Magna Achaea
Akhaiian Late Geometric and Archaic Pottery in South Italy and Sicily

ABSTRACT

Imported Akhaiian and locally produced Akhaiian-style pottery occurs in South Italy, Sicily, and beyond, found not only in the Akhaiian apoikiai, but also in other settlements. The most characteristic Akhaiian shape—the kantharos—is discussed within the context of its home region, including Elis. Examples of Archaic Akhaiian pottery in the West are assembled and the distribution is compared to that of Akhaiian and West Greek imports in the Late Bronze Age. A pattern emerges that suggests a complex reality of interaction and movement of people, commodities, and ideas between Greece and Italy in the pre- and protohistoric periods, thus contributing to a better understanding of the first western Greeks.

AIMS AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This paper emerged from a study of the pottery from the site at Francavilla Marittima, the extramural sanctuary of the Akhaiian apoikia of Sybaris on the site of an earlier indigenous settlement (Fig. 1). In dealing with the pottery from the sanctuary on the Timpone della Motta (see below), I discovered a large number of plain banded and monochrome kantharoi, many of which were locally produced, either in the plain of Sybaris or elsewhere in South Italy, while others were imported. These are not isolated examples, but together form one of the most numerous categories of pottery after Corinthian. In shape and style, these kantharoi are closest to a series of vessels from various sites in the northwest Peloponnese, particularly Akhaia. Despite the fact that Sybaris was traditionally founded by Akhaians, the Peloponnesian character of this material has not previously been recognized in studies of Greek pottery in South Italy and Sicily. The relevant material from Francavilla will be fully published elsewhere. Comparative material from other sites in South Italy and Sicily forms the basis of this article, the aim of which is to track, as far as is currently possible, the distribution of Akhaiian and Akhaiian-style pottery in the central Mediterranean. Some of the material that I refer to as Akhaian

1. For Francavilla see, most recently, Maaskant-Kleibrink 1993.
or Akhaian-style may ultimately derive from Elis, Ithake, or from the region on the north side of the Corinthian Gulf, opposite Akhāia. As will become clear, the results of this study are tentative; they are presented as a starting point for others more familiar with the material in mainland Greece and the West to build on or to reassemble.

Three interrelated issues are addressed. First, Akhāian pottery occurs commonly at sites in Magna Graecia; Akhāian or Akhāianizing pottery is found all over South Italy and parts of Sicily, and is not confined to the Akhāian colonial sphere. Second, in addition to the imports from the Greek mainland, Akhāian pottery was copied by potters at a number of sites, especially the Akhāian apoikiai of Sybaris and Metapontion, giving rise to a locally produced style of pottery that is best designated as "Akhāianizing" or "Akhāian-style." Such an appellation has the advantage of acknowledging the pedigree of the material, in the same way that the terms "Italo-Corinthian" and "Etrusco-Corinthian" point to the influence of Corinth. I hasten to add that my use of terms such as Akhāian and Corinthian is confined to the identification of easily distinguished ceramic styles. Pottery by itself can be a misleading and inadequate indicator of social realities; in particular, interpretations of social and economic preeminence and ethnicity should not be formulated on the basis of ceramic style alone.²

The example of Corinthian pottery is worth bearing in mind, since it is clear that the distribution of Corinthian-style pottery throughout the Mediterranean is not directly linked with colonial movement; the same is

---

true for Athenian, Lakonian, and other Greek pottery styles. Moreover, Corinthian-style pottery in Italy, Sicily, and beyond need not have been carried—or produced—by Corinthians, and Catherine Morgan has intimated that much of the pottery in the West referred to as Corinthian may, in fact, be from Ithake or Korkyra.3

Finally, in this article I seek to contextualize the evidence of Akhaian material remains not solely against the backdrop of the literary traditions of the foundation of colonies in the Early Iron Age, but within a broader framework that recognizes other avenues of circulation, as well as similar patterns in the Bronze Age. In so doing I attempt to bridge the systemic divide between prehistoric and classical archaeology in the study of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Mediterranean. The first western Greeks were Mycenaean, and it is striking how very similar the Archaic Akhaian pattern is to that of their Bronze Age Akhaian forebears. In drawing a common thread between the Akhaian of the Mycenaean age and those of the historic period, my aim is not, however, to conflate the very different worlds of heroic and historic Akhaian; nor is it my intention to confuse ethnic “Akhaian” with geographical or stylistic “Akhaian.” As Jonathan Hall has argued, there are numerous tiers of identity that were explored and exploited.4 My aim, rather, is to move toward eradicating the perceived gap between the “last Mycenaean” and the “first western Greeks.”

Following a historical introduction that sets out the parameters of Akhaian overseas settlement and the material evidence associated with it, an overview is presented of Akhaian pottery in its home region. This is followed by an annotated list of Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery, primarily kantharoi, found outside the northwest Peloponnese and adjacent regions. The purpose of the list, which forms the core of this study, is to reveal the distribution of Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery in South Italy and Sicily. A synthesis is then presented that summarizes the main patterns in the distribution of Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery of the later Geometric and Early Archaic periods and compares this distribution with that of Mycenaean pottery in the West. In the final section I explore more generally the evidence for Akhaians in South Italy.

Any account of the distribution of Akhaian pottery must necessarily begin with the most characteristic shape in the Akhaian repertoire: the kantharoi. This distinctive shape is found all over Akhaia, parts of neighboring Elis, especially at Olympia and Eleian Pylos, as well as at various sites on the north side of the Corinthian Gulf. Such a distribution, particularly in the coastal areas of the western Corinthian Gulf, raises the issue of whether these kantharoi are specifically Akhaian or, more generally, western Greek. Although it is clear that many of the kantharoi found in Elis, Phokis, Aitolia, and Akarnania were locally made, this is a question that cannot be answered conclusively at present. In some cases, the clays of this greater area are too little known to provide a more detailed guide to precise provenance within the region. It may well be that what I refer to as the Akhaian kantharoi—and generally as the Akhaian pottery style—was produced in an area considerably larger than the modern province of Akhaia.5 There exists, for example, a great deal of similar material in southern Phokis, Elis, Aitolia, southern Akarnania, and on Ithake. This

3. Morgan 1997; Morgan 1999a; see also Morris and Papadopoulos 1998. As Morgan has further argued, the perceived need to flesh out the Corinthian sequence by adducing evidence from the West to fill what were, until recently, gaps at Corinth has created a false picture, conflating western and Corinthian evidence in a misleading way. For filling in many of the noted gaps in Corinth see esp. Williams 1983; Williams 1986; Pfaff 1999; and, most recently, Isthmia VIII.
5. As Morgan (1991, p. 135) notes, the area of ancient Akhaia essentially corresponds to that of the modern Greek administrative district of the same name.
pottery, along with that from various sites in Akhaia and Arkadia, is currently being studied by various scholars working in these regions, and much of it is either unpublished or has appeared only in preliminary reports.

It is well beyond the scope of this article to provide a comprehensive overview of the pottery from these various regions or to anticipate the results of more thorough analyses of individual categories of pottery. New discoveries in the Peloponnese and western Greece and the systematic publication of material, such as William Coulson’s contributions on the Early Iron Age pottery of Messenia and Birgitta Eder’s recent studies of Elis in the Early Iron Age, are helping to define more clearly the individual traits of each region. It is worth stressing, however, that the very distinction between Akhaia and Elis in the Early Iron Age, for example, may be more apparent than real. The evidently koine style of pottery, particularly in Akhaia and Elis, may well reflect a more profound cultural, economic, and political koine in the northwest Peloponnese. The extent to which “Akhaia” or “Elis” were meaningful terms in the Geometric period or referred to clearly prescribed geographical areas remains moot.

A situation similar to that of the pottery has been observed in the regional style of Archaic Doric architecture of the Akhaian cities of South Italy. Barbara Barletta’s thorough examination of the geographical distribution and chronology of various elements of this style has demonstrated its adoption over a widespread area and she thus coined the term “Ionian Sea” style. Barletta also argued that this style appeared in the West before it did in the Peloponnese. Certainly other aspects of the Akhaian material record appear first in the West, including coinage (see below), and a number of scholars have argued that various innovations essential to the notion of the Greek city-state started in the western cities and from there were passed on to the homeland. I have decided, however, to retain the terms Akhaia and Akhaian-style in this study in keeping with the literary tradition of Akhaian colonization, though bearing in mind the problems associated with much of the historical evidence. Viewed from a slightly different perspective, “Magna Elis” or “Magna Ithake” might seem reasonable alternatives, except that there is no literary tradition for Eleian or Ithakesian colonization, nor is there a tradition of western Akhaians moving to the Peloponnese. Thus, in the title of this article, Magna Achaea is a rhetorical construct, not the same as, but not unlike, the very notion of Magna Graecia itself.

7. I am grateful to Jonathan Hall for bringing this to my attention and for fruitful discussion on related themes.
10. For these problems, see especially Hall 1997.
11. Early sources (e.g., Pind. Pyth. 1.146; Eur. Med. 439–440) use Μεγάλη Ἑλλάς to refer to the entire Greek world, not specifically to Italy. For the concept of Megalé Hēllas in Italy see, most recently, Greco 1998.
HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION TO AKHAIAN OVERSEEKS TRAVEL AND SETTLEMENT

During the last quarter of the 8th century B.C., according to conventional chronology, the first and most famous of the Akhaian apoikiai in Magna Graecia was founded on the river Krathis, on a broad and fertile plain, at Sybaris (Fig. 2). The river itself has the same name as the “never-failing Krathis,” which flows near Akhaian Aigai. According to tradition, the colonists were led by Is of Helike, and a contingent of Troizenians joined the venture; the latter, on the testimony of Aristotle (Pol. 1303a), were soon driven out by the stronger Akhaians of the new colony. In the course of the next two centuries, Sybaris was to become one of the most powerful and prosperous poleis of Magna Graecia, its name synonymous with luxurious living. The history of the city, and of the other Akhaian settlements of South Italy, including Kroton, Kaulonia, and Metapontion, as well as Poseidonia (Paestum) and others, is well known. Ironically, a fate similar to that which befell the mother-city—complete burial by natural causes—was to befall the colony, and both Sybaris and Helike were, for a very long time, lost from view. The fame of the colony, however, unlike that of the mother-city, had become proverbial—a topos—and the name of Sybaris achieved a prominence in human memory that Helike did not share.

Although the presence of Akhaian settlements in South Italy has long been known, evidence of Akhaian pottery—or of any material remains clearly identified as Akhaian outside of the script—has been curiously absent. Indeed, the Akhaian settlements of Magna Graecia have tended to be seen as paradigmatic cases of the lack of material influence on a colony by the motherland. The problem is in part the result of the lack of systematic excavation and thorough publication of material in Akhaia itself. Morgan’s overview of archaeological investigation in the region has shown it to be haphazard, with most of the material deriving from rescue excavations, along with chance finds.

13. RE IV.A.1, 1931, cols. 1002–1011, s.v. Sybaris (Philipp); Callaway 1950; see also Jacobsthal 1938.
14. Dunbabin 1948. For a useful overview, with recent bibliography, see Morgan and Hall 1996, pp. 199–215; also Osanna 1992; Pugliese Carratelli 1996; Greco 1998. See also the various entries in Nenci and Vallet 1977–1999. The problems inherent in identifying the exact origin of the colonists at these sites are many, and it is also difficult to establish the meanings—whether ethnic or geographical—of “Akhaian” in the Peloponnese and the West, which change through time (see Hall 1997; and further below).
15. Sybaris, destroyed in 510 B.C. by the Akhaians of Kroton, along with Thurii, the Classical city founded on the site of Archaic Sybaris, and Roman Copia, was deeply buried under the alluvium of the river Krathis. Helike, located on the coast of the Peloponnese east of Aigion, along with Boura, was completely destroyed by the devastating earthquake of 373 B.C.: Anderson 1954, p. 74, RE VII.2, 1912, cols. 2855–2862, s.v. Helike (Gundel). For the modern search for Sybaris, see Rainey and Lerici 1967; for Helike, see Marinatos 1960; Katsonopoulou 1991; 1998a; 1998b; Morgan 1991, p. 135; Soter and Katsonopoulou 1998; Pharaklis 1998; Courakis 1998.
16. See, for instance, the standard overviews of Blakeway 1932–1933; Dunbabin 1948; Ridgway 1992.
18. Morgan 1986; 1988. Even historians have tended to neglect Akhaia as a region, although the 1990s have seen a number of detailed studies dealing with the textual sources and history of the region, as well as its sanctuaries and cults. See, in particular, Rizakis 1995; also Rizakis 1991; Morgan and Hall 1996; Osanna 1996a; Osanna 1996b. Anderson 1954 remains useful for later historical commentary and for references in the ancient literary sources.
Recent archaeological work in southern Italy has brought to light a wealth of evidence, the full significance of which has yet to be realized. Perhaps more than anything else, the one aspect of Akhaian culture that left its mark most clearly on South Italy was the alphabet, evocatively illustrated in a number of dedicatory inscriptions, not least of which is the
well-known Kleom(b)rotos inscription from the Timpone della Motta at Francavilla Marittima, the extramural sanctuary of Sybaris.19 Nevertheless, the quantity of Archaic Akhaian inscriptions remains meager, and the situation remarked on by L. H. Jeffery in 1961 has essentially not changed:

Although the Achaian alphabet has left its mark not only in the Achaian colonies of Magna Graecia, but also along the trade-route which led thither through the Ionian Islands, through lack of excavation very few Archaic inscriptions have yet been found in Achaia itself.20

Jeffery went on to list eight inscriptions from Akhaia in the local script as opposed to some 35 inscriptions from the settlements in South Italy.21 In his revised edition of Jeffery’s standard text, Alan Johnston reattributed one of Jeffery’s Akhaian inscriptions to Phokis; two from Olympia were reassigned as colonial Akhaian rather than from the homeland, and another was assigned to Arkadia.22 Consequently, Jeffery’s original list of eight inscriptions has been trimmed to four. The quantity of inscriptions from Akhaian settlements in South Italy, however, has been steadily growing, and an important addition has been the bronze plaque found at Olympia recording a treaty between Sybaris and the Serdaioi.23 Indeed, it is interesting to note that Akhaian script is characterized largely on the basis of the western evidence, and most of the western examples—like Barletta’s “Ionian Sea” style of architecture—are earlier. Although this could well reflect a lack of excavations, as Jeffery suggested, the possibility that the script is largely a colonial construct should not be altogether overlooked.24 Similarly, the Achaian cities of South Italy all produced distinctive and early coinages, some as early as the middle of the 6th century B.C., whereas the Akhaians of the homeland produced very little before the 4th century B.C.25

In comparison to the script and coinage, the Late Geometric and Archaic pottery of Akhaia remains poorly understood. Nevertheless, enough is known to establish the existence of a thriving western Greek ceramic tradition—specifically a northwest Peloponnesian tradition. In part this tradition was open to influences from neighboring regions, including Corinth, as well as more distant ones, but in the main it resulted in a


The inscription is illustrated and most recently discussed in Papadopoulos, forthcoming, fig. 2b.
24. See Morgan and Hall 1996.
25. Papadopoulos, forthcoming. See Kraay 1976, pp. 162–170, for a useful overview of the Akhaian coinage of South Italy; for the coinage of Akhaia, see Head 1911, pp. 412–419; Kraay 1976, p. 95. For the traditional perspective of “colony and mother city,” see Graham 1964.
highly distinctive style, very different from that of Corinth. The salient lines in the development of Akhaian Geometric pottery have been mapped out by Nicolas Coldstream, and Iphigeneia Dekoulakou has done a great deal to fill in many gaps and clarify our understanding of Akhaian Late Geometric, Subgeometric, and Archaic pottery. Their contributions build on the earlier reports of Nikolaos Zapheiropoulos, Euthymeios Mastrokostas, and others responsible for excavations in Akhaia. The absence, however, of a full-fledged Akhaian figured style of vase-painting, such as contemporary Attic, Corinthian, Lakonian, and East Greek, has led to the general neglect of Akhaian pottery by students of Greek ceramics, and this neglect has extended to the imported pottery of Akhaia in South Italy and Sicily. It is, therefore, all the more a credit to the pioneering work of scholars such as Felice Gino Lo Porto and Juliette de la Genière, who were among the first to group a number of Akhaian and Akhaianizing vessels in South Italy. The former assigned vessels to the category "ceramica di tipo Itaca," while the latter included a few under the general heading "vases importés non attiques."

Lo Porto's and de la Genière's lead was followed by Coldstream, who singled out a few Akhaian pieces in Magna Græcia and correctly identified their origin. In an article published in 1998, Coldstream assembled a handful of Akhaian kantharoi from several sites in South Italy. These included one possible example from Sybaris, a complete profile from Leporano (ancient Satyrion near Taranto), and several other pieces reported by de la Genière from Amendolara and Sala Consilina (see below). In some cases this pottery is referred to in the original publications as "ceramica di tipo Itaca," but more often than not pottery similar to this is wrongly classified as "coppe ioniche" (or "di tipo ionico") or more generally designated as locally produced "coppe a filetti" or "dipinti coloniale." Indeed, a great number of problem pieces have been relegated to, or subsumed by, nebulous categories such as these. The inadequacy of such terms is well reflected in the publication of three related kantharoi from Incoronata, which were published in a recent volume on the Basento. One kantharos, fired red (oxidized), is listed under the heading "ceramica

Figure 3 (opposite). Map of part of central and southern Greece showing principal sites referred to in the text.
R. G. Finnerty


28. Of the numerous annual reports published in ArchDelt and Prakt, see, in particular, Zapheiropoulos 1952; 1956; and Mastrokostas 1968.
32. See Sibari I, p. 86, fig. 76, no. 216a (= p. 95, fig. 82, no. 216a–b); Lo Porto 1964, p. 227, fig. 48.1.
34. E.g., Tomay, Munzi, and Gentile 1996, p. 218.
di produzione coloniale,” whereas another is presented under the heading “ceramica bucceroido,” along with similar kantharoi fired gray (reduced); a banded kantharos of exactly the same shape is published as a Greek import.  

The distribution of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery in many parts of South Italy and Sicily, as well as in Ithake, Epeiros, and other parts of the Greek mainland (Fig. 3), and perhaps as far afield as Melita (Malta) and North Africa (see below), points to a more complex reality than one in which colonists carry with them domestic chattels from their homeland.

35. See Basento, p. 132, fig. 71; p. 158, no. 107; pp. 172–173, nos. 135–137; these are discussed more fully below under Incoronata.
Indeed, a number of scholars have recently attempted to explain such movements of commodities and people by looking beyond traditional motives such as the "spectres of over-population, land shortage, and states with commercial policies."36 Alternative models stress "private enterprise," active intervention and response against the backdrop of a growing world-system, and many more subtle and fluid avenues, allowing for mobility of people and ideas, not just commodities.37

In the historic period the phenomenon of Greeks traveling and settling overseas is not a unified movement that can be reduced to simple factors.38 The story is complex and fascinating, one of multiple diasporas in the Mediterranean and Black Seas that should not be seen solely in the light of other colonizations, particularly European colonizations from the 16th through 20th centuries A.C.39 In recent years the process of the foundation of any Greek foreign settlement has increasingly come to be seen not as a "foundation d'une colonie," but rather a "formation d'une polis d'outre-mer."40 At the same time it is important to stress that the pattern seen in South Italy and Sicily is not solely the result of the quest for land. Resource exploitation as opposed to territorial expansion leaves a notably different imprint on the landscape and on the material record. Its effect is more elusive, particularly when the resource driving colonization frequently does not survive in the archaeological record. In addition to human bodies, such commodities include some of the most critical economic resources: textiles, livestock and pelts, metal ores, timber, grain, oil, alcohol—"soft things," as Robin Osborne calls them.41 Perhaps the most radical response to the model of "colonization" has come from Osborne, who has argued that the very term is unsuitable for Greek settlement in the West in the 8th and 7th centuries B.C.42 He states:

Talk of whether or not there was "trade before the flag" is inappropriate, not because talk of trade is anachronistic, but because there was no flag. A proper understanding of Archaic Greek history can only come when chapters on "Colonization" are eradicated from books on early Greece.43

Whatever the reasons behind the formation of any Greek apoikia, as Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell have stressed, there is no reason to seek special (and, still less, apologetic) explanations for the overseas settlement of so many Greeks in the Archaic period, any more than for Athenian cleruchies, Roman coloniae, or Venetian and Genoese settlements in the later Middle Ages: "The establishment of cash-crop production in the landscape of the Hellenic overseas settlement is one of the more radical and intrusive dislocations in Mediterranean agrarian history."44 Moreover, such a dislocation in the Mediterranean is perhaps most visible archaeologically at Metapontion and, in the context of Greek literary tradition, best encapsulated in the fabulous stories of agricultural success at Sybaris, both Akhaian apoikia.45 It is against this broader perspective of Greek overseas travel and settlement—both real and imagined, historic and prehistoric—that one aspect of the material record is explored here.

39. Purcell 1997; see further Horden and Purcell 2000; Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002.
40. Luraghi 1996.
41. Osborne 1998; see further Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002.
44. Horden and Purcell 2000, p. 286.
THE AKHAIAN KANTHAROS IN ITS HOME REGION

Akhaia in Herodotos's day was a region that had twelve divisions and cities (Fig. 3). The relevant passage in Herodotos is worth quoting in full:

Πελλήνη μέν γε πρώτη πρὸς Σικυώνος, μετὰ δὲ Αίγειρα καὶ Αἰγαί, ἐν τῇ Κράθις ποταμός ἰδίνασος ἐστὶ, ἀπ’ ὅτεν οἱ ἐν Ίταλίᾳ ποταμός τὸ οὖνομα ἔσχε, καὶ Βοῦρα καὶ Ἔλυσι, ἐς τὴν κατέρρυσιν Ἰωνές ὑπὸ Ἀχαίων μάχη ἐσωθέντες, καὶ Αἰγίνον καὶ Ῥύπες καὶ Πατρέες καὶ Φαρέες καὶ Ὀλενος, ἐν τῷ Πεῖρος ποταμός μέγας ἐστὶ, καὶ Δύμη καὶ Τριταιές, οἱ μούνοι τούτων μεσόγαιοι οἴκευον. ταῦτα δικόκεια μέρεα νῦν Ἀχαίων ἐστὶ καὶ τότε γε Ἰώνων ἤν.

Pellene nearest to Sikyon, then Aig-era and Aigai, where the never-failing river Krathis flows, and from which the river in Italy took its name; Boura and Helike, where the Ionians fled when they were defeated in battle by the Akhaians; Aigion, Rhypes, Patrai and Pharai, and Olenos, where is the great river Peiros; Dyme and Tritaea, the only inland city of all these; these were the twelve divisions of the Ionians, as they are now of the Akhaians.

As already stressed, one of the most critical problems facing the study of Akhaian pottery, its production, distribution, and circulation within its home region, in Greece generally, as well as in the West, is the lack of systematic excavations and thorough publication of material from sites in the northwest Peloponnesse. Until the Late Geometric and Archaic levels of the major Akhaian city-states are explored, particularly Helike, the traditional "motherland" of Sybaris, our understanding of the material culture of the region must remain incomplete. Moreover, Herodotos’s account of the twelve Akhaian cities raises the possibility that what I refer to as Akhaian pottery may have been produced at more than one center.

46. The pottery drawings presented in this section and in the annotated list that follows derive from different sources and, as such, are not consistent in the manner of illustration. For further information on the pottery illustrated in this study, the reader is referred to the original publications.

47. Hdt. 1.145; in listing the Akhaian cities, I have followed closely the text of Herodotos; cf. the slightly different order of divisions given in Anderson 1954, p. 73. The list is repeated in exactly the same order, beginning with Pellene and ending with Tritaea, in Strab. 8.385–386 (8.7.4).

48. For the most recent account of the first excavation at Helike, see Katsonopoulo 1998b. For the geological and related studies that led to the location of the site, see Soter and Katsonopoulo 1998, and other specialist contributions in Katsonopoulo, Soter, and Schilardi 1998.

Earlier, however, in Polybios 2.41.7, Aigai, Rhypes, Helike, and Olenos had disappeared. For a more recent overview of the topography of Aigialeia, see the comments in Katsonopoulo 1998a. For a discussion of localized variations, see Morgan and Hall 1996.
Until recently, systematic excavations of Early Iron Age sites in Akhaia were rare, although those at Aigeira and Ano Mazaraki (Rakita) are important exceptions. Alongside these excavations are the considerable salvage finds from Aigion, and the results of the survey conducted by the Center for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Research Foundation (KERA) and the Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities of Patras (EPKA). This important fieldwork will go a long way in filling a gap in our knowledge of early Greece, particularly of early colonization, and has the potential to shed light on the history of Sybaris and other cities in South Italy. Despite recent advances, the quantity of Geometric and Archaic material from the region is not great. Michalis Petropoulos and A. D. Rizakis remarked as recently as 1994 in reference to the survey of the coastal area of Patras that “unlike the Mycenaeans, the Geometric period is almost unknown, there being a scarcity of archaeological finds.... It is paradoxical yet perhaps true that Archaic sites are less numerous than the Geometric.”

The relative dearth of physical evidence impedes a more detailed analysis of the Geometric and Archaic pottery of Akhaia, particularly in terms of the diachronic development of the ceramic repertoire on the basis of stratigraphy, as well as the fundamental issue of isolating individual workshops within the region. The study of clay sources and the visual, as well as scientific, determination of pottery fabrics in Akhaia, Elis, parts of northern Arkadia, as well as in Aitolia, Akarnania, and parts of neighboring Phokis and Lokris, are still in their infancy. The nature of the material is such that it imposes limits on what can be said with certainty, and many of the statements made in the following pages will require amendment, if not complete revision, as new evidence comes to light.

The following section is intended to summarize, albeit selectively, what can be said about the pottery from Akhaia and adjacent lands on the basis of excavated finds. As with many other regions of the Greek world, the Akhaian ceramic repertoire is rich and varied. Many different shapes were produced and some exported. These include jugs and other closed vessel forms, kraters, and even an idiosyncratic tall stamnos, referred to as a “pithos” (see below), but these are generally more difficult to identify outside the northwest Peloponnese and the adjacent area on the north side of the Corinthian Gulf, especially when fragmentary. The most distinctive shape


50. For a useful summary of the rescue excavations at Aigion, see Katsonopoulou 1998a, pp. 31–38; the overview in Papakosta 1991 is fundamental. Note also annual reports in ArchDelt, esp. Petras 1974; Papazoglou-Manioudaki 1989; Papakosta 1990. For the KERA/EPKA survey see Rizakis 1992; Petropoulos and Rizakis 1994; also Papagiannopoulos 1990. For the chor of Patras see esp. Petropoulos 1991. This survey has produced a range of monochrome wares that bear some similarity with Eleian, for which see below.


52. See Robertson 1948, pp. 72–74, pl. 27, no. 401; Benton 1953, p. 302, pl. 52, no. 859; for the various names given to this distinctive shape, which is most common in Crete, see Papadopoulos 1998.
in the Akhaians' repertoire is the vertical-handled kantharos and it is this shape that is most useful for tracking the distribution of Akhaian exports. There are two broad varieties of what I refer to as Akhaian kantharoi, the banded and the plain monochrome. Far more problematic is the question of Akhaian skyphoi, or horizontal-handled drinking vessels, especially since this involves the contentious provenance of the Thapsos class, and in many ways I do not want to confuse the issue by revisiting the debate over the provenance(s) of the Thapsos class. Consequently, horizontal-handled pots—skyphoi and cups—are not included in the present study, even though some may prove to be Akhaian or influenced by Akhaian vessels.

In the pieces that I have seen from Akhaians, as well as those vessels found in Italy that I presume to be Akhaian imports, the standard clay employed is fine, fairly well levigated, and with few visible impurities; occasionally there are small white inclusions, especially on larger, thicker-walled vessels. There is no mica to speak of, though in some cases the odd speck of surface mica might be observed. The color of the clay body and reserved surfaces can vary according to the conditions of firing, but it is characteristically brown. It is, most commonly, in the range of light brown (7.5YR 6/4), sometimes closer to reddish yellow (7.5YR 6/6) or, in paler examples, approaching 7.5YR 7/6 on the Munsell scale. The paint is usually of good quality, often lustrous, and sometimes with a pronounced metallic sheen, though a matt surface can occur. The metallic quality of the paint was remarked on fifty years ago by Robertson in his description of some probable Akhaians imported to Ithake (see below). The paint can fire a good black, thinning to various shades of brown where more dilute; occasionally a two-tone black and brown combination is found. In some cases the color of the paint can be a reddish brown, usually dark, some-

53. Although I firmly believe that Corinth created and produced Thapsos-class vessels, I do not believe that all Thapsos-class pottery is Corinthian, and too little is known of Akhaians by which to dismiss Akhaians as a possible source for some of these skyphoi. For discussion see Coldstream 1968, pp. 102–104; 1998a, p. 327; Bosana-Kourou 1980; 1984; Dehl 1984, pp. 44–48 (Thapsos-class skyphoi), pp. 58–63 (Thapsos-class kraters). See also Dehl 1983; Benson 1989, esp. pp. 16–17; and, most recently, Morgan 1997, pp. 325–326; *Isthmia VIII*, pp. 272–275. Neef's suggestion that Thapsos-class skyphoi—already some of them—were produced somewhere west of Corinth, still has much to commend it; see Neef 1981. For elemental analysis of Thapsos-class skyphoi, see Grimanis et al. 1980a; 1980b; also Deriu, Buchner, and Ridgway 1986. In the most recent publication of Geometric pottery from Corinth, the rarity of Thapsos-class pottery continues to be a striking feature; see Pfaff 1999, p. 59, n. 7, pp. 64, 99, fig. 31 (a solitary fragment); see further Williams 1983, p. 144. There are only five fragments of Thapsos-class pottery at nearby Isthmia; see *Isthmia VIII*, pp. 131, 272–277. For Thapsos-class vessels in Italy and Sicily see, e.g., d'Agostino 1979, pp. 63–64, fig. 36, nos. 2–3; Byvanck 1959, p. 70, fig. 1; Vallet and Villard 1952, pp. 334, 336, 338, figs. 8–11. For the original "Thapsos skyphos" from Thapsos, see Orsi 1895a, esp. cols. 103–104, pl. 4, no. 16.

54. It is clear that not all of the skyphoi in Magna Graecia classified as belonging to the "Thapsos class" are Corinthian. Many have been designated, whether rightly or wrongly, as local products, often on the basis of shape and decoration, without closer scrutiny of fabric. So numerous is this class, however, particularly in the West, that it requires its own study, which is well beyond the aims of this paper. Although it is impossible to present here a complete list of problematic pieces in Italy, some of the skyphoi from Sybaris and Kroton, both of which are Akhaians, as well as those from nearby Lokroi Epizephyrioi and its vicinity, cannot all be Corinthian. See especially Sabbione 1984, various examples illustrated on pp. 253–258 (classified as Thapsos and Corinthian, from Kroton), 260–265 (Kroton, locally produced skyphoi, including wasters), 286, 290, fig. 36, pp. 292–293 (various skyphoi from Santo Stefano di Grotteria). In addition to the numerous Thapsos and related skyphos types that are published in *Sibari I–IV*, see Guzzo 1984, various examples on p. 244, fig. 9, p. 245, fig. 11, n. 55.

times with a maroon tinge. The paint normally adheres well, although brush marks can be seen on some vessels, especially on the interior. Slightly more variation occurs in the fired color of the clay and paint among the plainer, monochrome vessels, with a wider range of reddish brown and red than is common on the banded vessels.

The kantharos is a standard vessel shape in western Greece generally, sufficiently different from Corinthian versions to avoid confusion in the majority of cases.\(^5^6\) Universally popular as a dedication in sanctuaries or as an offering to the dead, the kantharos enjoys a long history in the region.\(^5^7\) Nowhere is this more clear than in the discovery, some time ago, of two bronze kantharoi in the sanctuary at Olympia (Fig. 4);\(^5^8\) one of these is engraved with horizontal bands on the body and rim (Fig. 4:a), while the handles of the other (Fig. 4:b) are surmounted by three-dimensional figures of horses, dated by Adolf Furtwängler as no earlier than the 6th century B.C.\(^5^9\) Their shape, however, is that of the Late Geometric and Early Archaic clay kantharoi, especially those of the 7th century B.C.

Although it could be argued that the bronze vessels provide an immediate metallic model for the kantharoi in clay, it is important to remember that the kantharos enjoys a long history in terracotta in Mycenaean and Protogeometric Akhaia,\(^6^0\) as do other vertical-handled Bronze Age vessel

---

56. See the discussion of the Early Protocorinthian kantharos in Coldstream 1968, p. 107 (with n. 9); the vessel is comparatively rare, always fully glazed, and usually on the small side.


58. *Olympia* IV, pl. 35, nos. 670 and 671.

59. *Olympia* IV, p. 96; see further *OIForsch* VIII, p. 165, n. 94. The horses certainly look post-Geometric in style. Bronze kantharoi were not included in Part I of the publication of bronze vessels from Olympia (*OIForsch* XX); the horses (or animals) on the handles of *Olympia* IV, pl. 35, no. 671, were also not included in Zimmermann’s (1989) definitive study of Geometric bronze horses.

60. For the Mycenaean form generally, see Furumark 1972, p. 60, fig. 16, various examples; for Mycenaean versions in Akhaia see Papadopoulos 1978–1979, vol. 2, pp. 28–29, figs 48:b–c, 49:a–b (for Early and Middle Helladic kantharoi), and esp. the so-called “deep bowls with vertical handles,” such as p. 154, fig. 178:c–d; p. 243, fig. 267:c (with full discussion in vol. 1, p. 115). The latter are not common, and are represented in Mycenaean Akhaia by only two examples: one from Teichos Dymaion (the habitation site at Paralimni), the other said to come from Kangadi; see Papadopoulos 1978–1979, vol. 1, p. 115, ns. 58–64; note also the vertical-handled krater, p. 150, fig. 174:d,
forms, such as the stemmed kylix. 61 Related clay kantharoi of the Archaic period are common elsewhere in the Peloponnese, particularly in the Argolid, as well as in Lakonia, Messenia, and other areas, 62 while related miniature unglazed kantharoi are commonly found in a variety of votive contexts in Greece, South Italy, and Sicily. 63 Of all of these, the Argive kantharoi are perhaps closest in shape to those of Akhaia, but their rims are usually taller and the decoration and fabric quite different. 64 Elis, as well as coastal areas on the north side of the Corinthian Gulf, including Aitolia, parts of Akarnania, and coastal Phokis and Lokris, has yielded kantharoi and other vessel forms identical or very similar to those of Akhaia proper. 65 Judging by minor differences of shape, paint, and fabric, many of these are locally made, but others may be imported. As noted above, it is impossible to state with certainty whether these vessels were produced in a

p. 240, fig. 264: c. Vertical-handled bowls (kantharoi) and kraters are extremely common in Mycenaean Kephallenia; see Marinatos 1932, pl. 4–5, nos. 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 17–18; pls. 9–11, nos. 138–139, 141, 149, 151, 153, 157, 165; Marinatos 1933, p. 82, fig. 26, no. A3; p. 83, fig. 29 (right). For more recent bibliography on Mycenaean pottery from Akhaia, see above, n. 26. For Akhaian Protopotemetric, see Coldstream 1968, pp. 220–223, pl. 48 (from Derveni), and other examples discussed below. In Desborough’s seminal study of Protopotemetric pottery, there were no examples of Akhaian Early Iron Age pottery known to him; see Desborough 1952 (Zapheiropoulos’s first preliminary publication of Akhaian pottery appeared in the same year as Desborough’s monograph).

61. Coldstream 1998a, p. 323, considers the Mycenaean stemmed kylix as the immediate predecessor of the Early Iron Age kantharos; for the kylix in Mycenaean Akhaia, see Papadopoulos 1978–1979, vol. 1, pp. 117–119; vol. 2, p. 155, fig. 179: c–i, p. 245, fig. 269. The Mycenaean stemmed kylix is also very common in Kephallenia; see Marinatos 1932, pl. 6, 12 (numerous examples); Marinatos 1933, p. 79, fig. 21 (left); p. 80, fig. 23; p. 82, fig. 26, nos. A6, A9; p. 85, fig. 32, nos. g, g, h.

62. For the Argolid see, e.g., Papa-christoudoulou 1969, p. 132, pl. 76 (Argos, Kourkaki); Caskey and Amandry 1952, p. 196, pl. 53, no. 199; cf. also p. 195, pl. 53, no. 194 (Argive Heraion); Cook 1953, pp. 42–45, figs. 17–18, pl. 19, esp. nos. B4 and B6 (Mycenaean, the Agamemnonion); Tiryx 1, p. 102, fig. 38, no. 204 (Tiryx); Kosmetatou 1996, p. 119, fig. 5 (Midea); Wells, Ekroth, and Holmgren 1996, pp. 196–200, figs. 8–9, 12, nos. 3, 5–6, 14–15 (Berbati valley). For Lakonia see, e.g., Wace and Hasluck 1904–1905, p. 83, figs. 2–3; p. 85, fig. 6 (various examples, top row); Droop 1929, p. 57, fig. 31h. For Messenia see, e.g., Valmin 1938, pp. 456–458, fig. 93, nos. 4–18, cf. nos. 19–21, pl. 37c, e–g. At least 40 more or less complete examples were found at the Temple of Pamosos at Agios Floros, with fragments from at least twice as many. The kantharoi are all miniature or small, ranging in height from 0.028 to 0.086 m, and almost all had traces of black paint. For other regions, such as Elis, see below. Cf. the related monochrome kantharos of the Archaic period, in local gray fabric, from the cemetery at Agia Paraskevi (Thessalonike); Vokotopoulou 1985, p. 156, pl. 14:1 (middle).

63. For the ubiquitous miniature type, see, e.g., Droop 1929, p. 107, fig. 82f–h, also, some kantharoi illustrated by Valmin 1938, esp. the smaller examples, such as p. 457, fig. 93, nos. 9, 15, 18, pl. 37c, e (with additional parallels listed on p. 458); Perakourta II, p. 321, pl. 124, nos. 3354, 3355; Orsi 1933, p. 123, fig. 88 (various examples); Lo Porto 1981, pp. 312–314, fig. 23, nos. 3, 7, 17–20; see also p. 315, fig. 24, no. 2; Spadea 1996, p. 124, nos. 132–147; Dehl 1995, p. 412, pl. 71, no. 4802 (with further references).

64. This connection between Akhaia and the Argolid may well represent an Iron Age remnant of the Bronze Age drive of the Argive Akhaians to the west that Vermeule (1960, p. 20) cogently describes.

65. The kantharoi from Elis, including Olympia and Eleian Pylos, are discussed more fully below. A full list of related vessels from Aitolia, parts of Akarnania, as well as coastal Phokis and Lokris, is beyond the scope of the present study. For published examples see, e.g., Mastrokostas 1963, p. 184, pl. 212a (Palaionimania); Benton 1931–1932, fig. 20, nos. 1, 2, 4 (Kryoneri); see these references also for Aitolia and Akarnania (for a general overview, with bibliography, of Aitolia and Akarnania from the Palaeolithic to the Geometric periods, see Berktold 1996). For Phokis and Lokris, see F.D V.1, p. 136, fig. 512 (Delphi), and, for related jug: Larat 1938, p. 216, fig. 13, no. 6 (bottom row, middle); cf. also the jug F.D V.1, p. 137, fig. 527; Vatin 1969, p. 70, fig. 76, no. B 2 (=Themelis 1984, lp. 218, fig. 4 [bottom]) from Medeion; Themelis 1984, p. 235, fig. 30 (left), from Galaxeidi; also three related banded jugs: Themelis 1984, p. 235, figs. 30 (right), 31. For further discussion of the cemetery of Galaxeidi and the pottery from the tombs, see Morgan 1990, pp. 254–256. Note also the krater from Antikyra (Themelis 1984, pp. 221–222, fig. 8, pl. 1a), discussed in more detail below.
workshop, or workshops, in Akhaia and from there distributed over neighboring areas, or whether the stylistic similarity indicates the existence of a ceramic *koine*. It is even possible that the similarity in pottery style was the result of itinerant potters moving across the region, or potters relocating on a more permanent basis. I know of no published kiln sites of the period, nor of any comprehensive program of elemental analyses of the clays of the region.

Despite the lack of comprehensively published material from systematic excavations in Akhaia, enough material has been published to define the main characteristics of the kantharos and trace its chronological development. In order to illustrate the general form, I assemble and discuss below a few typical examples of published kantharoi, particularly of the late 8th and 7th centuries B.C., many of which have been previously dealt with by Coldstream and others. The account that follows does not pretend to be a comprehensive overview. Rather it summarizes, in a highly selective manner, a few well-known finds in mainland Greece as a necessary introduction to the material from South Italy that is the focus of this study. Figures 5 and 6 show not only the similarity of kantharoi from Greece and South Italy, but demonstrate that many are virtually indistinguishable. The kantharos illustrated in Figure 5, which is typical of Akhaian and Akhaian-style in Greece, was found in the Peloponnese; the fragments assembled in Figure 6, some with added white (see below), are from Francavilla Marittima in South Italy. The kantharoi in Figures 5 and 6 can be assigned to the 7th century B.C. All share the same shape, painted details, and—without aid of elemental analysis—appear to be of a similar fabric.

The Late Geometric and Archaic examples of the kantharoi follow directly from the earlier, so-called Protogeometric kantharoi of the region, especially those from Derveni (ancient Keryneia?) in Akhaia, Pleuron in Aitolia, and from the region of Agrinion in Akarnania, discussed in detail, respectively, by Coldstream, Dekoulakou, and the late Ioulia Vokotopoulou. There is also some related early material from Elis, including a Protogeometric kantharos from a pithos burial at Salmone.

66. Such a *koine* need not be confined to the political territory of any given region. Defining "Akhaia" as a political or even ethnic entity is not straightforward; Morgan and Hall (1996), who have admirably collected the literary evidence on the poleis of Archaic and Classical Akhaia, stress the geographical and cultural heterogeneity of the region that later formed the Akhaian ethnos. See also Osanna 1964a.

67. See Papadopoulos 1997b; also Denoyelle 1996.

68. See esp. Coldstream 1968, pp. 220–232, who lists and discusses significant groups of West Greek Protogeometric, Late Geometric I, and Late Geometric II. Coldstream's later phase of Akhaian Geometric is to a large extent based on the material from the excavations conducted by Zapheiropoulos (1952; 1956). More recent finds are presented in Dekoulakou 1984.

69. For Derveni, see Coldstream 1968, pp. 221–223, pl. 48 (= Vermeule 1960, 16–17, pl. 5, figs. 38–40); see also Desborough 1972, pp. 248–250, pl. 58. Cf. also the "grave group," said to be from the northern Peloponnese, now in Mainz, published in Hampe and Simon 1959, pp. 12–15, figs. 1–10, pl. 3; the group is further noted in Desborough 1964, p. 265. For the location of ancient Keryneia, see Anderson 1953, esp. p. 154 (with references); Katso-

70. The Salmone grave is discussed in Morgan 1990, p. 238 (with references); see also Desborough 1972, p. 250.
The date of the western Greek “Protogeometric” continues to be problematic, but the general style appears to be perhaps as late as ca. 750 B.C. or so, according to the conventional chronology. Similarly problematic are the earlier stages of the Late Geometric period. By 1968, Coldstream was unable to list even a single significant Late Geometric I group from Akhaia, although he did discuss several deposits of the period from Volimedia in Messenia, Aetos in Ithake, and Palaiomana in Akarnania.

More recently, Dekoulakou has attempted to fill the gap between a notional “Protogeometric” style and the Late Geometric period by assigning a number of vessels from different tombs in Akhaia to an Early and Middle Geometric phase. Thus, the material from a pithos tomb from Aigion, including a monochrome kantharos (Fig. 7) and two jugs, was assigned to the Early Geometric period. Dekoulakou also assigned vessels such as the decorated kantharos from Pithos Tomb 2 at Drepanon, a kantharos with a tremulous line approaching a zigzag on the rim from Valmantoura near Pharai (Fig. 8), and a monochrome kantharos from Priolithos near Kalavryta to a period she refers to as the end of the Early Geometric style in Akhaia. Her dating of these vessels to the middle of the 9th century B.C., however, seems too high. Whatever their precise date, these pots, taken together, define some of the salient features of Akhaian Geometric. They also establish the existence of the banded and monochrome kantharos, alongside kantharoi with more complex decoration.

Protogeometric material elsewhere in Elis has been recorded from ancient Elis and Agios Andreas (Pherai); see Morgan 1990, pp. 235–239. See also the so-called Submycenaean pottery from Pherai: Morgan 1990, p. 238; Gialouris 1957, p. 38, fig. 4. The fullest accounts are now Eder and Mitsopoulos-Leon 1999; Eder 1999.


74. Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 227–228, figs. 15–17; the date is discussed on pp. 224–225. A very similar monochrome kantharos from a tomb in the town of Elis was recently published and discussed in Eder and Mitsopoulos-Leon 1999, cols. 9–10, fig. 3.

75. For the Drepanon kantharos see Dekoulakou 1973, pp. 16, 19–20, fig. 1 (top right), pl. 1A; β; Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 225–227; for the Valmantoura kantharos see Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 226–228, fig. 18. The Priolithos kantharos was found in the same tomb with a Geometric lekythos-oinochoe: Mastrokostas 1968, pl. 156b; Dekoulakou 1984, p. 227.

76. An 8th-century B.C. date for this material seems more reasonable. In dealing with this chronology, Morgan cogently argued that the notional “gaps” in the sequence have more to do with the inapplicability of a terminology that was created largely on the basis of Attic and other sequences. See various discussions in Morgan 1986; 1988; 1991.
decoration, in Akhaia at a time before the traditional date of the foundation of the western Greek colonies. More than this, these vessels collectively show virtually no influence from Corinth at this early stage. Indeed, the very rarity of the kantharos in contemporary Corinth suggests that any influence may have been in the opposite direction: from Akhaia—perhaps even from Ithake—to Corinth.77

By the later stages of the Late Geometric period—what Coldstream refers to as West Greek Late Geometric II78—the banded and monochrome kantharos is ubiquitous in Akhaia and Aitolia. Figure 9 illustrates a banded kantharos from Pharai Grave α (A7);79 a related kantharos was found in Pharai Grave β (B4).80 In addition to these, Pharai Grave γ contained a banded kantharos (Γ3) and another decorated in a more complex manner (Γ1), as well as a proportionately broader and more squat kantharos decorated with swirls and whirligigs between horizontal bands (Γ2).81 The tomb also contained three jugs of different shapes (Γ4–Γ6), their necks and shoulders decorated with a variety of motifs, their bodies banded.82 A similar jug, along with a skyphos and two kantharoi—one slender and proportionately taller, the other broader and less deep—were found together in a tomb at Phteri in Akhaia.83 In describing these vessels, Zapheiropoulos was the first to refer to the taller and more slender of the two kantharoi as “Akhaian type” (κάνθαρος ἀκαθάκτου).84 A more rounded jug, a kantharoid krater, and two other kantharoi of “Akhaian type” were found by Zapheiropoulos to the second half of the 5th century B.C. (Zapheiropoulos 1952, p. 404); the remaining pyxis, associated with the kantharoi, is perhaps better accommodated in the 7th rather than the 8th century B.C.85

77. As Coldstream (1968, p. 102) notes, all of the “Corinthian” kantharoi—and most of the skyphoi—of the Late Geometric period belong to the Thapsos class. For further discussion see Dekoulakou 1984; and above, n. 53.


79. Zapheiropoulos 1952, pp. 402, 408, figs. 10, 26 (= Coldstream 1968, pl. 50f). In addition to the illustrated kantharos, Grave α contained a small, flat-bottomed jug (A1), two banded kantharoi (A2, A3), and three other kantharoi (including the tall and deep kantharos, A4) decorated with a variety of motifs—many of which, including figures of fish (sharks?), were assembled by Zapheiropoulos (1952, pp. 409–410, figs. 27–29)—as well as a bronze ring and many fragmentary iron obeloi. For this material see Zapheiropoulos 1952, pp. 401–403, figs. 8–12; two of the decorated kantharoi are more clearly illustrated in Coldstream 1968, pl. 50c–d.

80. Zapheiropoulos 1952, pp. 404–405, fig. 17 (= Coldstream 1968, p. 228). The banded kantharos from Grave β (B4) was found in association with two pyxides and a pyxis lid, as well as two banded kantharoi, one of which may have been a one-handled cup; see Zapheiropoulos 1952, pp. 403–404, figs. 13–14, 14–16, p. 405, figs. 17–18. One of the pyxides and the pyxis lid are clearly later than the other vessels in the tomb, and are dated by Zapheiropoulos to the second half of the 5th century B.C. (Zapheiropoulos 1952, p. 404); the remaining pyxis, associated with the kantharoi, is perhaps better accommodated in the 7th rather than the 8th century B.C.86


82. Two of the jugs are more clearly illustrated in Coldstream 1968, pl. 50g–h; there were also a couple of associated bronze rings.


84. Zapheiropoulos 1956, p. 196.
86. Zapheiropoulos 1956, pp. 198–201, pls. 93–94 (the kantharoi are illustrated on pls. 94 α2 and 94 β; mentioned in Coldstream 1968, p. 228).
88. Zapheiropoulos 1956, pp. 195–196, pl. 89 β; banded kantharoi, identical to many fragmentary examples in South Italy, can be seen in the top right-hand corner (three examples), while a monochrome kantharos is illustrated in the top row, second from the left.
89. See Alzinger, Lanschützer, Neeb, and Trummer 1986, pp. 327–329, figs. 118–119, nos. 1–2; Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 228–229, fig. 19.
90. For these see Themelis 1967, pl. 251 α–β; Lerat 1938, p. 216, fig. 13, no. 6 (bottom row, middle); Dekoulakou 1984, p. 228, ns. 34–36.
91. Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 228–230, figs. 20–21, found in the same pithos burial as the Thapsos-class skyphos, p. 230, figs. 22–23. For a similar pyxis found at Delphi, see Amandry 1944–1945, p. 37, fig. 3; for other vessels with impressed decoration, see Papapostolou 1982, pl. 125 β (from Rakita in Akhaia); Petropoulos 1987–1988, pl. I, figs. 6–7; Petropoulos 1996–1997, esp. p. 192, fig. 20 (right). Similar pottery with impressed decoration is also common at the Archaic sanctuary of Artemis at Lousoi; see Schauer 1996–1997, p. 268, figs. 19–21.

Together by Zapheiropoulos in a tomb some 28 km from Patras. Two similar kantharoi, both decorated with various motifs (Ss, whirligigs, triangles, Xs, horizontal bands), were found together with two jugs, a bowl with fenestrated stand, a kyathos, and a horizontal-handled vessel in a built tomb, containing more than one burial, at the site of Troumbi Chalandritis. Three other vessels—a banded jug, a bowl with ribbon handles (lekane), and a krater with reflex (combination horizontal and vertical) handles—from the same tomb were published earlier by Nikolaos Kyparissis. In addition to all of this pottery from tombs, numerous fragments of banded and monochrome kantharoi were discovered in a settlement context by Zapheiropoulos at Agios Georgios, near Pharai.

Other vessels from Akhaia that are contemporary or nearly contemporary with Pharai Graves α–γ include several base fragments of tall-footed kraters from Aigeira and a banded jug from a pithos burial at Ano Kastritsi in Akhaia, similar in shape and decoration to the two jugs from Aigion already noted. The jug is further compared to similar vessels from Eleian Pylos, Delphi, and Ithake. Also dating to the late 8th and earlier 7th centuries B.C. are a number of other vessel forms, such as a pyxis from Aigion with impressed decoration, and from Manesi, west of Kalavryta, a group of vessels including a lekane with ribbon handles, with close parallels from Sparta and Eleian Pylos; a hemispherical bowl, similar to two...
in clay and one in bronze from Drepanon; a lentoid flask following eastern Mediterranean prototypes; and a cylindrical unguent bottle in local fabric but suggestive of the Kreis- und Wellenbandstil curved flasks of the east Aegean.92 These vessels, along with various Corinthian imports, published and unpublished, provide a glimpse of foreign ceramic merchandise and influences current in Akhaia at this time, but the pattern is an eclectic one, with no dominant strand.93

A similar blend of indigenous and foreign influences can be seen in the pottery from a pithos burial at Asani, in Arkadian Azania, a region bordering Akhaia and indistinguishable from it on the basis of material culture.94 The burial is contemporary with, or slightly later than, the Manesi group, and is dated by Dekoulakou to the early 7th century B.C. on the evidence of an imported Protocorinthian aryballos found in the tomb. The northwest Peloponnesian character of the slender banded kantharos (Fig. 10) is clear enough;95 this vessel, along with the kantharos from Pharai (Fig. 9), may serve as the diagnostic type for the Akhaian Subgeometric kantharoi in South Italy and Sicily. A cylindrical kantharos, decorated with many of the motifs found on some of the Pharai kantharoi already discussed, reflects the stronghold of the kantharos shape in the local

92. Manesi, like Asani and Phlaboura (Flaboura), now in the modern province of Akhaia, was in antiquity located in Arkadian Azania; see Petropoulos 1985; Morgan 1999b; Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 229–232, figs. 24–29. The lekane is compared to that in Coldstream 1968, pl. 46h (= Droop 1929, p. 61, fig. 34), from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia; for related lekanai from Eleian Pylos, see Coleman 1986, pp. 40–43, ill. 7, pl. 27; for the Drepanon hemispherical bowls, see Dekoulakou 1973, p. 16, fig. 1, 4–III, 6–IV, and for the bronze bowl, p. 17, fig. 2, 17–II. For Phoenician lentoid and "pilgrim" flasks, see Culican 1982, pp. 50–51; for the lentoid flask in Early Iron Age Cyprus, see Pieridou 1973, p. 105, shape 15, pl. 13:5–9; cf. p. 103, shape 10, pls. 8:10, 9:1–2. The cylindrical bottle (Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 230–231, figs. 26, 29, bottom left), the top of which is not preserved, recalls the characteristic flasks of the east Aegean, for which see Friis Johansen 1958, p. 19, figs. 22–23, pp. 155–161; see further Pithekoussai I, p. 25, nos. 651–3, Sp. 11/2 (both classified as imports), and 271–10 (said to be a local imitation); Papadopoulos, Vedder, and Schreiber 1998, pp. 525–526, n. 96.

93. For Corinthian imports see Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 228–231; and, more recently, Morgan 1988. A fuller understanding of such influences more generally will only be possible once the evidence of ceramics is considered in the context of other imports, such as the metalwork from the shrine at Ano Mazaraki (see Gadolou 1996–1997 for preliminary remarks) or the fibulae from Aigion (noted in Morgan 1998, with references). This is beyond the scope of the present study.


95. Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 232–234, figs. 30–34; the Protocorinthian aryballos is illustrated in fig. 34.

96. Dekoulakou 1984, p. 233, fig. 30α–β.
Equally interesting is an oinochoe with tall sloping neck. Although it is of the same local fabric as the cylindrical kantharos, and shares with it many of the same motifs, this vessel is based on the Phoenician metallic prototype of the trefoil jug with tall and narrow sloping neck and a palmette at the lower handle attachment, as Coldstream suggested. Related oinochoai, referred to as *Giraffenbalskännchen*, are known at Olympia. Vessels such as these, which display Phoenician influence and are from the mountainous interior of the northern Peloponnes, provide a fleeting glimpse of the potential importance of cities such as Helike, located along the Corinthian Gulf, in the cultural exchange of commodities and ideas within the region.

Finally, special mention should be made of a banded kantharos, found in a pithos tomb at Velvinikon, near the village of Phlamboura, in the region of Kalavryta (Fig. 11). First published by Mastrokostas, the vessel represents a classic example of the Archaic Akhaian kantharos, best accommodated in the later 7th century B.C. The body is larger and proportionately broader than the slender banded kantharos from Asani, and the vessel stands on a low conical foot; its overall form is not unlike the earlier kantharos from Valmantoura mentioned above (Fig. 8). The kantharos from Phlamboura is of further interest as it preserves, on its upper body and centrally placed between the handles, a floral motif in added white repertoire.

---

97. Dekoulakou 1984, p. 233, fig. 31α–β.
98. Dekoulakou 1984, p. 233, figs. 32–33.
99. See Coldstream 1998a, pp. 326–327. Characteristic examples in silver and bronze are published in Culican 1976, pp. 83–84, figs. 1–2, with full references in nos. 1–7; see also Culican 1968 for further discussion of the type, including examples in bronze, ivory, and clay; see further Prayon 1998, esp. pp. 331, 334, figs. 1, 4. For the Phoenician clay jug with trefoil rim, see Moscati 1988, p. 496 (from Amathus, Tomb 302), p. 712, nos. 761–762. Cf. also the well-known Greek Geometric clay vessel from the “Warrior’s Grave” at Tarquinia: Randall-MacIver 1924, pp. 158–162, pl. 30:1; Blakeway 1932–1933, p. 197, pl. 32, no. 78 (= Blakeway 1935, pl. 21, no. A5). For related terracotta jugs in Elis, see *Olforsch* VIII, pl. 13, nos. 1–3, cf. nos. 4–5; Coleman 1986, pp. 50–52, pl. 34, no. C84. Among other eastern finds in Akhaia, note the scarab from Rakita: Papapostolou 1982, p. 188, fig. 1.
100. *Olforsch* VIII, pp. 110–112, pl. 13, esp. nos. 1–3, most notably no. 3.
paint; very similar motifs in added white appear on two kantharos fragments from Olympia (Fig. 12). Indeed, the use of added color, including white and red, is particularly common in Elis, especially at Eleian Pylos. Virtually identical motifs to the Phlamboura kantharos in added white are found on a number of fragmentary kantharoi at Megara Hyblaiain (Fig. 13) and at Francavilla Marittima (Fig. 14) that are imports (see below).

In Aitolia and Akarnania, during the so-called West Greek Protogeometric, the published finds mirror developments in Akhaia, particularly in the material from Derveni, but there are also important idiosyncratic differences. There is, however, very little published material to rely on, and the information that can be drawn from this evidence has been summarized by Coldstream. The situation for the Late Geometric and Early Archaic periods is also poorly understood on the basis of published finds, and it is idle to speculate until more material from this region, of which there is no shortage, is published.

To the east, in western Lokris and Phokis, the situation is somewhat different, and here the influence of Corinth is more readily seen. The material from sites such as Medeon, Antikyra, the Korykeion cave, Krisa, and Souvala (Polydroso) in Phokis, along with Amphissa and Galaxeidi in Lokris, as well as Delphi, tells a similar story. Alongside the locally produced plain pottery, much of which is handmade and has strong affinities with other regions of mainland Greece, including Thessaly, as does much

102. Mastrokostas 1968, pp. 215–216, where the motif is described as follows: Εφ’ ἐκατέρας τῶν ὄψεων ἀξονικὸν διακοσμητικὸν θέμα λευκόν, συνιστάμενον ἐν βασιλέαν ἐπὶ εὐθείας ἐπὶ μεταξὺ τῶν στερεόν παραμβάλλοντα φυλλάρια ή πέταλα, ἱσος, ἐξίτηλα.”

103. Morgan 1990, p. 245, fig. 23, nos. K2907 and K1344; Olivier XI, pl. 62, nos. 1–2. Cf. also Olivier V, pl. 61, no. 13.

104. Coleman 1986, pp. 37, 41, 51, 55, illus. 6–7, 10, 12, pl. 25, C2, pl. 28, C48–C50, pl. 29 (various examples), pl. 31, C76–C79, pl. 32, C110–112, C118–C125.

105. Coldstream 1968, pp. 220–223; 1977, pp. 180–185. For the “Protogeometric” kantharos from Kalydon, see Mastrokostas 1963, p. 183, pl. 212α, no. 1. For the “Protogeometric” krater from Pylene, see Mastrokostas 1969, p. 320, pl. 228α.

of the metalwork, the vast majority of the painted wheelmade pottery is Corinthian or Corinthian-inspired. There are, however, a growing number of what appear to be Akhaian—or northwest Peloponnesian—imports to the region, especially at Medeon and Galaxeidi, or else material of similar style made locally.\textsuperscript{107}

Special mention must be made of a distinctive krater found at Antikyra in Phokis (Fig. 15:a).\textsuperscript{108} In describing the vessel, Petros Themelis noted that despite a certain Corinthian influence, the fabric and decoration are local.\textsuperscript{109} The bands at the lower handle attachment, the lower wall painted solid, and the reserved face of the foot are all features shared by Akhaian banded kantharoi. Similarly, the 5s arranged in groups on the upper body are a characteristic found on many Late Geometric and Early Archaic decorated Akhaian vases. Also distinctive is the manner in which the decorative zone on the upper body is framed by “sausage” motifs; such motifs, whether continuous or opposed, are a standard feature on pottery from the northwest Peloponnese and western Greece generally.\textsuperscript{110} Having seen the krater firsthand, I am convinced that it is an Akhaian import to Antikyra, or of a local fabric that cannot be easily distinguished visually from that of Akhaia. This, in itself, is not surprising, particularly in light of other such imports to the region. What is perhaps more surprising is that in shape, decoration, and fabric, the krater is virtually identical to another krater, found at Bitalemi, the extramural sanctuary of Gela in Sicily (Fig. 15:b).\textsuperscript{111} These two kraters are so similar that they must have derived from the same workshop, if not the hand of a single potter.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{107} Themelis 1984, p. 218, fig. 4 (bottom) from Medeon (= Vatin 1969, p. 70, fig. 76, Tomb 22, B 2); p. 235, figs. 30–31 (Galaxeidi).
\textsuperscript{108} Themelis 1984, p. 221, fig. 8, pl. 1α.
\textsuperscript{109} Themelis 1984, pp. 221–222.
\textsuperscript{110} Robertson 1948, p. 104; Coldstream 1968, p. 396, pl. 49:f. The term “ugly sausage” or “sausage motif” was first coined by Martin Robertson (1948, p. 104) to describe the distinctive Ithakesian decorative element; Coldstream (1968, p. 227) retains the term “sausage,” but adds the adjective “mysterious.”
\textsuperscript{111} Fiorentini and de Miro 1984, p. 91, fig. 81 (inv. 20359).
\textsuperscript{112} It is also possible that the potter(s) relocated, rather than that the pots moved; see Papadopoulos 1997b; Denoyelle 1996.
In Elis, Akhaia's neighbor to the south and west, the kantharos is also the most favored drinking vessel in the Archaic period with a venerable history in the local repertoire. Indeed, there appears to be a convergence in kantharos shapes between these two regions. Banded and monochrome kantharoi have been found at a number of sites, including Olympia. Several banded kantharoi and at least one monochrome example found at Olympia appear to be so close to those from Akhaia that they may even be imports (Fig. 16). Alternatively, the similarity between the kantharoi from Olympia and Akhaia may suggest, as was noted above, that these neighboring regions were part of the same ceramic *koinē*, and it is clear that both shared a strong westward focus. Moreover, given the Panhellenic nature of the sanctuary at Olympia, it is possible that some of the kantharoi are Akhaian imports, and others locally made, including both banded and monochrome kantharoi. As for differences in fabric between the pottery of Akhaia and Elis, I follow Coldstream in his cautious reluctance to distinguish categorically between individual vessels of the broader region, particularly when shape and style are so similar.

A banded kantharos with figured representation (Fig. 17) is also known from Olympia, as well as the related fragments with decoration in added white already noted (Fig. 12). Both the banded and monochrome kantharoi occur in the standard shape found in Akhaia. So, too, does the banded kantharos with the striding feline; what survives of the lower body is painted solid (Fig. 17a). There are three thin bands near the midpoint of the vessel, immediately below the handle attachment; three similar bands are painted on the rim, and another at the lip. The upper body is framed on either side of the handles by “sausage” motifs; the reserved center of the upper body, thus defined, is decorated with a feline moving to the right, in added white paint, with details picked out in black. This is one of the rare examples of Orientalizing figured decoration in the Archaic pottery of the northwest Peloponnese. Other examples include a fish on the upper body of a deep kantharos, birds on the shoulder of a jug, and a menacing lion pursuing a deer on the upper body of a kyathos, all from Akhaian Pharai. Although the kantharoi from Olympia is traditionally dated later than the few figured vessels from Pharai, their date in absolute years cannot be too far removed.

113. For banded kantharoi, see *OlBer* VII, p. 125, fig. 68. Cf. also the kantharoi in *OlBer* VII, p. 123, fig. 64, which is very similar to one from Tocra (see below), and *Tocra* I, p. 92, nos. 993, 995. For monochrome kantharoi, see *OlBer* III, p. 38, fig. 24.


115. *Olympia* IV, pl. 69, no. 1296; *OlForsch* VIII, pl. 32, no. 3.

116. Fish: Zapheiropoulos 1952, p. 402, fig. 11, p. 410, fig. 29; more clearly seen in Coldstream 1968, pl. 50d. Birds, deer, and lion: Zapheiropoulos 1956, pp. 198, 200, figs. 1, 2, pl. 93:y.

---

**Figure 16.** Olympia: a) banded kantharos; b) monochrome kantharos. Courtesy Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens, negs. OL 4615, OL 2306; *OlBer* VII, p. 125, fig. 68; *OlBer* III, p. 38, fig. 24
A much larger group of kantharoi was found at Olympia in the wells under the north wall of the stadium and in the area to the southeast. This material was published in detail by Werner Gauer,117 and it is therefore unnecessary to give a lengthy description of it here. Among the large quantities of mostly local pottery recovered from the wells, the kantharos—Becher mit Vertikalhenkel—is the most common drinking vessel in the earlier stages of the Archaic period.118 During the developed stages of the period—what Gauer refers to as the hocharchaische Zeit—the skyphos of Corinthian type begins to occur more frequently than the kantharos, and by the Classical period, the distinctively local kantharos is virtually absent, represented only by a handful of undistinguished survivals.119 For the earlier Archaic period Gauer distinguishes two types of kantharoi: an early and a late form. The early form (Figs. 18–22) is characterized by a deep body, which curves in noticeably toward the top; the rim is shorter than on later types, either everted or slightly flaring, becoming progressively more vertical. The foot can be flat (Fig. 18:1) or slightly hollowed (Fig. 18:4), or the vessel stands on a ring foot that varies in height (Fig. 18:3, 6–11). The later form (Figs. 23–25) is similarly deep, but the upper body does not curve in as much as it does on the earlier type; the rim is almost vertical and becomes progressively taller and more offset from the body. The foot is invariably taller than on earlier examples, either conical or splaying.

In terms of decoration, the kantharoi from the Olympia wells are either banded (Figs. 20, 24a) or monochrome (Figs. 19, 21, 24b, 25), and occasionally the odd linear motif is permitted, such as a tremulous line on the rim (Fig. 24a), or groups of verticals, sometimes even a band of added color (Fig. 23:1).120 Some have decoration in added white or red paint.121

117. *OlForsch* VIII.
119. *OlForsch* VIII, p. 173 (skyphos of Corinthian type). For the Classical pottery of Elis from the excavations at Olympia, see *OlForsch* XXIII. The material is almost exclusively black-glaze and much of it is stamped. Apart from the established types of Classical kantharoi, which are similar to those of Athens and elsewhere (see *Agora* XII, pp. 113–124, figs. 6–7, pls. 27–29, 47, 56), survivals of the earlier local kantharos can be seen in pieces such as *OlForsch* XXIII, pl. 4, no. 7. In Athens the black-glaze kantharos is extremely rare in the 6th century B.C. Only three purported examples are presented in *Agora* XII (p. 114, pl. 27, nos. 624–626), only one of which (no. 625) is indisputably a kantharos, and this solitary example, dated to ca. 550 B.C., is not unlike the Akhaian version of the shape.
120. For the tremulous line see *OlForsch* VIII, pl. 34:2 (Fig. 24a); for the groups of verticals on the rim and band of added color on the body, see p. 170, fig. 21, no. 1 (48 SO) (Fig. 23:1).
121. *OlBer* VII, p. 123, fig. 64; *OlForsch* VIII, pp. 169–172.
Figure 18. Olympia, profiles of kantharoi (“Becher mit Vertikalhenkeln, Frühform”). Scale 1:2.
P. Finnerty, after OlForsch VIII, p. 166, fig. 20

Figure 19. Olympia, monochrome kantharoi. Courtesy Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens, negs. OL 2307, OL 7164

In this context special mention may be made of a fragmentary kantharos from Olympia (Figs. 18:5; 22), fully described by Gauer. Variations on the standard banded decoration are also occasionally found on other vessel forms, such as the rim fragment of a bowl (Schüssel). More recently, Jürgen Schilbach has published a number of primarily monochrome kantharoi of both the early and later type, a few of which are assembled in Figure 26.

By and large, although the decorative canon is identical to that of Akhaia, the local Archaic kantharoi from Olympia can be distinguished from their Akhaian counterparts, particularly in the quality of the paint and the appearance and feel of the fabric. On both the local Olympian

123. OlForsch VIII, pp. 151–152, pl. 32:5.
124. OlBer XI, pl. 1, nos. 1–5, pl. 65, nos. 1–12, and various examples on pls. 70–71. Note also the other Archaic vessels, including horizontal-handled cups, kraters, jugs, pyxides, and other vessel forms published in the same volume.
Figure 20. Olympia, banded kantharoi. Courtesy Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens, neg. 70/879

Figure 21. Olympia, monochrome kantharoi. Courtesy Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens, negs. OL 5561, 69/731

Figure 22. Olympia, fragmentary banded kantharos. Courtesy Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens, neg. 68/730
Figure 23. Olympia, profiles of kantharoi ("Becher mit Vertikalhenkeln, Spätform"). Scale 1:2. P. Finnerty, after *OlForsch* VIII, p. 170, fig. 21

Figure 24. Olympia, kantharoi: a) banded; b) monochrome. Courtesy Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens, neg. OL 7157

Figure 25. Olympia, kantharos. Courtesy Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens, neg. OL 7177
monochrome and banded kantharoi, the paint tends to be consistently streaky, often with a tendency to flake; it lacks the good black luster found on some of the best Akhaian products, nor does it adhere as well to the surface. In the case of the banded kantharoi, the banding is often applied in a more careless manner on the pottery from Olympia than on the Akhaian vessels, and there is sometimes a zone of banding on the lower body (Fig. 20a), a feature less common further north. These differences, however, are minor and largely based on subjective criteria and a statistically poor sample. Moreover, these differences may be more apparent than real, since they are perhaps the result of changes over time—given the fact that the Olympia material is mostly later than that thus far published from Akhaia—rather than synchronic variation. Until the Archaic levels of a major Akhaian city are fully explored, the relationship between Akhaian and Olympian Late Geometric and Archaic pottery must remain poorly understood.

I have referred to the material from the wells as “Olympian,” rather than Eleian, in order to distinguish it from that of other centers in ancient Elis. Among the material recovered by Themelis in the trial excavations at Eleian Pylos, at the site at Armatova near the modern village of Agrapidochorion, banded kantharoi featured prominently (Fig. 27). A number of complete or nearly complete kantharoi were found in what

---

125. Compare, e.g., the paint on Dekoulakou 1984, pp. 228–229, figs. 18–19; pp. 233–234, figs. 30a, 35. 126. E.g., OlBerX;I, pl. 33, nos. 3–4. 127. Themelis 1967, pl. 250; see further Morgan 1990, pp. 239–242. For Eleian, Triphylian, and Messenian Pylos, see McDonald 1942.
was described as a “Late Geometric to Early Archaic” well.\textsuperscript{128} The kantharoi from Eleian Pylos published by Themelis were assigned to the Late Geometric and Early Archaic periods.\textsuperscript{129} In addition to the kantharoi, the material from the well included several bowls or skypoi similar in shape to the kantharoi (but with horizontal handles), a banded jug virtually identical to that already mentioned from Ano Kastritsi, and the well-known fragment of a krater with a partially preserved representation of a ship.\textsuperscript{130} The banded kantharoi from Eleian Pylos are different from those of Akhaia and Olympia. Their bodies are proportionately broader and less deep, the rims are often less sharply articulated from the body, defining more of an S-curve with the upper body, and the vessels stand on low ring bases. In all of the published examples, the exterior is painted solid except for two thin reserved bands near the lower handle attachment; there is no banding on the rim, and the outer face of the low ring foot is reserved. This scheme of decoration is closer to that of kantharoi found in South Italy, such as one from Sala Consilina (see below), than it is to kantharoi from Akhaia and Olympia.

The more exhaustive excavations at Eleian Pylos by John Coleman uncovered important remains of the Geometric and Archaic periods, as well as material of earlier and later date. The characteristic wheel-made and decorated shapes of the Geometric period include kraters, round-mouth jugs, kantharoi, cups with horizontal handles, and a variety of mostly smaller, closed vessels.\textsuperscript{131} The repertoire of the fine, local Eleian, black and plain ware of the Archaic period includes kraters, bowls, plates, round-mouth jugs, hydriai, amphoras, oinochoai, tall-necked juglets, aryballoi, horizontal-handled cups, pyxides, and kantharoi (Figs. 28–29).\textsuperscript{132} Several of the Archaic kantharoi (e.g., Fig. 28:d–e) are very similar to those of Akhaia.\textsuperscript{133} Generally

\textsuperscript{128} The well was only partially excavated by Themelis (1967). It was finally cleared by Coleman (1986), who also excavated the Archaic and Classical settlement on the Armatova hill; see also Morgan 1990, p. 240.

\textsuperscript{129} Themelis 1967, p. 217, pl. 249:α–β.

\textsuperscript{130} Themelis 1967, pp. 217–218, fig. 4, pl. 250:α–ε (kantharoi and skypoi), pl. 251:α–β (jug), pl. 251:γ (krater); the krater is also illustrated in Coldstream 1977, p. 179, fig. 59:d; Coleman 1986, pl. 21, no. B1. The jug is very similar to examples from Akhaia, and the nonjoining fragments of the krater preserve motifs identical to those found on a variety of decorated vessels from Akhaia (see Themelis 1967, pl. 251:γ), not least of which is the "sausage" motif to the right of the ship.

\textsuperscript{131} Coleman 1986, pp. 18–30, 32–33, ills. 2–4, pls. 21–24.

\textsuperscript{132} Coleman 1986, pp. 34–65, ills. 6–12, pls. 25–35.

\textsuperscript{133} See esp. Coleman 1986, pp. 53–54, ill. 11, pl. 32, no. C106 (Fig. 28:d), and cf. pp. 54, 57, ill. 11, pl. 32, no. C126 (Fig. 28:e).
speaking, the broader and comparatively less deep local kantharos of the Late Geometric period was replaced by a variety of both banded (Figs. 28:a, d–e, 29) and monochrome (Fig. 28:b–c) kantharoi. Among these, Coleman distinguishes a number of types. Classified as a bowl, C52 (Fig. 28:a) is similar in shape to a kantharos, although the rim is slightly different from most kantharoi; the body is deep and banded; the form of the foot remains unknown.

Among the remaining kantharoi, Coleman distinguishes three types: broad and shallow (Fig. 28:b, C104), broad and deep (Fig. 28:c, C108), and tall (Fig. 29, C110–C111). The first two types correspond with Gauer's *Becher mit Vertikalhenkeln, Frühform* from Olympia; the third type, with a tall vertical rim and conical foot, is identical to Gauer's *Spätform*. A characteristic feature of the latter is the use of added white and red paint for horizontal bands, as well as for a variety of motifs, including vertical and diagonal lines, vertical zigzags, dot rosettes, and Ss.134 Many of the handles

are decorated with added white paint in a manner identical to those on plain painted Akhaian kantharoi (Fig. 30).\textsuperscript{135} As is the case at Olympia, the northwest Peloponnesian type of kantharos disappears in the Classical period at Eleian Pylos and is largely replaced by the skyphos.

Related pottery is known from a number of other sites in Elis, not least of which is that from the ancient city of Elis. In their recent overview of the history of Elis in the Geometric and Archaic periods, before the synoikismos of 471 B.C., Birgitta Eder and Veronika Mitsopoulos-Leon discuss and illustrate a number of kantharoi, some of which will be included in a forthcoming study by Eder. A Protogeometric monochrome kantharos from a tomb in the \textit{Westhalle} at Elis is very similar in shape and decoration to that from Aigion discussed above (Fig. 7).\textsuperscript{136} A banded kantharos assigned to the Late Geometric period is very similar to the standard type of kantharos in Akhaia and to examples from Olympia.\textsuperscript{137}

Together, the pottery from Olympia and Eleian Pylos provides a reminder that there were conceivably several local workshops in Elis, and that a similar situation may well have existed in Akhaia and Aitolia. The kantharoi of Olympia resemble more closely those of Akhaia, especially western Akhaia, than those from Eleian Pylos, even though Olympia is further away from Akhaia than Eleian Pylos. The importance of the pottery from Olympia and Eleian Pylos lies in its diachronic scope, especially for the Archaic and Classical periods, thus providing important complementary evidence to the published material from Akhaia, where the later Archaic and early Classical periods are less well represented. The forthcoming publication of the ceramics from Elis by Eder, as well as material from Akhaia by Anastasia Gadolou and Eleni Simoni, will greatly expand our knowledge of the regional pottery of the northwest Peloponnesian, and clarify many of the existing problems. Nevertheless, the deposits from Olympia and Eleian Pylos, when considered together with the largely funerary contexts from Akhaia, already allow us to trace the development of the northwest Peloponnesian kantharos from the early stages of the

\textsuperscript{135} This later type of kantharos is very similar to examples found at Tocra in North Africa, and elsewhere. Indeed, the Archaic levels at Tocra have yielded a number of interesting kantharoi, mostly decorated, but at least one monochrome vessel (\textit{Tocra} I, p. 91, pl. 68, no. 996); see below, Fig. 40.

\textsuperscript{136} See Eder and Mitsopoulos-Leon 1999, cols. 9–10, fig. 3.

\textsuperscript{137} Eder and Mitsopoulos-Leon 1999, col. 14, fig. 6.
Early Iron Age to the end of the Archaic period and later. More particularly, the history of the kantharos can be reconstructed for the critical years of the Late Geometric and Early Archaic periods—exactly the time that similar pottery is found in South Italy, Sicily, and beyond. It is generally assumed that Eleian pottery, like Messenian, was never exported to the West, but the same was—and still is—generally assumed for Akhaian. I therefore wonder if some of the pottery found in Magna Graecia is not Eleian rather than Akhaian, and if we may not have underestimated the role played directly or indirectly by a sanctuary such as Olympia—with its international relations—in the movement of commodities, people, and ideas to the West.

On the basis of the material discussed above, the two main categories of Akhaian kantharoi that I have distinguished—the banded and the monochrome—can now be summarized. Of the two, the more diagnostic type is the banded kantharos. It comes in a variety of sizes, averaging 10–12 cm in height and a normal rim diameter of 9–11 cm. Some examples are proportionately taller and more slender (Figs. 9–10), whereas others are broader and more squat (Fig. 8). This distinction, noted at least as early as the Late Geometric period, if not earlier, remains standard during the Archaic period. The most common type of base is a low ring foot, though a plain disk base, either slightly pushed up on the underside or slightly hollowed, is also found. It is only on the latest kantharoi, from Olympia and Eleian Pylos, that the foot is taller and more conical. Despite this variation, the general form is remarkably standard. The lower wall rises steeply to the point of maximum diameter, which is set quite high; the upper wall curves in to an offset vertical or flaring rim of varying height. Two vertical handles are attached from near the midpoint directly to the rim. These are characteristically thin and sharply angular in profile.

The standard banded kantharos is painted solid on the exterior, except for a reserved band near the center, immediately below the lower handle attachment, which is decorated with two or three, sometimes more, thin

138. See Morgan 1990, pp. 26–105. The origins of Italian metalwork are important in this context, but beyond the scope of the present discussion. For recent comments on Italian metalwork at Olympia see, e.g., Shepherd 1995, pp. 73–76; Philipp 1994; also Schauer 1992–1993.
horizontal bands. The rim exterior is similarly reserved and decorated with several thin bands. The interior is painted solid, except for the rim, which is either reserved or decorated with one to three bands. The outer faces of the handles are usually decorated with stripes, both horizontal and diagonal, as well as crosses, variously configured, or painted solid. A selection of some of the more common configurations of the decoration on the handles is presented in Figure 30. A few of the earlier banded kantharoi are further decorated with a variety of motifs in added white. Such decoration is limited to the upper body of the kantharos, above the reserved band near the midpoint and usually centered between the handles. Examples include the floral motifs on the kantharoi from Phlamboura in Akhaia (Fig. 11) and Olympia (Fig. 12), as well as the feline on the fragmentary kantharos from Olympia (Fig. 17). Added color becomes more standard on the late form of kantharos from Elis (Fig. 29).

Monochrome kantharoi are extremely common. The shape is a smaller version of the proportionately tall and slender banded kantharoi. A few pieces are painted in the same manner as the banded kantharoi, with a good metallic paint, but generally speaking the monochrome kantharoi are less well finished than the banded variety. There is, among the monochrome vessels, slightly more variation in the fired color of the clay, with a tendency to display a wider range of reddish brown and red than found on the banded vessels. The paint can vary from black through red, assuming many different shades of brown and reddish brown, sometimes appearing almost orange; often, the paint on a vessel can be two-toned. A flat disk base is often preferred, although a low ring foot is also common in the monochrome variety. The feet are typically smaller than those of the banded kantharoi, though some are of similar size. The profiles of the monochrome and banded kantharoi are similar: the lower wall rises steeply to the point of maximum diameter and the upper wall curves in to an offset vertical or flaring rim. Standard vertical strap handles, almost triangular in shape, are characteristic.

As with banded kantharoi, some monochrome examples are tall and slender (Fig. 16:b), whereas others are broader and more squat (Fig. 7). A chronological development from stout to slender seems evident. One-handed versions of the shape (strictly speaking, one-handed cups) are known, but they are less common than the two-handed kantharoi. Because monochrome kantharoi are less well finished than their banded counterparts, it is difficult to determine whether an individual kantharos is locally produced or an Akhaian import, especially in Italy. Given the current state of knowledge, all that can be said is that this is a very common variety of vessel found in the plain of Sybaris, but also widely distributed over a large area of southern Italy and Sicily. Similar monochrome kantharoi, also less well made than the banded variety, are very common in Akhaia (especially western Akhaia), as well as in Aitolia, Elis, and parts of Phokis and Lokris.

The majority of the banded and monochrome kantharoi found in South Italy and Sicily listed below are best accommodated in the 7th and early

6th centuries B.C. Of the kantharoi in the West, I am certain that, on the basis of their fabric and close similarity in shape and decoration with vessels found in the northwestern Peloponnese, many are imports. Others, however, were clearly produced locally. To insist, however, that the entire group is either local or imported or even that certainty is possible in all cases would be premature. Whether local or imported, however, the Akhaian—or northwest Peloponnesian—pedigree of this vessel form is unmistakable.

AKHAIAN AND AKHAIAN-STYLE POTTERY OUTSIDE ITS HOME REGION

The following annotated list is highly selective. It enumerates examples of Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery, primarily kantharoi, most of which have been previously published. It is presented here to substantiate the distribution pattern of Akhaian pottery outside its home region. The core of this list is material found in southern Italy. As noted above, some of the entries may turn out to be from Elis or some other center of western Greece, including the Ionian islands. In compiling this list I have usually erred on the side of caution, preferring to exclude uncertain pieces; at times, however, I have chosen to include problematic pieces rather than to disregard them. The latter are presented in a spirit of inquiry and are discussed in more detail below.

GREECE

The few pieces listed here are those that may be assigned as Akhaian with reasonable confidence. I do not include material from the northwest Peloponnese, Aitolia, Akarnania, or parts of Phokis and Lokris.

EASTERN CORINTHIAN GULF

Perachora

At least one fragment of an Akhaian banded kantharos from Humfry Payne’s excavations at the sanctuaries of Hera Akrai and Limenia at Perachora was originally classified as East Greek.140 Perachora has also yielded several examples of possible Akhaian monochrome kantharoi.141 Of the latter, some or all may derive from another West Greek center, perhaps even Ithaka.

Perachora II:

—Rim fragment, banded kantharos, p. 373, pl. 156, no. 4036. Cf other related fragments, including p. 376, pl. 157, no. 4067 (referred to as an “East Greek cup”).

—Three monochrome kantharoi, only one of which is illustrated (p. 72, pl. 28, no. 625), although two more are mentioned. The
illustrated fragment, no. 625, shown together with numerous fragments of Corinthian pottery, stands out on pl. 28 as being not obviously Corinthian.
—Cf. p. 374, pl. 156, no. 4047.142

**The Ionian Islands**143

**Ithake**

Outside of its home region, the greatest concentration of what I believe to be Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery in Greece is found on Ithake, and it is no coincidence that the alphabet used on the island is very similar to Akhaian.144 Considerable work on defining Ithakesian ceramic fabrics and workshops is currently being done by Sarantis and Nancy Symeonglou, and many of the statements made here will eventually need to be revised in light of their more comprehensive study.

In early studies of pottery from Aetos, Akhaian pottery was not recognized as an imported group. Robertson was the first to distinguish what I refer to as Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery as a *distinct class* within what he considered the local repertoire.145 He writes:

... but there exists an intermediate series, containing pieces of considerable worth, which shows the Ithakan potters' attempt to form a Geometric style of their own. This series begins with the metallising group mentioned above. ... The earliest pieces of this group—the krater 362 and the oinochoe 413—are almost Protogeometric and of poor quality, but the kantharos 331, the oinochoai 414 and 415 and the pithos 401 have in a quiet way

142. Cited by Hayes, in *Tocra I*, p. 89, n. 10, as a possible example of the Late Archaic kantharos of the type found at Eleian Pylos and Olympia (see above). It should be remembered that at the time when *Tocra I* was published, *Olforsch* VIII and Coleman 1986 had not yet appeared.

143. I list here only Ithake and Korkyra. There are, to my knowledge, no clear examples of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery from Kephallenia. The recent work of d'Agostino and Soteriou (1998) has shown that this island was not, as previously thought, devoid of human settlement in the period between the demise of Mycenaean civilization and the 8th century B.C. Of the small quantity of Geometric and Early Archaic pottery recently published from Pale and Same (d'Agostino and Soteriou 1998), the most prominent imported pottery is Corinthian. D'Agostino and Soteriou stress the role of Corinth on Kephallenia, which, they argue, was used as a Corinthian "stopover" to the West. Although there are no Akhaian pieces among the fragments recently published from Kephallenia, it is useful to remember that the Kephallenian alphabet resembles Akhaian, and therefore Ithakesian, in most respects, except for the use of the straight iota; see Jeffery 1990, pp. 231–232. The quantity of *published* Geometric and Early Archaic material from Zakynthos remains meager (see Benton 1931–1932, pp. 213–220; Snodgrass 1971, pp. 170, 211, 243), and even the Archaic alphabet of the island is unknown (there is no material from Zakynthos in Jeffery 1990). Despite the dearth of published material, the Zakynthians, according to Thucydides (2.66), were colonists of the Akhaians. The emblem of the tripod on the coinage of the island was compared to that of the Akhaian colony of Kroton by Benton (1931–1932, p. 220) long ago; for the coinage of Zakynthos see Gardner 1887, pp. 94–104; Kraay 1976, pp. 96, 100, 102–103, pl. 16, no. 283.


145. Robertson 1948.
considerable dignity of build and design. The decorative system of the oinochoai and the pithos is already truly Geometric, but there is little distinguishably foreign about them, and they seem to be a local development.\textsuperscript{146} 

It should be remembered that at the time when Robertson penned these sentences Akhaian pottery was virtually unknown. For this reason, several kantharoi found in the area of Taranto in South Italy were referred to as vessels of “Ithakesian type.”\textsuperscript{147} In any case, by 1953, the other half of the idiosyncratic pithos 401 published by Robertson was found and in discussing the piece, Sylvia Benton was firmly of the opinion that it was imported; she writes:

I am sure it is imported, but I do not know whence or when. It looks to me early and Cretan, but J. K. Brock does not think it is Cretan and adds that, if it were, it would be late!\textsuperscript{148}

In this statement, Benton not only challenged the Ithakesian provenance of this class of pottery, but also its Geometric date. Unfortunately, scholars were reluctant to follow her lead, and by 1968, in dealing with the same category of pottery, Coldstream writes:

In Ithaca there is also a class of local vases that is innocent of decoration; the entire surface is covered in glaze, punctuated only by groups of fine reserved bands at wide intervals. The nucleus, which has been collected by Robertson, consists of the kantharos R 331, the “pithos” R 401, and the tall jugs R 414 and 415.\textsuperscript{149}

This entire group, plus several of the kantharoi published by Robertson and Benton, I believe to be Akhaian imports. In shape they are related to local Ithakesian pottery, especially the ubiquitous kantharos, but their decoration and fabric are different. Moreover, they date to the end of Late Geometric or later. The following pieces from Ithake are listed here as likely Akhaian imports.

Robertson 1948:
—Banded kantharos (Fig. 31:a), pp. 66–67, fig. 40, pl. 22, no. 354.\textsuperscript{150}
—Monochrome kantharos (Fig. 31:b), pp. 66–67, fig. 40, pl. 22, no. 352; cf. no. 353.
—Krater, pp. 63–64, fig. 39, pl. 21, no. 331.\textsuperscript{151}
—Banded oinochoai, pp. 73, 75, fig. 44, pl. 27, nos. 414–415.
—Banded “pithos,” pp. 72–73, fig. 44, pl. 27, no. 401.\textsuperscript{152}
—Banded long-necked oinochoe; cf. p. 79, pl. 33, no. 471.

Benton 1938–1939:
—Fragmentary base, kantharos or one-handled cup, p. 19, pl. 10, no. 3.
—Three kantharoi, p. 20, pl. 10, nos. 19–21 (only nos. 20–21 are illustrated).

\textsuperscript{146} Robertson 1948, pp. 105, 109.

\textsuperscript{147} Lo Porto 1964, p. 227, fig. 48, with references to Robertson 1948, pl. 22, nos. 341, 354; Benton 1953, pp. 289, 292, fig. 11, no. 768, all of which I believe to be Akhaian imports. Cf., more recently, Maruggi 1996, pp. 262, 265, no. 226.

\textsuperscript{148} Benton 1953, p. 302, under no. 859.

\textsuperscript{149} Coldstream 1968, p. 227.

\textsuperscript{150} Cf. also the decoration on no. 341, pp. 66–67, fig. 40, pl. 22; the fabric and especially the shape of this kantharos are different from those of the Akhaian imports.

\textsuperscript{151} Although both Robertson and Coldstream classified this vessel as a kantharos, I prefer to call it a krater (or a kantharoid krater), since the thickened rim, different from that of a kantharos, does not facilitate drinking.

\textsuperscript{152} The zigzag or tremulous line flanked by bands on the upper shoulder is similar to that on the rim of the Akhaian kantharos from Valmantoura (Fig. 8).
Benton 1953:
—Benton lists seven kantharoi under the heading “dark late kantharoi” (pp. 289, 292, fig. 11, pl. 47, nos. 767–773). One of these (p. 289, fig. 11, no. 768) is a standard Akhaian banded kantharos. Another kantharos and a base fragment (p. 292, nos. 767 and 769) are not illustrated. The kantharos handles on p. 292, pl. 47, nos. 770–772 (some appear in Fig. 30) are typical decorated handles of Akhaian banded kantharoi. Benton illustrates only one Akhaian monochrome kantharos: p. 289, fig. 11, no. 773, which she compares (p. 292, n. 261) to Argive kantharoi.
—Banded “pithos,” p. 302, pl. 52, no. 859 (= the “pithos” published in Robertson 1948, pl. 27, no. 401).
—Banded amphoras; cf. p. 303, pl. 52, nos. 860–861.\(^{153}\)
—Banded oinochoe; cf. p. 309, pl. 44, no. 872 (also nos. 873–874, which are not illustrated).\(^{154}\)

**Korkyra**

The excavations conducted in the 1960s by George Dontas in ancient Korkyra (in the Εὔελπίδη plot) brought light a disturbed cemetery of the Late Geometric and Early Archaic periods underlying the remains of Classical houses.\(^{155}\) The imported pottery recovered from these excavations included, among other finds, Protocorinthian, Attic, and East Greek pottery.\(^{156}\) Possible Akhaian or other West Greek imports include the following:

**Dontas 1967:**
—Fragmentary banded jug, pl. 442:β. It is unclear from the photograph whether this vessel is an example of an Early Geometric jug from Corinth, as is claimed by the excavator, or an Akhaian banded jug or kantharos.

**Dontas 1968:**
—Rim fragment of an Akhaian or other West Greek krater, p. 323,

---

\(^{153}\) These are referred to by Benton as Early Geometric and “probably imported” (“fabric like Early Attic”). I am not sure that they are Akhaian, but they are certainly not Athenian Early Geometric; they are listed here as queries. Whatever their provenance, they do not look early. Cf. also p. 318, pl. 57, no. 970.

\(^{154}\) As with the amphoras, Benton classified no. 872 as Early Geometric and imported (“may be Attic”). Although similar banding is found on Athenian Early and especially Middle Geometric oinochoai, no. 872 does not seem to be Athenian and early. I prefer to compare it to the Akhaian jugs published in Robertson 1948, pl. 27, nos. 414 and 415.

\(^{155}\) The alphabet of Korkyra, unlike Ithake and Kephallenia, is Corinthian; see Jeffery 1990, pp. 232–233; also Kalligas 1984.

\(^{156}\) See Dontas 1965, pl. 210:γ–δ (Protocorinthian), pl. 211:α–γ (Geometric, Corinthian, and East Greek).
In describing the fragment, Dontas compares the piece to “island” and Corinthian styles, but is unable to suggest a provenance with conviction. The fragment, which preserves a row of vertically set tremulous lines between horizontal bands, framed by “sausage” motifs, is very similar to the Antikyra and Bitalemi kraters discussed above (Fig. 15:a-b).

In addition to the excavations conducted in the Ἐνελπίδη plot, ancient Korkyra (including the excavations in levels below the Early Christian Basilica of Iovianou, in the ancient agora, and at Mon Repos) has yielded at least one other possible Akhaian import:

Kallipolitis 1984:
—Fragments possibly of an Akhaian kantharos, p. 71, fig. 4.

NORTHWEST GREECE

Vitsa Zagoriou (Epeiros)\textsuperscript{157}

The excavation of the Molossian cemetery at Vitsa Zagoriou yielded two vessels from the northwest Peloponnese or the Ionian islands, a kantharos and a related one-handed version referred to as a kyathos, published by Vokotopoulou and both stated to be imports to the site. Vokotopoulou specifically refers to the kantharos as Akhaian; the kyathos is compared with similar vessels from Ithake.

Vokotopoulou 1986:
—Kantharos, p. 59, pl. 81:γ, fig. 71:γ, Tomb 45-2 (inv. 2191);
 (= Vokotopoulou 1984, p. 96, fig. 26).
—“Kyathos,” probably Ithakesian, p. 58, pl. 81:β, fig. 71:β, Tomb 45-1 (inv. 2140).

SOUTH ITALY

Akhaian apoikiai and Closely Related Indigenous Settlements

In the following list I have included two sites that are not, strictly speaking, Akhaian “colonies”: the first is the extramural sanctuary of Sybaris on the Timpone della Motta at Francavilla Marittima, which is located on the site of an earlier indigenous settlement.\textsuperscript{158} The close connection between Sybaris and Francavilla is clearly reflected in the large quantities of Akhaian pottery found at both sites, especially at Francavilla, where the material is mostly of the Archaic period. It is also reflected in the Akhaian dialect on the bronze Kleom(b)rotos inscription found on the Timpone della Motta, which identifies the sanctuary as that of Athena. I have also placed the indigenous settlement of Incoronata immediately after Metapontion. Again, the close relationship between the two can be seen in the pottery, especially the locally produced kantharoi in gray fabric that have been found in quantity at Incoronata that are clearly Akhaianizing.

\textsuperscript{157} In addition to the listed pieces from Vitsa, there are possible fragments of Akhaian-style kantharoi from Arta, mostly from rescue excavations in the city. See Vokotopoulou 1984, p. 79, fig. 2, second row, first on the left; cf. third row, second from the right (οἰκότεθος Κοῦροτη); also p. 82, fig. 6, possible fragments (οἰκότεθος Ἀγίων Ἀναγγέλων).

\textsuperscript{158} See the comments in Pedley 1990, p. 27: “At Francavilla, the Greeks showed no restraint; to mark their conquest, they built a sanctuary of Athena on top of the ruined Oenotrian village.”
Sybaris

I have seen numerous examples of kantharoi from the Archaic levels of the city, primarily from the excavations in the area of the "Parco del Cavallo," now in the Sybaris Museum. Among the classified and published material from the Archaic levels, several pieces designated "coppe ioniche" or "coppe a filetti" may be from Akhaian or Akhaian-style kantharoi. I have not had occasion to sort carefully through all of this material. The following is a list of the few published pieces that can be classified as Akhaian or Akhaian-style with some degree of certainty; there are many more pieces from the city, published and unpublished, that are not listed here:

Sibari I:
—Kantharos, p. 86, fig. 76, no. 216a (= p. 95, fig. 82, no. 216a-b). This piece (Fig. 32) is almost certainly Akhaian or Akhaian-style, rather than a "coppa di tipo ionico," as stated in the catalogue entry (p. 95). The fragment is mentioned in Coldstream 1998a, pp. 328, 331, n. 27.
—Open vessel, cf. p. 45, fig. 41, no. 122c and other fragments thought to be from Ionian-type cups.

Sibari II:
—Some of the rim fragments on p. 159, figs. 163–164, may be Akhaian, but they are too small and fragmentary to allow for certainty.
—Cf. some of the rim fragments on p. 174, fig. 189; p. 266, fig. 282.

Sibari III:
—Body fragment, open vessel, with added white, pp. 399, 427, fig. 437, no. 431 (inv. PdC 36978), wrongly labeled Corinthian. Clay described as "rosata," paint as "quasi metallica."

Sibari IV:
—Cf. some of the "coppe ioniche" on p. 329, fig. 322, and earlier plates. Note also the comments on pp. 531–532 on "coppe ioniche o d’imitazione."

Sibari V:
—Monochrome kantharos, pp. 123–124, fig. 107, no. 180 (= p. 137, fig. 122, no. 4495, inv. PdC 4495).
—Cf. p. 114, fig. 100, no. 149 (inv. PdC 2829).
—Cf. possible pieces on figs. 106, 108.
—Cf. the closed vessel, p. 132, fig. 117, no. 213.
—Cf. p. 207, fig. 207, no. 241 (= p. 236, fig. 221, inv. PdC 4079)

Francavilla Marittima

The settlement associated with the sanctuary on the Timpone della Motta, along with the tombs in the Macchiabate necropolis, has been identified most recently by Marianne Maaskant-Kleibrink as ancient Lagaria.159 It has to be stressed, however, that other sites, such as San Nicola near Amendolara (see below), cannot be categorically ruled out and remain

attractive alternatives.\textsuperscript{160} From the extramural sanctuary of Sybaris, excavated by Paola Zancani Montuoro and Maria Stoop,\textsuperscript{161} come numerous fragments of Akhaian kantharoi. Hundreds, if not thousands, of unpublished fragments in the Antiquarium and museum are being studied for publication by Silvana Luppino, Luigina Tomay, and their collaborators. In comparison, the tombs of the Macchiabate have, to date, yielded only one possible Akhaian or Akhaian-style kantharos.\textsuperscript{162} The relevant pottery from the Timpone della Motta is by far the largest collection of Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery in Magna Graecia known to me. The following inventoried pieces are those few examples that have been published to date, as well as those on display at the Sybaris Museum.

Tomay, Munzi, and Gentile 1996:
—Three rim fragments of banded kantharoi from “Stipe I” on the south side of the plateau (inv. FM 104005, FM 104006, FM 104007), p. 218, no. 3.95. All three fragments should be Akhaian imports.
—Two illustrated fragments (Fig. 14, two examples on far left), identical in shape, fabric, and decoration to the previous entry, but with added white decoration, pp. 218–219, no. 3.96.\textsuperscript{163}

Stoop 1979:
—Locally made monochrome kantharos, pp. 82–83, no. 3, p. 94, pl. IV:2, perhaps influenced by Akhaian kantharoi.

Stoop 1983:
—Jug, classified as an aryballos, pp. 29, 49, fig. 29, and described as “la stranezza dell’aryballos (fig. 29), che ricorda la ceramica insulare, rende difficile una datazione precisa ma dovrebbe appartenere al 7. secolo.” The vessel in fabric, shape, and decoration closely resembles Akhaian examples.\textsuperscript{164}

Unpublished examples:
—Three fragments, identical to those in Tomay, Munzi, and Gentile 1996, pp. 218–219, no. 3.96 (with added white, see above), on display in the museum (Fig. 14, center and far right). Together, these five fragments (FM 65207, FM 65221, FM 65235, FM 65236, FM 94270) derive from the excavations on the Timpone della Motta, although their exact location on the hill is not known. All are body fragments, except for FM 65235, which preserves part of the rim. Another fragment with added white (FM 25208) is in the museum storeroom.
—Monochrome kantharos (FM 94229).

\textit{Francavilla Marittima} (forthcoming):
—From Francavilla Marittima come 76 catalogued and over 100 additional fragments of Akhaian and Akhaianizing pottery, primarily kantharoi—both banded and monochrome—some with added white, though with a smaller quantity of kraters or

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{160} The various literary sources on Lagaria would place the settlement between Sybaris and Siris. I would tend to agree with Dunbabin (1948, pp. 33, 35, 147 [map]) and de la Genière (1990), that Lagaria is more likely to be located further north, near Amendolara.

\textsuperscript{161} For the latest reconstructed plan of the site, including the location of the votive stipe, see Maaskant-Kleibrink 1993, 5, fig. 4. The excavations of the Timpone della Motta, which brought to light a wealth of Archaic votive objects, including a great quantity of Akhaian, were conducted by Maria Stoop, and published, in a series of essentially preliminary reports. See Stoop and Zancani Montuoro 1970–1971; Stoop 1979; 1980; 1982; 1983; 1985; 1987; 1988; 1989; 1990; 1991; Maaskant-Kleibrink 1970–1971; Yntema 1985; also Mertens and Schläger 1980–1982 for the architecture.


\textsuperscript{163} Tomay, Munzi, and Gentile (1996, p. 218) compare these with a fragment of a trefoil oinochoe with added white decoration from Sybaris, see \textit{Sibari} II, p. 192, figs. 193–194, 209, no. 414.

\textsuperscript{164} The vessel is not local, nor is it Corinthian or “island.” I am grateful to Christiane Dehl for sharing with me her thoughts about this piece.
\end{flushright}
krateriskoi, closed vessels, and a distinctive two-handed tankard resembling a Vapheio cup. A small selection of banded kantharos fragments, two with added white, are illustrated in Figure 6.

—Possible Akhaian or Akhaian-style monochrome kantharoi or one-handled cup from Tomb T.25, p. 73, pl. 42:a, no. 3, described as a “Tazza(?).”

In addition to the pieces listed above, the sanctuary at Francavilla Marittima has yielded a large number of kernoi (mostly unpublished), with attached kantharoi, as well as other attached shapes, including miniature hydriai or hydriskoi.165 A very similar complete ring kernos surmounted by seven monochrome kantharoi (without provenance), now in the San Antonio Museum of Art, is of interest as the attached kantharoi are identical to plain Akhaian and Akhaianizing monochrome kantharoi discussed above.166

—Ring kernos with seven attached monochrome kantharoi (Fig. 33), San Antonio Museum of Art, inv. 87.2.1, published in Shapiro, Picón, and Scott 1995, p. 257, no. 141, described as an “Italo-Corinthian kernos” and dated to the 8th–7th century B.C.

Laos

Laos was founded on the Tyrrenian coast by settlers from Sybaris, due west of the larger metropolis, and its possession allowed the Sybaritans to control the Sybaris-Laos isthmus. Two other sites on the Tyrrenian coast are associated with Sybaris: Skidros, the location of which remains

165. For a small published selection of such kernoi from the sanctuary on the Timpone della Motta, see Stoop 1983, p. 43, nos. 12–17. For the significance of kernoi and other vessels in Archaic ritual, particularly in the context of cult meals, see Kron 1988, esp. p. 146, fig. 11.

166. Preferring material from known contexts, I have not made a thorough search of unprovenanced comparanda in museums, particularly as plain banded or monochrome vessels, such as Akhaian kantharoi, are not highly prized as exhibition-quality material. The same is true in most museums; even in Greece, at museums such as the National Museum or the Patras Museum, the number of Akhaian kantharoi on display is very small.
problematic, and Kerilloi, modern Cerilla, located just south of Laos.\footnote{167} After the destruction of Sybaris in 510 B.C., many Sybaritans sought asylum in Laos and Skidros.\footnote{168} The excavations at Laos have yielded a small quantity of Archaic pottery, including fragments of open vessels of uncertain shape with banded decoration. Although there is, as far as I know, no published piece from the site that is clearly Akhaian or Akhaian-style, a few pieces are worth noting as possibilities, including the following:

—Laos I, pp. 101–102, pl. 27, no. 23.

\textit{Kroton}

An early Akhaian colony, Kroton controlled a large territory and flourished in the 7th and 6th centuries B.C., especially after its victory over Sybaris in 510 B.C. The city enjoyed the hegemony of the Italiote League, which met in the sanctuary of Hera Lakinia, and its history has been discussed by a number of able commentators.\footnote{169} The Archaic levels at Kroton have not been thoroughly published. The material from Kroton published in Sabbione 1984 includes no definite examples of Akhaian kantharoi, though a number of fragments, listed below, may well be from Akhaian or Akhaianizing kantharoi. Moreover, some of the skyphoi, especially those in Sabbione 1984, pp. 260–265, would repay closer study, as would those from Santo Stefano di Grotteria, Sabbione 1984, pp. 286–293 (see below).

—Possible Akhaian or Akhaian-style kantharoi, Sabbione 1984, p. 261, nos. 34 and 38.

—Krater foot fragment, Sabbione 1984, p. 270, fig. 19, no. 68, looks Akhaian or Akhaian-style.

\textit{Sanctuary of Hera Lakinia at Cape Colonna}

There are, as far as I know, no published examples of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery from the sanctuary of Hera Lakinia at Cape Colonna, located to the south of the ancient city of Kroton.\footnote{170} The site has yielded numerous examples of miniature, undecorated kantharoi, referred to as “krateriskoi.”\footnote{171}

\textit{Sanctuary of Apollo Alaios at Cape Krimissa (Cirò)}

As with the sanctuary of Hera Lakinia, there are no published examples of Akhaian pottery from the excavations at the sanctuary of Apollo Alaios that I am aware of. The excavations have yielded a number of miniature votive vessels, among which various types of kantharoi are predominant.\footnote{172}

\textit{Kaulonia}

As Morgan and Hall have argued, there are two concurrent versions of Kaulonia’s foundation: a Krotonian version naming Kroton as the Kaulonian metropolis, and a Kaulonian version, which attempted to establish a first-generation Akhaian pedigree.\footnote{173} Archaic levels have been excavated in various parts of the site, although the pottery from the earlier excavations by Paolo Orsi has not been thoroughly published. A number of Corinthian and other sherds are illustrated by Orsi, as is some of the
The material from the recent excavations along the north fortification wall includes Archaic fragments, listed under the general category "coupes subgéométriques à filets," or "coupes à décor de bandes," that are possibly Akhaian or Akhaianizing, especially the following:

—Tréziny 1989, p. 44, fig. 28, nos. 4, 8, 17; p. 49, fig. 31, nos. 58, 60–61.

Metapontion

The northernmost of the Akhaian apoikiai of Magna Graecia, located at the mouth of the river Basento, Metapontion was a prosperous city, controlling an extensive territory. Metaponto itself, along with the earlier indigenous settlement at Incoronata, has seen ongoing excavations for a number of decades and it would be no exaggeration to state that the chora of Classical Metapontion has been more fully investigated than that of any other Classical city, its territory subject to regular division. In 1948 Dunbabin characterized the city in the following terms: “Metapontion was a small city whose many unusual cults may reflect an obscure and mixed origin. . . . in antiquity it was a worthy object of strife, and the Metapontines had to maintain themselves against both Tarantines and the native Oinotrians.” The model of Metaponto’s “obscure and mixed origin” may well be applied to numerous other settlements in southern Italy and Sicily.

Metaponto I:
—Possible fragments of banded open vessels, p. 216, fig. 223 (top left); the remaining fragments, all of which are probably from the same vessel, are clearly from a horizontal-handled form.
—Cf. also some of the rim fragments: p. 279, fig. 292:a (top row).

Adamesteanu 1984:
—Possible fragments of banded kantharoi, skyphoi, and kraters from the area of the Ekklesiasterion, dating to the second half of the 7th century: p. 312, figs. 12–13. Although the pieces are too fragmentary to identify with certainty, several of the rim fragments, as well as some of the krater fragments, are possibly Akhaian or Akhaian-style.

Incoronata

The indigenous settlement at the site of Incoronata, explored in recent years by a team from the University of Milan, was never an Akhaian colony, or at least no certain literary tradition concerning it survives. Its fate, however, was intimately linked with the rise of Metaponto and it is for this reason listed here. The relationship between Incoronata and Metaponto has most recently been explored by Osborne, who concludes: “Metapontum survived into the Classical period and acquired a colonial history. Incoronata perished at the end of the seventh century and did not. Should we account for their different fates in terms of different origins?

174. Orsi 1914, esp. cols. 817–818, fig. 77, and the material from the cemetery (cols. 906–941); see also Orsi 1891; 1923; Tréziny 1989.
176. Carter 1990; 1994. As Carter (1998, p. 3) has recently stated, the rural cemetery at Pantanello, in the territory of Metaponto, is the first necropolis of Magna Graecia to have been published in its entirety.
177. Dunbabin 1948, p. 87.
178. For bibliography see Orlandini and Castoldi 1995, pp. 11–21.
Figure 34. Incoronata, banded kantharos, St. 143654. Scale 1:2.
P. Finnerty, after Basento, p. 132, no. 71
(= p. 171, no. 2)

Or have their different fates in fact given them different literary fates? Whatever their fate, a good deal more Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery has been found at Incoronata than at Metapontion. This is perhaps not surprising, given the earlier date of the excavated levels at Incoronata.

Basento:
In addition to the pieces listed below, many of the pieces presented under the heading “ceramica di produzione coloniale” may prove to be Akhaian or inspired by Akhaian prototypes.

—Fragmentary banded kantharos (Fig. 34), p. 132, no. 71, p. 171, no. 2 (St. 143654), preserving complete profile, recognized by Davide Ciafaloni as a West Greek import, and compared to a similar kantharos from Asani published by Dekoulakou.

—Complete monochrome kantharos, p. 158, no. 107 (St. 288936), listed under locally produced “colonial” pottery.

—Fragmentary monochrome kantharos, p. 172, no. 135 (St. 123773), listed under the heading “ceramica buccheride,” but since the piece was fired red (oxidized), it is not listed under the “gray ware” discussed below.

—Cf. the banded “stamnos,” p. 153, no. 93 (St. 143654).

—Cf. complete skyphos, p. 159, no. 108 (St. 123615). This skyphos and others like it were locally produced but may have been based on Akhaian prototypes. They are very similar to skyphoi found in Akhaia, and there are no known locally produced Corinthian imitations from Metaponto.

Orlandini and Castoldi 1991:
—Two fragmentary banded kantharoi, pp. 51, 57, 76, 116, nos. 73–74, figs. 111–112, 191 (top row), St. 283812/2 and St. 283810/1 + 283811/1 + 283812/1 + 283807/2 (= Semeraro 1996, p. 271 [bottom], referred to as “kantharoi coloniales”).

—Rim fragment, banded kantharos, pp. 82, 97, no. 50, fig. 168 (St. 292776), described as “Frammento di presunto vasetto cantaroide.”

—Fragmentary monochrome kantharos, p. 101, fig. 182, no. 1 (St. 283857/1 + 283863).
Orlandini and Castoldi 1992:
—Cf. some of the base fragments illustrated on p. 82, figs. 140–142.

Orlandini and Castoldi 1995:
—Cf. one–handled cup related to the standard monochrome kantharos, pp. 68, 87, 157, figs. 78, 211 (left), no. 56 (St. 299719).
—A number of closed vessels, mostly one–handled jugs, seem very close in shape and style, if not fabric, to similar jugs in the northwest Peloponnese and in the area of the western Corinthian Gulf more generally. Among others, note especially the following: p. 153, fig. 194; p. 154, figs. 197–199.

Stea 1991:
Incoronata has produced a large number of locally made kantharoi in a distinctive gray fabric, which has been most recently studied by Giuliana Stea. The color of the clay, produced by reduction firing, has tended to dominate any discussion of this class of pottery. Consequently, it is more often than not considered against the backdrop of other gray fabrics, such as those from Troy, Lesbos, Chios, Larissa–on–the–Hermos, Smyrna, and elsewhere, including the general category of “bucchero ionico.” Locally made vessels of exactly the same shape, fabric, and decoration, but oxidized, and therefore fired red, also occur at Incoronata, suggesting that the category “ceramica grigia” or “ceramica buccheroide” need not designate a distinctive ware or type of fabric in all cases. Among the variety of shapes produced in the “gray” fabric at Incoronata, the kantharos occurs most frequently. The shape is fully discussed by Stea, who cites examples from various parts of South Italy, as well as Greece—Ithake, Akhaia, Elis, Epeiros, and the region around Delphi—including some of the pieces listed here. 181 Stea distinguishes three types of kantharoi: a globular type with elevated handles—that is rising above the level of the rim—(no. 1); a globular type with bent handles (nos. 2–5); and a “piriform” type (nos. 15–22). She also distinguishes a “kantharoid cup” (nos. 23–24). With the possible exception of no. 1, all are derivative of the standard Akhaian shape, whether banded or monochrome. I list below the gray–ware kantharoi in the order given by Stea:

—Kantharos, p. 414, fig. 13, no. 1 (St. 138826).
—Kantharos (Fig. 35:a), p. 415, figs. 4, 13, no. 2 (St. 145320).
—Fragmentary kantharos, p. 415, fig. 13, no. 3 (St. 124752).
—Kantharos, p. 415, figs. 5, 13, no. 4 (St. 299717).
—Body and handle fragments, kantharos, p. 415, fig. 13, no. 5 (St. 138823).
—Rim and body fragment, kantharos, p. 415, fig. 13, no. 6 (St. 136929/1).
—Kantharos fragments, p. 415, no. 7 (St. 123392–393).
—Rim and body fragment, kantharos, p. 415, fig. 14, no. 8 (St. 136929/2).

---Rim and body fragments, kantharos, p. 415, fig. 14, no. 9 (St. 124756).
---Rim fragment, kantharos, p. 415, fig. 14, no. 10 (St. 135809/4).
---Rim fragment, kantharos, p. 415, no. 11 (St. 136735).
---Rim fragment, kantharos, p. 415, fig. 14, no. 12 (St. 283435/1).
---Base and body fragment, kantharos, p. 415, fig. 14, no. 13 (St. 145321).
---Base fragment, kantharos, p. 415, fig. 14, no. 14 (St. 124754).
---Kantharos (Fig. 35:b), p. 415, figs. 6, 14, no. 15 (St. 137714); Orlandini 1985, p. 231, fig. 31; Malnati 1984, p. 75, pl. 23:a; Basento, p. 173, no. 136.
---Kantharos (Fig. 35:c), pp. 415–416, figs. 7, 15, no. 16 (St. 299716).
---Rim and body fragments, kantharos, p. 416, no. 17 (St. 123509).
---Rim and body fragments, kantharos, p. 416, no. 18 (St. 135809/1).
---Rim and body fragment, kantharos, p. 416, fig. 15, no. 19 (St. 124755).
---Rim and body fragment, kantharos, p. 416, fig. 15, no. 20 (St. 124755). 182
---Rim and body fragment, kantharos, p. 416, fig. 15, no. 21 (St. 283435/2).

182. Same published inventory number as the previous piece.
—Rim and body fragment, kantharos, p. 416, fig. 15, no. 22 (St. 136930).

—Large kantharos (referred to as a “crateriscos”) (Fig. 35:d), p. 416, figs. 8, 15, no. 23 (St. 137713); Orlandini 1985, p. 231, fig. 31; Basento, p. 173, no. 137.

—Fragmentary large kantharos (as previous), p. 416, no. 24 (St. 135809/2).

Orlandini 1984:

—Kantharoid krater, considered to be of local fabric, but which looks Akhaian in shape, decoration—even especially the banding on the lower body and the decoration of the handle—and fabric: p. 319, fig. 10 (= Basento, p. 151, no. 87 [St. 123747]).

**Poseidonia (Paestum)**

The most distant of the colonies of Sybaris, Poseidonia was traditionally founded around 600 B.C. and grew rapidly in the course of the 6th century B.C., a period of intense urban expansion. Although material evidence indicates that the nearby sanctuary at Foce del Sele was occupied perhaps as early as 700 B.C., the quantity of Early Archaic material recovered from Poseidonia itself is not great, and there is nothing clearly Akhaian or Akhaian-style in the more recently published material from the site. A possible example of an Akhaian or Akhaian-style kantharos from Foce del Sele is listed below. Jean Bérard suggested that the original Greek settlement was at the mouth of the river Sele (the ancient Silaris), but Dunbabin expressed uncertainty as to whether this was the original Sybaritan settlement, to be dated around 700 B.C., or “whether it preceded the Sybarites, who were responsible only for the settlement on the site of Poseidonia.”

Be that as it may, Coldstream has speculated that the Akhaian or Akhaian-style kantharoi found at inland sites such as Sala Consilina (see below) may have derived from Poseidonia rather than the east coast of Calabria. Such a movement, from west to east or southeast, is certainly possible and Poseidonia is well situated with regard to the inland route to the Vallo di Diano, skirting the rural sanctuary at Albanella. The relatively late date of the settlement at Poseidonia, however, renders the city a less likely source for the Akhaian-style kantharoi found further inland.

The more recent excavations at the extramural sanctuary in the “località Santa Venera” just outside the south wall of Poseidonia and some 450 m east of the south gate have yielded pottery ranging in date from the 6th century B.C. to the Medieval period. The material includes Corinthian, Attic, and East Greek imports, alongside locally produced imitations of Corinthian pottery and Ionian cups. Although there are no clear examples of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery, Theresa Menard, who is responsible for the publication of the pottery from the sanctuary, informs me that there may be one fragment from a vertical-handled vessel similar to Akhaian kantharoi. As with the settlement of Poseidonia, the late date of the foundation of the sanctuary would greatly limit the quantity of

183. See Pedley 1990.
184. For Foce del Sele see especially Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti–Bianco 1937, p. 209; Dunbabin 1948, pp. 25–26, 263. For an overview of Poseidonia see Pedley 1990; for the recent excavations at the site see Poseidonia–Paestum I–III; also Greco, d’Ambrosio, and Theodorescu 1996.
185. See Bérard 1941, p. 236; Dunbabin 1948, p. 26; see further Jeffery 1990, pp. 252–253.
186. See Dunbabin 1948, pp. 200–210; Pedley 1990, p. 18, fig. 6.
187. For an overview of the site, the history of exploration, and finds, see Johannowsky, Pedley, and Torelli 1983; Pedley 1990, pp. 129–162.
189. I am grateful to Theresa Menard for showing me photographs and drawings of all the catalogued pottery from the sanctuary at Santa Venera.
diagnostic Akhaian or Akhaian-style vessels. More recently, a number of sherds with dipinti evidently in the Akhaian alphabet have been found in the excavations directed by John Pedley and James Higginbotham.

**Foce del Sele**

The material from the sanctuary of Hera on the Foce del Sele (Capaccio), excavated by Paola Zancani Montuoro and Umberto Zanotti-Bianco, includes some of the earliest Greek imports to the region of Poseidonia. Illustrated among the pieces of Protocorinthian pottery in an early preliminary report is a solitary (miniature) kantharos:

—Small or miniature monochrome kantharos: Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco 1937, p. 323, fig. 78, top row, third from left.

A number of other Akhaian settlements, possible “colonies,” or dependencies are known, some only by their coinage. On the Tyrrhenian side, in addition to Laos and Kerilloi, are Aminaia, Pyxous, and Sirinos, the latter often confused with Siris/Polieion, as well as Terina and Temesa, with its copper mines, which came under the control of Kroton. Jeffery has provisionally assigned a coin with ΠΩΛ on the obverse and ΜΩΛ on the reverse to Molpe and Cape Palinuro, south of Poseidonia and Velia. From other parts of South Italy we can add Pandosia, an indigenous settlement that later came under the hegemony of Kroton, as well as Petelia and Krimissa (see above, Temple of Apollo Alaios).

**Non-Akhaian Settlements**

**Lokroi Epizefiri**

Lokroi Epizefiri, the *apoikia* of Opuntian Lokris established in the 7th century b.c., is so tradition states, went on to enjoy political prominence and itself founded a number of subsidiary settlements at Medma, Hipponion, and Metauros. The earliest levels of the city have not been as thoroughly explored as the Late Archaic and Classical levels.

---

190. I am grateful to John Pedley for showing me photographs of these fragments, which are to be published by James Higginbotham in a forthcoming issue of *NAC*.

191. For a description of the site and a detailed account of the architecture and architectural reliefs, see Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco 1951–1954. See further Zancani Montuoro 1964; 1965–1966; Stoop 1964; see also Pedley 1990, pp. 61–76.


194. Dunbabin (1948) distinguishes between Pandosia near Siris (pp. 33, 439) and Pandosia near Sybaris (pp. 83, 157); Jeffery 1990, pp. 254, 260. For Petelia see Dunbabin 1948, pp. 159–161; Jeffery 1990, pp. 258–259, 261.


196. See *Loci Epizefiri I–IV*. 
Nevertheless, a few possible, but uncertain, fragments of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery are listed below.

*Locri Epizefiri I:*
—Rim fragments: pl. 24:h, i, l, m, v (and others that are from horizontal-handled vessels), labeled “subgeometrica, corinizia e ionică.”

*Locri Epizefiri IV:*
—Cf. various rim fragments: pl. 44, nos. 1–4 (“ceramica locale arcaica e coppe di tipo ionico”).

*Santo Stefano di Grotteria*

The cemetery at S. Stefano di Grotteria, located about 15 km north of Lokroi Epizephyrioi and some 6 km inland, has yielded at least one complete Akhaian or Akhaianizing monochrome kantharos.197

—Tomb 2, inv. 51515 (on display in the Reggio di Calabria Museum); mentioned by de la Genière 1968, p. 189, n. 14 (and dated by her to the second half of the 7th century B.C.).

*Stefanelli di Gerace*

Claudio Sabbione considers that Stefanelli di Gerace, along with Santo Stefano di Grotteria, belonged to the *chora* of Lokroi.198 As far as I know, the site has yielded no Akhaian or Akhaian-style kantharoi. A number of skyphoi, however, thought to be locally produced, are remarkably similar in fabric and style to Akhaian pottery in the western Corinthian Gulf; see especially the following:

—Tomb XIV: Antiquarium di Locri, inv. 24562, Sabbione 1984, pp. 296, fig. 44, no. 102 (described on p. 295, n. 97, no. 102).

*Amendolara*

The site is located to the north of Sybaris and Francavilla Marittima. The excavations, directed by Juliette de la Genière over the course of several seasons, brought to light tombs in several cemeteries.199 The associated settlement was located and partly excavated at San Nicola (considered by some to be ancient Lagaria).200 At least one complete and one fragmentary kantharos were recovered from the tombs, and several others have been reported.201 The soil conditions of the site are such that all pottery is very badly preserved, particularly that from the cemeteries (Paladino and Mangosa). Consequently, it remains difficult to establish the following examples as imports or local products (whether produced at the site, in the plain of Sybaris, or to the north). The material is now stored in the Amendolara Museum.

—Complete kantharos from Mangosa Tomb 100, inv. 89830 (dated to the end of the 7th or early 6th century B.C.). The vessel appears to be monochrome.202

---

199. For a general overview of the site, see de la Genière 1967; 1969; also Laviola 1971.
200. See de la Genière 1967; de la Genière and Nickels 1975; Foti 1970, pp. 162–163, fig. 3. The other location thought by some scholars to be the site of ancient Lagaria is the settlement associated with, and mostly located below, the sanctuary on the Timpone della Motta at Francavilla Marittima; see Maaskant-Kleibrink 1993, p. 2.
202. I have not been able to locate a published illustration of kantharos inv. 89830. For some of the tombs excavated at the Mangosa cemetery at Amendolara, see de la Genière et al. 1980; also de la Genière 1971; 1973.
—Kantharos handle fragment: de la Genière 1973, Tomb 68, p. 42, fig. 20 (lower right). The presence of a shining black metallic glaze partially visible on the surface of this handle under the incrustation might suggest an Akhaian import. There is also a related rim fragment that must be from the same kantharoi, or one very similar.

Sala Consilina

An indigenous settlement in the valley of Diano, the site of Sala Consilina is located in the mountainous interior of eastern Campania, due east of Paestum and west of Metaponto and Taranto. Several complete kantharoi, either Akhaian imports or Akhaianizing (most probably the latter), are published by de la Genière and are important for mapping the distribution of the shape in the interior of southern Italy.

de la Genière 1968:
—Monochrome kantharos, Sala Consilina Tomb B.1, pl. 11:4 (right).
—Banded kantharos (banding restricted to midpoint of vessel only), Sala Consilina Tomb B.21, pl. 12:3 (right). Both kantharoi are mentioned in Coldstream 1998a, pp. 329, 331, n. 31.

Siris/Poliaeon/Herakleia (Policoro)

Like many other cities in Magna Graecia, Siris enjoyed a heroic pedigree, originating from Troy, though the basis for this remains rather unsubstantial; it is also said to have been a Rhodian colony. But the better-attested version, according to Dunbabin, makes Siris Kolophonian: the city was called Polieion, though the popular name—Siris—was taken from that of the river. As Dunbabin states: “Siris, an Ionian wedge between the two most northerly Akhaian cities, prospered for over a century and reached a height of luxury second only to Sybaris.” On the basis of numismatic evidence, some scholars once regarded the city as a Sybaritan foundation and thus Akhaian, but the relevant coinage dates to the second half of the 6th century B.C., after the city fell to the Akhaian from Sybaris, Kroton, and Metapontion. It is now clear that the coinage issued with the legend “Sirinos” refers to another city, not to Siris (see above). In 433/2 B.C. the site was partly built over by the later colony of Herakleia, which was founded by settlers from Taras. The problem of Siris’s various foundation traditions is well explored by Osborne.

The excavations at the site have brought to light a large number of open vessels with plain, banded decoration. Many of these are designated “coppe a filetti” and many are clearly fragments of horizontal-handled vessels (cups or skyphoi). All are thought to be local products, and indeed, excavations have yielded evidence of pottery production, including kilns. Among the various fragments on display in the Policoro Museum, I have seen several pieces that look identical in shape, fabric, and decoration to Akhaian kantharoi discovered in the northwest Peloponnesse. The following are some of the published pieces that may be Akhaian or Akhaian-style.

203. See de la Genière 1968, pls. 53–54.
204. Strab. 6.264 (6.1.14); Dunbabin 1948, p. 34.
205. Dunbabin 1948, p. 34.
206. Dunbabin 1948, p. 34.
208. For discussion see Jeffery 1990, p. 254; see also Jeffery 1949, pp. 32–33. For the coinage of Sirinos and Pyxous (or Pyxoes), see Kraay and Hirmer 1966, pl. 76; and esp. Stazio 1983; 1987; 1998; see further Greco 1990, pp. 43–44.
209. For a useful historical overview, see Perret 1941; also various papers in De Siena and Tagliente 1986, esp. Lombardo 1986; see also Lombardo 1983.
Hänsel 1973:
—Rim fragment, p. 435, fig. 22, no. 4 (cf. body fragment no. 3).
—Various rim fragments, mostly from horizontal-handled cups or skyphoi, p. 439, fig. 24, nos. 1–6, esp. no. 1.
—Rim fragment, p. 444, fig. 26, no. 14 (the size and profile of this piece is different from the horizontal-handled vessel illustrated on p. 444, fig. 26, no. 16).
—Cf. the following rim fragments: p. 447, fig. 28, nos. 1–2, 7.
—Cf. the banded body fragments illustrated on p. 462, fig. 39, esp. no. 16.
—Rim fragments, p. 464, fig. 40, nos. 1, 10.
—Rim fragment, p. 467, fig. 42, no. 5.
—Rim fragments, p. 472, fig. 47, nos. 8–13, esp. nos. 11, 12.

Adamesteanu and Dilthey 1978:
—Rim fragment, open vessel, kantharos(?), p. 530, fig. 3 (left). Fig. 3 includes material from a kiln, the fill of which yielded various fragments of locally produced and imported pottery (noted on p. 517).
—Cf. body fragments with banded decoration: p. 549, fig. 31.
—Cf. fragments of “coppe a filetti,” most with horizontal handles: p. 563, fig. 50.

Bianco and Tagliente 1985:
—Rim fragment, monochrome kantharos (paint fired red), preserving scar of vertical handle at rim, p. 79, fig. 23 (second row, second from left).

Policoro Museum:
—Cup with same shape and fabric as kantharoi, but with only one handle: Tomb 19, no. 6.XII.76.

Santa Maria d’Angelona
A complete monochrome kantharos was found in Tomb XXII at S. Maria d’Angelona in southeast Basilicata, immediately to the west of Herakleia (Policoro).\(^{212}\) The vessel is comparable to pieces from Metaponto, Timmari, Sala Consilina, and Satyrion (see above and below).

—Monochrome kantharos (Fig. 36), Malnati 1984, pp. 74–75, pl. 20A, no. 2 (Tomb XXII).

Montescaglioso
This site is located in the northeast quarter of Basilicata, south of Matera. Excavations brought to light at least one fragmentary banded kantharos, found in “la Tomba rinvenuta presso l’Edificio Scolastico nel 1953,” in association with a “coppa a filetti” (horizontal-handled drinking vessel) and local matt-painted ceramics. In discussing the kantharos, Giuseppina Canosa describes it as a “tazza di tipo Itaka con orlo a filetti,” and compares it to the well-known Akhaian kantharos now in Patras published by Coldstream.\(^{213}\)

\(^{212}\) For a summary of the site and bibliography, see Osanna 1992, pp. 109–110; see also de la Genière 1970, esp. pp. 624–625.

Figure 36. Santa Maria d’Angelona, Tomb XXII, monochrome kantharos. Scale 1:2. P. Finnerty, after Malnati 1984, pl. 20A, no. 2

Figure 37. Fragmentary banded kantharoi: a) Montescaglioso; b) San Nicola dei Greci (Matera). Scale 1:2. P. Finnerty, after Canosa 1986, pls. 58a, 69b

Canosa 1986:
—Fragmentary banded kantharos (Fig. 37:a), p. 175, pl. 58: (second row, right); now in the Museo di Ridola, Matera, inv. 9616a.

San Nicola dei Greci (Matera)

A fragmentary banded kantharos preserving a complete profile was found at San Nicola dei Greci, in the region of Matera in Basilicata, a settlement site which otherwise yielded large quantities of local matt-painted pottery, including a kiln and other evidence for local pottery production. In describing the “non-indigenous” kantharos, Canosa states: “L’unica ceramica non indigena rinvenuta nella cavità è costituita da alcuni frammenti (inv. 152638) grazie ai quali si ricostruisce una tazzina kanthariforme a vernice nera opaca con filetti sula superficie interna dell’orlo e linee nere in una fascia a risparmio sul punto di massima espansione del ventre.” She goes on to compare this “tazza di tipo Itaka” with two similar pieces from Satyrion and Gela (see below).

Canosa 1986:
—Fragmentary banded kantharos (Fig. 37:b), p. 181, pl. 69:b.

Timmari

At least one complete Akhaian or Akhaian-style banded kantharos was found among the tombs excavated by U. Rüdiger at Timmari, immediately to the west and slightly south of Matera, in association with

matt-painted pottery and metal finds. The vessel is described by Canosa as "tazza di tipo Itaka."\(^{216}\)

Canosa 1986:
—Complete banded kantharos, p. 182, pl. 70 (top row, right), Tomb 21; cf. Lattanzi 1980, pl. 7, no. 1.

Taras (Taranto)

The history of the Spartan colony Taras, which controlled the best harbor in the Gulf of Taranto, has been covered many times and need not be repeated here.\(^{217}\) Interestingly, Taras and sites within its territory have together yielded quite a number of Akhaian and Akhaianizing vessels. These include several that must be imports, either from the Greek mainland or from one of the sites in South Italy within the Akhaian sphere. Beyond Taranto, to the north and east, very few Akhaian and Akhaian-style vessels are known to me, and it would appear that the distribution of such pottery was limited, especially in the Salento, but also in Apulia more generally.

—Complete banded kantharos (Fig. 38:a), inv. 54963 (on display in the Taranto Museum), from one of the tombs in the necropolis at Via Giovanni Giovane (excavated April 22, 1954). Vessel mentioned in Lo Porto 1964, p. 227, n. 5 (under the general heading of "ceramica verniciata in nero tipo 'Itaca').\(^{218}\)

The excavations at the Archaic settlement at Crispiano, località L'Amastuola, have brought to light at least one certain Akhaian kantharos and fragments of several possible Akhaian or Akhaianizing vessels.\(^{219}\)

Maruggi 1996:
—Body and handle fragment, banded kantharos, pp. 262, 265, no. 226 (inv. 154428), classified as "frammento di kantharos tipo Itaca?"
—Cf. a few of the rim fragments classified as "frammenti di coppe a filetti," especially p. 262, nos. 204 (right, second from the top), 208 (top left), p. 264.

Scoglio del Tonno (Taranto)

The reef of islets known as Scoglio del Tonno lies opposite the western tip of the Greek colony of Taras extending into the Mar Grande. The excavations conducted by Quintino Quagliati at the archaeological site of Scoglio del Tonno—an extension of the low promontory of Punta Tonno—in 1899 and the years following brought to light an important prehistoric settlement. The upper levels of the site yielded significant quantities of imported Mycenaean pottery, along with Early Iron Age and Archaic Greek imports, of which the Mycenaean was published in detail by Lord William Taylour.\(^{220}\) I have not had occasion to inspect firsthand the imported, post-Mycenaean Greek pottery from Scoglio del Tonno, but in dealing with the Geometric and Protocorinthian pottery from the upper levels, Taylour refers to several fragments that may well be Akhaian:

216. Canosa 1986, p. 182. For the site of Timmari see further Quagliati and Ridola 1906.


218. I have not been able to locate a published illustration of this piece in the various excavation reports of Taranto, such as Lo Porto 1960; 1961.\(^{219}\) For the site see Osanna 1992, p. 36.

220. Taylour 1958, pp. 81–137. A few of the Archaic Greek sherds from Scoglio del Tonno are illustrated in Taranto, pl. 58.
Taylour 1958:
—Several vertical handles, particularly one of very thin ware
“painted with horizontal lines on the lower half and with
vertical ones on the upper half” (cf. Fig. 30), pp. 126–127. Lo
Porto (1964, p. 227, n. 4) mentions these fragments as examples
of his “ceramica verniciata in nero tipo 'Itaca,'” and thus highly
likely to be Akhaian or Akhaianizing vessels.

Satyrion (Leporano)

The town of Leporano is located some 12 km southeast of Taranto and is
of importance since it has yielded, along with Scoglio del Tonno, signifi-
cant quantities of imported prehistoric Aegean pottery, including Middle
Helladic Matt-Painted and Minyan, as well as Mycenaean pottery. Satyrion, along with Taras, is named in the well-known passage in Diodoros
Siculus (8.21.3) as a bane to the Iapygians. At least one fragmentary
kantharos and fragments of several others are listed under the category
“ceramica verniciata in nero tipo 'Itaca.'”

Lo Porto 1964:
—Fragmentary banded kantharos (Fig. 38:b), pp. 226–227,
fig. 48, no. 1. Kantharos mentioned in Coldstream 1998a,
p. 329.
—Cf. rim fragments (p. 227, fig. 48, nos. 2–3) and base fragments
(p. 227, fig. 48, nos. 8–9).

Gravina-di-Puglia

Although in Apulia, Gravina-di-Puglia is located some 75 km west of
Taranto and less than 20 km northwest of Matera in Basilicata and is thus
much closer to indigenous sites such as Montescaglioso, San Nicola dei
Greci, and Timmari than it is to sites in the Salento region. One rim frag-
ment from an open vessel associated with Tomb IX may conceivably be
from a kantharos. The fragment preserves banding on the rim consistent
with both Akhaian and Akhaian-style kantharoi, as well as the more ubiq-
uitous “coppe a filetti” (horizontal-handled vessels). The fragment is listed
here only as a possibility.

221. For Leporano see Taylour 1958, pp. 138–144; Lo Porto 1963,
pp. 329–333 (Middle Helladic),
pp. 333–343, 358–360, fig. 69 (Mycenaean); Lo Porto 1964, pp. 195–197
(Minyan), 197–204 (Mycenaean).
du Plat Taylor et al. 1977:
—Rim fragment, pp. 86, 88, fig. 33, no. 8 (compared with similar “Greek type cups of the late seventh and early sixth century B.C.” such as those from Montescaglioso and Sala Consilina).222

Otranto

Located on the easternmost tip of Apulia, directly opposite modern Albania, the area of Otranto would naturally seem to be one of the first ports-of-call for any westward-bound ship.223 The fact, however, that the earliest Mycenaean pottery, as well as the earliest post-Mycenaean pottery, is found at sites such as those on the Bay of Naples clearly shows that the aspect of proximity was not critical. This is a point well stated by Dunbabin: “The view that the nearer must have been colonized before the more remote cannot be upheld without rewriting the history of Greek colonization.”224 The quantity of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery in eastern Apulia is meager: as far as I know the only published fragment of a possible Akhaian-style kantharos from the Salento is that listed below, and it may conceivably be Ithakesian.225

D’Andria 1985:
—Rim and handle fragment, monochrome kantharos, pp. 359–360, fig. 23 (inv. OP 79–143; OP 81–489–439). In describing the piece, D’Andria states: “In misura molto minore si notano le imitazioni della ceramica corinzia prodotte nelle officine di Itaca e di altri centri della Grecia nord-occidentale, come il caratteristico kantharos dalle anse a gomito che nella particolare qualità dell’argilla rivela un’origine certamente non corinzia.”226

Pithekoussai

The literary sources for Pithekoussai, nebulous and late as they are, as well as the archaeological evidence, are admirably presented by David Ridgway.227 The cemetery in the Valle di San Montano at Pithekoussai228 has yielded a number of mostly monochrome kantharoi and also two related one-handled cups of similar form, well known for quite some time, that are assigned by their excavators as either Early Protocorinthian originals or local imitations. In shape they are related to Late Geometric Corinthian kantharoi, all of which, as Coldstream states, belong to the “Thapsos class,” and of which there is only one example from Tombs 1–723 at Pithekoussai (Tomb 177–1).229 They are, however, different from what Coldstream calls the Late Geometric “kyathos,” which is a straight-sided two-handled kantharos that continues to be produced into Early Protocorinthian.230 As Coldstream further notes, the Early Protocorinthian kantharoi is comparatively rare and “is always fully glazed and usually on the small side.”231 Of the kantharoi from Pithekoussai, a number are clearly Corinthian (e.g., Tomb 363–1; cf. Tomb 267–1). Some, however, differ from the standard Corinthian versions of the shape, resembling more closely the normal Akhaian, and generically northwest Peloponnesian, shape (especially Tomb 148–2, Tomb 455–2). In their preface to Pithekoussai I, Giorgio Buchner and David Ridgway, quoting Mervyn Popham, state: “An excavator . . . has two main responsibilities—to dig . . . and, then, to publish his findings for the

222. The cited comparanda include the horizontal-handled cup, de la Genièvre 1968, p. 188, pl. 49, no. 1, and the vessel from Montescaglioso, for which see Canosa 1986, pl. 58а (either center [cup] or right [kantharos]). See also Adamesteanu et al. 1976, pl. 45, no. 3.
223. D’Andria 1984 (with references).
225. The earth of Akhaian pottery in the region is well reflected in the recent volume by Grazia Semeraro (1997) on Archaic Greek pottery in the Salento; see also D’Andria 1997.
228. For an overview see Ridgway 1992, pp. 45–82.
benefit of other scholars. He may justifiably leave to others musings about the significance, historical or artistic, of his finds, though most of us, I suspect, find this the most attractive part of the job even if it may be in the long run of more ephemeral value.232

It is in the spirit of musing that I suggest that a few of the kantharoi from Pithekoussai may possibly be imports from the northwest Peloponnese or Ithake, or else were inspired by Akhaia or Ithakesian products. I am particularly interested in those designated by the excavators as "local imitations." In shape and decoration, many of these resemble the kantharos and related one-handled cup found at Vitsa in Epeiros, and designated by Vokotopoulou as Akhaian or other West Greek imports to the site.233 It may very well be that some of the kantharoi listed below are Ithakesian rather than Akhaian. For the sake of convenience, I list here all of the illustrated "Early Protocorinthian" kantharoi from Tombs 1–723 that are classified as "local imitations." Among these, Tomb 148–2 in particular stands out as a possible Akhaian or Akhaian-style kantharos. In a more recent publication of the material from the so-called Stipe dei cavalli from the acropolis of Pithekoussai, Bruno d’Agostino presents a solitary example of what he refers to as a "kantharos tipo Itaca," identical to those from the cemetery listed below.234 Indeed, the famous sherd bearing the inscription originally published, upside-down, as Greek by Margherita Guarducci, but correctly read as Phoenician by P. Kyle McCarter, is a fragment of a kantharos of this type.235 McCarter believed the piece to be an example of the familiar red or red-burnished Phoenician fabric, but Buchner and Ridgway list it as "PCA d’imitazione locale."236

**Pithekoussai I:**
- Tomb 148–2, pl. CXXI.
- Tomb 243–4, pl. CXL.
- Tomb 309A–3, pls. 116 and CLIV.
- Tomb 324–2, pl. CLIV.
- Tomb 515–2, pl. 153.
- Tomb 552–2, pl. CLXXIV.
- Tomb 622–3, pl. 175 (= Ridgway 1992, p. 79, pl. 6, bottom right, labeled: "imitation of Early Protocorinthian kantharos," and dated to Late Geometric II).
- Tomb 232–1, pls. 95, CXL.

The following pieces are listed in *Pithekoussai I*, p. 731, as kantharoi "PCA d’imitazione locale," but not illustrated:

- Tomb 382–1, p. 419.
- Tomb 389–2, p. 424.
- Tomb 556–3, p. 553.
- Tomb 560–1, p. 556.

d’Agostino 1979:
- Small monochrome kantharos, p. 65, fig. 37:3 (T. 111), no. 8, said to be "di fabbrica pitecusa," but of Corinthian type, with parallels given on p. 65, n. 27.
d’Agostino 1996:

Kyme (Cuma)
The special position of Campanian Kyme as traditionally the earliest Greek settlement on the Italian mainland is perhaps best typified in Alan Blakeway’s statement: “Cumae is the one Greek colony in the West whose foundation falls within the pre-colonisation period.”237 The tradition surrounding the foundation of Kyme has featured prominently in modern scholarship, and does not require separate comment here.238 As with Pithekoussai, Kyme has yielded a number of vessels, mostly kantharoi, which are possible Akhaian or Akhaian-style pieces.

—Monochrome kantharos, Gàbrici 1913, cols. 290, 315–319, pl. 40, no. 4.
—Cf. banded jug, Gàbrici 1913, col. 234, pl. 50, no. 4.239
—Pellegrini 1903, col. 275, figs. 59–60 (two monochrome kantharoi).

Suessula
A monochrome kantharos, similar to those from Pithekoussai and Kyme, in the Spinelli Collection now in the Museo Nazionale di Napoli, is said to have come from the necropolis of Suessula (modern Cancello) in Campania (the history of the collection is summarized by Mariarosaria Borriello).240

—Complete monochrome kantharos, Borriello 1991, pp. 16–17, pl. 11, no. 6 (inv. 160181 [Sp. 1333]).

Sicily

Naxos
Traditionally the oldest colony in Sicily, Naxos was founded according to the literary sources by Theokles or Thoukles of Chalkis, though later sources claim him as an Athenian.241 An account of the recent excavations at the site, including a useful summary of earlier work and an overview of the literary sources, is admirably presented by Paola Pelagatti and her collaborators.242 I know of no definite pieces of Akhaian or Akhaian-style kantharoi from Naxos, but among the numerous examples of Thapsos-type skyphoi, at least one may prove to be non-Corinthian:

Pelagatti 1982:
—Rim fragment, pl. 47, no. 7. Judging from the published photograph, the rim is taller and more slender than the common Thapsos type.


239. This is a squat, similar to examples illustrated in Dekoulakou 1984 (p. 227, figs. 15–16; p. 229, fig. 19); cf. Themelis 1984, p. 235, figs. 30 (left), 31 (Galaxeidi). For squat jugs in Akhaia see, in particular, Zappeiropoulos 1952, p. 406, fig. 21; 1956, pls. 92:α, 93:α; cf. Kyparissis 1932, p. 85, fig. 6 (left).

240. Borriello 1991, p. 3; for a more complete account of the excavations at Suessula, see Johannowsky 1983.


242. Pelagatti 1984–1985, with full bibliography and references to earlier work at the site.
Megara Hyblaia

Traditionally founded by colonists from Megara, who had previously failed to establish a settlement at nearby Trotilon and Thapsos, Megara Hyblaia was overshadowed by its more powerful neighbors, Syракousai and Leon-tinoi. Megara Hyblaia went on to find the more prosperous settlement at Selinous. Excavations at the site by the French School at Rome have brought to light large quantities of imported Archaic Greek pottery. There are at least four fragments of kantharoi with added white decoration, one of which (Megara Hyblaia II, pl. 160:4) is almost identical to those from Francavilla Marittima and Olympia and to the complete kantharos from Phlamboura in Akhaia discussed above.

Mégara Hyblaea II:

— Four fragments with added white, pl. 160, nos. 3–6. Of these, no. 4 (Fig. 13), almost certainly a banded kantharos, is clearly Akhaian. Rather than representing an “oiseau dans une mètope,” as stated by Vallet and Villard (p. 155), the decoration in added white is almost identical to similar floral motifs on the kantharoi from Phlamboura, Olympia, and Francavilla Marittima (Figs. 11, 12, 14).

— Kantharos with poorly preserved painted bands, pl. 200, no. 5.

— Small kantharos, pl. 207, no. 5 (cf. other small and miniature kantharoi on pl. 207).

— Cf. pl. 76, no. 3, as a possible example of the Late Archaic type of northwest Peloponnesian kantharoi found at Eleian Pylos and Olympia.

— At least one other monochrome kantharos on display in the Syracuse Museum (case 150, first panel, second row, first on left).

Syракousai

Traditionally founded by Corinthians led by Archias—the only Corinthian colony in all of Sicily and South Italy—Syракousai dominated the whole southeast corner of Sicily. It is interesting to note that Syракousai, along with Thapsos, has a name that is not obviously Greek or Sikel, but for which plausible Phoenician etymologies have been proposed. The original settlement on the island of Ortygia, well watered by a natural spring and boasting two fine harbors, quickly spread onto the adjacent mainland at Achkadina. The history of the original settlement and of the later city has been discussed in detail elsewhere. Excavations in various parts of Syракousai have brought to light a small but significant quantity of Akhaian and Akhaianizing pottery, much of which is unpublished. I have been able to locate the following:

— Monochrome kantharos from the “necropolis ex giardino spagna” (inv. 51546), Syracuse Museum, case 207.

— Monochrome kantharos, Hencken 1958, p. 260, pl. 58, fig. 7, no. 5, Grave 175 bis (= Orsi 1895b, p. 126 [not illustrated]).
Cf. also the kantharos, Hencken 1958, p. 264, pl. 63, fig. 21 (right), Tomb 367 (= Orsi 1895b, p. 157 [not illustrated]), cited by de la Genière 1968, p. 189, n. 12.

—Large but fragmentary krater, Villa P. Orsi, similar to that from Gela, Syracuse Museum, case 179. Note also some of the examples of locally produced “crateri tipo Fusco” assembled in Pelagatti 1984, esp. pp. 138–157, figs. 31–51.

—Rim and handle fragment, from the Tempio Ionico on Ortygia: Pelagatti 1982, p. 135, pl. 38, fig. 2, no. 5; pl. 39, no. 5, described as a cup: “In argilla beige ocra pallido, che non sembra corinizia come la forma: forse argiva.”

**Gela**

Founded according to tradition by Cretans and Rhodians led by Entimos and Antiphemos, and itself the founder of Akragas, Gela was the first Greek colony on the south coast of Sicily; it controlled the fertile plain of the Gelas River. As at Syrakousai, a small but not insignificant quantity of northwest Peloponnesian pottery has come to light, including the fragmentary krater from the extramural sanctuary at Bitalemi, which, as discussed above, is very similar to a krater from Antikyra (Fig. 15:a–b). The following are those few fragments that I have been able to find; there may well be more.

—Banded kantharos or one-handled cup from Tomb 9 of the predio La Paglia tombs at Gela, Adamesteanu 1956, p. 286, fig. 7 (bottom right), described as a “kyathos,” and stated to be “un prodotto di importazione insulare asiatica.”

—Krater (Fig. 15:b), from the extramural sanctuary at Bitalemi (inv. 20359), Fiorentini and de Miro 1984, p. 91, fig. 81.

—At least one fragment of a possible monochrome kantharos in the Gela Museum.

**Leontinoi**

According to tradition, within “six years of the foundation of [Sicilian] Naxos Theokles led a body of colonists south to Leontinoi, and very shortly afterward the Naxians also colonized Katane, under the leadership of Euarkos. Theokles’ objective must from the first have been the rich Laistrygonian plain, the home of wheat, and the site of Leontinoi.” I know of only one fragment of an Akhaian or Akhaianizing monochrome kantharos from Leontinoi:

—Fragment of a monochrome kantharos, on display in the Syracuse Museum (mislabeled “tipo ionico”).

**Himera**

Traditionally founded by Zanklaians, with the aid of exiles from Syrakousai, Himera, on the north coast of Sicily, has to date yielded no certain examples of Akhaian pottery, though compare one of the smaller unpainted votive kantharoi: Himera II, pl. 123, no. 5, esp. N.I. 17080.
MELITA (MALTA)

Melleba (Mellieha) Bay

No information exists about the provenance of the Akhaian banded kantharos now in Gotha (the Schlossmuseum) other than that given in Rohde 1964, p. 17: “Gefunden 1887 Melleba Bay, Malta.” Although published under the general heading of “Corinthian pottery,” the kantharos is not, as stressed by Rohde, of Corinthian fabric. This kantharos is, as far as I know, the only example of Akhaian pottery said to be from Malta. Melleba Bay, probably referring to Mellieha Bay, is located in the far northwest part of Malta, north of St. Paul’s Bay; the modern town of Mellieha, made into a parish in A.D. 1436, occupies a dominating position on the ridge to the south of the bay. J. D. Evans lists only the ruins of a minor megalithic structure on the southern shore of Mellieha Bay.258 Wherever it was found late last century, the kantharos is clearly Akhaian.

—Complete banded kantharos (Fig. 39), found in 1887, and now in the Schlossmuseum in Gotha (inv. J. 2534). Published in Rohde 1964, pl. 5, no. 7 (pp. 17–18).

NORTH AFRICA

Tocra

The Archaic levels at Tocra, the ancient Taucheira/Teucheira in North Africa, have yielded a number of interesting kantharoi. In discussing a group of these under the heading “Lakonian,” John Hayes writes: “The deep kantharoi (993–6) have not been recognized previously as a specifically Lakonian type.” Although different in shape and decoration than the standard Akhaian banded and monochrome kantharoi, a few of the Tocra examples may be Akhaian or Eleian.259 The close similarity between the decoration on the kantharoi of Tocra and the Late Archaic kantharoi from Eleian Pylos and Olympia is noteworthy.

—Tocra I, pp. 89–92, fig. 44, pl. 68, nos. 993–996 (Fig. 40:a–b). As is stated by Hayes, the majority of these are Peloponnesian. With

259. See further Tocra I, p. 89, citing parallels from Ithake, Perachora, and Megara Hyblaia. For the miniature version of this shape in Lakonia, see Lane 1933–1934, p. 155, fig. 20:m and, for an earlier forerunner, p. 103, fig. 2:1. For the Argive versions of the shape see above. A related miniature form, which is very common in Sicily, is the stirrup-krafter, or krateriskos, which imitates the popular Lakonian shape; numerous examples of these from Morgantina have been recently discussed by Claire Lyons, in Morgantina V, pp. 57–58, 81–82; see further the “imitazione paesa” illustrated in Orsi 1898, p. 324, fig. 34; see also Gentili 1961a, p. 213, fig. 17:d; Gentili 1961b, p. 218, fig. 3:a; for the Lakonian, full-size, prototype, see Stibbe 1989.
Figure 40. Tocra (Taucheira/Teucheira), banded kantharoi with decoration in added white and red. Scale 1:3. P. Finnerty, after Tocra I, fig. 44, pl. 68, nos. 993, 995

DISTRIBUTION OF AKHAIAN POTTERY IN THE ARCHAIC PERIOD AND BRONZE AGE

On the basis of the material presented above, a few tentative remarks can be made on the patterns of distribution of Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery. In Greece, east of its home region in the northwest Peloponnesian and adjacent areas, several Akhaian and Akhaian-style pieces are found at Perachora. Despite this material in the eastern Corinthian Gulf, there appears to have been no penetration into the Aegean, and there is certainly nothing akin to the distribution, for example, of Lakonian or Corinthian pottery in the east and north Aegean or in the eastern Mediterranean beyond. From the beginning the distribution of Akhaian pottery was essentially oriented toward the West. What is interesting about the Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery in the eastern Corinthian Gulf, however, is that it is largely contemporary with the Corinthian pottery found to date in Akhaia. Exact quantities and statistical proportions are impossible to determine given the dearth of comprehensively published pottery from systematic excavations in Akhaia, but the general impression is revealing. The two-way movement of pottery between the east and west Corinthian Gulf strongly suggests that the common assumption that Corinth influenced the development of the Late Geometric–Early Archaic Akhaian style is in need of modification, if not revision, as Morgan anticipated. Indeed, it may well be that Akhaia—or neighbors such as Ithake—influenced Corinth in certain aspects of ceramic production, as is possible in the case of the kantharos.

In northwestern Greece a small number of Akhaian or Akhaian-style vessels have been recorded at sites such as Vitsa Zagoriou and perhaps also Arta, some of which may prove to be Ithakesian. I suspect that more will come to light in the future, particularly in view of the fact that such vessels are found as far north, and inland, as Vitsa. The situation in the Ionian islands, particularly on Ithake, seems to point to the more enduring influence of Akhaia, and much of the recent literature on the Euboian and Corinthian influences on Ithake will also have to be revised.\(^{261}\) The Akhaian influence over Ithake extends well beyond the vagaries of ceramics, into the very language of the island. Despite claims that the alphabet of Ithake displays Euboian, specifically Chalkidian, influences,\(^{262}\) it is clear that the alphabet of Ithake is neither Euboian nor Corinthian. As Jeffery has shown, the Akhaian alphabet not only left its mark on the Akhaian colonies of Magna Graecia, but also along the trade route that led there through the Ionian islands.\(^{263}\) Indeed, the Akhaian version of the alphabet had already reached Ithake in the early Orientalizing period, if not earlier. In a similar vein, the Kephallenian alphabet resembles Akhaian,\(^{264}\) and according to Thucydides (2.66), Zakynthos was an Akhaian colony.\(^{265}\) This said, the Akhaian influence on the alphabet of the Ionian islands is not \textit{a priori} indicative of Akhaian influence in the ceramic production of those islands. Although there are no published examples of Akhaian pottery from Kephallenia and Zakynthos, largely on account of the paucity of finds of the Late Geometric and Early Archaic periods, Ithake has yielded a number of imports that should be Akhaian. Moreover, the local ceramic style of Ithake has much in common with that of Akhaia and western mainland Greece generally, as Coldstream has established.\(^{266}\) And it is possible, perhaps even highly likely, that Ithakesian pottery was widely distributed in South Italy and Sicily, as Morgan has intimated (see above). In addition to Ithake, Korkyra has yielded a few possible fragments of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery.

The presence of Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery in the traditional Akhaian colonies of South Italy—Sybaris, Kroton, Kaulonia, Metapontion—hitherto neglected, as well as at closely related indigenous sites such as Francavilla Marittima and Incoronata, is now more securely substantiated. The quantity of Akhaian imports at these centers, in addition to the locally produced imitations, especially at Sybaris, Francavilla Marittima (largely unpublished), and Incoronata, is probably far greater than is suggested here. Future excavations, along with the study and publication of previously excavated material, will no doubt produce additional similar material. With the growing publication of such material, it is hoped that more detailed studies, including targeted elemental analyses, can clarify many of the problems that currently exist.

The fact that little clearly diagnostic Akhaian material has been recorded at the later secondary Akhaian foundations, such as Poseidonia and Laos, is almost certainly the result of the late date of these foundations (see below). Nevertheless, the Akhaian elements in Poseidonia have most recently been illustrated in the discovery of dipinti, said to be in the Akhaian alphabet, on a number of sherd s from the recent excavations directed by Pedley and Higginbotham (see above).

---

265. There are no Archaic inscriptions from Zakynthos in Jeffery 1990.
Beyond the *chorai* of the traditional Akhaian settlements, Akhaian pottery has been found in several distinct areas of South Italy. To the south, Lokroı Epizephyrioi has yielded a few possible fragments of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery. This is hardly surprising given the proximity of the city to Kaulonia, the southernmost of the Akhaian *apoikiai*, and to Kroton. The discovery of a complete kantharos from Santo Stefano di Grotteria is noteworthy, as is a possible piece from Stefaneli di Gerace, both sites located inland from Lokroı, though not far from Kaulonia.

As stated above, the largest concentration of Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery thus far known comes from the plain of Sybaris and from Metaponto and Incoronata. In both regions the pottery was not restricted to the polis, but was widely distributed over the indigenous hinterland. This is especially true for the modern region of Basilicata, where Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery has been found at Santa Maria d’Angelona, Montescaglioso, San Nicola dei Greci (Matera), and Timmari. One might add here the rim fragment from Gravina-di-Puglia; although strictly speaking in Apulia, the site is very close to most of the sites in Basilicata where Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery has been found. The fact that Akhaian-style pottery was found as far inland as Sala Consilina, in the Vallo di Diano, led Coldstream to speculate that some of the material may have originated from Poseidonia (see above). Although this is possible, Sala Consilina is now only one of numerous inland sites where such material has been recorded and it is unlikely that all of this pottery derives from Poseidonia. In addition, non-Akhaian cities on the Ionian coast, including Siris (Polieion/Herakleia) and Amendolara (perhaps ancient Lagaria), have yielded quite a number of Akhaian or Akhaian-style vessels.

Akhaian or Akhaian-style material has also been discovered at Taras and its immediate vicinity, as well as, perhaps, in the area around the Bay of Naples, including Pithekoussai and Kyme. The quantity of Akhaian imports to the region of Taras is impressive; imports have been recorded at the cemetery at Via Giovanni Giovane, from the settlement at Crispiano (località L’Amastuola), and probably from Scoglio del Tonno. The site of Satyrion, located at modern Leporano, some 12 km southeast of Taranto, has also yielded fragments of Akhaian pottery. What is significant about the Akhaian pottery from Taranto and its vicinity is that most of it is imported, perhaps from the northwest Peloponnese rather than the Akhaian colonies in Calabria. As far as I am aware, there are few, if any, locally produced imitations of Akhaian, such as those of Metaponto and the plain of Sybaris, and in this way the pattern at Taranto is different from the Akhaian settlements further south. Beyond Taranto and its immediate vicinity, little Akhaian material has been recorded in Apulia; this may prove to be an accident of preservation or the result of the way in which the material from the region has been published. Be that as it may, the quantity of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery east of Taranto is meager.

The situation in the Bay of Naples is much less certain. I have listed above a number of kantharoi from Pithekoussai designated by their excavators as imitations of Corinthian. A few of these may be Akhaian or Akhaian-style, or perhaps Ithakesian. All are monochrome kantharoi; there
are none of the more diagnostic banded kantharoi. In listing the kantharoi published in *Pithekousai* I in this study, my aim is not to question the attributions of the excavators. Rather, I wish to point to the close similarity of the monochrome kantharoi at Pithekousai with those found in Akhaia, Elis, Epeiros, and Ithake, in addition to those from Metaponto and other parts of South Italy, which are clearly not Corinthian.267 On the mainland opposite, several monochrome kantharoi, similar to those at Pithekousai, and at least one banded jug have been recorded at Kyme (Cuma); another kantharos from Suessula (modern Cancellio) in inland Campania illustrates that such vessels are not restricted to sites on the coast.

Beyond peninsular Italy, Akhaian or Akhaian-style material has been recorded from various sites in Sicily, Tocra in North Africa, and perhaps Melita (Malta). The distribution in Sicily as it currently stands is largely confined to the cities of the east and southeast coasts. A more thorough search would undoubtedly bring to light more material. Unlike the situation in South Italy, there appears to be no significant distribution of Akhaian or Akhaian-style pottery at inland sites, with the exception of Leontinoi in the rich Laiostrygonian plain, but such a conclusion must remain tentative and provisional. I know of no Akhaian pottery in western, Phoenician, Sicily, but it would be wrong to read too much into this as there is no mistaking the Akhaian provenance of an intact banded kantharos, found late last century, said to be from Mellieha Bay in Phoenician Malta (Fig. 39). As for North Africa, Hayes in his meticulous publication of the pottery from the Archaic deposits at Tocra tentatively assigned several kantharoi to Lakonia.268 These are similar to the Late Archaic decorated kantharoi from Elis, particularly those from Olympia and Eleian Pylos, and it is therefore possible that they derive from a Peloponnesian center outside Akhaia.

The pattern of distribution of Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery in South Italy, Sicily, and beyond highlights the complexity of the structures within which this material circulated. The imports and imitations of Akhaian pottery at Akhaian *apoikiai* such as Sybaris, Metapontion, Kroton, and Kaulonia, along with imports at non-Akhaian centers such as Taranto, Satriion, Lokroi Epizephyroi, and some of the sites in coastal Sicily, bring into focus a maritime circulation following natural routes to good harbors and beaches. The fact that Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery is found at so many indigenous sites, particularly in the mountainous interior of Calabria and Basilicata, raises the issue of the adoption of (or resistance to) Greek commodities and how these functioned in Greek, indigenous, and hybrid or creolized contexts.

It is possible that the pattern witnessed by the distribution of pottery follows in part that of the Akhaian colonial coinage, particularly the rise of an “empire” dominated by Sybaris and the subsequent “alliance” headed by Kroton.269 Such a possibility seems attractive in the case of sites in the chorai of Sybaris and Kroton, perhaps also those within the sphere of Metapontion. But the broader distribution of the material across South Italy, as well as in parts of Sicily and beyond, suggests that this is only one

---

267. If I am correct in assigning some of the Pithekousai kantharoi to an Akhaian or Ithakesian pedigree, then this group represents one of the largest categories of imports from Tombs 1–723. A similar pattern is seen in other parts of Pithekousai, including the Monte di Vico acropolis (for which see further Coldstream 1998b, p. 304). At Pithekousai generally there is, in addition to a small amount of Euboian pottery and a sizable quantity of Corinthian, a good range of East Greek pottery, as well as imports from Italy, Carthage, the Levant (including “Phoenician Rhodes”), and the Iberian peninsula; see Osborne 1998, p. 258. A similar range of material is recorded elsewhere in Italy. In Apulia in the 9th and 8th centuries B.C., for example, Morgan (1998, p. 295) gives the following figures: 2,790 Corinthian, 26 Euboio-Cycladic, and 6 Euboian pottery imports.


of several factors at play. The fact that Akhaian and Akhaian-style kantharoi and other vessel forms are found in a wide variety of contexts—Greek and indigenous settlements, intra- and extramural sanctuaries, and in a variety of tombs—establishes that this pottery served many different functions and communities. It is possible, for example, that some of the Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery was circulated within the context of ritual exchanges within the framework of xenia, as Irad Malkin and others have suggested. It is also possible that some of this pottery, particularly the numerous kantharoi at sanctuary sites such as Francavilla Marittima, should be seen against the backdrop of ritual drinking and dining, as the work of Uta Kron, Catherine Morgan, and others has brought to the fore. Nevertheless, the wide distribution of this material in so many different contexts, including tombs in indigenous cemeteries, underlines the futility of searching for any one explanation that can account for the pattern seen in the West.

Chronologically, the majority of the banded and monochrome kantharoi and other Akhaian vessel forms found in South Italy are best accommodated in the 7th and early 6th centuries B.C. The earliest Akhaian material, particularly at Sybaris and Francavilla Marittima, appears to be contemporary with Early Protocorinthian, and, as such, may date as early as the very late 8th century, according to the conventional chronology. The nature of the deposits at both sites, however, especially the large votive stipe on the Timpone della Motta at Francavilla, is such that a detailed stratigraphic sequence has not been established. Few pieces can be assigned, as yet, to the earlier stages of the Late Geometric period. A similar chronological pattern is apparent for the Akhaian and Akhaian-style pottery in Sicily, and for many of the other sites in South Italy where similar material has been recorded.

A few of the Late Archaic kantharoi of the style well known from Elis have been recorded from Ithake, Tocra, and perhaps also Megara Hyblaia, but these are less common than the earlier Archaic type, and Akhaian exports appear to decline sometime during the 6th century B.C. There are few, if any, of the late type of kantharos at the traditional Akhaian colonies on the Ionian coast of Italy. I know of no examples of Gauer’s Spätform among the numerous examples of kantharoi at Sybaris or Francavilla, both sites presumably destroyed ca. 510 B.C. It would thus seem that in addi-

270. This is a theme dealt with in various contributions by Malkin, including Malkin 1987; 1994; 1998a (with references).


272. Recent excavations at the Timpone della Motta at Francavilla by Silvana Lupino and Maaskant-Kleibrink are producing important stratigraphic results.

273. The notable exception is Pithekousai, and perhaps Kyme, where many of the kantharoi have been found in tombs dating to the late 8th century B.C., though few of these vessels can be confidently assigned as Akhaian. The kantharoi from Pithekousai may be earlier than, or contemporary with, the earliest examples from the plain of Sybaris.

274. The extent of this destruction is not as far-reaching as some accounts suggest. Although used as a chronological "fixed point," especially for the material from Sybaris and Francavilla, the destruction of Sybaris was followed by the minting of a coin that displayed, on the obverse, the tripod of Kroton, with the bull of Sybaris on the reverse. Indeed, the existence of such "alliance" coins after 510 B.C. documents a resettled Sybaris, subject to Kroton. For further discussion see Papadopoulos, forthcoming.
tion to Akhaian imports declining in the course of the earlier 6th century B.C., the locally produced pottery of the Akhaian settlements in South Italy developed along lines different from those in the northwest Peloponnese. Consequently, the late date of sites such as Poseidonia (founded ca. 600 B.C.) and Akragas (ca. 580 B.C.), to mention only two, would reasonably preclude the discovery of any significant quantity of Akhaian pottery. Another chronological aspect worth noting is that, by and large, the material presented above from Magna Graecia appears to be contemporary with that found in sites on the north and east Corinthian Gulf, in Epeiros, and the Ionian islands. Our knowledge of earlier Akhaian pottery, however, especially “Protogeometric” and earlier Geometric, is very limited indeed. Although this study supports the notion of widespread distribution of Akhaian pottery in the Ionian islands, northwestern Greece, and Magna Graecia in the Late Geometric and Early Archaic periods, not enough is yet known about earlier Akhaian pottery to track the extent of its distribution. In this discussion of chronology it may seem that I have elided the 8th and 7th centuries. Any investigation, however, of clearly dated diachronic developments, as has been undertaken for Corinth for the 8th and 7th centuries B.C., is not possible on the basis of published Akhaian material. It is hoped that the publication of pottery currently being worked on from the northwest Peloponnese will remedy this situation.

A number of issues emerge from the preceding account. The distribution of Akhaian pottery is not linked solely to colonial movement, and in this it resembles the distribution of Corinthian, Attic, Lakonian, and other widely exported pottery types. With the possible exception of Sybaris, the contexts of Akhaian pottery do not represent the domestic chattels carried by colonists from their homeland. Furthermore, Akhaian pottery, like Corinthian, Attic, and Lakonian, need not have been carried by merchantmen or traders who were natives of the place where the pottery was made; they may have been middlemen from any part of the Mediterranean. Here the Phoenician graffiti on the possibly Akhaian-style or Ithakesian fragment from Pithekoussai may provide a clue as to the identity of some of the merchants who profited from the trade in well-glazed Greek ceramics.

In general, the distribution of Archaic Akhaian pottery is remarkably close to that of Mycenaean Akhaian pottery (Figs. 41–42), that is, Mycenaean pottery found in Italy but made in mainland Akhaia, or Mycenaean pottery made in Italy by emigrant Akhaian potters, or influenced by them. To be sure, the names of the sites in the West where Mycenaean and Archaic Akhaian pottery has been found are usually different, but the sites are nevertheless very close to one another. Thus, prehistoric Broglio di Trebisacce and Torre del Mordillo instead of historic Sybaris and Francavilla Marittima; similarly, Termitito rather than Metaponto or Siris; Scoglio del Tonno in place of Taras; Polla instead of Sala Consilina; Vivara in the Bay of Naples rather than Pithekoussai; Molineillo, Matrena, Cozzo del Pantano, and Pantalica in Sicily instead of Megara Hyblaia, Syракоуса, 

275. For Poseidonia see above; for Akragas see de Waele 1971.
276. This is a point made by Malkin with regard to the date of the Euboian and Corinthian pottery in the Ionian islands, in western Greece generally, and in Magna Graecia; see Malkin 1998a, pp. 74–81; 1998b, p. 5; though see Morgan 1998.
277. For further discussion on this aspect see Papadopoulos 1997a; Morris and Papadopoulos 1998.
278. The fragment with the graffiti is illustrated in Pithekousai I, pp. 289–290, no. 232*-1, fully discussed above (under Pithekousai).
Gela, and Leontinoi. Different also are the names of the scholars who study Mycenaean and Archaic–Classical Greek pottery. The systemic divide between the disciplines of Aegean and central Mediterranean prehistory, on the one hand, and classical archaeology, on the other, is to be regretted, since it has obscured continuities that should have been obvious. Beyond names, however, the archaeological pattern outlined for the Archaic period has a venerable Bronze Age ancestry.

The first western Greeks were Mycenaeans, or, as they were known in Homer, “Akhaian.” The archaeology of the Mycenaeans in the West has become a major growth industry. In his seminal study of Mycenaean pottery in Italy and adjacent areas published in 1958, Lord William Taylour listed some 17 sites in peninsular Italy, Sicily, and the Lipari and Bay of

279. For a useful summary of the distribution of Mycenaean pottery according to chronological phases, see Gras 1985, pp. 57–61, figs. 6–9; Vagnetti 1999, pp. 158–161. Regions where Mycenaean pottery has been found but, to date, no Archaic Akhaian, include the Lipari islands, Sardinia, Etruria, northern Italy, and the Adriatic coast of Apulia north of Bari.

280. See further Papadopoulos 1993.

281. Note Peroni’s (1979, p. 2) perceptive statement, cited and translated in Ridgway 1992, p. 7. Some scholars, notably Emilio Peruzzi, have argued for a more intimate and lasting Mycenaean legacy in Latium on the basis of ancient sources and linguistic criteria, as well as the evidence of architecture, weapons, textiles, agriculture, and religion; see Peruzzi 1980 (with references to earlier work).
Figure 42. Distribution of Late Helladic IIIA–C pottery in Italy, including Sicily and Sardinia. R. G. Finnerty, after Gras 1985, pp. 66–61, figs. 7–8

Naples islands that yielded Mycenaean pottery. By 1988 Elizabeth Fisher was able to expand the list to 53, and in 1999 Lucia Vagnetti listed 78 sites with Mycenaean material. The incidence of Mycenaean pottery in the West is now more secure thanks to the work of pioneers like Taylour, Vagnetti, and others. The quest for metals has been rightly emphasized as a motive for Mycenaean contacts in the West, but the distribution of Mycenaean pottery cannot be solely linked to metallurgy. Moreover, Mycenaean interests in the West are rarely seen against the backdrop of later Greek interests, including settlement, in South Italy and Sicily. What happens in the Bronze Age is, more often than not, presented

282. Taylour 1958; cf. Fisher 1988, fig. 1a, with a note that the sherds listed by Taylour from Rome were later shown not to be Mycenaean.


as a Mycenaean prologue, a sort of pre-precolonization or pre-protocolonization. Back in 1958, however, Taylour postulated the existence of a Rhodian Mycenaean "colony" at Scoglio del Torno. The impetus for this colony was trade, a familiar story for a site next to historic Taras and in control of probably the finest harbor in all of South Italy. Interestingly, the primary commodity noted by Taylour was not metals, but Murex trunculus shells, the source of purple dye and, hence, textile production, a story also familiar in a Canaanite/Phoenician context.

Although Taylour's hypothesis of a Rhodian colony was rightly challenged, first by Franco Biancofiore and later, and more convincingly, by Fisher, Taylour's lead forced students of Italian and Aegean Bronze Age ceramics to look more carefully at the provenance of Mycenaean pottery in the West. This ultimately led to the recent spate of elemental analyses of primarily Bronze Age pottery, and even the identification of Italian pottery in the Aegean, which confirms that ceramics moved both east and west. As for the general provenance of Mycenaean pottery in the West, the picture is, predictably, not straightforward. Biancofiore, for example, looked to the Argolid as the source of most of the Late Helladic IIIA-B pottery in South Italy, whereas in the ensuing LH IIIC period he argued that Cyprus, Rhodes, Akhaia, and the Ionian islands all played a part in the distribution of Mycenaean pottery. Adopting a similar diachronic approach, Fisher argued that the earliest Mycenaean pottery at Scoglio del Torno, down to LH IIIA, was largely dominated by Cretan and Argive imports, along with pottery with Rhodian parallels. Fisher stressed a connection during LH IIIB with western Greece, especially Akhaia, but also Aitolia, Akarnania, Epeiros, and the Ionian islands. In LH IIIC the Akhaian connection intensified, while the Cretan and Rhodian influences decreased; Kephallenia, Zakynthos, and northwest Greece continued to play an important role. At the same time, Fisher noted a number of pots with Cypriot parallels.

The most significant features that emerge from Fisher's study of Mycenaean pottery in the West are, first, the prominence of Akhaian and West Greek pottery in general, and second, the heterogeneity of the Mycenaean pottery in question. At Scoglio del Torno, for example, the

290. Jones 1986; Jones and Day 1987; Vagnetti and Jones 1988; Vagnetti 1989; Kommos III.
292. Fisher 1988, pp. 122–123, 177–179. The problem with the Rhodian parallels is that much of the LH IIIA1 and IIIA2 pottery on Rhodes may have been imported from the Peloponnes; see Fisher 1988, p. 123, following Mee 1982.
294. Fisher 1988, esp. p. 129, see also pp. 127–131, 181–183. Fisher (1988, pp. 182–183) states: "In summary, there is evidence for a shift in the provenance of the majority of the Mycenaean pottery from Apulia over the course of the LH III period. In the earliest represented period, LH IIIA2, the ties were with the Argolid, and possibly with Rhodes and Crete. During LH IIIB these ties lessened as Achaea played a more important role in the trade with Apulia. In the LH IIIC period, the ties with Achaea, Kephallenia, and other areas of western Greece intensified, while ties with other areas diminished. This is not really a new observation: Taylour had also picked up some of the increase in parallels in western Greece but the premise that Scoglio del Torno was the site of a Rhodian colony overshadowed the pattern which is now apparent."
Mycenaean pottery appears to derive from different centers; it is not of a consistent fabric. At the same time, Fisher was mindful to stress the presence at the site of Appenine and Sub-Appenine Italian pottery. The third feature has to do with the continuing eastern overtones, first Rhodian, then Cypriot. The important role played by Akhaia and western Greece, the heterogeneity of Mycenaean pottery in the West, and the eastern overtones of some of the material are all aspects that are strikingly reminiscent of the historic pattern. The heterogeneity of the pottery at Pithekoussai, for example, with its Corinthian, Euboian, possible Akhaian or Ithakesian, East Greek, Ionian, Etruscan, and other elements, along with persistent Phoenician elements, is repeated in similar ways across South Italy and Sicily. For the same reasons that Scoglio del Tonno is an unlikely Rhodian colony, Pithekoussai remains an unlikely Euboian colony. Both sites have been characterized as Greek “colonies” largely on the evidence of pottery and, in the case of Pithekoussai, a late literary tradition that has been described as “often confused and mutually contradictory.” To be sure, Pithekoussai was clearly a place where various Greek, Phoenician, North Syrian, Cypriot, Etruscan, and other Italian interests collided and colluded with those of the local population. A blend of local and overseas influences and elements can also be detected at Bronze Age Scoglio del Tonno.

Another feature that Fisher brings to the fore is the way in which different centers in Bronze Age Italy, even sites close to one another, such as Porto Peroni/Satyriion, Torre Costelluccia, and Scoglio del Tonno, employed somewhat different assemblages of Mycenaean pottery. Fisher argues that individual sites in Apulia traded independently with the Mycenaeans, thus accounting for the differences in their respective ceramic assemblages, or that each site maintained separate ties with Greece. A similar situation appears in the Late Geometric and Archaic periods throughout South Italy. Again, the pattern of the distribution of pottery, Mycenaean and Archaic, does not a priori point to colonial movement. It underscores a different type of movement of commodities, people, and ideas. As Osborne reminds us, it is a far more complex reality than just “trade before the flag.”

Other patterns share a similar material imprint across the Bronze and Iron Age divide. In Mycenaean times, Ridgway points to a basic distinction in the Italian peninsula between primary (coastal) and secondary (inland) reception points. The same is true in the historic period, when there is a distinction between the coastal Greek poleis and the indigenous hinterland. Similarly, Malkin has noted that the Euboians were the first “on both sides of Italy: both in the Bay of Naples and in the Ionian Sea.” Precisely the same is true for LH I–II pottery in Italy, some seven or eight centuries earlier (Fig. 41). Moreover, the “great leap” in the history of Greek colonization that Malkin speaks of, referring to the fact that the earliest “Greek colony”—Pithekoussai—was also the most distant, is another feature that enjoys a Mycenaean ancestry. Indeed, the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in general (Figs. 41–42) is a virtual blueprint for the distribution of Greek pottery in the historic period, while the distribution of Akhaian Mycenaean pottery in many ways appears to determine and

296. See esp. Osborne 1998, p. 258; for the non-Greek imports to Pithekoussai see Docter and Niemeyer 1994; for the Phoenicians in Pithekoussai and Italy see, most recently, various papers in Kopcke and Tokumaru 1992.

297. Coldstream 1994, p. 77. For the perils of equating the distribution of a particular style of pottery with colonial priority, see Papadopoulos 1997a.

298. Fisher (1988, pp. 184–185) elaborates: “the pottery from Porto Peroni does not seem to have the same origin(s) as the pottery from Scoglio del Tonno.”


301. This is a theme well treated in papers in Descoeudres 1990. Furthermore, the assumption that urbanization came to Italy as a result of Greek colonization during the historic era may well be overstated. Some scholars have suggested that Mycenaean trade was in part responsible for the urban development of Apulia; see esp. Whitehouse 1973.

302. Malkin 1998a, p. 80; see also 1998b, p. 5.

303. See Gras 1985, p. 58, fig. 6; and, most recently, Vagnetti 1999, p. 158, map 2.

define the later distribution of Archaic Akhaian pottery. It therefore comes as no surprise that the Mycenaean pottery at Broglio di Trebisacce, in the heart of the historic Akhaian Sibaritide, was locally made,\textsuperscript{305} in the same way that imitations of Akhaian Late Geometric and Early Archaic pottery became prominent at Sybaris, Francavilla Marittima, and Metaponto.

**AKHAIANS IN SOUTH ITALY AND BEYOND: THE “LAST MYCENAESTES” OR “FIRST WESTERN GREEKS”?**

In this article I have attempted to draw a common thread between the distribution of Akhaian pottery in the Bronze Age and the historic period. From sometime around the middle of the second millennium B.C., Mycenaean Greeks “sailed, explored, established guest-friendship (xenia) relations, raided, traded, and [perhaps even] colonized” on the Ionian and Tyrrhenian coasts of South Italy and Sicily.\textsuperscript{306} Where these people went and what they did, if the archaeological record is of any consequence, correspond closely to the destinations and activities of the later Greeks of the Late Geometric and Early Archaic periods. Against this backdrop, Malkin is correct in stressing that the Greeks who explored, traded, and colonized “were sailing in imagined space as well as, in the words of Michel de Certeau, *espace comme lieu pratique.*”\textsuperscript{307} In any imagined space, the figure of Odysseus dominates as the archetypal wanderer, the master of guile and deception: “I am become a name; for always roaming with a hungry heart.”\textsuperscript{308} In the *Iliad* his kingdom, from the perspective of Troy and Mycenae, was out of the way; from the point of view of Mycenaean long-distance trade, it was centrally placed. Had he lived in the Bronze Age, Odysseus would have been a quintessential Homeric “Akhaian.” Had he lived in the 8th century B.C., he would probably have spoken the Akhaian dialect of Greek.

Between the prehistoric and historic periods, however, lie several centuries of what has been cast as darkness. To quote Anthony Snodgrass: “In one large area of the Greek world there were special reasons for the absence of a school of Protogeometric: this was Sicily and southern Italy, where permanent settlement only began in the eighth century.”\textsuperscript{309} Whatever happened in South Italy and Sicily between the demise of the Mycenaean way of life and the 8th century B.C., several points are worth bearing in mind. First, the populations of South Italy and Sicily were barely, if at all, affected when the palaces of the Mycenaean Greek mainland were destroyed. As the Ridgways have remarked, “an age that was dark in Greece was not necessarily so elsewhere and the demise of Mycenaean long-distance trade need not have been bad business between other parties.”\textsuperscript{310} More than business, however, the bonds that were forged, the lessons that were learned, and the social, economic, political, and linguistic interrelationships that were established between the Mycenaes and the indigenous peoples of the Italian peninsula, whatever their nature, were not necessarily eradicated. The fact that there is no proven Mycenaean palace in Akhaia—and thus, no palatial collapse—but rather an expansion

\textsuperscript{305} See Pugliese Carratelli 1996, p. 113, and, most recently, Vagnetti 1999, pp. 142–150.

\textsuperscript{306} The quoted passage is taken from Malkin 1998a, p. 1, where reference is specifically made to Greeks “from the 9th century B.C. on.”


\textsuperscript{308} Alfred Tennyson, *Ulysses*, lines 11–12.

\textsuperscript{309} Snodgrass 1971, p. 91.

during LH IIIC places Akhaia in a special relationship with the West, unlike other Mycenaean centers, with the possible exception of Lokris. It should also be noted that what has been cast as “trade” by Fisher between Mycenaean Greece and Italy extended very late into the Bronze Age, spilling into the Early Iron Age. Thanassis Papadopoulos has also stressed the remote nature of Akhaian settlements and the fact that Akhaia, along with some of the Ionian islands, constituted one of the last strongholds of the Mycenaean way of life. As Fisher states:

Perhaps the trade ties which had been established and nurtured between Achaia and Italy, Kephallenia and Italy, and northwestern Greece and Italy to a much smaller extent, enabled the “last stronghold of the Mycenaean way of life” to remain prosperous for so long. . . . This is not an argument for a continuous contact between Greece and Italy through the Dark Age of Greece, but perhaps there was a memory or tradition of the Mycenaean trade with Italy which was recalled when prosperity returned to Greece and once again sent the Achaians and others to Italy in search for metals and other riches.

However long such “memories” survived in the oral tradition, more recent discoveries of Mycenaean pottery in Italy are confirming the strong link between Italy and western Greece, particularly Akhaia and Elis, at the very end of the Bronze Age. In 1993 Penelope Mountjoy published a LH IIIC Late stirrup jar in the Louvre said to have been found in Campania, and suggested that its origin was Kephallenia. The most significant discoveries, however, are the quantities of LH IIIC Late pottery from the controlled excavations at Punta Meliso, one of two small headlands jutting out of Capo Santa Maria di Leuca, the easternmost point of the Salentine peninsula in Apulia. In their account of the Mycenaean pottery from Punta Meliso, Mario Benzi and Giampaolo Graziaadio conclude:

As the above stylistic survey has shown, this group is up to date with LH IIIC mainland production and has close links with local styles of Western Greece in general and of Achaea/Elis in particular, but the lack of distinctive connections with the late Mycenaean pottery from Kephallenia and Ithaca must be emphasized, since links with these islands have been noticed at other sites in Apulia. Although ceramic connections between Apulia and Achaea have been pointed out previously, in no case are such links so consistently evident as at Punta Meliso. In this respect this group is unique among LH IIIC pottery groups from Italy.

Benzi and Graziaadio go on to argue that it is likely that the Mycenaean pottery from Punta Meliso was produced locally in Apulia by a Mycenaean potter (or potters), and they consider this as evidence for a small group of Mycenaean refugees in eastern Apulia. These “newcomers”—cast as the “last Mycenaeans in Italy?”—were from Akhaia or Elis and the tentative
chronology suggested places their movement in the second quarter of the 11th century B.C. 318 Benzi and Graziodio’s publication of the Punta Melisco material, together with Fisher’s overview of Mycenaean pottery in Italy, not only confirms the regions of Akhaia and Elis as the source of much of the Late Mycenaean pottery in the West, but is contributing to closing the chronological gap, albeit slightly, between the notional “last Mycenaeans” and the “first Greek colonists.”

The very small quantity of Protogeometric or earlier Geometric pottery thus far known in South Italy, particularly from Calabria and the vicinity of Taranto, not only follows the earlier and later pattern, but itself may well derive from western Greece, either Ithaca, as Snodgrass has suggested, 319 or the northwest Peloponnese. Here it is worth adding that Morgan, building on her earlier contributions, has argued for contact between Corinth and various sites on the Corinthian Gulf, and further inland, beginning as early as the Late Protogeometric period. 320 Again, more published material is needed from Akhaia, Aitolia, Akarnania, Epeiros, and the Ionian islands, but the information that exists points to considerable activity and movement within this area in the earlier stages of the Early Iron Age.

Another aspect that should be stressed is that the trade in commodities, meager as it was between Italy and Greece in the period before “colonization” but after the end of the Mycenaean palatial economy, was not unidirectional. In dealing with a Sardinian askos found in one of the tombs at the Early Iron Age Tekke cemetery at Knossos—one of a small but growing number of central Mediterranean imports in Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Greece—Vagnetti notes that whatever the circumstances of its arrival in Crete, it more likely involved Phoenician, rather than Greek (or Italian), agency. 321 I wholeheartedly concur with Vagnetti’s conclusion: “What happened in the way of trade and long-distance interconnection between the collapse of the Mycenaean palace economy and the rise of the polis in Greece is still a matter of conjecture, and the picture is changing so fast that any possible definition is bound to be superseded by new evidence.” 322

In her seminal article on the Mycenaens in Akhaia, Emily Vermeule discussed the external relations of these Bronze Age Akhaianers, beginning with Thucydides’ statement that Zakynthos was colonized from Akhaia, and from there noting that both Zakynthos and Kephallenia saw political reorganization in the generation of the “grandsons of Herakles.” 323 The latter traced their ancestry back to both Perseus and Pelops, and it is in the same mythical/historical landscape that we find the island Taphos, as well as Taphios, Pterelaos, and Komaitho, as related by Apollodoros (2.4.5–8) and, of course, the Taphian pirates of the Odyssey. 324 The collected deeds of the Taphian pirates, and of their individual princes, like Mentes—whose home was, according to some scholars, the island of Meganisi, off the southwest coast of Leukas 325—read like a primer for a new breed of Late Bronze or Early Iron Age entrepreneur. In the Odyssey (1.180–185, cf. 1.105, 417), the “oar-loving Taphians” sail across the wine-dark sea to the land of men

323. Vermeule 1960, p. 20. Thuc. 2.66.1. As Vermeule further notes, this colonization is not dated, but Anderson (1954, p. 77) puts it before the Trojan War.
324. Vermeule 1960, p. 20, n. 31, with reference to the myth of Pterelaos and Komaitho, in Apollod. 2.4.5–8; cf. Marinatos 1933, p. 100. Vermeule further notes that the generations are confused, though Taphios would be a contemporary of Herakles. She further cites Brundage 1958 for the Eleian and Mycenaean elements of the family and their relationship to the Taphian pirates and the fall of Mycenae.
325. For the equation of Taphos with the island of Meganisi, and by some identified with the Homeric Kephallenia, see Strab. 10.456 (10.2.14). See further Malkin 1998a, p. 73; Malkin specifically cites Strab. 6.255, though he is probably referring to Strab. 10.455–456 (10.2.13–16).
of strange speech in order to trade shining iron for copper. Their specific target is Temesa, on the Tyrrenian coast of South Italy, a failed colony in the historic period of the Aitolians, which later became a dependency of the Akhaian colony of Kroton.\textsuperscript{326} In \textit{Odyssey} 14.450–452 and again in 15.427, the Taphians engage in slave-trading; in the former passage Odysseus’s swineherd Eumaeus was able to buy Mesaulios from the Taphians with his own goods, whereas in the latter passage, the Taphians seized, out of Sidon, a Phoenician girl, the daughter of Arybantos. In \textit{Odyssey} 16.425–430 we find the Taphian pirates raiding the Thesprotians. In dealing with the Taphians, Vermeule writes: “If these \textit{Odyssey} references are eighth century at the earliest, still the pirates of the islands and the northwest coast have a respectable Mycenaean ancestry.”\textsuperscript{327}

In attempting to review the history of settlement in Mycenaean Akhaia, Vermeule turned to the familiar passage in Pausanias in which the Ionians were thrust out by a group of “Akhaians” from the Argolid, led by Tisamenos, the son of Orestes. The relative chronology of the tradition is clear: a generation after the Trojan War.\textsuperscript{328} The rest of the story is well known: the Ionians made their way to Attika and the Akhaians settled the twelve cities until the coming of Oxylos and the Dorian.\textsuperscript{329} For Vermeule, here was “the royal house of Mycenae pushing west at about the time when IIIIB pottery was becoming IIIC.” She goes on to state the following: “that these Achaian continued to claim descent from Mycenae is clear from a later historical transaction, which also explains . . . why there is no trace of a Dorian in Achaia.”\textsuperscript{330} Unwilling to accept the highly implausible scenario of an entire population displaced by another, Jonathan Hall views the story of the Akhaian migration as a composite myth, which served two very different functions:

In the first place, it acts as a foundation myth for the population of Akhaia itself (and, perhaps more importantly, the inhabitants of the Akhaian colonies in South Italy): what makes the Akhaians of the historical period distinct is not only their descent from Akhaios, but the fact that they once (though no longer) occupied a primordial territory in the Argolid. In the second place, it represents an

326. Vermeule 1960, p. 20; and further discussion in Malkin 1998a, pp. 72–73. An alternative possibility, known to Strabo (6.255 [6.1.5]), equates Temesa with Tamassos in Cyprus, but it is clear that both Homer and Strabo are referring to Italian Temesa, which, like Cyprus, was famous for its copper. For historic Temesa, see Dunbabin 1948, pp. 37, 162, 202–203, 223, 367–368; Jeffery 1990, pp. 254, 260; and esp. Maddoli 1982. For the coinage of Temesa see Head 1911, p. 112; Kraay 1976, pl. 33, nos. 578–580. 327. Vermeule 1960, p. 20. 328. Vermeule 1960, p. 19. 329. Vermeule 1960, p. 19; Paus. 7.1.1–9; 6.1.2, 2.18.6–8; Hdt. 1.145, cf. 7.94, 8.73.1. See also Hall 1997, pp. 72–73. 330. Vermeule 1960, p. 19. Snodgrass (1971, p. 86) phrases it thus: “Achaea has recently been shown to have witnessed an influx of population at the beginning of the Mycenaean IIIIC period, comparable with that which occurred in Kephallenia and Ithaka.” Perhaps rather than a scenario of “migration,” the case of Akhaia, and of a number of related regions, such as Lokris, may have more to do with the fact that there was no palatial collapse. The “increase in population” noted by a number of scholars may be a fitting rhythm in those regions without known Mycenaean palaces and central control, related to a buildup in activity through the 12th century B.C. and perhaps beyond.
attempt—presumably on the part of people who felt themselves to be newcomers—to invalidate any claims made by those who sought to derive their descent from the Akhaians of the Heroic Age: there could be no celebration of Akhaians ethnicity if there were no Akhaians left in the Argolid.\textsuperscript{331}

Here is another case of people *doing* things with words. In this instance, however, there is a direct link between myth and tradition, on the one hand, and colonization on the other. Whatever foundation myth(s) the Akhaians of the Greek mainland or those of the Akhaians *apoikiai* in South Italy began to construct for themselves in the Archaic period, Akhaians from the northwest Peloponnese had already arrived in South Italy generations earlier, in the Late Bronze Age. The distribution of Mycenaean pottery in South Italy and Sicily illustrated in Figures 41–42 and discussed above provides a glimpse of the possible interactions between mainland Greece and Italy. It is clear that this ceramic distribution by itself is not evidence for Mycenaean settlers. And it would similarly be wrong to insist that the bulk of this pottery was even carried by Mycenaean, especially since much of the Archaic Corinthian pottery in Italy and Sicily, as has been argued, was not carried by Corinthians.\textsuperscript{332} But whatever scenario one adopts to explain the presence of Mycenaean pottery in the West, the evidence from Punta Meliso presented by Benzi and Grazierio is indisputable on one point. The arrival of Mycenaean “newcomers” involves the most direct form of human agency: *people*. Similar evidence exists from other sites, such as Broglio di Trebisacce at the northern edge of the plain of Sybaris,\textsuperscript{333} and substantial groups of locally made Mycenaean pottery are known in the area of Taranto, at Termite, and Nuraghe Antigori in Sardinia.\textsuperscript{334} This “pattern,” if it can be termed that, may have had its origins even earlier, in the period of the Shaft Graves. Whatever the case, the Mycenaean Akhaians of Punta Meliso, at the very least, are the first western Greeks, for whom we have clear evidence, to have settled in the land that came to be known as Magna Graecia.

**CODA**

As Hall has shown, the expression of an Akhaian cultural identity in the West has to be seen within the context of the foundation myths that were in the process of being elaborated in the Archaic period.\textsuperscript{335} Although intimately linked to an identity and ethnicity of their own making, the Akhaians of the historic period—those who first achieved historical importance as the founders of cities in South Italy—left behind much more than a legacy of words. The Archaic “Akhaian” material presented in this article documents the continuation of a pattern already in place by the Late Bronze Age. It also challenges the idea that any one region dominated the westward movement of people, ideas, and commodities and serves to highlight the complexity of interactions not only in South Italy and beyond, but also along the Corinthian Gulf in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age.

\textsuperscript{331} Hall 1997, p. 73; see also Morgan and Hall 1996, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{332} See above; note esp. Culican’s (1982, p. 46) warning, that there is a certain naïveté in the expectation that colonial Phoenicians or Greeks can always be recognized in terms of the pottery of the motherland; see further Morris and Papadopoulos 1998.
\textsuperscript{333} Vagnetti 1999.
\textsuperscript{334} Vagnetti and Jones 1988; Vagnetti 1999, p. 148.
\textsuperscript{335} Hall 1997, p. 183.
\textsuperscript{336} Anderson 1954, p. 77; Dunbabin 1948, pp. 24–29.
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