

University of Groningen

Greek pottery on the Timpone della Motta and in the Sibaritide from c. 780 to 620 BC

Kindberg Jacobsen, Jan

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2007

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kindberg Jacobsen, J. (2007). *Greek pottery on the Timpone della Motta and in the Sibaritide from c. 780 to 620 BC: reception, distribution and an evaluation of Greek pottery as a source material for the study of Greek influence before and after the founding of ancient Sybaris.* [s.n.].

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Chapter 3. New finds of Greek pottery on the Timpone della Motta and a different approach to the study of Pre-Sybaris connections.

3.1. Introduction.

In the presentation of the Greek material in this chapter, I am following the traditional division between pre- and post-Sybaris pottery as described in the previous chapter.

I shall however, argue in Chapter 6 that the division is largely artificial and difficult to relate to any material or contextual developments in the Sibaritide.

As mentioned, some additional Greek pottery from the period prior to the foundation of Sybaris will be presented. The pottery itself present a new perspective in the discussion on pre-Sybaris connections since, as something new, Euboean Geometric pottery can be presented as a supplementary group to the Corinthian material of the Sibaritide. Still it will be argued that Greek pottery in itself does not say much conclusive about the nature of the contact, which brought it to the Sibaritide. The need for a different approach will therefore be indicated, which uses local pottery to form a basis for the understanding of the influx of Greek pottery.

3.2 Recent finds of Corinthian pottery on the Timpone della Motta

The study of the material from the Timpone della Motta has, so far, brought a small number of Corinthian fragments to light, which dates to the MGII and LG. Most of these are from drinking cups. Cat. no 3 is a rim fragment of Corinthian Aetos 666 *proto-kotyle* decorated with chevrons in the handle zone. The fragment should be dated to the later phase of MGII: The upright rim is lower than that of the *proto-kotyle* in its initial early MGII state but at the same time notably higher and more pronounced, than the rim of the latest series from the early part of LG¹²⁸. Two additional fragments of Aetos 666 *kotylai* probably dates early in the LG period (Cat. nos. 4-5). Cat no. 6 is a “black painted” rim fragment of an unusual large *proto-kotyle* (dia: 18 cm.) with dot and concentric circles in applied white and a preserved part of a reserved area probably in the shape of an hour glass. This fragment is at the very end of the *proto-kotyle* sequence where the hatched rim is minimal. A similar decoration is found on a *kotyle* rim fragment from Corinth dated to LG¹²⁹. Since cat. no. 6 is still a *proto-kotyle* it should be dated slightly earlier than the Corinth parallel probably to the early part of LG. The same is the case of the *proto-kotyle* rim fragment cat. no. 7 which has a close parallel from Isthmia¹³⁰. A date to the transition from LG to EPC can probably be assigned to the *kotyle* fragment cat. no. 8

¹²⁸ Compare e.g. with, *Coldstream 1968*, pl. 17.h (early MGII), *Corinth XV.3*, pl. 3, no 38 (early LG). The shape and decoration of cat. no. 3 is similar to e.g. that of *Coldstream 1968*, pl. 18.e and *Pfaff 1999*, pl. 100, fig 35. Both MGII.

¹²⁹ *Corinth XV.3*, p. 24, no 43, pl. 3, were it is also noted that the fragment is of “unusually large size” (Dia of rim: 16 cm). A later *kotyle* fragment with similar decoration is also found in Siracusa, *Pelagatti 1982*, p. 134, Tav. XIX, fig. 2, no. 4 and also at Otranto, *D’Andria 1994*, p. 492, fig. A.

¹³⁰ *Morgan 1999*, p. 118, no. 352, fig. I.47.

decorated with a hatched meander flanked by vertical bars ¹³¹. The most characteristic type is a group of Corinthian LG *kyathoi* found in the sanctuary. Fragments from four vessels have come to light during the GIA excavation (cat. nos. 9,10,11 & 12) and another three are found among the Stoop and Bern/Getty material. The decoration schema is of the Aetos 666 type with the exception of cat. no. 12, which is decorated with a *heron*. LGI *kyathoi* are not widely circulated in Italy and the closest parallels to the Francavilla pieces (especially the Stoop and Bern/Getty vessels) are found in LG graves at Pithekoussai¹³². Only one of the excavated Corinthian pieces is not from a drinking cup. Cat no. 13 includes three wall, neck and handle fragments from a Corinthian *conical lekythos*. The body is low and rounded and the transition from body to neck is curving and clearly indicates that the neck is broad at the lower part and probably narrowing towards the top. The shape can best be compared with that of Corinthian conical *lekythoi* of the MGII period, which is earlier than the higher LG *lekythos* with straitening wall and beginning angle at the transition between body and neck. The decoration, consisting of horizontal lines, panels with vertical lozenges chain, and stars at the shoulder, does not find a direct parallel among the Corinthian MGII *lekythoi*, since these generally are decorated with horizontal lines and crosshatched triangular around the shoulder. The manner of drawing, with rather thick lines that are not always evenly applied, does however resemble the MGII style, rather than the delicate use of many closely set thin lines, which can be observed on the LG Corinthian *conical lekythoi*¹³³.

Corinthian pottery of the Thapsos class is not included here but will be dealt with in chapter 6. I have decided to exclude the *Thapsos skyphoi* because there is sufficient contemporary evidence in the Sibaritide to say that the type, at least partly, relates to the period after the foundation of Sybaris since this *skyphos* type has been found in the Sybaris excavation. The type itself does however start in the LG period and it is therefore possible that some of the *skyphoi* are earlier than the foundation of Sybaris.

3.3. New Euboean pottery from the Timpone della Motta ¹³⁴.

Most notable are the finds of fragments from a MGII Euboean black cup (cat. no. 14). The distribution of this type in the western Mediterranean has until now been limited to Pontecagnano where they are attested in graves of period IIa and IIb (780/770-750 BC and 750-730 BC) ¹³⁵. The Francavilla *skyphos* is of a shallow type with a rather upright offset rim, which should justify a date in the MGII period¹³⁶. The remaining Euboean fragments are LG geometric in style and can therefore not be dated more precisely than to the

¹³¹ A close parallel is found at Corinth, *Corinth XV.3*, p. 23, no. 36, pl. 3, dated to LG.

¹³² Bern/Getty *kyathoi*: Unpublished, Sybaris museum, Ba415, Ba3446 & 58. Stoop *kyathos*: *Stoop 1979*, p. 82, no. 1, tav. IV.8. Stoop dated the fragment to the last quarter of the 8th Century BC, by regarding the fragment to be later than LGI *kyathoi* from Perachora. The close resembling to the Pithekoussai *kyathoi* however justifies a LGI date, see, *Pithekoussai I*, p. 273, no. 2 & 3, tav. 92, p. 711, Sp 6/2, tav. 250.

¹³³ Compare e.g. with, *Corinth XV.3*, pl. 2. no 18 (MGII) and *ibid*, pl. 6, no. 94 & 97 (LG)

¹³⁴ *Dehl 1996*, mentions a Euboean cup. I have not been able to find out neither type or date of this specific piece. I am in dept to Dr. Irene Lemos, Oxford for helping me with the identification of the Euboean pottery.

¹³⁵ *Modesti & Gastaldi 1999*. Phase IIa: fig. 11. no. 4888.1, fig. 13. no. 6547.1, fig. 12. no. 2337.1. Phase IIB: Fig. 12. no. 3111.1, fig. 11. no. 3179.1, fig. 13. no. 7394.1. On Euboean black cups in general see, *Kourou 2004*, p. 502-504, with references.

¹³⁶ *Ibid*. Compare with, fig. 11. no. 4888.1, fig. 13. no. 6547.1, fig. 12. no. 2337.1.

second half of the 8th century BC. I have nevertheless included them here in order to present the Euboean material as a group but point out that some of them might belong to the period after the foundation of Sybaris. Cat. no. 15 is a rim fragment of a *skyphos* decorated with concentric circles on the exterior part of the rim¹³⁷. Another LG wall fragment of a *skyphos* is decorated with a lozenges in the so called bicrome “black on white” style (Cat. no. 16)¹³⁸. A rim fragment of an *oinochoe* (cat. no. 17) is decorated in the same technique and another rim fragment from an *oinochoe* is monochrome (Cat. no. 18)¹³⁹. Finally, two joining fragments decorated with triangular motifs belong to a larger open vessel, which might be Euboean. The motif is however too generic to permit a specific comparison to Euboean pottery, (cat. no. 19).

3.4. Contextual situation.

The majority of pre-Sybaris fragments were found in later contexts of the 7th century BC and some in disturbed contexts. The remaining fragments are however associated with original contexts (see schema 1, below). These are presented in schema 1 below. The MGII *skyphos* (cat. no. 14) was found in a closed context (AC21.11) belonging to building Vb, which in addition to the Euboean fragments, contained local Iron Age ceramics and weaving utilities¹⁴⁰. The same was the case for cat. no. 16, which together with cat. no. 8 was found in a closed context (AC18.13) which together with a range of local pottery also contained a number of large labyrinth decorated loom weights and other weaving utilities¹⁴¹.

3.5. Evaluation of Greek pottery as an evidence for the reconstruction of pre-Sybaris connections

It is clearly evident that pre-colonial connections existed between the Sibaritide and the “out side world”. The MGII chevron *skyphos* from Torre Mordillo, the bronze bowl from the Strada tomb and the “Lyre player” scarab of Macchiabate tomb T69, are all in a chronological safe distance from the foundation of Sybaris. The new pre-Sybaris Greek pottery presented above, likewise stress that Greek pottery reach the Sibaritide from the MGII period and onwards. But how did it arrive ?

In her study from 1982, on the chronology and distribution of Corinthian pottery in Italy of the 8th and early 7th century, Christiane Dehl was leaning towards the conclusion that the earliest Corinthian fragments of the Sibaritide had not arrived here prior to the foundation of Sybaris. Dehl however left the possibility of a pre-colonial date open and stated that if in fact the material should prove to be earlier that the foundation of Sybaris then it was likely to have been an outcome of sporadic connections to Campania. Such a connection was already attested by the find of the “Lyre player scarab” (probably arriving from Pithekoussai) found in T

¹³⁷ Previously published in, *Kleibrink, Jacobsen & Handberg 2004*, p. 51, no. 3, For the type see, *Lefkandi I*, pl.46, especially no. 123 and pl. 60, no. 2. fragments from similar skyphoi has been found at Otranto, see. *D’Andria 1982*, fig. 7a.

¹³⁸ For the type see, *Lefkandi I*, pl.37, nos 13 & 16, pl. 60, nos. 14 & 16, *Boardman 1952*, pl I.B (Eretria).

¹³⁹ Oinochoe with black monochrome upper part are frequently found in Greek Geometric pottery for some Euboean exemplars, see in general *Lefkandi I*. pl. 95 and onwards.

¹⁴⁰ AC21 excavation notes and Harris matrix.

¹⁴¹ The Harris matrix for AC18 is published in *Kleibrink 2006a*, p. 139

69 at the Macchiabate necropolis¹⁴². At the time Dehl did her study on the Corinthian pottery good information was hard to come by. The publications on the majority of Macchiabate graves were still in the making and publications on the main part of the Greek pottery from the Timpone della Motta and the vast amount of geometric fragments from Otranto was still yet to come. In the meantime, the situation has improved. Publications have appeared raising the general level of empiric information and it is today clear that quite a lot of geometric pottery reached the Salento area from the beginning of the 8th century BC. In addition, there is positive evidence that a minor part of the Corinthian pottery travelled from the Salento to Incoronata (see Chapter 1.4.3). In the light of that, it seems appealing to suspect that some early Corinthian pottery ended up in the Sibaritide through the same connection that brought pottery to Incoronata. If so, the indigenous centre at Francavilla Marittima would in some way have been related to the “Corinthian circuit”, as e.g. suggested by Kleibrink (see chapter 2.5). The Corinthian fragments cat. no. 3 and cat. no. 14, presented above dates to the MGII period and since MGII Corinthian pottery is rarely attested at the Tyrrhenian coast (chapter 1), a connection to the “Corinthian circuit” seems likely. However, the new finds of Euboean Geometric pottery, especially the MBII *skyphos*, speaks more in favour of a connection to the Euboean circuit either through indigenous networks with Campania, as suggested by Dehl (chapter 2) or through direct contact with stopping Euboean sailors, as proposed by Guzzo (chapter 2.4). This does however not exclude the other possibilities in direction of the Salento region since after all, Euboean pottery has been found in the Salento region also.

Meanwhile, recent research stress that a Phoenician involvement in the pre-Sybaris period has to be taken into serious considerations as suggested early on by Marianne Kleibrink (see chapter 2.5). A new study by Albert J. Nijboer, presenting a close up examination of a number of graves at the Macchiabate necropolis containing Levantine objects, strongly indicates that Phoenician were in contact with leading Oinotrian families in the Sibaritide from an early point of the 8th century BC (according to the traditional chronology used in this thesis). By that it is following also possible that the Greek pottery, in fact was brought to the Sibaritide by Phoenicians.

While any of these connections are plausible, the actual pottery does not uniformly favour one particular explanation. The only definitive conclusion that can be deduced from the available material is therefore that it arrived.

3.6. *Summery*

The recent finds on the Timpone della Motta of Greek pottery from the MGII and LGI are of fundamental importance. The material does not only stress that Greek pottery arrived in the Sibaritide before the founding of Sybaris, it also shows that it began earlier (MGII) than previously known. However, competing arrival possibilities prevents an understanding of the specific contacts and cultural interactions, which lay behind. A

¹⁴² Dehl 1984, p. 107, 109.

different approach which also incorporates local produced pottery therefore has to be applied in order to gain a better understanding of the influx of Greek pottery during the pre-Sybaris period.

Data schema for chapter 3

Schema 1.

Phase	GREEK	MATT PAINTED	OTHERS
Vb	Cat. No. 14	Undulating line style	Weaving utilities
Vb-Vc	Cat. No. 16 & Cat. no 8	8 th century BC	Few weaving utilities