CORINTH 1980: MOLDED RELIEF BOWLS

(Plates 41–48)

THE 1980 EXCAVATION SEASON at Corinth uncovered a series of fills of pottery to the north of the east end of the Hellenistic racecourse. The levels of earth containing the pottery represent a dumped fill containing material destroyed sometime after the destruction of Corinth in 146 B.C. by Mummius. Among the broken pottery were fragments of 603 molded relief bowls. Several factors, aside from their archaeological context, make the study of these bowls as a group relevant to the understanding of Hellenistic pottery in Corinth. First of all, the material gives a more complete picture of the range of types and fabrics than do bowls and fragments selected in the past simply because of the intrinsic worth of any individual piece. Also, studying the locally made bowls together with contemporary imports not only gives added information on commercial relationships between Corinth and other centers, but also helps define the specific character of Corinthian production.

The starting point of the discussion is the chart in Figure 1. On the left side are the various fabrics that have been identified among the 1980 bowls. The first three are isolated since they are standard types recognizable to most students of pottery by salient characteristics. Fabrics A through E are grouped by similarities of clay and glaze. Two of these categories can be identified by other criteria. Fabric A probably is a variety of Corinthian; Fabric B is Argive. Fabrics C, D, and E are internally cohesive groups that must each represent the production of one center, though they cannot be localized with any assuredness. The category “Various Fabrics” includes fragments that could not be

1P. Russell has analyzed the dates of the levels of the fill (Hesperia 50, 1981, pp. 34–44). She distinguishes three possible strata. The very lowest levels may represent destruction debris of 146 B.C. in situ. Most levels belong to a post-destruction “clean-up” of the area when earth containing Hellenistic pottery was dumped over the race track. The presence of Italian dot-barbotine beakers in this stratum suggests that the bulk of the earth was dumped ca. 100 B.C. or later. The upper layers contained later thin-walled wares and Early Roman lamp types which Russell dates “not far from the turn of the era.” These Roman wares should be later than the Hellenistic fill, brought in by the early Roman colonists and used by them in the rooms of the first Roman stoa. Molded relief bowls appear in all levels of the fill; an appendix at the end of this paper lists them all by pottery lots according to type.

Special abbreviations used in this article are as follows:


2I thank C. K. Williams, II for the opportunity to study and publish the Corinth molded relief bowls, and Dr. N. Bookidis for much assistance in the Corinth Museum. Their patient advice and encouragement have kept me from many wrong paths and clarified my understanding of the material. Additional thanks go to E. G. Pemberton, S. Rotroff, P. Russell, and K. S. Wright. For all this help, my mistakes are my own.
CHARLES MALCOLM EDWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long Petal</th>
<th>Figured</th>
<th>Imbricate</th>
<th>Pine Cone</th>
<th>Net Pattern</th>
<th>Linear Leaf</th>
<th>Shield</th>
<th>Floral</th>
<th>Rim Frags</th>
<th>Wall Frags</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corinthian</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Greek</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Fabrics</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 1. Molded relief bowls and fragments from the excavations in 1980.

readily placed under any of the other eight types. The typological categories across the top of the chart are based on the classifications by G. R. Edwards in *Corinth VII, iii*.\(^3\) The size of the two categories containing unidentifiable types indicates the fragmentary nature of the material. Few complete bowls could be mended from the sherds, a fact which suggests that the earth containing the pottery was brought in from elsewhere and that the bowls were not broken up on the spot. The numbers in the chart indicate the approximate quantity of bowls. When a group of sherds seemed to come from a single bowl they were counted as one.\(^4\) The discussion following attempts to define more clearly the identified fabrics and to interpret their statistical relationships.

CORINTHIAN

The fabric called Corinthian on the chart exhibits the characteristics of Corinthian pottery of earlier periods. The color is light, ranging from a white (Munsell 10YR 8/2) to a pale pink (7.5YR 7/4), and a grayish green (5Y 7/2) when overfired. The texture of the clay is fine, though often spotted with inclusions and pits. It is soft, sometimes

\(^3\)Pp. 151–187.

\(^4\)Fragmentary wall and rim fragments cannot be identified by type. It is likely that some of the wall and rim fragments come from bowls included in the typological categories, although joins did not occur, and the fragments are too small to associate them confidently with other identifiable sherds. Nevertheless, the unidentifiable fragments are included in the count since otherwise the statistics would be incomplete.
powdery, to the touch. The flat, dull black glaze, typical of Corinthian pottery of all periods, is frequently fugitive, often preserved only around the outlines of the relief decoration. Doubtless the impermanence of the glaze was a problem that plagued Corinthian potters for centuries but it has preserved for us an important piece of information. Even when most of the glaze has flaked off, the Corinthian bowls show traces of a double-dipping streak, the point where the glaze overlaps when the bowl is hand dipped from opposite sides into the glaze basin.\(^5\) Whether this technique was a local or imported invention is impossible to know until the chronology of Hellenistic pottery is more fully refined.\(^6\) Nevertheless, double dipping was a technique which at present seems to have been used frequently by Corinthian potters of molded relief bowls.\(^7\)

The most striking statistic that the chart shows is the large percentage of Corinthian long-petal bowls: 23% of all Corinthian bowls and 11% of the total number of bowls from the dump. In his volume on Corinthian Hellenistic pottery, G. R. Edwards includes ten long-petal bowls found before 1963.\(^8\) The small quantity of material, plus "the restricted number of variations of the design in Corinthian bowls and the uniform good quality of their mould design and manufacture," led Edwards to the conclusion that the period of production of long-petal bowls in Corinth prior to the Mummian destruction in 146 B.C. was very short.\(^9\) Accepting the evidence from Thompson's Group D, Edwards suggested that the long-petal design had been introduced in Athens around 155 B.C. and was adopted by Corinth about five years later.\(^10\) The quantity of long-petal bowls found in the 1980 Corinth excavations, their range in type, and the appearance of several bowls made in worn molds indicate that the date for the introduction of long-petal bowls in Corinth should be raised, perhaps as much as 10 to 15 years.

---

\(^5\) Among the inventoried bowls from the previous seasons that have traces of a double-dipping streak are CP-518, CP-1931, C-28-59, C-33-1008, C-35-719, C-46-57, C-47-791, C-47-893, C-48-31, C-63-490, C-64-335, C-69-300, C-1976-94, C-1977-17, C-1979-13.

\(^6\) On the technique of double dipping see P. Hellström, *Labraunda: Swedish Excavations and Researches*, II, i, *Pottery of Classical and Later Date, Terracotta Lamps and Glass*, Lund 1965, p. 20, note 6, pp. 31–32; H. S. Robinson, *The Athenian Agora*, V, *Pottery of the Roman Period: Chronology*, Princeton 1959, p. 6; H. Comfort in *RE*, suppl. 7, 1940, col. 1302, s.v. Terra Sigillata. Double dipping as a common practice is usually associated with Eastern Sigillatas. At present there is no evidence that Eastern Sigillata of any kind was produced before 150 B.C.; no Eastern Sigillata occurs at Corinth in a Mummian context. At any rate, double dipping was used at Corinth as early as the late 3rd century, and possibly earlier (see a Corinthian hemispherical krater, C-60-58, *Corinth* VII, iii, no. 190, pp. 46–47, pl. 47). I thank K. S. Wright for discussing the chronology of this technical feature with me.

\(^7\) Double dipping was used occasionally by Athenian potters. See Hellström, *loc. cit*., C-35-115, an imported Attic molded relief bowl in Corinth, bears traces of a double-dipping streak. On the whole, however, Athenian potters did not use this method to any great extent.

\(^8\) *Corinth* VII, iii, pp. 176–179. Three more long-petal bowls were found from 1963 through 1979: C-63-490, C-1976-94, C-1977-17.

\(^9\) *Corinth* VII, iii, pp. 176–177.

G. R. Edwards suggests that the initial phase of the long-petal design is represented by bowls whose petals, "closely spaced, have linear outlines independent of one another and centers in relief."¹¹ He calls the style with contiguous petals and relief centers "subsequent, perhaps simultaneous" and lists three Corinthian examples of this category.¹² Fragments of three bowls may be added to the type with independent petals and relief centers and five bowls to the type with contiguous petals and relief centers (e.g. C-1980-138 a, b, Pl. 41; C-1980-174 a, b).¹³

One of G. R. Edwards’ later types is characterized by high-relief outlines and flat centers.¹⁴ He has only two examples in this category and says the rarity of the type suggests that it was short lived. One of these bowls is signed IIP.¹⁵ Four signed fragments of bowls of this type were found in the 1980 excavations, and fragments of at least ten more bowls can be attributed to the same workshop (C-1980-56, signed II; C-1980-103, signed P-\(\mathcal{O}\)TOM, Pl. 41; C-1980-105, signed TO; C-1980-107, signed P; also, e.g., C-1980-106 and C-1980-108, both Pl. 41).¹⁶ Distinctive characteristics of the IIP workshop are contiguous petals with high-relief outlines which start immediately above the concentric circles of the medallion zone and a multipetaled rosette in the medallion. Sixteen bowls of a single type indicate that the IIP workshop was an active center of production.

G. R. Edwards’ final category of long-petal bowls is characterized by contiguous long petals with outlines in low relief and flat centers. He gives two examples of this type.¹⁷ A bowl found in 1976 belongs to this category (C-1976-94, Pl. 41). Fragments of about 26 bowls can be added to this group (e.g. C-1980-93 and C-1980-104, Pl. 41; C-1980-135, Pl. 42). Although no signatures are preserved on these fragments, they may well represent the production of one workshop.

One small group of four bowls is characterized by poor workmanship. The outlines of the petals have been carelessly scratched into the molds. Edwards lists two such long-petal bowls (C-37-2249 b, c and C-33-1375, Pl. 42) as imports during the period of abandonment.¹⁸ The fabric of these bowls is that which I have called Corinthian. Perhaps he considered the bowls Sikyonian. At any rate, it seems better to include them in the category of carelessly worked Corinthian long-petal bowls.

Therefore the long-petal bowls found since G. R. Edwards’ publication tell a very different story from the earlier finds. The number of Corinthian examples is large, with

¹¹ *Corinth* VII, iii, p. 177.
¹² *Corinth* VII, iii, pp. 178–179. One fragment of a jeweled long-petal bowl of Corinthian fabric was found in the 1980 excavations.
¹³ Not all the 603 fragments were considered worthy of inventory, though an effort was made to give a representative sampling. See Appendix for a complete list of the bowls by type.
¹⁴ *Corinth* VII, iii, p. 178.
¹⁵ *Corinth* VII, iii, no. 904, p. 179, pl. 77 (C-34-304).
¹⁶ See also Fabric A, pp. 200–201 below.
¹⁷ *Corinth* VII, iii, no. 906 (C-33-146bis), pl. 77, no. 907 (C-35-973), p. 179.
¹⁸ *Corinth* VII, iii, p. 176, note 32.
a wide range of types of design and quality of manufacture. It seems eminently logical that production of moldmade long-petal bowls ceased in 146 B.C. with the destruction of Corinth. But the number of bowls now known makes it hard to accept Edwards’ date of 150 for the beginning of their production. Without stratified deposits we can do no more than suggest an inceptive date in the late second quarter of the 2nd century B.C.\textsuperscript{19} The Corinth finds support S. Rotroff’s suggestion that long-petal bowls “may first have been produced in Corinth” and that their manufacture was not taken up in Athens until slightly later.\textsuperscript{20}

Figured bowls constitute 19\% of the total number of Corinthian molded relief bowls found in 1980. Only two of these are signed: C-1980-41 b, Δ (Pl. 42) and C-1980-49, ΠA. G. R. Edwards includes one signed figured bowl in his catalogue: C-32-281, ΟΔΙ.\textsuperscript{21} Subsequently, one signed bowl, C-1979-13, ΔΙ (Pl. 43), was found in a pit within the portico of the South Stoa.\textsuperscript{22} Because of the paucity of signatures an exhaustive analysis of Corinthian workshops in the manner that has been carried out for Athens, Argos and Delos seems premature. Nevertheless, small groups of figured bowls can be arranged on the basis of the stamps used for floral motifs and the decorative syntax.\textsuperscript{23} These groups are listed below. No doubt with further study the categories can be refined and expanded.

**Group I\textsuperscript{24}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1980-10</td>
<td>Pl. 42 (Fabric A) ➔ same mold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-37-2425</td>
<td>Pl. 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-46-57</td>
<td><em>Corinth</em> VII, iii, no. 825, pl. 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-46-56</td>
<td><em>Corinth</em> VII, iii, no. 836, pl. 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of this group are an empty medallion surrounded by a corolla of small independent ferns that do not touch the concentric circle frame of the medallion, traditional figural types sometimes separated by thymiatera, and a lack of a rim pattern.

\textsuperscript{19}The recent discovery at Pella of molds from a workshop specializing in the production of long-petal bowls may help to clarify the chronology. I thank Iannis Akamatis for showing me the Pella material and discussing the chronological problems.


\textsuperscript{21} *Corinth* VII, iii, no. 838, pp. 154, 170, pl. 70.

\textsuperscript{22}C. K. Williams, II, *Hesperia* 49, 1980, p. 131, no. 23, pl. 25.

\textsuperscript{23}For the use of decorative motifs as a criterion for classification by workshop see Siebert, pp. 4–5.

It is possible that a single workshop is represented by the material found in the fill of a small, rectangular cistern during the 1926 excavations of the so-called precinct of Athena Chalinitis (T. L. Shear, “Excavations in the Theatre District of Corinth in 1926,” *AJA* 30, 1926, p. 447). Fragments of about 250 molded relief bowls come from the fill. Only 10 bowls are imports. Of the local production, 67\% (81 bowls) of the identifiable types are figured. All these figured bowls are decorated in the representational style with familiar stamps as well as some new, unparalleled mythological figures.

\textsuperscript{24}C-37-2425 in terms of clay belongs among the Fabric A bowls. For the identification of Fabric A as a variety of Corinthian see below, pp. 200–201. For the present moment, I will only indicate parenthetically which bowls are Fabric A rather than the traditional Corinthian.
Group II

C-48-14  Corinth VII, iii, no. 843, pl. 73
C-1980-132  Pl. 43

Characteristics of this group are a small, eight-petaled rosette in the medallion, a corolla of large ferns with striated spines alternating with small triangular ferns, a preference for scenes of hunting dogs and their quarry, and a rim zone decorated with a simplified ivy-leaf pattern. This group is directly related to a series of Argive bowls and may represent direct copies of Argive imports.

Group III

C-35-719 +
  C-35-117  Corinth VII, iii, no. 845, pl. 74
C-38-683  Corinth VII, iii, no. 807, pl. 68
C-47-237  Corinth VII, iii, no. 797, pl. 67
C-64-335  Corinth VII, iii, no. 802, pl. 67
C-65-98  Pl. 43; Corinth VII, iii, no. 796
MF-68-346  Pl. 43

All bowls have a medallion design of radiating ferns. Common motifs are a corolla of ragged-edged acanthus leaves with small ferns in between, small decorative units (rosettes, leaping hares) between the acanthus leaves, a crowded figural zone with stamps carelessly placed and often overlapping, and a rim pattern of a small, simplified ivy-leaf pattern. The designer has a tendency to stagger the figured stamps. As a result, a lower row of figures occupies the spaces between the leaves of the corolla, and an upper register stands above the leaves. C-64-335 has scraped grooves around the medallion and below the lip, washed with added miltos. A Corinthian imbricate bowl, C-69-238, has a similar groove below the lip. These bowls prove this feature cannot be exclusively Attic.

Siebert (p. 79) identifies C-48-14 as an Argive import. Both fabric and glaze, however, are typically Corinthian and exhibit none of the characteristics one can identify as Argive. On the other hand, the similarities to Argive bowls are unmistakable. Perhaps both C-48-14 and C-69-149 were made from a mold taken from an imported Argive bowl.

F. Courby (Les vases grecs à relief, Paris 1922, p. 283) called this pattern “‘coeurs’ emboîtés”. Thompson (op. cit. [footnote 10 above], p. 352, C 18) describes the pattern as a simplified guilloche. Here the term “simplified ivy-leaf pattern” is used on the basis of comparison with a fragment of a gray-ware long-petal sherd (C-1980-118) and a rim-pattern mold from Corinth (MF-68-345, Pl. 43). Both these examples preserve an elaborate ivy-leaf pattern for the rim zone.

The medallion, corolla, dogs, birds and rim pattern are paralleled on bowls of Siebert’s monogram class. Siebert, M.55, pl. 28, M.76, pl. 29.

Compare Corinth VII, iii, p. 154.
Group IV

A:
C-1980-41 a, b  Pl. 42, signed Δ on b.
C-1979-13  Pl. 43, signed ΔI
CP-1929  Corinth VII, iii, no. 817, pl. 69
C-32-281  Corinth VII, iii, no. 838, pl. 70, signed ΩΔI

B:
C-62-189  Pl. 43
C-1980-123 a, b  Pl. 44 (Fabric A) — same mold
C-1980-124  Pl. 44 (Fabric A)

The bowls of this group are divided into sub-categories. A is characterized by a medallion zone with radiating palmettes, a corolla of ragged-edged acanthus leaves, frequent use of a stamp with a bird in flight to the right, and a rim pattern of simplified ivy leaves. B consists of three small bowls with reddish glaze. The medallion is surrounded by small spade-shaped leaves. The Nikai of C-62-189 and C-1980-123 connect these fragments with C-1980-41 and CP-1929. The Eros stamp between the leaves of the corolla connects C-1980-124 to C-1979-13. The acanthus leaves of CP-1929 and C-1979-13 connect Group IV to Group III. All these bowls may be products of one workshop.

Group V

C-37-2737  Pl. 44; Corinth VII, iii, no. 818
C-47-893  Pl. 44; Corinth VII, iii, no. 816
C-1980-131  Pl. 44
C-1980-134  Pl. 44

A characteristic feature is the decoration in friezes. Common motifs are a corolla of large ferns with alternating plain and striated leaves and a frontal Nike with outspread wings.

In contrast to Attic bowls, the Corinthian figured bowls with idyllic scenes are less frequent than the locally produced bowls with representational scenes. Only three fragments (e.g. C-1980-163, Pl. 45) of the 52 figured bowls found in the 1980 excavations use the motif of rampant goats flanking a krater, a popular scheme on Athenian bowls. By and large the Corinthian market preferred representational scenes. Hunting bowls now seem to have been more popular than G. R. Edwards implies. Six sherds from this season’s excavation plus a nearly complete bowl found in 1969 have hunting

29 For Fabric A bowls see footnote 24 above.
30 I use S. Rotroff’s nomenclature for the two types of figured bowls. The idyllic types represent real or fantastic creatures placed in repetitive poses or antithetically. The representational types depict hunting scenes and mythological figures. See Rotroff, op. cit. (footnote 10 above).
31 Corinth VII, iii, pp. 163–165.
scenes (e.g. C-69-149, Pl. 42; C-1980-132, Pl. 43). One bowl depicts a group of dancing maidens who hold hands and encircle the wall of the bowl (C-1980-140, Pl. 45). The majority of figured sherds, however, use the standard repertoire of mythological stamps with no regard to narrative coherence. Poseidon, Amymone, the girl at the trophy, Dionysos and his retinue, and the seated Apollo with his cithara all appear, monotonously repeated and without attention to context. The unusual figure of a female striding right and brandishing a torch in her raised right hand occurs on one bowl (C-1980-123 a, Pl. 44) and is paralleled on two others (C-62-189, Pl. 43; C-69-151). Her resemblance to goddesses from gigantomachies suggests she is a deity, and the torch favors her identification as Kore, Artemis, or Hekate, though there is no strong reason at present for preferring one of these goddesses to another.

Figured bowls were made throughout the period of production of molded relief bowls in Corinth. In Athens they became less popular after the introduction of the long-petal design. In Corinth, one can only say both types were produced simultaneously down to the Mummian destruction in 146 B.C. It may be significant, however, that the quality of long-petal bowls is, in general, much higher than that of the figured bowls made in Corinth. The reason for this is partly technical. The ribs of the long-petal design were incised directly into the mold, while stamps were used for the figures, and those became worn from re-use. On the other hand, if Corinthian potters were responsible for the introduction of the long-petal design, there may have been a natural preference for this decorative scheme.

In terms of the quality of design, Argive and Attic artists easily surpassed the Corinthians on bowls decorated with hunting or mythological scenes. Corinthian mold designers show a lack of interest in creating original figural motifs and were content to copy figures from imported Attic and Argive bowls. It is surprising then that the majority of Corinthian figured sherds use the representational style. Why should Corinthian artisans expend so much of their energy producing a style of decoration for which they had no particular proclivity? Probably because the market demanded that type. Consumers had been impressed with imports from Argos and Athens and naturally wanted bowls decorated with mythological figures. In this sense, we may answer "yes" to G. Siebert's question "la cité marchande [Corinth] ne faisait-elle pas, en cela, concurrence à son propre artisanat?"

Other decorative schemes constitute 10% of the Corinthian bowls from the fills. The leaf-and-tendril, imbricate, and pine-cone types are thought to have been introduced early in the development of the molded relief bowls. The net-pattern, linear-leaf,

---

32 The same stamp was used for C-38-681, *Corinth* VII, iii, no. 829, pl. 70.
33 In spite of the appearance of the goddess brandishing a torch, C-69-151 can not be included in Group V. The stamps used for the Nikai and floral ornaments, as well as the decorative syntax, do not match the other bowls of Group V.
34 See *Corinth* VII, iii, p. 163; Siebert, pp. 74–75. Also, see footnote 66 below.
35 Siebert, p. 81.
and shield bowls are late, begun not long before 146 B.C.\textsuperscript{36} Our statistics and the bowls found since those catalogued by G. R. Edwards do not contradict his conclusions but they do suggest slight chronological and typological refinements.

Three of the four pine-cone bowls (e.g. C-1980-129, C-1980-130) have a stylization G. R. Edwards describes as pyramidal bosses.\textsuperscript{37} He dates this class within the first half of the 2nd century. The fourth fragment is decorated with nodules (C-1980-128, Pl. 45) of a form he dates to the late 3rd century in the belief that no bowls with nodules appear in contexts related to the Mummian destruction. The presence of this fragment in a Mummian context suggests the possibility that the two styles may have been contemporary, at least for a brief period of time.

Of imbricate styles, Edwards notes the type with small, veined, pointed leaves may not exist at Corinth, since no complete bowl or upper-wall fragment had been found.\textsuperscript{38} At least six wall fragments from the fill preserve this design, one of which is from the rim zone and proves the existence of this type in Corinthian fabric (C-1980-137, Pl. 45). There are also six imbricate bowls with patterns that should be classified under Edwards’ bowls decorated with rounded petal tips (e.g. C-1980-126, Pl. 45).\textsuperscript{39} But none of the fragments closely resembles the two examples he includes as paradigms in his catalogue. C-1980-126 finds its closest parallel in the Corinthian bowl with appliqué relief supports, C-69-238, and in fragment C-36-1992. Nor does the one bowl with pointed petal tips (C-1980-127, Pl. 45) fit easily among Edwards’ examples of that category. It is best paralleled by C-69-148 (Pl. 45), in the shape of the petals and the medallion rosette. These two bowls are probably from the same workshop. The evidence suggests the range of styles within the imbricate-pattern class is too great for meaningful stylistic groupings. G. R. Edwards’ three divisions of imbricate designs represent only three among various possibilities.

On the other hand, the 1980 net-pattern bowls support G. R. Edwards’ typology and amplify his groups.\textsuperscript{40} Three fragments belong to his bowls with nets of single lines. Two fragments have double-line pentagons with inner dots.\textsuperscript{41} One fragment has an anomalous design of double-line pentagons around the medallion and single pentagons above. The six shield bowls, all similar in type, support Edwards’ late dating of the type in Corinth.\textsuperscript{42} Five bowls of Edwards’ linear-leaf class also corroborate a date not long

\textsuperscript{36} Corinth VII, iii, pp. 152–153.
\textsuperscript{37} Corinth VII, iii, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{38} Corinth VII, iii, p. 159.
\textsuperscript{39} Corinth VII, iii, pp. 159–160.
\textsuperscript{40} Corinth VII, iii, pp. 179–182.
\textsuperscript{42} Corinth VII, iii, p. 183. P. J. Callaghan has convincingly argued that the shield-bowl type was invented by Corinthian potters. The inspiration came from Macedonian shields taken by Corinthian members of the Achaian League in the battle against Andriskos in 150 B.C. (“Macedonian Shields, ‘Shield-Bowls’, and Corinth: A Fixed Point in Hellenistic Ceramic Chronology?” AAA 11, 1978, pp. 53–60). If one accepts the
before 146 B.C. for the beginning of that class. Edwards characterizes the Corinthian linear-leaf bowls as “inept imitations of a very short lived linear style of decoration.”

Two joining fragments (C-1980-141 a, Pl. 46) preserving the upper wall and rim zone of a bowl probably belong to the linear-leaf class. This bowl was carefully executed and shows an elaboration of the design by the introduction of fleurs-de-lis between the leaves. Another linear-leaf bowl found in 1965 in the Demeter Sanctuary (C-65-565 a, b) is also well executed.

**East Greek**

A. Laumonier, in the first volume of his monumental work on the molded relief bowls from Delos, concludes that the class of bowls traditionally called Delian were manufactured in East Greek “Ionian” centers. Hence the name of this second category. These bowls are easily separated from the mass of fragments found in the 1980 excavations. The inturned or straight rim is a distinctive characteristic noted since Courby. The fabric is coarse, generally with some inclusions and voids, and highly micaceous. It is not exactly accurate to call this category “gray ware”, another traditional term, since the color of the clay ranges from a light red (2.5YR 6/6) to a gray (5Y 6/1). Likewise the dull, matt glaze can be a reddish orange color, a rich brown, or a deep bluish black. The glaze generally adheres well to the clay. Only rarely does one find a piece where the glaze has flaked or worn off completely.

East Greek imports account for 25% of the bowls in the fill, an impressive amount that far exceeds any other import category. Corinth’s position as an important commercial center in the Hellenistic period may account for the high percentage, though a discrepancy between statistics and chronology makes this explanation less than satisfactory. Laumonier cautiously avoids a strict chronological framework for his Ionian workshops. Some fragments of bowls were found in the foundations of the portico of Philip V on Delos, usually dated ca. 200 B.C. Laumonier, however, gives more weight to the evidence of fragments excavated in domestic contexts and sets the limits of production between 166 and 69 B.C. Though 20 years is a relatively short period of time to accumulate such a mass of material at Corinth, it is possible that the East Greek bowls are imports made between 166 and 146 B.C. On the other hand, those bowls which are attributable come from workshops dated to the second half of the 2nd century. At least six fragments find their closest parallels among the bowls from the monogram workshop, which Laumonier calls “le plus important, peut-être, de l’Égée en cette fin du IIe siècle av. J.-C.” (e.g. C-1980-119 and C-1980-116, Pl. 45; C-1980-117). One bowl is

---

43 *Corinth* VII, iii, p. 185.
44 Laumonier, pp. 2–3.
47 Laumonier, p. 132. In addition, a fragmentary bowl excavated in 1937 and possibly from the same fill as the 1980 material can be attributed to the workshop (C-37-2743).
from the workshop of Athenaios (C-1980-72, Pl. 46) and one from the workshop of Heraios (C-1980-74, Pl. 46). One fragment is signed by the potter Philon (C-1980-82, Pl. 46). The workshops of Athenaios, Heraios and Philon fall late in Laumonier’s relative sequence of workshops, perhaps as late as the first half of the 1st century B.C. This raises the possibility that these bowls might have been brought in at the time of the refounding of the colony in 44 B.C. Laumonier says that the life of a workshop may be as long as 50 years; it is possible to date the 1980 bowls on either side of the period of abandonment.

Conversely, over the years the evidence for activity at Corinth between 146 and 44 has been growing. Williams cites Corinth’s East Greek bowls as possible evidence for a relatively active community during this period. Until the chronology of the East Greek workshops becomes more refined, the imported East Greek bowls offer no strong evidence for dating one way or another. It is entirely likely, though, that they point to some form of community in Corinth immediately before the establishment of the Roman colony in 44 B.C.

The statistics suggest that long-petal bowls formed a higher percentage of East Greek imports than the previously inventoried bowls would lead one to think. It is impossible to determine the chronological significance of this fact until we know when long-petal bowls were first produced in the East Greek workshops. Laumonier implies long petals, along with imbricate bowls which are substantially represented in the Corinth inventories, are late.

ATTIC

Good Attic clay is familiar to all students of pottery. The 1980 fragments identified as Attic are typically hard and slightly micaceous. The colors of the clay include a reddish yellow (5YR 6/6), a light brown (7.5YR 6/4), and a pink (5YR 6/4). The glaze usually is dark and lustrous. One long-petal bowl has a thick red glaze. A scraped groove below the lip occurs on two fragments. One fragment has a scraped groove and applied miltos between the concentric circles of the medallion. Although this feature is characteristic of Attic bowls, it occasionally appears on bowls manufactured in Corinth as well.

49G. Siebert (pp. 194–195) has suggested that East Greek bowls were not exported to Greece proper before the second half of the 2nd century. He cites the small number of imported bowls at Corinth as partial evidence. We now know Corinth has a large amount of East Greek material; 148 bowls come from the 1980 season alone. Nevertheless, these statistics do not contradict Siebert’s hypothesis if Corinth’s East Greek bowls indicate a community during the interim period when the “squatters” at Corinth imported them.

In this connection it is interesting to note the total lack of East Greek material among the bowls from the cistern excavated in 1926 (see footnote 23 above). The logical conclusion is that the cistern was filled in before East Greek bowls were common in Corinth. One long-petal bowl supplies a terminus post quem of the late second quarter of the 2nd century for the date of the cistern’s discontinuation. At present, however, it is not clear whether the filling of the cistern is to be connected with the Mummian destruction.

50Laumonier, p. 12.
51See above, p. 194.
Attic bowls constitute a surprisingly small percentage (2%) of the imported wares found in the fill. This fact is especially odd when one considers the high quality of most Athenian molded relief bowls. The number of inventoried Attic bowls from previous seasons conforms to the general picture that few Athenian bowls were imported to Corinth during the Hellenistic period, though a conclusion based on statistics of inventoried sherds is likely to be misleading. Still, the count agrees well with the story told by the lamps that, after the 4th century, Attic imports decrease remarkably in Corinth.

One figured sherd (C-1980-122, Pl. 46) can be attributed to Rotroff’s M monogram class and is paralleled on bowls from the Agora and Kerameikos. Athenian contexts date this bowl to the second quarter of the 2nd century, while the Attic long-petal bowls would be imports just before the Mummanian destruction, if we accept a date of 150 for the beginning of production of this class in Athens (e.g. C-1980-86, Pl. 47; C-1980-87, Pl. 46).

**Fabric A**

Fabric A has pink (SYR 7/4) or reddish yellow clay (7.5YR 7/6), close in color to Attic but usually a little lighter. The clay is hard, though never so hard as Attic. There are occasional traces of mica. Many voids and fine, black-and-white inclusions are common. The glaze rarely covers the bowl with one consistent color and often ranges from red to a rich brown. It is prone to flaking. Many sherds show traces of the double-dipping streak common to Corinthian manufacture. Other factors lead to the conclusion that rather than an imported variety Fabric A is actually Corinthian. Most important for this argument is the fact that one of the Corinthian bowls from the 1980 excavation (C-1980-10, Pl. 42) was made from the same mold as a bowl of Fabric A from the 1937 season (C-37-2425, Pl. 42). Both bowls have an empty medallion zone surrounded by a corolla of alternating varieties of acanthus leaves. The walls are decorated with mythological figures separated by thymiateria. Each bowl is encircled by a fillet below the rim zone. In all measurements and placement of figures the bowls are identical. Although too fragmentary for one to be certain, one Corinthian figured sherd with rampant goats flanking a krater (C-1980-163, Pl. 45) seems to be from the same mold as a Fabric A sherd from 1936 (C-36-305). C-62-189 (Pl. 43; Corinthian fabric) and C-1980-123 a, b (Pl. 44; Fabric A) are also probably from the same mold.

Statistically Fabric A constitutes 5% of the 1980 material. If Fabric A is considered Corinthian, the percentage of locally produced bowls is raised to 51%. As with Corinthian fabric, the largest number of the identifiable types come from long-petal bowls.

---


53 See Russell, *op. cit.* (footnote 1 above). E. G. Pemberton tells me that few Attic imports have been found in the Hellenistic material from the Demeter Sanctuary.

The number of sherds and the variety of types accord well with what I have said above about Corinthian long-petal bowls. At least two fragments of long-petal bowls of Fabric A are attributed to the IIP workshop (see above, p. 192), as is a well-preserved bowl found in 1977 (C-1977-17, Pl. 46).

Three figured bowls of Fabric A can be attributed to Corinthian workshop groups.\(^{55}\) Two of the net-pattern bowls in Fabric A are signed. C-1980-58 (Pl. 47) is signed II in the upper register of the net, in the spaces between the pentagons (IIP workshop?). C-1980-57 (Pl. 47) is signed OY. An inventoried Corinthian net-pattern bowl (C-35-653) is also signed in the upper register, though upside down with respect to the rim, A/TW/[3 to 6 letters]/O/Y.\(^{56}\) Two other single-line Corinthian net-pattern bowls (C-37-2256 and C-37-2701) are signed A/T.\(^{57}\) We should perhaps connect C-1980-57 with this group of signed Corinthian net-pattern bowls. C-1980-57 lends support to the contention that Fabric A is of local production.

The identification of Fabric A with Corinth suggests that many bowls heretofore considered imports may actually be local products. Perhaps Fabric A was an attempt to solve the problem of the fugitive Corinthian glaze.\(^{58}\) Though the glaze adheres better on bowls of Fabric A, the glaze never fires to the consistent black color that the best Corinthian bowls show. As an unsuccessful solution, Fabric A may not have been used long for molded relief bowls where a consistency of color was desired. This would account for the fact that Fabric A constitutes only 10% of the local production. It may have been used longer for lamps and other utilitarian vessels.\(^{59}\)

**Fabric B**

Fabric B has coarse texture with many small black inclusions and voids. The clay has varying amounts of mica, but at least some is usually present. Its color is reddish brown (5YR 5/6, 7.5YR 5/6) and frequently fires with a blue streak running through the middle of the core. The thin, matt glaze shows a range of colors: red (2.5YR 5/6), brown (5YR 5/6) and a dark gray (10YR 4/1). The glaze has a tendency to flake and wear slightly but on the whole adheres well to the wall of the bowl. There is a lack of consistency to the color of the glaze, and the surfaces of Fabric B often show a mottled effect.

Several of the 1980 bowls are signed and can be identified as products of Argive workshops. C-1980-42 and C-1980-125 (both Pl. 47) preserve traces of the signature of the workshop of Demetrios-Iason.\(^{60}\) C-1980-48 (Pl. 47) is signed in the medallion zone

---


\(^{56}\) *Corinth VII*, iii, no. 911, p. 154.

\(^{57}\) *Corinth VII*, iii, nos. 912 and 909 respectively, p. 154.

\(^{58}\) At present it is impossible to know whether Fabric A was manufactured from a special clay imported for a limited time or represents a mix of clays that later was abandoned by potters.

\(^{59}\) See Russell, *op. cit.* (footnote 1 above), pp. 42, 43. The fabric of lamps type X, group 1 is identified as Fabric A.

\(^{60}\) See Siebert, pp. 30–40. C-1980-125 is an exact parallel for DI 90. The two bowls are possibly from the same mold.
by the workshop of Kleagoras. Other fragments may be attributed to Argive workshops by iconographic parallels (C-1980-51, C-1980-94, C-1980-95, all Pl. 47). These bowls probably date before 146 b.c.

Siebert poses the problem of the commercial relationship between Corinth and Argos in the Hellenistic period. Noting the lack of imported Corinthian bowls at Argos and the presence of bowls from only one Argive workshop among the inventoried pieces at Corinth, he hesitates to reconstruct an active current of trade between the two centers. He is left with the problem of several Argive bowls from the monogram Α workshop at Corinth and considerable influence of Argive works in terms of individual floral motifs. The material found in the 1980 excavations can shed some light on this problem. We now have signed bowls from two more of the Argive workshops at Corinth, and three fragments possibly from Siebert’s fourth group. The problematic workshop of the monogram Α is represented by a fragment found in 1969 and signed ΑC in the medallion (C-69-109, Pl. 48). Because the signature of the monogram Α workshop is found on bowls in Corinth, in Epidauros, in the National Museum (“qui ne sont pas de fabrication argienne”), and on Ephesos-type lamps, Siebert proposes that this workshop was based in one center, possibly in Asia Minor, and had branch workshops throughout the mainland. The clay of the fragment signed ΑC, however, fits in the Fabric B category and must be an Argive import to Corinth. The evidence seems to mount in favor of a rather active trade network, at least running from Argos to Corinth. The similarities Siebert notes between Argive and Corinthian bowls in terms of decorative devices is simply explained by assuming that the Corinthian potters copied motifs from imported Argive bowls. In the same way, Attic traits can appear on bowls beside Argive-Corinthian motifs.

61Siebert, pp. 41–50.
62C-1980-94 and C-1980-95 are attributed to the workshop of Agathokles. C-1980-51 is attributed to the workshop of Demetrios-Iason.
63Siebert, pp. 77–81.
64Siebert (p. 78) provides a chart of Argive decorative motifs and examples in Corinth that use “Argive” stamps. Four of the vases he cites as Corinthian examples are Argive imports to Corinth (C-47-788, C-47-789, C-47-796, C-47-240). Close examination of the Corinthian vases that he lists shows that his groups are not consistent. For example, under the category “Calice d’acanthes M.55” four different stamps appear, only one of which resembles M.55. Under the category “Calice d’acanthes M.27” appear three varieties of acanthus leaves, only one of which, represented by the Argive import C-47-788, resembles M.27. Similarly the category “Rosette M.1” includes examples of both eight- and ten-petaled rosettes. Although Siebert’s chart does indicate a general similarity and, in a few cases, duplication between Argive and Corinthian motifs, the chart does not prove an exclusive relationship between Corinth and Argive bowls of the monogram Α workshop.
65See footnote 62 above. C-1980-83 may be from the workshop of Agathokles, see p. 204 below.
66Stamps could easily be copied by taking a cast of all or part of an imported bowl. This process can be illustrated by a series of bowls from the Corinth inventories.

Braun (op. cit. [footnote 54 above], p. 172) has suggested that a particular form of fern with dotted fronds individually attached to the central stem originated in Corinth. Both bowls Braun cites as evidence for the Corinthian origin of the motif, however, belong to the Fabric B category and must be Argive imports (C-47-789 and C-47-796). Only one example of a Corinthian bowl decorated with the same fern
**Fabric C**

Fabric C is a hard, slightly micaceous clay with a bright orange color (2.5YR 6/8). It has many small voids and fine inclusions. The matt glaze adheres well to the wall and rarely flakes, though it wears easily on the relief surfaces. Smear marks indicate the thick glaze was wiped or painted on the interior. The inturned rims of two fragments suggest comparisons with East Greek bowls. At present it is impossible to localize Fabric C precisely.67

Most fragments come from long-petal bowls of the type with contiguous petals and flat centers. As seen above, this class is the most common represented at Corinth and probably does not begin before the late second quarter of the 2nd century. Insufficient data on the development of imported long-petal bowls prohibits any further chronologi-
cal qualification.

**Fabric D**

Fabric D has a gray core. The color of the clay ranges in shade (5Y 7/1 to 5Y 6/1) but is generally somewhat lighter than the imported East Greek wares. It is also distin-
guished from East Greek bowls by its slightly micaceous fabric, spotted with small black-and-white inclusions and voids. The clay can fire relatively hard but is sometimes soft and powdery. The glaze varies from lustrous black (2.5YR 3/0) to grayish brown (2.5YR 5/2); it is prone to flaking. The 1980 fragments come from the walls of unusually large bowls, the average thickness of a wall fragment being 0.006 m. The best preserved example of this type, a stemmed bowl with outturned rim (C-1980-120 [Pl. 47] + C-1980-121) has a restored diameter of 0.28 m.68

It is difficult to localize the center of production for Fabric D. The fabric is compara-
ble to East Greek gray wares. But the iconography of the figured sherds, hunting scenes, birds in flight, and nude warriors, finds parallels among mainland workshops. The same can be said for the floral and decorative motifs. It is safest to consider Fabric D the product of a Peloponnesian workshop until we know more about imported fab-
rics.

The long-petal bowl (C-1980-120) is of Edwards’ type with contiguous petals and relief centers. Three other fragments of similar Fabric D bowls are in the Corinth inventories.69 In size and quality of decoration these fragments are best paralleled by the

---

67 Siebert (p. 204) notes an unidentified “argiles ‘orangées’ dont on rencontre des examples sur presque tous les sites du Péloponnèse.”

68 A previously inventoried fragment of Fabric D (C-37-1602), a long-petal bowl with applied bolster, must have come from a vase of krater size.

69 C-37-1602 and C-37-2229 have independent petals with relief centers. C-63-699 has contiguous petals with relief centers.
Corinthian long-petal krater C-63-490 a–c (Pl. 48). Two Fabric D figured bowls, possibly from the same mold (C-1980-165, Pl. 48; C-80-175), show a nude warrior wearing a helmet and carrying a shield on his left arm, who runs to the left and with his right hand hurls a spear at some fantastic creature. Dogs and birds appear in the field above and below the scene. Again the best parallel is on a Corinthian sherd from a large molded relief bowl published by G. R. Edwards. Wherever the production center of Fabric D may finally be localized, the presence of its large and impressive bowls in Corinth exerted a strong influence on the local mold designers.

**Fabric E**

Fabric E has fine, hard clay with voids and fine white inclusions. The color ranges from a pale olive (5Y 6/2) to a darker gray (5Y 4/1). The metallic black glaze usually adheres well to the surface and has a slick, hard feel to the touch. Three fragments found in the 1980 fill preserve well-articulated rim zones (C-1980-166, Pl. 48; C-1980-167 and C-1980-168). The rims have straight, short sides and outturned lips. It is impossible at this moment to localize Fabric E precisely.

**“Various Fabrics”**

“Various Fabrics” is necessarily a catch-all phrase for bowls that do not fall easily into the major classifications. Some of these bowls are probably Attic, Argive, or East Greek; some may be Corinthian. But our state of knowledge does not allow us to group them at present according to fabric or iconography. They truly form a mixed bag: gray wares, buff fabrics, hard pinkish clay, etc. Even when a piece fills one set of criteria, other characteristics argue against the same classification. A good example is C-1980-83 (Pl. 48). The decorative motifs point to Argos and the workshop of Agathokles. Three figures are preserved, Aktaion, a cithara player and an unidentified draped figure, separated by tall, stylized ferns. These motifs are paralleled on many Argive vases. On the other hand the clay resembles Fabric A, a reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) with many voids and small black-and-white inclusions. Traces of a double-dipping streak on the interior also argue for a Corinthian origin. Was this bowl made in Corinth from an imported or copied mold or did Agathokles use a clay different from that of his Argive contemporaries?

Other bowls in this category have no parallels among the excavated material at Corinth. What must have been a magnificent large bowl, more properly krater, is preserved in three joining fragments (C-1980-47, Pl. 48). The gray clay is hard, non-micaeous, with small voids and some white inclusions. The distinctive glaze is a metallic

---

70 C-30-36, *Corinth* VII, iii, no. 844, pl. 74.
71 A few bowls (e.g. C-1980-173) are possibly Boiotian. The fabric is paralleled by many bowls from Eretria which I. Metzger identifies as Boiotian (Metzger, *Eretria*, II, *Die hellenistische Keramik in Eretria*, Bern 1969, pp. 23–27). I thank Professor Lilly Kahil for allowing me to see the Hellenistic material from Eretria.
72 See, for example, Siebert, A.1, pls. 1–3, A.27, pl. 5.
gray (5Y 3/1) with bits of mica. The lowest zone of decoration bears a trace of a large fleur-de-lis. The frieze zone above has Dionysiac figures separated by Ionic columns. The upper wall is decorated with three rows of moldings: bead and reel, wave pattern with crests to the right, and small branches. Indiscriminate rouletting covers the rim zone. The rim itself is short with an outturned lip.73

**Conclusions**

The present study of the molded relief bowls from the 1980 excavations has caused revision of some of the conclusions based on the inventoried material from past seasons. First of all, Corinthian production includes not only the light, soft clay we generally think of as the local fabric, but probably also a harder, pink clay that holds the glaze better. Corinthian artisans particularly excelled in the manufacture of long-petal bowls, a type they invented or at least introduced to the mainland in the late second quarter of the 2nd century B.C. Although the natural inclination was toward production of bowls of this type with simple, repetitive patterns, the popularity of imported bowls with mythological vignettes encouraged the continued production of bowls with representational scenes, even though such bowls were rarely of the highest quality. There was an active trade network with Argive workshops, a much less active one with Athens. The presence of so many East Greek bowls, particularly those of a relatively late style, may indicate some form of community at Corinth during the period of abandonment. Other fabrics represented in the Corinth material which at present can not be localized indicate a flourishing commercial center with connections to many areas of the Mediterranean. So many stimuli kept the production of Corinthian molded relief bowls a vital, if eclectic, commercial enterprise until the very last.

**Appendix**

The following appendix includes all the molded relief bowls and fragments found in the Hellenistic fill north of the east end of the Hellenistic racecourse. The bowls are listed in their lots according to fabric and type. There are three groups: The first signifies the upper levels of the fill that included Roman intrusions. The second represents lots from uncontaminated Hellenistic levels. The last group includes bowls from unlotted levels. Inventoried pieces are indicated parenthetically.

73 A few molded relief bowls from Delos (Laumonier, no. 3311, pl. 38, nos. 3312, 3313, pl. 39) and one from Samsun now in the Louvre (A. Greifenhagen, Jdl–EH 21, Beiträge zur antiken Reliefkeramik, Berlin 1963, pp. 62–64, figs. 57, 58) have frieze zones decorated with figures separated by Ionic columns. One imported bowl of unknown fabric in the Corinth inventories (C-53-81) also has a frieze of traditional figure types between Ionic columns. Greifenhagen compares the Louvre fragment to Homeric bowls representing the story of Circe and Odysseus where animal-headed men are depicted seated between columns. But on the Circe bowls the columns suggest an interior. On the Louvre, Delos and Corinth examples the columns are used in a purely decorative sense. Although these bowls are the closest parallels, the size and iconography of C-1980-47 are unparalleled.
LATE HELLENISTIC FILL, DISTURBED LEVELS

Lot 1980-3
1 Corinthian imbricate fragment
1 Corinthian floral fragment
1 Fabric D wall fragment
1 Fabric E figured bowl (C-1980-166 a [Pl. 48], b)
1 "Various Fabrics" long-petal fragment

Lot 1980-5
1 East Greek rim fragment (C-1980-69)
2 East Greek wall fragments
1 Fabric B wall fragment

Lot 1980-11
1 Corinthian long-petal fragment
1 Corinthian wall fragment
1 Fabric A long-petal fragment
1 "Various Fabrics" long-petal fragment

Lot 1980-21
1 Corinthian net-pattern bowl
1 Corinthian rim fragment
2 Corinthian wall fragments
1 Fabric C long-petal bowl
1 "Various Fabrics" floral fragment

Lot 1980-23
1 East Greek rim fragment

Lot 1980-31
1 Corinthian imbricate fragment (C-1980-126, Pl. 45)
1 Corinthian shield-bowl fragment
1 Corinthian wall fragment (C-1980-50)

LATE HELLENISTIC FILL, UNDISTURBED LEVELS

Lot 1980-6
6 Corinthian long-petal fragments (C-1980-93, C-1980-103, Pl. 41)
5 Corinthian figured fragments (C-1980-134, Pl. 44; C-1980-176)
1 Corinthian pine-cone bowl fragment (C-1980-130)
1 Corinthian shield-bowl fragment
2 Corinthian rim fragments
3 Corinthian wall fragments
1 East Greek long-petal bowl (C-1980-82, Pl. 46)

1 East Greek figured fragment
2 East Greek rim fragments
1 Fabric A figured fragment
1 Fabric A net-pattern bowl (C-1980-58, Pl. 47)

Lot 1980-37
1 East Greek wall fragment
2 "Various Fabrics" long-petal fragments
1 "Various Fabrics" pine-cone bowl fragment
1 "Various Fabrics" rim fragment

Lot 1980-53
2 Corinthian long-petal bowls (C-1980-174 b)
1 East Greek rim fragment

Lot 1980-60
1 East Greek wall fragment
1 Fabric D figured fragment (C-1980-165, Pl. 48)
2 "Various Fabrics" long-petal fragments

Lot 1980-61
2 Corinthian long-petal fragments
1 Corinthian rim fragment
1 East Greek rim fragment
1 East Greek rim fragment
2 Fabric A long-petal fragments
1 Fabric E long-petal bowl (C-1980-169)
1 Fabric E net-pattern bowl (C-1980-167)
2 "Various Fabrics" long-petal fragments
1 "Various Fabrics" wall fragment

Lot 1980-63
1 Corinthian figured fragment
2 Corinthian rim fragments
1 East Greek wall fragment

3 East Greek imbricate fragments
1 East Greek pine-cone bowl fragment
6 East Greek rim fragments (C-1980-73)
1 East Greek wall fragment
1 Fabric B figured fragment (C-1980-94, Pl. 47)
1 Fabric B floral bowl (C-1980-48, Pl. 47)
1 Fabric B rim fragment
2 Fabric D figured fragments
3 "Various Fabrics" long-petal fragments
1 "Various Fabrics" figured bowl (C-1980-47, Pl. 48)
1 "Various Fabrics" wall fragment
Lot 1980-8

2 Corinthian figured fragments
3 Corinthian wall fragments

Lot 1980-10

1 Corinthian imbricate fragment
1 Corinthian rim fragment
2 Corinthian wall fragments
3 East Greek long-petal bowls (C-1980-74, Pl. 46)
1 East Greek figured fragment
4 East Greek rim fragments (C-1980-70)
1 Fabric C long-petal fragment
3 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragments

Lot 1980-12

3 Corinthian long-petal fragments
1 Corinthian imbricate fragment
3 Corinthian wall fragments
1 East Greek long-petal fragment
1 Attic long-petal fragment
1 Attic wall fragment
1 Fabric D imbricate fragment
4 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragments
1 “Various Fabrics” shield-bowl fragment
2 “Various Fabrics” wall fragments

Lot 1980-13

3 Corinthian figured fragments (C-1980-171 a, b)
3 Corinthian wall fragments
1 Attic figured fragment
1 Attic rim fragment
2 Fabric D long-petal fragments
1 Fabric D wall fragment
1 Fabric D molded bowl support (C-1980-1)
1 “Various Fabrics” imbricate fragment

Lot 1980-14

1 Corinthian wall fragment

Lot 1980-15

1 Corinthian long-petal fragment
1 Corinthian figured fragment
3 Corinthian wall fragments
1 Fabric D wall fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” wall fragment

Lot 1980-17

1 Corinthian long-petal fragment
1 Corinthian net-pattern fragment
1 Fabric D long-petal bowl (C-1980-120, Pl. 47)

Lot 1980-23

1 Fabric A pine-cone bowl fragment
(C-1980-129)

Lot 1980-24

3 Corinthian long-petal fragments (C-1980-56; C-1980-106, Pl. 41)
2 Corinthian figured fragments (C-1980-164)
1 Corinthian imbricate fragment
1 Corinthian pine-cone bowl fragment
7 Corinthian rim fragments
10 Corinthian wall fragments
7 East Greek rim fragments
5 East Greek wall fragments (C-1980-116, Pl. 45)
1 Fabric A rim fragment
1 Fabric A wall fragment
1 Fabric B floral fragment
1 Fabric E long-petal fragment (C-1980-168)
2 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragments
2 “Various Fabrics” figured fragments
1 “Various Fabrics” pine-cone bowl fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” net-pattern fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” shield-bowl fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” floral fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” wall fragment

Lot 1980-25

10 Corinthian long-petal fragments (C-1980-107; C-1980-108, Pl. 41; C-1980-135, Pl. 42; C-1980-138 a, Pl. 41)
6 Corinthian figured fragments (C-1980-124, Pl. 44; C-1980-163, Pl. 45)
1 Corinthian imbricate fragment
1 Corinthian floral fragment
9 Corinthian rim fragments
2 Corinthian wall fragments
1 East Greek long-petal bowl (C-1980-75)
1 East Greek floral fragment
14 East Greek rim fragments (C-1980-76)
3 Fabric A figured fragments
1 Fabric A net-pattern fragment
1 Fabric A wall fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragment
3 “Various Fabrics” figured fragments (C-1980-83, Pl. 48)
1 “Various Fabrics” pine-cone bowl
1 “Various Fabrics” shield-bowl fragment
2 “Various Fabrics” rim fragments
2 “Various Fabrics” wall fragments
Lot 1980-26
1 Attic figured fragment (C-1980-122, Pl. 46)
2 Fabric A long-petal fragments
1 Fabric A net-pattern bowl (C-1980-57, Pl. 47)
1 East Greek rim fragment
3 East Greek wall fragments (C-1980-117)
1 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” wall fragment

Lot 1980-27
1 Corinthian shield-bowl fragment
2 Corinthian wall fragments
1 East Greek wall fragment
1 Fabric D rim (C-1980-121)

Lot 1980-28
2 Corinthian figured bowls (C-1980-140, Pl. 45)
1 Corinthian wall fragment

Lot 1980-29
2 Corinthian figured fragments
1 East Greek rim fragment
1 East Greek wall fragment
1 Fabric A rim fragment

Lot 1980-39
5 Corinthian long-petal bowls (C-1980-104, Pl. 41; C-1980-145)
6 Corinthian figured bowls (C-1980-10, Pl. 42; C-1980-136)
3 Corinthian imbricate bowls (C-1980-127 a [Pl. 45], b)
4 Corinthian linear-leaf bowls (C-1980-141, a [Pl. 46], b; C-1980-144)
1 Corinthian wall fragment
1 East Greek long-petal bowl
1 East Greek net-pattern bowl (C-1980-119 a [Pl. 45]–c)
7 East Greek rim fragments
3 East Greek wall fragments
1 Fabric A long-petal fragment
1 Fabric A figured bowl (C-1980-123 a, b, Pl. 44)
1 Fabric B long-petal bowl
1 Fabric B figured bowl
1 Fabric B rim fragment
2 Fabric B wall fragments
1 Fabric D long-petal fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragment
2 “Various Fabrics” wall fragments

Lot 1980-41
1 Corinthian figured fragment (C-1980-49)

Lot 1980-42
1 Corinthian long-petal fragment
2 Corinthian figured fragments (C-1980-132, Pl. 43)
1 Corinthian linear-leaf fragment
3 Corinthian rim fragments
2 Corinthian wall fragments (C-1980-142)
3 East Greek rim fragments
2 East Greek wall fragments
1 Attic long-petal fragment
1 Fabric D figured fragment
2 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragments

Lot 1980-44
1 Corinthian long-petal bowl
1 Corinthian figured fragment
1 Corinthian rim fragment
2 East Greek rim fragments

Lot 1980-47
1 Corinthian figured fragment (C-1980-162)

Lot 1980-50
1 Fabric B figured bowl (C-1980-125, Pl. 47)

Lot 1980-51
14 Corinthian long-petal bowls (C-1980-105, C-1980-174 a)
5 Corinthian figured fragments (C-1980-131, Pl. 44; C-1980-139 a, b, C-1980-176)
1 Corinthian imbricate bowl
1 Corinthian pine-cone bowl fragment (C-1980-128, Pl. 45)
1 Corinthian floral fragment
12 Corinthian rim fragments
9 Corinthian wall fragments (C-1980-177)
3 East Greek long-petal fragments
1 East Greek pine-cone bowl fragment
1 East Greek floral fragment
17 East Greek rim fragments
10 East Greek wall fragments
4 Fabric A long-petal fragments
1 Fabric A net-pattern fragment
1 Fabric A wall fragment
2 Fabric B figured bowls (C-1980-95, Pl. 47)
1 Fabric B floral bowl (C-1980-48, Pl. 47)
2 Fabric B wall fragments
3 Fabric C long-petal bowls
2 Fabric C imbricate bowls
2 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragments
2 “Various Fabrics” net-pattern fragments
1 “Various Fabrics” shield-bowl fragment

Lot 1980-52
1 Corinthian wall fragment

Lot 1980-64
3 Corinthian long-petal fragments
3 Corinthian figured fragments (C-1980-133)
2 Corinthian rim fragments
1 Corinthian wall fragment
1 Corinthian molded bowl support (C-1980-64)
1 East Greek imbricate bowl
1 East Greek pine-cone bowl fragment
2 East Greek rim fragments
2 East Greek wall fragments
1 Attic long-petal bowl (C-1980-87 a [Pl. 46], b)
1 Attic rim fragment
1 Fabric A long-petal fragment
1 Fabric A shield-bowl fragment
1 Fabric A wall fragment
1 Fabric B figured bowl (C-1980-51, Pl. 47)
1 Fabric B wall fragment
1 Fabric D figured bowl
4 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragments
1 “Various Fabrics” pine-cone bowl fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” floral fragment

Lot 1980-66
1 Corinthian figured fragment

Lot 1980-83
1 Corinthian rim fragment
1 Corinthian wall fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” wall fragment

Lot 1980-84
5 Corinthian figured fragments (C-1980-40; C-1980-140, Pl. 45)
1 Corinthian imbricate fragment
6 Corinthian rim fragments
14 Corinthian wall fragments
1 East Greek rim fragment
2 Attic figured fragments
1 Fabric A figured fragment
1 Fabric D long-petal bowl (C-1980-120, Pl. 47)
1 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” figured fragment (C-1980-173)
1 “Various Fabrics” linear-leaf fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” rim fragment
1 “Various Fabrics” wall fragment

Lot 1980-85
2 Corinthian figured bowls (C-1980-41 b [Pl. 42], a; C-1980-124, Pl. 44)
1 Corinthian imbricate fragment (C-1980-137, Pl. 45)
1 Fabric B figured bowl (C-1980-42, Pl. 47)

Lot 1980-86
1 Corinthian figured bowl

Lot 1980-87
6 Corinthian long-petal fragments (C-1980-138 b)
2 Corinthian figured fragments
6 Corinthian rim fragments
1 East Greek long-petal fragment
1 East Greek floral fragment
1 East Greek rim fragment
2 East Greek wall fragments
2 Fabric B rim fragments
1 Fabric D wall fragment
2 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragments
1 “Various Fabrics” floral fragment
2 “Various Fabrics” rim fragments
2 “Various Fabrics” wall fragments

UNLOTTED MATERIAL
C-1980-71 East Greek rim fragment
C-1980-72 East Greek long-petal fragment (Pl. 46)
C-1980-86 Attic long-petal fragment (Pl. 47)
C-1980-170 “Various Fabrics” long-petal fragment
C-1980-172 East Greek long-petal fragment
C-1980-175 Fabric D figured fragment
7 Corinthian long-petal fragments
2 Corinthian figured fragments
1 Corinthian shield-bowl fragment
1 Corinthian rim fragment
7 Corinthian wall fragments
1 East Greek long-petal fragment
2 East Greek floral fragments
6 East Greek rim fragments
5 East Greek wall fragments
1 Attic wall fragment
1 Fabric A long-petal fragment
1 Fabric A net-pattern fragment
1 Fabric A rim fragment
1 Fabric C long-petal fragment
1 Fabric C imbricate fragment
1 Fabric D long-petal fragment
1 Fabric D rim fragment
1 Fabric D wall fragment
3 "Various Fabrics" long-petal fragments
1 "Various Fabrics" shield-bowl fragment
2 "Various Fabrics" wall fragments

American School of Classical Studies
54 Souidias Street
Athens 140, Greece
CHARLES MALCOLM EDWARDS: CORINTH 1980: MOLDED RELIEF BOWLS
PLATE 42

CHARLES MALCOLM EDWARDS: CORINTH 1980: MOLDED RELIEF BOWLS
CHARLES MALCOLM EDWARDS: CORINTH 1980: MOLDED RELIEF BOWLS
CHARLES MALCOLM EDWARDS: CORINTH 1980: MOLDED RELIEF BOWLS
CHARLES MALCOLM EDWARDS: CORINTH 1980: MOLDED RELIEF BOWLS
CHARLES MALCOLM EDWARDS: CORINTH 1980: MOLDED RELIEF BOWLS
CHARLES MALCOLM EDWARDS: CORINTH 1980: MOLDED RELIEF BOWLS
CHARLES MALCOLM EDWARDS: CORINTH 1980: MOLDED RELIEF BOWLS