THE TREFOIL STYLE AND SECOND-CENTURY HADRA VASES

The Hellenistic period in the Aegean is one notoriously devoid of firmly established chronological markers with more than local significance and which might be used to divide the cultural material into smaller groupings. This is especially true for pottery. The Aegean basin was parcelled out among numerous ceramic provinces which, though all were obviously heirs to the traditions established in the Classical period, yet managed to interpret any new ideas in their own way and at their own speed. These apparently newly emerged styles were in fact of hoary antiquity. They represent the resurgence of local mores and traditions in pottery manufacture whose existence in the Classical and Archaic periods had been well-nigh overlooked by the excessive concentration on the study of the products of Corinth and Athens. Their re-emergence was occasioned by two factors consequent on the establishment of the Hellenistic kingdoms. The first was the collapse of Attic pottery production as a result of a series of disastrous wars and defeats in the later fourth and early third centuries B.C. The second was the very real prosperity enjoyed by the provincial centres in the newly Hellenised world.

To isolate and study all the products of these disparate centres is a task beyond any one person and, in the absence of sufficient large-scale excavations and published sequences, the task of bringing order into this chaotic period seems well-nigh hopeless. Nevertheless, if we set our sights low enough I believe that some real progress can be made and this article is the second in what I hope will be a series whose aim will be to provide as many fixed points as possible in the history of Hellenistic decorative arts. As a side issue it seeks also to strip Athens of any undeserved laurels as a great innovator in the arts which that tattered old dowager might yet retain as a result of her former pre-eminence. Finally, it is also an attempt to expound in explicit terms a methodology whose existence is implicit in the earlier paper. The original excuse for writing this paper was to illuminate a minor area of Hellenistic artistic endeavour. I hope the finished product will do more than that, for the material led the hunter a merry chase before it was forced to yield up some of its secrets.

THE PROBLEM

Hadra hydriae form a relatively closed group of material dating to the Hellenistic period and found, for the most part, in the cemeteries of Ptolemaic Alexandria. They were used as ash-urns for the burial of mercenaries, ambassadors and other dignitaries who died while
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visiting the royal court and, presumably, at least a part of the local population. In general their artistic standard is not high, though their modest achievements were once held to represent one of the more Hellenic of the strands which made up the artistic milieu of the Egyptian capital. Probably they would have attracted little attention had not over thirty of their number borne inked inscriptions written on the orders of a palace official whose task it was to dispose of the remains of any visiting dignitary who failed to survive his tour of duty. These inscriptions included a date formula expressed as a numbered regnal year, and offered a unique opportunity to provide a secure chronology for a substantial body of Hellenistic pottery. All that was needed was to marry the regnal year to the reign of a particular Ptolemy. Unfortunately, this is easier said than done, and it was only after a number of false starts, trial and error that Braunert\(^1\) introduced a measure of order into the corpus of dated vases. Even so, a few corrections have already been deemed necessary\(^5\) and, presumably, a few more will be found acceptable as our knowledge of both the period and the pottery progresses.\(^6\)

So much for the dated vases, which form but a small proportion of the Hadras now known. The vast majority of this class of vessel does not bear any inscription at all and has thus far been able to resist any attempt at a dating system for them which is universally acceptable. It is true that some of them may be closely associated with various of the dated vases on the basis of a comparison of the subsidiary patternwork,\(^7\) and it is reasonable to assume that such associations imply a certain degree of contemporaneity. This line of investigation, in fact, seems to offer a prospect of further rewards but much still needs to be done before clear patterns begin to emerge.\(^8\)

Hadras may be divided into two broad classes: those with decoration in dark paint on the clay ground, and those with polychrome patterns above a white slip.\(^9\) The fabric of the first group is fine and well prepared, that of the second red, gritty and badly levigated. There can be no doubt that the White Ground Hadras were produced in Egypt, since their fabric can be matched to that of the innumerable local terracotta figurines. Until recently it was generally agreed that the Clay Ground vases had also been produced in the Egyptian capital, although it was allowed that other areas, notably Crete, may have had small productions of their own.\(^10\) A short time ago I produced some arguments favouring a Cretan origin for the vast majority of the Clay Ground hydriae.\(^11\) For example, it can be shown that the technological quirk of the dropped floor, a characteristic feature of many Clay Ground vases, which had been isolated by Brian Cook\(^12\) and was practically unknown outside that body of material, had had a long history in Crete going back to the early Classical period. More impressive is the fact that a number of artists who decorated Hadras can also be shown to have been working in the West Slope technique at Knossos and on shapes of indisputably Knossian type.\(^13\) These arguments will be developed and illustrated in a forthcoming article; for now it is sufficient merely to note the relocation of some, at least, of the Hadra workshops.

\(^5\) See especially IHV.

\(^4\) JDAI 65/66 (1950-51) 231ff.

\(^5\) Brooklyn Museum Annual X (1968-69) 127 and fig 13; 130 and fig 17.


\(^7\) Brooklyn Museum Annual X (1968-69) 13-16.

\(^8\) B. F. Cook continues to work on this aspect of Hadra vases and informs me that his findings will be published in a forthcoming festschrift for Adriani.

\(^9\) IHV 9; Brooklyn Museum Annual X (1968-69) 116f.

\(^10\) IHV, 7 n. 3; R. M. Cook, Greek Painted Pottery 208.

\(^11\) BSA lxxiii (1978) 15, no. 42.
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Within the Clay Ground class yet another division can be made. A significant number of these vases may be distinguished from their fellows by noting certain peculiarities of shape, unusual patterns in the neck zone and, above all, the popularity of figured decoration. Since there is no reason to believe that these pots originated at workshops other than those responsible for the majority of the less ambitious Hadras, it seems likely that the observable differences reflect a slightly different function. Here again the literacy of the Hellenistic Greeks comes to our aid, for one of the vases in question bears an inscription which informs us that “Pylon painted it for the Games”. If all the Hadras of this class were intended for such a use, this would explain the close iconographic parallels which can often be found between them and Panatheneaic amphorae. There is no great problem, either, in finding them re-used as ash-urns. No Clay Ground hydria, in contrast to those of the White Ground style, bore specifically funerary scenes on its surface and thus there is no proof that they were ever primarily intended for the use to which they were ultimately put. Nevertheless, it is easy to imagine that the prize vases were carried to Alexandria by the victors themselves when they set out on mercenary service. Their subsequent use as receptacles for the ashes of their dead owners would make perfect sense given the prevailing Alexandrian custom of urn burial, as well as being particularly apt, since the vase would be a visible sign of the arete accumulated by the deceased while still alive. However that may be, the fact that two almost complete figured style Hadras were found in altogether less heroic contexts in the Athenian Agora suggests that there were other methods of dispersal and, always assuming that all these vessels were in fact prizes, may indicate that a second hand market had grown up around them. Either situation would explain why not a single vase of this type has been found with an official inscription of the sort mentioned above. In the one case, they would not have been available on the open market, in the other we might safely assume that bargain hunting on the second hand market was beneath the dignity of the palace official charged with the responsibility of burying deceased ambassadors.

The figured Hadras themselves may be further subdivided into various groups. The first has decoration in true Black Figure style, a second favours a silhouette treatment. Some vases use white paint in the same way as, and in place of, incision to pick out internal details. For the most part these appear to be more or less contemporary with the true Black Figure hydriae and merely a lazier version of that style. Conversely, to judge from the degenerate patternwork, the Silhouette Style vases should probably be regarded as later products.

It is unfortunate that none of the figured vases has a dated inscription, for the lack has led to much complex argumentation in print. Breccia noted the absence of figured Hadras at Chatby which, on the grounds of its many early imports and later Hellenistic role as an inhabited suburb of Alexandria, he regarded as one of the earliest burial grounds of the newly founded city. He therefore proposed that the hydriae decorated with floral or linear motifs which were characteristic of the Chatby graves, should antedate the figured vases. More recently,
Guerrini reversed this order and placed the figured Hadras at the head of her development, dating them to the later fourth and early third centuries B.C. Her reasons for so doing were based partly on a misinterpretation of the context evidence for one of the Agora vases, and partly on some vague similarities between the figured Hadras as a whole and some Campanian Black Figured vases which have been dated to the later fourth century. Brian Cook has criticised this dating in extenso and has also pointed out a few weaknesses in some of the groupings. He proposed a return to the Breccia system and a consequent down-dating of the figured Hadras. The evidence then available only allowed a slight reduction in the chronology and the figured vases remained firmly entrenched in the first half of the third century B.C. The problem lay in a potential clash with the accepted chronology of Alexandrian tomb painting styles as defined by Brown should there be any further reduction in the date of the pots. This tyranny of the loculus slab is best illustrated by Cook's attempt at reconstructing the so-called 1884 tomb group from Alexandria. Although he was obviously anxious to lower the date of the Hadras found in the tomb, he was forced to retain a fairly high chronology because of the presence in the group of stelai painted in the First, Second and Third styles. Any further reduction in the dating of the pots had to await some development which would undermine the very foundations of Brown's dating system.

Evidence for such an upheaval was soon forthcoming, and from two entirely different directions. In 1968 Cook, by examining the subsidiary patternwork on Hadras, isolated a design (made up of a series of vertical wavy lines between straight uprights) which seemed confined to dated pots of the penultimate decade of the third century, and several undated pieces which were obviously contemporary. A simplified version of this motif was used to decorate the side panels of one of the figured Hadras now in the Benaki Museum in Athens, and the natural assumption is that this piece should date either just before or just after the dated pots which share a similar treatment. The recognition of this link between at least one figured vase and well dated Hadras of so late a period means that some doubts about the present chronology can now be expressed, but suspicions they would have remained had not a series of excavations in Crete at the two cities of Knossos and Lyttos completely changed our ideas and provided proof positive for the true date of the figured vases.

The city of Lyttos was sacked by Knossos in 220 B.C. Although it was soon resettled by its old inhabitants it has produced a good destruction deposit which somehow managed to escape later disturbance. At Knossos, various excavations on the town site have brought to light large quantities of Hellenistic material. Much of this was decorated in the West Slope technique by the same hands who were painting the designs on Hadras of the Black Figured style. Almost invariably the versions of the local shapes which they decorated were more advanced than their counterparts in the Lyttos destruction deposit. It follows that the Black Figured Hadras must be radically down-dated at least into the final quarter of the third century B.C., and probably with an extension into the early second. This new Cretan evidence agrees exactly with that suggested by Cook's work on subsidiary ornament as outlined above. No insurmountable obstacle now remains to the radical down-dating of the 1884 Tomb and, in consequence of the
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stelai found therein. As we shall see, however, yet more evidence is required before the group can be tied down securely. (cf. Appendix).

Having established reasonably secure limits for the production of the Black Figure Hadras, it still remains to examine the dating evidence for the Silhouette Style. It has always been assumed that these vases post-date those in the true Black Figure technique and two pieces of evidence can be used to support this view. The first is the internal development of the Black Figure Style itself. It is easy enough to establish the direction of movement by following the progressive degeneration of ornamental patterns and the hardening of shape contours. Using these criteria we can trace a clear movement away from a painstaking mannerism in the brushwork and extensive and careful use of incision, toward an altogether bolder and cruder style with much less use of the graver. The logical next step was the abolition of incision altogether and the appearance of the Silhouette Style. A second piece of evidence is even more telling. A Silhouette Style Hadra has been found in a grave in Rhodes where it was associated with pottery similar to that in Homer Thompson's groups C and D. Even given a certain fuzziness in the chronology for this period there can be no doubt that this grave group proves the survival of the Silhouette Style well into the first half of the second century B.C. The question now presents itself as to whether it is possible to date any other Hadras of the Silhouette Style. The following pages are an attempt to do just that.

Guerrini has noted a close-knit group of hydriae within her Group B. The most obvious linking pattern is a horizontal, discontinuous, and highly stylised laurel wreath which was used to embellish the necks of all the Hadras in this group (fig. 1:1-5). Although there is enough variation in treatment to suggest the hand of more than one painter, it is likely that all these vases were produced in a single centre and over a short time span. Some of these pieces were also decorated with figured scenes in the Silhouette Style, and other figured vases of this sort also possessed laurel patterns which were made up of trefoil groups of leaves similar in treatment to those of the hydriae mentioned by Guerrini. The homogeneity of this one aspect in the decorative scheme becomes an important factor in any study of this material.

**Methodology**

All too often a single aspect of an ancient society's artistic output is studied in isolation. For obvious practical reasons the cultural material is compartmentalised and divided among various specialists whose prime concern is merely to establish an internal sequence for that body of material with which they have been presented. These then form a series of parallel verticals in a grid whose horizontal divisions are normally provided by the stratigraphy and history of the site being studied. Necessity often compels one to look beyond immediate context to find some supporting evidence for a proposed dating system, but this is seldom attempted in a systematic manner. Common sense should tell us that the different decorative arts at any given time are dipping into a common well of artistic experience no matter what minor differences in quality or choice of motifs should separate the nobler arts from the crafts, and each individual craftsman or artist from his fellows. Therefore, the close examination of any motif which crosses craft boundaries may well yield much more information if the evidence
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29 The movement in Guerrini from A, 7-8 to the later A, 3 and 5 is obvious, and is made yet more forceful by the fact that all the vases involved were painted by the same hand (not, however, Pylon pace Guerrini).


31 Guerrini, *op cit* 13 and B 12, 22.

32 For example, *AJA* lxx (1966) Pl 78, fig 3, which is the product of another workshop (probably situated in the Messara) and W. Horbow, *Kunst der Antike. Schätze aus nordeutschem Privatbesitz*. 184, no. 164.
from all those crafts is looked at as a whole. If the motif is also popular in other production centres all the better, though here more caution should be displayed in extracting chronological information from the material.

It is not difficult to see why this method, which is neither new nor revolutionary, should have fallen into disrepute. It is open to obvious abuse if not applied with due care, and can all too easily lead to the sort of uncontrolled trait chasing depressingly familiar in some branches of art history. Then again, there is the opposite, and in many ways even more vital, need to isolate and affirm those local characteristics which separate one tradition from another, even in the closest of cultural komai. This last approach tends, on principle, to avoid as much comment on developments outside the area under study as possible. Finally, one must ruefully admit that the concept of diffusion is today an unpopular one, mainly due to past diffusionist excesses. Indeed, one would be loth to resort to what is probably a "simplified diffusionist model" were it not for the fact that the Greek world provides us with sufficient firm evidence to support such an edifice.

The basic assumptions in this paper are threefold: that the different branches of the decorative arts generally influenced each other by passing motifs across craft boundaries, that metropolitan centres led and more provincial areas followed, and that diffusion could take place relatively rapidly. The hoped for result for any problem approached using the synthetic method would be a clustering of dates to indicate the probable point of origin, direction of diffusion and post quem for any other material. These may seem humble expectations, but they are probably the best we can do in a badly dated period without slipping into subjective treatment.

The Hellenistic period in particular seems to demand just this sort of approach given the very nature of its artistic conceptions. Scholars have long noted that there was a general tendency, even in the nobler arts, for elements of disparate origin to be juxtaposed in a single composition. The lesser the status of the artist, the more likely he was to indulge in this practice, and it is no exaggeration to describe many of these works as "Pastiche Art". The most obvious offenders which spring to mind are the well-known "liturgical" paintings from Delos, whose compositions are, to our eyes, so unformed and unintegrated as to resemble nothing so much as a group of pin-ups stuck on the surfaces of the walls and altars which they embellish. It is obvious that these circumstances would create ideal conditions for the type of cross-craft influence outlined above. The minor arts especially would tend to advance by eschewing any serious attempt at maintaining their own traditions, and could well live quite comfortably by cannibalising motifs and treatments created by more progressive fields of artistic endeavour.

The Trefoil Style

The linking motif for the Hadras under review is a laurel wreath pattern made up of a series of trefoil elements and rosettes. Any discussion concerned with the dating of those vases should naturally begin with this feature. In Greek art there is nothing new under the sun and it is
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33 For the possibility of very rapid diffusion of ideas cf. Shield Bowls, where it is shown that a relief bowl type was probably invented in Corinth in ca. 149 B.C., and had been copied by other centres before that city's destruction in 146 B.C.

34 A good example of this tendency, even in a major work of art is to be found in the Pergamene painting of Herakles and Telephos C. Havelock, Hellenistic Art 262 (who comments on the style).

35 Delos ix, passim.

55 For example: C. Kraay and M. Hirmer, Greek Coins Pl xviii, pl 132 no. 4070, 4080, 4090; pl 160 no. 514. The Hadra vase, Guerrini, op cit E, 2 must be redated and will be treated in a future paper.
hardly surprising that there are a few examples of trefoil wreaths in earlier art. Fortunately, the Classical versions, with their stiffer outline and more formalised treatment bear little real resemblance to their Hellenistic successors. They also exist, so far as I can see, in splendid isolation as allowable but eccentric variations of the more normal two-leaved treatment so beloved by the Classical artist. They certainly do not form the nucleus for a whole stylistic complex; to find that pattern, and trefoils which more resemble those on the Hadras we must turn to a far later period.

In 167-166 B.C. Athenian cleruchs settled the island of Delos as part of the general settlement after Pydna. The original inhabitants were expelled and the port was declared free, this last measure becoming the foundation upon which the subsequent commercial prosperity of the island was based. The material culture of this phase of the island’s history forms by far the richest and largest body of material in the Trefoil Style yet discovered. The pattern is used in vase painting, relief ware, mosaics, metalwork, stone carving and as a subsidiary ornament in wall painting (FIG. 2:2). In addition there is evidence from other sites that it was used in costly inlay work and by jewellers. In many branches of the arts the simple trefoil is soon forced to share its place with more complex designs where additional sets of leaves are added to each clump. In wall painting these additions are usually distinguished from the core trefoil element by the use of different colours, in other crafts such separation was impossible but there can be no doubt that the trefoil remained the basic element in the design and for this reason its name was used to describe the style. At Delos we have, then, a motif at the peak of its influence. It would be difficult to find a single area of artistic enterprise which is not permeated with the motif, but is this all-pervading quality a feature of the whole time span between the establishment of the cleruchy, or does it belong only to the final years before the sacks of 88 B.C. and 69 B.C. which led to the abandonment of the town? Unfortunately, in the present state of our knowledge concerning the stratigraphy at Delos, there is no easy way of answering that question. It is simple enough to date many of the buildings and monuments, but almost impossible to establish a time depth or cultural sequence for the smaller objects. On the other hand, recent work by members of the French School on various aspects of the Delian cultural assemblage enable us to make a few educated guesses on the matter.

The “Liturgical” paintings which embellished altars and the immediately surrounding wall space in street and house shrines scattered throughout the inhabited area of Delos are a well known feature of the site. More often than not there is evidence for frequent renewal of the painted plaster surface of these monuments, and it was at first thought that these renewals were annual. The relatively small number of layers on each monument, combined with the belief that the cults served by the altars were only instituted in the last thirty years or so of the second century B.C. combined to keep their dates low. Since almost all of these paintings

57 CAH VIII, 294.
58 G. Leroux Lagynos no’s. 10, 62, 91, 125; Delos xxvii, pl. 44:D 103, D 106, D 108.
59 Delos xxxi, passim.
60 Delos xxix: figs 177, 180, 196-7, 203, 246. Note the style of the diadem on the last; it corresponds to real jewellery types: fig. 1, 7 of this article and n. 74.
61 BCH c (1976) 819, fig 31: Delos xviii, pl xxviii.
62 Delos xviii 59 fig 87 and pl xxvi 185-2, 246.
63 Delos ix, passim.
64 cf. The painting of an inlaid shield at Leukadia, below n. 67.
65 cf. fig 1, 7 and Delos xviii, 513 fig 380 and pl xc. 803, xci 806-7.
66 For example, Delos ix pl’s. vii-viii.
67 Ibid pl xix.
68 Ibid passim and BCH Suppl. 1, 77-109 with bibliography.
69 P. Bruneau, Recherches sur les cultes de Delos à l’époque hellénistique et à l’époque impériale 589ff and especially 587.
70 Ibid.
Fig. 2 (Not to Scale).
include trefoil patterns as minor parts of the design, any possibility of extending their chronology is of interest to this study. Two developments appear to suggest just such a revision in our ideas. The first was the realisation that the altars were not quite so closely associated with the college of Compitales and the Romans as was at first thought.\textsuperscript{51} The second is potentially even more important, though work on this aspect has only just begun. An analysis of the state of wear and pitting on the surface of the lower layer of stucco protecting one of these liturgical monuments revealed that at least fifty years had passed before the decoration was renewed.\textsuperscript{52} Obviously this preliminary result means that no-one can any longer seriously consider the possibility of annual renewal of the decoration on the altars. Those monuments with at least eight layers of plaster probably represent a much longer period of use than was at first thought. Unfortunately, however, there is still no way of proving that any of these altars were original features of the houses which they served, nor is it safe to trace any artistic development on such an uncontrolled body of material.

A slightly more hopeful method of attack is provided by the Megarian bowls, many of which have recently been published in a large monograph.\textsuperscript{53} Laumonier has arranged the material into a series of workshops based on the common use of a group of moulds and decorative elements. He then placed the workshops in a stylistic sequence which, although based on more subjective reasoning, yet provides us with some interesting results. It is noticeable, for instance, that the trefoil pattern seems to have been popular from the first, appearing on bowls produced by all the “earliest” of the workshops.\textsuperscript{54} Fortunately, these early ateliers also provide us with just enough evidence to estimate a rough terminus ante for their activities. In an earlier paper,\textsuperscript{55} I dated the introduction of the bowl decorated with the Macedonian shield pattern to about 149-8 B.C. and identified it as a Corinthian invention. If this hypothesis is correct, then these bowls become an important horizon marker in the history of Hellenistic relief wares. It is interesting that none of Laumonier’s first three workshops produced bowls of this type,\textsuperscript{56} although it was otherwise popular among other ateliers. Another type absent from the earliest workshops is the “Ivy Bowl” which features trefoil ivy wreath patterns (FIG. 2:4 and 7) immediately beneath the blank rim area. These ivy patterns are surely based on the wreaths used to decorate the “Cistophoric” coinage of Asia Minor, the very area identified by Laumonier as the home of the workshops producing the bowls.\textsuperscript{57} The introduction of the “Cistophoric” coinage has been dated to about 166 B.C., giving a terminus post quem for the addition of the motif to the repertoire of patterns used by the coroplasts producing the moulds for the bowls. On the other hand, all the early workshops include examples of the Long Petal Bowl\textsuperscript{58} whose introduction in other centres can be dated reasonably closely;\textsuperscript{59} probably within the decade 160-150 B.C. Taken together, these data imply not only that the activities of the early ateliers ceased about the middle of the second century B.C. (or, at the very least, that they ceased to add new motifs after that date) but the consequent implication, given the variety of Long Petal Bowls being produced by them, that these types were probably invented

51 Ibid 617ff and BCH Suppl. 1 77-109.
52 P. Bruneau, op cit 619.
53 Délos xxxi “La céramique hellénistique à reliefs. 1. Ateliers Ioniens.”
54 Ibid The workshop of Menemachos is a particularly good control for this type of study since a large amount of material, representing a large and varied production, survives.
55 Shield Bowls.
56 The first bowl to even hint at knowledge of the “Shield Bowl” type is Délos xxxi pl 21, no. 551 which includes whirligigs of a type found on Macedonian shields in its decorative scheme. The earliest bowls of actual “Shield Bowl” type are to be found on pl 45. The bowls 4304 and 4311 on pl 112 are of early type but cannot be ascribed to any particular atelier.
57 Délos xxxi 3.
58 Ibid pl 11ff.
59 Shield Bowls.
in Asia Minor and the idea exported to the Greek mainland soon after. Since the early workshops were also producing several different varieties of Trefoil bowl before they ceased production, it seems highly likely that that motif had been introduced into the artistic repertoire some little time before the middle of the century. In short, it seems safe to assume that the motif was known in Delos from the very earliest days of the cleruchy. Delos can tell us no more, but that is not to say that our search is ended. It is hardly surprising, considering its great wealth and artistic eminence, that the Pergamene kingdom now commends itself to our attention.

The earliest datable monuments of the Trefoil Style could hardly be less prepossessing. Two small and battered fragments of Megarian Bowls were found in the foundations of the Great Altar of Zeus at Pergamon. Since it is generally allowed that this monument was substantially completed by the death of Eumenes II in 159 B.C., a likely date for the beginning of this large-scale building project would be the decade 180–170 B.C.60 Obviously the bowl fragments should predate the commencement of that activity. A close look at the pieces in question shows that the first61 bears little resemblance to the classic Trefoil Style pattern, while the other,62 though it conforms to the accepted canons of the style, does so in such a clumsy manner that we might easily see it as an experimental treatment very close to the inception of the new idea. If we might burden these small fragments with yet one more role we could note that, given the clustering of dates noted below, their presence under the altar should sway us toward as late a date as possible for the construction of that monument.

Among the latest issues of the Royal coinage of Pergamon is a coin bearing the head of Eumenes II on the obverse, and the Dioskouroi within a trefoil wreath on the reverse (FIG. 1:8). Since the Royal coinage went out of use at about the time of the inception of the “Cistophoric” issues,65 this coin is probably the earliest numismatic evidence for the use of the trefoil pattern. That honour might once have been claimed by the New Style Coinage of Athens, known to ancients and moderns alike as “stephanophoroi”, had not recent research produced a broad consensus of opinion that the date of the first issue of these types should be lowered from 196 B.C. to about 163 B.C.66 This is a few years after the suggested date for the first issue of the “Cistophoric” coins, and possibly slightly later still than the Eumenes example. This relative dating suggests that the idea of placing a wreath on the new Attic coins, a startling departure from previous practice, may very well have been borrowed from the Pergamene issues. Such an hypothesis is strengthened by the observation that the trefoil motif never became popular at Athens, while it is found repeatedly on material originating within the cultural sphere of the Pergamene kingdom. The first Syrian king to mint coins bearing a trefoil wreath was Demetrios I, whose “stephanophoroi” should be dated soon after 155 B.C.

Macedonia provides some confirmation for an early date. The tomb of Lyson and Kallikles at Leukadia has been dated on epigraphic grounds to the reign of Perseus (179-168 B.C.). I

60 E. Schmidt, The Great Altar of Pergamon 8; H. Kähler, Der Grosse Fries von Pergamon 151ff; especially 144 and 195.
61 A possibly earlier example is a bowl fragment from building phase IX at the Asklepieion AsP XI, 1 pl 45 no. 198 dated, with the whole deposit, to the decade before the destruction of 190 B.C. p. 125ff. The earlier material from under the altar has been lost and the fragments in question come from one of the compartments of the monumental base itself (J. Schäffer, op cit 26) meaning that they could be as late as the completion of this section of the project. The question of the dating of the material from the Asklepieion phases IX and X is complicated by the presence in the material of phase X of a bowl fragment (AsP XI, 1 pl 49, 256) of very late Shield Bowl type. This would seem, at the least, to call into question the assumption that phase X only lasted into the second quarter of the second century B.C.
62 Ibid Z123.
63 F. Kleiner and S. P. Boehringer, The Early Cistophoric Coinage 15f, 22 and pl 1, I.
64 ibid Z123.
have argued elsewhere for a similar date on the grounds of the stage of development reached by the painted Macedonian shield in one of the tympana of the main chamber.\textsuperscript{65} Another shield is also represented in the tomb (FIG. 1:6).\textsuperscript{66} A large central medallion is decorated with the Macedonian sunburst emblem, while the darker zone around the outer part of the shield bears a laurel pattern made up of a series of conjoined trefoils. Recent discoveries at Vergina suggest that this painting represents a richly decorated parade shield, embellished with inlay in precious or semi-precious materials.\textsuperscript{67} A closer look at the garlands which festoon the walls of the burial chamber\textsuperscript{68} reveals that they are made up of light coloured trefoils on a dark ground, and smaller trefoils in dark paint erupting from the main mass at frequent intervals (FIG. 2:1). Like the bowl fragments from the Great Altar, these paintings probably indicate a slight extension of the pattern's history back into the first quarter of the second century B.C.

Macedonia, and north Greece, provide one more piece of corroborative evidence. The local pyxis sequence suggests a development from a type with simple domed lid and saucer base,\textsuperscript{69} to an altogether more baroque style embellished with relief medallions on the top of the dome and animal leg supports.\textsuperscript{70} The relief medallions obviously reflect a type of gold object which now graces several Greek museums.\textsuperscript{71} These metal “pyxis covers” are often decorated with a trefoil wreath around the edge of the medallion and, if they can be assigned to the third century, would disrupt the hitherto clear evidence for a second century date for that motif. Fortunately, while it is as yet difficult to date the goldwork itself, we can provide a reasonably secure post quem by looking more closely at the pottery which reflects its existence. At the Nekromanteion at Ephrya, discovered by the Romans in 167 B.C., there appear to have been only pyxides of the earlier types.\textsuperscript{72} A slightly later Macedonian tomb at Vergina also only produced fragments of the simpler sort of pyxis.\textsuperscript{73} In short, the evidence suggests a date sometime in the second century B.C. as the earliest possible time for the introduction of the gold medallions. The date for another piece of Trefoil Style jewellery (FIG. 1:7), corresponds to the evidence quoted above.\textsuperscript{74}

One last piece of evidence must be disposed of before we leave the trefoil laurel wreath. A

\textsuperscript{65} Shield Bowls.
\textsuperscript{66} Macedonica 2 Pl xix top; Archaeology 27 (1974) 257 top.
\textsuperscript{67} A.A.A x (1977) 58. Another painted example is from Delos: Delos ix, 148 fig. 57.
\textsuperscript{68} Macedonica ii Pl xviii and xix bottom; Archaeology xxvii (1974) 257.
\textsuperscript{69} BCH lxxii (1958) 759 fig. 8: parts or fragments of pyxides of this type on top row 4th and 6th from left and 3rd from right (counting in zig zag fashion), the associated pottery is of the third century; Macedonika xiv (1974) 166-169. Pl l. (a) no. 8. Associated with pottery of the first half of the second century B.C. cf. p. 169 no. 15. AE (1955) 41 fig. 19.
\textsuperscript{70} A Delx xix (1964) Chron. B3 pl 413 b-c. The associated pottery suggests that this pyxis, and probably most of its fellows, belongs to the very end of the Hellenistic period. Two forms intermediate between this type and the simple domed cylindrical pyxides are known. The first has grown a small relief medallion at the top of the dome but retains the simple saucer base cf. R. Hampe et. al., Katalog der Sammlung antiker Kleinkunst des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität Heidelberg II Pl 71. The other example is from the Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles at Leukadia whose date has been discussed above. The medallion is much larger than on the Heidelberg piece, more like that on the late type, and the vase is supported by animal feet: Archaeology xxvii (1974) 251. It must date sometime in the four generations after ca. 175 B.C.
\textsuperscript{71} S. Karouzou, Guide to the National Museum 170 top. Stathathou Collection. B. Segall, Benaki Museum. Katalog der Goldschmied-Arbeiten 42-44 pl 15-14 no. 36. Note pl 14 top, the trefoil wreath decorating the outer edge of the disc; bottom, the trefoil wreath on Athena's helmet. These features suggest a date no earlier than the second century B.C. For discussion cf. R. Higgins, Greek and Roman Jewellery 170ff.
\textsuperscript{72} PAE (1961) pl 68, bottom; pl 69, top. S. Dakaris, The Antiquity of Epirus pl 10, top.
\textsuperscript{73} Macedonika xii (1972) 164, figs 19-20; pl iv. The tomb is dated to about the middle of the second century B.C.
\textsuperscript{74} A Delx xxiv 24 (1969) Chron. Bl 216. BCH xv (1971) 921, fig 265. The pottery found with this goldwork includes several Megarian Bowls, thus implying a second century date. An important link is provided between this group and the pyxis covers by the presence of a lunate ornament. This is of almost identical form to one on a necklace from Pelinnaion in Thessaly. Other pieces on the necklace include two small clipeate busts of the same type as the larger medallions. cf. A.A.A 11 (1970) 208-212. All the evidence combines to give a date sometime in the second century for the style. The later Macedonian pyxides suggest that the type lasted into the early Roman period.
series of grave stelai were found in the vicinity of Sidon early this century. On several of these, the frieze below the pediment is decorated with a Trefoil Style wreath. Both the iconography and the inscriptions make it clear that these stelai marked the graves of a Greek garrison force. The question was whether they formed part of the Seleucid or the Ptolemaic army. The two neighbouring states had possessed this part of the Lebanon in turn until it finally fell into the hands of the kings of Syria after the battle of Panion in 198 B.C. From that date until the re-establishment of an independent city state in 111 B.C. there would always have been a garrison of Seleucid soldiers on the spot. The stele of Aristidas of Gytheion provides us with the proof we need that the stelai belong to men of that garrison. He uses the ethnic Lacedaemonian to describe himself and, since this title would have been inappropriate before the resettlement of Lacedaemonian refugees in the coastal towns of Laconia in 195 B.C., this indicates that his stele was painted after that date. The stiff outlines of the leaves on the stelai correspond to one of the later Delian treatments of the motif and, since the coinage of Demetrius I mentioned above implies a relatively late date for the introduction of the trefoil motif to the Syrian domains, we might quite easily date all the Sidonian stelai to the latter half of the period of Seleucid domination.

We now have an uppermost limit for the Hadras of Guerrini’s subgroup of about 170 B.C. The trefoil laurel can provide no more help in narrowing the possible dating range so we must turn to other elements in the decorative schemes of the hydriae. One vase from Alexandria (Fig. 1:2), bears a striking new version of the ivy scroll. Previous treatments had been variations, more or less baroque, of a loose rolling scroll with ivy leaves and blooms arranged above and below at the ends of short side branches. The new type consists of tightly packed trefoils, their density being increased by placing dot rosettes in the small spaces between the leaves, arranged antithetically either side of a large cluster of dots. We do not have to hunt far to find the model for this pattern. About 166 B.C. the Pergamene king Eumenes II encouraged the minting of a new style of coinage in various cities of his kingdom. Although in theory municipal issues, they bore designs alluding to the divine origins of the royal house and the kingdom which sprang from Herakles and Dionysos. One of the major elements in the design is an ivy wreath similar to that on the Hadras. Closer examination of the coin types reveals that complex clusters of the sort represented by the central rosette on the pot mentioned above only appeared some time after the inception of the “Cistophoric” issues; sometime after 150 B.C. Thus it would appear that 150 B.C. is probably the uppermost
acceptable date for the group of hydriae under discussion. This would agree exactly with the apparent date for the delayed appearance of the “Ivy Bowl” at Delos and, since hoard evidence forbids any drastic change in the date of the coins, we must assume that the numismatic pattern took a little while to percolate through to the other crafts.

One final word is, perhaps, in order. The few hydriae which bear figured decoration in the Silhouette Style are obviously related, to a greater or lesser degree, to this group of Hadras with Trefoil Style neck decoration. At least three examples can be associated directly with the group and, thus, dated to about the same period. Various others appear less stylised and should probably belong to a slightly earlier period, though only the single example from Rhodes provides us with the evidence to support this claim. However that may be, the general date bracket for the class as a whole can be regarded as having been firmly established. Since this new date overlaps considerably with the final phase of settlement on Delos there can be little doubt that the Silhouette figures on the Hadras represent another facet of a style which is very popular among the artists responsible for the “Liturgical” scenes so popular there. In both the wall paintings and the pots we find the same sort of awkward stick men and chubby little figures, without any attempt at defining inner detail. Like all the other evidence quoted above, this particular aspect of their decoration tends to drag the pots ever further past the middle of the second century. An unpublished group from Knossos has a jug decorated with patternwork almost identical to that on the Hadras. Its date can be firmly fixed within the third quarter of the second century; this probably applies also to the hydriae whose history we have been at such pains to reconstruct.

Conclusions

The long journey which began with the discussion of the Hadra class as a whole has led us from the early third century to the later second as the true date of manufacture for the Trefoil Style hydria. This is a large leap and, it hardly needs stressing, could not have been accomplished had we not looked outside the corpus of Hadra vases to the evidence presented by products of other crafts, schools and areas. I hope that this little essay in methodology will point the way to further possibilities for refining our knowledge of the Hellenistic material. In the meantime it is not without significance that I have allowed Knossos, the assumed home of the group of vases about which I have been talking, the final word. Let us hope that the Cretans have begun telling the truth!

Appendix

The 1884 Tomb re-dated

The most up to date review of this important tomb is that by Brian Cook (cf. above n. 25) who traces the history of the finds from the time of their illicit excavation to the present. Although it is obvious that some of the material has disappeared or remains unrecognised, we might reasonably expect that the pottery we do have represents a representative sample of the whole group. If we can date this material, we should be able to date the painted stelai which were associated with them.

Ibid 16.
82 For example, AJA lxx (1966) pl 79, fig 8 left; Guerrini, op cit C, 3, and the strange A, 9 which has interior detail depicted by reserved areas. This has Delian parallels.
84 Delos ix, pl III, d; Pl IV; VI; IX; XIII etc.
85 UM S.A. Pit 2, primary fill. To be published in a BSA on the Post-Minoan material from above the Unexplored Mansion.
In 1966 Cook could only acknowledge that none of the 1884 vases could be related at all closely to any of the “dated” Hadras. This being so he was only able to proceed with his analysis by accepting the proposed chronology of the stelai, giving a suggested date bracket of the first half of the third century B.C. We are now rather more fortunate, and a further look at the pottery produces a somewhat different picture.

The hydriae numbers 12, 17 and 18 all have figured decoration in the Silhouette Style. In addition number 12 also has a trefoil wreath on its neck. The mass of evidence quoted in the main part of this article would suggest that none of these vases should predate 175 B.C., and that they may all, perhaps, be later than 150 B.C. A similar, or even later, date should be given the three White Ground hydriae numbers 13-15. Two of these share the flaring base of number 12 and are even more closely paralleled by the foot of a large column krater from Lato (BCH C (1976) 255) which can be dated, on the basis of the associated local pottery, to the second century at the earliest. The treatment of the handles on many of these White Ground pieces resembles that on Coan bowls, whose production, likewise, cannot yet be taken past the mid-second century. On artistic grounds we might also place them late in the Hellenistic period, since their stiff bows and ribbons can only find parallels at that time.

The hydria number 11 can be related to Guerrini A, 5 on the basis of the patternwork in the sidepanels. This would make it contemporary with the latter part of the career of a Black Figure artist who probably did not begin work very much before 225 B.C. The shoulder decoration may also relate to that of a hydria in the Black Figure Style (Guerrini C, 9).

None of the other vases can be precisely dated but the description of numbers 21-23 suggests a link with the sort of Baroque scrollwork being produced from the last quarter of the third century on. (Guerrini B, 1-3). In short, the surviving pottery suggests a date bracket within the second century B.C., and there is nothing in the descriptions of those pots which have since been lost to cause us to extend the period of use far into the preceding century. When we look at the accompanying grave stelai, we find that two are of Brown’s Style I, one of Style II, two of Style III and one verging on Style IV. According to the accepted chronology for the paintings, there is practically no chronological overlap at all with the other material from the tomb and we might reasonably ask whether a radical revision is not in order for the history of Alexandrian painting.

P. Callaghan

---

86 It may even be by the same hand. cf. Guerrini, op cit A, 5, Pl. XI.