

# Bryn Mawr Classical Review

Bryn Mawr Classical Review 2004.07.46

---

**Nina Mekacher, Marek Palaczyk, Esther Schönenberger,**  
*Matrizengeformte hellenistische Terrakotten. Amphorenstempel*  
*Grabungen 1965-2001. Eretria Ausgrabungen und Forschungen 12.*  
*Ecole suisse d'archéologie en Grèce. Gollion: Infolio éditions, 2003.*  
**Pp. 256; ill. ISBN 2-88474-400-2. €50.00/CHF 75.00.**

---

**Reviewed by Gloria S. Merker and Mark Lawall, Rutgers University, Newark and University of Manitoba (gmerker@rci.rutgers.edu and lawall@cc.umanitoba.ca)**

Word count: 3668 words

**Nina Mekacher, *Matrizengeformte hellenistische Terrakotten, Eretria XII*, pp. 9-161 (reviewed by Gloria S. Merker)**

In the first part of *Eretria XII*, Nina Mekacher meticulously presents the moldmade terracotta figurines of the second half of the 4th and the 3rd centuries B.C. that were discovered from 1964 to 1995 in the Swiss excavations of the western quarter of Eretria, south of the theater. Although the author's aim, to illuminate the nature of the local coroplastic industry, is the same as that of earlier publications of Eretrian material, her presentation is different, in that it emphasizes the technical aspects of the moldmade figurines.

Chapters I and II (pp. 13-17) relate the history of the study of figurines from Eretria, both from collections and excavations; set out the questions to be considered, especially the matter of local production; and discuss the technical issues inherent in a study of moldmade figurines.

Chapter III (pp. 19-62) presents the evidence in the form of a detailed catalogue of the 191 excavated figurines. This number seems to include everything found, including all fragments. Among them are at least 12 imported pieces. The first 129 figurines in the catalogue are divided into four workshop groups, distinguished from one another by fabric, techniques of molding, treatment of the back, venting, and base type. Groups 1-3 are considered local, while group 4 may have been imported from Attica. Archaeometric analysis of one piece in this group, however, suggests that the clay could be Euboean. Catalogue numbers 130-141 are also identified as imports, while 142-191 appear to be local but cannot be assigned to any of the workshop groups.

The workshop represented by group 1 favored types in the realm of religion and mythology, and is distinguished by handsome busts with heads in a nearly Classical style. The most familiar Eretrian types, however, are found in group 2, which is the largest group. These are mass-produced and rather indifferently made Tanagra types: seated or standing young girls; aulos players; mantle-wrapped women with hair arranged in the melon coiffure; and young boys, nude and seated or mantled and standing. This group is divided into sub-groups,

based upon different treatment of the back and thought to indicate different hands within the workshop. Group 3 is made up mainly of fragments but has enough technical unity to hold it together. Group 4 consists of wall reliefs of very high quality.

In groups 1 and 2, some types are extant in multiple generations; for each of these types, a drawing and a chart of detailed measurements is provided to illustrate the mold series. The groups are expanded in size by reference to related Eretrian figurines published elsewhere.

The periods of activity of the workshops are determined by the archaeological context dates of the figurines. These dates are derived either from the context pottery or the architectural phase, or both. Groups 2 and 4 appear to have been the earliest: group 2 was active from the late 4th to the middle of the 3rd century B.C., and group 4 from the end of the 4th to the first third of the 3rd century. Groups 1 and 3 were active during the 3rd century B.C.

Chapter IV (pp. 63-79) deals with questions of significance and function through a concise study of iconography and context. The discussion focuses on Tanagra types, figurines with jointed limbs, of which there are a small number, and religious or mythological themes. By intention, the discussion does not delve into the historical development of any of these subjects, but concentrates on the contexts with which they are associated at this site. The contexts concerned are houses, a burial, and burned votive deposits located throughout the excavated area, although figurines were found in scattered locations as well. The author is careful to determine whether figurines found in houses actually were part of their equipment. The figurines from four houses are discussed, including the Mosaic House, which yielded the richest assemblage of figurines. Issues discussed include the locations of different types within the houses, the possibility of thematic unity in decoration, and the various ways in which figurines could have been displayed in a dwelling. To the discussion of two figurines found in the burial is added the available information about grave offerings unearthed elsewhere in Eretria during the 19th century. A useful list of the burned deposits is provided with remarks on their function. This chapter is illustrated with useful tables and diagrams, the latter offering a statistical breakdown of iconography in different contexts. Table 3, which lists not only figurines but all of the contents of the burned deposits, was either printed upside down or was very poorly designed.

Chapter V (pp. 81-82) contains a summary of the author's conclusions. A long appendix (pp. 89-107) presents Yvonne Gerber's archaeometric study of the local figurine fabrics. The rather inconclusive nature of the results is perhaps attributable to the use of mixtures of clays by the workshops.

Mekacher's study is admirable for the clarity and discipline of its presentation of the evidence. Scholars who publish excavation terracottas have the disadvantage of drawing conclusions about a local industry from just a slice of the evidence. The author is probably correct in her position that the dependence of Eretrian coroplasts on Attic or Boeotian workshops has been overdrawn in previous studies. This reviewer would agree with her assessment that, on the basis of present evidence, the situation seems to be mixed. One can see clearly that the workshop represented by group 2 produced large numbers of cheap votives of indifferent quality. There is no evidence of the creativity needed to alter or renew types in order to diversify and prolong production. Under such circumstances, the mold series appear to have worn out quickly, so that one finds already by the early 3rd century such a degenerate figurine as catalogue number 54. Indeed, if one did not have the chronological information available from the archaeological contexts, one might be tempted to date some of the figurines in this group to a later period. A workshop such as this one was probably dependent upon molds or prototypes from elsewhere for its production.

On the other hand, the figurines of group 1, with their much higher technical quality and signs of creativity in the adaptation of a head type for different purposes, do suggest a local industry with unique qualities. In this case, the kind of iconographic and stylistic sleuthing that Mekacher has intentionally eschewed in this study might well prove fruitful to determine the sources of workshop materials and inspiration. The uniqueness of any local industry lies not necessarily in absolute originality but in the way its workshops adapted borrowed materials and ideas to local needs.

Although published in 2003, the manuscript of this study was closed in 2000, and hence the latest publication cited dates to 1998.

**Marek Palaczyk and Esther Schönenberger, *Amphorenstempel Grabungen 1965-2001, Eretria XII*, pp. 163-233 (reviewed by Mark Lawall)**

The second part of *Eretria XII* (Palaczyk and Schönenberger) presents a catalogue of 216 stamped amphora handles from the Swiss excavations between 1965 and 2001. The section begins by succinctly making the point that stamped amphora handles are exceptionally important both for providing evidence for dates of archaeological contexts and for providing evidence for ancient economic history (p. 177). While the work provides a wealth of new chronological evidence, the importance of which I shall highlight below, its contribution to economic studies is less successful.

The main part of the text opens with a summary of the classes of amphora stamps present in the collection (pp. 179-181). The expected major classes of stamps are all here: Thasian, especially in the first three quarters of the 3rd century; Rhodian, for the mid to late 3rd century; Knidian, for the 2nd century. Chios, for the 3rd century, is surprisingly well represented as is the *Parmeniskos* group, also from the 3rd century. *Ikos*, *Eretria*, *Paros*, and *Sinope* contribute one stamp each, and there is a small group of stamps from unknown producers. The authors express some surprise at the lack of stamped amphora handles from the western Mediterranean (p. 181); however, it is important to note that *amphoras* from the West are published from *Eretria*.<sup>1</sup> A comparison between the presence of the different classes of amphora stamp at *Eretria* and the profiles at other sites reveals that *Thasos* is relatively well represented at 9.1% of the total. *Rhodes* is underrepresented at 11.4%. A significant contribution from *Knidos* (53.4%) fits well with the patterns at *Athens*, *Delos* and *Tenos* (p. 182). *Eretria* clearly drew amphora imports from the major supplier in each major period (as summarized above). The authors propose that *Eretria's* commercial connections faced more to the north and to the Black Sea than did those of nearby *Athens*. While it is true that the *Parmeniskos* group (likely from the region of *Pella*, see below) seems to have a greater relative presence at *Eretria* than at *Athens*, the single *Eretrian* stamp reportedly found at *Olbia Pontica* before 1869 and two *Sinopean* stamps at *Eretria* hardly confirm the proposed special interest in Pontic trade (p. 181).<sup>2</sup> A closer study then follows of the distribution of amphora stamps found in House I and its environs near the West Gate of the city (p.183). No stamps are associated with the early fourth-century construction of the house; Thasian, Chian and other unidentified classes appear in the house's early third-century expansion; Knidian amphora stamps are most common in the third phase (second century). And yet, while the reader is provided with a concordance listing each *Fundkomplex* (FK) and the catalogue numbers pertaining to each FK (pp. 229-230), it remains difficult to know to which building phase each FK belongs.

Next is a catalogue of the 219 stamps (pp. 187-228). This catalogue deserves to be studied in some detail as it contains fundamental evidence related to the chronological arrangement of many different classes of amphora stamps.

The catalogue leads off with the Thasian stamps and here the volume provides perhaps the most significant chronological evidence. Of particular importance is Denis Knoepfler's thesis that Antigonos Gonatas sacked Eretria early in the Chremonidean War, probably in 265 BC.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the Thasian eponym Euagoras, two stamps (Cat. Nrs. 6-7) of which are found in a well filled in with debris from this sack, should date before 265. The same name was also found at Koroni but only in a survey of 1959, ahead of the published American excavation season of July 1960.<sup>4</sup> Another Thasian eponym Apollodoros (Cat. Nr. 3) is stylistically similar to Kleostratos found at Koroni. Apollodoros, too, should date before 265.<sup>5</sup> Theopompos (Cat. Nrs. 8-9), stylistically linked to Koroni eponyms Idnades and Demalkes, appears twice at Eretria.<sup>6</sup> One findspot is the surface near the Mosaic House, a building thought to have suffered in the Antigonid sack. The stratigraphic context is not as indicative as might be hoped, but it does raise the possibility that Theopompos, too, should fall before 265. A quite drastic shift comes with the eponym Kadmos who appears in the destruction level of the Mosaic house. This eponym's date has never been securely fixed, but it too must be before 265. It is unclear why the authors use "early third century" instead of ca. 265 for the destruction date of the Mosaic house (cf. Schmid 2000, 362-363).

The Rhodian stamps (Cat. Nrs. 21-45) may be passed over with little comment. The authors were not able to take account of Finkielsztejn's most thorough presentation of his 'low chronology',<sup>7</sup> but they were able to include useful references to earlier publications by Finkielsztejn that indicate the basic ideas. The catalogue entries themselves include useful collections of synchronisms between eponyms and fabricants and very up to date lists of findspot references for each stamp. The Eretrian findspots themselves seem to add little to current discussion of the Rhodian chronology. The only example from a potentially useful context (closed in 198) is an eponym stamp only preserving the month name (Cat. Nr. 38).

The two Zenon group-A stamps (Cat. Nrs. 46 and 47, under the heading "protoKnidian"), types close to those found at Koroni, may also offer useful chronological evidence. Both examples were apparently from excavation in section F/5. One (Cat. Nr. 47) even comes from a specific stratum of the excavation. But what is "Schnitt 51, Schicht 1"? Were any other datable objects here? What about the next level up? Even without this information, the presence of the dotted border (*Kugelkranz*) with the ZH/AN stamp (nr. 47) usefully brings the eponym AN(- close in style to those found at Koroni.<sup>8</sup> Such details begin to bring the ZH-group stamps into some rough chronological order. Even this sort of evidence is quite welcome since, as the authors point out, the class is dated by only two contexts, Koroni and the Serce Limani Hellenistic wreck. The date of the latter is not as securely fixed as might be suggested by the authors (p. 199) since it depends heavily on the date of one stamped Thasian amphora,<sup>9</sup> and the Thasian chronology in this period remains in some disarray (as indicated by the discussion above).

The presentation of the many Knidian stamps (Cat. Nrs. 48-162) follows the chronological scheme put forward by Grace and colleagues. The authors note that this chronological scheme is closely tied with that of Rhodes, but they were unable to consider implications of revisions to the Rhodian chronology and recent discussions of problems related to the Knidian chronology (e.g., Jefremov's extensively argued alternative Knidian chronology is mentioned once in footnote 56).<sup>10</sup> The excavations at Eretria do provide further potentially useful clusters of stamps from single excavation contexts (e.g., the cistern on the Acropolis of unspecified closing date), and such groups should assist the eventual refinement and detailed publication of the Knidian corpus.

The volume provides especially important new evidence for Chian stamp chronologies (Cat.

Nrs. 163-186). While Chian coin-type stamps of the 5th century are often discussed,— the single name stamps of the Hellenistic period are not. Grace's publications from the Pnyx and Delos provide some discussion of this chronology; recent discussions from Pergamon focus more on the range of Chian stamps present than on new chronological evidence.<sup>12</sup> Three Chian stamp names appear at Eretria: Ermhô- (Cat. Nrs. 163-171), Ikesios (nrs. 172-185), and Men(- (nr. 186). Before now, stamps of Ermhô- could be dated at best to the late 3rd century, or more likely the early 2nd century. Four examples had been found in the upper fill of the Chian well published by J.K. Anderson in 1954.<sup>13</sup> Anderson placed the accompanying pottery between Homer Thompson's Hellenistic pottery groups B and C in the mid third century. Since Group B is now thought to have closed shortly after ca. 230 BC, the date of this Chian fill must move down as well, even to the early second century.<sup>14</sup> While most findspots from Eretria would fit a late 3rd or early 2nd century date quite well, there is one findspot for a stamp of Ermhô- (Cat. Nr. 169) that does seem to require a date before 265 BC. This evidence lends some support to another recent publication of a Chian stamp, this one naming Philistes, which offered a context-based date of ca. 300 BC.<sup>15</sup> The other very common Chian stamp type at Eretria names Ikesios, and for this name the Eretrian evidence continues to support a date late in the 3rd century (especially Cat. Nr. 180 from House IV room L, thought to have been destroyed in Flamininus' attack<sup>16</sup>). This name, too, appeared in Anderson's well, and Grace referred to two Athenian findspots of similar date (Agora deposits N20:6 and O20:2). Closing dates for all three contexts now fall no earlier than the last quarter of the 3rd century, and yet the striking difference in the heights of the rim above the handles between cat. nrs. 176 and 180, both stamped by Ikesios, seems to indicate a considerable span of time for even this one name to have been in use on stamps. With such a wide range of dates for these Chian stamps, and with so few names repeated so often, there is clearly much to be done with Chian practices of amphora stamping and reasons for amphora stamping across the Aegean.

The small set (Cat. Nrs. 187-194) of stamps from the Parmeniskos group provides a welcome addition to the published examples from the Aegean outside Pella itself. As the authors note, Pella appears increasingly to be the epicenter for this group's production. In this regard it is important to note that Ian Whitbread did not demonstrate a Chalkidikean production of this group, only that the petrology of the fabric *could fit* the central or western Chalkidike.<sup>17</sup> Whitbread did not consider production nearer Pella, so this question remains open.

Only three Coan stamps appear here, and their significance is more to sound a note of caution than any substantive point of chronology. "Coan corpus" numbers often appear with such stamps with reference to a forthcoming publication ("des seit langem angekündigten Corpus," [p. 222]). And yet two of the three Coan stamps published here (Cat. Nrs. 196-197) are not in the "Corpus". One must assume that the Corpus numbers will have to change to reflect such new arrivals. So, why refer to an unpublished, and clearly incomplete, corpus? A minor difficulty in the introductory text for this section is the continued association of the so-called Nikandros group with Kos. Verena Gassner tentatively proposed an Ephesos-area provenance for the group. Her theory is supported by Gonca Cankardas-Senol's publication from Metropolis, where, as in nearby Ephesos, the class is very common.<sup>18</sup>

Miscellaneous stamps from known and unknown producers follow the Coan stamps. These discussions do tend to include consideration of the dates of accompanying pottery and the chronological evidence provided by the FK. Thus, for example, the rare stamp from Eretria itself (Cat. Nr. 198) is accompanied by late 4th through 3rd century pottery. One wonders if anything could be said of the context, however, in terms of its relationship to the ca. 265

or 198 BC destructions of the city.

Much more could have been done with the evidence provided by findspots. True, the stamps found in and near House I are mapped piece by piece. We are told that Chian, Thasian, and other stamps are associated with the early third-century phase of House I, but we are never told which stamps these are. There is no attempt to present the FK in terms of stratigraphically and historically meaningful groups such as those preceding the Antigonid attack, those related to the attack and its aftermath, those associated with Flamininus' attack, and those associated with Sulla's attack.

If the volume is generally successful and often extremely significant in providing evidence for archaeological chronologies, the first part of its stated objectives, it is less successful in addressing its second objective -- amphora stamps as making a contribution to economic history. The authors follow the entirely traditional approach of presenting numbers of stamps of each major class (Thasian, Rhodian, Knidian) and 'other' as percentages of the total of all Archaic through Hellenistic stamps.<sup>19</sup> A popular variation on this approach is to present the number of stamps in one class assignable to arbitrarily defined units of time as percentages of the total number of stamps in that class at the given site.<sup>20</sup> Recognizing that stamps do not provide a complete picture of ancient amphora shipping (since certain classes of amphora rarely or never stamped their jars), the authors argue that comparing sites only in terms of the stamped classes is a valid approach (p. 177). On this point, however, the evidence is unconvincing. In order for such comparisons to inform our knowledge of the history of amphora shipping, all sites in question should have the same possibility of importing amphoras for the same duration of time. If one site ceases to exist and therefore stops importing a half-century before the other, then the percentage of 'early' amphoras at the shorter-lived site will be exaggerated. The percentages are spread over a shorter span of time. Nowhere is this more clearly shown than in the comparison between the amphora stamps from the Middle Stoa fill in Athens and the overall imports to Athens (p. 182). Of course there are proportionately more Thasians and Rhodians in the Middle Stoa fill than in the city as a whole -- the Stoa fill stopped accumulating stamps before the rest of the city. If the percentage of, for example, Thasians in one Athenian graph differs so much from another Athenian graph, then surely such data, configured in this way, are problematic for reconstructing the economic history of Athens. Of similarly questionable validity is the comparison between, on the one hand, stamps accumulating at Eretria across the entire Archaic through Hellenistic periods and, on the other hand, those at Pergamon where the stamp collection is dominated by an unusually dense and massive late third to mid second-century amphora dump.<sup>21</sup>

Studies of amphora patterns at sites in the western Mediterranean offer an alternative approach.<sup>22</sup> This approach documents the percentages contributed by each producer in each clearly definable phase at the site (e.g., late Republican, Augustan, Flavian, etc.). In doing so, one controls for the variable occupational histories of different sites and one only compares comparable phases. Eretria, with its many identified destruction contexts, offers an excellent opportunity to adopt such an approach in the Aegean. Here again, alongside issues of chronology, is a reason to present the material (at least at some point in the volume) sorted according to major phases in the site's history.

Of course, even this approach does not avoid the problem that the number of, for example, Chian stamps found at a site is in no way indicative of the number of Chian *amphoras* found at that site. The authors recognize this problem (e.g., pp. 177 and 182-183; indeed, the problem has been widely recognized since 1982<sup>23</sup>), but it seems the traditional acceptability of the 'epigraphic' amphora publication will not change any time soon.

## Notes:

1. S.G. Schmid (2000) A group of early Hellenistic pottery from a well in Eretria, in *E Epistêmonikê Sunantêsê gia tên Ellênistikê Keramikê. Chronologika problêmata kleista sunola ergastêria*, Chania 1997. Athens, nr. 70; I. Metzger (2000) Funde aus einem Brunnen um Gebäude IV in Eretria, in *E Epistêmonikê Sunantêsê gia tên Ellênistikê Keramikê. Chronologika problêmata kleista sunola ergastêria*, Chania 1997. Athens, pl. 177a. The length of time between the appearance of Eretria XII and the appearance of this review is entirely the fault of Lawall; Merker's section was produced with admirable speed.
2. On problems associated with unusual finds "from Olbia" in the nineteenth century see J. Boardman (1998) Olbia and Berezan: The early pottery, in G.R. Tsetskhladze (ed.) *The Greek Colonisation of the Black Sea Area*. Stuttgart, 203-204. While Boardman's cautions in no way refute the attribution of this amphora stamp to Olbia, his comments should be borne in mind.
3. For the proposal of an attack on Eretria in ca. 265, see D. Knoefler (1993) *Les kryptoi* du stratège Épicharès à Rhamnonte et le début de la guerre de Chrémonidès, *BCH* 117, 339.
4. Record of this stamp is on file at the American School of Classical Studies archives.
5. Cf. A. Avram (1999) Matériel amphorique et non amphorique dans deux sites de la chôra d'Istros (Histria Pod et Cogealac), in Y. Garlan (ed.), *Production et commerce des amphores anciennes en Mer Noire. Colloque international organisé à Istanbul, 25-28 mai 1994*. Aix-en-Provence, 224, suggesting a date of 265 BC; on the relationship between Kleostratos and Apollodoros, see too Y. Garlan (1993) Nouvelles remarques sur la chronologie des timbres amphoriques thasiens, *JS*, 167-169.
6. On the grouping of Theopompos, Idnades and Demalkes, see too Garlan 1993, 168-169 and Avram 1999, 224.
7. G. Finkielsztejn (2001) *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des eponyms amphoriques rhodiens, de 270 à 108 av. J.-C. environ: Premier bilan* (BAR International Series 990), Oxford.
8. E. Vanderpool, J.R. McCredie & A. Steinberg (1962) Koroni: A Ptolemaic Camp on the East Coast of Attica, *Hesperia* 31, nr.113 with the eponym abbreviation SÔ also shows the dotted border.
9. Along with reference cited by the authors, see C. Pulak and R.F. Townsend (1987) The Hellenistic shipwreck at Serçe Limani, Turkey: Preliminary report, *AJA* 91, 31-57.
10. M. Lawall (2002) Early excavations at Pergamon and the chronology of Rhodian amphora stamps, *Hesperia* 71, 318-320.
11. E.g., V.R. Grace (1979) *Amphoras and the ancient wine trade* (AgPicBook 6, rev. ed.) Athens, figs. 44-45; H.B. Mattingly (1981) Coins and amphoras -- Chios, Samos and Thasos in the 5th c. B.C., *JHS* 101, 78-81; J.P. Barron (1986) Chios in the Athenian Empire, in J. Boardman and C.E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.) *Chios: A conference at the Homereion in Chios*, Oxford, 89-103.
12. V.R. Grace (1956) Stamped Wine Jar Fragments, in *Small Objects from the Pnyx II* (*Hesperia Supplement* 10). Princeton. 117-189.; V.R. Grace and M. Savvatianou-Pétropoulakou (1970) Les timbres amphoriques grecs, in P. Bruneau (ed.) *L'îlot de la maison des comédiens* (Exploration archéologique de Délos 27). Paris. 277-382.; for the extensive publication of Chian stamps from Pergamon, see C. Börker and J. Burow, 1998. *Die hellenistischen Amphorenstempel aus Pergamon* (Pergamenische Forschungen 11). Berlin.
13. J.K. Anderson (1954) Excavations on the Kofiná Ridge, Chios, *BSA* 49, 123-172. Detailed records of the stamps from this well are kept in the Virginia Grace files in the Archives of the American School of Classical Studies (these files are referred to as the Agora Archive in this volume, but the material is now stored at the American School of

Classical Studies).

14. For the initial chronology, see H.A. Thompson (1934) *Two centuries of Hellenistic pottery*, *Hesperia* 3, 311-480. This is then brought up to date by S.I. Rotroff (1997) *Hellenistic Pottery. Athenian and Imported Wheelmade Table Ware and Related Material*, *The Athenian Agora* vol. 29. Princeton. Now the lowering of the Rhodian amphora stamp chronology places the closing of Group B even slightly later, after ca. 230 BC; see Finkielsztejn 2001. Rotroff explores the implications of this revision for Hellenistic fineware dates in two forthcoming articles; I am grateful to her for being able to read these papers ahead of their publication.

15. G. Jöhrens (1998) *Amphorenstempel im Nationalmuseum von Athen zu den von H.G. Lolling aufgenommenen "unedierten Henkelinschriften."* Mit einem Anhang: *Die Amphorenstempel in der Sammlung der Abteilung Athen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*. Athens.

16. See E. Schönenberger (1998) *Die hellenistischen Amphorenstempel*, in K. Reber (ed.) *Die klassische und hellenistischen Wohnhäuser im Westquartier. Eretria Ausgrabungen und Forschungen* 10. Lausanne, 239 and 241. There are some other problems in the presentation of Chios here. The authors place Chian production as starting in the mid 6th century BC (p. 218). Chian production is securely identified from the mid seventh century, see P. Dupont (1998) *Archaic East Greek Trade Amphoras*, in R.M. Cook and P. Dupont, *East Greek Pottery*, London, 148. Second, the start of Chian stamping falls before the change to straight neck amphoras ca. 425 BC. An incuse A stamp appears on the latest bulging-neck types (see M.L. Lawall (1998) *Ceramics and Positivism Revisited: Greek transport amphoras and history*, in H. Parkins and C. Smith (eds.) *Trade, Traders and the Greek City*, London, 84), and early in the 5th century there are occasional examples of an impressed circle replacing the painted circle of the late Archaic Chian type. Finally, the proposed Chian attribution of stamps of Aristodikos (p. 225, Cat. Nr. 202) is unlikely due to the unusual coarseness of the fabric associated with the Aristodikos stamps.

17. I.K. Whitbread (1995) *Greek transport amphorae: A petrological and archaeological study*. Athens, 216-219.

18. V. Gassner (1997) *Das Südtor der Tetragonos-Agora: Keramik und Kleinfunde* (FiE XIII 1/1). Vienna; and G. Cankardas, Senol (2001) *Metropolis'den hellenistik döneme ait bir grup amphora mühürü*, *Olba* 4, 101-115.

19. This approach is also used by R. Etienne (1990, *Ténos II. Ténos et les Cyclades du milieu du IVe siècle av. J.C. au milieu du IIIe siècle ap. J.C.* (BEFAR 263 bis), Athens and Paris; and by Jöhrens 1998; in response to the latter, see M.L. Lawall (2003) *Review of Jöhrens 1998*, in *AJA* 107, 313-314.

20. Just a few recent examples include G. Finkielsztejn (2001) *Politique et commerce a Rhodes au IIe s. a.C.: le témoignage des exportations d'amphores*, in A. Bresson and R. Descat (eds.) *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au IIe s. a.C.* (Ausonius Publications, Études 8), Bordeaux, 181-96; and N. Conovici (1998) *Histria VIII, Les timbres amphoriques 2. Sinope*. Bucarest.

21. Lawall 2002, 314-315.

22. E.g., A. Tchernia (1986) *Oriente ed occidente: Considerazioni su alcune anfore "Egee" di età imperiale a Ostia*, in J.-Y. Empereur and Y. Garlan (eds) *Recherches sur les amphores grecques* (BCH Supplement 13) Athens and Paris, 608-635.

23. J.-Y. Empereur (1982) *Les anses d'amphores timbrées et les amphores: aspects quantitatifs*, *BCH* 106, 219-33.

[Read Latest](#)

[Index for 2004](#)

[Change Greek Display](#)

[Archives](#)

[BMCR Home](#)