

‘Small things remembered’: the under-theorized domestic material culture of Hellenistic Greece

D. Graham J. Shipley

Abstract

This paper argues that the material culture of hellenistic Greece, particularly the domestic, small-scale material culture of ‘Old Greece’ (the Greek homeland), is urgent need of being viewed synoptically by archaeologists and historians in the light of developments in material culture theory that are being applied to other periods and places. Where the archaeological evidence permits, artefacts should be interpreted in the context of the assemblages of which they form part, in order to begin to understand the value and meaning they held for those who used them. Imaginative reconstruction, such as that attempted by Deetz, may also be of value¹.

Keywords: material culture, Hellenistic history, domestic assemblages, meaning, fictional reconstruction, Greek social history

Narratives

Samos, c. 275 BC

Zopyrion watched as his mother prepared the evening meal in the two-roomed mudbrick house that was their home, overlooking the harbour. The warships of Ptolemy had arrived that day, disgorging sailors from all over the Inner Sea. They had brought a mix of Egyptian gifts to smooth their way in the taverns of the waterfront. Zopyrion’s mother, perhaps against her better judgement, had bought a clay figurine of the god Sarapis, latterly so popular. Now it stood on a high shelf in the corner of the main room. Zopyrion wondered what the sailors would take back with

them to Alexandria: perhaps pots of Samian honey for their girlfriends and wives, or pieces of the newfangled red-slipped pottery which his uncle Rhoikos had started making in his workshop at the back of the city.

Ai Khanum, c. 260 BC

Banabelos sighed as the horse slowed, sensing the stable was near. It had been a tiresome journey all the way from Babylon to this outpost of Antiochos’s realm. He couldn’t even remember the place’s Greek name. But the sight of the grand buildings woke him from his lethargy, and he turned to admire the theatre and colonnades, teeming with all manner of men engaged in their trades – here a copper-beater, there a shoemaker – offering the latest fashions direct from Alexandria, or so they said. Why do we have to have shoes from that sink of corruption, Ptolemy’s capital, thought Banabelos. But at least he would be in comfortable lodgings tonight and could spend time in the new gymnasium tomorrow.

Sparta, c. 240 BC

Hybrion watched as the new king rode past. He had little interest in who the king was, but recent events had made all the helots conscious that life was changing. Hadn’t the aristocrats even strung up one of the kings last year? He turned back to his lathe and resumed the tedious job of fashioning arrows for the army. The weather was unseasonably cold for October, so he called his niece to put more wood chips on the brazier. The girl picked up the brazier, protecting her hands with two of the cloth bags in which Hybrion kept his tools, and brought it closer to her uncle. ‘Get yourself a drink, my dear’, said his uncle, and the girl, tired from a long morning helping in the workshop, picked a leather beaker off the table and went to the great jar of water in the corner. She scooped a few mouthfuls up with the clay ladle and poured them into her beaker, removed a few stray basil leaves out, and dropped them back in the water.

Those familiar with the scholarship on material culture will recognize that I am paying tribute to the historical archaeologist James Deetz (1930–2000). The phrase ‘small things forgotten’, used in the title of his most famous

¹ The original from which this paper derives, somewhat distantly, was presented at the Swedish Institute in Athens in 2007, a shorter version being given at the Köln–Bonn conference. I am grateful to the organizers for accepting my paper, and for their hospitality and editorial improvements. I also thank other participants in the conference for their comments, particularly Jeroen Poblome, Susan Rotroff, and Mark van der Enden; and colleagues with whom I have had encouraging exchanges both earlier and more recently, including Penelope Allison, Jennifer Baird, Patricia Baker, Elizabeth Bollen, Glenn Bugh, Duncan Campbell, Jonas Eiring, Vincent Gabrielsen, Lisa Hannestad, Kerstin Höghammar, Lars Karlsson, Sandra Karlsson, Elizabeth Langridge-Noti, Jane Masségliia (*née* Anderson), Gary Reger, Susan Rotroff, Sarah Scott, and Jenni Wallensten. None of the above is responsible for any eccentricities in the views offered.

book², derives from a New England house inventory. My imaginative reconstructions imitate those with which he opens the work. They also find interesting resonance in a recent discussion of how ancient historians can liberate themselves from a Eurocentric view of Greece. Prompted by the gravestone of a metic woodcutter in fifth-century Athens, Vlassopoulos asks: How would our Phrygian converse with his Athenian mates, while serving in his Athenian regiment? What would a low-class Athenian think while he was reading this epigram, while passing by going to work in his workshop³?

I often ask students, as a stimulus to imagination and a corrective to scholarly abstraction, what they think was actually happening in the Athenian *agora* (or some other place) on a wet Tuesday morning in a particular season of such-and-such a year. Who was selling what to whom? What sorts of background noises could be heard? Who was plotting his next political move with whom and trying not to be noticed? What goods for sale were lying about on temporary booths, or on the ground? And so on. These essays in reasoned picture-building relate strongly to the way in which we study material culture⁴.

A gap in research

One of the most glaring gaps in scholarly literature on the hellenistic period, particularly from the point of view of a historian, is a book-length overview of its material culture. There are, in fact, very few publications on the hellenistic period in whose titles the phrase ‘material culture’ occurs⁵, Rotroff’s seminal chapter being the most notable exception⁶. By an overview I do not mean, of course, a comprehensive typological study of artefacts and chronology, but a synthetic treatment of part or parts of the hellenistic *oikoumene* addressing questions about social and ideological change.

Major handbooks exist, of course. They cover such classes of artefacts as terracottas⁷, jewellery⁸, coins⁹, architecture¹⁰, and above all (I mean in the largest numbers) sculpture¹¹ – to mention but a few. It is perhaps symptomatic of traditional

concerns that the standard handbook on what its title refers to as hellenistic ‘art’ is in fact almost entirely about sculpture, with brief excursions into mosaics, architecture, and (in passing) other pictorial representations such as wall-paintings and relief ceramics¹². The same is broadly true of a recent, and brilliant, developmental analysis of the Greek influence on Roman art, though its authors choose to put painting first¹³.

There are many important volumes – too many to list here – on the pottery (usually fine wares) and other classes of finds from specific excavations, such as Athens and Corinth. There are catalogues of exhibitions and museum collections¹⁴. Professor Drougou has organized eight Scientific Meetings on Hellenistic Pottery (Επιστημονικές Συναντήσεις για την Ελληνιστική Κεραμική) so far¹⁵, in which over 500 papers, posters, and abstracts have been presented; of those, only about one in ten takes a view wider than a particular site or locality¹⁶, though in many cases this only means analysing the development or distribution of a particular ceramic form across the wider Greek world. A still smaller number of the studies in these excellent volumes attempt to characterize a regional society, economy, or culture; or to examine the meanings which artefacts had for ancient users, the use contexts in which they are found, or the assemblages of disparate objects of which they formed part¹⁷.

Some classes of artefacts, such as jewellery or figurines, are treated in substantial volumes often covering the whole of Greek, or even the whole of Greco-Roman, antiquity. These and other so-called ‘minor arts’ are even less likely than fine pottery to receive synthetic and contextual treatment, and in excavation reports they are all too likely to be relegated to a catch-all chapter called ‘Small finds’¹⁸, whether they are individually small or not. Coarse and unpainted pottery often receives only summary treatment. In her recent studies of classical and hellenistic furnishings, Andrianou makes similar points about the misrepresentation of so-called minor objects¹⁹. And all of these points could be made with redoubled force for the hellenistic period, since few overviews of artefact types are specifically focused on this period, let alone on the social background to the artefacts in question²⁰.

² Deetz 1996.

³ Vlassopoulos 2007 (quotation from 237).

⁴ Key works on approaches to material culture include Bradley 1990; Chapman 2000; Cumberpatch and Blinkhorn 1997b; Deetz 1996; Garwood *et al.* 1991; Gosden 1999; Hill 1995; Moore 1982; Richards and Thomas 1984; Shanks 1996; Sterner 1989; Wells 1999.

⁵ One is to do with households in Greco-Roman Delos, with particular reference to early Christian times: Trümper 2003. The ‘cluster’ of papers in *TAPhA* 137. 2 (2007) collectively entitled ‘Literary and material culture in hellenistic Greece’ (introduction in Miller 2007) is important, but they focus variously on the materiality of inscriptions (Champion 2007) and of books of epigrams (Hörschele 2007), the theft of statues from Sicily by Verres (Rosenmeyer 2007), and the relationship between poetry and painting (Gurd 2007) – not on settlement archaeology.

⁶ Rotroff 2006.

⁷ e.g. Higgins 1963.

⁸ e.g. Boardman 2001.

⁹ Overview in Davis and Kraay 1973.

¹⁰ e.g. Wycherley 1978; Lauter 1986; Lawrence 1996.

¹¹ Classic works include Smith 1988; Smith 1991.

¹² Pollitt 1986.

¹³ Beard and Henderson 2001.

¹⁴ e.g. Pfrommer 1993; Pfrommer 2001 (but see criticisms of Rotroff 2002).

¹⁵ 1st Hellenistic Pottery Meeting in Ioannina 1986 (published 1989); 2nd Hellenistic Pottery Meeting in Rhodes 1989 (published 1990); 3rd Hellenistic Pottery Meeting in Thessaloniki 1991 (published 1994); 4th Hellenistic Pottery Meeting in Mytilene 1994 (published 1997); 5th Hellenistic Pottery Meeting in Chania 1997 (published 2000); 6th Hellenistic Pottery Meeting in Volos 2000 (published 2004); 7th Hellenistic Pottery Meeting in Aigio 2005 (published 2011); 8th Hellenistic Pottery Meeting in Ioannina (forthcoming).

¹⁶ (Figures based on the first seven meetings.) I do not include the general discussions and conclusions at the end of each conference.

¹⁷ Examples, all from the later conferences, include Doulgeri-Intzesiloglou 2000; Morel 1997; Rizakis 2004; Rizakis and Touratsoglou 2011; Rotroff 1997.

¹⁸ As remarked by Allison 1997.

¹⁹ Andrianou 2009, esp. 3–4.

²⁰ On hellenistic art see now Burn 2005 with Gorrie’s review in

A welcome exception to the above generalizations appears to reside in Tal's synthesis of the material culture (in its widest sense) of hellenistic Palestine²¹, though he is apparently seeking to answer broad questions of cultural continuity between periods, rather than to understand individual (public or domestic) environments. Art and architecture can also be used to address questions of culture contact²². Equally welcome is Andrianou's emphasis upon the use and depositional context of Greek furniture, marking a contrast with many earlier studies of artefacts, which are rarely if ever presented in their context of discovery. They are typically divided between specialists whose task is to establish – as is indeed necessary – a chronology and typology of their own material by invoking comparanda from other sites, rather than to go further and contribute to an elucidation of the social or economic features of the society that occupied a site. In a complete site report the project directors may write a synthetic chapter, usually quite brief, drawing general conclusions but not systematically showing by what methods the finds, let alone 'small finds', have been analysed to produce those conclusions²³. In some respects the authors of field survey volumes have done better in this respect, starting from compartmentalized study of types but teasing out (usually in period-specific sections) diachronic social change from the variation in surface assemblages recovered; for example the field surveys of Keos²⁴, Laconia²⁵, Methana²⁶, and so on.

Conversely, the work of hellenistic historians – even those who use quantitative and other data from excavations to investigate economies (such as in the Liverpool volumes)²⁷ – usually stands at a remove from the work of archaeologists. Two recent historical surveys of the hellenistic period in English are noticeably short on archaeology, including material culture²⁸; conversely, overviews of Greek archaeology tend to focus on archaic and classical and to underplay the hellenistic. This is not just a problem of the hellenistic subfield. Even a session on 'Material histories and textual archaeologies' at the Theoretical Archaeology Group conference in 2000²⁹, an event normally attended by at least some ancient historians,

attracted an audience made up entirely of archaeologists³⁰. The work of Sauer in explicitly bridging the gap between ancient history and classical archaeology, based on a session at the 2001 TAG³¹, seems to have had limited impact as far as hellenistic studies are concerned³². Efforts to provide more sophisticated theoretical underpinnings for classical archaeology as a whole have gathered pace with important publications³³, but this, too, has so far had a limited impact on hellenistic studies. Most historians of this period remain uninterested in the hands-on process of interpreting individual artefacts, or even in the compiled quantitative data regarding classes of artefact, and hence in the rules of evidence which a rigorous engagement with archaeology imposes; conversely, classical archaeologists (at least in the English-speaking world) often rely on outdated historical analyses or fail to offer sufficiently complex historical explanations or to problematize those they do offer. As always, there are opportunities to go forward, such as that provided by the imminent 'Theory in Greek Archaeology' conference³⁴, though at the time of writing none of the titles of papers so far announced appears to focus on the hellenistic period as such.

Hellenistic studies were not always so strongly compartmentalized between historians and archaeologists. Consider the wealth of archaeological evidence exploited by Tarn in his work on Baktria³⁵; or, again, consider how Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (originally published in 1941)³⁶ is decorated with photographs of scores of artefacts of many different categories – portrait sculptures, coin portraits, bronze copies of busts, relief carvings, ceramic and metal vases, gravestones, terracottas, faience statuettes, mosaics, wall-paintings (from Pompeii), glassware, jewellery, paintings representing textiles, bronze figurines, and so on. What Rostovtzeff does not do – understandably, given the era in which he was working – is to 'read' artefacts systematically, and with strict rules of engagement, in order to get history and society out of them. His aim seems to be, rather, that of illustrating the rapidly changing, multi-cultural nature of the hellenistic world whose economies are his central concern. Many of his artefacts are given no context in terms of an assemblage – indeed, they may have lacked such a context in the first place, especially those in museum collections. Nevertheless, one is grateful for the mind-broadening range of his expertise and the stimulus he gives us if we wish to conjure up imaginatively the aspects of life about which sources and inscriptions do not tell us. I should like to pay tribute, too, to another volume – somewhat neglected, I judge, since I have rarely if ever

Bryn Mawr Classical Review 2005.07.40 (<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2005/2005-07-40.html>, last visited on 11 Oct. 2012); on figurines and networks, see Langin-Hooper 2007.

²¹ Tal 2006, in Hebrew; I know it only through reviews, e.g. Lehmann 2008 and Rappaport 2007.

²² On Greek-non-Greek interaction through art and architecture, see Colledge 1987; Colledge 1990.

²³ For similar views, see Allison 1997. On the artificiality of the distinction between small finds and others (or 'bulk finds'), see Cumberpatch and Blinkhorn 1997a, v.

²⁴ Cherry *et al.* 1991.

²⁵ Cavanagh *et al.* 1996; Cavanagh *et al.* 2002.

²⁶ Mee and Forbes 1997.

²⁷ i.e. the (so far) three volumes of papers from the conferences on hellenistic economies: Archibald *et al.* 2001; Archibald *et al.* 2005; Archibald *et al.* 2011. Note also chapters elsewhere by Davies 2006; Manning 2007; Oliver 2006; and more fully Oliver 2007 on Attica; Reger 2007.

²⁸ Shipley 2000; and the excellent multi-authored historical survey Erskine 2003.

²⁹ Oxford, 18–20 Dec. 2000.

³⁰ P. A. Baker, pers. comm.

³¹ Dublin, 13–15 Dec. 2001.

³² Sauer 2004. Note the 10th anniversary colloquium organized by D. R. Stewart at Leicester, 19 Nov. 2011 (proceedings forthcoming).

³³ e.g. Alcock and Osborne 2007; Whitley 2001.

³⁴ Ann Arbor, Mich., 4–5 May 2012 (see <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/tiga/home>, last accessed 6 Feb. 2012).

³⁵ e.g. Tarn 1938.

³⁶ Rostovtzeff 1941 (2nd edn Rostovtzeff 1953, revised by P. M. Fraser).

seen it cited – which makes a bold attempt to integrate artefacts with history. I have in mind the *Plates* volume to the *Cambridge Ancient History* volume vii part 1, edited by Ling³⁷; particularly his own chapters on ‘Houses and life’, ‘Sport and education’, ‘Theatre’, ‘Religion’, and ‘Death and burial’.

With very few comparable exceptions, it seems that when either archaeologists or historians do attempt to do justice to hellenistic material culture, they do not always follow through very convincingly. Stamped amphora handles, for example, may be used as a measure of trade volume and direction, but not of culture. The former is a perfectly valid way of addressing certain questions, and I am certainly not saying the same one person should practise both; rather, I am urging that both should be done. Again, drinking vessels and the manner in which wine was consumed are typically interpreted on the basis of the Attic *symposion*, not that of wider consumption practices; yet we now know taverns existed in Greece, and that the *symposion* was the exception, not the rule³⁸. Studies have shown that existing typologies of divided domestic space, such as those involving the notions of the *andron* and *gynaikonitis* (the male room and the female room), are too schematic, and that rooms at Olynthos and elsewhere had multiple uses. In other studies, regrettably, pottery styles that draw on iconographic elements from multiple sources, or different styles of pottery occurring together, are sometimes taken simply as evidence of migration and the co-existence of different ethnic groups. Scholars may even fall into the trap of estimating the proportion of each ethnic group in a population from the proportions of different pottery styles. There is an additional problem of combining sources of different kinds: for example, representations of women, such as figurines, are sometimes compared with literary texts, such as Menander³⁹, rather than interpreted as possible evidence of changes in social relations in their own right – let alone interpreted alongside the objects with which they were found. Cultural analysis does not always get further than treating, for example, apparent borrowings from classical styles, or from the culture of Old Greece, as expressions of a Hellenism beleaguered in a sea of barbarian culture.

Great men and others

My particular interest in raising these issues is born of a desire to know more about the everyday, small-scale material culture of the hellenistic period, for most aspects of which there are, as far as I am aware, no synthetic treatments. I have in mind not only the so-called minor arts – figurines, coins, metalwork, jewellery, and so on – but also pottery assemblages, where the data are available. In

a chapter in an edited survey of the period, Rotroff gives a wonderful list of the kinds of things that must have existed, of which I quote a part: utilitarian objects and structures that, were we walking through a Hellenistic environment, we might not particularly notice, but which nonetheless carry important messages about life in that environment. . . . in the house, aside from the house itself and its fittings (doors, locks, paving, walls and their decoration, roof tiles, water pipes), furniture, domestic tools (looms, washtubs), textiles, baskets, wineskins, the pottery for storage, cooking, serving, eating, drinking, washing, and bathing, equipment for the household shrine, toilet items and secular ornaments; on ancient bodies, clothing, footwear, and items of personal adornment; in public buildings, ballots and voting machines, public measures, tokens and nametags, inscriptions, papyrus rolls, writing tablets; in the workshop, the potter’s wheel, sculptor’s tools, kilns, furnaces; on the farm, hoes, plows, grindstones, harnesses, beehives; in the gymnasium and the bath, athletic and bathing paraphernalia (jumping weights, discus, balls, strigils); and at shrines, votive pottery and figurines, offering tables, and sacrificial equipment. Out on the borders, soldiers on patrol would present another collection (armor, weaponry) and the unlucky victims of a siege could view from their walls the approaching material culture of the enemy in the form of siege machines. At sea, the ship, perhaps the most complex piece of material culture of its time, laden with its cargo of commodities and material culture, was also crammed with the nets, knives, cooking pots, crockery, gaming pieces, and navigational devices that sustained the crew and the passengers throughout the voyage⁴⁰.

One of the goals at which history should surely aim is the reconstruction of daily life and personal relationships, particularly when written sources are virtually silent on these matters. It is not as if politics is divorced from personal relations. John Arnold, in his splendid book *History: A Very Short Introduction*, argues compellingly that cataclysmic events happen not merely because of great men but precisely *because of* the non-great – not to mention women, including great ones⁴¹. The English civil war, for example, or the colonization of America, or the Reformation could not have happened without the mass (not an undifferentiated mass!) of ordinary and middling folk who were prepared to follow others, often into danger. There have been plenty of potentially charismatic leaders who never led anyone. Luther was not the first to nail theses to a church door, but he found a response others had not. And so on. One could make a similar point about Alexander the Great: his conquest would not have taken place without the tens of thousands of people willing to follow him. Their material culture, I suspect, has not been of much interest to ancient historians, even historians of ancient art.

³⁷ Ling 1984.

³⁸ Kelly-Blazeby 2008; also Kelly-Blazeby 2001.

³⁹ Again, the work of Andrianou marks a significant step forward in the sophistication with which archaeological and literary evidence are combined.

⁴⁰ Rotroff 2006, 136–137.

⁴¹ Arnold 2000.

The first part of Rotroff's imaginative list is perhaps the most tantalizing. Artefacts relating to technology, political-military life, or commerce relate to areas of ancient society that have tended to dominate research in any case. How much more urgent to look for evidence of value and meaning in the artefacts from domestic contexts! This sphere, it seems to me, offers the greatest potential for innovation. It might be objected that the amount of meaningful comparison we can make is limited by the differential preservation of different kinds of data in the conditions of the eastern Mediterranean, as well as by the inadequate recording practices of older excavations; but excavation and publication practice has changed, and we surely have a wide enough range of small artefacts – sometimes even assemblages in context – to make the attempt worthwhile.

Reasons for neglect?

Why has the small-scale material culture of the period not been synoptically viewed or adequately theorized?

One undoubted reason is the relative decline of interest in hellenistic history during much of the twentieth century, at least in the English-speaking world. 'Classical archaeology' in its Greek embodiment has tended to mean the archaeology of the archaic and, as the name suggests, classical periods, the hellenistic often being appended or subsumed in studies of artefact categories such as jewellery, fine pottery, and sculpture. Happily, the level of interest in hellenistic history has revived since the 1980s, and one may hope that this carries over into the study of archaeology.

Another explanation, superficially attractive, could be that, as with archaic and classical Greece, it takes a huge effort just to make sense of, and in particular to date, the vast amount of material remains. To put it less charitably, the quantity of finds gives us plenty to keep us at work, so that we are not under too much pressure to devise theoretical models. One step in rebutting that view would be to point to the post-Winckelmann aestheticism that was, until recently, dominant in all quarters of classical archaeology and that still has great influence, perhaps particularly in the USA. This approach either admires what it selects as 'art' or 'arts' and marginalizes other classes of artefacts, or actually regards hellenistic art as second-rate in comparison with classical, compounding the problem.

A more convincing explanation for our failure to develop a strongly social approach to hellenistic material culture is that this period, like the classical, is one for which we have written sources, so that we tend to think we have all the necessary reference points to understand society and ideology – or, better, societies and ideologies. One could respond, however, not only that the sources for the period

are very gappy⁴², but also that material culture theory has been most actively developed precisely in the study of literate societies such as early colonial America. And it is clearly not the case that Greek sources, or sources for any period, tell us all we would like to know about social relationships and attitudes.

New work

On the positive side, some studies have attempted to move in the direction indicated. All those I know of are by archaeologists rather than historians. One of the few explicit considerations of hellenistic material culture is Rotroff's chapter, already mentioned⁴³. It contains valuable pointers to what might be done, though given the introductory character of the volume of which it forms part, it understandably does little more than that. Rotroff does make telling points about the non-correspondence of datable artefact types either with the conventional limits of the period or, indeed, with each other. So-called hellenistic lamps, for example, continue into Flavian times, while Attic kraters cease around 175 BC. Changes in drinking pottery, such as the new lagynos shape, perhaps intended for a single drinker's portion of wine, can attest changes in drinking practices. Amphoras are valuable interpretative tools not only when they have stamped handles: some 90 per cent probably had no stamp, and these too must be considered. The use of rooms in elite houses, she remarks, becomes more flexible in this period. Greek cooking ware shapes are adopted in new places, helping to define a hellenistic *koiné*. At a certain stage Italian cooking wares enter on the scene. Some pottery styles may be described as hybrid (combining ostensibly Hellenic and non-Hellenic elements), and the interplay between conservatism, innovation, and fusion may illuminate cultural change. Material culture may tell us even more about non-Greek cultures than about Greek cultures not described in the sources. Changes in the representation of women may be the basis for a study of ideological changes. Finally, the design, use, and location of artefacts may reflect the importance of memory and 'spirit of place' (if I may foist upon Rotroff a term popularized, though not invented, by Lawrence Durrell), such as the attempt to claim a heroic past, discussed in Alcock's classic paper on late classical-early hellenistic cult at Bronze Age tombs⁴⁴. Residue analysis may further elucidate the physical uses to which ceramic artefacts were put.

To Rotroff's general methodological statement one may juxtapose a few detailed studies that engage with issues of context and interpretation⁴⁵. Houby-Nielsen has argued that the abandonment of sculpted grave monuments in Athens, under and after the regime of Demetrios of Phaleron, was

⁴² See general discussion in Shipley 2000, ch. 1.

⁴³ Rotroff 2006.

⁴⁴ Alcock 1991.

⁴⁵ Houby-Nielsen 1997.

not the result of his sumptuary law but part of a wider trend (already proposed in her earlier paper on the Kerameikos)⁴⁶ towards (a) equal treatment of men and women and (b) the conscious placing of grave markers against a background of earlier, still visible sculptural monuments meaning that people had a certain sense of landscape, of the placing of new monuments in a context that evoked a vision of the past; she uses the term ‘romantic’ at one point. Her earlier study calls to mind one of the few attempts I have seen to tease out the implications for social attitudes from art: Sutton’s study of fifth-century vase iconography, which argues for a softening of gender opposition at Athens and a greater willingness to permit women’s sexuality to be represented iconographically⁴⁷. Zanker’s study of sculptural reliefs from Smyrna is another such attempt⁴⁸; while the work of Masséglià represents the most comprehensive attempt yet to reassess the notion of individualism in hellenistic figurative sculpture⁴⁹.

Clearly the methodological climate is slowly changing, and some site publications now acknowledge the need for more synoptic analysis. Thus Eiring, in his excellent study of graves at Aitolian Chalkis – from which comes the cover photo on the relevant volume of *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens*, showing a selection of finds all from one tomb – declares as his ultimate goal a synthetic study of West Greek burial customs⁵⁰.

I should not of course neglect to mention complementary historical studies which attempt to characterize certain classes of social relationships in great detail, for example Gabrielsen’s outstanding work on Rhodian associations⁵¹. Nor would I rule out, as irrelevant to the study of everyday material culture, studies of economies and trade patterns based on the evidence of pottery and other finds. Elsewhere I have argued on the basis of studies of particular sites and localities that the stylistic analyses of early hellenistic pottery in the Peloponnese allow us to identify at least two different ‘Peloponneses’⁵². Some regions are characterized by the pottery experts as conservative and inward-looking: Eleia, the small *poleis* of Achaia and Arkadia, and the *polis* of Messene; while others show more active links with the wider world: Corinth, Dyme, coastal Messenian towns, and, perhaps surprisingly, inland Laconia including Geronthrai. It is also possible to divide the Peloponnese into a northern and north-western zone where pottery styles are apparently influenced more by Corinth, with other areas such as Laconia and coastal Messenia displaying stronger stylistic links with Magna Graecia and the eastern Mediterranean, particularly Alexandria. It would be interesting to tie this in with possible social and ideological developments in different areas.

While networks are vital to understand, we must not shirk the attempt to go beyond them and comprehend the social relations that underlay them.

A new agenda?

When Michael Shanks published his provocative book on Greek archaeology⁵³, he highlighted the need for a sociologically and anthropologically informed approach to artefacts. What, then, is it possible to aspire to do for the hellenistic period, and how feasible is the task?

To turn an earlier point on its head: hellenistic archaeology is extremely well placed to move forward into a new phase of study informed by material culture theory, precisely because the material record is relatively rich. To formulate telling questions, however, it will be necessary to draw upon methods applied by archaeologists to other cultures, as well as upon sociological and anthropological discourses.

In an encyclopaedia article, Morphy emphasizes, first, artefacts as ‘indices of cultural boundaries and markers of social categories’; second, as evidence of transformations in the value and meaning of objects as they move from context to context, either as part of local exchange systems or global trading processes. Material objects frequently outlast their maker; thus they are both sources of evidence about previous lifeways and objects to be reflected on by the generations who succeed their makers. [...] people make meaningful objects but they can also change the meaning of objects⁵⁴.

This formulation, while not exhausting the interpretative possibilities, does seem helpful, above all in its stress on *value* and *meaning* – notions I have rarely seen attached to the hellenistic ‘minor’ arts. The relative values we place on material items are not always predictable or consistent. When my family and I moved house a few years ago, we left behind (temporarily, since our old house was not yet sold) some of our most valuable silver-plated utensils because we didn’t have room for them. Among the things we took great care *not* to leave behind were a number of rather tired-looking mugs, some well-worn soft toys, and a very old, handmade table of rather ordinary pine, which we valued for its utility.

The term ‘historical archaeology’ carries a special meaning in the English-speaking context, namely the post-colonization archaeology of North America. Deetz’s classic study of early modern American life includes extensive discussion of ceramic finds, and prompts one to formulate questions about the hellenistic period. First, can we do more with the function and use of particular vessel shapes, for example to extract information about

⁴⁶ Houby-Nielsen 1998.

⁴⁷ Sutton 1992.

⁴⁸ Zanker 1993.

⁴⁹ Masséglià 2102; Masséglià forthcoming.

⁵⁰ Eiring 2004, esp. 155.

⁵¹ Gabrielsen 1997; Gabrielsen 2001.

⁵² Shipley 2008, 62–64.

⁵³ Shanks 1996, esp. ch. 6.

⁵⁴ Morphy 2004 (quotations from pp. 620 and 621).

regional differences in foodways or dining customs?⁵⁵ As far as I am aware, most of what has been written about foodways in Greek times has been based on literary texts and iconography⁵⁶. Second, where did pottery stand in relation to other items of technology? How widely used, for example, were non-ceramic implements? Third, is it possible to correlate different kinds of pottery with different social classes? Fourth, did some pottery have a non-functional role, for example what Binford (according to Deetz) called socio-technic and, on another level, ideotechnic (such as cultic) roles? A vase may be displayed rather than used.

Others will wish be able to devise areas for investigation, but one specific aspect that should be of wide interest to historians is ideology. Deetz argues that intellectual changes among the elite take a long time to have any impact on ordinary men and women, but may eventually do so, perhaps after hundreds of years⁵⁷. He has in mind the Renaissance and Enlightenment, and he undoubtedly over-schematizes, writing under the influence of Structuralism: we may be sceptical about his insistence on the essentially tripartite mental schemes characteristic of humanistic Renaissance thought, and the suggestion that modern babies' food bowls divided into three compartments are conditioning our children into Renaissance ways of thinking. While we can certainly formulate more relevant questions today, it seems vital to pose such questions and discuss them. For example, can we make any link at all between, on the one hand, the work of Aristotle and the early Stoics, the discoveries of the explorer Pytheas, the geographical research of Eratosthenes, and other intellectual advances in the late fourth century and the first half of the third; and, on the other hand, changes in intimate social relationships, domestic practice, diet and consumption, even religious belief and practice? It is a large gap to bridge, but such links have sometimes been posited – plausibly, though usually without detailed argumentation – by finding, for example, reflections of philosophical developments in imaginative literature of the period, such as the social comedies of Menander or the epic of Apollonios Rhodios. Those writers were themselves members of an elite, and thus in touch with intellectual innovations; on the other hand, we must not make the mistake of thinking that their attitudes were typical of Greeks in their age, or indeed that Greek attitudes did not vary extremely widely across the eastern Mediterranean and western Asia.

All these perspectives may be enriched by the study of excavated artefacts. I suggest that, given the right kind of data, we can use the surviving domestic material culture of the hellenistic period to explore social relations and ideology in greater depth.

Of course, it is a moot point whether there is a distinctively hellenistic material culture, or even cultures, as opposed to 'categories of material evidence that happen to be datable within certain chronological limits'⁵⁸. Equally, we must keep an open mind about the extent to which there was such a thing as a hellenistic material culture *koine* and, if so, when it existed and where, and when and where it did not. The interplay between *koine*, region, and locality must also be borne in mind⁵⁹. Given the quality of recent excavations from urban sites outside Old Greece – for example at Tell Anafa in Israel⁶⁰, Failaka off Kuwait⁶¹, and Jebel Khalid in Syria⁶² – it may well be that the most fruitful areas for investigation small-scale material culture lie in the 'new' Greek lands of western Asia. On the other hand, the intensity with which material from Greece itself has been studied may also lend itself to contextual investigation.

We are of course at the mercy of older excavation methods, as well as of delayed publication or even the failure to publish – what might be called 'un-publication'. Above all we are at the mercy of preservation of data, or the lack of it. The imagined sketches at the beginning of this paper may be thought of, in some respects, as shopping lists for what we would like to know rather than drawing on what we do know or even what we can hope to know. Zopyrion's self-interrogation about the harbour at Samos is predicated on Ptolemaic naval control of the island in the third century and the presumption that the fleet was manned by a cosmopolitan mix of well-travelled sailors; despite their officially military preoccupations, they 'surely would have' acted as long-distance purveyors of acculturation in several directions (Samian honey to Egypt is just one plausible object of trade)⁶³. But would a family whose mother had no slave to cook for her necessarily live in a relatively generously proportioned building? Only a probabilistic case can be made, and it would need to be made on the basis of the best current knowledge and theory. The fiction, consciously un-grounded in direct evidence, asks questions; it does not seek to provide authoritative answers. Neither do those about the craftsmen at Ai Khanum (whose Greek name is indeed uncertain) who are aware of Egyptian fashion (which seems wholly likely), and about the Laconian helot (helots, too, have families)⁶⁴ who works at his house but lives in relative comfort⁶⁵.

⁵⁸ J. Baird, pers. comm. (2007).

⁵⁹ See now Colvin 2010 and, in the same volume, Erskine 2010, for sceptical remarks about notions of a linguistic or cultural *koine* in the hellenistic period.

⁶⁰ Berlin and Slane 1997.

⁶¹ Hannestad 1983.

⁶² Jackson 2006 (figurines); Jackson 2011 (housing); Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011 (pottery); Jackson 2000 (lamps); Wright 2011. Cf. also study of Dura-Europos by Downey 1993.

⁶³ Cf. Shipley 1987, 18 and 269, for circumstantial evidence that Samos then, as now, produced noted honey. Cf. the multifarious island goods imported into Alexandria in 259 BC (Austin 2006, no. 298 = Austin 1981, no. 237 = *P. Cairo Zen.* 59.012)

⁶⁴ e.g. Hodkinson 2000, ch. 4.

⁶⁵ A Hybrion was commemorated near the perioikic town of Sellasia: Shipley 1996, 214 no. 2; see also <http://www.csad.ox.ac.uk/laconia/Inscription02.html> (last visited on 11 Oct. 2012). To what social class he belonged remains unknown; Spartiates who died in battle

⁵⁵ Cf. Deetz 1996, 75.

⁵⁶ e.g. Dalby 1996; Davidson 1997; Wilkins 2000; Wilkins and Hill 2006 (with some mention of archaeology).

⁵⁷ Deetz 1996, 59.

We may never know whether Greek children would take water from a pithos using a ceramic ladle, but if we do not present such scenes – and alternatives – to our imagination we may struggle to get closer to both the functions of everyday objects and the meanings they held for people.

While we may not find the data to answer all our questions, I believe that we must ask those questions. If we do not, we impoverish our understanding of life in hellenistic Greece.

D. G. J. Shipley
School of Archaeology & Ancient History
University of Leicester
University Road
Leicester
GB-LE1 7RH
gjs@le.ac.uk

Bibliography

- Alcock, S. E. 1991. Tomb cult and the post-classical polis. *American Journal of Archaeology* 95, 447–467.
- Alcock, S. E. and Osborne, R. G. (eds.) 2007. *Classical Archaeology*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Allison, P. M. 1997. Why do excavation reports have finds' catalogues?, in C. G. Cumberpatch and P. W. Blinkhorn (eds.), *Not So Much a Pot, More a Way of Life: Current Approaches to Artefact Analysis in Archaeology*, 77–84. Oxford, Oxbow.
- Andrianou, D. 2009. *The Furniture and Furnishings of Ancient Greek Houses and Tombs*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Archibald, Z. H., Davies, J., Gabrielsen, V., and Oliver, G. J. (eds.) 2001. *Hellenistic Economies*. London–New York, Routledge.
- Archibald, Z. H., Davies, J. K., and Gabrielsen, V. (eds.) 2005. *Making, Moving and Managing: The New World of Ancient Economies, 323–31 BC*. Oxford, Oxbow.
- Archibald, Z. H., Davies, J. K., and Gabrielsen, V. (eds.) 2011. *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies: Third to First Centuries BC*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Arnold, J. H. 2000. *History: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford–New York, Oxford University Press.
- Austin, M. M. 1981. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest (A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation)*. Cambridge, etc., Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, M. M. 2006. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest (A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation)*, 2nd edn. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Beard, M. and Henderson, J. 2001. *Classical Art: From Greece to Rome*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Berlin, A. and Slane, K. W. 1997. *The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery*. Ann Arbor, Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.
- Boardman, J. 2001. *Greek Gems and Finger Rings*, new & expanded edn. London, Thames & Hudson.
- Bradley, R. 1990. *The Passage of Arms: An Archaeological Analysis of Prehistoric Hoards and Votive Deposits*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Burn, L. 2005. *Hellenistic Art from Alexander the Great to Augustus*. Los Angeles, Getty Publications.
- Cavanagh, W. G., Crouwel, J., Catling, R. W. V. and Shipley, D. G. J. 2002. *Continuity and Change in a Greek Rural Landscape: The Laconia Survey*, i: *Methodology and Interpretation*. London, British School at Athens.
- Cavanagh, W. G., Crouwel, J. H., Catling, R. W. V. and Shipley, D. G. J. 1996. *Continuity and Change in a Greek Rural Landscape: The Laconia Survey*, ii: *Archaeological Data*. London, British School at Athens.
- Champion, C. B. 2007. Empire by invitation: Greek political strategies and Roman imperial interventions in the second century BCE. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137 (2), 255–275.
- Chapman, J. 2000. *Fragmentation in Archaeology: People, Places and Broken Objects in the Prehistory of South Eastern Europe*. London–New York, Routledge.
- Cherry, J. F., Davis, J. L. and Mantzourani, E. 1991. *Landscape Archaeology as Long-term History: Northern Keos in the Cycladic Islands from Earliest Settlement until Modern Times*. Los Angeles, Institute of Archaeology, University of California.
- Colledge, M. A. R. 1987. Greek and non-Greek interaction in the art and architecture of the hellenistic east, in A. Kuhrt and S. M. Sherwin-White (eds.), *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander*, 134–162. London/Berkeley, Duckworth/University of California Press.
- Colledge, M. A. R. 1990. Some observations on Greek art in western Asia after Alexander's conquest. In J.-P. Descoeudres (ed.), *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, 323–328. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Colvin, S. 2010. The koine: a new language for a new world, in A. Erskine and L. Llewellyn-Jones (eds.),

were allegedly commemorated with a gravestone (Plut. *Lyc.* 27. 1), and the battlefield of Sellasia is close by, but the lettering may be Classical. His name is oddly derogatory and the carving, to all appearances, not that of a professional letter-cutter.

- Creating a Hellenistic World*, 31–45. Swansea, Classical Press of Wales.
- Cumberpatch, C. G. and Blinkhorn, P. W. 1997a. Introduction, in C. G. Cumberpatch and P. W. Blinkhorn (eds.), *Not So Much a Pot, More a Way of Life: Current Approaches to Artefact Analysis in Archaeology*, v–vi. Oxford, Oxbow.
- Cumberpatch, C. G. and Blinkhorn, P. W. (eds.) 1997b. *Not So Much a Pot, More a Way of Life: Current Approaches to Artefact Analysis in Archaeology*. Oxford, Oxbow.
- Dalby, A. 1996. *Siren Feasts: A History of Food and Gastronomy in Greece*. London–New York, Routledge.
- Davidson, J. 1997. *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. London/New York, HarperCollins/Harper.
- Davies, J. K. 2006. Hellenistic economies. In G. R. Bugh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*, 73–92. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, N. and Kraay, C. M. 1973. *The Hellenistic Kingdoms: Portrait Coins and History*. London, Thames & Hudson.
- Deetz, J. 1996. In *Small Things Forgotten: An Archaeology of Early American Life*, Revised and expanded edn. New York, Anchor Books/Random House.
- Doulgeri-Intzesiloglou, A. 2000. Οικιακοί αποθέτες: μικρά “κλειστά” στρωματογραφικά σύνολα ελληνιστικής εποχής. In *Ε΄ Επιστημονική Συνάντηση για την ελληνιστική κεραμική*. Χανιά 1997, 329–332. Athens, TAP.
- Downey, S. B. 1993. Hellenistic, local, and Near Eastern elements in the terracotta production of Dura-Europos, in A. Invernizzi and J.-F. Salles (eds.), *Arabia Antiqua*, 129–145. Rome, Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Eiring, J. 2004. Death in Aetolia: the hellenistic graves at Aetolian Chalkis. *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* 4, 93–166.
- Erskine, A. (ed.) 2003. *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Malden, Mass.–Oxford, etc., Blackwell.
- Erskine, A. 2010. Between philosophy and the court: the life of Persaios of Kition, in A. Erskine and L. Llewellyn-Jones (eds.), *Creating a Hellenistic World*, 177–194. Swansea, Classical Press of Wales.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1997. *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. Aarhus, Aarhus University Press.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2001. The Rhodian associations and economic activity, in Z. H. Archibald, J. Davies, V. Gabrielsen, and G. J. Oliver (eds.), *Hellenistic Economies*, 215–244. London–New York, Routledge.
- Garwood, P., Jennings, D., Skeates, R. and Toms, J. (eds.) 1991. *Sacred and Profane: Proceedings of a Conference on Archaeology, Ritual and Religion*. Oxford, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
- Gosden, C. 1999. *Anthropology and Archaeology: A Changing Relationship*. New York–London, Routledge.
- Gurd, S. A. 2007. Meaning and material presence: four epigrams on Timomachus’s unfinished Medea. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137 (2), 305–331.
- Hannestad, L. 1983. *The Hellenistic Pottery from Failaka: With a Survey of Hellenistic Pottery in the Near East*. 2 vols. Aarhus, Jysk Archæologisk Selskab.
- Higgins, R. 1963. *Greek Terracottas*. London, Methuen.
- Hill, J. D. 1995. *Ritual and Rubbish in the Iron Age of Wessex: A Study on the Formation of a Specific Archaeological Record*. Oxford, Tempus Reparatum/British Archaeological Reports.
- Hodkinson, S. J. 2000. *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*. London/Swansea, Duckworth/Classical Press of Wales.
- Hörschele, R. 2007. The traveling reader: journeys through ancient epigram books. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137 (2), 333–69.
- Houby-Nielsen, S. 1997. Grave gifts, women, and conventional values in hellenistic Athens, in P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad and J. Zahle (eds.), *Conventional Values of the Hellenistic Greeks*, 220–262, pls. 8–14. Aarhus, Aarhus University Press.
- Houby-Nielsen, S. 1998. Revival of archaic funerary practices in the hellenistic and Roman Kerameikos. *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* 2, 127–145 (acknowledgements, 126).
- Jackson, H. 2000. Terracotta lamps of a hellenistic housing insula at Jebel Khalid, North Syria. *Rei Cretariae Romanae Fautorum Acta* 36, 11–17.
- Jackson, H. 2006. *The Terracotta Figurines*. Sydney, Meditarch.
- Jackson, H. 2011. A late Seleucid housing insula at Jebel Khalid in North Syria: archaeological evidence for chronology and lifestyle, in K. Erickson and G. C. Ramsey (eds.), *Seleucid Dissolution: The Sinking of the Anchor*, 133–148. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Jackson, H. and Tidmarsh, J. 2011. *The Pottery*. Sydney, Meditarch.
- Kelly-Blazeby, C. F. 2001. Tavernas in ancient Greece c. 475–146 BC: an archaeological perspective. *Assemblage*, 6. http://assemblage.group.shef.ac.uk/issue6/Kelly_web.htm (last visited 12 Oct. 2012)
- Kelly-Blazeby, C. F. 2008. *Kapeleion: casual and commercial wine consumption in classical Greece*. PhD thesis, University of Leicester.
- Langin-Hooper, S. M. 2007. Social networks and cross-cultural interaction: a new interpretation of the female terracotta figurines of hellenistic Babylon. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 26 (2), 145–165.
- Lauter, H. 1986. *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Lawrence, A. W. 1996. *Greek Architecture*, 6th edn. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Lehmann, G. 2008. Review of O. Tal, *The Archaeology*

- of Hellenistic Palestine, in *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 8 (http://jhonline.org/reviews/reviews_new/reviews317.htm, last visited 27 May 2013).
- Ling, R. (ed.) 1984. *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd edn, vii. 1: *Plates*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Manning, J. G. 2007. Hellenistic Egypt, in W. Scheidel, I. Morris and R. Saller (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*, 434–59. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Masséglia, J. E. A. 2012. Emotions and archaeological sources: a methodological introduction. In A. Chaniotis (ed.), *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World*, 131–50/49. Wiesbaden, Steiner.
- Masséglia, J. E. A. forthcoming: *Gestures, Postures and Body Actions: Body Language in Hellenistic Art and Society*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Mee, C. B. and Forbes, H. A. (eds.) 1997. *A Rough and Rocky Place: The Landscape and Settlement History of the Methana Peninsula, Greece (Results of the Methana Survey Project Sponsored by the British School at Athens and the University of Liverpool)*. Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Miller, P. A. 2007. Literary and material culture in hellenistic Greece. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137 (2), 253–254.
- Moore, H. L. 1982. The interpretation of spatial patterning in settlement residues. In I. Hodder (ed.), *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*, 74–79. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Morel, J.-P. 1997. Η ελληνιστική κοινή: κλασική παράδοση και τοπικές ιδιαιτερότητες. In *Δ' Επιστημονική Συνάντηση για την ελληνιστική κεραμική*. Μυτιλήνη 1994, 405–415. Athens, Ypourgeio Politismou.
- Morphy, H. 2004. Material culture, in A. Kuper and J. Kuper (eds.), *The Social Science Encyclopedia*, 3rd edn, 619–621. London–New York, Routledge.
- Oliver, G. J. 2006. Hellenistic economies: regional views from the Athenian polis. In R. Descat (ed.), *Approches de l'économie hellénistique*, 215–256. Musée Archéologique de Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges.
- Oliver, G. J. 2007. *War, Food and Politics of Early Hellenistic Athens*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Pfrommer, M. 1993. *Metalwork from the Hellenized East: Catalogue of the Collections*. Malibu, Calif., J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Pfrommer, M. 2001. *Greek Gold from Hellenistic Egypt*. Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Pollitt, J. J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Rappaport, U. 2007. Review of O. Tal, *The Archaeology of Hellenistic Palestine*, in *American Journal of Archaeology Online Book Review* 111.4. <http://www.ajaonline.org/online-review-book/522> (last visited 11 Oct. 2012).
- Reger, G. 2007. Hellenistic Greece and western Asia Minor, in W. Scheidel, I. Morris and R. Saller (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*, 460–486. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, C. and Thomas, J. 1984. Ritual activity and structured deposition in later Neolithic Wessex, in R. Bradley and J. Gardiner (eds.), *Neolithic Studies: A Review of Some Current Research*, 189–218. Oxford, Archaeopress.
- Rizakis, A. D. 2004. Οικονομία και οικονομικές δραστηριότητες των ελληνικών πόλεων από την Πύδνα έως το Άκτιον. In *ΣΤ' Επιστημονική Συνάντηση για την ελληνιστική κεραμική*. Βόλος 2000, 17–28. Athens, TAP.
- Rizakis, A. D. and Touratsoglou, G. 2011. Η οικονομία της Πελοποννήσου κατά την ελληνιστική περίοδο. In *Ζ' Επιστημονική Συνάντηση για την ελληνιστική κεραμική*. Αίγιο 2005, 17–34. Athens, TAP.
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. 2007. From Syracuse to Rome: the travails of Silanion's Sappho. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137 (2), 277–303.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1941. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. 3 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1953. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 2nd edn. 3 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Rotroff, S. I. 1997. Εργαστήρια και παράγοντες για τη διαμόρφωση του τοπικού χαρακτήρα. In *Δ' επιστημονική συνάντηση για την ελληνιστική κεραμική*. Μυτιλήνη 1994, 401–404. Athens, Ypourgeio Politismou.
- Rotroff, S. I. 2002. Review of M. Pfrommer, *Greek Gold from Hellenistic Egypt*, in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2002.05.14.
- Rotroff, S. I. 2006. Material culture. In G. R. Bugh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*, 136–157. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Sauer, E. W. (ed.) 2004. *Archaeology and Ancient History: Breaking Down the Boundaries*. London–New York, Routledge.
- Shanks, M. 1996. *Classical Archaeology of Greece: Experiences of the Discipline*. London–New York, Routledge.
- Shipley, D. G. J. 1987. *A History of Samos 800–188 BC*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Shipley, D. G. J. 1996. The epigraphic material, in W. Cavanagh, J. Crouwel, R. W. V. Catling and D. G. J. Shipley, *Continuity and Change in a Greek Rural Landscape: The Laconia Survey*, ii. *Archaeological Data*. BSA Supplementary Volumes 27, 213–234. London, British School at Athens.
- Shipley, D. G. J. 2000. *The Greek World after Alexander: 323–30 BC*. London–New York, Routledge.
- Shipley, D. G. J. 2008. Approaching the Macedonian Peloponnese. In C. Grandjean (ed.), *Le Péloponnèse d'Épaminondas à Hadrien*, 53–68. Bordeaux/Paris, Ausonius/De Boccard.

- Smith, R. R. R. 1988. *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Smith, R. R. R. 1991. *Hellenistic Sculpture: A Handbook*. London, Thames & Hudson.
- Sterner, J. 1989. Who is signalling whom? Ceramic style, ethnicity and taphonomy among the Sirak Bulahay. *Antiquity* 63 (240), 451–459.
- Sutton, R. F., Jr. 1992. Pornography and persuasion on Attic pottery. In A. Richlin (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, 3–35. New York–Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Tal, O. 2006. *The Archaeology of Hellenistic Palestine: Between Tradition and Renewal [in Hebrew]*. Jerusalem, Bialik Institute.
- Tarn, W. W. 1938. *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 1st edn. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Trümper, M. 2003. Material and social environment of Greco-Roman households in the east: the case of hellenistic Delos, in D. L. Balch and C. Osiek (eds.), *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*. Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmans.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2007. *Unthinking the Greek Polis: Ancient Greek History beyond Eurocentrism*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, P. S. 1999. *The Barbarians Speak: How the Conquered Peoples Shaped Roman Europe*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Whitley, A. J. M. 2001. *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkins, J. M. 2000. *The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, J. M. and Hill, S. 2006. *Food in the Ancient World*. Malden, Mass., Blackwell.
- Wright, N. L. 2011. The last days of a Seleucid city: Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates and its temple, in K. Erickson and G. C. Ramsey (eds.), *Seleucid Dissolution: The Sinking of the Anchor*, 117–132. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Wycheley, R. E. 1978. *The Stones of Athens*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Zanker, P. 1993. The hellenistic grave stelai from Smyrna: identity and self-image in the polis, in A. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long and A. Stewart (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, 212–230. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London, University of California Press.