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The Late Hellenistic Background

In general, the situation of the sigillata tablewares in the early Imperial period in Asia Minor is in many ways exceptional. To put this in context, it is necessary to sketch the background in the late Hellenistic period.

Around the middle of the second century B.C., a new fashion of red slipped tableware, which has been called sigillata or eastern sigillata more specifically, appears more or less simultaneously in two different regions of the eastern Mediterranean. Eastern Sigillata A (ESA) was produced somewhere in the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean and Eastern Sigillata C (ESC) was manufactured in the town of Pergamon. Unfortunately, the production centre(s) of ESA have not been located yet and, although major excavations have been undertaken in the potters’ quarter of Pergamon, the results have not yet been published in detail. In both cases it is clear that a tradition of local production of tableware already existed before sigillata was made. Sigillata should therefore be seen as a development and not an invention. The new tableware found its way only gradually, replacing other common late Hellenistic types of fine ware.

At the time when sigillata appeared, both regions were part of Hellenistic kingdoms. The production centre(s) of ESA were in the Seleucid Successor kingdom and ESC was being made in the capital of the Attalid kingdom. The political history of both kingdoms is very eventful and, especially in the case of the Seleucids, very complex. Tablewares, to be sure, would never have been a royal concern nor would sigillata production and trade have affected Roman policy abroad. This is a very crucial period in history, with Rome rising rapidly to supremacy throughout the Mediterranean. Its role during the late Hellenistic period grew from a somewhat reluctant arbiter of international affairs to an active dictating ruler. In the east, Rome created its first province of Macedonia in 148 B.C., finally sealing the fate of the Macedonian kingdom as well as the rest of Greece. The next eastern province was rather forced upon Rome by the last will of Attalos III of Pergamon in 133 B.C. The Attalid kingdom was organised as the provincia Asia in 129 B.C. The region in which ESA was being produced was brought under Roman rule when Pompey the Great reorganised the Near East. Cilicia Campestris was included in the new arrangement of the province of Cilicia in 66 B.C. Pompey also created the province of Syria, which included the southern part of the presumed region of production of ESA, out of what little remained of the once great Seleucid kingdom in 64 B.C., when this dynasty finally grew to weak to play a useful role for Rome. After the dismemberment of the Pompeian province of Cilicia, Cilicia Campestris was merged with Syria in 44 or 43 B.C.

More research is clearly needed to link the political events of the late Hellenistic period with possible changes in the socio-economic landscape that may have influenced patterns of exchange of goods, people, ideas and information. The nearly continuous warfare between the Successor kingdoms, the Wars of Rome with Mithridates of Pontus, the ever-changing pattern of the so-called Roman client-kings in the region, the growing pressure of the Roman tax-collectors in the newly created provinces, the disruption of sea trade by the so-called Cilician pirates between 139 and 67 B.C. and the Civil Wars must all have had a negative effect on long-term and substantial trade efforts.

However, the potters of Pergamon do not seem to have been affected by the new Roman organisation and consolidation of the province of Asia. Large scale supra-regional export patterns involving ESC can only be reconstructed from Augustan times onwards. Even if the Pergamene “Applikenkeramik”, which has been identified at sites throughout the eastern Mediterranean, is taken into account, the scale of export activities cannot be compared to ESA, and ESC itself would remain of regional importance. On the other hand, the export of ESA over large distances began immediately. Unfortunately, the late Hellenistic period is not well documented from a stratigraphical point of view in sites in the eastern Mediterranean. In general, very few well-defined stratigraphical deposits have been quantified and published. This prevents us, for example, from understanding how, when and where exactly eastern sigillata started to become more popular than other common types of late Hellenistic tableware and whether this process is different for areas of production and consumer sites. ESA apparently became the most common type of tableware. The production and
export of a third type of eastern sigillata, ESD or Cypriot Sigillata\(^1\), began early in the first century B.C. No production site has been found as yet, but both the distribution pattern and archaeometrical analyses suggest a Cypriot origin\(^4\). Lund recently suggested that the production centre(s) were located in the southwestern part of the island, in the Nea Paphos area in particular\(^4\). A late Hellenistic forerunner of Sagalassos Red Slip Ware\(^5\), another type of eastern sigillata, was recently identified on sites within the territory of Pisidian Sagalassos and at Sagalassos itself. During the summer of 1999, an oval-shaped kiln was discovered in the potters’ quarter of Sagalassos that had been dismantled in the Augustan period and may therefore have been used for the production of the local late Hellenistic tableware.

We can safely state that the ceramic phenomenon of sigillata developed in the Hellenistic eastern Mediterranean, under a growing Roman influence, and was commonly found on eastern tables by the end of the late Hellenistic period. Strikingly, ESA was the dominant type throughout the eastern Mediterranean. ESD was mainly restricted to Cyprus and the Levant, whereas ESC and late Hellenistic Sagalassos red slip-ware remained of mere regional importance.

**AN EVOLVING CERAMOLOGICAL PICTURE: THE TABLEWARE BOOM**

Things were about to change, however. In almost every respect, the early Imperial world went through gradual and subtle changes as a result of the vision of its first emperor, Augustus. This statesman had nothing to do with faith in tablewares, but his efforts at pacification and integration would bring about structural socio-economic changes throughout his empire, ranging from consolidation to broadening the horizon of opportunities. In this context, the ceramic scene experienced a big boom, the tableware boom.

Several processes were taking place at the same time. First of all, the early Imperial period saw the start of the import of Italian sigillata in the eastern Mediterranean. According to the evidence currently available, this seems to have happened somewhat later than in the west. Although some Italian sigillata is found in the eastern Mediterranean from the early days of Augustus’ reign, a substantial increase is noticeable in the mid-Augustan period. The peak of popularity was clearly at the end of Augustus’ long reign and in the Tiberian period. Important quantities of Italian sigillata were still imported in Neronian times. From then onwards, imports would steadily decline, to be reduced to a sporadic phenomenon by the end of the Flavian dynasty. Trade in Italian sigillata continued throughout the first half of the second century A.D., but the pattern is patchy and basically a shadow of its Julio-Claudian self\(^1\). It is clear, however, that Italian sigillata would have an exceptional influence on the concept of tablewares in the eastern Mediterranean (Fig. 1).

The designs of ESA underwent a face-lift\(^2\). The potters of ESA began to offer plates and dishes imitating the highly fashionable Italian sigillata. The new ESA product line basically interpreted the Italian concept of design to an eastern taste. ESA, new or old-fashioned, was still the most common type of tableware in the east. Although high quality tablewares were now also available from other sources, ESA would remain standard until the third quarter of the first century A.D. Pergamene ESC and Cypriot ESD were now also exported to many more sites. Investment in the production of ESC was increased with the foundation of a new production unit closer to the sea, near ancient Pitane\(^1\). The production of ESC in the Ketios valley continued alongside\(^14\), into the second century A.D. ESC was also found beyond its region of production, mainly on sites along the west coast of Asia Minor, but occasionally also on more remote sites. The distribution pattern of ESD has also become clearer, possibly substantiating a Cypriot origin. This tableware is mainly found at sites in the north-eastern corner of the Mediterranean and also further south along the coast of the Levant. Both tablewares also underwent a clear morphological influence from Italian sigillata\(^15\).

Another feature of this phase is that new sets of mass-produced tablewares were being introduced – ESB, Pontic Sigillata and Sagalassos Red Slip Ware. Archaeometrical evidence indicated that ESB was being produced in the southern part of the western coast of Asia Minor, possibly in the region of Tralleis\(^16\). Export of the ware mainly began from the turn of our era and was concentrated around the Aegean Sea. It has been found at sites in the southern Levant and along the north African coast. The distribution patterns of the two most recently identified types of eastern sigillata, Pontic sigillata\(^17\) and Sagalassos Red Slip Ware\(^18\), are not yet well enough documented to permit a comparison with the other types of sigillata. Early Imperial Sagalassos Red Slip Ware has already been identified at the harbour site of Perge\(^19\) and at Tel Anafa\(^20\).

For ESB and Sagalassos Red Slip Ware reference should again be made to links with the typology of Italian sigillata. But there is more: potter’s stamps indicate that some Latin potters are associated with the ori-
gin of ESB. Some, like Plusius or Blastus Munatus, are not well known, but the names of Calus Sentius, a very active sigillata potter from Arezzo, and Quintus Pompeius Serenus, another prolific potter from Puteoli, also appear on ESB dishes. This may imply that different ESB workshops had been installed simultaneously, in a pattern of regional production. Certain Italian potters, some even masters in their field, are linked to the initiation of sigillata production in this region of the east. Latin and Greek stamps mentioning Arentina, Arre or Are, on early ESB dishes of course best illustrate this point.

The Italian link with Sagalassos red slip ware can only be hinted at in a more indirect way. The region of Pisidia was only brought under more than nominal Roman control during the reign of Augustus. After the death of the client-king Amyntas in 25 B.C., his kingdom including Pisidia was transformed into the province of Galatia. The southern part of this province had never been completely pacified and it took the determined efforts of a man like Augustus to achieve this, with the input of one legion and a substantial amount of auxiliaries. To transform the military achievements into a more lasting peace, firstly, the local road system was improved and brought up to Roman standards, especially with the construction of the via Sebaste encircling the region, and secondly, veterans of Augustus’ armies were settled in a series of coloniae in the region. We cannot prove that these new settlers, who mainly came from Italy, all wanted Sagalassos Red Slip Ware but the pacification of the region, the improvement of its road infrastructure and the settling of the mainly Italian veterans, who were already in the habit of using Italian sigillata, may well have been the impetus for an investment in the already existing local potters’ craft to organise it on the level of a manufactory, with a suitable strategy for trading the tableware.

In other words, a series of events in the east indicates that, although sigillata had already existed there for about a century and a half, the imitation of Italian sigillata began in the Augustan period. The appearance of Italian sigillata in the east, finally, apparently inspired a more widespread use of the practice of stamping eastern sigillata. According to Bounegru et al., potters’ stamps were found on ESC from the start of its production but this sigillata was never found outside its region of production in the late Hellenistic period. From the moment stamped Italian sigillata is imported in the east, ESA and ESB potters began to stamp their wares on a much more regular basis. Stamping of ESC continued but this practice does not seem to have been as regular. The disappearance of potters’ stamps on eastern sigillata in the third quarter of the first century A.D. further exemplifies the Italian link. Indeed, stamped eastern sigillata seems to disappear from the markets together with Italian sigillata. Of the three types of eastern sigillata for which stamping was a more or less regular practice, export of ESA was then past its apex, while ESB and ESC were only beginning to grow in importance. In other words, the disappearance of potters’ stamps on eastern sigillata cannot be related to a decline of the production and distribution processes, but rather to the fate of Italian sigillata.

After the prelude in the Hellenistic east, sigillata clearly developed into an Italian phenomenon, which would in turn influence both the western and eastern part of the empire, making sigillata a cultural phenomenon of the Roman commonwealth from the Augustan period onwards. We propose to define this phenomenon as the Augustan tableware boom. Throughout the Roman empire, potters aiming to produce high quality tableware had to follow, from then on, a typical Roman concept of technology and design. In some cases, they managed to blend this with typical local features, both in the east and west, while remaining faithful to the Roman idea of sigillata.

Once this process of imitation and development was complete, in the course of the first century A.D., the short wave of integration was over once and for all. The east and west would go their separate ways and develop their own themes based on the original common Italian concept until the tradition of sigillata faded into the later red slipped wares. During the evolution of tablewares in Roman times this is, in fact, the only recognizable phase of empire-wide integration. No other region of production, in or outside Italy, would ever achieve a comparable impulse to the entire Roman empire, as far as tablewares are concerned. We believe this ceramic phenomenon of integration is part of much more developed socio-cultural, economic, religious, administrative and military pattern of exchange, involving a variety of other goods, people, ideas and information.

**CAN WE EQUATE THIS INTEGRATION WITH ROMANISATION?**

Straightforward as this question may seem to be, the answer is much less so and has to be put in perspective. The topic of Romanisation has a much greater tradition of research in the western provinces of the Roman empire. Here, the scholarly tradition has evolved from seeing Romanisation being brought about
by Roman presence in newly annexed or conquered territories, provoking material changes in native cultures and resulting in those cultures more closely resembling Roman concepts, to a process of dialectical change. Roman culture, itself a hybrid fusion of influences from different origins, interacted with non-Roman cultures to produce a new synthesis, which, with some help of hindsight, we call Romanised. In this way, the problem is not so much the resulting cultural product, but rather the study of the processes of change involving a multitude of communities and different contexts within the societies in the Roman empire.

Romanisation is not to be equated with imperialism, however, which has everything to do with the exercise of control. It has recently been defined as “the processes of socio-cultural change resultant upon the integration of indigenous societies into the Roman empire”39. Cognitive-ideological factors clearly played a central role in these processes and archaeology may actually provide a key into these ideational aspects of ancient society, through thorough contextual analysis. So, material culture may be studied as a bearer of symbolic meanings40.

In the east, the process of Romanisation has never been at the forefront of the discussion, mainly because of an assumed Greek cultural continuum, but blunt evaluations of the blessed effects of the coming of Rome can also be found. In Pisidia, for instance, civilisation was considered an imported Roman commodity: “In der Geschichte haben die Pisider, die nie eine gemeinsam durchgeführte Aktion unternommen haben, keine Rolle gespielt. Sie sind immer eine undisziplinierte, kriegerisch veranlagte Urbevölkerung geblieben, ohne ihr Bergland jemals verlassen zu haben”31 or “The coinage proves the existence of a considerable number of towns in the second and first centuries B.C. in the unruly mountainous region of Pisidia, but some doubt may be felt, especially after reading Strabo’s remarks on their tendency to brigandage, of the degree of hellenization that they had achieved”32. Recent fieldwork by the Pisidia Survey Project and the Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project clearly throw a very different light on the cultural diversity of the local Pisidian communities in their dealings with Rome, illustrating the wider need for the debate on Romanisation in the east at large. In some contrast to the west, the growth of Roman influence was gradual and involved a great deal of diplomatic activity without any direct involvement or presence of Roman magistrates and/or armies in occupied or conquered territories. The Romanisation that did take place seems to have been a long-term process and not something that happened over a limited period of time, as when peoples were integrated into the Roman empire. Although the geopolitical changes of the early Imperial period may have acted somewhat as a catalysing agent, we should also consider the range and nature of our evidence. In the case of tablewares, the abundance of early Imperial material is contrasted with a near absence of deposits from the last decades, or even the second half of the first century B.C. The process of Romanisation may have started when regions came within the orbit of Rome. This may have happened in many other ways than integration or annexation, and will therefore have happened at many different rates and by many different mechanisms. Any particular category of evidence may produce a different story in different geographical and chronological circumstances, dependent on the concept of Romanitas of local communities and the interventionist or intrusive nature of the mechanisms of acculturation at work33.

Moreover, Romanisation should also be studied as an academic construct, the origins of which may be traced to the Renaissance, but not necessarily to antiquity. Renaissance scholars rediscovered antiquity and in doing so constructed a contemporary intellectual framework for ancient society and culture. Standards were applied to the cultural attainments of ancient society, reminiscent of the degrees, forms and effects of Roman culture. Roman culture and Romanisation therefore run the risk of being measured by modern criteria41. The need for contextual archaeological evidence is once more as apparent as the risk of unwarranted generalisation.

As far as tablewares are concerned, we have to realise that the potter’s craft is traditional in nature. Potters, under normal conditions, are not eager to change their range of products, for the simple reason that they know that the existing range will sell. New products, in other words, mean a risk39. The Italian sigillata potters, therefore, must have had a strong incentive to create their drastically new line of products and the eastern sigillata potters must have had a similar incentive to start copying Italian sigillata.

The origins of Italian sigillata are still open to discussion8 and somewhat beyond the scope of this volume. We therefore chose to concentrate on the reasons behind the process of imitation of Italian sigillata in the east. As the possibility of an intervention by a central authority can be ruled out, we have two options left to play with37. First, the quality of the product may
have been superior and thus inspired imitation. Italian sigillata may have been superior from a technological point of view, from a design point of view and/or from a functional point of view. This may have been reinforced by some local feeling of dissatisfaction with the existing products. With the available archaeological evidence, however, it is very difficult to assess this concept of superiority and to avoid modern notions of taste and value influencing one’s judgement. Our second option is that the new Italian products may have flooded the market in huge quantities and/or resulted from more efficient distribution mechanisms, forcing the local products off the market. Although Fulford’s suggestion\(^3\) that the Italian pottery industry may have simply taken advantage of the traffic to Rome from all corners of the empire by loading their pottery in the ships on their return trips is excellent food for thought, the quantitative evidence does not support a very important role for Italian sigillata in the east in general\(^6\). We also feel that the existing pattern cannot be sufficiently explained in this way. The suggested options are too restricted and too much associated with a one-way model of influence and, in fact, disregard earlier, Hellenistic exchange patterns between Italy and the east\(^6\).

What seems to be happening is actually a process of dialectical change, involving Italy and the eastern Mediterranean. The producers of eastern sigillata may have been following an Italian concept of design of tableware from Augustan times onwards, but it was their decision to adopt this new style. Moreover, they followed eastern morphological interpretations, not exact imitations, of the Italian prototypes. Nor would this mechanism have functioned in a uniform way for all production centres and we should perhaps allow for some differences between, for instance, a traditional artistic protagonist such as Pergamon and a more provincial primus inter pares as Sagalassos. Romanisation, from a tableware perspective at least, may perhaps be an unlucky and a too loaded term; the integration of Roman society at large is possibly a more neutral approach. Our reconstruction, moreover, has to take a differentiated social structure into account. We have argued elsewhere that the local landowning elites, whom we consider to have taken the initiative in setting up eastern sigillata manufactories and controlling the raw materials and the means of production, may have had an important influence on what pottery was actually being produced and in what quantities\(^4\). This would narrow the range of typological creativity considerably, removing the initiative from the potters and placing it in the hands of their patroni, who looked for inspiration in their cabinets of gold and silver plate (Fig. 1). Sigillata followed an elite concept of design and this social stratum may have made the balanced choice of integration into Roman society, but perhaps the original message got somewhat blurred down the line or may have taken more time to have impact. Sigillata may, on the other hand, have presented an affordable opportunity for the lower classes to symbolise their participation in the new world order\(^2\). The tableware evidence cannot be used independently to judge changing ideological landscapes.

We have to be cautious, however, not to over-interpret the concept of integration. At this point it is important to stress that the most noticeable general trend in the distribution pattern of the various types of early Imperial sigillata is still the dominant importance of the local and regional market. In other words, people were buying products that looked different, but were they necessarily aware of why they looked different? Perhaps these trends can best be illustrated by our case study of western Asia Minor.

**The evidence from western Asia Minor**

Western Asia Minor is a key region in the Roman east and has witnessed more or less continuous archaeological activity from the days when archaeology as a scientific discipline was still coming into itself. We therefore consider this region as a valuable laboratory to evaluate the role that ceramic studies have played in classical archaeology and its potential to contribute to the discussion.

Excluding the evidence from the Aegean islands which lay under the authority of the provincial governor of Asia, information on tableware assemblages is available for 13 western Asian sites: Troia/Ilium, the Smintheion, Assos, Pergamon, Pitane (Çandarlı), Ephesus, Priene, Miletos, Didyma, Labraunda, Iasos, Gencik Tepe and Knidos\(^3\) (Table 1).

Compared with other regions in the eastern Mediterranean, western Asia Minor is relatively well represented. The pattern of sites for which tableware evidence is available is somewhat denser than the average in the east. Although evidence is also available for some inland sites, such as Koloe\(^8\) and Aizanoi\(^5\), our knowledge of western Asia Minor fits the general pattern of the eastern Mediterranean in showing a significant bias towards coastal sites. No doubt the mare nostrum played a predominant role in the exchange patterns of the day but, when trying to evaluate
processes of integration, we consider it of crucial importance to be able to compare more fruitfully the situation in more inland regions, where different processes may have been operational.

When considering the chronological pattern of the deposits and the associated pottery, a general lack of closed deposits, with well-defined chronological termini, is noticeable. Cistern fills, floor deposits with restricted time-span and detailed sequences of stratigraphical events documenting a chronological evolution, as excavated at Troia/Illion, Pergamon, Ephesos and Knidos, are too often lacking. In this respect, the potential of burial contexts, as found at the Sminthision and possibly also Assos, is clearly underestimated. This tendency can be seen as a result of greater attention being paid to the investigation of public, monumental architecture in classical archaeology. This means that dates given for pottery types are basically typological and not stratigraphical. In other words, reconstructing ceramic assemblages specific for a given period remains a hazardous task. Also, the usefulness of defining relative and absolute chronologies by the application of quantification methods is still not generally appreciated in western Asia Minor. Most evidence is still being presented as a catalogue of selected pieces, which are mostly dated using external criteria.

Although late Hellenistic material has been identified, reliably dated deposits from this period, as published for Pergamon, are rare in western Asia Minor. Most of the available evidence clearly dates to the early Imperial period. This tendency is to a certain degree related to the fact that the early Imperial period saw a significant rise in building activity, but we should keep the range of our ceramological data in mind when integrating it into more general patterns.

As far as the functional representation of types is concerned, tablewares are mostly published from archaeological deposits associated with public structures. It is tempting to relate this fact to the idea of the relative value and representative nature of sigillata tablewares. Admittedly, not much work has been done on the sociological and functional contexts of sigillata in the eastern Mediterranean as a whole. As a first step, it is of interest to look for evidence of sigillata not from urban contexts but from secondary communities, farmsteads and special purpose sites in the urban territories. Typically, archaeological surveys rather than excavations will provide this evidence. Preliminary results of the extensive survey on the territory of Sagalassos, for instance, indicated no substantial differences in the ceramological spectrum of the urban hinterland and the town of Sagalassos itself. Also on the territory of Miletos it would be difficult to substantiate sociological differences based on the ceramological evidence. In order to evaluate the sociological and functional aspects of ceramic assemblages in more detail, clearly, future research is needed on urban territories and the wider exchange patterns and mechanisms of goods, people, ideas and information.

From the distribution patterns of the different types of sigillata tablewares in western Asia Minor, the importance of local production centres in supplying the market is evident. Two types of eastern sigillata were produced in the studied region. ESC in the region of Pergamon and ESB presumably in the region of Tralleis. Both types of eastern sigillata are predominant in the ceramic assemblages of the neighbouring sites – the Sminthision and Assos in the case of ESC and Ephesos for ESB. Many more indications of local or regional ceramic production are available, however. A substantial range of other ceramic products was also produced at Pergamon. At Troia/Illion a grey ware with a waxy black gloss and a series of thin walled vessels predominated and were both considered regional products. Wide ranges of ceramic products are also associated with both Ephesos and Knidos. Epigraphical evidence provides further indications of ceramic production in the region. An inscription from Thyatira, in the hinterland between Pergamon and Smyrna, mentions a συντεχνία of κέραμες. The craftsmen funded and dedicated a statue for the emperor Caracalla. An inscription (CIG 3408) from nearby Magnesia ad Sipylum, mentioning a συντεχνία of κοράλλιοπλαστοί or craftsmen making terracotta (or wax?) figurines, may also be seen in this context. An inscription from Ephesos mentions another professional association of κέραμες, this time taking care of a tomb. A funerary epitaph for the descendant of a potter at Tralleis is also known.

Against the background of the eastern Mediterranean the importance of ceramic production in Asia Minor in general is, in fact, striking. Why were Greek centres not involved in the production of tablewares with a supra-regional distribution pattern? Why did north African tablewares, which can now be traced to the later Augustan period, not spread to the eastern Mediterranean before later Roman times? Do we have to think of technological advantages? Can we discern socio-economic or socio-political support in Rome’s dealing with Asia Minor, and may the dialectical process of Romanisation or integration have had wider impact? Or, is it as simple as Fulford suggested, that there seems to be a correlation between agriculturally prosperous regions and the production of pottery which served a wide market on the back of the agricultural
produce? Certainly the agricultural potential of Asia Minor in times of peace in the Roman commonwealth should not be underestimated.

We hope to have demonstrated that pottery studies in the eastern Mediterranean can finally move beyond the point of typological characterisation and chronological identification, and start to play a role in the interpretation of the larger scheme of things. Unfortunately, it does not seem that this will necessarily simplify the picture.
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