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Abstract

This paper takes a fresh look at the distribution of eastern sigillata A in Italy. The attested pattern is explained against the contemporary political, socio-economic and cultural background of the growing impact of Rome in the eastern Mediterranean. Especially in its early stages, the trade in eastern sigillata A formed part of wider patterns of dialectic exchange. In this way, the paper illustrates how the consumption of household artefacts could reflect and interact with wider processes, elevating eastern sigillata A to the status of desirable surrogate. Finally, a possible association with Rhosica vasa is suggested.*

RHOSICA VASA MANDAVI

On 20 February 50 BC, Marcus Tullius Cicero replied to a letter from his old school friend Titus Pomponius Atticus.2 At the time Cicero was in office as proconsul of Cilicia,3 residing at Laodikeia ad Lycum.4 His letter was very much a political document, complaining of the abuses of power in the region before he took over the provincial administration and discussing the convictions of the higher Roman political elite in the events leading up to Civil War between Caesar and Pompey. Before moving on to describing the threat of a Parthian War, Cicero casually mentioned ‘Rhosica vasa mandavi’, or the fact that he ordered the tableware from Rhosos,5 which Atticus had apparently requested in a previous letter, and he mocks his friend’s desire for earthenware.

Cicero’s remarks reveal that Rhosian ware was actually a specific type of ceramic tableware that could be considered a fashionable commodity. A second literary testimony in the second century AD, Deipnosophistai of Athenaios,6 claimed that Cleopatra VII, imitating Roman ways of life, served her dinners on Rhosian ware. It confirms the special nature of the tableware gracing the tables of the highest social circles. Nevertheless, Rhosica vasa have not featured widely in the archaeological literature, and, in spite of the papers of Francis Jones7 and Linda-Marie Hans,8 their identification should still be considered a matter that has not been solved satisfactorily.

Ancient Rhosos or Rhosopolis, formerly known as Arsuz and nowadays as Uluçınar in the Turkish province of İskenderun, lies in the shadow of the Amanus mountains, about 32 km S of Alexandretta. The town was founded by the legendary Cilix, son of Agenor9 or, in reality, possibly, by Seleukos I Nikator around 300 BC,10 but not much is known about this ancient settlement, being a silent witness to the geo-political events of the time. Along with the rest of the Seleucid kingdom, Rhosos was brought under Roman rule11 as a consequence of the re-arrangements enforced by Pompey the Great in the region, in dealing with the Cilician pirates12 and the political squabbling of the Seleucid dynasts. He organised Cilicia Campestris as a province in 66 BC, the remainder of the Seleucid kingdom as the province of Syria in 64 BC. Cilicia Campestris was joined with Syria in 44 or 43 BC. In 36 BC, Rhosos may have formed part of the lavish territorial gifts of Marc Antony to Cleopatra VII, but this proved to be only a short interlude before the battle of Actium. Evidently, the shifting of power had more than political consequences for the region, which became rapidly integrated into Roman fiscal, administrative, juridical, social and economical policies. The Tetrapolis of ancient Antioch, Seleukeia Pieria, Apamea and Laodikeia, in the hinterland of which Rhosos was situated, profited greatly from the stabilisation of the region.

Recent archaeometrical13 and archaeological14 research has indicated that a major player in the
contemporary tableware market was produced in this general area: eastern sigillata A (ESA). The production of ESA started around the middle of the second century BC and the specific ophiolitic nature of its clays has been linked to the region between ancient Tarsos and Laodikeia. It is our contention to identify the fashionable Rhosian tableware, ordered by a Roman provincial governor on behalf of one of his very rich friends in Rome, with late Hellenistic ESA, and to suggest Rhosos as one of its possible centres of production15, giving its name to the tableware in question. We consider the widely exported ESA as a better candidate to represent the *vasa Rhosica* than the lead-glazed wares proposed by F.F. Jones.16 In her article, Jones ruled out the option of ESA, or the ‘Hellenistic Pergamene’ ware as it was still called confusingly in those days, based on the fact that this type of tableware did not represent a novelty on the market. We argue that Cicero’s letter does not so much stress the new character of the ware, but rather its fashionable nature.

EASTERN SIGILLATA A IN ITALY

Within the framework of ROCT, being the international and interdisciplinary research network concerned with the ‘Roman Crafts and Trade’, supported by the Fund for Scientific Research-Flanders, Belgium, a research project was initiated involving the present authors, members of respectively the Italian National Research Council-CNR, the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and the National Museum of Denmark, focussing on the ceramic phenomenon of eastern sigillata.17 One specific aspect of this study of the mechanisms of production and exchange of eastern sigillata involves the distribution of these eastern Mediterranean wares in the western parts of the Roman territories and an appraisal of the degree of their penetration of the market, their competitiveness with other ceramic tablewares and their general impact, also from a social and fashionable point of view. This paper presents ESA in an Italian context between the second century BC and the second century AD, and offers an explanation for the success of the distribution of the ware.

The study of eastern sigillata in archaeological contexts of the Roman homeland has not yet received wide scholarly attention. This can partly be explained by the many research efforts on the native Italian sigillata lines of production, in particular Arretine sigillata, and partly by the difficulties experienced in identifying the eastern products, with the concept of ‘presigillata’18 not necessarily making matters any easier. Consulting J. W. Hayes’ section on ESA in the acclaimed ‘Atlante delle forme ceramiche (II)’,19 for instance,
supports our point: only few Italian finds are listed, and in all only five ESA-shapes are documented, forming part of the Hellenistic series (fig. 1).

This paper presents a preliminary quantified overview of the presence of ESA in Italy, based on published and unpublished data, under review of the authors. Fig. 2 visualises the data and highlights the trends. ESA is mainly attested in three regions:

1. the southern Adriatic coastal region in which the harbours of Brindisi and Otranto feature predominantly, along with some Calabrian data,
2. the eastern coast of Sicily, including the Eolian islands, with important data from Morgantina and Syracuse and a wider distribution attested by the recent data from Iaitas and other sites, and
3. Campania with relatively high amounts at Pompeii and Puteoli.

The archaeological record of Pompeii attests to the relatively important amounts of Hayes’ late Hellenistic ESA Forms and , demonstrating the commercial integration of the town. The port of Puteoli holds the key to understanding the influx of eastern commodities as part of the contemporary exchange patterns on the Tyrrenian, as further demonstrated by the stations of eastern merchants in the towns of Campania, such as the merchants from Syrian Tyrus at Puteoli. The representation of ESA along the coast of Latium is relatively less important. Ostia, in particular, shows an odd lack of material. This picture is confirmed by recent investigations along the coast of northern Etruria. Table 1 shows the presence of ESA in Italy per region.

The total of 399 typologically identified ESA fragments demonstrates clear preferences for particular types imported into Italy, mainly for the late Hellenistic and early imperial periods (tables 2-4). Table 5 summarises the chronological evolution of the pattern of importation. Late Hellenistic ESA is represented consistently, while ESA is particularly scarce in early imperial times, no doubt due to the availability and competition of the high-quality native types of sigillata. A modest increase is recorded in mid imperial times, with ESA mainly attested along the southern Adriatic coast and in Sicily, and fewer examples in Campania and Latium, where the late Italian wares were predominant. Interestingly, ESA is now also attested for the Antonine period, with a series of finds at Brindisi documenting the lingering interest in this tableware.

**Table 1. ESA in Italy: overview per region.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Aemilia</th>
<th>Samnium</th>
<th>Apulia &amp; Calabria</th>
<th>Prov. Sardinia</th>
<th>Campania</th>
<th>Prov. Sicilia</th>
<th>Etruria</th>
<th>Transpadana</th>
<th>Liguria</th>
<th>Umbria</th>
<th>Lucania &amp; Bruttium</th>
<th>Venetia &amp; Histria</th>
<th>Picenum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. ESA: Hellenistic series (numbers on the left refer to the shapes by Atlante II).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shapes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. ESA: Early Roman series.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shapes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. ESA: Middle Roman series.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shapes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Chronological evolution of the pattern of importation (numbers refer to the examples attested for each period).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Shapes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Roman</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Roman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late series (Antonine)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare shapes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain (shape/chronology)</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. ESA: Early Roman series.

Table 4. ESA: Middle Roman series.

Table 5. Chronological evolution of the pattern of importation (numbers refer to the examples attested for each period).

**POTS AND PEOPLE**

Obviously, our data need to be placed in their context. In ceramological terms, the so-called Megarian bowls, or rather mould-made bowls, formed a prelude to the pattern described above. Especially the distribution of such drinking vessels made in the monogram ΠΑ (Pariou?)

201
workshop at Ephesos\textsuperscript{39} was very wide, concentrated in the Aegean and Black Seas, but also reaching the Italian peninsula and further West. The unparalleled distribution of this ware should be seen in the context of the increasing Roman impact on the East,\textsuperscript{40} represented by the growing number of Italian negotiatores\textsuperscript{41} and mercatores\textsuperscript{42} in the eastern Mediterranean. These commercial agents were instrumental in creating the framework for the contemporary commercial East-West traffic, in which the island of Delos\textsuperscript{43} and the metropolis of Ephesos\textsuperscript{44} assumed a key role.

Especially from late Republican times onwards, the patterns of exchange were intensified, as exemplified by the case of Morgantina in Sicily.\textsuperscript{45} Clearly, the notion sustained until recently\textsuperscript{46} that late Republican Italy showed little interest in common eastern artefacts has to be revised. Our very same Cicero, ordering \textit{vasa Rhosica} in 50 BC, highlighted in his \textit{Orations 'Against Verres}\textsuperscript{47} the arrival in the West not only of people but also of a range of commodities from the eastern Mediterranean, including purple, incense, perfumes,\textsuperscript{48} flax, gems, pearls, and above all slave manpower.\textsuperscript{49} J.J. Aubert\textsuperscript{50} demonstrated, using legal, literary and epigraphic evidence, that the arrival in Rome and the West of a variety of eastern commodities was to an important extent also generated by the activities of business managers or \textit{institores}.\textsuperscript{51} This was the result of drastic innovations in late Republican law reflecting the importance of agency in the Roman economy, in response to commercial or other\textsuperscript{52} demands. D. Noy\textsuperscript{53} recently provided confirmation of the considerable degree of movement of people and the gravitational pull of Rome by enumerating 115 individuals from Syria and Palestine represented epigraphically in the capital city and Italy in general during one century. Also, D. Musti\textsuperscript{54} demonstrated the interaction of the late Republican economy with the Hellenistic economies,\textsuperscript{55} ascribing a major role to Puteoli,\textsuperscript{56} the port of which symbolised commercial activity with the East. In addition to Puteoli and later on Ostia,\textsuperscript{57} he also pointed out the emerging role of Sicily in this context, forming part of the exchange patterns as a profitable intermediary stop on the way to Campania and Latium, fostered by the geographical position of the island.\textsuperscript{58} Magna Graecia\textsuperscript{59} may have shown the rest of the Italian peninsula the way to the East and maintained its traditional strong links with its Greek origins into this period, manifested by a noticeable Greek presence in Naples, Velia,\textsuperscript{60} Taranto and other towns.\textsuperscript{61} The granting of citizenship\textsuperscript{62} by Italian townships to eastern Greeks clearly formed part of a deliberate and opportunistic economic policy on behalf of the Roman towns in function of their integration in the profitable patterns of long-distance exchange by rewarding protagonist individuals (\textit{negotiatores, mercatores}, \textit{τραπέζιται})\textsuperscript{65}. The granting of Roman citizenship by Octavian to Seleukos, as attested on his tombstone datable to 41 or 36 BC and found in the necropolis of Rhosos\textsuperscript{64} is of special interest in this context, illuminating how also this town formed part of the contemporary political and social network linking the East with the West.

The crucial archaeological matter is to recognise the exchange of material goods such individuals brought about, and to consider not only what types of wares formed part of these exchange patterns, but also the different nature of these commodities, ranging from profitable items shaping and maintaining the exchange patterns to other items which were more or less parasitic on the existing traffic. \textit{Vasa Rhosica}, for example, formed part of such patterns.

At the same time, a growing Italian presence in eastern communities\textsuperscript{65} is also noticeable. On Delos, where the sources allow the reconstruction of trends, most Italian merchants originated from Apulia, Campania and Magna Graecia. The rest of the peninsula came in second place, and Rome was noticeably underrepresented. Two brothers from Velia,\textsuperscript{66} Θέων Ὁμών Ὁλεάτης and Ὅριων Ὁλεάτης, for instance, settled on Delos early in the first century BC as \textit{helaiopo-lai} (merchants of oil), providing, along with other Italian merchants, a framework for the marked presence in the Cycladic emporium of Italian amphorae.\textsuperscript{67} Trebrios Losios, possibly from Pompeii, some of whose financial activities are documented on early second century BC Delos,\textsuperscript{68} might be identified on Graeco-italic amphorae found at various sites throughout the Mediterranean,\textsuperscript{69} along with Gaios Ariston whose name appears in amphora stamps found at Delos and Elis and who may be identified with C. Aristo\textsuperscript{70} in other, Latin, stamps. These agents may have belonged to the higher social strata in their native context. The activities of the resourceful Puteolean banker, C. Vestorius,\textsuperscript{71} who was well known to Cicero, also fit the pattern. The somewhat dated, yet still valuable work of J. Hatzfeld dealing with the presence of Italian tradesmen in the East, together with the recent conference proceedings \textit{Les Italiens dans le monde grec} (2002) provide a most detailed picture of the movement of individuals and their actions in the eastern territories under growing Roman influence.\textsuperscript{72}
Involvement in the Delian commercial community could also broker personal success for eastern merchants, as was the case for Philostratos, son of Philostratos, from Ascalon, active as a banker on Delos around 100 BC and who may have obtained citizenship of Naples. Similarly, Simalos, son of Timarchos, from Salamis on Cyprus was active on Delos in the last decades of the second century BC and was honoured with citizenship at Taranto, and Midas, son of Zenon, documented in the Agora of the Italians at Delos possessed citizenship of Heraclea.

A PROCESS OF DIALECTIC EXCHANGE

From this evidence, it is clear that in the late Hellenistic period an intricate and multi-faceted pattern of exchange was established between the Italian peninsula and the lands *ex oriente lux*. In this context, tablewares such as ESA will for sure not have been trend-setting commodities, but as most such goods have vanished from the archaeological record, the distribution pattern of ESA can be considered an important indicator for the contemporary socio-economic network. In order to understand the role of ESA in its Italian framework it is necessary, as a first step, to go back to its native, eastern context.

Although reddish tablewares had a long tradition in the Levant, the appearance of ESA around 150 BC, at first even in a mixed black and red slipped mode, and its fairly sudden commercial success should be seen as part of a wider process of intensification of craft production and trade. As far as tablewares are concerned, this process may have been introduced with the koinè of the mould-made bowls sketched earlier, but also glass production was brought up to speed with a series of mainly monochrome cast drinking vessels, typically associated with the Levant as region of origin. Whether or not Rhosos should be identified as the or one of the place(s) of manufacture of ESA is still an open question and, of course, the last thing we should do is to jump to conclusions based on this potentially misleading evidence. This is a matter for an integrated interdisciplinary project, forming a crucial part of the new way in which we try to approach classical archaeology. The fact that J.-Y. Empereur and M. Picon found evidence of production of carrot and LR1 amphorae to the north and south of Rhosos and - more importantly - also in the centre of modern Rhosos, associated with common wares and a red slipped tableware, certainly thickens the plot, and invites new fieldwork.

Considering the late Hellenistic distribution pattern of ESA, it is intriguingly simple to note that this type of tableware is in a league of its own. Within a couple of decades ESA dominated the markets throughout the eastern Mediterranean and beyond, with notable concentrations at Paphos, Tarsos, Antioch, Apamea, and Tel Anafa. This stands in clear contrast to other contemporary types of late Hellenistic sigillata which had a regional importance, such as ESD which was mainly restricted to Cyprus and the Levant, or ESC.

Why ESA achieved its dominating position is a question that is only recently being asked. Its success could be related to either the outstanding quality of the product, from a technological, design and/or functional point of view, or to more efficient distribution mechanisms, which enabled ESA to flood the market in very large quantities. To us, however, both answers, even combined, may not be sufficient to explain this phenomenon, as the first option is too strictly ceramological in nature, and the second needs further substantiation, and above all knowledge of the production centre(s).

Perhaps the supra-regional demand for late Hellenistic ESA should be projected against a wider background, taking into account the geopolitical shifts orchestrated by Rome, which influenced contemporary exchange patterns. As the next step, we would therefore like to sail back to the Aegean island of Delos.

Delos, birthplace of Apollo and Artemis and hence home to the Panhellenic sanctuary of Apollo, was handed over to Athens by the Roman senate in 167 BC, on the condition that its harbour functioned as a duty-free zone, without import or export taxes. In doing so, Rome intentionally damaged the interests of Rhodes as a result of its ambiguous position during the Third Macedonian War. Especially after the destruction of Corinth in 146 BC, Delos was favoured by Rome as a port of trade between the east and west, and the island experienced as a consequence a sudden urban growth. Delos enjoyed her major role as trans-Mediterranean emporion, involving mainly Greek, Italian and Oriental traders in eastern luxuries and slaves only for a short period, however. The town and mainly its Italian traders were targeted and raided in 88 BC by Mithridates VI, and again in 69 BC by the pirate Athenodoros. Perhaps mainly due to the growing competition of Italian harbours and the fact that commercial opportunities expanded considerably in post-Mithridatic Asia Minor, the late Hellenistic trade centre was to be reduced to the status of a village.
It is clear, however, that the trans-Mediterranean emporion is of crucial importance to understanding contemporary exchange patterns and may have been vital in establishing the distribution pattern of ESA in the Aegean and the western Mediterranean in its early decades. Delos catered for the needs of Italy, which had grown powerful and rich in the second century BC, by funnelling large amounts of slaves and a wide variety of luxury products, mainly from the Near East to Rome. Levantine merchants clearly contributed largely to the success of the island port by controlling the supply mechanisms. New money was to be made and, in the case of Delos’ mentor Athens, N. Vogelkoff has recently demonstrated how this may have influenced the introduction of commercially generated capital into the local politics and elite taste. The rich, and in this case the nouveaux riches, were keen to demonstrate their prestige, and Oriental precious metal plate and other luxuries may have played a role in this context. For the not so rich, as always, surrogates were available and in this particular case ESA may have grown into a desirable surrogate for eastern precious metal plate and thus acquired an esteemed position in the tableware market. It was hip to have ESA!

In a way this specific sociological context paving the way for ESA is reminiscent of what would happen about a century later to Italian sigillata. The success of ESA seems to have been dependent on conditions created by Rome in the East - whether we choose to refer to this development using the somewhat doubtful term ‘Romanization’ or not. It originated in a process of dialectical exchange, resulting from an increased Roman presence in the East, intensifying trade and communication, whilst progressively integrating eastern material culture into a Roman way of life. The fact that this type of tableware also met with a certain degree of success in Italian homes may be explained against this same background. The import of eastern luxuries for the Italian rich - and their derivates to their common counterparts - symbolised the Roman hegemony over the eastern Mediterranean, before many of the regions were actually annexed. In this way, the consumption of household artefacts may reflect and interact with wider cultural, political and socio-economic patterns. Such processes of interaction are no longer thought to result from models of cultural diffusion or domination, but may have taken many forms (e.g. competition, warfare, ceremonial exchange, language and symbolic exchange), which basically involved units of equal status or peer polities. In this context, the acting process of peer polity interaction - be it coined romanization or not - is no longer regarded as a single moment in time, but rather as a continuing and localised process of dialectic exchange, which may apparently find its origins long before actual political control was in place. It initiated processes of emulation between the different regions and communities of the empire and between the different social classes. As a result, objects such as ESA may be seen as part of communication strategies, demonstrating the position of these communities, regions or classes.

As with any feature of the ancient society and economy, there is a very distinct need to put things in perspective. First of all, the ESA-line of production formed an integral part of the eastern typological koiné of tablewares, and would only be influenced by Italian wares during the second half of Augustus’ long reign. It was not the product that was affected by Rome - the longevity of the late Hellenistic ESA-types attested to the popularity of the eastern morphology - but its distribution pattern. However, this aspect should be approached with caution, as throughout its entire period of production, the ESA-potters mainly survived because of regional mechanisms of marketing, a fact clearly attested in its distribution pattern. Moreover, the unpredictable profits from long-distance exchange did not entirely form part of a market economy, but were also partly contained within a relatively closed system in which profits largely returned directly or indirectly to the wealthy individual, who had founded the potting industry. As such, the ESA-industry or rather manufactory should be considered as an exceptional phenomenon in a basically agricultural economy. The supra-regional distribution pattern of ESA should always be seen as a function of processes of interdependence, which, as such, were not inevitable. On the contrary, they were entirely contingent, context-specific, unplanned, reversible and did not lead to a unified economy, but frequently conflicted with each other. The mixed nature of most contemporary ceramic assemblages, of which ESA only formed a part, should be seen as the result of such processes. J. Paterson has recently characterised this as an ‘economy of substitution’. In order to create markets for your goods you have to substitute them for the goods of others. So an increase in exports from one area is normally matched by a decline in similar exports from another area. No new markets are created. ... The reasons why one region enjoys a period of popularity and expansion in the market of its goods and then declines
in the face of competition from another region are bound to be complex and not always clear-cut.' The fact that the eastern sigillata-manufactory had their main periods of activity on a supra-regional level on an average of about two centuries or less, indicates the power of such changing market mechanisms. In order to gain a deeper understanding of these mechanisms of interdependence, we need to create intelligent GIS-maps combining origin, direction, quantities and destinations. Unfortunately, as far as ESA is concerned, one very important piece of the puzzle still seems to be missing: its place of origin, and we can only hope that Rhosos in the shadow of the Amanus mountains may soon provide part of the answer.

APPENDIX

The following appendix presents all published and unpublished data from the examined sites. The tables and maps in this contribution are based on these data. The presentation of the data per town and region, according to the organisation of Italy in 42 BC. ESA-types follow the typology of J. W. Hayes in *Atlante* II, the amounts are cited between brackets, and the publication, if available, between square brackets.

Italy

I. Campania (with Latium): 258 examples

*Pompeii:* 3 (42); 22 (24); 36 (61); 47 (79); 50 (3); 105 (1); [Pucci 1977, 19]; *Naples:* 36 (1); ? (6) [Arthur 1994, 115]; *Posto, Francolise:* 53 (1); 54 (1) [Aylwin Cotton 1979, 67]; *Ostia:* 3 (1); 4 (1); 6 (2); 22 (9); 28 (1); 36 (2); 42 (1); 47 (1); ? (21) [Ostia II, 193; *Ostia III,* 174, 218, 244, 258, 290, 326]; *Puteoli:* ? (7) [Soricelli et al. 1983-84, 245-285].

II. Apulia et Calabria: 316 examples

*Otranto:* 3 (8); 4 (2); 5 (2); 11 (1); 12 (6); 22 (7); 30 (2); 30/38 (2); 32 (1); 34 (1); 42 (2); 45 (1); 48 (1); ? (94) [Semeraro 1992, 29-41]; *Valesio:* 3 (1); 4 (2); 22 (1); 36 (1); ? (65) [Boersma 1995, 265-293, fig. 153]; *Gravina di Puglia:* 2 (3) [Small et al. 1992, 60]; *Leuca:* 3 (1); 5 (1); 22 (1); 36 (2) [Giardino 1978, 143-146]; *Brindisi:* 28 (1); 50 (1); 57 (1); tarda and (2); ? (102) [unpublished]; *Sybaris:* 4 (1) [Guzzo 1970, 114, n. 9, figg. 98, 199].

V. Picenum: 7 examples

*Ancona:* 4 (2); 22 (2); rare (1) [Brecciaroli Taborelli 1996-97, 5-277]; *Potentia:* 3-4 (2) [Mercando 1979, 223, n. 32, fig. 135e; n. 33, fig. 132h].

VI. Umbria: 3 examples

*Suasa:* (?) [unpublished].

VII. Etruria: 41 examples

*Pisa:* 2 (1); 3 (2); 4 (2); 5 (1); 6 (2); 20 (1); 22 (2); 42 (1); 53 (4); 57 (1); 113 (1) [Menchelli/Pasquinucci 2000, 371-374]; *Settefinestr:* 22 (1); 29 (1); ? (21) [Besutti 1985].

X. Venetia et Histria: 7+ examples

*Aquleia [unpublished];* ? (1) [Ventura 1991, 114-118]; ? (?) [Ventura 1994, 121-125]; *Duino:* 22 (1); 49 (1) [Maselli Scotti 1984, 54, tav. 4-1-2]; 47 (3) [unpublished]; tarda g (1).

Provincia Sicilia: 87 examples

*Sicilia generic:* 3 (1) [Carettoni 1959, 318, n. 5, fig. 23 f]; *Tindari:* 4 (1); 22 (1) [Lamboglia 1951, 36-38, fig. 2-3]; *Iaitas:* 4 (8); 7 (20); 12 (2); 29 (2); 22 (2); 32 (4); 42 (2); ? (2) [Hedinger 1999, 164]; *Castagna:* 48 (1); 50 (1) [Wilson 1985, 27, fig. 23, 1-2]; *Termini Imerese:* 4 (1); 13 (1); 28 (2); 45 (2) [Belvedere et al. 1993]; *Lipari:* 22 (1) [Meluginis Lipàra X, 319]; *Segesta:* ? (1) [Mandruzzato 1997, 1064]; *Morgantina:* 3 (10); 5 (2); 10 (4); 7 (2); 12 (1); 15 (3); 22 (3); 29 (2); 26 (2) [Stone 1982; Stone 1987]; *Siracusa:* 4 (2) [Fallico 1971]; *Messina:* ? (1) [Bonanno 2002, 207].

Provincia Sardinia: 60 examples

*Relitto di Spar:* ? (60) [Pallares Salvador 1979, 177].

NOTES

* The authors wish to thank the Rei Cretariae Romanae Faetores and the Journal of Roman Archaeology editorial teams for their constructive criticism to the paper. The contribution of J. Poblome presents research results of the Interuniversity Poles of Attraction Programme - Belgian Federal Science Policy Office (IUAP P5/01/11), the Concerted Action of the Flemish Government (GOA 2002/02) and the Fund for Scientific Research-Flanders (Belgium) (projects G.0245.02 and G.0152.04).

1 Roussel 1934, 34. The contribution of D. Malfitana presents research results of the Commessa CNR - IBAM (006.2: PC-P05-IBAM-C2), directed by D. Malfitana titled 'Approcci multidisciplinari integrati per lo studio dei manufatti: dalla produzione alla circolazione e all’uso’.

2 The *Epistulae ad Atticum* were written between 68 and 44 BC and provide a wealth of historical and political documentation, and an insight into contemporary cultural life.

3 Cicero was *quaestor* in Sicily in 75 BC, *aeditis* in 69 BC, *praetor* in 66 BC and finally *consul* in 62 BC. Afterwards he got caught up in the events of the Civil War and was sent into exile in 58 BC. Pardoned by Pompey, he rather unexpectedly was appointed *proconsul* of Cilicia in 51 BC.

5 Cicero, Epistulae ad Atticum 6.1.13: ‘Thermum, Silium vere audis laudari: valde se honeste gerunt. Adde M. Nonium, Bibulum, me si voles. Iam Scrofa vellem haberet ubi posset; est enim latum negotium. Ceteri firmant polleuntus Catonis. Hortensio quod seaweem commendas valida gratum. De Amiano, spei nihil putat esse Dionysius. Terenti nullum vestigium agnovi. Moeragenes certe periti; feci iter per eius possessionem, in qua animal religium nullum est. Haec non noram tum cum <de ea re cum> Democrito tuo locutus sum. Rhosica vasa mandavi. Sed heus tu, quid cogitas? In felicatis larcibus et splendidissimis canistris holusculis non sole pascere: quid te in vasis fictilibus appositorum putem?; translation by D. R. Shackleton Bailey in Loeb’s edition of 1999: ‘What you hear about Thermus and Silius being well spoken of is true enough. They are doing very creditably. Add M. Nonnius, Bibulus, myself if you will. As for Scrofa, I wish he had somewhere that gave him an opportunity - he’s an excellent creature. The rest are strengthening Cato’s policy. I am very grateful to you for recommending my cause to Hortensius. As to Amianus, Dionysius thinks there is no hope. I have not found a trace of thinking there is no hope. I have not found a trace of

6 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 6.229c: “Μέχρις γὰρ τῶν Μακεδονικῶν χρόνων κεραμείας ακεφάλης οἱ διε- νότες διαρκοῦστο, ὥς φησίν ὁ ἐμὸς Λόρας, μεταβα- λόντων δ’ ἐπί το πολυελεύθερον Ρωσίων τὸν δίκαιον κατὰ μήμας ἔκδοσα θέσα Κλεοπάτρα ἢ τὴν Αἰγύπτιαν καταλύσας βασιλέως τοιαύτα ἢ ἐνυφαίνει ἄργουν καὶ χορούν ἀπεκάλεσεν κέραμον αὐτῷ κέραμον μὲν ἀναπόθετο ἐκείνης τ’ ἀπεδίδων τὰ ἀπεράντα τὰ ἀπολύματα τοῖς διεπόμενοι καὶ τοῦτ’ ἂν το πολυελεύθερον ἐξ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ρωσίων εὐχαριστότητα ἄρτον κεράμων ἀνεψε τὰς ἡμέρας ἢ Ἐρατέας Κλεοπάτρας”; translation by C. Burton Gulick in Loeb’s edition of 1957: ‘Down to Macedonian times people at dinner were served from utensils of crockery, as my compatriot Juba says. But when the Romans shifted their mode of living in the direction of greater luxury, Cleopatra, who caused the downfall of the Egyptian monarchy, imitated the Romans gave up her mode of living. But not being able to change the name, she called a silver or a gold vessel “crockery” pure and simple, and used to bestow such “crockery-ware” upon her guests at dinner to take home; and this ware was of the most costly kind; for the Rhosc ware, which is the most gaily decorated of all, Cleopatra used to spend five minas every day.’ The work of Athenaeus has been recently published in an accurate Italian translation: Ateneo, I Deipnosophisti. Among the previous editions, see: Gulick 1941. Cleopatra mentioned in this section is Cleopatra VII Philopator.

7 Jones 1945.


9 Mutafian 1988, 76.

10 Freely 1998, 197.

11 For a wider perspective, see: Pavan 1990; Ball 2000; Sartre 2001.


14 Hayes 1997, 54.

15 See already Poblome et al. 2001, 144.


18 Wells 1990, 4.


20 For ESA along the Adriatic coast: Brecciaroli Taborelli et al. 1996/97, 187. For the Apulian area, see: Laudizzi/ Marangio 1998; Zaccaria 2001. For the provenience from the central Italy (Pyanoscum) and northern Adriatic area (Venetia et Histria), we are grateful to Federico Biondani and Paola Maggi for having supplied information from these areas, and for unpublished data from Trieste.

21 We would thank Francesco D’Andria (Lecce) and colleagues Rino D’Andria and Carlo De Mitri for putting at our disposal unpublished quantified ESA-data from a selection of Brindisi contexts (Atro Cattedrale and via Santa Chiara). - For the Apulian area, see: Giardino 1978, 121; D’Andria 1980, 79-88; Semeraro 1992, 29-31; Small 1992, 160; Yntema 1995, 400-401, notes 54-55; Boersma 1995, 265-293, fig. 149; D’Andria 1997.

22 Guzzo 1970.

23 Melignis Lipara IX. These scholars point out that in the case of the island of Lipari eastern and mainly Aegean products start to arrive in a sustained way from the first half of the second century BC onwards, including stamped Rhodian and Koan amphorae. See also, ibid., L. Campagna, 381-407; Melignis Lipara X, 319-320; A small quantity of ESA was published by Bacci/Tigano 2001; ibid., C. Bonanno, 207 no. VCT/16.


25 The Regional Archaeological Museum at Syracuse holds some ESA-finds. New data will be available upon the opening of the second floor of the Museum dedicated to the Hellenistic and Roman periods. There are also useful data from the excavation in a rural installation along the southern coast of Sicily, near Agrigento: Wilson 1985, 11-35.

26 Hedinger 1999, 164.

27 See also: Belvedere et al. 1993; Mandruzzato 1997, 1059-1070.

28 See also: Aylwin Cotton 1979.


31 Both forms are most common for the first century BC and they were registered in almost all contemporary contexts, supporting the notion these formed part of a ‘service’.


34 Eastern presence in the West and the creation of stations also become more general after 69 BC. The emporic role of Puteoli emerges immediately after the Hanniballic war and mainly from 215-214 BC onwards. After the Syrianus deflection in 214-211 BC, Puteoli became
the place of reference for all commercial transactions from the East. On this aspect, see: Sosin 1999, 275-284. Always interesting remains the well-known inscription for L. Calpurnius Capitolinus at Puteoli in the first years of the first century AD, by the Mercatores qui Alcantrae, Asiae, Syriae negotiantur (CIL X 1797). See: Hatzfeld 1919, 175; Cébeillac-Gervasoni 2002, 26, note 19. L. Calpurnius, of the family of the Calpurnii, was called Capitolinus in recognition of building the temple of the town (CIL X 1613).

Pucci 1977 already underlined the lack of eastern material at Ostia. - For Ostia, see esp. Ostia I; Ostia II.

For negotiatores synonymous with negotiator, mercator and mercatores have the following semantic differentiation: ‘indicando il primo un commerciante più modesto, il secondo non solo un grosso commerciante, ma, più in generale, un ricco uomo d’affari; a poco a poco però (a partire almeno dalla seconda metà del I sec. d. C.) essi tendono a diventare sinonimi e ad essere usati indifferenmente.’ - Aspects of the role of negotiatores have been discussed by Baldacci 1967, 273-291; D’Arms 1981, 42-52; Vandermersch 1994, 162-163. Very useful is: R. Étienne, Introduction, in Les Italiens dans le monde grec 1-8 (with rich bibliography).

On this production, see Medri 1992.


Bals 1979, 164; Guldager Bilde 1993, 192-209.

For negotiatores synonymous with πωλησόμενος, see: De Salvio 1992. This scholar (ibid., 19) underlines that in the Republican period the words negotiatores and mercatores have the following semantic differentiation: ‘...institori could engage in various activities, such as hiring or renting commodities, facilities, or services, or acting as guarantors.’

Fameni Gasparro 1973, passim. Of great interest is the evaluation of the names of the people on Delos practicing, e.g., the cult of the goddess Syria. They originated from Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine (Arados, Damas, Seleukeia, Ascalon, etc.), Asia minor (Miletos, Ephesos, Knidos, Nikaea), Egypt (Alexandria) and from southern Italy as well (Naples and Heraclea). - The importation of eastern cults in the West was a complex phenomenon, partly a result of Italians worshiping these divinities while circulating in the East. For this aspect, see: Alla ricerca di Iside, 5-168.

Noy 2000a; and also, Noy 2000b, 15-30. This scholar, studying the onomastics and the activity of the foreigners in the West, distinguished three groups: a first group (A) that includes people arriving in Rome for military purposes. Usually, they originated from Britain via Germany and Thracia; a second group (B) includes groups of civil immigrants from Asia, Gallia and Spain; a third group, finally, includes civil immigrants from the southern and eastern territories of the Mediterranean and from Asia minor. - On the relationships Rome-Syria, see: Sartre 2001b, passim.


For a clear picture of the economic life in the Neapolitan hinterland (Pompeii and Puteoli), see: Lepore 1952, 36-50.

Hatzfeld 1919, passim.


On the relation between Veii and the eastern part of the Mediterranean, see: Leivo 1985, 494-499.

See the list in: Ferry et al. 2002, 236-239. Altogether 91 individuals, with 2 from Ancona, 1 from Canusium, 13 from Heraclea Lucana, 2 from Locri, 2 from Metaponto, 19 from Naples, 1 from Petelia, 21 from Taranto, 2 from Ugento, 18 from Velia, and 10 undetermined.


On these agents, see: Camodeca 2000, 281-288. At Puteoli, a pagus Tyrianus with Syro-Palestinian members is attested by a yet unpublished early imperial inscription, along with many navicularii and mercatores from Cilicia, be it Corycus or Mopsuestia.

Roussel 1934, 32-74; Manganaro 1958, 289-296; Mancinetti Santamaria 1983, 133-134.

For aspects of the circulation of Italians in the East,
apart from Delos, see: Les Italiens dans le monde grec, with various useful contributions, and also an updated list of the Italic on Delos by Ferrary et al. 2002; Ferrary 2001, 93-106; Millar 2001, 1-11.


Tchernia 1986, 66-74.

Hatzfeld 1919.

The name of Trebius Losius can possibly be associated with stamps on Graeco-Italic amphorae: TR. LOISIO, see Will 1997, esp. 122-123; Lund 2000, 77-99.


On C. Vestorius, see: Sirago 1977, 50-61; 1979, 3-16. Fundamental work on this banker by Andreau 1983.

The latter work constitutes an updated re-examination of the topic. See also: Hatzfeld 1912, 1-208; Solin 1982, 101-117; Tréheux 1992; Baslez 1996, 215-224.

Mancinetti Santamaria 1982, 77-89; Rauh 1993, 14-15; 52; 93; 200; 298-299.

Inscriptions de Délos 1534; 1755 1.5; 1927 1.11; Mancinetti Santamaria 1983, 127.

Inscriptions de Délos 1689; 1854; 2234 1.9-10; 2253-2254; 2288; Mancinetti Santamaria 1983, 128; Rauh 1993, 299.

Hannestad 1983, 85-86.

Grose 1989, 193-197.

Empereur/Picon 1989, 237.


Jones 1950, 149-296.

Waagé 1948.

Vanderhoeven 1989.


In the context of Roman influence on the Athenian ceramic assemblage, see: Rotroff 1997, 98.

Bruneau et al. 1996; Rauh 1993.

In general, Delos imported wares mainly from Asia Minor and much less Athenian or even western products. Rather surprisingly only a few detailed studies of pottery assemblages excavated at Delos are available yet: Bruneau 1970, 239-262; Peignard 1997, 308-234.

Vogeikoff-Brogan 2000, 293-333.

Strong 1966.


Pobolme et al. 2000, 279-283.

Pobolme et al. 2000, 278-283.


For other case-studies, see: Sinopoli 1991.

Renfrew-Cherry 1986.

Appadurai 1986; Miller 1987; Schiffer 1999. Such patterns have only recently been demonstrated for antiq-


Slane 1997, 273-274.


Pobolme/Brulet (in press).

Horden-Purcell 2000, 342-344.

See for instance: Rotroff 1994, 133-151; Peignard 1997, see note 90; Vogeikoff-Brogan 2000, see note 90.
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