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SILVER ANCHORS AND CARGOES OF OIL: SOME OBSERVATIONS ON PHOENICIAN TRADE IN THE WESTERN MEDITERRANEAN

INTRODUCTION

The study of Greek vases is of prime importance to those ancient historians and archaeologists who want to understand the nature of exchange and trade in classical antiquity, as it 'can reveal the existence of a widespread network of trade through which other types of goods were distributed' (Anderson 1984, 119). Classical archaeologists, despite relevant literary testimonia, have tended to give fine painted pottery a privileged place in their picture of antiquity; this is somewhat understandable as pottery is virtually indestructible whereas other elements of the material culture have disappeared. The influence of the arts and crafts movement, among others, on the study of Greek pottery (e.g. Vickers 1985a, 122–6; 1987) led to a view of trade being formulated at the beginning of the twentieth century which we may characterise (e.g. Richter 1904–5; Walters 1905, 43–6) as a 'connoisseurship' approach. Although many ancient historians have broken away from these views (e.g. Finley 1985, 23; Pucci 1983) they are in fact with us today (e.g. Johnston 1972; Boardman 1980, 17; Salmon 1984, 106, 110, 113). Some have gone so far as to suggest that the cities of Corinth and Athens made their fortunes from selling expensive and luxury pots (e.g. Michell 1957, 296; Vallet and Villard 1963, 212–14) although others recognise that the export of pots from Athens can 'never have made a significant mark on the Athenian economy' (Osborne 1987, 109). Several ancient references to Phoenician trade in the western Mediterranean allow us to suggest a possible approach to the study of the movement of pottery which seems to be supported by the archaeological evidence of shipwrecks.

TRADE: THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL APPROACH

The place of pottery in trade has been assessed by M. Fulford in his studies of Southampton (Fulford 1978) and Carthage (Fulford 1980; 1983; 1984; 1987). For Southampton he compared the archaeological evidence of the Late Roman period with the archaeological and literary sources for the medieval port and noted that out of more than four hundred cargoes upon which dues were paid in 1439/40, one alone contained glass and possibly some pottery (Fulford 1978, 68). His conclusions show that the value of pottery lies in it being used as a vestige of trade as there is no evidence that so-called fine-wares were traded long distances on their own—rather they occur as space-fillers in more valuable cargoes' (Fulford 1980, 69; cf. Pucci 1983, 111–12). The main items of trade have long disappeared—metals have been melted down and reused, wood has rotted, textiles have perished and agricultural products have been consumed—but the pottery carried alongside these cargoes has survived and its distribution can indicate the routes of commerce.
J.-P. Morel has also appreciated the importance of pottery tracing a wider trading pattern. He pointed out that in antiquity the main items of commerce lay in metals and above all in agricultural produce (Morel 1985, 172). Thus the distribution of pots from his ‘atelier des petites estampilles’ (Morel 1969) can be seen against the background of ‘il dinamismo commerciale romano’ (Morel 1985, 176). He does not consider that pottery, at least in the Roman period, was in any way a luxury cargo (Morel 1983a, 67) and comes to the conclusion that it is only useful as an index of other activity. Such a position is not uncommon among French archaeologists (e.g. Gras 1979, 84).

Further insights into the role of pots in the trade pattern may be provided from other periods and cultures. The Dutch East India Company (VOC) was primarily interested in the shipping of spices (Wolf 1982, 237–9) but consignments of Chinese porcelain were also carried as ‘profitable ballast’ (Jörg 1982, 27). The East India Company of London were concerned with the export of tea (paid for with opium) (Wolf 1982, 255–8) but porcelain, appropriate for tea drinking, was also shipped. Sales figures from 1786 to 1789 show that the total sales of ‘Chinaware, drugs and coffee’ fluctuated between 1.6 per cent (1789) and 2.6 per cent (1787) of the total sales (Kathirithamby-Wells 1977, 220; cf. Vickers 1984a, 91 n. 30). ‘Chinaware’ was the only non-perishable item in all the cargoes and fortunately documentary evidence has saved us from creating a ceramic-orientated picture of trade for the late eighteenth century. The study of the modern pottery trade in the Aegean by S. Casson (1938; 1951) showed a haphazard pattern; little attempt was made to identify other items of trade. M. E. L. Mallowan (1939) presented an interesting exchange pattern for pottery in Syria during the 1930s. Amphorae were made in Sidon and taken on a journey of c. 240 km by sea to El Boss where they were exchanged against donkey-loads of sheep-dung which had been brought down from the Alaqoite hills. The dung was then transported by sea to various coastal towns, such as Tripoli, where it was sold as fertilizer for orchards and gardens. The exchange rate for the pottery was two amphorae for one donkey-load of dung.

COMMERCIAL GRAFFITI AND BATCHES OF POTS

It is well known from the study of commercial graffiti, scratched on the underside of vases, that the prices asked for Athenian pots were quite low. The highest recorded price for a fustile vase is three drachmae and occurs on two red-figure hydriae (Johnston 1979, 33); this is in sharp contrast to the value of silver plate which was worth some 1000 times the value of its clay counterparts (Vickers 1984a, 90 n. 26; 1985a, 116). Bronze vessels, it should be remembered, would have been worth approximately 1/100th of their silver counterparts (Vickers 1984a, 90 n. 26; Vickers 1985a, 120 n. 117); thus the bronze Vix krater (e.g. Boardman 1980, 220–1, fig. 261; Cook 1979, 154–5; Wells 1980, 53–5), worth only some 435 drachmae (Vickers 1985a, 120 n. 126), pales into insignificance beside the slightly heavier gold krater dedicated by Croesus at Delphi (Hdt. i. 51), worth nearly 1,700 times as much.

Athens was a major producer of silver plate in the fifth century B.C. due to her control of the Laurium silver mines in Attica, and it was said that she possessed ‘a
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fountain of silver buried beneath her soil' (Aesch. Pers. 240). In 415, the departure of the Athenian expedition to Sicily saw 'the whole circumference of the Piraeus . . . filled with incense burners and silver kraters' (Diod. xiii. 3. 2) and libations were poured from gold and silver cups on every deck (Thuc. vi. 32. 1). Although some would continue to insist that 'the archaic age was the great age of sympotic pottery' and indeed 'potters and painters became rich and famous, producing shapes and painting designs which echoed the sympotic preoccupations of their aristocratic patrons' (Murray 1983, 264), it has been convincingly argued that Athens' aristocratic citizens drank from gold and silver vases whilst her potters produced closely copied (and cheap) imitations in clay for the popular market (Vickers 1983; 1984a; 1985a; 1986; Vickers et al. 1986; Gill 1986a; 1987a). Laurium silver was exported either as plate, which is how it is found in the wealthy tombs of Thrace and the Crimea (Filow 1934; Gill 1987a; Gorbunova 1971; Vickers 1979), or in ingot form, for instance as part of the cargo found in the Porticello shipwreck (Eiseman 1979b; 1980). The evidence of trademarks and the comparatively low value of pottery in society indicate that it is unlikely that it would ever have been commercially viable to transport pottery on its own.

J. Boardman (1979, 35) has suggested that if it is possible to detect batches of pottery from a single workshop to one site 'we may be observing conduct of the bulk trade in decorated pottery'. At Tocra batches of votive pots were observed in the sanctuary which led Boardman to believe that the port was at the end of a Cyrenaican trading run (Boardman 1968) although no attempt was made to identify the main cargoes which were being traded there. Batches of pottery are particularly common at Spina, which has been described as 'probably the greatest single source of fine Athenian vases in the Greek world, or outside it' (Boardman 1980, 228). The arrival of the pots at the port is likely to mirror the export of agricultural produce from the Po Valley, or perhaps even slaves from Central Europe (Gill 1987b, 84–5). Other surviving batches include 20 Middle Geometric skyphoi in a Cypriot prince's tomb at Salamis (Coldstream 1977, 95), 13 identical plain komast cups from a single grave at Taranto (Brijder 1983, 94–5) and, from a house at Pompeii, 90 samian bowls packed in a wooden crate with 37 fictile lamps (Atkinson 1914). One of the most bulky cargoes must have been a batch of 23 kraters recorded on the foot of a column-krater in New York (Johnston 1979, Types 9F, 51 and 13F, 3). The largest batch recorded outside Athens is found on a lamp from Reggio and records a consignment of 285 (Gill 1987c). It is clear that a crate or two of pottery would only take up a tiny fraction of a ship's hold.

Excavation of the warehouses at Al Mina at the mouth of the Orontes confirmed that pottery was not the only item which was traded. It is true that batches of pottery were found in the debris—e.g. eleven identical black-glazed cup-skyphoi with stamped decoration (London 1960. 3–1. 2–12: Bron and Lemaire 1983, 183 pls. cxx, 6 and cxxi, 1)—but some arrived as containers for luxury perfume, such as the Attic red-figure squat lekythoi in Room 6 of House F (Wooley 1938, 23 fig. 8). Commercial graffiti reveal other batches which have not survived in the archaeological record (Johnston 1979, 20). Other stores contained amphorae, lead ingots and mercury (Wooley 1938, 24), and it is alongside these bulk cargoes that the pottery would surely have arrived (cf. Boardman 1980, 42).
Gravisca, the port of Tarquinia (Moretti 1971; Torelli 1971; 1977), has often been connected with the bulk import of Corinthian, East Greek and Attic pots. One of her traders was Sostratos, who dedicated a stone anchor to Aeginaetan Apollo in the sanctuary (Harvey 1976; Johnston 1972; Torelli 1971, 55–60). A. W. Johnston has suggested that this merchant be linked to SO commercial graffiti (Johnston 1972; 1979, 240) and the Sostratos, son of Laodamas, who was said to have made more fortune than Kalaios the Samian who visited Tartessus (Hdt. iv. 152). However this suggestion should be treated with extreme caution (Harvey 1976). Many personal names start with SO and it is a rash move to associate these particular marks with ‘yet another of the engaging walk-on characters in Herodotos’ work’ (Johnston 1972, 423). In reality the pots marked with the SO graffiti were probably brought in as space-fillers on ships which arrived carrying cargoes contained in amphorae (Slaska 1985) and left the port carrying Etruscan metals and metalwork (e.g. Ath. i. 28. b–c, citing Critias).

SHIPWRECKS AND CARGOES

Cargoes in antiquity were usually mixed (Parker 1984). The Giglio Island shipwreck revealed a main cargo of metal ingots, copper nuggets and iron spits as well as transport amphorae (Etruscan and Phoenician), some containing olives, and perfumed-oil containers (Corinthian aryballoi) (Bound 1985; Bound and Vallintine 1983). These items were accompanied by Etruscan buccheria, Corinthian, Ionian and Laconian pots. The Cape Antibes shipwreck had Etruscan transport amphorae as its main cargo and they were accompanied by buccheria and Etrusco-Corinthian pots (Bouloumí 1982). The Porticello shipwreck was carrying numerous amphorae originating in Mende, Motya, Byzantium and Magna Graecia (Eiseman and Ridgway, in preparation; Gill 1987d). In addition to this main cargo, the ship was carrying at least two fragmentary life-size bronze statues, lead ingots, nuggets of pure silver, remains of silver ingots, ink-pots with ink, and a small amount of black-glazed pottery. The lead from the sheathing of the hull, the ingots and the nuggets of silver all reveal Laurium as their source. A further wreck lies off Kyrenia in Cyprus, dated by coins to the end of the fourth century B.C. or perhaps the early third (Katzev 1969; 1970; Katzev and Swiny 1973). The main cargo consisted of amphorae, of which the majority were Rhodian, followed by Samian and Parian. There were 29 grinding stones laid out along the axis of the ship and these are more likely to have been a cargo than a ballast which already consisted of river stones and gravel. Over 9,000 almonds were found in the bow area and it seems that they were in sacks which have since perished. The small amount of pottery, in sets of four, seem to have been from the crew’s mess. In the Capistello wreck off Lipari, two consignments of Campanian pottery from a single workshop were separated by the main cargo of amphorae stacked amidships (Cavalier 1985). No shipwrecks have so far been identified which were carrying pots as their main cargo (cf. Fulford 1987, 61).

The composition of ancient cargoes finds parallels in the historical period. Although the cultural contexts are different, they illustrate the point that pots were
rarely carried in their own right. The seventeenth century Kvitsøy wreck of a Dutch galliot shows that the main cargo consisted of wine and oil in stoneware containers and they were accompanied by Delftware and clay pipes (Andersen 1974); the reverse cargo may have been timber. In 1613, the homeward bound Witte Leeuw, a Dutch East Indiaman, was wrecked off St. Helena (Report 1977). The small amount of porcelain accompanied the cargo of 15,000 bags of pepper. Another Dutch East Indiaman, the Geldermalsen, sank in 1752, and along with its main cargo which included one hundred solid gold ingots, there was the accompanying cargo of 160,000 pieces of Chinese porcelain carrying standard patterns (Norman 1986). In virtually every case, only the pottery cargo would have left some trace for posterity if the ship had arrived safely at port.

It is not unusual to find pottery accompanying cargoes of more value. In the Mycenaean period the levels of imported Mycenaean pottery on Cyprus seem to reflect the export of copper (Sherratt 1982, 184; Harding 1984, 233; Stubbings 1975, 182), probably in exchange for olive oil produced on the Greek mainland (Harding 1984, 232–3; Renfrew 1972, 460). Other forms of exchange occurring in the eastern Mediterranean, accompanied by Mycenaean pottery, would have included plain and perfumed oil (Immerwahr 1960, 5–6; Stubbings 1951, 101; 1975, 182), spices (Immerwahr 1960, 12; Harding 1984, 126) and ivory. In the Troad the appearance of Mycenaean pottery may reflect seasonal fishing trips (Mee 1978, 148) and in the west the search for metals, including copper (Harding 1984, 258). In addition to oil, wool may have been another valuable export of the palace-orientated societies and it could have been exchanged for copper, tin, amber, ivory and semi-precious stones (Harding 1984, 35–6). In the fifth century B.C. the levels of imported Attic black-glazed pottery at Marion on Cyprus were highest during times of war when copper was in demand for the production of bronze weapons and armour. At the Hellenistic city of Berenice in Cyrenaica, the import of pottery may reflect the export of grain, olive oil, silphium and perhaps even wool (Riley 1979, 402–18; Barker 1979, 127). In the Late Roman period, African Red Slip ware seems to have accompanied the export of North African olive oil or corn (Fulford 1980, 70; 1983, 11; 1984, 256; Peacock 1982, 154).

Pottery may also be used to indicate trade in other commodities which no longer survive. The large quantity of imported pots in Etruria is a well known phenomenon and some have seen the Etruscans giving ‘the Greeks the metal they wanted in return for what was often hardly more than the bright beads with which merchants are usually supposed to dazzle natives’ (Boardman 1980, 200). We may take Populonia as an example because its wealth lay in the export of metals, and perhaps even agricultural produce. Copper came from the nearby mines at Campiglia, iron from Elba. The slag heaps suggest that the annual extraction of iron ore may have been between 10,000 and 12,000 tons over a period of four centuries, and representing an annual production of 1,600 to 2,000 tons of iron. This would have required between ten and twenty ships, of 120 to 160 tons, to shift the ore annually (Gill 1987b). It is unwise to suggest that the balance of payment could have been met by cheap pots (Banti 1968, 144). The Crimea is another area which imported Greek, and especially Athenian, pots. This no doubt reflects the area’s ability to meet the Athenian desire for grain (Osborne 1987, 97–104). The payment
however was in silver which is found in the form of plate in so many of the tombs (Gill 1987a). At Marseilles, imported Ionian pottery may reflect the exchange of wine, olive oil and silver for grain, metals, forest products, leather, textiles and slaves (Graham 1984, 6; Wells 1980, 61–2). Likewise the range of pottery at Naucratis in Egypt reflects the Greek demand for wheat supplies (Boardman 1980, 129; Figueira 1984, 24) and perhaps even papyrus and linen (Boardman 1980, 129). Silver, gold, timber and worked wood, recorded on the Naucratis stele, may have been exchanged for these products (Gunn 1943). The Asyut hoard of Greek silver coins is now considered to have formed payment for a consignment of ivory from Africa (Vickers 1984a, 97; 1985b, 39–41).

PHOENICIANS AND THE POTTERY TRADE

One of the few references to the trade of pottery in antiquity occurs in pseudo-Scylax and records ‘Phoenicians’ on the west coast of Africa trading in Athenian pots and other items of commerce (Pseudo-Scylax 112: Müller 1882, 94). The high levels of Attic pottery on western Punic sites, particularly in the fourth century B.C., seem to confirm this picture (De Miro and Fiorentini 1977; Gill 1986b; Morel 1980; 1983b; Villard 1959). Indeed the range of imports corresponds closely with that found in the southern part of the Iberian peninsula and suggests that the western Phoenicians or Carthaginians, among others, were involved in their distribution (Gill 1986b; MacDonald 1979, 177). Punic involvement in the trade of pots is confirmed by a krater foot from Galera in Spain, dating to c. 430 B.C., inscribed with a Phoenician trademark noting a batch of four such vessels (Johnston 1978; 1979, Type 18C, 52). A possible Punic wreck of the fourth century B.C. lies off Majorca and was found to be carrying Athenian pottery as part of its cargo; some seem to carry Punic commercial graffiti (Pallares Salvador 1972). Its main cargo consisted of amphorae of several different types: Punic, Rhodian and Greco–Italic. Like the Kyrenia shipwreck it was carrying stone-grinders. A possible indicator of the extent of Punic trade in the second half of the fifth century B.C. and the early years of the fourth is provided by the widely distributed and robust Attic black-glazed Castulo cup (Shefton in Niemeyer 1982, 403–5; cf. Gill 1986b, 280–1, fig. 118, no. 29). Large numbers of these cups have been found in Spain and North Africa as well as along the maritime trade routes: Carthage, Tharros and Nora on Sardinia, and Ibiza.

The archaeological evidence seems to support the view that there was indeed Punic trade in Athenian pottery. However pseudo-Scylax also mentions ‘Phoenician’ trade in more valuable items which included perfume (muron) and ‘Egyptian stone’. Glass alabastra and amphoriskoi were well suited to serve as perfume containers and have been found on Phoenician sites in the west (e.g. Tharros: Harden 1981, pls. 10, 140 and 16, 291). In the same way the distribution of East Greek plastic terracottas of the Gorgoneion and Aphrodite Groups (Higgins 1959, 10), Corinthian aryballoi and alabastra (Salmon 1984, 117), and Attic black-glazed amphoriskoi reflects the popularity of the perfume rather than the container. This pattern may be compared to the export of Cypriot Bronze Age base-ring ware juglets to Egypt as opium containers (Merrillles 1962). Perfumes usually had an olive oil
base and were scented with different flowers and plants (Ath. xv. 688. d–689. b). Simple marketing may be seen in the decoration or shape of the container. Many Attic black-glazed amphoriskoi are decorated with a large spindly palmette stamp (e.g. Sparkes and Talcott 1970, pl. 48, 1153) which is reminiscent of the silphium plant represented on the coins of Cyrene (Boardman 1980, 157 fig. 198; cf. Chamoux 1985). Likewise the myrtle decoration on an alabastron from Cyrenaica may indicate its contents (Leiden KvB 22: CVA 3 [5] text p. 4, pl. 110 [204] 11). Other containers take the shape of an almond (Beazley 1940–5, 14; e.g. Oxford 1921. 1355, from Rhodes, 341 and 340: CVA 1 [3] pl. 40 [132] 14–16). Perfume was a luxury item. Anaxandrides refers to expensive Egyptian perfume (Ath. xv. 689. f-690. a) and Athenaeus (xv. 690. b, 691. c, 691. d) equates the use of perfume with luxurious living and explicitly states that the price of a kotyle of perfume at Athens was very high if not exorbitant. Hipparchus records a price of five mnas (Ath. xv. 691. c) and Menander a price of ten (Ath. xv. 691. c). Perfume could also have been exported in bulk in pelikai and then transferred to smaller containers at an emporium or point of sale. Phoenician perfumed-oil containers are quite common in the west (Ramon 1982).

In exchange for the luxury and cheap utilitarian merchandise of perfume and pots, the ‘Phoenicians’ obtained various animal skins and ivory. Ivory was a luxury item in Greece and was used in the manufacture of musical instruments, furniture, weapons, drinking cups, unguent containers and statues (Vickers 1984a, 91; 1985a, 111–12). The manufactured ivory goods could then be exported from cities such as Athens. Extant products include the Kul Oba painted plaques from southern Russia (Minns 1913, 204 A–D figs. 111–13). The picture of exchange provided by pseudo-Sclayrax shows luxury and cheap products being exchanged for luxury and cheap raw materials. In both cases the luxury items, perfumed-oil and ivory, were light and the accompanying cargoes of pottery and hide would act as a make-weight or saleable ballast. The cargo could then be sold for a profit in the markets of the Greek world and indeed Phoenician ships are attested in the Piraeus (Xen. Oec. viii. 11–16). The perfumed-oil and pottery could have been shipped together from Athens (even if the perfume was produced elsewhere) or transhipped at some point in the west, for instance at Carthage. In any case, out of all these items in the exchange process only the pottery, the perfumed-oil containers and very occasionally the manufactured and exported ivory products would be found in the archaeological record.

Herodotus (iv. 196) also mentions that the ‘Phoenicians’ bartered for gold on the west coast of Africa. Although he does not mention the other items for which it was exchanged, the pattern was probably similar to that recorded by pseudo-Sclayrax. Both pseudo-Aristotle (De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus 135: Dowdall in Ross 1913) and Diodorus (v. 35. 4) record the Phoenicians exchanging olive oil, small wares of maritime produce or wares of little worth for vast quantities of silver in the Iberian peninsula. Indeed there was so much that they even replaced the lead on their anchors with silver! Diodorus records that the valuable cargo was then transported to Greece and Asia Minor. B. B. Shefton suggested that the appearance of Attic SOS amphorae in southern Spain confirms these exchange patterns involving oil and silver (Shefton 1982, 338–9). Assuming a pattern similar to that found on the west coast of Africa, the other small wares might have included pottery and a good
candidate for this accompanying merchandise must be Early and Middle Proto-
corinthian skyphoi. Thus the finds of empty amphorae and skyphoi record the
import of olive oil (or other produce) and the export of silver which has not survived
in its original form. This trade probably continued throughout the fifth and fourth
centuries as reflected by the high level of imported pottery.

B. B. Shefton suggested that the Phoenician trade with Tartessus should be
linked to Ischia where the cargo of oil (and EPC/MPC skyphoi) was picked up and
the return cargo of silver delivered (Shefton 1982, 342). He used the similarity
between the distribution patterns of Attic SOS amphorae and Rhodian aryballoi in
southern Italy and Sicily to suggest East Greek involvement in the transport of olive
oil to Ischia. However S. Frankenstein had earlier pointed out that these Rhodian
aryballoi were carried on the currents of Phoenician trade (Frankenstein 1979,
275–6), although this would not, of course, have excluded other traders. Some have
suggested that the olive oil would have been rancid by the time that it reached
Ischia, let alone its final destination of Tartessus (Coldstream in Niemeyer 1982,
369), when in fact oil has a remarkably long life.

This explanation of Phoenician involvement in the distribution of Attic oil in
SOS amphorae may answer B. B. Shefton’s quandary as why ‘no other Etruscan site
other than Cerveteri has provided SOS amphorae of the early group’ (Shefton 1985,
285). An early SOS Attic amphora was found at Cerveteri in the Regolini–Galassi
Tomb (Johnston and Jones 1978, 119 no. 4; Pareti 1947, 344–5, no. 384) which is
notable for its range of Phoenician imports (Strøm 1971, 160–8; cf. Rathje 1979,
152–8). These included gilded silver bowls, silver jugs with piriform bodies and large
quantities of ivory, which even if not Phoenician in craftsmanship may have been
brought in an unworked state by them. It is perhaps worth drawing attention to the
Proto-corinthian skyphoi which were found in the tomb (Pareti 1947, pl. xlix, nos.
369–78) and have already been suggested as vases which accompanied SOS
amphorae. The first treaty between Rome and Carthage in 509 seems to suggest that
there was some trade between the Etruscans and Phoenicians although its full extent
has not yet been determined (MacIntosh–Turfa 1977).

A further indication of ‘Phoenician’ trade in the west during the archaic period
is provided by the ‘Rhodian’ bronze oinochoai (Shefton 1979; Vickers 1984b, 210).
They are found in Italy, Central Europe, the south coast of France and Spain, with a
few other instances from mainland Greece, Rhodes and the eastern Mediterranean.
The appearance of these oinochoai in Central Europe, via the Rhone Valley, has
been shown to be prior to the foundation of Marseilles (Villard 1956, 50–1).
Phoenician imports are common along the south of France (Bouloumié 1982, 66 fig.
17) and their amphorae form a high percentage of the total amphora assemblage on
sites in this area (Solier 1968, 133). Their activity in this area, or rather the
termination of it, is attested by the literary sources. Pausanias (x. 8. 4) recorded;

the Massaliots are a colony of Phocaea in Ionia, and their city was founded by some of those who
ran away from Phocaea when attacked by Harpagos the Persian. They proved superior to the
Carthaginians in a sea war, acquired the territory they now hold, and reached great prosperity.
Likewise Thucydides (i. 13. 6) recorded that the Carthaginians were defeated prior
to the foundation of Marseilles. Such defeats must have encouraged the Car-
thaginians to concentrate on their other areas of interest in the west.
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The ‘Phoenicians’ were clearly involved in the distribution of Attic and other ‘fine’ pottery in the western Mediterranean from the Archaic period down until the middle of the fourth century B.C. This trade involved more valuable and luxurious commodities such as perfumed-oil, silver, gold and ivory, and the extant pottery serves as a tracer of this other trade. The fragment of pseudo-Scylax, assisted by archaeology, provides an instance of F. D. Harvey’s thesis:

the presence of any pottery of any given state at any given site is no evidence for the activity of traders (or indeed settlers) from that state on that site (Harvey 1976, 211).

Any study of trade or colonisation would do well to take heed of such a warning. The routes to the west are not clear, but in the Archaic period Ischia, at least, may have served as a suitable point for transhipment, being replaced in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. by Carthage. The area was one which offered great profit and Herodotus (iv. 152) recorded that Kolaios the Samian made a great fortune there only surpassed by Sostratos of Aegina. Silver anchors and cargoes of oil have disappeared but the distribution of pottery bears witness to the active trading of Phoenicians in the west.

DAVID W. J. GILL
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