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Abstract

Mark van der Enden – Human Agency and Tableware Distribution Patterns in Hellenistic Greece and Asia Minor

This thesis utilizes ceramic legacy data to examine the influence of human agency upon the formation of tableware distribution patterns in Hellenistic Greece and Asia Minor. The formation of distribution patterns is a neglected area in Hellenistic pottery studies; differences between sites are usually taken at face value, paying scant attention to the human choices and behaviours responsible for observed variations.

Tableware from Athens and New Halos in Greece and Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis, Gordian and Sagalassos in Asia Minor is employed for comparative analysis. Agency and network theory is utilized, along with a close reading of the wider contextual background of the case-studies, to explore local consumer choices and address distributional differences. This approach is enabled by the systematic collection of tableware data in the ICRATES database.

This research shows that differences between sites, in terms of tableware consumption, can only be understood as reflecting human behaviour and choice. It is demonstrated that New Halos focused on Hellenistic shapes of more ‘Classical’ appearance and relied primarily for its tableware supply upon the wider region. Athens principally used local tableware focusing on a more properly Hellenistic repertoire, but an antiquated shape like the bolsal was produced specifically for the foreign market. Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Sagalassos similarly made different choices in tableware production and consumption. Observed differences relate to preferences, practices, and opportunities. Consumption at Ilion is influenced by Pergamum, whereas Ephesus develops a repertoire partly specific to itself. At Sagalassos producers and consumers used a repertoire which, while distinct and building upon local traditions, forms part of more widely shared tableware preferences. This study shows that within a general pottery koine various sub-koinai existed and interacted, reflecting varying contextualized choices. The results have important and wide-ranging implications for current approaches to cultural interaction, material culture and society.
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Chapter I: Introduction

1.1 Problem Orientation and Research Questions

This work is concerned with the study of the ceramic tableware repertoires of the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean (fig.1). Hellenistic ceramics is a relatively isolated field, its work only scarcely incorporated in broader studies of period or archaeological practice. Most studies of Hellenistic pottery tend to be vital chronological and typological treatments of the ceramic material. Though tremendously important this focus on typology and chronology has meant that further social and economic enquiries have remained somewhat underexplored. Trade and economics have received most attention\(^1\) but the people and communities behind the ceramics have received far less consideration. Within Classical archaeology, it has mainly been Romanists who have pursued more cognitive agendas of ceramic research.\(^2\) The field of Hellenistic pottery is still lagging behind somewhat in this respect. Studies of Hellenistic material culture are in general slightly under-theorized.\(^3\) This research, however, is part of a recent approach to the study of ceramics, which is firmly rooted within the concept of material culture studies,\(^4\) which focuses on the people and communities who used the ceramics, rather than ceramics themselves. By building upon the important typological and chronological studies of Hellenistic pottery in existence this research is able to bring into the fold the ancient consumer behind the archaeological distribution pattern and address the opportunities and choices open to him when it came to the production and consumption of tableware.

This project follows recent contributions to the field,\(^5\) by using Hellenistic tableware ‘assemblages’ to address the differences and similarities in consumption between various ‘Hellenistic’ communities located in Greece and Asia Minor. The ceramic distribution patterns of Hellenistic Athens, New Halos, Illion, Ephesus, Sardis, Gordian and Sagalassos will be analysed and contrasted. It will be demonstrated that these distribution patterns are not coincidental, but on the contrary entirely context

---

\(^1\) Thompson 1934; Hayes 1991; Rotroff 1982; Elgavish 1976; Pemberton 1985; Boggess 1970; Casson 1954; Rostovtzeff 1936; Davidson 1942; Archibald et al 2001; Dignas 2002.

\(^2\) Hamari 2012; Lund 1996; Poblome and Zelle 2002; Poblome et al 2002; Roth 2007.

\(^3\) Shipley 2013: 3.


dependent and the result of the opportunities available to and choices made by individuals and communities. This study will show that the tableware distribution patterns observable in the archaeological record reflect the contextualized choices of human agents reflective of specific behaviours and beliefs, and demonstrates that despite the existence of a general ceramic Hellenistic Aegean *koine* significant local variation existed. By utilizing the concept of human choice this study approaches this variation and introduces new perspectives on cross-Aegean ceramic distribution patterns.

**I.1.1 The problem: Understanding Tableware Distribution and....Consumption**

Analysis of economic and cultural interaction in the ancient world relies primarily on tracing the spread of ceramics. The evidence is often approached in a positivistic way. The presence or absence of (imported) ceramics is often used unproblematically as evidence of trade routes, sites or cultural associations. This kind of approach is too abstract, as it almost completely ignores the whole arsenal of choices and factors that could have resulted in the identified consumption patterns. Peña’s work has recently highlighted how dependent our ceramic distribution patterns are on human choices and how difficult it is to recognize and accurately interpret distribution patterns in the archaeological record.

This manuscript, therefore, wishes to put forward the concept of human choice or agency as an important avenue of investigation and one that is absolutely vital if we wish to acquire an understanding of the way in which particular ceramic distribution patterns came into existence. This research aims to translate tableware distributions to patterns of production and consumption which inform us about the way in which communities gave material form to the utensils required for drinking and eating and the different choices they made in this respect, in comparison with contemporary communities elsewhere. Tableware is thus approached as material culture fully embedded within society.

---

8 Peña 2007.
Despite Peña’s valid arguments regarding the way in which pottery enters the archaeological record, this manuscript is not a detailed re-study of selected archaeological contexts and therefore does not deal with choice in relation to artefact deposition. This is not a study of the influence of deposition and discard behaviours on the formation of tableware distribution patterns. Though of great importance for a much firmer understanding of artefact use and deposition, this manuscript deals with human choice and action on a broader level, focusing on the archaeological site as the smallest unit of analysis. These considerations will be discussed in more detail in chapter III.

The broader issue that this manuscript aims to address is the profound lack of interpretation and contextualization within the discipline of Hellenistic pottery studies. Human choice or agency as an avenue of investigation has received only limited and mostly indirect attention by students of Hellenistic pottery. Natalie Vogeikoff has shown how the shifting attitudes of Athenian elites led to the adoption of new shapes in the Athenian late Hellenistic ceramic repertoire and Susan Rotroff has illustrated how the introduction of the mouldmade bowl reflects both Athenian public sentiment and the opportunism of potters and possibly their patrons. Both authors do not claim to use choice or agency as a concept but indirectly demonstrate the importance of choices made against a background of specific socio-economic and geo-political conditions by both individuals and communities. Within Asia Minor (and the Levantine area), the works of Berlin, Shipley and Stewart are examples of studies which illustrate the importance of localized contextual developments in assessing and interpreting the ceramic data identified.

Unfortunately, this non-explicit use of human choice or agency and the explicit attention to the socio-economic and geo-political background of a site whose pottery ‘assemblage’ is presented is a rare occurrence in studies dealing with the ceramic material of the Hellenistic world. On the one hand, this is of course related to the

---

10 E.g. Schiffer 1972, 1983.
11 2000.
12 2006b.
13 1999.
14 In press.
15 2010.
inescapable fact that many of the key Hellenistic pottery publications are quite
dated. With this observation we do not mean to take anything away from their
accuracy and importance but rather highlight the difference in research interests
between then and now. More importantly these scholarly tours de force of the past
century laid the necessary ground work upon which future generations of scholars
could build. Without them, studies of a more interpretative nature would have been
impossible.

Contrary to the discipline of Roman pottery studies, the field of Hellenistic
pottery is still maturing. Hellenistic ceramics have only fairly recently received greater
attention and have been deemed worthy as an independent subject of study. A
contributing factor to this discrepancy is the greater uniformity of ceramic output in
the Roman world. The great sigillata categories are of course known to all of us, but
Hellenistic equivalents are harder to come by. There is the tail end of the great phase
of Attic export during the earlier part of the 3rd century BC and the widespread use of
similar shapes and West Slope decoration, but essentially every producer of pottery
during the greater part of the Hellenistic period exhibits local concerns. Clearer
standardization and extra regional distribution of tableware only starts in later
Hellenistic times and takes off fully during the Augustan period. Thus despite the
general occurrence of a similar shapes and types throughout the Hellenistic world,
substantial local and regional variation existed, making it extremely difficult to produce
distributional studies of similar vein to the ones conducted by students of the late
Hellenistic and Roman sigillatas. Where more uniform categories of Hellenistic pottery
can be distinguished their distribution and interpretation has unsurprisingly received
greater attention but as said before, categories like this are the exception rather than
the rule. Mouldmade bowls, unguentaria, White ground wares, Hadra Hydriae and
West Slope decoration are the prime examples (fig.2).

---

20 White ground ware see: Rotroff 1997a: 225-232. Hadra Hydria: Callaghan 1983; Callaghan and Jones
Despite the publication of Hellenistic pottery from more and more sites throughout Greece and Asia Minor, most new studies continue established traditions by presenting the material of a single site or context, focusing mainly on a description of the attested pottery, its parallels elsewhere and dating. Though very useful and necessary, adding knowledge of new sites and regions to the spectrum, the accumulation of Hellenistic ceramic data over the years from throughout the Eastern Mediterranean area finally allows us to make broader regional and extra-regional comparisons. The field in general is in need of contextualized broader interpretations, as we are now in a position to identify and approach an understanding of the differences and similarities between sites and regions. The well-known Scientific Meetings on Hellenistic Pottery conference volumes are a case in point.\(^{21}\) They offer a wealth of data, but little substantial interpretation. Comparative studies of Hellenistic pottery assemblages are equally rare.\(^{22}\)

This study attempts to redress this balance by comparing the ceramic data of various communities spread throughout Hellenistic Greece and Asia Minor (fig. 3-4). Not only will it highlight the relationship between human choice and context in relation to the production and consumption of tablewares, but equally represents one of few regional and extra-regional comparisons of Hellenistic tableware data in a wider Eastern Mediterranean context. As such this study hopes to contribute to a better understanding of the way in which tableware distributions were reflective of different socio-economic and geo-political contexts which defined and shaped the choice and consumption of ceramic tableware.

1.2 Research Context: Hellenistic Tableware

Hellenistic pottery has, as mentioned previously, largely been understudied. Our knowledge relies in effect on a handful of key sites, specifically Athens\(^{23}\) and Corinth\(^{24}\) for Greece. A similar situation can be observed in the East, where Ephesus, Pergamum, Tarsus and Antioch are the most commonly cited sites.\(^{25}\) However, over the past two

---

\(^{21}\) 1\(^{st}\)-9\(^{th}\) Scientific Meetings on Hellenistic Pottery.
\(^{22}\) Shipley 2008: 61, fig. 2a.
\(^{23}\) Rotroff 1982; 1997; 2006.
decades or so, we have seen a renewed interest in the study of Hellenistic ceramics. More publications presenting local deposits have been appearing\(^{26}\) and the Scientific Conferences on Hellenistic pottery (1986–2012) provide an important platform for the development of the field and the presentation of new material from a host of sites.\(^{27}\) What is still lacking, however, are a sufficient number of closely dated Hellenistic ‘assemblages’, particularly those stemming from primary contexts. New research thus still relies out of necessity for a large part on comparanda with well-known sites.\(^{28}\)

For Greece, but also to some extent Asia Minor, the work of Rotroff on the Athenian Agora material takes centre stage. Her publications of the mouldmade bowls, tablewares and plain wares of Athens provide reference points to Hellenistic scholars working within and outside of Attica and Greece. The excavation of so many closed deposits has allowed Rotroff to construct a fine-grained chronology for her material, which is used as a means for comparison by scholars working throughout the Hellenistic world.\(^{29}\) Using parallels from elsewhere can be a tricky undertaking. It can be justified when many imports, for example, Athenian are present. But obviously different regions may have been subjected to different chronological and functional developments. Uncritical use of parallels may lead to dangerous distortions in interpretation. Typological developments may follow local or regional developments not necessarily in line with developments in Athens.\(^{30}\) There may be substantial local differences in typology and chronology. Rotroff herself warns against using her work uncritically as a chronological parallel.\(^{31}\) This warning, however, has not prevented her study from becoming almost a handbook for Greek Hellenistic ceramic research. Similar difficulties are attached to using material from sites like Ephesus or Pergamum as comparanda.

Caveats aside, the general impression of the development of Hellenistic pottery is that it was relatively uniform. Similar shapes occur over a wide area and something of a Hellenistic ceramic *koine* may thus be discerned.\(^{32}\) This fact suggests that

---

\(^{26}\) E.g. Berlin 1999; Meztger 1993; Stewart 2010.

\(^{27}\) E.g. Regev 2000; Eiring 2000; Barker 2004; Rogl 2004.

\(^{28}\) E.g. Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003.

\(^{29}\) E.g. Mee and Forbes 1997; Cherry et al 1991; Cavanagh et al 2002.

\(^{30}\) Berlin 1999: 94.


\(^{32}\) Rotroff 2006a: 64; V. Stissi: personal communication; Coldstream, Eiring and Forster 2001: 90.
interregional comparison, though to be used with caution, can be meaningfully employed. The existence of this *koine* should not be taken as too uniform, as substantial local and regional variation existed.\(^{33}\) The *koine* is perhaps better described as a superficial veneer masking the variety present underneath. This variety manifests itself in the use of decoration, as in the different traditions of painted West Slope or the finishing of tableware vessels. Fully black slipped pottery, preferred in Athens, was not uniformly present everywhere else, as we will see below. Local shape repertoires also display considerable variation. The plain ware identified at the Athenian Agora corresponds with what is seen elsewhere only in its general outlook,\(^{34}\) and Hellenistic kantharoi, the general form of which is widespread, display substantial local and regional variation. The s-shaped kantharos, popular in Asia Minor, does not yield many good parallels at the Agora; and the same is true for the numerous skyphoid kantharoi identified on Eastern sites (fig. 5). Though ‘Greek’ pottery shapes are attested at many Hellenistic sites in the Eastern Mediterranean, ceramics recovered from Sardis, Gordion and Jebel Khalid, for example, illustrate the existence of different ceramic traditions and practices. Also within Greece itself, substantial local variation existed as is evidenced, for example, by the differences between Athens and Corinth, which share both similarities and differences in their shape repertoire (fig. 6).\(^{35}\)

Shapes which are in their general form widespread throughout the Hellenistic world are, for example, the echinus (fig. 7D) and outturned rim bowl (fig. 7C). The former is encountered on almost every Hellenistic site. The fishplate (fig. 7B) is widespread and so is the mouldmade bowl (fig. E-F). Rolled rim plates (fig. 15) also occur on many a site and so do cups with interior decoration (fig. 35). Most sites occupied during the early Hellenistic period also have yielded Classical kantharoi (fig. 7A) and its Hellenistic version (fig. 61) was likewise popular throughout the East. These are just some examples of the general uniformity that did exist and was real, however, superficial. Local or regional interpretations of these shapes were, however, the norm rather than the exception.

\(^{33}\) See Van der Enden et al in press a; compare e.g. Rotroff 1997 with Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011.
\(^{34}\) Rotroff 2006a: 64.
\(^{35}\) Compare Rotroff 1997 with James 2010.
Hellenistic tableware, especially that of Athens, was often slipped fully black. In this, the Classical preferences for a black slipped surface finish continued. Variation in the quality and colour of the glaze can, however, be noted at Athens and elsewhere. This is especially notable, for example, at Ephesus, where grey and brown slips occur regularly and at Sardis where pre-Greek traditions of finishing vessels red continued. Generally, during the early and middle parts of the Hellenistic period most tableware was reduced fired creating darker finishes. At Athens from about 150 BC onwards, the number of pots fired red or brown increases. Around this time we can indeed observe throughout the Hellenistic world a similar tendency. It is worth remembering, however, that red wares are considered traditional to the Levantine area and perhaps also some areas of Asia Minor (for example Lydia). We are thus also dealing in places with a continuation or development of established traditions (fig. 8).

In terms of decoration, the so admired (red) figured pottery of earlier days still sporadically occurs in the earliest Hellenistic deposits at the Athenian Agora but then disappears. What does continue is the application of rouletted and stamped decoration and West Slope decoration, though a development of the Hellenistic period evolves out of earlier traditions, as Rotroff has illustrated. New from the late 3rd century BC onwards is the widespread use of moulds to create relief bowls, which underscores a general tendency of Hellenistic vessels to imitate metal prototypes (fig. 9).

It is thus clear that certain general trends and tableware fashions transcended local or regional boundaries and helped construct a ceramic koine in which ‘Greek’ shapes were widespread. A certain amount of affinity existed between what people used for tableware in, for example, Greece, Turkey, Syria or the Levant. The widespread occurrence of ‘Greek’ style pottery was of course not new. We see that

38 Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 24-25; Rotroff 2006c: 148-149.
40 Rotroff 1997a: 11.
46 Rotroff 1997a: 12.
during the Classical period large numbers of Athenian imports reached Asia Minor, as is attested, for example, at Sardis or Gordion.\(^{47}\) Alexander’s conquests, however, appear to have further advanced the spread of Greek pottery.\(^{48}\)

### I.3 Organization of the Study

Chapter II of this work presents the theoretical background to this study, and introduces agency theory and the way in which an agency-based approach can be beneficial and implemented to an analysis of tableware consumption patterns. Chapter III will set out the proposed methodology, and introduces the data-set to be studied and the manner in which it has been collected and stored. Chapter III furthermore tackles the methodological issues relating to the comparison of the published tableware repertoire of various archaeological sites. Chapter IV sets out to compare the tableware data of two mainland Greek communities of varying scale, namely Athens and New Halos. The focus of comparison will be on the early Hellenistic period. Chapter V compares and contrasts the tableware repertoire of three sites in Western Asia Minor, Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis, for the duration of the entire period. The focus is on observable changes over time in the ceramic repertoire of the sites considered individually. Chapter VI moves much further inland and presents the tableware data (only published in preliminary fashion) of late Hellenistic Sagalassos, a mountain polis in Pisidia. Chapter VII draws the data presented in chapters V and VI together and addresses the observed varieties between sites, focusing on the way in which human choice helped shape these differences. In the final chapter, chapter VIII, the tableware data of Athens and Ephesus will be contrasted to highlight observable differences in tableware production and consumption and address the role and influence of active human choice in this respect. The final conclusions will draw the issues raised in the individual chapters together and presents some thoughts for the future.

This research is the first broad comparative study of Hellenistic pottery. It introduces the communities behind the artefacts by seeing ceramic distribution patterns as expressions of human behaviour. In so doing it moves away from the often

---


strictly economic interpretations of ceramic distribution patterns. Instead a new perspective is provided by utilizing the concept of choice which when applied to ceramic distribution patterns significantly furthers our understanding of the complex nature of production, distribution and consumption in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean.
Chapter II: Theory

II.1 Agency and Archaeology

Agency has become during the last decade a buzz word within archaeological studies seeking a cognitive approach to the material past.\(^{49}\) As a paradigm its use in archaeology resulted from the Post-Processualist reaction against the New or Processual Archaeology. The latter emphasized the existence of cross cultural laws and rules against which societies could be measured and studied.\(^{50}\) Human actors were seen to adapt to and constrained by the environment.\(^{51}\) People were seen not as active decision makers but rather as passive and reacting to external influences. Culture was viewed as a set of fixed mental templates structuring human behaviour which was passed on from one individual to another. Cultural change in this view is brought about by humans adapting to environmental pressures. There is little space left for human choice and action.\(^{52}\) In its focus on ecological determinism New Archaeology saw cultural expressions like ritual and religion as more or less second rate phenomena. Technology and economy were to be the focus of processual research. Cognitive subjects such as religion, belief systems and world views were deemed as inappropriate and unrealistic lines of enquiry.\(^{53}\) Systems theory thus had a distinct materialistic\(^{54}\) focus on productive expressions of human behaviour which could be more easily connected to environmental influences.\(^{55}\)

Cognitive Archaeology developed in response to the approaches of the ‘New Archaeology’. It formed part of the Post-Processualist movement which sprung up in reaction to the overly deterministic and universalistic stance of Processual Archaeology. The main aim of this theoretical counter-reformation was to bring back human individuals to the forefront of archaeological investigation and analysis.\(^{56}\) Abstractly put, Post-Processualists tend to favour meaning instead of explanation and focus on the individual and the particular. They see culture as vibrant. For them it is

\(^{49}\) Dobres and Robb 2000: 3.
\(^{50}\) Johnson 1999: 24-25, 30.
\(^{52}\) Whitley 1998: 5.
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not about fixed norms but all about symbolism, meaning and worldviews. These are not stable but are actively created, maintained and changed.\textsuperscript{57} The distinction drawn up by Processual Archaeology between social and cultural theories was broken down by Post-Processualist approaches to the past.\textsuperscript{58} Instead of distinct entities they are considered complementary. Post-Procesualism, however, is not one specific paradigm. It consists of a host of related approaches which emphasize the importance of human cognition and action with regards to cultural change.\textsuperscript{59} Agency theory, though already employed in a different guise in the processual phase of archaeology,\textsuperscript{60} can be seen as one of its major components.\textsuperscript{61}

Within archaeology, current thinking regarding agency stems primarily from the work of Giddens and Bourdieu. Giddens’ theory of structuration and Bourdieu’s habitus have been and continue to be hugely influential.\textsuperscript{62} Giddens\textsuperscript{63} defined agency as the capacity for action. Agents or actors have “the capability to make a difference.” Bourdieu sees agency as the “ability to understand and control our own actions” though the opportunities for human agency are context dependent.\textsuperscript{64} No universal definition of the term agency exists however.\textsuperscript{65} Barker,\textsuperscript{66} for example, sees agency as “the capacity of individuals to act independently and to make their own free choices.” Dobres and Robb\textsuperscript{67} helpfully have summarized some of the varied interpretations of what constitutes agency. Their selected examples range from the “experience of individual action in creating a life story”\textsuperscript{68} to “the strategic carrying out of intentional plans for purposive goals”\textsuperscript{69} and “the replication of unconscious cognitive structures”\textsuperscript{70} or “the social reproduction of system-wide power relations via cultural actions.”\textsuperscript{71} The
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cited definitions thus offer a varied spectrum and signify the complex scholarly engagement with theories of agency.

Most recent approaches to agency, drawing on Giddens and Bourdieu, stress the social embeddedness of a human actor or agent. Giddens in the 1970s had formulated the concept of duality of structure which revolved around the idea that human agents create and change the structure of society by their actions, both as intended and unintended consequences. At the same time, however, the structure of society provides “the rules and resources drawn upon in the production and reproduction of social action.” The actions of human individuals are thus shaped by the social structure of the society of which they form a part. Bourdieu similarly focussed around the same time on the conditions of daily life which structure and direct people’s lives and actions unconsciously and result in the creation and maintenance of social practices. He coined the term *habitus* to describe this lived human experience of daily life and introduced the term *doxa* as an indicator for the internalized social presuppositions of human beings which had a vital bearing on how human actors viewed and acted out in the world. In the view of Giddens and Bourdieu human choice and action therefore cannot be disentangled from the social and cultural framework in which an actor or agent was embedded. Agency and structure are closely intertwined.

The above view of agency is well established and forms the basis upon which most modern studies of agency in archaeology build. The importance of structure is also stressed by Cowgill who argues that humans can take conscious decisions but are never completely free agents. In a similar vein, Wobst is of the opinion that human agents are informed in their choices by context, history and social structure. Knapp and van Dommelen go as far as to suggest that the specific social context in
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which human actors are embedded is of greater importance than the intentionality behind the actions of individual agents. In practice these and similar approaches to agency all argue for actors who are embedded in society, meaning they are structured from the outset by a societal framework consisting of commonly held knowledge, traditions, thoughts and beliefs. This provides the actor with a template or structure for acting out in the world. Structure thus represents the internalized traditions and customs of a social group, which is the argument, heavily influence everyday social practices and the human agency which create and uphold them. Human Agency and social structures are thus closely intertwined.

The importance given across the scholarly board to structure can clearly be seen in Robb’s\textsuperscript{82} overview of certain key characteristics, which are generally seen as being vital elements of or impact upon human agency. These over-arching characteristics focus not on choice or action itself, but rather on the framework in which the human actors or agents operated. Thus it is held in common consensus that daily practices shape identity and social relations. These practices, the result of human action (agency), have material correlates which subsequently acquire meaning. Practices, however, do not exist in isolation rather they are part of specific historical contexts, which instruct and guide the actor or agent.\textsuperscript{83} The generally agreed definition of agency thus focuses on an individual who is embedded in a historical society which is upheld and redefined by his actions and their material expressions.

Despite the similarities in approach outlined above, significant variation exists, however, in the ways archaeologists see agency and apply it to the study of the past. A particular bone of contention concerns to extend extent to which human agents were knowledgeable. Silliman\textsuperscript{84} argues that archaeologists inspired by Giddens and Bourdieu can be separated into two camps, those that favour rational knowledgeable actors and those that favour structured and contextualized individuals. Dobres and Robb\textsuperscript{85} similarly mention intentionality as one of the major stumbling blocks among agency theorists. This discussion harks back to Giddens who envisions actors as

\textsuperscript{82} 2005: 3-4.
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knowledgeable and acting with intent in expectation of intended results.\textsuperscript{86} Recent research, however, has made it clear that the element of choice in the actions of humans is influenced and dictated more by the subconscious than by conscious and well thought-out decisions. The free will in the actions of humans appears more limited than previously thought. Instead the subconscious, in which all kinds of experiences and emotions assembled during life and genetic information are contained, plays an important role in human agency.\textsuperscript{87} Choice is thus heavily conditioned or structured. Human beings are informed and guided by the social structures in which they find themselves embedded and which they may not consciously appreciate or have full knowledge of. The actions of human agents therefore tend to adhere to established social practices and thus reconfirm and help to preserve the structure (social system) of a given society. Rather than being knowledgeable agents, many actors do not consciously conceptualize their actions. They are part of ingrained social practices or routines.

The structured nature of human agency is a stark warning that we should be careful in applying modern concepts of individuality and choice upon the past.\textsuperscript{88} Also Dobres and Robb\textsuperscript{89} warn against the projection of modern views of agency on the past. As Knapp and van Dommelen\textsuperscript{90} argue, we seem unable to cope with a past where human thought and action were not free but instead heavily structured. Individuals, ancient and modern, are the products of the societies in which they are embedded and generally live their lives accordingly, engaging in and with established social practices. The choices we make, whether consciously or unconsciously largely make sense within the contextual background in which they were conceived and acted upon.

\textbf{II.1.1 Human Choice, Action and the Archaeological Record}

Another major issue of agency studies concerns the practical applicability of the concept. How to detect agency; human choice and action, in the archaeological record? Dobres and Robb\textsuperscript{91} have identified this conundrum as one of the most
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fundamental issues facing archaeologists applying agency theory to a study of the material past. In order to answer this question we need to consider how agency or human choice and action are manifested in the archaeological record.

Archaeological remains are obviously resultant partly from human choice and action and are thus the material residues of agency. The archaeological record therefore encapsulates agency through the by-products of human action: material artefacts. Or to put it simply, the archaeological artefacts attested are the direct results of human choice and action and are thus the material exponents of agency frozen solid in time. We are encountering the material results of choices and actions, made within a specific context or structure. What we do not unearth directly of course is the rationale or intent behind the observed decision. Why was a product made in this way or why do we find it in this specific locale? To uncover the choices behind the artefact appears a daunting exercise indeed. How, for example, do we identify the intentions and motives behind the production or decoration of a ceramic vessel? How do we trace the reason why a particular architectural style or building was preferred? As Wobst aptly puts it, “Artefacts create and modify stories, they do not tell them.” So how do we discover what these stories are?

Surprisingly perhaps, not enough thought has gone into the question of how to make agency visible in material culture. A review of the literature shows that many scholars engaging with agency present case specific utilizations of the term and have difficulty in making their use of the concept directly applicable to the archaeological record. Context, however, perhaps unsurprisingly, is the vital concept that enables us to approach a better understanding of the choices behind the artefact. As Silliman rightly argues, “more attention should be devoted to sorting out the parameters of action – the alternatives and limitations for an individual in any given social setting.” We need to be able to understand the context in which human actors and material culture were embedded in order to comprehend the choices and actions that lie
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behind the creation or consumption of an artefact, the construction of a building or
the use of a particular decorative technique.

The importance of context is also stressed by Barrett\textsuperscript{98} who highlights the need
to focus on the mechanisms by which archaeological contexts come into existence,
operate and are upheld or recreated. The archaeological record is seen not as the
result of the actions of individuals but as the context in which agency operated. We
need to comprehend this context in order to understand the material culture of a
foregone era.\textsuperscript{99} Knapp and van Dommelen\textsuperscript{100} agree with this view. They argue that
people are always part of social collectives, even if they act as individuals.\textsuperscript{101} Therefore
they cannot be seen in isolation. Instead attention needs to focus on the contexts in
which these actors operated and which provided the boundaries and opportunities for
their activities.\textsuperscript{102}

The material artefacts themselves assist, as the products of partly structured
human choice and action, in the reconstruction of the contextual structure of which
they formed a part. Distribution patterns of archaeological ceramics, for example,
across a certain site or region, help to reconstruct the contextual framework
responsible for the observed pattern, by adding data about economic contacts, the
existence of networks or dietary preferences. In an archaeological quest for agency,
artefact and context or structure are thus closely intertwined and often
complementary. With notable exception the choice(s) behind the artefact can thus
best be made visible on the level of the aggregate group, as it is consistent data
patterning that allows for an appreciation of the artefact within a wider framework.
When available, historical data can be utilized to complement the material picture but
is not a prerequisite for approaching the meanings behind the artefact. Much historical
data in any case is not linked directly to everyday social practices and artefacts, the
kind of information most archaeologists are routinely dealing with and attempt to
interpret.
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Ethnography, though not directly applicable, can also inform us about the options open to individuals and communities and reveal the complex relationship of humans with the material world.\(^{103}\)

### II.1.2 An Approach to Agency

Human choice and action, heavily structured, most clearly manifests itself when there is change. Agency of course is responsible for the production of every artefact but can be made visible especially when, for example, a new pottery style is introduced or old ways of doing things are abandoned. A difference in the balance between local ceramic production and the import of pottery from elsewhere is another example of change. It is in these circumstances that the making of choices becomes readily apparent. Changes are potent signifiers of the outcome of human choice and action, and therefore archaeologists applying agency theory to the archaeological record should take observed changes in material culture as the starting point of their investigation. As research indicates that pottery producers tend to be fairly traditional in their use of models, any observed changes acquire significance.\(^{104}\)

A recent paper by David has identified change as a key concept vital for the application of agency theory to the archaeological record. David\(^{105}\) stresses the need to identify intention in the archaeological record. He defines intentionality as "a person’s conscious awareness — they mean to do something."\(^{106}\) In order to get to intent we need to first identify the options selected from a range of alternatives and, second, how such actions “transcend the social normative.”\(^{107}\) The way to do this and uncover agency is by identifying change in the archaeological record and access the impact of historical events.\(^{108}\) Change is identified as a key concept because in the words of David, it “implies the transcending of present (normative) ways of doing things, which in turn implies a break from existing social powers and hegemony.”\(^{109}\) The lack of change does not mean that no choices were made or intended actions pursued.

---

103 See Bowser 2000; Costin 2000; Kalentzidou 2000.
105 2004: 68.
106 David 2004: 68.
107 David 2004: 68.
108 David 2004: 68.
109 David 2004: 68.
Following established traditions does indeed involve intended action. Continuity in itself may equally signal a conscious choice. What makes the identification of change so important, however, is according to David that “when a new way of doing things appears in the archaeological record, we can surmise a conscious awareness of choice and the intent to do something other than the established normative.”

Change signifies a conscious break with the established conventions of the past and therefore represents a moment of choice par excellence. David’s work provides a useful and practical way of implementing agency theory in an archaeological context. Change should be the starting point for any agency-based analysis as it implies innovation and thus choice. Change, however, might not be the most appropriate concept to discuss observed differences between, for example, two archaeological sites. Two sites can be different from each other without significant changes having occurred. The differences between sites are, however, the result of the choices and actions of human agents who did things differently than their counterparts elsewhere. This of course does not need to mean that they had similar options open to them. Next to change, variation within a site or between sites and regions should therefore be a useful starting point to highlight different contextualized choices.

The next step would then be to draw in the contextual background of each site or region, the importance of which has been stressed in the above. Material culture informs, but is at the same time structured by, the contextual framework in which it is embedded. Poblome, Malfitana and Lund indeed argue that it is vital to place material culture in its wider context. Contexts can be identified at different scales ranging from, for example, an individual household to the Seleucid Empire as a whole. It speaks for itself that every context is different and that this needs to be appreciated when surveying the available options and opportunities. Interpretation can for obvious reasons not be detached from the specific context in which people produced, used and consumed material culture. Indeed identification of contextual differences between, for example, households, sites, provinces, regions is a vital path of enquiry to document the differences in human engagement with material culture. There is a need
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and indeed obligation to measure local responses to wider socio-economic and geopolitical processes.\textsuperscript{114} Only by doing this can we attempt to approach answering the why questions and examine why human agents made certain possibly different, choices.

Incorporating the contextual structure of a society, group or individual within an agency based approach to material culture leads to the identification of certain aspects that could have impacted (guided or constrained) human choice and action. We may think in this case of specific socio-cultural practices, economic developments or geographic realities and political forces. These elements are defined within this work as ‘aspects of choice’ and as such play a fundamental role in the guiding or constraining of human choice and action, the material results of which we can identify in the archaeological record. It is only by illuminating these aspects and identifying their potential impact upon the composition of the archaeological record that we can aim to approach an explanation of observed changes or the variety within or between sites. It is indeed one of the main arguments of this research that the differences between archaeological communities in terms of material culture are primarily shaped by varying contextual aspects which impacted the options available. By identifying these aspects and surveying landscapes of opportunity it is possible to address the variety between sites and regions as the material residues of contextually structured choices.

II.1.3 Agency and Ceramics

Pottery is the most common archaeological artefact encountered. It is therefore no surprise that agency theory has been applied to its study.\textsuperscript{115} Pottery of course represents a product largely used in the everyday activities of daily life. As such it is an important marker of routine social practice. Pottery is furthermore not seen as an elite product.\textsuperscript{116} Athenian fully black slipped tableware of the Hellenistic period is considered to have been available to a wide segment of the population of Athens.\textsuperscript{117} As such pottery is an abundant archaeological artefact engaged in common social
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practices such as eating and drinking, and represents the choices and actions of a wide segment of society. The identification of change or continuity with regards to pottery consumption within and between sites or regions can therefore potentially tell us a great deal about the (communal) preferences for, and engagement, with objects used on a routine basis.

Material culture studies have demonstrated that artefacts are not simply passive objects of use. Instead, artefacts may carry meaning and associations and have complex life-stories. Poblome, Malfitana and Lund recently stressed that artefacts were not only stylistic or chronological markers but embedded within society. In the words of Poblome, Malfitana and Lund, “material culture is non-coincidental”; it is encapsulated within society and part of social practices which inform its use and role but equally play a vital part in reconfirming established practices. Or as Appadurai puts it, “though from a theoretical point of view human actors encode things with significance it is the things in motion that illuminate their human and social context”. Mackenzie makes a similar point by stating that “It is objects themselves that give value to social relations, yet the social values of objects are culturally constructed.” The use of a knife and fork is, for example, guided by established social practices. The continued use and presence of these tools creates a material world in which the fork and knife are considered normative and by their mere presence helps to preserve those same established practices. As children, for example, we grew up in a material world in which knives and forks were ever present. Our early exposure too and engagement with, these material products helped to preserve their use, even within different or new social contexts. Pottery equally can and indeed does carry meaning(s) and association(s). Since it does so, continuity and change in, for example, the dining assemblage can inform us about wider socio-economic, cultural or geopolitical developments.

---
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II.2 Ceramic Innovation

Changing ceramics, be it in form, decoration or manufacturing technique, are highly visible reflections of human action which go against the grain of normative behaviour. This point is important, as potters are generally considered to be conservative and change their ways only when necessary.\footnote{Nicklin 1971: 47.} Potters tend to produce that which they know works; they are not innovative by nature but do so in anticipation of an advantage or because the market forces them.\footnote{Rotroff 2006b: 371-372; Kögler 2010: 39-40.}

Innovation is not purely a technological process, though it can be in the way that the material characteristics of a product are transformed. However, the reasons behind innovation are to be found in the realm of the social. If we take ceramic innovation as an example, this does not merely reflect an act of artistic inspiration on the part of the potter.\footnote{1971: 27-29.} The potter most likely has potential customers in mind,\footnote{Langridge-Noti 2013: 71.} works on the basis of a model and must have had a strong incentive to divert from traditional ways of manufacture. Potential consumers operated within their own specific context which was not stable but fluid. A new ceramic shape needed to make sense within these. Consumers therefore could accept, adapt or reject innovations.\footnote{For case studies involving the mouldmade bowl and Pergamene West Slope ware see Rotroff 2006b: 374-375; Kögler 2010: 39-40.}

Distributors too, have an important role to play with regards to change and innovation. They function as the pivotal link between producers and consumers. Their activities, however, are also ingrained within specific socio-cultural contexts resulting in context specific intentions, motivations and practices. Distributors would not spontaneously start trading in new products or with new areas all of a sudden. They have the choice to do so, but this choice needs to make sense within the wider societal framework in which they operated. So Roman traders, for example, are able to operate in the East because of the specific socio-political and economic processes in which their activities make sense.\footnote{See Reger 2006: 351-352.} Similarly their activities build upon and make sense within an existing context of Greco-Italic economic contacts and routes of trade.
and exchange.\textsuperscript{129} It is the wider framework within which choices were made that provides the answer to understanding ceramic distribution patterns.\textsuperscript{130} This view might sound overtly structuralist, but on the contrary within the parameters provided it leaves ample room for human agents to make choices.

Why things change, however, has been the issue of much debate. Functionalist approaches focus on the adaptive nature of human behaviour. They see innovation as a response to external pressures. Little room is built in for cognitive explanations.\textsuperscript{131} However, objects and technologies do not solely change because they respond to outside pressures. We need to imagine a more symbiotic relationship in which external and internal factors are combined. Internal factors are to be found in the realm of human cognition. Craftsmen and artisans work within established cultural and social frameworks which provide a context for their activities. The human mind operates within an already established framework in which the world and its inhabiting materials make sense.\textsuperscript{132} Tradition and routine thus play an important role, something which is evident if we consider some of our own preferences and tastes. Cutting bread with a fork and knife is, for example, something the author has learned since childhood. A deviation of these established practices of manufacture therefore potentially signals changing norms and values. Innovation is only possible or successful if it is accepted by the targeted audience. Undesired innovations will be considered flaws and will not be repeated. The question of most interest, however, to this research is why do norms and values shift, why does the normative behaviour of a society change?

\textit{II.3 Consumer Choice}

As this is a study of tableware consumption, it is indeed vital to consider ancient consumers, the people behind the artefact and their ability to choose. Consumer theory shares with agency studies many considerations regarding human choice and action but significantly adds to the latter by focussing on the various options available
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to human agents and consumers, a topic rarely considered directly by agency theorists.\textsuperscript{133}

Analyses of consumer choice are rare within archaeological and historical studies.\textsuperscript{134} People are not often approached as socially embedded individuals who could choose one option over the other.\textsuperscript{135} Production and distribution of archaeological artefacts have received most attention. This is especially the case with regard to the Greco-Roman period.\textsuperscript{136} It has primarily been the discipline of historical archaeology which has seen the application of consumer theory and a specific interest in consumer choice.\textsuperscript{137} This lack of engagement with consumer theory possibly has its roots in the primitivist–modernist debate\textsuperscript{138} regarding the nature of the ancient economy; and the application of modern theories of consumer behaviour and choice, to the archaeological record is not self-evident and without difficulties.\textsuperscript{139} Additionally, scholars may have been discouraged by the difficulties of acquiring useable archaeological data reflective of individual consumption.\textsuperscript{140} Recently Ray\textsuperscript{141} has demonstrated for Roman Pompeii how such an approach increases our understanding of the consumer side of things, providing a framework to answer a different set of questions.\textsuperscript{142} It is this different perspective on archaeological distribution patterns that strikes the author as the most valuable contribution of consumer theory to archaeological interpretation.

A consumer is “an individual or organization who acquires goods or services for his or her own use or for someone else's use.”\textsuperscript{143} That is, a human agent or actor who makes decisions upon which s/he acts. At the heart of studies of consumer choice lie basic but fundamental questions: what choices were made, what were the alternatives
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and why were certain options pursued and others disregarded? Consumer choice is about the wants and needs of people and the decisions they make in this respect. Questions such as these inform this research, which uses an approach that argues for greater attention to the ‘rationale’ behind human choice and action. These questions could be pursued on the level of the individual, but the nature of the archaeological evidence is more suited to approaching consumer choice from the perspective of the community. The community is the context in which artefacts were produced, distributed and used and as such provides a framework to address consumption practices, both on the local level and in relation to other communities located in the wider region or further afield. Human individuals are influenced in their consumption patterns by group membership. A communal approach allows a scalar view of human consumption practices across both time and space with changes particularly reflective of human agency. Studies of consumption are important for the discipline of archaeology as the act of consuming is an important avenue for the signalling of group membership, class, status, identity and ethnicity. Like agency, however, consumer theory also stresses the embedded and situational nature of choice and is especially useful in providing a flavour of the aspects that constrain or guide human choice, a topic considered already briefly in the above.

Historical archaeology has paid particular attention to consumer choice and pottery and as such has provided useful insights into early modern consumption patterns of ceramics and the parameters of choice. Research on Hebridean households in Scotland has shown that consumers had a particular preference for Scottish products despite the availability of affordable English wares. Specific local preferences are thus in evidence, showing that the wide availability of products need not
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necessarily lead to or be the reason for their adoption, something which is often assumed in studies of Greco-Roman pottery. The make-up of the local repertoire on the Hebrides equally demonstrates this. In contrast to communities on the mainland, a range of bowl forms was predominant. Imported pottery from the mainland largely conformed to these conventions. In the case of the 19th century Hebrides it is clear, therefore, that though availability increased the options open to consumers, local preferences and traditions dictated their adoption or refusal. The imported pottery was made to fit within local patterns of consumption, not the other way round. The evidence from the 18th century BC Pratt household in Newport also shows that out of a range of available options consumers could choose differently. For example, Pratt invested in porcelain teacups yet her social equals did not. The availability of products could, however, also push consumers in certain directions. Availability offered choices, but these could be restrictive. High-quality porcelain tableware was not produced in Colonial America and needed to be imported from England, mainland Europe or China. Consumers were thus forced to look in certain directions. Again, however, the evidence suggests that availability was dictated by demand and not the other way round. Witowski argues that British descent and a desire to conform to the living standards of mother England drove Americans of means to develop an appetite for imported products. Local tastes, not availability, determined demand in this case. Recent ethnoarchaeological research into ceramic consumption has indeed indicated that producers could attune their output to the specifics of local markets.

A few studies deal specifically with consumer choice and ceramics in the Greco-Roman period, especially Roman Britain. Pitts with regard to (pre-)Roman Britain emphasizes the importance of access to road networks for non-urban communities to tap into ceramic supply. There appear to be clear differences with regards to the options open to urban and rural communities. Choice, according to Pitts, was in this
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context subjected to issues of availability and connectivity. Consumer choice may thus have been limited in Roman Britain.\textsuperscript{162}

Ray has provided a thorough review of the available evidence regarding consumption and the aspects that affected the ability of consumers to choose.\textsuperscript{163} They are listed in 1.1.1.table1 and provide a good overview of the range of factors potentially influencing the choices and actions of consumers. Walsh\textsuperscript{164} has also surveyed some of the aspects influencing consumer choice and taste, mentioning, for example, proximity to the source of production, diversity and quantity of available objects and the ability of an object to be used in social and cultural signalling along with cost, availability and fashion.\textsuperscript{165} It thus becomes clear that no single factor or aspect can be deemed dominant.\textsuperscript{166} The cost of a product might, for example, be deemed the paramount factor in the mind of potential consumers. Though this may indeed be so, the cost might be related to its wider availability in the market, the access of consumers to the market, or the success of the product. Cost being enabling or prohibitive in turn could depend on a number of factors, most prominent among them the socio-economic status of a consumer. Ray’s work aptly shows how embedded the choices of consumers are both within their own local context and within wider social and structural frameworks and can provide a framework in which to conceptualize why certain choices were made. This research will indeed show how such aspects were responsible for the distributional differences in tableware production and consumption. As Ray\textsuperscript{167} has stressed, within “a field of limitations” structured rational choices were made. The latter might appear to us as irrational but make sense within the contextual framework in which the individuals concerned operated.

\textbf{II.4 Summary}

In the above, it has been argued ceramic distribution patterns can be effectively engaged with agency theory by focusing on observable changes over time within the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{162} Ray 2009: 131, citing Monaghan 1995.
\item \textsuperscript{163} Ray 2009: 152-153.
\item \textsuperscript{164} 2013: 240-241.
\item \textsuperscript{165} Walsh 2013: 231.
\item \textsuperscript{166} See Hamari 2012: 91.
\item \textsuperscript{167} Ray 2009: 54.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
confines of a single site and between sites of different complexion. Context and structure have been highlighted as key aspects of human agency as both severely impact the options open to individuals and communities. It has furthermore been noted that agency or consumer based approaches have only rarely been applied to the study of Hellenistic pottery and offer the potential to ask a new range of questions which can significantly advance our understanding of the differences within and between sites with regards to ceramic distribution and consumption. In the next chapter, chapter III, the proposed methodology of this research project and the associated problématique will be outlined.
Chapter III: Methodology

III.1 The Data-set

As set out in chapter I, this study explores the influence of human agency upon the creation of tableware distribution patterns in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean. In effect this research aims to explore whether the observed variety in tableware distribution within and between different archaeological sites can be explained with reference to human actors or agents making different choices, choices which effected the composition of the tableware repertoire. A further aim of this research is to explore, for the individual sites considered, the parameters of human choice with regards to the consumption of tableware. In order to approach a better understanding of the issues considered a methodology drawing on Hellenistic tableware data but placed within a wider archaeological and historical framework will be employed. This contextualized view of pottery production and consumption is one of the main contributions of this research and allows an appreciation of the human consumer behind the artefact.

III.1.1 Temporal and Geographical Scope

The chronological focus of this research rests on the Hellenistic period, ranging from the late 4th century BC to the early 1st century BC. Scholars generally agree that from a historical perspective, the Hellenistic period starts with the death of Alexander the Great in 323 BC.\textsuperscript{168} There is less consensus, however, as to when the period ends. This is the result of Rome’s relatively slow encroachment upon the Hellenistic dominions which affected different parts of the Hellenistic world at varying timescales.\textsuperscript{169} Traditional local, regional or universal cut-off points mentioned in the literature are the battle of Actium fought in 31 BC, the destruction of Corinth in 146 BC,\textsuperscript{170} the creation of the Roman province of Asia in 133 BC, the settlement of Pompey in 64 BC\textsuperscript{171} or in the specific case of Athens, the sack of the city in 86 BC by Sulla.\textsuperscript{172} In political terms, the Hellenistic period ends at different times in different places. Even

\textsuperscript{168} Shipley 2000: 2; Errington 2008: 13.
\textsuperscript{171} Errington 2008: 278.
\textsuperscript{172} In ceramic terms 86 BC has traditionally been seen as the arbitrary cut-off point between the Hellenistic and Roman phases of Athenian ceramic production. Rotroff 1997b: 100.
after Actium Hellenistic kingdoms continued to survive. The political trajectory of the Hellenistic period is thus by no means uniform and does not neatly fit within arbitrary chronological brackets. The utilization of the term Hellenistic to describe the post-Alexander III world before the Roman takeover is in many ways a misnomer as it does not pay heed to the obvious and extensive geo-political, socio-economic and cultural variety present within the territories formerly conquered by Alexander the Great. Besides roughly indicating an ill-defined chronological period, the word Hellenistic is too general of a term to be of much use in the construction of historical narratives involving specific regions.

Material culture and political narratives usually do not neatly correspond. This is especially the case with regards to mundane everyday artefacts such as pottery. Recently Rotroff has demonstrated that the development of Athenian Hellenistic pottery does not neatly correspond to the historical boundaries of the Hellenistic period. Local Attic production of pottery continued Hellenistic traditions of manufacture into the 1st century AD. Equally Athenian pottery was up until ca. 275 BC firmly embedded within Classical traditions of ceramic manufacture. Similar observations can be made for other Hellenistic sites. It is clear therefore that what we refer to as Hellenistic traditions of ceramic manufacture are not bound by the traditional historical book-ends of the period.

This research thus focusses on a late 4th century – early 1st century BC chronological range. This range enables an assessment of tableware production and consumption from the advent of a Macedonian-dominated Eastern Mediterranean to the period of the late Republic and the rise of Augustus. Exactly because pottery traditions did not change overnight such an extended view is necessary to access whether and if so how and why local consumers of tableware in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean were making different choices. The death of Alexander the Great and the rise of Augustus form convenient but arbitrary cut-off points. These two events do
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175 See Adams 1979.
176 1997b.
178 Rotroff 1997b: 112.
signal different phases in the political history of the Eastern Mediterranean. By seeing
the Hellenistic period in more loosely defined chronological terms it is possible to
access the potential impact on tableware production, distribution and consumption
across Aegean Greece and Asia Minor of changing geo-political, socio-economic and
cultural processes. It is perhaps fairer to say that this research is not necessarily
concerned with the Hellenistic period as such, but aims to document why consumers
of tableware were making different and/or similar choices.

Geographically this research limits its scope to Aegean Greece and South
Western and Central Asia Minor. The choice for this study-area is inspired by the fact
that both Aegean Greece and South Western and Central Asia Minor were part of a
Hellenistic pottery koine. Similar shapes and wares can to some extend be identified
across the areas considered. The presence of ‘Greek’ or extensively Hellenized
communities on the South Western shores of Asia Minor had facilitated the spread
of ‘Greek’ elements of material culture, including pottery. By Hellenistic times many
‘Greek’ shapes are indeed well established and part of local production and
consumption strategies. This general familiarity with ‘Greek’ tableware is an
important prerequisite for this research, as it begs the question why local consumers
are making different choices. A comparison between Aegean Greece and Hellenistic
Asia Minor therefore provides an excellent platform to address differing engagements
with ‘Greek’ tableware, in particular the way in which local choices shaped the
observed distribution patterns.

The documented extra-regional contacts between Aegean Greece and
(eespecially Western) Asia Minor also increase the likelihood that both producers and
consumers of the communities considered were to some degree aware of the latest
tableware fashions and trends, making it a pressing concern to access and explain any
observed variety. Such a geographical focus is further justified by the presence within
Aegean Greece and Asia Minor of important tableware producing centres, such as

180 To varying degrees.
183 Fishplate, mouldmade bowl, incurving rim bowl and kantharos are examples and identified by
     Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991; Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003; Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011; Berlin 1999; Stewart
     2010.
Athens,\textsuperscript{185} Ephesus\textsuperscript{186} or Pergamum,\textsuperscript{187} which greatly impacted the local, regional and extra-regional production and consumption of tableware (fig. 10).

\textbf{III.1.2 Tableware}

Tableware stemming from seven archaeological sites forms the framework around which this work has been constructed. Tableware has been selected for a number of reasons. First, constraints of space and time will not allow for a complete study of the ceramic dataset. The volume of material is simply too large. Secondly, the choice for tableware is supported by the specific questions this research wishes to address. This thesis aims to study agency from a consumer perspective. Tableware in particular appears much more dependent upon changes in fashion than cooking wares and pottery of a more domestic nature.\textsuperscript{188} Tableware was more susceptible to innovation\textsuperscript{189} than plain or cooking ware. The use of tableware offered opportunities for conspicuous consumption, social signalling, emulation and competition.\textsuperscript{190} This suggests that tableware has greater potential than vessels of a more utilitarian nature, to reflect or be impacted by wider socio-economic, cultural and perhaps geo-political trends or changes.

An additional incentive for a focus upon tableware is the state of current knowledge. Fine tableware has always received greater attention and study than cooking and plain wares.\textsuperscript{191} This has led to a better understanding of their morphological and chronological development. The latter is particularly important for the questions pursued in this work. Precisely because of the relative speed with which tableware shapes developed and are replaced by new products, the value of this medium for the dating of archaeological deposits is enormous and their study has thus received ample attention.\textsuperscript{192}

\textsuperscript{186} Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991; Gassner 1997.
\textsuperscript{187} Schäfer 1968; Meyer-Schlichtmann 1988.
\textsuperscript{189} The prime examples of innovation during the Hellenistic period are the introduction of the mouldmade bowl, cup with interior decoration and Hellenistic style kantharos/skyphos.
\textsuperscript{190} See Perkins 2000: 200-204; Dusinberre 1999: 96-98.
\textsuperscript{191} See e.g. Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991; Waagé 1948: 2; and the proceedings of the Scientific Meetings on Hellenistic Pottery.
\textsuperscript{192} See James 2010: 47-48.
The above factors combine to make tableware an appropriate category to single out for a study focusing on the influence of human agency upon the formation of consumption patterns. This work, however, does not focus on the complete tableware repertoire. Only cups, bowls and plates are studied. Serving and storage vessels are left out of the equation, as are vessels of ambiguous function, like lekanai or plain ware bowls, shapes that could have been used for a multitude of purposes (fig. 11). The reason to focus only on cups, bowls and plates is that these categories form a relatively unambiguous part of any tableware assemblage. Their role and function can be relatively clearly defined. This is not the case with the important category of serving vessels, which may have been used for pouring or storing liquids and are encountered in both slipped and unslipped versions and may have been served at the table but not necessarily so. The same can be said of lekanai. In short we cannot be certain for some ceramic vessels that they were actually used at the table. For cups, plates and bowls, the situation is less ambiguous, although of course we need to be very aware that these vessels were also extensively used in non-domestic contexts. Generally, however, we can safely assume, no matter what the specific nature of the archaeological context, that cups were used to drink and bowls and plates were used to contain and serve food. It is for these reasons that this work focuses solely on cups, bowls and plates.

III.1.3 Case-Studies
This research has collected and studied the catalogued Hellenistic tableware of Athens, New Halos, Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion. Added to this data-set is Hellenistic tableware from Sagalassos, studied by the author. These seven case-study sites have been chosen because they can be employed in the multi-scalar investigation which forms the essence of this research (for geographical location see fig. 3-4, 10). Scale in this context needs to be taken as referring to the different geographical, geo-political and socio-economic frameworks in which the communities investigated are embedded and in which human agency is played out. It needs to be taken into account that each of the seven sites was embedded within a specific socio-economic, cultural and
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195 See Lock and Molyneaux 2006: 4-10.
geo-political background which potentially could have influenced the options open to local consumers. It is evident that Athens in this respect differed substantially from New Halos as did Ephesus from Sagalassos. They are communities of a different scale. This study aims to address how local tableware consumption was shaped by human agency. In order to do this, it is necessary to approach the concept of scale both in terms of socio-economic and geo-political dispositions.

Athens and Ephesus, two major Hellenistic centres, represent in this context the highest level (scale) of analysis and interpretation. Both sites stand apart by virtue of their population size, economic power, strength of ceramic industry and position within exchange networks. Sardis equally was a community of considerable scale. Comparison with sites operating on a different level or scale is problematic because ceramic distribution cannot be easily disentangled from its specific socio-cultural and economic context. Athens and Ephesus therefore need to be understood on their own terms and cannot be easily compared to the average Hellenistic polity. New Halos, Ilion, Gordion and Sagalassos represent such lower-scale communities and discernible differences in tableware consumption between them and Athens, Ephesus and Sardis cannot be taken at face value, meaning observed differences need not reflect different choices but rather different opportunities. New Halos, for example, appears to have primarily operated on a local or regional scale, which possibly affected the options available to its inhabitants in terms of tableware production and consumption. Ephesus, on the other hand, was a renowned trade emporium which theoretically could have provided its inhabitants with more choice. Each site therefore needs to be understood first and foremost on its own terms when it comes to the influence of human agency upon tableware consumption.

In order to understand the dissimilarities in tableware distribution between sites of different scale, it is vital to approach an understanding of what shaped local agency, the aspects that influenced human choice and action. As such the sites have been deliberately chosen to represent some of the variety in terms of geography, cultural, socio-economic and geo-political dispositions encountered within Aegean Greece and Asia Minor during the Hellenistic period. The comparison of sites that operated on different scales provides an excellent opportunity to increase our
understanding of how the production and consumption of tableware and subsequently archaeological distribution patterns were affected by these differences.

III.1.4 ICRATES
The published catalogued tableware data have been collected and stored within ICRATES. ICRA TEDS is a database system set-up by the University of Leuven to systematically document the published material residues of artisanal activity in the Roman Eastern Mediterranean. It allows the systematic and uniform storage of already published ceramic data which subsequently can be statistically analysed, compared and contrasted. The explanatory power of this database system has been demonstrated by the work of Bes, who utilized it to access the distribution patterns of the Eastern sigillata.

Each published vessel was entered individually together with information about morphology, fabric, measurements and decoration. Every individual entry is connected with the specific archaeological context or deposit in which it was encountered. Not only can the technical details of the artefact in question be documented, but details about the publication itself can be accommodated, such as whether the material was quantified or not. Detailed information about the site and its geographical context, its connection, for example, with known routes of interaction, can also be added. This facilitates a uniform approach to the data considered and comparison of published data-sets on the level of a site, among sites and between regions (Fig. 12).

III.2 Site Comparison
This research uses ICRATES to compare the tableware data of the case-study sites. The comparison is focussed around a number of attributes associated with the collected tableware which are considered to have the greatest explanatory power in relation to the questions asked in this work. These attributes are: fabric, shape morphology, finishing, decoration and (when available) rim-diameter. When contrasted, these five elements provide important clues about the agency of both potters and consumers. The choices involved relate to the technical production of the shape involving
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traditions of material procurement and manufacture,\textsuperscript{199} and also provide insights into drinking and dining practices, patterns of interaction or socio-cultural strategies, each of which, when seen in context, can illuminate the options open to and choices made by individuals and communities. By highlighting changes over time within site repertoires and variation between sites and regions as prime indicators of human agency at work, this study seeks to address the observable variation within and between sites. Despite the uniform documentation of the collected tableware data within the ICRATES database system, the comparison of published ceramic material from different sites with another is not self-evident and without difficulties. The relevant problems and pitfalls thus warrant brief discussion.

\textbf{III.2.1 Problems and Pitfalls}

A particular thorny issue is that of sample selection and the representative nature of the published ceramic data-set. To what extent is a published site monograph incorporating the traditional pottery catalogue representative of the archaeological reality and, going one step further, the lived reality of ancient life? Archaeological projects generally do not tend to keep all the pottery excavated, let alone publish it.\textsuperscript{200} Usually a selection is made to keep, study and finally, publish. This selection need not bear any resemblance to reality (fig. 13), meaning that it is not reflective of the way in which the pottery was used and functioned as part of a corpus of material culture associated with particular traditions or practices.

The nature and composition of site catalogues is often rather arbitrary and surprisingly ill-defined. The intention usually appears to have been to present the best preserved or most exceptional pieces, not a representable sample. Most published ceramic reports concerning Hellenistic material do not attempt to quantify their material. We therefore have only a scant idea of how the published vessels relate to the mass of non-published pottery. It is difficult to gauge if a particular shape or ware was popular. There is the potential for a significant bias to creep into analysis before it has even started. Clearly this makes it difficult to compare the popularity of different

\textsuperscript{199} The agency of artefact producers has received ample attention, often from a \textit{Chaîn Operatoire} perspective. See for example Dobres 2000. Skibo and Schiffer 2008: 22, rightly point out, however, that \textit{Chaîn Operatoire} approaches do not consider the use and after use-life of artefacts.

\textsuperscript{200} See Rotroff 2006a: 9-12.
ceramic shapes across a range of sites. The nature of this selection process is thus of great importance, particularly when comparing sites, as research projects usually adopt different approaches to the collection and study of their material.

**III.2.2 Nature of the Archaeological Deposits**

An additional difficulty relates to the nature of archaeological contexts. When comparing different sites and deposits with one another, it is obvious that it is important to take into account the archaeological contexts. Specific contexts can have an impact upon the composition and nature of a data-set. Comparing and analysing differences between deposits of a dissimilar contextual background may not necessarily provide us with a great deal of information, as observed variations may be the result of the varied contextual nature of the deposits concerned and the result of varying human choices. Ideally one compares contexts of a similar nature, for example, domestic households. However, even if two houses are compared, contextual differences can still skew a comparison. Interpreting ceramic differences is thus not self-evident, and it becomes clear that consumer choice is heavily shaped by context.

Particularly problematic is when the contextual background of the material within an archaeological deposit cannot be reconstructed with confidence. Fills and dumps recovered from wells or cisterns are prime examples of deposits whose context of use cannot be easily reconstructed. The ceramic material extracted from fills or dumps could potentially have come from many different contextual backgrounds (for example, domestic and religious). Its internal composition does not need to reflect a living reality. Or in other words, ceramic shapes preserved together in a fill or dump do not necessarily need to have been part of the same use assemblage. These corpora of material are therefore difficult to interpret as interrelated data-sets, and as a result cannot be easily compared both to deposits of a similar nature and contexts from which the contextual background is more or less known. The material from the Agora can serve to illustrate the points made.

Most of the Hellenistic tableware from the Athenian Agora studied in this research comes from wells and cisterns in which they were discarded as part of fills or dumps. Wells and cistern deposits\textsuperscript{201} have been very important for the establishment

\textsuperscript{201} Rotroff 2005: 14-15.
of ceramic chronologies at the Agora and elsewhere. Their importance results from the relatively ‘closed’ nature of the deposits providing in essence sealed snap-shots of artefacts deposited during a certain timeframe. The closely dated Agora deposits have therefore provided us with a very good overview of ceramic development throughout the site’s Hellenistic phase. Problematic, however, is the fact that the wells and cisterns of the Agora do not represent use deposits. In most instances these deposits result from the gradual infilling with refuse material, deliberate dumping or clean-up operations. Deposits associated with the Sullan sack of Athens and the Tholos debris can be cited as examples of clean-up activities related to a specific event, whereas other deposits seem to represent a more gradual accumulation of ceramic refuse. Peña mentions in a Roman context that it appears that material was deposited in wells and cisterns on a regular basis, as distinct fills within a deposit can be identified. Rotroff has also identified fills of different dates within a particular well or cistern.

Studies have shown that pottery often is not discarded where it was used but found its way to specially designated dump sites or middens. These areas often did not serve a particular household but accumulated the refuse of multiple households, as has been evidenced for Pompeii. It also seems that discard areas were sometimes cleaned out, leading to an additional shake-up of the archaeological record. The ceramic material within these deposits therefore cannot be taken a priori as having belonged together. The Hellenistic tableware attested in most of the Agora deposits is resultant from discard practices in which the pottery was taken from its context of use and deposited elsewhere. This ‘unfortunate’ fact makes it difficult to address the material as a ‘living’ assemblage directly reflective of eating and drinking practices.
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Most of the Agora deposits accumulated gradually, making it very difficult to establish, for example, how much of the identified tableware, would have been in use together. We also don’t know if the inventory of a well or cistern represents the material coming from one household or many. In the case of the Agora, we equally cannot be sure that all the pottery came from purely domestic contexts. It is possible that at least part of the material could be associated with public eating and drinking or other non-domestic activities. This makes it extremely unclear what the ceramic inventory of individual deposits can tell us about ancient behaviours other than discard practices. Shape variety is a case in point. If a specific deposit contains a great number of different tableware shapes used for eating and drinking, does this signify specific use practices, status, wealth or is it merely reflective of the fact that multiple households deposited their ceramic refuse in this particular well or cistern? A mixture of different contexts, including non-domestic, could also have been responsible for the larger shape variety. It is clear therefore that the nature of well and cistern deposits poses significant interpretative difficulties which apply not only to the material from the Athenian Agora but also to that of Sardis which relies on similar non-primary, but less closely dated archaeological contexts.

III.2.3 The Way Forward
No easy fix exists to the problems and pitfalls noted above. This being so, how can a comparison of seven different archaeological sites, drawing tableware material from various deposits, yield fruitful results with explanatory power?

First of all, this research relies on the assumption that in very general terms the most numerously encountered shapes and wares in the traditional pottery catalogue correspond to the pottery and fabrics most commonly encountered during the actual excavation. This assumption need not hold true in all cases: certain shapes or wares have received more space than others. It is unlikely, however, that in general a vessel commonly encountered within the site catalogue was actually rare in the lived past. It seems reasonable to assume that shapes which are catalogued more than 20
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217 Utilitarian pottery is often underrepresented. It is clear from the Sardis pottery catalogue that mouldmade bowls and Pergamene applique ware are overrepresented in the catalogue.
times were more numerous than a vessel which is only represented once in the catalogue. Though this assumption cannot be proven, it seems probable. Let us take the echinus or incurving rim bowl as an example (fig. 14a). This vessel is commonly encountered in the pottery catalogues of a variety of Hellenistic sites. It is unlikely that this shape was rare. The same can be said about the Classical kantharos (fig. 14b), numerous represented in the Hellenistic pottery catalogue of the Athenian Agora. Though this cannot be proven, it appears that the average pottery catalogue reflects roughly which shapes were most commonly encountered during excavation. As pottery catalogues usually primarily set out to document the observed ceramic variety it can furthermore be assumed that the presence or absence of shapes or wares reflects in general terms the excavated variety, of the archaeological record. It has to be said, however, that this concerns primarily tablewares. Pottery of a utilitarian nature has received much less publication space.

Though difficult, it is possible to extract from the average pottery catalogue a general and approximate sense of which shapes and wares were most numerous encountered among the excavated material and as such potentially played important roles in the living ceramic assemblages of the past. We are helped by the fact that many authors of pottery publications reveal in additional comments quantitative information of help to the issue at hand. Rotroff, for example, comments upon the frequency of a number of tableware shapes of interest to this research. Interestingly, her comments appear to be mirrored to a certain degree in the make-up of the pottery catalogue. Classical kantharoi, for example, are mentioned by her as the standard drinking cup of the early Hellenistic period, and indeed are well represented in the pottery catalogue. The same can be said for the rolled rim plate (fig. 15). Other examples from other sites can be pointed out. Though such an approach does not replace the desired full study, publication and quantification of excavated ceramic

220 The plate with broad rim is mentioned by Gassner 1997: 44, as occurring regularly and being very popular among material from the South gate at Ephesus. Berlin 1999: 89, 94, mentions plates being rare at Ilion but bowls with incurving rim and salters are identified as the most commonly encountered food consumption vessels. Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 25, describe the downturned rim fishplate as the most popular variety of fishplates.
material it allows for an utilization of the traditional pottery catalogue in rough comparative analyses.

Secondly, when viewing and comparing ceramic production and consumption on the level of a site or community, a quantified overview is helpful but not necessarily vital. What is of greater interest in this context is the presence or absence of particular shapes and fabrics, which in an investigation of ceramic production, distribution and consumption already tell us a great deal about local or regional trends, opportunities and preferences, especially when combined with a general appreciation of the most popular shapes and wares.

The most problematic issue to navigate concerns the difficulty of comparing archaeological deposits of different formative backgrounds. As this research primarily concerns itself with the domestic use of tableware, one ideally wants to compare and contrast deposits of a similar domestic background. Unfortunately, well-defined domestic deposits of a primary nature dated to the Hellenistic period are in short supply. Most tableware indeed comes from fills, wells or cisterns and it is unclear whether if the attested pottery was used for purely domestic purposes. Public dining is indeed well attested at Athens.\textsuperscript{221} For a general comparison such as attempted in this research, the potential pitfalls are not insurmountable. The evidence from the Agora can again serve to illustrate this point. It is probable that a large part of the tableware came from houses surrounding the Agora.\textsuperscript{222} Even if the pottery derives in large part from public activities, it seems unlikely that the vessels used for public eating and drinking activities were radically different from those used in a more properly domestic context. A comparison of two deposits, one of a public nature, the other possibly of a more domestic complexion, can serve to illustrate this.

Deposit F11:2\textsuperscript{223} is not radically different in terms of the shapes attested from a deposit of a more domestic nature, Menon’s cistern and well.\textsuperscript{224} The tableware identified in deposit J5:1 possibly of a religious nature also displays similar tableware as identified in the previous two deposits (1.1.1.table 2-4). This suggests that dining vessels were largely similar and that their shape is not dependent upon context.

\textsuperscript{222} See Tsakirkis 2005: 67-82.
\textsuperscript{223} Tholos debris.
\textsuperscript{224} Deposit F16:8.
Rotroff\textsuperscript{225} lists only votives and certain other specific shapes as vessels specifically designed for religious use. This indicates that the other vessels discussed by her occurred in multiple contexts. Rotroff\textsuperscript{226} mentions specially that the rilled rim plate could have served a religious function but that these also occur in domestic contexts (fig. 16). We can therefore cautiously assume that the most popular shape categories identified within the Agora material were used for eating and drinking in multiple contexts, including those of a domestic nature. The tableware attested in the West Quarter houses in Eretria\textsuperscript{227} shows a similar range of shapes as identified at the Athenian Agora, confirming their use in overtly domestic contexts. The eating and drinking vessels of the Demeter and Kore sanctuary\textsuperscript{228} also represent to a large extent common tableware shapes, such as identified among Corinthian material,\textsuperscript{229} although the latter displays a much wider range of vessels. Stone’s work on ritual drinking and dining at Stymphalos also concludes that the vessels used in ritual activities are similar to the ones used in domestic contexts, although he demonstrates that certain vessels were clearly preferred. Stone suggests that the participants in ritual events dedicated part of their domestic tableware inventory as votives, the mouldmade bowl being his prime example.\textsuperscript{230}

It therefore appears that the most common tableware shapes utilized for eating and drinking occur throughout deposits of both domestic and non-domestic character. This inspires confidence in a comparison which focusses on the general use of shapes and wares at a certain site during a particular time. Furthermore such an approach also provides a way to compare the contents of a cistern with that of a house floor. As this research addresses tableware production and consumption on the level of the site, the specific contextual nature of an archaeological deposit does not limit comparison between sites. It has been argued above that the tableware shapes most numerously attested within the various deposits considered in this work represent the most common tableware shapes in use, irrespective of the precise archaeological context. It is thus assumed that the collected tableware data represents in general

\textsuperscript{225} 1997a: 204.  
\textsuperscript{226} 1997a: 151-152.  
\textsuperscript{227} Metzger 1998.  
\textsuperscript{228} Pemberton et al 1989.  
\textsuperscript{229} Edwards 1975.  
\textsuperscript{230} Stone 2007: 117-119.
terms the relative frequencies of the most commonly encountered shapes and wares. Although the danger of a quantification based on catalogued ceramic data is recognized, the author assumes that, although not a fully representative picture, quantification of the available published data for the case-study sites will at least provide a very rough indication of the representation of different shapes and wares amongst the tableware repertoires. Furthermore, we are in a position to check the obtained patterning in the data against the rich and accumulating body of Hellenistic pottery data, which has led to a fairly accurate overview of the most commonly encountered Hellenistic tableware shapes in the Eastern Mediterranean. The tabulated data suggests which shapes and wares were potentially more common than others and as such could inform us about the choices of both individuals and communities. Regardless, the influence of human agency upon the formation of tableware distribution and consumption patterns can already be seen with reference to the presence or absence of certain shapes or wares. This in itself reflects the choices made by individuals and communities and quantification of the catalogued material can provide additional insights.
Chapter IV: Tableware Production and Consumption at Early Hellenistic Athens and New Halos

IV.1 Introduction

Athens and New Halos an odd combination (fig. 17). The former was the largest polis in the Greek world, the cultural achievements of which were widely celebrated from antiquity to today. The latter was a small to medium sized community, re-founded on the orders of a Hellenistic king. The contrast could not be starker. The epigraphic, historical and archaeological record has yielded a great deal of information about Athens. New Halos has been the focus of much less attention. The historical record is largely silent and archaeology provides most of our information.

Obvious differences in scale, economy and geo-political history between Athens and New Halos can of course be pointed out. New Halos, for example, had an estimated population of ca. 9000 inhabitants and was dwarfed by contemporary Athens. The sources similarly have demonstrated the wide-ranging contacts of Athens with the wider Aegean world on a political, economic and cultural level. The Athenian import of grain from the Black Sea region is, for example, widely attested, and ceramic products of Attic manufacture have been attested on a variety of sites throughout the Eastern Mediterranean. Attic imports can also be seen to arrive at Corinth. A good example of late 4th century Athenian interaction with the outside world is provided by Christesen, who discusses a well-known example of a maritime loan in which a trade ship’s voyage is intended to go from Athens to Mende and

---

232 See Jones 1984; Spawforth 2012: 231.
234 Haagsma 2010: 22.
235 Camp 1986: 221.
238 The population size of Athens during the Hellenistic period has been estimated as between 100-125,000 persons. If surrounding territories are included these figures may rise to perhaps as many as a quarter of a million people. Billows 2003: 196.
244 Demosthenes XXXV, 10-13.
henceforward to the Bosporus. It is specified that goods taken on board during the return journey should be brought to Athens.

New Halos, as we will see, was clearly of a different order.²⁴⁵ Despite these differences, this chapter seeks to compare the tableware at both sites. New Halos was occupied from ca. 302 to 265 BC. Its material record can therefore be compared to contemporary remains from Athens.

It is exactly the discrepancy between Athens and New Halos that is of interest in the context of this research. We are contrasting a big with a small to medium site; a traditional economic, political and cultural centre versus a provincial town recently re-established. It is the contrast between Athens and New Halos that makes an analysis of the tableware at both sites interesting. Can differences be identified in the production and consumption of tableware? Do the two communities produce and consume tableware differently? As we will see, both sites have yielded their own specific tableware distribution patterns. The goal of this chapter is to analyse and explain the variation in tableware distribution and determine the influence of active human choices.

To approach an understanding of the varied nature of Athenian and New Halian tableware repertoires it is necessary to incorporate the impact of aspects of choice upon the formation of distribution patterns. It is these aspects, for example, from the location of a community or its socio-economic character,²⁴⁶ that would have shaped the choices made by individuals and communities in the production and acquisition of tableware.

First the differences and similarities between the tableware repertoires of Athens and New Halos will be presented. The discussion then aims to relate the varied nature of the assemblages to different aspects of choice and their impact upon the communities.

²⁴⁵ Something which of course is also aptly illustrated by the amount of public architecture identified at Athens, see Camp 1986: 153-158, and the conspicuous lack thereof at New Halos, see Haagsma 2010: 24; Reinders 1988: 134.
²⁴⁶ The interplay between Bourdieu's field and habitus. Maton 2008: 51-52.
**IV.2 Comparative Analysis**

The collected tableware will be compared and discussed below. Throughout repeated reference will be made to the appendices (see Volume II) in which all the data (both tabular and descriptive) used below is presented. The observations made for Athens and New Halos individually will not be presented, instead attention will focus on a comparative analysis of the tableware at both sites. A brief summary of key observations will, however, be presented. For further detail the reader is referred to appendix 1.2.1. and 1.2.2. After a short summary of important observations, a thematic discussion focused around tableware production and the repertoire used for drinking and eating will follow.\(^{247}\)

**IV.2.1 Collected Tableware Athens, Observations**

Drinking in Athens ca. 300-260 BC appears to have been primarily reliant upon the use of the so-called Classical kantharos and cup-kantharos (appendix 1.2.1.A.table 5-7). A number of other shapes with Classical antecedents were also present. The varieties of the Hellenistic kantharos were clearly not as dominant as the Classical kantharos and also other Hellenistic shapes (for example, cup with interior decoration) are subordinate in quantity. In terms of eating, echinus bowl, outturned rim bowl, fishplate and rolled rim plate seemingly were the vessels preferred. Saltcellars and small bowls for salting or seasoning are also noticeable (fig. 18-19).

The strength of local Attic production in this period is clearly illustrated by the material discussed in the appendix. Imports were few and far between; the absolute majority of the tableware was produced either in Athens or in Attica (appendix 1.2.1.A.table 5-7). Despite a number of vessels having fabrics which are unidentified, the evidence seems to suggest that ‘foreign’ tableware hardly reached Athens (or was locally consumed). The few imports that are identified illustrate ‘connections’ (direct or indirect) with mainland Argos, Corinth, Boeotia and Italy. The sparse presence of

\(^{247}\) The utilization of the catalogued Athenian Agora tableware for comparative purposes is not a straightforward exercise. Athenian deposits dated to between ca. 300-265 BC have yielded too small a sample of catalogued tableware (see table 5). In order to acquire a bigger comparative sample, tables 6 and 7 provide the catalogued tableware data for deposits dated between 325-300 BC (excluding those with an end date of before 300 BC) and all tableware shapes dated individually to between 310-260 BC (excluding for example 325-275 or 280-225 BC).
imports clearly illustrates that these wares were unable to establish themselves within the Athenian pottery market and break the hold of local or regional producers.

**IV.2.2 Collected Tableware New Halos, Observations**

The most commonly used vessels for drinking at New Halos were the Classical kantharos and the bolsal (appendix 1.2.1.B.table 9). The primary (practically the only) food recipients were the echinus bowl and fishplate (fig. 20). The tableware ‘assemblage’ appears functionally ‘specialized’, meaning that there is a clear focus on certain shapes and lack of variety. Although seven different drinking cups have been identified, only a few are numerous. A local production of vessels used for drinking and eating has so far not been securely identified. Imports show connections (direct or indirect) with Corinth and Athens and above all most probably with the nearby region of Thessaly,\(^{248}\) from which New Halos most likely procured most of its tableware.

**IV.2.3 Production and Supply, Observations from Athens and New Halos**

One of the most clear-cut differences between the Athenian Agora deposits and the six New Halos houses is that at the Agora locally and regionally produced (i.e. Attic) tableware dominates. This is in stark contrast to New Halos, where only a small minority of vessels has been identified (so far) as locally produced.\(^{249}\) Appendices 1.2.1.A-B.table 5-7, 9), provide an overview of the different fabrics attested at each site. At both sites a group of unidentified pottery incorporates a number of different fabrics. We have, however, seen that at the Agora this group was of considerably less importance than at New Halos, where it forms the most numerous category of tableware. This means that New Halos has no (securely established) local production of vessels for drinking. The absolute majority of the food consumption vessels, similarly, cannot be connected (yet) to a local production. Only liquid serving and mixing vessels (not discussed) have been so identified. At the Agora in contrast, all the major functional categories are dominated by local vessels.

Athens and New Halos present us with different pictures with regards to pottery manufacture. The Athenian data paints the known picture\(^{250}\) of local tableware.

\(^{248}\) Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication.

\(^{249}\) Tableware vessels used for serving liquids, not discussed in this thesis.

production. The Attic fabric is not necessarily restricted to the city of Athens, but archaeology and sources have confirmed the presence of an important pottery industry within the city. The pottery from the six excavated New Halian houses suggests that fine tableware was possibly not locally produced. The presence of a local production of tableware cannot be dismissed completely, but no conclusive evidence is known so far and the material most probably has a regional Thessalian origin.

Athens was thus by and large self-sufficient when it came to catering for the local consumption of tableware. The situation at New Halos was possibly the opposite. The presumed absence of local production makes importing tableware an obvious necessity, and the local region most likely provided this. There is evidence that a number of ‘regional’ workshops were servicing New Halos, indicating that the community did not acquire was what needed from a single provider. The presence of Attic imports, however, illustrates that regional Thessalian products did not totally dominate the tableware market; there was room for other products. The fact that Attic tableware has been identified in a number of the excavated houses suggests perhaps that its presence was not as uncommon as the numbers may suggest.

**IV.3. Production in Context**

### IV.3.1 Athens

The difference between local Athenian production of tableware and the ‘apparent’ lack thereof at New Halos is striking. How to account for this discrepancy? Athens, of course, was a well-known and traditional centre of pottery manufacture. Since Archaic times, it had developed a flourishing pottery industry, whose products were widely exported throughout the Mediterranean. Athens’ role as a major export centre of pottery declined after the early Hellenistic period, its products supplanted by local productions and imitations. We can note the scarcity of Attic imports at Ilion,
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253 Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication.  
254 Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication.  
258 Berlin 1999a.
Ephesus\textsuperscript{259} and Sardis\textsuperscript{260} (see appendix 1.3, 1.5), where previously they had been encountered in substantial numbers.\textsuperscript{261} Despite this, local production of tableware remained strong; though from the middle Hellenistic period onwards can we detect a decline in execution, ‘quality’ and variety.\textsuperscript{262}

The presence of an exceptionally large population\textsuperscript{263} undoubtedly generated a large and possibly varied demand for ceramic products, a demand which local or regional potters met. The limited numbers of imported tableware suggest at least that much. Athenian consumers seem generally to have been satisfied with the products of their potters. If not, we would expect to encounter more imported pottery, as in the later Hellenistic period. This could suggest dissatisfaction with local products.\textsuperscript{264}

Athens was an important centre of transhipping\textsuperscript{265} and thus would potentially have been able to acquire imports from elsewhere. Rotroff\textsuperscript{266} mentions that the acquisition of Delos could have opened up the Athenian market more too Italian wares which were arriving at the little island in numbers. It is highly doubtful, however, that a site of Athens’ magnitude could ever be supplied externally, with its basic needs of tableware probably far exceeding what could be reasonably imported. Stissi\textsuperscript{267} has estimated that Athenian households in the mid-5th century BC owned ca. 7-9 million pots. He goes on to suggest that 50-100,000 figured vessels per year would be the internal demand of Athens alone, with plain and black slipped pottery probably numbering 10 to 20 times as much. He has estimated the total output of figured vessels by Athenian potters as between 250,000-500,000 vessels a year.\textsuperscript{268} The sheer numbers involved suggest to the author that a city the size of Athens could hardly do without a substantial local production of pottery to meet its internal demands. Pemberton\textsuperscript{269} mentions that though Corinthian consumers liked Attic pottery, it forms an absolute minority when compared with the local Corinthian output. Corinth of
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course was also a large and important economic and geo-political centre\textsuperscript{270} with an established local pottery production.\textsuperscript{271}

Local or regional potters were thus bound to play an important role in Attica. Even in later Hellenistic times when the “quality” of the Athenian product had declined, local tableware plays an important role within the local market.\textsuperscript{272} Consumers of tableware in the larger cities of the Eastern Mediterranean would probably have been forced to rely upon local production out of sheer necessity and practicality, as demand for tableware would have been too great to rely solely on imports from elsewhere. The evidence from Athens and Corinth appears to suggest this, as does the pottery data from Ephesus and Sardis. Smaller communities (like New Halos) might have been able to satisfy their internal demand with imports. At Isthmia the bulk of the pottery is Corinthian in fabric,\textsuperscript{273} suggesting that this settlement relied for its tableware needs on Corinth or the Corinthia. Local production, however, cannot be excluded, as clays similar to Corinthian are utilized by nearby communities, for example, Sikyon.\textsuperscript{274} In the case of Sikyon, however, Stone\textsuperscript{275} mentions that a large part of the tableware vessels in use at the site was supplied by Corinth, and that probably up until the sack of Corinth in 146 BC the latter played an important role in supplying pottery to the Sikyonian market.

As Rotroff\textsuperscript{276} has noted, in Classical and early Hellenistic times Athens was a major exporter of Attic pottery. This implies the existence of networks of trade and interaction connecting the city with other locations, for example, the new Macedonian East. The export of Athenian pottery to Asia Minor and the Black Sea area has been widely documented.\textsuperscript{277} The argument has been made that pottery was largely carried alongside other products like grain or wine, as ballast or space filler on ships.\textsuperscript{278} Objections have been raised;\textsuperscript{279} but it can be assumed that Athens as a transhipping

\textsuperscript{270} See Hopper 1955; Williams and Bookidis 2003.
\textsuperscript{271} Risser 2003: 157-158.
\textsuperscript{272} Rotroff 1997b: 106.
\textsuperscript{273} Anderson-Stojanović and Reese 1993: 262-263; Anderson-Stojanović 1997: 15.
\textsuperscript{275} In prep.: 2-3, 12.
\textsuperscript{276} 1997a: 223.
\textsuperscript{279} But see Stissi 2002: 298.
centre would have witnessed the arrival and departure of a lot of merchants and their wares, probably including pottery, who would have had the opportunity if they so choose, to try and sell foreign pottery on the Athenian market.

It is known from the sources that Athens was a major importer of grain from the Black Sea area.\textsuperscript{280} The presence of Attic pottery in some numbers on Black Sea sites suggests that it was part of these economic transactions\textsuperscript{281} and probably travelled with the grain ships. Potentially of course the grain ships sailing for Athens could have brought back with them tableware vessels made elsewhere than in Athens. The same would hold true for commercial ventures coming from elsewhere. This all implies that imported pottery would have reached the city during early Hellenistic times when the city, according to Lawall,\textsuperscript{282} was still an important centre of transhipping and primarily imported its amphorae. The commercial contacts of Athens\textsuperscript{283} increase the likely arrival of imported tableware significantly. It becomes clear, therefore, that the primary reason why so little imported tableware is identified within the Athenian Agora material is primarily related to the presence of a well-established Attic pottery industry and large local or regional demand. The strength and importance of this industry is evidenced not only by the widespread nature and influence of Athenian products since Archaic times\textsuperscript{284} but also by the long history of certain shapes in the Attic repertoire, with a wide range and the introduction of new shapes, such as the mouldmade bowl\textsuperscript{285} and the Hellenistic kantharos, developed out of Boeotian models. Athens was also an important centre in the development of West Slope decoration (fig. 21).\textsuperscript{286}

The absence of large quantities of imported pottery at the Agora should therefore not indicate a lessened participation within exchange networks. Even if Athens’ role and influence declined on a political and economic level,\textsuperscript{287} the city

\textsuperscript{280} Tsetskhadze 1998: 53-62.
\textsuperscript{281} Hannestad 2005: 180-182.
\textsuperscript{283} See Burke 1992: 200, 203, for increase in Athenian commercial activity during the late 4th century BC.
\textsuperscript{284} See Sparkes and Talcott 1970; Rotroff 1997a.
\textsuperscript{285} Rotroff 1982: 6-13; 2006b.
\textsuperscript{286} Rotroff 1997a: 41-42.
\textsuperscript{287} See Habicht 1997.
continued to be connected economically with the outside world. Lawall shows that a wide variety of amphorae found their way to Athens. Patterns of interaction could change, however; and from the late 3rd century BC first Rhodes and then Knidos dominated as the main amphorae supplier of Athens (fig. 22). In this context we also need to factor in the troubled nature of the period, which could have disrupted trade and exchange to some extent; Oliver has shown the disruptive effects of political turmoil upon the Athenian economic environment. We have to remember, however, that in the Classical period when Athenian power was at its zenith imported pottery played only a minor role. This suggests that the popularity of local products was not initiated by an inability to participate within networks of interaction which could (and did, but in restricted numbers) have brought imported wares to the city.

One last element to consider is the fact that imported products could have been perceived as status markers, their ‘exotic’ origin, quality and the costs of procurement possibly being important elements. The ‘scarcity’ of imported pottery in early Hellenistic Athens suggests that this was not an issue. The entrepôt that was the Piraeus probably allowed for extensive contacts with other pottery-producing regions. We have noted that Athens acquired amphorae from a variety of places, and Attic pottery has been identified at Corinth and Ephesus, two important centres of pottery production. Products from the latter, however, have not been identified among the Agora material considered in this chapter and only a few Corinthian pieces (appendix 1.2.1.A.table 5-7) have been catalogued. Attic pottery datable to the 3rd century BC has been identified at another important pottery production centre of the Hellenistic period, Knidos, whose products (Knidian cups) arrived in Athens during the late Hellenistic period. The networks of interaction that took Attic tableware to areas further afield clearly were not utilized to take the ceramic products of these
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areas back to Athens. This testifies to the strength of the Athenian pottery industry and its ability to satisfy local or regional demand, and it also suggests that during the early and middle Hellenistic periods tableware generally did not form an important extra-regional export product. Only in exceptional cases was tableware exported in large numbers, over large distances and with its impact clearly documented in the archaeological record.\footnote{This observation is not meant to suggest that extra-regional trade in tableware did not take place during the Hellenistic period. It is merely intended to suggest that for large parts of the Hellenistic period extra-regional trade in tableware did not have the same impact and visible presence as documented for the earlier Classical – early Hellenistic and later Roman timeframes.} The ability of a producer to compete price-wise with local products was probably an important consideration,\footnote{Kögler 2010: 41.} and an important prerequisite for doing so was the ability to produce in bulk.\footnote{Kögler 2010: 44.} As we will see below, it is only during the late Hellenistic period that tableware again starts to move over larger distances in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean.

Athenian households, then, primarily put local products on their tables supplemented by the odd import.\footnote{See Sparkes and Talcott 1970; Rotroff 1982, 1997.} Local potters were able to create products whose quality, functionality and price, was deemed satisfactory for the events in which they participated.

**IV.3.2 New Halos**

The tableware data coming from the six excavated houses at New Halos paints a different picture. No evidence so far has been attested for the local on-site production of fine tableware. The vessels used for eating and drinking are deemed to have come mostly from regional Thessalian productions, which unfortunately are as yet unidentified. There are some identified Attic and Corinthian imports, but these amount to ca. 5% of the attested fine tableware.\footnote{Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication.} The presence of this material at New Halos illustrates that extra-regional trade in tableware did continue during the course of the Hellenistic period but equally demonstrates that local or regional products dominated consumption patterns.

The presumed absence of local tableware production presents us with interesting questions. The estimated 9000 inhabitants of the town belonging to ca.
1440 houses\textsuperscript{303} must have generated a substantial demand for ceramic produce. The site, however, was only occupied for ca. 35 years, so it is potentially possible, but perhaps unlikely, that at least part of the pottery could have been in use during most of the town’s occupational span. Peña\textsuperscript{304} has estimated an average use-life of about one year for most tableware\textsuperscript{305} but indicates that gloss-slipped tableware was generally regarded as more valuable and could have been retained for several decades. It is therefore possible that part of the tableware used was in use already before the re-foundation of the town. Interestingly plain and coarse ware was manufactured locally, indicating that local potters were active. Peña\textsuperscript{306} thinks it likely that cooking pottery had a use-life of perhaps less than one year,\textsuperscript{307} making it perhaps more necessary to produce these items locally. All kinds of utilitarian pottery may, depending on the tasks for which they were employed, have worn out quickly. It can therefore be suggested that tableware needed less frequent replacement than cooking or utilitarian vessels. If correct this observation might explain the situation at New Halos. The demand by the townsfolk for tableware could probably be catered for externally. Vessels of a utilitarian nature could have worn down more quickly and needed to be replaced locally in order to take care of demand.

Alcock et al\textsuperscript{308} argue that local production of tableware was more or less the norm in antiquity. The big centres like Athens,\textsuperscript{309} Corinth\textsuperscript{310} and Demetrias,\textsuperscript{311} had of course their own local production of tableware. But production is also attested at smaller communities, for example, at Eretria\textsuperscript{312} and possibly Mycenae.\textsuperscript{313} The perceived absence of a local tableware production at New Halos and the reliance of the six excavated houses upon regional producers is therefore of interest and warrants consideration. The presence or absence of a local pottery production is an important aspect of choice influencing the consumption of tablewares. If production was indeed
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absence at New Halos, the question arises if this also was the case at the predecessor settlement.

Unfortunately not much is known archaeologically about classical Halos.\(^{314}\) If tableware was locally manufactured at the site, the forced abandonment of the old town and resettlement in a new location may have influenced production. Rotroff\(^{315}\) mentions that the Athenian pottery industry received a significant blow as a result of Sulla’s assault on the city and resulting in a dependence on imported pottery.\(^{316}\) 44 years would lapse between the surrender of New Halos to Parmenion and its re-foundation in a new location.\(^ {317}\) Reinders\(^{318}\) asserts that for the period in between the former inhabitants of Classical Halos must have lived in scattered villages in the Krokian plain (fig. 23).\(^{319}\) The latter have recently been identified archaeologically.\(^ {320}\) It is possible, that just as had happened after the sack of Thebes by Alexander himself in 338 BC, local potters would have migrated elsewhere.\(^ {321}\) Perhaps the conditions after their forced removal of their home town did not foster the right climate under which the production of tableware could thrive. Potters could have given up their trade, re-align themselves to a much diminished market or move elsewhere.\(^ {322}\) When the town was subsequently re-founded the technical know-how of producing tableware might not have been immediately available. Perhaps the disturbances of the enforced exile and re-foundation had led to a loss in knowledge and skill which could not be easily overcome, at least not within the 35 years of occupational history of New Halos.\(^ {323}\) Interestingly Rotroff\(^ {324}\) mentions that demand for fine cups might have been diminished as the aftermath of the Sullan disaster that befell Athens might not have allowed much opportunity for the events in which these vessels were used. It is
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possible therefore, that the forced abandonment of the town may have severely curtailed the local Halian pottery industry.

During their 44 year period of exile the inhabitants of Classical Halos will have continued to have tableware needs. It is likely that these were fulfilled by surrounding communities. Perhaps manufacture even took place in the villages in which the Halian exiles most likely settled. Possibly these networks remained in place after New Halos was established. Perhaps there was no reason to change, at least initially. The Theban example suggests it may have taken some time before skilled artisans could be attracted again to the community. It probably also took a while before a sufficiently attractive market had established itself. The production of plain and cooking ware might be seen as a gearing up process, focussing as said before on items which had a swift turn-around, a process which was interrupted by the subsequent abandonment of the site.

The presence of Attic and Corinthian imports at New Halos demonstrates that if the new town was able to acquire products from as far away as Athens and Corinth, it must have been relatively easy to acquire regional Thessalian products. Possibly, north-south traffic was easier than east-west, as the Thessalian plains were ringed by mountains, only a few corridors providing access to the coastal areas (fig. 24).325 The strategic position of the town, situated as it was across the road north and along a west-east axis leading from Pharsalus to the area of New Halos and the coast,326 probably made it relatively easy to (re-)connect with surrounding communities and become embedded in networks of interaction which carried next to regional imports also Attic and Corinthian vessels to New Halos (fig. 25).

Tableware then, on the back of other commodities or by its own right, reached New Halos. There might have been little incentive for local potters to try their hands at fine tableware if quality products could be acquired apparently cheaply and easily,327 from elsewhere. Alternatively it is distinctly possible that during their exile the inhabitants of Halos had become accustomed to acquiring their vessels from other production centres and saw no immediate reason to discontinue this tradition. The

fact that most probably manufactories in the immediate region provided the bulk of the tableware suggests this and also indicates that the cost of importing these vessels would probably not have been prohibitive.

Haagsma\textsuperscript{328} has noted that the six excavated New Halian houses do not appear to represent the establishments of the rich. The presence of Attic imports therefore suggests that these products would have been available to the town at large. It also suggests that these vessels represent what was available within the networks of interaction and trade in which New Halos participated. Alternatively, the inhabitants of these six houses could have had a special preference for Attic imports. If Attic vessels had any special connotations or just formed part of the general corpus of imported tableware is impossible to reconstruct. We have to remember that only about 5\% of the pottery attested at New Halos is of an Attic or Corinthian origin.\textsuperscript{329} It is possible, however, that the comparatively few Attic imports were specially appreciated and had acquired added value in comparison to local/regional products. Outside Athens Attic pottery might have been a prized product, suitable in particular for display on the table.\textsuperscript{330} There may therefore have been a special demand for Attic products. Considering the minor presence of the imports, however, it is altogether more likely that as suggested, the Attic and Corinthian imports represented what trickled into the local and regional markets by means of regional and intra-regional networks. The dominance of tableware most likely coming from Thessaly itself indicates that local and regional patterns of interaction and trade (in tableware) took precedent.

**IV.3.3 Summary and Conclusions**

We can conclude that if tableware was indeed not produced locally at New Halos, it seems reasonable to assume that the specific contextual background of the site had a bearing on this, specifically in how the circumstances involving the abandonment of Classical Halos may have influenced and shaped the production of tableware at New Halos. The reliance on tableware imports seemingly reflects not only the wide availability of these wares and the relative ease with which they could be transported

\textsuperscript{328} 2010: 268-269, 271-272.
\textsuperscript{329} Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication.
to New Halos but also the special circumstances which as has been suggested led New Halian consumers to look elsewhere for their basic tableware needs.

Athens presents an altogether different story. This metropolis is, however, similar to New Halos in the way that the specific contextual background of the city influenced the production and consumption of tablewares during the early Hellenistic period. Athens’ large population fuelled an important local pottery ‘industry’ which had been and still was during the early Hellenistic period of extra-regional importance. As we will see below, Athenian potters were firmly embedded within a wider Hellenistic ceramic *koine*, meaning that they produced a repertoire that at least in part and with local or regional variations was widely used throughout the Hellenistic world. The presence of a vigorous local pottery industry allowed producers to offer consumers this repertoire, which developed in tandem with more general fashions in tableware during the Hellenistic period. Athens was also, as we will see below, sometimes a trendsetter in the introduction or continued development of new shapes and decorations.\(^{331}\) Athenian consumers were therefore in comparison with their counterparts at New Halos in a favourable position, which probably allowed them to sample a greater range of tablewares. The choices available to New Halian consumers were probably much more constricted, seeing that they possibly did not produce their own tableware, and thus may have been reliant upon what was circulating in the local or regional networks of exchange which supplied the town with its tableware needs. It can also be assumed that a provincial town as New Halos would probably lack behind a bit in comparison to a cosmopolitan city such as Athens, in picking up the latest fashions in tableware. We will see below, however, that contemporary new shapes did arrive but apparently were not picked up locally or regionally.

It has become clear that the different contextual trajectories of both Athens and New Halos were of major importance in relation to the production and consumption of tableware and subsequently to the formation of the tableware distribution patterns attested in the archaeological record. Below we will explore the

\(^{331}\) This has most clearly been demonstrated with regards the mouldmade bowl. See Rotroff 1982, 2006b. Athenian West Slope pottery also influenced productions elsewhere, its export was mainly restricted, however, to Greece and the Cyclades. Rotroff 2002: 100-102. It is one of the production centres where this technique of decoration is thought to have originated. Rotroff 1997a: 41. The cup with interior decoration possibly originated in Athens but may have come from Alexandria. Rotroff 1997a: 110-113.
tableware data of both sites further by comparing and discussing the similarities and differences in the use of particular shapes and how this relates to drinking and eating practices. The identified differences and similarities reflect choices on the part of the communities involved and the different aspects that potentially influenced these choices will also be explored below.

IV.4 Drinking and Eating at Early Hellenistic Athens and New Halos
This section compares the pottery of the Athenian Agora and New Halos by means of a thematic discussion of eating and drinking practices. The main aim of this section is to assess if Athens and New Halos used similar and/or different tableware vessels during the early Hellenistic period. If differences existed, the question is why. Just as in the above, regarding fabric, we will investigate if both communities potentially made different choices in their preference for certain tableware shapes and following up from that, which aspects possibly influenced these decisions.

In appendix 1.2.2 the collected tableware from Athens and New Halos is contrasted. The observations and conclusions of this analysis will be presented below. Beverage consumption vessels will be discussed first, followed by food consumption vessels. This section will conclude with a comparative overview of decoration and finishing practices. For a complete outline of the collected data-set and a detailed comparative overview and analysis, the reader is referred to appendix 1.2.1 and 1.2.2.

IV.4.1 Beverage Consumption Vessels
Having reviewed the beverage consumption repertoire of the Athenian Agora and the six New Halian houses (appendix 1.2.2.A-C) both similarities and differences have become apparent. The most obvious difference between Athens and New Halos is the fact that more different types of drinking cups have been identified at the former than at the latter (appendix 1.2.1.A-B.table 5-7, 9). This might be the result of the specific contextual nature of the Agora deposits and their formation. It is, however, possible that the more ‘provincial’ nature of New Halos and possibly the socio-economic status of its inhabitants restricted the types of drinking cups in use. Equally we have made the case that in a less urban environment such as New Halos (in comparison to Athens) functionality may have presided over appearance (see appendix 1.2.2.A-B), hence perhaps the focus on the Classical kantharos and bolsal.
The greater variety of beverage consumption shapes at the Agora may also have resulted from the fact (as mentioned previously) that the city was a renowned centre of ceramic manufacture and as an important socio-economic and geo-political unit had a wide reach. All of these elements could have increased the choices available to both Attic producers and consumers of tableware. New Halos operated on a different level and might not have had the same access to or knowledge of the latest ceramic developments. The absence of Hellenistic kantharoi at New Halos could support such a reconstruction but equally local or regional preferences could be in play here. The fact that two contemporary Attic shapes (hemispherical cup or bowl and bowl-kantharos) did reach New Halos offers support to the latter. The retention of the bolsal as an important vessel in the beverage consumption assemblage also highlights the potential for local choices and preferences. The presence of imported Attic bolsals furthermore indicates a specific demand or appreciation of this shape, locally at New Halos. This is further indicated by the general absence of bolsals at contemporary sites elsewhere.

The fact that the two most popular beverage consumption vessels attested within the six New Halian houses display a clear ‘Classical’ focus combined with the absence of the Hellenistic kantharos suggests, besides the existence of local consumption patterns, that New Halos lagged behind somewhat in following the latest drinking cup ‘fashions’. The Classical kantharos occurs regularly at Hellenistic sites during this period in time (also at Athens as we have seen), the bolsal, however, does not. In appendix 1.2.2.B some suggestions have been put forward as to why this is so. As has been suggested it appears likely that the choice for these products was heavily framed by the contextual background of New Halos. Next to Athens, New Halos was a provincial place which might not have been very much in tune with the latest ceramic developments. This might not only hold true for the New Halos area but perhaps also for the wider region more generally. As New Halos appears to have relied primarily for its tableware consumption upon regional productions,\textsuperscript{332} the absence of Hellenistic kantharoi at New Halos and the continued use of the bolsal next to the Classical kantharos, might point towards specific regional traditions of manufacture and

\textsuperscript{332} Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication.
consumption. On the other hand is it of course equally possible that regional potters catered for specific local needs at New Halos, supplying the town with products that were appreciated and in the demand.

The discussion above has illustrated that despite the use of generally similar shapes for drinking; local variation can still be detected and can present us with meaningful insights into the communities involved. It is highly likely that the attested differences between Athens and New Halos have both to do with the choices of individuals and communities and the specific contextual background in which all operated. Chapter II has illustrated the importance of incorporating these elements who as aspects of choice determine the composition of ceramic distribution patterns. We can thus draw a number of conclusions from our comparison of Athenian and New Halian beverage consumption vessels. Firstly, differences in the use of specific shapes can be pointed out. Secondly, these differences are most likely related to the specific contextual background of the communities involved and the active local choices made within such contexts.

IV.4.2. Food Consumption Vessels
At New Halos consumers used the echinus bowl and fishplate as vessels for eating. At the Athenian Agora a more varied picture emerges, most common are echinus and outturned rim bowls, fishplate and rolled rim plate. A variety of other shapes appears in more limited numbers next to these vessels (see appendix 1.2.2.D for discussion). Despite the larger shape variety at the Agora, it does not appear that consumers at Athens and New Halos dined fundamentally different. Both communities had plate and bowl as their primary vessels for the consumption of food. Both sites are also similar in their use of saltcellars. Most numerous at the Agora, was the footed saltcellar, a small echinus bowl. Similar vessels have also been attested at New Halos indicating that seasoning was part of eating practices.

As highlighted in the above on numerous occasions, the interpretation of the attested patterning in the tableware data of Athens and New Halos is highly problematic. It appears that Athenian consumers had access to a more varied food consumption and serving assemblage. Their counterparts at New Halos seem to have
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primarily focused upon two shapes, the fishplate and echinus bowl. It is possible that
the dining practices current in Athens necessitated the use of a greater array of
vessels. The varied tastes of the large Attic population and the activities of local or
regional potters could also have led to a greater variety of products on the market. The
presence of the latter was probably particularly important and the use of shapes such
as the rolled and rilled rim plate, very particular for the Attica region, indicates their
impact upon the creation of varied distribution patterns. The fishplates of non-Attic
morphology identified at New Halos, indicate in a similar vein distinct regional
traditions of manufacture.

It is likely that a site not producing its own tableware or a community of a more
provincial nature had an appetite for a more limited range of shapes. At Isthmia, for
example, the echinus bowl and one-handler appear to have been used for the
consumption of food; plates are conspicuously absent. Plates are also absent at
Mycenae, where echinus bowls and outturned rim bowls make up the food
consumption assemblage. At Koroni in Attica in contrast plates are identified. At
the Vari house, however, plates were possibly comparatively rare. It is thus possible
that smaller communities were indeed more functionally focussed, either because of
limited access to the full repertoire available, socio-economic status or distinct
preferences. We do, however, need to take into account that sites like Athens and
Corinth present us with a tableware amalgamation of numerous deposits, accounting
possibly for the larger shape variety. It is therefore worthwhile to verify if the variety
observed within the amalgamated Athenian Agora sample can be traced back in
individual deposits.

When this is done, the variety for most Agora deposits is less marked. Within
larger deposits (such as J 5:1 or F 16:8) a greater variety of food consumption and
serving vessels can be appreciated though (1.1.1.table 3-4). Not all of these shapes of
course would have been in use at the same moment in time. Individual Attic
households may therefore have focussed on a more limited number of key shapes just
as appears to have been the case at New Halos. The same holds true for the beverage

334 See Anderson-Stojanović and Reese 1993.
335 See Rudolph 1978.
336 Vanderpool et al 1962: 40, fig. 8.
consumption vessels used. It is likely, however, that the most numerous catalogued drinking cups and vessels utilized for the consumption and serving of food were extensively used within Athenian households during the early Hellenistic timeframe under consideration. Both in the drinking and eating assemblage the material from the Agora displays a greater variety of popular shapes than identified for New Halos. We may therefore conclude that shape variety, despite sample biases, was greater at the former than at the latter.

As stated before, the presence of local potters at Athens would have increased the potential for a more varied food consumption assemblage. New Halian consumers on the other hand possibly appear to have been reliant upon imports from the immediate region, and considering their more provincial context it is not unreasonable to presume that they acquired primarily that what they knew functioned well and was part of established dining practices. The use of drinking cups at New Halos has illustrated a certain preference for traditional shapes, something which appears to have manifested itself also in the use of dining vessels. Both echinus bowl and fishplate are of course part of the traditional ‘Greek’ repertoire.

As suggested new fashions in tableware may have had not much of a market in certain communities. New products may also have circulated sparsely in the networks of interaction that connected these communities with the wider world. Dining practices themselves may of course have differed between Athens and New Halos. Just as there is little architectural evidence for the symposium or formal dining to have taken place within the New Halian houses,\textsuperscript{337} dining may have been less formal and offered perhaps little opportunity for display,\textsuperscript{338} hence the focus on a limited repertoire at New Halos. The use of echinus bowls and fishplates at New Halos suggests, however, that in essence the way food was consumed did not differ much from Athens. At Isthmia and in Mycenae were plates are absent altogether, more fundamentally different dining practices may be postulated.\textsuperscript{339} It is thus easy to exaggerate the differences between Athens and New Halos as regards to dining. Both in the main focussed upon the fishplate and echinus bowl as their primary vessels for

\textsuperscript{337} Haagsma 2010: 201-202, 248.
\textsuperscript{338} Drinking and dining as an opportunity for conspicuous consumption became more important during the course of the Hellenistic period. Haagsma 2010: 243-244.
\textsuperscript{339} See e.g. Berlin 1999a: 89.
the consumption of food. There is no indication that the foods consumed or the dining practices employed at both sites radically differed. Rotroff\textsuperscript{340} has noted that at Athens the shift from fishplate to rolled rim plate was driven by practical considerations. At New Halos deeper fishplates occurred making the introduction of the rolled rim plate perhaps unnecessary. Most food consumption vessels identified within the Agora material but not at New Halos are also catalogued in limited numbers only.

\textbf{IV.5 Decoration and Finishing}

Painted decoration was possibly more common at Athens than it was at New Halos (for comparison Athens and New Halos see appendix 1.2.2.E). Athenian tableware appears also of better ‘quality’ than its New Halian counterparts. Attic imports at New Halos may therefore have been prized possessions. It is also the case that a larger proportion of tableware shapes was slipped at the Athenian Agora than at Halos. The implication of this is that there clearly was a large demand for good ‘quality’ black slipped pottery at Athens during this particular period in time. This may reflect the cosmopolitan tastes of the city, the specific contextual nature in which the material was used or reflects the presence of an important pottery ‘industry’ which was able to saturate the local market with black slipped products. The popularity of imports during the latter part of the Hellenistic period at Athens,\textsuperscript{341} when local products are of declining ‘quality’ indicates that Athenian consumers cared about product standards. It appears that Attic potters did not needed to restrict themselves in the production of fine tableware to vessels for eating and drinking, instead the quality of the Attic clay and undoubtedly its ready availability allowed most of the tableware repertoire to achieve a similar high standard of decoration and finish. The presence of an effective and well-established pottery industry probably allowed these products to be offered to a wide segment of the local market, making them the standard tableware in Athens.\textsuperscript{342}

The use of decoration and slip at New Halos probably reflects the appearance of tableware in less cosmopolitan, more provincial contexts. The nature and quality of Attic black slip may also have been rather exceptional outside of Attica, hence its popularity as an import, and perhaps difficult to replicate by potters elsewhere who

\begin{footnotesize}
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may not have had the skills or resources required. The fact that Attic products did find their way to the New Halian houses indicates that there was an appreciation for these vessels and makes it likely that they were seen as prized products.

**IV.6 Conclusions: Different Communities, Different Choices**

Our review of the tableware at the Athenian Agora and New Halos has illustrated the differences between the repertoires of both sites. In comparison with the Agora material, the tableware in the six houses at New Halos is less varied, seemingly focussed on a number of key shapes. In Athens it appears that consumers had available to them a more varied repertoire. Furthermore the shapes present at New Halos are ‘traditional’, having strong ‘Classical’ roots. Few ‘new’ Hellenistic’ shapes are present. Though the real change from a ‘Classical’ to ‘Hellenistic’ tableware assemblage happens at Athens around 250 BC,\(^{343}\) the material analysed in this chapter, roughly contemporary to that of New Halos, incorporates a substantial amount of newly introduced shapes. It has become clear therefore, that both communities made different choices in the production and consumption of tableware.

What also has become clear is that though the differences in tableware distribution attested at each site represent choices, both on the part of producers and consumers, it is highly unlikely that both communities had the same options open to them or had similar desires and preferences. It has been argued throughout, that it is the specific contextual background of a community and its role within socio-economic and geo-political networks that determined to a large extent the choices made and therefore the character of the tableware assemblage. In the above and appendix 1.22 a number of suggestions have been made as to how and why Athens and New Halos acquired different tableware repertoires. Below these notions will be summarized and an attempt will be made to explain the differences in tableware distribution between Athens and New Halos as the result of the influence of different aspects of choice upon two very different communities.

One of the most eye-catching differences already pointed out is in the variety of the attested tableware shapes. One can think of a number of explanations. The most obvious surely revolves around the nature of both sites. New Halos was a new

\(^{343}\) Rotroff 1997a: 11.
foundation, established on the orders of Demetrius Poliorketes in 302 BC. The newly laid out town was a sizeable and defensively formidable settlement but obviously pales in comparison to Athens. The demand for new pottery and new shapes must have been substantially less than at Athens. A large population of potential customers (such as was the case at Athens) would have generated more varied tastes and allowed potters to experiment with new products which could be marketed to specific segments of the population.

The heterogeneous population of Athens also displayed most likely more varied drinking and eating practices. We have, for example, no evidence that the inhabitants of New Halos held formal symposia or public dining events, both of which are attested at Athens, at Corinth and in Macedon. Haagsma discusses the evidence for the introduction and acceptance of Macedonian eating and drinking practices in Athens, which resolved around large-scale drinking parties. The likely use of metal kraters and deeper drinking cups appear as exponents of this development. Emphasis therefore, must also be given to differences in use and appreciation of tableware vessels at both sites. The presence of a larger variety of beverage consumption vessels in the deposits from the Agora could suggest differences in drinking habits and drinking occasions, demanding the need or choice for a different or a more varied array of vessels. Dibble argues for a wider availability of wine drinking activities in Classical Athens, continuing in the Hellenistic period. This wide availability of wine drinking and associated events to citizens and resident aliens may have spurred local or regional potters to try new things or cater for more varied demands. Dibble mentions the appearance of “cheaper, mass-produced” drinking cups.

We can envisage that the varied customer base with different socio-economic backgrounds had a need for vessels of different ‘quality or status’ suitable to the needs of individuals. Dibble envisions that the rapid innovation within the drinking repertoire illustrates that potters aimed to supply the middle classes or members of
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the elite with new products as alternatives became more widely available to the populace at large. Similarly Dibble\textsuperscript{351} has identified that more varied cuisine needed a more varied dining assemblage. He sees the introduction of rolled rim plates and fishplate as mirroring changes in Athenian cuisine, and relates this to the greater range of available food commodities. Similarly, the disappearance of the salter after the early Hellenistic period is seen as evidence for an increasing availability of spices and the trade therein.\textsuperscript{352}

Things are likely to have been different at New Halos. As we have seen, basically only two cups were used for drinking, one of which can be considered out of date in contemporary Athens. For eating also, only two vessel types were used. The evidence from the New Halian houses therefore indicates that the local cuisine and eating practices involved may have been less varied than at Athens. Perhaps in a more provincial context consumers did not have the same choices open to them as the inhabitants of cosmopolitan Athens. In terms of socio-economic status it appears likely that at least segments of the Athenian populace had greater opportunities in that respect than their New Halian counterparts and were able to purchase and/or use perhaps more expensive vessels and enjoy a more varied cuisine. Haagsma\textsuperscript{353} has mentioned, for example, that the number of decorated vases was small at New Halos and food consumption vessels occur in relatively low numbers, which may indicate less conspicuous dining practices. Added to this is the absence of evidence for formal symposia taking place in the houses\textsuperscript{354} and the use of a restricted tableware assemblage which according to Haagsma\textsuperscript{355} has a Classical Greek outlook. Haagsma\textsuperscript{356} has furthermore suggested that New Halos was lacking a wealthy elite. The material evidence from the site suggests therefore that what we have in the case of New Halos is a community of modest means, where conspicuous consumption or social competition and the usage of material culture in this did not play an important role. This in contrast to Athens where these activities can be pointed out.

\textsuperscript{351} 2010: 128-129.  
\textsuperscript{352} Dibble 2010: 131-132.  
\textsuperscript{353} 2010: 197-198.  
\textsuperscript{354} Haagsma 2010: 248.  
\textsuperscript{355} 2010: 248.  
\textsuperscript{356} 2010: 248.
It is likely that the issues raised above formed important aspects of choice which heavily influenced communal preferences or the ability of communities to make certain decisions. The shape of the tableware ‘assemblage’ attested at both sites can be seen to have been affected by the above considerations. The differences manifested in the varied outlook of the tableware distribution patterns identified at Athens and New Halos were therefore the result of a number of aspects of which the socio-economic status of the site and its inhabitants is one. Related to this, is the wider economic and geo-political context of Athens and New Halos. As said before on numerous occasions, it is likely that producers and consumers in Athens were more acutely aware what was going on ceramically elsewhere and therefore had available to them a greater range of options to choose from. The greater shape variety attested within the Athenian Agora material is probably partly the result of this. Producers and consumers at or near New Halos in all probability interacted mainly on a local or regional level and consumed what was current locally or regionally. It is possible that the latest ceramic fashions circulated only sparingly within the distribution networks carrying pottery to the town. The position of a community within socio-economic networks therefore emerges as an important aspect of choice and is particularly visible when the tableware assemblages of Athens and New Halos are compared, the greater variety of tableware at the former and the restricted and old-fashioned nature of the assemblage at the latter most likely at least partly resulting from this.

Another aspect of choice which has been heavily emphasized in the above is the presence or absence of a local production of tableware. As we have seen, the production of tableware (pottery) at Athens is well-established. The importance of the local or regional pottery industry is not only indicated by the absolute dominance of local products but also by the export of Attic ceramic products to sites elsewhere in Greece and Asia Minor, a distribution that continued into the early Hellenistic period. At New Halos by contrast, it is possible that no local production of tableware took place. Of course the evidence of only six excavated houses poses limits to our interpretation, but as we have seen Beestman-Kruyshaar\(^{357}\) believes a number of regional productions most likely supplied the town with the tableware it required.

\(^{357}\) Personal communication.
Local Athenian production would have assured Athenian households of a steady supply of tableware and mostly likely also led to a larger variety of shapes present in comparison to sites without local production or one geared to such a large market. If the tableware recovered from early Hellenistic Corinth is compared with that of contemporary Isthmia, it also appears that shape variety is greater at the former than at the latter, although, just as in the case of the Athenian Agora, we need to keep in mind the varied contextual nature of the Corinthian deposits and the impact of sample size. The likely production area of Eastern sigillata A, for example, has been narrowed down by locating the area with the greatest variety of shapes. This further suggests that shape variety in centres of manufacture was higher than in places which had no production or one geared towards a limited, perhaps only local or regional, market. New Halos can serve as an example of such a community. Possibly, as argued above, people at New Halos did not have the time or the tradition to (re)-establish the production of fine tableware. As we have seen, the conditions after the surrender of New Halos might have impacted upon the local pottery industry. Local production seemingly being absent, consumers, it appears, would probably have had access to or an interest in, a relatively limited tableware repertoire, sufficient for their local needs and practices. The contemporary tableware ‘assemblages’ of New Halos and Athens provide indications as to how production and availability are important aspects of choice in the consumption of tableware.

In terms of the actual shapes themselves, we have seen that both the six New Halian houses and the Athenian Agora deposits discussed here, favoured the Classical kantharos as their main beverage consumption vessel. The popularity of the Classical kantharos is not surprising considering that it was a well-established shape in the late-Classical and early Hellenistic periods. This was, however, not the case as we have seen, for the bolsal, a shape popular at New Halos but out of vogue in contemporary Athens. It appears furthermore, that the Classical kantharos and bolsal were in use simultaneously.
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359 See Anderson-Stojanović and Reese 1993.
The above discussion (and see appendix 1.2.2.B) has hopefully illustrated that the continued use of the bolsal manifests the importance of the concept of choice and the aspects that shape it. An explanation for the continued use of the bolsal could be that the inhabitants of New Halos continued to favour traditional ceramic shapes, with which they were familiar at Classical Halos. It is even conceivable that a focus on traditional pottery shapes needs to be understood in the context of the town’s refoundation. Pottery of course could have been brought from elsewhere to the new location. Older pots carried by the settlers probably remained in use for a while. The post-destruction occupation at Olynthus has illustrated that the occupants of the site probably used what they could salvage from the debris; there was possibly little room for the acquisition of new products.  

On the other hand it is also possible that a more traditional character of the beverage consumption assemblage could have served to stress the links with the previous settlement(s) and provided the inhabitants of New Halos with a sense of place, belonging and tradition within the context of a newly re-established home. They might have clung to traditional tableware shapes just that bit longer than contemporary counterparts at Athens. The belated introduction of the Hellenistic kantharoi might be seen in this light, although also at Athens around this time they do not form the dominant drinking cup category, nor do they of course at Corinth where the varieties of the Corinthian Hellenistic kantharoi are introduced later. New Halian consumers appear to have had little interest (at least initially) in this ceramic innovation. The arrival of contemporary Attic imports at New Halos suggests it would have been possible as stated in the above for the Hellenistic kantharos to have arrived at New Halos. The presence of other Attic imports and the closeness of regionally produced Classical kantharoi to Athenian models illustrates that Attic products and inspiration did reach the area of New Halos and influenced regional potters. The fact that only two fragmentary pieces are certainly contemporary with similar products found in Athens suggests, however, that the tableware repertoire of at least the six excavated New Halian houses did not develop in tandem with that of Athenian
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counterparts. Both dated parallels and the continued popularity of traditional shapes indicate that the inhabitants of these houses were lagging somewhat behind.

In terms of vessels used for eating, we have seen that New Halos clearly favoured the echinus bowl and the fishplate. It is more difficult to establish a pattern for the Agora deposits reviewed, here as the number of catalogued food consumption vessels per deposit is limited. A general review of Athenian food consumption vessels which were used between 300-250 BC displays, however, substantial variation. An indication of the variety in food consumption vessels is therefore obtained, a variety which is not found in the six New Halian houses which focussed on two shapes well established by early Hellenistic times.

A difference between Athens and New Halos is also suggested by the presence at the former of a number of smaller shape categories which appear to have been conceived as skeuomorphs. Perhaps what is visible here are the aspirations and socio-economic status of Athenian consumers versus those of their New Halian counterparts. As we have seen, Haagsma has found little evidence for formal symposia at New Halos or public dining. This is contrary to the situation at Athens where conspicuous consumption appears to have increased during the Hellenistic period. Athenian consumers also may have had more direct encounters with elaborate eating and dining practices and the excesses of conspicuous consumption, resulting in the adaptation in ceramic of shapes originally perceived in metal. Taken in its totality the tableware repertoire of Athens appears more elaborate than that of contemporary New Halos. The inhabitants of New Halos perhaps did not have the need or the means for a more elaborate tableware repertoire, which possibly represented a way of drinking and dining fairly alien or unnecessary to the established practices of the community.

This research takes as its central point of departure the concept of choice. The variety in tableware distribution visible at Athens and New Halos demonstrates that both the consumers of Athens and New Halos made differing choices in their
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consumption of tableware. These choices were sometimes deliberate but on other occasions would have resulted from the ingrained traditions in which each household and community was situated. Often the boundary between deliberate choice and unconscious action would have been blurred. The absence of the varieties of the Attic Hellenistic kantharos at New Halos may have resulted from a deliberate ‘no’ on the part of New Halian consumers but its refusal or slow introduction was most likely born out of established and ingrained conceptions of eating and drinking. Availability and connectivity also undoubtedly played their part.

Considering the above, it is more appropriate and useful to speak of the influence of aspects of choice, which involve as we have seen not only the actions and reactions of individuals and communities but also the wider contextual background which shaped the options and choices available to those communities and individuals in the first place. An understanding of the differences in tableware distribution between Athens and New Halos can be approached only with reference to the way in which aspects of choice impacted upon two very different communities. The presence of a well-established pottery industry, the socio-economic and geo-political importance of Athens and the occurrence of particular drinking and dining practices are all aspects of choice that determined the outlook of the tableware distribution patterns identified at the Athenian Agora. The location, character and history of New Halos are similarly important aspects of choice which helped to determine the tableware distribution patterns identified in the six houses. The choices of producers and consumers, of which the identified tableware distribution patterns are a material reflection, are the direct result of some of the aspects of choice discussed in this chapter and can only be understood with reference to them. This chapter hopes to have provided a context for the differences and similarities in tableware distribution between Athens and New Halos, and by doing so to offer greater insights into the way in which two very different early Hellenistic communities produced and consumed pottery. It has become clear that Athens and New Halos were making different choices, choices reflective not only of individual preferences but also of the wider social context in which producers and consumers were embedded.

368 E.g. the continued use of the bolsal or focus on fishplate and echinus bowl.
Chapter V: Moments of Choice, Three cities in Western Asia Minor Considered

V.1 Introduction

With its elongated coastline Asia Minor played an integral part of the history of the Eastern Mediterranean and was a core part of both the Persian and Roman empires. In Hellenistic times, a large chunk of Asia Minor played a vital part of the Seleucid realm next to which regional kingdoms, most famously those of Pergamum and Pontus, were able to survive. Its geographical position thrust upon Asia Minor the role of political, cultural and economic facilitator between West and East and as a result saw significant political, socio-cultural and economic developments (fig. 40).

Greek cities dotted the shores of Asia Minor from the 9th/8th centuries BC, developing into flourishing communities. Ephesus, Halicarnassus, Priene and Miletus are but a few of the most well-known poleis occupying the South Western coastal areas. The polis landscape of South Western Asia Minor contrasted sharply with the situation we encounter in the interior of Anatolia, where Greek poleis were scarcer and communities were mostly living in widespread villages often belonging to the estates of wealthy individuals or the king. The economy of these areas differed substantially from that of the coastal areas of South Western Asia Minor where local, regional and extra-regional exchange following coastal routes played naturally a much greater role driven as it was by the proximity of the sea, access routes inland provided by the great rivers valleys, relative close vicinity of a large number of similar communities and the relatively poor agricultural potential of the area.

The communities and peoples occupying Asia Minor were subjected to differing political, economic and cultural influences and the extent and nature of their interaction with ‘Greek’ or Hellenic cultural expressions varied locally and
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regionally.\textsuperscript{378} The traditional and somewhat misplaced term of Hellenization is used in this research to refer to the effects of cultural contact between on the one hand, ‘Greek’ or Hellenized individuals and communities and on the other, in origin non-‘Greek’ communities.\textsuperscript{379} Hellenization as utilized in this thesis refers in particular to the way in which communities of a non-Hellenic background engaged with cultural influences of ‘Greek’ or Hellenic origin or inspiration. This kind of cultural contact was of course not a one-way process. Transculturation or cultural contact are thus perhaps better terms to discuss the complex interaction process involving communities of varying cultural and ethnic backgrounds.\textsuperscript{380} The term ‘Hellenization’ is, however, employed as a shorthand.

Asia Minor is in many ways a melting pot of ‘Greek’ and non-‘Greek’ traditions that intertwined in varying ways.\textsuperscript{381} It is this world into which we will venture in this chapter and subsequent chapters, as the cultural, socio-economic and geo-political complexity and diversity of Asia Minor forms an interesting backdrop against which differences in the production and consumption of tableware can be measured and assessed and the impact of human agency explored. This particular chapter will discuss ceramic production and consumption at three communities in Western Asia Minor. The following chapter moves away from the Western coastal area and discusses a Hellenistic site located much further to the East and decidedly landlocked.

The focus of chapter IV was on the early Hellenistic period, more specifically on the period between ca. 302-265 BC. This chapter and chapter VI will expand on that analysis as both the temporal and geographical scales are extended. Not only is the number of sites looked at in detail increased, their distribution covers a much wider geographical expanse, incorporating communities on the West coast of Asia Minor and further inland. The temporal scale is also increased, by focusing on the Hellenistic period in its entirety. The longevity of the sites in question makes this possible. The advantages of such an analysis are paramount. The longer time-frame will allow a focus on changes in production and consumption over time. As such we are able to
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address the composition of tableware ‘assemblages’ for the duration of ca. 300 years and investigate the potential impact of wider cultural, socio-economic and geopolitical developments, upon the production and consumption of tableware. The more restricted analysis of chapter IV will thus be significantly widened, making it possible to scrutinize the importance and effects of human choice and action upon tableware distribution patterns across an expanded temporal and geographical framework.

Three sites will be discussed in this chapter and they have been deliberately chosen for a comparative analysis (fig. 40). Not only are all three sites recently well published, they also represent the variety alluded to in the above. Ilion\textsuperscript{382} and Ephesus,\textsuperscript{383} the first two sites to be discussed, are two well-known Aegean communities.\textsuperscript{384} Both, however, have their own specific local histories and place within regional and extra-regional networks of interaction. Both also represent communities of different scales, Ephesus being a large and important economic centre,\textsuperscript{385} whereas Ilion was of less economic and geo-political importance,\textsuperscript{386} although the town’s distinguished past made it subject to cultivation by kings, dynasts and generals alike.\textsuperscript{387}

Located somewhat further inland, away from the sea, we encounter Sardis.\textsuperscript{388} Sardis, former seat of the Lydian kingdom and Persian Empire and up until the battle of Magnesia powerbase of the Seleucid realm\textsuperscript{389} represents a community with a totally different background in comparison to Ilion and Ephesus. Its location and pre-‘Greek’ roots clearly distinguishes the community from Ilion and Ephesus.\textsuperscript{390}

The three communities chosen are therefore almost a cross section of the variety encountered within the ‘confines’ of Hellenistic Asia Minor. As previously mentioned, all three sites have received recent scholarly attention addressing the Hellenistic period, illuminating aspects of the material culture and socio-economic and political trajectories of the communities involved. Considering the above, an analysis

\textsuperscript{382} Berlin 1999.
\textsuperscript{383} E.g. Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991; Gassner 1997.
\textsuperscript{385} Strabo, Geography, book XIV, 24.
\textsuperscript{386} Lawall 2005: 207-209.
\textsuperscript{387} See Erskine 2001; Rose 2002: 34-40.
\textsuperscript{390} See Cook 1962: chapter II.
and comparison of contemporary tableware distribution patterns is of great interest and offers particular scope for an understanding of the way in which different communities, were able (or not) to make different choices with regards to the production and consumption of tableware, within their individual local contexts and against the backdrop of wider cultural, socio-economic and geo-political developments that were at play.

The focus of the current chapter is temporal and explores the development of the tableware repertoire throughout the course of the Hellenistic period for each site individually. It first traces and then focusses on the changes that can be observed over time. This chapter seeks to approach an understanding of what drove local changes in the production and consumption of the tableware at Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis and why at certain moments in time can we observe change or innovation. It aims to investigate if moments of change in the tableware repertoire of the communities considered represent moments of deliberate human choice or agency. As set-out in chapter II change is a clear marker of human choice and action. Change can be regarded as a readily identifiable indicator of human agency because it signifies a divergence from a previously established practice or product and as such can clearly be observed in the archaeological record. By focussing on changes in the tableware repertoire of Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis we can thus isolate most clearly the material correlates of human agency. The order of this chapter follows a rough West – East geographical trajectory. First therefore will be discussed Ilion and Ephesus, followed by Sardis. The order of subsequent sections is as follows; first the site itself and the deposits considered will be briefly introduced. Then moments of change in the tableware repertoire will be identified (see appendix 1.3.2, 5, 7). It will then be considered what drove these changes and finally if they represent deliberate human choice or agency on the part of local producers and consumers of tableware. An important element of this discussion is tracing the wider ceramic context of the observed local changes.

V.2 The Troad: Ilion
Ilion, Homeric Troy, is a household name within Classical Archaeology (fig. 41). Schliemann himself identified the site as ancient Troy and conducted excavations. 391

391 Schliemann 1875.
Since then the area has received intensive archaeological attention greatly enhancing our understanding of the different occupational phases. Naturally the greatest focus of attention rested on the site’s Bronze Age phase and the connection with Homer’s Trojan War. Ilion in the Hellenistic period has received less archaeological attention. Recently, however, the annual excavations of the Universities of Tübingen and Cincinnati have greatly enhanced our information about the site in the Greco-Roman period. Hellenistic ceramic material has been published from the lower town and acropolis and sanctuary areas. In this chapter, the focus will be on the stratified and well-dated contexts from the lower city (fig. 42) as they present the opportunity to trace ceramic consumption in the lower city area from the late 4th century BC to the late 2nd century BC.

Where appropriate, reference will be made to the Hellenistic material of the acropolis and sanctuary areas which primarily covers tableware dateable to the second half of the 2nd century BC – 1st century AD. The ceramic data itself is presented in tabular and descriptive form in appendix 1.3.1-2.

V.2.1 Ilion’s Lower Town
The Hellenistic deposits excavated in Ilion’s lower city consist of a refuse dump and domestic contexts, among which two occupational layers could be identified. The earliest identified activity in the lower-town is represented by pottery which was left behind by quarry workers. This context is dated to the late 4th – early 3rd century BC. Table 14 (appendix 1.3.1) provides an overview of the published tableware and fabric data. Occupational phase H1, which was preceded by a construction phase, is dated ca. 260-240/230 BC and represents domestic household occupation. The same is true for phase H2, dated ca. 225-130 BC. The two relevant contexts associated with the sanctuary and acropolis of Hellenistic Ilion are dated to
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190 BC - AD 75 and ca. 150 BC – Augustan period respectively (appendix 1.3.1.table 16-17). Appendix 1.3.2.A-D surveys the changing tableware repertoire of the contexts considered and the wider ceramic context, providing the basis for the forthcoming discussion.

**V.2.2 Ceramic Change in Context**

Changes affecting the Hellenistic tableware repertoire of Ilion’s lower city (see appendix 1.3.2.A) appears to follow primarily wider ceramic trends. The occurrence of new shapes and wares within the Lower City contexts and sanctuary and acropolis deposits follows more generally established patterns of Hellenistic and early Roman tableware production and consumption. This illustrates that Ilion could tap into networks of interaction that brought new products, knowledge thereof or both. The local or regional availability of new products or knowledge thereof thus appears to have been a key factor in deciding the outlook of Ilion’s tableware ‘assemblage’. Seen in this context, the absence of ‘Attic’ imports in the lower city households reflects not so much of a choice on the part of its inhabitants, but rather the decreasing availability of this product within the networks of interaction with which Ilion was connected. This is perhaps illustrated by the fact that tableware of light brown fabric occurs both in the pre-H1 and H1 phase, showing continuity. ‘Attic’ products on the other hand are not attested anymore. This suggests that ‘Attic’ vessels had disappeared from established patterns of trade and interaction. As mentioned, this is a wider trend, visible throughout the Eastern Mediterranean. The rationales behind this development are complex and will be further explored in subsequent chapters. With regards to Ilion specifically, we might, however, make some suggestions as to why the links between this community and the exporters of ‘Attic’ pottery were severed.

The pre-H1 phase represents the refuse left behind by quarry workers. ‘Attic’ tableware makes up a significant portion of the material (appendix 1.3.2.table 14). This is important as it is unlikely that these quarry workers were individuals of high social status or large financial means, which suggests that ‘Attic’ pottery during this period in
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time, was still widely available. Equally the presence of what is considered to be the traditional grey ware utilitarian fabric\textsuperscript{406} is attested in this phase. This has all changed come phase H1. A major change in the geo-political and economic landscape of the Troad around this time was the establishment of Alexandria Troas,\textsuperscript{407} from which light brown utilitarian fabrics, replacing those of grey ware, now possibly come. It is possible that this new centre started to dominate the regional economy becoming an important producer of pottery in the process.\textsuperscript{408} The possibility that the coarse light brown fabric originated from Alexandria Troas\textsuperscript{409} could indicate that also tableware vessels of light brown fabric came at least in part from this site, although the occurrence of tableware in this fabric pre-H1 also suggests the continuation of established traditions of ceramic production and consumption prevalent in the Central and Northern Troad area.

Rostovzeff\textsuperscript{410} himself already addressed the decreasing importance of Attic exports to the Greek East during the course of the Hellenistic period. He envisioned that after an initial demand for Attic imports the new centres of the Hellenistic world began to produce their own pottery, taking away the need for Athenian vessels. Though in reality a much more complex situation, the establishment of Alexandria Troas could have had a similar effect upon the Troad region with regional productions cancelling out the need for large numbers of imported pottery. The fact that Ilian Classical kantharoi continue to display Attic influences\textsuperscript{411} illustrates that the knowledge of and demand for similar products was still there but was now in the main catered for regionally rather than extra-regionally. Pergamene potters may also have imitated features of Attic tableware,\textsuperscript{412} showing both an awareness of and continued demand for Athenian style tableware. Consumer choice and ceramic change in this case is thus shaped not only by local preferences but also by availability and changes in the geo-political and economic constellation of the Troad.

\textsuperscript{406} Berlin 1999a: 86-87.
\textsuperscript{407} Hemer 1975: 87-88; Berlin 1999: 146; Bellinger 1961: 3.
\textsuperscript{408} Little evidence is available but see for political / economic importance: Hemer 1975: 88, 92.
\textsuperscript{409} Berlin 1999a: 146.
\textsuperscript{410} 1936: 239-240.
\textsuperscript{411} Berlin 1999a: 89.
\textsuperscript{412} Berlin 1999a: 86.
Availability is also a key aspect in understanding the occurrence and choice for the Hellenistic s-shaped kantharos in phase H1. As mentioned in appendix 1.3.2.A-B, this shape is a, for Hellenistic Asia Minor characteristic drinking cup attested since the mid. 3rd century BC\(^{413}\) and showing some affinity with the Attic angular kantharos.\(^{414}\) It has been noted\(^{415}\) that during the course of the Hellenistic period drinking cups increased in size. Rotroff\(^{416}\) mentions, for example, that baggy kantharoi of the late 3rd and early 2nd century BC look more like beer steins than wine cups. Classical kantharoi in contrast are reported as cups of modest size, ca. 9-12 cm in height.\(^{417}\) Pergamene s-shaped kantharoi are characterized by Schäfer\(^{418}\) as having a height between ca. 10-25 cm. The average height of Hellenistic kantharoi at the Athenian Agora, however, is 11.8 cm. The average rim diameter is 9.9 cm.\(^{419}\) Rim diameters are generally not recorded for Classical kantharoi from the Agora, but the average height of the catalogued vessels is 11.3 cm. On the face of it, the numbers do not show clear cut differences. Its needs to be remembered, however, that Classical kantharoi are stemmed cups and generally less wide than Hellenistic kantharoi, which both pose restrictions to the amount of liquid these cups can contain. The appearance of the s-shaped kantharos at Ilion may therefore reflect this Hellenistic appetite for a larger sized drinking cup, a preference which may have resulted from changes in the way in which the practice of drinking was conducted or perceived.

At Ilion, however, preserved rim diameters of Classical and Hellenistic kantharoi do not show clear cut differences. The fragmented nature of many of the published pieces from Ilion does not allow for a useful reconstruction of vessel volume. It is thus difficult to compare the relative sizes and content volume of the vessels involved. A comparison of the illustrated pieces\(^{420}\) does indicate, however, that potentially the deeper shape of the Hellenistic kantharos could hold more liquid than the average Classical kantharos. A visual comparison of Athenian Agora Classical and Hellenistic

\(^{414}\) Rotroff 1997a: 100.
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\(^{417}\) Rotroff 1997a: 83.
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\(^{419}\) Out of 143 catalogued Hellenistic kantharoi from the Athenian Agora 56 have a rim diameter greater than 10 cm and 92 have a height greater then 10 cm.
\(^{420}\) Berlin 1999a: 90, plates 2 and 3.
kantharoi equally indicates that the latter, of which the s-shaped kantharos is a variation, could contain a greater volume of wine (fig. 51).

The enlarged size of Hellenistic drinking cups has been seen as one of the characteristics of increasing tendencies of elaborate conspicuous consumption during the course of the Hellenistic period. Private instead of civic entertaining became increasingly important. The limited archaeological remains of Ilion’s lower city do not allow us to say much, however, about the setting in which eating and drinking activities took place. No entertaining spaces were identified and the houses themselves were of rather modest complexion. There is little evidence that symposium-like activities took place within the lower city households. Clear architectural spaces in which such activities should have taken place have not been defined. It is of interest in this respect that few table amphorae have been attested in the lower city and that ceramic craters are absent altogether. It can therefore not be verified if the occurrence of the Hellenistic kantharos at Ilion heralds a change in drinking practices. Classical kantharoi in any case remain in popular use and increase in size but equally become more slender.

The occurrence of the s-shaped kantharos at Ilion follows in any case a morphological pattern which is more widely carried within Western Asia Minor. The shape is attested within Asia Minor in a closely dated context first at Pergamum, ca. 265-235 BC. At Tinos the Hellenistic kantharos appears ca. 260-220 BC. The presence of the shape at Ilion within lower city phase H1, ca. 260-240/230 BC illustrates that the site is able to closely follow new emerging tableware trends, it being in this respect no different than, for example, Pergamum, although influence from the latter site is reflected in the presence of an s-shaped kantharos potentially of Pergamene manufacture in lower city phase H1. The Hellenistic kantharos had appeared in Athens ca. 275 BC, becoming very popular around 250 BC. No closely dated contexts
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pertaining to this early time-frame have been uncovered at Ephesus. It seems also clear that if initial inspiration for this shape came originally from Athens,\textsuperscript{429} potters within Western Asia Minor fairly quickly produced a regional variant, not directly paralleled in Athens itself.\textsuperscript{430} Clearly this ceramic innovation found ready acceptance within the Troad as is evidenced by the occurrence of Hellenistic kantharoi within phase H1 of light brown local or regional fabric. Though the particulars elude us, the occurrence of Hellenistic s-shaped kantharoi at Ilion appears largely driven by a local or regional engagement with wider Hellenistic ceramics trends, particularly those of Western Asia Minor communities, such as Pergamum, Ephesus and Sardis.

Tableware change at Ilion during the latter part of the Hellenistic period, signified by the presence of ESC, mouldmade bowls and ESA, is driven on the one hand by the ability of the community and specifically the inhabitants of the lower city to acquire new tableware fashions and secondly by the willingness of the same community to change established traditions of manufacture, a process which was most likely gradual (see appendix 1.3.2.C-D for a discussion of the Pergamene influence upon Ilion and the arrival of ESA). It is of particular interest that among the Pergamene imports from Ilion’s sanctuary and acropolis few plates are recorded and catalogued.\textsuperscript{431} This in contrast to ESA (see appendix 1.3.1.table 16-17). ESA may thus have offered a different morphological option in comparison with the Pergamene repertoire arriving at Ilion, although a few plates of Pergamene origin have also been catalogued.

\textit{V.3 Ionia: Ephesus}

Ephesus is relatively well known archaeologically, in particular because of the efforts of the Austrian Archaeological Institute who have documented many aspects of its history and material culture. Excavation at Ephesus began in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century and the Austrians have been working at the site since 1853. After 1956 annual campaigns took place uncovering large parts of the ancient city.\textsuperscript{432} The Ephesus with which we are

\textsuperscript{429} Via the baggy kantharos, related to the straight-walled kantharos and connected to the Kabeiric cups of Thebes. Rotroff 1997a: 103.
\textsuperscript{431} Plates in the Hellenistic tradition are present among the ESC repertoire dated to the 1\textsuperscript{st} quarter of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC. Meyer-Schlichtmann 1988: tafel 39.
concerned with in this thesis, is that founded by Lysimachus in the 280s BC and which for a short time functioned as his Asiatic capital.\textsuperscript{433} The re-establishment of Ephesus on a new location was very successful as by the time of Strabo, Ephesus was one of the most important sites of the Hellenistic and Roman Eastern Mediterranean. Strabo\textsuperscript{434} indeed calls Ephesus, “the greatest emporium of Asia West of the Taurus”. The importance of Hellenistic Ephesus pre-Strabo, especially with regards to East-West communication, is attested by the usage of the city as a base by many a king or general.\textsuperscript{435}

Hellenistic pottery from the post-Lysimachian town is relatively well known, though, the published material comes only from a limited part of the city. It has been estimated that only ca. 5% of the ancient city has been excavated.\textsuperscript{436} Utilized in this research will be the contexts (see appendix 1.3.4 for brief description) associated with the Basilika am Staatsmarkt,\textsuperscript{437} the South gate of the Tetragonos Agora,\textsuperscript{438} terrace house 1\textsuperscript{439} and the Prytaneion (fig. 54).\textsuperscript{440} Appendix 1.3.5.A-B surveys the changing tableware repertoire of the contexts considered and the wider ceramic context, providing the basis for the forthcoming discussion.

\textbf{V.3.1 Ceramic Change in Context}
The Ephesian Hellenistic tableware repertoire displays similarities to Ilion, including important connections with sites elsewhere, particularly in Western Asia Minor. Ephesian producers and consumers clearly were connected to wider trends and fashions. Athens in particular appears as elsewhere to have influenced local productions during the early Hellenistic period although the lack of Ephesian deposits pre ca. 250 BC does not allow us to trace this development in detail. We do know that Classical tableware from Ephesus displays significant Athenian influence on what was already a strong local tradition of pottery manufacture, as evidenced by the limited
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numbers of imports.\textsuperscript{441} Recently it has been shown, however, that despite Attic influence, the actual amount of black slipped tableware attested at Ephesus during the Classical period was not great.\textsuperscript{442} Some of the earliest Hellenistic tableware presented by Mitsopoulos-Leon, however, displays clear connections with the Athenian morphological repertoire of the early Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{443} It is important to mention in this context a well-known inscription dated to the 320s BC, which bestows citizenship on two Athenian brothers who worked as contract potters for the temple of Artemis at Ephesus.\textsuperscript{444} Mitsopoulos-Leon\textsuperscript{445} has suggested that Ephesus during the second half of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC started to develop its tableware repertoire independently from Athens. This trajectory is characterized by the development of an Ephesian West Slope style decoration tradition and the occurrence in the repertoire of new Hellenistic kantharoi and skyphoi not easily paralleled in Athens.\textsuperscript{446}

During the course of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC the Attic influence upon the Ephesian tableware repertoire abates\textsuperscript{447} as both potters and consumers are looking in new directions and the local ceramic industry matures. The observable changes in the tableware repertoire of Ephesus between the mid and late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC need to be seen in such a context and represent the tail end of this development (see appendix 1.3.5.A). This Ionian metropolis indeed became during the course of the Hellenistic period an important centre of ceramic manufacture. The ceramic output of the city testifies to this.\textsuperscript{448} The changing tableware repertoire of Ephesus during the mid- to late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC could therefore be representative of a general new sense of direction in which Ephesus acquires a new ‘Hellenistic’ identity. The morphological links with other communities in South West Asia Minor demonstrate the grounding of Ephesus within regional patterns of production and consumption, in which it could have taken the lead or followed others. Pergamum, for example, may have supplied
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Ephesus with the model for the s-shaped kantharos.\textsuperscript{449} In general, however, little Pergamene influence on the Ephesian ceramic repertoire of the Hellenistic period can be attested.\textsuperscript{450} Thus after an initial phase in which local potters and consumers were looking at Athens for inspiration, Ephesus develops independently within the general koine of Hellenistic ceramic production and consumption.

The regional grounding of the Ephesian tableware repertoire in particular the move away from Athens resulted from a complex array of geo-political, socio-economic and cultural processes which together drove this shift in production and consumption preferences. As an export centre of tableware Athens as we have seen had become of decidedly less importance during the course of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC. The political troubles of Athens during the late Classical and early Hellenistic period undoubtedly affected economic conditions and trade. It is also noteworthy to mention in this context that Ephesus frequently changed hands between the death of Lysimachus and the end of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC.\textsuperscript{451} Mitsopoulos-Leon\textsuperscript{452} sees Attic pottery and lamps imported to Ephesus up until ca. 300 BC; hereafter Athenian influence declines as old shapes die out and new ones are developed.

It is unlikely, however, that the decrease in Athenian export of tableware was solely responsible for the new direction of the Ephesian ceramic ‘industry’. Attic imitations produced outside of Athens in, for example, South West Asia Minor already comprised most of the Atticizing tableware identified at Ephesus in the Classical period.\textsuperscript{453} Atticizing pottery was, for example, also supplied to communities in the Troad.\textsuperscript{454} There thus existed a broad market for products of Attic manufacture and inspiration, a demand which could be satisfied locally in the form of imitations as the evidence from Ephesus\textsuperscript{455} and Sardis\textsuperscript{456} asserts. One would assume that if a preference for Attic or Atticizing tableware continued to exist at Ephesus, local potters would have been able to fulfil demand, just as they had done earlier. We have seen previously, for example, that in Ilion’s lower city part of the tableware continued to display Attic
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features. It is thus possible that the faltering engagement with tableware in the Attic tradition at Ephesus during the first half of the 3rd century BC as evidenced by the material from the *Prytaneion Terrasierung* deposit and the pottery from the *Basilica am Staatsmarkt*,\(^{457}\) represents a much wider reorientation of local consumption preferences. This situation may have grown organically during the course of the 3rd century BC, when the local pottery ‘industry’ matured and Athenian imports arrived in lesser numbers. Indeed we may be seeing a circular situation in which the one influences the other.

This brings us to an important question. Would potters and consumers at Ephesus have been aware of new Athenian tableware trends after Attic imports had stopped arriving? If we answer this question with a no, then we can imagine a situation in which potters, out of the necessity, to supply their customers with new and exiting products, needed to look in other directions or take innovative steps themselves.\(^{458}\) The evidence from Ilion and in particular the widespread occurrence from the late 3rd century BC onwards of the mouldmade bowl and the cup with interior decoration both probably conceived firstly in Athens indicates, however, that knowledge of new trends was not directly dependent upon the arrival of substantial numbers of imports. Athenian mouldmade bowls have, for example, not been identified among the material considered. It is still likely, however, that keeping up to date so to speak, with external traditions of manufacture would have been harder when large numbers of imports were not arriving. Seen in this context, it is not surprising that the Ephesian tableware of the late 3rd century BC displays primarily a local and regional focus tying in to what was current within the wider region of South West Asia Minor.

We should also consider that Ephesus was an important centre of ceramic manufacture which already in Classical times had a strong local production geared to what must have been a sizeable market already, although Ephesus only appears to have become a city warranting the description “greatest emporium of Asia west of the Taurus”\(^{459}\) during the latter part of the Hellenistic period.\(^{460}\) Developments independent from Athens are therefore to be expected and again already a feature of

\(^{458}\) See Rotroff 2006b for a casestudy regarding the mouldmade bowl.
\(^{459}\) Strabo, Geography, book XIV, 24.
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the Classical period. It is therefore no surprise to encounter in such a large and important economic centre primarily locally or regionally produced tableware. We have previously seen this was the case also at Athens. The observable changes from the mid to late 3rd century BC document this development and indicate that Ephesus and South West Asia Minor more generally create a distinct Hellenistic ceramic identity which, however, does display affinity with what is happening elsewhere in the Aegean. The different renditions of the Hellenistic kantharos in evidence at many sites (see appendix 1.3.2.B) are in effect variants on the same general theme as was of course the case with more shapes in the Hellenistic repertoire.

The Ephesian amphorae evidence might reveal more about the external connections of the site and thus its ability to potentially stay in touch with wider trends of ceramic manufacture and consumption. Lawall provides a summary of the major developments. His work shows that Ephesus both locally produced and exported amphorae. Before the 1st century BC amphorae from the Southern Aegean have been identified at Ephesus thereafter, amphorae from the Adriatic and Southern Italy increase in importance. Local Ephesian amphorae have been attested at Israel, Alexandria, Delos and Pergamum. It is perhaps significant that Athens is not mentioned in this list. Ephesus in any case seems to have been involved, on the basis of Lawall’s preliminary assessment of its Hellenistic amphorae, in external interaction covering a wide-area but perhaps focussed mainly on the Southern Aegean. It is likely that this situation increased the awareness of local producers and consumers of new emerging tableware trends and fashions, in the wider region, although the evidence of the mouldmade bowl and cup with interior decoration shows us that they did not needed to be picked up immediately.

Another round of notable changes (see appendix 1.3.5.A) can be observed between material dated to the late 3rd century BC and tableware falling chronologically into the 2nd century BC. These developments signify a profound change in the way in which material form was given to eating and drinking practices at Ephesus and therefore warrant ample consideration. The arrival and local production at Ephesus of the mouldmade bowl and cup with interior decoration indeed represent an important
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new development and illustrate the links of this Ionian community to wider Aegean tableware fashions. The declining popularity of West Slope beakers in favour of the mouldmade bowl also fits within wider trends. Whereas Ephesus previously focussed on a repertoire grounded primarily within local and regional traditions of manufacture (see appendix 1.3.3, 5), the occurrence of both vessels stresses the ability of producers and consumers to stay in touch and have a demand for more widely carried trends and fashions. The introduction, however, of shapes hardly paralleled elsewhere such as the plates with *beidseitig verdickte lippe* and the plate with *gedrechselte rand*, vessels which subsequently became very popular in the Ephesian tableware repertoire, illustrate that local traditions of manufacture and consumptions continued to range strong despite producers and consumers tapping into wider Aegean trends and fashions (see figure 58 L, M).

Just as at Ilion, however, the mouldmade bowl in comparison with Athens appears relatively late.\(^{463}\) This delayed popularity reflects a continued preference for West Slope beakers. The absence of the latter from the terrace house 1, well fill 2 deposit may suggest that it is only now that mouldmade bowls became the most important beverage consumption shape. The cup with interior decoration is another example to mention in this context. Though attested since the early 3\(^{rd}\) century BC at Athens,\(^{464}\) Ephesian deposit evidence points to the late 2\(^{nd}\) – early 1\(^{st}\) century BC as the period of greatest popularity for this shape at Ephesus (appendix 1.3.3.table 18-22). Clearly established traditions of manufacture and patterns of consumption where not easily changed, something which is also argued by Rogl\(^{465}\) who states that Ephesus only reluctantly accepted new shapes and that the local Hellenistic repertoire was preferred. At Knidos, for example, we also see that the mouldmade bowl only gathers popular support relatively late, traditional Knidian shapes were preferred.\(^{466}\) The cup with interior decoration is altogether as good as absent from Knidos.\(^{467}\)
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phenomenon can be observed also on mainland Greece, for example, at Corinth,\textsuperscript{468} where the mouldmade bowl was produced later than at Athens.

Why then, considering the strong local or regional traditions of manufacture, do these changes eventually occur? Obviously, we are dealing in part with an element of material acculturation. Ephesus’ economic and political importance continued to rise during the Hellenistic period culminating in its acclamation as capital of Asia in 84 BC.\textsuperscript{469} The Aegean connections of Ephesus\textsuperscript{470} no doubt provided potters and consumers with knowledge about trends and fashions elsewhere as is indeed evidenced by the tableware. The presence of so many ‘Greek’ communities along the shores of South West Asia Minor would have increased the potential for substantial interaction and as a result information exchange. The general ceramic koine visible in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean indeed proves the high level of interaction and information exchange. Rogl\textsuperscript{471} notes in this context that only slight differences can be observed between late 2\textsuperscript{nd} – 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC material from Ephesus, Samos, Delos and Pergamum, highlighting the regional interconnections.

The many resident non-citizens of Ephesus, some of which may even have been potters, could also have acquainted Ephesian consumers with different cultural traditions. Davies\textsuperscript{472} has indeed illustrated that there was a willingness to accept non-citizen residents at Ephesus. This situation favours a gradual exposure of Ephesian producers and consumers of pottery to new ideas and products. Rogl\textsuperscript{473} describes a similar process when talking about the transition from the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC at Ephesus. Consumer preferences in such a context would have evolved gradually, responding to what was on offer or known locally or regionally. Local potters, however, would have had incentives to try out new things in order to satisfy a varied and heterogeneous customer base. Rotroff as we have seen makes a similar observation when discussing the introduction of the Athenian mouldmade bowl.

Mouldmade bowls and conical cups are classic examples of skeuomorphs. The general view is that potters engaged in the imitation of vessels in other more costly

\textsuperscript{468} James 2010: 77, note 84-85.
\textsuperscript{469} Gualiani 2007: 28.
\textsuperscript{470} Davies 2011: 190.
\textsuperscript{471} 2007: 189.
\textsuperscript{472} 2011: 191.
\textsuperscript{473} 2007: 189.
material media; such as glass and especially metal plate.\textsuperscript{474} The imitation in ceramic of these vessels, which are referred to as skeuomorphs, allowed consumers to acquire products which may have carried upper class drinking and dining connotations. The popularity of skeuomorphs such as the mouldmade bowl and conical cup is thus partly explained with reference to their elite associations (fig. 65). As such they do not seem out of place in an Ephesus which during the course of the Hellenistic period becomes one of the most important cities of the ‘Greek’ East.

It is possible that Pergamum, a kingdom to which Ephesus belonged after 189 BC,\textsuperscript{475} played a role in this process. It is perhaps no coincidence that the mouldmade bowl becomes only very popular at Ephesus after the incorporation of the city within the Pergamene kingdom. Pergamum as mentioned previously produces the mouldmade bowl earlier than Ephesus and although in terms of morphology and decoration there is little connection between the two centres,\textsuperscript{476} the original impetus for the local production of the shape may have come from the Attalid capital. We need to remember in this context that also the s-shaped kantharos arrived at Ephesus possibly via Pergamum.\textsuperscript{477} The Attalid kings were certainly involved with Ephesus as demonstrated by serious infrastructure investment at Ephesus on their part.\textsuperscript{478} Their involvement with and interest in Athens is also widely known.\textsuperscript{479} Pergamum thus may have been a potential avenue as Attalid influence expanded after 189 BC, through which the concept of the mouldmade bowl reached Ephesus and perhaps South West Asia Minor more widely. Pergamene influence may also be behind the late surge in popularity at Ephesus of the cup or bowl with interior decoration. This shape is paralleled at Pergamum\textsuperscript{480} but also elsewhere.\textsuperscript{481} At Athens it is rare, however, after ca. 175 BC whereas at Pergamum it is reported in early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC contexts and may have been produced until the middle of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC.\textsuperscript{482} As an important

\textsuperscript{474} Rotroff 1997a: 12.
\textsuperscript{475} Rogl 2007: note 2.
\textsuperscript{476} Gassner 1997: 88.
\textsuperscript{477} Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991: 15.
\textsuperscript{478} Davies 2011: 199.
\textsuperscript{479} Habicht 1990.
\textsuperscript{480} Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991: 38; Gassner 1997: 66.
\textsuperscript{481} Rotroff 1997a: 110, note 113; Van der Enden et al accepted a.
\textsuperscript{482} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 41-42.
port city knowledge of new fashions could of course have reached Ephesus via other avenues of interaction.

**V.4 Lydia: Sardis**

Sardis was a community with a well-established pre-Hellenistic background. For over 200 years, it had been the seat of the Achaemenid Imperial administration.\(^{483}\) The city itself of course, was not Greek but Lydian. In fact Sardis was before the Persian conquest the capital of the Lydian empire ruled over by the famed Croesus.\(^{484}\) The former capital was subsequently used by the Persians as their prime seat of power in Asia Minor. The site, strategically located,\(^{485}\) has yielded an intriguing mixture of Lydian, Persian and Greek cultural influences.

Hellenistic pottery from Sardis has recently been published.\(^{486}\) Few of the deposits involved, however, represent actual use contexts, most are in fact dumps. The so-called PN area (fig. 66), however, is thought to represent household debris from structures destroyed in the attack upon the city by Antiochus III.\(^{487}\) Most of the deposits are associated with the heart of the city\(^{488}\) and thus likely to be associated with either public or domestic use-contexts.

Little of the Hellenistic tableware of Sardis has been independently dated. The identified material is therefore primarily dated on the basis of external parallels and with reference to wider Hellenistic ceramic developments and trends.\(^{489}\) Any chronological overview of the changes in Sardis’ tableware ‘assemblage’ during the course of the Hellenistic period naturally relies on these ‘dated’ shapes and can only be constructed with some provision. In order to provide an overview of ceramic developments at Sardis, all the dated pottery\(^{490}\) has been subsumed within a few artificially created chronologically ranges. Appendix 1.3.6.table 24-33 sets out these ranges and the material incorporated in them. Appendix 1.3.6.table 34 provides an overview of all the beverage and food consumption vessels catalogued for Hellenistic

---

\(^{483}\) Mitten 1966: 56.
\(^{484}\) Pedley 1968.
\(^{485}\) Hanfmann 1983: 2; Mitten 1966: 39.
\(^{486}\) See Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003.
\(^{488}\) Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 1.
\(^{490}\) Taken from from the catalogue.
Sardis. Appendix 1.3.7 provides a descriptive overview of the observable tableware changes at Hellenistic Sardis and the relevant wider ceramic context.

V.4.1 Change in Context
In appendix 1.3.7.A it has been highlighted that the tableware repertoire of Sardis can be seen to change profoundly between the mid. 3rd and late 3rd/early 2nd century BC. It is during this timespan that Sardis acquires a properly Hellenistic ceramic identity, one embedded within the wider region of Western Asia Minor. Another important moment in the city’s ceramic history appears to have been the introduction of substantial volumes of Pergamene sigillata from the second half of the 2nd century BC onwards. As has been argued in chapter II, these changes are manifestations of intended human action which deviate from the normative situation. Although in general terms Sardis is following wider ceramic trends (see appendix 1.3.7.B) the question why the tableware repertoire can be seen to change during these moments in time remains to be answered. This question is especially relevant with regards to the evidence from the 213 BC destruction contexts associated with an event earmarked as a watershed moment in the history of the community. Why did Sardian producers and consumers change direction after ca. 213 BC and why was Pergamene sigillata arriving in large numbers at the former Seleucid capital? These trajectories are by no means self-evident and are dependent upon processes both internal and external to the site. It is this interaction that reflects the choices made.

V.4.1.1 The ‘Hellenization’ of Sardis
In order to approach an understanding of the scale of the changes that can be observed around the mid. 3rd – late 3rd/early 2nd century BC it is important to briefly consider the extent to which the tableware repertoire of Sardis was Hellenized during late 4th – early 3rd century BC. This is especially important to consider in the light of the contexts associated with the 213 BC sack of the city by Antiochus III, contexts which have yielded hardly any ‘Greek’ tableware. Despite the fact that ‘Greek’ drinking shapes were known at Sardis and had already arrived at the site in some number, it appears that the Hellenistic period data suggests that they were not very popular. It is

---

492 See Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003; Schaeffer et al 1997.
very interesting that black slipped pottery even though probably locally produced at Sardis, was rare.\textsuperscript{493} Additionally the category of partially slipped pottery, popular at Sardis since the 3rd century BC and probably produced locally and in wider Asia Minor, does not contain ‘Greek’ drinking shapes (fig.73).\textsuperscript{494} Rotroff has suggested that these partially slipped wares might have been cheaper alternatives to the fully slipped wares. This does, however, not take away the fact that no ‘Greek’ drinking shapes are to be found among its repertoire at Sardis.

It thus appears that ‘Greek’ style tableware was rare at the site during the early Hellenistic period, especially so with regards to vessels used for drinking. That there was some demand for these vessels is attested, however, by the arrival of these shapes in the first place and the presumed local or regional production of fishplates. A demand for and appreciation of ‘Greek’ style tableware is also evidenced by the previously mentioned arrival of Attic imports during the Achaemenid period.\textsuperscript{495} In the early Hellenistic period this demand may be associated with the evidence that Greeks and Macedonians settled at Sardis.\textsuperscript{496} It has also been argued that the city was subjected to Hellenizing influences during the course of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC.\textsuperscript{497} According to Mitten\textsuperscript{498} public buildings in ‘Greek’ style begun to be erected already in the last quarter of the 6th century BC and Hanfmann et al\textsuperscript{499} has noted that ‘Greek’ buildings were before 213 BC added to the periphery of the town centre. Furthermore, textual evidence attests to the fact that Sardis had a \textit{boule}, assembly, theatre and gymnasium and of course the temple of Artemis. The temple and theatre are thought to have been constructed in the early 3rd century BC.\textsuperscript{500} Inscriptions were also published in Greek and we have already mentioned the mass of Attic pottery that found its way to Sardis. Also attested are temples to Zeus Polieus, Zeus Olympios and a precinct to the Seleucid queen Laodice.\textsuperscript{501} Sardis thus certainly had a ‘Hellenized

\textsuperscript{493} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 19.
\textsuperscript{494} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 24-25.
\textsuperscript{495} See Schaeffer et al 1997.
\textsuperscript{496} Hanfmann et al 1983: 113.
\textsuperscript{498} 1966: 57.
\textsuperscript{499} 1983: 109.
\textsuperscript{500} Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993: 182.
\textsuperscript{501} Hanfmann et al 1983:116.
Greek’ face and this undoubtedly would have created a demand, however, limited, for ‘Greek’ style tableware during the course of the early Hellenistic period.

Equally, epigraphic evidence suggests that Persians continued to live at Sardis.\footnote{Hanfmann et al 1983: 113, 135.} The early Seleucid city also seems to have consisted primarily of Lydian style houses and the basic pre-Alexandrian plan of the city seems not to have been changed.\footnote{Hanfmann et al 1983: 110, 116.} Lydian also was used for public documents in the 4th century BC and the use of Lydian personal names continued.\footnote{Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993: 180; Mitten 1966: 50.} We know also that some deities attested at Sardis were never completely Hellenized and retained aspects of their Lydian and Persian origins.\footnote{Ascough 2005: 6.} There is thus compelling evidence which suggests that Sardis in the late 3rd century BC was still heavily grounded in its pre-Hellenistic past. Hanfmann et al\footnote{1983: 109.} have argued in this context, that the Lydian-Persian city continued in existence until 213 BC.\footnote{Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993: 180.} Both the pottery recovered from the pre-213 BC destruction contexts (fig. 69) and the overall scarce appearance of fully black slipped pottery in the Greek tradition are in accordance with this view, especially the limited number of attested drinking cups.

The ‘Hellenization’ of Sardis, thus appears to have picked-up speed during the course of the late 3rd century BC. We know that after the sack of the city by Antiochus III in 213/212 BC, damaged Sardis is rebuilt and partially realigned.\footnote{Hanfmann et al 1983: 109.} Later evidence indicates the presence of Doric peristyle capitals and suggests according to Hanfmann et al\footnote{1983: 118.} the replacement of the Lydian house by ‘Greek’ peristyle houses. Zeuxis, Antiochus’ viceroy of Asia Minor, was now installed in the Sardian citadel and from here furthers the interests of the Seleucid king and oversees the reconstruction of the city. That the city had received substantial damage is perhaps indicated by the apparent need or desirability of a synoecimos.\footnote{Mitten 1966: 60.}

Sardian producers and consumers after ca. 213 BC deliberately turned a page. Perhaps the urban reorganization led to increased contacts with the ‘Greek’
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communities of Western Asia Minor and perhaps subsequently to a greater exposure to ‘Greek’ material culture. However, also before 213 BC Sardis was an important node in the Seleucid and even earlier Lysimachean realm. This does not suggest that Sardis did not have information about ‘Greek’ tableware practices. On the contrary, we have seen that ‘Greek’ imports did arrive and were imitated locally or regionally. The preference for Lydian style ceramic products thus appears to have been a deliberate choice, especially when we consider that Sardis was an important centre of artisanal manufacture and could (and would) most likely be able to produce ‘Greek’ fully black slipped pottery if desired. The likely explanation therefore is that producers and consumers at Sardis preferred traditional ways of giving material form to drinking and dinning practices. It was only after prolonged exposure to ‘Greek’ cultural influences and a profound reconstruction of the urban community that the way in which drinking and dining was given material form changed. The traditionalism of Sardian consumers is also showcased by the belated popularity of the mouldmade bowl.\textsuperscript{511} Apparently consumers at Sardis departed only reluctantly from their preferred West Slope beakers and kantharoi.

V.4.1.2 The Influence of Pergamum
The next importance change that we have come across (see appendix 1.3.7.A) is the arrival of Pergamene products at Sardis during the course of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC (figs.70-71). Pergamene sigillata became indeed an important part of the Sardian table.\textsuperscript{512} Why is this? Did Sardian consumers prefer Pergamene products specifically or did other aspects influence the choice for tableware products? Pergamene products certainly may have been appreciated because of their inherent qualities. The extra-regional distribution that Pergamene sigillata or ESC acquired signifies indeed a wide acceptance of the ware.\textsuperscript{513} As Rotroff and Oliver Jr.\textsuperscript{514} put it, the “excellent, satiny glaze, often contrasting black and red on inside and outside” of ESC appealed most likely to the tastes of Sardian consumers and so probably did Pergamene applique ware. The appreciation of the qualities of ESC can, however, not be the sole reason

\textsuperscript{511} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 95.
\textsuperscript{512} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 84.
\textsuperscript{513} See Bes 2007.
\textsuperscript{514} 2003: 84.
why this product appears to have been popular at Sardis. As we have seen, Sardian consumers pre-213 BC were certainly familiar with ‘Greek’ shapes, the apperance of which probably also appealing to at least some consumers. These shapes, however, did not appear to have arrived in any great numbers during the early Hellenistic period as a Lydian repertoire was preferred. The choice for Pergamene products thus needs to take into account other aspects.

We know that Pergamene sigillata began to be produced ca. 150 BC.\textsuperscript{515} We also know that between 188 and 133 BC Sardis formed part of the Pergamene kingdom.\textsuperscript{516} This suggests that there is a connection between the political ascendancy of Pergamum and the spread of its ceramic products. Bes\textsuperscript{517} quotes Zelle who argues that the strong presence of ESC in 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC Pednelissos in Pisidia might indeed have been the result of the incorporation of the region in the Pergamene kingdom. As we have seen Pergamene products have also been identified at Ilion a site in close vicinity to the Attalid capital.\textsuperscript{518} Something similar might have happened at Sardis. Though the lack of closely dated deposits at Sardis hampers tracing the introduction of this ware accurately, the earliest dateable pieces fall into a mid-2\textsuperscript{nd}- to 1\textsuperscript{st}-century BC range.\textsuperscript{519}

A cost-effective production probably allowed Pergamene sigillata to acquire an extra-regional importance. Producers of the ware were most likely able to compete in terms of price and quality with competing local and regional wares. Though in order to be successful local acceptance and appreciation is important, the ability for an imported product to compete locally is equally a vital component. If this is not achieved, imports will not be able to take over local markets.\textsuperscript{520} This observation suggests that in the early Hellenistic period though ‘Greek’ style imports did arrive and were locally imitated, the Sardian market was not flooded with them. Imports in such a scenario were never a serious alternative for locally produced wares. The impact of imports thus represents a careful balancing act between on the one hand the ability to export pottery cost-effectively and on the other the willingness of local consumers to accept the new product. Both are needed in order for an imported product to oust
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local production, a situation not often observed since the decline of the Attic export in the early Hellenistic period and before the late Hellenistic period when important extra-regional productions appear again.\textsuperscript{521} If a product is deemed agreeable, but cannot compete costwise with home-made products, local imitation will most likely take over and cater for this new demand. We have established in the above that this was only the case to a limited extent for early Hellenistic Sardis with regards to ‘Greek’ style tableware products. The latter apparently did not flood the local or regional market and imitations did not take over, suggesting a limited local demand.

Pergamene sigillata thus most likely profited from the political dominance of the Attalid kingdom after Magnesia. The increased contacts with the constituent parts of the enlarged realm possibly allowed opportunistic entrepreneurs to market their wares more widely, assisted by changes in the organization of production which allowed a standardized product to compete with local wares. The creation of the Roman province of Asia after 133 BC would have continued this process and Meyer-Schlichtman\textsuperscript{522} relates the advent of ESC to this development and associates it with the activities of the \textit{publicani}. Pergamum and the Attalid kings were revered during the Hellenistic period as centres of ‘Greek’ culture and civilization. This undoubtedly awakened an appetite in the wider region for things Pergamene. Both factors combined to shape the choices of Sardian consumers and helped to cement the importance of Pergamene sigillata during the 2\textsuperscript{nd}- and 1\textsuperscript{st}-centuries BC at Sardis. This reconstruction of events is supported by the fact that local Sardian mouldmade bowls display connections with Pergamum and many fragments possibly come from this important centre of ceramic manufacture.\textsuperscript{523}

\textbf{V.5 Conclusions: Active or Passive Consumers? Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis Reconsidered}

In the above and appendix 1.3 changes in the tableware repertoire of Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis have been approached. We have seen that change can clearly be identified at specific moments in time. We have also seen, however, that the observed ceramic changes visible in the deposits studied tend to be part of more widely shared

\textsuperscript{521} Examples are the Ephesian export of mouldmade bowls (Bilde 1993) and the advent of the Eastern sigillatas (see Bes 2007).
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trajectories in tableware production and consumption. The observed changes therefore do not appear to have been isolated events, applicable only to a specific site or region. It has become clear that Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis were able to tap into new developments in tableware production and consumption bringing new ceramic fashions and innovations. What remains to be discussed, however, is the important matter of active human choice or agency. Did local producers and consumers at our three case-study sites consciously change their ways by adopting a new shape or ware, making a deliberate choice out of a range of alternatives or are we faced with a situation in which both producers and consumers had little to choose and were simply using what was available to them? This distinction is important as it signals the (in)ability of producers and consumers to variously and actively engage with material culture. If material change, is solely driven by the availability of new products the active role of human agents would appear fairly limited.

The similar developmental trajectories of the tableware repertoire of Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis indeed signal the importance of the local availability of new products and wares. Availability clearly is an important concept when addressing ceramic change over time and the adherence of individuals or a community to new fashions in tableware consumption. It may appear from the above discussion that changes in the ceramic repertoire of Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis occur because the sites in question are merely following new ceramic fashions as they become available. It could thus be argued that it is the availability of new products that drives ceramic change and accounts for the differences between sites as not every community would most likely have had the same options available. In what follows, however, we will assess to what extent the observed changes reflecting wider ceramic developments in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean can be equated with active human choice and were not merely resultant upon the availability of these products to the networks of interaction that brought them.

In terms of availability it appears that the decline of the export of Attic pottery did indeed affect all our three case-study sites. ‘Attic’ tableware disappears from the site repertoires. It has previously been mentioned that politically and economically Athens had its problems during the early Hellenistic period, problems which look to have affected the ability of the community to sustain its previously large scale export
of ceramics. In this case therefore we can state that the disappearance of Attic tableware reflects not so much the choices of individuals and communities but rather issues of supply and availability. There is, however, another side to this story. As Rostovzeff had already indicated\(^{524}\) it was also the case that local or regional productions began to cater for demand pushing away perhaps products of Athenian or Greek manufacture. We have indeed seen that at Ephesus around 250 BC potters pursued different trajectories than their Athenian counterparts. Availability is thus just part of the story, not the complete picture. An element of active human choice on the part of the individuals and communities involved can also be discerned.

The continued Attic influence upon Ilion’s tableware repertoire indicates as previously mentioned that demand for Atticizing tableware did not abate. The mouldmade bowl is the example par excellence of a shape originally invented in Athens which is widely disseminated throughout the Hellenistic world.\(^{525}\) It is thus clear that despite the lack of actual Athenian imported pottery, communities (producers and consumers) were aware to a certain extent of what was happening elsewhere and able to follow and join new trends. These examples not only illustrate the need for communities in Western Asia Minor to sustain patterns of consumption in which ‘Attic’ tableware previously functioned but also indicate as argued above in the case of Ephesus, the rising importance of Western Asia Minor in the Hellenistic world plus the need to supply a cost-effective product to local markets. The absence of Attic tableware across the deposits considered from Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis may thus reflect next to issues of availability and supply a conscious decision of the individuals involved to focus on locally or regionally produced wares which perhaps, in the face of potential Athenian difficulties to maintain the pottery supply were more cost-effective. It equally reflects the rising political and economic importance of Western Asia Minor in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean, something which was already pointed out by Rostovzeff.\(^ {526}\) Ephesus in particular appears to have shrugged off its dependence on Athens for ceramic inspiration, independently developing its tableware repertoire and becoming more orientated towards the wider region of Western Asia Minor.
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At Ilion Attic influences continue to be visible next to traditions developed it appears, within Western Asia Minor. This reconstruction of events is supported by the fact that productions of Atticizing tableware during the second and third quarters of the 4th century BC spring up in the Troad area prior to the decline of the Attic export. That the Atticizing products outnumber the imports\(^{527}\) illustrates that the demand for these vessels was substantial and could most effectively be met locally or regionally. It is also of interest to note that among amphorae dated to between 325-240 BC and attested at Athens, many examples from the South East Aegean are present suggesting substantial cross-Aegean commercial contacts.\(^{528}\) If pottery was indeed piggy-backing on the substantial trade in more perishable goods, then the presence of these amphorae at Athens may have provided the means by which Attic ceramics or knowledge thereof could move across the Aegean. It certainly shows that economic interaction continued despite Athenian troubles although the time-frame utilized by Lawall (325-240 BC) does not allow a detailed assessment. The fall-off in Athenian export to the Eastern Mediterranean is thus not solely a supply issue but also involves changes in local production and consumption.

The scarcity of fully black slipped tableware in the Attic tradition at Sardis and the shift in the late 3rd century BC when ‘Greek’ style tableware appears more widely accepted has also more to do with specific local choices than with availability and supply. The limited presence of ‘Greek’ tableware prior to the late 3rd century BC shows that local producers and consumers were aware of these products; local production even displays a limited demand. The arrival of Attic pottery already in pre-Hellenistic times\(^{529}\) certainly illustrates that the community was aware of ‘Greek’ pottery traditions. Other aspects of Sardian society display as we have seen mixed cultural influences providing evidence for an engagement with Hellenic cultural expressions but equally for a continuation of traditional Lydian practices.

Culturally Sardis thus appears to have been a hybrid community but at least before the middle of the 3rd century BC the tableware repertoire most probably for the majority of its population was of a traditional Lydian complexion, at least if the

\(^{527}\) Berlin and Lynch 2002: 168.
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deposits associated with the 213 BC destruction can be deemed representative for the community as a whole. Most likely, however, we are dealing with a situation in which within a single community various developmental trajectories reflecting different cultural choices are in evidence. It seems in any case that the observed tableware distribution patterns in the contexts associated with the 213 BC destructions represents a refusal on the part of elements of the Sardian community to engage with ‘Greek’ style tableware in every day domestic contexts. Clearly no need was perceived to do so. This observation does, however, not necessarily represent active human agency. Local producers and consumers may not have been consciously aware of their actions and simply continued established traditions of manufacture and consumption. What most likely does represent deliberate human choice are the changes observed during the mid/late 3rd century BC when Sardis as argued in the above joins up more clearly with the Hellenistic ceramic traditions of Western Asia Minor, as reflective by the close ceramic parallels shared between the various communities.

The above thus suggests that within the options available to them, Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis were able to make active choices with regards to the production and consumption of tableware. Though it has become clear that our case-study communities respond to wider developments in tableware production and consumption, the noted changes reflect the varying engagements of local communities with more general trends, and as we have seen active choices, could be and were made in this respect, displaying clear consumption preferences. ‘Active’ in this context does not, however, need to mean ‘conscious’, as all the communities operated within specific parameters and traditions which shaped and informed local choices. In chapter VII, the differences between the three communities will be explored further. The next chapter, however, will first introduce a new case-study into the mixture, namely the Pisidian community of Sagalassos.
Chapter VI: Away from the Coast, Consumer Choice and Ceramic Distribution at Hellenistic Sagalassos

VI.1 Introduction
The current chapter presents a considerable corpus of pottery of late Hellenistic date unearthed at Sagalassos, which has only partly been published.\(^{530}\) The tableware of this Pisidian community provides an important case-study against which to address the influence of human choice upon the formation of tableware distribution patterns, particularly as it adds to the mix a region far removed geographically from the ‘Greek’ centres of Hellenistic Western Asia Minor previously discussed. This provides an opportunity to assess the impact (or lack thereof) locally at Sagalassos of some of the wider ceramic trends visible in Western Asia Minor and detailed in previous chapters.

This chapter ties in with previous chapters by highlighting the different choices made by Sagalassian producers and consumers of tableware in relation to developments elsewhere in Pisidia and Asia Minor. The socio-economic and geopolitical background of late Hellenistic Sagalassos will similarly, and in line with previous chapters, be touched upon in order to provide a framework against which identifiable choices in the production and consumption of tableware can be explored. In short, this chapter will attempt to investigate how and why the tableware repertoire identified at Sagalassos differs from that attested at sites in the immediate region and further afield, exploring the importance of choice(s) and the aspects that influenced the options open to both individuals and communities. The primary aim of this chapter (as was the case in previous chapters) is to investigate how the tableware of late Hellenistic Sagalassos was anchored in society and how identifiable choices involving this ceramic medium reflect or interact with local or regional and extra-regional developments. Before moving over, however, to the core-part of this chapter, it is necessary to set the scene and sketch briefly something of the geo-political context of Pisidian Sagalassos.

VI.2 Hellenistic Sagalassos
Sagalassos is located in Pisidia, an inland region in South West Turkey (fig.74), situated at over 100 km from the sea, perched on mountain terraces at about 1450-1600 masl,

\(^{530}\) See Poblome et al 2012; Van der Enden et al in press a/b.
forming part of the western Taurus range. Sagalassos is considered to be, together with Termessos and Selge, one of the three biggest cities of Hellenistic Pisidia. In Roman Imperial times, the site developed into a provincial town of some regional importance. Pisidia in Hellenistic times, however, was often considered to be some sort of backwater inhabited by an unruly population famous for supplying mercenaries to warring monarchs. Recent archaeological research has started to re-address this negative image of Pisidia and provide alternative narratives illustrating local differences within Pisidia itself. The nearby site of Düzen Tepe, for example, appears to differ markedly in terms of material culture used from other contemporary sites in the area. This observation suggests that local communities in Pisidia were potentially making different choices from one another affecting the outlook of their material culture.

Few archaeological remains dated to the Hellenistic period are extant or have been unearthed at Sagalassos. It is therefore difficult to approach the contemporary nature and character of the town. The material that survives is primarily mid to late Hellenistic. Yet epigraphic evidence, coinage and the development of monumental architecture clearly indicate that Sagalassos was developing into a Hellenistic polis. The earliest phases of the Hellenistic settlement, as it was conquered by Alexander the Great, have, however, so far eluded us. Sagalassos appears to have developed alongside the nearby site of Düzen Tepe. The community, however, looks to have consciously orientated itself towards the Hellenistic world whereas Düzen Tepe did not. Features of a polis community and the public use of Greek plus an engagement with Hellenistic material cultural influences have been identified. There is evidence for the functioning of traditional ‘Greek’ civil offices. The transformation of Sagalassos into a fully-fledged Greek city is, however, only completed during the 1st

---
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century BC,\textsuperscript{540} to which, for example, a Hellenistic style bouleuterion can be dated (fig. 75).\textsuperscript{541}

Politically, Sagalassos started the Hellenistic period in spectacular fashion as its inhabitants were direct witnesses to its creation. The conqueror himself, Alexander the Great, defeated local levies and captured the city. Before Alexander Sagalassos was part of the Persian satrapy of Greater Phyrgia, although part or all of Pisidia was frequently asserting its independence from Persian rule.\textsuperscript{542} After Alexander’s death Sagalassos initially formed part of the great Antigonid Empire\textsuperscript{543} but after the defeat of Antigonus and Demetrius at Ipsos,\textsuperscript{544} the area belonged, perhaps after a spell of independence, to the orbit of the Seleucid Empire. This remained so until Antiochus III was forced by his Roman adversaries to evacuate all his territories west of the Taurus Mountains. Sagalassos now formed part of an enlarged Pergamene kingdom. Upon the death of Attalus III, Sagalassos was drafted into the newly created Roman province of Asia, in which it remained until the early 1st century BC when a provincial reorganization saw it added to the Roman province of Cilicia. Sagalassos and Pisidia ended the Hellenistic period as part of the Galatian kingdom of Amyntas,\textsuperscript{545} a kingdom which became a Roman province after 25 BC.\textsuperscript{546}

In Augustan times important changes can be noted in both the society and material culture of Sagalassos. The inhabitants appear to have embraced both the political and cultural influence of Rome\textsuperscript{547} which found its expression in conspicuous urban expansion.\textsuperscript{548} Ceramically this time span is associated with the rise to supra-regional importance of Sagalassos Red Slip Ware (SRSW),\textsuperscript{549} a predecessor of which was produced at Sagalassos at least since late Hellenistic times.\textsuperscript{550}

\textsuperscript{540} Waelkens 2002: 329.
\textsuperscript{541} Waelkens 2002: 315.
\textsuperscript{542} Waelkens et al 2011: 34-36.
\textsuperscript{543} See Billows 1997.
\textsuperscript{544} See Serrati 2013.
\textsuperscript{545} Waelkens 2002: 314.
\textsuperscript{546} Waelkens 2002: 321.
\textsuperscript{547} Waelkens 2002: 360.
\textsuperscript{548} Waelkens 2002: 335.
\textsuperscript{549} Waelkens 2002: 322, for SRSW see Poblome 1999.
\textsuperscript{550} Waelkens 2002: 320.
SRSW has received considerable scholarly attention: the organization and mechanisms of production\textsuperscript{551} have been studied and the typo-chronology of its shapes and their distribution charted and contextualized,\textsuperscript{552} though the genesis of SRSW is only being approached recently.\textsuperscript{553} The scarcity of specific Hellenistic excavated deposits at Sagalassos and associated artefacts has made it difficult to trace the history of pottery production at Sagalassos further back and, for example, identify patterns of consumption. This has changed with the discovery of the Hellenistic potters’ quarter, as well as the analysis of a range of Hellenistic deposits containing material belonging most likely in majority to both last centuries BC (see appendix 1.4.2.A, fig. 76).

VI.3 The Late Hellenistic Tableware

The tableware repertoire of Sagalassos considered in this chapter shows affinity in shape, finishing and (lack of) decoration with ceramic material dated between the 2\textsuperscript{nd} - 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BC and possibly later (see appendix 1.4.1-2 for a tabular and descriptive overview of the archaeological deposits considered and the wider chronological (see appendix 1.4.2.B) and ceramic context of the material discussed). Parallels in glass and metal plate also point to the late Hellenistic period (see appendix 1.4.2.C). It should be noted in this context that SRSW occurs together with this corpus of material in some of the contexts considered. This possibly is a further indication of a date late in the Hellenistic period for the material considered and so is the occurrence of a few fragments of Pergamene applique ware and thin walled ware. Similarly, fusiform unguentaria like the ones attested at Sagalassos (in the Apollo Klarios deposit) are thought to date later in the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{554} Grey ware unguentaria category 4 and 5 of the Athenian Agora,\textsuperscript{555} dated to ca. 215-150 BC and 180-100 BC respectively,\textsuperscript{556} are akin to the unguentaria from Sagalassos, some of which also display a grey fabric and exterior.

The banded and painted closed shapes attested in the Apollo Klarios deposit (fig. 77), also indicate a late Hellenistic dating as these vessels appear to be related to

\textsuperscript{551} Murphy and Poblome 2011; Poblome in press.
\textsuperscript{553} Poblome et al 2012; Poblome et al in press.
\textsuperscript{554} Anderson-Stoja
\textsuperscript{555} Rotroff 2006a: 154.
\textsuperscript{556} Rotroff 2006a: 153, table 14.
the tradition of dark decoration on a light background,\textsuperscript{557} which in the case of the Sagalassian examples not necessarily involves the characteristic light slip. Banded lagynoi from the Agora\textsuperscript{558} also lack the characteristic slipped base. The lagynos is the most characteristic shape of the light ground tradition and particularly popular during the second half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC (fig. 97).\textsuperscript{559} It remained popular until ca. 50 BC.\textsuperscript{560}

The dominance of bowls or cups of conical or ovoid shape at Sagalassos (appendix 1.4.1.table 35) appears to be related to a general preference for such shapes in the 2\textsuperscript{nd}- and (early) 1\textsuperscript{st}-centuries BC both in ceramic, glass and metal plate. Locally at Sagalassos this trend could of course have continued. This is indeed evidenced by the continued popularity of the mastos in SRSW\textsuperscript{561} of which the Hellenistic mastos is a precursor. The Achaemenid cup, a shape popular at Sardis pre-213 BC also still occurs in SRSW until the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD (fig. 98).\textsuperscript{562} A certain traditionalism or continuation of established practices can thus be observed. And although the Sagalassian bowl with thickened exterior rim occurs already in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC at Jebel Khalid, a late date for this shape is also suggested by its relationship to Cypriot sigillata (see appendix 1.4.2.C). It should be stressed, however, that in the absence of hard dating criteria it remains difficult to date the material considered. A reliance on external parallels can only provide hints as to where, chronologically, we should need to place the Sagalassos material. The tableware considered in any case displays distinct local or regional characteristics which cannot be easily compared with material from elsewhere. Though shapes showing affinity with the mastos from Sagalassos are encountered on a wide variety of sites (see appendix 1.2.4.C), its exact shape is not widely mirrored in ceramic, though it appears in glass and metal plate. The outward flaring rim and concavity of the flaring wall are in particular features which appear to be specific for the Sagalassian interpretation of the mastos. The same can be said about the conical or ovoid bowl or cup. In shape it reminds of the cup with interior decoration but the Sagalassian vessels are always undecorated. The value of external parallels for the dating of the Sagalassian material considered is therefore limited.

\textsuperscript{557} Rotroff 1997a: 225-232.
\textsuperscript{558} Rotroff 1997a: 231, cat. 1550-1556.
\textsuperscript{559} Gassner 1997: 69-70.
\textsuperscript{560} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 72.
\textsuperscript{561} Poblome 1999: 304.
\textsuperscript{562} Poblome 1999: 304.
Considering the cited parallels (see appendix 1.2.4.C),\textsuperscript{563} the dominance of colour-coated red or orange slipped vessels, presence of SRSW and relationship of the non-SRSW material to the former, a second half 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC – 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC dating for most of the tableware considered seems, however, likely. It is during this late Hellenistic time-frame that conical cups, including the mastos, appear to have been popular within Asia Minor and the Levantine area, not only in ceramic but also in glass and metal plate and red slip is widely accepted as the preferred finishing for tableware.

\textbf{VI.4 The Sagalassian Tableware Repertoire and Hellenistic Asia Minor}

The late Hellenistic tableware repertoire recovered from the findspots considered shows both similarities and differences with material from elsewhere in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean. Clear and direct parallels in ceramic are, however, hard to come by for some of the most numerously attested shapes (see appendix 1.4.2.C). This emphasizes the particular nature and character of the Sagalassian repertoire. However, despite the fact that direct parallels are hard to come by, affinity with tableware encountered elsewhere in Hellenistic Asia Minor and the Levant, clearly exists and especially glass bowls widely encountered in the Eastern Mediterranean provide good parallels to the mastoi from Sagalassos. Sagalassian potters and consumers therefore did not operate within a vacuum completely oblivious from ceramic trends and developments elsewhere; rather they appear to have focussed on local interpretations of broader patterns in tableware consumption visible during the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BC.

The use of conical or ovoid bowls or cups represents such an interpretation (fig. 79). Shapes that show affinity have been attested both in Greece, Western Asia Minor and the Levant. The cup with interior decoration in particular is in its general outlook quite similar and highly popular at, for example, Ephesus during the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} – early 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC.\textsuperscript{564} The numerous occurrence (appendix 1.4.1) of conical or ovoid bowls or cups at Sagalassos, suggests a local preference for a similar shape, one lacking however, the decoration common on examples elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{563}See van der Enden et al accepted a.
\textsuperscript{564}Ladstätter 2003: 30-32.
Considering the morphological relationship between the Sagalassian vessels and the cup with interior decoration plus the popularity of the latter shape during the late Hellenistic period and the occurrence of both decorated and undecorated examples elsewhere (see appendix 1.4.2), it is possible that both shapes were part of the same widely shared preference for handless conical or ovoid or hemispherical bowls or cups during the latter part of the Hellenistic period. Vessels showing affinity in shape, but undecorated have indeed been identified at Jebel Khalid in Syria,\textsuperscript{565} where they are dated to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC. At Ephesus conical cups similarly occur both with and without interior decoration. The latter are mentioned as particularly characteristic for the late Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{566} It thus appears that we need to place the Sagalassian conical or ovoid bowl or cup within such a context. If contemporary with the cup with interior decoration attested elsewhere, these vessels could represent a local or regional interpretation of a general trend. Similar vessels from Hama and Jebel Khalid (see appendix 1.4.2.C) seem to denote a similar trajectory. The occurrence of similar vessels in glass and metal plate has already been remarked upon.

The conical or hemispherical bowl or cup may thus have been a shape which in its general outlines conforms to more widely carried trends of ceramic manufacture and consumption. The mastos (fig. 78), identified numerous in the deposits considered (appendix 1.4.1.table 35), equally can be viewed within such a context. Links with the cup with interior decoration can be pointed. More or less direct parallels to the flaring mastos of Sagalassos are, however, attested only sporadically.\textsuperscript{567} It is the affiliated cup with interior decoration that was widespread throughout the Hellenistic world,\textsuperscript{568} not the unpainted mastos.\textsuperscript{569} The clear dominance of the ceramic mastos within most of the Sagalassian contexts considered is thus unusual. To this observation, we need to add that the exact shape of the Sagalassian mastoi, with its outward flaring concave wall, is equally unusual in ceramic and not really paralleled at, for example, Ephesus,\textsuperscript{570} Pergamum\textsuperscript{571} or Jebel Khalid,\textsuperscript{572} three sites where cups or

\textsuperscript{565} Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: figure 107, cat. 124, figure 13, cat. 10.
\textsuperscript{566} Ladstätter 2003: 30-32; Gassner 1997: 49.
\textsuperscript{567} See Van der Enden et al accepted a.
\textsuperscript{568} Rotroff 1997a: 110, note 113.
\textsuperscript{571} Meyer-Schlichtmann 1991; Schäfer 1975.
bowls of conical or ovoid shape occur fairly regularly. Though difficult to gauge from the published record, the impression is that vessels of ‘canonical’ mastos shape were not usually the dominant part of the drinking vessel repertoire. This was, for example, not the case at the Athenian Agora, where only three mastoi were catalogued and six inventoried. Also, shapes attested at, for example, Athens, Ephesus, Pergamum, Sardis, Knidos or Jebel Khalid and displaying varying degrees of affinity with the Sagalassian mastoi, formed only a part of a more varied repertoire (see appendix 1.4.2.C). The dominant occurrence of ceramic cups of mastoid shape in most of the contexts considered thus cannot be easily mirrored elsewhere.

Differences between the Sagalassian late Hellenistic ceramic tableware considered and contemporary material from Hellenistic sites elsewhere in Greece, Asia Minor and the Levant, can thus be pointed out. Shapes like the popular mastos and conical or hemispherical bowl or cup but also the identified Achaemenid cups and bowls with thickened exterior rim (fig. 80, 82) are not directly paralleled in especially Hellenistic Greece and Western Asia Minor. The latter two shapes indeed appear to have been absent from the usual Hellenistic repertoire, although the early Hellenistic calyx cup did of course derive its inspiration from the Achaemenid cup (fig. 94). Having said that, the wider preference for cups or bowls of conical or hemispherical shape in ceramic, glass and metal plate, illustrates that both Sagalassian potters and consumers were most likely aware to a certain degree of larger over-arching trends in the production and consumption of tableware throughout the Hellenistic world and acted accordingly. The connectivity of Sagalassos to wider patterns of ceramic production and consumption is indeed demonstrated by the presence in the findspots considered (appendix 1.4.1.table 35), of a few pieces of Pergamene applique ware, dateable to ca. the second half 2nd century – early 1st century BC. A few body fragments of ESA have also been identified, as well as some thin walled ware illustrating again that ceramic products from across the region reached the city. Hellenistic transport amphorae from the Aegean have also been attested at
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Sagalassos.\textsuperscript{578} The substantial body of unguentaria attested in the Apollo Klarios deposit (see appendix 1.4.2.A), may furthermore incorporate imported specimens. Some of the examples associated with the Apollo Klarios findspot display a red brick coloured fabric and grey exterior. Similarly the banded and painted closed vessels from the same findspot, among which vessels related to white ground ware,\textsuperscript{579} could have arrived at the site as imports. The presence of a few fragments of mouldmade bowls within the contexts considered and recovered from elsewhere in the city,\textsuperscript{580} further indicates the connectivity of the community to new ceramic developments and fashions.

\textbf{VI.5 An Eastern Focus?}

The ovoid cups from Jebel Khalid associated both with the mastos as identified at the Athenian Agora\textsuperscript{581} and with ESA cups of Hayes form 17\textsuperscript{582} (see fig. 93) share with the mastos and conical or hemispherical bowl or cup from Sagalassos the lack of interior decoration and general affinities in wall profile and interior grooving below the rim. An ovoid bowl with plain rim from Jebel Khalid\textsuperscript{583} is, for example, very similar to the conical cup or bowl from Sagalassos. The ovoid bowls attested at Jebel Khalid, also share a link with the cup with interior decoration as examples of similar shape but with interior decoration have been identified at Antioch.\textsuperscript{584} The ovoid cups or bowls from Jebel Khalid are thus symptomatic, for the connections existing between mastoi and conical cups carrying interior decoration (fig. 99). The popularity of unpainted conical or ovoid vessels at Jebel Khalid and the popularity of ESA form 17, a vessel of similar shape (fig. 100), in the Levant, possibly indicates that the similarly undecorated Sagalassian mastoi and conical or ovoid or hemispherical bowls or cups more closely resemble Levantine traditions of manufacture, than those of Greece and in particular Western Asia Minor. Here the conical cup with interior decoration as we have seen proliferates and mastoi akin to those of Sagalassos occur only sporadically. This
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observation is strengthened by close shape parallels in glass which though fairly widespread occur primarily in the Levant (fig. 92).\textsuperscript{585}

Further connections between Sagalassos and areas further east are indicated by the presence of the bowl with thickened or folded rim on the exterior, a shape absent in the Hellenistic Aegean (fig. 95). As indicated in appendix 1.4.2.C, connections both with Cyprus and again Jebel Khalid can be pointed out. The presence of this shape at Sagalassos therefore further suggests that this Pisidian town though probably aware as argued before of wider ceramic developments current in Western Asia Minor, looked also in other directions. Sagalassos indeed, continued to do so, as the shape is also present in the SRSW repertoire.\textsuperscript{586} Another shape which appears to illustrate this is the Achaemenid cup. This shape occurs in some numbers among the diagnostic material of the Upper Agora North findspot and was apparently popular enough, to be incorporated into the SRSW repertoire (see appendix 1.4.2.B-C).\textsuperscript{587} The survival of this shape in SRSW suggests that at Sagalassos, both potters and consumers continued to some extent with established patterns of manufacture and consumption or that established local traditions did not waver easily.

At Sardis Achaemenid cups are considered to stress the non-Greek character of the tableware repertoire of at least part of the city during the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC and therefore highlight the Lydian roots of part of the community.\textsuperscript{588} The presence of the Achaemenid cup among the late Hellenistic material considered and as part of the SRSW repertoire, again links this Pisidian city to the manufacturing traditions of the East and Levant.\textsuperscript{589} Achaemenid cups have, for example, been identified among late Classical pottery of Palaepaphos on Cyprus\textsuperscript{590} a region with which Sagalassos also shares the occurrence of the bowl with thickened exterior rim. These cups are very widespread in the Achaemenid period and occur also in the Levant.\textsuperscript{591} Vessels of mastoid or conical shape have also been attested on Cyprus.\textsuperscript{592}
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It is equally of interest, that few plates have been identified among the findspots studied. Lund\textsuperscript{593} makes a similar observation for the earliest Cypriot sigillata.\textsuperscript{594} Though the contextual background of the material considered largely eludes us, specific dining practices may be evidenced by the configuration of the tableware repertoire. A configuration which differs from that of, for example, Ephesus (appendix 1.3.3.table 18-23), Knidos\textsuperscript{595} and Pergamum,\textsuperscript{596} all three sites where plates appear to have been an important feature of the tableware repertoire. Local or regional differences may thus be in evidence. Berlin\textsuperscript{597} has indeed similarly identified a typical configuration of the dining repertoire of Ilion’s lower city households. Plates are relatively scarce, leading her to propose that formal dining may have been largely absent.

The above (and appendix 1.4.2) demonstrates that the late Hellenistic tableware considered in this chapter illustrates (clear) connections to Cypriot-Levantine traditions of tableware manufacture and consumption. It is argued, however, that Sagalassian potters and consumers were not solely looking in one direction. The arrival of pottery imports and amphorae from the Aegean at the site, illustrate indeed the external contacts of the community. The cups, bowls and plates attested in the findspots considered display a general appreciation of more widely shared late Hellenistic trends in ceramic tableware manufacture and consumption. Potters and consumers tapped, for example, into contemporary preferences for conical cups and bowls, but with a twist, focussing on what were probably highly localized or regional interpretations of wider ceramic developments. Sagalassos in the late Hellenistic period, appears not to have followed the lead of the major Western Asia Minor production centres, on the contrary it utilized a ceramic repertoire which though related to developments elsewhere, and then probably more those coming from a Cypriot-Levantine context, appears unique to the site itself. Within an Eastern Mediterranean world which had become considerably smaller because of Rome’s

\textsuperscript{593} 2002: 195.
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involvement, during the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, Sagalassos can thus be seen to make choices in the production and consumption of tableware.

VI.6 The wider Social Context

In order to approach a greater understanding of the identified choices in the production and consumption of tableware at Sagalassos during the late Hellenistic period, it is vital to integrate the wider socio-cultural context of the site with its ceramic discourse. Only within such a framework can we attempt to see the tableware of Sagalassos as material culture, reflective or not, of wider cultural, socio-economic and even geo-political trends. As argued before, pottery should not be studied in isolation but rather viewed as one element of a material culture assemblage, an assemblage that is always grounded in cultural and socio-economic realities.

By the time of Alexander’s arrival, Sagalassos already was one of the most important centres of Pisidia. Despite the lack of archaeological deposits securely pre-dating the Hellenistic period, urban survey has identified substantial quantities of Classical-Hellenistic wares and types, similar to those identified at Düzen Tepe. Though no doubt an important city, Sagalassos only gradually, as mentioned already, acquired the features which we deem typical of polis life and organization. Ancient Greek sources seem to indicate that tribal affiliations were indeed traditionally important social and political frameworks in Pisidia. The ‘Hellenization’ of Pisidia therefore must have been a gradual process. Only in the 1st century BC can we, for example, identify something of a political structure, when a bouleterion is constructed. Kosmetou has also suggested that only during the 1st century BC was ‘Hellenic’ culture appropriated more forcefully and celebrated outwardly.

We do, however, know that most likely a Greek law-code was in operation at Sagalassos already during the late 4th century BC and that Greek quickly was used as the official language. During the early 3rd century BC Greek appears to have become
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the preferred communication vehicle, something which is also indicated by the ubiquitous use of Greek names by both elite and non-elite alike (with the exception of the dynastic name Arsakes). An important element in the engagement of Sagalassos with Hellenic cultural influences may have been the potential presence of Macedonian soldiers or veterans. Many Pisidians may also have served in the armies of one or the other Hellenistic king, becoming acquainted with ‘Hellenic’ culture. Kosmetou has also entertained the possibility of Macedonian soldiers at Sagalassos.

The scarcity of Hellenistic remains prevents any firm conclusions but the non-ceramic material culture evidence that we possess further illustrates connections with a ‘Greek’ cultural orbit. During the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC, ashlar buildings at Sagalassos follow models in vogue with the Greek settlements on the Western coasts of Asia Minor. The bouleuterion built in the early 1st century BC, also is firmly embedded within the world of Hellenistic architecture. In the realm of religion, we see superficially the influence of the ‘Greek’ pantheon but as Talloen et al have demonstrated we are dealing mainly with syncretized indigenous deities. This illustrates, as might be expected, that local or regional traditions were not obliterated by ‘Hellenic’ cultural expressions. The preservation of Pisidian dialects in the countryside further indicates the persistent nature of local or regional traditions.

Though remains are scarce, epigraphic, historical and archaeological evidence combine to suggest that although the inhabitants of Sagalassos were at least partially Hellenized, local or regional traditions, as evidenced by the field of religion, continued to play an important role. The Sagallan or Pisidian pantheon raises the possibility that any ‘Hellenizing’ features identified may just have been a veneer placed atop a society which continued in one way or another established practices, which were perhaps only dressed differently. The fact that the ‘Hellenization’ of Sagalassos and Pisidia, was a gradual process lends support to this observation.

---
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Additional confirmation now comes from the attested tableware. The majority of pre-Imperial (late Hellenistic) eating and drinking vessels from Sagalassos display only general affinities with their ceramic counterparts in use at some of the major ‘Greek’ communities of Asia-Minor’s West Coast (see append 1.4.2). Instead, Sagalassian producers and hence consumers appear to have utilized a tableware repertoire which locally or regionally interpreted more wide-ranging trends and fashions. Links with other Hellenistic sites can be pointed out but it appears only lip-service was paid to some of the wider and more commonly occurring tableware fashions in evidence at other Hellenistic sites, especially those of Greece and Western Asia Minor.

The ceramic tableware in use at late Hellenistic Sagalassos thus does not present a picture of a community totally reliant upon a typical ‘Hellenic’ material format for the consumption of food and drink; although it does closely mirror contemporary tastes in glass and metal plate. These distributional trends represent, as has been argued on many an occasion in previous chapters, the choices of individuals and communities. Choices which start to make sense when the ceramics are integrated with the little we know of pre-Roman Sagalassos.

**VI.7 ‘Hellenization’**

By now we have established that Sagalassos was making choices regarding the production and consumption of tableware that were different from those of some of the major Hellenistic sites of (Western) Asia Minor. The Sagalassian tableware products considered in this chapter show only general affinities with the ceramic material in use at sites on the western coast of Asia Minor. In fact, we have seen that Sagalassos’ tableware repertoire, provisionally dated to the 2nd – 1st centuries BC has little directly in common with ceramic ‘assemblages’ elsewhere. How can we understand the choices involved?

An important concept to consider is that of Hellenization. In origin, Sagalassos was a Pisidian, not a ‘Greek’ community. Little is known of pre-Roman Sagalassos, but we can be sure that this community developed its own distinct cultural practices.

---

615 Vanhaverbeke et al 2010: 122.
and preferences, which resulted among other things in material choices. At Sagalassos such choices are visible as argued, within the tableware repertoire, evidenced by the popular presence of the mastos and other shapes not easily mirrored elsewhere. We have also seen that the survival of these shapes in SRSW indicates the stability of ceramic preferences in the face of a sustained interaction with ‘Hellenic’ cultural influences, as alluded to in the above. It is noteworthy to observe the differences between the Sagalassian repertoire and late Hellenistic material from other sites. Therefore, by the 2nd and 1st centuries BC consumers at Sagalassos were not, as might have been expected, using a ‘typical’ ceramic tableware repertoire in evidence, for example, at Ephesus, Pergamum or Sardis. On the contrary, Sagalassian producers and consumers focussed upon a repertoire with links only sideways to the major ceramic manufacturing centres of late Hellenistic Western Asia Minor.

The subdued impact of Hellenizing influences upon the local tableware repertoire contrasts, however, with the recorded changes in architecture, language and political organization. The tension thus created signifies the usefulness of employing a concept such as choice when dealing with the interpretative implications. Clearly different choices were made with regards to the different areas of society. Consumers at Sagalassos did not univocally take over elements of ‘Greek’ material culture but appear to have been in a position to choose and pick, depending upon local circumstances and wishes.

Concepts like Hellenization and Romanization are complex and contentious terms; the usefulness of the latter has been recently thoroughly debated. Hellenization as a concept has also been critically approached recently. ‘Hellenization’ as used in this thesis (see chapter II) in essence signifies the complex cultural contact between ‘Greek’ or ‘Hellenized’ communities and the indigenous communities (such as the Pisidians) of Asia Minor, resulting in the adoption by the latter of ‘Greek’ cultural elements. ‘Hellenization’, however, does not mean, in the view of the author, cultural imposition but rather signifies a complex process of
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616 For local variation within Pisidia see Vanhaverbeke et al 2010: 120-122; for the local choices of the Pisidian city in a Roman Imperial context see van Nijf 2010.
620 After Gosden 2004: 5; see also Lomas 1995: 362.
negotiation which can have different and varying outcomes. Hellenization could indeed affect different areas of a society at different speeds and with differing results.  

The above might suggest that the ‘Hellenizing’ influences attested at Sagalassos were perhaps only a veneer, resultant from a choice to outwardly show a ‘Greek’ face to the world. The adoption of Greek names, however, both by elites and non-elites suggests that ‘Hellenizing’ influences at Sagalassos went deeper. The adoption of Greek names by elites and non-elites alike is crucial in understanding the extent to which the inhabitants of Sagalassos assimilated ‘Greek’ cultural elements. At Seleucid Uruk, for example, Greek names were attested next to Babylonian names indicating a differing degree of cultural assimilation. This is also the case at Hellenistic Gordion where next to Greek names, Phrygian names continue to occur, although the Greek script has been adopted.

By changing one’s name, an important statement about a real or perceived identity is made. The adoption of Greek names by Sagalassian elites and commoners in this context reveals a clear wish on the part of the individuals involved to don a ‘Greek’ identity. Interestingly, however, this wish was not directly translated as we have seen into the ceramic tableware repertoire, which differs substantially from what would be in use at contemporary Ephesus or Pergamum.

We have, however, also seen that the mastos in particular and conical cups in general occur regularly during the late Hellenistic period in glass and metal plate. This observation therefore does suggest that producers and consumers at Sagalassos were in tune with wider tableware trends, particularly those utilized by the more affluent members of society of which the ceramic repertoire was perhaps a more mundane reflection. Thus though ceramic mastoi of the type encountered at Sagalassos do not appear to have formed an important part of contemporary tableware assemblages elsewhere the popular occurrence of similar vessels in glass and metal plate demonstrates that the community participated in current fashions of tableware production and consumption. It is also clear, however, that the ceramic tableware

---

621 Lomas 1995: 327.
repertoire in comparison with sites on Asia Minor’s West Coast shows only limited affinity; mouldmade bowls as we have seen are hardly attested.

The Hellenizing influences from Western Asia Minor appear thus to not have altered profoundly the local ceramic repertoire which derived its inspiration primarily from the Levantine region, an area where as we have seen glass mastoi and conical cups are found in abundance next to undecorated ceramic parallels during the latter part of the Hellenistic period (appendix 1.4.2). This suggests that dining practices at Sagalassos and the way in which they were given form and meaning were possibly quite resistant to change and would have needed significant incentive to do so. The well-reported traditionalism of potters\(^{624}\) reflects in many ways a similar attitude on behalf of the consumers. Thus, unless sufficient incentive is given, a potter is likely to produce what he knows best and what sells.\(^{625}\) Change in ceramic manufacture is thus largely driven by demand\(^{626}\) and while there was a demand for Hellenizing influences in certain aspects of Sagalassian society, the pottery used for eating and drinking appears to have escaped a closer assimilation to the canonical late Hellenistic tableware repertoire of Asia Minor’s West Coast. Hellenizing influences thus did not affect all levels of Sagalassian society equally and the late Hellenistic tableware repertoire is a good indicator for the continuation of local or wider regional practices.

VI.8 High and Low Culture
The Sagalassian data lends itself also for a discussion of the difference between what is called ‘high’ culture and ‘low’ culture.\(^{627}\) Ceramics in the Hellenistic and Roman world are considered generally to have been non-elite products.\(^{628}\) The assumption is that elites were primarily using tableware vessels made of precious metals.\(^{629}\) This does not mean that pottery, especially decorated pottery was always very cheap\(^{630}\) although in

\(^{624}\) Nicklin 1971: 47; Poblome 1996: 87.
\(^{625}\) Rotroff 2006: 371.
\(^{626}\) Nicklin 1971: 17-18.
\(^{627}\) See Gans 1999; Bourdieu 1984; Burke 2009: 335-386.
Hellenistic times even Megarian bowls are considered to be relatively cheap alternatives to metal ware.631

Public architecture, religion and use of administrative language on the other hand are usually more associated with elite behaviour.632 If we apply such a division upon the Sagalassos material it would appear that Hellenizing influences impacted mostly those segments of society involved with public display or other forms of elite behaviour and interaction. The construction of public monuments is during late Hellenistic times, primarily associated with kings or wealthy citizens, for whom self-representation was first and foremost on their thoughts.633

As tableware was generally a relatively inexpensive product, this observation suggests that ‘Greek’ cultural influences did not profoundly impact upon everyday practices such as the eating of food and the drinking of beverages. A remarkable contrast perhaps with the adoption of Greek names by elite and non-elites alike. The process of changing one’s name is, however, possibly more of an outward focussed message,634 signifying an identity which may have had a different dimension in the confines of the household. Foxhall635 indeed draws our attention to the fact that dining in Greek households does not resemble our modern day perceptions and probably was a relatively low-key affair in which food (and drink) was served informally to varying members of the household, possibly at a number of different moments during the day. In such a context, domestic dining may have been a venue of less importance in the expression of cultural identities. At Gordion interestingly we lack evidence for public drinking activities,636 suggesting that the tableware material recovered belonged primarily to the private sphere.

The contrast at Sagalassos between the attested late Hellenistic ceramic tableware repertoire and architecture, religion and language, could conceivably relate to the differences between ‘high’ and ‘low’ culture. The upper classes of Sagalassos probably cultivated a greater awareness of what went on politically and culturally

631 Baur 1941: 229.
632 See e.g. Waelkens 2002: 318, 329; Ratté 2002: 5, 19-20.
636 Stewart 2010: 209.
outside of the boundaries of Sagalassian territory.\textsuperscript{637} Considering this, elites were probably more likely to pick up or be sensitive to, external cultural influences. They probably also would have been closely involved in the planning and construction of any new building projects, administration and religious activities. Waëlkens\textsuperscript{638} in the context of early Imperial Sagalassos indicates the role of local elites in urban construction but does not see such a development occurring during the Hellenistic period. It is not a great leap, however, to imagine how Hellenizing influences through the connections and actions of local elites were made visible locally. Ample evidence exists\textsuperscript{639} to indicate that elites used material culture to differentiate themselves from other segments of society.\textsuperscript{640} In this context, it is therefore not unreasonable to assume that Sagalassian elites were initially, the primary receivers of Hellenizing influences. It would have been the prominent members of the community that interacted with the outside world, particularly with the representatives of the Hellenistic kings.\textsuperscript{641} As tableware is considered not to be an elite product, they would have used metal plate, which as such can account for the limited connections between the Sagalassian ceramic repertoire and tableware attested in Western Asia Minor.

\textbf{VI.9 Elite emulation}

The popular presence of the mastos among the late Hellenistic ceramic material considered complicates matters, however. In the above we have already alluded to the fact that mastoi as identified at Sagalassos need to be seen within the context of a late Hellenistic preference for handleless conical or hemispherical cups or bowls, especially visible within Asia Minor and the Levant. The shape itself, however, imitates similar vessels in cut glass or precious metal\textsuperscript{642} and was particularly popular during the late Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{643} Though the available data does not allow us to confirm that mastoi in metal plate served as the inspiration for their counterparts in ceramic,
extensive work done on skeuomorphism\textsuperscript{644} does indeed suggest that this was the case. In terms of chronology there is no reason to presume a different trajectory. Both the shape in ceramic and metal plate occurred around the same time and became very popular and widespread around roughly the same time as well (appendix 1.4.2). It is thus likely that as remarked by Rotroff\textsuperscript{645} the origins of the ceramic mastos and cup with interior decoration need to be connected with the occurrence of models in metal plate.

Thus despite the fact that few direct ceramic parallels can be identified (appendix 1.4.2.C) the mastos itself is a shape widespread and apparently popular among Hellenistic elites as attested by its seemingly common occurrence in metal plate. Noteworthy also is the already referred to popularity of the shape in glass. Its occurrence at Sagalassos therefore does not signify the rejection or absence of ‘Hellenizing’ influences in the tableware repertoire. On the contrary the occurrence of the mastos brings Sagalassos firmly within the Hellenistic orbit. The popular occurrence of the shape does, however, suggest an orientation of potters and consumers towards the manufacturing traditions of Cyprus and the Levant were undecorated vessels of similar shape in ceramic have been encountered in substantial numbers and where glass mastoi providing very good parallels are encountered numerously as well (appendix 1.4.2.C).

In terms of the present discussion, it appears that the differences between ‘high’ and ‘low’ culture were possibly not that profound at pre-Imperial Sagalassos. The fact that the mastos imitates similar vessels made of glass or precious metals reveals that there probably was no great cultural disconnection between elites and the lower strata of society when it came to the materiality of drinking. In such a scenario, both elites and non-elites were using a similar cup shape, albeit in a different material format.\textsuperscript{646} The adoption of Greek names by both elites and non-elites possibly indicates that the cultural differences or aspirations of both were perhaps not so dissimilar. Seen in this context, it is proposed that the popularity of conical cups during the later Hellenistic period within Asia Minor and the Levantine area but also

\textsuperscript{644} E.g. Vickers 1985, 1986a-b.
\textsuperscript{645} 1997a: 109-112.
\textsuperscript{646} See Dusinberre 1999: 100, who makes a similar observation for Sardis, where the skyphos gives way in ceramic and precious metals to the Achaemenid cup.
elsewhere reflects an attempt to translate upper class tableware utensils into a more widely affordable medium such as ceramic and glass. The mastoi identified at Sagalassos could be placed within such context.

Another conical cup or bowl, the medallion bowl, was according to Strong\textsuperscript{647} was popular in gold and silver during the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BC. The popularity of this vessel corresponds neatly with the popularity in Western Asia Minor at, for example, Ephesus or Kordon Tumulus, of the cup with interior decoration, a shape in ceramic to which it can be related. The absence in large numbers of ceramic mastoi in Greece and Western Asia Minor may therefore be related to varying local or regional preferences. The cup with interior decoration and possibly medallion bowls may have been preferred within Western Asia Minor, whereas mastoi were preferred in more Eastern areas. The relatively scarce occurrence of West Slope decoration in the East\textsuperscript{648} fits this pattern as does the popular continuation of the mastos and vessels of mastoid shape in SRSW\textsuperscript{649} and ESA.\textsuperscript{650} The most numerouslly encountered Sagalassian tableware vessel of the late Hellenistic material considered therefore does not signify a typically non-Greek or characteristically Pisidian identity. On the contrary, the popular occurrence of the mastos reflects the adherence of Sagalassian producers and consumers to Hellenistic ceramic trends carried more widely, especially in the Levantine region. The popular occurrence of the shape does, however, indicate the importance of local and regional preferences in tableware production and consumption throughout Hellenistic Asia Minor, something which is indeed evidenced by the occurrence and continued production of shapes like the Achaemenid cup and bowl with thickened exterior rim plus the scarceness of the mouldmade bowl and other shapes characteristic of the late Hellenistic tableware repertoire at Sagalassos. Tableware production and consumption at Sagalassos appears to have had a traditional edge and though paying heed to wider fashions, was perhaps more resistant to influences from Western Asia Minor than other aspects of society.

\textsuperscript{647} 1966.
\textsuperscript{648} Rotroff 2002: 98-99.
\textsuperscript{649} Poblome 1999: SRSW form 120A.
\textsuperscript{650} Hayes 1986: form 16-18.
VI.10 Geography and Scale
In order to better understand what is happening at Sagalassos, we need to take into account issues of geography and scale. Naturally Sagalassos differed in this respect from some of the other communities considered, such as Ephesus or Sardis. Even within the region of Pisidia itself local differences can be observed when the tableware of Sagalassos is compared with material from Düzen Tepe and Kozluca (see appendix 1.4.4-5 for a brief comparative overview).

VI.10.1 Location
In previous chapters scale has emerged as an important aspect of producer and consumer choice. Different communities operated on different geo-political and socio-economic scales. It has become clear that tableware distribution patterns are affected by, for example, the economic pull of a community or geographical location. In assessing the evidence from Sagalassos, we therefore need to take scale into account as an important aspect influencing the production of and choice for tableware. It can be proposed, for example, from the outset, that Sagalassos’ location in Pisidia adversely affected the ability of producers and consumers to follow the latest tableware fashions and trends in vogue at the ‘Greek’ centres of Western Asia Minor. In a non-integrated economy651 we cannot expect producers and consumers at Sagalassos of, for example, tableware to have had a detailed knowledge of what contemporaries were using as dining utensils at, for example, an Ephesus, Pergamum or Sardis. They were probably only vaguely familiar with what was used elsewhere and barring specific incentives to do otherwise, most likely utilized what was current in the immediate region. Evidence for this comes from the tableware itself. As we have seen, the tableware of Sagalassos displays only faint affinity with the ceramic repertoires of some of the well-known Hellenistic sites of Western Asia Minor. The preference for mastoid and conical cups at Sagalassos does, however, clearly fit within a wider preference in Hellenistic Asia Minor and the Levant during the latter part of the Hellenistic period for conical or ovoid cups. To some extent therefore producers must have been aware of wider trends in ceramic production and consumption, something

651 See Woolf 1992: 289-290; Duncan-Jones 1990: 58; for an integrated view see Temin 2006: 139-140.
which is especially clear when the popularity of the mastos in glass and metal plate during the late Hellenistic period is taken into consideration.

Sagalassos’ location away from the main centres of political and economic power in Hellenistic Asia Minor is, however, a geographic fact. The major centres of ‘Greek’ culture and ceramic production, for example, Ephesus or Pergamum were located in the western half of Asia Minor. Sagalassos thus was geographically at a disadvantage in comparison with communities located further to the West. A further disadvantage was the fact that Sagalassos did not have a direct connection with the sea. Trade-goods would have to reach the town overland, and this would not only take longer than transport by sea, but would also be more expensive. Geographical distance therefore potentially not only affected the arrival of trade-goods but also that of new ideas, fashions, and trends.

As transport overland was more difficult and took longer, it was more costly. Subsequently, we have seen (see chapters IV and V) that communities tend to produce and consume by and large everyday items like pottery locally or regionally. From a costs-perspective approach this makes perfect sense. The result is that it was not as straightforward as we might imagine for tableware produced, for example, in Athens, Ephesus or Knidos to reach Pisidia. Productions only reached a dominant extra-regional distribution, when the cost-price of an item could be kept low so as for imports to be able to compete with local or regional products and perhaps eventually drive them from the market or force local potters to adapt. This could only be achieved when production could be sustained on a large enough scale. We see this happening, for example, with the large-scale export of Attic pottery from Athens in Archaic to early Hellenistic times and in the Roman period with the production and export of sigillata. Ephesian mouldmade bowls are also a good example. In all these cases a large scale production could be sustained, presumably allowing these wares to compete with local or regional products and thus obtain a dominant position. The fact
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654 Kögler 2012: 44.
655 Stissi 2002: 24, 30–34; for low prices of pottery see, for example, Gill 1994; but in response, see Boardman 1988, 1996.
656 See Poblome and Zelle 2002.
657 Kögler 2012: 44.
However, that other aspects of ‘Greek’ culture, for example, architecture and language, did find their way to Sagalassos demonstrates that distance in itself does not necessarily need to be a limiting factor. Cultural influences can transcend considerable distances as is evidenced by the ‘Hellenizing’ aspects identified at Sagalassos and other Pisidian communities.\textsuperscript{658} It is clear, however, that ‘Hellenization’ occurred at different levels, not impacting all aspects of society equally and at the same speed. Within a region local variation also did exist, as is evidenced by the available data from Düzen Tepe and Kozluca (see appendix 1.4.4-5), sites in the immediate vicinity of Sagalassos. The latter site indeed was more strategically located and thus perhaps in a better position to tap into more wide ranging networks of cultural and economic interaction.

Distance and location were therefore factors of importance and Sagalassos’ location could have resulted in a relatively limited exposure to ‘Greek’ style tablewares of a coastal Western Asia Minor origin. Only a few fragments of Attic pottery have been identified at Düzen Tepe and Sagalassos.\textsuperscript{659} Limited exposure would probably have meant that little incentive existed for potters and consumers to produce or prefer something else. No doubt some segments of society did attempt to serve their food and drink their beverages from more properly ‘Greek’ vessels but in majority local or regional traditions continued despite a greater integration in the Hellenistic world regarding other aspects of material culture. As we have seen, however, producers and consumers of tableware at Sagalassos did operate within wider Hellenistic frameworks of production and consumption, mirroring the widespread preferences for mastoid and conical cups and bowls, in metal, glass and ceramic. It appears, however, that producers and consumers were primarily looking towards the Levant.

\textbf{VI.10.2 Economic pull}

The general economic position or standing of a site is also an important element of scale impacting the choices of consumers and producers. Ephesus and Knidos are two sites whose products reached an extra-regional distribution.\textsuperscript{660} Pottery as a trade good is thought to piggy-back other more perishable goods and as such, the wide

\textsuperscript{659} Jeroen Poblome: personal communication.
\textsuperscript{660} See Bilde 1993; Kögler 2010.
distribution of pottery from Ephesus and Knidos can thus tell us something about the economic reach of both cities and their trade connections. Ephesus in particular but also Knidos, and other centres like Pergamum, Antioch and even Sardis, would have significant economic pull. Their substantial population created large and relatively stable markets which would create and attract significant economic activity. Contrary to Ephesus, Sagalassos was not known as a renowned emporium. Most of the information we have pertains to the Roman period. As indeed most communities in the ancient world, it was primarily concerned with agricultural production.\textsuperscript{661} From a geographical perspective, Sagalassos may have been not as well connected, as natural thoroughfares do not provide easy access to the Aglasun plain in which Sagalassos is located.\textsuperscript{662}

In later Hellenistic times Sagalassos was connected by a road built by M.’ Aquilius, to Pergamum.\textsuperscript{663} The Via Sebaste, built in 6 BC increased the connectivity of Sagalassos both to other cities within Pisidia and the maritime outlets of Pamphylia.\textsuperscript{664} Waelkens\textsuperscript{665} sees a direct link between this increased connectivity and the adoption by the Sagalassian elites of Roman cultural elements. It appears that increased connectivity resulted also in greater economic opportunity and activity (fig. 105). It is perhaps no surprize, that the production of SRSW on the level of a manufactory\textsuperscript{666} is a feature of the Augustan period. The importance of the construction of the Via Sebaste for economic activity at Sagalassos is further highlighted by Talloen and Poblome\textsuperscript{667} who refer to the potential involvement of the town in the slave and marble trade. The local forests are also mentioned as export products destined for Phrygia and possibly Egypt. Waelkens et al\textsuperscript{668} refers to Sagalassos’ position, connected as it was by means to the Roman road system to major urban centres including ports, as exceptional. For the majority of the Hellenistic period, however, Sagalassos appears as relatively isolated, with no obvious connections to either the sea or overland with other Anatolian communities. Information exchange would have been more restricted, narrowing in

\textsuperscript{661} Poblome et al in press: 4
\textsuperscript{662} Poblome et al in press: 2; Waelkens 2011: 24.
\textsuperscript{663} Waelkens 2002: 317.
\textsuperscript{664} Waelkens 2002: 322.
\textsuperscript{665} Waelkens 2002: 359.
\textsuperscript{666} Poblome and Brulet 2005.
\textsuperscript{667} 2005: 67.
\textsuperscript{668} 2011: 24.
the process the choices open to local inhabitants. The slight affinity between the ceramic tableware repertoire identified at Sagalassos and that of communities on the Western Coast of Asia Minor, may well be the result. Instead the repertoire identified at Sagalassos has a more Eastern Asia Minor or Levantine Hellenistic character (see discussion in the above).

Few imports have indeed been attested at Hellenistic Sagalassos. Reported are a few pieces of Attic pottery and some Pergamenian tableware. ESA has also been identified (appendix 1.4.2.C). We have seen in the above, that some of the grey ware unguentaria or White Ground ware may also have been imported. The same can be said for the few pieces of mouldmade bowl which were identified at the site. Most of the tableware attested is, however, of local or regional manufacture. Imports from nearby Kozluca, for example, could be isolated and have been identified.

Information about new tableware shapes and fashions could nonetheless have arrived piecemeal either by traders bringing small assortments to Sagalassos or by means of hearsay and the experiences of Sagalassians elsewhere. New ideas and fashions may have been picked up like this. We also need to consider, as mentioned before, the role elites played, and the impact of ceramic emulation. It is likely, however, that significant change only occurs either when there is a large demand for new products or when imports are flooding the local market, drowning out alternatives. In the case of Sagalassos, the first option is limited as we have seen, by the site’s out of the way location and specific cultural traditions, while the second is not attested at Sagalassos.

**VI.11 Conclusions**

In the above, it has been demonstrated that most likely a combination of geographical distance and cultural traditionalism, relating specifically to the practice of eating and drinking, was responsible for the specific outlook of Sagalassos tableware ‘assemblage’. Clearly other aspects of material and political culture at Sagalassos were transformed by ‘Hellenic’ influences. The fact that tableware largely seems to continue established local or regional traditions suggests that producers and consumers at Sagalassos were making different choices from their counterparts at, for example,
Ephesus, Pergamum or Knidos. As stated before, the ancient economy was not very well integrated in the modern sense of the word. Producers and consumers at Sagalassos were not necessarily aware of what contemporaries elsewhere produced and used. Choice therefore never was totally free or unobstructed. We have seen that a few shapes at Sagalassos conform directly to the more well-known Hellenistic forms. The scarcity of imports at Sagalassos (as far as can be established) and limited morphological affinity especially with productions of tableware further West signals both a lack of availability and demand.

The fact, however, that the ceramic mastoi and conical cups attested at Sagalassos, though not directly paralleled in ceramics elsewhere, form part of a wider late Hellenistic appreciation of similar looking ceramic vessels throughout the Aegean area and the Levant suggests as argued that local producers and consumers did had an inkling of wider tableware fashions and trends. This is indeed confirmed by the close parallels that exist between the Sagalassian cups and vessels in metal plate and glass, which as we have seen occurred widely throughout the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean during the late Hellenistic period. It has been argued that Sagalassos was primarily looking towards the Levantine region for ceramic inspiration. It is here that affiliated vessels in ceramic and close parallels in glass are regularly encountered. This Levantine focus may represent established traditions of manufacture which despite Hellenizing influences continued to dominate ceramic production and consumption during the late Hellenistic period and as such potentially indicate that this community is making different choices from contemporary communities elsewhere in Hellenistic Asia Minor. The next chapter will explore the observed differences between the case-study communities considered in more detail and explore if, how and why they were making different choices.
Chapter VII: Four cities in Asia Minor; a Comparative Analysis of Tableware Production and Consumption

VII.1. Introduction
Chapters V and VI have discussed the tableware data of our four Asia Minor case-study sites individually, surveying the motors behind tableware innovation and relating change overtime to active human choice. In these chapters we have seen that change in the tableware repertoire often reflects wider societal changes. We have also seen that despite the obvious similarities in tableware production and consumption between the various sites considered, important local and/or regional trajectories of ceramic production and consumption existed. Whereas in chapters V and VI the focus was on showing that diachronic differences in tableware production and consumption on the level of the individual site, potentially reflect wider changes in society and active human choice, the current chapter will show how the distributional differences between diverse sites throughout the course of the Hellenistic period can be related to the making of different choices by both producers and consumers of tableware.

Despite the existence of a general morphological koine of Hellenistic tableware, local communities did things differently, sometimes profoundly, sometimes with only a slight twist. Examples of such behaviour are the continued reliance at Ilion upon the Classical kantharos, the rarity of black slipped products in the ‘Greek’ tradition at Sardis, the belated popularity of the mouldmade bowl at Ephesus and the dominant occurrence of mastoi and oxidized slipped tableware at Sagalassos. The current chapter aims to present the similarities and differences between Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis more systematically, before examining how differing local choices helped to shape varying tableware distribution patterns. Sagalassos has already been treated extensively in chapter VI and will only be briefly referred to in this chapter. A new case-study is, however, brought into the fold for comparative purposes, namely Phrygian Gordion. This central Anatolian community will add another geographical, cultural and socio-economic dimension to our study of tableware distribution patterns. Network theory\textsuperscript{670} and regionalism\textsuperscript{671} will be employed (in the second part of this chapter) as useful analytical tools to address the issues at hand.

\textsuperscript{670} See Brughmans 2010, 2012; Coward 2010; Malkin et al 2007; Malkin 2011; Vlassopoulos 2007.
VII.2 Patterns of Production and Consumption

The current chapter aims to establish where and when the tableware repertoires of the individual sites (with the addition of Gordion) differ or show similarities. The current section provides an overview of some of the most noteworthy similarities and differences. Further sections will address in more detail the observed variety in tableware distribution. As drinking was the most important practice in a ‘Greek’ context involving tableware, beverage consumption vessels will be discussed first, followed by an overview of the bowls and plates used for the serving and consumption of food. The tableware material of Ilion and Gordion will be discussed first, as both represent smaller-scale communities in comparison to Sardis and Ephesus, which follow.

VII.2.1 Drinking Cups

In terms of the attested drinking repertoire, Ilion and Gordion display similarities and differences. Similar is the use at both sites of the Classical kantharos. Different is the extent to which this shape was used. A comparison of the site catalogues of both Ilion and Gordion illustrates this and highlights the difference between the two sites. Out of a total of 321 catalogued tableware vessels, only 30 (= 9%) beverage shapes are catalogued for Gordion. Out of 164 catalogued vessels at Ilion 61 (= 37%) vessels are identified as beverage consumption shapes. Clearly ceramic drinking cups were a much more integral part of the tableware assemblage at Ilion than Gordion. Drinking by means of ‘Greek’ shapes never seems to have taken off at Gordion, a situation persisting throughout the site’s occupational history. Below, this difference is explored against the varied contextual background of both communities (fig. 106).

In general, 3rd and 2nd century BC drinking shapes attested at Sardis resemble their functional counterparts at Ilion and Gordion to a limited extent. Similarities are primarily confined to the early Hellenistic period in the case of Gordion. Similarly to the latter, ‘Greek’ drinking cups may have been rare at Sardis. Of all the published vessels individually dated, only the cup-kantharos, skyphos and (Classical) kantharos...
are placed in the early Hellenistic period (see appendix 1.3.6 table 24-25, fig. 107). Only five catalogued beverage consumption vessels represent this period, however, and from a total catalogued sample of 490 catalogued vessels only five Classical kantharoi, four cup-kantharoi and two (Attic) skyphoi can be identified (appendix 1.3.7 table 34). Popular drinking cups occurring during the later Hellenistic period at Sardis, for example, West Slope beakers, mouldmade bowls and cups with interior decoration, are notably scarce within Ilion’s lower city houses and also have not been encountered at Gordion (fig. 108). The Achaemenid cup\textsuperscript{676} and mastos attested at Sardis equally represent ceramic traditions which are not accounted for at Hellenistic Ilion and Gordion (fig. 109).\textsuperscript{677}

At Ephesus, the situation in the earliest part of the Hellenistic period is difficult to gauge. The community was of course relocated during the 280s BC\textsuperscript{678} and ceramic material dated before this span is therefore scarce.\textsuperscript{679} From the second half of the 3rd century BC, however, differences with Ilion can be discerned. With Gordion Ephesus only shares the presence of the Classical kantharos. West Slope beakers proliferate, and skyphoid kantharoi, skyphoid cups with exterior decoration, skyphoi, cups with interior decoration and cups with shell feet are all recorded. All these shapes have also been identified at Sardis, where they become very popular around the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC (and possibly earlier).\textsuperscript{680} Unlike the situation at Ilion and Gordion, mouldmade bowls are commonly attested at Ephesus. Just as at Sardis this shape occurred relatively late in the tableware repertoire of Ephesus (fig. 110).\textsuperscript{681}

\textbf{VII.2.1.1 Summary}

This overview of the drinking cups identified at Ilion, Gordion, Sardis and Ephesus has thus illustrated considerable variation. Throughout the earliest part of the Hellenistic period all four sites display the use of similar drinking cups, primarily the Classical kantharos. During the 3rd century BC, however, divergent patterns are starting to emerge. Drinking cups at Ilion appear to remain traditionally focussed (at least in the

\textsuperscript{676} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 203; Dusinberre 1999: 78.
\textsuperscript{677} The Achaemenid cup forms at Gordion part of the late Phrygian repertoire, Stewart 2010: fig. 23.
\textsuperscript{678} Kraft et al 2007: 135.
\textsuperscript{679} For pre-Hellenistic Ephesus see Kerschner et al 2008; Gassner 1997: 25-38; Scherrer and Trinkl 2006.
\textsuperscript{680} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 39-42.
\textsuperscript{681} Gassner 1997: 71, 87-88.
lower city houses) and at Gordian ‘Greek’ cups almost disappear from view altogether. Only Sardis and Ephesus appear to walk along a similar developmental path (though differences can also be observed) when it came to the production and consumption of tableware. We have seen, however, that it may have taken until the late 3rd century BC for Sardian producers and consumers to cast aside alternatives completely and set-off along this road. Before the implications of the observed patterning in the data are discussed, the evidence of the vessels used for dining needs to be added.

**VII.2.2 Bowls and Plates**

At Hellenistic Ilion (lower city households) the clearest evidence for dining vessels comes from the H1 and H2 phases. The salter was the most common food consumption shape, to which were added a number of other plates and bowls, among which the fishplate, incurved rim bowl and outturned rim bowl were most notable. At Gordion pre-275 BC, the attested dining vessels show similarities with the arrangement of the food consumption repertoire at Ilion. Contemporaneous with the Classical kantharoi are the shallow echinus bowl, fishplate and salter. Next to the use of ‘Greek’ shapes, traditionally Phrygian vessels also enjoyed great popularity and from the late 3rd century BC onwards they are the only dining vessels attested.\(^{682}\) This trend continues throughout the rest of the Hellenistic period at Gordion (appendix 1.5.1 37-41). This repertoire of Phrygian shapes, the main exponents of which are the plain rim bowl, ledge rim dish, projecting rim bowl, is not paralleled at Ilion, or at Sardis and Ephesus and thus clearly reflects a different pattern of production and consumption, non-‘Greek’ in origin or inspiration.

At Sardis we have seen that among pre-213 BC deposits ‘Greek’ shapes are similarly not attested.\(^{683}\) From elsewhere across the site ‘Greek’ food consumption shapes have, however, been recovered. Dining vessels dated to the 2nd half of the 4th – early 3rd century BC included fishplates, echinus and outturned rim bowls (appendix 1.3.6.table 24). Sardis thus in the early Hellenistic period, displays connections with both Ilion and Gordian in its use of the fishplate and echinus bowl. When we look at Ephesus it is apparent that producers and consumers favoured shapes of a different morphological repertoire than attested at Ilion, Gordion and Sardis. The Attic-style
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\(^{682}\) Stewart 2010: 239-242.
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fishplate was in fact rare at Ephesus, favoured was the plate with broad rim (fig. 58 K, 59 G), a shape with primarily Eastern parallels. The demand for this shape appears to remain relatively stable throughout the course of the Hellenistic period. Other dining vessels, like the plate with *beidseitig verdickte lippe* or the plate with *gedrechselte rim* also find few parallels elsewhere as we have seen (fig. 111).

**VII.2.2.1 Summary**

This brief survey of food consumption vessels attested at Ilion, Gordion, Sardis and Ephesus has demonstrated that both similarities and differences existed between the sites. All four sites share at least some similarity in the use of fishplate and echinus bowl. But equally distinct local differences can be observed. The differences are especially marked between Gordion and the other three sites from ca. 275 BC onwards. The traditional Phrygian shapes produced and consumed by Gordion’s inhabitants are not paralleled elsewhere. The dominant use of the salter in Ilion’s lower city households is another example, as is the evidence coming from the 213 BC destruction contexts at Sardis. At Ephesus, furthermore, fishplates were rare and shapes not paralleled at the other sites considered take centre stage.

**VII.3 Local Production versus Trade in Tableware; the Evidence from Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion**

The current section addresses how the four sites are different or similar in terms of the balance between locally produced and imported tablewares. This balance provides not only insights into the strength of the local ceramic industry, but also highlights external connections and potential avenues of ceramic inspiration.

The Hellenistic tableware recovered from Ilion’s lower city does not provide conclusive evidence for a local production. No kilns, production waste or moulds have been attested. Nonetheless Berlin assumes that tableware was produced either locally or close by. The common light brown fabric is thus, accepting Berlin’s argument, a local or regional ware coming from the central Troad. The fact that Berlin reports the import of cooking and domestic wares (coarse light brown fabric)
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illustrates, however, that consumers at Ilion had the opportunity and the means to acquire everyday ceramic utensils from elsewhere. The former possibly came from Alexandria Troas⁶⁸⁹ and the latter shows affinity in fabric with material attested at Knidos.⁶⁹⁰ Comparative evidence would suggest, however, that it would be extremely unlikely that Ilion would not have produced at least part of its own tableware.⁶⁹¹

At Gordion, in contrast, the local production of tableware is very well documented. Kiln evidence⁶⁹² has been attested at this site. Stewart⁶⁹³ has argued that the ceramic evidence suggests that during the earlier part of the Hellenistic period ad hoc production of tableware took place at Gordion. Around ca. 235 BC she documents an intensification of production, resulting in a more standardized output.⁶⁹⁴ Sardis equally produced tableware, including mouldmade bowls for which moulds have been attested.⁶⁹⁵ The majority of the published Sardinian tableware vessels can, however, only be classified as products of local or regional origin.⁶⁹⁶ This makes it likely but not certain that a large part of the tableware was in fact locally produced. Sardis’ size and reputation as an artisanal centre make this equally likely.⁶⁹⁷

Finally at Ephesus, similar to Sardis, the local production of the mouldmade bowl has been well established.⁶⁹⁸ The greater part of the Ephesian tableware is, however, ill-defined in terms of fabric. The products are classified under general headings such as Glanztonware, Hellenistische fritisware or Glanztonware mit schlickerdekoration.⁶⁹⁹ It seems likely that substantial fabric variety is embedded within these artificial groups, including Attic imports.⁷⁰⁰ Most of this material is, however, thought to have been locally produced⁷⁰¹ but this supposition is never made explicit and related to production evidence. Considering the importance of Ephesus, especially
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its economic position\textsuperscript{702} and what appear to be site specific characteristics of the attested ceramic material,\textsuperscript{703} it is likely and more or less confirmed that most of the published tableware grouped under general headings such as \textit{Glanztonware}, was indeed of local or regional origin.

A comparison of Ilion, Gordion, Sardis and Ephesus thus illustrates that all four sites are likely to have produced tableware. At all four sites the material labelled as local dominates the material record. This suggests that local or regional production catered for most of the tableware needs in these four communities, whether out of necessity or out of choice. This observation confirms the generally accepted view in the literature\textsuperscript{704} that most pottery was always locally produced. Regional and extra-regional imports have, however, been identified at Ilion, Gordion, Sardis and Ephesus.

\textbf{VII.3.1 Known Imports}

In chapter V, we have already seen that during the late 4th – early 3rd century BC Attic or Atticizing tableware is attested at Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis. Similar imports have also been attested at Gordion (appendix 1.5.1.table 37). Athens does not necessarily need to have been the actual place of manufacture but the pieces in question are certainly in the Attic tradition and imported. Some of this material identified at Sardis arrived via or was produced in Western Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{705} Similarly Stewart\textsuperscript{706} has suggested that black slipped ‘Attic’ style pottery was imported via or produced in the Black sea area. It is interesting and perhaps of great importance that in Ilion’s lower city pre-HI phase ‘Attic’ tableware is reasonably well-attested among the material left behind by quarry workers (appendix 1.3.1.table 14). The latter were probably not the most affluent members of Ilian society and this suggests as mentioned already in chapter V, that ‘Atticizing’ tableware was perhaps widely available at Ilion during the late 4th – early 3rd century BC. This wide availability (but not necessarily popularity) is indeed confirmed by the fact that atticizing pottery has been identified also at Gordion, Sardis and Ephesus (see appendix 1.3.1, 3, 6; 1.5.1). Indeed Attic pottery was

\textsuperscript{702} Bilde 1993: 200-201; Davies 2011.
\textsuperscript{703} Gassner 1997: 60; Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991: 32.
\textsuperscript{704} See Rice 1987: 177.
\textsuperscript{705} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 1997: 31-32.
\textsuperscript{706} 2010: 83-85, 233.
attested at Gordion already in the late Phrygian period\textsuperscript{707} and at Sardis\textsuperscript{708} between the 6\textsuperscript{th} and 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC.\textsuperscript{709} Attic and Atticizing pottery is also identified in large numbers in a late 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC Ilian deposit.\textsuperscript{710}

Other known extra-regional imports identified among the tableware material of the four case study sites considered can be appreciated from the relevant tables in the appendix. Sardis and Ephesus again show a similar pattern. Both sites witness the arrival of Eastern sigillata and white ground wares (see appendix 1.3.3.table 18-23 for Ephesus; appendix 1.3.6.table 31-32 for Sardis). The latter could also have been produced locally at both sites.\textsuperscript{711} The same can be said about grey ware, increasingly popular during the latter part of the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{712} These imports at Ephesus appear not to have obtained a great slice of the local pottery market. Ephesian tableware continued to dominate.\textsuperscript{713} At Sardis, however, Pergamene sigillata (ESC) becomes very important during the latter part of the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{714} A situation akin to what we can observe for Ilion’s lower city households and the material coming from the sanctuary and acropolis findspots (see appendix 1.3.2. table 14-17). At the latter, ESA and Ionian products have also been identified. Gordion was abandoned before the wares considered achieved their extra-regional distributions and cannot therefore serve a comparative purpose.

Despite the presence of extra-regional imports at Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis, we can observe that throughout most of the Hellenistic period extra-regional imports either did not arrive at our case study sites, or in such small numbers that they have not made an impact in the archaeological record. Ilion, Gordion, Sardis and Ephesus thus primarily relied during this time-span upon their own local or regional productions of tableware. Even in the early and latter part of the Hellenistic period when extra-regional imports can be identified the importance of local productions can be established. The dominance of local or regional tableware illustrates that all four sites could, or were forced to; respond to their own tableware needs and were generally
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not reliant upon external supplies. This picture conforms to the generally held notion that most pottery was indeed locally produced.\footnote{Rice 1987: 177.}

VII.3.2 Summary
Drawing together the evidence obtained for drinking cups, dining vessels and fabric regarding the four sites considered a number of observations can be made. First of all, despite the obvious morphological similarities, the developmental trajectory of drinking and dining vessels at Ilion, Gordion, Sardis and Ephesus is not identical. Clear differences in acceptance and perhaps use can be observed. All sites, for example, utilized the Classical kantharos but its use was rare at Gordion and possibly also Sardis. At Ilion on the other hand, at least in the lower city households, the shape seems to persist longer than elsewhere. Another example is the fishplate: attested at all four sites, it appears to have been particularly popular only at Sardis. The use of similar shapes therefore does not denote similar tableware practices. Indeed a case can be made for the argument that Ilion, Ephesus and Gordion all display different dining practices as represented by their respective ceramic repertoires. Formal dining with the use of sets appears to have been the norm at Ephesus\footnote{Ladstätter 2003: 40, fig. figure 6.} whereas at Gordion meze style dining, which made use of an assortment of bowls was probably the norm.\footnote{Stewart 2010: 228.} Ilion shows perhaps a similar pattern.\footnote{Berlin 1999a: 89, 94.}

Ephesus and Sardis display considerable similarity in terms of the drinking repertoire utilized. With Ilion and especially Gordion more potent differences have been identified. Local or regional differences are therefore apparent. This also applies to Ephesus and Sardis. Despite obvious similarities, the frequent occurrence of Pergamene sigillata is not attested at Ephesus, nor is the occurrence of the Achaemenid cup. It is of interest that the similarities observed between the four sites appear the greatest in the realm of beverage consumption. Food consumption vessels appear to share less obvious similarities. Ephesus, for example, utilized a repertoire of which the most popular shapes are not very well paralleled at the other sites. The same goes for Ilion which, with its focus on the salter, uses an altogether different
arrangement of the table. Universal shapes, like the fishplate, were of course present as well, but they appear to have been (except at Sardis) of limited importance in the dining repertoire. All four sites considered therefore display their individual peculiarities, the result it is argued, of different choices made within varying contextual backgrounds. It is to these backgrounds, which incorporate socio-economic and geopolitical characteristics and developments that we now turn. As vital aspects constraining or enabling choice, they influenced the actions of individuals and communities and thus the production, distribution and consumption of tableware. The differences observed in the above are therefore considered as non-coincidental and reflective of the societies in which they originated.

**VII.4 Koine: The Options**

In order to approach an understanding of the influence of human choice upon the formation of tableware distribution patterns, an important step is to reconstruct what options were available to both individuals and communities. If our four case study sites did not have the same options available then this has important repercussions for the role of choice as an explanatory concept and highlights the importance of aspects that could have influenced choice, concepts that shaped, guided and influenced the decisions of both individuals and communities. This section will therefore survey to what extent the tableware repertoire attested at Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion was considered common knowledge or part of a similar *koine* of material culture. Which shapes were widely known and widespread, thus potential options open to all four communities? Which shapes had a more local or regional distribution?

**VII.4.1 ‘Classic' Hellenistic Shapes**

We have already seen that shapes like the Classical kantharos, echinus bowl, outturned rim bowl and fishplate have been identified at all four sites considered. These examples were all locally produced and imitated as well, suggesting that they were indeed widely available and part of an accepted material *koine*. Rotroff demonstrates that the echinus bowl was very common throughout the Eastern Mediterranean and is identified at sites as geographically diverse as Corinth, Mycenae, Poblome et al 2006: 571. Rotroff 1997a: 161, note 53.
Paphos, Chios, Tarsus and Pergamum. The outturned rim bowl is described by her as “one of the most common shapes of the Hellenistic period; indeed, there is scarcely a site at which it does not occur.” The shape is attested at, for example, Pergamum, Eretria, Samaria, Corinth and Ikaros. The concept of the fishplate is equally widespread throughout the Hellenistic world. The Classical kantharos, was also a shape widely known, although its presence is particularly well-attested in Attica it occurs also at, for example, New Halos, Corinth, Macedonia, Halicarnassus and even Jebel Khalid (fig. 112).

The late Classical Athenian export of pottery most likely helped to ingrain the mentioned vessels within local traditions of manufacture and consumption. Berlin indeed emphasizes the numerous occurrence of Attic tableware in the Aegean and Asia Minor during the 4th century BC. The presence and popularity of shapes characteristic of the late Classical Attic repertoire is therefore not surprising. The shapes considered were thus part of a ceramic koine which was by Hellenistic times known, accepted, fairly traditional and exploited throughout the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean.

The shapes just mentioned all have their origin in the late Classical period. ‘Classic’ widespread fully Hellenistic shapes are the mouldmade bowl and cup with interior decoration. Both shapes represent vessels that during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC become popular at a wide range of sites across the eastern Hellenistic world. The mouldmade bowl has indeed been identified at all four sites considered and the cup with interior decoration occurs at Ephesus and Sardis.
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VII.4.2 Local and Regional Traditions

Other shapes appear to occur less widely than these ubiquitous Hellenistic (-period) vessels. Hellenistic kantharoi, for example, are widely attested throughout the Hellenistic world but vary in appearance regionally. Athens appears to have played an innovative role in the production of this new Hellenistic shape\(^{734}\) and through its networks the shape may have been adopted elsewhere. The vessels identified at the Athenian Agora appear to have with exception achieved primarily a ‘Greek’ distribution. Examples are identified at or in, for example, Corinth, Eretria, Demetrias, Megara, Macedonia and Lokris. Only the baggy kantharos is attested on mainland Asia Minor, notably at Pergamum, Miletus and Tarsus.\(^{735}\) The s-shaped kantharos, attested at Ilion, Sardis and Ephesus is, however, not attested at the Agora but mentioned as a variety of the baggy kantharos shape (fig. 113).\(^{736}\)

Although initial inspiration may have come from Athens, local potters in Western Asia Minor further developed this classic Hellenistic shape. The presence of s-shaped kantharoi at Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis (see appendix 1.3.1, 3, 6; 1.5.1) and Pergamum illustrates that the shape was primarily confined to Western Asia Minor.\(^{737}\) It is, for example, not known from Tarsus\(^{738}\) and Jebel Khalid\(^{739}\) and none are published from Antioch either.\(^{740}\) The shape is also not attested among 3rd century BC material from Kedesh.\(^{741}\) The shape has also not been attested at Gordian. It is equally not reported by Kögler\(^{742}\) for Knidos and is also not identified at Chios,\(^{743}\) Ténos\(^{744}\) or Halicarnassus.\(^{745}\) Skyphoid West Slope kantharoi and West Slope skyphoid cups also appear to have been products primarily of Western Asia Minor (fig. 30, 62). They have been identified at Ephesus, Pergamum, Sardis and Rhodes. Parallels elsewhere are not mentioned.\(^{746}\)
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Whereas the Hellenistic West Slope cups just considered appear to represent specific manufacturing trends of Western Asia Minor the food consumption shapes attested at Gordion represent distinct Phrygian traditions of production and consumption.\textsuperscript{747} Only at Sardis have a few bowls with projecting rim similar to examples at Gordion been attested (fig. 114).\textsuperscript{748} Stewart\textsuperscript{749} does not provide other external parallels for this repertoire. The most numerous catalogued food consumption shapes from Ephesus (see appendix 1.3.3) similarly represent traditions of manufacture not widely paralleled elsewhere. It is in this context noteworthy to mention that the salter so common at Ilion in the lower city households is by this time barely attested on Hellenistic sites elsewhere.\textsuperscript{750} Local and regional trajectories are thus evident.

During the late Hellenistic period extra-regional imports again appear on the scene. Since the downfall in Attic or Atticizing exports during the early 3rd century BC this has not been documented. At Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis a number of these imports have been attested (see appendix 1.3.1, 3, 6), among which are to be found, white ground ware,\textsuperscript{751} grey ware,\textsuperscript{752} mouldmade bowls,\textsuperscript{753} ESA\textsuperscript{754} and ESC.\textsuperscript{755} Bes\textsuperscript{756} has traced the distribution pattern of the major Eastern sigillatas and demonstrates that distinct patterning’s can be observed which illustrate that not all sites would probably have had the opportunity to partake in this exchange. Sardis in particular appears to have been positioned outside of networks that distributed ESA, which was focussed primarily upon the coastal areas.\textsuperscript{757} Sardian consumers therefore may, even if they were interested, not have been able to acquire ESA products in any large volumes. Grey and white ground wares in contrast appear to have been manufactured in multiple places, including Ephesus and Sardis.\textsuperscript{758} From ca. 150 BC, these wares are
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widely encountered throughout the Hellenistic East,\textsuperscript{759} especially the Ionian platters (fig. 115).\textsuperscript{760} The export and various places of production of both white ground and grey ware indicate a wide acceptance and demand for these vessels.

\textbf{VII.4.3 Summary and Conclusions}
This brief survey of the occurrence elsewhere of the most numerously attested tableware shapes present at the case-study sites considered has documented that not all vessels or wares encountered would have necessarily been available to each and every individual or community. Clear local or regional distributions of tableware have been identified, for example, the occurrence of the s-shaped kantharos specifically in Western Asia Minor or the lack of external parallels for the Ephesian plate with \textit{beidseitig verdickte lippe}. The occurrence of the Achaemenid cup at Sardis, a shape not identified in the Hellenistic Aegean should also be mentioned in this context.

The nature of our evidence makes it difficult (if not impossible) to prove that the absence at a site of a particular shape or ware represents a deliberate choice or has to do with issues of availability. It seems likely, however, that shapes and wares widely paralleled and distributed would have been more widely available to other communities than counterparts who displayed a much more restricted distributional pattern. The echinus bowl thus was a shape commonly known and as such available if so desired to probably most areas and regions of the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean. The absence of external parallels for the plate with \textit{beidseitig verdickte lippe} at Ephesus illustrates the opposite side of the spectrum. This vessel was probably not widely known outside of its area of manufacture and as such would most likely not have been an option open to individuals and communities elsewhere. The same can be said for the Phrygian tableware shapes utilized at Gordion or the use of the Achaemenid cup at Sardis. Local producers and consumers at Gordion may equally not have been very much aware of the latest tableware fashions in Western Asia Minor. The regionally restricted distribution pattern of s-shaped kantharoi possibly indicates that this shape would not have been commonly available to producers and consumers at Gordion. The collected tableware evidence can thus be divided into shapes and wares which occur widely throughout the Hellenistic world and shapes and wares that
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have much more restricted distributional patterns, from specific regions to individual sites. The latter are the least likely to have been available to communities and individuals elsewhere and as such their absence at a particular site indicates not (in this context) the making of different choices but rather highlights issues of availability and connectivity to networks of exchange and interaction.

**VII.5 Networks and Regions**

Shapes and wares had particular distribution patterns, links which potentially signal networks of interaction along which information travelled. The differences between sites in terms of tableware production and consumption are thus to a large extent resultant from the embeddedness of a site within particular networks of interaction or knowledge. It was linkage to and integration within networks that made available locally new tableware fashions or wares. As such being part of a network and your position within it decided to large extent the options available to local producers and consumers of tableware. Networks are thus vital in approaching an understanding of the influence of human choice upon the formation of tableware distribution patterns. Networks indeed dictate the availability, dissemination and appreciation of, for example, products, information and cultural values. Below this notion is explored in more detail and by using network theory an attempt is made to address why the tableware repertoires of Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion show differences and similarities.

**VII.5.1 Network Theory**

Network theory has recently been applied to both ancient history and archaeology. Network theory focusses on connections, the links between individuals, communities or regions. The latter are the nodes within networks and the amount of connections a node has illustrates its position within the network. Networks operate on multiple levels. They exist among individuals, families, communities, cities and regions. The fabric of society is indeed formed by a myriad of connections and links. Vlassopoulos has recently developed a useful approach to the study of networks in
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the ancient world. He\textsuperscript{765} uses the concept of the world-system to address the links between different communities. A world-system is said to exist when groups and communities are linked in interaction, a process which allows for the movement of people, goods and ideas.\textsuperscript{766} Vlassopoulos\textsuperscript{767} identifies three main aspects that comprise a world-system: processes, centres and forms of change. With processes is meant the movement of goods, people and information between the nodes of the network. Centres refer to the communities that control the aforementioned processes and forms of change concentrates on changes within a world-system. Key issues in the study of processes are scale, form and extent of the networks involved. In terms of the second key aspect identified by Vlassopoulos\textsuperscript{768} important issues are the characterization of the centre, relationship between centres, the scale of the centre and the ability or wish of a centre to control processes of interaction. Three forms of change are identified by Vlassopoulos\textsuperscript{769} as actor change, control change and interaction change.

Network theory offers a dynamic multi-faceted approach to the study of the ancient world, one that leaves space for both individual connections and those of a higher scale. As such network theory is well suited to address the differences and similarities in terms of tableware production and consumption, between Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion, as it offers a framework to study the processes, centres and changes that constituted drove or affected networks of interaction. Network theory also connects well to a recent call for an emphasis on regionalism in archaeology and ancient history\textsuperscript{770} stressing local and regional connections and relationships.

\textbf{VII.5.2 A Hellenistic World-System}

Vlassopoulos\textsuperscript{771} definition of a world-system appears appropriate to Hellenistic Asia Minor: “A world-system can be said to exist when there is a manifest presence of processes, exchanges, and interactions linking many individual groups, communities,
and polities; and when these processes, exchanges and interactions, moving people, goods, and ideas, range beyond the boundaries of a single group, community, or polity.” On the basis of this definition, Hellenistic Asia Minor definitely was a world-system and as such can be analysed within the framework laid out by Vlassopoulos. The regional particularity of Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor has indeed been stressed recently indicating the existence of varying networks and connections within the confines of Asia Minor. This notion is of course central to network theory with its emphasis on the relationships between nodes of varying status depending on the scale and nature of the networks in which they were embedded. Following Vlassopoulos’ approach, tableware can be labelled as a process. The Hellenistic ceramic koine was created by the movement of pottery and pottery fashions through the links and networks that connected communities and regions. Imported pottery, imitations but also the use of similar shapes and tableware practices are illustrative of the connections that existed between communities and the functioning of networks. As such the similarities and differences in terms of tableware production and consumption between communities tell us something about the nodal position of a community within a network and the options available.

VII.5.3 Tableware Processes
In the above, it has been pointed out, that certain shapes and wares were shared by all the four case study sites considered. In this section, we will look at the similarities and differences between Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordian as evidence for the existence of and varying participation in networks of (ceramic) interaction. The presence of similar shapes or wares is taken to represent the participation within a network of ceramic interaction. It is of course realized that the links and connections within such a network need by no means to have been direct. The echinus bowl, a shape very widespread can be cited as an example in this respect. Though it occurs widely across the Hellenistic East (see above) its presence at practically every Hellenistic site, merely signifies a general acceptance of this shape and not a direct connection to a specific...
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and well defined network of ceramic interaction. On another level, however, the widespread occurrence and acceptance throughout the Hellenistic world of a shape like the echinus bowl does signify the existence of interlinking networks of ceramic interaction which made possible this distributional pattern. The occurrence of the echinus bowl at both Ephesus and Gordion therefore illustrates that to some extend the two sites were linked, however indirectly, through interlocking networks of ceramic interaction. An analysis of the position of Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion as nodes within networks of ceramic interaction can therefore produce fruitful insights and help approach a greater understanding of the influence and role of human choice in relation to the formation of tableware distribution patterns.

VII.5.3.1 Knowledge and Networks

In the above it has been indicated that the majority of the tableware attested at the four sites considered was of local or regional manufacture. Links between the four case-studies in terms of the presence of similar wares are limited and primarily restricted to the early and late Hellenistic period (see above). Networks however, exist in many forms and sizes\textsuperscript{776} and not necessarily need to involve the direct movement of goods and people. Information can equally travel along the links that bind communities and regions and as such knowledge is a vital commodity that warrants investigation as it allows an appreciation of the scale and extent of networks that are not based upon the direct and archaeologically identifiable exchange of tangible goods. The spread of architectural styles provides perhaps the most well-known and evident example of the importance of information exchange and knowledge in relation to material change.\textsuperscript{777} The occurrence of similar locally or regionally produced shapes across the four sites considered, equally stresses the importance of information exchange and knowledge, especially so because the networks of interaction which communicated new ceramic fashions appear not to have been driven by the large scale movement of tableware from one community to another. If imports played a role in driving ceramic change and fashion then they have not made a profound impact archaeologically at the four sites considered. Certainly imports drive ceramic change


during the early and late Hellenistic periods.\textsuperscript{778} Equally important, however, was knowing, learning and experimenting, in short knowledge and information, which travelled via the links that existed between communities.\textsuperscript{779}

Knowledge as a concept thus should play a vital role in accessing pottery distributions. In order to evaluate the options open to individuals and communities, we need to approach an understanding of the knowledge available to both potters and consumers. Did they know what was going on in other areas or regions in terms of ceramic production and consumption? For example, did potters in Gordion know about the latest Ephesian or even Sardian trends? In this context it is interesting to mention Stewart’s\textsuperscript{780} observations about the imitation of ‘Greek’ shapes at Gordion. Only vessels that arrived in the form of imports at the site were imitated. This could indeed mean that local Gordian potters and consumers had no knowledge about other ‘Greek’ shapes and could therefore not reproduce them.\textsuperscript{781} It could also mean that specific preferences are at work. The presence of decorated (Atticizing) echinus bowls at Gordion, for example, which remain in use here when they have already disappeared in Athens\textsuperscript{782} equally demonstrates the existence of local preferences or the inability of individuals or communities to tap into the latest tableware fashions. A similar observation could be made for the continued popular occurrence of the salter at Ilion.\textsuperscript{783}

\textbf{VII.5.3.2 Tableware Links}

During the late 4\textsuperscript{th} / early 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion were part of interacting networks bringing Attic or Atticizing tableware and a tableware repertoire that in part utilized similar shapes (see appendix 1.3.1, 3, 6; 1.5.1). A general Hellenistic tableware \textit{koine} appears to have been in existence. New Hellenistic ceramic

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{778} We have seen that in the Troad area in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC productions of Atticizing pottery sprung up in response to the import of Attic ceramics (Berlin and Lynch 2002; Berlin 2002) For the late Hellenistic period see Rotroff 1997b: 110-111 and for the local imitation at Athens of the Knidian cup, Rotroff 1997a: 119.
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developments during the course of the 3rd century BC, however, affected the sites
considered differently. Shapes such as the cup with interior decoration, s-shaped
kantharos, mouldmade bowl or skyphoid cup are not or only scarcely attested at Ilion
and Gordian (appendix 1.3.1.table 14; 1.5.1.table 37-41). Considering the popularity of
the aforementioned shapes, their absence or scarce occurrence indicates that the sites
in question were not part of or did not fully partake in, the networks that were
responsible for the wide adoption of these shapes (in Western Asia Minor). The
existence and impact of differing networks of interaction is also indicated by the extra-
regional movement of tableware during the late Hellenistic period. ESC, for example,
was popular at Sardis and Ilion but was uncommon at Ephesus until the late 1st century
AD. ESA equally has been identified at Ilion and Ephesus but not at Sardis (see
appendix 1.3.1, 3, 6). White ground wares in contrast are not identified in Ilion’ lower
city households but were present at both Ephesus and Sardis. The connections in
terms of tableware production and consumption between the sites considered were
therefore varied.

It can be appreciated from the available tableware evidence that Ephesus but
also Sardis during the course of the Hellenistic period display a closer connection both
to each other and to sites elsewhere which produced or used some of the new
Hellenistic shapes coming in vogue during the course of the 3rd century BC. The
external parallels for the shapes attested suggest that Ephesus and Sardis were part of
a relatively dense network of ceramic interaction. The evidence from Ilion’s lower
city households could suggest that this Troad community was a more peripheral node in
this network. Except for the early Hellenistic period, Gordian largely existed outside of
the networks of ceramic interaction that led to a commonality in shapes utilized across
Western Asia Minor (appendix 1.5.1.). This appears to have been the case also for
Sardis, but only during the early part of the Hellenistic period (see chapter V) when the
links in terms of ceramic production and consumption between the former Lydian
capital and the Greek and Hellenized cities of Western Asia Minor were not as strong
as they later came to be.

In terms of choice, this discussion is important because it provides insights into the connectivity of sites and in particular the way in which they fit within wider trends and fashions. The position of a site within networks of interaction is vitally important as this directly influences the options and choices available to producers and consumers of tableware. In this respect the available evidence indicates that producers and consumers at Ephesus and Sardis may have had more options available to them in comparison to their counterparts at Ilion and Gordian. What is additionally suggested by the collected tableware data is that Ephesus and Sardis interacted on a higher scale than Ilion and Gordian whose tableware repertoires are locally or regionally grounded, the limited impact of new ceramic fashions appears to testify to this. Whereas Ephesus and Sardis conformed to wider trends within the Hellenistic Aegean and beyond, Ilion’s lower city households and Gordian appear as using a fairly traditional ceramic repertoire, one that does not indicate extra-regional connections or links in terms of the production and consumption of tableware.

Tableware distributions alone, however, do not suffice in addressing availability or the options open to producers and consumers. The absence of the s-shaped kantharos from Gordian, for example, does not need to mean that producers and consumers were unaware of its existence. The absence of links or connections between in this case Ephesus and Gordian could potentially refer simply to a refusal of or lack of interest in a new ware or shape. A similar situation could be envisaged for Sardis pre-213 BC, when at least part of the city utilizes a repertoire which displays little connection with contemporary tableware material from Western Asia Minor (fig. 69). The absence of ‘Greek’ shapes from the PN deposits (appendix 1.3.6.table 28) does again not need to mean that consumers were unaware of their existence or unable to acquire these vessels if so desired. How to remedy this situation? Casting a wider net and incorporating other strands of archaeological evidence can help to better define the position of a community within networks of interaction. Coins, architecture, amphorae, and textual evidence are the obvious candidates to look at. If a site is shown to have wide-ranging connections but does not follow contemporary fashions in terms of tableware production and consumption, this might mean that we are in fact dealing with a conscious choice to pursue an alternative materiality. Care is needed as the existence of external connections does not necessarily have a direct
bearing on the availability or knowledge of tableware fashions. Pottery as mentioned before was a relatively inexpensive item, primarily produced locally or regionally and subject to specific traditions of manufacture and consumption. The arrival of wine at Gordion from the Aegean area therefore does not need to mean that tableware travelled the same way or that producers and consumers at Gordion became aware of what was happening elsewhere. As pottery, however, was a by-product (so it is thought) of more profitable or other trade activities, wide-ranging external contacts do increase the likelihood that a community came into contact with or learned of tableware fashions and developments elsewhere. In the next section therefore, we will pursue the evidence relating to external contacts for Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion.

VII.5.3.3 External Links
Of the four case study sites considered, Ephesus comes most clearly across as having substantial external connections. Strabo indeed as we have seen, considers Ephesus to have been the most important node in commercial networks west of the Taurus mountain range. Lawall who is in the process of considering Ephesus amphorae evidence puts the site down as both importing and exporting amphorae. In the early Hellenistic period amphorae come mostly from Rhodes, Knidos and Kos. Amphorae from the North Aegean are also attested. From the late 3rd until the middle of the 2nd century BC, amphorae from the local region dominate. This situation continues into the late Hellenistic period. Contacts with other regions are indicated by the presence of Rhodian, Knidian and during the 1st century BC amphorae from the Western Mediterranean. Davies has equally highlighted the Aegean connections of Ephesus, connections which appear to cluster in Western Asia Minor.

Ilion in contrast operated on an altogether different scale. Lawall has asserted that Ilion rarely exported amphorae and was primarily a regional centre. A wide array of other amphorae did reach Ilion, but only in limited numbers. The only
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significant amount of imported amphorae is formed by Rhodian vessels. Lawall thus concludes from the available evidence that Ilion was perhaps on the fringes of the main lines of exchange and interaction along which amphorae moved. In terms of house architecture Ilion (the portico house) connects, however, with the established conventions of the Hellenistic world.

Coins attested at Ilion might also (with caution) serve to illuminate some of the external connections (directly and indirectly) of the community. Besides local civic issues, coins from nearby Alexandria Troas dominate. Coins from a variety of other Troad communities have also been attested, for example, from Dardanus, Sigeum, Scepsis and Abydos. Coins from Mytilene, Lampsacus, Pergamum, Lydia, Ionia, Rhodes, Bithynia, Thrace and Macedonia have also been recovered. The local/regional importance of Alexandria Troas and Ilion is demonstrated by the fact that early in the 3rd century BC they provided bronze coin issues for all the communities in the local region.

Coin and amphorae evidence from Gordion illustrate that except between ca. 275-250 BC this community had expansive external contacts (whether direct or indirect). During the early Hellenistic period coins attested at Gordion are primarily coming from Ionia and the east Aegean but specimens from, for example, Ecbatana and Babylon have also been attested. Their presence may according to Stewart illustrate the wide-ranging and perhaps frequent movement of goods to Gordion. Coins minted at Abydos, Aradus, Damascus, Pamphylia and the Black Sea have also been attested. Throughout the early Hellenistic period most amphorae attested at Gordion came from the South East, North Central and North East Aegean. Rhodes, Chios, Ionia and Thasos appear as the most important producers. Amphorae from Heraclea Pontica provide, however, a link with the Black Sea. Thasian amphorae appear to have arrived at Gordion via Heraclea.
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The period 275-235 BC saw few amphorae imports arriving at Gordion. Products from the Black Sea area disappear altogether. Coin evidence attributed to this timespan paints, however, a different picture. They come mostly from Western Asia Minor. Coins from Lysimachus are also strongly represented, demonstrating his interest in the area.\(^{801}\) In the middle Hellenistic period, Rhodian amphorae clearly dominate (91% of the attested amphorae).\(^ {802}\)

Finally, with regards to Sardis, chapter V has highlighted the Hellenizing influences to which the city was subjected during the course of the 3\(^{rd}\) century BC which illustrate the links between the former satrapal capital and ‘Greek’ Western Asia Minor.

The evidence from our four case-study sites thus not unsurprisingly illustrates that Ephesus was the community with most extensive and wide-ranging external links/interactions. The Mediterranean wide distribution of Ephesian mouldmade bowls during the latter part of the Hellenistic period\(^ {803}\) perhaps symptomatic for not only the economic importance of Ephesus but also its extensive external connections direct or indirectly. For Hellenistic Sardis unfortunately limited evidence is available. No amphorae studies, for example, are published. The material culture of the site does however, offer some clues to suggest that Sardis was reasonably well connected to the Hellenized communities of Western Asia Minor, particularly Ephesus but also Pergamum. The well-recorded political importance of the city equally suggests fairly substantial external links.\(^ {804}\) Within this context the ‘fashionable’ tableware repertoire of Ephesus and Sardis fits well. The available evidence indeed seems to suggest that the opportunities were there for producers and consumers from both communities to appreciate what was going on elsewhere and make the decision to respond or not.

Interestingly coin and amphorae evidence from Gordion point to wide-ranging external connections, which again do not need to have been and were most likely not direct. These connections brought before 275 BC imported ‘Greek’ tableware to
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Gordion. The external links of the former Phrygian capital thus allowed the community to sample wider fashions and developments. The evidence from Hellenistic Ilion is unfortunately limited. The available amphorae evidence perhaps point to a regional character of trade connections and according to Lawall Ilion was indeed located astray from the main trade routes. This situation may have affected the options open to Ilian producers and consumers. The coin evidence equally appears to suggest a primarily regional economic focus.

VII.5.3.4 Conclusions
A brief survey of the external links (ceramic and other) of the four case-study sites considered in this chapter reveals that there is little evidence to consider with regards to the Hellenistic period. Pottery and coins are the primary vehicles of information. It becomes clear, however, that Ephesus was an exceptional site which as the available data suggests was very well connected to the outside world. Gordion, perhaps surprisingly, also entertained extensive connections with Western Asia Minor and the Black Sea area. The attested tableware, however, does not show such links after ca. 275 BC. We can wonder also about the volume of Gordion’s external interactions. The traditional tableware repertoire attested in Ilion’s lower city households is perhaps reflected in the regional character of the available amphora evidence. The limited evidence available for Hellenistic Sardis does not allow for any firm conclusions but considering the history of site, external connections were likely to be extensive.

The tableware data and the evidence it provides for external links or the lack thereof thus appears to a certain extent to find confirmation in other available evidence. Gordion after 275 BC and Sardis pre-213 BC present, however, interesting case-studies in that despite the attested or presumed (in the case of Sardis) incorporation of the communities involved in wider networks of interaction, a locally or regionally specific tableware repertoire dominated absent alternatives which could possibly have arrived via external links (as imports or information). Local choices made within local contexts thus evidently influenced the composition of the tableware.
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repertoire utilized and therefore substantially influenced the observed variety in the archaeological record.

**VII.6 Hellenistic centres**

In approaching the differences and similarities between sites and the influence of human choice upon tableware production and consumption patterns, it is important to characterize the nature of the communities involved, particularly their position and role within networks of interaction. Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion are all nodes within networks of interaction. The position and character of a node within the network influences, however, the options open to the community. This section compares the nature and character of the nodes themselves and aims to appropriate an understanding of how the particular nodal background of the four communities involved may have affected patterns of tableware production and consumption and the choices open to the different communities considered.

**VII.6.1 Geographic Location, Strategic Position**

Location is an obvious key aspect of any assessment of networks, connectivity and the nodal position of a community with a network or networks of interaction. Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion were positioned in different geographical niches and are located at quite some distance from each other (fig. 10). Herodotus records the distance between Ephesus and Sardis as being 540 furlongs, which is about 100 km and an estimated 3 days’ journey in antiquity. The distance between Ilion and Ephesus overland is much greater, 242 km. Gordion is even further removed from all the other three case-study sites. Clearly to go from Gordion to Sardis, Ephesus or Ilion (or the other way round), would involve many days’ travelling.

Overland connections were not only affected by the amount of time it took to travel from A to B but also by the relatively high costs of overland transport. Sea or river transport was much faster and more cost effective. Communication between
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communities at or near the coast therefore would have been easier. The fact, for example, that the widespread occurrence of ESC coincides with production at ancient Pitana, Pergamum’s coastal harbour,\textsuperscript{813} reflects the importance of coastal transport and its role in trade and exchange. Hanson\textsuperscript{814} has recently demonstrated the importance of site location in terms of access towards the Mediterranean coast, showing that many sites are seemingly located to facilitate such access. It seems therefore highly likely, that communication between Ilion, Ephesus and even Sardis potentially would have been much easier than between any of these sites and Gordion. The recorded tableware distribution patterns, as illustrated, seem to confirm this. The tableware repertoire of Gordion is largely distinct from what was utilized in Western Asia Minor by the other sites considered. Distance can potentially restrict knowledge of, contact with, or access to developments in the production and consumption of tableware.

Distance can furthermore have an important impact on the distribution of pottery itself as not every vessel type would have been marketed over great distances. This is illustrated by the situation at Gordion where only certain ‘Greek’ shapes have been encountered,\textsuperscript{815} suggesting either a limited access to a more varied ‘Greek’ repertoire or specific local preferences. The further away sites are from one another, the likelier it is that differences manifest themselves in tableware production and consumption, differences which of course are not solely the result of distance. It is telling, for example, that Pergamene sigillata occurs only in limited numbers at Ephesus, whereas it seems to have been popular at Ilion and Sardis. The latter two sites are, however, closer to the centre of manufacture. ESC is also common, for example, at Assos.\textsuperscript{816} Geographical distance may thus have been a factor in explaining the scarceness of this ware at Ephesus. It seems therefore highly likely that the considerable distance between Gordion and the Aegean coasts of Turkey allowed only a superficial penetration of ‘Greek’ tableware.

Ephesus, Sardis and Ilion might be expected to have more in common with one another in terms of ceramic production and consumption, because the distances
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between these communities are smaller, though still reasonable. Ephesus and Sardis
are furthermore connected by means of the road network.\textsuperscript{817} There was thus greater
scope for interaction between the two communities. The tableware evidence bears
this out as Ephesus and Sardis utilized a ceramic repertoire which showed clear
connections and similarities with the tableware repertoire from Ilion have also been
pointed out. This ceramic \textit{koine} was no doubt the result of the close contacts that
existed between the ‘Hellenized’ communities of Western Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{818} It is possible
that Sardis position further inland, away from the coasts in part facilitated an initial
traditional outlook of the tableware repertoire utilized by at least part of the
community.

Distance, however, could be overcome. The large numbers of Attic and
Atticizing pottery attested at Sardis\textsuperscript{819} and the more limited amount of Western
imports attested at Gordion\textsuperscript{820} pre-Alexander, are a clear examples of this. Overland
connections should therefore not be dismissed out of hand. In fact Ephesus, Sardis and
also Gordion were all strategically located with respect to overland connections. All
were connected to the old Persian Royal road.\textsuperscript{821} Sardis in particular was an important
node, connecting via the Royal road with communities to the west, north, south and
east.\textsuperscript{822} Via Ephesus, the Persian Royal road connected with Ionia and Western Asia
Minor, giving access to the Aegean coasts and all that that entailed. Gordion by being
connected to the eastern branch of the Royal Road therefore tapped into a network
that connected one end of Asia Minor with another.\textsuperscript{823} It is clear from the available
evidence that cultural influences among which tableware products and the knowledge
thereof could and did travel along this road.

The spread of ESA\textsuperscript{824} is illustrative for the importance of location (figs. 48-50).
ESA has been identified at both Ilion and Ephesus. It is, however, absent from Sardis.
Bes\textsuperscript{825} survey of ESA, illustrating the sites with most forms, is a list mostly of
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communities located at or close to the coast. This and the most likely area of production, eastern Cilicia in the vicinity of Antioch, indicates that the distribution of this ware would have primarily relied on sea transport. From these coastal communities ESA would then trickle further inland. Bes has shown that outside of its core zone ESA is also primarily found in coastal areas. Sites therefore not able to access the trade routes that carried ESA could have been left out. Sites also could have opted out. The fact that ESA was not common at Ilion and Sardis also reflects the close vicinity of Pergamum, which produced its own Eastern sigillata. Distance is thus again a key aspect influencing availability and local choices.

It thus becomes clear that the similarity in the tableware repertoire between Ephesus and Sardis is to a large extent facilitated by the Royal Road which connects the two communities. Gordion also connected to this system but much further down the line. This may partly explain the difference between the repertoires. A strategic location and being positioned close to the centre of action (so to speak) therefore certainly helped to create an awareness of the latest ceramic trends and fashions. If Lawall is correct and Ilion was primarily involved in relatively marginal trade routes, this may provide in part an explanation as to why the repertoire of the lower city households appears as old fashioned.

VII.6.2 Scale, Demography and Production
Networks and connections are of course not only determined by location. Although of vital importance, the ability of a community to attract economic activity also needs to be considered. Communities differ in scale, as in the size, economic potential and outreach, and access to networks of interaction of a community. In short the pull-factors that made a particular locality a hub of economic activity. Especially important in this respect are demography and production and their interrelationship.

We have previously seen (chapter V and above) that Ephesus was an important economic hub during the Hellenistic and indeed Roman periods. This important
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economic position resulted from the good harbour facilities, strategic location and the presence of the important sanctuary of Artemis. 831 The Ephesian mouldmade bowl industry, very well documented, indeed testifies to the external contacts and economic potential of the city. 832 Ceramic production at Ephesus was clearly well-organized, and established. This strength is evidenced by the scarceness of imports at Ephesus and the relatively wide ranging export of Ephesian mouldmade bowls 833 Ephesus thus appears to us as a flourishing community, an economic powerhouse and important centre of transhipment. It had a sizeable population in the Hellenistic period, estimated as being two to four times larger than that of contemporary Athens 834 itself an important economic centre. 835 Ephesus thus was a city with considerable economic pull, a large population and well established ceramic industry.

Of the three other case-study sites considered in this work, only Sardis appears to be on a similar scale as Ephesus. Though not located near the coast, Sardis nonetheless appears to us as an important economic and political centre. It was under the Persians and Seleucids the satrapal capital 836 and took up a highly strategic position along the Royal Road, 837 connecting with Ephesus, Pergamum and the interior of Anatolia. Next to its strategic and political importance Sardis appears to have been also an important economic centre. Traditionally, Sardis has been associated with gold 838 and it continued to be renowned as a skilled centre of manufacture, famed especially for its textile production and dye work. 839 Local craft production therefore seems to have been an important part of the Sardian economy and the presence at Sardis of moulds confirms local pottery production. 840 There is also evidence for one or maybe two tile kilns 841 and an establishment producing lamps. 842 Additionally, Rotroff
and Oliver Jr. have surveyed Sardis’ strong tradition of tableware manufacture. The archaeological evidence thus fits well with the tradition of local craftsmanship as evidenced by the references to metal and textile industries. The HoB area in particular is identified as an industrial quarter. About half of the mouldmade bowl moulds came from here. The presence and importance of workshops at Sardis is further suggested by a letter from Antiochus III to the city which grants it freedom of rents paid for the lease of workshops. The agricultural potential of Sardis was probably also quite substantial. Ancient sources describe the Sardian plain as very fertile. It is even mentioned by Hanfmann et al. that Sardis possibly was a grain supplier to Pergamum, providing an economic basis for the close connection between the two cities.

Sardis thus was a city carrying considerable economic weight. It was strategically located, had a sizeable population and a tradition of artisanal manufacture. Considering its strategic position and its political role, it probably was an important economic hub with considerable pull. Though not of a similar scale as Ephesus, the latter being an important node in Western Asia Minor trade networks Sardis was one of the most important cities of Asia Minor during the Hellenistic period, a position which is made clear by it being the Seleucid most westerly royal capital.

In contrast with Ephesus and Sardis, Ilion and Gordion are definitely of an altogether different scale. Both were much smaller sized communities, of decidedly less political and economic importance. Like Ephesus, however, Ilion had its own sanctuary from which the community probably was able to profit economically. Since the late 4th century BC Ilion and the cult of Athena Ilias were at the centre of a league consisting of Troad communities, something which would have facilitated inter-regional contacts and drew in economic activity, particularly during festival days. Clearly, however, Ilion cannot be compared with the emporion that was Ephesus or the
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royal capital Sardis. This contextual background is reflected in the ceramic evidence attested in Ilion’s lower city. The tableware identified was primarily of a local or regional origin. Most imports came from nearby Pergamum. The amphorae evidence also bears this out, as we have seen.

For Gordion, similar observations can be made. Next to its out of the way location. Gordion was a community much smaller than Ephesus and Sardis; most likely in Hellenistic times a village or small town. Gordion thus definitely represents a community of a different scale than that of especially Ephesus but also Sardis. Gordion was not, during the Hellenistic period, an important political or cultural centre. It is not known as an entrepot for trade or centre of artisanal manufacture. Wide-ranging external contacts, however, are as previously mentioned, still attested for Hellenistic Gordion.

VII.6.3 Conclusions
Hellenistic Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion were communities of different scale and occupied varying nodal positions with networks of interaction ranging across and beyond Asia Minor. Attention has been drawn to how potentially issues of scale and location affected the production and consumption of tableware, particularly the choices open to individuals and communities. Ephesus and also Sardis were both top-tier communities of significant socio-economic and geo-political pull. The tableware repertoire utilized by both communities reflects this and demonstrates that the scale of a community influenced the options available to its constituent parts. It is no surprise therefore that at Ephesus and Sardis we find a more varied tableware repertoire in relation to Ilion and Gordion and also a repertoire that is aware of and partakes in contemporary fashions in tableware. The position of Ephesus and Sardis as key nodes in networks of interaction spanning Western Asia Minor is thus reflected in the tableware repertoire utilized. The more peripheral position of Ilion and Gordion could have impacted the ability of local producers and consumers to effectively take part in contemporary fashions of tableware current in the major centres of production in Western Asia Minor.
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The tableware evidence seen in this light thus could be interpreted as suggesting that the position of a community within networks of interaction directly affected the choices open to local producers and consumers. The less varied or regionally specific repertoires of Ilion and Gordion resulted perhaps partly from the inability of consumers to partake to the same extent as an Ephesus or Sardis in contemporary fashions of tableware. This inability could be related to issues of scale. Smaller scale communities like Ilion or Gordion would have drawn in less socio-economic or geo-political interaction and as such would have had a more limited access to new information and developments especially if this is coupled with a more peripheral position within networks of interaction. Scale also pertains to the demographic and productive characteristics of a community, aspects which in the case of Ephesus and Sardis would have facilitated a large and varied demand to which a well-oiled ceramic industry could respond. Smaller scale communities like Ilion and Gordion would have been unable to do so to the same extent.

**VII.7 Forms of Change**

As has been previously argued, choices are visible to us in the archaeological record as changes from the accepted norm. Networks and links between communities are equally shaped by changes, to which Vlassopoulos\(^{855}\) draws attention. These changes influence the position of a node within the network and can result from internal or external processes. The fall-off of Athenian export during the early 3\(^{rd}\) century BC is an example of a change that directly influences the shape of networks of interaction. The establishment of the Pergamene kingdom and its rise to absolute power in Asia Minor is another change that shaped patterns of interactions. The intensification of tableware production at Sagalassos, possibly driven by increased elite interest and control is an example of how internal changes can exert influence. This section focusses upon the way in which internal and external changes and processes influenced the position of a community within networks of interaction. The implications with regards to tableware producer and consumer choice will be discussed below.

---

\(^{855}\) 2007: 18-19.
VII.7.1 Shifting Political and Economic Boundaries
Throughout this research, we have encountered the (potential) impact of economic and geo-political processes upon tableware distribution patterns. This is reflected most clearly, with regards to the case-studies considered, in first the presence and then disappearance of Attic or Atticizing tableware. It has been argued previously that this trend may partly have been the result of the political and economic troubles that Athens was facing. We have seen that it had lost control for many years of its own harbour.\textsuperscript{856} Trade may therefore have been disrupted to a certain extent by the political struggles of the day and in doing so re-shaped networks of interaction. This section, however, will focus on changes observable in the late Hellenistic period, a time when Aegean networks of ceramic interaction undergo substantial change.\textsuperscript{857}

The arrival on the scene of the Eastern sigillatas marks a watershed change in ceramic interaction. Not since the early Hellenistic period are a number of specific wares so widely attested. ESC produced in the Pergamum area\textsuperscript{858} is one of these wares and attested at Ephesus, Sardis and Ilion. Only at Sardis, however, can we clearly state that ESC played an important role.\textsuperscript{859} At Ilion the ware is also very well attested (see appendix 1.3.1). At Ephesus in contrast Pergamene sigillata is less numerously attested (see appendix 1.3.3.table 22). Why is this so? Geography and economic push and pull factors have already been discussed in this respect, the political and economic rise of the kingdom of Pergamum, however, has not.

After the Seleucid defeat at Magnesia (189 BC) Ilion and Sardis were handed over to the Attalids, loyal Roman allies. It is likely that this led to increased contacts between both cities and Pergamum. We have already seen that Zelle, quoted by Bes,\textsuperscript{860} argues in a similar vein, stating that the strong presence of ESC at 1st century BC Pednelissos in Pisidia might be the result of the incorporation of the region in the Pergamene kingdom. In fact outside of Pergamene sigillata, other Pergamene influences in the tableware repertoire have been identified (see above) at both Ilion

\textsuperscript{856} Oliver 2007: 260-261.
\textsuperscript{857} For the Eastern sigillatas see Bes 2007; for amphorae see Lawall 2006: 274-277.
\textsuperscript{858} See Meyer-Schlichtmann 1988.
\textsuperscript{859} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 84.
\textsuperscript{860} 2007: 79-80.
and Sardis. It is even possible, as previously suggested, that Rhodian amphorae, identified in quantity at Ilion, arrived there via Pergamum.\footnote{Stewart 2010: 121.}

Pergamene tableware occurs early in Ilion’s lower city houses and ESC has been identified in bulk among late Hellenistic material from the sanctuary and acropolis areas.\footnote{See Tekkök-Þiçken 1996.} Ilion clearly belonged to the economic orbit of Pergamum. Of importance is the fact that Berlin\footnote{1999: 147.} has described the H2 assemblages as ‘old-fashioned’. The fact that Pergamene imports appear in these households seems significant therefore, illustrating that Pergamene products were available even to apparently less well-off or more traditionally inclined households. This then suggests that Pergamene products were perhaps widely available, even to families of modest means. In the case of Sardis, Rotroff and Oliver Jr.\footnote{2003: 84.} have remarked that Pergamene sigillata became an important part of the Sardian table, which equally suggests its wide availability.

It seems no coincidence that the increasingly widespread distribution of ESC coincides with the Pergamene take-over of most of Asia Minor. As a result contacts between the Attalid capital and the territories which made up this enlarged kingdom would in all likelihood have increased. This would especially have been the case with respect to such an important city as Sardis. Ilion appears from an earlier stage as we have seen, to have already fallen within the Pergamene orbit, as is ceramicly testified by the presence of, for example, Pergamene West Slope kantharoi. In fact other archaeological and historical evidence documents the increasing interests of the Attalids in both Ilion and Sardis.\footnote{Lawall 2003: 101-103; Kosmetou 1997, 2003a.} This increased interaction and its economic consequences thus led to a greater influx of Pergamene ceramic products at Ilion and Sardis. Price-wise ESC must have been able to compete with local wares in order to make the kind of impact visible in the archaeological record. It is possible that changes in the production process allowed potters to offer a standardized product en masse and relatively cost-effectively.\footnote{For SRSW: Poblome et al 2002: 880-881; Poblome 2004: 498. For ESC: Meyer-Schlichtmann 1988: 209.} It was thus able to compete with local wares. The quality and appearance of ESC also undoubtedly attracted customers who, because of
the increased contacts both on a political and economic level would perhaps have had more opportunity to come into contact with the material culture of Pergamum.

Though political developments did not have a direct bearing upon the world of pottery and everyday practices of production and consumption, the above illustrates that geo-politics do have a role to play in understanding the varied tableware distribution patterns we encounter in the archaeological record. It is highly likely that ESC was more prominent at Ilion and Sardis because both communities were incorporated within the enlarged Pergamene kingdom. Political change or domination thus had an effect (in this case) upon economic interaction and consumption. Perhaps we need to imagine a scenario as sketched by Berlin for the Troad and Alexandria Troas (see chapter V). The incorporation of Ilion and Sardis within the Pergamene kingdom resulted possibly in the reorientation of previously established networks of interaction, with the Attalid capital pulling in an increasing volume of political and socio-economic activity. The reputation of Pergamum as a cultural centre would most likely also increase the attractiveness of ESC. Ephesus also became part of the enlarged Pergamene kingdom after the Seleucid withdrawal from Asia Minor West of the Taurus mountain range. There is some evidence to suggest that the city lost under Attalid rule part of its liberties, a feat reversed upon the bequeathal of the Pergamene kingdom to Rome, when Ephesus not only regained its freedom but became the new provincial capital. Despite existing within the Pergamene realm ESC did not become common at Ephesus, a situation which draws attention to varying local trajectories and indicates that geo-political processes had different effects locally.

The scarce occurrence of ESC at Ephesus does not mean, however, that it was disconnected from the Attalid capital in terms of networks of interaction. Overland Ephesus connected with Pergamum via Sardis and the coastal connections between the two sites were presumably good. In terms of the tableware utilized during the Hellenistic period, Ephesus and Pergamum show similarities, for example, the use of the s-shaped kantharos and during the late Hellenistic period the differences between
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Pergamum and Ephesus are slight and refer to local or regional variations. That ESC occurred so scarcely has probably more to do with the strength of the Ephesian ceramic industry. Pergamene appliqué ware, for example, was indeed locally imitated. Also, during Augustan times Ephesus ESB produced somewhere in the Maeander valley becomes common.

We can thus conclude that at least in part the popularity of ESC at Ilion and Sardis but not Ephesus reflects shifting geo-political, and possibly economic, boundaries. The rising fortunes of Pergamum appear to have led to an increased economic importance of this city. It has been mentioned earlier (chapter V) that the decrease in ‘Attic’ imports visible at all four sites also reflects in part geo-politics. Geo-political and resulting economic developments therefore helped to shape the choices open to individuals and communities. At all four sites this resulted in the absence of ‘Attic’ or Atticizing imports from the tableware repertoire during the early Hellenistic period and in latter Hellenistic times we can see this in the presence of ESC at Ilion and Sardis. Geo-political events could affect patterns of economic interaction and as a result the availability of products and the choices open to individuals and communities.

VII.7.2 Different Identities

Networks of course were not shaped only by economic, political or geographic considerations. Social and cultural processes culminating in local identities also need to be taken into account as is amply illustrated by the tableware and contextual background of Sardis and Gordion. We have already witnessed the importance of identity in relation to changes in the tableware repertoire on the level of a site. This section addresses how it helped shape the observable differences between sites. Sardis and Gordion because of their non-‘Greek’ cultural heritage are the obvious starting points in such a discussion.

We have already seen that Sardis was a city with a well-established pre-Hellenistic connection (see chapter V). Seen against this background of continuing pre-Hellenistic cultural traditions the observed tableware distribution pattern for early Hellenistic Sardis starts to make sense. It can be observed that despite the fact that

‘Greek’ drinking shapes were known at Sardis and had already been imported in some numbers, they are not very well attested (see appendix 1.3.6). It is also noteworthy that black slipped pottery in general was rare, even though probably locally produced at Sardis.\textsuperscript{873} Additionally the popular Sardian category of partially slipped pottery probably produced locally and in wider Asia Minor, does not contain ‘Greek’ drinking shapes.\textsuperscript{874} This very limited presence of ‘Greek’ drinking vessels during the early Hellenistic period at Sardis suggests that consumers did not have an appetite for these shapes, very much in contrast to what we have seen at Ilion and Ephesus, where consumers utilized well-known Hellenistic drinking vessels. It appears that the use of ‘Greek’ style drinking vessels had not profoundly penetrated or changed drinking practices at Sardis. In the earliest part of the Hellenistic period at Sardis both producers and consumers therefore operated within a traditional framework in which there was little space for ‘Hellenic’ style drinking. The identified Achaemenid cups, reported by Rotroff and Oliver Jr.\textsuperscript{875} as occurring in considerable numbers, fit very well within such a framework. Their presence at Sardis is reported since Achaemenid period\textsuperscript{876} and clearly illustrates that producers and consumers at Sardis were looking in a different direction than their contemporaries at Ephesus and Ilion.

Such a conclusion can also be drawn with regards to the tableware repertoire attested at Hellenistic Gordion, a site also with a strong non-‘Greek’ cultural background. Stewart\textsuperscript{877} indeed has observed that drinking vessels are generally scarce or lacking at Hellenistic Gordion, which suggests particular traditional practices of consumption. They most likely used vessels in other materials to satisfy their thirst. We can think of wooden or leather cups as examples. The symposium as we know it from Greek sources appears therefore not to have taken place at Gordion or perhaps only very rarely. The dining repertoire displays a similar emphasis on traditional shapes which differ substantially from food consumption vessels identified at Ephesus or Ilion. Plates, for example, were rare and the bowls prominently attested are not widely paralleled but are classified as traditionally Phrygian shapes. It seems clear therefore,

\textsuperscript{873} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 19.
\textsuperscript{874} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 24-25.
\textsuperscript{875} 2003: 60.
\textsuperscript{876} Dusinberre 2003: 177-178.
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that the choice for tableware at Gordion depended heavily upon the site’s socio-cultural background. Dining habits at Gordion appear to have necessitated a particular configuration of the assemblage which was maintained throughout the Hellenistic period. It has been observed by Stewart,\textsuperscript{878} that the ‘Greek’ shapes identified pre-275 BC also confirm in their functional use to this configuration.

We can thus conclude that the tableware evidence from Sardis and Gordion demonstrates that ceramics played an important role in the continuation and preservation of local identities. In chapter V, we have argued that producers and consumers at Sardis and Gordion deliberately continued established practices of manufacture and consumption. At both Sardis and Gordion ‘Greek’ imports had been available since Archaic and Classical times. Their impact, however, appears to have been relatively superficial and, as DeVries\textsuperscript{879} has illustrated, needs to be understood within local practices. The emphasis on a traditional repertoire at both sites during (part of) the Hellenistic period may therefore reflect the continuation of traditional practices of manufacture and consumption.

VII.7.3 Changing Behaviours
It has been shown in the above that the variation between the tableware repertoires of Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion is in part the result of differing local traditions and identities most clearly manifested in the material of the latter two communities. This observation links the tableware to aspects of behaviour which may have been important in the formulation of these local identities. Ceramics are not only proxies (so it is generally thought) for economic activity and interaction but also for associated behaviours. It is these associated behaviours that to a large extent influenced artefact production and choice and as such play a primary role in accounting for the differences between sites and regions and the shaping up of local, regional and extra-regional networks.

Berlin\textsuperscript{880} has already drawn attention to the potential use and configuration of Ilion’s lower city tableware assemblage, specifically the scarcity of plates and the abundant occurrence of the salter. Formal dining and entertaining is considered to

\textsuperscript{878} 2010: 86.
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have been absent instead it is envisioned that the salter served as a small individual receptacle containing, for example, olives, bean pastes or sauces.\footnote{1999a: 94.} Serving vessels are also scarce.\footnote{Berlin 1999a: 94.} The architectural layout of the lower city houses equally lacks proper entertaining spaces; \textit{andrones}, for example, have not been identified.\footnote{Aylward 2005: 42-45.} If Berlin is right, the occupants of the houses did not have the financial means to acquire the most fashionable products, nor perhaps did they need them in their daily routines. Socio-economic status is, however, not the sole decider of the outlook and configuration of any particular tableware assemblage. Local traditions also play a determining role in deciding what was appropriate and what not. The use of primarily Classical kantharoi and salters could thus reflect specific local or regional traditions of drinking and eating although it is interesting that in terms of cooking vessels attested the repertoire corresponds to that seen elsewhere in the Hellenistic world suggesting that in theory at least similar dishes could be prepared in Ilion’s lower city houses.\footnote{Berlin 1999a: 101.} This is clearly reflected by the presence of the casserole at Ilion, a shape synonymous with ‘Greek’ traditions (fig. 116).

Casseroles, however, are only scarcely attested at Gordion. The food consumption repertoire instead is designed around a deep cooking pot that served to prepare liquid foodstuffs. The deep bowls and dishes which comprised the dining assemblage were well suited to accommodate this kind of food\footnote{Stewart 2010: 228-231.} and the most popular ‘Greek’ style imports to Gordion fulfilled the same function. Traditional and established dining practices are thus guiding the choice for tableware products. The same can be said about the practice of drinking which was by and large not conducted in the ‘Greek’ fashion.\footnote{Stewart 2010: 231-232.}\footnote{Stewart 2010: 222-223.} Stewart\footnote{2010: 222-223.} raises the possibility that rather than communal drinking it was communal dining that was important at Gordion. It has already been mentioned in chapter V that meze-style dining is the most likely way in which the assortment of bowls and dishes attested at Gordion was used.\footnote{Stewart 2010: 172.}
The choice for tableware at Gordion was thus to a large extent shaped by local culinary practices which determined the outlook of the available repertoire. Alternative choices were, however, possible, as is demonstrated by the presence of casserole, salters and gutti\textsuperscript{889} in some of the houses and the identification of an andron in the Eisman house.\textsuperscript{890} The presence of amphorae equally reflects a taste for ‘Greek’ wine,\textsuperscript{891} even if ceramic drinking cups were scarce. Some of the inhabitants of Hellenistic Gordion thus held more cosmopolitan tastes but for the majority drinking and dining in the traditional way continued. In comparison with Ilion, these traditions dictated a different configuration and use of the dining and drinking repertoire. At both Ilion and Gordion therefore, use to a large extent determined the choice for a particular ceramic product. The abundance of drinking cups at Ilion suggests that drinking by means of ceramic utensils was an important social activity whereas this was not the case at Gordion. In terms of eating, however, some similarities can be observed. The reliance on bowls and/or dishes plus the scariness of (serving) plates at both Ilion and Gordion suggests that mezze style dining was practiced. The smaller-sized salters identified at Ilion\textsuperscript{892} may have been particularly suited for eating in this manner.

Though use was a determinant factor in the choice for tableware at Gordion and Ilion the occurrence of, for example, shallow echinus bowls in the Attic tradition at the former and the continued adherence to the Classical kantharos at the latter illustrates that the material style chosen for the enactment of eating and drinking practices was open to individual or local interpretations. At Ilion the tableware repertoire probably resulted from a complex mixture of socio-economic considerations and local preferences and traditions. The same can be said for Gordion but there is enough evidence to suggest that (at least some) producers and consumers consciously adopted a different style pre-275 BC for the enactment of traditional dining practices.\textsuperscript{893} A choice which indicates the desire of at least some of Gordion’s
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inhabitants to connect with (superficially) the ceramic traditions of Western Asia Minor.

No such desire is encountered within the PN deposits at Sardis which have been tentatively associated with the sack of the city in 213 BC and consist of well-defined floor contexts the material of which has been deliberately broken and preserved in situ. The PN area is largely considered to have been of a domestic nature with Lydian houses being identified. These contexts are the only ones associated at Sardis with an historical event and present an overview of domestic pottery in use during a particular moment in time. The lack of ‘Greek’ style tableware among this material has already been mentioned (see chapter V) of interest in this context, however, is the scarceness of food consumption shapes, most vessels being of a liquid serving or storage capacity (appendix 1.3.6.table 28). Together with the presence of Achaemenid cups for drinking, a particular tableware ‘assemblage’ is thus presented, one in which ceramic food consumption and serving vessels do not appear to have played a role of importance.

Dusinberre has reconstructed the dining repertoire for Sardis in the Achaemenid period and identified the use of bowls with incurving rims. When we add to this the Achaemenid cup and pitcher with ridges at the base of the neck (fig. 69) a tableware ‘assemblage’ of distinctly ‘non-Greek’ style emerges with clear Achaemenid period links. Cooking ware of Hellenistic Sardis has unfortunately not been published. The incurving rim of the Achaemenid period bowl suggest, however, a preoccupation with preventing spillage and thus possibly the use of ‘wet’ foods. The deep cooking pots of the late Achaemenid period attested at Sardis equally suggest the preparation of ‘wet’ foods. Bowls like this could, however, be used for multiple purposes. Meze-style dining could again be a possibility with diners perhaps using bread as individual platters. The tableware repertoire of the inhabitants of the PN area of early Hellenistic Sardis is thus shaped by the particular dining habits in which they were engaged and for which suitable clay objects were needed. Unlike the situation at
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Gordion, at least in this part of the city ‘Greek’ ceramic utensils were not utilized within traditional dining configurations, demonstrating a different engagement with the ceramic traditions of Western Asia Minor or perhaps varying socio-economic status.

Outside of the PN area the lack of primary, well-dated domestic deposits has prevented us from appreciating the diachronic composition of tableware assemblages in any detail. In chapter V, however, we have seen that ‘Greek’ style ceramics appear to have been limited in the early Hellenistic period. Their presence does suggest that at least part of the inhabitants of Sardis opted for ‘Greek’ style ceramic utensils. That this choice involved not only the adoption of a ‘Greek’ style but also behaviour is suggested by the acceptance of (fish)plates, shapes alien to the local Achaemenid repertoire of Sardis and one scarcely identified among earlier imported pottery. Individuals are thus making different choices, driven by particular circumstances and ambitions. Unlike the situation at Gordion the Sardian evidence suggests that by the end of the 3rd century BC consumers had in majority adopted ‘Greek’ dining and drinking habits. The dominance of plates at Sardis particularly those of a partially slipped nature indicates a shift in dining practices resulting perhaps in individual place settings (see appendix 1.3.6.table 34). All the elements of the symposium (cup, table amphora, krater) were also in place during the course of the 3rd century BC. The demand for ‘Greek’ style pottery at Sardis was thus fed by a change in dining and drinking practices representing a shift in cultural and perhaps culinary traditions. In this respect Sardis differs significantly from Ilion and Gordion, two sites that operated within established cultural and culinary traditions and continued to do so.

The new Sardian tableware repertoire compares well in terms of associated behaviours, with the Ephesian evidence considered in chapter V. Appendix 1.3.3.table 18-23 demonstrate the importance of plates throughout the Hellenistic period. A survey of late Hellenistic Pergamum, Samos, Delos and Ephesus indicates that all sites considered utilized a largely similar shape repertoire which equally suggests similar or related dining practices. A typical Ephesian dining service ca. 100 BC
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consisted of a cups plus a number of bowls and plates (fig. 117)\textsuperscript{904} a configuration which is (in general terms) visible also at Pergamum, Samos, Delos and Sardis. Detail differences do of course exist. Outturned rim bowls were, for example, very common at Ephesus\textsuperscript{905} whereas at Sardis they are scarce among the published material.\textsuperscript{906} Differences such as these may represent functional or stylistic variations. In the case of the outturned rim and incurved rim bowl, Rotroff\textsuperscript{907} asserts that both were used for the serving of food. The type of food served up might, however, have been different.

\textbf{VII.7.3.1 Summary}

This section has illustrated that particular dining and drinking habits are behind the configuration and subsequently variation of the tableware repertoires of Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion. The choice for a particular ceramic product was thus primarily dependent upon the function this vessel needed to fulfil. The acquisition of a plate, for example, would not be contemplated by consumers for which meze-style dining was the accepted norm. Similarly, consumers at Hellenized Ephesus and Sardis needed to acquire certain types of vessels to accommodate their culinary needs and table practices. The differences between Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion thus to a certain extent accommodated different choices in this respect. The style in which these choices manifested themselves is, however, of great interest and reveals much about the socio-cultural behaviour of both individuals and communities, particularly how they responded to changing circumstances and shifting networks.

\textbf{VII.8 One City in Pisidia}

The final section of this chapter draws in the tableware evidence from the Pisidian city of Sagalassos. We have seen in chapter VI that the tableware repertoire of Sagalassos dates to the latter part of the Hellenistic period and differs substantially in terms of morphology and composition from that of Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis. In this section, we ask the question why this is so. The topics discussed above will therefore be invoked to discuss to the rationale behind the observed variations in tableware distribution.
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Sagalassos was like Gordion, far removed from the major producers of tableware on Asia Minor’s West Coast. We have seen that the site had no direct access to the sea and an effective road network was only created in Augustan times. The local or regional outlook of the tableware assemblage (see chapter VI) may thus in part be the result of the particular location of the site and its potential inability to participate to the same extent in the networks that enabled Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis to become embedded to varying degrees, in a ‘Greek’ ceramic koine. In this respect Sagalassos shows interesting similarities with Gordion and also pre-213 BC Sardis.

At Sagalassos, ‘Attic’ pottery has also been identified during the early Hellenistic period, albeit in low quantities. Unlike Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion, however, Sagalassos was not connected to the Royal Road and as such was excluded from networks of interaction centring upon this road. Sagalassian potters and consumers may therefore have been only faintly aware of wider trends and fashions in the production and consumption of tableware throughout Western Asia Minor. The few imports that have been identified certainly allowed for little in the way of models available to Sagalassian producers and consumers. We have seen, however, that the mastoid and conical cups so popular among the Sagalassian material do display general affinity with contemporary vessels used elsewhere, particularly those of glass and silver. This illustrates that Sagalassos was aware of general trends, but perhaps not the specifics. The conical and mastoid cups do, as set out in chapter VI, mirror wider preferences in the late Hellenistic period for similarly shaped vessels a trend which may have inspired production at Sagalassos. The arrival of the mouldmade bowl at Sagalassos and Pergamene applique ware indicate indeed that imports could and in fact did arrive during the course of the Hellenistic period and as such were able to provide models of inspiration. No cups with interior decoration or mastoi imported from Western Asia Minor have, however, been identified among the material considered.

Sagalassos, was, a community on a totally different scale than Ephesus, Sardis and perhaps even Ilion. All three aforementioned sites are strategically located. Ephesus and Ilion have direct access to the Aegean and Sardis is a key node along the
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trajectory of the Persian Royal road. Ephesus of course was a great emporium and Sardis a satrapal capital. Little Ilion was home to an important cult of extra-regional importance, just as was Ephesus. The amphorae evidence attested at Ephesus and Ilion illustrates that wide-ranging external contacts existed, something which is also established for Phrygian Gordion.

Sagalassos on the other hand was but one of the three most prominent Pisidian communities, perhaps with a primarily local or regional reach. Sagalassos certainly was not a centre comparable to Ephesus or Sardis, two sites of an entirely different order of magnitude. Unlike the situation at Sardis and Gordion where the tableware evidence provides us with a record of varying choices, consumers at Sagalassos seem to have had very little interest in alternative ceramic styles. Perhaps this in part results from Sagalassos position within regional and extra-regional networks of interaction. Amphorae from the Aegean have, however, been identified.

Identity has been treated as an important concept in the above to address the differences in terms of tableware production and consumption, primarily between Ilion and Ephesus on the one hand and Sardis and Gordion on the other. Sardis and Gordion were indeed two non-‘Greek’ communities, which is reflected in varying traditions of ceramic manufacture and dining practices. Sagalassos equally was a non-‘Greek’ community. Pisidia was considered barbarous and wild in the eyes of ‘Greek’ contemporaries. The specific ceramic repertoire attested at Sagalassos, which has few direct ceramic parallels elsewhere, is thus primarily reflective of local or regional traditions and practices. This is evidenced as we have seen, by the focus on mastoid cup, Achaemenid cup and the presence of few plates. Although no primary Hellenistic contexts have been unearthed at Sagalassos, the attested tableware particularly the scarceness of plates and the varied and non-uniform nature of the many bowls attested indicates perhaps again a kind of meze-style dining. The incurve nature of most bowls equally suggests the serving of ‘wetter’ dishes. Bread again may have been
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used as an alternative to the plate. The continued use of the Achaemenid cup as drinking vessel may equally suggest alternative non-Hellenized practices.

We have seen in the case of Sardis and Gordion that local traditions of tableware production and consumption were difficult to supplant as they formed an integral part of local identities. The presence of the Achaemenid cup and mastos within the SRSW repertoire indicates that this was the case also at Sagalassos. Local consumers continued to favour a certain repertoire for their consuming needs. This choice was perhaps in part informed by the out of the way location of Sagalassos and by the strictly local or regional importance of the community. Despite this, it has been argued that both producers and consumers at Sagalassos still had an inkling of wider ceramic trends and fashions which were adapted to serve local needs and expectations. The metal and glass evidence previously mentioned also indicates that Sagalassos was aware of wider fashions in tableware. It appears, however, that the community did not acquire this awareness by means of connections with Asia Minor’s West Coast but rather through a focus upon the Levantine area. Direct ceramic influence from the major West Coast producers of tableware can indeed be identified only sparingly. All this suggests that Sagalassos was not an important node within extra-regional networks of interaction connecting Western Asia Minor with Pisidia.

We can thus conclude that as was the case at Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion, a range of aspects influenced the choice of tableware at Sagalassos. The options available to producers and consumers at Sagalassos were, however, not the same as those available to Ephesus and Sardis. This was a direct result of the specific nature and contextual background of the site, which was relatively isolated and enmeshed within non-‘Greek’ cultural traditions, which only slowly Hellenized during the course of the Hellenistic period, a process only relatively complete during the 1st century BC. We have seen, however, in the case of Kozluca (see chapter VI) that other options were available to Pisidian communities. Kozluca was situated in a much more accessible location, but we should not exclude local or regional sensitivities and associations which manifested themselves in the tableware repertoire produced and used.
VII.9 Alternative Choices, Five Cities within Hellenistic Asia Minor Considered

A network based approach to the material considered in this chapter has highlighted the importance of the nodal position of a site within networks of interaction. Ephesus and Sardis in this respect find themselves on a different footing than Ilion, Gordian and Sagalassos. It has been demonstrated clearly in the above that both communities when it came to the production and consumption of tableware operated on another level. The tableware attested at both sites illustrates that consumers were looking outwards choosing by and large products that were widely distributed across the Hellenized communities of Western Asia Minor. Absent substantial quantities of imported pottery, the shared affinity in the shape of the tableware repertoire serves to indicate this connectivity and the existence of a ceramic koine encompassing a number of sites in Western Asia Minor but also further afield. This affinity is demonstrated also functionally with drinking and dining conducted in similar ways.

It was of course to be expected that Ephesus and Sardis display in their ceramic repertoire more external connections than Ilion, Gordian and Sagalassos, as both sites had a much greater political and economic reach. As a result producers and consumers had more models or options available to them and were able to connect better with wider trends in tableware fashions. To these advantages we need to add the demographic power and artisanal capabilities of larger scale communities like Ephesus and Sardis. Larger communities would have provided local and regional potters with a solid and perhaps varied demand creating a climate in which potters were able to try out new things and in which consumers similarly desired innovations. This process facilitated the maintenance of a ‘large-scale’ ceramic ‘industry’. The data indeed (and expectedly) shows Ephesus and Sardis having a more varied tableware repertoire. The Ephesian tableware furthermore displays the innovative characteristics of an important pottery production centre. Interestingly Sardis appears to have been much less innovative or distinctive in its ceramic production. The site was in general terms primarily following regional or inter regional trends.

Ilion, Gordian and Sagalassos, three communities of decidedly smaller scale are seemingly much less in tune with ceramic developments elsewhere. In general the repertoire attested at Ilion, Gordian and Sagalassos was also less diverse, although the
larger ceramic samples from Ephesus and Sardis undoubtedly skew the data in this respect. The less central position of these three sites within networks of interaction could have influenced, as has been demonstrated in the above, the access to new ceramic trends and fashions. Furthermore tableware production at Ilion, Gordion and Sagalassos was not on the same level as that of Ephesus (and possibly Sardis) which catered for a much larger demand and even exported tableware widely. As said before, the presence of a well-established ceramic ‘industry’ and a large population, allowed these larger centres to experiment and develop new local and regional styles. A community like Ephesus, probably with regards to ceramics was a leader rather than a follower, whereas the reverse was true for Ilion. The tableware attested in Ilion’s lower city does indeed display in terms of morphology little local innovation. The shapes attested are those well-known and current with Western Asia Minor.

The more cosmopolitan communities, specifically those backed up by socio-economic and geo-political qualifications were more in tune with wider ceramics trends than lower scale communities whose reach was primarily local or regional. Scale therefore affects the choices open to a community. Ilion and Gordion by their very nature did not have the same options as an Ephesus or Sardis. They lacked the external connections, large and varied populations, influx of new goods and ideas and a well-established ceramic industry geared towards supplying a large solid and varied customer base. The attested tableware distribution patterns reflect this to a certain extent. The observation that the more cosmopolitan and larger communities had more options open to them and thus more to choose from is indeed an obvious one but one that must be taken into account when accessing the distributional patterns of the sites considered. It has, however, been demonstrated that despite these differences in scale the communities considered were able to maintain specific preferences in the face of alternatives the implications of which must now be considered.

It has been shown that besides Ephesus, all sites considered had their external connections and as such where part of local, regional and extra-regional networks of interaction. Admittedly, the position of a site within such networks varied, Sardis taking up, for example, a more central position in comparison to Gordion or
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Sagalassos. All sites, however, show that to varying degrees they were aware of wider ceramic trends and fashions. Therefore besides the obvious effects of location, distance, connectivity and scale, all aspects which conditioned the options available, it is to the importance and impact of varied local choices that we must turn in order to approach a better understanding of the distributional differences between Ephesus, Ilion, Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos. The social context in which these choices were made thus takes centre stage. Individuals and communities had the choice to differentiate themselves from their neighbours in terms of ceramic production and consumption. Choice was thus to a large extent driven by the customs, aspirations and desires that made up a community. Despite choice being conditioned the prime distributional differentiator was human behaviour and the social context in which this occurred.

In this chapter (and chapters V and VI) tableware distribution patterns have been followed from the early to late Hellenistic period. We have thus been able to illustrate and compare the changing nature of the tableware repertoires of Ephesus, Ilion, Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos. By extension we have documented changing behaviours conditioned by socio-economic and geo-political processes and uncovered the impact and importance of local choices. The main thread throughout this chapter and the previous one is the local response to and engagement with Hellenizing influences. Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos, being non-Greek communities variously reacted and engaged with Hellenizing tableware. Ephesus and Ilion being ‘Greek’ or fully Hellenized communities form the other end of the cultural scale. The collected tableware has shown that all these communities were making different choices and incorporated external influences in different ways giving us insights into varying local behaviours.

In the early Hellenistic period all sites considered received their share of Attic or Atticizing pottery. The engagement with this material varied, however. At Ephesus, Ilion and Gordion, it is clear that Attic or ‘Atticizing’ tableware was utilized within normative patterns of consumption. In other words, the shapes fitted functionally within local repertoires and their presence does not herald changing consuming behaviours. Ephesus and Ilion on the one hand and Gordion on the other do differ with respect to the reasons why Attic or Atticizing tableware was utilized in the first place.
At Ephesus and Ilion, two communities of ‘Greek’ origin, Attic or Atticizing tableware fitted within local stylistic and morphological repertoires; at Gordion this was not the case. Whereas at Ephesus and Ilion Attic tableware may have been appreciated because of its quality or Athenian associations at Gordion its presence reflects a different kind of behaviour, namely a deliberate wish by at least part of the community to engage with a different kind of materiality, one with ‘decidedly ‘Greek’ associations’.

Ephesus and Ilion of course were communities of ‘Greek’ origin and already fully part of a shared koine of material cultural. The fact therefore, that only a limited ensemble of ‘Greek’ shapes has been attested at Gordion has perhaps more to do with local preferences than availability. The adoption of such vessels within local functional repertoires signals a conscious wish to express (perhaps only superficially) different cultural affiliations. DeVries indeed has demonstrated that ‘Greek’ imports in the East pre-Alexander are not associated with a change in dining practices. Rather ‘Greek’ shapes are utilized and function within local repertoires, something which Stewart has also identified for early Hellenistic Gordion. It was this choice on the part of members of the community that shaped the particular tableware distribution pattern observable in the archaeological record and as such distinguishes Gordion from a site like Ephesus whose engagement with Atticizing tableware was different.

The wish of some members of the Gordian community or as has been suggested actual Greek or Macedonian settlers; to drink and dine more fully in a ‘Hellenized’ manner equally reflects a conscious change of direction which led to a change in the practice of eating and drinking for some. These choices were made against a background of increasing Hellenizing influences at Gordion in the wake of Alexander’s conquests. For the majority of the population, however, the impact of all this was fairly superficial and restricted to outward display. The functionality of eating and drinking at Gordion was not affected and also other aspects of society
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display substantial continuity with the pre-Hellenistic past. The preferences and aspirations of Gordian consumers, the individuals that occupied the excavated houses, thus directly influenced the patterning within the archaeological record and the observable differences with the other case-studies considered. This has important implications. A conventional reading of the data would perhaps have stressed the importance of network position and economic interaction. The differences between, for example, Ephesus and Gordion would be primarily associated with factors like these. Though they were important and had an impact, our survey of networks, centres and forms of change has indicated that communities like Gordion might not have been as isolated as perhaps imagined and as Stewart shows us, where able to make choices. Even though choices at Gordion may have been more restricted than at Ephesus, it is choice nonetheless that shaped ceramic distribution patterns. It is thus argued, in contrast to Stewart, that the absence of ‘Greek’ style imports after ca. 275 BC reflects a conscious choice on the part of the Gordians. Clearly consumers now preferred to express traditional associations within the material format of eating and drinking practices. This choice, which perhaps reflects a heightened sense of local identity, puts the Gordian tableware repertoire in direct opposition to contemporary assemblages from elsewhere. At Sardis, for example, different choices led to a different developmental trajectory of ceramic production and consumption and subsequently to the variation observed within the archaeological record.

We have seen previously that Sardis, like Gordion did receive its share of ‘Greek’ style imports among which Attic or Atticizing pottery. Producers and consumers at the former capital of the Lydian kingdom engaged differently, however, with this new materiality. As at Gordian in pre-Hellenistic times Attic imports functioned within local repertoires. The kind of material that was imported did not necessitate a shift in dining and drinking habits. The scarceness of ‘Greek’ style tableware recorded by Rotroff and Oliver Jr. for the early Hellenistic period suggests this continued to be the case despite Hellenizing influences affecting other areas of
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Sardian society and the nodal position held by the city in Seleucid networks of power and control.\textsuperscript{928} Thus despite the potential availability of alternatives and a tradition of ‘Greek’ style imports, the majority of Sardian consumers continued to opt for a more or less traditional ceramic repertoire. That alternative choices were available is suggested by the limited presence of fully black slipped tableware in the ‘Greek’ style consisting of the characteristic eating and drinking vessels we associate with Greek dining and the symposium. The contextual background of early Hellenistic Sardis equally suggests that alternative choices were most likely available. Unfortunately at Sardis we are not in a position to verify if these differences might have had a socio-economic background. What kind of neighbourhood, for example, was the PN area, where Lydian style pottery dominated up until 213 BC, when this neighbourhood suffered in the Seleucid attack?

Up till 213 BC Sardis (at least part of the city) and Gordion display a similar engagement with ‘Greek’ style tableware. Thereafter, however, the differences become readily apparent. The increasing presence at Sardis of ‘Greek’ style tableware led to a profound shift in the material framework of dining and drinking activities. This choice becomes apparent by the clear connections that the tableware repertoire now shows with that of contemporary Ephesus. That this was indeed a conscious choice on the part of Sardian consumers is demonstrated by the fact that local dining practices appear to have changed if judged from the limited evidence available. Drinking practices may also have undergone profound changes with the symposium repertoire replacing Achaemenid practice.\textsuperscript{929} Sardian consumers thus engaged in a different way with ‘Greek’ style tableware than their counterparts at Gordion.

From the available evidence it is clear that the distributional differences discussed are primarily created by the material effects of different choices. These choices represent different contextual trajectories relating to the particular geopolitical and social-economic processes to which Sardis and Gordion were subjected. That choices could be subtle and not only revolved around the acceptance or rejection of ‘Greek’ style tableware is clearly illustrated by the repertoires from Sardis and Gordion and has important implications for an understanding of local and regional

differences in the production and consumption of tableware. An example in this respect is the proliferation of semi-slipped ‘Greek’ style tableware at Sardis during the course of the 3rd century BC.\textsuperscript{930} This type of finishing; especially the frequent use of brown and/or red slip harks back to Lydian traditions and shows that ‘alien’ shapes were adapted to suit local tastes.\textsuperscript{931} Whereas at Gordion products of a ‘Greek’ style were deemed suitable to fit local needs at Sardis in contrast ‘Greek’ shapes were adapted to suit local tastes. This variation signals important conceptual differences and varying ways of engaging with ‘Greek’ material culture. Choice could therefore be subtle but nonetheless have important repercussions.

Subtle choices are also revealed in the differentiation that is made at Sardis between the eating and drinking repertoire. Among the semi-slipped tableware drinking cups are scarce. The reverse is true, however, for tableware decorated in the West Slope technique. This signals a different appreciation of the practices of eating and drinking. Something which is also observed at Gordion,\textsuperscript{932} were drinking by means of ceramics is not very well attested. At Sardis, however, the drinking repertoire appears to have received the lion’s share of Hellenizing attention. Furthermore drinking vessels did not need to be translated into a traditional format, they were readily accepted as they were and no attempt was made to fit these vessels within traditional manufacturing traditions. Though both eating and drinking practices were transformed at Sardis during the course of the 3rd century BC consumers chose to apply a different emphasis, one that possibly signifies the importance of drinking in the communication of identities. Differing choices and material engagements are thus in part responsible for the observed variation between Sardis, Gordion and Ephesus.

Subtle choices are equally revealed when the tableware of Ephesus and Ilión is contrasted, communities which were both thoroughly embedded within a general shared ceramic \textit{koine}. We have seen previously that within the lower city households\textsuperscript{933} it is the combination of familiar and well known Hellenistic ‘Greek’ shapes that reveals subtle choices reflecting perhaps a specific socio-economic

\textsuperscript{930} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 24-25.
\textsuperscript{932} Stewart 2010: 229.
\textsuperscript{933} See Berlin 1999a.
background or local traditional practices. Contrary to Berlin\textsuperscript{934} who emphasizes primarily the perceived low socio-economic status of the lower city households, it is equally possible that the observable distribution pattern results from specific local choices, perhaps guided by local practices. It is of interest in this context that Berlin\textsuperscript{935} reports only eight plates from a 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC ritual deposit which according to her is heavily biased in favour of tableware. Bowls and salters massively outnumber plates, a familiar configuration.

The differences in tableware distribution noted for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BC (the late Hellenistic period) were as we have seen the result of a complex set of factors, including the nodal position of a site within networks of (political, cultural, economic) interaction and the pottery production capabilities and traditions of a community. The absence of ESA from Sardis and the limited impact of ESC at Ephesus (see above) is revealing in this respect and demonstrates how contextualized choices shaped tableware distributions patterns. Pergamene sigillata and ESA both (especially the former) appear to have had only a limited or moderate impact upon the Ephesus\textsuperscript{936} area because local consumers favoured by and large local or regional products.\textsuperscript{937} The quality and output of the Ephesian productions was such that imports did not acquire a viable or dominant market share. The evidence equally demonstrates that despite the limited impact, producers and consumers in the Ephesus area were aware of what was happening elsewhere ceramically, for example, at Pergamum. Local imitations of Pergamene applique ware and West Slope beakers have been encountered.\textsuperscript{938} There clearly existed a general awareness of ceramic trends and developments.\textsuperscript{939} New trends could thus find wide acceptance, even without the \textit{en masse} movement of the actual products from one site to the other. Knowledge travelled equally fast.

\textsuperscript{934} 1999a: 146-147.
\textsuperscript{935} 2002: 135-136, table 1.
\textsuperscript{936} Bes 2007: 48, 50, 82, fig. 30.
\textsuperscript{937} We should keep in mind that the boom in Eastern sigillata exchange was during the Augustan period and not earlier. See Poblome and Zelle 2002.
\textsuperscript{938} Rogl 2007: 202-204.
\textsuperscript{939} Rogl 2007: 202.
Chapter VIII: Aegean Differences, Local Choices

VIII.1 Introduction
The previous chapters have looked at Aegean Greece and Hellenistic Asia Minor, more or less in isolation. We have seen that the sites studied were able to make similar or different choices, with regards to the production and consumption of tableware. Human action was influenced or made possible by varying aspects of choice ranging from site-location to cultural identities. It has been established that these aspects dictated the options open to individuals and communities and as such are vital concepts in an understanding of observed varieties in tableware distributions. In the current chapter the collected data from Aegean Greece and Asia Minor will be compared and contrasted. Previous chapters have already introduced the tableware repertoires of the sites studied in this work and the discerning reader would have been able to make out some of the differences and similarities in tableware production and consumption that existed, for example, between Athens and Ephesus or New Halos and Ilion. In this chapter we will focus on cross-Aegean differences and similarities and aim to approach an understanding of why different trajectories can be observed. Was deliberate human choice responsible for the observed variety in the archaeological record?

A cross-Aegean comparison presents some difficulties. How to compare, for example, sites like New Halos and Gordion with one-another? Both are small-scale communities of only local or regional importance. We have seen that both sites display distinct ceramic traditions. It is therefore difficult to compare two sites of such nature. These communities operated primarily on a local or regional scale and therefore would not have had available to them the same options or opportunities. Differences between such communities are therefore primarily the result of local or regional traditions and the availability of wares and shapes and not necessarily the result of specific choices made in the face of alternatives. The fact that the s-shaped kantharos has not been attested at New Halos but was present at Ilion does not necessarily represent a conscious choice on the part of the inhabitants involved, but more likely reveals what was current and available locally. Producers and consumers at New Halos most likely were ignorant of what their counterparts at Ilion or even more so Sardis
and Gordion where doing in terms of ceramic production and consumption. The options open to these locally or regionally focussed communities, would naturally have been more restricted than more outwardly orientated, larger scale *metropoleis*, who by their very nature would have been more involved in inter-regional (Aegean) interaction.

A cross-Aegean comparison is thus most fruitful and revealing when sites of roughly equal stature and scale are compared and contrasted. Sites that engaged within cross-Aegean patterns of interaction were important socio-economic and geopolitical centres and had sizeable populations. Athens and Ephesus are the two obvious candidates among the sites considered in this research. Both had available to them important harbours, were important nodes within Aegean networks of economic interaction, had large populations and importantly had well-established ceramic ‘industries’. It can be envisioned that producers and consumers at both Athens and Ephesus would have had more opportunity to be familiar with wider trends in tableware production and consumption than their counterparts at Ilion, Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos. The very nature of both Athens and Ephesus probably made them more open to outside cultural influences and thus offered greater scope for choice. Choices would have been more restricted for smaller scale communities. We have indeed seen in previous chapters that the greatest variety of tableware is encountered in the larger centres, strategically positioned as important nodes in networks of trade and interaction.

This chapter will first identify and then discuss cross-Aegean differences on the basis of a comparison between Athenian and Ephesian tableware material. Working outwards from these two sites, the engagement with wider ceramic trends and developments during the Hellenistic period will be addressed and the role and influence of human choice upon these processes assessed.
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VIII.2 An Aegean koine? Similarities and Differences in Tableware Production and Consumption at Hellenistic Athens and Ephesus

In previous chapters the Athenian influence (direct or indirectly) upon ceramic production and consumption in Asia Minor has been mentioned several times. Tableware production during the Hellenistic period owes indeed a great deal to Athenian models. At Ephesus this influence has been acknowledged by Mitsopoulos-Leon,\textsuperscript{944} at Ilion by Berlin,\textsuperscript{945} at Sardis by Rotroff and Oliver Jr.\textsuperscript{946} and at Gordion by Stewart.\textsuperscript{947} During the late 4\textsuperscript{th} – early 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC Attic or Atticizing exports are still attested in Asia Minor and they have indeed been identified at all five sites considered in this work. The occurrence of similar tableware shapes, at a variety of sites throughout the Eastern Mediterranean (including Ephesus) denotes the existence of a morphological koine. The demand for Atticizing pottery during the early Hellenistic period underscores the existence of this koine and shows that similar conceptions of tableware were widely preferred. At Corinth, for example, the influence of the Athenian ceramic ‘industry’ is visible in the presence of the Classical kantharos, Attic type skyphos and fishplate.\textsuperscript{948} At Ephesus the adoption of West Slope decoration is another example of Attic inspiration upon the local tableware repertoire as this style of finish shows Athenian connections before the second half of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC.\textsuperscript{949} The well-known Athenian export of pottery of pre- and early Hellenistic times had thus resulted in the creation of interconnected morphological patterns which were accepted and made sense at a variety of sites across and beyond the Hellenistic Aegean.

Below the tableware repertoire of Athens and Ephesus is contrasted. The focus will be on observable differences in tableware distribution. These differences will then be further explored in the second part of this chapter which aims to answer the question raised in the above and central to this research: Can we prove that human choice influenced the shape and form of tableware production and consumption? The collected tableware for Athens and Ephesus will be compared per centennial time-
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slice. The comparison has been framed in such a way because it allows for a useful diachronic overview in which both general and more specific trends can be observed and followed. Appendix 1.6.2 provides a brief descriptive overview of the observed data patterning, the implications of which will be discussed below.

VIII.2.1 Athens and Ephesus, The 3rd century BC
When we compare the beverage consumption vessels attested in the Ephesian and Athenian Agora deposits (see appendix 1.6.1-2a; for Athenian tableware up until the 1st century BC), it becomes apparent that the mouldmade bowl is absent from the two Ephesian deposits dated to within the 3rd century BC and that only a few have been catalogue for the Agora. As the mouldmade bowl is thought to have been invented in Athens around ca. 224 BC it could of course not have been present in the Prytaneion deposit at Ephesus, which is dated to the mid-3rd century BC. Its absence from find-complex SR12 of terrace house 1 at Ephesus, dated from the late 3rd century to ca. 200 BC, suggests, however, that the mouldmade bowl was not immediately transplanted to other areas. Gassner notes that the mouldmade bowl apparently was only very popular at Ephesus from the second half of the 2nd century BC onwards. Rogl states that there is no evidence for an Ephesian mouldmade bowl production before ca. 200 BC. As Rotroff has indicated, it took a while before the shape became very popular and forced competitors off the market. Mouldmade bowls only turn up in substantial numbers at the Agora, after ca. 175 BC.

The ‘belated’ introduction of the mouldmade bowl at Ephesus illustrates that ceramic developments at these two important Aegean centres did not necessarily follow the same trajectory, something which is also evidenced by the other drinking cup shapes attested at Athens and Ephesus during the 3rd century BC. Furthermore, the technique of West Slope style decoration may similarly have been introduced later at Ephesus. This type of decoration was established during the first quarter of the 3rd century BC at Athens but is absent in the Ephesian Prytaneion deposit dated to the
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middle of the 3rd century BC (appendix 1.3.3.table 18).955 The absence of West Slope pottery in the Prytaneion deposit but its presence within terrace house 1, find-complex SR12 is therefore suggestive that as was the case with mouldmade bowls, it took some time before new developments reached or were adopted at Ephesus. This suggestion is strengthened by the absence of another vessel, the cup with interior West Slope decoration, in the Prytaneion deposit. The vessels are attested at the Agora from ca. 280 BC onwards956 and though absent from the two Ephesian contexts dated to the 3rd century BC appear commonly among late Hellenistic material from Ephesus (see appendix 1.3.3.).

Variation between the two sites can also be observed in the way in which tableware was finished. Among the Athenian Agora material semi-slipped tableware at this stage is rare and most vessels were slipped a shiny, glossy or metallic black. At Ephesus in contrast black slips of similar appearance and texture are rarer and semi-slipped tableware is already more prominent.

A review of Attic and Ephesian tableware dated to the (second half) 3rd century BC thus reveals both differences and similarities. In terms of drinking both sites primarily used differently shaped, though morphologically related vessels. The same might be said for vessels used for the serving and consumption of food, apart from the ubiquitous echinus and outturned rim bowls.

VIII.2.2 Athens and Ephesus, The 2nd century BC
During the course of the 2nd century BC957 the mouldmade bowl at Athens ousts nearly all competing shapes and the Hellenistic kantharoi give way. At Ephesus, this seems to have happened later during the second half of the 2nd century BC (appendix 1.3.3.table 20). At Athens, however, shapes like the Hellenistic kantharos appear to have disappeared from view much earlier,958 whereas at Ephesus skyphoid kantharoi and beakers continued at least down to the late 2nd century BC (appendix 1.3.3.table 20; 955 The lack of Ephesian deposits dated to the first half of the 3rd century BC does not allow us, however, to verify this. Rotroff 2002: 97, surveying the occurrence of West Slope in the East mentions that this type of decorating occurs first in Greece during the 1st quarter of the 3rd century BC and subsequently spread elsewhere.
957 Rotroff 2006b: 373-374.
958 Rotroff 1997a: graph 4; Rotroff 2006b: 374-375.
1.6.1.table 43). The use of West Slope style decoration equally appears not as common at the Athenian Agora as during the 3rd century BC.

Despite similarities, varying trajectories in tableware production and consumption are thus visible between Athens and Ephesus during the course of the 2nd century BC. Something which is not only evidenced by the beverage consumption repertoire but also visible among vessels utilized for dining purposes. The echinus bowl, for example, appears to play a much more important role than it did at contemporary Athens (Compare appendix 1.3.3.table 20-21 and 1.6.1.table 43). The, at Ephesus dominant plate with broad rim is as before (3rd century BC) not attested at the Agora. At both sites however, a relatively similar configuration of the dining ‘assemblage’ can be identified. A common plate and bowl formed the core set around which various less popular plate and bowl shapes were grouped. Thus during the 2nd century BC, the differences of the 3rd century BC continue as Athens and Ephesus continue to develop their established practices of production and consumption. Colour-coated and semi-slipped tableware continues, for example, to proliferate at Ephesus959 a development which starts to become visible among the Agora material (bowls and plates) around the end of the 2nd century BC.960 It can also be observed, however, that both sites display an increasing preference for the mouldmade bowl, a trend generally visible throughout the Hellenistic world961 and part of a general internationalization of production and consumption practices. Further evidence of this is the presence of the extra-regional imports identified at both sites (see appendix 1.3.3; 1.6.1).

VIII.2.3 Athens and Ephesus, The 1st century BC
Throughout the 1st century BC the tableware repertoires of Athens and Ephesus continue to display similarities and differences (see appendix 1.3.3; 1.6.1). These similarities and differences represent or stem from traditions of manufacture and consumption of which the outlines were already emerging during the course of the 3rd century BC. Ephesus in particular appears to have been fairly traditional in the development of its tableware assemblages. Few new tableware shapes are introduced
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during the 2nd and 1st centuries BC (appendix 1.3.3.table 19-22). This is especially so with regards to the beverage consumption repertoire, which, if anything, appears to narrow its focus around only two shapes, the mouldmade bowl and cup with interior decoration. Something which is of course true as well for Athens (minus the cup with interior decoration). The food consumption repertoire of Ephesus equally shows continuity from the 3rd to the 1st century BC and its most popular shapes are as we have seen morphologically distinct from their Athenian counterparts. The Athenian material however, appears to respond more quickly than Ephesus to new trends and fashions. Both the Hellenistic kantharoi and cup with interior decoration, for example, lose out much earlier to the mouldmade bowl than their counterparts at Ephesus.

VIII.3 One Koine, or Multiple?
In the above we have observed that despite obvious morphological similarities, the tableware repertoires attested at Athens and Ephesus differ substantially when it comes to the most popular vessels utilized. This is especially so pre-150 BC. In the latter part of the Hellenistic period, the tableware repertoires of both communities display, at least when it comes to drinking greater affinity. Variation and affinity throughout the course of the Hellenistic period can thus be observed.

Scholars often talk\textsuperscript{962} about the existence of a Hellenistic ceramic \textit{koine}. This \textit{koine} reflects the shared ceramic morphological similarities between various Hellenistic communities located throughout (and beyond) the Eastern Mediterranean. From Greece, to Asia Minor, the Black Sea region, the Levant and areas further east similar looking vessels were utilized to varying degrees. Chapters V and VII have, for example, demonstrated the morphological affinity of tableware utilized at Hellenistic Ephesus, Ilion, Sardis, Gordion and, in part Sagalassos. The extent to which communities were embedded within this \textit{koine} could vary, however, as has been demonstrated in chapter V. Of all the case-studies considered in this research Athens and Ephesus might be expected to be the flag-bearers of a shared Hellenistic tableware culture. The observed tableware links between Athens and Ephesus signify indeed the participation of both communities within a shared milieu of material culture. Equally, however, many morphological differences and differences in finishing

\textsuperscript{962} E.g. James 2010: viii, 31; Rotroff 2006a: 65.
and decoration can also be observed raising important questions about the interaction between more widely shared patterns of tableware production and consumption and local or regional trajectories.

The effectiveness or extent of the *koine* is naturally defined by the presence and magnitude of the links that existed between communities. The more extensive the links, the greater the involvement of communities within a shared milieu of material culture. It should also be realized that a particular community could be involved or embedded within various *koines* involving both similar and different types of material culture. Two cities may share, for example, important similarities with regards to house architecture or language utilized but not with respect to the pots and pans needed locally for cooking, drinking and dining. As we have seen in chapters V and VII, the use of tableware vessels similar in morphology equally does not need to mean that eating and drinking practices were shared.

As Rotroff\(^{963}\) already noted in the context of the Athenian Agora, despite obvious similarities, Hellenistic sites display also clear differences, differences related to specific local or regional trajectories of tableware production and consumption. To talk about one Hellenistic Aegean ceramic *koine* is thus oversimplifying the issue. This is amply illustrated by the similarities and differences observable between Athens and Ephesus during the course of the Hellenistic period. Ephesus, for example, shows links with Athens but also with other communities in Western Asia Minor, such as Pergamum or Sardis. The s-shaped kantharos is a good example of a Hellenistic shape which appears primarily confined to Western Asia Minor. We could thus label its area of occurrence as part of a regional *koine* of material culture. Another example of a shape primarily occurring in Hellenistic Western Asia Minor is the skypoid West Slope beaker as identified at Ephesus, Sardis and Pergamum. A shape like the echinus bowl or Classical kantharos occurred, however, much more widely and as such formed part of a shared *koine* of material culture which transcended local and regional boundaries. A single site could thus at the same time form part of different (sub-) *koines* of material culture. The case-study sites considered in this work give indeed excellent insights into the existence of multiple ceramic *koines* (see chapters IV, V, VI and VII).

\(^{963}\) 2006a: 65.
At, for example, Gordion we have seen that next to familiar ‘Greek’ shapes a totally different repertoire co-existed. At Sardis a similar situation appears to have been the case. The Achaemenid cup, a shape alien to the ‘Greek’ repertoire, has been identified in pre-213 BC Sardis next to fishplates and Classical kantharoi.

The collected evidence clearly illustrates the existence of overlapping koines of tableware. Extra-regional and regional similarities and differences are reflective of this and overlapped both with each other and locally specific production and consumption practices. The tableware repertoire utilized for eating and drinking could thus demonstrate links to various koines at the same time. In the case of Ephesus we can note, for example, the impact of Aegean wide influences, regional trends and locally specific developments. The same can be said for Sardis or Gordion.

The level of involvement of a community with various tableware koines varied and could relate to only a few key shapes, modes of finishing and decoration or the entire outlook of a tableware repertoire. Ephesus and Sardis (post-213 BC), for example, share many similarities with regards to the tableware produced and consumed. Ephesus and the lower city households of Ilion less so. The tableware repertoire utilized at Gordion equally displays (during the early Hellenistic period) only a few links with Ephesus. Instead of sharing the same ceramic language, Gordion and Ephesus communicated by means of a few key words, words quickly forgotten or ignored after ca. 275 BC. The shared similarities behind Hellenistic pottery around the Eastern Mediterranean therefore represents but one level of extra-regional affinity behind which local and regional traditions of manufacture and consumption are in evidence.

The widespread occurrence of a similar shape repertoire and template for decorating tableware resulted primarily from the late Classical and early Hellenistic export of Attic tableware which had reached most areas of the now ‘Greek’ East. The local appreciation, articulation and utilization of this ‘cosmopolitan’ template varied, however. Athens and Ephesus were at the heart of it. By virtue of their geo-political and socio-economic background the Hellenistic morphological and decorative repertoire stood at the base of local tableware production and consumption. The substantive links between the two communities in terms of the tableware considered but also more generally within the socio-economic system of the Hellenistic Aegean in
which both Athens and Ephesus played important roles\textsuperscript{964} indicates or suggests that probably local producers and consumers would have been aware of new fashions originating at either site or elsewhere in this core region of Hellenistic ceramic material culture. The presence of, for example, the mouldmade bowl and cup with interior decoration at both Athens and Ephesus but the absence of direct ceramic links between the two communities in the form of actual imports is illustrative of the fact that knowledge of ceramic trends and fashions did not necessarily move on the back of substantial trade in pottery but could also be disseminated by means of information exchange. As we have seen, this exchange of information did not necessarily mean that ceramic developments followed the same chronological trajectory. Considering the above, the observed variation between Athens and Ephesus takes on extra importance and is likely to reflect the impact of specific local or regional choices.

\textbf{VIII.4 Aegean Choices Approached, Athens and Ephesus in Contrast}

It has been shown in the above that Athens and Ephesus display during the course of the Hellenistic period a tableware repertoire that shows both similarities and differences. The current section will explore if they are the result of human choices made in the face of alternative options. In short, is active human choice responsible for the observable differences between Athens and Ephesus and if so, why were different choices made? The aspects or factors that influenced local choices will also be addressed.

\textbf{VIII.4.1 Innovation and fashion}

We have already established that both Athens and Ephesus had rich ceramic traditions. Both also appear to have been innovative, in the sense that certain shapes are thought to have been produced first at or near these two sites. In the case of Athens we can mention in this respect the mouldmade bowl and the use of West Slope decoration. At Ephesus shapes like the plate with \textit{gedrechselte rand} or \textit{beidseitig verdickte lippe} are hardly paralleled elsewhere. The great variety of tableware identified at both sites and the fact that some of these shapes occurred first or solely at Athens or Ephesus underscores the innovative character of the local ceramic

\textsuperscript{964} See Lawall 2005; Knibbe 1998. Habicht 1997: 69, 183, 190, 193, 259; has noted the diplomatic and economic contacts of Athens with Ionia and Asia Minor during the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC. Ephesus is mentioned specifically.
‘industries’. This innovative character and varied tableware repertoire are important characteristics of a flourishing and important ceramic industry. Other sites of similar impact in this respect where, for example, Pergamum\textsuperscript{965} and Knidos,\textsuperscript{966} the products of which were widely distributed during later Hellenistic times.\textsuperscript{967} Antioch was probably also a key ceramic centre and its influence has been attested at, for example, Jebel Khalid.\textsuperscript{968} ESA is, of course, now thought to have come from the Antioch region. How innovative, however, were Athens and Ephesus and to what extent did both set fashions and trends? Were they leaders or followers?

It can be appreciated from appendix 1.3.3 that the Ephesian tableware repertoire displays a significant continuity during the course of the Hellenistic period. This continuity has even been remarked as signifying a certain traditionalism on the part of the Ephesian potter and consumer.\textsuperscript{969} Both the drinking and dining repertoire show, except for the introduction of the mouldmade bowl during the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC, little substantial change. Apparently there was at Ephesus little incentive to try out new shapes, suggesting that local demand was stable. At Athens, despite the obvious developmental trajectory of certain shapes a similar continuity can be observed. New shapes do not pop up in relatively short intervals. Instead the image we get is that change in the tableware assemblage was more measured and slow moving. The introduction of the mouldmade bowl\textsuperscript{970} illustrates in particular the time that it took for a shape to oust its competitors. We can, however, note that Athens, in comparison with Ephesus, was somewhat ahead in terms of the adaptation of new shapes and ceramic fashions. This was the case with the mouldmade bowl but also with the cup with interior decoration. Both shapes become, as we have seen, very popular but do so only relatively late at Ephesus. The ‘traditionalism’ of the Ephesian potter and consumer is again reflected in the fact that cups with interior decoration continue to be popular at Ephesus well into the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC (appendix 1.3.3.table 22).\textsuperscript{971}

\textsuperscript{965} Meyer-Schlichtmann 1988; Schäfer 1968.
\textsuperscript{966} Kögler 2010.
\textsuperscript{967} See e.g. Rogl 2007: 195-200; Kögler 2010.
\textsuperscript{968} Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: 283.
\textsuperscript{969} Rotroff 2002: 98; Rogl 2007: 189-190.
\textsuperscript{970} See Rotroff 2006b.
\textsuperscript{971} At Athens cups with interior decoration were made only in small numbers after the end of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC. Rotroff 2006b: 374.
Can we thus say that Athens appears to have been more in touch with (in comparison with Ephesus) or played a leading role in, the development of new tableware trends, even after the early 3rd century BC? Rotroff\textsuperscript{972} has meticulously listed the parallels of Athenian tableware shapes. As such we are thus able to trace the distribution of the most commonly catalogued Athenian shapes. Up until the 2nd century BC parallels with many sites elsewhere can be identified illustrating that Athens was very much connected to a wider ceramic \textit{koine} which at least superficially gives the impression of widely shared conceptions of the way in which material form was given to eating and drinking activities. Despite not supplying Greece and the Eastern Hellenistic world with large volumes of Athenian pottery, in terms of ceramic fashions and trends, Athens remained a focal point. This is clearly illustrated, by the development of the Hellenistic kantharos and mouldmade bowl at Athens, two shapes which then spread to the four corners of the Hellenistic world. Though for other shapes we cannot at present establish if they were firstly produced at Athens, the fact that the repertoire at Athens is mostly widely paralleled elsewhere suggest that Athenian potters were self-aware, able and knowledgeable. Athenian producers and consumers kept up with the latest Hellenistic trends in tableware.

The Ephesian repertoire is, on the contrary, much less widely paralleled\textsuperscript{973} As we have seen, it appears that the s-shaped kantharos and skyphoid cups with West Slope decoration were mainly to be found in Western Asia Minor, where they have been identified at, for example, Pergamum\textsuperscript{974} and Sardis.\textsuperscript{975} The lack of parallels to Ephesian vessels elsewhere must surely indicate that at this period in time the city (its producers and consumers) was not very much concerned with partaking in a much more widely shared tableware \textit{koine}. On the contrary local or regional traditions were clearly preferred. Only with the advent of the mouldmade bowl and the tableware trends of the late Hellenistic period do Athens and Ephesus start to develop their tableware repertoires on relatively parallel lines. It is safe to say that in terms of ceramic influence, inspiration and the adherence to more widely shared tableware trends Ephesus was, during the greater part of the Hellenistic period, not on par with

\textsuperscript{972} 1997a.
\textsuperscript{973} See parallels provided by Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991; Gassner 1997; Ladstätter 2003, 2010.
Athens. This conclusion is perhaps surprising as economically and politically Athens was in considerable difficulty for large parts of the (early) Hellenistic period\footnote{See Habicht 1997; Oliver 2007: 193-200.} whereas Asia Minor and Ephesus in particular became more and more important,\footnote{Bilde 1993: 200-201.} the more so when the Roman province of Asia was created.\footnote{Knibbe 1998: 100-103; Davies 2011.}

As said, it is during the late Hellenistic period, from ca. 150 BC onwards that the tableware repertoires of Athens and Ephesus become more and more similar, especially with regards to drinking. Both now focus very much on the mouldmade bowl and new imports like Knidian grey ware and ESA arrived. Previous differences in the tableware repertoire are now much less accentuated although they of course still existed, especially with regards to the morphology of the plates used for dining (fig. 111) and the continued use of the cups with interior decoration at Ephesus. This uniformity of the tableware repertoire of these two important Aegean coastal communities signifies the existence of shared Aegean tastes particularly with regards to drinking vessels. The presence of extra-regional imports from Pergamum or Knidos also underscores the importance of other centres of ceramic manufacture. In comparison to Ephesus, Knidos and Pergamum all of which exported tableware on a substantial scale,\footnote{See Bilde 1993; Kögler 2010; Outschar 1993; Meyer-Schlichtman 1988: 207-207.} Athens was now of decidedly less importance and saw the arrival of more imported pottery than previously, especially so after the destruction of 86 BC.\footnote{Rotroff 1997b: 98-99, 105.} Athens of course still continued to observe widely shared trends in tableware production but no longer appears to have played a leading role in ceramic innovation and the setting of new trends. That position now belonged to other centres such as Pergamum,\footnote{See Meyer-Schlichtmann 1988: 206-207; and for the influence of Pergamene products elsewhere: Berlin 1999a; Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003.} Knidos\footnote{Kögler 2010: 46-59.} and the Antioch region. It is of interest to note in this respect that ESB produced since Augustan times\footnote{Bes 2007: 21; Hayes 2008: 31.} in the Maeander region sees Ephesus jumping on the bandwagon of the great sigillatas, something which Athens as we know does not accomplish.\footnote{Proto-ESB (a fore-runner of proper ESB) found on Delos and dated to before 69 BC, imitates ESA shapes. Hayes 2008: 31.} This is another indication that Athens now was not a trend-
setter anymore; it had become a follower rather than a leader when it came to ceramic production and consumption. Ephesus on the contrary was moving in another direction.

**VIII.4.2 The Context**

In previous chapters the relationship between tableware, economy and society has been made abundantly clear. We have, for example, seen this when discussing the differences between Athens and New Halos (chapter IV) or when comparing the tableware repertoires of Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos (chapters V, VI and VII). If we want to understand the observed differences between Athens and Ephesus and through the tableware repertoires of these two sites, the differences in tableware distribution more generally between Hellenistic Greece and Asia Minor, then we also need to understand the economic and societal context in which producers and consumers operated. The current section therefore addresses to what extent Hellenistic Greece and Asia Minor were subjected to different socio-economic and geo-political processes. The question if and how these processes could have affected the production and consumption of tableware will be at the forefront of the discussion. Were Hellenistic Greece and Asia Minor, in particular Athens and Ephesus subjected to different socio-economic and geopolitical processes which might have affected the outlook of the tableware repertoire and helped shape local choices?

Politically, Athens during the Hellenistic period was but a shadow of its former self. Its overseas territories were almost all lost and its last proud remainder the navy was decisively defeated during the struggles with the Macedonians after Alexander’s death. Athens no longer ruled the waves and needed to resort more and more to placating foreign rulers, in particular those of the Bosporus, to ensure an adequate supply of grain. It also became clear during the 3rd century BC that Athens no longer was a match for the new monarchies. On land its troops could not defend the city and countryside and the Piraeus was lost for a considerable period to a Macedonian occupation force. These disasters from an Athenian perspective undoubtedly had an economic effect and there is evidence that Athenian finances were in disarray and

---

needed to be rebuilt.\textsuperscript{988} The obsession with the food supply illustrates the difficulty in maintaining trade links during times of political upheaval and Macedonian enmity.

Whereas Athens was politically marginalized during the Hellenistic period. Western Asia Minor and the Hellenistic East became as we have seen much more important both politically and economically during the course of the Hellenistic period, the result of the opening up of the former Persian Empire to the ‘Greek’ world and the establishment of ‘Greek’ and Macedonian monarchies in the East. Important new centres such as Alexandria and Antioch are established and Pergamum establishes itself, through the course of the Hellenistic period, as a major power player in Asia Minor and beyond.\textsuperscript{989} Under the tutelage of Rome\textsuperscript{990} Pergamum rises to be the dominant power in Asia Minor, an ascendancy which appears to have economic consequences as well. The production and export of ESC is undoubtedly partly related to the new possibilities offered by the prospect of empire (see above). The artisanal output of the city is also notable particularly its innovative character in relation to tableware production.\textsuperscript{991}

The economic importance of Western Asia Minor is underscored by the many Romans and Italians that settled on its shores.\textsuperscript{992} At Ephesus in particular many settled as evidenced by their slaughter instigated on the orders of king Mithridates of Pontus.\textsuperscript{993} Though resented locally, the presence of Romans and Italians in the ‘Greek’ East is evidence for the significant economic opportunities that offered themselves to enterprising individuals. The production of ESB in the Maeander region has, for example, been connected with Italian potters.\textsuperscript{994} The rise of Delos in the later Hellenistic period further underscores the importance of the Eastern trade. Many Italians and traders from elsewhere have been reported on the island.\textsuperscript{995} Contacts between West and East increased even more when in 133 BC, the Pergamene kingdom

\textsuperscript{988} Habicht 1997; Oliver 2007: 194-196.
\textsuperscript{989} See Evans 2012.
\textsuperscript{991} E.g. Rogl 2007 who describes the Pergamene influence upon Ephesus.
\textsuperscript{992} See Sherk 1984: 59, 85, 93.
\textsuperscript{995} Rauh 1993; Bes 2007: 105-106; Rathbone 2007: 314.
became the Roman province of Asia, with eventually Ephesus as its capital. The Roman administrative focus on Ephesus instead of Pergamum is perhaps illustrative for this development. Because of direct Roman control the new province of Asia would naturally be orientated towards the Italy and the West. Ephesus was of course ideally suited to facilitate such connections as this important harbour had both excellent communications with the Anatolian hinterland and was strategically located to tap into coastal traffic meandering along the shores of Asia Minor. Both changed political and economic circumstances thus probably facilitated the increasing importance of Ephesus during the latter part of the Hellenistic period.

Coming back to Athens, it should be noted that the Hellenistic period was not all bad for the city. Athens rather adapted to changed circumstances just like the other poleis and communities of the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean. In terms of economics Athens did of course still possess the harbour of Piraeus, which became even more important for West-East trade activities once Corinth was removed from the equation. Athens of course did also still possess considerable cultural credit in the eyes of the ‘Greek’ and Roman world and attracted considerable interest of Hellenistic kings and Roman politicians. We have also seen that Athenian tableware produced until the 2nd century BC is widespread (in terms of morphology) throughout the Aegean illustrating the embeddedness of the city within wider patterns of interaction and consumption. Though no longer supplying large numbers of tableware to communities elsewhere, there clearly existed something of an Atticizing cultural koine of tableware production and consumption. Producers and consumers within this koine were at least partly and perhaps incompletely, aware of what other members where doing in terms of ceramic production and consumption. The fact that most of these shapes are attested among the material from the Athenian Agora highlights the pivotal role that Athens played within such a framework.

996 For the pottery evidence see Patterson 2001: 373; Martin 2006: 175-176; Lawall 2006: 272; Bezecky 2004: 85.
999 See Habicht 1990, 1992; Raubitschek 1946.
There is evidence, however, that Athenian elites realized that traditional values and conceptions were of little use in this new world. Vogeikoff-Brogan\textsuperscript{1000} has illustrated that Athenian elites transformed themselves from landowners to merchants. This shift led to increasing external contacts, particularly with the Roman West. The new elite adopted Italian fashions of metal plate and these in turn were locally imitated in ceramic.\textsuperscript{1001} Choices resulting from changed geo-political and socio-economic conditions thus are reflected in the production and consumption of tableware at Athens during the late Hellenistic period. Athens of course also controlled Delos and the Athenian families’ active on the island became important politically at home.\textsuperscript{1002} The acquisition of Delos thus substantially benefited the Athenian economy, the fruits of which were undone by the sacking of both Athens and Delos during the Mithridatic wars.\textsuperscript{1003} Athens continued economic importance during the late Hellenistic period can also be gauged from work done on its amphorae by Lawall. In the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC more Western amphorae are reaching the city while imports from Knidos do also arrive in bulk.\textsuperscript{1004} The evidence therefore continues to support the image of an active city, an important market centre, with contacts both to the East and West.

The story of Athens and Ephesus is thus the story of two cities both of considerable economic importance and key nodes in Hellenistic networks of exchange and interaction. One is, however, slowly declining in importance while the other’s fortunes are steadily on the rise. Did these developments have an effect upon the tableware repertoire utilized at both sites and the choices made in this regard? We have already seen that at Athens changed economic circumstances did indeed indirectly affect the composition of the ceramic repertoire with Italian inspired imitations of metal ware attested during the late Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{1005} The substantial differences between the Athenian and Ephesian repertoire pre-150 BC point to different choices in this respect, but perhaps also to different options and opportunities. Furthermore would Athenian and Ephesian producers and consumers

\textsuperscript{1000} 2000: 326.
\textsuperscript{1001} Vogeikoff-Brogan 2000: 326.
\textsuperscript{1002} Tracy 1979: 213-215.
\textsuperscript{1003} Habicht 1997: 224, 259; Vestergaard 2000: 98.
\textsuperscript{1004} Lawall 2005: 213-214.
\textsuperscript{1005} See Vogeikoff-Brogan 2000.
have been familiar with the tableware repertoires utilized at both sites? The morphological links between the two communities suggests that there probably existed a general sense of what was current and in fashion. The differences between Athens and Ephesus should also not be exaggerated as the shapes popular at both sites adhere to similar trends in tableware production and consumption. How much importance, for example, did ancient consumers give to the different varieties of the Hellenistic kantharos? Possibly we are dealing here solely with local or regional traditions of manufacture.

**VIII.4.3 Aegean Differences, Local Choices**

In chapter V it has been argued that the Ephesian pottery ‘industry’ comes into its own during the course of the 3rd century BC. Athenian influence on the tableware repertoire had waned somewhat and shapes were developed in new directions. As we have seen, the development of the Hellenistic s-shaped kantharos is a good example of this process and so is the popularity of the plate with broad rim, initially inspired by Attic models.\(^{1006}\) Decorating by means of the West Slope technique also deviates from established Athenian practices after the second half of the 3rd century BC.\(^{1007}\) Why is this happening? Why is Ephesus, a community presumably well connected to Aegean networks of trade and exchange, especially during the latter part of the Hellenistic period, focusing on a tableware assemblage that appears very regionally specific and has let go direct Attic inspiration?

Part of the answer must be that Athenian pottery exports abated during the late 4th – early 3rd century BC. There was thus much less direct Attic influence upon local tableware repertoires. However, it is likely that both potters and consumers were not completely oblivious to major ceramic trends of tableware production and consumption. We have indeed seen that some of the most popular shapes identified at the Athenian Agora were widely distributed, which as argued previously surely must have meant that at least some sort of general awareness of these vessels must have existed among Ephesian producers and consumers. This is also evidenced by the spread of the popularity of the mouldmade bowl to Ephesus and Asia Minor. Clearly both producers and consumers had become aware of this new Athenian invention.

\(^{1006}\) For the respective shapes Gassner 1997 and Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991.

\(^{1007}\) Rotroff 2002: 98.
Significantly no large amount of imported Attic mouldmade bowls has been identified on Hellenistic sites in Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{1008} This indicates that morphological knowledge spread freely and was not reliant upon large scale extra-regional movements of tableware. The s-shaped kantharos similarly was a variant of the Attic baggy kantharos. Its popular occurrence in Western Asia Minor demonstrates that fashions from other areas could be locally adapted and transformed. A general awareness of tableware trends and fashions therefore appeared to have existed. The choice for a different morphological repertoire therefore cannot solely be attributed to a fall-off in Attic imports.

We have to remember, however, that during the 280s BC an important moment of change took place in the history of Ephesus. The city is transferred to a new location by Lysimachus. What is more, not only was the city transferred, it was also forced into a \textit{synoecism} with a host of surrounding communities.\textsuperscript{1009} We know there was quite a lot of resistance to this move by Lysimachus. Ephesian citizens were as reluctant to move as the citizens of the communities selected for the \textit{synoecism} were to give up their local identities. Lysimachus needed to use forceful persuasion to convince the participants of his views. The new community was now styled Arsinoe.\textsuperscript{1010} Is it possible that the noted changes in the tableware assemblage during the course of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC and ceramically the move away from Athens can be related to the construction of a new civic identity resulting from Lysimachus machinations? Then again, this morphological repertoire was not specific to Ephesus but shared similarities with other sites on Asia Minor’s West Coast as we have seen.

The ceramic links with Ilion, Pergamum and Sardis illustrate that ceramic production and consumption had matured more widely in Asia Minor since the middle of the 3rd century BC. Both Athens and Ephesus moved away from the ‘old’ late Classical tableware repertoire but they did so in different ways. This suggests perhaps the increasing importance and self-awareness of western Asia Minor during the Hellenistic period. No longer was it the Eastern border for the ‘Greek’ world, it now had become the centre. This increasing self-awareness in the opinion of the author is

\textsuperscript{1008} Bilde 1993: 196-197.
\textsuperscript{1009} Knibbe 1998: 93-94.
\textsuperscript{1010} See Davies 2011; Knibbe 1998.
reflected in the tableware assemblage. Producers and consumers no longer solely looked towards Athens for ceramic inspiration as they had done previously. Local and regional developments now took precedence resulting in the great popularity of s-shaped kantharoi, skypoid kantharoi and West Slope beakers plus the development of an own brand of West Slope style decoration. All are examples of the importance of regional traditions of manufacture based within a more general koine of Hellenistic material culture.

The tableware evidence from Athens indicates that the city remained embedded within more widely shared traditions of tableware manufacture and consumption. Despite obvious geo-political and socio-economic problems Athens remained a central node within a Hellenistic ceramic koine. As we have seen its political and economic problems did not lead to an inability to tap into or take a lead in, widely shared tableware trends. Most parallels to the Athenian repertoire are, however, to be found in Greece and Macedon, illustrating indeed that Asia Minor and Athens (mainland Greece) had parted ways. Direct Athenian influence, in the form of overseas possessions and large scale export of pottery had disappeared and within these circumstances a maturing of local or regional productions can be observed.

Following on from the mid/late 3rd century BC change in the tableware repertoire, which sees the replacement of Classical shapes by Hellenistic inventions (see above, chapters V and VII), a sense of continuity can be observed. Both at Athens and Ephesus the only major change as we have seen, is the introduction of the mouldmade bowl. This shape signifies a preference for hemispherical and mastoid cups without handles or feet. Whereas previously the ceramic repertoires of Athens and Ephesus had been on a different course, now they seem to converge again. The preference for hemispherical and conical cups spreads throughout the Aegean area and beyond.\(^{1011}\) West Slope kantharoi and skyphoi disappear or decrease significantly in popularity as we have seen. It has been pointed out as well (see chapter 3 and above) that it took some time before mouldmade bowls became popular within Athens and Western Asia Minor judging by the primarily second half 2nd century BC dating of examples attested among our case-study material. Initially therefore, Athens

\(^{1011}\) See Van der Enden et al in press a; Bilde 1993.
and Ephesus continued along different local or regional trajectories. This is not only true for the mouldmade bowl but also refers to the cup with interior decoration. A shape which at Athens originated ca. 275 BC but only became very popular at Ephesus during the 2nd century BC. This developmental trajectory emphasizes the traditional outlook of Ephesian producers and consumers but also illustrates that shapes first needed to become sufficiently popular to be noticed by other areas and communities. Ephesian choices in this case were both shaped by availability and local preferences.

Why do Athens and Ephesus in terms of ceramic production and consumption draw nearer to each other during the 2nd century BC? We have already mentioned the greater political and possibly economic integration of the Eastern Mediterranean as a (indirect) result of Roman activities and the increasing political unity that it brought. As the old Hellenistic monarchies gave way, evidence suggests that a more connected Eastern Mediterranean was born.1012 We have seen that during the second half of the 2nd century BC for the first time since the break-off in Attic exports, tableware is moved in larger quantities across and beyond regions.1013 The export and import of Ephesian mouldmade bowls, Knidian two-handled cups, grey ware, unguentaria, ESA and ESC are all examples of this climate of increased connectivity and economic opportunity, judging from the tableware evidence.

We have previously argued that Athenian and Ephesian consumers would mostly likely have had a general awareness of more widely shared trends in the production and consumption of tableware. This is evidenced indeed in the general morphological and decorative links that connected the two communities. The preference for hemispherical and conical cups in ceramic, glass and metal plate1014 which manifest itself during the 2nd century BC, indeed the almost sole focus of local repertoires upon these shapes at Athens and Ephesus but also elsewhere suggests, however, the existence of a much closer material template for drinking activities during the latter part of the Hellenistic period. It appears that we are observing a converging of tableware tastes and values which possibly relates to the increased integration of the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean. Perhaps we see here the

1013 See Bes 2007 for overview.
1014 See van der Enden et al in press a.
beginnings of a more international Hellenistic culture of consumption. Vogeikoff-Brogan\textsuperscript{1015} has already hinted at such a culture for Athenian elites.\textsuperscript{1016} It is possible that local elites, as Poblome has argued in the context of SRSW, were involved in the production process of tableware\textsuperscript{1017} and as such may have provided the morphological models, drawn from the most likely predominantly metal plate repertoire they themselves utilised, for ceramic production and consumption.

Drinking was the arena upon which the development just outlined was focussed. The dining repertoire of Athens and Ephesus continues to shows local disparities in morphology. This gives us an insight into ancient priorities and ideas about conspicuous consumption, especially in non-elite contexts. The upturned rim plate was, for example, scarcely attested at Ephesus. The same can be said for the rolled rim plate. At Ephesus equally we have seen that local food consumption shapes hardly paralleled elsewhere were most popular. It follows from these observations that dining may for some reason have been in less of a need for the use of an ‘internationalized’ shape repertoire during the latter part of the Hellenistic period. This may reflect contemporary attitudes towards consumption and display. Clearly drinking appears to have been the activity deemed more worthy of attention and uniformization.

**VIII.4.3.1 Differing Fortunes**

A key moment within the late Hellenistic history of Athens was the sack of the city by the Roman general Sulla in 86 BC.\textsuperscript{1018} The Roman attack appears to have dealt a severe blow to the Athenian ceramic industry.\textsuperscript{1019} It is reported that the quality of local or regional Attic ceramic production now significantly declines and that imports become more important.\textsuperscript{1020} Such a tragedy did not befall Ephesus, which somehow appeared relatively unscathed from its involvement with Mithridates and the subsequent Roman civil wars.\textsuperscript{1021} Local tableware production remained strong (see appendix 1.3.3) and

\textsuperscript{1015} 2000: 326.
\textsuperscript{1016} See van der Enden et al in press a for a case-study of the Hellenistic mastos, a shape with good parallels in metal plate and glass.
\textsuperscript{1017} See Poblome 2006; Poblome et al 2002.
\textsuperscript{1018} Habicht 1997; Rotroff 1997a: 34-35.
\textsuperscript{1019} Rotroff 1997a: 10.
\textsuperscript{1020} See Rotroff 1997a: 11-12.
\textsuperscript{1021} Knibbe 1998: 104-105.
imports are only sparingly attested. Little Italian influence is as we have seen visible in the tableware repertoire, despite the large number of Italian inhabitants recorded at Ephesus.\footnote{Ephesian and Asia Minor trade may have suffered from the Mithridatic wars. Bilde 1993: 206.}

The scarceness of tableware imports at Ephesus, the continued export of Ephesian products, the production of ESB and the city’s ability to function within networks of tableware distribution, as evidenced by the imports that did arrive, all signal that in terms of ceramic production, distribution and consumption, Ephesus was a power player. Though it is clear that Athens continued to be connected to the outside world, as attested by the arrival of tableware imports (appendix 1.6.1.table 44-45) local potters and consumers may have been constrained by a general economic malaise, possibly the result of the sack of the city by Sulla. Investment in the ceramic craft as evidenced by the establishment of ESB potting facilities in the Maeander valley are not attested and Rotroff\footnote{1997b.} has shown that up until the time of Tiberius the Athenian tableware repertoire remains relatively stable in outlook. From being a leader, Athens had become a follower.

**VIII.4.3.2 From Ephesus to Athens**

Athenian influence upon the Ephesian ceramic repertoire has been documented. Despite its position as an emporium and having a vigorous ceramic industry Ephesian tableware products or ideas do not seem to have arrived at Athens. Instead, influences went primarily the other way, especially during the early Hellenistic period but also with regards to the introduction of the mouldmade bowl in the late 3rd century BC and possibly also the cup with interior decoration. Why is this?

During the Hellenistic and Roman periods Athens remained, despite losing its political and economic hegemony, the most important cultural and educative centre of the ‘Greek’ world.\footnote{Habicht 1997: 5; Engberg-Pederson 1993: 287-288.} In Western Asia Minor only Pergamum could rival somewhat this reputation.\footnote{See Kuttner 1995.} Both Athens and Pergamum had an important impact upon tableware production in the Hellenistic period, one that is well-documented and to which has been referred extensively in the above. Pergamene influences have indeed been
attested at Ephesus during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC. It is in this context interesting to mention that ESA came most likely from the Antioch region, another of the great centres of the Hellenistic world. Ephesus was indeed a great emporium but not known as cultural centre on the level of Athens, Pergamum, Alexandria or Antioch.

For (Western) Asia Minor at least Pergamum becomes the most important cultural centre during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC a development which goes hand in hand with the increasing geo-political and economic importance of Western Asia Minor. The subsequent popularity of the mouldmade bowl does, however, show that during the late 3rd century BC Athens was still a focal point from which material (cultural) innovations could spread. Cultural pull factors combined with economic push factors ensured that local trends and fashions found wide acceptance and imitation. A community such as Ephesus may have lacked the cultural pull factors during the Hellenistic period, necessary to ensure that local trends or fashions and preferences found wide acceptance and imitation. This observation illustrates that the spread of tableware trends, innovations and fashions did not solely depend upon a site’s economic position, power or indeed presence of a capable ceramic industry. Tableware was a cultural product and as such made subject to various cultural and socio-economic associations.

VIII.4.4 Points of Contact
This research has clearly sketched the importance of context, the geo-political and socio-economic background of different communities, in relation to the choices open to and made by producers, distributors and consumers of tableware. Within regional and extra-regional networks of interaction sites like Athens and Ephesus played a key role with regards to product and information exchange. Because of their important position within networks of trade and interaction communities like Athens or Ephesus would have had greater information access and as such local producers and consumers of tableware potentially had more options open to them in relation to sites lacking such a favourable position. It is through sites like, for example, Athens, Ephesus or

---

1026 E.g. by Rogl 2007.
Pergamum, that developments in tableware production and consumption spread outwards. Communities like Ilion, Gordion or Sagalassos most likely had few direct extra-regional trade connections. Interaction was possibly conducted along the lines of certain nodal points in networks of contact spanning the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean.

Athens, Ephesus and Pergamum have already been mentioned as points of contacts, centres where Aegean interaction converged and fanned outwards. Other obvious major sites in this respect are Corinth, Demetrias, Pergamum, Antioch (through Seleucia Pieria) and Alexandria. We should not imagine, however, that contacts between these sites, for example, Corinth and Alexandria occurred always or predominantly directly. Ancient seafaring was a dangerous enterprise and followed established routes which brought merchant ships to many ports along the way. The nature of ancient seafaring made it necessary that ships sought the safety of a harbour frequently to replenish supplies and seek shelter from the elements. A ship making its way from Athens to Ephesus would therefore potentially call at many ports along its projected route, in which it could have sold part of its cargo or added to it.\textsuperscript{1028} Sites located along established seafaring routes where thus automatically better positioned to tap into the trade passing along its shores. The distribution of ESA\textsuperscript{1029} indeed gives us a clear insight in the workings of this process. From its distribution, it is clear that ESA primarily hugged the shores and that merchants sold their wares to communities encountered along the way.

The distributive function of commercial \textit{entrepots} primarily impacted sites located further inland and not connected to the sea or sites located away from the main trade routes. Ilion, for example, would possibly have been only indirectly connected to trade routes hugging the South Western shores of Western Asia Minor, perhaps through Ephesus. Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos naturally relied upon such centres for the acquisition of extra regional tableware products. The few Attic pieces attested at Sagalassos were most likely not produced at Athens specifically for the Sagalassian market. It is more probable that these products arrived at the site by means of redistribution. When dealing with such a limited amount of imports, it seems

\textsuperscript{1028} See Davis 2009: 160, 238, 240.
\textsuperscript{1029} See Bes 2007.
likely that they arrived not because of a specific or sustained demand but more as a side-effect of regional interaction in which these products trickled in on the back of more sustainable economic interactions. The few Pergamene imports identified at Sagalassos similarly are an example of such economic interaction.

It is worthwhile in this context to consider briefly the Attic imports attested at New Halos. Does the presence of Attic tableware at New Halos reflect direct economic interaction between this Thessalian community and Athens? I suspect not. Interestingly, however, at New Halos we have seen that Attic imports of the bolsal, an antiquated shaped still popular locally, have been attested. This suggests that Athenian potters fabricated and distributed a ceramic vessel which was not popular anymore within Athens itself. This indicates that potters and distributors were familiar with local or regional preferences. The same applies to the deeper Attic fishplates attested at New Halos (see chapter IV).

Similarly we have seen that at Gordion Attic or Atticizing imports conform to shapes which could function very well within the local tableware repertoire fulfilling a similar function as indigenous shapes. Again this suggests that potters or distributors were aware what was going on locally or regionally. Whether potters and distributors possessed accurate real-life information or this pattern resulted from trial and error remains to be seen. It is most probable that we are dealing with a system of trial and error. Tableware was sent out along with other products and sold at the final destination, along the way or both. In such a manner producers and distributors would get an idea of what sold and what not, repeating the experience with the next voyage, perhaps also increasing the quantities, adding new products and leaving out what was not desired. The Atticizing tableware of Gordion is thought to have come mostly from the Black Sea region\textsuperscript{1030} and is thought to be a proxy for other more perishable products.\textsuperscript{1031} This suggest that instead of having real time information about the local needs and preferences of Gordian consumers, Black Sea potters or merchants dealing in Atticizing tableware would over time figure out which vessels were locally or regionally preferred and thus worthwhile to concentrate on.

\textsuperscript{1030} Stewart 2010: 84.
\textsuperscript{1031} Stewart 2010: 90.
The larger urban hubs most likely functioned as points of arrival and departure both of information and products, something which is demonstrated in relation to tableware by the varied and cosmopolitan assemblages present at such sites. It was towards such urban hubs that, for example, amphorae exporters like Rhodes or Knidos where focussed.\textsuperscript{1032} Urban hubs thus attracted significant volumes of economic activity and information exchange and were the primary means by which tableware imports and innovations fanned outwards regionally, especially with respect to landlocked areas. The tableware repertoires attested at these urban hubs thus hold the key in understanding regional change. What was accepted at such sites was more likely to influence regional production and consumption than what was rejected. Seeing the larger urban hubs as points of economic and cultural interaction thus helps us in addressing the differences between various Hellenistic sites in Greece and Asia Minor.

We have seen that Ilion appears to have been influenced to a large extent in terms of ceramic production and consumption by Pergamum with which it shares similarities in West Slope style decorating, s-shaped kantharoi and ESC. Non-ESC Pergamene products have also been identified (see chapter V). It seems clear that Ilion during the later Hellenistic period was primarily looking towards Pergamum\textsuperscript{1033} which therefore served as the site’s connection to wider Hellenistic trends in tableware production and consumption. Alexandria Troas may similarly have fulfilled such a role, although we have no archaeological evidence to back up such a supposition.

Sardis, an important economic centre in its own right, had from the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC (as we have seen) a tableware repertoire that connects well with contemporary material identified at Pergamum and Ephesus. Though local production is attested and Sardis was an important centre of artisanal manufacture, information about new trends and fashions would most likely have come via connections with both Ephesus and Pergamum, two of the most important ceramic centres in the wider region and via the road network linked with Sardis. As an inland community Sardis probably depended upon connections with important urban hubs such as Ephesus and Pergamum to stay in contact with wider cross-Aegean ceramic trends. We have seen that mouldmade bowls and West Slope style decorating at Sardis are very much

\textsuperscript{1032} See Lawall 2005.
\textsuperscript{1033} See Berlin 1999a.
influenced by what was happening at Pergamum. Mastoi after Pergamene models are also identified. The presence of large numbers of Pergamene sigillata and applique ware is another prime example of how the Sardian tableware repertoire was impacted by the former Attalid capital.

Equally Stewart has suggested that Gordion may have depended upon Heraclea Pontica for access to ‘Greek’ style pottery.\textsuperscript{1034} It is furthermore suggested by Stewart that Rhodian amphorae may have arrived at the site via Pergamum. Both Pergamum and Heraclea Pontica were important urban hubs, the latter especially important in relation to Black Sea trade with the Aegean.\textsuperscript{1035} The evidence from Gordion thus appears to suggest that in terms of the acquisition of ‘Greek’ tableware in particular and other products such as, for example, wine amphorae, Gordion was particularly positioned towards certain communities.

For Hellenistic Sagalassos, it has proven more difficult to pinpoint specific places of ceramic inspiration and connection. Producers and consumers showed a general awareness of, for example, the preference for conical and hemispherical cups during the later Hellenistic period but the attested ceramic repertoire only displays cursory connections with sites elsewhere. This may be a reflection of the fact that Sagalassos was not terribly well-positioned to tap into important existing trade routes or avenues of interaction. Perched on the flank of a mountain far removed from the sea, the site was somewhat difficult to access. The most obvious links are with material identified on Cyprus and in the Levant. Again it seems unlikely that producers of tableware in Antioch or Paphos were directly producing or influencing the Sagalassian market. Connections would have been more indirect, as is evidenced by the general and cursory nature of the observed similarities. Harbour sites like Side and Aspendos would most likely have served as points of contact between extra-regional or regional and local networks of exchange and interaction.\textsuperscript{1036} That the ability to tap into these networks was important is illustrated, however, by the different tableware repertoire identified at Kosluca (see chapter VI) which provides a somewhat different picture

\textsuperscript{1034} Stewart 2010: 84.
\textsuperscript{1035} Burstein 1976: 5, 26.
\textsuperscript{1036} The importance of these coastal communities is underscored by the fact that Attalus II, having failed to get under his control either Side or Aspendos restorted to the establishment of an Attalid coastal colony named Attaleia. Waelkens 2004: 446.
than attested for Sagalassos and also Tepe Düzen. As an inland community, however, Kosluca also would have depended upon external connections providing information about the latest trends in tableware production and consumption. It is likely that this information exchange resulted from (regular) economic interaction with hubs of regional significance.

The material from New Halos finally makes a similar point in that it is heavily influenced by Attic traditions of manufacture (see chapter IV). Such traditions had, however, become common knowledge within mainland Greece and elsewhere as we have seen, but the introduction of new contemporary Athenian vessels and the local or regional production of shapes that copy Athenian pottery of the late 4th/early 3rd century BC illustrates that a clear Athenian focus is visible. Whether or not the imports and/or information arrived directly via Athens or through an inter-mediator, the Athenian influences upon the local or regional tableware repertoire of New Halos illustrate the importance of sites like Athens in feeding smaller scale communities with information about new tableware trends and fashions.

VIII.4.5 Tableware Practices
Economic interaction and exchange with regards to tableware production and consumption has been amply discussed in the previous sections. Below the way in which tableware was used and its role within the societies considered are the subject of our attention. We have already touched upon this topic in previous chapters but below we will focus on a comparison between Hellenistic Greece (the ‘old’ world) and Hellenistic Asia Minor (the ‘new’ world). The main question of the final section of this work is the following; can we detect by means of the tableware repertoire differences in behaviour between Athens and Ephesus?

In terms of the configuration of the beverage and dining repertoire it appears on the basis of the available evidence that there are no clear cut differences between Athens and Ephesus. Both communities appear to have favoured formal dining based around individual plate settings. We have seen that at Athens the rolled rim plate and fishplate were particularly popular to which were added outturned rim, echinus bowl and saucer. At Ephesus we see the occurrence of the popular plate with broad rim to which were also added the echinus and outturned rim bowl. The concepts of dining
thus appear to have been similar and are perhaps indicative for a comparable type of cuisine although this cannot be established. With regards to drinking, a comparable set of vessels has also been identified. Drinking indeed appears at both sites to have played a very important role, which confirms to both archaeological and historical evidence concerning the importance of drinking in the ‘Greek’ world. Both Athens and Ephesus thus appear to have had shared values in drinking and dining settings.

How do the observed Athenian and Ephesian behaviours reflect upon the other sites considered in this work? It has become clear that the observed tableware repertoires at New Halos, Ilion, Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos represent in part behavioural differences with Athens and Ephesus. Gordion represents the clearest case but Sardis and even Ilion display important differences as well. What is important to stress here, is first of all, that the use of similar vessels did not necessitate similar tableware practices as has been illustrated by Berlin\textsuperscript{1037} for Ilion and Stewart\textsuperscript{1038} for Gordion. In comparison with Ephesus both sites display a dissimilar use of the same familiar tableware vessels. Local identities and traditions were negotiated and made visible within the everyday needs of the tableware repertoire. We have seen this also at New Halos\textsuperscript{1039} and Sardis.\textsuperscript{1040} The functional unity displayed between Athens and Ephesus is thus not replicated at the other sites considered in this work. Not only did sites like Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos display different shapes, they also ate and dined differently. As eating and drinking are important social activities, the choice for a certain repertoire and ways of dining are important markers of identity and status. As we have seen Berlin\textsuperscript{1041} has suggested as much for Ilion, which though utilizing ‘Greek’ shapes displays distinct preferences in the way the tableware repertoire was set up and functioned.

\textbf{VIII.5 Conclusions}

This chapter has demonstrated how Athens and Ephesus during the Hellenistic period were making different choices with regards to the production and consumption of ceramic tableware. Different choices are especially apparent during the early
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Hellenistic period but can also be pointed out in later Hellenistic times. We have seen how Ephesus moves away from Athens ceramically speaking during the first half of the 3rd century BC and acquires a ceramic identity which is rooted in local and regional traditions of manufacture and consumption. Seen in context, this regionalization of the Ephesian tableware repertoire illustrates; as argued before the increasing self-awareness of a region which during the Hellenistic period increases significantly in importance and as a result the community was making different choices, choices which start to make sense when viewed in the associated local contexts.

While initially drifting apart, we have seen that with regards to drinking, since the late 3rd century BC and especially during the 2nd century BC Athens and Ephesus in general resemble each other more and more in terms of the repertoire utilized. The use of mouldmade bowls and other handleless cups became widespread at both sites and also elsewhere in the Hellenistic East. In terms of behaviour, this reflects an increasing homogeneity of drinking practices. Though Athens apparently took the lead in the development of the mouldmade bowl in ceramic, it is argued that its popularity elsewhere and similarly that of handleless cups reflects the existence of an international elite culture of drinking during the latter part of the Hellenistic period. The widespread choice for the ceramic versions of the mouldmade bowl and handleless cups is thus a conscious reflection of this development; a development facilitated by the increasing integration of the Hellenistic world made possible in part by Roman political activity. It is perhaps no coincidence that mouldmade bowls and handleless cups are most popular throughout the Hellenistic world during the second part of the 2nd century BC, when Rome had obtained a definite foothold in the East and evidence for extra-regional movement of tableware is again visible. The commercial island of Delos, where many Ephesian mouldmade bowls have been attested, is a good example of how increasing commercial contacts facilitated the spread and demand of new fashions and trends. Wealthy traders or patrons on Athens and Delos would most likely have used vessels similar to mouldmade bowls and handleless cups in precious metal plate or glass rather than ceramic. The increasing commercial interest of local

1043 Bilde 1993: 200-201.
elites\textsuperscript{1044} facilitated the spread of a similar drinking repertoire as evidenced by the widespread occurrence of mouldmade bowls and handleless cups. Interestingly, this uniformization seems only to hold true for vessels associated with drinking and not for the dining repertoire, which as suggested may reflect the social importance in the ‘Greek’ world given to drinking.

It has furthermore been argued in this chapter that sites like Athens and Ephesus enable new tableware trends and fashions to filter through to other, lower scale communities. As such both Athens and Ephesus served as points of contact connecting a varied spectrum of sites with a shared corpus of material culture. Above all, this chapter has demonstrated that the varied tableware distribution patterns of Athens and New Halos, Hellenistic Greece and Asia Minor, can only be accessed with reference to human agency. It is humans making decisions, within certain contextual limitations, that were responsible for the observed patterning in the data. It is only with reference to these decisions therefore that we can approach a better understanding and appreciation of tableware distribution patterns in the archaeological record.

\textsuperscript{1044} See e.g. Vogeikoff-Brogan 2000.
Chapter IX: Conclusions

This research has employed an agency-based approach to the study of Hellenistic ceramics and aimed to facilitate a greater understanding of the varied engagement of different Hellenistic communities with a particular type of material culture: tableware. This work has shown that the observed differences in tableware production and consumption between Athens, New Halos, Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos are not coincidental but result from individuals, groups, and communities making varied, highly contextualized choices. Indeed, the term community,\textsuperscript{1045} often employed throughout this work, is certainly not meant to indicate that all the inhabitants of, for example, Sagalassos thought or wanted the same. Reference to the term community or a site as a whole is meant as a shorthand because pottery very rarely allows us to talk about the choices of identifiable individuals or families or groups. We can usually only generalize about communities and their activities.

An important contribution of this work is that it illustrates that the observed variety within the Eastern Hellenistic world in terms of tableware production and consumption did not result solely from patterns of economic or cultural interaction connecting, for example, a certain core with more peripheral areas. On the contrary, both producers and consumers can be seen to be making active choices, choices reflected in the tableware produced, distributed and consumed. This thesis thus focussed not solely on pottery distributions but, more vitally, engaged with the communities behind the ceramic artefacts, showing that the varied and complex tableware distribution patterns encountered in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean can only be understood with reference to the communities that used and produced these artefacts and engaged with them in locally meaningful behavioural activities.

**IX.1 Results**

This research has discussed Hellenistic tableware from Athens, New Halos, Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos. Hellenistic tableware from these case-studies was systematically collected and utilized to acquire an overview of patterns of tableware distributions focussing in particular on the differences and similarities

\textsuperscript{1045} Or site.
between the sites considered. The latter were specifically chosen to represent some of the scalar variety with regards to archaeological sites visible in Aegean Greece and Western Asia Minor during the Hellenistic period. The concept of human choice and action (agency theory) was subsequently employed to address the formation process of the observed tableware distribution patterns. In this respect, this study did not concern itself with archaeological site formation processes but rather focussed on the role of the consumer and the community in the creation of patterning in the collected tableware data. This innovative approach has provided valuable new perspectives on the creation and formation of archaeological distribution patterns, in particular the role and influence in this respect of the human agent. These insights are of interest not only to the field of Hellenistic pottery but carry wider significance potentially beneficial to archaeological studies of other eras and places. In this concluding section the obtained results from previous chapters will be discussed first, after which methodological and theoretical issues of wider interest and significance will be addressed.

**IX.1.1 Big Versus Small**
Chapter IV compared the Hellenistic tableware of Athens and New Halos during the early Hellenistic period. It showed that the observed tableware distribution differences between the two sites result from the specific contextual background of each individual community. The choice for tableware products was constrained by the available opportunities. Athens and New Halos unsurprisingly differed in this respect and as such their associated tableware repertoires equally display fundamental differences.

It has been demonstrated that Athens and New Halos differed profoundly when it came to the production and consumption of tableware. Athens produced most of its tableware whereas New Halos was supplied by the wider region. This would have affected the options open to contemporary consumers. Athens furthermore was in a much better position to dip into new tableware trends. This position is born out by the city’s well established ceramic industry, strategic location, external connections, demographical make-up and socio-cultural practices. Consumers at New Halos simply would not have had the same opportunities as their counterparts in Athens. Despite
this the retention of the bolsal and the preference for a particular type of fishplate, both of which can be identified as Attic imports, demonstrates that local preferences were maintained in the face of alternatives. The inhabitants of the six New Halian houses most likely had different needs. Tradition plays a role in this but also the specific contextual background of life in a more ‘provincial’ setting in which the practices of daily life differ from that in the big city.

The comparison of the tableware material of Athens and New Halos helps us not only to appreciate the different geo-political, cultural and socio-economic position of the sites in question but enables us to approach an understanding of how these elements influenced local production and consumption strategies. These aspects are vital in approaching an understanding of the formation of tableware distribution patterns. Distributional differences do not simply exist, they exist for a reason. They occur because individuals and communities make different choices but also because the latter are subjected to different opportunities.

**IX.1.2 Asia Minor**
Chapters V, VI and VII focus on Hellenistic Asia Minor, specifically upon Ilion, Ephesus, Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos. Chapter V focuses on change in local tableware repertoires and shows that ceramic change at the level of single site results from active but contextualized human choice. The tableware repertoires of Ilion, Ephesus and Sardis change because the engagement of local producers and consumers with the material culture utilized for eating and drinking practices develops and responds to new situations and opportunities. And although the choices behind the replacement of one ceramic model by another are highly contextualized, the development seen within local tableware assemblages does result from an active engagement of both producers and consumers.

At Ilion we see that the inhabitants of the lower city houses preferred tableware of an Atticizing nature and continued to do so despite regional alternatives. It can also be demonstrated that the community was clearly focussed upon Pergamum from an early stage onwards, an affiliation which substantially influenced the development of the tableware repertoire. Ephesus on the contrary displays a clear move away from Atticizing traditions of tableware manufacture and instead becomes
firmly embedded, and most likely takes a leading role in, the establishment of a new tableware sub-koine for Western Asia Minor. Ephesian food consumption vessels, however, are not widely paralleled elsewhere showing that not all elements of the tableware repertoire became part of this sub-koine. The strength of the Ephesian pottery industry allowed the city to pursue independent trajectories of manufacture and consumption. The tableware from Sardis demonstrates that before ca. 213 BC producers and consumers had little interest in ‘Greek’ shapes and dining practices. This disinterest did not result from problems or availability but reflects local or regional cultural practices. The capture of the city by Antiochus looks, however, to have heralded a change in attitude. The ceramic production of the city of Pergamum, furthermore, greatly influenced production and consumption at Sardis during the latter part of the Hellenistic period. The shifting nature of local tableware repertoires is thus non-coincidental. It involves producers and consumers responding to varying internal and external circumstances and opportunities. In this, as demonstrated in chapter V, consumers were able to make choices.

Chapter VI involved a more detailed case-study of the issues addressed in chapter V by presenting recently excavated and only partly published late Hellenistic pottery from Sagalassos, situated relatively far away from the major West Coast centres. It was shown in this chapter that late Hellenistic Sagalassos was making different choices than a contemporary Ilion, Ephesus, Pergamum, Sardis or Knidos. Clearly the community was ingrained within local or regional patterns of ceramic manufacture corresponding to deep-rooted conceptions of the practice of eating and drinking. The survival into the Hellenistic and early Roman period of a pre-Hellenistic shape such as the Achaemenid cup and the occurrence of more specifically Eastern ceramic types such as mastoid and conical cups and bowls with thickened exterior rim signifies this. On the other hand, the Sagalassian material clearly shows an awareness of more widely carried Hellenistic tableware trends and suggests that local producers and consumers were to some extent able to monitor and follow wider trends. Conical cups in particular are seen throughout Hellenistic Asia Minor during the latter part of the Hellenistic period. The Sagalassian material thus shows that Sagalassos during the latter part of the Hellenistic period was making its own choices. The city, though aware of wider trends, looked more towards the Levantine coast than to the traditional
powerhouses of Hellenistic pottery production located on the western shores of Asia Minor.

In chapter VII the data from the Asia Minor case-study sites was drawn together using network theory to facilitate a greater understanding of the observed patterning in the data. It was shown that the nodal position of a particular community within networks of interaction was vitally important with regards to the make-up of tableware distribution patterns. It was demonstrated that certain shapes and wares were widely disseminated and thus more likely to have influenced local patterns of production and consumption than shapes of decidedly local or regional orientation. The s-shaped kantharos is a good example of a shape which formed the basic ingredient of a Hellenistic ceramic koine encompassing Western Asia Minor. The Ephesian plate with beidseitig verdickte lippe was, however, a vessel restricted to Ephesus in its production. Sites that were well connected to existing networks of exchange and interaction would have had a greater chance to be influenced by and be part of, a more widely shared koine of material culture. The scale of a particular community is also an important aspect to consider in this respect. Ephesus being a large and economically important community strategically located was always more likely to share into a Hellenistic ceramic koine than sites like Gordion and Sagalassos. It was therefore again demonstrated that the differences between sites (just as in the case of Athens and New Halos) are to a large extent the result of the options open to local communities.

It was, however, also shown that local behaviours have an important part to play when it comes to accessing variation in tableware distribution patterns. A comparison of the tableware data of Athens and New Halos during the early Hellenistic period led to a similar conclusion. Differences exist not solely because communities have different opportunities but equally because they variously engage with material culture. Sardis, for example, was strategically located and well connected to the existing road network. It also had received Greek imports in substantial numbers. Despite this, no significant local demand developed for these vessels prior to the late 3rd century BC.

Chapter VII clearly illustrates that communities like Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos were aware of a wider Hellenistic ceramic koine. All sites had connections
with Asia Minor’s West Coast and saw the arrival of traditional Hellenistic shapes. They variously engaged with this material, making different choices dependant upon specific local circumstances and preferences. Consumers at early Hellenistic Sardis, for example, seem to have had little space within their drinking and dining repertoire for Hellenistic ‘Greek’ vessels whereas their counterparts at Gordion utilized selected ‘Greek’ shapes within their traditional format for dining. In Ilion’s lower city households consumers continued to use a traditional shape repertoire despite the availability of alternatives and consumers at Sagalassos clearly adhered in their preferences to widely shared morphogical notions but with a local or regional twist. Local choices deriving from local opportunities are thus key in facilitating a greater understanding of tableware distribution patterns.

IX.1.3 Regionalization and Internationalism
The penultimate chapter of this work, chapter VIII, approaches cross-Aegean variety from the perspective of Hellenistic Athens and Ephesus. Once again it becomes clear that the contextual background of a community profoundly influences the options available. Observed cross-Aegean differences (visualized in this work by means of a comparison of Athens and Ephesus during the course of the Hellenistic period) reflect varying local and regional trajectories. The outlook of the Athenian and Ephesian tableware repertoire first diverges and then converges during the latter part of the Hellenistic period. Hellenistic tableware of the 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC displays distinct morphological cross-Aegean differences. The West Coast of Asia Minor clearly developed, within a more general koine of Hellenistic tableware, its own sub-koine, characterized by shapes such as the s-shaped kantharos, skypoid kantharoi and West Slope skyphoi. It has been argued that this was the result of the increased emancipation and importance of centres of ceramic production on Asia Minor’s West Coast, a situation indicative of wider political, social, economic and cultural developments operating within the Hellenistic world. The choices open to local producers and consumers were shaped by these developments.

Athens, however, continues to exert an influence upon the production and consumption of tableware in western Asia Minor. This is especially evident during the late 3rd – early 2nd century BC when the Athenian invented mouldmade bowl starts to
become an important part of local repertoires. This development demonstrates that ceramic knowledge travelled across the Aegean without needing to rely on substantial numbers of imports. The increasing interregional contacts during the latter part of the Hellenistic period appear to have created a climate in which knowledge spread fairly rapidly. The common use of similar drinking vessels during the 2nd century BC in Athens, Ephesus and elsewhere demonstrates that local or regional tastes had converged again, and it is argued, display the existence of an international elite culture of which the ceramics in question are derivatives in a more affordable medium. The changing socio-economic and geo-political climate during the latter part of the Hellenistic period thus enabled local producers and consumers of tableware to dip into wider trends. The fact that this uniformity is not visible within the dining repertoire highlights the importance of drinking in a Hellenistic ‘Greek’ context but also the ability of producers and consumers to pick and choose. The agency of consumers is equally reflected in the observation that the use of morphologically similar vessels does not need to indicate similar tableware practices. The reverse is true as well. Morphologically different vessels do not need to indicate dissimilar tableware practices.

This research has demonstrated how various sub-koines existed within the shared commonalities of the Hellenistic ceramic world. Comparative ceramic studies allow the identification of such koines and the subtle differences between various sites and regions, differences which were on occasion actively created. It is precisely these subtle differences within and between sites that have the potential to reveal the choices of individuals and communities. By exploring the notion of koine this study offers a significant contribution to our understanding of material interaction in the Hellenistic Aegean and integrates standard assumptions about interrelationships between different sites within the notions of koine and sub-koine.

**IX.1.4 The Influence of Human Agency upon the Formation of Tableware Distribution Patterns**

This research has demonstrated the importance of human agency in relation to the formation of Hellenistic tableware distribution patterns. Not only has it been identified in this study where and when human actors actively contributed to local, regional and extra-regional variation but the contextual background of these decisions has also
been explored. Although the rationales behind human choice and action are difficult to recover from the archaeological record this thesis has made it abundantly clear that in order to approach an understanding of the formation of archaeological distribution patterns, we need to appreciate the role and influence of human agency. The presented distribution patterns only start to make sense and acquire meaning when viewed within context. A context which shaped the choices of producers and consumers. This research has also shown that human agency can never be disconnected from structure. Producers and consumers were able to make choices and take action but they only did so within parameters that made sense and were accepted within local frameworks. It is this combination that decides the shape and form of tableware distribution patterns and creates differences within and between sites.

IX.2 Methodological Considerations
Building upon previous scholarship, this research employed previously published and newly acquired ceramic data in a comparative methodological framework set up to compare and contrast the tableware data of a number of different case-study sites. By making use of the existing published record, referred to as legacy data, this research provides an innovative approach to the study of Hellenistic tableware, enabling the raising and formulation of new questions and answers.

IX.2.1 Legacy Data
In the world of Hellenistic tableware research the full potential of legacy data is often not fully explored. Studies of Hellenistic pottery most commonly utilize previously published material from the same site or elsewhere, to frame discussions of chronological and morphological developments. Although the use of legacy data in this respect is vitally important, the human behaviour and choices that lie behind the artefact are rarely explored to the full. This research, however, has shown that the current body of available published material provides an ideal platform to contrast and compare human behaviours and choices as reflected by the distribution of Hellenistic ceramics. The many excellent ceramic site overviews currently in existence, the result of the gradual building up of local typologies and chronologies, provide windows into a

---

human engagement with material culture. By viewing Hellenistic tableware as material culture, this research was able to expand upon the body of Hellenistic pottery publications and ask new questions by integrating ceramic legacy data in a critically informed manner within a research framework addressing contemporary issues, such as the influence of human choice and action (agency).

The importance of legacy data cannot be overstated. Extensive research on many a Hellenistic site throughout the Eastern Mediterranean has built-up a substantial published record of ceramic activity throughout the Hellenistic world, creating a record not only of local typologies but equally of local behaviours. The road is thus open to compare and contrast the ceramic output of different sites, not as ceramic artefacts per se but as expression of human behaviours. One of the primary aims and necessities of this research was indeed to find a successful method to facilitate the critical integration and comparison of ceramic legacy data pertaining to the Hellenistic period.

This research has devised an innovative methodology which focussed on a comparison of various individual sites across varying analytical scales. It has been demonstrated that sites and archaeological deposits can be meaningfully compared when the associated ceramic tableware data is systematically collected and stored. The ICRATES database system, an online catalogue developed for the storage and interpretation of Roman tableware legacy data has enabled an effective comparison of varied Hellenistic ceramic data-sets. The systematic comparison of tableware data of various archaeological sites has previously been attempted by Romanists working on the ‘great’ sigillata categories.\footnote{\textit{E.g.} Bes 2007; Lund 2005; Poblome and Brulet 2005; Poblome and Zelle 2002.} Comparison was facilitated by the widespread occurrence of particular wares, which could be readily identified and isolated wherever they occurred. We have seen in the preceding chapters that for the better part of the Hellenistic period similar ‘universal’ categories are lacking. Cross-site and regional comparison of Hellenistic tableware is hampered by the lack of a sufficient number of ceramic categories identifiable on multiple sites across the Hellenistic East. The absence of such categories has with exceptions (for example, the mouldmade bowl) dissuaded scholars from broader comparative efforts. As we have seen in the above,
despite morphological similarities significant local and regional variation existed, which coupled with issues relating to the specific contextual background of sites and deposits makes it difficult to compare like with like. This study has, however, succeeded in successfully comparing different sites with one another. This was accomplished by shifting the emphasis from individual vessel development and morphology to a focus on general patterns of production, distribution and consumption. The published data were harnessed to illuminate the varying engagement of the communities in question with tableware as material culture reflective of active and passive human choice and action. In so doing, the ceramic tableware of disparate backgrounds (with regards to assemblage formation, excavation and publication strategies and cultural, geo-political and socio-economic dispositions) could be meaningfully compared, analysed and interpreted, an approach not attempted before on this scale in the field of Hellenistic pottery.

IX.2.2 Deposits, Assemblages and Repertoires
In chapter III, some of the problems and pitfalls with regards to a broad comparison of tableware distribution data from different sites were outlined. This exercise has led to a number of important observations of interest not only to this study but also to the wider discipline of Classical Archaeology; in particular those studies which seek to interpret human society and behaviour by means of material culture. Four of these considerations will be briefly highlighted.

First, it has been emphasized throughout this work that ceramic deposits do not transfer automatically or easily into what we would call use-life assemblages, sets of ceramic tableware (in the case of this research) more or less complete and suggestive of a specific behaviour or activity. Among the material considered in this research such material assemblages are rarely represented. In fact sets like this are usually recovered only in special circumstances.

Second, the formation processes of many deposits are often unclear, particularly the relationship of the attested material with one-another. This poses considerable difficulties for a study of ceramics and human behaviour. If one does not know how a deposit has formed or if the material attested belonged together chronologically and functionally, then it is impossible to speak in terms of assemblages
of use. It has been observed that this situation affects most of the deposits and contexts studied in this research. Indeed, one of the reasons why Hellenistic pottery has rarely been compared in terms of usage, assemblages and behaviour probably results from the mentioned difficulties (see chapter III).

Third, the fact that use-life assemblages are hard to come by not only results from a particular archaeological reality but equally is affected by excavation, collection and publication strategies. Different archaeological projects have different aims, priorities and research questions of which the data they collect and publish is reflective. As has been highlighted in the above, (ceramic) data is never presented neutrally. Before the process of publication a host of considerations determines the outcome of the final product presented to an academic audience. It is thus questionable how representative the various site publications utilized in this work are for actual eating and drinking practices. In many cases the aim of the publications utilized in this research was not to illuminate human behaviour and engagement with material culture, but to present a typological and chronological overview of a certain data-set. This situation once again probably dissuaded scholars of Hellenistic pottery (but also Roman pottery, the study of which is afflicted by similar considerations) from pursuing avenues of enquiry of a more interpretative nature.

Fourth, excavation provides only a small window into the past. The picture we are seeing therefore might not be representative for a site or community as a whole. It is thus difficult to make definitive statements for a site as a whole. Furthermore, such a situation makes the comparison of different sites problematic, and is the reason why scholars of pottery tend to focus on specific categories such as Attic red figure, lagynos ware or ESA. In these cases they are partly sidestepping the issue by focussing not so much on behaviour but rather on distributions of presence or absence.\footnote{E.g. Bilde 1993; Rotroff 2002.}

This research has aimed to navigate the concerns raised and successfully proved that various deposits from different sites can be meaningfully compared. It has done so by focussing on broad comparisons of tableware repertoires on the level of the site. The term repertoire when employed in this research refers to ceramic tableware which is most commonly encountered among the material under
consideration and which was in all likelihood as common in the lived past as it was in the archaeological record. The latter has been established by carefully and critically comparing the relevant pottery catalogues with author notes about shape occurrence and frequency and comparative patterns from sites elsewhere. It has also been shown that the major tableware categories do not vary significantly across the host of different contexts considered, an observation which makes it possible to compare and contrast meaningfully, but on a general level, the ceramic data of various sites and deposits. Facilitated by the systematic collection and storage of the (individual) ceramic data in ICRATES this approach transforms legacy data into a powerful tool of archaeological comparison and analysis.

This research has provided a methodological approach which makes it possible to utilize the published record in meaningful comparative exercises, which have wider archaeological significance. As such the methodology employed in this study has relevance beyond the discipline of Hellenistic ceramics and can provide a framework of how to integrate the published record in contemporary research trajectories. It has been established during the course of this investigation that the systematic collection of artefact data and its incorporation within a purposefully designed database system which allows the storage not only of the artefact itself but also of its associated context data, facilitates broad comparison of previously published data-sets and enables the employment of theoretical approaches, in our case the use of agency theory. The methodology employed was designed to facilitate the use of abstract archaeological artefacts (in our case ceramics) as objects of use and part of human material culture. When so employed, this research has shown that meaningful data patterning can be obtained from legacy data which can be related to material of more recent archaeological extraction, not only as an archaeological parallel but also as an expression of human behaviour. The focus of this research upon a particular aspect of human behaviour, namely activities of eating and drinking has enabled such an approach by moving away from the focus on a particular ware or artefact category. Instead the deliberate strategy employed in this research allowed a comparison all drinking cups, bowls and plates encountered across the case-studies utilized. The result, though most likely not fully representative for the individual case-studies sites as a whole, nonetheless enabled an appreciation of the similarities and differences
between sites and regions, providing insights into local trajectories reflective of specific human actions and behaviours.

IX.3 Theoretical Considerations
The methodology employed in this research was designed to allow the application of the concept of agency to the study of ceramic distribution patterns. As set-out in chapter II, human choice and action are vital parameters for an understanding of the formation and nature of archaeological distribution patterns. This study has shown how agency theory can be usefully employed to a study of ceramic distribution data and how patterning in the latter can be approached through the concept of human choice and action.

IX.3.1 The Nature of Agency
Chapter II surveyed some of the most important and current issues. This study contributes to this debate and further illuminates the nature and influence of human choice and action in relation to ceramics. Human choice and action is a mixture of conscious and unconscious decisions variously influenced or formed by the social, cultural, economic and political contexts in which individual agents and communities operated. In this study it has indeed been clearly shown how human agency was affected by various parameters and does not result solely from the conscious decisions of individuals. The scarceness of ‘Greek’ style tableware at early Hellenistic Sardis illustrates, for example, the embeddedness of the local population within traditional patterns of consumption manifested by the presence of the Achaemenid cup and decorative techniques reminiscent of Lydian traditions. On the other hand, evidence from Gordion shows how individuals were able to incorporate ‘Greek’ style tableware within traditional dining practices illustrating that consumers could escape the bonds of tradition and consciously pursue alternative strategies. The comparative framework of this research provides an ideal perspective upon such matters as it provides a broad overview of the engagement with tableware of various communities strung across the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean.

Whether choices are made consciously or unconsciously should not matter in discussions of human agency. Both are part of choice and action and thus vitally important in understanding archaeological distribution patterns. It has been decisively
shown in this research that human agency is fundamentally dependent upon the particular local context in which it operates. Human choice and action are by their very nature highly contextualized and situationally dependant. Agency was never completely free it was always situated and ingrained, part of wider societal processes and developments.

**IX.3.2 Agency in Action**

The primary aim of this research was to measure the impact of agency (human choice and action) upon the formation of tableware distribution patterns. It has been shown that agency influences ceramic production, distribution and consumption in a number of ways. Firstly, analysis of the tableware data suggests that despite (or alternatively, because of) geographical and contextual considerations human agents or actors were able (at times) to actively choose and pursue certain actions. Secondly, this research has illustrated that wider socio-cultural and geo-political changes can be reflected in the local consumption of tableware. In fact certain patterning in the data only makes sense in terms of local choice and appreciation when seen in a wider context. Thirdly, this research has shown that any variation within and between different sites in tableware distribution patterning can be the result of differing active human choice and action. This is, for example, clearly reflected in some of the differences between Athens and Ephesus or Sardis, Gordion and Sagalassos.

This research has also shown, however, that the differences between sites are not automatically representative of differing conscious human choices and actions. Differences in ceramic production, distribution and consumption are shaped not only by active human agency but are equally impacted by a wide variety of contextual factors. Geographical distance and cultural practice have emerged from this research as particularly important elements which impacted the outlook of tableware distribution patterns. This observation ties in to the issue of availability and scale, both topics extensively discussed in this work and of vital importance in assessing the impact of human agency. It has been shown in this research that not all of the case-studies considered had the same options available to them. Observed differences were thus not always the result of different local choices but rather of different local opportunities. Each community operated in this respect within its individual
parameters. Any cross-regional comparison of tableware distribution patterns must pay heed to the issue of availability or risk reading too much into any observed variation. This study has clearly shown that tableware distribution patterns differ not only because individuals actively and consciously made different choices but also because different communities were subjected to different contextual backgrounds which directly influenced the options available. The use of agency theory to illuminate human consumption behaviour is thus a careful balancing act between, on the hand, the choices of human agents, and on the other, the contextual world and the environment in which the latter operated.

The impact of human agency upon the formation of tableware distribution patterns is thus situational and context dependent. Only by carefully assessing material assemblages can active human choice be identified and the preferences and limitations of individuals and communities revealed. This research carefully navigates between expressions of active human agency and instances where differences appear to have resulted from issues of availability or connectivity. In so doing this study provides an integrated approach to cross-site variation and places human agency within its proper framework. The term aspects of choice has been proposed in this research to denote site specific contextual factors shaping local options. It has been shown that aspects of choice account in many instances for the variety between different sites. This research therefore nuances the dichotomy between agency and structure by showing that human individuals and communities could be subjected both to different and similar opportunities. Agency thus impacts tableware distribution patterns in different ways. On the one hand human choice and action can reflect the variable preferences of different communities, able to pick and choose from a range of similar options. On the other hand, however, available opportunities may have been dissimilar and restricted.

**IX.4 Considerations for the Future**

This research has demonstrated the scientific potential of the systematic incorporation and utilization of Hellenistic ceramic legacy data. It has shown the benefits that can be obtained from looking at Hellenistic tableware as material culture, taking into consideration the human agent who produced and used this material. It represents
only the first step. In order to fully uncover the potential locked away in the various site publications and build up a living picture of ceramic production, distribution and consumption in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean much more needs to be done. The number of sites looked at in this research is restricted. In order to really build up a much more complete picture of ceramic production and consumption more sites need to be studied. It is also not enough to solely discuss ceramic distribution patterns on the level of a site. Though broad conclusions can be drawn from such an analysis, attention should equally be diverted to the detailed study and interpretation of specific archaeological deposits. The analysis of specific contexts has the potential to yield important insights into the identification and interpretation of the archaeological residues of human agency. In so doing we will be in a position to compare, for example, the choices made by different households or sanctuary sites. A comparison of grave goods can also be very illuminating in this respect. What is thus required is a re-study of previously published archaeological use-contexts and a greater contemporary interest in the excavation and publication of such deposits. Well published use-contexts of Hellenistic pottery are unfortunately still relatively scarce.

An equally important issue is the need for more fully quantified pottery publications. Full quantification allows us to move away from a qualitative analysis of the material at hand and build up a much more complete picture of pottery production and consumption. Full quantification also greatly improves the validity of comparative exercises. Our understanding of legacy data will equally be improved when we can view the available data in the light of information obtained from fully quantified deposits.

When viewed in terms of material culture, Hellenistic pottery can help us to approach an understanding not only of trade and economies but also of patterns of human behaviour and social practice. These were not uniform and varied locally and regionally. When we view Hellenistic pottery in terms of material culture the observed variation in tableware distribution patterns reveals the choices of individuals and communities and opens up a whole range of new questions vital to any understanding of local, regional and extra-regional ceramic variation.

This work hopes to have made a case for the importance of viewing pottery in general and tableware in particular as material culture by showing that only as
material culture can Hellenistic pottery contribute to a greater understanding of production, distribution and consumption in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean. It is hoped future work on Hellenistic pottery will continue to develop ways in which the communities behind the artefacts can be illuminated revealing the contextualized choices of human individuals.

The incorporation of choice as an analytical concept in material studies of the past changes the way in which data patterning in the archaeological record is understood and translated to human activities. Material culture is heavily contextualized. The concept of choice provides an important new perspective of wider relevance to the archaeological discipline by shifting the analytical emphasis to the variations between sites and regions. As such, the concept of choice draws attention to communities behind the artefact, their opportunities, preferences, and their choices. Approaching the material of the past by means of human choice allows us to move away from site-based approaches to material artefacts, to recreate some of the complexity and variety of the ancient world, and to explore the differences and similarities between sites as expressions of human behaviour, subject to varying opportunities and limitations.
Appendices
Appendix 1: Hellenistic Tableware Data

This appendix contains the Hellenistic tableware data around which the analyses in the main text are building. The appendix is organized into six sections and several subsections. Each of the six sections corresponds to a particular chapter. Presented in such a section are the ceramic data around which the main chapter text is built. The data is presented in both tabular and descriptive form. Sub-section one of each chapter section always presents the raw data. The various other subsections provide a descriptive discussion of the archaeological context concerned and the visible data patterning. Within these sub-sections reference is made also to the relevant tables and images (of appendix 2). As such appendix 1 provides the reader with both the raw data and the descriptive analysis and comparison upon which the observations and conclusions in the main text are based. The organization of appendix 1 per chapter facilitates its use next to the main text and gives the reader easy access to the supportive data and analysis.

A Note on the Tables

The tables presented in the appendix display the collected Hellenistic ceramic tableware data stemming from the case studies considered in the main text. This published data-set is stored in the ICRATES database operated by the University of Leuven under the auspices of Jeroen Poblome.

The Hellenistic ceramic tableware data utilized for analysis in this work are presented below in a, where possible, uniform tabular form. Each table is headed by the name of the site and/or deposit in question. Added also are the chronological parameters of the deposit(s). The most left-hand column of each table usually presents the different pottery fabrics of relevance, which are subdivided according to the various tableware shapes collected and catalogued in the ICRATES database. The next column to the right presents the ‘quantified’ data and the subsequent column translates this number to a percentage from the total amount of tableware data collected.

Interspaced among the tabular data stemming from the primary case-studies we find in the various sections of appendix 1 tables addressing particular issues
discussed in the main text. These tables are intended to illuminate specific points raised and their lay-out varies accordingly. Clearly labelled, these tables are easily distinguished from the primary Hellenistic ceramic tableware data around which this research is build.

As stated in the main text, the data presented in the tables below represents Hellenistic ceramic tableware collected from the pottery catalogues published by the various archaeological projects engaged in the study of the sites considered in this work. Where possible English disciplinary jargon has been employed to denote the various ceramic wares and shapes. In some instances, however, (chiefly in the case of Ephesus) it has been decided to keep the German terminology, mainly because the terms concerned adequately describe the material at hand and are not easily transcribed to English.

Apart from the previously published and collected Hellenistic tableware appendix 1 (section 4) also presents Hellenistic tableware from Pisidian Sagalassos. This body of material has not been entered to the ICRATES database (which only presents a record of published legacy data) and is thus summarized in a table format different from that employed for the other case studies considered. The left-hand column of this table (4.1.table 1) presents tableware shapes and or wares attested in the four Sagalassian contexts considered. The columns to the right present for each context a full quantification of the attested tableware plus the translation of this number into a percentage from the total amount of tableware. It is important to stress that this material is fully quantified and as such provides a full record of all the tableware uncovered from the deposit in question.
Appendix 1.1. Data for Chapter II

1.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard of living</th>
<th>Household size and structure</th>
<th>Income strategies</th>
<th>Purchasing power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Competing items</td>
<td>Durability</td>
<td>Process of acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal (or group) customs and tastes</td>
<td>External economic conditions</td>
<td>Social expression (communication of identity)</td>
<td>Object use and function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emulation</td>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>Cultural differences (such as diet)</td>
<td>Market impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice availability in the market place</td>
<td>Market accessibility</td>
<td>The role of women in the household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Stimuli of consumer choice (adapted from Ray 2009: 153).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora Deposit F11:2, Tholos debris</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table amphora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryballos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echnius bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rilled rim plate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltcellar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl, broad base</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Tableware catalogued and collected from deposit F11:2, Tholos debris (Rotroff 1997a, 2006a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora Deposit F16:8</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolsal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canteen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, mouldmade feet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep bowl, projecting rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic jug, form 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic jug, form 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, baggy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, straight wall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekane, form 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekane, form 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One handler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, concave rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rilled rim plate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltcellar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl, broad base</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trefoil jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Tableware catalogued and collected from deposit F16:8, Menon’s cistern and well (Miller 1974; Rotroff 1997a, 2006a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora Deposit J5:1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolsal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolster cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck askos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation Knidian cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olpe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One handler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, concave rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rilled rim plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltcellar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Tableware catalogued and collected from deposit J5:1 (Rotroff 1997a, 2006a).
Appendix 1.2. data for Chapter IV

1.2.1

1.2.1.A. Athens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora</th>
<th>Chronology 300-265 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>8 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>4 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>5 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow bowl</td>
<td>2 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Catalogued and collected tableware from Athenian Agora deposits (Rotroff 1997a) dated between ca. 300-265 BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora</th>
<th>Chronology 325-250 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argive?</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>237 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsal</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolster cup</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>10 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>5 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>5 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>36 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>5 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, mouldmade feet</td>
<td>6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>16 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>30 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, baggy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, moulded rim</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, straight wall</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One handler</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, concave rim</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, thickened edge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rilled rim plate</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltcellar</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl, broad base</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl, projecting rim</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small decorated plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tray</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two handled cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeotian?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, baggy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinthian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic jug, form 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, straight wall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>257</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Catalogued and collected tableware from Athenian Agora deposits (Rotroff 1997a, 2006a) dated between ca. 325-250 BC (excluding deposits with a closing date before 300 BC).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora Dated sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>Chronology 310-260 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric + shape</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attic</strong></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolster cup</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, mouldmade feet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, baggy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, moulded rim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, straight wall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large West Slope plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One handler</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, concave rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, thickened edge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rilled rim plate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltcellar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl, broad base</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl, projecting rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small decorated plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corinthian</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gnathia Ware</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7: Catalogued and collected tableware from the Athenian Agora (Rotroff 1997a) dated individually to between ca. 310-260 BC (excluding, for example, data ranges such as 325-275 or 280-225 BC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora</th>
<th>Finishing and decoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric + shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking cups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolster cup</td>
<td>1 Black, brown slip; West Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>1 Black slip; West Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>1 Black slip; three West Slope decoration; two of which have ribbed body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>2 Black slip (generally); One semi-slipped; One west Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>1 Black slip; West slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>9 Black slip (generally); eight West Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, baggy</td>
<td>2 Black, brown slip; West Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, moulded rim</td>
<td>2 Black, brown slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, straight wall</td>
<td>3 Black slip (with other colour combinations); two West Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos (general)</td>
<td>1 Black slip; ribbed decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>1 Black slip; West Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified fabric</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>1 Black, green slip; applique decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>1 Black, red slip; West Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>1 Black slip; West Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bowls and plates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argive?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outturned rim bowl</td>
<td>1 Grey semi-slipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>2 Black slip; one stamped decoration and rouletting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>1 Brown slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1 Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rilled rim plate</td>
<td>4 Black, black-brown slip on floor only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltcellar</td>
<td>2 Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small decorated plate</td>
<td>1 Black slip; West Slope decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corinthian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1 Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1 Semi-slipped brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

265
Table 8: Tableware Athenian Agora (Rotroff 1997a): Finishing and decoration. Tableware stemming from deposits dated to within ca. 300-250 BC.

1.2.1.B. New Halos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Halos</th>
<th>Chronology 301-265 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsal</td>
<td>17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spool saltcellar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, everted rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, everted rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Halos ware</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Catalogued and collected tableware New Halos (Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003). *Three bolsals are mentioned as Attic by Beestman-Kruyshaar. They are, however, not listed as such in her pottery catalogue.
Table 10: Number of complete profiles of Classical kantharoi and bolsals identified at New Halos (Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Halos</th>
<th>Finishing and decoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking cups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsal</td>
<td>Grey, black slip (generally); one West slope; three stamped decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
<td>Grey slip / unslipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>Slip assumed but not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>Grey slip; one West Slope and miltos; one ribbed body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemisphere bowl</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>Slipped grey, black (some combinations with red); one incised decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Grey slip (one not mentioned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls and plates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, everted rim</td>
<td>Grey slip; Palmette stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Halos ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Unslipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Unslipped/grey slip; two stamped decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, everted rim</td>
<td>Grey slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>Grey slip (generally); five stamped decoration; one incised decoration; one rouletting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>Grey slip (generally, also black and red); One unslipped; two not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Unslipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltcellars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified fabric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl</td>
<td>Slipped (black, grey, red); one unslipped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spool saltcellar</td>
<td>Grey slip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Tableware New Halos: Finishing and decoration.

1.2.1.C. Koroni and Mycenae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Koroni</th>
<th>Finishing and decoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storerooms E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking cups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bowls and plates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking cups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bowls and plates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish plate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer, rilled rim</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking cups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bowls and plates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Tableware Koroni: Finishing and decoration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mycenae</th>
<th>Finishing and decoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Black, brownish slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Brown, black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Red, brown to black slip, dull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Dark brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Reddish brown slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Red, brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Black to reddish slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>Dark brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>Black slip; ribbed decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>Dark brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>Dark brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>Black to brown slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Black to brown slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Black, brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>Black slip; ribbed decoration; incised decoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>Black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>Brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>Brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>Brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>Brown to black slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Mouldmade decoration, figured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Mouldmade decoration, figured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Mouldmade decoration, figured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Mouldmade decoration, figured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13: Tableware Mycenae: Finishing and decoration.*
1.2.2

Overview and Comparison of Drinking and Dining vessels attested at the Athenian Agora and New Halos

1.2.2.A. Kantharoi

The most obvious similarity between the Athenian Agora material and that of New Halos is the popularity of the Classical kantharos (appendix 1.2.1.A-B). In Athens the Classical kantharos was the most popular drinking cup of the late 4th – early 3rd century BC\(^{1050}\) and this was also the case at New Halos. Classical kantharoi stopped being produced at Athens around 250 BC.\(^{1051}\) This particular shape was widespread throughout the Eastern Mediterranean area\(^{1052}\) in the early Hellenistic period and was clearly the preferred beverage consumption vessel in many places. The Classical kantharos was, however, not universally popular. At Knossos, for example, it is virtually absent.\(^{1053}\) At Corinth,\(^{1054}\) the local production of the kantharos developed along different lines (fig. 26).

The position of the Classical kantharos as the most popular drinking cup was taken over at Athens by the Hellenistic kantharos and this shape appears rather numerously in the Agora material considered (appendix. 1.2.1.A.table 5-7). The first Hellenistic kantharoi are introduced at the Agora in the late 4th century BC.\(^{1055}\) Interestingly no Hellenistic kantharoi are published from New Halos though the shape is attested elsewhere.\(^{1056}\) Corinthian Hellenistic kantharoi appear later, around ca. 300 BC second quarter 3rd century BC.\(^{1057}\)

The apparent enthusiasm for the adaptation of this new shape in the beverage consumption assemblage is an interesting phenomenon. The shape itself in many ways

\(^{1050}\) Rotroff 1997a: 117; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 122.

\(^{1051}\) Rotroff 1997a: 85.

\(^{1052}\) Classical kantharoi have been identified for example at Ephesus: Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991; Gassner 1997; Sardis: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003; Iliion: Berlin 1999; Gordion: Stewart 2010; and Isthmia: Anderson-Stojanović and Reese 1993.

\(^{1053}\) See Coldstream 1999: 323-324, 334-335.


\(^{1055}\) Rotroff 1997a: 99.

\(^{1056}\) The popular angular kantharos for example is attested at Corinth, Mycenae, Megara, Lokris, Demetrias, Aiane, Knossos, Rhodes, Beşik Tepe and Alexandria. See Rotroff 1997a: 100, note 81 for references.

could not be more different than the slender Classical kantharos and perhaps this signifies a different conceptualization of drinking events. The deep shape of the Hellenistic kantharos\textsuperscript{1058} might suggest the serving of bigger portions or the mixing of wine and water directly in the cup. Rotroff\textsuperscript{1059} has indeed suggested that symposiasts might have mixed their wine individually (fig. 27).

Within the inventories of the six New Halian houses (appendix 1.2.1.8), the Hellenistic kantharos has not been attested. A single unpublished and very fragmented piece of a skyphoid Hellenistic kantharos has, however, been identified in one of the houses and small numbers of the same shape occur in the town’s cemetery. Skyphoid Hellenistic kantharoi have also been identified at nearby Demetrias.\textsuperscript{1060} Later secondary occupation, located within the South Eastern gate of the town, shows the presence of Hellenistic kantharoi of the skyphoid and angular type.\textsuperscript{1061} It appears therefore that aside from the skyphoid kantharos, which occurs in small numbers, the different types of the Hellenistic kantharos as current in Athens did not reach contemporary tableware assemblages in New Halos during ca. 302-265 BC. The angular kantharos did reach New Halos eventually. We should not automatically assume that Athens was the place of inspiration for these kantharoi as Corinth also produced an angular kantharos, developed probably independently from the Athenian model and produced from ca. 225 BC into the first half of the 2nd century BC (fig. 28).\textsuperscript{1062}

The near absence of Hellenistic kantharoi in the six New Halian houses is interesting as the Attic varieties with straight and angular wall and possibly also the variety with moulded rim could have arrived in New Halos either as import or local/regional imitation. It is important to note in this respect, that Hellenistic kantharoi start to appear at Corinth later than at Athens\textsuperscript{1063} and as James mentions\textsuperscript{1064} not one example of an Attic angular kantharos has been attested at Corinth. This suggests that the impact of new Attic shapes upon other areas could be limited. The most popular drinking cups at Corinh up until the mid-3rd century BC were the Attic

\textsuperscript{1058} Rotroff 1997a: 97.
\textsuperscript{1059} 1997a: 15.
\textsuperscript{1060} See Furtwängler 1990: plate 16, b-e.
\textsuperscript{1061} Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication.
\textsuperscript{1062} James 2010: 66-68.
\textsuperscript{1063} James 2010: 47-48.
\textsuperscript{1064} 2010: 66, note 45.
skyphos, kotyle and one-handled cup. Despite the fact that Attic Classical kantharoi were imported in numbers\textsuperscript{1065} it is apparent that the focus of the beverage consumption assemblage at Athens and Corinth during the early 3rd century BC was different and Corinth appears perhaps as more traditionally focussed in its production and use of drinking cups.\textsuperscript{1066} Corinth itself, was of course an important producer of pottery and therefore perhaps better able to resist external influences as it depended not so much on what was available within the exchange networks to which the city was connected but rather on the choices and wishes of local consumers. (fig. 29). For New Halos things might have been different as it perhaps had only limited control over what was offered locally or regionally.

The excavation of secondary (squatter habitation) occupation levels of the gatehouse in New Halos has turned up larger numbers of the skyphoid kantharoi and also angular Hellenistic kantharoi\textsuperscript{1067} showing that the shape did reach New Halos eventually. No good parallels for the skyphoid kantharos are known from Athens.\textsuperscript{1068} New Halos therefore was apparently not looking in only one direction. Perhaps it drew inspiration from Western Asia Minor where skyphoid kantharoi were common. Skyphoid West Slope shapes have also been attested at Demetrias.\textsuperscript{1069} Alternatively the Corinthian one-piece kantharos\textsuperscript{1070} may have served as inspiration (other trajectories are of course possible) (fig. 30).

It seems that it took some time before Hellenistic kantharoi became sufficiently popular at New Halos and even then not all the varieties of the shape as known in Athens or Corinth for that matter are attested. Further East additional varieties on the theme were used.\textsuperscript{1071} This begs the question how long it took for a newly introduced shape to find its way from, for example, Athens to New Halos and elsewhere. Beestman-Kruyshaar\textsuperscript{1072} believes that the time between the introduction of a new shape in Athens and its appearance in New Halos would not have been that great as

---

\textsuperscript{1065} James 2010: 48.
\textsuperscript{1066} Dominant at Corinth until the mid-3rd century BC were the Attic type skyphos, the kotyle and the one-handled cup, all shapes of Classical tradition. James 2010: 47.
\textsuperscript{1067} Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication
\textsuperscript{1068} Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication.
\textsuperscript{1069} Furtwangler 1990: plate 17.
\textsuperscript{1070} James 2010: 60-66, cat. 23-51.
\textsuperscript{1071} E.g. the s-shaped kantharos. See Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 38-39.
\textsuperscript{1072} Personal communication.
the houses have yielded contemporary shapes. The fact that contemporary Attic shapes are attested at New Halos suggests that a time lag between introduction at Athens and occurrence at New Halos should not be seen as primarily responsible for the absence of the shape within the contents of the six New Halian houses. The evidence from Corinth also suggests that new shapes were not automatically introduced or popular elsewhere. Other potential explanations must be explored.

**Some Observations**

It is possible that the inhabitants of the New Halian houses were much more traditionally orientated then contemporary Athenian consumers. Miller, in discussing the material from Menon’s cistern suggests that due to the troubled circumstances facing Athens, pottery of a wide stylistic and chronological range continued to be used. Vanderpool et al also asserts that a pottery assemblage in use usually represents a mixture of old and new shapes. If we turn to Western Asia Minor, Berlin has suggested that the inhabitants of Ilion’s lower city households continued to prefer the Classical kantharos, this despite the presence of the new Hellenistic kantharos. Berlin notes that Classical kantharoi also continued to be favoured in Ionia and on Crete. Clearly it is therefore distinctly possible that traditional preferences resisted change and that local or regional potters continued to produce shapes which elsewhere (for example at Athens) were not popular anymore. Even in Corinth, as we have seen traditional preferences appear to have determined the outlook of the beverage consumption assemblage during the earliest part of the Hellenistic period. The absence of Hellenistic kantharoi within the six New Halian houses, therefore possibly reflects the individual preferences of the inhabitants. Local or regional potters may also have resisted change, unwilling perhaps to try out new fashions, choosing rather to focus on what they knew was in demand. Both potters and consumers were in their choices closely intertwined, demand upholding production and vice a versa. It will have been difficult for new products to break this

---

1075 1964: 70.
1076 1999a: 89.
hold as the evidence from both Ilion and also Corinth suggests. If there was no incentive for change potters would most likely not amend their ways.\textsuperscript{1078} Potters, however, might have been persuaded to take innovative steps in order to get the better of their competitors.

The large and varied population of Athens might have offered potters more opportunities to experiment with new shapes. Cosmopolitan Athens must always have had an appetite for the latest fashions. Rotroff\textsuperscript{1079} has argued that the vigorous ceramic tradition of Athens with, for example, many beverage consumption shapes on the market, may have favoured a rapid acceptance of a new shapes. Potters were therefore stimulated to try out new things and get one better over their competitors. Rotroff\textsuperscript{1080} has suggested a reconstruction of the introduction of the mouldmade bowl, in which it was economically attractive for potters to produce the new cup suggesting economic competition between potters. This combined with Athens position as an important node within socio-economic and geo-political networks, which would most likely have acquainted both producers and consumers of tableware with new fashions, probably provided a fertile ground for ceramic innovation, which is evidenced of course by the varied corpus attested in the Athenian Agora (see appendix 1.2.1.A).

Despite the presence of contemporary Attic shapes, New Halos lacking both the local manufacture of tableware\textsuperscript{1081} and a large and possibly varied population which would have stimulated an equally varied demand and ceramic innovation, probably did not had immediate access to the latest ceramic fashions. Nor did its inhabitants probably wish to throw overboard traditional ways of drinking. Regional potters must have known this and responded to it. Rotroff has shown that it took some time before the mouldmade bowl became popular.\textsuperscript{1082} At Sardis\textsuperscript{1083} and Ephesus\textsuperscript{1084} the period of greatest popularity of the mouldmade bowl is also placed in the early 2nd century BC. An extensive corpus of mouldmade bowls dated to the 2nd century BC has also been

\textsuperscript{1078} See Rotroff 2006b: 372, who argues in the case of the mouldmade bowl that the development of this shape by the potter was driven by market demand.
\textsuperscript{1079} 2006b: 374.
\textsuperscript{1080} 2006b: 371.
\textsuperscript{1081} As far as we can tell from the published evidence.
\textsuperscript{1082} See Rotroff 2006b.
\textsuperscript{1083} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 93.
\textsuperscript{1084} Gassner 1997: 88.
attested in house I of the West-quarter in Eretria. Ceramic shapes were therefore not replaced overnight, something which is further illustrated by the co-existence of the Classical and Hellenistic kantharos at Athens and Ilion.

Alternatively, we might envision that New Halos as a relatively small community and despite the presence of Attic and Corinthian imports was mostly embedded within regional networks of interaction. The fact that most of the tableware was probably supplied by regional workshops seems to support this. The inhabitants of the six houses may simply have used what was available to them, paying little attention to changes in fashion. Attic tableware may have circulated only sparsely within the exchange networks to which the town was connected and the impact of new tableware fashions may have been restricted. The absence of Hellenistic kantharoi at New Halos suggests perhaps that this shape had not yet made its mark upon the region and hence the newly founded town. Hellenistic kantharoi were manufactured in Athens from the late 4th century BC, becoming very popular during the course of the 3rd century BC. Therefore there appears to have been ample time for this shape to arrive in New Halos. The fact that only one fragmentary skyphoid kantharos has been attested in one of six excavated houses, seems to suggest something about either the preferences of the inhabitants of these houses, possibly their wealth and status, or the connectivity of New Halos to the outside world and familiarity with the latest ceramic fashions and developments. It is interesting to note that only two other pieces, a bowl-kantharos and hemispherical bowl of Attic manufacture represent contemporary Athenian vessels dated to the latest phase of the houses, ca. the 260’s BC (fig. 31). This suggests that traditional shapes continued to be used and that the latest Athenian fashions in tableware did not arrive immediately and in any great number at New Halos. Many of the Classical kantharoi attested at New Halos, however, are close to Athenian counterparts and in general the tableware attested at the site displays Attic inspiration suggesting that local or regional potters had some knowledge about developments elsewhere (fig. 32). Dated parallels for these vessels suggest, however, a

1086 Rotroff 1997a: Graphs 3-4.  
1087 Berlin 1999a: 89.  
1088 Beestman-Kruyshaar: personal communication.
late 4th – early 3rd century BC dating, which again indicates that local or regional potters worked from traditional templates.

Despite this, it is unlikely that both producers and consumers of tableware in the region of New Halos were totally unaware of what was going in Athens or for that matter elsewhere. The continued popularity of the Classical kantharos at Ilion\textsuperscript{1089} in the face of the Hellenistic kantharos illustrates that knowledge of new products did not automatically need to lead to a momentous shift in the use of material culture. The evidence from Menon’s cistern\textsuperscript{1090} appears to suggest the same, as the Hellenistic kantharos is only attested in limited numbers in this deposit.\textsuperscript{1091} The Hellenistic kantharos is absent at Koroni (appendix 1.2.1.C.table 12)\textsuperscript{1092} an Attic site roughly contemporary with the projected latest phase of occupation at New Halos.\textsuperscript{1093} This site has been identified as a Ptolemaic military camp. It is thought that the pottery in use by the soldiers was taken from local households and Rotroff\textsuperscript{1094} estimates that the kantharoi in use are not earlier then ca. 270 BC. The absence of Hellenistic kantharoi at this site is interesting but can perhaps be partially explained by the fact that this was a military site. If the tableware used, however, was taken from surrounding communities, then the absence of Hellenistic kantharoi at Koroni could suggest perhaps that this shape was at the time, not common everywhere in Attica. This concurs with Rotroff’s observation that at Athens and elsewhere the Hellenistic kantharos becomes the standard drinking cup only during the middle of the 3rd century BC.\textsuperscript{1095} Just as was the case with the mouldmade bowl it apparently took some time before this shape was adopted in numbers.

The above appears to suggest that the absence of Hellenistic kantharoi and the continued popularity of the Classical kantharos at New Halos fits a wider pattern in which new shapes took hold slowly. Even among the material from the Athenian Agora, the Hellenistic kantharos was clearly not the most common drinking cup at this stage. The absence of this cup at Koroni perhaps suggests patterns in tableware

\textsuperscript{1089} Berlin 1999a: 89.
\textsuperscript{1090} Miller 1974.
\textsuperscript{1091} See Rotroff 1997a: 101 for appearance of the angular kantharos in Menon’s cistern.
\textsuperscript{1092} Vanderpool et al 1962.
\textsuperscript{1093} Rotroff 1997a: 31.
\textsuperscript{1094} 1997a: 32.
\textsuperscript{1095} Rotroff 1997a: 97.
consumption in the rest of Attica did not run parallel with what was happening in Athens itself. Rural Attica was perhaps slower in accepting or seeking new tableware fashions. We might envision a similar scenario for New Halos. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that to an extent the specific preferences of the inhabitants of the houses came into play, at least in part. The fact that skyphoid kantharoi have been attested in the cemetery of New Halos illustrates this. This new shape appears initially to have had special connotations, hence its use as a votive. Interestingly the first Hellenistic kantharoi arriving in Athens were probably also votives. It is possible that the inhabitants of these six houses and perhaps of New Halos in general had no particular taste for the Hellenistic kantharos as a drinking cup and preferred to make use of existing templates. Socio-economic considerations are perhaps unlikely because if one can afford to discard a vessel as a votive it is extremely unlikely it is too expensive for use as a drinking cup. It is possible that the continued popularity of the Classical kantharos at New Halos and the absence of the varieties of the Hellenistic kantharos represent a deliberate choice or appreciation on the part of the inhabitants of the six houses and possibly the city at large.

1.2.2.B. Bolsals
A drinking cup sparsely represented within the Athenian Agora material but appearing prominently within the inventories of the New Halian houses is the bolsal (appendix 1.2.1.B.table 9). The bolsal is a shallow bowl, has a vertical wall, elaborate foot and two horizontal handles. It first appeared in the third quarter of the 5th century BC. Sparkes and Talcott mention that the bolsal is most popular in the late 5th century BC but decidedly less so in the 4th century BC. The introduction of new kantharos types is deemed responsible for its declining popularity. The shape was produced apparently in limited numbers until the end of the 4th century BC and only a few examples are known from Hellenistic deposits in the Agora. Some have been attested at Vari but they are not attested in Koroni and Demetrias. Edwards did not

1097 Unless of course only special vessels were used as votives. See Stone 2007: 118-119, who points to mouldmade bowls as appropriate dedicatory vessels.
1100 Jones et al 1973: 375, fig. 5.
discuss the shape in his treatment of the Hellenistic pottery of Corinth but in a footnote\textsuperscript{1103} he suggests that the bolsal probably continued to be produced in the early Hellenistic period, just as other shapes of Classical origin. James\textsuperscript{1104} reports that Attic bolsals were imitated at Corinth during the late 4th – early 3rd century BC. Pemberton\textsuperscript{1105} suggests, however, that this shape was not very popular at Corinth and none is recorded from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore.\textsuperscript{1106} The shape therefore belongs to the earlier Classical repertoire (at least at Athens) and is not well represented after the 4th century BC making its popular appearance at Halos all the more interesting (fig. 32).

We should also consider the fact that three bolsals are actually of Attic fabric.\textsuperscript{1107} This possibly indicates that Athenian bolsals were still exported abroad when at home their use declined. In this respect the imitation of Attic bolsals at Corinth during the late 4th – early 3rd century BC is also interesting, suggesting perhaps that the local and export market of Athenian pottery did not run parallel. Perhaps the latter took customer preferences into account. There is evidence that Athenian potters of earlier periods did exactly that.\textsuperscript{1108}

In total three bolsals have been catalogued at the Agora. Two are Attic, one is possibly Boeotian.\textsuperscript{1109} The two catalogued Attic bolsals are dated to 325-300 and 350-300 BC. At New Halos most bolsals (appendix 1.2.1.B.table 9) have a fabric which is unidentified except for three, which have an Attic fabric. For three bolsals (including one Attic example) shape parallels have been identified within the Athenian Agora material. In Athens these parallels have been dated to the second half and the last quarter of the 4th century BC.\textsuperscript{1110} The bolsal, as we have seen, at the Athenian Agora therefore appears confined to the 4th century BC. 29 bolsals have indeed been catalogued in Agora XII.\textsuperscript{1111} The occurrence of this ‘Classical’ shape in numerous

\begin{itemize}
\item Ptolemaic military camp, see Vanderpool et al 1962, 1964.
\item Macedonian capital in Thessaly, see Milojčić 1976 for pottery.
\item Edwards 1975: 63, note 54.
\item 2010: 29, note 6.
\item 2003: 172.
\item Pemberton et al 1989.
\item Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 93.
\item See Osborne 2001: 278-279.
\item See Rotroff 1997a: 259-260.
\item Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 93.
\item Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 107.
\end{itemize}
examples (including three Attic ones) at New Halos is therefore an interesting phenomenon.

**Some Observations**

Perhaps the bolsal belonged mainly to the earliest span of New Halos. The fact, however, that 17 bolsals have been attested in the six New Halian houses makes it likely that use of the shape was not confined solely to the early years of New Halos. It is possible that the bolsals attested at the site, continued reaching the area up until the turn of the century, indicating a possible difference between Athenian export and local consumption. Interesting in this respect is Peña’s suggestion that even though pottery was an inexpensive good, people at the “lower end of the economic scale” might have found it more difficult or would be less willing to replace perfectly serviceable vessels for the latest fashions. It is possible that just as the surviving inhabitants of Olynthus the citizens of New Halos might have had limited means and difficulty in ‘updating’ their tableware assemblage.

If, however, these vessels belonged to the assemblages used around the 260’s, then their appearance is in even greater contrast to what’s happening at the Athenian Agora and at Corinth, around the same time. The fact that 17 bolsals have been attested in the six New Halian houses makes it likely that use of the shape was not confined solely to the early years of New Halos. At Athens Rotroff sees the shape going out of use around ca. 290 BC and Edwards as we have seen, also seems to suggest that the bolsal survives only into the first few years of the Hellenistic period. It is therefore possible that in more ‘provincial’ New Halos the bolsal would have continued to form an important part of the beverage consumption assemblage while this was no longer the case in contemporary Athens.

As was the case with the absence of Hellenistic kantharoi in the houses, local or regional preferences might come into play as potential explanations for the observed pattern. Sparkes and Talcott described the bolsal as a simple and sturdy shape which

---

1112 Taking note that three of the bolsals attested at New Halos were of Attic manufacture.
1113 2007: 44.
1115 The time around which the houses seem to have been abandoned.
1116 Rotroff 1997a: graph 3.
was, however, replaced at Athens by the Classical kantharos.\textsuperscript{1118} This apparently did not seem to have happened to the same extent in the six New Halian houses; on the contrary it appears the two shapes were in use simultaneously. This observation can be demonstrated by a survey both of all the dated imports\textsuperscript{1119} attested at New Halos and other dated parallels.\textsuperscript{1120} It appears that most shapes have parallels which are dated from the late 4th century to around 275 BC or earlier. Most of the parallels identified for imports date to the last quarter of the 4th century BC, only a few fall within the first quarter of the 3rd century BC.\textsuperscript{1121} If the dating of these parallels has any bearing on the rest of the material this might imply that most of the material needs to be dated to the late 4th century – first quarter 3rd century BC. Considering what we know of the historical trajectory of the town this seems unlikely. It therefore seems that either these shapes continued in use for a longer time, represent an earlier phase of occupation or continued to be marketed to New Halos while not in use anymore at the Athenian Agora.

The relationship of the bolsal to the Classical kantharos, the most popular drinking cup identified at New Halos, is also of importance in this context. Beestman-Kruyshaar\textsuperscript{1122} has noted that the diameter to height ratios of most of the complete kantharoi suggest in comparison with Athens a late 4th century dating. Comparing bolsals and kantharoi, it seems that a similar chronological pattern emerges, as parallels for these vessels also indicate a late 4th century dating. Only two kantharoi have early 3rd century BC parallels. As we know New Halos was re-founded in ca. 302 BC. The parallels for most Classical kantharoi therefore seem to pre-date the foundation of the town. The same is true for the few parallels of bolsals attested at the Athenian Agora. It is possible that all these vessels belong to the earliest stage of the town’s existence but this is unlikely as the bolsal and especially the Classical kantharos are numerously attested in the six houses.

\textsuperscript{1118} Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 108.
\textsuperscript{1119} Imports from Athens and Corinth.
\textsuperscript{1120} See Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 102, table 3.10.
\textsuperscript{1121} Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 101.
\textsuperscript{1122} 2003: 95.
The state of preservation of both bolsals and Classical kantharoi is another important element in the above discussion. Beestman-Kruyshaar\textsuperscript{1123} has noted that most pottery encountered in the six New Halian houses was very fragmentary and probably “household ware that was in use for an indefinite period of time within a span of about 40 years.” Only where pottery was found more or less intact (a small minority) could conclusions be drawn about vessels used shortly before the destruction of the town.\textsuperscript{1124} Haagsma in her study of the houses of New Halos also only incorporated complete vessels.\textsuperscript{1125} Appendix 1.2.1.B.table 10 lists the state of preservation of the kantharoi and bolsals at New Halos. It can be appreciated that very few complete profiles are preserved.

Appendix 1.2.1.table 10 would suggest that Classical kantharoi and bolsals indeed belonged to the earliest stages of occupation at New Halos. The absence of alternatives and the fact that both shapes are encountered so numerously seems to contradict this however. If only a few complete profiles have been attested for the numerous Classical kantharoi and we accept that they would have been used and formed the most popular drinking cup up until the end of occupation at New Halos, then this must also hold true for the bolsal. This is not meant to mean that the bolsals identified in the six houses could not have fallen relatively early in the town’s history, but rather to highlight the fact that seemingly they played a significant role within the New Halian houses in the early 3rd century BC, contrasting with the occurrence and role of the shape at the Athenian Agora.\textsuperscript{1126}

1.2.2.C. Other Drinking Cups
A drinking cup which on the other hand is sparsely represented at New Halos but very numerous within the Athenian Agora material considered, is the cup-kantharos (See appendix 1.2.1.A-B). Invented in the first quarter of the 4th century BC, it often contained West Slope decoration in early Hellenistic Athens.\textsuperscript{1127} Production of this shape probably continued until the early second quarter of the 3rd century BC.\textsuperscript{1128}

\textsuperscript{1123} 2003: 82.
\textsuperscript{1124} Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 82.
\textsuperscript{1125} Haagsma 2010: 151.
\textsuperscript{1126} But also Corinth, Koroni and Vari.
\textsuperscript{1127} West Slope is also attested on a fragment from New Halos, Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 96.
\textsuperscript{1128} Rotroff 1997a: 87.
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Two cup-kantharoi identified at New Halos have parallels at the Athenian Agora dated to ca. 300-260 BC and 290-275 BC. This indicates that these two cup-kantharoi followed contemporary shape developments in Athens and did not as was the case with the bolsal follow older shape conventions. The fact that only a few examples have been identified at New Halos suggests, however, that the shape was not as popular as it was at Athens (appendix 1.2.1.B. table 9). The more slender and fragile nature of cup-kantharoi, in comparison to Classical kantharoi (and bolsals) might not have made them the most obvious candidates for usage as a domestic drinking cup. Cup-kantharoi are also absent from a well in the Rachi settlement at Isthmia. Classical kantharoi have, however, been identified between this material, which was deemed to be domestic refuse. Cup-kantharoi have possibly also not been attested at Vari. The cup-kantharos (and Classical kantharos) is also absent from domestic contexts at early Hellenistic Mycenae. This is of course in line with the situation at nearby Corinth, where the shape was not locally produced until the third quarter of the 3rd century BC. Attic imports did, however, arrive. It is therefore possible that the absence of the cup- (or calyx) kantharos at Mycenae relates to the small and overtly domestic nature of the community. The fact, however, that cup-kantharoi are encountered in substantial numbers at the Athenian Agora and are imported to Corinth in some number indicates the likely use of the shape in domestic and/or public drinking events (fig. 33).

The scarcity of cup kantharoi within the six New Halian houses (appendix 1.2.1.B.table 9) could therefore suggest that this shape was more of a cosmopolitan product, better suited to life in the ‘big city’ then to that in more provincial and rural places. Perhaps it was indeed not sturdy enough to survive the hardships of everyday domestic use or the shape simply did not form an important part of the repertoire in use at New Halos and perhaps in the wider region by which the town was
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1130 See Rotroff 1997a: 86, who notes its absence at Koroni.
1131 Anderson-Stojanović 1993.
1132 Anderson-Stojanović 1993: 261.
1134 Rudolph 1978.
1135 James 2010: 67-68.
1136 James 2010: 69, indeed indicates that the shape was not restricted to any particular context.
1137 See Rotroff 1997a: 86.
supplied. A number of profiled feet identified at Demetrias\textsuperscript{1138} are possibly of cup-kantharoi and if so attest to the occurrence of the shape in nearby Demetrias.

In contrast to most of the drinking cups treated so far, the hemispherical cup or bowl, one fragment of which is identified at New Halos (appendix 1.2.1.B.table 9), is a thoroughly Hellenistic shape.\textsuperscript{1139} In Athens this shape was being produced around ca. 275 BC and elsewhere continued to be produced until late Hellenistic times.\textsuperscript{1140} The Attic fragment identified at New Halos appears to have been in use around 265 BC.\textsuperscript{1141} Rotroff\textsuperscript{1142} notes that hemispherical cups or bowls belong to a 3rd century preference for cups without handles or feet. Metal ware may have inspired the invention of these new shapes.\textsuperscript{1143} The hemispherical bowl of New Halos most likely belongs to the category which has mouldmade feet. The single fragment identified at New Halos illustrates that the shape played no important role in the drinking assemblage of the New Halian houses. Within the Athenian Agora material presented here hemispherical cups occur more numerously but Rotroff\textsuperscript{1144} has noted that though widespread, this shape was produced only in limited numbers. Just as was the case with the Attic bowl-kantharos (see below) identified at New Halos, the presence of an Attic hemispherical cup or bowl illustrates the fact that new Hellenistic shapes did arrive to New Halos, although not in any great numbers (fig. 34).

A related shape identified at the Athenian Agora, but not within the six houses at New Halos, is the cup with interior decoration (appendix 1.2.1.B.table 9, fig. 35). The shape was widespread and the conical variety occurs at the Agora ca. 280 BC.\textsuperscript{1145} Just like the cup with mouldmade feet, the cup with interior decoration has parallels in silver and metal and Alexandria possibly is its place of origin.\textsuperscript{1146} Appendix 1.2.1.A.Table 5-7 illustrate that compared to the kantharos and cup-kantharos, both the cup with mouldmade feet and cup with interior decoration occur in limited catalogued numbers. The appearance of only one fragment among the ceramic

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1139] Rotroff 1997a: 107.
\item[1140] Rotroff 1997a: 108-110.
\item[1141] Beestman–Kruysaar 2003: 95.
\item[1142] 1997a: 107.
\item[1143] Rotroff 1997a: 107.
\item[1144] 1997a: 108-110.
\item[1145] Rotroff 1997a: 110.
\item[1146] Rotroff 1997a: 110-112.
\end{footnotes}
inventories of six houses does not therefore need to indicate that at this stage in time, the shape was substantially less well represented at New Halos. If the same ratio of representation is applied to the 1440 houses still to be excavated then a total of 240 cups with interior decoration is reached, a significantly larger amount than those identified at the Athenian Agora.

It is thus difficult to draw any conclusions. It is possible, however, that this shape was more common at the Athenian Agora than it was at New Halos. Shapes imitating metal vessels might have been more appropriate to cosmopolitan Athens then provincial New Halos. Potters and consumers in Athens might conceivably also be better acquainted with what was happening elsewhere. What we know of the rest of the assemblage of New Halos, also suggests this shape is perhaps out of place in this Thessalian town. The continued use of Classical kantharos and in particular the bolsal suggests that new shapes were either not received with open arms, did not circulate very numerous in local or regional networks of supply or perhaps did not suit the socio-economic status of the inhabitants of the houses. The shape has, however, been identified at Demetrias and is close to Attic models (fig. 35b). Attic imports have also been identified. The pottery is, however, not contemporary with the material of New Halos and the Athenian Agora as it is dated from the last quarter of the 3rd century BC to 168 BC. We can, of course, not exclude that the shape did not circulate earlier in the region. The cup with interior decoration is, however, not identified at Koroni, suggesting that context may play a role. It is also not present among contemporary material from Eretria indicating again the potential for local or regional trajectories.

Another new Hellenistic shape was the bowl-kantharos, two fragments of which have been identified at New Halos. The shape occurs more numerous at the Athenian Agora but was by no means one of the most popular drinking cups used (appendix 1.2.1.A.table 6-7, fig. 36). In Athens this shape is envisioned to have been produced for a relatively short time, from 290-275 BC, always carrying West Slope

The fragments identified at New Halos belong most likely to the same vessel and represent the Hellenistic version of the shape. Both fragments are of Attic manufacture. Despite representing most likely only a single vessel, the occurrence of this Attic bowl-kantharos at New Halos illustrates, like in the case of the hemispherical cup or bowl, that contemporary Attic products did arrive at New Halos and considering the short production span of the shape at the Athenian Agora, did so quite rapidly. Seen in the context of the six excavated houses, the bowl-kantharos did not play an important role however.

**Implications**

What are the implications of the presence of these contemporary Attic fragments at New Halos? As stated before new Hellenistic shapes could arrive at New Halos. The absence of the Hellenistic kantharos and retention of the bolsal are thus put into focus once more. If two shapes produced in only limited numbers at Athens did arrive, why then did the Hellenistic kantharos (fragmented piece of skyphoid-kantharos excluded) fail to make an appearance? Of course we have to remember again in this context that only six houses have been excavated, it is possible that the other estimated 1494 as of yet unexcavated houses will show the presence of Hellenistic kantharoi in the future. It is equally possible that the presence of shapes like the hemispherical bowl or cup and bowl-kantharos is grossly underrepresented. It is therefore difficult to gage the impact of new Hellenistic shapes upon New Halos as a whole.

It is possible that there was some demand for new shapes at New Halos. Inhabitants of the site, who travelled to Athens or Attica, could have obtained the vessels as basically one-off buys. Attic potters or distributors of pottery could have probed new markets for a new product, perhaps quickly realising that New Halos would not be an attractive customer. The hemispherical cup or bowl and bowl-kantharos could also have circulated in indirect ‘regional’ trade networks in which products were being sold at markets and fairs. The absence of ‘new’ Hellenistic shapes at New Halos in any great numbers suggests, however, either a certain
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1151 Rotroff 1997a: 93.  
1153 See Rotroff 1997a: 93.  
1154 See Archibald 2005: 13-16 for overview of discussion markets and fairs in the Hellenistic world.
conservatism on the part of the inhabitants of these six houses or a general limited circulation of these products within the networks that supplied New Halos with tableware. Perhaps the socio-economic status of the inhabitants of the houses prevented them from acquiring the latest in tableware (in any quantity). Haagsma\(^{1155}\) has demonstrated that there is little evidence for symposium activities having taken place at New Halos. Perhaps ‘domestic’ drinking required a less extensive set of beverage consumption shapes, with functionality possibly being the overriding consideration, hence the limited occurrence of, for example, the cup-kantharos. The fact that a number of drinking cups are identified at the Athenian Agora (in limited numbers) but not at New Halos might point in this direction (compare appendix 1.2.1.A.table 5-7 with 1.2.1.B.table 9).

1.2.2. D. Dining vessels
Both within the collected material of the Athenian Agora and the six houses of New Halos, the echinus bowl is the most prominent food consumption shape (See appendix 1.2.1.A-B). Hellenistic sites elsewhere in Greece and the wider Eastern Mediterranean display a similar reliance upon the echinus bowl at this time.\(^{1156}\) Another food consumption vessel common to both Athens and New Halos and prominent at the latter was the fishplate. The fishplate was first produced in Athens at the end of the 5th century BC but became rare after ca. 175 BC,\(^{1157}\) on other Mediterranean sites it remains common though (fig. 37).

A number of fishplates identified at New Halos were of Attic manufacture and correspond to the classic formulation of the shape. Parallels at the Agora give a date of 310-290 BC for these plates.\(^{1158}\) A fishplate of similar formulation finds a parallel at Labrunda and is dated to the second half of the 4th century BC.\(^{1159}\) The parallels thus suggest an early dating. The presence of complete Attic fishplates (found in only 3 houses) at New Halos suggests, however, that they were used perhaps up until the destruction of the town.

\(^{1155}\) 2010: 247-248.
\(^{1156}\) See Rotroff 1997a: 161, note 53.
\(^{1157}\) Rotroff 1997a: 148-149.
\(^{1158}\) Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 97.
\(^{1159}\) Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 97.
Complete examples are also present of fishplates in as of yet unidentified fabrics. They are of a different appearance than the plates mentioned earlier and are characterized by thin spreading walls and a slightly off-set rim (fig. 37b). The latter are not paralleled at the Athenian Agora. Closest in shape comes a late 2nd – early 1st century BC fishplate. Deep fishplates of similar form and early dating have been identified at Eretria. A fishplate from the Anaktoron also shows affinity with fishplates from New Halos. Unfortunately the chronology of the Demetrias material is not so narrowly defined but it is interesting that no fishplate with the characteristic downturned rim has been recorded from Demetrias (fig. 38).

Despite the fact that these vessels are not paralleled at the Agora and the majority of these plates have an as of yet unidentified fabric, Beestman-Kruyshaar mentions that a number of them are Attic. If this observation is correct, this leads to the conclusion that a shape apparently not paralleled in contemporary Athens was produced there (or in the region) and distributed to New Halos. Interestingly, Rotroff mentions that at Eretria Attic fishplates not conforming to the normal Attic shape template are attested. The possibility that there was a particular demand for these vessels at New Halos is strengthened by the fact that the deeper fishplates occur also in the Attic fabric at New Halos, this despite the fact that the shape itself is not paralleled at this stage within the material of the Athenian Agora. The fact that this formulation of the fishplate outnumbered the more characteristic version with broad base and downturned rim, coupled with the possible importation of Attic vessels indicates that this shape must have been popular at New Halos, perhaps indicating a local or regional preference. We have indeed seen that similar plates occur at Demetrias.

The picture we, therefore, get is that food consumption vessels are overwhelmingly made up at New Halos by only two different shapes, the echinus bowl and fishplate. The Athenian Agora deposits display more variety and the fishplate
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1161 Rotroff 1997a: cat. 733.
1165 2003: 98.
1166 Not listed as such in the catalogue.
needed to share centre stage with the rolled rim and rilled rim plates and outturned rim bowl (see fig. 15-16, 19c). The rolled rim plate, in particular, has been identified as very popular. This shape began to be produced in the early 4th century BC and continued in production throughout the Hellenistic period.\footnote{Rotroff 1997a: 143-145.} The rolled rim plate was popular in particular in Attica but is also encountered elsewhere.\footnote{See Rotroff 1997a: 143, notes 5 and 6.} No parallels from Northern Greece are, however, listed by Rotroff and we might conclude that the shape was perhaps less popular here, something which its absence at New Halos may illustrate. A black slipped example attested in Demetrias illustrates, however, that the shape does occur close to New Halos.\footnote{Rotroff 1997a: 156-157.}

The rilled rim plate, produced throughout the entire Hellenistic period, appears peculiar to Athens. Rotroff\footnote{Rotroff 1997a: 151-152.} has suggested that the shape probably was restricted to Athens, because of its low quality of manufacture and its probable functioning in specific Athenian religious customs. Just as the rolled rim plate, the rilled rim plate has not been attested at New Halos. The presence of these two shapes at the Athenian Agora and their absence within the six New Halian houses highlights therefore the potential for local and regional variation and points to local or regional traditions of ceramic manufacture and consumption.

In contrast to the rolled rim and rilled rim plate, the outturned rim bowl\footnote{A shape present since the 5th century BC. Rotroff 1997a: 156.} has been attested at New Halos. Only two fragments, however, one of which is of Attic manufacture, have been identified (fig. 39). The outturned rim bowl is one of the most common bowls identified at the Athenian Agora but most numerous after ca. 225 BC, when it ousts the echinus bowl from its position as the most popular food consumption vessel.\footnote{Rotroff 1997a: 156.} The presence of one Attic example at New Halos indicates that outturned rim bowls did reach New Halos. The absolute dominance of the echinus bowl suggests, however, that the shape was not very popular and that the inhabitants of the six New Halian houses preferred to utilize the echinus bowl. New Halos thus conforms to the pattern visible within the Athenian Agora material, although at the latter the outturned rim bowl looks to have appeared more commonly from an earlier
stage onwards. This in contrast, for example, with material found in the destruction layer of the house of the Mosaics at Eretria. Among this corpus the echinus bowl is not well represented, the outturned rim bowl, however, is.\textsuperscript{1174} Outturned rim bowls also appear to have been popular at Corinth already in the early Hellenistic period, when many Attic imports, reached the site.\textsuperscript{1175} Echinus bowls, however, were also very common.\textsuperscript{1176} The outturned rim bowl has also been identified among the Demetrias material.\textsuperscript{1177}

\textbf{1.2.2.E. Decoration and Finishing}

The six houses of New Halos have yielded only two tableware pieces which carry West Slope decoration. Some vessels like the hemispherical cup and bowl-kantharos which at the Athenian Agora usually carry West Slope decoration\textsuperscript{1178} have unfortunately been too fragmented to leave any trace of painted decoration. West Slope has only been identified on a cup-kantharos and bolsal (appendix 1.2.1.B.table 11). The cup-kantharos contains painted ivy leaves in white slip; the bolsal has an ivy and grape garland painted in buff clay.\textsuperscript{1179} It is interesting to note that the bolsal is not listed by Rotroff\textsuperscript{1180} as a shape carrying West Slope decoration. The fragment in question, however, is of Attic manufacture. Are we dealing here with a rare occurrence or is this an indication that an Athenian potter was catering for a different market? As we know the bolsal was a popular shape at New Halos and Athenian potters might have attempted to apply a ‘new’ decorative style to a traditional shape still in demand.

A review of the Athenian Agora material illustrates that many vessels did have painted West Slope decoration (appendix 1.2.1.A.table 8), the use of white becoming popular around ca. 275 BC.\textsuperscript{1181} We need, however, to be careful in seeing too much in this observation as Rotroff\textsuperscript{1182} has noted that West Slope decoration occurs sporadically on Classical kantharoi, the most popular drinking cup at New Halos. West Slope decoration was also never present on the echinus bowl, the most common food

\textsuperscript{1174} Metzger 1993: 109.
\textsuperscript{1175} James 2010: 97.
\textsuperscript{1176} James 2010: 88.
\textsuperscript{1178} Rotroff 1997a: 92-93, 107-119.
\textsuperscript{1179} Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: catalogue.
\textsuperscript{1180} 1997a: 45-46.
\textsuperscript{1181} Rotroff 1997a: 42-43.
\textsuperscript{1182} 1997a: 85.
consumption shape at New Halos. The scarce occurrence of West Slope decoration therefore is perhaps more related to the specific domestic context of the houses than anything else. The variable contextual nature of the Agora deposits may have overrepresented painted vessels. Few West Slope vessels have been identified, for example, at Mycenae and Koroni (appendix 1.2.1.C.table 12 and 13). It is thus possible that painted decoration was perhaps not so common in domestic contexts. Domestic deposits in Eretria, however, have yielded large quantities of West Slope vessels. West Slope pottery is apparently common within the destruction deposit of the house of the Mosaics and also occurs among early Hellenistic pottery attested in houses in the city's West-quarter. The socio-economic status of households could be a factor. Koroni was of course a military camp. Specific local or regional preferences probably also played a role. James has noted, for example, that West Slope at Corinth occurs on a limited number of shapes and with a restricted decorative repertoire.

The previous discussion has highlighted that most tableware from the Athenian Agora considered here was slipped black. Variations and deviations of course occur. The characteristics of Attic black slip have been described before and do not need repeating here. As Rotroff notes, Athenians preferred black slipped vessels to plain ones for almost any task. At Corinth during the earliest part of the Hellenistic period most tableware vessels carried a thick, dull matt black slip. At New Halos things are similar in that the majority of the tableware is described as “fine glazed ware”. A large proportion of the vessels, however, seem to have been slipped grey (appendix 1.2.1.B.table 11). Beestman-Kruyshaar notes that in contrast to the few Attic pieces identified at New Halos the slip of most vessels is of a poor quality. Most of the vessels used for pouring and mixing are also unslipped; this was not the case at the
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1183 See Rudolph 1978.
1184 See Vanderpool et al 1962.
1185 See Metzger 1993.
1186 See Metzger 1998.
1187 2010: 36, 40.
1188 Usually referred to as glaze or gloss.
1190 2006a: 115.
1191 James 2010: 36.
1192 Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 84.
1193 2003: 84.
Athenian Agora, as we have seen. Stamping finally occurred at both sites but was not common at New Halos.\textsuperscript{1194}

\textsuperscript{1194} Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: 84.
### Appendix 1.3. Data for Chapter V

#### 1.3.1 Ilion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-H1 quarry dump</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13% of Grand Total</td>
<td>late 4th / early 3rd century BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric + shape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Attic’</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse light brown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine gray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine light brown</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H1 construction fills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H1 construction fills</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>6% of Grand Total</th>
<th>chronology ca. 260-240/230 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Fabric + shape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coarse light brown</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fine light brown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine light brown</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H1 occupation debris**

| H1 occupation debris  | 12    | 10% of Grand Total          | chronology ca. 260-240/230 BC |

**Fabric + shape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine light brown</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, offset rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, drooping rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2 construction fills</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric + shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse light brown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, drooping rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine gray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine light brown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, drooping rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pergamene</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2A occupation debris</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric + shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse light brown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine light brown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, offset rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2A occupation debris, dump</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric + shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse light brown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine grey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine light brown</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, offset rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, offset rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2B occupation debris</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3% of Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronology ca. 180/175 BC – 130 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine gray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine light brown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, floral decoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene fine ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net pattern bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2B possible occupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.81% of Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronology ca. 180/175 BC – 130 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse light brown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post H2B occupation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6% of Grand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronology Post 130 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çandarli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian platter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Hellenistic tableware lower city Ilion (Berlin 1999a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deposits</th>
<th>Pre-H1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H1 cons.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H1 occ.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H2 cons.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H2a/b occ.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish plate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, offset rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, drooping rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer, ledge rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td><strong>365</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Hellenistic tableware lower city Ilion (after Berlin 1999a, table 7). Numbers represent the quantified diagnostic (rims and bases) material attested in the deposits considered. Not included in this count are handles. Table and service vessel bowls of same shape have been merged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilion</th>
<th>Chronology 190 BC – AD 75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit A, sanctuary area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-glazed ware</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pergamene semi-glazed ware</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Vase</th>
<th>Type of Ware</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosian grey ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic grey ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene grey ware, thin-walled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, offset rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey ware, thin walled</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaker, vertical lip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, flaring lip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One handled cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesian grey ware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey ware, other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, knob rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local red slipped ware</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outcurved rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local red slipped ware, thin-walled</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, offset rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, flanged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic red slipped ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene red slipped ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red slipped ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White slipped ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene ware, thin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: Catalogued and collected tableware Unit A, sanctuary area, Ilion (Tekkök-Bićken 1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric + shape</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White ground ware</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastos</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local plain ware</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B, Well</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 150 BC –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augustan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, rouletting</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outcurving lip</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, upright rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, deep</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine grey ware</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, upright rim</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pergamene applique ware</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pergamene red slip ware</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESA</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 22a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red slip ware, other</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Catalogued and collected tableware Group B, well, Illion (Tekkök-Biçken 1996).
1.3.2

1.3.2.A. Moments of Ceramic Change: Hellenistic Ilion

A number of changes can be observed when the different archaeological contexts of Hellenistic Ilion are contrasted (appendix 1.3.1.table 14-16). When comparing the tableware attested in Ilion’s lower city pre-H1 phase with that of the H1 lower city construction and occupation phases it can be noted that potentially Attic tableware has only been attested in the former. Both the pre-H1 and the H1 lower city phases have yielded a comparable small corpus of material (appendix 1.3.1.table 14). It is thus revealing to see that in the latter contexts ‘Attic’ imports are not represented anymore. All tableware vessels in the H1 contexts except for two imports from Pergamum are of a light brown fabric (appendix 1.3.1.table 14). Pergamene imports are not present among the pre-H1 material. Another change associated with the transition from pre-H1 to H1 in the lower city, is the appearance of the Hellenistic kantharos in the latter, which is about as numerously represented as the Classical kantharos, the only cup-shape attested pre-H1. Other new shapes are plates with offset and drooping rims (fig. 43). No marked change can be identified between lower city phases H1 and H2a, a significant continuity can instead be observed. The one notable change is the occurrence of a hemispherical bowl in small numbers (appendix 1.3.1.table 14) (fig. 44). A marked change can be observed, however, between lower city phases H2a and H2b. The mouldmade bowl not seen before is attested in the latter phase. The size of the H2b corpus is very small, however, but this makes the occurrence of three mouldmade fragments perhaps all the more telling (fig. 45). Post H2b activity has equally yielded a very small corpus of material. This limited body is of interest however, because it illustrates the presence at Ilion of ESA, ESC, Çandarlı and Ionian imports. Among this equally limited corpus ESC is most numerously represented.

The material from the sanctuary and acropolis deposits (appendix 1.3.1.table 16-17) partially overlaps with lower city phases H2b and post H2b. The published tableware represents in terms of shape a largely unrepresentative selection of the variety attested. Noteworthy is the presence of red slip tableware among which

---

1195 Hence forward referred to as ‘Attic’.
products of Pergamene manufacture are dominant. ESA is also reasonably represented. Tableware products specifically designated as local take up 21% of the collected data-sample. Most of the shapes catalogued classify as bowls.\textsuperscript{1197} The occurrence of mouldmade bowls, ESC and ESA in Unit A of the sanctuary deposit corresponds to trends already visible in the material of lower city phase H2b and post H2b. In comparison with the collected tableware from lower city phase H2a, it is clear, however, that the influx of Pergamene products is now much more substantial. The dominance of red slipped tableware products\textsuperscript{1198} in general is a marked change with the situation as observed in occupational phase H2a (fig. 46).\textsuperscript{1199} The dominance of red slipped tableware from the second half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC onwards is confirmed by the group B acropolis material. ESC and ESA primarily make up this body of material. The most catalogued general shape among this material is the plate (appendix 1.3.1.table 17). Cup shapes are scarcely catalogued, mostly of Pergamene manufacture, but are derived from Hellenistic ceramic traditions. The collected material from the Acropolis thus conforms to the picture obtained from the sanctuary material; the increasing importance of red slipped tableware and within this context the Pergamene influence upon Ilion.

\textbf{1.3.2.B. The Wider Ceramic Context}

The first change noted when surveying the transition from pre-H1 to H1 activity in Ilion’s lower city phase was the absence of ‘Attic’ tableware. The export of Attic pottery has received widespread attention in the archaeological literature dealing with the Classical Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{1200} Athenian pottery has indeed been found far and wide but the heyday of this export was in Classical times.\textsuperscript{1201} It has, for example, been attested at pre-Hellenistic Sardis and Gordion.\textsuperscript{1202} At Ilion, Attic pottery has been encountered in large numbers in a late 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC ritual deposit.\textsuperscript{1203} Atticizing tableware, produced in North Western Asia Minor is also encountered.\textsuperscript{1204} During the

\textsuperscript{1197} Plates make up 10% of the collected sample. This is 6% for kantharoi and 6% for mouldmade bowls.

\textsuperscript{1198} Among which ESA but also products identified as local.

\textsuperscript{1199} These developments considering the dating of phase 2, thus took place after ca. 130 BC.

\textsuperscript{1200} See for example Boardman 1979, 1988; DeVries 1977; MacDonald 1979.

\textsuperscript{1201} Rotroff 1997a: 219; Boardman 1979.


\textsuperscript{1203} Berlin 2002: 137-138.

early Hellenistic period, however, the export of Attic pottery decreases significantly and eventually stops reaching overseas territories altogether. The absence of ‘Attic’ tableware imports in phase H1 of the lower city at Ilion thus forms part of a wider pattern mirrored throughout the ‘Greek’ East.

The appearance of the Hellenistic kantharos at Ilion in phase H1 equally mirrors wider tableware developments (fig. 43b, 61). The Hellenistic kantharos identified at Ilion is the version with an s-shaped profile and is attested at Pergamum and Ephesus during the 3rd and early 2nd century BC. The shape later becomes part of the ESC repertoire. The s-shaped Hellenistic kantharos appears to have been restricted in its distribution primarily to Western Asia Minor, although both Rotroff and Mitsopoulos-Leon have drawn attention to the similarities between s-shaped kantharoi and the cyma-kantharos attested at Corinth, Elis and Olympia (compare with fig. 28b). Significant variation in shape, such as the outlook of the base and wall-profile can, however, be observed. Parallels to the hemispherical bowl with exterior painted decoration attested at Ilion, have been identified, for example, at Pergamum and Ephesus dated to the late 3rd and first half of the 2nd century BC. The shape, however, has not been identified at the Athenian Agora nor is it directly paralleled at Sardis.

Two other new shapes that appear in lower city phase H1 are, however, not widely paralleled within or beyond Hellenistic Asia Minor. The plate with drooping rim finds a parallel at Pergamum and the plate with off-set rim at Sardis (fig. 47). The fact that within the largest corpus of material, that of phase H2b, only the off-set rim plate is attested and sparingly for that matter, suggests that these ‘new’ shapes potentially had only a limited impact on Ilion’s lower city households. Parallels are not attested among the sanctuary or acropolis material.

---

1205 Rotroff 1997a: 219; see also for Atticizing pottery Berlin and Lynch 2002: 175.
1207 MS form S6, Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 39, note 35.
1208 Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 38; Rotroff 2002: 100, 103-104.
1210 1997a: 103.
1213 See Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 14, Cat. 69.
The occurrence of the mouldmade bowl in H2b is in line with wider ceramic developments and fashions occurring throughout the Hellenistic world. At Ephesus\textsuperscript{1214} and Sardis,\textsuperscript{1215} for example, the mouldmade bowl was introduced and popular during the same time-span. As Rotroff\textsuperscript{1216} has convincingly argued, the mouldmade bowl was most likely first manufactured in Athens during the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC.

The presence of regional and extra-regional imports plus the dominance of fully red slipped tableware identified in the lower city post-H2b phase and among the sanctuary and acropolis material is also in line with wider regional developmental trajectories.\textsuperscript{1217} Ilion is indeed located within the heartland of the distribution of ESC during the late Hellenistic period,\textsuperscript{1218} especially so during the Augustan and Tiberian period.\textsuperscript{1219} A good number of the Pergamene products and imitations attested in, for example, the sanctuary deposit (appendix 1.3.1.table 16) represent some of the earliest ESC shapes such as MS B2, B7, N1, K2, S6 and S7.\textsuperscript{1220} ESA equally already achieved a limited distribution West of Cyprus between ca. 150-75 BC\textsuperscript{1221} and the forms attested at Ilion belong primarily to the shapes which Bes\textsuperscript{1222} identified as those exported more widely in the Aegean from the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC onwards (fig. 48-50).

1.3.2.C. Pergamum and Ilion
The occurrence of two Pergamene imports among the tableware material of lower city phase H1 (appendix 1.3.1.table 14) is noteworthy and potentially very significant. Pergamene imports were not recovered from pre-H1 contexts and were also not present among late Classical pottery from the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{1223} The presence of these two pieces within lower city phase H1, a presence which is maintained throughout phase H2, illustrates that Pergamene products arrived in the Troad relatively early in the history of the Attalid kingdom, a realm which had achieved independence in 281

\textsuperscript{1214} Ladstätter 2003: 73.
\textsuperscript{1215} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 93-95.
\textsuperscript{1216} 2006b.
\textsuperscript{1217} See Bes 2007.
\textsuperscript{1218} Bes 2007: 78, 107.
\textsuperscript{1219} Bes 2007: 85.
\textsuperscript{1220} See Meyer-Schlichtmann 1988 for typology ESC; Compare with Bes 2007: 75, note 387, who lists the earliest occurring ESC shapes.
\textsuperscript{1221} Bes 2007: 77.
\textsuperscript{1222} 2007: 77-78.
\textsuperscript{1223} See Berlin 2002.
It is possible that the s-shaped kantharos was originally contrived at or near Pergamum, perhaps evidenced by the earliest occurrence here of the shape in Western Asia Minor. If this shape derived its inspiration indeed from related Athenian cups then it is equally noteworthy that Pergamene potters were apparently aware of Attic trends and fashions, something which is evidenced by the presence of Attic details on what are most likely Pergamene vessels, features not identified on local Ilian vessels of similar shape. An Athenian – Pergamene connection is further indicated by the similarities in shape between the Pergamene s-shaped kantharos attested at Ilion and the Attic angular Hellenistic kantharos of stages 1-2 although the author agrees with Rotroff who does not see the s-shaped kantharos occurring at Athens. The parallel cited by Berlin for the Pergamene s-shaped kantharos refers in fact to an Attic angular kantharos of stage 3, a shape which occurs in this guise during the third quarter of the 3rd century BC which makes renewed Athenian influence from this direction unlikely; possibly it was the other way round (fig. 52). Pergamene pottery has indeed been attested at the Athenian Agora. The earliest securely identified pieces of Pergamene West Slope ware, have the following contextual dates: 3rd – 1st century BC; ca 225-150 BC; before ca 150 BC; 250-175 BC.

Ilion may thus have been influenced by Pergamene productions but this is by no means secure as the earliest occurrence of s-shaped kantharoi elsewhere is not clearly defined. A further connection between the Ilian and Pergamene material is, however, the similarities in West Slope style decoration. It is therefore possible to tentatively argue that already around the middle of the 3rd century BC Pergamum made its mark ceramically in the Troad which may have led to the introduction and local acceptance of the Hellenistic s-shaped kantharos in the tableware repertoire of

---

1224 Evans 2012: 22.
1226 Berlin 1999a: 86.
1228 1997a: 103, note 87.
1229 Rotroff 1997a: 102.
1232 Rotroff 1997a: 412, cat. 1678.
1233 Rotroff 1997a: 412, cat. 1679.
Ilion’s lower city phase H1. Again, though despite Pergamene ceramic influence around this time can be clearly attested at Ilion, this does not need to have coincided with the acceptance and production of the s-shaped kantharos, which could have been introduced to Ilion via other avenues.

A recent synthesis of the history of Pergamum has drawn attention to the fact that up until 189 BC Pergamum was a decidedly small kingdom whose reach did not extend far beyond the Ketios valley. In 218 BC, for example, Attalus I, the first king of Pergamum held sway over a still limited territory. Pergamum itself was probably also not yet the cosmopolitan city it later came to be. In fact Evans notes that the Attalid stronghold was modest in outlook and equally not a major player in the movement of goods. The major political and economic expansion of Pergamum took place after the battle of Magnesia. Direct Attalid control outside of the Ketios valley was limited in 218 BC. In relation to Ilion we learn that the polis was on friendly terms with the king of Pergamum and perhaps had been for some time as can be discerned from Polybius. Seen in this context the Pergamene ceramic connections visible in phase H1 of Ilion’s lower city reveal that already at a relatively early stage Pergamum had developed economic ties with the Troad of which the attested tableware was presumably reflective. This despite the fact that the Attalid capital was not yet the great urban hub it later came to be. The Pergamene influence upon Ilion’s tableware repertoire at this stage may be considered somewhat surprising as ceramic export and influence has been connected with larger urban hubs of greater economic power and demand, something which Pergamum was not during this period in time (fig. 53).

We should also not exaggerate the Pergamene ceramic influence upon Ilion, imports were not very abundant. Their presence in phase H1 of the lower city is important, however, particularly because this phase of occupation at Ilion is considered to have been of a modest nature. The fact therefore that Pergamene

---

1239 Evans 2012: 14, 16.
1243 Evans 2012: chapter 1.
imports have been attested in these contexts suggests that these products were fairly widely available, even to citizens of rather modest means. Though local or regional products dominate in phase H1 of the lower city the presence of Pergamene products illustrates the economic connections of the Troad with the Ketios valley. Hemer, following Rostovzeff, has drawn attention to the economic importance of the Troad, from which many commodities were obtained for the Pergamene kingdom. Hemer quoting Strabo mentions that king Attalus I had written about the pine-forests of Mount Ida, showing an acute awareness of local resources. It is thus distinctly possible that this economic relationship with the Troad was build up relatively early. Gruen sees the Troad and Ilion already under Pergamene control during the reign of Attalus I. The presence of Pergamene tableware imports at Ilion may reflect this economic involvement and interest. The geographic vicinity of Pergamum to the Troad is of course an important factor in this.

1.3.2.D. Mouldmade bowls and Eastern Sigillata
The occurrence of the mouldmade bowl in phase H2b (appendix 1.3.1.table 14) is another example of the inhabitants of the lower city following ceramic trends of the wider region as is the occurrence of the hemispherical bowl in phase H2a. Parallels for the latter which carries West Slope decoration on the exterior have been identified at Pergamum and Ephesus and similarly to Ephesus, Sardis and Gordion, the mouldmade bowl makes an appearance between ca. 180/175 BC – 130 BC. This shows that consumers within the lower city continued to have access to tableware trends and fashions current in the wider region. The mouldmade bowls identified at Ilion consisted, for example, primarily of Ionian type bowls, products which achieved a wide distribution during the 2nd and 1st centuries BC. Two of the attested mouldmade bowl fragments were of fine light brown fabric, the presumed local ware and as such illustrate the local demand and appreciation for this product. The changes observable when moving through the different occupational phases of the lower city

1244 1975: 90.
1245 1975: 90.
1247 Berlin 1999a: 86.
and taking into account also the tableware coming from the acropolis and sanctuary, are thus primarily the result of producers and consumers responding to wider fashions and trends. In doing so, consumers at Ilion were embedded within regional traditions of tableware manufacture of Western Asia Minor.

That the lower city households continued to be aware of and connected to wider regional and extra-regional ceramic trends is indicated by the meagre post-H2b evidence attested in the lower city. This body of pottery shows a clear Pergamene connection in the form of the presence of Pergamene imports, reflective no doubt of the important economic and political position occupied by the former Attalid capital and its geographic proximity to the Troad. The evidence from the sanctuary in particular displays the Pergamene influence upon Ilion (appendix 1.3.1.table 16-17). This can be appreciated not only from the actual presence of Pergamene imports but also from the latter's influence upon local production as listed parallels primarily point to Pergamum.\textsuperscript{1251} In terms of the repertoire attested the shapes represented in this deposit continue the established late Hellenistic traditions of the time as evidenced by the occurrence of cups of conical or hemispherical shape, Hellenistic kantharoi and mouldmade bowls (appendix 1.3.1 table.16, fig. 46). It is clear that there was a market for Pergamene products at Ilion, a demand perhaps reflective of the traditional connections between the Troad and the Attalid capital (see above), no doubt increased by the acquisition of most of Western Asia Minor by Pergamum after the Seleucid defeat at Magnesia in 189 BC and later on, the creation of the province of Asia,\textsuperscript{1252} events which would have led to a closer political and economic integration of Western Asia Minor. It is interesting considering this closer political integration, that ESC\textsuperscript{1253} up until ca. 75 BC is identified by Bes\textsuperscript{1254} as common only at Pergamum itself and Assos. This suggests that the initial distribution of ESC builds on previously established Pergamene contacts with the Troad area as can be seen in the Pergamene influence upon the Ilian tableware repertoire both before and after the advent of ESC.\textsuperscript{1255} The

\textsuperscript{1251} See Tekkök-Biçken 1996.
\textsuperscript{1252} See Lawall 2005: 101, for Attalid interest in Ilion; Meyer-Schlichtmann 1988: 208-209. See Bes 2007, for distribution Eastern sigillatas among which ESC.
\textsuperscript{1253} Pergamene sigillata.
\textsuperscript{1254} 2007: 76.
\textsuperscript{1255} It is only after ca. 125-25 BC, that ESC achieves a somewhat wider but still modest distribution in the Aegean. Bes 2007: 78.
arrival of ESC in number at Ilion is thus a continuation of this relationship, one upheld after the dissolution of the Attalid kingdom and the creation of the province of Asia. The numerous presence of ESA demonstrates, however, that alternatives also arrived at Ilion and that consumers had choices. The acceptance of both wares at Ilion illustrates again that local consumers had access to new tableware trends, including a greater interest in plates and were as such firmly embedded within wider trends of distribution and consumption current in the Aegean area. In terms of the morphological repertoire both ESA and ESC initially conformed to established traditions of Hellenistic tableware manufacture and would therefore have made sense to local consumers.

1256 Not seen in the lower city households. Various plates are represented among the earliest Pergamene ESC material. Meyer-Schlichtman 1988: 196-197, tafel 39.
### Ephesus

**Ephesus Prytaneion, Terrasierung**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric + shape</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal rim bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fineware</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebrauchskeramik</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glanztonware</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos/kantharos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, thickened lip</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outturned rim bowl</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 18: Catalogued and collected tableware Prytaneion, Terrasierung, Ephesus (Ladstätter 2010).

**Ephesus Terrace house 1, SR12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric + shape</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feine gebrauchskeramik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, broad rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, stamped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hellenistische firnisware</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open shape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glanztonkeramik</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schale mit wandknick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchige schale, horizontal handle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conical bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, palmette decoration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurving rim</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, broad lip</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, gedrechseltem rand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, rolled rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, thickened rim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, upturned rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feintonige gebrauchskeramik</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, broad rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conical bowl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, broad rim</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Slope ware</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base, interior decoration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Catalogued and collected tableware Terrace house 1, SR12, Ephesus (Ladstätter 2003).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base, relief medallion</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moulded decoration</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, figured</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, blattkranz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, rankenwerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, schuppenblatt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, buckel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, zungenblatt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net-pattern cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trechter beaker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes form 3-4?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Catalogued and collected tableware Tetragonus Agora, Ephesus (Gassner 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ephesus Terrace house 1, well fill 2</th>
<th>Chronology late 2nd century - 100 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>176 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Hellenistic f runishare</td>
<td>66 38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conical beaker</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Knidian’ cup</td>
<td>4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichtervormige schale</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>14 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schalchen mit wandknick</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, broad rim</td>
<td>6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, beidseitig verdickte lippe</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, gedrechseltem rand</td>
<td>6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate/bowl</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Quantity 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open shape</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feine gebrauchskeramik</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl (small)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schälchen mit geschwungener wand</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, broad rim</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, beidseitig verdickte lippe</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, rolled rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open shape</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesian Applique ware</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf. Hübner type 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical beaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesian</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical beaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate/platter, Samaria form 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, Hayes form 22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Catalogued and collected tableware Terrace house 1, Well fill 2, Ephesus (Ladstätter 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ephesus Prytaneion, Vorhof Deposit</th>
<th>274</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chronology mainly 1st century BC
| Category                        | Glaztonware | Mastos | Cup/bowl, interior decoration | Hemispherical bowl/cup | Skyphos | Knidian bowls/cups | Cup, shell feet | Kantharos/skyphos | Half-conical bowl, thickened rim | Conical bowl, outturned rim | Base, large palmette decoration | Echinus bowl | Bowl with wandknick | Bowl with profiled rim | Large plate/bowl, overhanging rim | Fishplate | Plate, broad rim | Plate, beidseitig verdickte lippe | Plate, gedrechseltem rand | Local gebrauchskeramik | Beaker | Conical cup/bowl | Bell bowl, outward flaring rim | Steilrandteller | Bowl, wandknick | Echinus bowl | Plate, upturned rim | Plate, cf. Hayes form 3-4 | Plate/bowl, thickened rim | Plate, broad rim | Plate | Grey ware | Table | Conical bowl | Echinus bowl | Bowl, wandknick | Plate, broad lip | Plate, upturned rim | Large platter, overhanging rim | Conical plate | Platter |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                 | 150         | 55     | 20                             | 16                     | 1       | 1                  | 2             | 6                 | 16                              | 1                         | 1                                | 21            | 17               | 1                        | 3                              | 1         | 21              | 8                              | 5                 | 77               | 1          | 4               | 1                | 1                | 1              | 17               | 2                          |                  | 31               | 1         | 16              | 1                | 3                | 1              | 8                | 3                | 2                | 6         | 2               |

**Note:** The table above represents data on various types of vessels and their quantities.
| Thin walled ware | 9 | 3 |
| Cylindrical beaker | 2 | 1 |
| Belly beaker | 3 | 1 |
| Beaker | 2 | 1 |
| Handle fragment | 1 | 0 |
| Barbotine fragment | 1 | 0 |
| ESA | 21 | 8 |
| Hayes form 3-4 | 10 | 4 |
| Hayes form 5ª, 22 | 10 | 4 |
| TA form 25ª | 1 | 0 |
| ESB | 5 | 2 |
| Atlante form 12 | 1 | 0 |
| Atlante form 7 | 1 | 0 |
| Atlante form 14 and 35 | 2 | 1 |
| Atlante form 22 | 1 | 0 |
| ESC | 4 | 1 |
| ESC fragment | 4 | 1 |
| ITS | 1 | 0 |
| Surus-beaker | 1 | 0 |

Table 22: Catalogued and collected tableware Prytaneion, Vorhof deposit, Ephesus (Ladstätter 2010).

| Ephesus Pyrtaneion, Hestiasaal | Chronology 1st century BC – Augustan |
| Fabric + shape | 12 | % |
| Glanztoware | 6 | 50 |
| Hemispherical bowl | 1 | 8 |
| Skyphos, thick walled | 1 | 8 |
| Conical plate | 1 | 8 |
| Plate, upturned rim | 1 | 8 |
| Plate, beidseitig verdickte lippe | 1 | 8 |
| Plate, gedrechseltem rand | 1 | 8 |
| Grey ware | 1 | 8 |
| Conical bowl | 1 | 8 |
| ITS | 1 | 8 |
| Plate, consp. 20.1 | 1 | 8 |
| Thin walled ware | 1 | 8 |
| Belly beaker | 1 | 8 |

Table 23: Catalogued and collected tableware Prytaneion, Hestiasaal deposit, Ephesus (Ladstätter 2010).
1.3.4

Ephesian Deposits

The Basilica am Staatsmarkt
The basilica was built between AD 4-14 and provides a *terminus ante quem* for the pottery associated with its construction phases. Below the structure, a *stoa* has been detected which has yielded Hellenistic ceramic material.\(^{1259}\) The associated material covers a fairly wide chronological range from ca. 300 BC to the 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) century BC. Most material encountered, however, is dated to second half of the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) and 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) centuries BC.\(^ {1260}\)

The Tetragonous Agora
The deposit containing Hellenistic material associated with the Tetragonous Agora represents a closed context of which the latest dateable material can be placed in the last third of the 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) century BC.\(^ {1261}\) The context itself has been identified as a fill and the material within it can therefore not be readily associated with a specific use-background. The tableware is considered to date mainly to the 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) century BC.\(^ {1262}\)

Terrace house 1
Terrace house 1 has yielded a number of Hellenistic contexts. Three contexts are of interest, find-complex SR12, dated to the late 3rd – ca. 200 BC,\(^ {1263}\) well fill 2, containing material dated to the late 2nd century - 100 BC and context SR9c, dated to ca. 50-10 BC.\(^ {1264}\)

The Prytaneion
Contexts associated with the *prytaneion* and containing Hellenistic material can be divided into three phases. Three contexts are of interest for this research. These are the *Terrasierung, vorhof* and *Hestiasaal* contexts, the latter two comprising *Bauphase 1*. The material identified in the *Terrasierung* context is dated in majority to the mid-
3rd century BC.\textsuperscript{1265} Bauphase 1 is dated to the Augustan period.\textsuperscript{1266} The material of the Vorhof context dates primarily to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC and was most likely closed during its latter years.\textsuperscript{1267} The Hestiasaal context is of a similar 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC – Augustan dating.\textsuperscript{1268}
1.3.5

1.3.5.A. Moments of Ceramic Change: Hellenistic Ephesus

The oldest Hellenistic Ephesian context available is the *Terassierung* deposit dated to the mid-3rd century BC and associated with the city’s *prytaneion*.\(^{1269}\) This context can therefore serve to establish what was current (in this deposit), ca. 250 BC in terms of tableware. Appendix 1.3.3.table 18 provides an overview of the identified shapes and fabrics (fig. 55). Appendix 1.3.3.table 19 lists the tableware shapes identified in context SR12 of terrace house 1, dated from the late 3rd to ca. 200 BC (fig. 56).\(^{1270}\) It is evident, that a number of shapes identified in the *Terassierung* context are not represented among the material from SR12. Most notable absentees are the s-shaped kantharos, hemispherical bowl, outturned rim bowl and Attic or Atticizing imports. Mitsopoulos-Leon,\(^{1271}\) however, sees the s-shaped kantharos occurring at Ephesus during the 3rd and early 2nd century BC (fig. 57). The absence of the shape from the SR12 context therefore does not indicate the disuse of the vessel for the site as a whole. The outturned rim bowl similarly occurs numerously among later 2nd century BC material of Ephesus. Newly present, however, in comparison with the material encountered in the *Terassierung* deposit, are the plate with broad rim (fig. 56 E), stamped plate and skyphoid beakers with West Slope decoration.

Ephesian Hellenistic tableware dated to the 2nd century BC illustrates some measure of continuity with the picture obtained from SR12 (Appendix 1.3.3.table 20 fig. 58). Changes can, however, be observed, the most notable being the presence of the mouldmade bowl. A number of other differences with context SR12 can also be pointed out. Identified, for example, have been cups with interior decoration, conical cups or bowls, bowls with broad rim, plates with _gedrechsele rand_ (fig. 58 L) and for the first time ESA. Thus despite continuity\(^{1272}\) changes are equally evident.

Well fill 2 (Appendix 1.3.3.table 21, fig. 59), allows us to continue to trace the development of ‘the Ephesian’ tableware ‘assemblage’ into the late 2nd century BC. The most important change with previously presented contexts is the absence of West Slope skyphoi or kantharoi from this deposit, the latter is still very popular among the

---

\(^{1269}\) See Ladstätter 2010.

\(^{1270}\) Ladstätter 2003: 73.

\(^{1271}\) 1991: 35-36.

\(^{1272}\) Continued popularity of plate with broad rim and West Slope skyphoid beaker/kantharos.
material from the Tetragonus Agora. Absent also are cups with interior decoration and West Slope pottery more generally. A new development is also the occurrence of plates with *beidseitig verdickte lippe* (fig. 59 H) and of more fragments of ESA. A piece of applique ware has also been attested as have fragments of ‘Knidian’ cups.

Material of the 1st century BC (Appendix 1.3.3.table 22, fig. 60), displays continuity with that of the late 2nd century BC. Conical bowls with interior decoration, however, are identified in the vorhof deposit of the Prytaneion demonstrating the difficulties in interpreting and accessing ceramic trends on the basis of a limited and unrepresentative selection of deposits. Of interest also is that now ITS, ESC and ESB have been identified whereas ESA now comprises 8% of the collected material. Other notable fabrics are grey and thin walled ware. To the former belong the large platters which represent the most significant ceramic change in comparison to material dated to the late 2nd century BC. The small *Hestiasaal* context (Appendix 1.3.3.table 23) dated to the (late) 1st century BC similarly does not show significant differences with the material from the vorhof.

A review of the Ephesian tableware repertoire from the mid-3rd century BC to the latter stages of the 1st century BC thus reveals three moments in time, in which significant change in the tableware repertoire of the deposits considered can be documented. The first of such moments covers the transition from the mid- to late 3rd century BC. A second moment of change involves the late 3rd – 2nd century BC divide. Another important change in the tableware repertoire appears to have occurred during the second half of the 2nd century BC.

**1.3.5.B. The Wider Ceramic Context**

The greatest change between mid-3rd century BC material and pottery falling within a late 3rd century BC range is the presence in the latter of the plate with broad rim and West Slope beakers. This group includes skyphoid kantharoi and skyphoid beakers (compare appendix 1.3.3.table 18-19). Skyphoid kantharoi attested at Ephesus, though showing affinity with shapes identified at Corinth and Athens occur primarily in the

---

1273 Ladstätter 2010: 93-94.
1274 Ca. 250-225 BC.
1275 Ca. 225-200 BC.
East and have been identified at Demetrias, Pergamum, Samaria and Tarsus, to which Rotroff and Oliver Jr. add Sardis and Rhodes (fig. 61). West Slope skyphoi attested at the site are also identified at Sardis and similar looking vessels are again reported at Pergamum and Rhodes (fig. 62). The emergence of West Slope decoration in this context, which though absent from the Terrassierung deposit probably would have occurred already earlier at Ephesus is also a trend carried widely, although comparatively little West Slope pottery has been published from sites in South West Asia Minor. The same can be said for the absence of Attic pottery from context SR12. Ephesus, however, appears to be bucking the general trend, at least initially, with regards to the introduction of the plate with broad rim. This shape was very popular in the East during the 2nd century BC but appears earlier at Ephesus. Possibly inspired by Athenian plates with thickened rim of the Classical period the occurrence of this vessel represents an innovation on the part of the Ephesian potters and as such a deviation from established practices which focused on shapes of a Classical tradition (fig. 63).

The tableware changes involving the late 3rd – 2nd century BC transition at Ephesus are exemplified by the introduction of the mouldmade bowl which is dated to the second quarter of the 2nd century BC. The introduction of the mouldmade bowl at Ephesus seems to have happened relatively late. As is well-known, it occurs early at Athens but also at Pergamum. At Ephesus this particular shape appears to have been most popular during the second half of the 2nd century BC. It thus took some time, from its inception probably in Athens ca. 224 BC, for this shape to

---

1277 Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 40.
1284 Ladstätter 2003: 73.
1286 Where it is thought to have been invented. See Rotroff 1982, 2006b.
1287 Ladstätter 2003: 73.
1289 Rotroff 2006b: 359.
become so widely used as to make a real impression in the archaeological record. Rotroff,\footnote{Gassner 1997: 71.} however, also mentions that Athenian mouldmade bowls were most popular around ca. 180 BC, illustrating that this vessel may have become widely popular and used round about the same time, although if Gassner\footnote{Gassner 1997: 66.} is correct in placing the mouldmade bowl’s period of greatest popularity in the second half of the 2$^\text{nd}$ century BC, this still occurs substantially later then at Athens. In terms of parallels, the bowls from Ephesus have most in common with counterparts from Delos and Samos. There is little affinity with Pergamum and Miletus.\footnote{Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991: 57.} It is indeed thought that many of the mouldmade bowls identified at Delos and Samos originated in Ephesus.\footnote{Ladstätter 2003: 31.} Samos had a close connection with Ephesus when it came to pottery. Ephesian mouldmade bowl workshops are indeed thought to have existed on the island.\footnote{See Kögler 2010 for distribution.} Despite being part of a wider phenomenon in which the mouldmade bowl becomes the most popular drinking cup during the 2$^\text{nd}$ century BC, the introduction of this shape at Ephesus developed at its own pace.

The introduction of the cup with interior decoration at Ephesus also parallels developments elsewhere (fig. 64). Similar vessels from Pergamum and the Kerameikos have been identified,\footnote{See Bes 2007.} to which Gassner\footnote{Gassner 1997: 66.} adds Samos, Tarsus and Athens. Medallion bowls, however, mentioned as occurring throughout the Hellenistic world\footnote{Gassner 1997: 49.} were apparently rare at Ephesus.\footnote{1991: 57.} Mitsopoulos-Leon\footnote{1991: 38.} sees parallels for the Ephesian products at Demetrias, dated to the end of the 3$^\text{rd}$ century BC. The equally new conical bowls are mentioned as occurring throughout Asia Minor and Greece from the 3$^\text{rd}$ to the 1$^\text{st}$ century BC.\footnote{Gassner 1997: 49.} Knidian cups\footnote{Ladstätter 2003: 31.} similarly were widely distributed in late Hellenistic times\footnote{See Kögler 2010 for distribution.} and so was of course ESA.\footnote{See Bes 2007.} This flurry of new
shapes and wares which appears during the (second half) 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC is thus a development paralleled at other sites in Asia Minor and elsewhere.

Local and regional differences were, however, not obliterated by the existence of this material \textit{koine}. West Slope beakers conforming to those identified at Ephesus have, for example, not been identified at Halicarnassus,\textsuperscript{1306} Iliion,\textsuperscript{1307} Tenos\textsuperscript{1308} or Knidos.\textsuperscript{1309} Local differences are also highlighted by the appearance at Ephesus during the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC, of two plates not previously seen. These are the plate with \textit{beidseitig verdickte lippe} and the plate with \textit{gedrechselte rand} both will become very popular (fig. 58 L, M, fig. 60 H, P). Real parallels to these shapes cannot, however, be identified,\textsuperscript{1310} although there is some affinity with Athenian rolled rim plates.\textsuperscript{1311}

\textsuperscript{1306} See Vaag et al 2002: 72-73.
\textsuperscript{1307} See Berlin 1999a.
\textsuperscript{1308} See Etienne and Braun 1986.
\textsuperscript{1309} See Kögler 2010.
\textsuperscript{1310} Gassner 1997: 47.
\textsuperscript{1311} Ladstätter 2003: 34.
### 1.3.6

**Sardis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardis</th>
<th></th>
<th>Chronology second half 4th – early 3rd century BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Minor/Sardian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, projecting rim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey ware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated to ca. the second half 4th – early 3rd century BC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardis</th>
<th></th>
<th>Chronology first half 3rd century BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Minor / Sardian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated to the first half 3rd century BC.
### Table 26: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated to the 3rd century BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardis</th>
<th>Fabric + shape</th>
<th>Asia Minor/Sardian</th>
<th>Fishplate</th>
<th>Bowl, outturned rim</th>
<th>Grey ware</th>
<th>Bowl</th>
<th>Echinus bowl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>4  67</td>
<td>3  50</td>
<td>1  17</td>
<td>2  33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated to ca. the mid-3rd – early 2nd century BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardis</th>
<th>Fabric + shape</th>
<th>Asia Minor/Sardian</th>
<th>Hard fabric</th>
<th>Cup, interior decoration</th>
<th>Net-pattern cup</th>
<th>Pergamene?</th>
<th>Cup, exterior decoration</th>
<th>Unidentified</th>
<th>Net pattern cup</th>
<th>S-shaped kantharos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>3  8</td>
<td>3  8</td>
<td>2  5</td>
<td>1  3</td>
<td>6  16</td>
<td>6  16</td>
<td>26  68</td>
<td>3  8</td>
<td>5  13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 28: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated to pre-213 BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardis PN contexts</th>
<th>Fabric + shape</th>
<th>Attic?</th>
<th>Kantharos, moulded rim</th>
<th>Fabric 1</th>
<th>Achaemenid cup</th>
<th>One handled cup/small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 %</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3  20</td>
<td>1  7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28: Catalogued and collected tableware from the PN deposits, Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003). Some of these contexts are associated with destruction of Sardis in 213 BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardis</th>
<th>Chronology (second half) 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey ware</td>
<td>1 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard fabric</td>
<td>2 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>2 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene applique ware</td>
<td>2 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiagnostic</td>
<td>2 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local?</td>
<td>2 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>2 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>2 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outturned rim bowl</td>
<td>1 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated to ca. the (second half) 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardis</th>
<th>Chronology 2\textsuperscript{nd} to (early) 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Minor/Sardian</td>
<td>3 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>2 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey ware</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated from the 2nd to (early) 1st century BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene sigillata</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, shell feet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann S 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann TS 1a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann S 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated to the 1st century BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grey ware</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tray</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene applique ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiagnostic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene sigillata</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann TS 1b-c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann TS 1c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated from the late 1st century BC to the early 1st century AD.
### Table 33: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003) dated to the late Hellenistic period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardis</th>
<th>Chronology late Hellenistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric + shape</strong></td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Minor/Sardian</td>
<td>6 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, downturned rim</td>
<td>2 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>4 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grey ware</strong></td>
<td>1 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>1 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardis</th>
<th>All tableware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric + shape</strong></td>
<td>490 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Minor/Sardian</td>
<td>46 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, downturned rim</td>
<td>5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>16 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>14 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, stamped floor</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting rim bowl</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic?</td>
<td>8 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric 1</strong></td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaemenid cup</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One handled cup/small pitcher</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric 2</strong></td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaemenid cup</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl/cup</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric 2?</strong></td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grey fabric</strong></td>
<td>30 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long petal bowl</td>
<td>6 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>22 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey ware</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, angular profile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, shell feet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tray</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard fabric</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net pattern cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import (unidentified)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallic black glaze</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not local</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pale fabric</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene applique ware</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiagnostic</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene sigillata</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, shell feet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann S 9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann TS 1a</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann TS 1b</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann TS 1b-c</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann TS 1c</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly local</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably imported</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene?</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, exterior decoration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric Type</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fabric 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardin</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, figured</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, imbricate</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long petal bowl</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear bowl</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, pinecone</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, exterior decoration</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, shell feet</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup/bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer-Schlichtmann S 9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net pattern cup</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Slope Skyphos</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-shaped kantharos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: Catalogued and collected tableware from Sardis (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003). All potential eating and drinking vessels.
1.3.7

1.3.7.A. Moments of Ceramic Change: Hellenistic Sardis

The oldest Hellenistic material published from Sardis is dated to the late 4th – early 3rd century BC. The identified shapes and fabrics are what one expects to encounter at a Hellenistic site during this period in time (appendix 1.3.6.table 24, fig. 67). Tableware dated at Sardis to the early 3rd century BC and the 3rd century BC (appendix 1.3.6.table 25-26) more generally displays a similar picture. With tableware assigned to the mid-3rd – early 2nd century BC differences and changes can, however, be pointed out (fig. 68). Newly attested shapes are the cup with interior decoration, the net-pattern cup and the s-shaped kantharos. To this new array of shapes, we also need to add skyphoid shapes with West Slope decoration. The latter are potentially Pergamene imports. Attic or Atticizing tableware, however, has only been attested among material dated to the late 4th / early 3rd century BC. Shapes not dated to this time-span are the Classical kantharos and Attic type skyphos. Interestingly material coming from the only contexts which are externally dated to ca. before 213 BC (fig. 69)\textsuperscript{1312} provides a totally different picture. ‘Greek’ shapes are as good as absent and of special interest is the presence of the Achaemenid cup.

Tableware dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC (fig. 70) sees a similar preference for the cup with interior decoration but adds Pergamene applique ware and a hemispherical bowl to the mixture. Mouldmade bowls, though appearing already at Sardis during the late 3rd century BC become very popular around this time.\textsuperscript{1313} Not dated to this time-span are the previously popular s-shaped kantharoi and skyphoid West Slope vessels. Among material dated to the 2nd – early 1st century BC Pergamene sigillata plays a dominant role (fig. 71). This is a trend which is visible also among material dated to the 1st century BC and the late 1st century BC – early 1st century AD. Notable, however, among the latter body of material is the attested grey ware which is made up of large platters and trays, shapes not seen before (fig. 72). The cup with interior decoration does not appear to have survived into the 1st century BC

\textsuperscript{1312} The PN deposits.
\textsuperscript{1313} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 94.
at Sardis. It is unclear up until what time mouldmade bowls continued to be produced but they seem not to have occurred long into the early Roman period.\footnote{Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 93.}

In conclusion, two important moments of change and ceramic transition, have been identified during roughly the mid-3rd – early 2nd century BC and the 2nd – early 1st century BC. The former sees the introduction of cups with interior decoration, skyphoid cups with West Slope decoration and s-shaped kantharoi, the latter sees the influx of Pergamene sigillata. The 213 BC threshold may also have been an important moment of change, if not for the whole, then at least for part of the community.

The rough chronological reconstruction of tableware production and consumption patterns just presented can only serve as an approximate indicator of particular trends. As this overview relies on dated pottery only, it is extremely difficult to gauge the specifically local Sardian trajectory of developments. Well-known shapes and wares are placed of course in a chronological box which does not necessarily need to correspond to a Sardian reality. The evidence from the only contexts more or less securely dated at Sardis, those associated with the 213 BC sack, is highly illustrative in this respect as it shows that at least in certain parts of the city the tableware repertoire we would expect to encounter is not present. We can therefore only gauge the development of the Sardian tableware repertoire in relation to developments elsewhere. The changes observed in the above therefore do not necessarily need to correspond to real changes on the ground as the chronology of the local trajectory may have been different. Having said that, the general patterns observed still provide valuable insights and reflect the engagement of Sardian producers and consumers with specific shapes and wares. This informs us about Sardis’ position in the wider Hellenistic world and the outlook and preferences of the local community.

\subsection*{1.3.7.B. The Ceramic Context}

Since the 5th century BC, Attic pottery has been found in quantity at Sardis.\footnote{Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 19; Schaeffer et al 1997.} During the Hellenistic period, however, Attic or Atticizing pottery is much rarer and primarily restricted to the earlier part of the period.\footnote{Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 19.} This is a trend visible throughout Asia
Minor. We have indeed seen it at Ilion and Ephesus and we will see it again at Gordion. The disappearance of Attic or Atticizing products from the tableware repertoire thus forms part of a wider trend affecting multiple communities across Western and central Asia Minor. The same can be said for the appearance of the cup with interior decoration, identified at a variety of sites in Asia Minor and thought to be produced from the third quarter of the 3rd to at least the first half of the 2nd century BC. The belated popular occurrence of the mouldmade bowl during the second quarter of the 2nd century BC equally corresponds with the situation at Ilion and Ephesus. The s-shaped kantharos likewise became the standard drinking cup of western Asia Minor from the middle of the 3rd century BC onwards (fig. 61) and the net-pattern cup similarly occurs at many sites in the Greek East, including for example, Pergamum but also areas further East like Antioch or Tarsus. Skyphoid West Slope beakers common at Sardis during the 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC are also attested at Ephesus, Pergamum and Rhodes (fig. 62). Finally, shapes like the Classical kantharos and Attic skyphos also elsewhere decline in popularity after ca. 250 BC, although in places they remained the preferred drinking cup for a while longer.

We can thus conclude that the changing tableware repertoire of Sardis during the mid-3rd – early 2nd century BC does so in tandem with wider ceramic developments and illustrates the connectivity of the community as it is clearly able to stay in touch with what is going on ceramically in the wider Hellenistic world. This is also illustrated by the other big identifiable change in Sardis’ tableware repertoire, the introduction of Pergamene applique ware and Pergamene sigillata during the second half of the 2nd century BC which is a development mirrored at other sites in the wider region. This also holds true for the occurrence of grey ware platters and trays during the late 1st century BC.

Because the tableware of Sardis is dated primarily on the basis of external parallels it was to be expected that the site confirms in patterns of production and

---

1317 Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 41.
1318 Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 95.
1320 Rotroff and Oliver 2003: 41-42.
1324 Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 32.
consumption closely to what is happening elsewhere. The presence of Achaemenid cups in the contexts associated with the 213 BC destruction is evidence, however, that at least part of the city was doing something completely different in terms of ceramic production and consumption then, for example, contemporary Ephesus, Pergamum or Ilion. This opens the possibility that some of the well-known Hellenistic pottery types attested at the site may actually date or were popular somewhat later than elsewhere in the wider region.
### Appendix 1.4. Data for Chapter VI

#### 1.4.1 Sagalassos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AK Deposit</th>
<th>OD Deposit</th>
<th>UAN Deposit</th>
<th>TSW Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBSB</td>
<td>RBSB</td>
<td>RBSB</td>
<td>RBSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hellenistic + Roman imperial</strong></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, Achaemenid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, Mastroid</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, Mastroid or Achaemenid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRSW 1A130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaker, flaring rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl/Cup</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl/Cup, conical/ovoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, thickened exterior rim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurving rim</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, convex incurving rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, mouldmade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate/Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamene siglata (incl. appliqué ware)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead glazed pottery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin-Walled ware (incl. barbotine)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open shape, grey ware</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35: Catalogued and collected tableware from four Sagalassian contexts dated to the latter part of the Hellenistic period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>108</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>133</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SRSW, open shape</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-HL body fragments</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.2

1.4.2.A. The Findspots

_The Hellenistic Potters’ Quarter Underneath and Next to the Roman Odeon, Contexts: 63-146; 81-168; 110-224; 129-227; 134-234_

The Odeon, a covered concert hall, is located on a terrace north of the Lower Agora. Underneath the remains of the Odeon, in the north eastern part of the cavea, a badly preserved pottery kiln was uncovered. A number of fills, deposited after the excavated kiln went out of operation, were attested within its remains. The pottery of the lowest strata has been tentatively dated to the end of the third and the second centuries BC whereas that of the upper strata represents a mixed picture of Hellenistic and Roman Imperial pottery of the end of the first century BC and the first half of the first century AD. It is suggested that we are dealing here with a later disturbance of the upper layers of the kiln, possibly in anticipation of the construction of the Odeion.

Appendix 1.4.1.table 35 presents the most numerous shapes identified within the relevant OD contexts associated with the kiln findspot. The mastos or mastoid cup and the conical or ovoid bowl or cup are the most numerously attested cup shapes across the contexts associated with this particular findspot. Noteworthy is, however, the presence of three fragments of Achamenid cups. With regards to proper bowls, incurving rim bowls are the most common but bowls with thickened exterior rim are also relatively well represented (appendix 1.4.1.table 35). SRSW has hardly been attested in this deposit. This may suggest, as suggested by the excavators of the kiln-site, that the main body of this material dates relatively early, before the advent of SRSW production.

_The Apollo Klarios Temple, Contexts: 14-38; 16-41; 20-48_

The temenos and temple dedicated to Apollo Klarios was located on an artificially enlarged hill to the west of the Lower Agora. The architectural decoration of the temple building blocks date the original monument to the Augustan period. The loci

---

1325 See Poblome et al 2012.
containing late Hellenistic material were excavated in a sounding, situated immediately to the west of a pavement which probably formed part of the atrium of the late antique church which was installed in the remains of the former temple. The loci were considered to have formed part of the temple foundation deposits.\(^{1328}\)

Large amounts of unguentaria and banded and painted closed shapes, likely to be of small jugs or flasks\(^{1329}\) have been encountered in this context (fig 77). Together with the encountered tableware, which consists primarily of cups and bowls they are strong indicators of seeing this context as the result of ritual drinking and dining and subsequently deposition.\(^{1330}\)

It can be appreciated from appendix 1.4.1.table 35 that the mastos or mastoid cup is encountered numerous. A conical or ovoid bowl or cup is also well-represented amongst the material considered. Food consumption vessels, plates in particular, are, however, in comparison with drinking cups not well attested. Most common is the incurring rim bowl (echinus bowl). SRSW has been encountered in large numbers in context 14-38. A number of diagnostic fragments are attested, among which is most prominent the 1A130 (appendix 1.4.1.table 35).\(^{1331}\) The large number of SRSW vessels in context 14-38 can point to the mixing in of pottery of different chronological affiliation or possibly reflects the occurring together in time of large numbers of SRSW and Hellenistic tableware.

Next to the SRSW, the presence of a piece of thin-walled ware\(^{1332}\) and lead-glazed pottery\(^{1333}\) products of the 1\(^{st}\) century BC and later, also point to an Augustan dating of this context which seems in accordance with the historical and architectural evidence concerning this findspot. Although we cannot exclude the possibility that the context concerned accumulated gradually, mixing material of Imperial and pre-Imperial date, it is possible that both the attested SRSW and the tableware of fabric 11


\(^{1329}\) Many small hydriae have also been encountered at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, popular in the Hellenistic period (Pemberton et al 1989: 65).

\(^{1330}\) Bookidis et al 1999 also noted the dominance of cups among the Demeter and Kore sanctuary material and Berlin 1999b: 30-32, discussed ritual dining at the Sanctuary of Pan at Banias/Caesarea Philippip; see additionally Stone 2007: 114-115, for ritual deposition of dining assemblage at Stymphalos. Unguentaria are also commonly encountered in the context of ritual deposition but more usually as grave goods, see for example Saraçoğlu 2011: 8, for Trallies and for Corinth Pemberton 1985: 283-284.

\(^{1331}\) The SRSW mastos, for this shape, see Poblome 1999: 37.

\(^{1332}\) See Hayes 2008: 95-104.

manufacture occurred together in time. External parallels for the most common shapes identified in fabric 11 and attested within this context do not necessarily disagree with such an observation.

**Upper Agora North, Contexts: 12-10; 13-22; 37-30; 45-41; 49-50; 49-50; 51-55; 61-63**

Excavations in the area on top of and north of the Upper Agora revealed that originally a retaining wall was constructed here in late Hellenistic times. Possibly, the elaborate wall screened the north side of the pre-imperial phase of the Upper Agora. In early Roman Imperial times, possibly in conjunction with the re-arrangement of the Upper Agora, major water works were laid out within the terrace, probably feeding an original fountain along the north side of the Upper Agora. As part of the same operation, the retaining wall was reconfigured, while also smaller water pipe-lines were installed within the early Roman Imperial street level, which was laid out on this terrace.\(^{1334}\)

Appendix 1.4.1. table 35 presents the tableware attested in the relevant contexts associated with the Upper Agora North findspot. Unfortunately relatively few diagnostic pieces have been attested. Of special interest is the occurrence of a larger number of Achamenid cups. SRSW also occurs in considerable numbers, this in contrast to the mastos or mastoid cup encountered relatively numerous in the findspots previously considered.

**Eastern domestic quarter (TSW 5) Contexts: 89; 91; 94**

The ceramic material from TSW 5 resulted from test soundings in the Eastern residential area of Sagalassos. Geophysical research indicated the domestic character of this area while a programme of soundings established the early Roman Imperial date of this quarter’s development. TSW 5 refers to the excavation of two test trenches. Trench I contained the remains of a Roman Imperial house. Trench II provided evidence for the construction of a street level and water channel during the

---

\(^{1334}\) Murphy and Poblome 2012: 242.
first century AD. The material considered was excavated in trench II below the street level, containing Hellenistic, late Hellenistic and early Roman Imperial material.\footnote{Martens and Waelkens 2006: 280-281.}

Appendix 1.4.1.table 35 presents the attested tableware shapes. Most commonly attested within the studied contexts of this findspot is the mastos or mastoid cup. The conical or ovoid bowl or cup occurs also consistently. The most numerously attested food consumption shapes are the incurving rim bowl and bowl with thickened exterior rim. SRSW occurs only in limited numbers in context 91 and is therefore possibly intrusive.

**Summary and Overview**

The deposit data (appendix 1.4.1.table 35) indicates that cups of mastoid shape (fig. 78) occur fairly regularly among the diagnostic Hellenistic material considered. The mastos, also identified in SRSW,\footnote{Poblome 1999: Form 1A130.} and related shapes, are characterized by a conical and flaring wall profile with a rim bevelled towards the interior or slightly outward flaring. One or two interior grooves usually but not always occur below the rim. Few examples carry a rim heavily profiled on the interior. Mastoi at Sagalassos never carry decoration. Fairly numerous in the Apollo Klarios Temple findspot, is also a conical or ovoid cup or bowl (fig. 79). It has a flaring wall, which is slightly convex and ends in a faintly in-turned rounded lip. This thin-walled vessel can have one or more grooves just below the rim on the interior. Noteworthy is the presence among the diagnostic material from the Upper Agora North Terrace of the Achaemenid cup, a shape of Persian origin and characterized by a convex / concave wall-profile ending in a flaring rounded rim (fig. 80).\footnote{Dusinberre 1999: 76-78.} Together, the mastos, conical or ovoid cup or bowl and Achaemenid cup are the only beverage consumption shapes attested in any significant number among the diagnostic material unearthed. Mouldmade bowls are very scarce among the pre-Imperial material and kantharoi or skyphoi have not been attested (appendix 1.4.1.table 35).\footnote{It is possible some of the attested profiled bases, may have belonged to either kantharoi or skyphoi. A fragment of a beaker has also been identified.} In terms of food consumption vessels, incurving rim bowls (fig. 81) are most commonly and consistently attested. Noteworthy, however,
amid a varied repertoire of bowls is a vessel with thickened exterior rim (fig. 82). Plates are scarce among the material considered and were present generally have an incurving or upturned rim (fig. 83).

The Hellenistic tableware of Sagalassos considered thus primarily is composed of mastoid cups, conical bowls, Achaemenid cups, echinus bowls and bowls with thickened exterior rim.

1.4.2. B. Chronology
With the exception of the Hellenistic potter’s quarter underneath and next to the Roman Odeion, the tableware considered forms part of findspots which are placed around the late 1st century BC – early 1st century AD in which it occurs together with SRSW. Deposits dated to this timespan and containing SRSW have previously not been available and thus potentially can provide important insights into the early production stages of SRSW. As the deposits in question are foundation or terracing fills and not primary use-contexts, a certain amount of residuality is to be expected. The Hellenistic pottery encountered is indeed very fragmented and it cannot be assumed a priori that it was used together with the attested SRSW. It is thus necessary to briefly survey the chronological indications that can be obtained from the pottery itself.

An important distinction between SRSW, produced since Augustan times, and the material attested in the pre-Imperial deposits, is fabric. Mature SRSW (of late Augustan date), was manufactured from Chanakli clay located ca. 8 km away from Sagalassos. The majority of the tableware discussed is, however, of the so-called fabric 11, consisting of ophioltic and flysch clay, to be found in the potters quarter of Sagalassos itself but also frequently encountered in the wider Aglasun valley. Chanakli clay was however already used in pre-Augustan times for the production of local black gloss products. Similarly the earliest SRSW used fabric 11, next to Chanakli clay. Only in late Augustan times, when the production of true SRSW on the level of a manufactory was set-up at Sagalassos, was Chanakli clay exclusively used for the production of tableware.

1339 See Van der Enden et al accepted a-b.
1340 See Poblome et al 2002a; Neyt et al 2012.
1341 Poblome in press.
The fact that most of the Hellenistic tableware attested in the deposits considered is of fabric 11 indicates that this material pre-dates the later Augustan period, when tableware at Sagalassos was exclusively manufactured from Çanaklı clays. The popularity of orange slips in particular and colour coated ware more generally may be of further chronological significance (fig. 84). Examples of colour coated ware at Paphos\textsuperscript{1343} date primarily to the 2nd and 1st centuries BC and at Knidos colour-coated ware appear in large numbers during the late 2nd – early 1st century BC.\textsuperscript{1344} Orange slips indeed possibly anticipate the later production of SRSW in which a full red slip coating is a characteristic feature.\textsuperscript{1345} The dominance of orange and reddish slips among the material considered thus possibly points to a post 150 BC dating as around this time red slipped pottery became more common in the Eastern Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{1346} There is, however, substantial evidence from more easterly Hellenistic sites but also from, for example, Ephesus that oxidized slips occurred substantially earlier.\textsuperscript{1347} There are indications that also at Sagalassos and Düzen Tepe slips fired traditionally red, orange or brown.\textsuperscript{1348} The occurrence of oxidized finishing at Sagalassos therefore does not \textit{a priori} indicate a late Hellenistic dating.

The rare occurrence of rouletting or stamping and West Slope (fig. 85) decoration on the Hellenistic tableware vessels identified at Sagalassos is also noteworthy from a chronological perspective. Concerning stamping and West Slope decoration Ladstätter\textsuperscript{1349} has noted that at Ephesus both go out of fashion during the late 2nd century BC. At Pergamum, a similar absence of painted, rouletted or stamped decoration\textsuperscript{1350} has been identified after the first quarter of the 1st century BC and at Knidos stamped pottery and West Slope decoration was rare during the late 2nd – early 1st centuries BC.\textsuperscript{1351} At Paphos\textsuperscript{1352} and Jebel Khalid\textsuperscript{1353} West Slope, however, was

\textsuperscript{1343} Hayes 1991: 23-25.  
\textsuperscript{1344} Kögl 2010: 24-25.  
\textsuperscript{1345} Poblome 1999: 27.  
\textsuperscript{1346} For Pergamon see Meyer-Schlachtman 1988: 195; for Athens see Rotroff 1997: 11; for Ephesus see Gassner 1997: 39.  
\textsuperscript{1347} For Antioch see Waagé 1948: 4, 14; for Sardis see Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 1-2; for Ephesus see Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991: 15.  
\textsuperscript{1348} Poblome et al in press: 5-7.  
\textsuperscript{1349} 2003: 40.  
\textsuperscript{1350} Meyer-Schlachtman 1988: 200.  
\textsuperscript{1351} Kögl 2010: 33.  
\textsuperscript{1352} Hayes 1991: 6.
scarce altogether throughout the course of the Hellenistic period. Other indicators of a late Hellenistic/early imperial dating are the occurrence of Pergamene applique ware (fig. 86), ESA, thin-walled ware, lead glazed ware, fusiform unguentaria, and banded and painted closed shapes related to white ground wares in the contexts considered. The presence of SRSW itself also points to a dating close to the end of the Hellenistic period.

The rare occurrence of the mouldmade bowl at Sagalassos (only a few pieces identified) may similarly have chronological repercussions (fig. 87). At Ephesus the mouldmade bowl has disappeared from the tableware repertoire during the third or 4th quarter of the 1st century BC. Neuru equally sees the end of the mouldmade bowl production around ca. the mid-1st century BC, which is echoed by Kögl for Knidos. At Sardis, however, Rotroff suggests that the mouldmade bowl may have been produced until replaced by ESB products. Mouldmade bowls were also not part of the repertoire of Pergamene sigillata, produced from ca. 150 BC onwards. It should be noted however that mouldmade bowls continued to be produced in ESA during the 1st century AD.

The scarce occurrence of the mouldmade within the deposits considered in this chapter, together with the equally scarce occurrence of West Slope style decoration

---

1353 Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: 518.
1354 See Meyer-Schlichtmann 1997; Hübner 1993. Fragments dateable to ca. the second half 2nd century — early first century BC.
1355 See Hayes 2008: 95-104.
1357 Fusiform unguentaria like the ones attested at Sagalassos are thought to date later in the Hellenistic period (Anderson-Stojanović 1987: 108-109). Grey ware Unguentaria category 4 and 5 of the Athenian Agora (Rotroff 2006b: 154), dated to ca. 215-150 BC and 180-100 BC respectively (Rotroff 2006b: 153, table 14), show affinity with the unguentaria from Sagalassos, some of which also display a grey fabric and exterior.
1358 See for discussion and examples Rotroff 1997a: 225-232, cat. 1550-1556. The banded and painted closed shapes attested in the Apollo Klarios deposit, appear to be related to the tradition of dark decoration on a light background, which in the case of the Sagalassian examples not necessarily involves the characteristic light slip. Banded lagynoi from the Athenian Agora (Rotroff 1997a: 231, cat. 1550-1556) also lack the characteristic slipped underground. The lagynos is the most characteristic shape of the light ground tradition and particularly popular during the second half of the 2nd century BC (Gassner 1997: 69-70). It remained popular until ca. 50 BC (Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 72).
1361 2010: 60-61, 414.
1362 2003: 93.
and stamping and rouletting, may therefore suggest that the majority of the attested tableware needs to be placed around ca. 50 BC. The dominant occurrence of red and orange slip in Hellenistic colour coated fashion provides an additional indication of a dating fairly late in the Hellenistic period. We cannot be certain, however. It is indeed equally possible, that the mouldmade bowl was perhaps never very popular at Sagalassos, even during its heyday in the 2nd century BC. We have previously seen that the mouldmade bowl was popular at Sardis relatively late and appears not to have been very popular or established at Gordion. Equally we have seen that the use of West Slope decoration at Jebel Khalid was very limited. Local or regional preferences and traditions and opportunities may therefore had a part to play as well. Alternatively, the limited corpus of pre-Imperial material considered may not represent the full range of shapes and wares utilized at Sagalassos.

1.4.2.C. Shape Parallels
Vessels of mastoid and related shape have been widely attested throughout and beyond the Eastern Mediterranean. Although the shape and related vessels occurred already during the late 3rd century BC, it appears to have been popular primarily in the 2nd and perhaps early 1st centuries BC. In shape, the mastos (fig. 78, 88, 90) is related to the cup with interior decoration. It was part of the late Hellenistic preference within and beyond Western Asia Minor for cups of conical shape. At Ephesus, for example, conical cups related in shape to the mastos have been attested. Earlier versions of this shape carry painted decoration, whereas conical cups of the 2nd and 1st centuries BC are usually undecorated. Similar cups with interior decoration have also been attested at Sardis and are dated to the mid-3rd - 2nd centuries BC. Vessels of conical or mastoid shape were especially popular in the

---

1365 Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 95.
1366 Stewart 2010: 161-162.
1367 Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: 518.
1368 See for a full discussion: Van der Enden et al in press a.
1369 See for a full discussion: Van der Enden et al in press a.
1370 E.g. Ladstätter 2010: plate 171, cat. 152; Ladstätter 2003: plate 8, cat. 73.
1372 Ladstätter 2003: 30.
Levant (fig. 89).\textsuperscript{1374} The mastos also has close parallels in silver and glass,\textsuperscript{1375} examples of which are primarily dated to the late Hellenistic period (fig. 90).\textsuperscript{1376}

Silver tableware, it is thought, became more widespread during the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{1377} The mastos in fact was the most common and widespread shape associated with this new and more varied repertoire to which medallion bowls, a shape also attested in ceramic and a variant of the earlier mentioned cup with interior decoration\textsuperscript{1378} also belonged (fig. 91).\textsuperscript{1379} With regards to dating, these vessels are thought to have existed in silver already in the early Hellenistic period. Preserved examples date, however, primarily to the late Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{1380} Strong\textsuperscript{1381} indeed suggests that medallion bowls in silver were very common during the last two centuries BC. These observations generally concur with the image we get from the ceramic version of the shape.

Glass vessels of conical and mastoid shape were especially popular in the Levant during the late Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{1382} At, for example, Tel Anafa, glass mastoi were numerous. Thousands of fragments have been identified, and are dated to the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} and early 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BC.\textsuperscript{1383} Equally at Maresha, so-called sagged bowls of ovoid or conical shapes are numerous attested and considered to be the predominant glass vessels of the late Hellenistic period. Bowls with interior grooves like the mastoi or cups with interior decoration in ceramic are especially common.\textsuperscript{1384} Glass bowls of mastoid shape with horizontal grooves and rounded bottom are indeed most numerous in the eastern part of the Hellenistic world and have furthermore also been identified at, for example, Hagoshrim, Jerusalem, Beirut and in Turkey. They occur, however, also in Cyrenaica, Italy, Carthage, Spain, and Northern France. In the Aegean the shape has been found in quantity on Delos. Fragments have been attested from the mainland and other islands. Also at the Athenian Agora the shape was

\begin{thebibliography}{9}

\bibitem{1374} Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: 307; 339.
\bibitem{1375} Rotroff 1997a: 109.
\bibitem{1377} Strong, 1966: 91, 106.
\bibitem{1378} Rotroff 1997a: 110-112.
\bibitem{1379} Strong 1966: 106-108.
\bibitem{1380} Strong 1966: 109-111.
\bibitem{1381} Strong 1966: 109-111.
\bibitem{1382} Weinberg and Stern 2009: 24.
\bibitem{1383} Weinberg and Stern: 2009: 24-25.
\bibitem{1384} Jackson-Tal 2005: 51.
\end{thebibliography}
attested and comes from late 2nd century BC and later contexts. Of particular interest is a fragment with beading on the interior, which links the vessels with similar cups or bowls of ESA fabric. Similar glass bowls are known from, for example, Ashdod, Samaria, Maresha, Caesarea, Crete and Delos. Some are dated on the basis of context to the second half of the 2nd century BC. At Ephesus comparable glass vessels have also been identified. Similar in particular are conical bowls and especially so-called linear cut bowls with outturned rim. The conical bowls are dated from ca. 150 BC to the middle of the 1st century BC, when linear cut bowls appear. The production of the latter is sustained throughout Augustan-Claudian times. Parallels to the Ephesian glass vessels have been identified at a host of sites including Athens, Delos and Knossos but primarily occur in the Levant.

The late Hellenistic period thus saw the popular occurrence of vessels of mastoid shape both in metal plate and glass. Both appear to have been fairly widespread but the latter in particular were common in the Levant which may have repercussion for accessing the spread and popularity of the ceramic mastos, particularly because the glass vessels provide close parallels to the mastoid cup as attested at Sagalassos.

The preference for vessels of conical shape is further evidenced by the plentiful occurrence at Sagalassos of a bowl or cup of conical or ovoid shape (fig. 79). This thin-walled vessel shows in its wall profile affinity to the canonical shape of the cup with interior decoration and as such, finds general affinity on quite a number of sites (fig. 93). At Ephesus in particular, a number of shape parallels have been identified which primarily date to the 2nd and (early) 1st centuries BC. Vessels showing affinity in wall-profile have also been identified at Halicarnassus, Pergamum, Kordon Tumulus, Sardis, Hama and Jebel Khalid. The general wall profile of the

---

1385 See Weinberg and Stern 2009.
1387 Weinberg and Stern 2009: 24-25, 26, 33.
1388 Ladstätter 2003: 30, K73, dated to the late 2nd century BC and considered typical for the late Hellenistic period, 32, K. 92, dated to the 2nd - 1st century BC, 2010: 93-94, K156-162, dated to the late 2nd – early 1st century BC.
1389 Vaag et al 2002: K. 94, compared to a parallel from the Athenian Agora dated to the first quarter of the 2nd century BC.
1390 Schäfer 1968: 58, cat. D2, dated to the second half of the 3rd century BC.
1391 Aydin 2007: cat. 2, 15 dated to 125-100 BC, cat. 54, dated to 150-100 BC.
more rounded cups with interior decoration\textsuperscript{1395} attested at the Athenian Agora, also displays affinity. It needs to be stressed, however, that the affinity of the Sagalassian vessel with the cup with interior decoration is slight and only concerns the general profile of the wall. Interior decoration is absent as are the grooves frequently encountered on proper cups with interior decoration. It is also uncertain as to what kind of base needs to be envisioned as no complete profile has been attested. At Hama and Jebel Khalid similar looking vessels without interior decoration have, however, been identified (fig. 93). Examples from the latter site are connected with cups with interior decoration as identified at Antioch.\textsuperscript{1396} At Ephesus similar looking vessels related to the cup with interior decoration are equally absent decoration.\textsuperscript{1397} As such this vessel also finds affinity in the aforementioned metal plate and glass production of primarily the late Hellenistic period.

The Achaemenid cup (fig. 80) is, in contrast, a shape not widely attested among pottery of the Hellenistic world. It does, however, occur at Hellenistic Sardis in some numbers during and before the end of the 3rd century BC (fig. 69).\textsuperscript{1398} It occurs widely across the Achaemenid world.\textsuperscript{1399} The Achaemenid cup inspired the production of the ‘Greek’ calyx-cup (fig. 94) a vessel fairly widespread in the early Hellenistic period. Rotroff\textsuperscript{1400} sees the shape dying out during the second quarter of the 3rd century BC.

The most numerously attested food consumption shape among the material considered was the incurving rim bowl (fig. 81). This is not surprising considering that this shape is found all over the Hellenistic world in large numbers\textsuperscript{1401} and is popular throughout.\textsuperscript{1402} At Athens this vessel was most popular during the early Hellenistic

\textsuperscript{1392} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 41-42, plate 31, cat. 208, 210, to be placed somewhere between the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC.
\textsuperscript{1393} Christensen and Johansen 1971: 13, fig.6, cat. 60-63, dated to second half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC on the basis of parallels.
\textsuperscript{1394} Jackson and Tismarsch 2011: 18-19, figure 13, cat. 10, dated to a mid-2\textsuperscript{nd} – early 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC range; Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: 306-307, figure 107, cat. 124.
\textsuperscript{1395} Rotroff 1997a: 277-279, figure 21, cat. 333, dated 280-260 BC, cat. 351, dated 150-100 BC, cat. 346, dated 200-175 BC.
\textsuperscript{1396} Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: 306-307.
\textsuperscript{1397} Ladstätter 2003: 30.
\textsuperscript{1398} Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 61-62; Dusinberre 1999: 78.
\textsuperscript{1399} Dusinberre 1999: 76-78.
\textsuperscript{1400} 1997a: 91-92.
\textsuperscript{1401} Rotroff 1997a: 161, note 53; Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 24-25.
period but in the Hellenistic East it remained popular throughout the Hellenistic period and at, for example, Cyprus, they are recorded up until the Augustan period. In Knidos bowls of this shape occur from the 3rd to at least the first third of the 1st century BC. They are common in all phases.

The bowl with thickened exterior rim (fig. 82) is, however, much more rarely encountered. This shape, which makes a noticeable appearance among the material considered at Sagalassos, is similar in appearance to Cypriot Sigillata, form P22a, identified, for example, at Paphos. The shape is there common in the late 1st century BC and early 1st century AD. At Jebel Khalid though this shape occurs already during the 3rd century BC, and is thought to represent an Eastern ceramic tradition, one not generally encountered on more western Hellenistic sites. Another early parallel from Palaepaphos on Cyprus, dated to the late Classical period, is equally somewhat similar and attests to the early occurrence of this vessel in the Levantine region (fig. 95).

Plates were as stated before relatively rare among the material considered and the few diagnostic pieces identified represent primarily vessels with incurring or upturned rim. Plates with incurring or upturned rim (fig. 83) find similar shapes at many sites, for example, at Athens, Knidos, Ephesus, Jebel Khalid and Tel Anafa, dating in general between the (second half) 2nd century BC – early 1st century AD.
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1405 Hayes 1991: 27.
1406 Kögler 2010: 150-151.
1407 Hayes 1991: figure XIX, figure LXI, cat. 21-22, form P22, Cypriot sigillata, see also figure LII, cat. 19, form 22a, Cypriot sigillata, dated to ca. 40-10 BC.
1408 Hayes 1991: 42.
1410 Maier 1986: fig. 5ab, form IV.
1411 Rotroff 1997a: figure 58, cat. 847, dated 110-86? BC, 328, figure 97, cat. 1603-1604, contexts of 150-110 BC and 11- to early 1st century AD respectively.
1412 Kögler 2010: cat. D112, ESA, Atlante form 3, dated to second half 2nd century BC.
1414 Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: 413, figure 115, ESA Hayes form 3-4.
### 1.4.3 Kozluca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-set rim plate (and related)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate/platter, overhanging rim</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large platter (Ionian?)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, painted decoration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate (related)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, upturned rim</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, incurving rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow plate, downturned rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup (various profiles)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, cf. SRSW 1a130</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, cf SRSW 1a100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup cf. SRSW 1a140</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup/bowl, cf. SRSW 1b100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long petal bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastos/mastoid cup</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouletted cup</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRSW, 1a100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA, cf. SRSW 1a100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA?, cf. SRSW 1a130</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA?, bowl/cup, rolled rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA?, cup/bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, various profiles</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, stamped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurving rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, rouletted decoration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open shape, painted decoration</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open shape</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish/saucer, various profiles</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36: Studied tableware (potential eating and drinking shapes) from the Kozluca reference collection.
1.4.4 Düzen Tepe
The evidence from Düzen Tepe, a site in close vicinity (fig. 101) of Sagalassos\footnote{Vanhaverbeke et al 2010: 106.} appears to confirm the suggestion that at least this part of Pisidia, in terms of ceramic production and consumption differentiated itself from the ‘Hellenized/Greek’ communities on Asia Minor’s West Coast and eastern centres like Tarsus and Antioch. The pottery of Düzen Tepe, collected during field survey and excavation consisted of simple bowls with straight rims, incurving rim bowls and Achaemenid cups (fig. 102). Most of this pottery was either locally or regionally produced. A few imported black slipped pieces and mouldmade bowls have also been identified.\footnote{Vanhaverbeke et al 2010: 118.} The tableware of Düzen Tepe is generally oxidized fired, creating a brown and red finish.\footnote{Vanhaverbeke et al 2010: 105.} Though this is a fairly restricted corpus of material, dated between the fifth and second century BC\footnote{Vanhaverbeke et al 2010: 118.} similarities with the pre-imperial tableware corpus from Sagalassos can be pointed out. Differences in fabric aside, both, for example, make use of simple bowls and the Achaemenid cup,\footnote{Poblome et al in press: 5.} the mouldmade bowl has also been attested at Düzen Tepe.\footnote{Vanhaverbeke et al 2010: 118.} Interestingly plates also appear rare in both communities. Though the late Hellenistic tableware of Sagalassos appears somewhat more varied in its shape repertoire and indeed incorporates shapes which find parallels or affiliated shapes, elsewhere in the Hellenistic world\footnote{Waelkens et al 2011: 34.} the difference between Sagalassos and Düzen Tepe is perhaps less profound than previously imagined. Both sites in the end display a somewhat limited tableware repertoire which is not easily or directly mirrored elsewhere and perhaps was in origin orientated primarily locally or regionally.

It thus appears on the basis of the current evidence, that from the 5th to 1st century BC Düzen Tepe and Sagalassos were not closely or directly following ceramic trends elsewhere. Both communities appear to be lagging behind or are enmeshed within different traditions of manufacture and consumption in which the varied tableware repertoire of the ‘Greek’ world only had a limited and locally negotiated impact. The presence of the Achaemenid cup both at Sagalassos and Düzen Tepe, plus
the early occurrence of oxidized wares does indeed point to the existence of alternative and persistent ceramic traditions. We may similarly point to the incurving rim bowl and the scarceness of plates. Although the former was widely used, the fact that at both Düzen Tepe and Sagalassos it was the only numerous food consumption shape, is indicative for dining practices.

What is very important to consider, is the different character of Düzen Tepe and Sagalassos. The former has been characterized as a proto-urban settlement,\textsuperscript{1424} less sophisticated than the latter.\textsuperscript{1425} Even though Düzen Tepe was a fortified settlement,\textsuperscript{1426} it had a rather old-fashioned appearance as evidenced by the crude construction of its walls, lack of roof-tiles, simple houses and absence of ashlar masonry.\textsuperscript{1427} Amenities which Sagalassos and other smaller contemporary sites in the region did possess\textsuperscript{1428} and which Waelkens sees as features of a ‘Hellenization’ process transforming Pisidia and Sagalassos.\textsuperscript{1429}

Though there is some doubt as to the exact occupational span of Düzen Tepe and if and when it was contemporaneous with Sagalassos\textsuperscript{1430} the above suggests that despite obvious differences in the material outlook of each community both utilized tableware assemblages, relatively comparable in terms of shape morphology, which illustrates that both sites were not trend-setting communities in terms of ceramic production and consumption. The links with the major tableware producers of Asia Minor’s West Coast were faint. Though both sites, especially Sagalassos during the latter Hellenistic period appear to have been aware of more widely carried trends, this did not result in a major overhaul of the tableware assemblage at Düzen Tepe and Sagalassos. Tableware therefore was relatively unaffected by the Hellenizing influences from Western Asia Minor impacting other aspects of material culture (at Sagalassos).

The choice for tableware at both communities was most likely primarily influenced by what was current and available locally or within the immediate region. It indeed has been argued in the case of Sagalassos that the tableware considered,
though fitting within wider Hellenistic trends, shows closer connections with Cyprus and the Levantine area, not so much with the major centres of Hellenistic pottery located further west. Tableware perhaps was a medium to mundane to be transformed at the same pace as other aspects of material culture, like, for example, architecture, which had a greater public display value. The absence of Hellenic influences at one site but present at the other, while both entertain a roughly similar (in very general terms) ceramic shape repertoire, illustrates that ‘Hellenization’ processes did not necessarily impact everyday ceramic utensils. Alternatively, local and regional traditions may have continued to be preferred.

**1.4.5 Kozluca**

It is dangerous, however, to be too generalizing. The tableware recovered by means of a non-intensive surface survey from a site, Kozluca, close to Sagalassos, (fig. 103), provides a somewhat different picture as the ceramic material collected from this site corresponds somewhat better to material from elsewhere. Of interest in this respect is the presence of mouldmade bowls and large grey ware platters with upturned rim (possibly of Ionian manufacture). Rolled rim, off-set rim and projecting rim plates (appendix 1.4.3.table 36) have also been identified. Rouletted cups and bowls are present as well (fig. 104). Mouldmade bowls interestingly were most numerous among the beverage consumption material collected from the site. All of these shapes are attested on the more well-known Hellenistic sites and are therefore indications that Kozluca was perhaps more in tune with ceramic fashions of Asia Minor’s West coast then Sagalassos and Düzen Tepe.

In part the observed pattern could be related to the more strategic location of Kozluca or ancient Kormasa, which was positioned along the main thoroughfare connecting the interior with the coast. It is possible, however, that this material is not contemporary with that from the Sagalassian findspots previously discussed and the differences observed may therefore have a chronological background. It is conceivable, however, that Kozluca, whose tableware repertoire appears to date primarily to the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, acted different from Sagalassos and Düzen Tepe in terms of ceramic production and consumption. The shapes just mentioned conform better to

---

1431 E.g. Grey Ware platters. See Rotroff 1997a: 233; Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: 31-36
1432 Waelkens et al 2000: 190-192, Figure 3
some well-known Hellenistic types and certainly appear to have formed a more important part of the tableware repertoire at Kozluca, then at Sagalassos or Düzen Tepe. Continuity with Sagalassos and Düzen Tepe is, however, also visible as illustrated by the common occurrence of the incurving rim bowl among the sampled material and the presence of the mastos. The more strategic location of Kozluca in terms of connectivity may indeed have had a hand in the different outlook of its tableware repertoire.
## Appendix 1.5. Data for Chapter VII

### 1.5.1 Gordion

| Category                        | Fabric + shape | Attic | Skyphos, Corinthian type | Attic? | Fishplate | Kantharos | Dense orange ware | Echinus bowl, shallow | Grey-pink fineware | Kantharos | Salter | Orange | Kantharos | Echinus bowl, shallow | Red ware | Kantharos | Salter | Semi fine buff | Kantharos | Bowl, outturned rim | Salter | Echinus bowl, shallow | Semi fine grey | Kantharos | Bowl, outturned rim | Salter | Echinus bowl, shallow | Unidentified | Fishplate | Kantharos | Bowl, outturned rim | Salter | Echinus bowl, shallow |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-------|--------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------|--------|----------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|--------|---------------------|----------|----------------------|---------|---------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|--------|---------------------|
|                                | 65             | 1     | 1                        | 3      | 2         | 1         | 5                | 5                    | 2                   | 1         | 1      | 13     | 1         | 12                    | 2        | 1         | 1      | 9                   | 2        | 3                    | 1       | 3                   | 13                  | 1        | 1                   | 3       | 3                   |
|                                | %              | 2     | 2                        | 5      | 3         | 2         | 8                | 8                    | 3                   | 2         | 2      | 20     | 2         | 18                    | 3        | 2         | 2      | 14                  | 3        | 5                    | 2       | 12                  | 20                  | 2        | 2                   | 5       | 5                   |
|                                |                |       |                          |        |           |           |                  |                      |                     |           |        |        |          |                       |          |           |        |                     |          |                      |         |                     |                      |          |                     |         |                     |
|                                |                |       |                          |        |           |           |                  |                      |                     |           |        |        |          |                       |          |           |        |                     |          |                      |         |                     |                      |          |                     |         |                     |

### Chronology 333-275 BC
Table 37: Catalogued and collected tableware from Gordion (Stewart 2010) and dated to 333-275 BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gordion</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Chronology 333-235 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse buff fabric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse grey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine buff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim bowl</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl, shallow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine grey</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim bowl</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl, shallow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine grey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine grey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine grey to buff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38: Catalogued and collected tableware from Gordion (Stewart 2010) and dated to 333-235 BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gordion</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Chronology 235-189 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, fine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine buff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging rim platter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting rim bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 39: Catalogued and collected tableware from Gordion (Stewart 2010) and dated to 235-189 BC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gordonia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chronology Ca. 200 BC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddish brown, grey core</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down curved rim dish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-orange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, recurved handle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine buff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everted rim bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting rim bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine grey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 40: Catalogued and collected tableware from Gordion (Stewart 2010) and dated to ca. 200 BC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gordonia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse buff fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine buff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down curved rim dish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine buff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everted rim bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging rim platter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting rim bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular rim bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical rim bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting rim bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi fine grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incurved rim bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl kantharos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, recurved handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cylindrical cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down curved rim dish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, incurved rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge rim dish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41: Catalogued and collected tableware from Gordion (Stewart 2010) and dated to ca. 189 BC.
Appendix 1.6. Data for Chapter VIII

1.6.1 Athens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora</th>
<th>Chronology 3rd century BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beverage consumption</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>9 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>11 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, baggy</td>
<td>6 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, moulded rim</td>
<td>6 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, figured</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, pine cone</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net pattern cup</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyx cup</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical kantharos</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food consumption</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep bowl, projecting rim</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishplate</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rilled rim plate</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small decorated plate</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42: Tableware catalogued and collected from Athenian Agora (Rotroff 1982; 1997a) deposits dated between ca. 265-200 BC and 300 BC to ca. 265 BC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora</th>
<th>Chronology 2nd century BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beverage consumption</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup, interior decoration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, angular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, baggy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos, moulded rim</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical cup</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation Knidian cup</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, figured</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, floral</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, imbricate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, long petal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, pine cone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net pattern cup</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two handled cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grey Ware</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italian Thin-Walled Ware?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thin-Walled ware</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knidian Gray Ware</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-handled cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pergamene ware</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, floral</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unidentified</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, figured</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, floral</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl, long petal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43: Tableware catalogued and collected from Athenian Agora deposits dated within the 2nd century BC (Rotroff 1982, 1997a, 2006a; Hayes 2008; Thompson 1934).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two handled cup</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, vertical upper wall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep bowl, projecting rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, offset rim</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, upturned rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rilled rim plate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled rim plate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltcellar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltcellar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Arezzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athenian Agora</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical bowl, footed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long petal bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Minor grey ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl/skyphos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinthian red slip ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>ESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESBI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl/plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESBII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian thin-walled ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Arezzo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knidian grey ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin walled ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaker/jar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White ground ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi glazed bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemispherical cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44: Tableware catalogued and collected from Athenian Agora deposits dated to the 1st century BC (Rotroff 1997a; Hayes 2008; Robinson 1959)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athens South slope Acropolis</th>
<th>Chronology Sullan deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric + shape</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>4 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouldmade bowl</td>
<td>7 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>3 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, outturned rim</td>
<td>2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two handled cup</td>
<td>2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knidan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knidan cup</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinus bowl</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45: Tableware catalogued and collected from deposit C 14, South acropolis, Athens (Vogeikoff-Brogan 2000).
1.6.2

1.6.2.A. Hellenistic Athens and Ephesus: Ceramic Comparison

**Athens and Ephesus, The 3rd century BC**
Appendix 1.6.1.table 42 and 1.3.3.table 18-19 present the tableware data of Athens and Ephesus pertaining to the 3rd century BC. The Ephesian deposit evidence concerns mainly the second half of the 3rd century BC. Most common beverage consumption vessels attested during this span are Hellenistic skyphoid kantharoi, Hellenistic s-shaped kantharoi and skyphoid West Slope beakers. At the Athenian Agora in contrast this honour befalls the varieties (straight-walled, angular, and baggy) of the Hellenistic kantharos and the cup with interior decoration.

In terms of vessels used for dining, common shapes like the echinus and outturned rim bowl are identified at both sites, together with a number of different plate shapes, some of which are attested at both sites. Notable differences, however, are the fact that the, at Athens popular rolled rim and fish plates were scarce at Ephesus during the 3rd century BC. The Ephesian plate with broad rim, though seemingly inspired by Athenian examples, appears also peculiar to Ephesus at this stage.\(^{1433}\) In general, however, during the 3rd century BC, similarities among Athenian and Ephesian food consumption vessels are greater than for their beverage consumption counterparts.

**Athens and Ephesus, The 2nd century BC**
Appendix 1.6.1.table 43 and 1.3.3.table 20-21 present the Athenian and Ephesian material considered which stems from deposits dated to within the 2nd century BC. Among material dated to this timespan the mouldmade bowl is now prominently represented. Similarities between the two sites are also visible in the use of West Slope cups with interior decoration. The, at Ephesus popular skyphoid kantharoi and skyphoid West Slope beakers are, however, not paralleled at the Athenian Agora where West Slope beakers of a different morphology are preferred. The application of West Slope itself differed between the two sites.\(^{1434}\) During the second half of the 2nd century BC Knidian cups and ESA are attested at both sites. Lagynos ware has also

\(^{1434}\) Rotroff 2002: 98.
been identified at both Athens and Ephesus. Other well-known extra-regional imports are, however, not present at both sites. ITS, thin-walled ware and Pergamene tableware have, for example, only been identified among the Athenian Agora material considered.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1435} Some applique ware reported at Ephesus possibly comes from Pergamum, however. Mitospoulos-Leon 1991: 60.}

In terms of dining vessels utilized, both Ephesus and Athens share the use of the echinus and outturned rim bowl. The plate with broad rim, so popular at Ephesus, is, however, not attested at the Athenian Agora, were the rolled rim plate and saucer are the primary shapes for the consumption of food. As can be appreciated, the most common shapes used at Athens and Ephesus for the serving and consumption of food, are augmented by vessels which are attested at both sites but also by vessels that are not paralleled.

**Athens and Ephesus, The 1st century BC**

Appendix 1.6.1.table 43 and 1.3.3.table 22-23 present tableware from Athens and Ephesus coming from deposits dated to within the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC. It can be observed that mouldmade bowls and hemispherical cups are attested among the material considered at both Athens and Ephesus. The illustrated Ephesian mouldmade bowls are, however, all of the Ionian type\footnote{\textsuperscript{1436} Ladstätter 2010: 171.} and the popular Ephesian hemispherical cups differ substantially from their Attic counterparts.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1437} Compare Ladstätter 2010: plates 172-173 with Rotroff 1997a: cat. 324-327.} The in Ephesus popular cup with interior decoration is equally not present among Athenian Agora material dated to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC. Food consumption shapes attested at Ephesus also display morphological differences with the material identified at the Athenian Agora. Shapes like the plate with broad lip, conical plate, plate with \textit{gedrechselte} rim or plate with \textit{beidseitig verdickte lippe} are not paralleled among 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC Athenian material. Also at the Athenian Agora, however, certain shapes identified cannot be paralleled at Ephesus. Examples are the saucer, rilled rim plate and footed hemispherical bowl.

The imports attested at both sites present a more uniform picture. At the Athenian Agora identified are ESA, thin walled ware, white ground ware, grey ware, lagynos ware, ITS, Knidian grey ware, ESB, ESC and ESD. Except for ESD all these wares
are also to be found among Ephesian material dated to the 1st century BC. Athens and Ephesus were thus able to receive or acquire a similar range of imports.
Appendix 2 Figures

Scale of figures is, except for the tableware presented from Sagalassos, relative and serves solely to indicate general vessel size.
Figure 1: The Hellenistic world (Braund 2006: Fig. 2.1).
Figure 2: Categories of Hellenistic pottery widely attested: A) mouldmade bowls, B) West Slope ware, C) Hadra Hydria, D) Lagynos/White ground ware, E) unguentaria (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: Plate 77, cat. 452, plate 141, fig. B; Rotroff 1997a: plate 19, cat. 206-208, plate 113, cat. 1500a, plate 115, cat. 1505-1507.)
Figure 3: Hellenistic Greece (Source: Errington 2008: map 3).
Figure 4: Western Asia Minor (Source: Errington 2008: map 2).

Figure 6: Popular Corinthian Hellenistic pottery shapes not attested at Athens (Source: James 2010: figure 4, cat. 29, figure 6, cat. 36, figure 7, cat. 40, figure 13, cat. 72, figure 17, cat. 109).
Figure 7: Widespread ‘Hellenistic’ shapes (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 5, cat. 27-28, figure 50, cat. 709, 711, 713, figure 59, cat. 879-88, figure 62, cat. 979, figure 63, cat. 993-994; Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 77, cat. 452-453, plate 78, cat. 455, 456).

Figure 9: Common Decorative Techniques seen in the Hellenistic Period: A) rouletting, B) stamping, C) West Slope decoration, D) mouldmade decoration, E) White ground decoration (Source: Rotroff 1997a: plate 19, cat. 208, plate 142, cat. 638, plate 143, 653. plate 144, 852; Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 5, cat. 13, 19, plate 18, cat. 105, plate 20, 122, plate 77, cat. 453).
Figure 10: Asia Minor (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 11: A) lekanai, B) plain ware bowls (Source: Rotroff 2006a: figure 10, cat. 52, figure 48, cat. 275, figure 52, cat. 306-308, 312-313).
Figure 12: ICRATES data sheet (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 13: Relationship between deposit sample Athenian Agora and material published in catalogue (Source: Rotroff 2006a: figure 1).

Figure 14: A) echinus bowl, B) Classical kantharos (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 5, cat. 27-28, figure 62, cat. 979, figure 63, cat. 993-934).
Figure 15: Various Athenian Agora rolled rim plates (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 45, cat. 652-654, figure 47, 660-661, figure 48, 670-671, figure 49, 688-689).

Figure 16: Attic rilled rim plates (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 54, cat. 788-790, figure 55, cat. 803-805, plate 68, cat. 791-801).
Figure 17: Map of Greece, marking position of Athens and New Halos (Source: Reinders 2003: figure 0.1).

Figure 18: A) Classical and cup kantharoi, B) Hellenistic kantharoi, C) cup-kantharoi (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 5, cat. 27-28, figure 8, cat. 73-75, figure 14, cat. 187-190, figure 16, cat. 232-235, figure 22, ca. 357-363, plate 35, fig. 360-362).
Figure 19: A) fishplates, B) rolled rim plates, C) outturned rim bowls, D) incurving rim bowls, E) small bowls/salters (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 51, cat. 716, 724, figure 47, cat. 655-656, figure 59, cat. 872, 874-875, figure 62, cat. 981-982, figure 65, cat. 1080-1082).

Figure 20: Common tableware shapes attested at New Halos. A) Classical kantharoi, B) bolsals, C) fishplates, D) echinus bowls, E) salters (Source: Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: figure 6.5a, cat. P352-353, P371-372, P374, P388-391, figure 6.5b, P415, P424, figure 6.5c, cat. P452, P448, P451).

Figure 23: Map of Krokan plain with location of Classical and New Halos (Source: Haagsma 2010: figure 2.2).

Figure 24: Map of Thessalian plain, note location of mountain ranges (Source: Bellos et al 2004 figure 1).
Figure 25: Communication routes in the New Halos area (Source: Haagsma 2010: figure 21).

Figure 26: A) Classical kantharoi Athens, B) Classical kantharoi New Halos (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 5, cat. 27-31; Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: figure 6.5b, cat. P408, P411, P415-16, P420, P422-425).
Figure 27: A) straight-walled kantharoi, B) angular kantharoi, C) baggy kantharoi (Source: Rotroff 1997a: plate 16, cat. 173-175, plate 18, cat. 192-194, plate 22, cat. 236-237).

Figure 28: A) one piece kantharos, B) cyma kantharos, C) articulated kantharos (Source: James 2010: plate 3, cat. 3, 29, plate 4, 34-36, plate 5, cat. 44-45, plate 7, cat. 58-59).
Figure 29: A) Attic skyphos, B) koytle C) one handled cup (Source: James 2010: plate 2, cat. 15, 17-18, plate 1, cat. 9, 11, plate 1, cat. 6-8).

Figure 30: A) Sardinian cups with exterior West Slope decoration, B) Skyphoid West Slope cups from Demetrias (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 19, cat. 117-120, plate 20, cat. 121, 124; Furtwängler 1990: 16, figure a-e).
Figure 31: hemispherical bowl with shell feet (Source: Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: figure 6.5b, cat. P406).

Figure 32: A) bolsals from the Athenian Agora, B) bolsals from New Halos (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 13, cat. 168-169, plate 16, cat. 168; Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: figure 6.5a, cat. P371-372, P374).
Figure 33: A) cup kantharoi Athenian Agora, B) cup kantharos New Halos (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 8, cat. 72-77; Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: figure 6.5c, cat. P435).

Figure 34: A) Attic cups with mouldmade feet, B) bowls with mouldmade feet from New Halos (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 20, cat. 311, 315, plate 32, cat. 311); Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: figure 6.5b, cat. P406).
Figure 35: A) Attic cups with interior decoration, B) cups with interior decoration from Demetrias (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 21, cat. 333, 341-342, 348, plate 34, cat. 345-348; Beyer et al 1976: tafel 43, cat. 2, 4, 8).

Figure 36: Attic bowl kantharoi (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 11, cat. 135, 138, 142-144, plate 13, cat. 143-144).
Figure 37: A) Attic echinus bowls and fishplates, B) fishplates and echinus bowls attested at New Halos (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 62, cat. 979-984, 986, figure 51, cat. 717, 725; Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: figure 6.5c, cat. P.448, P.451-452, figure 6.5b, cat. P352-353).

Figure 38: Fishplate from Eretria (Source: Metzger 1993: 127, abbildung 210, cat. 115).

Figure 39: Outturned rim bowl attested at New Halos (Source: Beestman-Kruyshaar 2003: figure 6.5b, cat. P405).
Figure 40: Western Asia Minor (Source: Errington 2008: map 2).
Figure 41: The Troad (Source: Tekkök-Biçken 2000: 95, figure 3).

Figure 42: Ilion lower city excavations (Source: Aylward 1999: figure 1).
Figure 43: A) Classical kantharoi, B) Hellenistic kantharoi and C) plates with off-set rim attested at Ilion (Source: Berlin 1999a: plate 2, cat. 8, 158, plate 3, cat. 61-62, plate 107, 136).

Figure 44: Hemispherical bowls attested at Ilion. A) bowl with interior decoration, B) bowls with exterior decoration. (Source: Berlin 1999a: plate 22, cat. 128, plate 26, cat. 192-193).

Figure 46: Tableware from the Sanctuary deposit, Ilion. A) West Slope drinking cups, B) fishplates (black and semi slipped), C) echinus and outturned rim bowls (black slipped), D) mouldmade and red slipped bowl, E) thin walled red slipped ware, F) thin-walled grey ware, G) Pergamene thin ware, H) ESA (Source: Tekkök-Bičken 1996: figure 4, cat. A14-16, figure 1, cat. A1, A36, figure 3, cat. A6, A9, A4, A38, figure 2, A2, figure 6, A30, figure 7, A34, figure 12, A60-64, figure 13, A67-72, figure 14, A75-79, figure 17, A90, A92, A94).
Figure 47: Plate with off-set rim (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 14, cat. 69).

Figure 48: Distribution of ESA (orange), ESC (dark blue) and ESD (light blue) pre-75 BC (Source: Bes 2007: fig. 58).
Figure 49: Distribution of ESA (orange), ESC (dark blue) and ESD (light blue) 125-25 BC (Source: Bes 2007: fig. 59).

Figure 50: Distribution of ESA (orange), ESB (beige), ESC (dark blue) and ESD (light blue) 30 BC – AD 30 (Source: Bes 2007: fig. 60).
Figure 51: Comparative size of A) Classical kantharoi and B) Hellenistic kantharoi (Source: Rotroff 1997a: plate 2-3, 6-8, 17, plate 18-19-23, plate 24-25, 28-29, 31).

Figure 52: Pergamene? kantharos attested at Ilion, B) Hellenistic angular kantharos from the Athenian Agora (Source: Berlin 1999a: plate 3, cat. 62; Rotroff 1997a: figure 155, cat. 213).
Figure 53: Pergamum and its possessions before 189 BC (Source: Kryston (13/06/2007), Map of Minor Asia after the Treaty of Apamea in 188 BC, en.wikipedia.org. Accessed 13/12/2013.
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Figure 55: Tableware attested in Terrasierung deposit, Prytaneion, Ephesus. (Source: Ladstätter 2010: tafel 162-165).

Figure 56: Tableware attested in Terrace house 1, SR12 deposit, Ephesus (Source: Ladstätter 2003: tafel 29-33).
Figure 57: Ephesian s-shaped kantharoi (Source: Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991: tafel 24, B19-20).

Figure 58: Tableware from the Tetragonus Agora, Ephesus (Source: Gassner 1997: tafel 7, cat. 114-116, tafel 11, cat. 177, 179, cat. 172-173, 175-176, tafel 10, 169-170, tafel 12, cat. 185, 189, 192, 194, tafel 13, cat. 198-197, tafel 21, cat. 277, tafel 8, cat. 125, tafel 7, cat. 119, tafel 14, cat. 209, tafel 21, cat. 274-276, tafel 6, cat. 100-101, cat. 107-109, 111).
Figure 59: Tableware attested in Terrace house 1, well fill 2 deposit, Ephesus (Source: Ladstätter 2003: tafel 7-14).
Figure 60: Tableware attested in the Prytaneion, Vorhof deposit, Ephesus (Source: Ladstätter 2010: tafel 166-188, 211-212).


Figure 64: Cups with interior decoration from A) Ephesus, B) Pergamum, C) Sardis, D) Alt-Agina, E) Athens, F) Demetrias (Source: Gassner 1997: tafel 12, cat. 192, 194, tafel 13, cat. 197-198; Schäfer 1968: D2; Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 31, cat. 208; Smetana-Scherrer 1982: 74, abbildung 59; Rotroff 1997a: figure 21, cat. 333; Beyer el al 1971, tafel 24, cat. 2).
Figure 65: Metal and glass vessels serving as examples for ceramic plate (Source: Ignatiadou 2012: 234-235).
Figure 66: Map of the excavations at Sardis (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 1).
Figure 67: Tableware attested at Sardis dated to the late 4th–early 3rd century BC (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 4, cat. 7, 11, plate 5, cat. 13-14, plate 6, cat. 29-30, plate 10, cat. 52).

Figure 68: Tableware attested at Sardis dated to the mid-3rd–early 2nd century BC (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 8, cat. 36, plate 20, figure 121, 124, plate 22, cat. 144, plate 31, cat. 208; plate 19, cat. 117-120; plate 18, cat. 18).
Figure 69: Pottery of non-‘Greek’ style encountered in the PN contexts and dated to pre-213 BC (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 34, cat. 217, 219, 221, plate 35, cat. 226).

Figure 70: Tableware attested at Sardis dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 30, cat. 204, plate 33, cat. 213, plate 74, cat. 441, plate 115, cat. 657, 659).
Figure 71: Tableware attested at Sardis dated to the 2nd – early 1st century BC (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: Plate 56, cat. 338, plate 28, cat. 354, plate 59, cat. 356).

Figure 72: Grey ware platters (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 16, cat. 88-89, 91).
Figure 73: Partially slipped tableware (primarily composed of echinus bowls and fishplates) attested at Sardis (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 7, cat. 33, plate 11, cat. 55, 57).
Figure 74: Geographical position of Sagalassos in Asia Minor (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).

Figure 76: The Sagalassian deposits considered (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 77: A) unguentaria and B) banded closed shapes from the Apollo Klarios deposit (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 78: Mastoi from Sagalassos (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 79: Conical/ovoid cup/bowl (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 80: The Achaemenid cup (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 81: Incurving rim bowls (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 82: Bowls with thickened exterior rim (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 83: Plates with upturned rim (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).

Figure 84: Oxidized slips (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 85: West Slope (related) ware attested at Sagalassos (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).

Figure 86: Pergamene applique ware (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 87: Mouldmade bowl attested at Sagalassos (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).

Figure 88: The mastos (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 90: metal and glass parallels to ceramic mastos (Source: Ignatiadou 2012: 234-235; Rotroff 1997a: 328-330).

Figure 91: Ceramic medallion bowl (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 21, plate 33, cat. 333).
Figure 92: Glass bowls from A) Maresha, B) Ephesus and C) Athens (Source: Jackson-Tal 2005: figure 1, cat. 1-4; Czurda-Ruth 2007: tafel 1, cat. 2, 5, tafel 2, cat. 16, tafel 3, cat. 29; Weinberg and Stern 2009: figure 2, cat. 25-26, 31).

Figure 93: Cups with interior decoration and vessels of conical shape from A) Sagalassos, B) Ephesus, C) Pergamum, D) Sardis, E) Hama, F) Jebel Khalid (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project; Gassner 1997: tafel 12, cat. 192; Ladstätter 2010: tafel 172, cat. 162-163; Schäfer 1968: D2; Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 31, cat. 208, 210; Christensen and Johansen 1971: figure 6, cat. 60, 63; Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: figure 13, cat. 10, figure 107, cat. 124).
Figure 94: Hellenistic calyx cups from the Athenian Agora (Source: Rotroff 1997a: plate 12, cat. 118-213).

Figure 95: Bowls with thickened exterior rim from A) Sagalassos, B) Paphos, C) Palaepaphos and D) Jebel Khalid (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project; Hayes 1991: figure LXI, cat. 21-22; Maier and Wartburg 1986: figure 5a-b, V; Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: figure 15, cat. 3-4, 7-8).
Figure 96: Fusiform unguentaria from A) the Apollo Klarios deposit and B) the Athenian Agora (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project; Rotroff 2006a: figure 63-64).

Figure 97: A) Banded ware from the Apollo Klarios deposit and white ground ware from B) the Athenian Agora and C) Sardis (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project; Rotroff 1997a: plate 117, cat. 1529, plate 120, cat. 1550, plate 121, cat. 1552; plate 116, cat. 1515; Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 51, cat. 308-309).
Figure 98: The SRSW A) Achaemenid cup and B) mastos (Source: Poblome 1999: figure 8, cat. 1-2, figure 9, cat. 1-4, 9).

Figure 99: Conical/ovoid cup/bowls from A) Sagalassos, B) Jebel Khalid and C) Antioch (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project; Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: figure 107, cat. 124, Waagé 1948: plate II, cat. 52-55a).
Figure 100: ESA Hayes form 17 (Source: Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011: figure 119, cat. 296-300).

Figure 101: The location of Düzen Tepe (Source: Vanhaverbeke et al 2010: figure 1c).
Figure 102: Pottery from Düzen Tepe (Source: Waelkens et al 2011: figure 22).

Figure 103: Location of Kozluca (Source: Kaptijn et al 2013: fig. 1).
Figure 104: Some Hellenistic pottery from Kozluca (Source: Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project).
Figure 105: The Roman road system and the position of Sagalassos (Source: Waelkens et al 2011: figure 3).
Figure 106: The early Hellenistic Gordian tableware assemblage (Source: Stewart 2010: figure 41).

Figure 107: A) Classical kantharos and B) Attic skyphos attested at early Hellenistic Sardis (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 4, cat. 5, 7, 11).
Figure 108: West Slope cups and mouldmade bowl attested at Sardis (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 18, cat. 108, plate 20, cat. 121, plate 31, cat. 210, plate 74, cat. 441).

Figure 109: A) Achaemenid cups and B) ribbed mastoi from Sardis (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 34, cat. 217, plate 23, cat. 156-157).
Figure 112: Widespread Hellenistic tableware shapes. A) Classical kantharos, B) mouldmade bowl, C) fishplate, D) echinus bowl, E) outturned rim bowl, F) cup with interior decoration (Source: Rotroff 1997a: figure 5, cat. 26, figure 21, cat. 333, figure 50, cat. 715, figure 62, cat. 979, figure 60, cat. 893).

Figure 113: The s-shaped kantharos (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 18, cat. 108).
Figure 114: Bowl with projecting rim from Sardis (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 10, cat. 52).

Figure 115: Ionian platters from A) Athens, B) Ephesus and C) Sardis (Source: Rotroff and Oliver Jr. 2003: plate 16, cat. 91; Rotroff 1997a: figure 95, cat. 1574-1575; Mitsopoulos-Leon 1991: tafel 94, F10).
Figure 116: Cooking pots from A) Ilion and B) Gordion (Source: Berlin 1999a: plate 11, cat. 33, 118, 239, plate 12, cat. 242; Stewart 2010: figure 190, cat. 7, figure 192, cat. 21).
Figure 117: Typical Ephesian dining service ca. 100 BC (Ladstätter 2003: abb. 6).
Bibliography

Ancient Sources


Abreviations


Kögler, P. (2010), *Feinkeramik aus Knidos vom mittleren Hellenismus bis in die mittlere Kaiserzeit (ca. 200 v. Chr. bis 150 n. Chr.).* Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.


Mee, C., and Forbes, H. (eds), (1997), A Rough and Rocky Place: The Landscape and Settlement History of the Methana Peninsula, Greece (Results of the Methana Survey Project Sponsored by the British School at Athens and the University of Liverpool) Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.


Zoroğlu (Antalya: Suna & Inan Kıraca Research Institute on Mediterranean Civilizations), x-xx.


Ramsay, W. M. (1890), The Historical Geography of Asia Minor. London: John Murray.


Segal, A. (2003), *Imperial Architecture in the Roman East: The Local and the Unique*. Tel Aviv University.


Stone, P. J. (in prep.), 'Report on the Hellenistic Pottery of Sikyón'.


Strootman, R. (2011a), 'Kings and Cities in the Hellenistic Age', in O. N. van Nijf, and R. Alston (eds), Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age (Leuven: Peeters), 141-154.


Williams, D. (1991), ‘The Invention of the Red-Figure Technique and the Race between Vase-Painting and Free Painting’, in T. Rasmussen and N. Spivey (eds), *Looking at Greek Vases* (New York: Cambridge University Press), 103-130.


Yeo, C. A. (1946), ‘Land and Sea Transportation in Imperial Italy’, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 77: 221-244.
