made. The author then attempted to sort the Hellenistic amphora fragments from earlier and later types. This was an extremely difficult task (see below, unstamped amphora fragments section). What resulted was, to a large extent, an assemblage of Rhodian and Koan amphora fragments, along

\(^{21}\) Tell el-Ḥer had significant Persian-period remains (Oren 1993a, Oren 1394), and this is represented both in the amphora stamp and coin finds. The single stamped handle of the Kouriote class (68) is the only 4th-century BCE handle from the Survey. The only stamped handle from L303 at Tell el-Ḥer (T-58D), it finds a chronological parallel in the find of the only Persian-period coin from the survey, described as a Philistian obol (no. 1). Dated by Kool to the mid-5th – 4th century BCE, but probably late 5th – early 4th century according to the latest chronological thinking, the obol is close in date to the Kouriote handle. Unfortunately, Kool’s draft does not detail the locus, if any, from which it derived.

\(^{22}\) Ariel 1990, 17 table 1; Lund 1993, 367–369; Finkielsztejn 1995.

\(^{23}\) Grace 1974a.

with a few other pieces recalling other Hellenistic classes. Extreme weathering of some pieces complicated their identification even further.

It is therefore no coincidence that the assemblage of unstamped material appears to mimic the stamped finds. Some observations may nevertheless be noted regarding the unstamped material but they are better understood after an examination of the chronological distribution of the stamped handles.

Chronologically, one should begin by examining the site with the most handles: T-58D. This is the only site where one may speak of an internal chronological distribution. There, the earliest dated handles were found (7, 68), as well as one of the latest (75). There, too, almost all of the classes were represented: Rhodian, Koan, Kouriote, and Latin. What may be said is there is no significant difference in chronological distribution between T-58D and the stamped amphora handles from the survey as a whole.

The entire assemblage of stamped handles may now be considered. The chronologically-relevant sample is much smaller than the total of seventy-four handles uncovered. Thirty seven handles of the Rhodian class are well identified and thirty-six are well dated (1–40). The Koan, Kouriote, and Zenon Group classes are only roughly dated as classes. The Latin class as well may all belong to the 1st century BCE (see above). Regarding overall range, then, the Kouriote handle is the earliest (4th [–3rd?] century BCE), and the Latin stamped handles are the latest (1st century BCE). The whole Hellenistic period may therefore be said to be represented. There is also no incontrovertible evidence of gaps within the Hellenistic period. However, looking more closely at the finds of the predominant Rhodian class, some observations are in order. The Rhodian finds from the survey date from the mid-3rd through last quarter of the 2nd century BCE. The less well dated ‘Early Rhodian’ handles (8 and 16) certainly moves the beginning date of the Rhodian class in the survey back to the first half of the 3rd century BCE. This is all the more the case because in fact the production of ‘Early Rhodian’ stamped amphoras was small and sporadic relative to the heyday of Rhodian amphora production in the second half of the 3rd century BCE.

The small amount of Period V handles (ca 146–107 BCE) and the near absence of Periods VI–VII (ca 107–50 BCE) appears to be more significant, as Period V material was certainly plentiful in Egypt25. The latest stamped Rhodian handles date from ca 128 BCE (11) and ca 107 BCE (6). This suggests that the level of trade through the northern Sinai dropped towards the end of the 2nd and early 1st centuries BCE. Such a possible gap finds support in the absence of any stamped handles of the Knidian class, which were most prevalent in the later 2nd century BCE, and appear in Egypt and Syro-Palestine in small but not-insignificant quantities. Of course other classes may have ‘replaced’ the Rhodian and Knidian in the late 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, namely the Koan and Latin (Brindisi) classes. Therefore, it is unwise to posit a more complete break of commerce along those trade routes during that time. Moreover, it should be noted that while the stamped Rhodian amphora material is not found beyond ca 107 BCE, unstamped Rhodian fragments have been identified (figs. 7–14), some dating from roughly the second half of the 1st century BCE.

While caution is in order we can summarize in the following way. The Early Hellenistic period is represented in the bulk of the amphora material. By the mid-2nd century BCE, there is evidence of a drop in commercial activity in the region, or at least along the ‘Ways-of-Horus’ road. This drop, which may actually have been a break, is only known to change with the appearance of handles of the Latin classes, roughly in the 1st century BCE.

This summary for the bulk of the material, however, does not appear to apply to Qasrawet, 8 km southeast of the nearest way station on the road (Qatya). The poorly dated stamped Rhodian and Latin handles from Qasrawet point to a later Hellenistic horizon. Although 41–46 are Rhodian handles with illegible stamps, the profile drawings of 41–45 (fig. 4, 1–5) suggest that they are mostly from the second half of the 2nd century BCE or later. The remaining three

25 Grace 1985, 42.
stamped handles from Qasrawet bear Latin stamps. 71 is either from a Brindisian or Greco-Italic amphora, and 72–73 are unidentified and undated, but their Latin inscriptions provide generally later dates than the Rhodian material. To this may be added the numismatic material from Qasrawet. Out of 232 identified coins coming from the site, seven are Hellenistic. Kool stated that the range of the Hellenistic material was »Ptolemy VIII – Nabateans« and provided dates of 145–104 BCE. Although the dating of both the Ptolemaic and the earliest Nabatean coin series have changed significantly in the decade since Kool’s manuscript, it is nevertheless interesting that his date for the Hellenistic Qasrawet coins also seem to fall in same chronological period as the amphora handles. The coins and the stamped handles of the North Sinai Survey from Qasrawet all seem to provide dates in the second half of the 2nd century BCE and later.

This dating is also consistent with the amphora readings published by Clédat for Qasrawet. All but one of the six Rhodian amphora stamps Clédat published from the site belong in the second half of the 2nd century BCE or later. In addition, the fact that Clédat’s finds produced a high number of Latin stamped handles (11) relative to Rhodian handles is congruent with the later date range.

Oren viewed the numerous Hellenistic sherds embedded in the mortar of walls in the Qasrawet temple quarter as evidence of a Hellenistic occupation nearby. In other words, the date of some of the coins and many of the amphora stamps provide a second half of the 2nd century BCE date for the beginning of the as yet undiscovered Hellenistic settlement at Qasrawet. This is a refinement of the general 2nd century BCE date that both Oren and Verreth proposed for the beginning of settlement at Qasrawet.

Catalogue

The arrangement of the handles and conventions regarding the readings follows Finkielsztejn 2001, 213–216. Rhodian stamps with names not read are organized by context.

Rhodian stamped handles

1 Δ 28628, Context R 51, L. 113 (fig. 2, 1)
   Rectangular stamp, red spot

Δανθωκλεύς

The fabricant Δανθωκλεύς 2nd, who placed the month on the stamps bearing the eponym’s name, was active in the early 2nd century BCE. Based upon connections noted in Jöhrens 1998, 63 no. 162 and Jöhrens 2001, 409 under no. 153, the range of Δανθωκλεύς 2nd was ca 183–161 BCE at least. Three handles found in the North Sinai apparently belonged to amphoras produced by this fabricant: one from Tell Temilat (Clédat 1912, 48 no. 36 = Verreth 2006, 227 no. 4) and two from Tell el-Mufariq (Abdallah et al. 1996, nos. 21–22 = Verreth 2006, 784).

26 Koöl unpublished.
27 Koöl unpublished.
28 Clédat 1912.
29 The exception may be Clédat 1912, 165 no. 1 (= Verreth 2006, 666 no. 4), which Verreth restored as the eponym Ἀριστοφάνης. However, according to Finkielsztejn 2001, 179, this eponym is a ‹floater› and cannot yet be dated.
32 Oren 1993b, 1213.
33 Oren 1993b, 1215.
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2 Δ 25171, Context A 224 (fig. 2, 2)
Rectangular stamp
Πεδαγεί(τυος)
Ἀγησίλας

A tau is written instead of the delta in the first line. The fabricant Ἀγησίλας may be dated to between ca 196 and ca 190 BCE at least, based upon the dates of three eponyms in whose terms he was active (Jöhrens 1998, 36 no. 83 and Jöhrens 2001, 410 no. 154). A drawing of a complete amphora of Ἀγησίλας 1st dated by the term of Δαμοθέμις is published in Ben Dov 1982, 71.

3 Δ 25098, Context T-58D, L. 505
Rectangular stamp
Ἀγλουμβρότου
Ὑακίνθιος

Although the preposition ἐπι does not appear, this stamp apparently refers to the eponym of this name. The late Virginia R. Grace kindly confirmed this for me in a personal communication. A stamp of probably the same die (with month in nominative case) was found in Samaria (Reisner et al. 1924, 312 no. 1). Another example of this eponym appearing without the preposition is published (as a fabricant) in Sztetyłł 1983, 72 no. 16. That stamp names a different month. The eponym is dated to ca 197 BCE in Finkielsztejn 2001.

4 Δ 23051, Context T-58D, L. 504
Rectangular stamp
Ἀγοράνακτος
[Ἀρταμίτιου]
in frame

Ἀγοράναξ shared a workshop with Μαρσύας and Πασίων (who also employed frames on his stamps (Finkielsztejn 2001, 106). Ariel – Finkielsztejn 1994, 212 noted that Ἀγοράναξ and Πασίων overlapped there for nine years. Finkielsztejn 2000b, 217, gave the range for the linear framed stamps of Ἀγοράναξ (with Helios head) as 203–193 BCE. Another stamp from an amphora of Ἀγοράναξ, is known from the eastern site of Tell Temilat (Petrie – Ellis 1937, pl. 51 = Verrehl 2006, 228 no. 7).

5 Δ 25017, Context T-58D, L. 302 (fig. 7, 6)
Rectangular stamp
Ἀγοράνακτος
Βαδρομίου

See 4 above. The chronological range of this type, without frame, has not been established. It certainly falls within the larger range of the fabricant’s period of activity. Grace had suggested at least a 23-year range in her chronology (Grace 1974a, 200). Finkielsztejn has suggested that other types of the fabricant Ἀγοράναξ were dated—in his chronology—to somewhere within the 26-year range of 212–187 BCE (Finkielsztejn 2000b, 217).

6 Δ 25101, Context T-58D, L. 302 (figs. 2, 3; 8, 3)
Rectangular stamp
Ἄρταμιτίου
ἐπὶ τερέφος Ἀγο
φαράγας
τὸ[c] all retrograde

This stamp of the cursive style was read by G. Finkielsztejn, and its rubbing was almost identically read by A. Dimoulinis. The eponym Ἀγοράναξ has been dated by Finkielsztejn to ca 108 BCE.
Fig. 2: Rhodian stamped handles (nos. 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 12).

7 Δ 25093, Context T-300 (fig. 2, 4)
Circular stamp

\[\varepsilon[\gamma]\varsigma\tau\pi\tau\mu\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\ A\iota\nu\epsilon\alpha\varsigma\]

rose

The stamp is identical to one from Lindos (Nilsson 1909, 359 no. 28. 4; pl. I, 5, as well as two stamps from the Athenian Agora on file in Athens. This fabricant is the first of two homonyms. The second employed a rectangular stamp with a bunch of grapes on the right of his name, an arrangement which belongs to the second half of the 2nd century BCE (Pâris 1913, 157 no. X-3, and Nicolau 1991, 204 no. 34). Aινέας 1st is discussed in Grace 1974b, 92–94, A2, where seven probable non-joining connections to eponyms are noted. Θέστωρ and Δαμόθεος are named. These eponyms have been dated consecutively by Finkielsztejn to ca 192 and ca 191 BCE respectively. A third eponym, Αρχίδαμος, is named as associated with another Aινέας type, which is also apparently associative with the first fabricant homonym. The date of Αρχίδαμος (ca 180/178 BCE, no. 12 below) suggests Aινέας 1st was active between ca 192 and ca 180/178 BCE at least.

8 Δ 4936, Context T-58E, L. 500 (fig. 7, 1)
Circular stamp

[A]λ
κ[πτσ]
[centre]

The reading of this stamp was kindly provided by A. Dimoulinis from a rubbing, on the basis of unpublished parallels on file in the Amphora Project offices in Athens. It is an ›Early Rhodian‹ type of Ἀλκισθένης. Lund 2002, 169, H58, dated this fabricant to Period I.

9 Δ 25090, Context T-58D, L. 503 (fig. 7, 13)
Rectangular stamp

Ἀριστινος

This fabricant of this name was originally dated by Grace 1950, 140 no. 17, to Periods I–II. Brugnone 1986, 48–50 nos. 68–70, lowered his period of activity to ca 210–186 BCE. See also Sztetyło 1991, 63 nos. 97–99, and p. 37 note 136 (end of 3rd and
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beginning of 2nd century BCE). Grace 1985, 40, had noted a twelve-year range for the fabricant, with Δορκυλίδας (15) as perhaps the earliest. Finkielsztejn’s datings of the eponym connections noted by Brugnone expand the range significantly, to over thirty years. However, the earliest and latest dated eponyms associated with the fabricants Αριστών (Θεύδωρος 2nd [ca 203–199 BCE] and Αρατοφάνης 1st [ca 169 / 167 BCE], respectively, according to Finkielsztejn 2001) are only noted as possible connections in Brugnone 1986. Discounting those two eponyms yields an only slightly shorter period of activity, throughout the first quarter of the 2nd century BCE. Conovici – Garlan 2004, 112 no. 21) maintained a short period of activity, in the end of Period II and beginning of Period III.

10 Δ 23045, Context T-58D, L. 400 (fig. 2, 5)
Rectangular stamp
[Ἀριστωνο[ς]]
See 9 above.

11 Δ 25080, Context R 22 (fig. 8, 2)
Rectangular stamp
Ἐπί Αριστο
γενεύς
Ἀρταμίτου]
The eponym is dated ca 129 BCE in Finkielsztejn 2001. Considering the eponym’s date and the stamp’s style, it may be that the fabricant was Μίδας, for whom a connection is already known (Finkielsztejn 2001, 132).

12 Δ 25018, Context T-58D, L. 400 (fig. 2, 6)
Circular stamp
[Ἐπ[ί] Αρχιδάμου [- - -] rose
The eponym is dated ca 180 / 178 BCE by Finkielsztejn 2001.

13 Δ 25099, Context T-58D, L. 505
Rectangular stamp
Διοκλῆς
Ὑακινθίου
The nu is retrograde, and the final omicron and upsilon are ligatured. In all likelihood this stamp names a fabricant, who from the curved profile of the handle and appearance of the month, dates to Period II (ca 234 – ca 199 BCE). Grace (from files in Athens) corrected a reading of a stamp from Gezer reading ΔΡΟΚΑΣΙΣ/ΥΑΚΙΝΘΙΟΥ to have the above reading (Macalister 1912, 356 no. 191). However, Conovici and Irimia (Conovici – Irima 1991, 164 under no. 278) identify an eponym of this name from the same period, appearing on a particular flower-shaped stamp identified by Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2001, 103) as characteristic only of the fabricant Ἐπίγονος 1st (Grace 1953, 121 had rejected a Διοκλῆς as eponym). The period of activity of Ἐπίγονος 1st falls between ca 219 and ca 205 BCE. Conovici and Irimia’s identification is based upon a restoration Διο(κλῆς) (?) provided in Nilsson 1909, 91 and 105–106. See Grace 1934, 234, under no. 75. Finkielsztejn apparently considered the restoration as incorrect, preferring to view the three letters on Ἐπίγονος 1st’s as the beginning of the month Διόσθνυος.

14 Δ 25021, Context T-58D, L. 302 (fig. 7, 7)
Rectangular stamp, red spot
Σμυνθίου
Δίσκου
In the lower right corner of the stamp are the remains of a sigma — evidence of double stamping (upside down) of the handle. Δίσκος 1st is differentiated by his more prolific later homonym by the appearance of the month on stamps bearing his name. He worked in the term of Ξενόστρατος (Grace 1963, 334
no. 8) who is dated by Finkielsztejn to Period IIb (ca 219–210 BCE), but with the notation that he may date later (Finkielsztejn 2001, 191).

15  Δ 25100, Context T-58D, L. 505  
Rectangular stamp  
Ἐπὶ Δορκυλί[δα]  
Θεσ[μοφοιίου]

The eponym is dated by Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2001) to ca 198 BCE.

16  Δ 25083, Context T-58D, L. 502 (fig. 7, 2)  
Rectangular stamp  
Ἐπι[·]
Κρ(  
A. Dimoulinis identified the handle as 'Early Rhodian' on the basis of unpublished parallels on file in the Amphora Project offices in Athens. The reading given there is Ἐπικράτης. An even closer parallel is very similar stamped handle in the collection of Kibbutz Yavneh reading Ἐπικράτης (IAA 1996–5099). The later Period IV homonym fabricant, designated Ἐπικράτης 1st, is discussed by Conovici and Garlan (Conovici – Garlan 2004, 115 no. 35).

17  Δ 23039, Context T-58D, L. 302  
Rectangular stamp  
Ἐρμωνος  
caduceus, right  
There are a number of homonyms with this fabricant’s name. One who employs the caduceus device is published in Pridik 1926, 324. A connection of this homonym to the eponym Αὐξέμβοτος (Finkielsztejn 2000a: ca 134 / 133 BCE) is on file at the Athenian Agora in Athens, and places the Ἐρμωνος homonym with caduceus in Period V. Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2001, 135) discussed contemporary fabricants utilizing caduceus devices, which were common in that period.

18  Δ 25094, Context T-58D, L. 400  
Rectangular stamp  
Ἐπ[i Eυ]δά  
μου  
Δαλίου

The reading of the eponym’s name was kindly provided by A. Dimoulinis. The eponym is dated to Period IVb (ca 152–146 BCE) based upon the name’s appearance on rhomboid stamps of Θεύμαντος (Finkielsztejn 2000b, 218).

19  Δ 25086, Context T-300 (fig. 7, 3)  
Rectangular stamp  
Εὐφρανόρου

Because of the handle’s curved profile the fabricant can only be Εὐφράνωρ 1st. He is dated by Criscuolo 1982, 97–98 no. 106, to Period I.

20  Δ 25020, Context T-58D, L. 504 (fig. 7, 8)  
Rectangular stamp, red spot  
Helios  Ἐπι Θευ

JHP 2 – 2017
The only published example of this type is from Gezer (Macalister 1912, 358 no. 252). It belongs to Θεύδωρος 2nd, whose term is placed by Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2001) between 203 and 199 BCE. Based upon the devices the amphora was made by Λυγοάνας (Finkielsztejn 2001, 108, Style T1a). Another stamp in the year of Θεύδωρος 2nd comes from Tell Temilat (Clédat 1915, 48 no. 43 = Verrett 2006, 229 no. 16).

21 Δ 23042, Context T-58D, L. 100
Rectangular stamp
Star Ἐπὶ Ίασι
κράτεις

The eponym is dated by Finkielsztejn 2001 to ca 190 BCE. The particular large star device on the left or right of the stamp is characteristic of two fabricants only (and see below, 22 and 53). Because of the eponym’s date, the fabricant of this amphora was most likely Αριστείδας 2nd. Based upon eponym connections to Αριστείδας 2nd gathered by Jöhrens 1998, 67 no. 175, and Finkielsztejn’s dates for them (Finkielsztejn 2001), the period of activity of Αριστείδας 2nd began (at least) three years earlier than the year of Ἰασικράτης, in ca 193 BCE (under Κλειτόμαχος). No association of Ἰασικράτης with Αριστείδας 2nd has heretofore been noted.

22 Δ 23052, Context T-58D, L. 505 (fig. 7, 14)
Rectangular stamp
Star Ἀρταμ(ίου)
Ἱεροκλ(ῆς)

This is the earlier of two fabricants who employed the large star device on the left or right of the stamp. He was the first of two homonyms, and was active after their appearance of months on stamps, ca 234 BCE (Finkielsztejn 2001, 196). See Grace – Savvatiānou-Pétropoulakou 1970, 309, E 24. Ariel 1990, 63, S 302 should be corrected to belong to this fabricant. The surveyed handle’s profile clearly places it late in the fabricant’s career which, because of the stylistic similarities with stamps of Αριστείδας 2nd, may have been followed directly by the latter. See 21 above and 53 below.

23 Δ 23048, Context T-58D, L. 302
Rectangular stamp
Κ[ρ]έοντ
ος

This fabricant was active late in Period I and in Period IIa, until ca 220 BCE. See Jöhrens 1998, 46 no. 111. Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2001, 57) noted two contemporary fabricants who may have been associated with Κρέων. A stylistic association (Finkielsztejn 1990, under no. 238) with the eponym Αγλώκριτος may extend Κρέων’s period of activity into Period IIIb (ca 219 – ca 210 BCE). A later homonym(s?) has been proposed by Basal’yan (Badal’yants 1980, 177–178: Periods III–IV) and Szetylo (Sztetyło 1976, 63 no. 182: Period VI).

24 Δ 23037, Context T-58D, L. 502
Rectangular stamp
Πι[νάμ][υ]
[device?]

The identification of the cluster was kindly provided by A. Dimoulinis. The range of certain types of this fabricant’s stamps (with Helios heads) has been given as ca 186–151 BCE. This handle has a different type. All of the eponym connections noted in Sztetylo 1991, 75–77 nos. 131–135, and Jöhrens 1998, 71–72 nos. 186–189, fall in the above mentioned range, except for Κρατίδας, who would extend the period of activity of Μαρσύας noted above one year backward, to include ca 187 BCE. This handle should also date in that range.
25 Δ 25019, T-58D, L. 505 (fig. 7, 9)
Circular stamp

[Ἐ]πὶ Μυτίων[ος]
grape cluster

Μυτίων is dated in Finkielsztejn 2001 to between 209 and 205 BCE. See also discussion in Ariel – Finkielsztejn 1994, 204 under SAH 45. The appearance of the grape cluster device on a circular stamp is extremely rare. I know of two published examples. One (Kent 1953, 132 no. 9) appears on a stamp dated by Αγέμαχος, who is dated by Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2001) to 181/179 BCE. The other appears on a stamp found in a site identified as the workshop of the fabricant Ιεροτέλης. It was restored by Grace to provide the name of the eponym Εὐροφάνου (Empereur – Tuna 1989, 297–298 no. 24). This eponym was a contemporary (same time frame) of Μυτίων. Grace identified the fabricant of the Εὐροφάνου stamp as Διονύσιος on the basis of a stylistic detail. Although the grape cluster on this stamp is quite different in style from the one on the stamp naming Εὐροφάνου, it is likely that Διονύσιος too was the fabricant of this stamp, owing to the rarity of the cluster device on circular stamps. It would be difficult to associate Διονύσιος with the stamp naming Αγέμαχος, because of the large difference in dates.

26 Δ 23053, Context T-58D, L. 502 (fig. 3, 1)
Rectangular stamp

Νικάγιδος

The stamp may be identical to one from Pergamon (Burow 1998, 95 no. 278). Based upon the few eponyms published as officiating on stamps of amphoras produced by Νίκαγις, this prolific fabricant was active from late in Period II, and well into Period III. Νίκαγις produced an amphora in the year of Αστυμήδης 1st (ca 204 BCE in Finkielsztejn 2001). See Grace 1968, 177 no. 12. From an amphora of Νίκαγις dated by Καλλικρατίδας 2nd (Finkielsztejn 2001, ca 175–173 BCE), we know that Νίκαγις was active until at least Period IIId. See Finkielsztejn 1993, 384.

27 Δ 23040, Context T-58D, L. 300
Rectangular stamp

[Νυσ]ίου
caduceus, right

The restoration of the name was provided by A. Dimoulinis. For the fabricant’s Period III date, see Ariel 1990, 56, S 230–233. Νύσιος produced amphoras in the terms of two Period IV eponyms (Jöhrens 1998, 73 no. 192). For the possibility that the fabricant remained active until early Period V, see Sztetyllo 2000, 108 no. 97. Finkielsztejn (pers. comm.) suggested a period of activity of ca 169/167 – 140/139 BCE.

28 Δ 23049, Context T-58D, L. 504
Rectangular stamp

Ἐπ[ι] Ξ[ενο]φάντου

Ξενόφαντος 1st is dated by Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2001) to ca 210 BCE. Ξενόφαντος 2nd has been dated ca 151 BCE (Finkielsztejn 2001). By virtue of the handle’s profile, we believe this handle names Ξενόφαντος 2nd.

29 Δ 5097, Context T-58D, L. 300 (fig. 7, 10)
Circular stamp

Ἐπὶ Ξενοφάντου [Β]αδρομίου
rose

This handle was dated by Ξενοφάντος 1st (ca 210 BCE) because of the handle’s profile. See 28 above and 30 below.
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Fig. 3: Rhodian stamped handles (nos. 26, 37, 38).

30 Δ 5175, Context T-58G, L. 100 (fig. 7, 11)
Rectangular stamp
[Ἐπὶ Ξενοφάντης]
Τάκινθίου
This handle was also dated by Ξενοφάντος 1st (ca 210 BCE) because of the handle’s profile. See 28–29 above.

31 Δ 5114, Context T-58D, L. 302 (fig. 7, 4)
Rectangular stamp
Παυσανίας
A fabricant homonym of this name was active in the 3rd century BCE. Conovici and Irimia (Conovici – Irimia 1991, 166 nos. 308–310) suggested a range of almost all of Period II. For a discussion of the homonyms, including Παυσανίας 2nd of Periods III–IV, see Finkielsztajn 2001, 76, note 55. This handle belongs to the earlier homonym on the basis of the profile of the handle. Jöhrens 1998, 17 no. 16, discussed Παυσανίας 1st and eponyms associated with him. Based upon Finkielsztajn’s dates of these eponyms (Finkielsztajn 2001), Παυσανίας 1st was active possibly only in Period IIa (ca 234–220 BCE). The only outlier eponym, Αἰσχυλίνος, a ›probable‹ association according to Jöhrens, dates in Period IIb (ca 219–210 BCE).

32 Δ 23054, Context T-58D, L. 503 (fig. 8, 1)
Rectangular stamp
Helios Ἐπὶ Παυσανίας
head Ἐπὶ Παυσανίας
For the three homonyms of this eponym see Grace – Savvatianou-Petropoulakou 1970, 304–305, under E 12. This handle apparently belongs to the third eponym, of Period IV, which Finkielsztajn (Finkielsztajn 2001) dated to ca 152 BCE. The Helios head type makes Παυσανίας the fabricant of this amphora.

33 Δ 25022, Context T 90 (fig. 7, 5)
Circular stamp
Ἐπὶ Παυσανίας [Πα]νύμου
rose
On the basis of the curved profile of the handle, the stamp probably names Παυσανίας 1st, dated by Finkielsztajn (Finkielsztajn 2001) to within Period IIa (ca 233–220 BCE). Calvet 1972, 32 no. 60 is a published example of the type.
This stamp apparently names Παυσανίας 2nd, based upon the profile of the handle. Παυσανίας 2nd is dated by Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2001) to within Period IIc (ca 203–199 BCE).

Róδων 2nd is discussed by Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2001, 154). Four eponym’s are associated with the fabricant, yielding a period of activity possibly as restricted as the third decade of the 2nd century BCE (ca 129–[124–122] BCE).

Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 2000a, 145, CRh 16) dated the range of the prolific fabricant Σωκράτης 2nd to ca 204–172 BCE. Another stamp of an amphora of Σωκράτης 2nd was reported from the same site (Carrez-Maratray et al. 1996, 192 = Verreth 2006, 777 no. 19).

Based on the confluence of eponym connections (Finkielsztejn 2001, 124) and Finkielsztejn’s proposed dates for them, the period of activity of this fabricant may be placed between ca 189 and ca 161 BCE.
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40  Δ 25082, Context T-58D, L. 400 (fig. 7, 15)  
Circular stamp  
Ἐπὶ [Φιλο]δάμου [Π]ανάμο(υ) 
rose  
The reading is restored, with the help of A. Dimoulinis, on the basis of an identical die from the Athenian Agora. The eponym officiated ca 183 BCE (FINKIELSZTEJN 2001).

Rhodian stamped handles: Names not read

41  Δ 21321, Context D-54 (fig. 4, 1)  
Illegible rectangular stamp  

42  Δ 22312, Context D-54 (fig. 4, 2)  
Illegible circular stamp  

43  Δ 22313, Context D-54 (fig. 4, 3)  
Illegible rectangular stamp  

44  Δ 28612, Context D-50 (fig. 4, 4)  
Illegible rectangular stamp  

45  Δ 8034, Context D-50 (fig. 4, 5)  
Illegible circular stamp with Helios head device  
The Helios head device in circular stamps dates to Periods V and VI. See Ariel – FINKIELSZTEJN 1994 passim.

46  Δ 22314, Context D-54  
Illegible rectangular stamp  

47  Δ 18629, Context M 30  
Rectangular stamp  
Ε[- - -] 
v[î]ð[α]  

This is the reading of A. Dimoulinis based upon a rubbing. Dimoulinis thought the handle may not be Rhodian. Nevertheless, Finkielsthejn, who examined the object, suggested it may read Σ[θεν]/νîda. Comparisons to stamps published in Bingen 1955, 131 no. 2, Criscuolo 1982, 104–105 nos. 119–121 and MELAERTS 1994, 347 no. 18, this suggestion is possible if not likely. The stamp would consequently name an early Rhodian fabricant, whom Bingen and Criscuolo dated to the first half of the 3rd century BCE.

48  Δ 25081, Context R 21, L. 168 (fig. 4, 6)  
Rectangular stamp  
[ - - -]  
[Π]ανάμο(υ)  

49  Δ 2810, Context S 32A (fig. 4, 7)  
Rectangular stamp  
[ - - -]  
[ο][ - - -]  
[ - - -]
Fig. 4: Rhodian stamped handles (nos. 41–45, 48, 49).

50  Δ 23038, Context T-58D, L. 100
Rectangular stamp

  caduceus, left [- - -]ου
  in frame

51  Δ 23041, Context T-58D, L. 502
Circular stamp

  ἡγματεύς
  rose

The stamp is poorly impressed.

52  Δ 23046, Context T-58D, L. 400
Rectangular stamp

  Ἐ[πι
  α[to[ retrograde
  Ἰακ[νθιο]υ]

53  Δ 23047, Context T-58D, L. 502
Illegible rectangular stamp with large star on left

As noted above, the large star device on the left or right of the stamp is characteristic of two fabricants only: Ἱεροκλῆς 1st and Ἀριστείδας 2nd (and see above 21–22). This handle therefore dates to Periods II and III. From the handle’s somewhat angular profile, it appears more likely that it belongs to Period III. Early in that period the fabricant Ἀριστείδας 2nd began producing amphoras. Ἀριστείδας 2nd’s period of activity, based on the evidences noted under 21 above, fell between ca 193 BCE and ca 174/172 BCE at least.
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54 Δ 23050, Context T-58D, L. 300
Rectangular stamp

55 Δ 23055, Context T-58D, L. 400 (fig. 5, 2)
Circular stamp

Επι[- - - ικρα Βαδρομιου
rose

56 Δ 25102, Context T-58D, L. 500
Illegible rectangular stamp

57 Δ 25023, Context T 90
Rectangular stamp

[\- - -]

58 Δ 28850/1, Context T 90 (fig. 5, 1)
Illegible rectangular stamp

59 Δ 28852, Context T 90 (fig. 5, 4)
Illegible rectangular stamp

60 Δ 27460, Context T 150, L. 800 (fig. 5, 3)
Illegible rectangular stamp

61 Δ 2827, Context T 260
Illegible rectangular stamp

The handle has a curved profile and a very small stamp. It may not be Rhodian.

62 Δ 25097, Context T-300
Circular stamp

[\- - - Πιαναυμυ]
rose

63 Δ 25088, Context T-300 (fig. 5, 5)
Rectangular stamp

Ε[\-]

Rhodian stamped lagynos handle

64 Δ 25032, Context R 10, L. 143 (fig. 8, 7)
Anepigraphic rectangular stamp with Helios head device (?)
A. Dimoulinis, on the basis of rays which he discerned in a photograph, identified this poorly preserved stamp as above. Upon examining the object, G. Finkielsztejn preferred a rose identification. For the type see Ariel 1990, 79, S 477.

Koan stamped handles

65 Δ 25089, Context T-300 (fig. 10, 2)
Rectangular stamp
Θευδ
Ωκον

The ware of the handle is red-brown, with a light brown slip. The handle is double-barreled, and therefore belongs to the Koan class. No stamps of this type have previously been noted in the extensive files of that class in the Amphora Project offices in Athens. The closest parallel on file there reads: [Θ] ευδω(ος), and has a club device below. It is Koan Type 355 and is published in Breccia 1921, 52 no. 260. See also Grace 1962, 121 no. 18 (names beginning Θευ).

66 Δ 23044, Context T-58D, L. 302 (fig. 10, 3)
Rectangular stamp
Πα[...]

The handle’s ware is also red-brown, but with a light green/buff slip. No stamps of the Koan class on file in the Amphora Project offices were able to definitively restore this stamp’s fragmentary reading.

67 Δ 4222, Context T 72 (fig. 10, 4)
Illegible rectangular stamp with club (?) device

Kourioti stamped handle

68 5115, Context T-58D, L. 303 (fig. 11, 6)
Oval stamp

The ware of the handle is brown, with many white grits. On the small Kourioti class, see Grace 1979b. Examples of the class come mostly from Cyprus and Alexandria. This type belongs to a series within the class bearing a tripod as its main device. As described in Grace 1979b, 180, to the right and left are the letter alpha...
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and monogram alpha-rho. Below the tripod are found changing subsidiary devices. Grace’s discussion included the following: double ax, bird (?), lamp (?), and monogram. The device under the tripod in our stamp is clearly identified as a flower. No other example of the flower subsidiary device is on file at the Amphora Project offices in Athens. The flower, described by Finkielsztejn (Finkielsztejn 1990, no. 449), appears on another Kouriote stamp type found in Samaria (IAA 36–666). Meyza (Meyza 2004, 277 pl. 14) noted a lotus flower on yet another Kouriote stamp, but there the flower indeed looks different. The rough date for stamped handles identified in this class is the 4th–3rd centuries BCE, and perhaps a bit later (Meyza 2004, 274).

Stamped handle of the Zenon group

69 Δ 19419, Context Y 14 (Deir el-Balah) (figs. 6, 1; 9, 4)
Rectangular stamp with rounded corners

Zη

This stamp (without abbreviated second name) belongs to the second Zenon group, dated by Empereur and Tuna (Empereur – Tuna 1988) to the end of the 3rd – beginning of the 2nd century BCE. For a summary of finds spots, date and provenance see Ariel 1990, 76–77, S 464. See Russell 1997, 51 no. 49 (a first Zenon group find in Amman).

Latin stamped handles

70 Δ 23043, Context T-58D, L. 501 (fig. 12, 1)
Rectangular stamp

AOI

The handle is curved in profile and flattish in cross-section. Its ware is pink with a buff surface. The ware has grey and dark red inclusions. While not in Desy 1989, its general appearance points to a Brindisian origin.

71 Δ 8063, Context D-52 (fig. 6, 2)
Rectangular stamp

CARITTO

The reading of the stamp is of interest. Desy published stamps reading CARITO (or CARITON), including some found in Egypt, and presumed this to be a potter’s name (Desy 1989, 173) associable with the Brindisi series. See Desy 1989, 101 no. 709 and p. 136 no. 1036. Blanc-Bijn et al. 1998 (e.g., p. 21 no. 487) published stamps reading CARITTO. They identified them as belonging to the Greco-Italic series, and appear to associate it with another Greco-Italic stamp in Greek, yielding the name Gaius Ariston. It is likely but not definite that the CARITO and CARITTO stamps are associated. The North Sinai survey stamp has a small sign under the left arm of the T. It may be that in many if not all cases of readings of CARITO, this was overlooked, as we originally did. That sign appears to be a retrograde S.

72 Δ 22315, Context D-54 (fig. 6, 3)
Rectangular stamp

LVI

The closest parallel in Desy’s corpus reads L VIIIVI MYRTILI (Desy 1989, 157 no. 1224). According to him it is a unique stamp of an uncertain type. But our stamp apparently has only the letters read above. See also Grace 1962, 128 no. 38 (LVCO), and dates in the century before 50 BCE, based on its context (see Desy 1989, 111 no. 804 – LVCO, a Brindisian potter (?); Desy 1989, 180). Rebuffat (Rebuffat 1999, 84 no. 1196) published a stamp reading LV[...], and noted parallels reading L V IV and LVIVCV. Blanc-Bijn, Carre, Hesnard and Tchernia published stamps reading LV[...] (Blanc-Bijn et al. 1998, 276 no. 1368) and LVD (ibid, 276 no. 1369).
Fig. 6:
1. Stamped handle of the Zenon group (no. 69); 2–4. Latin stamped handles (nos. 71–73).

73 Δ 8062, Context D-50 (fig. 6, 4)  
Rectangular stamp  
MAN[ 

Based on Desy’s corpus, possible restorations are MANIS, MANISA, and MANVSA – all types of the Brindisi series (Desy 1989, 103 nos. 730–732 and p. 106 no. 766). Desy believed these names are of potters (Desy 1989, 181). Blanc-Bijon, Carre, Hesnard and Tchernia added two other possible restorations. MATIVSM, deciphered by them as M. Atios M] is unclassified (Blanc-Bijon et al. 1998, 142 no. 461). M • ANTO, in their Fasculi 1 category, is a second possibility (ibid, 159 no. 955). The N and T are ligatured there, but on the North Sinai handle the N is not completely preserved, and the possibility of a ligature cannot be rejected.

74 Δ 25103, Context R 51 (fig. 12, 2)  
Rectangular stamp, framed  
MAPIC[ 

The handle’s ware is pink, micaceous, with many inclusions forming an irregular surface, with a buff slip. MAP may itself be a Greek abbreviation. See Desy 1989, 83 nos. 543–544; 123 no. 909; 126 no. 944; 137 no. 1050. All of these read MAR (according to Desy, a potter), but see p. 181 there. MAPIC, however, does not appear in Desy 1989, Carre et al. 1995 or Blanc-Bijon et al. 1998. A Brindisian origin is nevertheless possible for this handle.

75 Δ 25084, Context T-58D, L. 301 (fig. 12, 3)  
Rectangular stamp  
PI·L • BETIL • M  

Desy (Desy 1989, 89 no. 600; 134 no. 1020; 138 no. 1055; 144 no. 1115) has four variants of the same person’s stamps, which he identified as belonging to the Brindisi series. On two handles with the same stamp published by Palazzo 1990, 148–149 nos. 9–10 (= Blanc-Bijon et al. 1998, 87 no. 723, and p. 101 no. 774) a secondary stamp, depicting an unidentifiable object, is preserved. On one (Palazzo 1990, 148–149 no. 9) a full profile (rim to shoulder) is preserved. Desy identified P(h)il as a potter (Desy 1989, 177), and M. Betilienus as a master (Desy 1989, 166).

Desy’s no. 1115 derived from Qasrawet (= Clédat 1912, 167 no. 15 = Verreth 2006, 667 no. 10), while no. 75 is from Tell el-Her.

76 Δ 36060, Context BM 010, L. 60  
Rectangular stamp  
VEHILI[ 

Desy (Desy 1989, 170) identified Vehilius as a Brindisian master. Blanc-Bijon et al. 1998, 98–100 nos. 761–769 (in their Italian Ovoid category), publish a number of stamp variants. See Ariel 2003, 199; SAH 22. In addition to the other stamped handles of the Latin class which may be Brindisian, a typical Brindisian amphora button base with biconical section was found in the survey (fig. 12, 4).
**INDICES**

**A. Names of Persons: Greek**

Names are Rhodian unless otherwise noted. Boldface numbers refer to catalogue numbers of words published here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Αγαθοκλῆς 2nd</td>
<td>Fab. 1</td>
<td>Θέστωρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγέμαχος</td>
<td>Ep. 22</td>
<td>Θεύδωρος 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγηρύλας 1st</td>
<td>Fab. 2</td>
<td>Θεύδωρος Ὀνάσανδρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγλούμβρτος</td>
<td>Ep. 3</td>
<td>Θεύδωρος Koan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγοράναξ</td>
<td>Ep. 4. 5. 20</td>
<td>Θεύμανστος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγοράναξ</td>
<td>Ep. 6</td>
<td>Ιασικράτης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αἴνεας 1st</td>
<td>Fab. 7</td>
<td>Ίεροκλῆς 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αἴνεας 2nd</td>
<td>Fab. 7</td>
<td>Ίεροτέλης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλκισθένης</td>
<td>Fab. 8</td>
<td>Κρείδας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρατοφάνης 1st</td>
<td>Ep. 9</td>
<td>Κρέων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αριστείδας 2nd</td>
<td>Fab. 21. 22. 53</td>
<td>Μαρσύας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αριστίων</td>
<td>Fab. 9, 10</td>
<td>Μίδας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αριστογένης</td>
<td>Ep. 11</td>
<td>Μυτίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αριστοφάνης</td>
<td>Ep. P. 26, note 29</td>
<td>Νίκαγις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρχίδαμος</td>
<td>Ep. 7. 12</td>
<td>Νύσιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λαστιμήδης 1st</td>
<td>Ep. 26</td>
<td>Ξενόφαντος 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαμόθεμις</td>
<td>Ep. 2. 7</td>
<td>Ξενόφαντος 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διοκλῆς</td>
<td>Fab. 13</td>
<td>Ξενόστρατος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διονύσιος</td>
<td>Fab. 25</td>
<td>Πασίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δίσκος 1st</td>
<td>Fab. 14</td>
<td>Παυσανίας 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δορκυλίδας</td>
<td>Ep. 9, 15</td>
<td>Παυσανίας 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Επίγονος 1st</td>
<td>Fab. 13</td>
<td>Παυσανίας 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Επικράτης</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Παυσανίας 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εμιον</td>
<td>Fab. 17</td>
<td>Παυσανίας 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ειδάμος</td>
<td>Ep. 18</td>
<td>Ρόδων 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐφράνωρ 1st</td>
<td>Fab. 19</td>
<td>Σεθενίδας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐφράνωρ</td>
<td>Ep. 25</td>
<td>Σωκράτης 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζή(νον) Zennon</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Σωκρατής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Φιλαίνιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Φιλόδαμος 2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Names of Persons: Latin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Potter?</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTO</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>MANIS</td>
<td>Potter?</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARISTON</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>MANVSA</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATIVS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>MARIC[</td>
<td>Potter?</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETIL(ienus)</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>PIL(=P(h)il)</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARISTO (or CARITO)</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>VEHIL(ius)</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVCO</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>Vinius Myrtilus</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Rhodian Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἀρταμίτιος</td>
<td>4. 6. 11. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βαδρόμιος</td>
<td>5. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δάλιος</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διώσθνυος</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θεσσαλοφόριος</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάναμος</td>
<td>33. 38. 40. 48. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάναμος Δεύτερος</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πεδαγείτνυος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σμίνθιος</td>
<td>14. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τακίνθιος</td>
<td>3. 13. 30. 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐργαστηράρχας</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱερέως</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird?</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caduceus</td>
<td>17. 27. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>65. 67?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>7. 21. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double ax</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helios head</td>
<td>20. 32. 45. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herm</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp?</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>12. 29. 33. 40. 51. 55. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>21. 22. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torch, burning</td>
<td>36. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear device</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Unstamped Amphora Fragments

On the need for examining unstamped amphora fragments as a complement to the often more exacting results derivable from the stamped fragments, see Ariel 1990, 82. Work on amphoras found in the eastern littoral of the Mediterranean has lagged poorly behind more developed and much better published research regarding western Mediterranean site finds. A summary of Greek amphoras, with the most photographs, is Grace 1979a. Empereur – Hesnard 1987 is more updated, and has good line drawings.

While it may be presumed that all of the stamped handles found in the survey were brought to the attention of this author, it should be noted that the unstamped fragments were processed by him in a much less thorough way. As noted, the stamped handles were thoroughly studied, including having problematic stamps re-examined by the Amphora Project in Athens. At the same time, for the unstamped fragments, the author does not know what exactly the strategy of their selection was during the survey; i.e., whether all diagnostic fragments were saved or not. Moreover, the fragments that were saved underwent two additional selections by the North Sinai staff, and only afterwards were they shown to the author. The first selection was a typologically quantitative one. In other words individual fragments of similar types were noted in the computerized data base, so that one exemplar of each type was saved for examination. The second selection created the local and imported categories. It must be assumed that this selection was largely based on questions of fabric, the survey team being most familiar with the local (and Egyptian) fabrics.

Arthur and Oren cited Hellenistic amphora fragments from the Rhodian, Koan, Chian Knidian, Tripolitanian, Brindisian, and perhaps Black Sea classes. The only class I did not identify of that list was Tripolitanian. Perhaps they were referring to fig. 14, 13 of what I have designated Dressel 2/4. In the same article, they also published forms of some four fragments. Their Koan rim to double-barreled handle is fig. 13, 2 below, which I called Dressel 2/4, i.e., conceptually the same. My Rhodian lagynos handle on fig. 8, 8 was identified by them as »miniature Koan«. Finally, their ›Black Sea? fragment is my fig. 11, 3 and only has a semantic change, as I call it Northern.

From the remainder, the author was asked to select from among the imported category the fragments dateable by him to the Hellenistic period. This third selection was probably the most difficult of the three. While the forms and wares of the large (often stamped) Hellenistic classes (Rhodian, Koan, Knidian, Chian) are well known, the task of differentiating between the less well-known Hellenistic classes and their Roman period descendants (or Egyptian imitations) was truly daunting. Our success rate would have been higher had we felt more comfortable in clearly identifying the Roman classes. Of course our work was further hampered by the fact that we were dealing with small fragments rather than complete forms.

The difficulty in sorting was exacerbated by the fact that certain Hellenistic classes (especially the various Italian classes) have a large variety in their forms and wares. Moreover, there is little that differentiates this variety from their immediate post-Hellenistic, Roman imperial amphora classes. Some fragments have in fact been retained on the plates, although it is more likely that they date to the beginning of the Roman period (e.g., Dressel 2/4).

35 Riley 1979, 112.
38 Arthur – Oren 1998, fig. 4, 2.
40 Arthur – Oren 1998, fig. 4, 4.
Nevertheless, this selection was accomplished in one day, in the spring of 1994, with the invaluable assistance of Gérald Finkielsztejn\footnote{My thanks to Gérald Finkielsztejn for sharing his breadth of knowledge (especially in the busy days before the material was returned to Egypt). Thanks are also due to Mark L. Lawall for his constructive comments on an earlier draft of this report. The responsibility for the conclusions, however, are the author’s alone.}.

An additional problem lay in the fact that in many cases forms alone do not allow for certain identification. The wares of the fragments contribute much toward the identification of the provenance of amphoras. Toward that end samples for petrographic analysis were taken. The samples were kept by The North Sinai Expedition for further study.

After the selection of the sherds was done, the author was provided with a database which included our preliminary identifications, fabric readings, including Munsell numbers (\textit{Munsell} 1975; for most of the fragments, made by members of the North Sinai staff), and scale drawings. It then became apparent then that no quantitative data was found in the database. On the face of it this would mean that there was no typological duplication in the fragments selected. While that is in fact possible, because of the resulting lack of clarity, our operative assumption has been that the database should not be regarded as quantitatively reliable. Also, by virtue of the above mentioned research process, the quantitative relationships between our imported amphora fragments and the so-called local fragments is no longer clear.

By the time the database of selected imported unstamped Hellenistic amphora fragments was prepared there was no opportunity to re-examine the fragments, nor to complete the missing fabric readings, or check the reliability of the prepared readings and the drawings. This was because the fragments were already in the process of being returned to the Egyptian authorities, an effort completed in December 1994\footnote{The materials’ return to Egypt was part of an agreement signed between the two countries, stipulating the restoration of all archaeological artefacts excavated by Israeli archaeologists in Sinai.}. There remained for the author to select those fragments from this database he found worthy of publication in plates. Thanks are due here to Barbara L. Johnson for her subsequent aid in preventing overlaps in the amphora material studied by me, and the enormous amount of material which became her lot in the publication project. As a consequence of that examination conducted with Johnson, some four fragments – which I had never seen – were added to my material (\textbf{figs. 12, 4; 14, 2–4}).

The following analysis, therefore, suffers from problems arising mostly from the time-frame restrictions, or in other words, from our inability to re-examine the objects. It should be made clear that the author, and not the North Sinai publication team, takes responsibility for the deficiencies arising from the above. Nevertheless, given the importance of the unstamped amphora material as an adjunct to the stamped handle report, we believe the following analysis has sufficient value to justify its publication in this state. In short, the material selected for the plates appears sufficiently accurate to permit analysis. This is certainly true of the profiles of the stamped material appearing on the plates. It is also the case for the unstamped fragments, especially as the reader is now aware of the problematic background to this part of the author’s research. It may also be noted that the author’s one time examination of the material is more than can be boasted by Barbara L. Johnson, whose work had to be based almost exclusively on the North Sinai staff’s drawings and fabric readings.

\textbf{Rhodian (figs. 7–8)}

The drawn fragments of the Rhodian class appear on \textbf{figs. 1–5, 7–11}. For \textbf{figs. 4, 1–5; 7, 3–5; 7, 10–12; 9, 1–3. 5} the profiles played a contributing role in determining the handles’ dates. There follows a selection of a rim (\textbf{fig. 8, 4}) and bases (\textbf{fig. 8, 5–8}) belonging to the class. The ceramic typology of the Rhodian class is quite well understood. Typological discussion has been usually subsumed within discussion of other aspects of the class (the stamps and their
Fig. 7: 1–14. Rhodian amphora handles (nos. 5. 8–9. 14. 16. 19–20. 22. 25. 29–31. 33–34); 15. Rhodian amphora top (no. 40).
functionality, or issues relating to standardization of the volume of the amphoras\textsuperscript{43}. Fragments of the Rhodian class in its period of high production (second half of 3rd through the end of the 2nd century BCE) are easily identified on the basis of their characteristic fabric: a very well levigated and fired clay whose core is light red to reddish yellow, with a pinkish to very pale brown slip. In the fragments appearing on \textit{figs. 7–14}, a number of the other typological features of the Rhodian class are found: everted rounded rim, cylindrical neck, handles extending from under the rim to the top of the shoulder. The stamped handles are arranged in chronological order, thus showing their development from curved to angular profiles in the last quarter of the 3rd century BCE. The shortening and narrowing of the upper portion of the angular handles in the second half of the 2nd century BCE is also seen. The rim (\textit{fig. 8, 4}) is of characteristic Rhodian ware, but is unusual in that its profile is complex. The cylindrical toes (\textit{fig. 8, 5–6}) both belong to the period of high production noted above. The form of \textit{fig. 8, 6} is unusual, although its ware places it in the Rhodian class.

Two lagynoi handles (\textit{fig. 8, 7–8}) – one stamped (64) – are securely identified as Rhodian because of their fabric\textsuperscript{44}.


\textsuperscript{44} But see Arthur – Oren 1998, 198 fig. 4, 3 (Koan). – See Ariel 1990, 82 and Ariel – Finkielsztejn 1994, 229, SAH 130.
Knidian (fig. 9, 1–3)\(^{45}\)

Most Knidian ware is coarse (though well levigated) and reddish, and sometimes slightly micaceous. The core is often grey. Sometimes the clay can be very Rhodian in appearance. The only feature of the Knidian amphora’s form seen on fig. 9, 2–3 is its knobbed toe\(^{46}\), typical of the Knidian class through the first quarter of the 2nd century BCE. After that point it develops into a ringed toe\(^{47}\). It should be noted however that other classes also have knobbed toes (e.g., the Zenon Group). In our cases, the ware makes their association with the Knidian class certain\(^{48}\). It may also be that fig. 9, 1 is Knidian.

A Knidian stamped handle is found further east, at Tell Temilat by Petrie and Ellis\(^{49}\) and dates in the last quarter of the 2nd century BCE. Oren also cited Knidian amphora fragments at Qasrawet\(^{50}\), although none was identified by me.

Zenon group (fig. 9, 4)

This stamped handle is identified as belonging to the Zenon Group on the basis of its stamp alone (69). The handle’s curved profile is otherwise quite uninformative. Grace identified these mid-3rd century amphoras as »Ptolemaic (?)«\(^{51}\), and of Egyptian origin. This provenance has been challenged by Empereur and Tuna\(^{52}\), who found that stamped handles of this type (bearing only the zeta-eta abbreviation) had chemical profiles similar to Knidian wares, and therefore located their provenance in the vicinity of Knidos. We have accordingly located fig. 9, 4 after the Knidian class\(^{53}\).

---

45 For the Knidian class, see Grace 1934, 205, and Grace – Savvatianou-Pétropoulakou 1970, 317–324.


47 Grace 1974b, 89–90.

48 See also Riley 1979, 129 no. D 35.

49 Petrie – Ellis 1937, pl. 51 no. CW? X = Verreth 2006, 231 no. 28 (this and the Rhodian stamps noted from there may come from nearby Tell el-Sheikh, Verreth 2006, 238 and 242 note 851).


53 See also Ariel 1990, 76–77, S 464 and pl. 1.
Koan ware is thought to be distinguished from its imitations by a characteristic reddish clay with a light greenish surface. Mica is also common. The North Sinai fragments shown here, where we have Munsell readings, range from pink to light reddish brown. Our original examination identified figs. 10, 2–10, however, as true Koan. Even though fig. 10, 1 is characterized by a double-barreled handle, it was first thought to be Chian, because of its more orange hue. But this ware can nevertheless be true Koan55. The typology of these fragments is definitely Koan, Pseudo-Koan, or Dressel 2/4, having everted rolled rims, cylindrical necks, and especially double-barreled handles (figs. 10, 1–7). A minority of these handles were stamped, the relation of unstamped (e.g., fig. 10, 4) to stamped (fig. 10, 2–3) being roughly 100 : 156. Bases of Koan amphoras have numerous variations, but may be generally described as having short, somewhat pointed toes or buttons. On the basis of its ware one fragment was identified by us as Pseudo-Koan (fig. 10, 11). This is a contemporary Hellenistic type distinguished from true Koan by its differing ware, and yet not a later derivative of Koan, as in Dressel 2/4 (below).

54 For the Koan class see Grace 1949, 186 no. 8; Grace 1965, 5.10 and Grace – Savvatianou-Petropoulakou 1970, 363–364.
55 M. L. Lawall, pers. comm.
Northern (Black Sea?) (fig. 11, 1–3)

These three fragments were originally identified as deriving from a Northern (Black Sea?) source on the basis of the characteristic black grits in their fabric. Fig. 11, 3’s pinkish grey colour clay also is characteristic. (The North Sinai data-base had originally given this piece a Roman date.) The Munsell reading of fig. 11, 1 – pale yellow surface over a light brownish grey core – is less so. It may be North Aegean. Fragments of amphoras from the Black Sea in regions contiguous to the North Sinai are known from Alexandria, Marissa and Samaria.

Pamphylian (?) (fig. 11, 4–5)

The Pamphylian class was most fully treated by V. Grace. Our identification of two fragments is based on considerations of form and colour. Handles of the Pamphylian class are curved and are attached just below the rim and join to the body on its sloping shoulder. Regarding the fabric, the Munsell readings taken do not appear to reflect Grace’s description of the clay as usually having a light red core and light buff surface. Fragments of the Pamphylian class were found near the North Sinai in Nessana, where in fact the class was first tentatively identified in a publication. The North Sinai data-base had originally given fig. 11, 4 a Roman date.

Kouriote (fig. 11, 6)

The fragment profiled on fig. 11, 6 was identified as Kouriote by its stamp. The profile demonstrates the Kouriote amphora’s characteristic curved profile and short upper

---

57 M. L. Lawall, pers. comm.
58 Grace 1962, 106 note.
60 Grace 1973, 199 fig. 11.
63 For this class see Grace 1979b.
arm. For the profile see also Calvet 1982, 43–44. Although no Munsell readings were recorded, the fabric was described by the author as being brown in colour, and having many white grits of many sizes.

**Brindisi (fig. 12, 1–6)**

This class of Late Hellenistic stamped and unstamped amphoras from the region around the city of Brindisi in south-eastern Italy has been studied by C. Palazzo, E. Lyding Will, and P. Desy64. The class dates from the late 2nd through mid-1st century BCE. Shown here are profiles of three stamped handles (fig. 12, 1–3) and one typical button base with biconical section (fig. 12, 5)65. There exists some variety in fabrics for the class. The pink surface of the base of fig. 12, 5 is one of the choices given66.

**Republican ovoid (fig. 12, 7–8)**

The name for this group, coined by Empereur and Hesnard67 refers to Italian, non-Brindisian, ovoid amphoras from the late 2nd – early 1st centuries BCE – within the Roman Republican period. Described by Cipriano as Adriatic Ovoid, this generic term includes a large number of Hellenistic ovoid categories published in the literature68. Many are wrongly identified as Brindisian or Lamboglia 2 – also produced in the (north) Adriatic region. These identifications are often uncertain, and the wares vary considerably69. Only bases of these amphoras have been identified in the survey. The rich variety of forms for Republican Ovoid amphora bases range from button-like (fig. 12, 7–8) to simply pointed ones. Cipriano dates the

---

65 See Baldacci 1972, 116 and fig. 16; Peacock – Williams 1986, 82; and Palazzo 1989, 548 and 550 fig. 1, types 2 and 4.
66 See also Finkielsztejn 1993, 444.
Republican Ovoid class to between 50 and 30 BCE\(^70\), while Empereur and Hesnard date them more generally to the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE\(^71\).

**Dressel 2/4 (fig. 13, 1–5)**

Also known as the ›Greco-Roman amphora‹ or the ›Koan type‹, this class clearly derives from the Hellenistic traditions of islands off Anatolia. Yet production sites for the type are also found in Italy\(^72\) as well as two sites in Egypt\(^73\). The Alexandrine sites began production sometime in the Late Hellenistic period and continued functioning until the mid-3rd century CE. Hence our inclusion of the Dressel 2/4 class in this report. Fragments of this class are distinguished (often with some difficulty) from the Koan prototype by their wares\(^74\). On all of the handles shown here (fig. 13, 1–4) one can see the characteristic simple rounded rims and double-barreled handles. Bases are solid and generally slightly flared\(^75\). **Fig. 13, 5** does not appear flared.

**Unclassified (fig. 14)**

This group by definition is the most poorly understood. While we believe the pieces to be Hellenistic in date, there is no doubt that some fragments may rather come from Early Roman amphorae. In fact, the North Sinai data-base had originally given **fig. 14, 7. 9–10** and **fig. 14, 12** Roman dates. Our selection was based largely upon the different wares which looked to be less red in colour, and less well levigated, as those are characteristic of many imported Roman period classes.

The rim in **fig. 14, 1** is similar to one from Benghazi\(^76\), though its colour is different. There described as a collar rim of Dressel 1b, it should be noted that **fig. 14, 1** is thinner than the very thick bodied Dressel 1 class.

---

70 **CIPRIANO – CARRE 1989**, 79.
72 **PEACOCK 1977**, 261.
Fig. 14: Unclassified amphoras.

**Fig. 14, 5** exhibits a slightly bulging neck, which though that characteristic appears in some Roman period classes, it is also characteristic of the early (Persian period) Chian and Mendean classes\(^\text{77}\).

**Fig. 14, 6** may belong to the Nikandros Group. The first publication noting the isolation of this group of amphoras was by Grace and Savvatisanou-Pétropoulakou\(^\text{78}\). The lower arm of this fragment is not as vertical as is described as being characteristic of the group by Grace and Savvatianiuou-Pétropoulakou. Otherwise the other typological and colour considerations do fit the identification. A number of stamped handles of this group have been identified in excavations in the Palestinian region: one each at the Jewish Quarter in Jerusalem\(^\text{79}\), and

---

77 See Grace 1979a, fig. 43, in front, for a Mende amphora, and fig. 46 for a Chian amphora, with bulging neck.


Imported Hellenistic Stamped Amphora Handles

Giv’at Yasaf, north of ‘Akko and two from Maresha. Of those, the best preserved fragment, from Giv’at Yasaf, has a similar profile to fig. 14, 6.

Fig. 14, 7 may be a variety of a Brindisian button base, as in fig. 12, 5. On the other hand, some of the bases in figs. 14, 7–12 may belong to the pointed bases of the Republican Ovoid class, which, as noted have often been confused for Brindisian amphoras. Though we haven’t found an exact parallel, fig. 14, 13 may belong to the Dressel 2/4 class (see fig. 13, 5). Fig. 14, 11 is a more elongated pointed base. In the Hellenistic period, there are two very different classes to which it may belong. One is the Italian Lamboglia 2 class. The other is a very different form, dating to the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic periods, the ›loop-handle jars‹, now known to be of Cypriote origin.

Fig. 14, 14–17 are all flat or ring based amphora fragments. Ring base amphoras are known in Greek amphora traditions. For a parallel to fig. 14, 17, see Zemer 1978, 28 no. 23 (of the 5th century BCE). A closer parallel for fig. 14, 15 may come from a more local tradition. This small disk base resembles a photographed base of the Egyptian ›Petos Group‹, dating from sometime between the second half of the 3rd century and the mid-1st century BCE.

Nevertheless, the flat or ring based amphora types are definitely more common beginning in the Roman Imperial period. Fig. 14, 15 has a similar form to an early Roman amphora fragment from Benghazi whose context suggests an Augustan date. (The North Sinai database had in fact originally given this piece a Late Roman date.) Early Roman flat and ring based amphoras appear to belong to a tradition which developed in Spain and France in the 1st century CE, and reached the eastern Mediterranean in the beginning in small quantities. Later types, most notably the ›Hollow Foot‹ amphora, are like fig. 14, 16, and come likely from the Aegean, with a wide distribution in the East.

---

82 See also Ariel 1990, 88 pl. 3, 12.
84 Humbert 1991, 588, and 589 fig. 10, a. – See also Riley 1979, 143 no. D 87 (from the miscellaneous Hellenistic amphora group), and Ariel 1990, 88 pl. 3, 10.
86 Riley 1979, 176 no. 210 fig. 81, 210.
87 Laubenheimer 1989, 125.
## Appendix to Part II. Description of the Amphoras on Figs. 7–14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Stamped handle No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Surface Exterior</th>
<th>Surface Interior</th>
<th>Temper, hardness, other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHODIAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 1</td>
<td>4936</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>T-58E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 2</td>
<td>25083</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 3</td>
<td>25086</td>
<td></td>
<td>T-300</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 4</td>
<td>5114</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 5</td>
<td>25022</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 6</td>
<td>25017</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 7</td>
<td>25021</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>25020</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 9</td>
<td>25019</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 10</td>
<td>5097</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 11</td>
<td>5175</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>T-58G</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 12</td>
<td>25091</td>
<td></td>
<td>T-300</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 13</td>
<td>25090</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 14</td>
<td>23052</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 15</td>
<td>25082</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 1</td>
<td>23054</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 2</td>
<td>25080</td>
<td></td>
<td>R-22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 3</td>
<td>25101</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 4</td>
<td>25030</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>R-010</td>
<td></td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>dark gray</td>
<td>7.5 YR 8/4</td>
<td>very pale brown</td>
<td>10 YR 8/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. No.</td>
<td>Reg. No.</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Stamped handle No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Core Colour</td>
<td>Munsell No.</td>
<td>Surface Exterior Colour</td>
<td>Munsell No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 5</td>
<td>21604</td>
<td>R-63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>base reddish brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/3</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 6</td>
<td>35887</td>
<td>R-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>base light brown</td>
<td>7.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 7</td>
<td>25032</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>lagynos handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 8</td>
<td>25034</td>
<td>R-57</td>
<td></td>
<td>lagynos handle</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>dark gray</td>
<td>7.5 YR 8/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 1</td>
<td>27480</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>T-150</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 5/6</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 2</td>
<td>28825</td>
<td>T-90</td>
<td></td>
<td>base yellowish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 5/6</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>reddish yellow</td>
<td>5 YR 7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 3</td>
<td>27893</td>
<td>R-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>base reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 5/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 4</td>
<td>19419</td>
<td>Y-14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. No.</td>
<td>Reg. No.</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Stamped handle No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Core Colour</td>
<td>Munsell No.</td>
<td>Surface Exterior Colour</td>
<td>Munsell No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 1</td>
<td>25358</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>R-27</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>gray</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 5/1</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 2</td>
<td>25089</td>
<td>T-300</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 3</td>
<td>23044</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 4</td>
<td>4222</td>
<td>T-72</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 5</td>
<td>21607</td>
<td>R-63</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 6</td>
<td>25029</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 5/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 7</td>
<td>25031</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 8</td>
<td>28836</td>
<td>T-90</td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 9</td>
<td>34197</td>
<td>M-42</td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>pinkish gray</td>
<td>5 YR 6/2</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. No.</td>
<td>Reg. No.</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Stamped handle No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Surface Exterior</td>
<td>Surface Interior</td>
<td>Temper, hardness, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,10</td>
<td>34186</td>
<td>A-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/3</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEUDO-KOAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,11</td>
<td>25026</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>R-27</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light brown</td>
<td>7.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light gray</td>
<td>10 YR 7/2</td>
<td>very pale brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>28771</td>
<td>R-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light brownish gray</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/2</td>
<td>pale yellow</td>
<td>2.5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>pale yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>35145</td>
<td>T-70</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>35870</td>
<td>T-57</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>pinkish gray</td>
<td>7.5 YR 6/2</td>
<td>pinkish gray</td>
<td>7.5 YR 6/2</td>
<td>pinkish gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMPHYLIAN ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>34342</td>
<td>T-90</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light red</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/6</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>35867</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>reddish yellow</td>
<td>5 YR 6/6</td>
<td>reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 5/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. No.</td>
<td>Reg. No.</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Stamped handle No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Surface Exterior</td>
<td>Surface Interior</td>
<td>Temper, hardness, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOURIOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 6</td>
<td>5115</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>redish</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRINDISI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 1</td>
<td>23043</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>redish</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 2</td>
<td>25103</td>
<td>R-51</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 3</td>
<td>25084</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>T-58D</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>reddish</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>reddish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 4</td>
<td>5055</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>T-58</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 5</td>
<td>30671</td>
<td>T-300</td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>redish</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 6</td>
<td>5063</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>T-58</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>reddish</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>reddish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN OVOID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 7</td>
<td>26567</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>R-21</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>reddish</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 8</td>
<td>25373</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>R-27</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>reddish</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>5 YR 7/6</td>
<td>reddish yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESSEL 2/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 1</td>
<td>25079</td>
<td>R-22</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>red</td>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2.5 YR 5/6</td>
<td>weak red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. No.</td>
<td>Reg. No.</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Stamped handle No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Surface Exterior</td>
<td>Surface Interior</td>
<td>Temper, hardness, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 2</td>
<td>18636</td>
<td>M-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/3</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 3</td>
<td>25024</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>A-259</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/3</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 4</td>
<td>26564</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>R-21</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>dark gray</td>
<td>7.5 YR 8/4</td>
<td>dark gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 5</td>
<td>21966</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>10 YR 8/2</td>
<td>pinkish white</td>
<td>7.5 YR 8/2</td>
<td>pinkish white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNCLASSIFIED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 1</td>
<td>34339</td>
<td>T-70</td>
<td></td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/3</td>
<td>very pale brown</td>
<td>10 YR 7/3</td>
<td>very pale brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 2</td>
<td>35861</td>
<td>E-108</td>
<td></td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>reddish yellow</td>
<td>5 YR 7/6</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>7.5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 3</td>
<td>34223</td>
<td>R-88</td>
<td></td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>light gray</td>
<td>10 YR 7/2</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>7.5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>very pale brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 4</td>
<td>36550</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>T-58</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>reddish yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig No.</td>
<td>Reg No.</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Stamped handle No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Surface Exterior</td>
<td>Surface Interior</td>
<td>Temper, hardness, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 5</td>
<td>27317</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>C-86</td>
<td></td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>pinkish white</td>
<td>dark gray</td>
<td>7.5 YR 8/4; some minute to medium buff grits; few minute to small dark brown inclusions; very hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 6</td>
<td>28632</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>R-51</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>dark gray</td>
<td>7.5 YR 8/4</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>10 YR 8/1; some minute to small dark brown inclusions; very hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 7</td>
<td>34200</td>
<td>R-47</td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/3</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4; some minute to medium buff grits; few minute red brown inclusions; very hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 8</td>
<td>34346</td>
<td>R-88</td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>light red</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/8</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>light red</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/6; many minute gray grits; some minute to small dark brown inclusions; few minute buff grits; hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 9</td>
<td>34185</td>
<td>M-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/4; some minute to large white grits; few minute to small red brown inclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 10</td>
<td>35865</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>light red</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/8</td>
<td>reddish yellow</td>
<td>light red</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/6; many minute to medium white grits; few minute to small brown inclusions; very hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 11</td>
<td>25374</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>R-27</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4; many minute to small dark brown grits; some minute to small light gray inclusions; few minute to small buff grits; hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 12</td>
<td>34190</td>
<td>T-70</td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>light brown</td>
<td>7.5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>light reddish brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/4</td>
<td>7.5 YR 6/2; some minute to small buff grits; few minute to small red brown inclusions; some minute sparkling inclusions; hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 13</td>
<td>25033</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/4</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>5 YR 7/3</td>
<td>5 YR 7/3; some minute to small buff grits; few minute to small red brown inclusions; some minute sparkling inclusions; hard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Imported Hellenistic Stamped Amphora Handles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Stamped handle No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Munsell No.</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Munsell No.</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Munsell No.</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14,1</td>
<td>14,15</td>
<td>14,16</td>
<td>14,17</td>
<td>14,18</td>
<td>many small to medium red brown grits; some minute to small dark brown inclusions; some minute to small buff grits; very hard</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/3 pink</td>
<td>5 YR 6/1 light gray</td>
<td>10 YR 7/2 light gray</td>
<td>5 YR 7/2 pinkish gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,1</td>
<td>35881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some small black grits; few minute to small buff grits; very hard</td>
<td>7.5 YR 6/3 light brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/1 light gray</td>
<td>10 YR 7/2 light gray</td>
<td>5 YR 7/2 pinkish gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,1</td>
<td>34199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some small black grits; few minute to small buff grits; very hard</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/3 pink</td>
<td>5 YR 6/1 light gray</td>
<td>10 YR 7/2 light gray</td>
<td>5 YR 7/2 pinkish gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,1</td>
<td>34192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some small black grits; few minute to small buff grits; very hard</td>
<td>7.5 YR 6/3 light brown</td>
<td>5 YR 6/1 light gray</td>
<td>10 YR 7/2 light gray</td>
<td>5 YR 7/2 pinkish gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,1</td>
<td>26619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some small black grits; few minute to small buff grits; very hard</td>
<td>2.5 YR 6/3 pink</td>
<td>5 YR 6/1 light gray</td>
<td>10 YR 7/2 light gray</td>
<td>5 YR 7/2 pinkish gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Stone Ossuaries in the Hecht Museum Collection
and the Issue of Ossuaries Use for Burial

Ofra Guri-Rimon

The first part of the article\(^1\) is devoted to the publication of four stone ossuaries in the Hecht Museum collection, thereby joining them to the rich and varied assemblage of stone ossuaries that have been published up to now\(^2\). The second part of the article relates to the use of stone ossuaries for burial purposes toward the end of the Second Temple period\(^3\). I present an argument with regard to this issue that has not been advanced to this day: the custom of burial in ossuaries bears a relationship to the Jewish ritual laws (halacha) of uncleanness and purity similar to the affinity between these laws and stone vessels.

Four Ossuaries in the Hecht Museum Collection

The stone ossuaries are made of soft lime-stone (chalk). According to the museum records they were acquired by Dr. Hecht in Jerusalem.

1. **H-1372 (fig. 1)**
   - Description: Ossuary with four low feet and vaulted lid.
   - Size: L. 62.5 cm. (at base 60 cm.); W. 25 cm. (at base 23 cm.); H. 32 cm.
   - Decoration: Two vertical zigzag lines divide the front into two metopes in zigzag frames, each containing a six-petalled rosette within a zigzag circle. Each rosette is surrounded by three incised circles and a wedge-patterned circle. Similar decorations with slight variations are common on ossuaries in Jerusalem\(^4\).

2. **H-1373 (fig. 2)**
   - Description: Ossuary with four low feet; flat lid, painted orange.
   - Size: L. 64 cm. (at base 61 cm.); W. 25.5 cm. (at base 23 cm.); H. 31 cm.

---

\(^1\) The article was first published in Hebrew, see GURI-RIMON 2011.
\(^2\) See in particular RAHMANI 1994.
\(^3\) I wish to thank Asher M. Goldstein who translated the Hebrew version of the second part of this article.
\(^4\) RAHMANI 1994, nos. 22, 203, 214 and 249; SHADMI 1996, nos. 23, 27, 32. The ossuary was published in HACHLILI 1988, 12 no. 1.
Decoration: Two vertical zigzag lines, enclosing a row of truncated triangles, divide the front into two symmetrical metopes, each containing a sixteen-petalled rosette within concentric zigzag circles. Single zigzag lines at top and bottom and double zigzag lines at both sides enclose the metopes. Rahmani proposed to identify the truncated triangles with the scales of the palm trunk. Multi-petalled rosettes are recorded on ossuaries in Jerusalem.

3 H-2713 (fig. 3, a–e)
Description: Ossuary with four low feet; chisel marks cover all sides on exterior and interior.
Size: L. 41 cm (at base 37 cm); W. 22.5 cm (at base 19.5 cm); H. 23 cm.
Decoration: The main decorative element is the zigzag line between two lines or within two circles. The front is divided into a ‘triglyph’ between two metopes. In the ‘triglyph’ there are two small five-petalled rosettes, their petals with zigzag lines. Each rosette is set

5 Rahmani 1994, 49. For other ossuaries with the palm-trunk pattern see Rahmani 1994, nos. 242, 246, 360.
inside concentric zigzag circles, and a zigzag line separates the two rosettes. The metopes contain each a slightly larger six-petalled rosette, the petals with zigzag lines. Concentric zigzag circles enclose the rosettes. A zigzag frame borders the ossuary on all sides. A six-petalled rosette decorates the narrow side of the ossuary, set within a double circle and an outer frame, petals, circle and frame with zigzag patterns.

Chisel marks covering the surface of ossuaries occur in Jerusalem and surroundings\(^7\). The decorative arrangement of the rosettes and the same use of zigzag circles and frames is found on an ossuary from Jerusalem\(^8\).

\(^7\) Rahmani 1994, 10. 55. 81. 178.

\(^8\) Rahmani 1994, no. 178.
4  H-3468 (fig. 4)

Description: Ossuary with four low feet; vaulted lid, painted orange; a rim in form of a narrow shelf carved on the inner long sides.
Size: L. 52.5 cm. (at base 48 cm.); W. 27.5 cm. (at base 25 cm.); H. 33 cm.
Decoration: Two six-petalled rosettes, each inside two concentric line circles, decorate the front. At the top and the lateral sides the frame consists of two wavy lines, and at the bottom there is a single wavy line. The motif of two rosettes side by side occurs frequently.

The Relationship between Burial in Ossuaries and Laws of Ritual Uncleaness and Purity

Jewish society’s faithful preoccupation, at times to the point of exaggeration, with the laws of ritual cleanness and uncleanness toward the end of the Second Temple period is well reflected in the Tractate Toharot of the Babylonian Talmud, in particular in regard to the laws of the impurity of a dead person. This hyperbolic exactitude had already earned the criticism of the Sages as these examples attest:

»SIMILARLY ... A ZAB MUST NOT DINE, [etc.]. It was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Come and see how far purity has spread in Israel! For we did not learn, A clean man must not eat with an unclean woman, but A ZAB MUST NOT DINE TOGETHER WITH A ZABAH, AS IT MAY LEAD To SIN.« (BT Shabbat 13a; also Jerusalem Talmud, Shabbat 8b).

And this:

»“Once an accident,” etc. The rabbis taught: It once happened two priests were running, and were on a par. When they came to the top, one outstripped the other by four ells; he took a knife and stuck it into the other one’s breast. R. Zadok stood on the staircase of the porch, and said: Brethren of Israel, hear! It is written: “If there be found a slain person in the land . . . shall take a heifer.” For whom shall we bring the heifer? For the city, or for the Temple? The whole people began to weep.

Then the father of the young man arrived, and found him yet agonizing. He said: “May he [the dead] be an atonement for your sins; and as he shows yet signs of life, the knife has not become unclean [since he still lived].” We may infer from this, that the defilement of the knife was considered by them as a yet greater misfortune than bloodshed. « (BT Yoma 23a)

Still another source testifies to the centrality of these laws in Jewish society toward the end of the Second Temple period:

»… R. Isaac, the Smith, said: [This means,] the yoke of Sennacherib shall be destroyed on account of the oil of Hezekiah, which burnt in the synagogues and schools. What did he do? — He planted a sword by the door of the schoolhouse and proclaimed, ‘He who will not study the Torah will be pierced with the sword.’ Search was made from Dan unto Beer Sheba, and no ignoramus was found; from Gabbath unto Antipris, and no boy or girl, man or woman was found who was not thoroughly versed in the laws of cleanness and uncleanness. And concerning that generation it is said, and it shall come to pass in that day, that a man shall nourish a young cow, and two sheep…. « (BT Sanhedrin 94b) 10

The archaeological finds from this period that were exposed in excavations in Jerusalem and its environs, which I shall describe below, accord with what may be inferred from the sources. These finds, however, testify not only to the scrupulousness in observing laws of purity and uncleanness but also to the practical ways with which the individual and Jewish society as a whole coped with these pedantic laws.

Multiplicity of purity ritual baths

Avigad and Reich emphasize the multiplicity of ritual baths in the upper city of Jerusalem 11. Reich cites the large quantity of ritual baths for purity purposes dating to the end of the Second Temple period that were discovered throughout Israel: more than 300 are known, of which 150 are in Jerusalem alone. This density of ritual baths in relation to area, according to the archaeologist, even exceeds that of the ritual baths uncovered at Qumran 12, whose inhabitants were especially strict in their observance of laws of purity and uncleanness 13. Regev, in relating to the many ritual baths uncovered in Mazar’s excavations west of the Temple Mount, argues that they testify to hyper-purity, or »removal of impurities,« in the words of the Sages, because

10 Sanhedrin, translated into English, with notes, glossary and indices, chapters i–vi by Jacob Shachter, chapters vii–xi by H. Freedman, under the editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein. Rabbi Yitzhak Napkhah, who belonged to the second and third generations of Amoraim in Israel, projects onto the time of King Hezekiah a reality from the closing days of the Second Temple period. The Gemorah expounds on the oil that was lit in synagogues and study halls of Hezekiah, king of Judea, who returned to the people its strength and health through enforcing Torah study. In so doing, Hezekiah brought about unusual accomplishments in spreading the Torah, and especially in making the laws of Impurity and Cleanliness widespread. On identifying Antipars with Antipatris, which is at the source of the Yarkon River, see the interpretation in Steinsaltz 1982, 417.
11 Avigad 1983, 139–143.
12 Reich 2000.
13 Baumgarten 1997, 98.
people immersed themselves even though they were already ritually clean\(^\text{14}\). Klomer and Zissu report ritual baths in the vicinity of some of the burial caves in the periphery of Jerusalem, so that the counting of clean days would begin immediately after leaving the impure area\(^\text{15}\). It is interesting to note that the archaeological finds also testify to the fact that alongside the vigilant maintenance of the obligation to immerse themselves, the residents of the upper city of Jerusalem found a way to enjoy the advantages of the warm bathhouse without contradicting the laws of purity and impurity that they were very careful to keep\(^\text{16}\).

**The Use of Stone Vessels\(^\text{17}\)** which are not susceptible to ritual uncleanness

Bearing testimony to the scrupulous adherence to the laws of cleanness and uncleanness are the many stone vessels that have been uncovered (fig. 5). Most researchers adopted Magen’s outlook, that the motive for manufacturing stone tools is the halachic rule (*Mishna*, *Ohalot* 5, 5; *BT Shabbat* 58a; *BT Minachot* 69b) that stone vessels do not absorb impurity, and thus they have priority over vessels fashioned from other materials (fig. 6). The stone vessel finds, which are quite impressive, include a variety of utensils, among them mugs, bowls, basins, tables, large containers (*kalal*), and stoppers. The diversified vessel assemblage testifies to the fact that despite their being stone vessels and, therefore, heavier and significantly more liquid-absorbent than pottery, they were in everyday use. This was an expression, on the one

\(^\text{14}\) Regev 2005. The author argues that the ritual baths in the area of the Temple Mount were not meant for purification from ritual uncleanness of those who ascended to the Temple, because according to Jewish law (*halacha*), those making this pilgrimage who were required to immerse themselves were obligated, in addition, to wait a period of time that depended on the type of impurity from which they were being cleaned, a day or week, until their entrance to the Temple was permitted. In other words, a person who immersed him/herself in a ritual bath (*mikve*) for ritual purification from uncleanness could not enter the Temple Mount immediately after immersion; thus the location of these ritual baths is irrelevant for this person’s purposes. In Regev’s opinion, the ritual baths served those who had already arrived in Jerusalem in a ritually clean condition, but for the sake of enhancing the commandments, they immersed themselves once again, despite the fact that they were ritually clean.

\(^\text{15}\) Klomer – Zissu 2007, 44.

\(^\text{16}\) Reich 1989, 208–209.

\(^\text{17}\) The assemblages of stone vessels from the end of the Second Temple period are well recognized, and their typology, geographical distribution, the chronological issue of their appearance and disappearance, and also technological aspects have all been discussed at length; see Cahill 1992; Magen 2002; Geva 2010; Amit 2010. The last author offers a new and updated discussion on the various aspects of this phenomenon based on archaeological finds in recent years; there is also an added bibliography.

hand, of scrupulous adherence but, on the other hand, of a practical and efficient solution that enabled coping with the severity of the ritual laws of impurity and purity.

Protecting clay vessels from being ritually unclean

Another example of a way of coping with the ritual laws may be seen in the manufacture of stoppers and lids made of stone. According to the halacha, pottery becomes unclean from its atmosphere – that is, from what is inside it – and in that event, it cannot be purified in a ritual bath and must be shattered; its shattering is its purification (Mishna, Kelim 2, 1). The halacha teaches, though, that a pottery vessel may be protected from ritual impurity if it is tightly closed: »and earthenware utensils fitted with tightly fitting covers remain clean« (Mishna, Toharot 7, 5). In this spirit, the Rambam (Maimonides) wrote in his Mishne Torah: pottery in the tent of a deceased becomes unclean, for the impurity enters into its atmosphere; and if it is tightly encompassed by a cover, it and whatever is within are clean as was elaborated in the Torah, for no uncleanness enters it except through its opening (Mishne Torah, Laws of Impurity of a Dead Person ch. 6, 4). The number of stoppers in the stone vessel assemblage is noticeably large. These stoppers are suitable for closing up goblets, cruses, jugs, and so forth; in other words, vessels that are containers and therefore susceptible to impurity. There is no need to stop up simple earthenware vessels – pottery utensils that are not containers – since they are not susceptible to ritual uncleanness (Tosefta, Hulin 1, 12; Mishne Torah, Laws of Vessels 1, 9).

A significant proportion of the stoppers have an encircling recess or ring (fig. 7). This recess, in my opinion, allows tightening of the stopper onto the vessel with the aid of a thread that is coiled in the depression and that goes around the neck or the handle of the vessel (fig. 8). The recess, which is typical of many of the stoppers, allows, in my opinion, an interpretation of the term tzamid ptil as an expression describing the stopper that is intended to protect a pottery vessel from being susceptible to ritual impurity: it is the function of the stopper to be a ›lid cover‹; that is, to be well attached by means of a twisted rope. This interpretation, which is based on characteristics of stone stoppers discovered in excavations, accords with Rashi’s interpretation of Book of Numbers (Bamidbar) 19, 15: »... therefore, if the cover that forms its lid is not well joined to it by a perfect contact, it [the vessel] becomes unclean....« The interpretation of the term »the lid is joined« differs from the accepted reading, presented by Magen, among others, according to which ptil is a covering on a vessel while tzamid is the material that seals the opening of the vessel and finishes the lid. The Mishna mentions a selection of materials for sealing (Mishna, Kelim 10, 2).

19 See for example, Cahill 1992, 249 fig. 17, 1–7; Magen 2002, 74–77 pl. 10; Geva 2010, 172–173. 198 pl. 5. 11, 1–7)
20 Magen 2002, 140.
The many stone stoppers that were uncovered in the excavations, in addition to those made of other material and that apparently were not preserved, testify, too, to the care with which the ritual law was kept, as well as to the ability of the Jewish society to create a practical and effective solution that enabled coping with the pedantic law. There is no doubt that earthenware vessels were widespread among the utensils in daily use, and the protection of their openings from susceptibility to uncleanness, which would have obligated their being broken, constituted a vital solution for every Jewish household toward the end of the Second Temple period. The relatively large amount of finds of stone stoppers is evidence of their preference over stoppers made of other material, not only because they were fashioned from a raw material that was available and easy to process, but also and principally because those who were scrupulous in keeping the laws of ritual impurity preferred the former precisely because they were made of stone and so were considered as not being susceptible to ritual impurity. For the same reason, these people apparently preferred stone tables, sundials, stone weights, and other items made of stone\textsuperscript{21}.

\textsuperscript{21} See, for example, a stone oven, which is not susceptible to uncleanness: Mishnah, Kelim 5, 11; also see Kehati’s interpretation of a bath-house bench – ספסלין במרחץ (Kelim 22, 10). There are those who give the interpretation that the legs alone are impure and the bench itself clean, for stone vessels have no ritual uncleanness. In Mishna Kelim 8, 12, weights are numbered among the items that are susceptible to impurity only when considered vessels. In light of this halacha, one may understand the reality of many stone weights discovered in the excavations in Jerusalem (Reich 2006).
Burial in stone ossuaries

The question remains: Can stone ossuaries which have been discovered in burial caves and in which the bones of the deceased were collected about a year after the original burial be viewed as the manifestation of a practical and effective solution through which the individual and the society coped with the stringency of the laws relating to the severest of impurities, the ritual uncleanness of a dead person, the ‘prototype impurity’ that defiles?

An accepted opinion among researchers is that the Jewish artisans who worked with stone and created stone vessels were also those who manufactured the stone ossuaries and apparently also in those same manufacturing centers; this supposition is based on their complete similarity of manufacturing methods, decoration, and raw material. The researchers also point to the similarity of the two phenomena in regard to geographical dispersion and chronology—the time of their appearance and their disappearance. Following Rahmani and Magen, it became customary to explain the two phenomena by the affinity to Jewish religious law, halacha: the phenomenon of stone vessels and its affinity to the laws of impurity and purity; and that of burial in ossuaries, and its affinity to Jewish law formulated toward the end of the Second Temple period in regard to the resurrection of the dead at the end of days; this being a physical resurrection of the individual, the person’s bones had therefore to be preserved. However, none of the researchers connected the custom of burying in ossuaries with the laws of purity and uncleanness; none saw in these religious laws the reason for manufacturing and using these ossuaries. Rahmani even sharpens the difference between the two groups, invalidating with this assertion any possibility of connecting the ossuary burial custom with the laws of purity and impurity: »The Jerusalem stone cutters in this period faithfully processed the local soft chalkstone, preparing various household vessels, from containers of various sizes to table tops. It may be assumed that the great request for stone vessels stemmed from the laws of impurity and purity, but it was not because of this that the craftsmen were requested to prepare stone vessels for burying the bones of the dead, for these, like the entire gravesite, were in any event ritually unclean. Like the skill of these cutters in creating stone vessels, suppliers made them for customers who sought durable and cheap vessels for permanently storing the bones of their dear ones«. Magen, too, did not see any connection with the ritual laws that brought about the manufacture of stone vessels. In his opinion, there were two motivations for using ossuaries: the need to reduce the number of burials in burial caves in order to enable new burials; and, following Rahmani, the need to preserve the deceased person’s bones in order to enable a physical resurrection at the end of days.

Cahill, in the framework of her comprehensive research on the finds of stone vessels in the City of David, raised a number of questions about the prevailing opinion among researchers as to the affinity of stone vessels to Jewish ritual law. In her opinion, the fact that

---

22 On the collection of bones, see Jerusalem Talmud, Tractate Moed Katan 5a; also Tractate Semachot 12, 9: »And this is what Abba told me when he was dying: ‘My son, first bury me in the valley, and finally collect my bones and give them over into an ossuary.’«

23 The deceased imparts impurity when being borne, when touched, and in a tent. In other words, one who touches the deceased or any part of the body or someone who carries it even though he may not actually be touching it, or anyone inside the same tent as the dead person – all are unclean for seven days and require the sprinkling of the ashes of a red heifer on the third day and on the fourth day of his impurity. Therefore, the impurity of the dead is called the impurity of the seven (Kehati 1970, 273).


27 RAHMANI 1994, 30.


the two phenomena, use of stone vessels and burial in ossuaries, occur especially in Jerusalem and adjacent to the Temple does indeed hint of their affinity to Jewish law. However, she is of the opinion that the nature of this law and the cause of these phenomena are still not understood. She continues to raise questions: if the advantage of stone vessels lies in their not being susceptible to ritual impurity because of the material from which they are made, is it possible to relate this quality to ossuaries, which are also made of the same raw material but are intended to be placed in graves, where uncleanness is all prevailing? How may one explain finding stone vessels together with glass and earthenware vessels, which are susceptible to impurity, in the assemblages discovered in graves? In effect, in the light of the full similarity of the two phenomena in regard to their distribution, chronology, and technology and, at the same time, of the lack of similarity as to causes of these phenomena, Cahill casts doubt on the explanation of the affinity of stone vessels to religious laws of uncleanness and purity.30

To me, as well, it seems unreasonable that the two phenomena would be identical in all the aspects cited above. However, for the most meaningful aspect, the factor or motive for the phenomenon, there is no similarity. This reality led me to search for an answer in another direction: to try to investigate whether the custom of burial in stone ossuaries can be related to the laws of impurity and purity. It is true, of course, that the deceased is the prototype of ritual impurity and the burial cave does ritually defile one; but perhaps there is an attempt in the use of stone ossuaries to restrict and limit the impurity, thereby connecting this phenomenon, too, with the laws of ritual uncleanness and purity. Is not the stone ossuary a practical and effective solution assisting the individual and Jewish society in coping with the very strict, pedantic laws of the impurity of the deceased? A study of the works of the Sages, in particular the Mishna and its commentaries dealing with the laws on the impurity of the deceased, shows that situations do exist in which it is possible to limit and restrict ritual impurity. Some of these situations may, in my opinion, be understood by linking them to the use of stone ossuaries, which are distinguished by qualities relevant to the laws describing situations in which the harm caused by the uncleanness of the deceased is limited. My suggestion, detailed below, does not contradict Rahmani’s interpretation of the motivation for the custom of collecting the bones and preserving them. I am only offering an explanation of the fact that they were collected into stone ossuaries precisely because of the special characteristics of these containers.

A stone ossuary is a chest, the volume of which is very limited considering its purpose: storage of the bones of a deceased person. Rahmani points to the relationship between the dimensions of the ossuary and the dimensions of the thigh bone, the pelvis, and the skull of the one buried in it.31 It is clear that the volume of the chest allows storage of the bones of a dead person only with utmost crowding.32

Furthermore, in many cases, the ossuary contains the bones of two and even more buried persons.33 It seems to me that the especially narrow dimensions of the ossuaries may be understood by their affinity to ritual law of »broken impurity,« the spread of which uncleanness is limited: it rises and also breaks through below, but it does not spread over its environs. Impurity, by contrast, does spread over its surroundings when there is a hollow space in the grave that is larger than one by one cubit (tefah): (Ohalot 7a). The Rambam summarizes these laws quite clearly (Mishne Torah, Laws of the Impurity of the Dead ch. 7: 9 [4]–11 [5]).

31 Rahmani 1994, 6, 33.
32 The external dimensions of the ossuary for burying an adult were 42–65 cm. in length, 23–28 cm. in width, and 30–39 cm. high. The thickness of its walls in most cases was 3 cm. Ossuaries whose dimensions were larger were intended for the joint burial of two family members (Rahmani 1994, 6).
33 Kloner – Zissu 2007, 111.
34 A tefah is the size of a tightly closed fist or 4 fingers. Its length dimension has various interpretations, ranging between 7 and 10 cm.
There is no doubt that such a situation is more convenient for those burying their dead or for those visiting graves in a burial cave, which owing to the use of such a container exposes them less to the harm of ritual impurity. The use of stone ossuaries can provide an answer, too, to a situation in which one has to go into a burial cave or to a situation of clearing out graves. Because the uncleanness is broken within the stone ossuary, then the spread of the impurity is lessened in the process of moving the deceased by being limited to moving upward and downward, but not sidewise. Thus, the air space inside has an advantage for those who transfer the buried bodies to the new cave. The series of caves in the Jerusalem area contained vegetable gardens, fences, olive presses, and wine presses; in other words, a flourishing agricultural periphery. There is no doubt that the laws of impurity in this environment constituted a problem whose damage it was worthwhile to restrict.

The following religious law (halacha), quoted from the Mishna, may be related to the situation of moving the deceased by means of an ossuary whether within the burial cave or outside it. Among other things, the Mishna details situations in which the damage of uncleanness is limited; it describes a situation in which the casket may be grasped without one’s being susceptible to impurity.

»If a tomb is wide below and narrow at the top and a corpse is in it, one that touches below is clean but above is unclean; if it is wide above and narrow at the bottom, one that touches it anywhere is unclean. If is equally broad above and below, one that touches it anywhere is unclean, according to the view of R. Eliezer. But R. Joshua says, [one who touches it] more than one cubit beneath is clean, but less than a cubit above is unclean. If it were made in the form of a chest, whatsoever touches it anywhere becomes unclean; if it is in the form of a case, whatsoever touches it anywhere, save at the place where it opens, remains clean.« (Mishna, Ohalot 9, 14 [15])

The foregoing Mishna also shows that the tomb or chest is made like a small cupboard or clothes closet whose covering envelops the walls. In other words, when the cover is removed vis-à-vis the walls the chest conveys uncleanness. However, if the lid is only a covering over the opening – something that is typical of ossuary covers that have been uncovered in excavations – then the impurity in such a situation affects only someone who touches the area of the opening, and whoever comes into contact with any of the other sides of the chest is not susceptible to uncleanness. It is in this context that one may read the Rambam in the Mishne Torah and its explicators, according to whom a coffin made of stone offers an advantage, for it defiles only those who touch its opening (Mishne Torah ch. 6, 12–13). And there is Ravad’s commentary on the Rambam. The Toharat Yisrael commentary on the Rambam says: But the chest is the cover of the dead person and [the corpse] does not roll or knock, and is not a closed

35 On clearing out graves in Jerusalem, see Kloner – Zissu 2007, 106–107; Magen 2002, 143–144. On clearing out graves in the sources, see for example the Rambam, Mishne Torah, Laws of the Unclean Dead 8, 7: the grave that is found, it is permissible to clear out; and if it is, its place is impure, and it is forbidden to derive benefit from it until it has been examined as will be explained. And the grave of a well-known person, it is forbidden to clear it out; and if it is, its place is clean, and it is permitted to derive benefit from it. A grave that causes damage to many is to be cleared out; its place is impure and no benefit may be derived. And therefore (Tosefta, Baba Batra 1, 7) a grave that surrounds the city whether in all four directions or in three directions or two directions, in contrast to one that is more than fifty ama distant on any side, does not have to be vacated, but is to be cleared out if less than that; all the graves are to be cleared out, except for that of the king and that of the grave of the prophet. Rabbi Akiva says, even the grave of the king and that of the prophet are to be cleared out.

37 Kehati 1970, 357.
38 Ravad (also known by the abbreviation RABad) mentions the »Arukli,« where נקרוס – gluskos is interpreted as chest.
grave; the body does not impart impurity in a stone chest, but whoever makes a tent over it against uncleanness.

The stone sarcophagus, which is not especially heavy, may be transferred relatively easily from place to place if held from the bottom. The short legs of most sarcophagi enable placing one’s hands at the bottom of the sarcophagus quite easily; as quoted above (Mishna, Ohalot 9, 14 [15]), grasping the bottom of the case from the height of a cubit or less prevents susceptibility to uncleanness. The possibility of carrying the sarcophagus on one’s shoulder receives testimony in Tractate Semachot of the Jerusalem Talmud in the context of a discussion of the laws of mourning. One learns from the text that the body of a baby was carried in a sarcophagus (Semachot, ch. 3; Halacha 1, 3–7), similarly in the Babylonian Talmud (BT Moed Katan 24b).

To sum, it seems to me that the hyper-caution of the Jewish society in Judea toward the end of the Second Temple period in regard to laws of impurity and cleanness was due to the practical and efficient solution that reduced the damage of the impurity of the dead. It was a solution that benefited the individual whether he or she belonged to the rank and file, the common folk, or to the upper classes. Kloner and Zissu argue that the archaeological finds testify to the custom of collecting bones and the use of ossuaries that was prevalent among all sectors and was not just the legacy of one exceptional group.39 This solution was manifested in the practice of collecting the deceased person’s bones into an ossuary made of stone, whose volume was very restricted and which had a cover that lay over the opening and did not slope down and touch its walls; furthermore, the material of which the ossuary was made enabled limiting the damage of the impurity of the dead, which is the prototype of ritual uncleanness.

With the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 CE, the influence of the laws of purity and uncleanness on everyday Jewish life, both that of the individual and that of the society, diminished. In the absence of the Temple and the consequent abolishing of sacrifices; the ashes of the red heifer, which were necessary for purification of the uncleanness of the dead, were depleted. Despite the permutations that were generated in the Jewish world, the archaeological finds and the sources in the literature of the Sages testify to the fact that in the days of the Tannaim too, i.e., in the late Roman period, the use of stone vessels and ossuaries continued in the Galilee and in the rural Jewish settlements in Judea. After a while, though, things changed: stone vessels and ossuaries are not revealed in the archaeological assemblages after the 3rd century CE, which is in accordance with the picture that emerges from the literature of the Sages. As is known, there is only Mishna but no Gemorah to the Toharot Order, the 6th in the Babylonian Talmud, except for the Tractate of Niddah, which deals with family purity, a subject that is au courant at all times and in every place; in the Jerusalem Talmud, only three chapters of the Tractate of Niddah have been preserved.

In the course of the foregoing discussion, I have tried to present my opinion that the two phenomena, that of stone vessels and that of stone ossuaries, are identical from the aspect of

39 Kloner – Zissu 2007, 113, see also note 8 for the authors’ estimate of the quantity of ossuaries and their distribution in the Jerusalem necropolises.

40 See Amit 2010 and the additional bibliography there for new, updated conclusions based on up-to-date archaeological information in the context of the continued use of stone vessels in the Galilee and in the rural settlement in Judea after the destruction of the Temple, as well as in the 2nd and 3rd centuries and even perhaps in the early 4th century; on the termination of the practice of burial in ossuaries and on the continuation of the custom of collecting bones into stone ossuaries in Judea and the Galilee after the destruction see Rahmani 1994, 24–25; see also Kloner – Zissu 2007, 113–114 on the continuation of the custom until the 3rd or early 4th centuries.

41 See testimony in the following sources for the continued strict adherence to laws of purity at the time of the Tanaim: Raban Gamliel: Mishna, Yadayim 3, 1; Tosefta Kelim, Baba Metzia 11, 2; Kelim, Baba Batra 2, 4; BT Niddah 6b; Raban Shimon ben-Gamliel: Tosefta, Para 12, 12; Rabbi Yehuda the Prince: BT Niddah 6a–b.

42 My sincere thanks go to Dr. Gabriel S. Breuer, Shaarei Zedek Medical Center, Jerusalem, who kindly agreed to read the manuscript and made helpful comments.
their affinity to Jewish religious law (halacha)—that is, the laws of uncleanness and purity—and, therefore, to offer a position according to which there is complete similarity between all aspects of these two phenomena. I am hopeful that this idea, which has been presented only concisely and which has accompanied me since I was curator of the exhibition ‘Purity broke out in Israel’ [a phrase taken from BT Shabbat 3a]—Stone Vessels in the Late Second Temple Period at the Hecht Museum in 1994, will arouse interest and in its wake lead to additional research and studies of this fascinating subject.
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Nysa-Scythopolis: The Hellenistic Polis

Gabriel Mazor & Walid Atrash

For ninety-five years excavations have been going on at the site of Hellenistic Nysa-Scythopolis. From 1921 to 1923 the expedition of the Pennsylvania University Museum, Philadelphia worked at Tel Bet She’an. From 1991 to 1994 and 2005 to 2010 the expeditions of the Bet She’an Archaeological Project and the Israel Antiquities Authority were active at Tel Bet She’an and Tel Iztabba, sites located on both banks of Nahal Harod (fig. 1). The excavations revealed the construction of a military stronghold and an administrative centre of the mid-3rd century BCE on Tel Bet She’an and the foundation of a polis on Tel Iztabba around 170 BCE until the destruction of Hellenistic Nysa-Scythopolis by the Hasmoneans in 108/107 BCE. Numerous scholars published their research on the material culture and ancient sources, highlighting the history and cultural identity of Nysa-Scythopolis, a Greek city of Coele Syria. This article summarizes the basic data of those researches and reviews the archaeological and historical evidence.

Archaeological research

During the years 1921–1933 the expedition of the Pennsylvania University Museum at Philadelphia (henceforth UME1) conducted extensive excavations at Tel Bet She’an (Tel el-Hussan, the fortress mound), a monumental landmark that rises over the southern bank of Nahal Harod (Jalud). Reaching the earlier Bronze (Egyptian) and Iron Age (Biblical) strata, the excavation cleared the entire layers of the later periods, leaving scanty remains of the Hellenistic period at the eastern fringes of the mound. These were later excavated by the expedition of the Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem (henceforth IAHU, see below2). The late strata were termed by the UME excavators3 as following: »City level III – Hellenistic, Jewish and Roman (301 BC – 329 AD); City level II – Byzantine, Roman, Christian (330–636 AD); City level I – Arabic, Crusader etc. (636 AD – ca. 19th century)«. In the excavation report a joint plan of Strata II and I was published though no plan of Stratum III.

The excavations of UME failed to identify a clear stratum of city level III and just sporadic, non-stratified finds, mostly out of later pits of city level II were recorded with no architectural

1 The expedition was directed by C. S. Fisher in the years 1921–1923, by A. Rowe in 1925–1928 and by G. M. FitzGerald in the years 1930–1931 and 1933.
3 Rowe 1930, 7–8. 44–45.
remains. Few pottery sherds of unknown provenance (with no references to loci or areas) were published along with thirteen stamped Rhodian amphorae handles.

The head of a colossal marble statue was revealed in a fill within a Byzantine period cistern. Apart from the broken chin and nose the head is in mint condition (fig. 2). Thiersch identified it as a 2nd century BCE fusion of Dionysos, Alexander and Antiochus IV. Its accepted identification today is Alexander, perhaps assimilated with Dionysos. Wenning dated it, based on its baroque treatment to the years 170–150 BCE, a date accepted by Erlich, based on style and historical considerations. According to Erlich the head reflects the characteristic components of Alexander as established by Lysippos, his court sculptor. It combines heroic appearance, the authoritative and the divine and captures his symbolic significance and apotheosis. The deeply drilled long and high sculptured mane of hair (anastole), described by Plutarch as a distinctive feature of Lysippan Alexander’s physiognomy, is in Pollitt’s

4 FitzGerald 1931, pls. 30–36 (from the mixed assemblage of strata III–I); Iliffe 1933, 126 nos. 15–16; Comfort – Waagé 1936. The stamped Rhodian amphorae handles were dated by FitzGerald 1931, 44–46 to the first half of the 2nd century BCE.

5 Rowe 1930, 45 pl. 55; Thiersch 1932, 57–76 assumed that it is a representation of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, an identification rejected by Fuks 1983, 78; Avi-Yonah 1962, 130 note 50 stated that as the male head is not bearded it cannot be Zeus and suggested that it might have represented Alexander.

6 Thiersch 1932, 57–76.


8 Erlich 2009, 10–11.

9 Plut. Alex. 4.1; Plut. de Alex. fort. 2.2.3

assessment well reflected in the high Pergamene style of the Head of Alexander from Pergamon (ca. 200 BCE), now in Istanbul Archaeological Museum. According to Pollitt other typical Lysippan features can be observed in the turn of the neck, the slightly open mouth and aspiring glance. There also seems to be clear resemblance in technique and features to the ›Heroic Alexander‹ statue head from Pella, presumably dated to the time of Philip V or Perseus (ca. 200–175 BCE), now in the Pella Archaeological Museum. The latter might be a close reflection of a Lysippan prototype along with other Alexander figures from Ptolemaic Egypt. Wenning suggested that by erecting a statue of Alexander in 2nd century BCE Nysa-Scythopolis, the Seleucid rulers and the citizens of the polis asserted and legitimized their rule, thus declaring their political identity and their intended association and participation in the Hellenistic koine. Smith proposes the head’s attribution to »a (cult?) statue of a Hellenistic king, based on images of Dionysos and later Alexander types«. Considering historical and stylistic criteria as well as the archaeological evidence Stewart refutes a Hellenistic date and tentatively assigns the head to a Roman statue of Alexander, emphasizing characteristic features of sculpture of the Severan period like the porcelain-like finish, the drilled ›bridges‹ in the hair and the depiction of the irises of the eyes flattened for painting and rolled up high under their upper lids.

An inscription carved on a stone block was revealed in the debris of a Byzantine period reservoir. The inscription represents a priests’ list of the Olympian Zeus and reads »[Priests of the] Olympian [Zeus] [and of the] Savior [Gods]. In the year … of the king [Demetrius?] Euboulos, son of Epicrates …sos …ou. Heraclides, son of Sarapion«. The inscription was dated to about the mid-2nd century BCE.

Rowe stated that in the 3rd century BCE a large temple (37.05 x 22.08 m) was erected atop the summit. The probably peripteral temple was built of white marble, with column drums and Corinthian capitals revealed. According to Rowe it resembled the Temple of Aphrodite at Naukratis in Egypt. He also mentioned a frieze member decorated by a garlanded head of Bacchus, which testified that at a later stage (Roman) the temple might have been dedicated...
to that deity. A reexamination of the architectural members clearly dates the temple to the Roman period.

Finally, a hoard of twenty silver tetradrachms was found in a broken pot below the Byzantine level at the southern edge of the summit. The coins were minted at the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 BCE) and most of the dateable coins of the hoard are from the years 259–249 BCE.

When the excavations of the mound were resumed (1989–1996) by the IAHU expedition scantly remains of the Hellenistic period were unearthed along the western fringes of the mound (Area P, Stratum 5; Plan 1.1), revealing the stone foundations of brick walls with remnants of plaster. The remains were identified as a domestic structure containing several rooms and courtyards with ovens, in which three phases were distinguished (P5a–c), evident in some alterations of the walls and raised floors. Stratum P5 was reached immediately under the massive foundations of a Byzantine structure. The pottery assemblages, both of imported and local wares, fit well into the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE. Eighteen stamped amphora handles were retrieved and dated to the third quarter of the 3rd century BCE, and they seem to reflect an earlier date than those revealed in the UME excavations. Eleven coins were retrieved in Area P21. The earliest coins (nos. 1–2) are from the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 BCE), while the rest (nos. 3–12) are Seleucid attributed to the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164 BCE) and that of Antiochus IX Cyzicenus (third reign, 96–95 BCE). Four Hasmonean coins of Alexander Jannaeus (nos. 17–20) and two Tyrian shekels from the 1st century BCE (nos. 13–14) were also found on the mound, though not in Area P, Stratum P5. Terracotta figurines, few and fragmentary, were found in Area P and they seem to represent domestic cult objects or decorations. Their state of preservation and provinciality of material prevents a more accurate dating within the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE.

In the wake of the IAHU’s work on Hellenistic Nysa-Scythopolis the Israel Antiquities Authority (henceforth IAA) carried out excavations at Tel Izbatta (1991–1994) where Hellenistic remains were observed. The deep gorge of Nahal Harod (Jalud) that runs from west to east along the northern limits of Roman-Byzantine Nysa-Scythopolis sets a majestic imprint on the landscape of the polis. The stream-bed, deeply cut in Nahal Harod’s rock layers created a deep and narrow gorge with high, sharply sloping banks. Along the southern bank rises Tel Bet-She’an, while the northern bank consists of three low flat hills, separated by small tributaries. In the west spreads Tel Naharon, a flat hill that during the Byzantine period housed an extra muros neighborhood. In the east is Tel Hamam, a relatively small and rounded hill that served during the Byzantine period as the city main necropolis. In between Tel Naharon and Tel Hamam a long, relatively wide and rather flat table-shaped hill extends, Tel Izbatta (Tel el-Mastaba) that slopes gently into the flat land in the north. Its southern steep slope, the

16 The scattered architectural members mistakenly identified as marble were of limestone quarried in the Gilboa Mountain quarries that presumably started functioning at the late 1st century CE. The Corinthian capitals of the temple were analyzed by Fischer 1990, 61 no. 229 and dated to the Flavian period. On the mound no earlier architectural members were revealed. The temple should therefore be dated to the late 1st century CE and there is no evidence for any earlier temple at the site.
18 Mazar 1994, 82–83; Mazar 2006, 240–248. The surviving remains might indicate what the nature of the Hellenistic stratum was before it was obliterated by the UME clearing.
19 Johnson 2006, 523–537.
Nahal Ḥarod northern bank served during the Bronze Age as a necropolis and is honeycombed by hundreds of burial caves, part of which were excavated by UME\textsuperscript{25}. Previous surveys and several trial excavations conducted at Tel Ḥarob revealed Hellenistic remains\textsuperscript{26} (fig. 3).

Two major Areas (W and Z) were opened in the eastern part of the flat hill and various smaller areas (Areas H, O, M and T) in the west and north. Further trial excavations were conducted during the years 2005–2010 by W. Atrash, E. Yannai and Z. Horvitz in the western premises of Tel Ḥarob\textsuperscript{27}.

Area W represents a residential quarter constructed in the characteristic orthogonal layout (fig. 4). Residential insulae (16 $\times$ 75 m), composed of numerous houses, are separated by axial alleys 2–2.5 m wide, paved with earth-beaten floors consisting of crashed lime mixed

\textsuperscript{25} Rowe 1930, 2. 52 pls. 4–5; Oren 1973.
\textsuperscript{26} Tzori 1962, 152–154; Tzori 1977; Landau – Tzaferis 1979.
\textsuperscript{27} Yannai 2014; Atrash 2016.
with pebbles and pottery sherds; under the floors are drainage channels. Walls, built of sun-dried mud bricks on basalt stone foundations were plastered with yellow, red and black painted frescoes on white stucco in masonry style panels (fig. 5). The floors of the rooms were of compressed crashed limestone and in some cases plastered. Two storied-buildings of medium size and similar type contained relatively small rooms surrounding a courtyard from two sides and opened to alleys on both longitudinal sides of the insula (fig. 6). Stone-paved courtyards held ovens and cisterns; rooms had plastered floors, while the roofs and upper level floors were made of wood, reed and plaster. Rooms in several buildings had burnt wooden looms with numerous loom weights scattered around them (fig. 7). A large amount of pottery, both imported and of local production, including many Rhodian wine amphorae was retrieved. Several ceramic assemblages, mostly of complete vessels, were separated into vessels found on the ground floor in various rooms and courtyards and vessels that originated from the second-floor rooms and collapsed as the buildings were set on fire (fig. 8).

Beneath the buildings an earlier phase was revealed, composed of hearths and pottery, yet with no architecture. The Hellenistic phases were constructed on top of an Early Bronze III stratum that seems to extend over a large portion of the mound.
Area Z revealed several public buildings that were partly exposed. A large-sized complex composed of numerous rooms surrounding a spacious courtyard represented the first and main structure, while other units, separated by a 3 m wide plastered street, had various sizes. Architectural elements including white limestone bases, column drums and Ionic capitals retrieved in secondary use in the walls of an Early Roman structure that was built over the ruined Hellenistic complex might have originated from a temple or a public structure. Walls construction of sun-dried mud bricks were plastered with white masonry style stucco. North of Area Z and downhill, Area O revealed another public structure, presumably a warehouse with a sophisticated drainage system and a plastered courtyard. Probes conducted in the western parts of Tel Izbabba in Area H, T and later in the rescue excavations undertaken further west indicated that the Hellenistic polis spread over the entire area of the hill covering some 225,000 sq. m. At the north-eastern section probes revealed what seem to be parts of the city wall with an integrated tower (fig. 9). Altogether, three phases were clearly indicated in the excavations of the Hellenistic polis at Tel Izbabba. The meagre earliest phase from the second half of the 3rd century BCE comprises hearths and pottery with no architecture. The two subsequent main phases represent the well-planed, extensive polis constructed around 175 BCE, including the minor changes it underwent during its time of existence. In 108 / 107 BCE this city was conquered by the Hasmoneans, destroyed by fire and never re-built.

In the habitation debris at Tel Izbabba several categories of outstanding finds came to light, and although just a small part of the polis was excavated (7 %), their quantity and quality contrast the meagre finds published by the UME that excavated the entire Hellenistic strata at Tel Bet She’an. Some 360 stamped amphora handles were recovered, besides some earlier ones.

Fig. 6: Artistic reconstruction of residential insula.
the bulk dates to the 2nd century BCE, the latest stamps from 108/107 BCE (figs. 10–11). Their research determined the dates of Nysa-Scythopolis’ foundation and destruction and provided evidence for the city’s long-distance trade patterns and consumption habits.

Meticulously conducted excavations of complete houses within the residential quarter of Area W enabled the specific attribution of a considerably large amount of restored pottery assemblages to the various floors and rooms of the analyzed houses. The systematic research of the pottery assemblages resulted in a precise assessment of the types of vessels (table wares, lamps, cookware, storage jars and amphorae) and their distribution as revealed in various

Fig. 7: Burnt wooden loom with scattered vessels around.
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Fig. 8: Empty amphorae stored in room’s corner.

Fig. 9: City-wall and tower in Area H.
functional rooms of the first and second floors of houses and courtyards. Furthermore, the research also documented patterns of settlement abandonment that occurred prior and during the violent conquest and destruction of the polis in 108/107 BCE and its possible impact on analyzing the archaeological evidence.

About 380 coins were retrieved, apart from coins dated to the 2nd half of the 3rd century BCE the bulk was dated to the 2nd century BCE and few (five) to the Hasmonean conquest. In addition there were over 300 clay loom weights of the truncated pyramidal type, some 20 lead sling shots, arrows and various minor tools, terracotta figurines, glass beads and an inscribed astragal.

Some one-hundred sealings were unearthed in one of the buildings in the residential quarter of Area W, representing a private archive. The preserved clay sealings derive from burnt legal and official documents. They bear scenes of Greek nature, mostly depicting mythological gods and goddesses and Seleucid portraits in the so-called ›Republican Style‹. Dated to the later part of the 2nd century BCE they seem to reflect the culture and ethnicity of the polis officials. Outstanding are five unique sealings that depict the local cult myth of Nysa breastfeeding Dionysos. Petrographic analysis of the sealings revealed a rather wide distribution of legal documents that were sent to Nysa-Scythopolis from various Hellenic centres in the nearby Decapolis, as well as from more distant centres like Antioch, Cyprus and the Aegean Islands. The main categories of finds shed important light on the commercial ties with the Greek Islands and bear witness to the Hellenic affiliation, culture, religion and ethnic identity of the citizens at Hellenistic Nysa-Scythopolis, a deeply-rooted marker still present decades later.

In the 2nd century CE, the citizens of Roman Nysa-Scythopolis erected a statue in honor of the emperor Marcus Aurelius (161–180) in front of a temple (kalibe), presumably dedicated to the imperial cult. The temple was built within the civic centre in front of an irregular piazza.
located at the junction of two colonnaded streets. In the inscription on the round pedestal that once carried the bronze statue the Greco-Roman polis was declared a Holy City and Asylum, one of Coele Syria’s Greek cities. The abbreviated title HL[LHNIC] POL[IS] also appears on coins of Nysa-Scythopolis from the year 175/6. According to Barkay the usage of the anachronistic titles »indicates the city’s desire to emphasize its Greek origins and its deeply-rooted Hellenistic heritage« as well as its honorable historical Hellenic ethnicity. Barkay assumed that the titles that evoked the Hellenic past, Greek culture and ancient origins, were revived during the reign of Hadrian, the philhellene emperor, probably at the time of his visit to the region (130 CE) and in accordance with his policy of Hellenization.

**Historical research**

During the summer of 332 BCE Gaza was captured by Alexander the Great following a two-month siege, an event that marked the beginning of the Hellenistic period in Coele Syria. There is no clear archaeological evidence that the colonization or poleis foundation was initiated in the region by Alexander the Great, although various scholars dated military or urban settlements as early as the late 4th century BCE. Fuks assumed that Macedonian military strongholds were first founded along the coastline in accordance with Alexander’s strategy of keeping control over the Phoenician coast. Among these early poleis foundations Rostovtzeff counts Gaza and Tyre that might have served along with Acre and Sidon as administrative centres. Rostovtzeff further assumed that the earliest colonization of Greek administrative centres and military strongholds along the coast resulted in the arrival of Greek officials in constantly rising numbers in places which were gradually turned into katoikoi with no urban legal status. In time those administrative and military centres, both in Asia Minor and Syria, were turned into poleis.

---


35 **Fuks 1983**, 14 no. 8.

36 **Rostovtzeff 1941**, 132.

37 **Launey 1949**, 92–93; Rostovtzeff 1941 III, 401 no. 137.
states that Alexander established a military stronghold at Samaria although later he attributes it to Perdiccas who suppressed the Samaritan revolt38. Further east, Gerasa might have been founded at the time as a military stronghold, its foundation attributed either to Alexander or Perdiccas39. Gerasa was joined by some other strongholds that were presumably established by Perdiccas at Pella, Dium and Abila, all of which were thought to have been established in order to form the eastern frontier of the Hellenistic kingdom against nomads40.

Fuks assumed that once Ptolemais (Acre) was established by Ptolemy II Philadelphus the foundations of Nysa-Scythopolis, Philotera and Philadelphia must have followed soon after41. Engaged in both the first (276–272 / 273 BCE) and second (259–255 BCE) Syrian wars, the importance of Coele Syria loomed high in Ptolemy II’s strategy. Once the Ptolemaic naval base and administrative centre in Coele Syria was founded the secure connection of the coast with the Hellenistic centres of Transjordan, strengthened by Philadelphia, became crucial. Philotera guarded the passages over the Jordan River, while Nysa-Scythopolis was located at the region’s most important road junction (caput viarum) that connected the coast with the Hellenistic poleis of Transjordan and Damascus42, a vital road junction (Bet She’an) that in the past housed an important military stronghold of the Egyptian Empire. There is no clear evidence that at the time of their foundation the rights of a polis were granted to any of the three Hellenistic centres, and it is reasonable to assume that they were originally established as military strongholds at well-chosen strategic locations and later developed into semi-autonomous poleis.

The foundation legend of the city, the rather obscure names (Ζκυθωπόλις, Νύσα) and the founder’s identity (Dionysos) are interrelated according to Di Segni44. Analyzing an inscription that refers to Dionysos as the city founder (Θεῷ Διονυσῷ κτίστη τῷ κυρίῳ) Di Segni examines the historical sources. In his 1st century CE list of cities that formed the Decapolis Pliny remarks: »Scythopolis, previously called Nysa, as Liber Pater buried his nurse there, having settled Scythians [at the site]«. His legendary remark was later repeated by the 3rd century CE writer Solinus45. By contrast, the 6th century CE historian John Malalas

---

38 Eus. chron. 114, 118; Tcherikover 1973, 83 states that during the years of Perdiccas’ regency (323–321 BCE) he upgraded Samaria to a polis, while Jones 1971, 237 concludes that both Alexander and Perdiccas established military strongholds rather than real cities. The fortified city gate at Samaria with its round towers might have been erected at the time (Crowfoot et al. 1942, 24–27).

39 The city was either named after its elders speared by Alexander or after his veterans that settled there (Steph. Byz. 3, 543; Seyrig 1965, 25–28; Spijkerman 1978, 102–103 no. 13). An inscription found at Gerasa hints to its founding by Perdiccas (Welles 1938, 423 no. 137).

40 Fuks 1983, 15–16. Both Pella and Dium were named after cities in Macedonia, the former Alexander’s birth place (Steph. Byz. 3, 544). However, the relation of the names to the Macedonian cities was opposed by Jones 1971, 448 and Tcherikover 1973, 79.

41 Fuks 1983, 22–23. Ptolemais’ monogram first appears on coins of Ptolemy II in 260–261 BCE (Poole 1883, 33 no. 108) and the city is mentioned by its new name in Zenon’ papyri dated to 259 BCE (PCZ 59004, 59008; PSI 406, 616; PSI 366). Philotera was named after the king’s sister (Tcherikover 1973, 82). It was identified by Sukenik 1922, 101–109 with Khirbet el-Kerach where Hellenistic remains were found (Baramki 1944, 86–90; Maisler et al. 1952, 166–167; Bar-Adon 1953, 132; Bar-Adon 1955, 273). Amman was renamed by its dynastic name (Hier. comm. in Ez. 335 and Steph. Byz. s.v. Philadelphia) right after 259 BCE as Zenon papyri PSI 406 still carries the old name.


43 The name ›Scythopolis‹ appears in the 4th century CE Book of Judith 3, 10, in Polyb. 5, 70, 4–5 and the Books of Maccabees I 5, 52; 12, 40; II 12, 30, while the name ›Nysa‹ appears in learned or poetic contexts (Di Segni 1997, 145 nos. 20–21). Di Segni further points out that the name Nysa was not used by the Ptolemies (RE XVII, 2, 1937, 1627–54).


45 Plin. nat. 5, 74; Solin. 36, 156. In his poem Dionysiaca the Byzantine poet Nonnos mentions Nysa as one of the nymphs in Dionysos’ retinue with no reference to the legend (Di Segni 1997, note 15).
connected the name Nysa to Iphigenia, rescued from the Scythian king Thoas, and stated that a temple was built to her patron goddess Artemis in Tricómia\textsuperscript{46}. Notwithstanding Pliny’s statement that the name Nysa was older than Scythopolis, Rigsby\textsuperscript{47} argued that Nysa was a dynastic name of the eldest daughter of Antiochus IV who presumably re-founded and renamed the city, following her birth in ca. 174 BCE, and concluded that the name Nysa has no relation to the local myth of Dionysos and was later added to the name Scythopolis. The excavation results at Tel Iţtabba revealing that the re-founded polis dated to 175/170 BCE verify Rigsby’s dating but not his assumption that no cult of Dionysos was practiced in the city at the time. Di Segni\textsuperscript{48} assumed that the foundation myth either attests to an early tradition or cult of Dionysos already practiced during the Hellenistic period or might be regarded as an etiological tale that explains the toponym. The unique sealings found during the excavations at Tel Iţtabba, depicting Nysa breastfeeding Dionysos (fig. 13), provide clear evidence for the validity of the myth and the existence of a cult practice of the local triad: Dionysos, Zeus and Nysa already in the 2nd century BCE and probably even earlier. The Ptolemaic dynasty regarded Dionysos as their founder (αρχηγέτης), and Di Segni therefore considers the likelihood that such a cult existed already in the mid-3rd century BCE and might have assisted a later Nysa cult to take root. It seems rather unlikely that the Seleucids with their dynastic god Zeus would encourage a cult of Dionysos \textit{ktistes} in the re-founded polis unless it was already practiced long before. Yet an inscription from Tel Bet She’an attests to the cult of Zeus Olympios in the 2nd century BCE. However, it should be remembered that Zeus also played a central role in the myth of Dionysos and that he might have shared the foundation cult at Nysa-Scythopolis with his son and wet-nurse long before the 2nd century\textsuperscript{49}.

Civic coins of Roman Nysa-Scythopolis portraying the foundation myth of Dionysos served, according to Lichtenberger, as »identity fostering«\textsuperscript{50}. He connects the phenomenon with the Second Sophistic that publicized orators during the 2nd to 3rd centuries CE in the Decapolis and emphasized Greek origins (\textit{eugeneia}) as promoted by Hadrian, the Pan-Hellenic emperor, hailed as the \textit{ktistes} par excellence in numerous inscriptions\textsuperscript{51}. Lichtenberger alludes to the powerful dominance of the Dionysos \textit{ktistes} myth that first over-shaded the Seleucid princess Nysa and later Gabinius, the re-founder of the Roman Nysa-Scythopolis. The name Gabinia was added for a while to the Roman city name.

Fuks devoted a long and thorough discussion to the assumed foundation date and nature of Hellenistic Nysa-Scythopolis\textsuperscript{52}. His research was based on historical and epigraphic sources, supplemented by the meagre archaeological data known at the time from the UME excavations, and while it predated the recent excavations both at Tel Bet She’an and Tel Iţtabba, its validity has not been basically questioned.

The foundation issue of Nysa-Scythopolis and its supposed date were earlier dealt with in length by various scholars. Beloch assumed that Nysa-Scythopolis and other poleis in the region as Pella, Gadara, Hippos, Dium and Gerasa were Macedonian foundations of the late 4th century BCE\textsuperscript{53}. Jones considered Nysa-Scythopolis a Ptolemaic foundation, although he

\textsuperscript{46} Di Segni 1997, 144 note 16. Tricómia was also referred to as the possible origin of Scythopolis by Appelbaum (Appelbaum 1980, 63–69; Fuks 1983, 69 note 22). The 6th century CE historian John Malalas (Ion. Mal. 139–140) preserved a tradition regarding the foundation of the city as a result of synoecism of three villages, originally named Tricómia. As for the alleged Artemis temple, no temple of that deity or any other evidence for her cult was found at the site.

\textsuperscript{47} Rigsby 1980, 238–242.

\textsuperscript{48} Di Segni 1997, 144–145.

\textsuperscript{49} SEG VIII, no. 33.

\textsuperscript{50} Barkay 2003, 111–154; Lichtenberger 2004, 23–34.

\textsuperscript{51} Di Segni 1997, 148.

\textsuperscript{52} Fuks 1983, 44–74.

\textsuperscript{53} Beloch 1903, 233.
was not specific about its foundation date. Tcherikover agreed with Jones and stated that the city’s main deity (Dionysos) was firmly related to the Ptolemaic dynasty. Abel was the first to propose that a Scythian stronghold was established by Antigonus Seleucus or Ptolemy II, an assumption later rejected by Tcherikover. Avi-Yonah combined foundation date and city name and postulated that Scythians serving in the Ptolemaic army founded the city in the autumn of 254 BCE, the time of the visit of the Bosphoran delegation on behalf of Paerisades II.

Describing the activity of Joseph the Tobiad, the tax collector, Josephus states that the Scythopolitans refused to pay the tax, which earlier they willingly did, and therefore the tax collector executed the prominent citizens (protos) and sent their property to the king. Fuks dated Joseph’s activity to the years 240–205/204 BCE and placed the incident occurred in the early years of his service. As new foundations were exempted from tax payment during their first years Fuks assumed that a foundation date around 260 BCE would be quite accurate. His dating was corroborated by the hoard of twenty silver tetrachards from Tel Bet She’an. He further supposed that in light of Ptolemy II’s aggressive strategy against the Seleucids, culminating in the two Syrian wars, the king decided to strengthen his hold of Coele Syria. With the earlier Ptolemaic foundations along the coast and in Transjordan the addition of a military stronghold at the main strategic crossroad at Bet She’an fitted the king’s strategy well. A military unit, presumably consisting of Macedonian Thracians and Greeks from Asia Minor, was stationed in a fortress on Tel Bet She’an which subsequently served as the administrative centre of the district in which Ptolemaic officials resided.

Applebaum accepted the authenticity of Josephus’ account of the activity of Joseph the Tobiad and the supposition that Ptolemy II Philadelphus first founded a military stronghold. Yet, he argued that at the time of the incident reported by Josephus Nysa-Scythopolis must have been a polis as the term used for the deputies (protos) is decidedly a municipal term. Polybios states that Antiochus III, while invading the region during the fourth Syrian war (218 BCE), captured Philoteria, Scythopolis and later Pella and placed a military unit in each.
polis. The historian also mentions the cities’ territory (chora), legally referred to a polis⁶⁷. Contradicting Polybios’ reference Avi-Yonah, dating the ›municipalization‹ of Scythopolis to the 2nd century BCE advanced the view that Philoteria and Scythopolis were at the time administrative district centres. Their inhabitants were organized as politeumata, while their land was part of the royal domain and therefore they were not poleis and could not possess any chora⁶⁸.

In an attempt to establish the foundation date of Nysa-Scythopolis as a self-administered polis Fuks tried to date its chora⁶⁹. In his opinion the Hephtziba inscription (dated to 200–199 BCE, while some lines were presumably added in 195 BCE) demonstrates that at the time Scythopolis had no chora⁷⁰. The inscription indirectly refers to Scythopolis, indicating village land in the vicinity of Scythopolis that fall into three differing categories of legal ownership: land held by the king, land held by Ptolemy son of Thraseas in hereditary tenancy and land transferred by the king to Ptolemy. As all of this land is not part of its chora Fuks concluded that the city did not possess any at the time. Although the evidence from the Hephtziba inscription is ambiguous Fuks uses it as a terminus post quem, while the priest list unearthed on Tel Bet She’an serves as a terminus ante quem.

The fragmentary inscription with a priest list dates from the reign of Demetrius II (145–140 BCE) and was compared by Mouterde to a similar complete inscription from Samaria⁷¹. The reference to a city clerk (grammateus) in line 5 and probably to an archon in line 11 presumably indicates that Samaria was a polis at the time. In analogy Scythopolis could have been one. On a lead weight from Tel Bet She’an dated to the years 118 / 117 BCE the Agoranomus Satyros was mentioned⁷². In the light of the policy of Antiochus IV it seems reasonable that under that king Scythopolis became a polis. Hence, Fuks concluded that about thirty years after Antiochus III’ victory at Paneas (200 BCE) all the land referred to in the Hephtziba inscription was granted to the city’s chora.

In view of the excavation results at Tel Iṣṭaba and Nysa’s foundation date as a polis around 175 BCE Fuks’ assumption seems reasonable. The numismatic evidence from both Tel Bet She’an and Tel Iṣṭaba is quite consistent. Nysa-Scythopolis did not mint its own coins, neither as a military stronghold and administrative centre founded by Ptolemy II on Tel Bet She’an, nor with its foundation as a polis by Antiochus IV on Tel Iṣṭaba. Most of the coins that were found at both sites were minted at Acco-Ptolemais and it seems that Nysa-Scythopolis even as a polis was never granted full administrative autonomy.

Nysa-Scythopolis is the only city among those termed Greek cities by Josephus⁷³, while Gadara, Hippos and Gaza depicted the term ›Greek Polis‹ on their coins and inscriptions. The title could have been re-claimed during Hadrian’s reign in order to demonstrate the city’s Hellenic ethnic origin. The term iera (holy) was granted in the Hellenistic period to cities

---

⁶⁷ Polyb. 5, 70.
⁶⁸ Applebaum 1989, 3 does not support Avi-Yonah’s assumption that links the foundation of Pella and Scythopolis, apart from stating that from an economic and military point of view both were closely connected. He states that Pella and Philoteria were founded at the 3rd century BCE (Maišler et al. 1952, 165–173. 218–219) and that one of Zenon’s papyri indicates that at 258 BCE Pella had an archon (Edgar 1931, 12 note 5). This official term does not inevitably imply an urban status. According to Georgios Synkellos (Synk. 558–559) Philoteria was a Macedonian colony, later renamed Berenice after a Ptolemaic princess (Steph. Byz. s.v. Berenice); Avi-Yonah 1962, 53 also states that the suffix polis in a city name does not necessarily point to its urban self-administrated statues; Jones 1971, 449 note 20; see Lifshitz 1977, 267–268.
⁶⁹ Fuks 1983, 66–73.
⁷¹ Mouterde 1933, 180–182.
⁷² Lifshitz 1976, 181 no. 33.
⁷³ Ios. ant. Iud. 17, 11, 4.
dedicated to a specific deity to whom a sanctuary was erected. It appears on Nysa-Scythopolis’ coins from the time of Marcus Aurelius and on coins of other cities in the region as well. It seems that the reused term relates to its earlier Hellenic connotation\textsuperscript{74}. The term asulou (right of sanctuary), always related to the former, appears at the same time on inscriptions and coins of Scythopolis and even earlier in several other cities in the region. It holds Hellenic sanctuary restrictions and recalls the earlier Hellenic connotations that were most likely kept traditionally in Nysa-Scythopolis.

Nysa-Scythopolis is occasionally mentioned in historical sources of the Hellenistic period. Polybios\textsuperscript{75} describes the campaign of Antiochus III against Ptolemy IV (218 BCE), in which the city was captured by an agreement with no fighting involved. The Ptolemaic military unit was replaced by a Seleucid one, although not for long, as after the battle of Raphia (217 BCE) the Ptolemies regained their control over the region, followed by an extensive royal tour of the region by Ptolemy and his sister Arsinoe. Although it would be reasonable to assume that the tour included a visit at Nysa-Scythopolis there is no evidence for such. The Hephtziba inscription indicates that shortly after, during the fifth Syrian war, the city was re-captured by Antiochus III (year 111 of the Seleucid era, 202 / 201 BCE). At the time the Seleucid governor of Coele Syria and Phoenicia, Ptolemy son of Thraseas, gained control over some villages near the city\textsuperscript{76}. During the winter of 201 / 200 BCE Ptolemy Schopas launched a counter attack and regained control over Nysa-Scythopolis\textsuperscript{77}. In the summer of 200 BCE Antiochus achieved his decisive victory over the Ptolemies who finely withdrew from Coele Syria.

In 163 BCE Judas Maccabaeus launched a campaign to save the Jews of the Gilead and on his route via Nysa-Scythopolis used the regional crossroad. While passing by the city he acceded to the local Jews request to spare the city on behalf of their good relation with the pagan community\textsuperscript{78}.

Twenty years later Tryphon, the usurper to the Seleucid throne during the reign of Demetrius II (146–142 BCE), marched his grand army from Antioch to Nysa-Scythopolis (143 / 142 BCE) where he met Jonathan the Jewish High Priest with his 40,000 men\textsuperscript{79}. Avi-Yonah assumed that serving as the arena for both sides’ meeting grounds reflected the city’s neutral standing in the conflict\textsuperscript{80}. On his way back from Jerusalem Tryphon passed through the region once again\textsuperscript{81}.

The Seleucid era at Nysa-Scythopolis ended in 108 / 107 BCE as attested by the excavation results at Tel Izbabba and historical sources. Epikrates, the general of Antiochus IX Cyzicenus, »openly betrayed« the city and its nearby vicinity for a sum of money to the prince and High Priest John Hyrcanus, the conqueror of Samaria and Peraea\textsuperscript{82}. Josephus states that the city was destroyed and burned as the archaeological evidence clearly indicated. Its citizens went into exile, although Josephus does not specify where to. The ruined city was not resettled by the

\textsuperscript{74} Bikerman 1938, 154–156; Barkay 2003, 162–163; Stein 1990, 299.
\textsuperscript{75} Polyb. 4, 70, 5–6.
\textsuperscript{76} Landau 1966, 59.
\textsuperscript{77} Ios. ant. Iud. 12, 135.
\textsuperscript{78} 2 Macc. 12, 29–31. Although Nysa-Scythopolis was outside of the Jewish realm of Judea the presence of a presumably substantial Jewish community in the city is clearly attested since 163 BCE (Fucks 1983, 147–156). As for the vicinity, the presence of quite a few synagogues in the Bet She’an Valley attests to a densely Jewish populated chora.
\textsuperscript{79} 1 Macc. 12, 40–41; Ios. ant. Iud. 12, 6, 1–2.
\textsuperscript{80} Avi-Yonah 1962, 55.
\textsuperscript{81} 1 Macc. 12, 41–52.
\textsuperscript{82} Ios. ant. Iud. 12, 10, 3. According to Josephus (los. bell. Iud. 1, 66) the city was captured in war and did not surrender (Lifshitz 1977, 269–270). For the date see Schürer 1973, 210 note 22. The exile of the pagan citizens of the city and presumably those of its chora was dated in Megillath Ta’anith to the 15th and 16th of Sivan.
Hasmoneans, notwithstanding that *Josephus* mentions the visit by Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy VII of Egypt, to Nysa-Scythopolis some years later in 102 BCE, when she made a pact of mutual assistance with Alexander Jannaeus against her son Ptolemy Lathiros. No Hasmonean stratum was revealed at Tel Bet She’an and Tel Iztabba, both of which were left in ruins. The conquest of Pompey (64/63 BCE) and the re-foundation of Nysa Scythopolis by Gabinius (57/55 BCE) abandoned both mounds and occupied the vast area of the Amal Basin and its surrounding hills to the north of Tel Bet She’an.
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Wading Through Jerusalem’s Garbage: Chronology, Function, and Formation Process of the Pottery Assemblage of the City’s Early Roman Landfill

Hélène Machline & Yuval Gadot

Most scholars would agree that garbage constitutes a large portion of the source of materials discovered in archaeological excavations. Official garbage disposal areas (landfill) from the past, however, have rarely been studied by archaeological methods. In this article, we wish to present a unique pottery assemblage that originates from what was minimally a 7 m thick accumulation of alternating soil layers that we interpret as Jerusalem’s official landfill during the Early Roman period.

Study of the pottery sherds found in the landfill can help frame the time the landfill was operational and facilitate the understanding of how it was formed. Furthermore, the landfill assemblage reflects the pottery usage, trade relations and social status and values of the people living in Jerusalem at a most dramatic moment in its history—the 1st century CE.

The Early Roman period, especially the days of Herod the Great and the rule of the procurators that followed (late 1st century BCE to 1st century CE), saw Jerusalem reach its zenith as an urban centre. Monumental and complex building projects completely altered the city landscape and new neighborhoods grew up around the old core. Coupled with the influx of Jewish pilgrims who made their way to the city three times a year, Jerusalem must have hustled and bustled with people, activities and ideas.

It is against this background that we evaluate the dedication of the western slope of the Kidron Valley to garbage disposal during the Roman Period. In what follows we introduce the dig and its methodology, emphasizing how the pottery was collected, along with an illustration of the dramatic effect the different sifting procedures had on the quantitative composition of vessel types within the assemblage. Based on typological analysis and by comparison with

---

1 The excavations in Area D3 were directed by Yuval Gadot on behalf of the Sonia and Marco Institute of Archaeology at Tel Aviv University and the Israel Antiquities Authority (license no. G-4/2013). The excavation team included: H. Machline (area supervisor), O. Moshevič (wet-sifting supervisor), N. Edaron (pottery drawing and preparing plates), N. Nehama and R. Abu-Halaf (administration), A. Peretz (photography), V. Essman and Y. Shmidov (surveying and drafting), and S. Adalah (metal detection). We wish to thank M. Polack and N. Ben-Melech for their assistance in preparing the manuscript.

2 Schiffer 1983; Rathje – Murphy 2001.

3 Shaw 2012.

4 Gadot 2014; Gadot – Adler 2015; Spiciarich et al. 2017; see also Reich – Shukron 2003; Bar-Oz et al. 2007; Reich 2011, 219–224.

5 Levine 2002.
Fig. 1: Plan of the City of David ridge, marking the location of Area D3.
additional well dated assemblages from other parts of the city, we attempt to determine the
time span the landfill was operative. We then analyze the vessels’ functional roles and the
relative frequencies of the different functional groups. We attempt to understand the nature of
the assemblage and possibly its origin. Finally, by recording the state of the ceramic fragments,
we illustrate how pottery sherds aid in illuminating landfill formation processes.

Context and Methodology

In October 2013, we began a long-term excavation project on the eastern slopes of the
Southeastern Hill, the Lower City also known as the City of David and Silwan (Area D3, fig. 1).
The area chosen for excavation is in the vicinity of Areas B, D1 and D3 of Y. Shiloh’s excavations,
and just above Nahal Kidron. The area is a 40 m long × 25 m wide section, oriented west–east
into the occupational level of the site (fig. 2). The first two seasons were primarily devoted to
understanding the minimally 7 m thick layer of debris covering the eastern slope of the City of
David ridge leading down to Nahal Kidron. These layers of debris, from the Temple Mount in
the north to the Siloam Pool in the south, were documented by previous researchers. All had
noted the enormous volume of everyday artefacts found in these deposits: ceramic sherds,
bones, seeds and charcoal, chalkstone vessels, coins and metal objects.

Two adjoining sections were marked for excavation:
• The northern section (Section M–N/10-11) is 12 m long (west–east) and 9 m wide
(north–south; figs. 3–4).
• The southern section (Section M–N/14) which is 7 m long (west–east) and 4 m wide
(north–south; figs. 5–6).

Over the course of excavations, it became clear that the landfill is composed of distinct
layers that slope sharply downwards from west to east (fig. 3). Each layer is on average 0.30 m
thick, although this fluctuates from one location to another. The layers were found to slope
downwards to the north as well, which probably reflects the natural topography of the bedrock
buried below the debris. Two types of layers, deposited in alternating order, were noted: layers
rich with finds and layers dominated by soil.

The character of these deposits posed two major challenges: the steep slope of these
layers proved difficult to excavate stratigraphically, and the sheer volume of the material
culture items, from which these layers were composed, was so overwhelming that conventional
recovery and registration techniques were impractical. In order to overcome these obstacles
but at the same time collect data in a fashion that would allow us later on to study the landfill
and its content, a specially designed sampling strategy was implemented in four consecutive
stages:

1. Two 4 × 6 m squares were excavated from the surface down and one out of every
20 buckets of fill removed was subjected to wet-sifting (using a 0.5 mm mesh) in order
to recover all finds that might be associated with human activity. Finds collected
at this stage are representative of the entire depth of the garbage layer, without
distinction into sub-layers. A metal detector was employed regularly at this stage.

2. The sections of the square were sketched and photographed, and the layers were
marked with string to serve as guidelines for the subsequent stage of excavation.

3. Careful stratigraphic excavations were conducted on 1.5 × 0.5 m segments of these
sections. The finds recovered from each sub-layer were registered separately.

4. Twenty buckets from each sub-layer were subjected to wet-sifting (using a 0.5 mm
mesh) and the remainder was dry-sifted (using a 1–2 mm mesh).

6 Ariel 2000. See the map in Levine 2002, xii.
7 Bar-Oz et al. 2007, Table 1.
8 Gadot 2014.
Following the excavations, 21 loci were chosen for further analysis. Most of them are from the layers dug separately using intensive sifting (Stages 3 and 4, Loci 1050–1060 and Loci 1046–1048, 1061–1072). Also included were Loci 1022 and 1035 that were dug in Stage 1. These Loci hold clean pottery originating from the landfill but were not separated into distinct layers. Locus 1044 represents an earth fill layer buried under the earliest layer of the landfill.

Eleven thousand five hundred and thirty-one sherds from the above-mentioned loci were classified according to their morphological and functional attributes. Quantification was conducted by counting only diagnostic sherds: the rim for bowls, cooking pots, jugs and storage jars; the neck for juglets, flasks and unguentaria; the nozzles for oil lamps. Estimation of minimum number of complete vessels was conducted using the method employed by Mazar and Panitz-Cohen. It includes an estimation of the size of the rim’s circumference, and a calculation of the relative size of a rim fragment in units of one-eighth of the complete circumference. Where the entire circumference was preserved, the number 8 was registered. A small sherd (less than one-eighth of the diameter) was registered as 1. Thus, all the sherds were measured on a circumference key sheet and given numbers between 1 and 8. This procedure was conducted for the loci dug in Stages 3 and 4, where a reliable sample of pottery types was achieved.

Fig. 3: The layers of the landfill in the northern cut.

Fig. 4: Drawing of the northern section.
Fig. 5: Picture of the southern section.

Fig. 6: Drawing of the southern section.
Typology and Chronology

The pottery of Jerusalem from this period is well known from previously excavated parts of the city. Parallels were drawn from Jerusalem’s Early Roman well stratified dwelling quarters in the vicinity, mainly in Jewish Quarter excavations, the Armenian Garden excavations, the Giv’ati Parking Lot excavations and at the Jerusalem International Convention Center workshops site (henceforth JICC). When needed, parallels from further away sites such as Jericho and Masada are also included. Some cooking pot types have parallels only in the Galilee at Kfar Hanania, and on the coastal plain at Caesarea Maritima.

The majority of the vessels are made of plain fabric. The paste is fired light brown, gray or pinkish-brown, or orange-brown with a small amount of white grits. In general the clay is similar in appearance to clay made from the Moza formation. The clay of most of the cooking ware vessels is similar to that of the cooking vessels from the kilns at the JICC site. The clay is warm red-brown in colour, and the fabric is smooth, with a moderate amount of small and medium rounded and subangular white grits.

The deposits include ceramic types that belong to a multitude of domestic activities, ranging from meal preparation and consummation, food storage and illumination. The abundance of vessels made of stone found together with those made of clay leads us to suggest that the vessels come from a quarter inhabited by a Jewish population. It is interesting to note

---

Table 1

| Ceramic Phase 1: late 2nd century BCE to early 1st century BCE | D3-Phase 1 |
| Mid-1st century BCE to late 1st century BCE | D3-Phase 2 |
| Corresponds to Stratum 6 in Area A of the Jewish Quarter |
| Early 1st century CE to mid-1st century CE | D3-Phase 3 |
| Corresponds to Ceramic Phase 3 at the JICC site and to Stratum 3 in Area E of the Jewish Quarter |
| Mid-1st century CE to 70 CE | D3-Phase 4 |
| Corresponds to Ceramic Phase 4 at the JICC site and to Stratum 2 of Area B in the Jewish Quarter |

(See Berlin 2005 for the ceramic phases at the JICC site; Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003 for the stratigraphy of Area A in the Jewish Quarter and Geva 2010 for the stratigraphy of the Burnt House in Area B.)
the marginal presence of imported vessels: open and closed vessels and lamps from western Asia Minor, the Gulf of Iskenderun, the Levant and Italy. In terms of the maximum number of vessels counted in D3, 0.15% was imported. However, in terms of the minimum number of vessels counted, the proportion changed: in the northern and southern cuts, we found 0.52% imported vessels, essentially Sigillata wares. It does, however, not fit the profile documented for the habitation levels of the Upper City where Sigillata wares and other imported tableware can be associated with the growth of the Jewish urban elite.18

It is generally accepted that the repertoire of pottery vessels dating to the Early Roman period is primarily composed of types that do not change from the mid–late 1st century BCE to 70 CE. Berlin’s study of the pottery from JICC site shows four main chronological ceramic phases and places special emphasis on recognizing the few but important typological types that can be attributed to one of the four phases19. In order to determine the time span during which the landfill was operational, and also, if possible, to determine the chronology of each layer independently, we tried to fit our ceramic typology into her phases. In most cases we could only determine if a certain type belongs to Berlin’s Phases 1–2 or 3–4. In addition, the assemblage includes pottery types that are earlier than her Phase 1. We therefore defined four local chronological phases which we label here as D3-Phase 1 (the earliest) to D3-4 (the latest) (see table 1).

Following is a description of the pottery types that comprise the assemblage. We focus on seven main functional vessel groups: tableware (bowls, cups, kraters), pouring vessels (jugs, flasks); small containers/small bottles (juglets, unguentaria), cooking ware (cooking pots, casseroles, cooking jugs), large storage vessels (storage jars), oil lamps (mold-made lamps, wheel-made, knives-pared lamps) and utensils (ladies and stands).

We first describe the types that, based on Berlin’s chrono-typology, are chronological markers that allow a fine-tuned chronology. This is followed by a short description of the remainder of the repertoire.

### A. Chronologically Significant Pottery Types

**Markers for D3-Phases 1–2 (2nd–mid / late 1st century BCE)**

- **Type BL1 Bowl (fig. 7, 1), D3-Phases 1–2**
  This bowl has a shallow, rounded body and a simple rim, with a circular and flat base. It is known from 2nd and 1st century BCE strata in the Jewish Quarter excavations but is missing from assemblages that date to the 1st century CE. It is difficult to differentiate this type of bowl from Types BL2 and BL3 if the whole profile does not exist. We therefore refrained from quantifying its presence in the different layers.

- **Type BL6 Bowl (fig. 7, 18–21), D3-Phase 2**
  This type of small deep bowl or cup has straight or nearly straight walls and a slightly everted rim. The paste is fired light brown and is usually red-slipped internally and externally. Some vessels have rouletted decoration while others are incised. The fragment on fig. 7, 21 has a band of gray slip on the exterior from the rim to the external ridge. The texture of the vessel is very soft. The fabric was termed ›Palestinian red slipped ware‹ and ›red-slipped ware‹ in the Upper City repertoire or ›local red-slipped tableware‹ at the

18 Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2014, 397. To date, no conclusive evidence is available for Judea, as the imports to Jericho and Masada await publication.


### Table 2

The presence of chronological diagnostic pottery types in the diagonally dug loci.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/Locus</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>BL6</th>
<th>D3-2</th>
<th>JG1</th>
<th>D3-3-4</th>
<th>UN1</th>
<th>D3-3-4</th>
<th>SJ1</th>
<th>D3-1-2</th>
<th>CP1</th>
<th>D3-3-4</th>
<th>LI2</th>
<th>D3-3-4</th>
<th>BL4</th>
<th>D3-4</th>
<th>KR</th>
<th>D3-4</th>
<th>FK</th>
<th>D3-3-4</th>
<th>CJG1</th>
<th>D3-3-4</th>
<th>CSI</th>
<th>D3-3-4</th>
<th>LPI</th>
<th>D3-3-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hasmonean palace complex at Jericho, where it is dated to 85/75–31 BCE and is missing from the Herodian Palaces. Fragments of this type are rare in the assemblage and, as can be seen in table 2, they were mostly found in the lower loci that make up the landfill.

- **Type JG1 Jug (fig. 8, 1), D3-Phase 1**
  This jug has a straight, narrow neck with everted rim and a spherical body. In the Jewish Quarter, this sub-type is found from the 2nd century BCE until the beginning of the 1st century BCE. Jugs of this type are rare and were found only in Locus 1044, which predates the creation of the landfill (table 2).

- **Type UN1 Unguentarium (fig. 9, 10–11), D3-Phases 1–2**
  The fusiform unguentarium is the tall version characterized by a long and very thin foot and neck, and a small fusiform body. It has a sharpened-everted rim and is the latest Hellenistic form of unguentaria in general. The fusiform unguentarium is particularly popular in Jerusalem. In the Jewish Quarter excavations, this sub-type appears first in the 2nd century BCE but becomes more common in the 1st century BCE. Additional parallels are known from the Giv’ati Parking Lot excavations and from Jericho.
  Only an extremely small number of unguentaria of this type were found (table 2), hence they seem to represent a type that had already fallen out of use when the landfill became operational.

- **Type SJ1 Storage Jar (fig. 10, 1–7), D3-Phases 1-2**
  This jar type has a square-sectioned or rounded-thickened, everted rim. It can be divided into three sub-types: the first has a square shaped rim and a long or short neck (fig. 10, 1–5). Although most typical of the 2nd century BCE, this jar still appears in assemblages of the 1st century BCE. It remained in use during the first part of the 1st century CE. Parallels in Jerusalem are found at the JICC site in a 1st century BCE context. It is also found in the excavations at the Giv’ati Parking Lot, in the Jewish Quarter and the Armenian Garden.
  The second sub-type has a low, out-curving neck and a rounded and out-folded, thickened rim (fig. 10, 6). This is a characteristic feature of the late-2nd century BCE, and the form remained in use during the 1st century BCE. The third sub-type has a simple everted rim and a high neck (fig. 10, 7). Examples from the 1st century BCE are found in the Jewish Quarter excavations.

---

24 Geva 2003, pl. 5.2, 48–49; 5.7, 29; Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, pl. 6.2, 7–14; Geva – Hershkovitz 2006, pls. 4.4, 1–4; 4.7, 3–4; 4.9, 4; 4.10, 8; 4.12, 2.
25 Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.4, 6–10; 5.8, 13–16; 5.13, 17–20; 5.18, 19–22.
26 Bar-Nathan 2002, Type J UN1.
28 Sandhaus 2013, fig. 4.2, 2 Type SJ1b; Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.11, 12; 5.16, 2–6.
29 Geva 2003, pl. 5.1, 7; 5.2, 19, 27–29; 5.4, 5 Type SJ1; Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, pl. 6.1, 3. 18. 21. 22. 24; Geva – Hershkovitz 2006, pl. 4.3, 1. 2. 4. 9.
31 Sandhaus 2013, 90 figs. 4.2, 6; 4.9, 15.
32 Geva 2003, 124 Type SJ4; Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, pl. 6.1, 6. 32.
As can be seen in table 2, this type of storage jar was common only in layers that predate the creation of the landfill. The few items that were found in lower layers of the landfill were probably residual.

- **Type SJ2 Storage Jar** (fig. 10, 8–9), D3-Phases 2–3
  This jar type is characterized by a collared rim and a high neck. Changes in the form of the collared rim have chronological significance. The earlier types have a shorter, everted collar, which over time became thicker\(^{33}\) and longer\(^{34}\). At the JICC site, they are found in contexts dating to the 1st century BCE. The jars with long and slightly concave collar rims (fig. 10, 8) date mainly from the 1st century BCE\(^{35}\). Some jars have high, upright convex necks with short squared collar rims (fig. 10, 9). Parallels found in the Jewish Quarter excavations date from the first half of the 1st century BCE\(^{36}\).

33 *Gitin 1990*, 239 Type 161.
35 *Geva 2003*, pl. 5.9, 8 Type SJ3b; *Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003*, pl. 6.1, 25, 28; *Geva – Hershkovitz 2006*, pl. 4.3, 13–14; 4.9, 3; 4.10, 3; *Tchekhanovets 2013*, figs. 5.2, 6; 5.12, 4–8.
Fragments of SJ2 storage jars that do not have a complete rim and neck profile are similar to SJ3 storage jars and so were not counted separately.

- **Type CP1 Cooking Pot (fig. 11, 1)**, D3-Phases 1–2
  Cooking pots of this type have a straight, relatively high everted neck and a globular body. They are thin-walled, and their handles extend from rim to shoulder. Their rim is rounded or pointed. Chronologically this type is represented in the first phases of the workshop at the JICC site, dated to the 1st century BCE. Production of this sub-type terminated in the 1st century CE. This cooking pot is found in the Upper City only in Area A, Stratum 638.

  Only a few CP1 fragments of vessels of this type were counted. Some were recovered in Locus 1044, a pre-landfill layer, the others in the lowest layers of the landfill (table 2).

- **Type LP2 Lamp (fig. 12, 13)**, D3-Phase 2
  This lamp type is the Judean radial mold-made, with an incised-lines motif. Finds at Jericho indicate that it was introduced at the end of the Hasmonean period, during the second half of the 1st century BCE. A locally produced lamp of this type is known from the Jerusalem’s Upper City. Only two fragments of this type of oil lamp were found in the entire counted assemblage (not only the diagonally dug layers), and only one of them was found in the lower-most layer of the landfill. Either this type of oil lamp was not produced when the landfill was operational or it was not popular with the people producing the waste studied here.

37 Berlin 2005, fig. 3.
40 Avigad 1983, 88; Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, 219 pls. 6.8, 4; 6.9, 43; 6.10, 21; Geva – Hershkovitz 2006, pls. 4.6, 2–4. 6–8; 4.8, 15–18.
Markers for D3-phases 3–4 (mid / late 1st century BCE to 70 CE)

- Type BL3 Bowl (fig. 7, 5–10), D3-Phases 3-4
  This type of bowl has an outturned and slightly thickened rim and a thin wall with a carination close to the rim. It appears at the beginning of the 1st century CE up to 70 CE at the JICC site\(^41\). At Jerusalem’s dwelling sites it appears during the mid-late 1st century BCE and becomes common during the 1st century CE, lasting until 70 CE. Parallels are found in all the main Early Roman excavation sites in Jerusalem: the Jewish Quarter\(^42\), the Armenian Garden\(^43\) and the Giv'ati Parking Lot\(^44\). It is very difficult to differentiate this type of bowl from Types BL1 and BL2 when the whole profile does not exist. We therefore refrained from quantifying its presence in the different layers.

\(^{41}\) Berlin 2005, fig. 17, 7–9.
\(^{42}\) Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, pls. 6.3, 14; 6.6, 22–23, 30–31; 6.9, 28; Geva – Hershkovitz 2006, pl. 4.13, 12.
\(^{43}\) Tushingham 1985, fig. 20, 28.
\(^{44}\) Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.1, 3; 5.5, 10; 5.15, 5.
Type BL4 Bowl (fig. 7, 11–14), D3-Phases 3–4
This type of bowl has simple or everted rims and its body is slightly curved with a round base and very thin walls. The fine fabric, different than the fabric used for other contemporary vessels, is fired pinkish-brown, forming a very light and hard ware. On the external or internal rim the bowls have a red or brown paint band. The interior is also decorated with red-brown paint. The interior of the bowls has both stylized floral patterns and chains of adjoining oval shapes.
This type of bowl was named ‘Jerusalemite painted bowl’ by Avigad, and it is part of a group of painted vessels common in the ceramic repertoire of the second half of the 1st century CE in Jerusalem and Judea. Neutron Activation Analysis has shown that these bowls were manufactured in Jerusalem and that Avigad’s attribution was correct.

---

46 Perlman et al. 1986, 78.
Parallels are found in the excavations in the Jewish Quarter\textsuperscript{47}, at the Giv’ati Parking Lot\textsuperscript{48}, the Citadel\textsuperscript{49}, to the south and west of Temple Mount and in the Armenian Garden\textsuperscript{50}. Outside of Jerusalem the bowls were recorded in the Judean Desert at Herodium\textsuperscript{51} and Jericho\textsuperscript{52}.

As can be seen in table\textsuperscript{2}, bowls of this type occurred in all the layers of the landfill. They were not present at all in Locus 1044, a pre-landfill fill layer. Their number seems to diminish in the upper layers of the landfill.


\textsuperscript{48} Ben-Ami – Tchekhanovets 2011, fig. 7, 6.8; Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.1, 6–8; 5.5, 16–23; 5.10, 6–7; 5.15, 8–9.

\textsuperscript{49} Amiran – Eitan 1970, pl. 6, C.

\textsuperscript{50} Tushingham 1985, fig. 20, 36.


\textsuperscript{52} Bar-Nathan 2002, pl. 20, 335; for parallels outside of Jerusalem, see De Vaux 1959, fig. 2, 7; Kaplan 1963, 13 fig. 4, 13; Perlman et al. 1986, 82 fig. 1.
Fig. 12: Typology: oil lamps and utensils (see table 7).
• Type BL5 Bowl (fig. 7, 15–17), D3-Phases 3–4
  This bowl type has straight walls and a ledge rim. Called cup in many publications, it is sighted in Jerusalem from the mid-late 1st century BCE to 70 CE. Parallels are found in the Jewish Quarter excavations\(^53\). This type cannot be distinguished from other typological shapes based on small fragments, and thus these bowls were not counted individually.

• Type KR Krater (fig. 7, 24), D3-Phase 4
  This type of krater has a triangular rim and an out-curved mouth. It is usually red-slipped. Parallels are found in the Jewish Quarter excavations only in the 1st century CE\(^54\). Similar kraters also dated to the 1st century CE came to light in Jericho and its cemetery\(^55\). Only a small number of kraters of this type were retrieved from the diagonally dug layers. It should be pointed out that although dated to the 1st century CE, they do appear in the lowest layer of the landfill (see table 2).

• Type UN4 Unguentarium (fig. 9, 18–22), D3-Phases 3–4
  This type of unguentarium has a small rounded or carinated body and a high cylindrical neck. Common in the 1st century CE in Jerusalem’s Upper and Lower City\(^56\) and at Jericho and Masada\(^57\), Bar-Nathan terms it ›Judean kohl bottle‹ and, based on its size, suggests the use as receptacle for cosmetics or medicinal products; at Masada three kohl sticks were found close to an unguentarium in a Zealot context\(^58\).

• Type FK Flask (fig. 8, 12–13), D3-Phase 3–4
  This flask, made in plain fabric, has a tall, straight neck with two flat and twisted handles vertically attached to the neck and to the body. The complete forms found in Jerusalem show an asymmetrical and globular body. At the JICC site this type belongs to the 1st century CE\(^59\). Other parallels were found there\(^60\) as well as in the excavations in the Jewish Quarter\(^61\), at the Giv’at Parking Lot\(^62\) and in the Armenian Garden\(^63\). Flasks of this type are common in almost all the layers of the landfill (table 2). Their presence in Locus 1044 is puzzling as it is the only late type that appears in this fill layer, which is understood to predate the landfill.

• Type CP3 Cooking pot (fig. 11, 5), D3-Phase 4
  This type of small cooking pot with a globular body and a short neck has a rim diameter that ranges from 7 to 9 cm. Its walls are thin. According to estimates made by A. Berlin its capacity is one third of that of the cooking pot with triangular rim (CP2)\(^64\).

\(^{53}\) Geva – Hershkovitz 2006, pls. 4.4, 17; 4.12, 12.
\(^{54}\) Geva – Hershkovitz 2006, pl. 4.4, 16.
\(^{55}\) Pritchard 1958, pl. 58, 8–9; 15; Killebrew 1999, fig. III, 57.
\(^{56}\) Geva 2010, pl. 4.4, 13–14; Tchekhanovets 2013, fig. 5.18, 2–3.
\(^{58}\) Bar-Nathan 2006, 205–206.
\(^{59}\) Berlin 2005, fig. 16.1, 2. 4.
\(^{60}\) Hershkovitz 1987, fig. 1, 7–8.
\(^{62}\) Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.3; 5.7, 12–15; 5.13, 3–6; 5.18, 1–6.
\(^{63}\) Tushingham 1985, figs. 20, 17; 21, 22–26; for more parallels see Bar-Nathan 2002, pl. 10, 120–122 and ill. 52; Bar-Nathan 2006, pl. 22, 70–73 Type M-FL1.
\(^{64}\) Berlin 2005, 42.
production of this type of cooking pot at the JICC site began only in the mid-1st century CE (Convention Center phase 4)\(^65\). It is absent from Area A in the Jewish Quarter excavations, but is well represented in Judea in the 1st century CE at sites like Jericho\(^66\), Herodium\(^67\) and Qumran\(^68\).

Only few CP3 cooking pot fragments have been observed in the landfill assemblage, none of them in the diagonally dug layers. This may be the result of the size of the sherds but may also be significant chronologically as it may suggest that the landfill fell out of use at the time these cooking pots were produced in mass numbers.

- **Type CJG1 Cooking jug (fig. 11, 11–12), D3-Phases 3–4**
  This cooking jug has a high neck, globular body, and one strap handle extending from the rim to the shoulder. The rim is sometimes grooved or triangular. Production of this jug began in the late 1st century BCE and increased during the 1st century CE until 70 CE\(^69\). A substantial number of 1st century CE parallels Jerusalem are recorded in the excavations at the Giv’ati Parking Lot\(^70\), in the Jewish Quarter\(^71\) and the Armenian Garden\(^72\).
  Cooking jugs of this type are common in all the layers of the landfill, and a few items already appear in Locus 1044, the fill below the landfill (table 2).

- **Type CS1 Casserole (fig. 11, 8–9), D3-Phases 3**
  This type of casserole has a wide mouth, marked by a sharp carination between the shoulder and body. The vessel is almost flat and the rim is vertical. The vessel is absent from the Late Hellenistic stratum of Areas W and X2 of the Jewish Quarter. At the JICC site it was produced starting in the 1st century CE\(^73\). Parallels in Jerusalem were found only in Area A, Stratum 5 of the Jewish Quarter excavations\(^74\) and in the Giv’ati Parking Lot excavations\(^75\).
  Fragments of this type appear in large numbers mostly in the upper layers of the landfill and they are most frequent in the upper layer of the northern section excavated (table 2: Loci 1047 and 1046). They are absent from Locus 1044.

- **Type CS2 Casserole (fig. 11, 10), D3-Phase 4**
  This casserole, sometime termed ‘pan’, has a ledge rim. It is rare in Jerusalem with parallels found at the JICC site, appearing only between the mid-1st century CE to 70 CE\(^76\). One example was found in the Armenian Garden excavations\(^77\). Not even a single example of this casserole came to light in the diagonally dug layers and very few examples at other loci. It seems that the landfill was not active when this type of casserole became common.

---

65 Berlin 2005, 42 fig. 9, 1–8.
66 Bar-Nathan 2002, pl. 26, 484–485 Type JCP2d.
67 Bar-Nathan 1981, 54 and pl. 5, 78.
68 De Vaux 1953, fig. 3, 7; Yellin et al. 2001, fig. 3.9.
69 Berlin 2005, 39 fig. 6.
70 Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.1, 18; 5.6, 9–10; 5.11, 8.
72 Tushingham 1985, fig. 25, 8.
73 Berlin 2005, fig. 7.
74 Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, pl. 6.5, 44.
75 Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.1, 16; 5.6, 8; 5.11, 2–6.
76 Berlin 2005, 50–51 fig. 19, 5.
77 Tushingham 1985, fig. 22, 24.
• Type LP1 Lamp (fig. 12, 1–12), D3-Phase 3–4
This lamp type is wheel-made and knife-pared. In most of cases, it has one nozzle and sometimes two (fig. 12, 4). The examples shown in fig. 12, 8–9 are very small lamps of this type, while generally the reservoir is standard in its size and only the size of the nozzle varies (e.g., fig. 12, 2). Some of the oil lamps are decorated by one, two or three incised lines on the nozzle or by rouletted dots and one or two concentric circles.
The wheel-made and knife-pared lamp’s first appearance should be dated to the end of the 1st century BCE. Bar-Nathan noticed the absence of this type of lamp in the repertoire of Area E in the Jewish Quarter excavations, which is a stratum well dated until about 20–10 BCE. In the later phases the lamp becomes popular, probably until 70 CE. At Jericho’s Herodian palaces such oil lamps appeared first in a context dating to 15 BCE – 6 CE.
Dark gray fabric lamps (fig. 12, 10–11) show a variant that is covered with a shiny black slip. The nozzle is decorated with a bow-shaped rouletted pattern between a rouletted line and stamped circles. Parallels were found in the Jewish Quarter. Neutron Activation Analysis of similar lamps from the Jewish Quarter shows that these black lamps were produced in the Jerusalem area. Lamps of this type were found in almost all the layers of the landfill and also in Locus 1044, below the landfill (table 2). They appear in significantly higher numbers in the upper layers of the northern section.

• Type LP4 Lamp (fig. 12, 15), D3-Phase 3
The fragment belongs to the early Imperial volute lamps with decorated discus, resting on a flattened disc base. The discus motif can no longer be identified. The very fine fabric is light brown, almost white without any visible grits. Fabric and flat base suggest the lamp’s provenance from a Levantine workshop, producing Roman-type lamps of Broneer Types XXII–XXIII / Bailey Types A–B from late 1st century BCE and 1st century CE. Only sporadic oil lamps of this type came to light in the Upper City, probably because these lamps were not superior to the locally produced wheel-made and mold-made lamps and the figurative subjects could not be tolerated by Jews. Too few fragments of this type were found to make its frequency chronologically significant.

B. Other Pottery Types

B1. Tableware

• Type BL2 Bowl (fig. 7, 2–4), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4
This type is a small, deep and slightly carinated bowl with in-turned rim and thin walls. It is made of plain fabric. It is common at the JICC site in the time span from the early 1st century CE to 70 CE. In the Upper City such bowls are »common during the 2nd and
1st century BCE, and they were found in abundance at the beginning of the 1st century CE, until 70 CE.  

- Type BL7 Bowl (fig. 7, 22, 23), D3-Phases 1, 2, 3
For coherence and quantitative analysis (see below), we grouped all imported bowls and cups under Type BL7. The vessels are described individually.

**Fig. 7, 22:** The fragment can be attributed to an Eastern Sigillata A cup (ESA) with ring foot, probably Atlante Form 46, dated to the beginning of the 1st century CE. In the Upper City occasional imports were retrieved in late Hasmonean times. Under Herod the Great imports increase and continue up to 70 CE. Recent research suggests that the workshops were located in the Gulf of Iskenderun.  

**Fig. 7, 23:** The fragment belongs to an Italian Sigillata plate (ITS) and is a small version of Conspectus Form 18. By 15/10 BCE imports from Italy reached the markets in the eastern Mediterranean regions; there was a boom during the years 10–50 CE, yet as a whole the trade volume with the East was minimal.

### B2. Pouring vessels

- Type JG2 Jug (fig. 8, 2–4), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4
This jug type has a narrow neck, an everted triangular rim and an inner ledge. The handle extends from the rim to the shoulder, and the body shape is piriform. The jug became the leading type in the 1st centuries BCE and CE in Jerusalem. It is found in the Jewish Quarter and the Giv’ati Parking Lot excavations.

- Type JG3 Jug (fig. 8, 5–10), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4
This jug type is known by the term ›cup-shaped rim‹. It has a large ridge in the middle of its neck, and its handle extends from the ridge to the shoulder. Complete forms found in Jerusalem show a globular to piriform body. It is made of plain fabric. The type appears from the middle of the 1st century BCE to 70 CE. It is found in the Jewish Quarter and the Giv’ati Parking Lot excavations.

- Type JG4 Jug (fig. 8, 11), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4
This jug type is made of a fine unidentified gray ware and is black-slipped; the paste is fired light brown with no visible grits. A similar jug, but with a filter, was found in the Jewish Quarter in a layer dating to the end of the 1st century BCE and the beginning of the 1st century CE. Apart from that, no parallels were found in Jerusalem and environs.
The jug might be imported from an eastern Mediterranean workshop, possibly located at Ephesos, Knidos or on Cyprus.96

C. Small Containers

- Type JT1 Juglet (fig. 9, 1), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4
  This juglet is characterized by an everted and thickened rim, a short neck and a strap handle extending from the rim to the shoulder. Parallels are found in the Upper City,97 where the type appeared during the 1st century BCE. During the 1st century CE it became more popular in the Giv’ati Parking Lot assemblage.98

- Type JT2 Juglet (fig. 9, 2–3), D3-Phase 2, 3, 4
  This juglet type has a cupped rim with a squarish (fig. 9, 2) or a rounded section (fig. 9, 3). Made in plain fabric it has a single strap handle attached from rim to shoulder. The type appears in the mid-late 1st century BCE and becomes the most popular type in Jerusalem during the 1st century CE. Parallels were found at the JICC site as well as in the excavations at the Giv’ati Parking Lot, in the Armenian Garden and the Jewish Quarter.99

- Type JT3 Juglet (fig. 9, 4), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4
  This juglet has a long, straight neck and a flaring rim. A single strap handle extends from the rim to the shoulder. The type is well known in the Upper and Lower City and at Jericho in contexts dating from the 1st centuries BCE and CE.100

- Type JT4 Juglet (fig. 9, 5)
  This juglet has a large cup-shaped rim with a short, narrow neck and a strap handle that extends from below the rim to the shoulder. The paste is fired pinkish-brown. No exact parallel was found.

- Type JT5 Juglet (fig. 9, 6), D3-Phase 2, 3, 4
  This gray / black juglet has a cup-shaped rim with a squarish section, a narrow neck and a handle that extends from below the rim to the shoulder. It is made of very fine gray fabric. No close parallel has been found, but it looks very similar to the ‘gray jug’ found at the Giv’ati Parking Lot excavations.105 Most probably, it is an import from a workshop located at Ephesos, Knidos or on Cyprus like the jug illustrated in fig. 8, 11.

---

97 Geva – Hershkovitz 2006, pls. 4.4, 10; 4.13, 7.
98 Tchekhanovets 2013, fig. 5.13, 14.
100 Ben-Ami – Tchekhanovets 2011, fig. 8, 8.
101 Tushingham 1985, figs. 21, 27–30; 23, 16–17.
102 Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, pls. 6.2, 3–4; 6.9, 12; for more parallels, see Bar-Nathan 1981, pl. 4, 24; Bar-Nathan 2002, pl. 10, 85–87 Type J-JT1A1; Kelso – Baramki 1955, pl. 24, A137.
103 Geva – Hershkovitz 2006, pl. 4.13, 7; Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.4, 4; 5.8, 10.
105 Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.3, 10; 5.7, 18.
• Type JT6 Juglet (fig. 9, 7–9), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4
This spouted juglet is termed ›lamp filler‹ at Masada\(^\text{106}\). Several small spouts belonging to such a juglet were found in the assemblage. Parallels are known mainly from the excavations in the Jewish Quarter\(^\text{107}\) and at Jericho\(^\text{108}\).

• Type UN2 Unguentarium (fig. 9, 12–16), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4
The piriform unguentarium has a thin wall, a high narrow body, a cylindrical, upright neck, an everted flaring rim and a flat base. It appears in the mid-1st century BCE and was used together with the fusiform unguentarium and gradually replaced it in the 1st century CE\(^\text{109}\). This observation is supported by the finds in the Jewish Quarter excavations\(^\text{110}\) and at Jericho\(^\text{111}\).

• Type UN3 Unguentarium (fig. 9, 17)
This unguentarium is made of a fine gray / black fabric with no visible grits. The imported vessel could originate from Asia Minor, possibly from Ephesos as gray platters and Ephesos-type lamps were imported into the Upper City\(^\text{112}\).

D. Storage Vessels

Typological differences, the result of chronological developments, enable the division of the jars into three main types (SJ1-SJ2-SJ3) and a number of sub-types. The typological division is based on rim variations. The rim is simple; in the earlier types it is thick and over the time lengthens. The earlier jars have a collared neck, to which later a ridge at the lower neck is added.

• Type SJ3 Storage jar (fig. 10, 10–23), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4
This type has a ridge at the base of the neck and is the latest in the typological series of the Second Temple period. It is very common in the 1st century CE and found in the 70 CE destruction layers of the Jewish Quarter, and even continues in the 2nd century CE\(^\text{113}\). The first sub-type has a simple straight rim and a long, convex (fig. 10, 10–13) or concave (fig. 10, 14) neck with a small ridge at its base. Parallels from the last third of the 1st century BCE and 1st century CE are found in all of Jerusalem’s excavated locations of that period such as the JICC site\(^\text{114}\), the Giv’ati Parking Lot\(^\text{115}\), the Jewish Quarter\(^\text{116}\) and the Armenian Garden\(^\text{117}\).
A second sub-type has a vertical neck, sometimes out-curving, beveled rim, and a ridge at the base of the neck (fig. 10, 15–18). Parallels were found in the Jewish Quarter

106 Bar-Nathan 2006, pl. 33, 15 Sub-type M-JT2.
109 Anderson-Stojanović 1987, 110.
111 Bar-Nathan 2002, 165–167 Type J-UN2A.
114 Berlin 2005, 30 fig. 1, 9; Hershkovitz 2005, fig. 1, 1–2.
115 Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.2, 10; 5.16, 20 Type SJ3b.
117 Tushingham 1985, fig. 23, 32.
A third sub-type is a storage jar with a vertical neck, triangular rim and ledge rim and with a ridge at the base of the neck (fig. 10, 19–22). This sub-type is dated to the 1st century CE in the Jewish Quarter and at Giv’ati Parking Lot excavations. A fourth sub-type also has a vertical neck, triangular, ledge rim on the outside and inside. It has a ridge at the base of the neck (fig. 10, 23). At the JICC site, it is occurs in the 1st century CE. Additional parallels were found in the Jewish Quarter excavations.

**E. Cooking Ware**

The cooking vessels are all thin-walled and well fired, made of reddish brown to dark brown ware. Black soot covers the lower part of most of the cooking pots found. The vast majority of the cooking vessels are similar to the cooking vessels produced in a single workshop at the JICC site. The source of a few of the types, however, is from other workshops outside of Jerusalem.

- **Type CP2 Cooking pot (fig. 11, 2–4), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4**
  The CP2 type cooking pot has a triangular rim and a short neck. It is a closed pot with a globular body and a rounded bottom. It generally has a gentle wheel ridging on the shoulder, although at times the ridging is over the entire body. The handles extend from the rim to the shoulder. The neck is everted. Production of this type in the workshop at the JICC site began at the end of the 1st century BCE. During the 1st century CE production of the high neck cooking pot ceases and production of the triangular rim cooking pots continues until 70 CE. The triangular rim cooking pot is the most popular vessel among the cookware and it is very common in the Upper and Lower City.

- **Type CP4 Cooking pot (fig. 11, 6–7), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4**
  These cooking pots have an inner groove on the rim and are morphologically similar to Kefar Hananya Cooking Pot 4A. The neck may be concave or straight on the interior. Its red clay fabric has many small black grits and minute to small white grits. It differs from other Jerusalem cooking pots. Two flattened coil handles are attached to the rim and extend to the shoulder. This type is dated between the mid-1st century BCE and the mid-2nd century CE. It is common at Kfar Hananya and at Caesarea Maritima. Its form is not known in the Jerusalem cooking pot typology of the Early Roman period.

---

119 Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, pl. 6.9, 6; Geva 2010, pl. 4.1, 1.
120 Tchekhanovets 2013, figs. 5.3, 1; 5.7, 7; 5.12, 15 Type SJ4a.
121 Berlin 2005, 47 fig. 14.
122 Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, pls. 6.5, 7–9; 6.9, 5; 6.10, 7.
124 Berlin 2005, 36–38 fig. 4.
125 Tushingham 1985, figs. 19, 36; 22, 3; Geva – Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2003, pls. 6.2, 25; 6.5, 40; 6.9, 17–18; Geva – Hershkovitz 2006, figs. 5.1, 12; 5.6, 4; 5.10, 14–16; 5.15, 12–13.
126 Adan-Bayewitz 1993, 125–126.
F. Oil Lamps

- **Type LP3 Lamp** (fig. 12, 14), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4

A nozzle fragment of this lamp type was found. It is short and splayed at the ends, unslipped, and decorated with a relief pattern. Parallels with different relief patterns are found in Jerusalem in a context dating to the 1st century BCE and the 1st century CE. Rosenthal-Heginbottom suggested that this type of oil lamp is a regional imitation of the Knidian type.

G. Utensils

- **Type LD Ladle** (fig. 12, 16), D3-Phases 2, 3

The cup-shaped vessel with a long vertical handle, made in plain fabric, is termed ladle, clay spoon, or cup with twisted handle in reports of contemporary sites. It is found in Jerusalem during end of the 1st century BCE and 1st century CE.

- **Type ST Stands** (fig. 12, 17–18), D3-Phases 2, 3, 4

The ring stands are approximatively 4 to 6 cm. tall and have a diameter of 10 cm. They are made of a fabric similar to that of the cooking vessels found at Jerusalem. According to Berlin, who reported on finding 207 fragments of this type at the JICC site, this stand is connected to the manufacturing process of pottery, probably functioning as drying supports for vessels after manufacture but before firing. Chronologically it appears in all ceramic phases, from the middle of the 1st century BCE to 70 CE. It was noted at the Giv’at Hamivtar workshop as well. In domestic assemblages ring stands occur in limited quantity.

**Chronological Conclusions**

As stated above, the ceramic repertoire primarily dates to the Early Roman period and is very like the material found at other contemporary excavated sites. In our overview of the chronology of the landfill, before we related to each layer individually, we noted the overwhelming uniformity of the assemblage (table 3). We did not find even one ceramic type of post-70 CE date during the entire excavation. Less than 1% of the whole cataloged ceramic material belonged to the repertoire of the late 2nd century BCE – early 1st century BCE (our D3-Phase 1) while 93% of the ceramics belonged to types that appeared at the end of the 1st century BCE and continued to appear until 70 CE (D3-Phases 2 and 3). The remaining 6% of the ceramics belonged to the latest types, which appeared only during the 1st century CE (D3-Phase 4).

Pottery collected from an earth fill layer that is below the landfill and considered as pre-dating the landfill (Locus 1044), contains a large proportion of early types that date to the Late Hellenistic period. Among all the jugs from 1044, 50% are from that period. Thirty-two percent of all the storage jars from 1044 are also Late Hellenistic. In contrast, in Loci 1050–1060 (the layers of the southern section, located physically above L1044), less than 1% of the cooking
pots and storage jars are of this period (table 4). At the same time the finds from L1044 also include a significant number of later dating pottery types such as the flasks (FK) and oil lamps of Type LP1 (table 2). Their presence indicates a late date for the soil layer under the landfill and therefore places the initiation of the landfill in the 1st century CE.

This conclusion is supported by two further observations:
1. An examination of table 2 shows that pottery types belonging to Phases D3-3 and 4 is present in all the layers that comprise the landfill, even the lowest ones.
2. Pottery fragments of earlier types are present in very sporadic numbers in all the loci dug diagonally; in some cases, in numbers that suggest these fragments are residual and the manufacturing of vessels had already ceased (for example UN1, SJ1, CP1 and LP2). The amount of pottery from these types never exceeded 1.7 % of the whole pottery assemblage found in each locus. On the other hand pottery that serves as a chronological marker for D3-phases 3–4 is present in higher quantity and represents from 3 % up to 25.64 % of the material found in each locus.

A further chronological observation may help in determining when the landfill fell out of use. It seems that pottery types that were defined by Berlin as indicative of the years before the destruction (our Phase D3-4) are becoming rare again. This observation is true for the kraters (KR), for cooking pots of Type CP3 and casserole CS2.

Finally, when comparing between the pottery types found in the southern and northern cuts it seems that a slight chronological difference exist between the two. Pottery types that are
indicative of the earlier period are present in slightly higher numbers in the southern cut (see for example BI6 and CP1). On the other hand, in the northern section the higher layers contain many more items of types indicative of the later phase, for example CS1 and LP1.

Based on the contribution of the pottery for determining the chronology of the landfill, it is quite safe to claim that the landfill in Area D3 was mainly active during the 1st century CE and that it fell out of use before the city was destroyed by the Romans in 70 CE. An initial survey conducted by Y. Farhi of the close to 1000 coins that were collected from the landfill support the conclusions reached by the study of the ceramic typology. Most of the coins date to the time of Agrippa II (king from 53–66 CE) and the Roman procurators. Coins dating to the Great War (66–70 CE) were not retrieved, and the latest dated coin is of the year 54 CE.[134]

Functional Analysis

The deposits include ceramic types belonging to a multitude of domestic activities, ranging from meal preparation and consummation, to storage and lighting.

A methodological note on the effect of sifting with thin net on the assemblage composition

Before an estimation of the relative frequency of the different functional types can be achieved, there is a need to evaluate how the different sifting procedures affect pottery retrieval. In order to do that we compared two different assemblages:

1. Soil buckets were wet sifted with a 0.5 mm net and then picked.
2. Soil buckets were dry sifted with a 1 or 2 mm net. Ceramics were also picked by the diggers quickly, during the excavation.

Both methods were used on the same locus / layer. The results show that the two techniques led to two drastically different ratio patterns of the vessels types collected (table 5).

In one locus (1022), we noticed that while using a 1 or 2 mm net for dry sifting, bowl rims constitute 1.69 % of the entire assemblage. The use of 0.5 mm nets and wet sifting brings the bowls ratio to just over 50 %. Clearly the accuracy of vessel frequencies is imperative for the conduct of functional analysis of assemblages and the results here illustrate the importance of high resolution sifting procedure in relevant cases.

We could also notice the predominance of cooking pots and juglets in the units sifted with 1 or 2 mm, without picking after digging time. Most of the sherds of cooking pots and
juglets are broken with a handle; by instinct, the digger picks these fragments because they are larger and easy to see, and they possibly throw away the small fragments of ceramics barely visible in the brown earth.

Similar results were obtained when we compared vessel frequencies in the loci excavated diagonally that were mostly wet-sifted but occasionally were also dry sifted (Fig. 13). When the earth is wet sifted, the bowls are the first category, occupying almost 40% of the whole assemblage. When using 1–2 mm net dry sifting, the bowls, in the same layers dug carefully using the same method, occupy only 14% of the composition of the ceramic assemblage.

Following the results presented above we concentrated in the functional analysis on the pottery retrieved using wet sifting only in 0.5 mesh. The results (Table 6) show that serving dishes, mainly bowls, are the most frequent vessels (38%) followed by cooking ware (32%), large storage jars (15%) and smaller containers (14%). Over all this assemblage seems to represent a mixed household assemblage. However, to date we have no contemporary household that was excavated and published using similar methods that will allow a valid comparison.

We were able to compare the results from Area D3 to other contemporary assemblages collected in other excavations (Table 6). In a previous publication Bar-Oz et al. presented a counting of pottery functional types from a study of the landfill content from a section located farther north of Area D3. In this study the scholars noted the high percentage of cooking vessels and deduced from this that vessels were used by Jewish pilgrims tenting outside the city. Comparing between the two assemblages shows very clearly that in Area D3 there is a higher quantity of bowls. Providing that this difference is not the result of methodological issues and that both excavations used the same procedure, then this significant difference is reflective of a different origin of the garbage. It is interesting to note that differences in the garbage composition were also noted in the study of the faunal remains and Chalk stone vessels.

The pottery assemblage from the Burnt House in Area B in the Upper City (Geva 2010) does not represent a systematically collected assemblage and a quantification study cannot be conducted.

Bar-Oz et al. 2007.

Spiciarich et al. 2017; Gadot – Adler 2016.
## Table 6

Comparison with other dump area near the current excavation
(minimum numbers 1/8 of vessel type, ceramic sub-types from the other area of excavation)
*Reich – Shukron 2010; ** Reich – Shukron 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pottery type</th>
<th>Northern and southern cuts D3 units dug in diagonal, sifted with a 0.5 mm net in D3</th>
<th>Locus 205 (Channel dump)*</th>
<th>Stepped street*</th>
<th>City Dump (lower part, Location A)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, cups, large bowls</td>
<td>155.65 38.01</td>
<td>21.9 6.3</td>
<td>3.8 1.7</td>
<td>22.75 6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>4.62 1.11</td>
<td>46 13.3</td>
<td>5.3 2.3</td>
<td>34.5 9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flasks</td>
<td>14.82 3.66</td>
<td>27 7.8</td>
<td>9 4</td>
<td>12.5 3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamps</td>
<td>18.125 4.48</td>
<td>61 17.7</td>
<td>22.3 9.9</td>
<td>52 14.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jugs and juglets</td>
<td>50.8 12.55</td>
<td>66.6 19.3</td>
<td>32.5 14.5</td>
<td>49.25 13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage jars</td>
<td>60.86 15.04</td>
<td>82.9 24</td>
<td>130.9 58.2</td>
<td>54.875 15.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking vessel</td>
<td>101.5 25.08</td>
<td>39.6 11</td>
<td>21.1 9.4</td>
<td>113 31.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 3.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>406.375 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>345 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>224.8 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>359.25 100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future studies of primary locations such as destruction assemblages will hopefully enable understanding of the meaning behind the differences.

**Site Formation and Ceramic Index of Breakege**

In order to understand how the landfill was formed and to reconstruct the line of activity, whether human-induced or natural, that brought the pottery sherds and other broken artefacts to the landfill in a myriad of superimposed layers, we have examined and indexed the ceramic sherd breakage.

Several archaeological investigations have exploited sherd size distribution as a trace of trampling by people, animals and machines. They proved that trampling reduces artefact size in predictable ways\(^{138}\) and sorts artefacts by size\(^{139}\).

Following Schiffer’s experiment we measured the longest length of 396 ceramic fragments. The samples were picked from different points of the diagonal layers, from the top of the slope at the western extremity, to the lowest eastern point of the slope, in two trenches, and from several layers (fig. 14).

The ceramic fragments discussed here present many traces of uses. Some of the cooking pots and storage jars are deeply worn on the handles. Soot marks are noticed on most of the cooking pots bases, and the nozzles of the oil lamps. Some traces of repair (little holes performed next to the lips) have also been observed on few bowls, storing jars and cooking pots.

There are almost no complete or even semi-complete vessels in the assemblage, the only complete vessels being small ceramic bottles (unguentaria). In addition, the sherds making up the assemblage comprise a mixture of countless numbers of vessels and restoration is impossible. Primary deposits should include fragmented vessels with a length much higher than the mean of those usually found on the floors in abandoned sites. Obviously the landfill vessels are not deposited in their primary dump, i.e. the place in which they were discarded at the end of their life cycle.

On the other hand, the results show that the entire assemblage is not broken into little pieces, and the longest side of most of the majority of the ceramic fragments is larger than 5 cm. In most cases the broken sides of the sherds are acute, which makes it difficult to believe

140 Schiffer 1983.
141 Ilan 1999, 115–117.
that the material rolled with water or wind. We were also able to notice that in the lowest part of the layers, the length of the sherds was bigger, and the size variable from 2 to 12.5 cm. with an average of approximatively 5 cm.

These quantified observations lead us to suggest that this accumulation of sherds not often trampled upon and that the sherds were brought to the landfill very quickly following their brakeage. There is no reason to suggest, for example, that the garbage layers documented by Reich and Shukron found on contemporary street pavements was the source of the garbage that made up the landfill\textsuperscript{143}. Rather, the garbage was brought directly to the landfill. The sherds show no signs of weathering by being exposed to wind or water, and so it is most likely that once they were discarded, they were quickly buried under other soil layers. A similar conclusion was reached in a study of the faunal remains from the landfill\textsuperscript{144}. We can therefore exclude the possibility that the layers were formed by natural forces and strengthen the assessment that they are the result of human activity.

**Conclusions**

The ceramic sherds represent the majority of the composition of the garbage deposit. They are also found together with large quantities of animal bones. Studies of the faunal remains showed that they represent a typical household assemblage, similar to the conclusion reached here\textsuperscript{145}. It seems evident that at the end of their life cycle the pottery fragments were discarded here by people, before they were trampled or moved by water or wind, and during a specific period between the beginning of the 1st century CE and up to the decade that preceded the Great War. The abundance of stone receptacles found together with ceramic vessels points to the possibility that the vessels come from a quarter inhabited by a Jewish population\textsuperscript{146}. To sum, the ceramics deposited in the landfill represent the material culture of Jerusalem and Judea until the destruction in 70 CE. The repertoire is essentially a late Hellenistic indigenous form tradition, and the paucity of imported pottery is striking. In comparison to the substantial amount of tableware retrieved in the habitation levels of the Upper City where Eastern Sigillata A and D, Ephesian gray ware platters and lamps, Italian Sigillata, Pompeian Red ware dishes and orlo bifido pans as well as a small number of Roman-type volute lamps came to light\textsuperscript{147}, the landfill assemblage most likely points to a different social stratum, namely a conservative traditional population different from Upper City’s urban Jewish elite more open to the lifestyle of the Greco-Roman koine.

\textsuperscript{143} Reich – Shukron 2003.
\textsuperscript{145} Spiciarich et al. 2017, 114.
\textsuperscript{146} Gadot – Adler 2016.
\textsuperscript{147} Rosenthal-Heginbottom 2014b.
### Table 7
Catalogue for figs. 7–12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Basket</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7, 1</td>
<td>Simple shallow bowl</td>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>14588/2</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>2nd–1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 2</td>
<td>Bowl with incurved rim</td>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>14590/3</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>2nd c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 3</td>
<td>Bowl with incurved rim</td>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>13869/1</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>2nd c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 4</td>
<td>Bowl with incurved rim</td>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>14068/1</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>2nd c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 5</td>
<td>Bowl with outturned rim</td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>13875/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 6</td>
<td>Bowl with outturned rim</td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>14590/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 7</td>
<td>Bowl with outturned rim</td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>14765/3</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>Bowl with outturned rim</td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>14609/1</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 9</td>
<td>Bowl with outturned rim</td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>14590/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 10</td>
<td>Bowl with outturned rim</td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>14424/2</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 11</td>
<td>Jerusalem painted bowl</td>
<td>BL4</td>
<td>14424/1</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 12</td>
<td>Jerusalem painted bowl</td>
<td>BL4</td>
<td>14612/2</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 13</td>
<td>Jerusalem painted bowl</td>
<td>BL4</td>
<td>20053/1</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 14</td>
<td>Jerusalem painted bowl</td>
<td>BL4</td>
<td>20034/1</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>1st century CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 15</td>
<td>Bowl with ledge rim</td>
<td>BL5</td>
<td>14612/1</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 16</td>
<td>Bowl with ledge rim</td>
<td>BL5</td>
<td>14306/3</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 17</td>
<td>Bowl with ledge rim</td>
<td>BL5</td>
<td>14590/4</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 18</td>
<td>Red-slipped ware</td>
<td>BL6</td>
<td>14307/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 19</td>
<td>Red-slipped ware</td>
<td>BL6</td>
<td>14287/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 20</td>
<td>Red-slipped ware</td>
<td>BL6</td>
<td>14337/1</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 21</td>
<td>Red-slipped ware</td>
<td>BL6</td>
<td>14306/4</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 22</td>
<td>Base of Eastern Sigillata A cup</td>
<td>BL7</td>
<td>13621/4</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Import beginning of 1st c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 23</td>
<td>Italian Terra Sigillata plate</td>
<td>BL7</td>
<td>20032/1</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>Import ca. 15/10 BCE – 50 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 24</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>KR</td>
<td>14081/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig.</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jugs and Flasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 1</td>
<td>Early narrow neck jug</td>
<td>JG1</td>
<td>14306/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>2nd – 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 2</td>
<td>Later narrow neck jug</td>
<td>JG2</td>
<td>13903/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 3</td>
<td>Later narrow neck jug</td>
<td>JG2</td>
<td>13621/8</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 4</td>
<td>Later narrow neck jug</td>
<td>JG2</td>
<td>14400/2</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 5</td>
<td>Ridged neck jug</td>
<td>JG3</td>
<td>13646/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 6</td>
<td>Ridged neck jug</td>
<td>JG3</td>
<td>13412/3</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 7</td>
<td>Ridged neck jug</td>
<td>JG3</td>
<td>13654/3</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 8</td>
<td>Ridged neck jug</td>
<td>JG3</td>
<td>13502/6</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>Ridged neck jug</td>
<td>JG3</td>
<td>13959/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 10</td>
<td>Ridged neck jug</td>
<td>JG3</td>
<td>14394/1</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 11</td>
<td>Gray ware jug</td>
<td>JG4</td>
<td>13497/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 12</td>
<td>Flask</td>
<td>FK</td>
<td>13621/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 13</td>
<td>Flask</td>
<td>FK</td>
<td>13903/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Juglets and Unguentaria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 1</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>JT1</td>
<td>13875/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>2nd–1st centuries BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 2</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>JT2</td>
<td>13621/5</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 3</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>JT2</td>
<td>13412/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 4</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>JT3</td>
<td>13957/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 5</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>JT4</td>
<td>14145/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 6</td>
<td>Gray/black juglet</td>
<td>JT5</td>
<td>13822/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 7</td>
<td>Spouted juglet</td>
<td>JT6</td>
<td>13828/1</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 8</td>
<td>Spouted juglet</td>
<td>JT6</td>
<td>14588/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 9</td>
<td>Spouted juglet</td>
<td>JT&amp;</td>
<td>14307/2</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td>Unguentarium (foot)</td>
<td>UN1</td>
<td>14538/1</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>2nd – 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 11</td>
<td>Unguentarium (rim)</td>
<td>UN1</td>
<td>14559/1</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>2nd – 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 12</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN2</td>
<td>13739/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 13</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN2</td>
<td>13628/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 14</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN2</td>
<td>13848/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig.</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 15</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN2</td>
<td>13875/3</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 16</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN2</td>
<td>14068/2</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 17</td>
<td>Gray/black unguentarium</td>
<td>UN3</td>
<td>13412/4</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 18</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN4</td>
<td>13943/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 19</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN4</td>
<td>14542</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 20</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN4</td>
<td>13621/9</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 21</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN4</td>
<td>13502/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 22</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>UN4</td>
<td>13654/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Storage Jars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Basket</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10, 1</td>
<td>Thickened storage jar</td>
<td>SJ1</td>
<td>14143</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>2nd – early 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 2</td>
<td>Thickened storage jar</td>
<td>SJ1</td>
<td>14765/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>2nd – early 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 3</td>
<td>Thickened storage jar</td>
<td>SJ1</td>
<td>14765/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>2nd – early 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 4</td>
<td>Thickened storage jar</td>
<td>SJ1</td>
<td>14759/2</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>2nd – early 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 5</td>
<td>Thickened storage jar</td>
<td>SJ1</td>
<td>14607/2</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>2nd – early 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 6</td>
<td>Thickened storage jar</td>
<td>SJ1</td>
<td>14570/2</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>2nd – early 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 7</td>
<td>Thickened storage jar</td>
<td>SJ1</td>
<td>14588/3</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>2nd – early 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 8</td>
<td>Collared storage jar</td>
<td>SJ2</td>
<td>14759/1</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>2nd – early 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 9</td>
<td>Collared storage jar</td>
<td>SJ2</td>
<td>14584/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>2nd – early 1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 10</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>13959/3</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>13875/5</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 12</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>13875/6</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 13</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>14433/1</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 14</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>13443/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 15</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>14400/1</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 16</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>13654/5</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 17</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>13654/4</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 18</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>13875/4</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 19</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>13491/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 20</td>
<td>Rridged storage jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>14306/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig.</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 21</td>
<td>Ridged Storage Jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>14392/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 22</td>
<td>Ridged Storage Jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>13621/6</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 23</td>
<td>Ridged Storage Jar</td>
<td>SJ3</td>
<td>14398/1</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cooking Vessels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Basket</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11, 1</td>
<td>High neck cooking pot</td>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>14155/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Late 2nd c. BCE – 1st c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 2</td>
<td>Triangular rim cooking pot</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>13681/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 3</td>
<td>Triangular rim cooking pot</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>14559/2</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 4</td>
<td>Triangular rim cooking pot</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>14570/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 5</td>
<td>Small cooking pot</td>
<td>CP3</td>
<td>13435/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 6</td>
<td>Grooved rim cooking pot</td>
<td>CP4</td>
<td>13502/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-1st c. BCE – 2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 7</td>
<td>Grooved rim cooking pot</td>
<td>CP4</td>
<td>13567/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-1st c. BCE – 2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 8</td>
<td>Casserole</td>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>13621/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 9</td>
<td>Casserole</td>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>13397/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Early 1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 10</td>
<td>Casserole/pan</td>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>13843/1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Mid-1st c. CE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 11</td>
<td>Cooking jug</td>
<td>CJG1</td>
<td>13502/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 12</td>
<td>Cooking jug</td>
<td>CJG1</td>
<td>13621/3</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oil Lamps and Utensils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Basket</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12, 1</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>14223/1</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 2</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>13412/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 3</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>13903/3</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 4</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>13503/1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 5</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>13397/3</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 6</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>13959/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 7</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>13654/2</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 8</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>13871/1</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 9</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>14224/1</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 10</td>
<td>Gray ware wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>13502/5</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 11</td>
<td>Gray ware wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>13502/7</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 12</td>
<td>Wheel-made lamp</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>14308/1</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig.  Vessel  Type  Basket  Locus  Period  
12, 13  Judean lamp  LP2  13818/1  1045  Mid-1st c. BCE – late 1st c. BCE  
12, 14  Knidian-type lamp  LP3  15777/2  1103  Mid-late 1st c. BCE – mid-1st c. CE  
12, 15  Roman-type lamp  LP4  16567/1  1116  Regional early 1st c. CE – mid-1st c. CE  
12, 16  Ladle  LD  13447/1  1022  Late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE  
12, 17  Stand  ST  13502/3  1035  Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE  
12, 18  Stand  ST  14081/1  1046  Mid-late 1st c. BCE – 70 CE  
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Two Hadra Hydriae
in the Collection of the Patriarchal Sacristy in Alexandria

Kyriakos Savvopoulos

Introduction

Hadra hydriae have been seen by many scholars as being emblematic of the necropolis of Alexandria, since they represent a type of funerary urn that was widely used in the Hellenistic city. Their name refers to the site of the Hadra cemetery, situated to the east of Alexandria. This was one of the earliest sites to be systematically excavated (1883–1884), resulting in the discovery of a substantial number of funerary urns of this type. Since then, Hadra hydriae have been discovered in other cemeteries in the western and eastern parts of the city. However, they are not exclusive to Alexandria. Hadra hydriae have been found in several places across the Hellenistic eastern Mediterranean—in Cyprus, Rhodes, Athens and also Crete, which appears to have been a major centre of production for this type of urn. Still, there is a strong association with the history and society of the city of Alexander, based on written evidence inscribed on the surface of a few dozen Hadra hydriae, indicating name, status or even profession of their occupants. On the basis of the inscribed examples, Hadra hydriae are dated to the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE. Other hydriae-type urns were used in Alexandrian cemeteries throughout the Hellenistic period.

Hadra hydriae are divided in two main categories: 1) White Ground hydriae, identified by the whitish layer of clay slip applied to the porous surface of the urn, which serves as a ground for painted decoration in a wide range of colours; and 2) Clay Ground hydriae, which are made of harder, granulated pinkish clay, which is glazed in variations of ochre. They typically bear monochrome decoration – from reddish brown to black – with floral motifs such as laureated wreaths, vine and ivy tendrils, in a few cases combined with scenes featuring human and animal figures.

1 Neroutsos 1887, 61–68; Neroutsos 1888, 1–2. 102–116. The term ‘Hadra hydriae’ was introduced by Merriam in 1885, upon the study of a large group of Hadra hydriae, which had been transferred to New York the previous year.
3 For examples, see Breccia 1911, 188–205; Cook 1966a; Fraser 1953; SEG 15 no. 856; 21 no. 1761; 32 no. 1972; 39 no. 1692; 41 no. 1610; 44 no. 1443; 46 no. 1044; 48 no. 1973 and 2038bis; 49 no. 2124; 51 no. 2107–2109; 52 no. 1761; 53 no. 1601; 53 no. 1942; 55 no. 1780–1805. In a few cases, information is included for other non-funerary uses of these vases, before they ended up in the cemeteries, see Callaghan – Jones 1985, 2. For a comprehensive catalogue and study of Hadra hydriae, see the unpublished thesis of A. Enklaar (Enklaar 1992).
4 This basic division was established by Merriam (Merriam 1885). It is still widely accepted by the scholarly community.
Fig. 1: Hydra A. – a. Front; b. Back; c. Left side; d. Right side; e. Top; f. Bottom; g. Plaster-cover; h. Neck; i. Base; j. Shoulder.
The two Hadra hydriae presented in this paper are the only two artefacts from the Hellenistic period that are held in the collection of the recently inaugurated Sacristy of the Patriarchate of Alexandria and All Africa. Unfortunately, no information is preserved regarding the context of their discovery, yet their Alexandrian provenance seems more than probable, as this is the origin of the majority of the Sacristy’s exhibits. Both of them belong to the category of the Clay Ground hydriae, sharing some shape characteristics: the mouth is straight; the neck is set off from the ovoid body; the body has a vertical handle, which extends from the middle of the neck to the shoulder, and two horizontal handles, curved slightly upwards and round in section. Both hydriae are preserved in a complete state, and only some minor conservation treatment was needed before their exhibition in the museum. Also, they share similar decoration, details of which will be described in the individual sections below.

A. Hadra Hydria of the Clay Ground Type (fig. 1)

H. 36; D. of body 22; D. of lip 9; D. of foot 13.5.

Date: 3rd century BCE, according to dated inscribed examples.

The hydria is in a good state of preservation. There is minor sporadic denting on the surface, with more substantial damage to the right of the left handle. Also, there is a large oval dent at the lower part of the body under the left handle, revealing the inner colour of the clay. Most of the original plaster seal on the mouth of the hydria is preserved.

The decoration, one of the simplest versions of the kind, is applied in maroon. Thin striped bands encircle the top surface of the lip and the inside of the neck. Short diagonal lines decorate the side edge surface of the lip as well as the surfaces of the three handles. On the neck, there is a thin stripe at the height of the upper junction of the vertical handle; the middle part of the neck is encircled with a single spray of ivy. On the shoulder of the vase, at the junction with the neck, there is a round necklace with dots.

Two double stripes form a horizontal band around the body of the urn, demarcating an area that is as broad as the height of the two horizontal handles that they interlink. Two decorative registers are formed between the horizontal handles, at the front and the back of the vase respectively. The front side features a wreath made of two thin laurel branches, which usher from two rectangles of trellis work, positioned next to each handle and joined at the centre. The rear side is decorated with an indistinct motif, positioned beneath each vertical handle, which is reminiscent of a garland, or a deep frill of fabric. Finally, the base is encircled with a wide painted zone, interleaved with bands of undecorated surface on its upper and lower edges.

B. Hadra Hydria of the Clay Ground Type (figs. 2–3)

H. 43.5; D. of body 20.5; D. of lip 14.5; D. of foot 9.5.

Date: 3rd century BCE; according to dated inscribed examples.

---

5 The Sacristy (archaeological museum) is situated in an impressive underground cistern, discovered during the course of undertaking renovation work in the premises of the Patriarchate in the 1990s. It was Patriarch Theodoros II’s initiative to convert the cistern into an impressive museum, which would display the Patriarchate’s remarkable collection of antiquities, dating from the Pharaonic to the Islamic periods. The inauguration of the Sacristy took place November 27th, 2013.

6 The Sacristy collection consists of donations made by Greek Alexandrian nobles mainly during the 19th and 20th centuries. Some of these people were known for being active members of the Archaeological Society of Alexandria, as well as collectors of Alexandrian antiquities – including Hadra hydriae – who had also made major donations to the Graeco-Roman Museum of Alexandria. See Seif el-Din 2010, 94–95.

7 Compare, Metropolitan Museum access. no. 90.9.50; Cook 1966b, no. 21.

8 Compare, Metropolitan Museum access. no. 90.9.13; Cook 1966b, no. 8.
Fig. 2: Hydria B. — a. Front; b. Back; c. Left side; d. Right side; e. Detail of decoration; f. Mouth; g. Bottom; h. Base; i. Lid.
The hydria is preserved in complete form, apart from its lid, of which only the bottom is preserved. The body is slightly more oblique, compared to A. The decoration is applied directly on the natural clay in a blackish-brown colour, mostly preserved in good state. Even in parts where the painted decoration has been eroded, the ›riverbed‹ of the black paint is still detectable allowing the reconstruction of the original decoration. Black circles run around the edge and on the underside of the lip. On the neck, there is one black stripe at the height of the upper junction of the vertical handle. A wreath of two laurel branches runs horizontally around the neck, meeting at the centre of the front face. This element might be seen as painted imitation of some rare examples of actual bronze wreaths, which were placed around the neck of Alexandrian funerary urns. There is some indication that such wreaths are likely to have borne the head of the deceased during the cremation process.

On the shoulder of the vase, at the junction with the neck, there is a round ›necklace‹ with dots. Also, a black band, combined with a zone of arches with dots, runs around the lower part of the shoulder. This black band corresponds to another thicker black band between stripes on the body, which runs just under the two horizontal handles. Thus, two decorative registers are formed between the horizontal handles, at the front and the rear side of the vase respectively. On the front side, the register is further framed with two sections filled with dots (horizontally) and two indistinct radiated motifs (vertically). Within the frame runs a slender vine ornament. On the rear side, there is a simplistic motif recalling garlands or a deep frill of fabric. The base was painted in black, apart from a stripe of clay surface, running next to the lower edge of the foot.
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Prefatory Note

For various reasons this publication was delayed. Meanwhile, though, archaeological work in the Black Sea area has continued, and that with increased vigour\(^1\). To mention only a few benchmarks: in the wake of the deep-rooted changes in the Eastern-Block system, at the end of the 20th century and during the first years of this millennium alone three dedicated research-centres were founded, one German, one American, and one Danish. These are the ›Zentrum für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des Schwarzmeerraumes‹ (ZAKS) at the University of Halle-Wittenberg in 2000, the ›Centre for Black Sea Studies‹ at Aarhus University in 2002 and in 2004 the ›American Research Centre in Sofia‹ (ARCS). Among state-funded institutions, the Eurasian department of the DAI of 1995 has an extraordinary scope which sweeps over all of Asia.

A thorough summary of archaeological activities around the Pontos Euxinos has been published in ›Archaeology in the Black Sea Region in Classical Antiquity 1993–2007‹ co-authored by Pia Guldager Bilde († 2013), Birgitte Bøgh, Søren Handberg, Jakob Munch Høtje, Jens Nieling, Tatiana Smekalova and Vladimir Stolba\(^2\). This long essay, originally an Archaeological Report of the BSA, fairly detailed lists the major research initiatives and illustrates how, upon the dissolution of the Soviet bloc, there followed an upsurge of initiatives and a number of co-operations between Western institutions and partners around the Black Sea. Out of all the work, some very useful tools have come. Thus the Aarhus Centre’s Black Sea Studies series (BSS)\(^3\) and their extensive annual reports have set high standards in every respect, including an enviable timeliness in reporting. In addition, all materials were produced for ›open access‹\(^4\).

\(^1\) The popularity of the subject also seems to be reflected by the more than 2000 ›followers‹ listed under ›Academia.edu‹ ›Black Sea Archaeology‹ (Spring 2016).


\(^3\) See http://www.pontos.dk/publications/books. To date, 16 volumes have appeared.

\(^4\) See: http://www.pontos.dk/. Pontos: The Danish National Research Foundation’s Centre for Black Sea Studies, with a detailed overview of the centre’s programme.
The increased activities on the Crimea since the early 1990ies also included more archaeological work at ›Scythian Neapolis‹⁵, the site the following report concentrates upon. The report is the outcome of an attempt to bring about longer term collaboration, involving an American university and the Crimean Archaeological Institute. Now, as we are composing this prefatory note, the Crimea once again has undergone another turn in her turbulent political history and the future of archaeological work in the region on a steady keel seems far from assured at the time of this writing.

After the work in 1993 in ›Scythian Neapolis‹ more campaigns followed, with the reports on these undertakings written in Russian and Ukrainian⁶. The existing language barrier was first lowered in 2001 in a paper the principal excavator presented at Aarhus emphasizing the changing interpretation and chronology of Scythian – ending late 4th century BCE versus the Late Scythian culture beginning ca. 200 BCE⁷. Understanding the status quo was made easier in 2004 when Y. Zaytsev⁸ published an English summary of research in Neapolis Scythica in which he also included a reference to the trench IUTRIAL⁹. The book contains a detailed presentation of the various levels which the local excavators identified¹⁰. A year later the same author published a summary on the ›Absolute and Relative Chronology of Scythian Neapolis in the 2nd century BCE‹¹¹. As far as the site itself is concerned, it has received a special status as historical and archaeological reserve ›Scythian Neapolis‹.

Fig. 1: Simferopol / Neapolis Scythica on Crimea.

5 The ancient name of the site comes in various forms. *Zaytsev 2004* entitles his book ›The Scythian Neapolis‹. ›Neapolis Scythica‹ reads the lemma in the Princeton Encyclopaedia (Princeton NJ 1976) 615. We have decided to follow the nomenclature used by Zaytsev to avoid unnecessary confusion. This does not imply, though, that we consider this to be the final word on the actual name of this Hellenistic-Roman settlement.

6 *Zaytsev 2004*, 44.

7 *Zaytsev 2001* passim on the historic background.

8 A different spelling of the name: Zajcev is in print. Here the one on the title of *Zaytsev 2004* has been selected.

9 *Zaytsev 2004*, 4 fig. 10 no. 1.

10 *Zaytsev 2004*, 8, chapter 3 passim.

11 *Zaytsev 2001*, passim; *Rotroff 2005*. 
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Excavations
Small scale excavations took place on the Acropolis plateau above the modern city of Simferopol (fig. 1) during the first two weeks of August 1993. The goal was to familiarize the team with stratigraphical issues of this site, and to lay the groundwork for a possible future excavation project at this site which has long been recognized as a major settlement occupied during the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods, in size equal to or even larger than other well-known settlements along the northern coast of the Pontic Sea.

The Site and its Post-Ancient History
The remains of the ancient settlement on top of the mesa-like rock in the middle of modern Simferopol (fig. 2) have been identified as those of Neapolis Scythica, the capital of the Scythian state in the Crimea. This identification goes back to the investigations of Blaramberg in 1831 which were triggered by the find of a stone relief of a horseman, and of three Greek
inscriptions. In the course of his probe he also came upon the nowadays well known relief depicting an older and a younger Scythian. Basing his argument upon a quote in Strabo he then identified the site as Scythica, the capital of the Scythians’ state on the Crimea. This identification has been accepted and traditionally is being used to the present day.

A dissenting opinion has been voiced by D. Raevskii. This author follows O. Dashevskaia, in that the available evidence supports the name of Palakium rather than Neapolis for the capital of the Scythian kingdom on the Crimea. In the end, irrefutable evidence for one or the other is currently lacking, and for reasons of tradition alone the name Neapolis appears the preferred one and it therefore used here.

During the century and a half since the first systematic research at Simferopol’s Kermenchik plateau, excavations have been conducted at varying intervals. Some of the work was conducted in the interest of public welfare. Thus, the plateau now holds the city of Simferopol’s major water-deposit, and several huge pipelines cross the terrain in different directions (fig. 3).

As a result of these research activities it has become clear that the site contained an important, large community with outlying cemeteries, and probably a dense settlement on the mesa-top at one time or another. The site has a history which goes back to at least the 6th/5th centuries BCE, although its floruit began probably only in the 3rd century BCE when it became the major city for the Scythians. Its end as an active settlement falls in the 3rd century CE. From then on it seems to have lain unused safe for grazing activities or as a point of retreat and/or defence during times of war.

The site has received little attention in western literature. The work done over the years by Russian and Ukrainian archaeologists on the site has been summed up first in a monograph however, in 1979, written by T. N. Vysotskaja. The author, who was involved in work at the site for many years, gives a comprehensive account from her point of view, describing the successive phases and linking them with the relevant materials. Now, the 2004 monograph of Zaytsev has made the materials more widely accessible.

14 See Schulz 1946.
15 Strab. geogr. 312. »Besides the places listed in the Chersonesus there were also the forts built by Scilurus and his sons—the forts which they used as bases of operations against the generals of Mithridates — Palacium, Chabum, and Neapolis.«
16 Rayevsky 1976.
17 Dashevskaia 1958, 2 passim.
18 For a listing see now Zaytzev 2004, ch. 1.
19 Gajdukevic 1971, 306, note 3, reports erroneously that on the Kermentschik a man-made lake was built in 1926. The German word ›Stausee‹ (dammed up lake) can describe only the water distribution installation which was erected on top of the plateau to benefit from the pressure its elevated height provided. A man-made lake does, indeed, exist, south of the city on the road to Alushta, where the river has been dammed.
20 Zaytzev 2004, map: fig. 2, nos. 6–8 and views: fig. 3.
22 Vysotskaja 1979, passim.
The Geography of Neapolis

The site is located on a limestone spur overlooking the well-watered valley of the Salgir river. The spur rises steeply up to 45 m. (ca. 310 masl) above the valley floor. Its eastern side is bounded by a continuous cliff (bare limestone), 5–15 m. high (fig. 4). The narrow northern end is precipitous as well, while on its western side the spur is flanked by a ravine, which becomes progressively deeper to the North. Finally, to the South, the spur is continuous with a complex of terraces that extends to the foot of the Crimean mountains ca. 12 km away.

The central, main part of the spur is a plateau, rising progressively from N–NW to S–SE. Within what was the inhabited and presumably, intra-mural area of the ancient city, gradients vary significantly from one quarter to the next, although they do not normally exceed 10%. Extensive areas in the southern part of the plateau are in fact nearly level, while in the northern part gradients with 6–8% dominate. Such gradients would suffice to induce severe sheet erosion. Today, however, the surface is covered by a dense, virtually continuous turf and appears to be stable (fig. 5). Erosion is limited along trails (many of which run across the site), and to the shoulders of the spur, especially along the rim in the eastern side. It is likely that, through slope wash and weathering/collapse of the limestone face, the rim has retreated somewhat since ancient times; the foot of the cliff is buried in voluminous talus deposits. The extent of that retreat, and possible damage to, or loss of, ancient buildings, cannot be determined without excavation at several points along the rim. It is worth adding that the turf effectively reduces ground visibility throughout the Neapolis plateau to a minimum. An intensive surface survey would be impracticable: the frequency of ancient artefacts on the surface is extremely low (estimated to one item or less per 100 m²).

The entire plateau bears considerable micro-relief of pits, ditches, ridges, and small mounds. The largest of the mounds, up to 3 m. high and covering several hundred square meters each, are said to be ancient features (»ash mounds«, Yuri Zaytsev, pers. communication). Some of the ridges, up to 0.5 m. high, may conceal parts of ancient walls or debris (cf. below). The remainder of the micro-relief is the result of diverse activities from various periods, such as stone robbing from ancient buildings, modern waterworks, or dumping the dirt from archaeological excavations. Today, the largest part of the plateau is a protected archaeological site, and it is used for recreation, for grazing small flocks of sheep and goats, and as a corridor for people living in the vicinity of the site. The periphery of the site, on the other hand, is occupied by buildings, residential, commercial, and a city water tank-and-pump.

Most points on the spur afford long range views – toward the hills across the Salgir valley (to the east and north), toward the coastal lowland (toward the Northwest and West), and across the terraces to the Crimean mountains (to the South). At least one other ancient settlement, ca. 5 km to the Northwest, is visible from Neapolis. Arable land is in no short supply in the valley bottom and in the plain further North and West; the valley, in particular, provides light,
well drained alluvium, and it would be easily irrigable. A copious spring is located midway up the cliff in the spur’s eastern side. The plateau, between the cliff and the ravine bordering the site on the West, provides more than ten hectares of usable space. All those elements – proximity of good farmland and water, a spacious, elevated area, protected by cliffs and steep gradients on three sides, and long range visibility – make Neapolis a privileged location for a sizeable ancient settlement. It should also be noted that the Salgir river valley is the natural route from the southern coast of Crimea to the peninsula’s central and northern territories. Simferopol (the name may well be interpreted as ›city where people convene‹ or ›bring things together‹) no doubt owes some of its growth to its strategic location with regard to that route. The possibility should not be discounted that the route was also important in antiquity, and that ancient Neapolis – as well as other ancient towns along the Salgir valley – benefited from their location on that route. We will return to this issue below.

The Excavation

A trench of 2 x 10 metres was laid out and excavated in the NW part of the site, ca. 50 meters from its northern edge. The objective was to test the sediments for archaeological remains and stratigraphy in an area where no excavations had previously been conducted. When laying out the trench care was taken to avoid pits and ditches of the modern age, as well as underground pipelines. The specific location of the trench (provisionally named IUTRIAL) was chosen after intensive geophysical survey, conducted over an area 10 x 10 m. by T. Smekalova and B. Bevan. Magnetometry in that area identified a small (ca. 1 m²) yet highly distinct source of anomaly, and a second, equally small but less distinct one, ca. 3 metres to the E of the first (fig. 6). The trench was laid out so as to encompass both sources of anomaly. As in most parts of the plateau, virtually no ancient artefacts could be found on the surface of IUTRIAL and its vicinity (cf. above).

The ground in the area of IUTRIAL rises from W–NW to E–SE (gradient 6.5 %), with the western end – Sectors A–B – of the trench being 0.60–0.70 m. lower than the eastern (fig. 7). A low ridge (ca. 0.25 m. high) ran diagonally across IUTRIAL. The excavation showed that the ridge marked the location of an ancient wall in ruined condition (see below).

A temporary datum point was established 9.90 m. to the north of IUTRIAL. All elevations within IUTRIAL were measured in cm. above or below this datum point by means of a simple surveyor’s plane, constructed at the site with three iron rods and a string. The trench was
notionally divided into five 2.00 m. x 2.00 m. segments, A through E. Excavation units were of variable depth (depending on stratigraphic circumstances) and of variable horizontal extent (most often limited to a single segment); they were named after the segment(s) in which they were dug and they were numbered in sequence (e.g., E6, BC2). Their stratigraphic sequence is shown in fig. 7 and in the matrix-diagram (graph 1). Digging proceeded with few tools (spades, shovels, trowels and knives), and was carried out by a work force of two to four people. A small portion of the sediment removed was dry-sieved.

The excavation of IUTRIAL revealed a series of superimposed earthen floors and stone walls with some additional features, separated by fairly thick deposits, up to 0.35 m. of construction debris and refuse. As much as five centuries may separate the oldest from the most recent of the features (approximately from the 3rd century BCE to the 3rd century CE; see Chronology, below). All essential features are shown in the section (fig. 7) and in the two plans (figs. 8–9), and photographs (figs. 10–12). They are described below, beginning with the lower part of sequence in segments A and B, then taking up the lower part of the sequence in segments D and E. Segment C was excavated to a minimal depth; features encountered in it will be described last, along with the uppermost deposits in all segments of IUTRIAL.

Graph 1: Matrix - Diagram
IUTRIAL, the lower deposits in segments A and B

Bedrock was reached in a portion of segment A only, at 1.30 m. to 1.35 m. below the modern surface (1.65–1.70 m. below datum). Such bedrock is hard limestone; its exposed surface has the characteristics of in situ chemical weathering (cracks, loose angular gravel immediately on top). It is overlain by a thin (5–8 cm.) horizon of reddish clay, containing much limestone gravel but devoid of cultural residue—clearly, an undisturbed C horizon. In its upper part, the C horizon gives progressively way to a light grey-brown sediment, loosely packed and free of stones, but with sporadic artefacts and charcoal specks (deposit K; 140–160 cm. below datum). In the limited area (ca. 2 m²) where deposit K was exposed the artefacts were primarily small potsherds, their frequency increasing upward. A concentration of at least three
tiles in a tumble was also noted in the northern scarp; whether they represent secondary refuse or the edge of a collapsed structure immediately to the N of segment A, it will take further excavation to tell. A small piece of a floor, probably still in situ, was also exposed (Floor I) at ca. 150 cm. below datum.

Deposit K in segment A was sealed by a floor, at ca. 1.35–1.40 m. below datum (Floor II). Like Floor I and all floors encountered in IUTRIAL, Floor II was distinguished from sediments above and below by its brighter, yellowish brown colour and its greater compactness. It was 3–5 cm. thick and could be traced over area ca. 1.8 m$^2$. Upon that floor rested a voluminous pile of limestone boulders and smaller stones in a loosely packed matrix – a light brown sediment also containing many land snails, charcoal, few potsherds and animal bone scraps, and small pieces of red-fired construction clay, some with imprints of twigs on one surface (deposit L; 100–135 cm. below datum). The bulk of the boulders and other stones were removed during the excavation; what was left in place is a line of five boulders, in a single course, running diagonally from the SW to the NE corner of segment A (Wall I). It is not clear at the moment what sort of a structure those boulders once formed; it could have been a massive wall, or a platform. In either case, the boulders left in place appear to form the south-eastern face of that structure. It is also unlikely that the structure was functionally related to the delicately constructed floor (Floor II) on which it was found resting. More probably, the floor and the boulder structure represent two distinct episodes of construction and use.

To the East of the boulder structure and at an elevation even with the tops of the boulders (ca. 100 cm. below datum), lay the remains of yet another floor (Floor III), comparable in its technical features to Floor II described above. A small portion of that floor, in segment B, had been fired to a bright red colour and contained a concentration of charcoal (cross-hatched area in fig. 9). There were no structural features associated with the spot, and we cannot therefore guarantee that it was the place of a permanent hearth. In any case, that red-fired spot was identified as the source of the major magnetic anomaly noted in the area of IUTRIAL during the magnetic survey. The exposed part of Floor III (ca. 4 m$^2$) has been left in place.

The deposit above Floor III and the boulder structure in segments A and B is a light brown silty sediment (lighter toward the bottom), very friable (almost powdery) and free of gravel, containing variable amounts of potsherds, animal bone, charcoal and fragments of red-fired construction clay (deposit M). Its top lies between 60 and 33 cm. below datum, its bottom at ca. 100 cm. It probably resulted from several depositional episodes, spanning a period of time of some length, certainly after Floor III went out of use: sediment from decaying buildings as well as refuse accumulated in an area of little traffic, perhaps the interior of an abandoned / collapsed building. This phase terminated with renewed construction in the area, namely with the laying of stone foundations for one or two buildings. Portions of those foundations were found in the uppermost part of the sequence at IUTRIAL, just below the surface. Before we turn to them, it is necessary to describe the stratigraphic sequence in the eastern portion of IUTRIAL, especially in segments D and E.

$IUTRIAL$, the lower deposits in segments $D$ and $E$

In segments D and E excavation reached a depth of ca. 90 cm. below the modern surface (ca. 65 cm. below datum). At that depth an earthen floor was encountered (Floor IV), displaying the familiar technical features – yellowish colour and high cohesion. The floor is continuous throughout, extending beyond the excavated area in all directions (exposed area 5.75 m$^2$). It has several shallow pits, two or three of which may, on account of their regularity, be related to the use of the floor, the remainder being the result of wear and tear. Nothing like a ›floor‹ or ›pit deposit‹ was identified. The sediment and artefacts accumulated over that floor date instead from a time after its abandonment, the deposit consisting of relatively few potsherds and some

23 Vysotskaja 1979, 102 where she presents her view that at the beginning of the Christian era the quantity of burnished pottery went noticeably down in Neapolis, to be replaced by ›crude vessels, poorly smoothed over‹.
charcoal and animal bones, in a highly friable, powdery, light grey-brown sedimentary matrix, free of stones (Deposit N; cf. Deposit M [West] in segments A and B). Deposition ceased with the construction of another floor (Floor V; ca. 0.45 m. below datum), similar to the one below, but less well preserved. Like its predecessor in segments D and E, Floor V was also abandoned and was succeeded, five centimetres higher, by a third floor of similar construction (Floor VI; 35–40 cm. below datum).

As in the case of Floor IV, no ›floor deposits‹ were present on either Floor V or Floor VI. Moreover, neither of the last two floors extended up to the eastern boundary of IUTRIAL. They terminated instead ca. 0.80 m. from that boundary (see segment E in fig. 7), as if they had been cut/penetrated by a pit or ditch of a later date.

It is not likely that any of the floors in segments D and E are to be correlated with the floors found in segments A and B (fig. 7: note the difference in elevation). The material accumulated on top of Floor VI was comparable to that of deposit M (West), encountered in segments A and B (cf. above), and has therefore been designated as Deposit M (East). Deposition was interrupted at 14–19 cm. below datum with the construction of the stone building(s) already mentioned, the remains of which occupy the largest part of IUTRIAL. We turn now to those remains and to the subsequent depositional history at IUTRIAL.

**IUTRIAL, the uppermost deposits (all segments)**

At elevation 14–19 cm. below datum (i.e. 30–35 cm. below the modern surface) a ca. 0.80 m. wide stone foundation was laid into deposit M in the eastern half of IUTRIAL (fig. 10 and fig. 7: A.B. & Wall II): the wall, running diagonally through segments C and D, is preserved up to 0.23 m. It consists of two courses of field stones (all local limestone), but – to judge from the amount of rubble found on top and immediately to the NW of the preserved part – it must have originally been higher by at least two more courses. It does not appear to be associated with any floors, and may therefore have been intended and used as a fence or yard wall. It collapsed almost exclusively to the NW, onto what was probably an open space (see area covered by rubble in fig. 12, and fig. 7 segments B, C, and D). The remains of that wall, and most of the rubble collapse, have been cleaned and left in place.

Sediment accumulation in the area of IUTRIAL ceased with the collapse of this wall: the thin (ca. 0.15 m.) deposit of turf that covered the wall and its rubble collapse prior to excavation perhaps originated in the superstructure of the wall itself – or in a variety of natural and human actions following the abandonment of the area. In the parts of IUTRIAL which were not covered by rubble from Wall II, the uppermost boundary between deposit M and the turf that today covers Neapolis is still sharp (see top of scarp in figs. 10–12). Like elsewhere at the site, that turf contained many artefacts of the modern era, in addition to ancient ones.

A second wall foundation was identified at the northwest corner of IUTRIAL (fig. 7, segment A, Wall III). It is of similar construction and orientation as Wall II, and, like the latter, it was founded into deposit M, at elevation ca. 0.80 m. below datum (i.e. 0.35–0.40 m. below the modern surface). In spite of the difference in absolute elevation (60–65 cm.), Wall III may belong to the same building complex as Wall II. But this proposition can only be negotiated by further excavation.

**IUTRIAL Chronology**

The chronology indicated by the ceramic finds from Neapolis Scythica represents – for want of numismatics or amphora stamps – the best method to arrive at a time-related sequence for the settlement phases identified in the excavation (graph 2).

The latest phase, here identified as ›Turf‹, encompasses activities of the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE. During that time, judging from the accumulation of debris in this stratum, activities were both rather heavy as well as extending over an extended time period. No clear
Graph 2. Chronology of trial trench 1993
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deposit M (East)

Deposit DELTA

Deposit K & C HORIZON

UNIT D7

Deposit DELTA

Deposit K & C HORIZON

UNIT D7
The preceding stratum of activity, marked by Deposit M (East) and by Deposit M (West), also exhibits signs of interfacing, i.e. remains which may indicate a later level of activity, i.e. that of stratum ›Turf‹. For Deposit M (West) the overwhelming majority of the datable pottery finds indicates concentrated activity in the 1st century BCE – 1st century CE.

For the second segment of this deposit (East) the indication is less clear. It may well have been that activities there, on the other side of the big wall, were somewhat later than on the western side.

In Deposit DELTA one anomaly occurs: the fragment of a 5th century BCE black-glazed skyphos. It remains just that, a stray that signals the presence of earlier activities at the site. But the core of the finds here indicates a peak during the 3rd to 2nd centuries BCE. The widely scattered pattern of dates for this level is difficult to interpret; possibly major work took place during the 2nd into the 1st centuries BCE.

The concentration of dates for Deposit K and C Horizon clearly indicates activities only during the beginning and middle Hellenistic period. This may well be the deposition of materials which was generated by the presumed installation of a major settlement in this location. Likewise, the finds from Unit D7 bespeak an activity related to the establishing of a major settlement on the plateau.

The Finds

The Ceramics: Physical Distribution

The following matrix was developed to serve as a guide for the placement of finds, especially of the ceramics in relation to each other (graph 2; diagrams A–B)24.

Ceramics: Statistics

The volume of pottery from the trench was greatest in the upper strata. Fragments occurred in different densities in various parts of each excavated unit. The small size of the trench did not allow for any clues as to the activities connected with these ceramics.

A survey of finds, ceramics as well as bone and stone fragments from units with finds of a statistically significant number is given below. The fragments found are given in total numbers without reference to size which ranges from more than ten centimetres to less than one centimetre for both bones and pottery. The few worked stone fragments fall outside our range.

The arrangement in the tables is by pottery category, listing the totals for Fine Ware, Plain Ware and Coarse Ware. Plain Ware has further been subdivided by adding the important category of Amphorae. Pottery fragments not identifiable as belonging to a category are listed as unidentified (UnId). In addition, when possible, fragments were separated out as to whether they belonged to open or closed vessels. Thus, the first number in each ware category connotes the open vessels, the second the closed ones. Bone and Stone stand by themselves.

See also above section 3.
Precise distinctions between open and closed fragments are often complex to be made in this category.

If open shapes are indicated these have been determined through rim fragments. The number of
fragments listed under closed shapes may then well include fragments from open coarse ware vessels.

The first number indicates the number of bone fragments found, the second the number of teeth
identified.

**Diagram A**

**Finds statistics**

**1. TURF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Amph.</th>
<th>Coarse*</th>
<th>UnId</th>
<th>Bone**</th>
<th>Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-E1</td>
<td>1/-</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3/44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16/1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>6/-</td>
<td>-/25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2/210</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC2</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>-/2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1/24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14/-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1/27</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16/-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7/4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ceramics</td>
<td>11/33</td>
<td>1/29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8/317</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53/3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 482 = 100</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. DEPOSIT M (West)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Amph.</th>
<th>Coarse*</th>
<th>UnId</th>
<th>Bone**</th>
<th>Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>-/1</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2/26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>-/1</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB4</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB5</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ceramics</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/1 /</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 88 = 100</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. DEPOSIT M (East)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Amph.</th>
<th>Coarse*</th>
<th>UnId</th>
<th>Bone**</th>
<th>Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE4</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-/-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ceramics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 16 = 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. FLOOR VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Amph.</th>
<th>Coarse*</th>
<th>UnId</th>
<th>Bone**</th>
<th>Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>-/3</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?/5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ceramics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 8 = 100</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. FLOOR V**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Amph.</th>
<th>Coarse*</th>
<th>UnId</th>
<th>Bone**</th>
<th>Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>-/1</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ceramics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 28 = 100</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6. DE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Amph.</th>
<th>Coarse*</th>
<th>UnId</th>
<th>Bone**</th>
<th>Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>?/20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ceramics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 63 = 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. DEPOSIT DELTA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Amph.</th>
<th>Coarse*</th>
<th>UnId</th>
<th>Bone**</th>
<th>Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>1/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>?/10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ceramics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 24 = 100</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagram B

Summary Statistics of Ceramics in Diagram A, 1–7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Amph.</th>
<th>Coarse</th>
<th>Unld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Turf</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. M (West)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. M (East)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Floor VI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Floor V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DE5</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Delta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ceramics: General Remarks

The distribution peak in diagram B lies with the coarse ware, next to which the other categories appear of very low importance. Noticeable, too, is the presence of plain ware only in the upper most level, it seems to have a much lower presence in the earlier strata of the settlement. This may be due in part to the fact that some body fragments of plain ware possibly have been misidentified and were subsumed under amphorae, but even an error margin of three to five percent would hardly change the picture. If amphorae and plain ware were combined, their total of 28.1% would still be well less than half that.

It is assumed that coarse wares were locally made, either in the Crimea or even in Neapolis itself. The repertoire contains both open and closed forms, although the former occur rather infrequent. As the various samples in the catalogue below demonstrate, the level of variation among the shapes is considerable, more so than among the closed vessels. Given the lack of full vessel profiles from the trial trench, observations can be preliminary only. But the closed vessels from the site seem to prefer a collar-type of rim, coupled with an often voluminous, bulging body. Handle shapes may vary widely, again, the available evidence does not allow for further conclusions. These daily use ceramics are made with great skill, some of them quite beautiful with their carefully worked surfaces and pleasing, highly functional shapes.

Fine wares in terms of numbers, too, play a very limited role, and then mostly for the layer Turf, encompassing the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE. Their presence in the ceramic assemblage resembles that of exotic birds: their presence is noted more quickly, because of their relative scarcity which sets them apart from the rest. In daily life they seem to have played a much less obvious role, too, than amphorae, for example. The repertoire, as far as it can be read from the few existing fragments, is fully in keeping with what is known about the terra sigillata industries of the later Hellenistic through Roman periods, using mostly open shapes, and some closed ones as well. For the latter, however, precise form parallels are

25 VYSOTSKAJA 1979, 111 mentions the excavations of kilns at Gorodishe Krasnoe and at Neapolis.

26 With regards to the picture of pottery types and their distribution some observations can be made. A perusal of the illustration material in Dashevskaya 1991, passim displays the materials arranged by the various geographical regions of the Crimea, central Crimea, north western Crimea etc. Some slight typological difference seems apparent in the coarse ware materials, but without autopsy any further assessment needs to wait.

27 Noticeable, for example, is the absence of handmade ceramics with applied surface ornamentation, which, according to VYSOTSKAJA 1979, 109 (see also fig. 41, p. 108) were widespread in the Crimea during the first centuries CE.

28 And, with an eye towards the history of scholarship and the training the authors have received, one is trained to recognize such things more quickly and – horribile dictu – to imbue them with an automatic and higher value.
difficult to determine. Fine wares reflect how the Crimea, in particular Neapolis, participated in the exchange of ceramic goods during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Open remains the questions whether local factories may have played a major role.

Both amphorae and fine ware have in common, however, that they provide chronological benchmarks by means of their specific and typological precise ways of manufacture. Due to their nature of preservation, though, the amphorae fragments found deliver only general indications of chronological periods, all the more, as one of the most precise dating instrument, amphora stamps, has not been found. On the other hand, the shapes of the handles, rims and feet place the finds within certain periods.

The piece-meal nature of the amphora fragments did not invite a closer study as to the various manufacturing places, but it appears that the amphorae mostly came from places in the eastern Pontic region, especially the cities of the Crimea and the Caucasus shores. Some others appear to have been brought from further afield. The amphorae demonstrate how the settlement at Neapolis had widespread contacts throughout the Pontic sea region and possibly even further afield.

Summary: IUTRIAL, general remarks

Quite clearly, the area where IUTRIAL was sunk has been one of intense, if discontinuous, activity in antiquity, an urban space built and rebuilt many times. At least six phases can be distinguished in segments A and B, and another six (perhaps completely unrelated to the first) in segments D and E. Of the six phases in each area, four correspond to building episodes, the remainder to times of abandonment. To this correspond four principal phases of ceramic chronology, encompassing 1. Turf, 2. Deposit M, both East and West, 3. Deposit Δelta and 4. Deposit K and C Horizon as well as Unit D7. This phasing reflects probably poorly the life of the people at the site, but it gives some impression of their lively activities which kept them attending to their daily needs in a multitude of ways.

Floors probably mark moments when the area was enclosed, covered rooms; they were carefully constructed to a uniform thickness (ca. 5 cm.) with select, freshly excavated earth, originating in an area beyond the inhabited space of Neapolis (note that very few, if any, artefacts were embedded in them). To extend to which such moments correspond to historical events eludes us right now. But the shifting from the Scythian to a Sarmatian population, for example, is probably reflected here.

Foundations of walls were built with locally outcropping limestone. It is impossible to tell at this time to what sort of buildings those foundations belonged, and the same holds for the intriguingly massive feature Wall I, the concentration of large boulders in segment A. The approximately uniform orientation of the stone foundations, enduring through time, also is intriguing; it is suggestive of «close quarters», an area of continuously dense habitation in the urban core of Neapolis – if not of a regular city design. It may well have been that in the enormous size of the plateau – the «mesa» – at Simferopol-Neapolis a system of cohabitation and cooperation existed which – while maybe drawing on models of Greek cities – was adapted to serve the need of the local population, long familiar with the land and the climate.

29 See the two maps Vysotskaja 1979, 146 fig. 70 (Hellenistic times) and 149 fig. 71 (Roman times) with which the author illustrates her view of the trans-oceanic relations of Neapolis.
Measurements are given in centimetres unless otherwise indicated. When no diameter is given it was not defined.

**Turf**  
(Units: A–E1, A2, BC2, D2, E2)

**Fine ware – open shapes (fig. 13)**

1. Dish  
H. 1.4.  
Lip of a terra sigillata plate. Rim projecting outward in shallow angle, widely rounded, underside straight. 2.5YR \(5/7.5\); A–2/3, glaze thin, reddish orange, slightly worn. (A2)  
Compare to [Dashevskaya 1991](#), pl. 35, 6.20–21.

2. Bowl or dish with high rim  
H. max. 1.5.  
Rim fr. of small red slip bowl. Rounded lip, steep wall, shallow groove on outside. Terra sigillata red, glaze worn. 2.5YR \(6/8\); A–B/3 (A–E1).  
Compare to [Dashevskaya 1991](#), pl. 35, 7.9; also pl. 35, 6.20–21.

3. Bowl with incurring rim  
H. max. 1.35.  
Wall fr. Yellow slip inside and out. On the outside a double frieze of rouletting: on top a series of slanted, slender lance-tip like impressions, below a shallower broader rouletting. 2.5YR \(6/8\); A/3. (A–E)  
Cf. possibly [Dashevskaya 1991](#), pl. 35, 7–9.

4. Skyphos  
H. 3.5; L. thumb-rest 2.2.  
Handle. External curve of lip visible. Wide curve, handle pentagonal in section with high central ridge. The top thumb-plate oblong hour-glass (rounded, not angular) stamped into it a faint ridge. The top thumb-plate oblong hour-glass. 2.5YR \(7.5/3\); A–2/3. The glaze is thin, reddish-brown, slightly worn. (A2)  
Compare: [Knipovič 1952](#), 315 fig. 9.5: ca. 1st c. BCE / 1st c. CE; similar also the glazed version: [Dashevskaya 1991](#), pl. 33, 1.

5. Skyphos (?) , not illustrated  
L. max. 2.5; D. ca. 1.5.  
Handle fr. round in section. Part of handle root with smear mark from attachment process. Traces of red, thin wash-glaze visible. 10YR–7.5; A#–1/2.  
Red-brown glaze, brush-marks. (D2)  
Possible from a similar vessel as 4.

6. Skyphos or bowl (?) with vertical rim  
H. max. 1.35; D. ca. 12–15.  
Rim fr. Sharp, evenly rounded, narrow rim, tapering towards lip which is tightly rounded. On exterior, close under lip, fine groove. Surface uneven, pitted, but traces of reddish colour still visible. 7.5YR \(6.5/3\); A–1/2, with surface treated. Thin, red-brown surface wash, as undercoat for terra sigillata red, one small speck preserved. (D2)  
Possibly similar to [Dashevskaya 1991](#), pl. 35, 16–17.

7. Cup or bowl with flaring rim  
H. max. 2.65; D. est. 10–12.  
Rim fr. Lip evenly rounded with sharp edge on exterior. 10R \(6/8\); B–1/2. Surface treated with thin reddish-brown slip. Thicker, dark-brown glaze with fine whitish chalk-like points breaking through the surface. (D2)  
Compare to [Dashevskaya 1991](#), pl. 35, 6.20–21.

8. Bowl with incurving rim  
H. max. 2.5; D. ca. 12–15.  
Rim fr. Wall of even thickness, lip even rounded on top. Reddish-orange terra sigillata glaze, densely applied with drip-traces and finger marks from smoothing. 2.5YR \(8/6\); A–1/2. (E2)  
Compare: [Knipovič 1952](#), 315 fig. 11.3–4, ca. 1st c. BCE / 1st c. CE; [Hayes 1972](#), 49–51 fig. 8 Form 27: ca. 160–220 CE; [Dashevskaya 1991](#), pl. 35, 7.9; also pl. 57, 17 with lip slightly thickened; For the shape see also the terra sigillata types: [Vysotskaja 1979](#), fig. 66, 13.

9. Bowl with incurving rim  
H. max. 2.2.  
Wall fr. Similar to 8. Wall thickening in up-curve. Reddish-orange terra sigillata glaze, densely applied with finger marks from smoothing, overall worn. 2.5YR \(8/5\); A–1/2. (E2)  
Cf. above 8.

**Fine ware – closed shapes (fig. 13)**

10. Jar / Jug / Oinochoe  
H. max. 2.1; D. ca. 5.0–7.0.  
Foot fr. Ring foot, exterior twice carinated, interior in convex curve rising towards floor. Underside floor set off by groove, sagging slightly. Wall rising under ca. 45°; barely curved. Traces of red, thin wash-glaze, both on exterior and interior of foot and on outside wall. Interior body unglazed. 2.5YR \(6/8\); A–2/3; very dense. Light red-brown glaze, brush-marks. (D2)  
For the shape see: [Knipovič 1929](#), pl. III, 41–42; [Dashevskaya 1991](#), pl. 35, 28.30.32.

11. Oinochoe or bottle (lekythos), not illustrated  
L. max. 8.1.  
Two joining wall fr. Probably oinochoe. Segment of prominently bulging wall. Interior with pronounced ridges. Exterior: lower section reserved – lower portion of foot – above wall covered with evenly applied black glaze. The colour is black to dark-brown with brown undertones. Slightly metallic sheen throughout, matt in reflection. 3.75YR \(6/8\); A–2/3. (D2)  
The glaze is applied with a brush; along the lower edge a finer, light brown line indicates the brush’s side. The evenness of the application, too, attests to this.
Fig. 13: Turf – Fine wares. (M 1:3)

12 Oinochoe or bottle (lekythos), not illustrated
L. max. 5.0.
Wall fr. Probably oinochoe. Segment of central body. Interior with pronounced ridges. Exterior with light reddish-brown glaze, worn. Across the wall two parallel shallow grooves, carefully applied. 5YR 7.5/6; A–2/3. (D2)

13 Jug/pitcher (?)
L. max. 6.5.
Two joining fr. Probably jug with carinated shoulder area. 5YR 7/5; B–C/3 with some inclusions of grog. Fox-brown, thin glaze. (A2)
Possibly from oinochoes such as Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 35, 30 which seems to stand in the tradition of the Hellenistic lagynos bottle.

14 Lagynos (?), not illustrated
L. max. 4.5.
Lower wall fr. Lagynos (?) or related vessel shape. Interior with careless ridges. Exterior carefully smoothed and in part covered with red-orange irregularly outlined glaze. 5YR 5/6; B–C/3 with some inclusions of grog. Fox-brown, thin glaze. (A2)
Cf. above 13.

15 Oinochoe/pitcher
L. max. 4.8.
Upper body-lower shoulder area wall-fr. Gentle, full curve. Egg-shell thin wall, very hard firing. Interior with pronounced ridges. Exterior with high sheen. Medium brown surface colour, with darker brown to black even stripes, banding the whole surviving fr. 2.5YR 5/6; A–3, glaze thin, red-brown, slightly worn. (BC2)
 Rounded shoulder fr. indicating a vessel such as Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 35, 23 or 32.

16 Oinochoe
L. max. 5.8.
Lower wall fr. Probably fairly large oinochoe. The wall rises swiftly, bulging outwards slightly in lower third of body below widest diameter. Interior with pronounced ridges, some also on exterior.
Exterior: lower section with light fox, reddish-brown slip. Portion above covered with brushed on brown-black glaze with clouding in spots. Slightly metallic sheen throughout, matted in reflection, some scaling apparent. 2.5YR 6/8; A–2/3. (E2)
The glaze is applied with a brush; along the lower edge a finer, light brown line indicates the brush’s side. The evenness of the application, too, attests to this.

Plain ware – open shapes (fig. 14)

17 Basin or lekane
L. max. 5.3; H. 2.6; D. 38.
Rim fr. Rim flat, broad with a gentle groove running in the centre, slight moulding at ext. edge. Outer edge recessed under 45 degrees, edge slightly undercut ending against gutter shaped groove. Slight ridge at beginning of wall, no traces of latter preserved, but the interior curve of rim suggested a gently bulging, rather steep (vertical) wall. 10R 5.5/1; H/1–2 in layers, small inclusions. Red-brown slip, grainy surface. (A2)

Plain Ware – closed shapes (fig. 14)

18 Jug/pitcher
H. max. 3.0.
Neck fr. Rising upwards, gently inclined. The thickness of the wall and the circumference of the neck point out that the fr. belonged to a household pitcher or jug. Traces of finger smoothing on exterior. D/2–3; 2.5YR 6/8. (D2)

19 Amphora
H. max. 4.3; D. of mouth ca. 12.
Rim. Wide curve. Evenly rounded on top, wall thinning below. Low ridge at exterior. 2.5YR 5/7; H/2–3. (A2)
Cf. Zeest 1960, pl. 90.

20 Amphora
H. 3; D. 10.
Rim fr. Lip bulging outwards, thickened in interior. Wall tapering evenly below. Slight ridge
on top of neck, finger marks. Reddish brown slip. 2.5YR 5/8; D–E/2. (A2)

20A Amphora (from the same vessel)
D. max 4.2 by ca. 2.2;
Handle fr. Straight segment, compressed ovoid in section. (A2)
Possibly Thasos? cf. LOMTADZE – ŽURAVLEV 2014, handle-section(s) p. 179 fig. 3, 2.3, 3rd c BCE.

21 Amphora
Th. 2.8; W. 4.4.
Handle fr. Segment of neck attachment with top-curve. Broad ovoid shape with two pronounced ridges on one side. 2.5YR 5/8; D–E/2, very similar to that of 20 and 20A. (A2)

22 Amphora
Th. 2.0; D. 3.2.
Handle fr. Segment beginning with remnants of handle root and part of top-curve. Broad ovoid shape with five ridges, central one slightly pronounced. 2.5YR 4.5/7; E/2. (A2)
Cf. ZEEST 1960, 166 pl. 30, 72a, 73e: 2nd–3rd c. CE; DASHEVSKAYA 1991, pl. 28, 19: 2nd–3rd c. CE.
Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 7.5.
Neck and handle fr. Rather narrow neck, handle rounded ovoid, smooth. 7.5YR 4.5/6; E–F/2. (A2)

Amphora
Th. 2; W. 4.4.
Handle fr. Handle flattened ovoid, large ridge slightly off-centre, broad groove concave and wider, other side gently convex. Overall section asymmetrical. 5YR 7.5/4; E–F/2. (A2)

Amphora
D. ca. 2.2.
Handle fr., central portion. Handle round in section. 10R 5.5/4; C–D/2–3. Clay rather gritty, with some very large inclusions /2–3. (A2)

Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 8.
Two joining lower wall fr. Segment with carination on exterior and carination. 2.5YR 3.7/5; C–D/2–3. (A2)

Amphora
H. 5.9; D. mouth 9; Handle: Th. 2.2; W. ca. 5.5.
Rim fr. and handle root. Lip narrow, flattened on top, groove on interior side. Handle pulled close to rim underside, rim area wall thinner than rest of neck. Interior lip set off by low moulding, wall vertically down to a low ledge. There clay shaped into small rounded protrusions, set off by well-scalloped divisions. Neck curving inwards and thickened. Handle broadly oval in section, gently upwards curved. 2.5YR 4.5/8; E–F/2 with numerous inclusions and mica. (BC2)

Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 4.1; D. mouth 9; Handle: Th. 2.2; W. ca. 5.5.
Rim fr. and handle root. Lip narrow, flattened on top, groove on interior side. Handle pulled close to rim underside, rim area wall thinner than rest of neck. Interior lip set off by low moulding, wall vertically down to a low ledge. There clay shaped into small rounded protrusions, set off by well-scalloped divisions. Neck curving inwards and thickened. Handle broadly oval in section, gently upwards curved. 2.5YR 4.5/8; E–F/2 with numerous inclusions and mica. (BC2)

Amphora
H. max. 2.5; D. mouth ca. 16.
Rim fr. Exterior sharply, moulding-like projecting, ledge undercut with half-round groove. Lip fairly low, broadly rounded, continuing evenly into shoulder. Clays rather gritty, with large inclusions. 5YR 1.5/6; C–D/3, rather tight clay body with some inclusions /2–3. (BC2)
into interior. Traces of dark reddish brown slip. E–F/1–2; 5YR 7/6.5. (D2)

40 Amphora
H. max. 2.8; D. 18.
Rim fr. Exterior evenly curving upwards to tightly turned lip. Interior lip with femn smoothed, portion below gently convex. Lip set off by small groove below. Traces of a rather dense, dark brown-reddish glaze on interior and exterior. E/2; 2.5YR/5.5/7 with inclusions. (D2)

Zeest 1960, 166 pl. 30, 73s: 2nd–3rd c. CE.

41 Amphora
H. max. 4.8; D. 11.
Rim fr. Top of neck slightly bulging. Lip shallow, but sharply set off with undercut below. Exterior evenly curving upwards to tightly turned lip. Interior lip with femn smoothed, portion below gently convex. Lip set off by small groove below. Traces of a rather dense, dark brown-reddish glaze on interior and exterior. E–F/1–2; 10R/2.5YR 6/8 with inclusions, gritty structure. (D2)

42 Amphora, not illustrated
H. max. 5.5.
Neck fr. Gently curving upwards, three grooves pressed into exterior. Traces of a slightly grainy reddish-brown glaze on interior and exterior. E–F/2–3; 1.5YR 6/8 with whitish inclusions, gritty structure. (D2)

43 Amphora, not illustrated
H. max. 3.5.
Shoulder fr. Gently rising, three grooves very similar to 42. Traces of a whitish slip. Possibly from same vessel as above? E–F/2–3; 2.5YR 6/8 with inclusions, gritty structure. (D2)

44 Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 14.2; D. shoulder ca. 30+.
Shoulder fr. Body portion rising steeply, pronounced carination under shoulder, a second one at the top of the handle root. Wall thinner below, thickened in shoulder region. Root of a broad, flat-oval handle preserved, rising slightly outwards inclined. Traces of a slightly grainy reddish fox-brown wash in mottled patches over the surface. E–F#/1–2; 2.5YR 6/8 exterior, 10R 6/8 in interior (shoulder region), body with whitish and grog inclusions throughout, some over 0.25 mm. (D2)

45 Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 5.
Shoulder fr. from transition to neck, ascending gently. Three precise grooves on shoulder preserved, as is whitish engobe throughout. Character of grooves similar to (D2) with one side sharply cut in, the other ascending more slowly. E–F#/1–2; 2.5YR 5.75/7.5 with whitish inclusions. (D2)

46 Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 4.9.
Shoulder fr. from transition to neck, ascending gently. Three precise grooves on shoulder preserved, as is whitish engobe throughout.

47 Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 6.8; H. pres. 4.1.
Wall fr., steep ascend. Three wide and deep grooves preserved, as is whitish engobe throughout. Grooves regularly undulated, wall relative thin. E–F/1–2; 2.5YR 6/5.4. (D2)

48 Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 7; H. pres. 4.1.
Wall fr., steep ascent. Three wide, shallow grooves preserved with flat rounded tops in between. Whitish-cream engobe throughout. Wall relatively thin. E–F/1–2; 10R 8/4.5. (D2)

49 Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 4.9; H. pres. 3.4.
Wall fr., steep ascent. Two wide grooves preserved, as is whitish engobe throughout. Grooves regularly undulated, lower than previous. Wall thin. E–F/1–2; 2.5YR 7/5.5. Evenly interspersed grog. (D2)

50 Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 6.9; H. pres. 5.6.
Wall fr., steep ascent, beginning of shoulder bend. Two narrow grooves preserved, light reddish-brown slip on exterior. E–F/1–2; 2.5YR 7/6. Evenly interspersed grog, rather small inclusions. (D2)

51 Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 7.8; H. 3.7.
Wall fr., steep ascent, off-set moulding at shoulder bend. Ivory-yellow slip on exterior. E–F/1–2; 2.5YR 7/6. Evenly interspersed grog, rather small inclusions. (D2)

52 Amphora
H. max. 7.5; D. 17.
Rim fr. Exterior steeply rising, wall gently curved. Lip thickened inwards, slight outcropping on exterior. 5YR 5/7; E–F/2 with inclusions. (E2)

53 Conical bowl
H. 11.3; D. lip 18; D. foot 10.2.
The majority of the fr. comes from the uppermost unit A–E, one joining rim fr. comes from unit A2. Full profile. Handmade. The flat base is hollowed underneath. The foot area is marked on the outside by a small vertical stretch. Above it the wall rises steeply, bulging out slightly. It thickens towards the shoulder, and becomes thinner again at the lip. The latter is flattened, otherwise unpronounced. The clay is coarse with small inclusions of minerals, and on the outside it is gently burnished, leaving a slight reflection in some spots still. The interior is rougher, with some ridges from the building up still visible. 2.5YR 2.75/0; H–J#/1–2 (A–E1; A2).
Cf. Kruglikova 1970, 29 fig. 21, 10; the similar bowl Vysotskaja 1979, 101 fig. 34, 23 is placed in the Hellenistic period. The overall proportions seem to indicate a different time of manufacturing. In her discussion of later pottery in Vysotskaja 1979 passim, this type does not seem to have received attention. Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 16, 15–16. 20
Fig. 15: Turf – Coarse wares. (M 1 : 3)
depicts bowls of the same type, but somewhat heavier in their make from the central Crimea, dating 2nd–3rd c. CE. Samples from the northwestern Crimea ibid. pl. 24 nos. 1–2 are closer in their formal specifics. These too, are dated 2nd–3rd c. CE.

54 Conical bowl
H. 3.6; D. lip n.a.; D. foot ca. 12.
Floor and lower wall profile. Handmade. Very similar to no. 53, but larger. Base is hollowed underneath. The foot area is marked on the outside by a small bulge. 2.5YR 2.75/2; H–J#/1–2. (A2)

55 Conical bowl
H. 11.3; D. lip n.a.; D. foot 10.
Floor and lower wall profile. Handmade. Very similar to previous. The flat base is hollowed underneath. The foot area is marked on the outside by a small bulge. 10R 1/3.5; H#/1–2. (A2 16)

56 Shallow plate
H. pres. 1.6; L. max: 3.4; D. ca. 21.
Rim / wall fr. Rim rising gently towards lip, latter slightly outwards bulging, flattened on top, rounded within. Highly burnished with strokes of fine modelling implement on both exterior and interior. Top of lip also buffed. J/1–2; 2.5YR 2.5/0. Coarse clay body, remnants of organic inclusions. (D2)

Cf. VYSOTSKAJA 1979, 101 fig. 34, 22, second from right: Hellenistic period.

57 Bowl
H. pres. 2.8; L. max. 2.8; D. 22.
Lip / wall fr. Lip broad and rounded, curving on top, rounded within. Wall descending under 45°. Surface finger smoothed. 2.5YR 1/3.5; J/1–2. Coarse clay body, remnants of organic inclusions, inclusions through. Finger smoothed surface, brown surface slip. (D2)

Cf. VYSOTSKAJA 1979, 101 fig. 34, 22: Hellenistic period.

Coarse ware – closed shapes (figs. 15–16)

58 Jug / vessel, not illustrated
Measurements n. a.
62 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 3.3; L. max. 3.6; D. ca. 30.

63 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 3.3; L. max. 2.8; D. 20.
Rim fr. of a pot. Similar to preceding, but rim thinner and less even. Lip smoothed and compacted with straight edged instrument. Exterior curving out slightly, indicating joining with shoulder. Interior dark grey-black, exterior light grey to brownish cover. 2.5YR 5/0; J#/1–2. Very coarse clay body, remnants of organic inclusions. Finger-smoothed surface. (D2) Cf. 62.

64 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 4.6; L. max. 5.2; D. 25.

65 Collar-necked vessel, not illustrated
H. pres. 2.6; L. max. 2.35.
Rim fr. Rim flaring out gently, lip rounded, smoothed unevenly. Exterior curving towards joint with shoulder below. Finger-smoothed surface. Interior and exterior grey slip. 10R/2.5YR 0/3; J/1–2. Coarse clay body, with inclusions, some over 0.2 cm. Finger-smoothed surface with light buffing. (D2)

66 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 4.9; L. max. 3.6; D. 18.
Rim fr. Rim flaring out gently, lip rounded, smoothed unevenly. Exterior curving into shoulder below. Interior and exterior grey. 3.75YR 0/4.5–1/4.5; J/1–2. Evenly gritty clay body, with inclusions, some over 0.2. Finger-smoothed surface with light buffing and three irregular lines of burnishing. (D2)

67 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 2.2; L. max. 3.

68 Collar-necked vessel, not illustrated
H. pres. 2.3; L. max. 2.
Rim fr. Rim straight, lip rounded, smoothed unevenly. Interior and exterior light grey to brown slip. 2.5YR 7/4; J/1–2. Very gritty clay body, with inclusions and remnants of organic material. Finger-smoothed surface. (D2)

69 Pot or basin, not illustrated
H. pres. 2.85; L. max. 3.15.
Wall fr. A thick wall rising very steeply. In interior sharply off-set slightly undercut ridge, from there flares outwards what appears to be the rim. Exterior of wall curving out slowly. Interior and exterior light brown slip. 3.75YR 0–1/4; J/1–2. Very gritty clay body, with inclusions and remnants of organic material. Finger-smoothed surface. (D2)

70 Collar-necked vessel, not illustrated
H. pres. 6.15; L. max. 3.8.
Wall fr. of a pot or basin. A shoulder rising swiftly to beginning of rim. Interior and exterior with light grey cover. 5YR 2/3; J/1–2. Very gritty clay body, brittle, with inclusions throughout. Finger-smoothed surface. (D2)

71 Collar-necked vessel, not illustrated
H. pres. 6.15; L. max. 3.8.
Wall fr. of a large, round bellied pot. A shoulder rising swiftly into rim. Interior and exterior with light grey to brownish cover. 5YR 1.5/4.5; J/1–2. Gritty clay body, with inclusions throughout. Finger-smoothed surface. (D2)

72 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 3.1; D. ca. 20–22.
Fr. of vertical rim, widening slightly to top, rounded above. Interior wall vertical with light grey to brownish cover. 2.5YR 4/8; J/1–2. (A2) Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 24, 11: 2nd–3rd c. CE.

73 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 1.3; D. 16.
Fr. of vertical rim, lip rounded above. 2.5YR 5/8 to 4.5/2; J/1–2. (A2) Cf. Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 24, 8: 2nd–3rd c. CE.

74 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 3.2; D. 20.
Fr. of shoulder and vertical rim, the latter rising continuously from body. Lip narrow, slightly rounded, and projecting outwards. 5YR 5.5/3.5; J/2–3. (A2)

The term ‘collar-necked vessel’ describes such pots which have a clearly set-off rim area. The rim may stand vertical, flare outward or even be inclined inwards to a small degree. These vessels are always handmade, and their degree of typological precision varies considerably from that of wheel-made pottery. The definition is applied to a majority of fragments found in the trial trench, since this formal occurrence was apparently a very common one in the handmade ceramics of the Crimea through time. The individual body shapes of the vessels – which varied considerably in size – may have been very different.
Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 26, 2 or 13: both 2nd–3rd c. CE. Conceivably this was an open pot.

75 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 2.5; D. ca. 20.
Fr. of top of shoulder with continuous rim. Lip broad, well rounded on top. 5YR 2.75/1; J/2–3. (A2)

Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 29, 9: 2nd–3rd c. CE.

76 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 2.8.
Fr. of lip and handle of small pot or pitcher. Neck rising vertically, opening into trumpet-mouth. Lip flaring prominently, thickened and rounded throughout. Oval, compressed handle attached to lip, smoothed down and narrowed at attachment. 2.5YR 3/0; J/2–3. (A2)
Cf. Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 76, 12; pl. 21, 1: both 1st c. BCE–1st c. CE. Reflect the type, although our sample seems lighter and carefully made.

77 Collar-necked vessel (bowl?)
H. max. 3.2; D. ca. 18–20.
Fr. of thick, broadly flaring rim. Lip thickened, outer edge almost vertical. 2.5YR 2.75/0; J#/1–2. (A2)

78 Collar-necked vessel
L. max. 3.8.
Fr. of wall, gently rounded. Wall rather thin, surface well burnished with mottling from light brown-beige to black-brown. A pattern of converging lines, creating a triangular pattern, is engraved in the surface. 2.5YR 2.75/0; J#/1–2. (A2)
Vessels with such decoration are typical of the Kital-Koba (spelling) culture of the 7th through 6th c. BCE. This shard seems clearly intrusive into the topmost stratum of this trench, but it is another token for early activity at the site.

79 Collar-necked vessel (open pot?)
H. max. 2.3; D. foot ca. 11.
Fr. of base and beginning of wall. Base flat, slightly hollowed underneath, wall rising under approx. 45°. Vertical burnishing strokes on exterior, interior finger smoothed. Exterior with grey cover and interior with grey to brownish coloration. 2.5YR 3/0; H/1–2. Gritty clay body, with inclusions and organic remnants throughout. (D2)

80 Handle
D. 2.2; L. max. 6.
Fr. broken off on one side. It curves in a low arch, originally set horizontally against the vessel. It is irregular rounded-rectangular in section, finger smoothed, and well compacted. Exterior with light cinnamon-to-brown cover and interior with grey to brownish coloration. 10R 1/2.7; 5J/1–2. Gritty clay body, with inclusions and organic remnants throughout. (D2)
No specific type is indicated, but handles of this form are quite common in the repertoire of handmade ceramics of the 2nd–3rd c. CE in the Crimea, see for example Dashevskaya 1991, pls. 24–25. 27 passim.

81 Basin
H. max. 3.8; Th. ca. 1.
Wall fr. of large conical vessel, roughly formed, handbuilt. On the outside a sharp ridge runs around the vessel. Exterior with red-brown coloration, interior with grey to brownish coloration. 2.5YR 6/6; J/1–2. Very gritty clay body, with considerable inclusions and organic remnants throughout. (A2)

82 Basin
H. max. 3; Th. ca. 1.5.
Wall fr. of large conical vessel (or bowl?), roughly formed, handbuilt. At the top of the fr. the wall angles outwards, set-off by a sharp carination inside, a lesser curve on the exterior. 5YR 4.5/1; J/1–2. Gritty clay body, with considerable inclusions and organic remnants throughout. (D2)

83 Closed vessel
H. max. 4.5.
Shoulder, rising gently, breaking upwards sharply into rim. Exterior well burnished. 5YR 4/1; J#/1–2. (E2)

Deposit M West
(Units A3, B3, AB4, AB5)

Fine ware – open shapes (fig. 17)

84 Bowl with incurving rim (?), not illustrated
H. max. 2.
Wall fr. Wall splintered. Reddish-orange terra sigillata glaze, densely applied with brush marks from smoothing. 2.5YR 8/6; A–1/2. (B3)

85 Bowl or skyphos
H. max. 2.2; W. 2.6; D. lip 12.
Rim fr. Wall rising steeply under 45°. The exterior is even, the lip very narrow on top. In the interior it is thickened with a prominent, drop-shaped moulding undercut below. Exterior covered with dark-brown glaze, scaled in places, the interior is covered with a lighter terra sigillata red-brown. Lip worn, clay colour. 2.5YR 8/5.5; B/2–3. (AB4)
Distantly related the shape of: Hayes 1972, 46 fig. 7; 47 Form 23 type A: early to mid-2nd c. CE.

Fine ware – closed shapes (fig. 17)

86 Oinochoe
H. max. 4.3.
Neck fr. with beginning of a broad strap-handle’s root attachment. Fairly wide, conical shape with fine ridges on the exterior, interior with rougher finger marks. Surface covered with thin terra sigillata glaze. From top of mouth drops of brown glaze dripped down. B–C/3; 3.0YR 7/3.5. (A3)

87 Oinochoe or pitcher
L. max. 5.4.
Shoulder fr. of medium size vessel. Shoulder sloping slowly upwards, thin wall. Step sets off neck, which is wide and probably rather squat. Interior with light buff to greenish slip, exterior
mottled surface from light to dark brown in irregular patches of glaze. Slightly metallic sheen in spots. D/3; 3.75YR 3/5.5. (B3)
The shoulder form as well as the type of clay and the glaze with its irregular, often thin application strongly resemble late Hellenistic lagynoi from the Pontic basin and the Aegean. The exact form remains undetermined, and the date can range from the last two c. BCE to the early Imperial period. The place of manufacture remains undetermined, but may well be local.

**Plain ware – closed shapes (fig. 17)**

**88** Amphora
H. max. 4.
Rim fr. Lip integrated continuing evenly into neck. Traces of ivory light slip. E–F/2; 10R–2.5YR 8/5.5. (B3)

**89** Amphora
H. max. D. ca. 15–16.
Rim fr. Exterior evenly curving upwards to tightly turned lip. Interior lip with berm smoothed, portion below gently convex. Lip set off by small groove below. Traces of a rather dense, dark brown-reddish glaze on interior and exterior. E/I–2; 10YR/6/3; very highly condensed clay. (A3)
Zeest 1960, 159 pl. 23, 49b: 2nd c. BCE.

**90** Amphora
L. max. 5.6; W. 4.1; Th. max. 2.4.
Handle, central segment with portion of zenith curve. Section asymmetrical, basic shape oval. Off centre on top two ridges, one small, the other large. F/1–2; 7.5YR 7/5. (A3)
Cf. Vnukov 1988, 199 fig. 1 Type CIIA and CA: 1st c. BCE–early 1st c. CE.
Zeest 1960, 164 pl. 28, 64b: 1st c. BCE.

**91** Amphora
L. max. 6.9; W. 4.3; Th. max. 2.9.
Handle, central segment. Similar to 90. Section asymmetrical, basic shape oval. Next to centre on top two ridges, only slightly different in size. F/1–2; 7.5YR 7/6. (B3)
Zeest 1960, 164 pl. 28, 64b: 1st c. BCE.

**92** not given

**93** Hydria (?)
L. max. 6.9; D. 2.
Handle, about one third. The handle was part of a ›double barrel‹ handle, whose underside was flattened. Horizontally mounted. Surface covered with an ivory slip. F/I–2; 2.5YR 5/6. (AB4)

*Implement:*

**94** Clay roundel, not illustrated
D. max. 4.6; Th. 1.
A fr. of an amphora shoulder with the neck-shoulder joint apparent – was roughly cut into a circular shape. D/F/2–3; 2.0YR 5/7. (AB4)

**Coarse ware – open shapes (fig. 18)**

**95** Open vessel, not illustrated
H. max. 3.6; W. 3.
Wall fr., vessel possible conical in shape. Handmade. The fr. is burnished on both sides: The interior shows a grey colour with brownish undertones and slight undulation of the surface from the ceramic construction. The shiny exterior is highly burnished in a beige to fox-brown with burnish stripes, creating an irregular stroke pattern. Clay F/j/2; 2.5YR 6/3.5, very gritty but well compacted.
Among the finds from this trial trench this fr. represents probably the finest burnished pottery. The wall is rather thin and well built up; the pot could have served well in the table service of a household. The shape remains ambiguous, but a general conical form, possibly with an integrated lip, is assumed. The time period is most likely Hellenistic or the transitional period – 1st c. BCE–1st c. CE, when such wares, according to Vysotskaja31, were much more popular than later on.

**96** Large bowl
H. max. 6.5; D. ca. 19–20.

31 Vysotskaja 1979, 102, where she presents her view that at the beginning of the Christian era the quantity of burnished pottery went noticeably down in Neapolis, to be replaced by ›crude vessels, poorly smoothed over‹.
Fig. 18: Deposit M West – Coarse wares. (M 1 : 3)
Wall fr. of hemispherical, thick-walled bowl, curving evenly upwards. The rim turns inwards; the lip is flattened on top and slanted towards interior of bowl. 2.5YR 5/3; H–J/2, very coarse throughout. (AB5)

Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 13, 5.7: 1st c. BCE–1st c. CE.

97 Plate
H. max. 2.6; D. 16.
Rim fr. of widely spreading plate. Rim curving upwards lightly, exterior of lip off-set, top flattened and set off against interior with sharp edge. 2.5YR 3.75/0.5; H–J/2, very coarse throughout, but well compacted. (A3)
For a somewhat related dish see Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 13, 10: 1st c. BCE–1st c. CE.

Coarse ware – closed shapes (fig. 18)

99 Round bellied pot
H. max. 2.5; D. ca. 18.
Rim fr. of vessel with more or less vertical rim. Lip slightly thickened, flattened-round on top. 2.5YR 3/2; H–J/2. Very gritty clay body loose in structure. (B3)

100 Vessel
H. max. 3.2; W. 5; D. ca. 28.
Rim fr. (tureen?), vessel possible conical in shape. Handmade. Surface inside and out is rough and lightly compacted, finger marks. H–J/2; 2.5YR 5/8. Very gritty clay body loose in structure. (B3)
Cf. 99.

101 Vessel with collar neck
H. max. 3.9; L. max. 5.5; D. 16.
Rim fr., rising steeply. Lip thickened outwards. Surfaces inside and out rough and uneven. Smoothed, traces of a whitish slip. H–J/2; 5YR 6.5/6; clay with pores, coarse matter, and inclusions. (AB4)
Cf. Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 19 no.: 1st c. BCE–1st c. CE.

102 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 6; L. max. 7.1; D. 18.
Rim and wall, approximately half profile. Rounded shoulder, spheroidal body, shape of base unknown. Rim rising almost vertically, lip rounded. Exterior finger marks, compacted, grey to brown, some mottling. Interior with burnishing pattern, especially directly under lip. Grey-brown to light brown surface. 2.5YR 2.75/1; J#/1–2. Soft clay body, very coarse matter, some organic(?) inclusions. (AB4)
Cf. Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 19, 2; see also ibid. pl. 18, 2–3, all: 1st c. BCE–1st c. CE.

103 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 3.6; L. max. 4.3; D. 17.
Rim, similar to no. 102. Rim flaring lightly rounded. 2.5YR 2.75/2; J#/1–2. Soft clay body, very coarse matter, some organic(?) inclusions. (AB5)

104 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 3.6; L. max. 3.7; D. 20.
Rim, similar to no. 102. Rim flaring lightly rounded. Light burnishing of surface, compacted. Lip flattened, burnish marks. 2.5YR 2.75/2; J#/1–2. Soft clay body, very coarse matter, some organic(?) inclusions. (AB4)

105 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 2.9; L. max. 4.9; D. 16.
Rim, similar to no. 102. Rim flaring, lip lightly rounded. Interior with finger marks, compacted. Exterior finger-smoothed, brown to grey and black-soot, mottled. H#/1–2; 2.5YR 0/2.5. Coarse clay matter. (AB5)

106 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 2.6; L. max. 3.6; D. 16.
Rim, similar to preceding. Rim rather low, flaring, lip bent out and rounded. 5YR 5/6; H#/1–2. Sandy clay structure, fine inclusions. (B3)

107 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 3.2; L. max. 4.7; D. 15.
Rim fr. Rim vertical, lip thickened and slightly projecting, flattened on top. Interior nearly vertical. Bottom rim turning out into shoulder rise. Finger-smoothed surface, brown surface slip. 2.5YR 5/3; J/2. Coarse clay body, remnants of organic inclusions. (A3)

108 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 2.7; L. max. 2.5; D. 23.
Rim fr., vertical, lip thickened and slightly projecting, flattened on top. Interior nearly vertical. Bottom rim turning out into shoulder rise. 7.5YR 6.5/6; H/2. Finger-smoothed surface, brown surface slip. 2.5YR 5/3; J/2. Coarse clay body, remnants of organic inclusions. (A3)

109 Collar-necked vessel, not illustrated
H. max. 6; L. max. 7.1; D. 16.
Rim, rising almost vertically, concave, rising steeply. Lip narrow and ridged on top. Finger marks on exterior, interior compacted. 2.5YR 5/6; H/2. Clay body firm, inclusions of pebbles and grog. (A3)

Stone objects

110 Grindstone, not illustrated
L. max. 11.1; W. 5.3; Th. 3.5.
Hand-size grindstone, part of one side with corner broken off. The original shape was broadly drop-shaped, with the lower wider end fitting well inside the palm. Underside is flat, the narrower end blunted, as if used for hammering. The wider end is sloping some and overall rounded. Lime
incrustation over much of the surface. Hard sandstone. (DE4)

Deposit M – East

Fine ware – closed shapes (fig. 19)

111 Oinochoe
H. max. 3.9; L. max. 4.7; D. not defined.
Lower wall fr. Probably fairly large oinochoe. The wall rises swiftly, bulging outwards lightly in lower third of body below widest diameter. Interior with pronounced ridges, some also on exterior. Lower section with light fox, reddish brown slip. Portion above covered with brushed on brown-black glaze with clouding in spots. Slightly metallic sheen throughout, matt in reflection, some scaling apparent. 2.5YR 6/5.5; B/1–2. (DE4)

This fr. comes from a rather small vessel, probably a type of round bodied, narrow necked jar or lekythos. It most likely dates to the late Hellenistic period, and is of uncertain, probably local, i.e. Crimean, manufacture.

Cf. for possible shape Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 34, 7: 1st–1st c. CE.

Plain ware – closed shapes (fig. 19)

112 Amphora
H. max. 10.2; W. 7; D. mouth.
Neck and rim. Neck cylindrical, slightly bulging. Round, rolled and projecting lip, undercut by shallowne groove. A short distance below the lip a handle attachment. ‘Double-barrel’ handle of two rounded straps. 4.5YR 6/6; Clay F/2–3. The body is very gritty with large amounts of finely ground grog. (DE4)

Cf. Vnukov 1988, 199 fig. 1 Type CI: ca. 1st–early 2nd c. CE; Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 31, 1 (from Ust-Alemnskoje Gorodische) and 2 (from Alma-Kermen): 1st–3rd c. CE.

Coarse ware – open shapes (fig. 20)

115 Flat based vessel/jug(?)
H. pres. 4.6; W. 5.7; D. foot 9.
Base fr. Handmade. Base flat, exterior set off by small moulding. Underside almost flat, slightly uneven. Bottom rather thin, wall heavy, rising under ca. 45°, running almost straight. Slight undulation in the wall from coil-building. Clay 2.5YR 0/3.5; D&F/2. Coarse and uneven clay body with large pores and inclusions. (DE4)

Cf. Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 15, 8–9 (from Neapolis): 2nd–3rd c. CE.

Fig. 19: Deposit M East. (M : 3)
450 BCE; no. 342: ca. 470–460 BCE; no. 343: ca. 460–440 BCE; no. 440–425 BCE.

**Plain ware – closed shapes (fig. 20)**

117 Pitcher / Jug
H. max. 3.4; D. base 11.
Foot fr. Foot projecting, rounded with groove on outside. Narrow curved resting surface, underside evenly hollowed. Floor thin. Wall thick, rising steeply, set off by irregular ridge against foot. Buff wash. 9.0YR 5/7; C/2–3. (A6)
A general comparison can be made with such vessels as Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 54, 13 (from Neapolis, Mausoleum): 1st c. BCE–1st c. CE.

118 Amphora
H. max. 2.2; D. ca. 12.
Rim fr. neck bulging, slightly curving inwards. Lip rounded above, well moulded, sharply set off by undercutting. 10R/2.5YR 6/8; C–F/2. With inclusions, gritty structure. (A6)
Zeest 1960, 160 pl. 24, 52a (from Kos): 3rd–2nd c. BCE.

**Coarse ware – open shapes (fig. 20)**

119 Hemispherical bowl
H. max. 2.7; D. rim 21.
Rim fr., rising steeply, little curved. Handmade. Lip rounded-square in section, slight moulding on exterior. Burnished with vigorous strokes, creating a pattern of vertical-slanted ripples on the exterior. Lighter coloration on the lip and top of interior. H/2–3; 10R 1/2.5. (A6)
Cf. Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 11, 12. 15: 3rd–2nd c. BCE.

120 Hemispherical bowl, not illustrated
L. max. 9.9.

**Coarse ware – closed shapes (fig. 20)**

121 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 3.9; L. max: 10.4; D. mouth.
Vysotskaja 1979, 106 fig. 39, 12: ca. 1st c. CE.

122 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 3.4; L. max. 5; D. mouth ca. 14.
Rim fr., similar to preceding (A6) flaring widely in trumpet-mouth fashion. Handmade. Lip rounded, and little thickened underneath, smoothed
unevenly. Interior and exterior light grey to black, with mottled effect. 10R 0/3.5; H–J/2. Evenly gritty clay body, with inclusions. Finger-smoothed and compacted surface. (A6)

**Vysotskaja 1979,** 106 fig. 34, 6: Hellenistic period; **Dashevskaya 1991,** pl. 17, 7: 3rd–2nd c. BCE.

123 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 6.1; L. max. 4.1; D. mouth 10.
Rim and shoulder fr., rising evenly. Handmade. Lip thin and rounded on top smoothed unevenly. Wall thin. Exterior mottled fox-brown to black, the latter possible trace of fire. Finger smoothed and compacted surface. Interior grey. Clay body fired in two colours: exterior 2.5YR 5/5; interior 2.5YR 0/4.5; H–J/2. Evenly gritty clay body, with inclusions. (A6)

**Cf. Dashevskaya 1991,** pl. 12, 14: 1st c. BCE–1st c. CE.

124 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 8.5.
Shoulder fr., rising evenly. Handmade. Overall similar to no. 123. Wall thin. Exterior and interior grey to black. Wavy surfaces from coil-building. 10R 0/3.5; H–J/2. Evenly gritty clay body, with inclusions. Finger-smoothed surface. (A6)

**Stone objects (fig. 20)**

125 Grindstone
L. max. 3.2; W. 2.1; Th. 0.3.
A sliver like fr. of a grind implement of a dense stone. Surface evenly worked. The stone probably was hand-sized originally with corners evenly rounded. (A6)

---

**Deposit K and C Horizon**

(Units A7, A8)

**Plain ware – closed shapes (fig. 21)**

126 Amphora
H. max. 4.3; L. max. 5.5; D. mouth ca. 11.
Rim fr., neck vertical. Lip a round moulding, projecting prominently. 10R/2.5YR 6/8; C–F/2 with inclusions, gritty structure. (A7)

**Zeest 1960,** 160 pl. 24, 51a (from Kos): 3rd–2nd c. BCE.

127 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 3.4; L. max. 5.2; D. mouth 18.
Rim/shoulder fr., rising vertically, concave. Handmade. Lip slightly thickened and rounded, smoothed unevenly. Finger smoothed and compacted surface. Exterior black-grey to reddish brown, mottled, interior grey to brownish. 10R 0/3.5; H–J/1–2. Evenly gritty clay body, with inclusions. (A7)

**Cf. Dashevskaya 1991,** pl. 10, 11 (from Neapolis): 3rd–2nd c. BCE.

128 Among the body sherds of transport amphorae one large body lower segment shows traces of overfiring. The surface turned slightly vitreous and the wall began to buckle. It is uncertain, though, whether this is part of a still usable vessel or the remains of a firing mishap, executed on the acropolis of Neapolis.
128 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 2.4; L. max. 1.9.
Rim fr., rising vertically, gently concave. Handmade. Lip slightly thickened, flat-rounded, smoothed unevenly. Exterior black-grey, interior grey to brownish. 10R 0/3.5; H–J/1–2. Gritty clay body, with inclusions and pores. (A7)

129 Collar-necked vessel
H. 2.7; L. max. 2.4; D. (est.) 18.
Rim profile, flaring out widely. Handmade. Lip’s edge folded over in building process. Finger marks on the exterior, the interior patted with some finger traces. 2.5YR exterior 5/8 interior 3.5/0; H#/1–2. (A8)

130 Large collar-necked pot
L. max. 4.0; H. 3.3; D. (est.) 19.

131 Collar-necked pot
H. pres. 2.8; L. max. 2.9; D. ca. 20.
Very similar to preceding, but smaller. Handmade. Rim flaring more pronouncedly, lip thicker, moulded and projecting on exterior. Finger smoothed surface, brown surface slip. Finger striations on exterior and interior. 2.5YR 5/6 exterior, interior 2.5YR 5/0; H–J/2. Coarse, but rather compact clay body, remnants of organic inclusions. (A8)

132 Collar-necked vessel
H. max. 1.0.
Rim fr. Handmade. Rim flaring out, lip fully moulded and angling outwards. Grey to dark-grey surface inside and out. 2.5YR interior 2.5YR exterior 5/6 3/0; H–J/2. Coarse and gritty clay body, two layers separated from firing. (A8)

133 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 2.5; L. max. 3.4; D. ca. 16.
Rim / top of shoulder fr. Handmade. Rim leaning outwards a little, lip hardly emphasized. Top of lip undulating with small scalloped shape areas gauged out. Surface semi-burnished and finger compacted. Dark-grey brownish in colour inside and out. 2.5YR 5/6 exterior, interior 2.5YR 5/0; H–J/2. Coarse and gritty clay body, two layers separated from firing. Possible surface slip(?). (A8)

134 Collar-necked vessel
H. pres. 1.6; L. max. 5.1; D. foot 9.
Fr. of base and beginning of wall. Handmade. Base flat wall rising very steeply. Exterior with light reddish-brown cover, interior grey. H#/1–2; 3.75YR 5/0. Very gritty clay body, with inclusions throughout. (A8)

135 Round-bellied pot, not illustrated
H. pres. 2.7; L. max. 3.7.
Rim fr. Handmade. Rim flaring outwards. Lip as wide as wall, evenly rounded. Wall thin. Surface highly burnished with dense gloss, deep black. 2.5YR 5/6 exterior, interior 2.5YR 5/0; H–J/2. Coarse clay body, brittle, some layering. (E7)

Floor V
(Unit E7)

Plain ware – closed shapes (fig. 22)

136 Amphora
L. max. 7.5; H. handle 2.2; W. handle 3.8.
Handle fr., curved section. Handle oval-pointed in section. Clay with finely ground grog evenly inter-spaced. 5YR 8/4; C–D/2. (E7)

137 Amphora, not illustrated
L. max. 12.0.
Shoulder / wall fr. Evenly curved. Clay with frequent mica. Ivory slip on exterior. 5YR 6/4; C–D/1–2. (E7)

Coarse ware – closed shapes (fig. 22)

138 Round-bellied pot
H. pres. 10.3; L. max. 7.9; D. mouth 12.

In addition, body fr. of amphora is worth mentioning. It comes from the lower segment of an amphora body and is of a light brown clay carrying purple tint. A fair amount of mica is evident, as well as finely ground ceramic additions.
Rim and wall, full profile preserved to inward curve of base. Collar rim, vertical and gently concave. Lip rounded, smoothed unevenly. Interior dark in bottom area, brownish towards top, exterior soot-black. Finger marks on exterior, interior compacted, light buffing on top of lip. 10R/2.5YR 0/3; J/1–2. Coarse clay body, with inclusions. (E7)

For general typology compare Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 17, 2. 6: 3rd–2nd c. BCE.

Passa D7

**Fine ware – open shapes**

**Bowl / dish, not illustrated**

L. max. 4.0. Lower wall fr., spreading sideways. Wall rather thick. On exterior traces of terra sigillata, interior brownish-red slip. Clay fired unevenly, B/1–2; exterior 2.5YR 5/7, interior 2.5YR. Fine turning grooves on exterior. (D7)

The thickness of the wall points to a rather large bowl or plate, which dates probably from the Hellenistic period.

**Coarse ware – open shapes**

**Bowl, not illustrated**

H. 3.8; L. max. 6.4; D. ca. 30. Rim fr., rising steeply. Handmade, uneven. Lip wider, bulging inwards, raised at outer edge and rounded forward. Top undulating, exterior wall also uneven. H/1–2; exterior 2.5YR 5/6, interior 2.5YR 0/4. Buff, greyish yellow slip, surface carefully smoothed, possibly to emulate plain ware. (D7)

Cf. the bowls Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 10, 15, 16. 20 (all from Neapolis): 3rd–2nd c. BCE.

**Pitcher, not illustrated**

H. 1.4; L. max. 2.8; D. ca. 20. Handmade, uneven. Rim rising steeply, flaring out. Lip rounded inwards. Surface gritty, rough finger marks on exterior. Interior smoothed and compacted. 2.5YR 5/4.5; H/1–2. (D7)

Cf. Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 10, 22: 3rd–2nd c. BCE.

**Hemispherical bowl, not illustrated**

L. max. 8.5. Bottom fr. Evenly curved, thick wall. Handmade. Burnished with densely compacted interior surface, creating a mottling effect from slate-grey to grey-brown. Exterior well-polished and lightly burnished in brown to almost dark mottling effect. 2.5YR 3/1; H/1–2 I.T. (E8)

Cf. for a possible comparison: Dashevskaya 1991, pl. 11, 15: 3rd–2nd c. BCE.

**Deposit N**

(Unit E8)

**Deposit M: East**

In the soil debris of a mud-brick construction and waddle-and-daub came to light, partly still covered with carefully prepared white lime-plaster adhering to them. On several of these fr. impressions of wood or reed have been preserved, their D. ranges from 0.4 to more than 1.8 cm. The size of the wooden inserts lies in the range of ca. 1 to over more than 2 cm, but as unworked wood was used the variations of size seem to be considerable. Not enough has been preserved to gauge the frequency or the density of these insertion rods both length or crosswise. The thickness of the wall, too, eludes us at this point.
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Archaeological News and Projects
The ancient Hellenistic city of Maresha was the capital of Idumea and contains thousands of subterranean rooms. These chambers were filled approximately 2200 years ago with tons of debris that appears to have been dumped into them from the dwellings that once existed above them on the surface. During the course of the excavation we discovered that some of these rooms contained up to nine meters of unstratified debris. The fill includes pottery sherds, complete local and imported vessels, Greek and Aramaic ostraca, coins, jewelry, animal bones, amphora stamps, figurines as well as many bricks from the dwellings on the surface. These many finds detail the everyday life of the inhabitants of Maresha; a cosmopolitan city that included Idumeans, Nabateans, Arabs, Phoenicians, Judeans, along with many other ethnic groups.

While this lack of stratigraphy has limited our understanding of certain aspects of the city’s past, it has allowed for the »Dig for a Day« program of the Archaeological Seminars Institute to function here. The actual excavation work is carried out by people from around the world with no training who want to experience archaeology, first hand, and for a short period of time. This program allows people of all ages to dig and sift through unstratified fill, guided by professionals. Over 1,000,000 people have enjoyed the excitement of participating in this program whose fees have underwritten the entire excavation, including the processing of all of the finds, for the past 30 years. Due to the fact that all the excavation is underground, the site is cool and comfortable in the hot summer months and dry and warm (relative to the surface) in the winter months. In order to participate one must make a reservation at:

office@archesem.com – or – http://www.archesem.com/dig.asp

The excavations are undertaken on behalf of the Israel Antiquities Authority, funded by the Archaeological Seminars Institute, Jerusalem and directed by Ian Stern and Bernie Alpert.
The following excavation reports can be consulted:

- E. Ambar-Armon, Oil Lamps on Kernos Vessels from Maresha, Strata 28, 2010, 102–140
- I. Stern – B. Alpert, Tel Maresha: Subterranean Complex 1, Hadashot Arkheologiyot – *Exclsr* 126, 2014 (online)
- I. Stern, Subterranean Complex 147 at Maresha: the Construction Phases of the Columbarium, *‘Atiqot* 87, 2016, 37–48 (online)

Moldmade bowls; Photos by Gabi Laron.
The Ancient Pottery of Israel and Its Neighbors from the Iron Age through the Hellenistic Period

Seymour Gitin (ed.)

These two volumes, published in 2015 by the Israel Exploration Society, the W.F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, the Israel Antiquities Authority and the American Schools of Oriental Research, offer a comprehensive corpus of ceramic forms and their typological development organized according to period, geographical region, and cultural tradition. The focus of each chapter is on the most characteristic pottery types and decorative motifs selected from a wide range of sites.

Unique in scope, this publication presents a wide range of ceramic types accompanied by specially prepared pottery plates and colour photos illustrating thousands of forms. A classic reference work, it will serve as an essential resource for archaeologists and other scholars and students of ancient Near Eastern studies. Volumes covering the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods and Bronze Age are currently in preparation.

808 pages; 328 plates with 3,393 images; 34 colour photos illustrating 277 vessels; 27.6 x 21 cm; hard cover. ISBN 978-965-221-102-6. Price: $240 ($204 for IES members) + shipping: airmail to U.S. $46, airmail to Europe $28; surface mail to U.S. $17, surface mail to Europe $20
Unguentarium.
A terracotta vessel form and other related vessels in the Hellenistic, Roman and early Byzantine Mediterranean.
An international symposium

May 17-18, 2018 / Izmir, Turkey
with an excursion to Lesbos, Greece
on May 19-21, 2018

Venue
DESEM at the Rectorate Building of the Dokuz Eylül University (DEU)

Address
DESEM, D.E.Ü. Rektörlük Binasi, Cumhuriyet Bulvari No. 144, Alsancak, TR-35210 Izmir, Turkey.

Websites
https://independent.academia.edu/TheLydiaSymposium
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/The_Lydia_Symposium

Institutional organizer
EKVAM of the Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir

Contact
gulserenkan@hotmail.com or terracottas@deu.edu.tr

Logo illustration: A terracotta unguentarium in bulbous form from Kuşaklı Höyük-Sivas in central Anatolia (kindly provided by Prof. Andreas Müller Karpe in 2001).
The present work represents the concluding volume of the National Museum of Denmark’s research program ‹Pots, Potters, and Society in Ancient Greece›. The initiative, generously funded by the Foundation of Consul General Gösta Enbom, resulted in the publication of five volumes, four edited monographs (›Pottery in the Archaeological Record: Greece and Beyond‹,1 ›Red-figure Pottery in its Ancient Setting‹,2 ›The Transport Amphorae and Trade of Cyprus‹,3 and ›The Regional Production of Red-figure Pottery: Greece, Magna Graecia and Etruria‹4) and Lund’s ›A Study of the Circulation of Ceramics in Cyprus from the 3rd Century BC to the 3rd Century AD‹. The specialists called on to contribute to this research program have made a number of important contributions to the study of ancient pottery. Lund focuses on the Hellenistic and Roman pottery from Cyprus from the 3rd century BCE to 3rd century CE to, among other things, determine to what degree ancient ceramics are capable of »contributing to our knowledge of the history of ancient Cyprus – economic or otherwise«.5 The work is the first monograph devoted entirely to the Hellenistic and Roman pottery from the island, but also contributes to a growing trend among scholars of ancient Cyprus to harness a specific class of material culture to shed light on an ancient Cypriot population that had experienced political ruptures and reorganizations following the arrival of the Ptolemies and later the Romans.6

In Chapters 1 (›Introduction‹), 2 (›Hellenistic and Roman Cyprus: An Overview‹), 3 (›Prolegomena‹), 4 (›A Regional Approach‹), 5 (›Evidence for Kilns and Potters in Cyprus‹), and 6 (›Scientific Clay Analyses of Hellenistic and Roman Pottery from Cyprus‹), Lund outlines his aims and potential pitfalls, provides current states of research on topics central to his study, and defines key concepts. The author delineates and interprets a series of regional exchange networks by studying certain classics of pottery produced in Cyprus during the

5 P. 11.
Hellenistic and Roman periods. His ceramic datasets derive from three archaeological projects: Canadian Palaipaphos Survey Project directed by David W. Rupp and Lone Wriedt Sørensen, Akamas peninsula survey and excavations directed by Jane Fejfer and Hans Erik Mathiesen (excavation) and Peter Hayes (survey), and the excavations at Pangia Emathousa-Aradippou directed by Lone Wriedt Sørensen. The author focuses on specific fine ware, coarse ware, and plastic vessel classes from these sites, coupled with various museum holdings and other archaeological projects, to create a 1703-piece catalogue. In noting that there are no standard ceramic classification systems for Hellenistic and Roman pottery from Cyprus, a regional approach is employed to examine the implications of the »circulation of ceramic artefacts for our understanding of regionalism in Hellenistic and Roman Cyprus«. In essence, the author asks why ceramic artifacts are so distributed and then attempts to examine local level (up to 20 km from a given site) distribution and identify ceramic regions (an area with definable boundaries or characteristics). Following invaluable summations of the state of Hellenistic and Roman archaeology, evidence for kilns and potters, and scientific approaches to ceramic data specific to Cyprus, Lund begins his study.

In Chapter 7 (›Case Studies‹), Lund outlines 15 ceramic classes that are local to Cyprus and its environs: Palm-Leaf Ware, Lagynoi, West Slope Pottery, Colour-Coated Ware, Pink Powdery Ware, Matt Red Ware, Cruches Locales, Jugs with Gouged Decoration, Clay Lanterns, Conical Unguentaria, Frying Pan with a Folded Handle, The Skouriotissa Type Transport Amphora, Head Vases of the Magenta Group, Rattles in the Shape of a Pig, Zoomorphic Plastic Vases. The presence and distribution of these classes and their associated forms are plotted in Chapter 8 (›Beyond Distribution Patterns‹) to identify six ceramic regions with high proportions of certain pottery classes: western Cyprus, north-western Cyprus, north-eastern Cyprus, eastern Cyprus, southern Cyprus, and central Cyprus. The subsequent analysis indicates the differing nature of ceramic distribution on the island. For example, in the western Cyprus ceramic region, 82.9 % of the known vessels from the following ceramic categories are present: two forms of Lagynoi, Pink Powdery Ware, Cruches Locales, and the Frying Pan with Folded Handle. This specific pattern, as well as the rest of the identified ceramic regions, is further substantiated by the fact that »up to a third of the pottery that predominated in a given ceramic region was also distributed outside of it, and nearly always in one or more adjoining ceramic regions«. The remaining 17.1 % of the vessels consisting of the aforementioned western Cyprus forms are found in only one other ceramic region, north-western Cyprus. Therefore, it appears that western Cyprus in general was more restrictive and insular with regard to its ceramic distributions.

The eastern Cyprus ceramic region differs and is defined by 64.6 % of all known vessels from the following ceramic classes: two forms of lagynoi, Plain White Ware Jugs with Gouged Decoration, Clay Lanterns, Rattles in the Shape of a Pig, and Zoomorphic Plastic Vases. The remaining 35.4 % of these vessels are scattered across six other regions (north-eastern Cyprus [9.3 %], western Cyprus [9.3 %], south-eastern Cyprus [5.6 %], southern Cyprus [3.7 %], central Cyprus [3.7 %], northern and north-western Cyprus [1.9 % each]). The more cosmopolitan nature of eastern Cyprus, in stark comparison to western Cyprus, suggests a greater degree of connectivity and ceramic circulation within different ceramic regions. In interpreting the nature of this circulation, Lund first outlines four underlying assumptions before explaining the impetus for ceramic circulation. First, items mapped in the same fabric can be said to be from restricted sources. Second, items mapped in the same general style demonstrate where

7 P. 44.
8 Pp. 154–158.
9 P. 159.
10 Pp. 159–160.
types are in use, but is incapable of communicating the source of the type. Third, the number of find-sites and quantities of a specific type will decrease with distance from a production center. Finally, ceramic classes predominately found within their respective ceramic regions were their source areas. With these assumptions in place, the author argues that the circulation of the aforementioned ceramic classes in Cyprus was a result of trade.

In Chapter 9 (‘Cyprus and Her Closest Neighbors: A Ceramic Perspective’), the author compares the geographic distribution patterns of certain ceramic wares and vessels (Eastern Sigillata A, Cypriot Sigillata, Lead-Glazed pottery from Tarsus, Pinched-Handle amphora, Agora M 54 amphora, and clay sarcophagi) to »illuminate the relations between Cyprus and her nearest neighbors: Rough and Smooth Cilicia, and north-western Syria«. After identifying two ceramic zones in south central Turkey, western Rough Cilicia and Smooth Cilicia, the author argues that similarities among the percentages of occurrences for certain wares from the Rough Cilicia Survey and Anemurium (both in Rough Cilicia) with the Akamas Survey (western Cyprus) substantiate a link between the two areas in the Hellenistic and Roman times. Furthermore, the ceramic evidence also suggests a link between Smooth Cilicia and southern and south-eastern Cyprus. While in Chapter 10 (‘Long-Distance Exchanges Involving Cyprus’), Lund examines different ceramic artifacts and other materials (ivories, jewelry, etc.) to show further connections to Cyprus. The chapter does not carry the robust analysis of the previous chapter, but the analysis does demonstrate that Nea Paphos was the primary corridor to Hellenistic and Roman Cyprus.

Chapter 11 (‘Writing Economic History with Potsherds?’) consists of a series of summations that explore the economic implications of Lund’s Cypriot ceramic regions and their interconnectedness with themselves and areas farther afield. The author reiterates that pottery circulation within and between the aforementioned ceramic regions was a result of trade and produced for local and regional consumption. The author argues, ceramic diversity in Cyprus was greatest in the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, but imports, notably the introduction and eventual establishment of Eastern Sigillata A, eroded this diversity by the late 1st century BCE, as »pottery consumers in the Eastern Mediterranean turned increasingly towards imported ceramic fine wares with the consequence that local fine ware producers were apparently forced out of business«.

The present work represents a welcomed departure from more traditional ceramic studies that rarely move beyond typological classifications and subjective analyses of source areas. Although examinations of geographic distributions of specific forms and wares are not unique to Cyprus, Lund’s approach, outcome, and interpretation are novel. The author is quick to acknowledge the perils indicative of most ceramic analyses (i.e. pigeonholing ceramic types into established periodization schemes, lifecycle duration, visibility in the field and at the ceramicist’s table, archaeological coverage, etc.), but does not let these handcuff his research aims. The work’s greatest strength is Lund’s clear mastery of the ceramic evidence and its utilization in addressing local and regional links and interconnectedness.

There are few pitfalls present in this work. At times transitions between chapters are a little disjointed, whereby certain chapters, namely Chapters 5, 6, and to a lesser extent 10, would be better suited for the introduction or concluding discussions. The only real drawback this reviewer identified was the comparisons made between survey projects from Cyprus and south central Turkey presented in Chapter 9. Differing surveying methods, sampling strategies, collection strategies, research goals, preparation of respective ceramicists, and publication outcomes all make survey data comparison a notoriously difficult endeavor. The author’s geographic distributions of Eastern Sigillata A, Cypriot Sigillata, Lead-Glazed pottery from Tarsus, Pinched-Handle amphora, Agora M 54 amphora, and clay sarcophagi by raw
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figures do little to support his larger claims of ceramic links between Cilicia and Cyprus. The comparison of various wares’ »percentages of occurrences«, however does add credibility to and help reify these links.

Readers will find that Lund has produced a well-written work and an invaluable resource for scholars interested in Hellenistic and Roman Cyprus. Following nearly a century of continuous study, many of the dominant ceramic fine-ware industries of the eastern Mediterranean in the Hellenistic and Roman periods are now quite well understood with detailed shape typologies. Contemporary local Cypriot industries, however, make the ceramic record of Hellenistic and, to a slightly lesser extent, early Roman Cyprus difficult and at times outright ambiguous. A Study of the Circulation of Ceramics in Cyprus helps clarify this ambiguity and tasks ancient ceramics with contributing to a greater scholarly narrative, and for doing this, Lund has made a lasting scholarly contribution.
After decades of relative neglect so-called coarse wares have now emerged as a worthy focus of study in their own right and no longer merely as a relatively small (and often perfunctory) chapter in an excavation report. In particular, the study of cookwares has found its rightful place as a rich and endlessly rewarding field for archaeologists, ethno-archaeologists, ceramicists, historians and those in any way interested in the variety and evolution of cuisines across time and cultures. In fact, bearing in mind our fascination with the seemingly never-ending array of new cookery shows which emerge on prime-time television it is perhaps surprising that it has taken so long!

However, to combine some or most of these aforementioned areas into a substantial work on ancient cookware written by a single author (as opposed to an edited volume with multiple contributors) is by no means easy. In this regard Gloria London certainly can claim the necessary expertise. For more than thirty years London has been involved in a variety of archaeological and ethno-archaeological projects including surveys and fieldwork in the Sinai, Israel, and Jordan as well as working alongside traditional potters in the Philippines and, especially, Cyprus. It is her experiences in the mountain and lowland villages of this last country that underpin the first two parts of her book.

The book is divided into three main parts – Traditional Ceramics in the Levant and Cyprus (Part I); Ancient Manufacturing Techniques for Cookware (Part II); Cookware Through the Ages (Part III) – followed by a glossary and a bibliography of some twenty pages. All three parts are divided further into chapters that include a sub-section on archaeological implications (Parts I and II) and a brief summary (Parts I, II, III).

Each of these parts offers valuable insights with Part I (one hundred and thirty eight pages) providing a mine of information not generally collected within one volume. Thus within Part I are lumped together eleven chapters (1–11) which include ancient and modern data sources from Cyprus and the Levant; the deposits, traditional mining, preparation and manufacturing techniques for Cypriot clays; the preparation, processing, preservation and transporting of foods and, for good measure, a nine page discourse on the cleaning of clay pots. One could argue that chapter 9 (»Making Breads, Roasting Grains, and Cooking Other Food«) and chapter 10 (»Foods Processed, Preserved, Distilled, or Transported in Ceramics«) could have been assigned a separate part, but this is a minor quibble and, in my opinion, would go against the author’s desire to stress the essential unity between cookwares and the food itself. For any archaeologist who is involved with ceramics (as I am) there is much in Part I which is of real importance, none more so than chapter 7 (»Traditional Firing Techniques for Ceramics«) which emphasises the underlying difficulties in identifying ancient pottery workshops (particularly those for coarse wares) due to their frequent small scale and location in household courtyards, the often temporary nature of the firing structures, and the overall low rate of misfires or wasters (most of which are then utilised in other processes anyhow).
Interspersed throughout the book, particularly within Part I, are photographs (some dating back to the 1930s) that cover virtually the complete manufacturing process from the transport of clay from its sources through to the utilization of the pot itself in the cooking process.

Most of these images were taken in Cyprus including many from the author’s years of field work with Cypriot potters; a small selection (four in all) were gleaned from the archives of Joan du Plat Taylor, one of the leading figures in pre-World War II Cypriot archaeology, and provide a fascinating and nostalgic insight into the era of the scattered small village-based industry whose products were then displayed outside the workshops themselves or transported to nearby villages or towns on donkeys, carts or overloaded rickety buses (fig. 6.9). Not surprisingly, cafés and restaurants seem to have been the locations of choice for sale of these pots.

Part II is a much shorter section (twenty six pages) and looks at different aspects of the ancient clay cookware containers themselves including the rationale for their shape, clay bodies, and manufacturing techniques. As we also observe in Parts I and III, the text never strays far from a consideration of the foods and liquids being processed, cooked, or preserved within these containers and of the archaeological implications which flow from these processes.

Part III (one hundred and one pages) is essentially a survey of cookware throughout the ages from Neolithic to modern times. Any survey of ancient cookware throughout the ages in the Levant and Cyprus is bound to be relatively superficial in some areas (as this survey is) but, rather than emphasising the more subtle changes in form or fabric for their own sake, London is much more focussed on the ethno-archaeological questions of why and how these changes have come about and herein lies its value. This is clear from the concluding chapter (Chapter 22: »Implications of Ethnoarchaeological Studies for Ancient Cookware«) in which she anticipates those FAQs (frequently asked questions) often raised by archaeologists concerning both the characteristics of the pots themselves and those concerning »the industry in general«. In one or two paragraphs she deals with diverse queries such as (to name but a few): Why do pots have round bottoms? How did people cope with porous pot walls? Was cookware too mundane to be traded? How long does cookware last?

As London reminds us in the title, and emphasises throughout the book (e.g. Part I, Chapter 4) her work is a study of ancient cookware from the ethno-archaeological perspective. Not that she is unacquainted with the more scientific aspects of pottery studies, however, as is demonstrated by her lengthy chapter in Hesban 11. To do justice also in this book to the ever-widening field of ceramic analytical technology would result in an unwieldy tome of truly heroic proportions. Therefore this reviewer would suggest that one satisfactory compromise would be to refer both to London’s work and that of M. Spataro and A. Villing (eds.) with the latter (not included in London’s bibliography) offering sound contributions on materials analysis as well as socio-economic practices and other aspects of kitchen ceramics not (or only lightly) touched on by London. Noteworthy here is the very fine and exhaustive preface by the editors (»Investigating ceramics, cuisine and culture – past, present and future«) that should be required reading for any scholar entering the field of ancient cookware.

Written in an anecdotal style that, while resulting in a certain amount of repetition, further serves to emphasise London’s close involvement with her subject and relatively – but not completely – free from typographical errors (e.g. pages 22, 50, 51), this well-produced book will certainly prove a valuable and lasting resource for all those mentioned in the first paragraph of this review.


The excellent volume under review, presenting twenty-three papers and covering diverse periods, geographical regions, cultural and ethnic identities, is the fruit of the conference »Ceramics, cuisine and culture: the archaeology and science of kitchen pottery in the ancient Mediterranean world«, held at the British Museum in December 2010. It is a masterly interdisciplinary research volume with the participation of forty scholars, and the editors deserve our honest admiration and gratitude. After a comprehensive introduction by the editors (Chapter 1 – Investigating ceramics, cuisine and culture – past, present and future), referred to in John Tidmarsh’s review, the papers are grouped under three main headings – How to make a perfect cooking pot: technical choices between tradition and innovation (Part I); Lifting the lid on ancient cuisine: understanding cooking as socio-economic practice (Part II); New pots, new recipes? Changing tastes, culinary identities and cross-cultural encounters (Part III). The last paper is a postscript by Y. Kyriakopoulos on Aegean cooking pots in the modern era (1700–1950), followed by an index. Each paper is provided with an extensive bibliography.

It is impossible to do justice to all contributions and their wide range of topics discussed; hence the reviewer focusses on ceramics from the Hellenistic period. In Part I papers deal with cookware production and the role of raw materials in Greece and the Aegean (Chapter 2, I. Whitbread), Bronze Age cooking pots from Akrotiri, Thera (Chapter 3, N. S. Müller – V. Kilikoglou – P. M. Day), with models and simulations of heat transfer (Chapter 4, A. Hein – N. S. Müller – V. Kilikoglou), with four modern potters of cooking vessels on Mallorca (Chapter 5, P. M. Day – M. A. Cau Ontiveros – C. Mas Florit – N. S. Müller), with fabrics and manufacturing techniques at Aegina during the Bronze Age and the Archaic-Classical Period (Chapter 6, W. Gauss – G. Klebinder-Gauss – E. Kiriatzi – A. Pentedeka – M. Georgakopoulou) and with the evidence for four phases of patterns of production and consumption of cooking wares at Knossos in the Early Iron Age and Archaic periods (Chapter 7, J. Whitley – M.-C. Boileau). Chapter 8 by K. Winter-Jacobson surveys cookware manufacture on Hellenistic Cyprus. The analysis of archaeological data shows that in the Early Hellenistic period highly specialized though not heterogeneous fabrics were introduced, resulting in the production of thin-walled cooking vessels with probably quartz-tempered fabrics in urban centres by the late 3rd century. Such fabrics, already noted at Tel Anafa in Upper Galilee1, exhibit particular crack stability, as proven in experiments2.

In Part II seven papers discuss cooking as socio-economic practice. Based on work at the Mycenaean site of Mitrou in Central Greece, B. Lis (Chapter 9) wants to break a lance
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for increased interaction and exchange of ideas between various specialists when analyzing cookware. The analyses should comprise the study of morphological features like wide mouth, deep capacious form, stability and tripod cooking pots as well as the examination of assemblage and context and the study of specific forms in a diachronic perspective. Furthermore, archaeozoological, archaeobotanical and residue analyses contribute important information on food processing and culinary practices. Related topics are discussed in a paper on Late Minoan I cooking technology with the focus on the experimental aspect of cooking (Chapter 10, J. E. Morrison – C. Sofianou – T. M. Brogan – J. Alyounis – D. Mylona) and in a contribution on variegated residues present in Roman kitchen and other domestic vessels; for example, cooking pots from Late Roman Sagalassos contained high concentrations of saturated fatty acids in distributions indicative of animal products (Chapter 11, L. E. Cramp – R. P. Evershed). A. J. Donnelly (Chapter 12) offers insights into the function of cooking pots based on textual evidence from three authors of cookbooks, *Apicius*, *Vindiniarius* and *Anthimus*, each representing a different cultural background with Greco-Roman, Romano-Gothic and Frankish dietary preferences. E. Langridge-Noti (Chapter 13) explores the correlation of the evidence for food preparation and consumption in ancient Laconia, based on literary sources and archaeological evidence from Hellenistic Geraki. Noteworthy is the prevalent occurrence of a particular form of flat-bottomed pan with a single high-swung strap handle, likely to have been used for preparing flat bread and / or preparing an egg dish or perhaps a fish dish, although Geraki is far removed from any source of fish. While a typical component of cooking assemblages in Laconia, it is concluded that flat-bottomed pans are rare in the Greek world and more common in the Roman period. L. M. Banducci (Chapter 14) describes the ceramic stands in central Italy from the 1st millennium BCE and focusses on vessel morphology and thermal properties, cooking fuel and food preparation times. L. G. Meulemans (Chapter 15) documents the widespread consumption and breeding of the dormouse in Roman Italy, including pre-Roman finds and Greek and Roman literary references.

In Part III seven papers investigate kitchen vessels and customs of food preparation and consumption among different cultural and ethnic communities. In Chapter 16 S. I. Rotroff relates to the documentation of 450 cooking vessels from the Athenian Agora, covering the time span from ca. 1050 BCE to the end of the 1st millennium BCE. Two primary forms are recorded: first, a deep and capacious closed pot, at first flat-bottomed and jug-like (termed cooking jug) and later round-bottomed (the chytra); second, a shallower more open vessel (the lopas). A third less common vessel is a wide shallow flat-bottomed pan, attested in the second half of the millennium. Chytrai were in use throughout the millennium and the only form during the first half. The statistical evidence revealed that in the second half chytrai were nearly twice as numerous as lopades and more than four times as numerous as pans. The cooking jug had disappeared by the early 6th century and by that time must have been replaced by the round-bottomed Aeginetan chytra, subsequently imitated by Athenian potters. During the Hellenistic period a greater variety of chytrai, lopades and pans were manufactured, and imported flat-bottomed dishes from Asia Minor and Italy occur.

A.-M. Curé (Chapter 17) presents the evidence for the introduction of Mediterranean-type cookware in southern Gaul (6th to 3rd centuries BCE), and A. Quercia (Chapter 18) deals with cookware in southern Italy (8th to 3rd centuries BCE). The Roman period is represented by a paper on the cuisine in Roman Tuscany (Chapter 19, G. Schörner) and on the adoption of Roman culinary practices by the indigenous population at Castro do Vieito in northwestern Iberia (Chapter 20, A. J. Marques da Silva). In two papers on kitchen pottery, the first from the
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3 The exceptions mentioned in the paper comprise a single specimen from the Athenian Agora from a Late Hellenistic—Early Roman context (S. I. Rotroff, *Hellenistic Pottery. The Plain Wares, Agora 33* [Princeton, N 2006] 186. 315 no. 675) and pans from Paphos with a date from the 2nd century BCE onwards (J. W. Hayes, *The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery, Paphos 3* [Nicosia 1991] 81–82). However, in the Athenian cookware production flat-bottomed pans are recorded from the mid-first millennium onwards, albeit without the high-swung handle (see chapter 16, figs. 16. 3 and 16. 6–8 of the volume under review).
southern Levant during the Bronze Age, the Iron Age and the Early Islamic period (Chapter 21, A. Fantalkin), the second from Iron Age Cyprus (Chapter 22, S. Fourrier), the authors present diachronic perspectives.

All told, this volume presents the reader with a chock-full of varied archaeological data, discussions, interpretations and questions relating to ancient cookware and culinary practices. Well-illustrated with colour photos, drawings, diagrams, thin-sections and maps it is a true treasure-trove and an invaluable research tool for every ceramist and anthropologist and in particular a trend-setting stimulation for young scholars.
James C. R. Gill, Dakhleh Oasis and the Western Desert of Egypt under the Ptolemites
Dakhleh Oasis Project Monograph 17
504 pages, numerous colour and b&w illustrations, maps
ISBN 9781785701351

Review by Andrea M. Berlin

James Gill’s 2016 monograph, a lightly modified version of his 2014 PhD thesis, is a terrific example of how to write history from material evidence. His accomplishment is all the more impressive because the evidence in question is pottery derived from excavation and survey, which – as readers of this journal know well – comprises perhaps the most messy, intractable type of material evidence available. In this review article I will first broadcast Gill’s big historical conclusions right up front (for the benefit of any ancient historians sufficiently enlightened to be reading this publication). I will then provide a kind of long-form summary of the evidence he has painstakingly amassed to build his case – and, in the process, take him a little bit to task for the way in which he presents this evidence because it creates unnecessary difficulties for anybody wanting to use this book as a guide. I will close by laying out the full array of Gill’s conclusions regarding Ptolemaic policies and activities in the Western Desert, as these insights are truly outstanding contributions that bear emphasizing.

In his introduction Gill promises to do nothing less than revisit the entirety of the evidence for Ptolemaic activity throughout the Western Desert, and specifically its oases: Dakhleh, Farafra, Kharga, Bahariya, Siwa, and the several minor oases. By page 144 of his concluding chapter he has done it:

»This study clearly demonstrates the Western Oases experienced a substantial rise in population during the Ptolemaic period, which coincided with the development of new settlements and increased agricultural production. … [These changes] were the result of a deliberate Ptolemaic strategy aimed at exploiting the agricultural potential of the oases, while at the same time providing both control over long-distance trade routes and military security, particularly against the looming threat of Carthage to the west. This was not an entirely new strategy … the Persians had been active in the oases, probably for many of the same reasons; however, under Ptolemaic rule, exploitation of the oases intensified … Given that the exploitation of the Fayum, the development of Cyrenaica, and the expeditions to the Red Sea and Lower Nubia were all the results of policies implemented during the Early Ptolemaic period, it seems likely that much of the development witnessed in the oases began around the same time.«

How does he get here?
Background

In chapter 1, Gill lays out the obligatory, necessary groundwork. He summarizes all previous scholarship on the oases, including literary testimony, archaeological work, and historical syntheses of Ptolemaic activity in the region. This section is actually rather short since, as Gill notes, »The Western Oases feature very little within the published literature« (p. 6). This is due in part to a paucity of epigraphic and historical testimony and in part because much archaeological work has only taken place only in the last twenty-five years – but mostly it is because there has simply been no way to actually recognize Ptolemaic-era material, and therefore no way to recognize Ptolemaic-era activity.

Perhaps the most fundamental issue has been the inclination of historians of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt to draw wide-ranging conclusions based on very small amounts of poorly understood data. Gill explains the problem concisely (pp. 7–8). The site survey index published by the Dakhleh Oasis Project (DOP) in 1999 lists a total of 214 Roman period sites vs. only 17 Ptolemaic period sites. This huge discrepancy »led scholars to propose that the Roman Period in Dakhleh was a time of huge agricultural expansion and population increase« – and, conversely, that there is very little Ptolemaic presence and interest. Gill cites multiple instances of this idea, in works as recent as 2010\footnote{E. Cruz Uribe, Social Structure and Daily Life: Graeco-Roman, in: A. B. Lloyd (ed.), A Companion to Ancient Egypt, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Ancient History (Chichester, West Sussex – Malden, MA 2010) 491–506.} and 2012\footnote{O. E. Kaper, The Western Oases, in: C. Riggs (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt (Oxford 2012) 717–735.}. He notes, reasonably, that it is simply »illogical to suggest that the Ptolemies did not see the oases as a source of potential wealth« (p. 11), especially considering that Saite and Persian rulers took interest in this region, that the Ptolemies also controlled Cyrenaica, and were active in Lower Nubia, in the Eastern Desert, and along the Red Sea coast.

The remainder of Chapter 1 is described as a summary of comparative evidence from the Nile Valley, but it is not actually a comprehensive collection of Ptolemaic activity, settlement, building, or even ceramics. Instead what Gill does here is collect evidence for interaction between the Valley and the oases, via inscriptions and artifacts. Most important in this regard is the famous »Oasis List«, a long inscription on the interior of the girdle wall of the temple of Edfu which has been dated to the reign of Ptolemy VII\footnote{S. Aufrère, La liste des sept oasis d’Edfou, \textit{BIFAO} 100, 2000, 79.} or Ptolemy IX\footnote{O. E. Kaper, Egyptian Toponyms of Dakhla Oasis, \textit{BIFAO} 92, 1992, 117.}. It depicts the king and queen making an offering to Horus, followed by seven identical fecundity figures that personify the oases. Each figure has a caption listing name and relative position, and while not every oasis has been certainly identified, there is consensus that the five major western oases of Kharga, Dakhleh, Farafra, Bahariya, and Siwa are included. Gill notes that the list »demonstrates that during the Ptolemaic period the Egyptians recognized seven distinct oases in the Western Desert, and that these were viewed as part of the Egyptian administration« (p. 13). This text, along with other Ptolemaic inscriptions from Karnak, Esna, Dendera, and Kom Ombo, »regularly identify the oases as important wine-producing regions« – a continuation of activity known from New Kingdom times, from wine-jar labels, oasis amphoras, and wall paintings in private tombs (p. 16). Gill makes the interesting point that while oasis wine was also the primary product in Ptolemaic times, the depictions now occur only in temples, in the context of tribute-bearing scenes, emphasizing the authority and interest of the king, perhaps at the expense of local officials in Upper Egypt (p. 16).

One of Gill’s points in presenting this summary of known evidence is to demonstrate the unlikeliness of concluding that the Ptolemies did not care to invest in this region. And yet historians have continually downplayed their involvement here, in large part due to the lack of securely datable Ptolemaic-era remains. This makes excavated, stratified, objectively datable
pottery an absolute and fundamental necessity, especially because that pottery could then be
used a kind of magic key to help identify Ptolemaic-era vessels from the masses of already
collected but previously undatable survey material. In his next chapters, that is what Gill
presents: a large corpus of (mostly) stratified pottery from Mut al-Kharab, the site of a temple
and sanctuary in the heart of the Dakhleh Oasis, which he then uses as a baseline to re-analyze
older survey material collected by the Dakhleh Oasis Project (DOP). This in turn allows him to
completely revise the 1999 site index as well as re-study the published material from the other
Western Desert oases, notably Kharga, Farafra, Bahariya, and Siwa. He promises no less than
»the first major synthesis of Ptolemaic Period activity in the Western Desert of Egypt, as well as
the most extensive study of Ptolemaic Period pottery from the oases to date« (p. 1). And then
he delivers it.

**Contexts and Pottery**

In chapter 2 Gill presents the excavated contexts from Mut al-Kharab. The site comprises
a large mud-brick temenos built originally in Dynasty XXVII. A wall surrounds a huge area
(180 x 217 m). A large depression in the center marks the location of a Ptolemaic-era temple,
although the building is almost completely destroyed. Surviving are two parallel north-south
stone walls, about 16 m apart, inscribed stelai and sections of wall reliefs, hundreds of ostraca
in both Demotic and Greek, and excavated pottery and small finds, including a foundation
deposit (on which see below). Mud-brick buildings in the SE corner of the temenos were
probably living quarters for temple personnel, since they contained both cooking vessels and
decorated table wares. The ancient settlement that was likely connected to this complex is
today completely obscured by the modern town, although scattered Ptolemaic-era cemeteries
provide a sense of its extent. The size of the temenos suggests that Mut al-Kharab was the
largest and most important temple in Dakhleh, and rivaled the temple of Hibis in Kharga.

The presentation of the excavation is, of course, essential but rather inhospitable to use. I
have not seen Gill’s dissertation but I suspect this chapter has been little changed from that. It
would have been preferable if Gill would have taken a step back and re-arranged this material
chronologically, beginning at the bottom with the earliest material and grouping together
contexts that in the end comprised a single stratigraphic or constructional episode. This would
have allowed the outline of the excavation to be more easily linked to ceramic groups. Instead
this is essentially a detailed, illustrated field report, so that, for example, there are repeated
instances of contexts described as »rubbish used as convenient fill for foundation packing«,
with contents comparable to other individual contexts. This kind of presentation puts the onus
of sense-making on the reader, a procedure that is difficult at best and sometimes impossible.

The best example of how un-sensibly these contexts are explained is that the foundation
deposit – which is the most exciting as well as most coherent of all the contexts – is embedded
within the rote list of deposits. The deposit, dating to late Ptolemaic times, comprised a wooden
box containing »a collection of molds in ceramic and plaster, some inscribed with Demotic
notations, … used for the manufacture of glass or faience inlays for a monumental image of a
falcon-headed god depicted with a tripartite wig, collar, kilt, and outstretched wings, which
is probably to be identified as Seth« (p. 33). Also inside the box were a bronze Osiris figurine,
a faience plaque with a cartouche of Psamtek, and a plaster sculptor’s model of a male head.
The dating is secured by stratified finds: in the fill above this deposit were ostraca and a late
Ptolemaic coin; in the fill below was Ptolemaic pottery.

In chapter 3 Gill presents all of the pottery from the Mut al-Kharab excavations as well
as from other sites surveyed by the DOP. He begins with an overview of previous research
and citation of relevant comparative studies from Dakhleh itself, other of the Western Oases,
and also the Nile Valley. He notes, correctly, that in the past twenty years there has been
a dramatic increase in detailed studies of Ptolemaic-era pottery, and he cites a satisfyingly
complete list – although I note the puzzling omission of Herbert and Berlin’s 2003 Coptos
publication5, which is an unfortunate oversight given the particular relevance of that crucial Upper Egyptian entrepôt.

For most readers of this review, I suspect that the details Gill presents in this chapter will be the most welcome and repeatedly consulted. For this reason, I here provide a certain amount of detail and also editorialize on the form and manner of presentation. Gill begins, sensibly, by discussing fabrics and wares. He is able to rely on a welcome body of petrographic analyses by his DOP colleague M. Eccleston6. Eccleston had identified three groups of Ptolemaic fabrics, all iron-rich and ferruginous: Coarse Ferruginous, Mudstone / Claystone / Shale (B3), and Mudstone / Claystone / Shale – Vegetal Tempered Variant (A4) (pp. 47–52), and Gill provides detailed descriptions. There was a marked increase in the use of Mudstone / Claystone / Shale fabric (B3) from earlier to Ptolemaic times, although Gill neither explains nor speculates as to why. This section represents a great deal of careful work that cries out to be shared, for which reason I here make a plea for Gill and Eccleston to please post these excellent descriptions, along with illustrative thin-section photos, on the open-source Levantine Ceramics Project website (https://www.levantineceramics.org) so as to make this important work easily and widely available.

Following fabrics, Gill then describes three categories of Ptolemaic-era wares – and here I offer a round of applause for the welcome distinction between fabric and ware, with ›fabric‹ being the clay body and its inclusions while ›ware‹ represents the potter’s treatment of that fabric, which can include specific types of finishing and surface treatment. This is an especially critical distinction to make in order then to be able to date pottery from survey, since particular wares tend to be more chronologically bounded than specific fabrics. Gill identifies three categories of Ptolemaic wares: plain, cream-slipped, and red-slipped. Probably the most notable aspect of the Dakhleh Ptolemaic pottery is the amount of exterior decoration, which Gill classifies under various rubrics – linear, floral, figural, applied modeled, incised, impressed. This propensity to design sets the oasis material apart from the great majority of Ptolemaic-era pottery from both the Delta and the Nile Valley. Gill says that the painted decoration is »one of the more diagnostic features of the Ptolemaic pottery tradition, both in the oasis and in the Nile Valley«. He cites Schreiber’s important work7 on the latter, and (disapprovingly) quotes me as saying that Ptolemaic period pottery was rarely decorated8. But my statement is based on the enormous quantities of undecorated pottery from Naukratis, Coptos (whose publication, as noted above, he seems to have missed), and Elephantine; it’s simply not true that painted decoration is frequent everywhere, or even frequent in the Nile Valley. It’s hard to know why Gill doesn’t acknowledge difference, since it would only enhance the interesting specificity of the oasis material, which – along with Scheiber’s Theban material – is sui generis: these corpora are odd, not exempla for the entire country. Gill indeed goes on to note the Dakhleh designs are unique and »seem to have developed locally« (p. 52). Right: the Dakhleh material is not a model or a paradigm. It is special.

On to forms. Everybody who works on pottery must make an essential, basic decision when confronted with a body of material: shall I use standard, readily understandable shape names such as bowl, plate, jar, etc. – even though the names may mislead? Or shall I use project-specific code, which lends itself to databases but may be unintelligible to outsiders? Gill chooses neither, opting instead for an approach that I do not recall ever seeing before. He uses names – but only two: ›bowl‹ to refer to all open shapes; and ›jar‹ to refer to all closed shapes (p. 63). He explains that he wanted to avoid real-world terms such as ›plate‹, ›casserole‹, ›baking dish‹, etc. because he believes that »terms like these lead to a preconceived notion about the function of different vessel forms, which is not always correct and hinders our ability to examine the material objectively« (p. 63).

But pottery is not objective data. It is the product of human manufacture, intended for practical use. Vessels had functions, and while we all know that the functions could be multiple and also different from the intentions of their makers, it remains the case that when somebody made a clay vessel, she or he had one or more specific uses in mind, ranging from the very specific such as brewing brew, raising bread, or parching beans, to more general, such as holding any liquid or dry good. If we hope to use ceramic evidence to move from vessels to behavior, and from artifacts to the larger questions they may inform, then we must do our best to figure out and say plainly what things seem to have been used for. Of course we must also be honest about the evidence and its limitations, honest about what we are more or less sure about, and honest about what we surmise. But our job is to try to make human sense of the objects we recover so as to help readers of all sorts develop their own ideas and questions.

In addition, there’s something fundamentally un-collegial about not acknowledging or referring to terms that are long established, well understood, widely used, and intrinsically meaningful. Gill’s Form 4a, which he calls a shallow bowl, and further describes as having a modeled rim and ring-base (p. 64), is the well-known rolled rim plate. It’s disingenuous and actually also unhelpful not to use this term or even refer to it. In order to recognize that the Dakhleh potters made their own version of this originally Attic-inspired and very widely emulated form, a reader would have to bring a fair bit of knowledge to his or her reading here. What is the advantage in creating such difficulties of access and understanding? That is surely not the intention of scholarly publication, and I don’t believe it’s Gill’s intention either. But it is a result of the choice he makes here.

Further, Gill himself effectively undermines this bowl/jar approach to naming by regularly identifying functional uses and their logical names in the descriptions. So his Forms 47–49, which he calls »Two-Handled Bowls«, are described as follows: »bowls with a modeled rim, a rounded base and two horizontal loop-handles applied just below the rim. The rim has been modeled to form an internal ledge, which is designed to support a lid. It is clear from the shape, fabric, and surface wear that such vessels were used as cooking pots« (p. 76). If it’s so clear, then why not call them cooking pots? Why invent so misleading a term as »two-handled bowls«? Why classify Forms 91–93 as ›jars‹ and then go on to admit in the description that they are really flasks? By the end Gill has himself given up: about Forms 100–101, he says straight out that they are stands (pp. 91–92). Right.

Within the presentation of forms, Gill illustrates a single example of each, along with some parallels. He provides a full list of find-spots in a table in the appendix, and lists more parallels in another appendix table. The separated lists are frustrating and unnecessary.

Ptolemaic Sites and Activities

In chapters 4 and 5 Gill goes on to reap an incredibly satisfying harvest of historical data. Using his detailed analyses of the Mut el-Kharab pottery, he re-examined the large collection of material from the DOP survey – and completely transformed our understanding of Ptolemaic activity in the western desert. The original survey site index listed 17 Ptolemaic-era sites; Gill brings the total up to 72 – a significant increase that, in one fell swoop, undermines pretty much every historical conclusion yet reached about Ptolemaic interests in the western desert.
He shows that these sites are spread throughout the oasis: 23 sites in the west, 33 in the center, and 16 in the east.

Gill does more than simply identify the sites. He also categorizes them as one of four types: settlement (large-scale domestic activity with multiple buildings); occupation (small-scale domestic activity, such as an isolated farmstead); temple; and cemetery. He then plots these sites in Dakhleh and finds compelling evidence for a pattern of 13 clustered groups, with each group comprising two to ten sites within a two km radius. Each group contains a major settlement, one or more small occupation sites, one or more cemeteries, and (generally) a temple. Unsurprisingly, the distribution of these groups corresponds to areas of modern settlement, probably because both ancient and modern populations required similar conditions for subsistence: access to springs and land that is low and level for irrigation.

Gill makes the insightful observation that the range of settlement types and diversity of burial types likely correlated to a range of social strata and positions, which suggests that Ptolemaic Dakhleh had a »complex and stratified society«. He then situates the Ptolemaic settlements within the longer arc of settlement in the oasis from Old Kingdom through Roman times. He shows that from the Late Period through the Early Roman era, the number of settlements increased by 106 %, and from Ptolemaic through early Roman times the increase was even more marked: 178 % – almost double – the number of sites (p. 123). This all suggests that the population increase »was the result of a deliberate strategy of settlement and agricultural exploitation that was implemented by the Ptolemies« (p. 123).

Gill next turns to a re-examination of the evidence from the other oases in the Western Desert. Here he is operating at something of a disadvantage, since he had generally to rely only on what has been published. This makes for uneven knowledge – yet here too Gill’s patient and determined investigating has upended our understanding of Ptolemaic activity in this region. He presents a discussion oasis by oasis: Kharga, Farafra, Bahariya, Siwa, and then the minor oases. Gill was able to re-date a number of sites by comparison with the pottery from Dakhleh, and he brought his understanding of the patterns he encountered there to the evidence from these other places. He makes a strong case for seeing these places within a regional frame.

Conclusions

Gill’s concluding chapter is a deeply satisfying read – both because he offers so many large and persuasive insights and also because they all rest on his painstakingly careful amassing of ceramic data. For those of us committed to the study of pottery, this monograph demonstrates how substantial the pay-off for such study can be.

Gill shows that the population in the Western oases rose substantially during the Ptolemaic period. There were new settlements and increased agricultural productivity, which – considering the locale – is most probably due to deliberate Ptolemaic investments. The Ptolemies would have had several compelling reasons to invest resources here. First, new settlements here would produce more food and, especially, wine. Second, new settlements would serve as points of control over long-distance trade routes. Gill proposes adopting the terminology proposed by Joseph Manning9 and understanding the new settlements as ›gateway communities‹. They would help in the administration and control of trans-Saharan trade, especially the acquisition of gold, ivory, semi-precious stones, and wild animals (pp. 151-154).

Third, the Western Oases provided a military buffer zone against uprisings from within and threats from without (pp. 155–159). The new settlements offered housing for military units and so maintained security, particularly against the rising threat of Carthage to the west. Gill notes that “this was not an entirely new strategy … the Persians had been active in the oases, probably for many of the same reasons; however, under Ptolemaic rule, exploitation of the oases intensified … Given that the exploitation of the Fayum, the development of Cyrenaica, and the expeditions to the Red Sea and Lower Nubia were all the results of policies implemented during the Early Ptolemaic period, it seems likely that much of the development witnessed in the oases began around the same time” (p. 144).

Gill uses the evidence of the site patterning he uncovered in chapters 4 and 5 to explain the mechanism of Ptolemaic settlement here, specifically the function of temples. He cites recent studies that see Ptolemaic temple construction here as limited (in large part because most were made of mud-brick and undecorated, and so are poorly represented in the physical landscape) and a kind of incidental by-product. But the settlement clusters are strong counter-evidence to this interpretation. Gill advocates for reading the Ptolemaic temple foundations as deliberate attempts to establish control over existing temple estates and their associated settlements, in order to provide a strong administrative base from which to launch new settlement and land development programs (p. 149). Gill also postulates that temples provided housing for soldiers. In later Roman times there were fortresses built in the oases; but no such facilities have been found from Ptolemaic times. In those years, soldiers were likely stationed inside temple precincts, whose sizeable mud-brick temenos walls would have secured the men along with their supplies. Soldiers would have functioned as local police and desert guards, regular reminders of connections with and dependence on the king and the larger political enterprise he stood for.

All of these conclusions bear directly on several larger historical issues: how the Ptolemies continued, extended, but also modified the Persian models they inherited; what patterns and parameters they bequeathed to the Romans; the character, extent, and development of Ptolemaic administration, infrastructure, and social norms; and the character of interaction between the Western Desert and the Nile Valley. This is a very important book, full of necessary new information, ideas, and syntheses. It is the best kind of pottery study, because it makes of that mundane material historical testimony.

---

To date, there is no comprehensive corpus of Hellenistic imported and local ceramics from the eminent maritime metropolis of ‘Akko–Ptolemais. Hence, the present publication of substantial ceramic finds presented and discussed by Andrea M. Berlin and Peter J. Stone will serve as an essential compilation and as an indispensable tool for future research, complementing the previous study by Dalit Regev. The ceramic finds originate from two locations, the Courthouse site and the Hospitaller Compound, where excavations were carried out on behalf of the Israel Antiquities Authority between 1991 and 1998.

The book is divided into three parts – Excavations at the Courthouse Site (Part I); Excavations in the Hospitaller Compound (Part II); Finds and Studies (Part III), with all three parts divided further into chapters. In Chapter 1, placed before Part I, Nadav Kashtan presents a historical overview until Roman times. The three chapters of Part I comprise a summary of the architectural remains and of the stratigraphic evidence at the Courthouse site (Chapter 2 by Moshe Hartal) and the presentation of glass finds (Chapter 3 by Natalya Katsnelson) and loom-weights and whorls (Chapter 4 by Orit Shamir). The glass vessels retrieved date from the Late Hellenistic period until the 13th century CE and underline the opulence of the prolific glass production in the region. Waste of probably Hellenistic date indicates a production site in the vicinity. Some rare cast bowls among the Hellenistic vessels from the late 2nd–early 1st centuries BCE, if not imported, shed new light on the quality of the local production.

Part II opens with the presentation of the building remains in the Hospitaller Compound (Chapter 5 by Eliezer Stern). Here, the exposed buildings rest directly on bedrock; sealed loci indicate that the area was first settled in the late 3rd–early 2nd centuries BCE, either before or after the Seleucid victory over the Ptolemies in the Battle of Panium (Baneas) in 200 BCE and the subsequent take-over of Palestine and Phoenicia. The impressive residential building unearthed in Unit B, either private or public, was embellished with columns, plastered stairs and coloured stucco panels in ‘Masonry Style’. Chapter 6 by Yael Gorin-Rosen describes the few Hellenistic and Early Roman glass vessels. Outstanding and relatively rare in excavations in Israel is a mosaic glass fragment of the luxury objects class. It is decorated with a spiral pattern which is the most common pattern among the Hellenistic hemispherical glass bowls found at Delos and also dominant on glass bowls from Marisa and Dora from ca. 150–50 BCE. In Chapter 7 Natalie Messika discusses a dozen fragmentary terracotta figurines, by

---

1 For preliminary publications see p. 198 note 1 (contribution by A. M. Berlin and P. Stone).
3 The publication scheme for the substantial amount of finds is summarized in table 1 with details of already published and forthcoming studies.
Part III contains three chapters. Chapter 9 by Andrea M. Berlin and Peter J. Stone presents a selection of the Hellenistic and Early Roman pottery recovered at both excavation sites, covering the time span from the 3rd century BCE through the early 1st century CE. In their own words the authors focussed on the presentation of »all apparent imported wares; all diagnostic vessels and fragments from large floor deposits; representative diagnostics from fills; and particularly well-preserved and unusual pieces«. Most significant, the approach is not a merely typological one, but the target is to »offer some observations regarding market networks, the chronology and character of local production, and aspects of the stylistic attitudes and dining habits of ‘Akko’s Hellenistic residents«. In the reviewer’s opinion, for any archaeologist who engages in a scholarly analysis of ceramics such a comprehensive perspective is vital for the assessment of the cultural background and should always be an indispensable requirement for the final presentation of the material. The chapter comprises two sections: a detailed discussion and a pottery catalogue. In the discussion, the authors sum up the evidence that the pottery provides for the city’s culture and economy. The catalogue is organized by stratigraphic groups according to the excavation areas and strata outlined in Chapters 2 and 5. Within each group, the pottery is classified by function: vessels for individual drinking and eating, vessels for table service, household tasks, cooking, and storage and transport (figs. 9.1 – 9.26). Figures 9.27 and 9.28 illustrate a number of unstratified, yet well-preserved or unique finds.

In the discussion the ceramics collected in the five stratigraphic groups are analyzed, followed by the description of sixteen ceramic wares. In each paragraph of the stratigraphic groups the authors contextualize the evidence derived from the evaluation of the functional classes, clarifying consumer behaviour and the customers’ dependence on local and eastern Mediterranean markets. The identification of the wares and archaeometric analyses permits two conclusions to be drawn. First, ‘Akko participated in the exchange and trade networks on a local, regional and superregional stage; second, the bulk of vessels were produced in workshops along the central and southern Levantine coast, while a relatively small amount of imported wares from the Aegean, Asia Minor and Italy attest to the residents’ openness for the life-style of the Greco-Roman koine.

The twenty-eight figures in which the items are illustrated are accompanied by a compact table, specifying vessel shape, ware, and decoration. For each item a respective number of parallels are provided, arranged by geographic regions of the southeastern Mediterranean. The lists begin with Israel, and the sites are enumerated in alphabetical order, including parallels from previous excavations in ‘Akko. In the eyes of the reviewer the arrangement is not reader-friendly, and I cannot see a benefit in the separation of the comparanda by modern state borders. Occasionally, references from other regions are given; for the brazier lug in fig. 9.14:1 Athens is mentioned, while the basic research on the finds at Knidos is not included. The early 1st century CE Broneer Type XXIII lamp in fig. 9.26:13 is said to depict »gladiator and lion«. It is suggested here that the motif is a simplified version of the charioteer on a biga, with the charioteer no longer present. It is fine example of the wide-spread practice of copying Roman-type volute lamps and gradually reducing details of the original figure-type, while the

4 Quotations on p. 133.
5 M. Şahin, Hellenistische Kohlenbecken mit figürlich verzierten Attaschen aus Knidos, Knidos-Studien 3 (Möhnesee 2003).
imagery attests to the highly connected visual culture in the Roman Empire⁶. Extraordinary is a Hellenistic black-slipped circular lamp with seven nozzles and a clam shell for a handle. Some Hellenistic lamps with seven nozzles are recorded in the Levant⁷, yet to date there is no parallel for the unique specimen from ‘Akko.

The visual presentation of the black- and red-gloss wares is an unfortunate detriment of the publication; when a black slip covers the exterior and/or interior surfaces the vessels are coloured in black, while a red slip is indicated by a raster of parallel lines, set diagonally on the vessel. A customary style of ceramic drawings published in the IAA reports, the addition does not improve the drawing, and actually naming the wares and describing the slip is sufficient. Moreover, the practice does not follow the standard norm of Greco-Roman ceramic studies, as a quick glance at the excavation reports of the Athenian Agora will reveal⁸. The reviewer takes it for granted that these publications serve as paradigma for archaeologists researching Greco-Roman ceramics.

In Chapter 10 of Part III Danny Sion presents a concise summary of the approximately 200 coins found in both excavation areas, pointing out that unfortunately the civic issues of ‘Akko-Ptolemais are in rather poor state of preservation. The catalogue list 103 coins from the 4th century BCE to the 7th century CE. Chapter 11 by Eliezer Stern on the city’s geography is an analysis of the archaeological data, discussing the process of expansion away from Tell ‘Akko and the boundaries of the Hellenistic city. In table 11.1 the author compiled a summary of excavated sites with archaeological remains from all periods at ‘Akko. It is a most convenient data base for scholars and students.

All in all, the editors and contributors of this volume are to be praised and congratulated for a thorough presentation and discussion of excavated archaeological remains within and outside the Old City of ‘Akko, especially enhancing our knowledge of the material culture, of consumption and trade in the Hellenistic and Roman metropolis and in the region.

---


⁷ R. Rosenthal-Heginbottom, The Sacred Number Seven – Reflections on the Hellenistic Seven-Nozzled Lamps from Tel Dor, Eretz-Israel 29, Ephraim Stern Volume (Jerusalem 2009) 194*–208*.

This book represents the conclusion to a study project completed by Anna Gamberini concerning the «Hellenistic Fine Ware» (ceramica fine) discovered in Phoenike and studied over the last few years.

The site is being investigated by an Italo-Albanian team in collaboration with the Centre of Albanian Studies in Tirana and the University of Bologna. For the Albanian staff Shpresa Gjonqej introduced the excavations and the site and presented the target of the research, and Sandro De Maria, head of the Italian Archaeological Mission, wrote the preface.

In the first chapter Gamberini presents a brief historical and geographical description of the settlement, situated in Chaonia, one of the three regions which, together with Thesprotia and Molossia, formed Epirus.

This is followed by the presentation of the excavation contexts used for the study, listing those of the upper city, for each of which the main points regarding the history of research and the discoveries that served to establish the chronology are briefly but exhaustively described. In terms of material culture, objects belonging to classes other than Fine Ware – which the author rather too generically includes in «coarse ware» (ceramica acroma) – are also mentioned. In terms of current terminology, placing forms such as lopades and chytrae, which were used exclusively as kitchen ware, in the class of coarse ware, a general category in which the author includes all pottery not classed as Fine Ware, appears unconvincing. The chapter’s final paragraph illustrates selected contexts in the area of the necropolis, providing a useful, more detailed discussion of some areas that had already been described elsewhere but not with sufficient thoroughness.

The second chapter prepares the ground for the classification and defines certain important aspects. First of all it invites reflection on an important question, that is, what exactly do we mean when we speak of Fine Ware? Broadly, it is a conceptual definition that we apply today to artefacts from the past that had multiple uses, counting both their original function and their reuse in the course of their life before their definitive exit from the scene for whatever reason. In ancient societies the finest ware was made of metal, but this has only in rare cases survived until the present day, thus obliging the author to specify what she means by Fine Ware. From a functional point of view, Fine Ware includes all objects used in the context of social gatherings, as well as containers of small personal objects, oils and unguents. From a technical point of view, the defining feature is the presence of a coating (generally black gloss) or moulded decorations in relief (Moldmade Ware) on the surface. However, this does not exclude pottery without a coating, which may belong to the category for two reasons, either because the coating, often of poor quality, has not been conserved, or because these objects
have the same morphological characteristics as the ›fine‹ specimens and thus may have had the same function as the items with the coating.

Ample space is dedicated to production, establishing the predominance of local and regional artefacts with respect to imports. This significant conclusion was reached by means of naked-eye observation combined with morphological classification, which is followed by the study of the mineral and geochemical composition of selected samples. The latter made it possible to distinguish two main groups, the first compatible with local and regional production and the second with imported items, mainly of Attic origin but also from the Peloponnese, Asia Minor and lastly, the Tyrrenian area (including Campana A Black Gloss Wares).

The analyses do not remove all doubt however, because, as already highlighted by Verena Gassner’s study of the containers used for transport, and indeed stressed by the author herself, some pieces that appear to be imported on the basis of their macroscopic features are in contrast shown by the chemical-mineralogical analyses to be compatible with the local group. An example is a plate that recalls products made in the Salento peninsula belonging to the class of varnished items known as Hard-fired red (HFR), which the chemical-mineralogical analyses identify as locally made.

Despite the few exceptions then, the analyses also confirm the existence of local production, clearly made in Phoenike in the case of Moldmade Ware, the other items being made in one or more other locations in Chaonia.

The next chapter presents the classification of the wheel-made Fine Ware articles, subdivided on the basis of their function: first the drinking and pouring vessels, which include kantharoi, skyphoi, cups, amphorae, kraters, olpi and lagynoi; next vessels related to the serving and consumption of food, with plates, small plates, platters and bowls; last are the vessels for other uses, mainly unguentaria.

For each form, the recognized types are listed, including a description and attribution of each type within the general classification of black gloss ware. Similar items from other nearby sites are also listed, together with the contexts of discovery within the site, the dating and a detailed bibliography.

Among the drinking vessels, the most frequent form is the kantharos, of which there are various types. Widely attested is the cyma kantharos, which, together with a few variants, has certain recurring characteristics: the vertical handles are always surmounted by a horizontal handle plate and the vessels have a high moulded foot. Another amply documented type of kantharos is described by the author herself as heterogeneous because the definition encompasses two sub-types, the first is the Illyrian kantharos followed by the articulated or biconical kantharos. Perhaps it would have been more appropriate to analyze them as distinct types.

Another form with a complex typological differentiation is the cup, of which three types may be distinguished: footed, conical and hemispherical with no foot. With regard to the conical cups it is interesting to observe the presence of cups with moulded medallions. The


small number of specimens perhaps prevented the identification of a type distinct from the
other conical cups. These vessels belong to the class of cups with medallions, whose most
famous production sites were located both in the West, in Cales, and in the East, in Knidos.
The discoveries in Phoenike confirm the existence of production in peripheral areas of lesser
commercial importance, such as this part of Epirus. At the same time, the study of this local
production suggests that these cups were perhaps exported in a short-to-medium commercial
range, even reaching the coasts of Italy, as suggested by a discovery made in Leuca (originally
attributed to a workshop in Cales) and another in Muro Tenente (2017 excavations, no published
description available).

In the classification that follows, the reason for analyzing the small Epirote amphora as
a distinct form rather than a type within the group of amphorae and pelikai is not explained.
Aside from this methodological consideration however, the typological definition of the small
amphora, which appears to be characteristic of the area of Epiros as a whole, is undoubtedly
useful. The last of the forms found among the pouring vessels is the lagynos, discovered in a
small number of cases in funerary contexts, confirming the symbolic value attributed to this
vessel in the Hellenistic period.

In the group of vessels related to the serving and consumption of food, four forms are
listed: the plate, the platter, the small plate and the bowl. The definition and analysis of the fish
plate of the Epirote type, a typical product of the area, is significant.

To the final group belong the vessels linked to other uses, represented by a small number
of specimens, of which the only ones that can be classified into specific types are the unguent
pots and pyxides. However, I find the definition of what appear to be ›miniature pots‹ as
›unguent pots‹ rather unconvincing, especially considering their exclusive discovery in
funerary contexts.

Lastly there is a paragraph on the limited quantity of imported products, mainly from
Attica, among which the ›Gray Unguentaria‹ are analyzed separately, discussing the issues
affecting this class.

The following chapter presents Moldmade Ware, which is known to have been produced
in Phoenike thanks to the discovery of moulds, and the archaeometric analyses conducted on
both the moulds and some ceramic specimens.

The final chapter describes the chronological and typological evolution of the various
types identified, with the help of excellent illustrated tables that summarize the classification
of the forms. Lastly, the material culture of Phoenike is analyzed in relation not only to the
main regional contexts but also the Ionian-Adriatic area and, where possible, the more distant
contexts in Asia Minor and the West. These valuable additions make it possible to understand
not only the morphological development of the various forms but also and above all collocating
Phoenike in a broader commercial network in which material culture was the tangible sign of
contact and interaction between different geographical areas.

The English version of the concluding chapter is followed by the catalogue, clear and
exhaustive, of the roughly 500 pieces analyzed. The volume is then rounded off with a series
of appendices (lists of the samples analyzed, the tombs of the southern necropolis and the layers
cited in the text), the bibliography, complete and detailed, and excellent plates.

The work thus constitutes a fundamental point of reference for ceramological studies
and offers an important key for understanding the commercial exchanges, often over short
distances that characterized the two shores of the Ionian and Adriatic seas, contextualizing
this relationship within the broader process of economic and cultural exchange in the
Mediterranean in the late Hellenistic period.

---

5 L. Giardino, La ceramica “calena”, in: R. van Compernolle et alii, Leuca (Galatina 1978) 122.
This volume is the revised and expanded version of Maja Miše’s (henceforth MM) Ph.D. dissertation, »Gnathia Ware on the East Adriatic Coast (from 4th to 1st c. BC)« (2010; Department of Archaeology, University of Zagreb, Croatia). The reason for the study is the abundance of Gnathia pottery at sites in the East Adriatic region, originating from South Italian as well as local workshops and contributing to the clarification of production issues and trade relations in the regions on both sides of the Adriatic Sea. As MM points out in the introduction, the primary aim of the publication is to give the Gnathia ware of the East Adriatic region greater scientific attention. This goal is already achieved by the publication of the finds and their analysis in an international language – English; making the material available to the research community in a satisfactory manner. Further objectives of the study are the definition of the local production of the city of Issa, the identification of additional workshops and the exploration of trade contacts and exchange mechanisms in the Adriatic region.

The material basis of the study is the author’s previous compilation of all Gnathia vessels in the East Adriatic area published so far, totaling 605 specimens. Of these, the largest part (426 vessels) comes from forty sites along the eastern Adriatic coast with a concentration in Issa; the remaining pieces (179) belong to the Greek and Hellenistic Collection of the Archaeological Museum in Split. However, the inadequate publication and documentation of the material, mainly from older excavations, impedes fully-fledged data collection. The lack of contextual information is a severe handicap for context analysis, which, in combination with the accepted stylistic and typological approach, represents the fundamental methodological perspective of the study.

The comparative style analysis in particular is therefore used to differentiate the local products from the imported Gnathia ware. Such a target requires the thorough study of the South Italian Gnathia pottery. Hence, the author devoted the first of five parts of her work to a summary of the state of research of the latter class. Clearly arranged in small subchapters, MM presents what is known so far about its genesis, production facilities, production technology, chronology and distribution - or better, what is not known. The chapter drastically highlights the still large gaps in our knowledge of the South Italian Gnathia commodity, notwithstanding the large amount of funds for research provided over decades.

The second part of the publication addresses the problems that the open questions about the South Italian Gnathia ware imply for the treatment of the East Adriatic finds. Here as well, MM presents clearly structured sections on the status and history of research, provides more information on the collected vessels, illuminates the location of the specimens from different find-spots and classifies the imported vessels with an allocation to production groups. Finally, the author describes in detail the Gnathia ware of Issaean production and its previous research, before addressing the typological and chronological contextualization. In the classification of the vessels, unlike in previous studies, a sum of characteristic features is considered: shape, decoration, motifs, and fabric. Clay and coating are described in detail, unfortunately without color illustrations which would give the reader a better impression of the material.
Noteworthy is the limited type spectrum of Gnathia ware of Issaean production, consisting of only four forms: oinochoe, pelike, skyphos, and table amphora, with each of these forms revealing predominantly developmental variants. Attached type charts clearly illustrate every single vessel form with all its appearances. When evaluating this small repertoire, however, the reader should be aware that the majority of the material comes from necropolises and that the spectrum of vessels used as grave goods is limited to a few types. The picture that emerges here - also with regard to the percentage of Gnathia vessels in the total quantity of finds - can change quickly with future finds from a more intensive urban excavation.

The detailed typological analysis is followed by a similar study of the decoration, limited in the same way, yet especially by comparison with the South Italian production displaying a restricted motif repertoire. Again, the description is reader-friendly, supplemented by a comprehensive table with a compilation of motifs. Both in the vessel types as well as in the painting, the author was able to work out an initial dependence on or influence of late Apulian prototypes. In the course of their genesis, however, the Issaean vessels dispense with their Italian models, which they outlive in time, and continue to develop independently, with the motif repertoire influenced by the West Slope pottery. Only isolated motifs, on the other hand, are Issaean inventions.

On the basis of the preparatory work carried out by means of individual studies, the author succeeds in defining three production phases within a time span from the introduction of the Issaean Gnathia ware around the mid-3rd century BCE until the end of the 2nd century BCE. The problems of a chronological framework, not based on stratified contexts but on only a few coin-dated graves, are finally discussed in detail in a separate chapter.

The author concludes the second part of her work with a survey of the distribution of Gnathia ware from Issa, focusing mainly on Dalmatia, and with a list of possible other production sites along the East Adriatic coast.

Lastly, the third part of the book deals with related Hellenistic wares on the East Adriatic coast. The author discusses - on the (limited) basis of the published material – various groups of painted and non-painted pottery: red-figured ceramics, West Slope ware, Alto Adriatico vases, black- and gray-glazed wares, and late Hellenistic coated wares. The discussion takes into account the different aspects of the individual genres, such as their chronology in the places of origin, the relationship of individual groups to each other, and finally their distribution and chronological appearance in the East Adriatic region.

In the fourth part of the book, MM summarizes the results of her research and evaluates them with regard to the goals formulated at the outset. In doing so, she undertakes the difficult task of combining and correspondingly interpreting the picture derived from the development and distribution of the Issaean Gnathia ware as part of the economic and historical development of the region. The distribution study documents the full integration of the East Adriatic coast into the Adriatic trade network since the 4th century BCE, whereby Issa and Pharos played a significant role as trading centres and transshipment points. The subsequent reflections on the economic conditions and trade relations in the region throughout the Hellenistic age certainly have some plausibility. However, at the same time they must also be viewed critically, as they rely on the Gnathia ware, representing a very small and exclusive portion of pottery production and commodities. For example, to construe the absence of imports from southern Italy as an indication of disturbed trade relations may be somewhat over-interpreted, due to the possibility that the strong domestic production of the Issaean workshops may have led to the displacement of the South Italian Gnathia ware from the local market. Similar concerns hold true when interpreting the absence of Issaean Gnathia ware in neighboring regions as an indication of non-existent economic or other types of contacts. To draw such conclusions a more intensive study of the archaeological material and context would have to take place, which also includes other genres. As the author is well aware, once again the desolate research and publication situation has to be considered.
The work is completed by a detailed and generously designed catalogue of the 179 Gnathia vessels in the collection of the Archaeological Museum of Split, including the samples from South Italian and local workshops.

Overall, the volume is characterized by a sound and clearly structured presentation, adequate in form and content. The methodology is always clearly recognizable and makes the individual work steps easily comprehensible for the reader. The study displays a sensitive, yet critical handling of the material and reveals the author’s extraordinary awareness of the problems. Regrettable is only the absence of coloured illustrations.

The publication closes one of the many gaps in our knowledge of the Hellenistic material culture in the East Adriatic region. At the same time, like many similar studies of its kind, it very drastically highlights the immutable research deficits and our severely limited knowledge of ancient civilizations as a result of the negligent and careless treatment of this kind of material in former times.
An exhibition of more than seventy objects was presented at the Antikensammlung of the University of Freiburg in spring 2015. Entitled ›Vom Trinken und Bechern. Das antike Gelage im Umbruch‹ it lasted from 26 April to 28 June. It consisted of mostly ancient Greek clay vessels of Classical and Hellenistic times, which were associated with the ancient symposium on account of either their use or their iconography. A catalogue complemented the exhibition focusing on the central theme, i.e. the symposium, which has often preoccupied archaeological research – and continues to do so – posing several individual questions on the related objects, drinking vessels and tableware or on the social and anthropological aspects of the institution itself. We should remember the 1990 exhibition in Munich on a related theme and the accompanying publication on the ›Kultur des Trinkens, Kunst der Schale‹ (ed. K. Vierneisel – B. Kaeser), though with a different emphasis than the one in Freiburg. At the same time, new studies and research programs on the subject of wine, the architectural space of the symposium and its relation to funerary or other religious activities are constantly coming up in scholarly literature. This confirms the central role, in every sense, held by the ancient symposium not only in the archaeological or historical research but also in the education of younger archaeologists on topics in antiquity. We believe that the latter has been one of the intentions of publishing the catalogue of the Freiburg exhibition. Yet, several difficult historical and methodological issues are addressed as well in the treatment of the relevant archaeological material, first and foremost the pottery.

A. Heinemann and J.-A. Dickmann are the editors of the catalogue, who together with other young archaeologists contributed substantial essays. The clay vessels of Classical, Hellenistic and Roman times, from Athens, Boeotia and South Italy form the real core of the exhibition. Still, in this context the opportunity to discuss certain general but essential issues related to the period and category of the exhibits presented itself. Following the editors’ informative introduction, the first part of the book consists of nine essays that include a number of generic and theoretical observations on the vessels and the activities or meanings of the symposium. The more extensive second part consists of the catalogue of the exhibits with all their features and necessary data. From the start, the principal target of this volume becomes evident, one that actually reveals the aim of its creators to not only record the objects of an exhibition but also to establish a different approach and interpretation of the particular archaeological material. The transfer of focus from the Classical period to the 4th century and the Hellenistic times is apparent from the beginning, obviously serving as the basis for the commentary included in the essays. This chronological framework allows some of the main features of the Hellenistic era to be examined as observed throughout this long period from the end of the Classical time to the beginnings of the Roman Empire. Besides, it is generally assumed by all that the pottery of this long and strongly ›international‹ or ›universal‹ age
was transformed according to both the fashion for new shapes and their particular uses and their commercial value or aesthetic quality etc., which are directly connected to the social and economic reality at the time. It is significant that very often scholars – regardless of their methodology – resort to the terminology of the vase shapes in order to explain their use or origins etc., though such an approach with regard to the Hellenistic pottery can be deceptive and lead to misinterpretations.

The mixing of wine with water and the use of the krater and the distinctive shallow cup (kylix) for that purpose has been a typical topic in the study of Classical times, both a real and a symbolic feature. As A. Heinemann rightly notes, the changes in this picture become clearly discernible in the 4th century BCE, in spite of the transformations in shapes and modifications in uses having been gradually occurring since the 5th century BCE. The latter is evident in the choices made by the workshops that produced red-figure pottery (cf. the changes in the groups of painters and potters in the end of the 5th century BCE) or the increase in the numbers of black-glazed vessels and the alterations in their shapes that signal the changes of the 4th century BCE. The relation between the black-glazed ware and the pottery with decoration in terms of their production in the same workshops poses two fundamental questions; a technical one concerning their production and a commercial one concerning the market preferences of the customers. On the other hand, excavation finds or assemblages, like the one from Building Z in the Kerameikos, allow for quite a few observations on the types of vases and their chronology. However, at the same time they require careful treatment regarding their interpretation given the multiple usage of Building Z in different periods.

Nevertheless, the 4th century BCE and the Hellenistic period should not be examined as a unity. Even though a continuity and evolvement or disappearance of phenomena and trends is certain from one century to the next, still large-scale changes occur in the political, economic and social milieu, when these happen. Major political and economic centres were transferred from mainland Greece to the East. Urban populations and their needs increased and a new cultural perception was formed while new objects and fresh ideas on food culture and the symposium indicate this new everyday reality of the Hellenistic peoples and settlements.

As far as the 4th century BCE is concerned, the picture derived from vessels and vases (amphoras, lekanai, kylikes, skyphoi etc.) [H. Pflug] found in public areas, like the Athenian Agora, and mostly inside stores, such as taverns, etc. where one could purchase or consume wine is quite characteristic. In essence, these are places that are associated less with the symposium and more with the market ›community‹. The attempt to broaden the observations with the inclusion of historical and social evidence is apparent and certainly right.

The researchers of the exhibition and its catalogue are preoccupied with chronological periods that dictate the study of other areas besides Classical Athens, in terms of chronology, locality and even typology. The development of new economic centres reinforced the creation or advancement of local workshops, which on one hand followed the tradition and on the other imitated Athenian products for the sake of profit and to accommodate their clientele. The needs of contemporary local cults were a decisive factor in the making of products in many larger or local workshops. The Kabeirian cups (kantharoi?) found in the homonymous sanctuary in Boeotia comprise one of the most typical examples with regards to their shape and decoration [K. Schlott].

Even though large building complexes, both private and public, have been preserved in major Hellenistic urban centres, such as Priene, Pergamon etc., where an extensive and

1 The Kerch style red-figure pottery – both at its peak and in its final phase – should be also examined according to the historical and economic reality of the 4th century BCE because it seems that it served specific purposes that influenced its shapes and iconography, as shown during the recent conference on the North Aegean Pottery (Thessaloniki, May 2017).

2 Cf. the similar picture that emerges from, for example, the houses at Olynthos and their movable finds, see F. Fless, Rotfigurige Keramik als Handelsware (Rahden 2002). A similar study of the ancient farmhouses would be rather useful.
distinct production of tableware and vases developed, it is rather difficult to draw a picture of the symposium and identify the use of all these objects. In those areas – and not just there – most of the excavated structural remains date from late Hellenistic times while various items belong to the time-span from the 4th to the 1st centuries BCE\(^3\). Hence, it is challenging to outline with certainty the symposium in the 4th century BCE house at Priene [L. Heinz], the 3rd century BCE royal residences of the Attalids or the festive banquets in the sanctuaries of Pergamon, a fact acknowledged by the writers of the articles as well. The widespread distribution of many pottery objects – along with many other products and the development of coin transactions – established many vessels as ›common‹ (koina) in nearly the entire Hellenistic world, like the mould-made relief bowls (skyphoi)\(^4\). The Hellenistic two-handled cups of Cnidus (Knickwandschalen) comprise one of the most characteristic new types of wine cup with no Attic origin and no relation to the Classical kylix. The shape was widely used in the area and eventually became dominant in the late Hellenistic pottery. L. Picht rightly points out the principal issues associated with the production and use of the vase at a time when the symposium had acquired quite different features and the religious context had become a lot more complex.

The region of Magna Graecia supplied huge amounts of archaeological material, especially with regard to pottery and its iconography, though the finds discovered in cemeteries are greater in numbers, and therefore, the information they provide is somewhat different than that needed to identify the symposium [St. Merten]. Still, recent excavation research in the large area of South Italy and Sicily offered interesting data on private residences and the development of urban complexes. This sort of information will enable to ›decode‹ this aspect of the society of Greek colonists and their cities in their daily lives, their relation with the mother-cities as well as the environment of the period. As far as the Hellenistic era is concerned, the examination of these issues seems more demanding because the international nature of trade created both new products and habits.

Special mention deserve the topics of the last two essays by M. Flecker and J.-A. Dickmann. They are dedicated to the Roman world, a topic which in our opinion should form the subject of an entirely new book of similar content in order to gain a sufficient overview of wine culture, tableware and symposium practices. In truth, the military organization, the transfer of large army forces and the relation with the Hellenistic tradition in terms of luxury ware constitute the beginning of a new era.

The catalogue has been organized on the basis of certain concepts that arise from the use or the iconography of the exhibits. It is interesting to note that in this section the theoretical commentary is rather more realistic, though on certain occasions the interpretations derived from the iconography need further processing. In contrast, the observation about the alternation between the shapes and their size, e.g. small krater, large skyphos, is quite thought-provoking; similarly, the initiatives and deviations taken by the potter to create a new form (cf. the kantharos with the high calyx-shaped lip and its combination with another similar kantharos!). The gradual elimination from the shapes of vases and ware of the 4th century BCE and the introduction to the Hellenistic times, even as seen in the few examples exhibited in Freiburg, reveal the need to discuss further issues, like their chronology and technique, their social and economic context, so that the distinctive nature of their era and the area they were created and used would not be lost. The value of the excavation data in relation to the interpretation of all these objects of everyday culture in an age such as the Hellenistic one has by now become apparent. With the help of contemporary means, it is possible to examine large amounts of

---

3 Burial assemblages and the objects associated with them offer more secure chronologies; however, the funerary process might alter their interpretation.

4 It is known that there is an ongoing extensive research of this category that has produced many significant conclusions, as shown in the fundamental studies by U. Hausmann, S. Rotroff, I. Akamatis; still, further study is needed to understand the technique, its importance and distribution etc.
excavation finds or vessels of similar types from extensive geographical units. In this way, the international character of the Hellenistic period and its ›globalized‹ economy could be defined. Time and again, the objects could be more articulate and real than the various explanatory and theoretical notions research often resorts to.
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