

CHRISTOPH BÖRKER und JOHANNES BUROW, *Die hellenistischen Amphorenstempel aus Pergamon*. Pergamenische Forschungen 11. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin / New York 1998. XII, 160 Seiten, 6 Abbildungen, 40 Tafeln.

This volume has two parts. Börker presents a revised publication of the 'Pergamon-Komplex' (PK), originally published by CARL SCHUCHHARDT in 1895 (*Altertümer von Pergamon VIII 2* [1895]); and Burow publishes other stamps found at Pergamon from both recent and past excavations. The many catalogue entries are grouped by city of origin or by name on the stamp. Brief introductions to each section summarize the current state of knowledge of each class of stamps. Stamps are well illustrated by photographs, and some handles appear as profile drawings. Despite lacking standard conventions for profiles, the drawings are useful. The indices include not only the expectable concordances and the names and devices on stamps but also lists of Rhodian potters and eponyms alphabetized from the front of the name and from the back of the name (helpful for reconstructing poorly preserved stamps). Presentation of the stamps is clearly the goal, and in this effort the authors certainly succeed.

Readers may expect much more. The PK plays a central role in amphora chronologies and, in turn, Hellenistic pottery generally. Börker, however, does not provide a critical view of the role of the PK in these chronological debates. He loosely agrees with V. Grace that "around three decades" (p. 6) is an appropriate length for Rhodian Period III (205–175 B.C.; cf. V. GRACE-PETROPOULAKOU / M. SARRATIANOU-PETROPOULAKOU, *EAD* 27, 1970, 291, 210–175 B.C.), adding that the tightest series of eponyms in the deposit fits well in the first quarter of the 2nd c. B.C. Börker makes the very important point that the PK includes stamps that are much earlier than these Rhodians (cf. V. GRACE, *Hesperia* 54, 1985, 18, note 43). Börker retains the idea that the later Rhodians in the PK form a narrowly dated series of eponyms in Period III. Does the archaeological context of the PK support its role in the Rhodian chronology and the absolute dates of 205–175 B.C. (Grace's dates depend in part on an assumed start of 188 B.C. for secondary stamps, but Börker's discussion of these stamps does not demand this starting date.)?

The archaeological context of the PK faded from scholarly attention after the initial publication. SCHUCHHARDT (*op. cit.*, 423) described the findspot as: "...zwischen der alten ursprünglichen und der späteren weiter vorgerückten Burgmauer fand sich nämlich der ganze Innenraum zwischen den Grundmauern eines Gemaches vom Felsen her ausgefüllt mit Scherben von Amphoren." Schuchhardt noted that "Hr. Bohn erklärt, daß die Baulichkeiten, in welchen die Henkel gefunden wurden, 'spätestens aus dem 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.' stammen." (*ibid.* 432). Schuchhardt then proposed the reigns of Attalos I. and Eumenes II. as periods of close political ties between Rhodes and Pergamon and, therefore, a likely time for the accumulation of the deposit. F. BLECKMANN (*De inscriptionibus quae leguntur in vasculis Rhodiis* [1907]) accepted this general period for the PK and used the 40 eponyms in it to specify a range of 220 to 180 B. C. Bleckmann also studied Rhodian stamps from Carthage (before 146 B. C.), but these eponyms never forced a terminus of 180 B. C. for the PK (G. FINKIELSZTEJN, *Acta Hyperborea* 1995, 280).

In 1930, G. Kawerau published an architectural study of the upper city, including the area where the PK was found (G. KAWERAU, *Altertümer von Pergamon V 1* [1930] 40). The main features are as follows: South of Palace V the bedrock, sheathed in places with polygonal and ashlar masonry ('old' city wall), falls away to a lower terrace. Polygonal masonry foundations of a later city wall appeared at the outer edge of this terrace, under a Byzantine city wall. On this lower terrace is a two room building, mostly of rough polygonal masonry, with a long, heavy south wall. The PK centers on this building, which should postdate the construction of this outer wall, and Kawerau describes finds on the terrace as follows: "In dem als Hinterfüllung der vorgeschobenen Mauer [the 'later city wall'] benutzten Schutt fand sich eine auffallend große Menge von Scherben einfacher Tongefäße, darunter namentlich mehr als tausend Henkel..." (*ibid.*, 40). Storage buildings on a still lower terrace, to the southeast (Building Group VI), include a long building, running east-west, which backs against and isolates the PK.

While traces of city wall and the masonry of the PK building provide little chronological evidence, the broader architectural context of the terrace and possible sources of the PK debris are more helpful. The PK terrace lies at the foot of the Palace V complex. Palace V's construction used a coffering block intended for the Great Altar, so the construction should occur sometime after the start of work on the Altar. Pottery found within the Altar foundations suggests construction began in the late 160s B. C. (P. J. CALLAGHAN, *Bull. Inst. Class. Stud.* 28, 1981, 115–121). Furthermore, Palace V covers storage buildings, which resemble Building Group VI and the earlier of the Hellenistic 'Arsenals' (Altertümer von Pergamon X [1937]). Building Group VI, as noted above, ignores the PK terrace area. Had a door faced the PK terrace from a second floor of the long east-west building in Building Group VI, it would have opened against the heavy south wall of the PK building. The isolation of the PK terrace following the construction of Building Group VI suggests that the PK building predates Building Group VI (and the buildings under Palace V).

Once the building on the PK terrace went out of use, the area served as a garbage dump. The debris is not likely to have come from the storerooms below, to the south; the buildings to the north are a more likely source. Third-century buildings under Palace V could provide the scatter of 'early' stamps, mostly Thasian, from ca. 250–200 B. C. on the terrace below. Much debris would be expected from the clearance of these storerooms with the construction of Palace V. Stamps in the PK could have accumulated into the 160s B. C.

This reconstruction fits very well with Finkielstzejn's downdating of the Rhodian sequence by eleven years (to 164 B. C.) (FINKIELSZTEJN, *op. cit.*, 280–281), and there are further effects. Tying the PK's date to the Great Altar creates the following sequence relevant to both amphoras and long-petal bowls: the Athenian Middle Stoa fill (GRACE, *op. cit.*); stamps and bowl fragments south of the Middle Stoa (S. J. ROTROFF, *Hesperia* 57, 1988, 87–93) and from the Great Altar foundations (CALLAGHAN, *op. cit.*; BUROW nos. 492 & 687 for the stamps); and, finally, the closure of the PK. Aristokles, on a Knidian stamp (KT 239 in Grace's unpublished series for Knidian stamps), appears in the Great Altar foundations. The fabricant is dated as late as "ca. 182–175 B. C.?" (GRACE, *op. cit.*, 49, no. 21 = KT 238; KT 239 is not published) and perhaps was a Rhodian official after 150 B. C. (*ibid.*, 18). The Great Altar stamp could post-date the Middle Stoa handles. Aristokles, the same man as Rhodian fabricant (*ibid.*, 10), and Euanthes (BUROW no. 687, the other stamp from the Altar) also appear in the PK before its closure supporting its position at the end of the sequence. Any shifts in chronology have wide-ranging influences, and there is not room to consider all ramifications of this study of the PK context. This argument for the date of the PK also removes need for an a priori connection between politics and trade. If such a connection builds the Rhodian chronology, then debates about politics and trade at Pergamon easily become circular arguments.

While these issues of Rhodian chronologies are not covered by Börker, many topics are raised by the authors. They make a substantive contribution to studies of amphora stamps of the Pergamene region. Stamps with the names Bakchios and Euanthes are attributed to Pergamon on the basis of occurrences of the former name in Pergamene inscriptions and the rarity of the stamps elsewhere. Bakchios also appears

on a stamp found at Troy with a grazing horse (of Alexandria Troas? unpubl., information from B. Rose). The profile published by Burow resembles a complete jar found at Pergamon (*Altertümer von Pergamon IX* [1937] pl. 49 g) whose form reappears at Troy (M. L. LAWALL, *Stud. Troica* 9, 1999, fig. 7, nos. 48–49). These comparanda were unavailable to the authors and support the authors' attribution of the stamps to the Pergamene region. Burow adds stamps reasonably attributed to the cities of Antandros and Gargara. To this group, one should also add the stamp of Alkanor (not Parmeniskos group) whose distribution, Grace noted, is concentrated on Troy (O. BRONEER, *Hesperia* 22, 1953, 193; C. PANAS-PONTES / H. PONTES, *Stud. Troica* 8, 1998, 579; LAWALL, *op. cit.*). Börker and Burow thus provide new raw material for the study of the economic history of the Troad and Pergamon. These data may be studied in light of finds from Assos (N. KRAMER, *Asia Minor Studien* 10 [1993] 187–198), stamps of Alexandria Troas, and rare stamps of Lamponia (A. U. KOSSATZ, *Arch. Anz.* 1985, fig. 22, no. 3).

Many stamps are attributed to Chios; this is a difficult class. Stamps attributed to Chios show a wide range of fabrics and surface treatments. There are other amphoras whose tall, thick handles resemble Chian handles, but which differ in fabric and overall form. Epigonos stamps exemplify such difficulties. Their fabrics are coarser, with larger and more frequent stoney inclusions than is common for Chian fabrics. Chian handles of the 2nd c. tend to be more curving and tapering than is seen in the Epigonos handle profile. Dates suggested by Burow for Epigonos are puzzling: the lagynos handles must date before 146 B.C.; one example of the amphora stamp is accompanied by four Rhodian stamps also earlier than 146; but Burow follows the previously published date for their findspot as last third of the 2nd to mid-1st c. B.C. (*Altertümer von Pergamon IX* [1937] 149). That the same name appears on both an amphora and a lagynos may indicate a Chian origin, but the Chianness of every lagynos cannot be assumed. In this regard, perhaps lagynos stamp monogram 'Gar' (BUROW no. 640) should be read as Par(ion?). Burow's case for this being a Chian lagynos is not advanced by his reference to a retrograde Koan stamp with Gar... (How is the reader helped by the reference to the unpublished Kos Corpus?). Anyone using this volume to study Chian exports should treat the group carefully; much more study of Chian amphoras is needed.

Issues of form and fabric are also raised by Burow's discussion of the Nikandros group. Burow publishes a stamp of Nikandros with a narrow rim (no. 543) neatly paralleling a stamp found on Delos in the same group with the name Chares (GRACE/SARRATIANOU-PETROPOULAKOU, *op. cit.*, E 247). Stamps in this group often appear with an overhanging, mushroom-like rim. Burow's attention to the greenish-white slip as perhaps connecting this group to Kos should now be added to Grace's and A. AVRAM'S (*Dacia* 33, 1989, 247–252) arguments towards a similar attribution of the Nikandros group to either Koan manufacture or strong Koan influence.

Attention to fabric also contributed to study of the Hekataios group. Börker notes that Neutron Activation Analysis of these handles did not indicate a Thasian origin, but he reasonably suggests that the amphoras might come from an area under Thasian influence (either an island as Börker suggests, or one of many mainland producers). The general appearance of the fabric on examples known to this reviewer certainly supports his proposal of a northern Aegean origin. Given both authors' attention to fabric, it is surprising that there is no mention of I. K. Whitbread's petrographic work (I. K. WHITBREAD, *Bull. Corr. Hellénique Suppl.* 13 [1986] 95–101; IDEM, *Greek transport amphorae* [1995]), which addressed many of the difficulties encountered by K. SLUSALLEK et al. (*Berliner Beitr. Archäometrie* 8, 1983, 261–276).

Other points arise. Börker's discussion of circular Rhodian stamps as referring to the liturgical office of an ergasteriarch is characteristic of his interest in the content, not simply dates, of stamps. Stamps from Smyrna are useful additions to studies of production in central Asia Minor.

This volume is certainly a welcome and valuable resource. Readers may find the minimal examination of findspots to be a weakness. This review scarcely touches issues that emerge when stamps are considered in terms of their archaeological contexts. Burow warns the reader about difficulties with findspots, but some coverage of Pergamon's contribution to chronologies would be welcome. It is unfortunate, too, that the authors do not use their thorough knowledge of these finds to consider issues of Pergamene commerce. A synthetic conclusion addressing Pergamon's contribution to such topics could move this work from being a high-quality, traditional publication of amphora stamps to a broadly reaching archaeological study of these artifacts of trade. After more than a century of amphora studies, interpretation should be the equal partner of documentation.