

Morella Massa, *La ceramica ellenistica con decorazione a rilievo della bottega di Efestia*. Monographie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente, Band 5. «L'Erma» di Bretschneider, Rom 1992. 276 Seiten, 8 Abbildungen, 129 Tafeln.

Work at ancient Hephaistia, the chief Classical city of the island of Lemnos, dates back to the 1920's and 1930's, when excavations of the Italian School examined both Classical and earlier remains there. Subsequently Prof. L. Beschi returned to the site and from 1979 to 1984 resumed investigations in and around the Archaic sanctuary unearthed in earlier campaigns. In the course of that work, he came across the remains of three kilns as well as traces of the rooms and courtyards that accommodated the associated workshop. A substantial deposit of extremely fragmentary pottery, mostly Hellenistic moldmade relief ware, lay close to one of the kilns, and similar material was retrieved from elsewhere in the area. The presence of molds, wasters, and draw pieces, as well as clay potter's wheels, stamps, and kiln props identify the material as debris from the shop. Morella Massa's publication is thus a welcome addition to the small number of studies devoted to Hellenistic ceramics from a well-documented workshop context.

After a brief outline of the character of the deposit and an overview of the favored product of the workshop, the Hellenistic moldmade bowl, Massa goes on to describe the results of the excavation in some detail. The workshop occupied part of a large complex consisting of eight rooms and several paved courtyards (as illustrated in a clear and well-labeled plan, Pl. 1). Close study of the kilns and of the stratigraphy, particularly the deposits below and above the pavement of the courtyards, suggests that the establishment went through two phases. One of the kilns and a first phase of the other may be associated with the first years of the shop, dated on the basis of ceramic comparanda between the end of the 3rd century and the second quarter of the 2nd century B.C. In a second phase, one kiln was rebuilt and the other replaced by a completely new one; new areas were paved, and a water reservoir in the form of two pithoi was added. A coin of Perseus V under one of the new pavements places these alterations after 178–168 B.C. Only ten fragments of long-petal bowls and one mold were found in the area, suggesting that the shop did not continue to function long after the middle of the 2nd century (although some of the wheelmade pottery may be slightly later, see below).

The bulk of the book (pp. 49–192) is devoted to the moldmade bowls and molds, which are published in full. There are 540 of these – 243 bowls and 297 molds – and the unusual proportion of molds to bowls again underlines the industrial character of the deposit. About two thirds come from the kiln dump, the rest from other areas, but joins between fragments from dump and elsewhere demonstrate the unity of the collection.

The most remarkable feature of these objects is their close similarity to their Athenian counterparts. Many of the characteristic stamps of the Attic industry appear: the distinctive Athena Parthenos and gorgoneion of the Attic workshop of Bion, for instance, and ferns and lotus stamps seemingly indistinguishable from their Attic equivalents. The Lemnian bowls display the same preferences for rim patterns that appear in the Attic repertoire, especially the guilloche combined with double spirals crowned by palmettes or small leaves. Like Attic bowls, and in contrast to the industries of the eastern Mediterranean, Lemnian bowls show a preference for figured decoration, and many of the figures, as well, find close parallels at Athens, as Massa demonstrates amply by her many well-drawn comparisons to Attic material. I see more affinities with the Workshop of Bion than with the contemporary Workshop A, but stamps of both groups appear. At the same time, the Lemnian bowls do not copy Attic material slavishly. A number of conventions (e.g. the use of an emblem-like bust as a medallion element) and subjects (e.g. Herakles with a cornucopia, Leda and the swan, a bull hunt) find no parallel in Attica. Some reflect innovation on the part of the Lemnian

potter, others were doubtless adopted from other industries (and Massa goes to some lengths to try to trace these borrowings). The form of the molds, too, differs from the Attic, substituting a raised base for the ring foot more commonly used on Athenian molds.

This conspicuous Athenian element will of course come as no surprise to those familiar with the island's history, for Lemnos had been an Athenian colony in the 5th century and was repeatedly under Athenian control in later years. The Lemnian bowls thus serve as a striking example of the way that ceramics sometimes reflect political realities, and it can fairly be said that, even if we had no textual information about the island, we would have to posit special connections between Lemnos and Athens in the Hellenistic period.

By what process were Attic images and conventions communicated to Lemnos? Perhaps heavy import of Attic material to the island provided models, but no Attic bowls or molds were found at the workshop. Massa makes the very attractive suggestion that an Athenian potter may have emigrated to the island and set up shop. If she is correct, we might be able to pinpoint the date of the origin of the shop closely, for such an enterprise is most likely to have been undertaken during one of the times when Lemnos was under Attic control. According to the history of the island as outlined by Massa, Lemnos remained within the Macedonian ambit from the last quarter of the 3rd century until the early years of the 2nd when, as a consequence of the defeat of Philip V at Cynoscephalae in 197, the island regained her independence; the Lemnians then enjoyed a period of autonomy before returning to Athenian control in the years after 168. Although the movements of a single artisan need not depend directly on political events, one could plausibly rule out a period of Macedonian control as a likely time for Athenian enterprise on the island, thus limiting the arrival of our Attic potter to the years after 197. Perhaps even more likely would be the years of renewed Athenian influence, after 168, although this would compress the life of the shop and shift it somewhat later than the pottery at first view suggests. It is intriguing, though, that the Athenian Workshop of Bion, whose products are most clearly reflected in the Lemnian material, was destroyed some time around the end of the first quarter of the 2nd century; one wonders if its owner, or one of his employees, set sail shortly thereafter for Lemnos, armed, if not with molds and stamps, then with a mental lexicon of familiar motifs, which he then reproduced (with variations and innovations) in his new situation.

Massa's particular interest is iconography, and she attempts to identify prototypes in the painting and sculpture of earlier times for each of the figures on the bowls. Her investigations in this direction are exhaustive and impressively documented, but ultimately unsatisfying. Several earlier studies have pursued these prototypes, which almost always elude discovery (e.g. W. SCHWABACHER, *Hellenistische Reliefkeramik im Kerameikos*. *Am. Journal Arch.* 45, 1941, 182–228; G. SIEBERT, *Recherches sur les ateliers de bols à reliefs du Péloponnèse à l'époque hellénistique* [1978] 235–280). Renewed attempts to discover lost 'originals' at the beginning of an iconographic tradition of this type seem pointless. Even if some single work of art does lie behind each figure in the moldmade-bowl repertoire, we are unlikely to be able to discover it, given the tiny number of major works that have survived. Furthermore, such an undertaking assumes that minor arts simply mirror major arts, ignoring the fact that innovation may have been easier in the lesser arts, where less was at stake. Coroplasts, for instance, might experiment with postures and compositions with more ease than casters of large bronze sculptures, for their failed experiments would not be very costly in either time or money. Thus, by the time a particular stance or figure was produced at large scale, it may well have been part of the traditional repertoire for some time. The single original inspiration is, to my mind, a phantom, the pursuit of which is not likely to be fruitful; much better to regard this iconography as a compendium of inherited motifs that are part of the craft tradition of the ancient world.

A selection of the other objects from the excavation is also published, in a catalogue of 163 items (pp. 193–241): wheelmade table and plain wares, lamps, loom weights, potter's tools and equipment, terracotta figurines, and coins. They provide a clearer picture of the shop's overall output and equipment, as well as additional evidence for the date of its activity. Molds for lamps and a terracotta figurine testify to the diversity of items manufactured, which also included much of the wheelmade pottery and perhaps the loom weights. Several fragments of potter's wheels are particularly interesting, their find spots pointing to the location of the room in which the pots were thrown. As at other sites, clay stamps for the production of molds are few (only two were recovered: no. 570 and p. 200, note 537), offering additional support for the oft-repeated suggestion that most stamps were made of other materials: wood, metal, or even unbaked clay are possibilities.

The influence of neighboring industries is stronger in the wheelmade pottery than in the moldmade bowls: the only amphora fragment is of the type preferred in Asia Minor, with spreading, angular rim, and the baggy, S-shaped kantharos of the Pergamene tradition is represented. The wheelmade material covers a wider range than that suggested by the moldmade bowls (and here I would disagree with some of Massa's dates). In particular, a series of well preserved plates (nos. 605–608, dated by Massa in the first half of the 2nd century [p. 209]) are remarkably similar to Attic plates of the second half of the 2nd century and well represented in Thompson's Group E, which was deposited around 110 B.C. (cf. H. A. THOMPSON, *Two Centuries of Hellenistic Pottery*. *Hesperia* 3, 1934, 394, EI-IS, 1–15, figs. 82 and 116). Two bowls (nos. 613; 614, dated by Massa in the first half of the 2nd century and in the course of the 2nd century, respectively [p. 211]) also find parallels in Group E (*Hesperia* 3, 1934, 395–396, E 38, E 42, E 43) and in other deposits of the second half of the 2nd century (e.g. S. I. ROTROFF, *Three Cistern Systems of the Kolonos Agoraios*. *Hesperia* 52, 1983, 295, no. 94, fig. 4); the distinctive offset on the inner wall, at Athens in any event, indicates a date at least as late as ca. 150. The side-pouring lekythos (no. 634), with handle at right angles to the spout, is also characteristic of the second half of the 2nd century; no Attic example can be securely dated before ca. 125 B.C. If the testimony of Attic parallels can be admitted, these objects can be grouped with the long petal bowls as part of the latest output of the workshop and may suggest its survival further into the 2nd century, though perhaps with decreased output of moldmade bowls.

All of the bowls and molds have been illustrated by photographs and many have been drawn as well. The abraded and broken surfaces of the molds, in particular, are a photographer's nightmare, and often it is impossible to make out the decoration, even with the aid of Massa's clear and detailed descriptions. To remedy this, six plates of drawings of individual stamps are included, as well as a plate giving characteristic rim patterns. Not only is this of great value to the reader, it also provides a convenient overview of the typical stamps of the industry. Profile drawings of 17 bowls and 65 molds are also included, and excellent profiles illustrate the wheelmade pottery as well.

A number of incorrect references and slightly garbled bibliographic entries detract from the work: Vierendeel Schlörb for Schlörb-Vierendeel, Pollit for Pollitt, Harryson for Harrison, Scwabacher for Schwabacher (particularly irritating in a book about moldmade bowls); and Dorothy B. Thompson's last name is Thompson, not Burr Thompson or Thompson Burr, as Massa variously has it. It is a shame that these small errors were not corrected, for they undermine confidence in what is otherwise a good piece of scholarship. Students of Hellenistic pottery will find this presentation of a new corpus of moldmade bowls accessible and useful; although I might quarrel with her emphasis, I commend the author for her powers of observation, organization, and description and for the exhaustive research that went into the production of this handsome volume.