CORINTHIAN MOLDMADE BOWLS: THE 1926 RESERVOIR

(Plates 85–90)

WITH THE RECENT PUBLICATION of large collections of moldmade bowls from Delos, Argos, and the Athenian Agora, the study of this branch of Hellenistic ceramics has advanced beyond the initial stages of presentation and classification. Typologies are clearly defined, and local styles can be discerned. The relative chronologies of the bowls from one site can be checked against those of another. As a result, the date of a moldmade bowl may be the most precise and trustworthy chronological clue available for the archaeologist.

One focus of study has been the classification of bowls by workshops. Especially important is S. Rotroff’s volume on the moldmade bowls from the Athenian Agora. Given the number of dated deposits in the Agora and Rotroff’s careful analysis, the production of moldmade bowls in Athens can be understood in greater detail than elsewhere. Potentially this knowledge is a great help to the study of non-Attic pottery. For example, bowls from the Argive workshop distinguished by the monogram Χ have a stylistic affinity with Attic.

My thanks go to Charles K. Williams, II for the opportunity to study and publish the bowls from Reservoir 1926-2. He and Dr. Nancy Bookidis offered helpful advice and happy working conditions. Dr. Kathleen Slane showed tireless generosity in discussing the intricacies of fabric distinction. Dr. Susan Rotroff not only looked at material from the Athenian Agora with me but through her interest and knowledge kept me from some bad mistakes.

Works frequently cited will be abbreviated as follows:


Corinth VII, iii = G. R. Edwards, Corinth, VII, iii, Corinthian Hellenistic Pottery, Princeton 1975

Courby = F. Courby, Les vases grecs à reliefs, Paris 1970

Délos XXXI = A. Laumonier, Exploration archéologique de Délos, XXXI, La céramique hellénis- tique à reliefs, i, Ateliers “ioniens”, Paris 1977


Siebert = G. Siebert, Recherches sur les ateliers de bols à reliefs du Peloponnesse à l’époque hellénistique (Bibliothèque des Écoles Française d’Athènes et de Rome 233), Paris 1978
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bowls. In particular, certain motifs seem to have been inspired by, if not actually copied by the Argives from, the Attic Workshop of Bion, one of the earliest Athenian workshops, dated by Rotroff to the years between 225 and 175 B.C. This lends welcome confirmation to G. Siebert’s suggestions that the Monogram Workshop is one of the earliest at Argos. But if Argive potters were initially inspired by Attic models, they soon developed their own distinctive and vigorous style, independent of their Athenian competitors.

On the other hand, Corinthian bowls have always proved a puzzle. In a city renowned for its craftsmanship, Corinth’s moldmade bowls have appeared surprisingly derivative and poorly conceived. Siebert suggested that a strong tradition of Hellenistic ceramics in Corinth made the best potters inherently conservative and generally suspicious of new types. This explanation might suffice if there did not exist many Corinthian moldmade bowls. Recent study indicates that a great many bowls at Corinth heretofore considered imports are actually products of local workshops, and there are other reasons to increase their number.

Corinth’s role as a commercial center encouraged the importing of large numbers of bowls to the city. Their presence provided the main stimulation, even to the degree of dry imitation, for Corinthian artisans. Over 150 bowls found in a reservoir in the 1926 excavations suggest, however, that there was more originality or, at least, ambition in one Corinthian workshop than has been acknowledged so far.

The Reservoir

Rectangular Reservoir 1926-2 lies 2.50 m. north of the eastern end of the buttressed retaining wall of building 5 east of the Theater. The Reservoir measures 2.40 (north–south) x 1.75 m., and reaches a depth of 1.65 m. Its walls are covered with waterproof cement. A stairway of seven steps is preserved against the west wall. With the help of notes kept by the excavator, Oscar Broneer, it is possible to form a basis for study of its contents by reconstructing the relative levels at which the finds appeared in the Reservoir.

The topmost soil in the Reservoir contained few sherds. Some early Corinthian roof tiles were found with fragments of a Corinthian Type B amphora dated within the second quarter of the 3rd century B.C. The contents of the fill remained consistent from immediately below the top level to the bottom. Fragments of moldmade bowls constitute the bulk of

3 For the Monogram Workshop see Siebert, pp. 50–64; for the similarity between Attic bowls and bowls of the Monogram Workshop see Agora XXII, p. 43.
4 Compare for example the stamp of a bird flying left on bowls of the Workshop of Bion (Agora XXII, p. 26, no. 154, pl. 28) to the motif on a bowl from the Monogram Workshop (Siebert, no. M.50, pl. 28). The stamps may not be the same, but clearly the motifs are related.
6 Siebert, p. 81.
7 C. M. Edwards, 1981, pp. 200–201; also see below, p. 404.
the ceramic finds. In addition, there are six lamps of Bromeer types IX and X which should
date to the late 3rd century or the first half of the 2nd century B.C.\textsuperscript{11} Eight conical loom-
weights probably belonging to the 3rd or 2nd century, one fusiform unguentarium, one flat-
rim plate, and fragments of six terracotta figurines make up the rest of the pottery of the
Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{12} Ten coins were scattered throughout the fill from the top to the bottom
of the basin. Of the four that were legible, two are Sicyonian dated 323–251 B.C., one Cor-
inthian, 400–250 B.C., and one Macedonian of Demetrios Poliorcetes, 306–283 B.C.\textsuperscript{13}

The presence of the moldmade bowls gives the most reliable information for the date of
the fill. Fragments of approximately 152 bowls were found. Most of the material was ex-
tremely fragmentary: 39 Corinthian sherds preserve only traces of rim patterns or the
medallion and calyx zones, and so the wall decoration, by which moldmade bowls are classi-
fied, is unknown.\textsuperscript{14} It is possible that some of these fragments belong to the same bowl, but
no joins were found and none could convincingly be associated with other fragments. Of the
Corinthian bowls the largest number, 43, preserve figural decoration. Seventeen have walls
covered with leaves in an imbricate pattern, 15 in floral designs. Six are so-called shield
bowls. Four are decorated with nodules imitating a pine-cone, three with a net pattern.
Two bowls belong to the long-petal class. Three comic masks, which served as supports to
kraters, and two molds were found. Comparatively little imported material came from the
Reservoir: five figured Argive bowls and 11 Attic fragments. Four sherd:s could not be iden-
tified. No East Greek bowls were found.

One critical moment in the chronology of moldmade bowls is the introduction of the
long-petal type.\textsuperscript{15} Rotroff has assessed the Athenian material and suggests that long-petal

\textsuperscript{11} Bromeer, \textit{op. cit.} (footnote 9 above), pp. 47–51; P. Russell, “Early Roman Thin-walled Wares and
(pp. 34–44), pp. 40–43.

\textsuperscript{12} For conical loomweights see G. R. Davidson, \textit{Corinth}, XII, \textit{The Minor Objects}, Princeton 1952,
pp. 148–161. The weights from the Reservoir belong to Davidson’s profiles X and XI (p. 149, fig. 23).
For the unguentarium a good parallel is found in the Kerameikos in Dipylon Well B\textsubscript{1}, \textit{Abschnitt VII}
(K. Braun, “Der Dipylon-Brunnen B\textsubscript{1}, Die Funde,” \textit{AthMitt} 85, 1970 [pp. 129–269], p. 152, no. 161, pl. 65).\textit{Abschnitt VII} belongs to the upper use fill, recently dated “from \textit{ca.} 200 to perhaps slightly after 175” (\textit{Agora}
XXII, p. 111).

G. R. Edwards dated flat-rim plates at Corinth to the years just before 146 B.C. but left open the possi-
bility that earlier stages might have existed in the evolution of the type (\textit{Corinth} VII, iii, p. 38). The example
found in the 1926 Reservoir finds its best parallel in a plate in Corinth, G-66-158, which Edwards wrote is
“an example of an appreciably earlier stage of the form” (\textit{Corinth} VII, iii, p. 38, note 24).

Of the terracottas only one is substantially intact, T 339; it represents a reclining banqueter. It finds its
best parallel at Corinth in a similar figurine dated by Davidson to the 3rd century (\textit{Corinth} XII, p. 47,
no. 293). A fragmentary figurine of a standing child from the bottom of the Reservoir is from the same mold as
a figurine dated by Davidson to the 2nd century B.C. (\textit{Corinth} XII, p. 52, no. 351, pl. 31).

Other pottery from the Reservoir is of pre-Hellenistic date: three sherd:s of 6th-century Corinthian ware,
one Corinthian red-figured sherd, and a fragment of the lower wall of a large and elaborately decorated
skyphos, possibly West Greek.

\textsuperscript{13} 26-1506, 26-1507, 26-1510, 26-1512.

\textsuperscript{14} See \textit{Corinth} VII, iii, pp. 151–152.

\textsuperscript{15} For the date of the beginning of long-petal decoration see, most recently, V. R. Grace, “The Middle Stoa
bowls were not introduced into Athens before the mid-140's. But the ambiguous contexts of many such bowls prevent the evidence from being conclusive. Recently V. R. Grace in her study of the date of the Middle Stoa in Athens has tried to resolve this ambiguity by suggesting that "the style began in the first quarter of the 2nd century but had at first a limited vogue, because in its first more elegant form it was difficult and fussy to engrave in the mold." Rotroff has also noted the possibility of "experimentation with the long-petal motif in Athens some time before the type was wholeheartedly adopted into the repertoire around 150 B.C." 

Corinthian potters produced large numbers of long-petal bowls; the type was well established before the Mummian destruction in 146. When it was introduced is hard to know. No Corinthian long-petal bowls have been found in contexts that can be precisely dated before 146 B.C., and only one may have come from destruction debris in situ. The date of the inception of manufacture therefore rests on a guess as to how long it would take for such a body of material to accumulate. Since he knew only a very few examples of Corinthian long-petal bowls, G. R. Edwards maintained that whatever development took place within the type was very rapid. Recent studies have modified the statistical relationship between figural and long-petal bowls so that we can perhaps grant the Corinthian potters a little more time for a leisurely development of the type. Previously I suggested a date of ca. 165 B.C. for the beginning of manufacture of long-petal bowls in Corinth. Considered with Callaghan's analysis of the material from Pergamon, that date seems to hold.

G. R. Edwards suggested lines for the evolution of the long-petal type in Corinth. The
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16 Agora XXII, pp. 35-36.
18 Grace, op. cit., p. 23.
19 Rotroff, op. cit. (footnote 17 above), p. 274.
20 C. M. Edwards, 1981, pp. 190–191. Although substantial evidence now suggests habitation of the site during the supposed period of abandonment, I continue to believe that bowls of Corinthian manufacture should be dated before 146 B.C. The bulk of the material which can be dated between 146 and 44 belongs to the later 2nd and early 1st centuries B.C. See C. K. Williams, II, "Corinth 1977, Forum Southwest," Hesperia 47, 1978 (pp. 1–39), pp. 21–23; for the stamped amphorae, see p. 21, note 29; for the East Greek bowls, see p. 23, note 34 and C. M. Edwards, 1981, pp. 198–199. Evidence for activity at the site therefore suggests little if any continuity between 146 and 100 B.C. but some form of community at Corinth in existence around 100 B.C. and thereafter. Even so, it is likely that it was agrarian rather than industrial.
21 Corinth VII, iii, p. 179, no. 901, pl. 38. Fragments of two East Greek long-petal bowls were found in the construction fill of "the room east of the columned hall" in the southwest corner of the forum (C. K. Williams, II, "Corinth 1976: Forum Southwest," Hesperia 46, 1977 [pp. 40–81], pp. 57, 70, nos. 15, 16, pl. 25). Williams dates the building, on the evidence provided by these bowls, to just before the 146 B.C. destruction. Rotroff (Agora XXII, p. 35) suggests that the building may have been built by squatters after 146. Until more is known about the chronology of East Greek workshops the two long-petal bowls cannot be dated securely. See C. M. Edwards, 1981, pp. 198–199. P. Callaghan (Callaghan, 1982, p. 65) has also called attention to these bowls. He mistakenly says, however, that they represent local fabric.
22 Corinth VII, iii, pp. 176–177.
25 Corinth VII, iii, pp. 177–178.
earliest form was the most complicated: independent petals with convex centers. Sometimes
the petals were separated by lines of jewelng. The process of engraving was later simplified
by leaving the center of each petal flat or by making the petals contiguous. The final stage
was the easiest to engrave: contiguous petals with low-relief outlines and flat centers. G. R.
Edwards noted that this hypothetical development, which moves from the most complicated
to the simplest form, runs contrary to the usual typological pattern. Nevertheless, it can be
defended by the fact that in Athens the simplest form of design had the longest life.26

Since scholars studying the Attic material suggest that a phase of experimentation took
place in the production of long-petal bowls before the easy solution was reached, there may
be some justification in reading the Corinthian material in the same way.27 On the other
hand, it seems to me that in connection with the material from the 1926 Reservoir a problem
of terminology arises. The two bowls with long-petal decoration from the Reservoir (29, 30)
belong to G. R. Edwards' category of contiguous petals with relief centers, or step 2 in the
development. More precisely, these are not bowls or drinking cups at all but large mixing-
bowl kraters. Their decoration may be simple, but they are carefully worked and elegant.28
Corinthian potters produced many of these long-petal kraters, Athenian potters none at
all.29

Fragments of two such kraters have been found at Argos,30 one of them comes from the
Hellenistic building southeast of the Odeion. Siebert dates the destruction of the building to
a time between the end of the 3rd century and the first quarter of the 2nd.31 Given this
fragment from Argos, and the fact that two long-petal kraters but no typical long-petal
bowls were found in the 1926 Reservoir, it is possible that the large, long-petal krater
preceded the introduction of the smaller long-petal bowl.

If we accept the long-petal krater as a type that is earlier than the small long-petal
bowl, beginning at ca. 165 B.C. or before, then it is surprising to find shield bowls in the fill
from the Reservoir (31, 32), for the earliest shield bowls have been dated by the evidence
from Athens and from Corinth to the years around 150 B.C.32 Their chronology seemed so
secure that Callaghan was led to believe that Macedonian shields captured by the Achaean
League in the battle against Andriskos in 150 B.C. served as the inspiration for the design.33
If that were true, then the shield bowls would be the latest material from the Reservoir.

Few shield bowls, or concentric-semicircle bowls as Rotroff terms them, have been
found in Athens, although we know the type had been introduced there before 146, since
one occurred in the building fill of the Stoa of Attalos.34 Because most of the shield bowls

ogical indicators. Material from Pergamon and Delos supports this contention.
27 See footnotes 15 and 17 above.
28 Note the elaborate ivy-leaf rim pattern on 30 and the appliqué relief support on 29.
29 70, 71, C-80-174; Gray Ware: CP-3193, CP-3216, C-37-1602, C-37-2220, C-63-699, C-1980-120. For
the identification of Corinthian Gray Ware, see p. 404 below. Mold: MF-1984-44.
30 Siebert, p. 364, An.6, from the building southeast of the Odeion, and An.7, pl. 41.
31 Siebert, pp. 161–168.
34 Agora XXII, nos. 400–402, 410; no. 401 from the fill of the Stoa of Attalos. No shield bowls were found
from the Athenian Agora are imported, it seems likely that Attic potters produced only few, if any, examples of this type. At least it was never popular in Athens.

Argive potters rarely used the shield-bowl type, and when they did they gave free rein to the design of it. Chronological indicators for these bowls are lacking, but it is significant that the workshops which produced shield bowls are among the earliest at Argos.

Corinthians also manufactured shield bowls. Lacking any dated deposits at Corinth, one usually estimates their period of production by a statistical method: the fewer the bowls, the shorter the span of production. There may be something hazardous in this assumption.

A parallel situation to that of the Reservoir is found in the building fills of the Asklepieion at Pergamon. In Bauphase 10, dated from 190 B.C. down to the second quarter of the 2nd century, a fragment of a shield bowl was found together with figured bowls, one of which is Attic and is similar to products of Workshop A. The same situation occurs in Bauphase 11 dated to the second quarter of the 2nd century.

Much of the Pergamene material was dated by comparison to Thompson’s Group C from the Athenian Agora. Recent investigation has suggested that Thompson’s date for Group C should be lowered by as much as 35 years, so that it may be possible that the dates for the Bauphasen of the Asklepieion need a comparable adjustment. At any rate, the Pergamene material suggests that shield bowls appeared in East Greece in the first half of the 2nd century and before the introduction of the long-petal bowl.

Callaghan’s suggestion that shield bowls were first introduced at Corinth around 150 B.C. was primarily based on the apparent similarity between those bowls published by G. R. Edwards and the most developed form of actual Macedonian shields as reconstructed from numismatic evidence. Particularly important was “the separation of the inner ring of bosses from the radiating lines of the same motif.” That form, according to Callaghan, finds its best parallel on coins of the Macedonian republic minted between 158/7 and 150 B.C. G. R. Edwards considered the bowls which displayed that system of design as the


35 Siebert, nos. DI.124, DI.125, pl. 20; M.99, pl. 30.
36 Corinth VII, iii, nos. 921–932; add five more examples found in the 1980 excavations, C. M. Edwards, 1981, p. 190, fig. 1.
38 Ibid., no. 256, pp. 138–139, pl. 49; no. 261, p. 139, pl. 49.
39 Ibid., pp. 140–141; shield bowl: no. 290, p. 143, pl. 51; Attic bowl: no. 291, pp. 143–144, pl. 49. A long-petal fragment was also found. It belongs to G. R. Edwards’ earliest type. See above, p. 393 with footnote 26.
43 Ibid., p. 58.
44 One can object to this reading of the comparison. On the coins, the “inner ring of bosses” do not serve as a continuation of the “outer bosses”. They are rather a ring of jewelings, the individual units of which are smaller and more densely placed than the heavier bosses. This ring of jewelings serves to frame the profile head of
initial stage in the development of the type. Consequently he considered the more elaborate shield bowls, wherein "the effect is enlivened by reducing the size of the bosses and increasing their number so that they pepper the available surface," as a later development, presumably to be dated very close to 146 B.C.

32 from the 1926 Reservoir does not fall into any of G. R. Edwards' categories. It is not a proper shield bowl at all but uses the concentric-semicircle motif with bosses as a calyx pattern. A whirligig decorates the medallion. The whole design finds numismatic parallels on coins of Philip V and Perseus. The shield bowl from Bauphase 10 at Pergamon also provides a good parallel.

It would seem that the simplest form of the shield bowl, on which Callaghan based his theory, is actually the latest in the typology. Shield bowls at Corinth, like long-petal bowls, may have developed from a more complicated to a simpler form. Tentatively it can be suggested that the shield-bowl motif appeared in Corinth as early as the first quarter of the 2nd century. It appears at Pergamon at the same time and was probably used in Argos. Athens more or less rejected it, and East Greek workshops were slow to accept it.

It is not necessary to deny the connection between the concentric-semicircle motif on the bowls and actual Macedonian shields. The relationship between the two explains the evident popularity of the type at Corinth and its relative scarcity at Athens. The Corinthians' pro-Macedonian sentiments are well known and contrast sharply with Athenian antipathy. In the year 218 B.C. Philip V and the Macedonian army remained in Corinth while preparing for the war against the allied contingent. The soldiers' shields would have been a familiar sight. This need not imply that Corinthian potters invented the shield-bowl type, although they may have. More precise archaeological evidence will be needed before we can be sure.

G. R. Edwards said that net-pattern bowls, one of which comes from the 1926 Reservoir (33), are examples of a linear class which had its greatest period of popularity between 160 and 120 B.C. Both Callaghan and Rotroff have suggested that because the net pattern appears on incised ware of much earlier date, it is possible that net-pattern moldmade bowls were manufactured earlier than G. R. Edwards thought. This seems reasonable. The
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Artemis on the coins rather than to promote a unity of design. See Pierre A. Mackay, "The Coinage of the Macedonian Republics, 168–146 B.C.," in Ancient Macedonia, B. Laourdas and C. Makaronas, edd., Thessaloniki 1970, pp. 256–264, pls. 73, 74. Callaghan acknowledges this distinction but reads the coins as a degeneration of the motif as it might have appeared on shields (Callaghan, 1978, p. 59). This seems unlikely.

45 Corinth VII, iii, p. 183.
46 Compare the Argive bowl attributed to the Monogram Workshop, Siebert, no. M.99, pl. 30.
47 H. Gaebler, Die antiken Münzen von Makedonia und Paonia, Berlin 1935, pl. 2, nos. 13, 14, pl. 35, no. 256.
48 Ziegenhaus and de Luca, op. cit. (footnote 37 above), pl. 49, no. 256.
49 The first East Greek workshop that can be shown to have produced shield bowls is the Monogram Workshop. See Délos XXXI, pl. 45, nos. 4305, 4328, 4303. Laumonier (p. 132) calls it "le plus important, peut-être, de l'Égée en cette fin du II siècle av. J.C."
50 Polybios, v.2.4–7.
51 Corinth VII, iii, p. 181.
presence of the net-pattern bowls in the 1926 Reservoir does not, therefore, offer good evidence for the date of the filling.

Additional information comes from a comparison of motifs used on the bowls. Almost exclusively the figural and floral designs which are not the inventions of Corinthian designers were borrowed from the Attic Workshop of Bion (5, 10, 11, 12, 17, 24, 27, 33) or the Argive Monogram M Workshop (2, 10, 15, 19, 23, 24, 25).

The technique of manufacture of a moldmade bowl has been well described by various scholars. The stamps for individual motifs could be made by taking a cast of a relief motif in clay or occasionally, most likely during the early years of manufacture, directly from metal vases. Rotroff has pointed out that stamps could also be made by taking molds from ceramic bowls. As has been demonstrated for terracotta figurines, the process can be followed in a series arranged in “generations” according to relative sizes.

The clay impression of a seated Apollo found in the 1985 excavations illustrates the technical procedure (MF-1985-72). It is a thick piece of Corinthian clay with a round depression on the back (Pl. 90). It is likely to be an impression taken from a type of terracotta altar, examples of which have been found throughout the Mediterranean. Two from Corinth preserve the figure of Apollo (MF 9270, MF-1979-34; Pl. 90). From an impression such as ours, stamps could be made for moldmade bowls. The shrinkage of the clay would result in a motif considerably smaller than the image on the original altar.

53 See most recently Agora XXII, pp. 4–5.
57 MF-1985-72, found May 3, 1985, east of the Theater in fill above bedrock in the northwest room of building 5; see Williams, 1985, p. 162, footnote 33. H. 0.051 m. Oval piece of clay, thick, with rounded surfaces; deep finger impression on back. Fine, pink clay, unevenly fired, with scattered white inclusions. Slightly pinker than 5YR 6/6.
59 MF 9270, Corinthian, found August 16, 1947 in Well 1947-3; see Corinth VII, iii, p. 211, Deposit 46. H. 0.076 m. Three joining fragments preserve one corner of a terracotta altar. Buff clay (5YR 8/3), fired darker at top (5YR 7/6). MF-1979-34, import, found July 7, 1979 in the Southeast Building, dumped fill associated with the “first” building trench. P.H. 0.042 m. Single fragment of terracotta altar; broken all around. Fine, hard-fired clay with many specks of gold mica. Core (5YR 6/1) fired darker than surface (5YR 7/6).
60 The two altars (MF 9270, MF-1979-34) and the impression well illustrate the diminution in size which occurs in generations of a single motif. On MF-1979-34, the preserved height, from feet to the top of the kithara, measures 0.037 m. The same measurement on MF 9270 is 0.031 m. The smallest of all, MF-1985-72, is 0.028 m. The largest example is the most detailed and represents the first generation. MF 9270 has a worn impression, but the stamp for this figure may have been second generation. MF-1985-72 would therefore be an impression made from a second-generation figure. The stamp made from it would represent the third generation.
Fig. 1. Generations of decorative motifs. Bird in flight to left: A) Attic, 41; B) Argive, C-47-789; C) Corinthian, 12. Dotted and striated frond: D) Argive, C-47-796; E) Corinthian, 15

If Corinthian potters had taken molds of motifs from Argive or Attic bowls, the resulting stamps should also be appreciably smaller than their imported counterparts. Two generations of the same figural motif are found on bowls from the Reservoir. 42 and 43, both Attic and probably products of the same mold, preserve a group identified as Zeus and Ganymede. 61 15 preserves a smaller version of the same motif. 20 preserves second and third generations of the group of a Dionysiac trio on a single bowl.

Corinthian potters also borrowed decorative motifs from imports. That borrowing can be illustrated by the motif of the bird in flight to left in Figure 1: A, B, C. The motif appears in its original form on bowls attributed to the Attic Workshop of Bion, dated 225–175 B.C. Corinthian bowls show the second and third generations. A similar “family-tree” can be

61 Agora XXII, p. 22.
arranged for the motif of the large frond with striated and dotted spine (Fig. 1: D, E). The original invention of the ornament may appear on an Attic bowl from the Pnyx. A very similar stamp appears on both Corinthian and Argive bowls. The quality and larger size of the impression on the Argive bowls at Corinth indicates that these represent the first generation of the motif.

Figure 1 gives visual evidence for the interchange between Corinthian workshops, the Workshop of Bion in Athens, and the Monogram Workshop in Argos. Rotroff has argued convincingly that Bion’s workshop went out of business around 175 B.C. That in itself supplies little evidence for the date of the fill of the 1926 Reservoir: once a motif had been introduced into the designer’s repertoire, there is no certain way to know how long it was used. On the other hand, it is suggestive that no motifs characteristic of later Athenian workshops appear on the bowls from the Reservoir.

Of course, not all the motifs found on the bowls are “hand-me-downs”, but those which can be attributed to Corinth exclusively offer no chronological evidence. The *Nymphaea nelumbo* with figures (20) has been considered a form dated not before ca. 100 B.C. Recent studies indicate, however, that the motif was used during the first half of the 2nd century.

Finally, all the Attic imported bowls which can be attributed come from the Workshop of Bion and can be dated no later than 175 B.C. (41–46). The Argive sherds come from the Monogram Workshop (38–40). It is one of the earliest Argive workshops, producing bowls by the end of the 3rd century.

In summary the evidence for the date of the fill of the Reservoir is fourfold:
1. No long-petal bowls were found. The large, long-petal kraters are probably predecessors to the smaller, simple bowls.
2. Two shield bowls were found. That type is documented at Pergamon in the first half of the 2nd century, in a context without long-petal bowls.
3. The Corinthian potter under consideration used motifs derived from early foreign workshops, predominantly from the Attic Workshop of Bion and the Argive Monogram Workshop. The former ceased activity around 175 B.C.
4. The imported bowls can also be attributed to either the Workshop of Bion or the Monogram Workshop.

Of these four criteria, the first supplies the most important evidence. Callaghan has argued that long-petal bowls of G. R. Edwards’ earliest type were introduced in Asia Minor
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63 *Pnyx*, no. 5, p. 93, pl. 35.
64 *Agora* XXII, pp. 27, 103.
65 Logically, the smaller and less distinct the impression became, the less likely the stamp was to be used.
66 It is true that bowls which we would date later than those from the Reservoir show less dependence on Attic and Argive motifs. See below, pp. 405–406. The appearance on these later bowls of a frontal Nike, who is directly related to a stamp used by Workshop A and Class 3 in Athens, is striking. See *Agora* XXII, p. 31. The stamp was used on Attic bowls as late as *ca.* 140 B.C. It is missing on bowls from the Reservoir and those which we would attribute to the same workshop.
67 See below, p. 407.
68 Siebert, p. 170.
slightly before 165 B.C. and that soon thereafter they began to be produced in Corinth. 69 Possibly a few such bowls were made in Athens. 70 A date for the initial manufacture of long-petal bowls at ca. 165 B.C. corroborates the other evidence from the Reservoir. It must have been filled in sometime between 175 and 165, or about twenty years before Corinth was destroyed.

**The Workshop**

The moldmade bowls from the Reservoir 1926-2 date between ca. 225 B.C. when the type was introduced from Athens and ca. 165 B.C. when the Reservoir was filled. 71 What little else came from the Reservoir is either much earlier or contemporary with the bowls. The fact that so many bowls but little else was found leads to the suspicion that the material from the Reservoir does not represent a random gathering of earth and pottery to be used as dumped fill but might be the debris from a workshop located near by. 72 The presence of molds in the Reservoir lends credence to this idea.

Siebert has lucidly laid out the principles that the scholar should apply when attributing moldmade bowls to a single workshop. 73 If the material is moldmade and in a series, one cannot adopt the Morellian system of attribution based on the observation of detail. Rather one must establish a repertoire of types or, more specifically, stamps in order to define the coherence of a given class of objects. 74 Even so, with moldmade bowls of the Hellenistic period, when artisans of widely separated areas drew from a stock repertoire for figural designs, attribution by stamps is even further limited. Hausmann, Laumonier, Rottroff, and Siebert have all followed the good advice of Courby to look to seemingly insignificant details as clues to attribution. 75 Rim patterns and filling ornaments are the most reliable. Motifs which fill the medallion zone may have played the role of signatures to a certain extent, but it seems that even these devices could be borrowed. 76

In 1975 G. R. Edwards wisely rejected the temptation to classify the Corinthian bowls by workshops. The material was not plentiful, nor did the derivative quality of the bowls seem to justify the attempt. Siebert has warned us that unless three criteria are fulfilled, it is fruitless to seek an attribution: 1) a large number of signatures; 2) a large amount of material (he estimates a minimum of 100 vases and fragments); 3) direct contact with the

---

69 See footnote 24 above.
70 The long-petal fragments found under the filling of the Stoa of Attalos (Agora XXII, p. 83, no. 325, pl. 59) belong to G. R. Edwards' class of continuous long petals with relief centers. It has been worrisome that these fragments appear in the context that they do. See Grace, op. cit. (footnote 15 above), p. 23. At any rate, these fragments are more precisely worked and have a careful, delicate rim pattern, characteristics not typical for the bulk of the Athenian material produced after 150 B.C.
71 For the date of the beginning of production, see Agora XXII, pp. 6–13.
72 Compare, for example, the two cisterns from the Athenian Agora which contain workshop debris: Agora XXII, p. 27.
73 Siebert, pp. 3–8.
74 For the difficulties inherent in attribution by means of stamped images, see Agora XXII, p. 25.
75 U. Hausmann, *Hellenistische Reliefbecker aus attischen und böotischen Werkstätten*, Stuttgart 1959, p. 65; *Délos XXXI*, p. 6; Agora XXII, pp. 25–26; Siebert, p. 6; Courby, p. 394.
Fig. 2. Decorative motifs of the Workshop of Reservoir 1926-2: A) 12; B) 59; C) 71; D) 12; E) 13; F) 53; G) 18; H) 57; I) 59; J) 16
material over a prolonged period of time.\textsuperscript{77} At Corinth criteria 2 and 3 are fulfilled, but except for a few letters, signatures are still missing.\textsuperscript{78} Nevertheless, Rotroff’s example encourages us at least to make a beginning in this direction for the Corinthian bowls. The material from the 1926 Reservoir offers an opportunity.

Because Corinthian potters borrowed not only figural designs but even minor motifs and ornaments from imported bowls, we cannot be sure that these derivative stamps represent part of an isolated repertoire. Anyone could copy an imported bowl. We should begin with those motifs which have the best chance to be exclusive to Corinth.

Seven bowls from the Reservoir make use of a particular floral motif: a pointed petal with dots along the edges and a double spine (see Fig. 2:G).\textsuperscript{79} The mold 6 from the Reservoir (Pl. 85) and one found in the 1985 excavations (MF-1985-82; Pl. 90) testify to its use.\textsuperscript{80} The pointed petal appears as parts of the medallion and calyx designs on two inventoried bowls from the Reservoir (18, 23). On 23 the petals alternate with acanthus leaves with dotted spines. The latter were very popular on Corinthian bowls.\textsuperscript{81} Bowl 24 has the same stamps as 23 for the acanthus leaf and for the medallion decoration. 18, 23, and 24 are therefore products of a single workshop.

Another motif which is exclusively Corinthian is the rim pattern of horizontal double spirals (12, 13, 31; Fig. 2:A). Two Corinthian molds preserve that pattern (MF-1982-45, MF-1982-83; Pl. 90).\textsuperscript{82} On 12 three other decorative motifs appear which are paralleled only on Corinthian bowls: Eros riding a swan, a fox running right, and a hare leaping left (Fig. 2:D, E, F). Although all three of these motifs are comparable to and therefore possibly were inspired by imported motifs, they differ sufficiently from their Attic counterparts that they must be Corinthian inventions. If at this point we look beyond the material from the Reservoir, we find these three motifs used on other bowls.

Eros on a swan occurs on a fragmentary Corinthian bowl together with the motifs of Zeus with Ganymede and a small Nike flying left (55). Both of the latter seem to be made with second generation stamps derived from Attic prototypes.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{77} Siebert, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{78} Corinth VII, iii, p. 154; also C. M. Edwards, 1981, p. 193.
\textsuperscript{79} The motif may have been inspired by similar petals on Attic bowls, possibly products of Workshop A. See Phny, no. 58, pl. 43; for possible attribution to Workshop A, see Agora XXII, no. 316, p. 82.
\textsuperscript{80} MF-1985-82, found June 14, 1985 east of the Theater in a balk under the northwest room of building 5; see Williams, 1985, p. 162, footnote 33. P.H. 0.045 m. Single fragment of mold with hemispherical body. Exterior smoothly finished with a few turning marks. Fine, buff clay with a few fine, red inclusions and some voids. 10YR 7.5/4.
\textsuperscript{81} See molds MF-1985-82 and MF-68-346, C. M. Edwards, 1981, pl. 43. For an acanthus leaf of the same type see Siebert, DI.90, DI.92, pl. 18; M.55, pl. 28. The Corinthian stamp is closely related to those used by the Argive workshops.
\textsuperscript{82} MF-1982-45, found June 3, 1982 east of the Theater in hard-packed, red earth south of wall 1 and west of wall 10. P. H. 0.028 m. Single rim fragment. Fine, buff clay pink at core. 10YR 7/3. MF-1985-83, found June 14, 1985 in Reservoir 1985-1, east of the Theater. See Williams, 1985, p. 150, note 17. P.H. 0.047 m. Two joining fragments of upper body and rim. Fine, light-tan clay with scattered fine, dark inclusions. 10YR 7/5.
\textsuperscript{83} The Nike originated in the Attic Workshop of Bion. She is found on two bowls (42, 43), probably products of the same mold, from the 1926 Reservoir.
The Corinthian fox appears on the wall of a moldmade krater (57) with comic-mask supports. One of the floral motifs of the calyx of 57 is a small frond with a dotted spine (Fig. 2:H) which also occurs on 12. This frond was inspired by an Attic floral motif but became very popular in Corinth. It appears on another large moldmade krater (53), this time with the Corinthian hare.

The calyx design of 53 is elaborate. One stamp, a rounded petal (N. nelumbo) from which springs a curving acanthus leaf (Fig. 2:J), occurs on several Corinthian bowls, one of which (16) comes from the 1926 Reservoir.\(^8^4\) We find it again on a fragmentary krater (51) which has a comic mask for a support. An identical comic mask came from the 1926 Reservoir (37), and its mold was found in the 1985 excavations.\(^8^5\)

The small frond with dotted spine is used as part of the medallion design on 17. The rounded ferns (Fig. 2:I) that form the calyx pattern on this bowl are exclusive to Corinth. They are also found on the large krater 20 from the Reservoir and on a figured bowl with hunting scenes (59). The latter has a rim pattern of vertical double spirals. The same stamp was used for part of the rim pattern on the pine-cone bowl 3 from the Reservoir (Fig. 2:B).

A closely interlocking system of decorative motifs begins to emerge from this reading. The same stamps were used over and over on bowls of different types. That a single workshop could produce bowls in such variety of both type and shape is not surprising. It happened at Athens and at Argos.

Six inventoried bowls from the Reservoir (2, 4, 9, 25, 34, 35) use decorative motifs either for the rim or the medallion, which find exact parallels on Argive bowls from the Monogram M Workshop and are of the same generation as those that appear on Argive bowls at Corinth.\(^8^6\) Either the Corinthian potters had access to stamps made from the same patrux or positive model, or else Argive molds were imported to Corinth. A fragmentary mold found in the 1985 excavation seems to be Argive (MF-1985-81; Pl. 90).\(^8^7\) It can be attributed to the Monogram M Workshop.\(^8^8\)

Two Corinthian bowls made from one mold are in every detail of design Argive.\(^8^9\) The one of this pair that he knew Siebert was led to attribute to the Monogram M Workshop. The fabric and glaze, however, are Corinthian. It would be more precise to say that the bowls were made in Corinth from a mold of the Monogram M Workshop.

---

\(^8^4\) The stamp was probably inspired by a motif on imports. See C-1977-99, possibly East Greek. This fragment compares with bowls from the Workshop of Menemachos, Dêlos XXXI, no. 1980, pls. 3, 116.

\(^8^5\) MF-1985-84, found June 6, 1985 east of the Theater in fill in drain 1 of the East Theater street. See Williams, 1985, p. 150, note 17. P.L. 0.055 m. Roughly hemispherical fragment with rounded exterior and irregularly smoothed lip. Fine, pinkish tan clay with sparkling inclusions, fired to light gray at core. From 7.5YR 7/4 to 5YR 7/6.


\(^8^7\) MF-1985-81, found May 6, 1985 east of the Theater above a terracotta drain in the west corridor, building 5. See Williams, 1985, p. 153, note 22. P.H. 0.036 m. Single fragment of mold with slightly flaring ring foot. Fine clay with scattered red-brown inclusions, fired tan or light brown on exterior, gray on interior. Sparkling inclusions. Between 7.5YR 6/4 and 5YR 6/4.

\(^8^8\) For the acanthus leaf, see Siebert, p. 53, no. M.55, pl. 28; for rampant goats flanking a kantharos, see Siebert, p. 57, nos. M.67–M.76, pl. 29.

\(^8^9\) C-48-14 = Corinth VII, iii, no. 843, pl. 73; C-69-149, C. M. Edwards, 1981, p. 196, pl. 42.
On CP-3209 (Pl. 90) the calyx is decorated with the large frond with striated and dotted spines (Fig. 1:D), the wall with figures from the Judgment of Paris series. The size and forms of these motifs are exactly the same as those found on Argive imports at Corinth. The clay and glaze are unmistakably Corinthian. CP-3209 must be a Corinthian bowl made in an Argive mold.

Three inventoried fragments from the 1926 Reservoir are Attic in every detail of design and in every motif (41, 42, 43). All three can, on these bases, be attributed to the Workshop of Bion. The fabrics of 41 and 42 fall into a kind of no-man’s-land we could call either pale Attic or pink Corinthian. 43 which comes from the same mold as 42 has a different fabric: a soft, light-gray clay with brown inclusions and a little mica. It is easier to accept these fragments as Attic than to argue that they are Corinthian. Nevertheless, since Argive molds were evidently imported to Corinth, Attic ones might have been as well. A fragment of a medallion and calyx from a bowl found in 1928 may be a Corinthian bowl made in an Attic mold (C-28-74; Pl. 90). The gorgoneion in the medallion is from the Workshop of Bion. The beading around the medallion never occurs on Corinthian bowls but is frequent on Attic. The clay, however, is unambiguously Corinthian.

On the other hand certain decorative details independent of molds, and of the same generation, were also passed from one center to another. Let us assume that if a workshop in Athens or Argos exported a quantity of material to be sold in Corinth, this material would be distributed by a ceramic commercial center. Together with bowls, molds and stamps were probably passed to the Corinthian potters. That is one explanation for the juxtaposition of first generation imported motifs with local stamps on Corinthian bowls. There is another possibility. If Athens led in the production of moldmade bowls, Argos and Corinth were soon to follow. Might not workmen from Athens have moved to other centers and taken molds and stamps with them? There is nothing to prove it, but a lot that suggests it. In one way or another, the workshop represented by the bowls from the 1926 Reservoir had close ties to both the Monogram Workshop at Argos and that of Bion in Athens.

Because of these “stolen” motifs, harsh judgment has been passed on Corinthian potters. One category of vases, represented by eight bowls from the 1926 Reservoir (1, 5, 15, 16, 20, 29, 36, 37), may show Corinth’s most original contribution to the manufacture of moldmade bowls.

90 CP-3209, inventoried in 1984; provenance unknown. Five joining fragments from calyx to mid-wall. P.H. 0.078 m. Fine, compacted light-buff clay. 10YR 8/2.5. Traces of black glaze inside and out. For the large frond, see pp. 397–398 above; for the Judgment of Paris series, see Courby, p. 387, fig. 80, no. 10 and Siebert, pp. 255–258.

91 C-47-796 and C-47-789. The stamp for the frond on the Corinthian bowl has been slightly reworked so that striations appear over dots. That is not surprising. In respect to Archaic terracotta figurines R. V. Nicholls (op. cit. [footnote 56 above], p. 223) writes “as a large number of moulds was usually taken directly from a single archetype, and as details done in intaglio on them had to be cut afresh in each case, we must inevitably expect these moulds to show an element of variation in the rendering of such details.”


93 Compare Agora XXII, p. 80, no. 295, pl. 56.

94 For potters moving and taking characteristic stamps with them in a later period, see J. A. Stanfield and G. Simpson, Central Gaulish Potters, London 1958, pp. xxxiv, 181.
bowls. These are large kraters with appliqué relief supports, which usually take the form of comic or tragic masks. G. R. Edwards first defined this type and considered it a variation of his figured-bowls classification. We now know that it also includes pine-cone, imbricate, and long-petal types. Siebert raised the possibility that these kraters were the products of a single Corinthian workshop. He noted that although no such kraters have been found in Argos, an Argive import to Corinth suggests that they were made in other centers as well.

No other site has produced so many examples of kraters with mask feet. G. R. Edwards listed 24 Corinthian examples and noted the presence of many foreign fragments of this type at Corinth. These “foreign” fragments were defined as such on the basis of fabric distinctions. We now know that the range of Corinthian fabric is wider than had been thought. I previously argued that in addition to the familiar fine, buff clay, Corinthian fabric includes a harder, pink variety. On this premise 11 of the examples, termed imports by G. R. Edwards, may be Corinthian. The fabric which I called Fabric D in 1981 now seems to me to be a gray variety of Corinthian. In addition to the close similarity in texture and degree of purity between Fabric D and other Corinthian wares, many bowls of this gray ware were made in the same molds as bowls of the more traditional Corinthian fabric.

Three tragic-mask supports at Corinth are of the Corinthian gray fabric (C-69-81 [Pl. 90], C-1978-55, C-1980-1 [Pl. 90]). A fragment of a long-petal krater found in 1980 (70) and of this clay probably was made from the same mold as 30. Two other gray, long-petal kraters can also be included as examples (C-37-2220, C-63-699). The fragment of a mold found in 1984 is for just such kraters (MF-1984-44; Pl. 90).

95 Corinth VII, iii, p. 171.
96 Siebert, pp. 75–77.
97 Ibid, p. 77. Only one very early pine-cone bowl with satyr-mask feet is included in Agora XXII, no. 1, p. 45, pl. 1.
100 Corinth VII, iii, p. 172, note 26, p. 173, note 28. The following bowls listed by G. R. Edwards have the hard, pink fabric which I identify as Corinthian: CP-889, C-29-115, C-34-356, C-34-2179, C-35-45, C-35-116 (53), C-37-2322, C-49-33, C-59-21, C-61-51, C-61-64. The last is from the same mold as the tragic-mask support on 16.
101 C. M. Edwards, 1981, pp. 203–204. For Corinthian lamps of the late Hellenistic period that were made of gray clay see Williams and Russell, op. cit. (footnote 11 above), pp. 39, 44. See also a local gray-ware pitcher of the 1st century after Christ, K. S. Wright, “A Tiberian Pottery Deposit,” Hesperia 49, 1980 (pp. 135–177), p. 151, no. 59.
102 C-69-81, found May 8, 1969 in Sacred Spring South, disturbance above quadriga base. Max. p. dim. 0.071; height of face 0.038 m. Mended from three fragments; preserves part of lower wall and appliqué relief head. Gray-buff clay with oval voids. 2.5Y 6/2. Black glaze. C-1980-1, found April 10, 1980 in Forum Northwest, general fill under Roman paving. Max. p. dim. 0.056, p.H. of head 0.037 m. Single fragment broken all around. Fine, gray clay with small black voids; slightly micaceous. 10YR 5/1 to 2.5Y 6/2. Black glaze.
103 MF-1984-44, found May 2, 1984 in dump fill north of the terrace ramp and buttress of phase 3 of the Theater. See Williams and Zervos, “Corinth, 1984, East of the Theater,” Hesperia 54 (pp. 55–96), pp. 73–74. P.H. 0.057 m. Single fragment of rim and upper wall. Buff clay with a few dark inclusions. 7.5YR 7/6 to 10YR 7.5/4.
Three fragmentary kraters, including 1 from the Reservoir, use the same stamp for the rim pattern: a large, simplified ivy leaf with a small fern in the center.\textsuperscript{104} Because that stamp is not found on either Argive or Attic bowls, it can be included as a motif characteristic of the workshop (see Fig. 2:C).

All these examples testify to an active Corinthian production of moldmade kraters, many with appliqué relief supports. The pine-cone krater (1) should probably not date much after 200 B.C., based on comparison with the Attic material.\textsuperscript{105} These kraters replaced the wheelmade bolster and hemispherical kraters of the 3rd century, as G. R. Edwards suggested.\textsuperscript{106}

Did Corinthian potters invent the use of masks as appliqué relief supports? Statistics would lead us to think so. There is, however, at Corinth a group of five relief-head supports which are not local.\textsuperscript{107} The fabric is a hard, compacted clay with some voids and a few inclusions. The color is a deep pinkish red (5YR 7/4 to 2.5YR 6/6). It is slightly micaceous. The glaze is uniformly a heavy, glossy black. This fabric finds its closest comparisons with examples identified as Campana A ware.\textsuperscript{108} The heads seem to have supported large vessels with thick, undecorated walls. Two types are preserved. One mask (CP-991; Pl. 90) depicts a youthful Dionysos or a maenad whose head is wreathed with ivy.\textsuperscript{109} The other is unquestionably female (C-37-2230; Pl. 90).\textsuperscript{110} Her hair is styled with a heavy braid running across the top of her head. Neither of these types was copied by Corinthian potters, which is surprising. The quality of their manufacture and design is very high. Perhaps these heads represent Italian imports which inspired the Corinthian potters to use masks as appliqué supports for their large kraters.

In 1981, I isolated five groups of figured bowls as a preliminary step to classification by workshops.\textsuperscript{111} Group III is probably from the same workshop as the bowls from the 1926 Reservoir. Group IV may also be from the same workshop, but if so, it represents a later stage of activity.\textsuperscript{112}

Group V constitutes a different group based on the repertoire of decorative motifs. A

\textsuperscript{104} The others are 71 and C-47-797.

\textsuperscript{105} Agora XXII, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{106} Corinth VII, iii, p. 45.

\textsuperscript{107} CP-991, CP-1923, C-37-2230, C-38-660, C-38-637.

\textsuperscript{108} C-48-21, found January 15, 1948 in South Stoa Well 1948-8. H. 0.047, est. diam. 0.133 m. Bowl mend- ed from seven fragments. Convex ring foot with flat resting surface; body rises with flaring walls in steep convex profile to outturned rim. Fine, light reddish clay with some red inclusions; rough fracture. Slightly browner than 5YR 7/4. Lustrous black glaze inside and out. On interior floor, four stamped palmettes encircled by one roll of rouletting.

\textsuperscript{109} CP-991, found in 1930 in the peribolos of Apollo. Max. p. dim. 0.06, H. of head 0.044 m.

\textsuperscript{110} C-37-2230, found May 17, 1937 in Forum Northeast below the forum bedding. H. of head 0.0455 m. Face chipped; nose broken.


\textsuperscript{112} Although there is some overlap of decorative motifs with the bowls from the Reservoir, several stamps appear in this group which are not represented in the 1926 material. In particular, note the bird in flight to right and the rim pattern of large ivy leaves. A frontal Nike appears on many of these bowls. Her origin is to be sought in Athens on bowls attributed to Workshop A and to Class 3. See Agora XXII, p. 31 and pl. 94.
frontal Nike with outspread wings is one characteristic stamp (Fig. 3:C); a large and simple ivy leaf applied on the rim usually in a very sloppy way is another (Fig. 3:A).\textsuperscript{113} Bead-and-reel and large eggs are other favorite stamps. Broad ferns with leaves alternately striated and concave frequently decorate the calyx (Fig. 3:B). Medallions have either large or small seven-petaled rosettes (Fig. 3:D, E). Because this workshop is much less tied to those of Argos and Athens, its bowls are easier to isolate than those of the previously discussed group. This second workshop produced mostly imbricate and figural bowls. It may also have manufactured long-petal bowls.\textsuperscript{114} The bowls are all approximately the same size and display a limited repertoire of motifs.\textsuperscript{115} None of the rim patterns, medallion designs, or filling ornaments characteristic of this workshop appear on the bowls from Reservoir 1926-2.

\textsuperscript{113} Add to the bowls listed in C. M. Edwards, 1981, p. 195 the following: \textit{Corinth VII}, iii, no. 791, pl. 65; no. 799; no. 821, pl. 70; no. 829, pl. 70; also CP-3201, C-30-168, C-30-172, C-30-174, C-69-148, C-1976-93, and C-1980-127.

\textsuperscript{114} C-30-168 and C-30-174.

\textsuperscript{115} One original contribution appears to be a group of dancing girls who encircle the wall. This design is found on three bowls: CP-3189, C-38-681 (= \textit{Corinth VII}, iii, no. 829, pls. 37, 70), and C-1980-140 (C. M. Edwards, 1981, pl. 45).
Those bowls which in 1981 I put in Group I remain an isolated group.\textsuperscript{116} Two more fragments can be added to them.\textsuperscript{117} I think they must all be late, \textit{ca.} 146 B.C. With such a small number, the term “workshop” hardly seems justifiable.

The figural stamps used by these last two groups are generally limited to the most common types derived from terracotta altars and from the Judgment of Paris series.\textsuperscript{118} The workshop of the 1926 Reservoir was somewhat more original. Six new figural motifs can be added to the repertoire of types (Fig. 4). They were invented and used only by the one workshop.

Most striking is the Athena who appears on 15 (Fig. 4:A). She wears an Attic helmet, has a small aegis over her chest, and is draped in a chiton and himation. She leans to the right, supported by her shield. Beside Athena on the same bowl is a young girl wearing a peplos (Fig. 4:B). She is in profile to the left. She seems to stand in a meditative mood, with her left arm stretched forward and possibly her right hand raised to her chin.\textsuperscript{119} On the same bowl and on 20 is a woman seated to right on a rock(?); she lifts her himation from her face with her left hand (Fig. 4:C). On 16 is the lower half of a girl dressed in a long skirt (Fig. 4:D). The movement of the folds suggests that she is dancing. Two other fragments preserve the upper half of the figure.\textsuperscript{120} She holds a lyre in her left arm; perhaps she is a Muse. 17 and 20 show a regal woman with a scepter in her right hand and a polos on her head (Fig. 4:E). Her left hand is propped on her hip.\textsuperscript{121}

20 preserves a type of design otherwise unparalleled on bowls from the Greek mainland. The shape is that of a large leaf, \textit{N. nelumbo}, the tip of which falls forward (Fig. 4:F). Within the upper half of the leaf two banqueters recline to the right on a cushion. A curtain hangs behind them. The banqueter at left raises a horsehead rhyton in his right hand. The banqueter at right also lifts his right arm; in his left hand he holds a small bowl. The lower half of the leaf is not preserved on this fragment but is partially so on another fragment from a large krater found in 1934.\textsuperscript{122} The leaf tapers to a point; its sides are dotted. Within grows an acanthus leaf flanked by flowers on leafy stems.

\textit{N. nelumbo} petals as a decorative motif are thought to have originated in Alexandrian metalwork.\textsuperscript{123} L. Byvanck-Quarles van Ufford who studied the evolution of this design considered the petals inhabited by figures to be the latest stage of the development, not appearing before the 1st century B.C.\textsuperscript{124} Siebert sought the origin of the “animated” petal in

\textsuperscript{117} C-30-38 and C-30-40.
\textsuperscript{118} See footnotes 58 and 90 above.
\textsuperscript{119} A fragment found in 1985 (C-1985-146) preserves the best impression of this figure, although it is still unclear if she did indeed raise her right hand to her chin.
\textsuperscript{120} CP-1620 and C-30-132.
\textsuperscript{121} The same figure appears on a Corinthian fragment, CP-1603, and on a fragment from Kenchreai, B. Adamscheck, \textit{Kenchreai, IV, The Pottery}, Leiden 1979, p. 16, Gr. 38, pl. 4. Adamscheck mistakenly identified the figure as Leto from the terracotta-altar series.
\textsuperscript{122} C-34-2008; see also CP-1603.
\textsuperscript{124} Byvanck-Quarles van Ufford, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 7.
Fig. 4. Figural motifs: A) Athena from 15; B) Peplophoros from 15; C) Seated woman from 15; D) Muse(?), reconstructed from 16 and C-30-132; E) Goddess with polos and scepter, reconstructed from 17, 20, and CP-1603; F) Nymphaea nelumbo with banqueters, reconstructed from 20, G-34-2008, and MF 13676

Taranto and thought that the concept was not related to an evolutionary stylistic principle. Rather it was the spontaneous creation by Tarentine potters who wished to suggest little caves filled with people.\(^{125}\) On the other hand, Siebert did not question the late date of the image.

\(^{125}\) Siebert, pp. 141–145.
Despite the stylistic arguments for a date in the 1st century B.C., the Corinthian fragments suggest that the motif was in use in the first quarter of the 2nd century.\(^{126}\) There also exists in the Corinth inventories a stamp for this type (MF 13676; Pl. 90).\(^{127}\) On the stamp Eros and a female companion dine while reclining on a cushion. The floral design below is exactly paralleled on the 1934 fragment.\(^{128}\)

*N. nelumbo* petals filled with figures are not infrequent on East Greek bowls.\(^{129}\) Laumonier refrained from dating the Delos material precisely, but Callaghan has suggested that the first three workshops represented in *Délos XXXI* are early, certainly producing bowls before 166.\(^{130}\) "That is convincing. Possibly the Corinthian potter was inspired by motifs on bowls from the Workshop of Menemachos.\(^{131}\) At any rate, the image on 20 is probably a Corinthian invention. Beside the East Greek examples, it is decidedly chaste. Contact with the East Greek workshops seems to have been much less direct than with those in Argos and Athens.\(^{132}\)

The bowls, including those from the Reservoir, attributed on the basis of decorative motifs to a single workshop can be divided into two groups: big and little bowls, or more precisely kraters and drinking cups. Certain figural and decorative motifs were used primarily for one or the other. That is to be expected. The kraters required large motifs in order that their surfaces might not appear confused and messy. Because the workshop excelled in the production of large kraters, its original contributions to the iconographic repertoire are often found on these bowls. Smaller drinking cups preserve the standard figural types appropriate to their size. Nevertheless there is enough overlap in decorative motifs between these two groups to assure us that they are products of one workshop. The two groups share a similar decorative syntax. The workshop preferred calyces of tall ferns and acanthus leaves. Small figural motifs are frequently placed between the floral ornaments. Larger figural elements are usually placed on a single level, above the calyx. There is no strong iconographic coherence. Rim patterns are simple.

If Hellenistic pottery is indeed the "ugly duckling of Greek ceramics,"\(^{133}\) then it is hard to claim a place for our bowls anywhere but at the very back of the flock. The few original

\(^{126}\) Only M. T. M. Moevs ("Italo-Megarian Ware at Cosa," *MAAR* 34, 1980 [pp. 157–227], p. 202) has suggested that the *N. nelumbo* framing figurative scenes may have appeared as early as the first half of the 2nd century.

\(^{127}\) MF 13676, found May 4, 1960 in Agora Southwest. H. 0.081. Fine, pinkish tan clay with some small voids and white inclusions. 7.5YR 6/6. Broken at upper right. Stub on back chipped.

\(^{128}\) The stamp bears a similarity to a scene on the famous bowl by Popilius in the Vatican (Museo Gregoriano, inv. no. 14411) dated ca. 100 B.C. See most recently Siebert, pp. 143–144, and Moevs, *op. cit.* (footnote 126 above), pp. 193–194, pls. 17:1, 18.

\(^{129}\) *Délos XXXI*, pl. 3, nos. 1980, 1343; pl. 4, nos. 1340, 1958.

\(^{130}\) Callaghan, *op. cit.* (footnote 41 above), p. 42.


\(^{132}\) Siebert (pp. 194–195) suggests that East Greek bowls were not imported to Greece proper until the second half of the 2nd century. On the whole that seems to be true, although the *N. nelumbo* with figures and the wind-blown acanthus on 16, 52, and 53 seem to have their origins in the East. The majority of the East Greek bowls at Corinth can be attributed to workshops active at the end of the 2nd century and the beginning of the 1st. See C. M. Edwards, 1981, pp. 198–199. These provide good evidence for a settlement at Corinth ca. 100 B.C. and thereafter.

contributions of the potters had only a limited appeal, both topographically and chronologically. But if we can narrow our aesthetic criteria, then perhaps the products of this workshop show a readiness to absorb ideas and a willingness to experiment, which give the bowls a kind of charm. Corinthians were never opposed to a good idea, their own or another’s.

**CATALOGUE**

The catalogue is arranged in two parts. The first gives a representative sample of the inventoried pieces from Reservoir 1926-2. The second lists bowls attributed to the Reservoir workshop. If bowls have been previously published, reference is given to that publication. If the bowls are unpublished, a full description is given. Conventions and terminology generally follow those in the catalogue of *Agora* XXII; all dimensions are in meters. Since it has been my intention to show not only that the bowls from the Reservoir come from one workshop but that the workshop had close ties with others, both in Argos and Athens, comparative pieces are listed below each description. In reference to individual motifs, some can be verified as having been made by the same stamp or by a second or third generation use of the same motif. Those distinctions are noted. When “compare” is used, the word means there is a close similarity between motifs but not necessarily that they are impressions from the same stamp.

**I. BOWLS FROM RESERVOIR 1926-2**

**CORINTHIAN**

1. (C-1926-45 a–f) Pine-cone bowl  Pl. 85
   P.H. a) 0.115, b) 0.096, c) 0.075, d) 0.037, e) 0.04, f) 0.035. Six non-joining sections preserving part of medallion, wall, and part of rim. Overfired clay ranges in color from greenish white to pink (7.5YR 8/2 to 7.5YR 8/4). Traces of mica, many small oval pits and light-brown inclusions.


   Compare *Agora* XXII, nos. 1, 2, 4. For fragments of similar Corinthian pine-cone kraters, see *Corinth* VII, iii, no. 783 and C-1980-128, C. M. Edwards, 1981, p. 197, pl. 45.

2. (C-1926-68) Pine-cone bowl  Pl. 85
   P.H. 0.067. Four joining fragments of upper wall and rim. Fine, pinkish clay with many oval pits and small, white inclusions (7.5YR 7/4).


   For Corinthian pine-cone bowl possibly from the same mold see *Corinth* VII, iii, no. 784. Rim, same stamp: 39 and on imported Argive bowls, e.g. C-47-789 (*Hesperia* 18, 1949, pl. 13, fig. 2 at left) attributed to Monogram Φ Workshop (Siebert, p. 76).

3. (C-1926-34) Pine-cone bowl  Pl. 85
   P.H. 0.074. Eight joining fragments; full profile preserved. Overfired, pale green clay with many small pits and some inclusions (2.5YR 8/2).


   Rim, same stamp of vertical double spirals: 59, 60, 61. Compare patterns on bowls from Gortys (Siebert, no. Go.34, pl. 49, 85:2).

4. (C-1926-33 a–c) Imbricate bowl  Pl. 85
   P.H. a) 0.131, b) 0.05, c) 0.037. Three non-joining sections preserving part of medallion, wall, and rim. Overfired, pale green clay, pink at outer edge. Small and large pits; small white inclusions (10YR 8/2 to 7.5YR 8/4).

Same mold: C-69-149. Same stamp for lotus petals on two bowls from Isthmia, IP 3435 and IP 2097, and on an uninvested sherd from the Reservoir. Rim, same stamp: 9, 34, 62, 64; Corinth VII, iii, no. 796 = Siebert, no. Co.4, pl. 44; Corinth VII, iii, no. 843, pl. 73.

5 (C-1926-42 a–c) Imbricate bowl Pl. 85
P.H. a) 0.042, b) 0.057, c) 0.03, d) 0.024, e) 0.03.
Five non-joining sections of wall and rim. Pale green clay with some pits and many fine inclusions (10YR 8/1).
Wall: imbricate pattern of small ferns. Trace of attachment for appliqué relief support on e. Rim: wavy line drawn freehand; dots above and below. In empty spaces above line, birds in flight to left. In empty spaces below line, ten-petaled rosettes. Worn black glaze on exterior.

Birds in flight to left, same stamp, third generation: 12, 56; same motif, second generation: 24, 61, C-1981-107 = Hesperia 55, 1982, no. 27, pl. 40; Argive import C-47-789 = Hesperia 18, 1949, pl. 13, fig. 2 at left, Monogram Σ Workshop; same motif, first generation: 41, Attic import, Workshop of Bion. Ten-petaled rosette, same motif, first generation: Argive imports, C-47-788 = Siebert, pl. 44, Co.6; C-47-796 = Siebert, pl. 46, Co.8, Monogram Σ Workshop.

6 (MF 13668) Mold for imbricate bowl Pl. 85
P.H. 0.108. Fragment from foot to upper wall. Hard-fired, well-compacted, gray-green clay, fired to buff at core (near 2.5YR 7/4, surface; 10YR 7/3, core).
Mold has ring foot (broken away), deep convexo-hemispherical body. Wheelmarks on smoothed exterior. On interior, trace of medallion ridge. Impressed in imbricate pattern are pointed leaves with dotted edges and two ribs down center.

Leaf pattern, same stamp: 18, 23.

7 (C-1926-28 a, b) Imbricate and floral Pl. 85
bowl
P.H. a) 0.073, b) 0.055; est. diam. 0.140. Two non-joining sections preserving upper wall and rim. Color of clay ranges from pale brown to orange. Small pits and inclusions, mostly white (7.5YR 7/4 to 5YR 7/6).
Wall: lower wall, small ferns in an imbricate pattern; upper wall, a garland of alternating leaves and buds. Glaze ranges from bluish green to red. Double-dipping streak on interior.
Compare garland on Argive bowl possibly to be attributed to Workshop of Demetrios-Iason, Siebert, Di.39, pls. 15, 72:2. Same stamp for leaves: C-47-334, C-1980-162.

8 (C-1926-79) Floral bowl Pl. 86
P.H. 0.065. Two joining fragments preserving upper wall and rim. Slightly micaceous, pale green clay with some oval voids and light inclusions (10YR 8/2).
Compare C-63-613, Attic bowl, possibly Workshop of Bion.

9 (C-1926-50) Floral bowl (Leaf and Pl. 86
Tendril)
P.H. 0.07. Seven joining fragments preserving entire profile. Pale greenish clay, slightly micaceous, with oval pits and small white and brown inclusions (2.5YR 8/2).
Medallion, same stamp: 25, 62, 63, 66. Rim, same stamp: 4, 9, 62, 64. See 4 for comparanda.

10 (C-1926-35) Figured bowl (Idyllic) Pl. 86
P.H. 0.104. Two joining fragments preserving upper wall and rim. Overfired clay ranging from pale green to yellow; many small pits and black and white inclusions (10YR 8/2 to 10YR 7/6).

11 (C-1926-78) Figured bowl (Idyllic) Pl. 86

P.H. 0.051. Single fragment broken all around, preserves part of upper wall and rim. Fine, buff clay with some voids and inclusions (10YR 8/3).

Wall: satyr kneeling to left, trace of kantharos at left. Rim: horizontal double spirals, vertical striations.

*Satyr*: compare *Pnyx*, p. 97, no. 32 b, pls. 40, 51; probably to be attributed to Workshop of Bion. See *Agora* XXII, no. 134, p. 60. Horizontal double spirals: compare 3, 10.

12 (C-1926-29) Figs. 1:C, 2:A, D, Pl. 86

Figured bowl

P.H. 0.08; est. diam. 0.135. Nine joining fragments preserving wall and rim. Soft clay ranging in color from buff to orange; small pits and several large white inclusions (10YR 7/4 to 5YR 6/8).

Calyx: fronds with dotted spines; between fronds alternate birds in flight to left and Erotes riding swans. Wall: hounds and hares running left; deer and foxes running right. Rim: large horizontal double spirals above frieze of foxes running right. Glaze ranging from black to red on interior and exterior. Signed at right edge △.


13 (C-1926-30) Figured bowl Fig. 2:E, Pl. 86

P.H. 0.034. Single fragment preserving part of upper wall and rim. Pinkish buff clay with small voids and inclusions (5YR 8/2).

Wall: hound running left. Rim: horizontal double spirals; below, foxes running right. Red glaze on interior and exterior.

Probably from same mold as 12.

14 (C-1926-41) Figured bowl Pl. 86

P.H. 0.051. Four joining fragments of wall. Light-brown clay with some pits, many fine white spots, and some inclusions (5YR 7/6).

Calyx: small ferns in imbricate pattern. Wall: Nikai driving chariots pulled by panthers. Brown glaze on exterior; red glaze on interior.


15 (C-1926-24 a-d) Figs. 1:E, 4:A–C, Pl. 86

Figured bowl

P.H. a) 0.15, b) 0.14, c) 0.013, d) 0.028. Four non-joining sections of wall and part of rim. Hard-fired, gray-green clay; many oval pits and white inclusions (2.5Y 7/2).


*Tall frond*, same stamp, second generation: 48, 49; same motif, first generation: 50, CP-3209; Argive imports: 40, C-47-796 = Siebert, Co.8, pl. 46; C-47-789 = *Hesperia* 18, 1949, pl. 13, fig. 2 at left, Monogram ロ Workshop; compare *Pnyx*, no. 5. *Goats*, same stamp, second generation: 49, C-1980-163, C. M. Edwards, 1981, pl. 45; same motif, first generation: 19, Argive import, C-47-788 = Siebert, Co.6, pl. 44, Monogram ロ Workshop. Corinthian mold: MF-69-362. Figural stamps: *Athena leaning*
on shield, owl: unparalleled(?); woman seated on rock: 20; girl in profile to left: C-1985-146; Prokne(?): same motif, first generation, Attic import G-36-2087; compare Agora XXII, no. 202, pl. 38. Other figural stamps from standard repertoire. Bucranium, same stamp: 10, with comparanda.

16 (C-1926-27) Figured bowl Figs. 2:J, 4:D, Pl. 87

P.H. 0.13. Six joining fragments preserving three quarters of medallion and part of lower wall. Light-brown clay with small and large pits, white inclusions (slightly lighter than 7.5YR 6/4).

Medallion: eight-petaled rosette surrounded by small ferns. Calyx: tips of small leaves, series of broad, rounded leaves the tips of which bend forward (N. nelumbo); inside these leaves other plant forms; acanthus leaves with spines curving to the left, tips to the right. Wall: hunter with spear, woman in long dress (Muse?), Eros, unidentified figure. Tragic-mask support: thick hair on top, fillet across forehead, open mouth. Lower face squeezed together when applied to surface. Black glaze on exterior. Double-dipping streak on interior.


17 (C-1926-40 a–c) Figured bowl Fig. 4:E, Pl. 87

P.H. a) 0.06, b) 0.041, c) 0.025. Three non-joining sections preserving concave medallion, wall, and part of rim. Fine, pinkish buff clay, slightly micaceeous; some pits and white spots (7.5YR 7/4).


Frond, same stamp: 12, 57, 58. Fern, same stamp: 20, 59. Woman with scepter, same stamp: 20, CP-1603. Other figural stamps from standard repertoire. Rim: unparalleled(?).

18 (C-1926-39) Figured bowl Fig. 2:G, Pl. 87

P.H. 0.05. Three joining fragments of concave resting surface and wall. Grayish green clay with oval pits and many small black and white inclusions (10YR 7/2).

Medallion: pointed leaves forming eight-pointed pattern. Calyx: pointed leaves with dotted borders alternating with tall fronds. Wall: Hermes, Athena, Aphrodite, Hera. Traces of black glaze on exterior. Ridge across medallion indicates that mold was cracked.

Medallion, compare 23, 24. Leaf pattern, same stamp: 6, 23; compare Agora XXII, nos. 308, 316; Pnyx, nos. 57, 58.

19 (C-1926-58 a–d) Figured bowl Pl. 87

P.H. a) 0.065, b) 0.026, c) 0.028, d) 0.028. Four non-joining sections of part of wall and rim. Overfired, gray clay with oval voids and dark inclusions (5Y 7/1).

Calyx: rampant goats flanking acanthus leaves; between backs of goats, ten-petaled rosettes. Wall: separated from calyx by ridge; Amymone, legs of animal (Eros on horseback), leafy branch. Rim: Eggs with striated darts at left.

Goats: see 15. Acanthus, same stamp: 64, 65, 68; compare Siebert, M.55, pl. 28, Monogram 41 Workshop. Eros on horseback, same stamp: 47.

20 (C-1926-32 a–d) Figured bowl Fig. 4:E, F, Pl. 87

P.H. a) 0.16, b) 0.10, c) 0.05, d) 0.09. Four non-joining sections of wall and rim. Overfired, pale green clay with oval pits and many small dark and white inclusions. Slight traces of mica (2.5YR 8/2).

Wall, decorated in three friezes. Lowest frieze: acanthus leaves alternating with large petals the tips of which bend forward (N. nelumbo). Between acanthus leaves and petals are ferns. Inside the petals are two banqueters who recline to right in front of a curtain. The edge of the curtain is visible at left. Banqueter at left raises in his right hand a rhyton with horse protome; banqueter at right holds bowl in his left hand. Cushion beneath figures. Middle frieze: a) woman seated on rock, woman with scepter. b) Ajax and Cassandra, tall-stemmed kantharos, woman with scepter(?). Upper frieze: large


_of_ Palmette: compare Agora XXII, no. 187, pl. 34, Workshop A.

21 (C-1926-43) Figured bowl Pl. 87
P.H. 0.09. Single fragment of wall. Pale buff clay with many pits and some white inclusions (7.5YR 8/4 to 7.5YR 7/4).

Frontal Erotes with wings spread and hands behind back. Black glaze on interior and exterior.

Same stamp: 16, 47, Corinth VII, iii, no. 875, pl. 76; same motif, second generation: 22.

22 (C-1926-44) Figured bowl Pl. 87
P.H. 0.045. Single fragment of lower wall. Pale buff clay, slightly micaceous, some white spots (10YR 8/3).

Frontal Erotes with wings spread and hands behind back. Trace of attachment for appliqué relief support. Ridge above. Traces of black glaze on exterior, more consistently preserved on interior.

Same motif, first generation: see 21.

23 (C-1926-52) Wall fragment Pl. 87
Max. p. dim. 0.076. Four joining fragments preserving slightly concave resting surface and about one fourth of lower wall. Pale green clay with small pits and many black and white inclusions (2.5Y 8/2).

Medallion: eight pointed leaves in radiating pattern. Calyx: acanthus leaves with striated spines alternating with the tips of pointed leaves. Above the latter and between the acanthus leaves are pointed leaves outlined with dots. Wall: Trace of old-man mask. Black glaze on exterior; red glaze on interior.


24 (C-1926-59) Wall fragment Pl. 88
Max. p. dim. 0.058. Two joining fragments of medallion and lower wall. Light-red clay with many small white inclusions (2.5YR 6/6).

Medallion: eight pointed leaves in radiating pattern. Calyx: tips of pointed leaves alternating with acanthus leaves. Between acanthus leaves, birds in flight to left. Red glaze on interior and exterior.

Medallion: compare 18, 23. Acanthus, same stamp: 23 with comparanda. Bird in flight to left, same stamp: 61; C-1981-107 = Hesperia 51, 1982, no. 27, pl. 40; Argive import, C-47-789 = Hesperia 18, 1949, pl. 13, fig. 2 at left, Monogram Μ Workshop; for other generations of same motif see 5.

25 (C-1926-57) Wall fragment Pl. 88
Max. p. dim. 0.053. Single fragment of part of medallion and lower wall. Slightly micaceous, pinkish brown clay with white inclusions (7.5YR 7/4).


Medallion, same stamp: 9, 62, 63, 66; compare Siebert, M.92, pl. 30, Monogram Μ Workshop.

26 (C-1926-62) Wall fragment Pl. 88
Max. p. dim. 0.052. Single fragment of part of medallion and lower wall. Slightly micaceous pink clay with some small inclusions (7.5YR 7/4).

Medallion: radiating ferns. Calyx: alternating tall and short ferns with dotted spines. Between tall ferns are tips of other triangular ferns. Wall: pendant clusters of grapes. Micaceous brown glaze on interior and exterior. Stamps very worn; some motifs were pressed twice into the mold so that forms overlap.

Grapes, same stamp: 59.

27 (C-1926-53) Wall fragment Pl. 88
P.H. 0.03. Single fragment. Pale green clay, slightly micaceous with many brown and white inclusions (2.5Y 7/2).
Calyx: fronds with dotted spines, each topped with loop. Wall: prancing griffins(?). Traces of black glaze on exterior.

*Fronds and griffins*, compare *Agora* XXII, no. 168, pl. 31, Workshop of Bion.

28 (C-1926-56) Wall fragment Pl. 88

P.H. 0.051. Three joining fragments of lower wall. Fine, slightly micaceous, light-brown clay with some pits.

Calyx: acanthus leaves between which is a lily on a wavy stem. Row of dots. Trace of motif (ivy leaf?) above. Dark glaze on interior and exterior.

*Acanthus*, same stamp: 68; compare Corinthian bowl from Isthmia, IP 1251. *Lily*: compare two Corinthian bowls from Isthmia, IP 3358, IP 3357.

29 (C-1926-46 a–d) Long-petal krater Pl. 88

P.H. a) 0.064, b) 0.09, c) 0.039, d) 0.025. Four non-joining sections of wall. Clay ranges from greenish brown to pink; many small and large pits; dark and light inclusions (10YR 7/3 to 5YR 7/3).


Possibly from same mold as 30. Compare 70, 71, C-63-699, MF-1984-44.

30 (C-1926-47 a–c) Long-petal krater Pl. 88

P.H. a) 0.05, b) 0.04, c) 0.04. Three non-joining fragments of wall and rim. Greenish brown clay, slightly micaceous, a few oval pits, and small black and white inclusions (slightly lighter than 10YR 7/3).

Wall: convex contiguous long petals. Rim: ivy leaf.

Possibly from same mold as 29 and 70. See 29 for comparanda.

31 (C-1926-16) Shield bowl Pl. 88

P.H. 0.073; est. diam. 0.14. Three joining fragments from medallion to lip. Slightly sandy, fine clay with oval pits, white inclusions. Fired light tan (7.5YR 7/4–7/6).

Medallion: two rows of bosses. Wall: three pendant semicircles with whirligig in center; bosses in field. Two rows of bosses above. Rim: horizontal double spirals. Dull black glaze on interior; on exterior glaze ranges from black to red.

Compare *Corinth* VII, iii, no. 931, pl. 81. *Rim*, same stamp: 12, 13, 72, MF-1985-83.

32 (C-1926-55) Shield bowl Pl. 88

Max. p. dim. 0.064. Single fragment of convex resting surface. Light-brown clay, slightly micaceous, some small pits and white inclusions (7.5YR 6/4).

Medallion: whirligig surrounded by ridges. Calyx: semicircular loops with central bosses; bosses separating loops and surrounding medallion. Two ridges surround design. Black glaze on interior and exterior.

*Medallion*, compare C-65-565. For *shield-bowl design* as calyx compare Siebert, M.99, pl. 30 and An.8, pl. 40.

33 (C-1926-61) Net-pattern bowl Pl. 88

P.H. 0.04. Single fragment of wall and part of rim. Slightly micaceous, grayish white clay with many small voids and some inclusions (2.5YR 8/2).

Wall: net pattern with Erotes within each division. Ridge above. Traces of black glaze on exterior. Stamps very worn.

*Net pattern*: compare 72. *Erotes*: compare *Agora* XXII, no. 87, pl. 15, Workshop A, and many other examples.

34 (CP-2721) Net-pattern bowl (Cross-hatching) Pl. 88

H. 0.071–0.072; diam. 0.126. Complete bowl with flat resting surface, flaring body, tall vertical rim, and flaring lip. Mended from ten fragments. Fine clay without noticeable inclusions, fired light tan (near 7.5YR 7/4).


Compare 35; *Agora* XXII, no. 404, pl. 69; two Corinthian bowls from Isthmia, IP 3499, IP 3561. *Rim*, same stamp: 4, 9, 62, 64. See 4 for comparanda.
35 (C-1926-48) Net-pattern bowl  Pl. 88
(Crosshatching)
P.H. 0.043. Single fragment of wall and part of rim. Fine, buff clay, slightly micaceous, some white inclusions (5YR 8/4).
Wall: crosshatching. Rim: simplified ivy leaf. Glaze on interior and exterior ranges from dark brown to red.
See 34.

36 (C-1926-69) Comic-mask support  Pl. 88
P.H. 0.07; H. of mask 0.05. Fragment of lower wall broken all around; appliqué relief support attached. Lower lip chipped; top of head worn. Air-hole at right. Light-brown clay with oval pits and some white and dark inclusions (10YR 7/3).
Same mold: 47, 48.

37 (C-1926-70) Comic-mask support  Pl. 88
P.H. 0.057. Two joining fragments of appliqué relief mask. Pale brown clay with small white inclusions (10YR 6/3).

Comic-mask support: broadly open mouth, pug nose, projecting brows. Incised striations on top of head to indicate hair. Partially preserved dark glaze on exterior; traces of dark glaze on interior.
Mold: MF-1985-84; same motif, second generation: 51.

ARGIVE

38 (C-1926-31) Figured bowl  Pl. 88
P.H. 0.057. Single fragment of wall and part of rim zone. Coarse, pink clay with many fine pits and some small white inclusions (2.5YR 6/4).
Calyx: compare Siebert, M.45, pl. 27. Nike in biga: compare Siebert, M.48, pl. 27.

39 (C-1926-54) Figured bowl(?)  Pl. 88
P.H. 0.045. Single fragment of rim. Coarse, micaceous, brown clay with many pits and black and white inclusions (slightly darker than 5YR 7/9).
Wall: trace of figure(?). Rim: simplified ivy leaf. Dark brown glaze on interior and exterior.

40 (C-1926-49) Wall fragment  Pl. 89
P.H. 0.036. Single wall fragment. Coarse, micaceous clay with some pits and black and white inclusions (2.5YR 6/4).

Tall fronds with striated spines and leaves alternating with large rosettes on tall stems. Traces of dark glaze on interior and exterior.
Tall frond, same stamp: Argive imports C-47-796 = Siebert, Co.8, pl. 46; C-47-789 = Hesperia 18, 1949, pl. 13, fig. 2 at left.

ATTIC

41 (C-1926-37) Figured bowl  Fig. 1:A, Pl. 89
P.H. 0.052. Fragment of upper wall and rim. Fine, buff clay with some voids and inclusions (7.5YR 8/4).

Wall: Triton and bird in flight to left. Rim: pairs of double spirals crowned by small leaves, row of beading with simplified ivy leaf below. Black glaze on interior and exterior.
Rim: compare Agora XXII, no. 172, pl. 31. Bird in flight to left: compare Agora XXII, no. 154, pl. 28.
Workshop of Bion.

42 (C-1926-76) Figured bowl  Pl. 89
P.H. 0.045. Four joining fragments of upper wall and part of rim. Hard, pinkish clay with a few oval voids and white spots (5YR 7/4).


Probably same mold: 43. Old-man mask, same motif, second generation: 46; compare Agora XXII, no. 238, pl. 46, no. 243, pl. 48; Pnyx, no. 49. Nike: compare Agora XXII, no. 238, pl. 46. Rim: compare Agora XXII, no. 171, pl. 31, no. 275, pl. 54.
Workshop of Bion.
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43  (C-1926-77) Figured bowl  Pl. 89
P.H. 0.034. Fragment of wall. Soft, light-gray clay with brown inclusions (10YR 7/1).
Wall: Herakles and Auge, old-man mask, Nike, Zeus and Ganymede, old-man mask.
Probably from same mold as 42. See 42 for comparanda.

44  (C-1926-60) Rim fragment  Pl. 89
P.H. 0.03. Single fragment of upper wall and part of rim. Fine, reddish yellow clay (5YR 6/6).
Wall: trace of figure(?). Rim: small ferns, jewelining, egg-and-dart, jewelining, pendent small ferns.
Lustrous black glaze on interior and exterior.
Compare Attic import to Aigina, Siebert, E.22, pl. 61. Pendent ferns: compare Agora XXII, no. 320, pl. 58, no. 237, pl. 45.

45  (C-1926-38) Rim fragment  Pl. 89
P.H. 0.031. Single fragment of rim. Fine, reddish yellow clay (5YR 7/6).
Pairs of double spirals crowned by palmettes, row of jewelining, simplified ivy leaf. Black glaze on interior and exterior. Scraped groove with added miltos below lip.
Compare 41; Agora XXII, no. 120, pl. 21, no. 129, pl. 24, no. 130, pl. 25, no. 134, pl. 25.
Workshop of Bion.

46  (C-1926-51) Medallion and lower  Pl. 89
P.H. 0.053. Single fragment of medallion and part of calyx. Fine, light-brown clay, some bits of mica (2.5YR 6/4).
Rosettes: compare Pnyx, no. 50, pl. 41; Agora XXII, no. 177, pl. 32. Old-man mask, same motif, first generation: 42, 43. See 42 for comparanda.
Workshop of Bion.

II. BOWLS ATTRIBUTED TO THE RESERVOIR WORKSHOP

Attributions to the workshop are based on decorative motifs. It has seemed safest to limit the attributions to bowls on which two or more motifs characteristic of the workshop appear together. Motifs derived from Argive or Attic workshops are not used for the attribution unless they appear frequently and in conjunction with exclusively Corinthian motifs.

47  (C-48-62 + C-36-499) Figured bowl  Corinth VII, iii, no. 873, p. 172, pls. 38, 76.
Corinth VII, iii, no. 873, p. 172.
Characteristic motifs: large fronds with dots and striations (second generation), frontal Eros (first generation), Eros on horseback, appliqué relief mask (as on 36).

Characteristic motifs: large fronds with dots and striations (second generation), appliqué relief mask (as on 36).

49  (C-1985-145) Figured bowl  Pl. 89
P.H. 0.064. Single wall fragment. Found east of the Theater in the northwest room of building 5; see Williams, 1983, p. 152. Hard, pink clay with oval pits and white inclusions (5YR 7/3).
Tall fronds decorated with striations and dots (second generation); between fronds, rampant goats. Compare 15; probably from same mold. Trace of appliqué relief support.

50  (C-30-145) Figured bowl  Corinth VII, iii, no. 895, p. 174.
Characteristic motifs: large fronds with dots and striation (first generation), rampant goats, trace of appliqué relief support. Possibly Corinthian bowl made in Argive mold.

51  (C-69-85) Medallion and calyx  Pl. 89

52 (C-31-104) Rim fragment

Corinth VII, iii, no. 877, pp. 172–173.


53 (C-35-116) Figured bowl

Fig. 2:F, Pl. 89


Calyx: N. nelumbo with floral motifs inside, from which spring curving acanthus leaves (16, 51, 52). Between leaves, tall fronds with dots. Wall: hunt scene with hounds, boars, and hares (12). Tragic-mask support.

54 (C-35-88) Figured bowl

Corinth VII, iii, p. 173, no. 884.

Characteristic motifs: tall frond with striations and dots (second generation). Tragic-mask support.

55 (C-31-480) Figured bowl

Corinth VII, iii, no. 827, p. 169, pl. 70.

Characteristic stamp: Eros on swan (12).

56 (C-47-51) Figured bowl

Pl. 89

H. 0.077. Eight joining fragments preserving complete profile. Convex wall, straight rim, outturned lip. Trace of ridge around medallion. Found 1947, South Stoa well XXX, Corinth VII, iii, p. 234. Hard, pinkish brown clay with small round pits; a few brown and many white inclusions (7.5YR 8/4 to 10YR 8/3).

Calyx: ferns with striated spines alternate with eight-petaled rosettes. Above, birds in flight to left. Wall: foxes leaping right (12, 13, 57). Rim: small rosettes framed by narrow double ridges. Glaze on exterior ranges from dark blue on wall to red on lip. Glaze on interior ranges from greenish blue to red. Scraped groove below lip.

57 (CP-3073) Figured bowl

Fig. 2:H, Pl. 89

Max. p. dim. 0.178. Single fragment preserving medallion and part of lower wall. Exact findspot unknown. Hard, pink clay with a few small voids and white and dark inclusions (5YR 7/3).

Medallion: eight-petaled rosette surrounded by small fronds. Two ridges around medallion. Calyx: tall fronds, between which are small fronds with dotted spines (12, 17, 58). Wall: foxes leaping right (second generation: 12, 13, 56), small Erotes flying left. Comic-mask supports. Dark black glaze on interior and exterior. Bowl made in cracked mold.

58 (C-1981-106) Figured bowl


Characteristic motifs: frond with dotted spine (12, 17, 57), Nikai in chariot pulled by panthers (14, 61).

59 (CP-250) Figured bowl

Fig. 2:B, I

Corinth VII, iii, p. 170, no. 842, pls. 72, 73.

Characteristic motifs: rounded fern (17, 20), vertical double spirals (3, 60, 61).

60 (C-30-143) Figured bowl

Corinth VII, iii, p. 170, no. 841, pl. 71.

Characteristic motifs: tall frond with striations and dots, vertical double spirals (3, 59, 61).

61 (C-47-236 a, b) Figured bowl

Corinth VII, iii, p. 169, no. 822.

Characteristic motifs: bird in flight to left (second generation: 24, 61), vertical double spirals (3, 59, 60).

62 (C-47-790) Net-pattern bowl

Corinth VII, iii, p. 182, no. 919, pls. 36, 80.

Characteristic motifs: medallion with four radiating palmettes (9, 25, 63, 66), rim with simplified ivy leaf (4, 9, 34, 64).

63 (C-69-238)

Hesperia 41, 1972, p. 12, no. 3, pl. 4.

Characteristic motifs: medallion with four radiating palmettes (9, 25, 62, 66), rim pattern of simplified ivy leaves (4, 9, 34, 62).
Characteristic motifs: acanthus leaf \((19, 65, 68)\), rim patterns of simplified ivy leaves and horizontal double spirals \((4, 9, 34, 62)\).

**66** (C-65-373) Figured bowl  
Corinth VII, iii, p. 168, no. 798 = Siebert, Co.4, pl. 44.

Characteristic motifs: acanthus leaf \((19, 65, 68)\), rim pattern of simplified ivy leaves \((4, 9, 34, 62)\).

**67** (C-65-98) Figured bowl  
Corinth VII, iii, p. 168, no. 796 = Siebert, Co.4, pl. 44.

Characteristic motifs: acanthus leaf \((19, 65, 68)\), rim patterns of simplified ivy leaves \((4, 9, 34, 62)\).

**68** (C-1980-40) Floral bowl  
P.H. 0.094. Many joining fragments preserving convex wall, straight rim, and outturned lip. Found in 1980 in fill north of the east end of the Hellenistic racecourse; see C. K. Williams, II, *Hesperia* 50, 1981, p. 28. Hard, buff clay with voids and some dark and white inclusions \((7.5YR 8/2)\).
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