

HEROM

JOURNAL ON HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN MATERIAL CULTURE

VOLUME 6, ISSUE 1, 2017

LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

Reprint from Herom, volume 6.1 - © Leuven University Press

CONTENTS

New Light on the Early Days of Sagalassos and its Surroundings	7
<i>John Lund</i>	
Late Achaemenid and Early Hellenistic Pisidian Material Culture from Düzen Tepe (SW Anatolia)	11
<i>Dries Daems, Dennis Braekmans, Jeroen Poblome</i>	
The Pottery of Late Achaemenid Sagalassos: An Overview	49
<i>Dries Daems and Jeroen Poblome</i>	
A Taste of Time. Foodways and Cultural Practices in Late Achaemenid-Early Hellenistic Düzen Tepe (SW Anatolia)	63
<i>Sam Cleymans, Dries Daems, Bea De Cupere, Elena Marinova, Jeroen Poblome</i>	
Hellenistic and Italic Amphorae from Sagalassos	97
<i>Patrick Monsieur, Dries Daems and Jeroen Poblome</i>	
Instructions to Authors	119

HELLENISTIC AND ITALIC AMPHORAE FROM SAGALASSOS

Patrick Monsieur⁽¹⁾, *Dries Daems*⁽²⁾ and *Jeroen Poblome*⁽²⁾

(1) GHENT UNIVERSITY, (2) UNIVERSITY OF LEUVEN

Abstract

Amphorae have traditionally been regarded as ideal proxies for reconstructing contacts between sites within socio-economic networks, because of their intrinsic functionality as transport vessels of agricultural produce. Taking abstraction of exact provenance and trade routes, they also generically represent material attestations for participation in wider trade networks. The aim of this paper is to present an overview of a small number of fragments that can be considered the oldest attestations of amphora fragments, dated to the middle/late Hellenistic (c. 200-25 BCE) and early Roman imperial (25 BCE – 100 CE) periods, found at the archaeological site of Sagalassos, located in ancient Pisidia in southwest Anatolia. The proposed outer date of arrival of the oldest of these fragments coincides with a phase of development of the urban fabric of Sagalassos and its associated material culture. It is suggested that the appearance of amphorae at Sagalassos and the associated participation in wider trade networks is one attestation of a wider transition phase, signifying a shift from the primordial roles of individual households towards the workings of the newly developing urban community as a whole.

Keywords

Amphora, Sagalassos, urbanization, community

HELLENISTIC AND ITALIC AMPHORAE FROM SAGALASSOS

Patrick Monsieur⁽¹⁾, *Dries Daems*⁽²⁾ and *Jeroen Poblome*⁽²⁾

(1) GHENT UNIVERSITY, (2) UNIVERSITY OF LEUVEN

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to present an overview of a number of middle/late Hellenistic (c. 200-25 BCE) and early Roman imperial (25 BCE – 100 CE) amphora fragments found at the archaeological site of Sagalassos, located in ancient Pisidia in southwest Anatolia.

Whereas the importance of material culture has long been acknowledged for tracing trade and exchange in the past,¹ amphorae particularly have been regarded as ideal proxies for reconstructing contacts between sites within socio-economic networks, because of their intrinsic functionality as transport vessels of agricultural produce.² The pivotal importance of amphorae implies their extensive study, resulting, at times, in a very detailed description of aspects of fabric, form, chronology, content, provenance and distribution. Establishing the provenance of amphorae found at a given site has great potential to show patterns of connectivity and trade. Counting sherds and/or defining the minimum number of individual vessels or estimated vessel equivalents can be indicative of the intensity of contact.³ However, we should be careful using amphora fragments to automatically assume direct trading contacts between settlements or assess the respective weights of trade routes.⁴ At any rate, such studies are most effective when the spatial and temporal dimensions of the material are contextually linked, requiring the material to derive from securely datable archaeological deposits. Additionally, the

1. Peacock 1977a.
2. Peacock and Williams 1986; Lawall 1998, p. 76. For an historical overview, see Garland 1983.
3. Fulford 1977; Orton 1975; 2009.
4. Lawall 2005, pp. 190-194; Panagou 2016, pp. 209-210.

attested material culture needs to be embedded in a conceptual approach of ancient socio-economic systematics, to make things speak.

Unfortunately, for the material discussed in this paper such arguments are difficult to construct. The town of Sagalassos reached its largest extent during Roman imperial times and continued to be inhabited into the middle Byzantine period. These later occupation phases have covered and/or destroyed much of the archaeology related to the late Achaemenid origins of the community and its original phase of urbanisation in middle Hellenistic times. As a result, the material presented here was in most cases not found *in situ*, making any attempts at linking aspects of connectivity to a secure chronological dimension through these amphorae impossible. Of the studied fragments, three were found during archaeological surveying campaigns within the Ağlasun valley, which Sagalassos overlooks, while the others were found during excavations at the site proper. Of the latter, two were found in a topsoil layer, five in erosional layers, two in late antique fill layers, one in a fourth century CE occupation layer, one in a foundation trench of a building constructed in the second half of the first century CE, and two in foundation trenches linked to construction works in the first half of the first century CE. As even the fragments from the oldest stratigraphic deposits consisted of reworked material brought in during construction works related to the early Roman imperial period, little to no direct chronological information can be derived from this material. The only chronological framework that we can rely on is external, relating to periods of circulation of specific types of amphorae, obtained from other sites. This allows setting the brackets for the Sagalassos fragments to between middle Hellenistic and early Roman imperial times, ranging from c. 200 BCE to 100 CE.

Even though our material comes with clear limits, we considered its presentation to hold some importance. The listing of amphora finds from non-coastal regions in the ancient world has relevance for understanding past realities of circulation of goods, as well as approaching socio-economic patterns of these past worlds. At Sagalassos, a lot of attention has so far been dedicated to its local pottery production, allowing the presented material to instigate some reflection on wider aspects of urban life. Specifically, (part of) the material can be related to the initial stages of urbanisation, which is an area of growth in studying the history of the region of Pisidia.

Presenting the material

The amount of fragments of Hellenistic and Italic amphorae from Sagalassos is at present very limited.⁵ All were found in locations other than their original contexts. In general, the archaeological harvest at Sagalassos is related mostly to the Roman imperial, late antique and Byzantine periods in line with the archaeological opportunities offered by the extant urban framework. It should therefore come as no surprise that the discussed amphora fragments are small, resulting from the long object history, starting as imported amphorae in periods before the main archaeology of the site and ending up as sherds in residual positions in scattered deposits. Nevertheless, the identification of the origin of the amphorae and the broad external chronological framework based on typology and fabric provide a first glance at the relations of an inland, mountainous site in Asia Minor with some well-known agricultural production centres and regions on the Aegean and Tyrrhenian coasts. All of the amphorae originally carried wine.

RHODIAN HELLENISTIC AMPHORAE

1. SA-2002-DA2-94 (FIG. 1)

Rim fragment with small part neck and traces of handle, preserved height 4.5 cm, preserved length 7 cm. Exterior light beige with traces pale slip, core beige to brown, well levigated fabric with nearly no inclusions visible, hard fired.



FIG. 1. Rim fragment of Rhodian amphora.

5. The fieldwork leading to this paper was carried out in the 2009 Sagalassos season. Dr. Philip Bes kindly prepared the initial selection of the amphora material. The sherds discussed in this paper were found during a variety of excavations initiated by Marc Waelkens as director of the Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project (1990-2013).

2. SA-2003-SS-134

Lower part vertical handle fragment, preserved height 7.5 cm, diameter 3.5 cm. Exterior beige, core light brown to light red, well levigated fabric with fine white inclusions, one notable red brown inclusion, hard fired.

3. SA-2003-LA2-80 (FIG. 2)

Upper part vertical handle fragment, broken at the bend towards horizontal part, split off lengthwise, preserved height 5.5 cm. Light brown, well levigated fabric with fine colourless, grey and dark inclusions, hard fired. Two other Rhodian fragments, a small shoulder fragment with print of handle attachment and a small wall fragment could form part of the same amphora.



FIG. 2. Wall fragment of Rhodian amphora.

4. SA-1996-B-197

Bottom with beginning of peg toe, interior slightly twisted clay pellet, preserved height 6 cm. Exterior light brown, core red pink, well levigated fabric with fine white and red brown inclusions, badly eroded and decomposing.

5. SA-2003-SS-107 (FIG. 3)

Fragment lower wall, maximum length preserved 6.5 cm. Exterior light brown, traces pale slip, core light red, well levigated fabric with fine white and dark inclusions, hard fired.



FIG. 3. Wall fragment of Rhodian amphora.

The output of wine and amphorae on Rhodes in the Hellenistic period was very considerable.⁶ The top shaped Rhodian amphora with its fine rounded handles was easily recognisable, then as now. These containers were widely distributed throughout the Mediterranean and Levant. Although production started already around 300 BCE, the massive output from Rhodes is best situated between c. 250-80 BCE with a peak in the second century BCE. Both handles of the Rhodian amphorae were systematically stamped with the respective names of the eponym officials and the producers providing invaluable dating clues.⁷ Unfortunately, no stamped handles have been discovered at Sagalassos so far. The First Mithridatic War most probably led to a serious decline of production which ended with the capture of Rhodes in 43 BCE by Cassius. Production was resumed from Augustan times onwards and Rhodian amphorae of a more slender form with typical horned handles were successfully distributed throughout the empire during the first century CE. As far as is known, no fragments of this Roman imperial version turned up at Sagalassos, although production centres in the *peraia* of Rhodos on mainland Asia Minor are well attested and considered prolific.⁸

6. Grace and Savvatianou-Petropoulakou 1970, pp. 289-316; Empereur and Hesnard 1987, pp. 18-20; Withbread 1995, pp. 53-67.
7. Grace 1953; Finkielsztejn 2001.
8. Hesnard 1986; Empereur and Picon 1986, pp. 116-117; 1989, pp. 224-225; Peacock 1977b, pp. 266-270.

KNIDIAN HELLENISTIC AMPHORA?

6. SA-2000-TSW2-13

Middle to lower wall fragment, rather coarse fabric, irregular break, dark brown matrix with lots of small white, dark, red brown and colourless inclusions. Some letters of a graffito *post cocturam* preserved:]I Π (height 1.5 cm) followed at a distance of 1.5 cm by the smaller letters ΥΛ(?) (height 0.5 cm).

Knidian wine and amphora production became important around the end of the fourth and the early third centuries BCE.⁹ Typical morphological features were the egg shaped body, the slender tall strap handles and the ringed toe. From the final decades of the third century BCE on, stamping on the handles became regular. As much as the Rhodian stamps, the Knidian ones are invaluable tools for dating. No Knidian stamps were found in Sagalassos. A wide variety of fabrics is considered to point to a large number of production sites, as also indicated by the stamps. Hellenistic Knidian amphorae circulated widely in the Cyclades, Athens and mainland Greece. An appreciable production continued in Roman imperial times.

KOAN HELLENISTIC AMPHORAE AND IMITATIONS FROM THE ASIA MINOR COAST

7. SA-2000-TSW2-13 (FIG. 4)

Upper vertical part of the two tubes of a double barrelled handle, broken at the bow to the horizontal part, preserved height 8 cm, diameter 2.6 cm. Fairly levigated fabric, exterior greenish beige, core beige, some red brown, black and colourless inclusions, medium-hard fired. Almost certainly original from Kos.



FIG. 4. Handle fragment of Koan amphora.

9. Grace and Savvatianou-Petropoulakou 1970, pp. 317-354; Empereur and Hesnard 1987, pp. 20-21; Withbread 1995, pp. 68-80; Koehler and Wallace Matheson 2004, pp. 163-169.

8. SA-2008-MAC-0084-00136 (FIG. 5)

Upper horizontal part of a double barrelled handle, width 4.8 cm, preserved length 5.5 cm. Beige slip, core brown, fabric with white and dark inclusions, scaly at break, hard fired. Probably Koan imitation from a centre on the Asia Minor coast.



FIG. 5. Handle fragment of Koan imitation amphora.

9. SA-2006-DA-47-88

Wall fragment, preserved length 11 cm. Light greenish slip, core and interior red brown, fabric with colourless and brown inclusions, a fair quantity of white inclusions, sandy but medium-hard fired. Probably Koan imitation from a centre on the Asia Minor coast.

10. SA.2002-DA2-111 (FIG. 6)

Fragment shoulder with handle attachment, preserved length 8 cm, rounded to quadrangular section handle of 2.8 x 3.3cm. Greenish grey exterior, core light brown to pink brown, fabric with red-brown and some white inclusions, medium-hard fired. Imitation of a Rhodian example from Kos or Asia Minor coast?



FIG. 6. Shoulder fragment of Koan imitation amphora.

Wine and amphorae from Kos manifested themselves in the course of the third century BCE.¹⁰ Initially, different types with strap and rounded handles existed, but in the end the double barrelled handles became typical, as well as the thin wall of the body. The slender types of the second and first centuries BCE were much imitated, with fabrics macroscopically hard to distinguish. Petrological analysis and surveys on production sites proved this type to be made on different coastal sites such as at Myndos and even in the peraia of Knidos.¹¹ Kos remained a prolific centre in Roman imperial times with an important distribution. Some fragments of this later production were also found in Sagalassos. In the first century CE, the Koan amphora type became one of the most imitated wine containers in the empire.

CHIAN HELLENISTIC AMPHORA AND LAGYNOS

11. SA-1996-B-192 (FIG. 7)

Fragment shoulder broken at the carination to the lower wall, preserved length 3.5 cm. White slip on surface with red brown core and interior, well levigated fabric with nearly no inclusions visible apart some fine white particles, hard fired.

10. Grace and Savvatianou-Petropoulakou 1970, pp. 363-365; Empeureur and Hesnard 1987, pp. 22-23; Withbread 1995, pp. 81-106.
11. Hesnard 1986; Empeureur and Picon 1986, pp. 109-112; Empeureur and Picon 1989, pp. 225-226; Empeureur and Hesnard 1987, p. 13; Monsieur and De Paepé 2002, pp. 163-166.



FIG. 7. Wall fragment of Chian amphora.

12. SA-1999-LA-127 (FIG. 8)

Fragment shoulder most probably from a lagynos, preserved length 7.5 cm. White slip on surface with red brow core and interior, slightly laminated, well levigated fabric with nearly no inclusions visible, some white and red brown particles, hard fired.



FIG. 8. Shoulder fragment of Chian lagynos.

The production of wine amphorae on Chios was impressive in Archaic and Classical times. In the second half of the fourth century BCE, a new amphora type was designed with a long neck, rounded handles and a triangular shaped body ending in a massive toe.¹² In the course of the third century BCE, Chios probably lowered its mass production and focused more on quality wine, which is supposedly reflected in a substantial decrease of amphora and lagynoi output for export. The production of this amphora type continued into Augustan-Tiberian times.

12. Grace and Savvatianou-Petropoulakou 1970, pp. 359-363; Empereur and Hesnard 1987, pp. 21-22; Monsieur 1990; Withbread 1995, pp. 134-153.

ITALIC REPUBLICAN AMPHORAE FROM THE TYRRHENIAN COAST

13. SA-2008-MAC-0084-00136 (FIG. 9)

Fragment upper vertical part of a handle with break on the carination to the horizontal part, preserved height 12 cm. Exterior light pink red, core dark pink red, coarse fabric with much inclusions, especially black, red brown and colourless particles, medium-hard fired.



FIG. 9. Handle fragment of Tyrrhenian amphora.

14. SA-2001-DA1-136 (FIG. 10)

Wall fragment, length preserved 3.5 cm. Pink red coarse fabric with much inclusions, especially black sparkling particles, medium-hard fired.



FIG. 10. Wall fragment of Tyrrhenian amphora.

15. SA-2001-DA2-111

Chip of a wall fragment, length preserved, 3.5 cm. Brown red coarse fabric with much inclusions dominated by black particles, some white.

16. SA-2002-SS-83 (FIG. 11)

Wall fragment, preserved length 5.8 cm. Pink red coarse fabric with core of grey and red brown layers, fair amount of inclusions, red brown particles as abundant as black.



FIG. 11. Wall fragment of Tyrrhenian amphora.

The fabrics of these Italic amphora fragments leave no doubt as to the location of the production sites on the Tyrrhenian coast. All sherds point to a volcanic environment, most probably Campania known as a major wine and amphora production region.¹³ One diagnostic handle can be identified safely as a late Graeco-Italic or an early Dressel 1 type, dated to 150-50 BCE. The thickness of the three wall fragments indicates that these belonged to amphorae, although Campanian table and cooking wares were also distributed in the Eastern Mediterranean. Our fragments, however, can be assigned to a specific amphora type, with implications for the chronology. The sherds formed part of the more slender versions of the Graeco-Italic types (second century BCE), the sturdy Dressel 1 types (first century BCE) or the Dressel 2-4 types with their double barrelled handles in imitation of Koan prototypes (first century CE).

Discussing the amphorae

Although out of context and reduced to rough external chronological indicators, we tend to read in the examples collected at Sagalassos that these did not appear before the original phase of urbanisation of this settlement,

13. Hesnard *et al.* 1989; Ricq de Boüard *et al.* 1989; Peacock and Williams 1986, pp. 84-92 and 105-106; Tchernia 1986, pp. 42-100; Maza 1988; Monsieur and De Paepe 2002, pp. 166-169; Olmer 2003.

TABLE 1. Overview of Hellenistic and Italic amphorae found at Sagalassos.

Type	Origin	Chronology	Fragment	Context/Locus
1 Hellenistic type	Rhodos	250-50 BCE	rim	SA-2002-DA2-94
2 Hellenistic type	Rhodos	250-50 BCE	handle	SA-2003-SS-134
3 Hellenistic type	Rhodos	250-50 BCE	handle	SA-2003-LA2-80
4 Hellenistic type	Rhodos	250-50 BCE	bottom	SA-1996-B-197
5 Hellenistic type	Rhodos	250-50 BCE	wall	SA-2003-SS-107
6 Hellenistic type	Knidos?	200 BCE- 50 CE	wall	SA-2000-TSW2-13
7 Dressel 5 Hellenistic	Kos or imitation	200-50 BCE	handle	SA-2000-TSW2-13
8 Dressel 5 Hellenistic	Kos or imitation	200-50 BCE	handle	SA-2008-MAC-0084-00136
9 Dressel 5 Hellenistic	Kos or imitation	200-50 BCE	wall	SA-2006-DA-47-88
10 Imitation Rhodian Hell.?	Kos or imitation	200-50 BCE	shoulder	SA-2002-DA2-111
11 Hellenistic type	Chios	200BCE - 25 CE	shoulder	SA-1996-B-192
12 Lagynos	Chios	200-50 BCE	shoulder	SA-1999-LA-127
13 Greco-Italic or Dressel 1	Campania	150-50 BCE	handle	SA-2008-MAC-0084-00136
14 Gr-It or Dr 1 or Dr 2-4	Campania	150BCE - 100 CE	wall	SA-2001-DA1-136
15 Gr-It or Dr 1 or Dr 2-4	Campania	150 BCE - 100 CE	wall	SA-2001-DA2-111
16 Gr-It or Dr 1 or Dr 2-4	Campania	150 BCE - 100 CE	wall	SA-2002-SS-83

from around c. 200 BCE onwards.¹⁴ (TABLE 1) Apart from a presumed demographic concentration within the newly constructed urban framework, this phase also saw the origin of an extensive territory administratively linked to the new town. The newly found momentum of development was also translated into the initiation of a new line of pottery tableware production, mostly in line with Anatolian models.¹⁵

On the other hand, we should avoid coming to far-reaching historical conclusions based on this limited amount of material, from secondary and scattered deposits. Moreover, research on contemporary amphora material, especially at inland Anatolian sites or sites along the south coast of the peninsula, is not yet encompassing enough to gauge and compare importance of types and patterns.

Sites such as Gordion, Pessinous and Xanthos¹⁶ also did not reveal large quantities of Hellenistic and Italic amphorae, although Gordion seems a case on its own regarding the import of Rhodian amphorae. The pre-Hellenistic period yielded a certain amount and diversity of Pontic, Aegean and Levantine amphorae, possibly due to the position of Gordion on or near the

14. Talloen and Poblome 2016.

15. Poblome *et al.* 2013a; 2013b; van der Enden *et al.* 2014.

16. Lawall 2008; 2010; Monsieur 2001; Monsieur and De Paepe 2002; Lemaître 2015.

Persian Royal Road. In the wake of arrangements of the Galatian settlement around 260 BCE, imported amphorae seem to become rare. This is contrasted with a group of 34 Rhodian amphora stamps discovered in the context of the so-called SET house. These formed a chronologically homogenous group of the first decade of the second century BCE. Mark Lawall proposed in a very convincing way a link with the base that the Roman commander Manlius Vulso set up at Gordion in 189 BCE, upon the abandonment of the city by the Galatians. The clustering of Rhodian amphorae in this case seems to reflect supply of the Roman army rather than market dependent exchange or trade. As impressive amounts of Rhodian amphorae otherwise came to light in Ionia and Pergamon,¹⁷ military logistics of supply could tap into the supply to these markets.

Although both Pessinous¹⁸ and Sagalassos were confronted with the expedition of Manlius Vulso, the available evidence at both sites is too scant and hazy to consider explaining the presence of Rhodian amphorae at both sites in this way. Moreover, a clear chronological framework is lacking. No stamps were found at these sites and the amphora fragments were too small to extract dating clues from their typology. Rhodian Hellenistic amphorae were produced and exported successfully during a window of 150 years,¹⁹ of which there is ample proof on some Asia Minor coastal sites. At Perge,²⁰ the excavations at the acropolis yielded 12 legible Rhodian stamps with a chronology between c. 234-146 BCE (TABLE 2). On the south-eastern Cilician coast, at Kinet Höyük,²¹ probably ancient Issos, some 30 Rhodian stamps were evenly spread in a longer chronological range, i.e. between 250-100/80 BCE. Strangely enough, although not situated far from the coast, we should remark that Xanthos revealed only a small amount of Rhodian amphorae.²² We cannot propose a detailed scenario as to why and how, but the presence of Rhodian Hellenistic amphorae at newly urbanising Sagalassos can perhaps be seen in the context of the relative proximity of Rhodos, its massive wine and amphora production and the generally successful distribution of the latter in these parts of the ancient world.

17. See the famous Pergamon Deposit with more than 900 Rhodian amphora handles found on the Burgberg and dated to c. 198-161 BCE: Börker and Burrow 1998.
18. The Rhodian amphorae of Pessinous are not yet published. Some 10 fragments were identified.
19. Rhodian wine production and export culminated between c. 190-150 BCE: Lund 2011, pp. 287-289.
20. Laube 2003.
21. Monsieur and Poblome, in press.
22. Lemaître 2015, p. 12: amongst them there is one illegible stamp.

TABLE 2. Legible Rhodian amphora handles found on the acropolis of Perge.²³

	Period	Date	Eponym	Manufacturer	Month	Device
1	IIa-b	c. 233-220+		Soteridas		
2		c. 233-220+		Damonikos	Artamitios	
3		c. 219-210+		Mentor	Badromios	
4	II?	c. 234-199?		Menandros I		
5	IIIa	c. 194	Sostratos			head Helios
6	IIIc	c. 177-175	Kallikrates II		Petageitnuos	
7		c. 176-174	Damokles II		Petageitnuos	
8	IIC-IIIe	c. 199-167/165+		Damokrates I		rose
9	IIIe	c. 165-163	Archilaidas		Artamitios	
10	IIIb-IVa	c. 186-153+		Marsyas	Karneios	
11	IVa	c. 154-153	Gorgon		Karneios	
12	IVa-b	c. 160-146+		Hippokrates		rose
13	III-IV	c. 194-146		Herakleitos I or II?		

Sagalassos also yielded some other typical Hellenistic wine amphorae from Chios, Kos, several unknown production centres on the Asia Minor coast, and perhaps Knidos. These types occurred in small quantities at the inland site of Pessinous as well, but not anymore at Gordion as upon its abandonment in 189 BCE there was only an important resettlement phase by the end of the first century CE.²⁴ There is also a remarkable paucity of Hellenistic amphorae in Xanthos.²⁵ The nearly complete absence of Knidian amphorae at Sagalassos is not necessarily surprising. Whatever the reasons may be, Knidian amphorae did not occur regularly along the western and southern coasts of Asia Minor, nor in the Levant.²⁶ In contrast, the presence of Knidian amphorae is massive in Athens, the Cyclades and somewhat less at Alexandria.²⁷ It seems as if the markets of Asia Minor were mostly reserved for Rhodian wine.

What could have been expected in Hellenistic Sagalassos are Pamphylian amphorae. Perhaps these went unnoticed. These vessels were rather well represented on the acropolis of Perge.²⁸

23. Arrangement after Laube 2003, pp. 133-134. For the chronology of the manufacturers the upper dates of a combination with eponyms were chosen.

24. Monsieur 2001; Monsieur and De Paepe 2002; Lawall 2008, p. 164.

25. Lemaître 2015, p. 10.

26. E.g. at Kinet Höyük where only some fragments were probably identified; even in Pergamon these are poorly represented: Börker and Burow 1998, pp. 56-58 and 110-112.

27. Koehler and Wallace Matheson 2004.

28. Grace 1973; Laube 2003, pp. 132-135.

The evidence on activities of Italic and Roman merchants within Anatolia and on the south coast of Asia Minor is not very abundant and the nature unclear. Considering the current state of the art, amphorae do not qualify as telling tracers even though these do occur in a certain variety on different sites. Nevertheless, it is difficult to grasp their importance because there is no quantified data available.²⁹ We mostly rely on the publication of isolated finds of Italic amphorae, which, in a fragmented condition, can be difficult to recognise.³⁰ At Sagalassos only Campanian amphorae were identified and with the exception of a handle of a Graeco-Italic or an early Dressel 1A type, their poorly preserved state does not allow assignation with certainty to a specific typology. Strikingly, no other Tyrrhenian or Adriatic productions were represented. This is in contrast with the typological variety attested in wrecks or of finds on land elsewhere. Central Adriatic wine amphorae of the Lamboglia 2 and Dressel 6A types are known from Pessinous, Kinet Höyük, Tarsos and some underwater locations.³¹ A geographically related group, carrying another commodity, the Apulian and Brindisian oil amphorae were attested in Pessinous, Patara, Xanthos, Kinet Höyük and Tarsos.³² Finally, there are different types of Tyrrhenian origin: the wine amphorae Dressel 1A and B and Dressel 2-4 (Pessinous, Patara and Xanthos)³³ and those for fish-based products, the Dressel 1C and Dressel 21-22 (Xanthos and Museum of Anamur)³⁴. The oldest imports of Italic amphorae in the Eastern Mediterranean were Central Adriatic Graeco-Italic types. Six complete examples were found in the fill of a man-hole within the South Stoa at Corinth, containing materials of the 146 BCE destruction.³⁵ To be sure, the import of Italic amphorae in Greece and Asia Minor needs to be considered partly in the light of Roman colonialism and military expeditions, such as the Mithridatic wars and the wars of Pompeius against the Cilician pirates.

29. Lund 2000, p. 89; Lemaître 2015, p. 3.

30. Lemaître 2015, p. 24.

31. Pessinous: unpublished, at least 8 fragments were identified. Kinet Höyük: Monsieur and Poblome, in press. Tarsos: Jones 1950, n° 1050, fig. 169 and 177. Underwater finds: Museum of Bodrum: Oğuz Alpözen 1975, p. 21, n° 1 and p. 28, n° 1; Museum of Anamur: Zoroğlu *et al.* 2008, p. 48, n° 34-37.

32. Pessinous: unpublished, at least 2 fragments. Patara: DüNDAR: 2013; Lemaître 2015, p. 19. Xanthos: Lemaître 2015, p. 18. Kinet Höyük: Monsieur and Poblome, in press. Tarsos: Jones 1950, fig. 143, A.

33. Pessinous: Monsieur 2001; Monsieur and De Paepe 2002. Xanthos: Lemaître 2015, pp. 13-16 and 18; Patara: DüNDAR 2013; Lemaître 2015, p. 19.

34. Lemaître 2015, pp. 4-5, 16, 18; Zoroğlu *et al.* 2008, p. 48, n° 39.

35. Romano 1994, pp. 86-88, n° 63-68.

First interpretations and conclusions

With little to no information preserved regarding the original contexts of these fragments, can we still use this material to understand aspects of local community development within a larger framework? The material under scrutiny in this paper represents the oldest examples of amphora encountered at Sagalassos, with the beginning of their circulation situated between 200 and 150 BCE. Interestingly, amphorae were all but absent from the material record at the nearby late Achaemenid to early Hellenistic site of Düzen Tepe. Radiocarbon dating and palynological studies, combined with evidence from ceramological studies, have indicated that Düzen Tepe was inhabited from the fifth century onwards, until its abandonment somewhere during the second century BCE, with the main occupation of the settlement probably situated during the fourth and third centuries BCE.³⁶ This places the arrival of amphorae at Sagalassos near the end date of the occupation period of Düzen Tepe, or even outside of this time period altogether when the maximal end-date of the circulation period – 50 BCE for the Hellenistic amphorae and 79 CE for the early Roman imperial pieces – is considered. This leaves ample room for these objects to have reached Sagalassos only after Düzen Tepe was already abandoned. As a result, the absence of amphorae at Düzen Tepe can be attributed to chronological differences. However, it can be argued that the main underlying explanation goes deeper and is related to differences in socio-cultural frameworks.

The absence of amphorae at Düzen Tepe and contemporary Sagalassos cannot be attributed to a supposed isolation of local communities from wider system dynamics. Although Düzen Tepe was characterized by a predominantly locally-oriented socio-economic system, it clearly had no problem familiarizing itself with wider developments to provide a template for local artisanal production where possible/wanted, nor to supplement local production with import whenever the former was not possible, sufficient or desired.³⁷ Could the observed Anatolia-oriented template of material culture perhaps be symptomatic of the community not having access to Aegean/Mediterranean trade patterns that would have allowed amphorae to reach the site? As amphorae did reach the later, middle Hellenistic community at Sagalassos, while a similar Anatolia-oriented template was still observed for its material culture, connectivity cannot have been the only factor. Did the people of Düzen Tepe perhaps have no need for importing amphorae and their contents because of sufficient local production? Archaeobotanical and palynological research

36. Vanhaverbeke *et al.* 2010; Daems *et al.*, this issue.

37. Daems and Poblome 2016; Daems *et al.*, this issue.

indicated local olive and grape cultivation and processing taking place at Düzen Tepe or in the immediate vicinity of the site, suggesting local production of oils and wine must have existed, insofar as vine cultivation can be directly linked to wine making.³⁸ But also at Hellenistic Sagalassos we have the same indications for local grape or olive production, suggesting local production did not prevent the import of other wines.

Interestingly, the proposed outer date of circulation of these amphorae and the demise of Düzen Tepe roughly coincided with the initial phase of development of the urban fabric of Sagalassos and its associated material culture.³⁹ Are these (quasi) simultaneous developments happening coincidentally? Or can we suspect these processes to be in some way interconnected? We should not necessarily interpret practices and the processes behind them to be directly causally connected, but perhaps rather to be symptomatic of larger developments shaping social, economic, cultural and political configurations and developments at this time.

Even in Moses Finley's minimalist assessment of the ancient economy, individual households as basic economic units were never completely self-sufficient, despite the 'ideology of autarky'.⁴⁰ Diversification in household production therefore already required a certain amount of production beyond its own needs, generating inter-household exchange to obtain goods necessary for the average household to perform all its functions. Such inter-household reciprocity provided the necessary economic base for family-based social organization and can be subsumed under the moniker of 'domestic economy'.⁴¹ In such a system, local grape and olive production was sufficient to fulfil basic local needs, leaving no incentive to participate in trade systems connected with the Aegean, let alone Campania, which could have resulted in the import of amphorae. Yet, amphorae, more or less by definition, were geared towards long-distance markets based on the exchange of production surpluses.⁴²

In the post-Finley era it has been commonly asserted that the ancient economy went beyond the limitations of the domestic economy model.⁴³ Keeping things simple and putting aside the role of individual entrepreneurship, most other economic incentives beyond the level of the household can be sub-

38. Bakker *et al.* 2012, pp. 253-259; Vermoere 2004, pp. 133 and 136-139; De Cupere *et al.* 2017; Cleymans *et al.*, this issue.

39. van der Enden *et al.* 2014; Poblome *et al.* 2013b; Talloen and Poblome 2016.

40. Harris and Lewis 2016, pp. 5 and 25-28.

41. Ault 2007

42. Lawall 2016, p. 263.

43. Hopkins 1983; Mattingly and Salmon 2001; Harris and Lewis 2016.

sumed under the marker of ‘political economy’. On this level, household production was connected to the outside world through the emergent nexus of the community as a local socio-political unit. Although these three scales (in a simplified model consisting of household, community, and outside world) could in theory interact freely with each other, certain lines of structuration guided much of this intra-scalar communication along fixed pathways. However, such pathways do not merely offer constraints but also act as a catalyst for further system dynamics to emerge and develop. Therefore, we should like to suggest that the appearance of amphorae at Sagalassos can be seen as a material trace of a wider transition phase, moving from the primordial roles and activities of households to those of the community as a whole. In this respect, the attestation of amphorae at Sagalassos from middle Hellenistic times onwards can be regarded as symptomatic of wider developments crystallizing as urbanisation at work.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Belgian Programme on Interuniversity Poles of Attraction, the Research Fund of the University of Leuven and the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO). The authors wish to thank the reviewers for their insightful comments and Heather Rosch for proofreading the text.

References

- Ault 2007 = B. Ault, *Oikos and Oikonomia: Greek Houses, Households and the Domestic Economy*, (*British School at Athens Studies* 15), pp. 259–65.
- Bakker *et al.* 2012 = J. Bakker, E. Paulissen, D. Kaniewski, V. De Laet, G. Verstraeten, M. Waelkens, *Man, Vegetation and Climate during the Holocene in the Territory of Sagalassos, Western Taurus Mountains, SW Turkey*, “*Vegetation History and Archaeobotany*”, 21 (4), pp. 249–66, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00334-011-0312-4>.
- Börker and Burow 1998 = C. Börker and J. Burow, *Die hellenistische Amphorenstempel aus Pergamon. Der Pergamoncomplex. Die übrigen Stempel aus Pergamon* (*Pergamenische Forschungen* 11), Berlin, 1998.
- Daems and Poblome, 2016 = D. Daems, J. Poblome, *Adaptive cycles in communities and landscapes. The case of Sagalassos and Düzen Tepe during the Classical/Hellenistic period*, “*Archaeological Review Cambridge*”, 31-2, 2016, pp. 91-107.
- De Cupere *et al.* 2017 = B. De Cupere, D. Frémondeau, E. Kaptijn, E. Marinova, J. Poblome, R. Vandam, W. Van Neer, *Subsistence economy and land use strategies in the Burdur province (SW Anatolia) from prehistory to the Byzantine period*, “*Quaternary International*”, 436/B, pp. 4-17, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2015.11.097>.

- Dündar 2013 = E. Dündar, *Roman Amphora Stamps from Patara*, “Olba”, 21, pp. 142-149.
- Empereur and Picon 1986 = J.-Y. Empereur, M. Picon, *A la recherche des fours d'amphores*, in J.-Y. Empereur and Y. Garlan (eds) *Recherches sur les amphores grecques et romaines*, (*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique Suppl.* 13), Paris, 1986, pp. 103-126.
- Empereur and Hesnard 1987 = J.-Y. Empereur, A. Hesnard, *Les amphores hellénistiques*, in P. Lévêque, J.-P. Morel (eds), *Céramiques hellénistiques et romaines II*, Besançon, 1987, pp. 10-71.
- Empereur and Picon 1989 = J.-Y. Empereur, M. Picon, *Les régions de production d'amphores impériales en Méditerranée orientale*, in *Amphores romaines et histoire économique: dix ans de recherche*, (*Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome* 114), Rome, 1989, pp. 223-248.
- Finkielsztein 2001 = G. Finkielsztein, *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des éponymes amphoriques rhodiens, de 270 à 108 av. J.-C. environ. Premier bilan* (*BAR International Series* 990), Oxford, 2001.
- Fulford 1977 = M. Fulford, *Pottery and Britain's foreign trade in the later Roman period*, in D.P.S. Peacock (ed.) *Pottery and early commerce. Characterization and trade in Roman and later ceramics*, London, 1977, pp. 35-84.
- Garlan 1983 = Y. Garlan, *Greek amphorae and trade*, in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins, C. Whittaker (eds), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*, London, 1983, pp. 27-35.
- Grace 1953 = V. Grace, *The Eponyms named on Rhodian Amphora Stamps*, “*Hesperia*”, 22, pp. 116-128, <https://doi.org/10.2307/146986>.
- Grace 1973 = V. Grace, *Imports from Pamphylia*, in *Etudes déliennes* (*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique Suppl.* 1), Paris, 1973, pp. 183-208.
- Grace and Savvatianou-Petrouloulakou 1970 = V. Grace, M., Savvatianou-Petrouloulakou, *Les timbres amphoriques grecs*, in P. Bruneau (ed.), *L'ilot de la Maison des comédiens* (*Exploration archéologique de Délos, Fascicule* 27), Paris, 1970, pp. 277-382.
- Harris and Lewis 2016 = E. Harris, D. Lewis, *Introduction: Markets in Classical and Hellenistic Greece*, in E. Harris, D. Lewis, M. Woolmer (eds), *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States*, New York, 2016, pp. 1-39, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139565530.002>.
- Hesnard 1986 = A. Hesnard, *Imitations et raisonnement archéologique: à propos des amphores de Rhodes et de Cos*, in J.-Y. Empereur, Y. Garlan (eds), *Recherches sur les amphores grecques et romaines*, (*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique Suppl.* 13), Paris, 1986, pp. 69-79.
- Hesnard et al. 1989 = A. Hesnard, M. Ricq de Bouard, P. Arthur, M. Picon, A. Tchernia, *Aires de production des gréco-italiques et des Dressel 1*, in *Amphores romaines et histoire économique: dix ans de recherche*, (*Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome* 114), Rome, 1989, pp. 21-65.
- Hopkins 1983 = K. Hopkins, *Introduction*, in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins, C. Whitaker, *Trade in the Ancient Economy*, London, 1983, pp. 1-15.
- Jones 1950 = F.F. Jones, *The Pottery*, in H. Goldman (ed.), *Excavations at Gözli Kule, Tarsus: I. The Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1950, pp. 149-296.
- Koehler and Wallace Matheson 2004 = G.C. Koehler, M.P. Wallace Matheson, *Knidian amphora chronology, Pergamon to Corinth*, in J. Eiring, J. Lund (eds), *Transport*

- Amphorae and Trade in the Eastern Mediterranean*, (Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 5), Athens, 2004, pp. 163-169.
- Laube 2003 = I. Laube, *Die Amphorenstempel*, in H. Abbasoğlu, W. Martini (eds), *Die Akropolis von Perge I. Survey und Sondagen 1994-1997*, Mainz am Rhein, 2003, pp. 131-137.
- Lawall 1998 = M.L. Lawall, *Ceramics and Positivism Revisited: Greek Transport Amphoras and History*, in H.M. Parkins, C. Smith (eds), *Trade, Traders and the Ancient City*, London, 1998, pp. 75-101.
- Lawall 2005 = M. Lawall, *Amphoras and Hellenistic Economies: Addressing the (Over) Emphasis on Stamped Amphora Handles*, in Z.H. Archibald, J.K. Davies and V. Gabrielsen (eds), *Making, moving, and managing: The new world of ancient economies, 323-31 BC*, Oxford, 2002, pp. 188-232.
- Lawall 2008 = M.L. Lawall, *Rhodian Amphora Stamps from Gordion 189 BC*, in A. Avram, V. Lungu, M. Neagu (eds), *Philius Charin: Mélanges à la mémoire de Niculae Conivici, Călăși*, 2008, pp. 111-120.
- Lawall 2010 = M.L. Lawall, *Pontic, Aegean and Levantine Amphorae at Gordion*, in D. Tassab Tezgör, N. Inaishvili (eds), *PATABS I. Production and Trade of Amphorae in the Black Sea*, (Varia Anatolica 21), Istanbul, 2010, pp. 159-165.
- Lawall 2016 = M. Lawall, *Practices in the Economies of Greece, Sixth to First Centuries BCE*, in E. Harris, D. Lewis, M. Woolmer, *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States*, New York, 2016, pp. 254-275, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139565530>.
- Lemaître 2015 = S. Lemaître, *Amphores italiqes en Lycie: témoins des réseaux marchands en Méditerranée orientale? (IIe s. av. J.-C./Ier s. ap. J.-C.)*, “Cahiers Mondes Anciens 7”, 2015, <https://doi.org/10.4000/mondesanciens.1617>.
- Lund 2000 = J. Lund, *Transport Amphorae as Evidence of Exportation of Italian Wine and Oil to the Eastern Mediterranean in the Hellenistic Period*, in J. Lund, P. Pentz (eds), *Between Orient and Occident, Studies in Honour of P.J. Riis*, Copenhagen, pp. 77-99.
- Lund 2011 = J. Lund, *Rhodian transport amphorae as a source for economic ebbs and flows in the Eastern Mediterranean in the second century BC*, in Z. Archibald, J. K. Davies, V. Gabrielsen (eds), *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC*. Oxford, 2011, pp. 280-295, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199587926.003.0013>.
- Mattingly and Salmon 2001 = D. Mattingly, J. Salmon, *Economies Beyond Agriculture in the Classical World*, London, 2001, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203204467>.
- Maza 1988 = G. Maza, *Recherches méthodologiques sur les amphores gréco-italiques et Dressel 1 découvertes à Lyon. II^e-I^{er} siècles avant J.-C.*, SFECAG, Actes du Congrès d’Istres, pp. 11-30.
- Monsieur 1990 = P. Monsieur, *Une amphore de Chios au Musée de Tournai*, “L’Antiquité Classique”, 59, pp. 237-245, <https://doi.org/10.3406/antiq.1990.2297>.
- Monsieur 2001 = P. Monsieur, *Note préliminaire sur les amphores découvertes à Pessinonte*, “Anatolia Antiqua”, 9, pp. 73-84, <https://doi.org/10.3406/anata.2001.957>.
- Monsieur and De Paepe 2002 = P. Monsieur, P. De Paepe, *Amphores de Cos et amphores italiqes à Pessinonte: Croiser les données archéologiques et pétrographiques*, “Anatolia Antiqua”, 10, pp. 155-175, <https://doi.org/10.3406/anata.2002.979>.

- Monsieur and Poblome, in press = P. Monsieur, J. Poblome, *Greek amphora stamps and the pottery found at Kinet Höyük (Cilicia)*, in N. Badoud, A. Marangou-Lerat (eds), *Analyse et exploitation des timbres amphoriques grecs (Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique Supplément)*, forthcoming.
- Oğuz Alpözen 1975 = T. Oğuz Alpözen, *Bodrum müzesi ticari amphoreları*, “*Türk arkeoloji dergisi*”, 12, pp. 5-32.
- Olmer 2003 = F. Olmer, *Le commerce du vin chez les Éduens d’après les timbres d’amphores*, (*Bibracte* 7), Gluxen-Glenne, 2003.
- Orton 1975 = C. Orton, *Quantitative pottery studies: some progress, problems and prospects*, “*Science & Archaeology*”, 16, pp. 30-35.
- Orton 2009 = C. Orton, “*Four pots good, two pots bad*”: exploring the limits of quantification in the study of archaeological ceramics, “*FACTA. A Journal of Roman Material Culture Studies*”, 3, pp. 65-73.
- Panagou 2016 = T. Panagou, *Patterns of Amphora Stamp Distribution: Tracking down Export Tendencies*, in E. Harris, D. Lewis, M. Woolmer (eds) *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States*, New York, 2016, pp. 207-229, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139565530.010>.
- Peacock 1977a = D.P.S. Peacock (ed.), *Pottery and early commerce: characterization and trade in Roman and later ceramics*, London, 1977.
- Peacock 1977b = D.P.S. Peacock, *Roman amphorae: typology, fabric and origins*, in *Méthodes classiques et méthodes formelles dans l’étude des amphores*, (*Collection de l’Ecole française de Rome* 32), Rome, 1977, pp. 261-278.
- Peacock and Williams 1986 = D.P.S. Peacock, D.F. Williams, *Amphorae and the Roman economy. An introductory guide*, London, 1986.
- Poblome et al. 2013a = J. Poblome, D. Braekmans, B. Music, M. van der Eenden, B. Neyt, B. De Graeve, P. Degryse, *A pottery kiln underneath the Odeon of ancient Sagalassos, SW Turkey. The excavation results, the table wares and their archaeometrical analysis*, in N. Fenn, C. Römer-Strehl (eds), *Networks in the Hellenistic world according to the pottery in the Eastern Mediterranean and beyond (BAR International Series 2539)*, Oxford, 2013, pp. 193-204.
- Poblome et al. 2013b = J. Poblome, D. Braekmans, M. Waelkens, N. Firat, H. Vanhaverbeke, F. Martens, E. Kaptijn, K. Vyncke, R. Willet, P. Degryse, *How did Sagalassos come to be? A ceramological survey*, in M. Tekocak (ed.), *Studies in Honour of K. Levent Zoroğlu*, Antalya, 2013, pp. 527-540.
- Ricq de Boüard et al. 1989 = M. Ricq de Boüard, E. Meille, M. Vichy, M. Picon, *Les argiles utilisées pour la fabrication des amphores en Italie. Etrurie, Latium, Campanie*, in *Amphores romaines et histoire économique: dix ans de recherche*, (*Collection de l’Ecole française de Rome* 114), Rome, 1989, pp. 257-268.
- Romano 1994 = I.B. Romano, *A Hellenistic deposit from Corinth: evidence for Interim Period activity (146-44 B.C.)*, “*Hesperia*”, 63, pp. 57-104, <https://doi.org/10.2307/148242>.
- Talloon and Poblome 2016 = P. Talloon, J. Poblome, *The 2014 and 2015 control excavations on and around the Upper Agora of Sagalassos: The structural remains and general phasing*, “*Anatolica*”, 42, pp. 111-150.
- Tchernia 1986 = A. Tchernia, *Le vin de l’Italie romaine. Essai d’histoire économique d’après les amphores (Bibliothèque de l’Ecole française de Rome 261)*, Rome, 1986.

- van der Enden *et al.* 2014 = M. van der Enden, J. Poblome, P. Bes, *From Hellenistic to Roman Imperial in Pisidian tableware: the genesis of Sagalassos Red Slip Ware*, in H. Meyza, K. Domzalski (eds), *Late Hellenistic to Mediaeval fine wares of the Aegean coast of Anatolia - Their production, imitation and use*, Nieborów, 2014, pp. 81–93.
- Vanhaverbeke *et al.* 2010 = H. Vanhaverbeke, M. Waelkens, K. Vyncke, V. De Laet, S. Aydal, B. Music, B. De Cupere, J. Poblome, D. Braekmans, P. Degryse, E. Marinova, G. Verstraeten, W. Van Neer, B. Slapsal, I. Medaric, H.A. Ekinci, M.O. Erbay, 'Pisidian' culture? *The Classical-Hellenistic site at Düzen Tepe near Sagalassus (southwest Turkey)*, "Anatolian Studies", 60, pp. 105-128, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066154600001046>.
- Vermoere 2004 = M. Vermoere, *Holocene vegetation history in the territory of Sagalassos (southwest Turkey): a palynological approach*, Turnhout, 2004.
- Withbread 1995 = I. K. Whitbread, I.K., *Greek transport amphorae. A petrological and archaeological study*, (Fitch Laboratory Occasional Paper 4), 1995.
- Zoroğlu *et al.* 2008 = L. Zoroğlu, M. Dillon, D. Yakınlar, N. Rauh, *Anamur arkeoloji müzesi'ndeki amfora araştırmaları raporu (Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı 26)*, Ankara, 2008, pp. 33-50.