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Approaches and Parameters for Studying the Ancient Ceramic Production

Rositsa Hristova

Abstract: This article presents the current approaches and parameters for studying the ancient ceramic production established in the scientific literature. The main goal is to introduce a base for the Bulgarian scholars who face the analysis of the ceramic record and are aware that the pottery typology and chronology is not enough to understand the change of pottery through the ages. The objective is to supply them with a foundation related to the manufacturing and trade organization from which the archaeologists can start to develop new research as well as particular concerns and interests.

Keywords: ancient pottery, production, studying.

The past decade has seen a tremendous increase in the literature that attests to the vitality and potential of ceramic studies. Recent works on pottery include a comprehensive sourcebook on ceramic materials and analyses (Shepard 1956; Rice 1987; Orton et al. 1993); a guide to ceramic technology (Rye 1981, republication in 2002); approaches to archaeological pottery (Sinopoli 1991); a view of ceramic production in ethnographic context (Balfet 1965; Arnold 1985; Longacre/Skibo 1994; Vincentelli 2004; May/Tuckson 2000; Sippen 2005); studies of the social context of pottery production and the status of potters (Arnold 1998; 2008; Underhill 2002); general references on ceramic production and distribution system (van der Leeuw 1976; Peacock 1982; Hirth 2009), and many other monographs and articles. This growth of literature attests to the vitality and potential of ceramic studies for archaeological analysis and to our increasing ability to use ceramics to ask and answer questions about the past.

Currently, several paradigms seek to explain technological change of pottery through time, which gives a holistic perspective of the relationship of pottery and social change that is directly relevant to archaeologists’ study of the past. The classification of vessels or sherds into meaningful types is the first step in using ceramic data in archaeological analysis, therefore, the approaches to ceramic typology and classification are varied (Whallon/Brown 1982; Hörr et al. 2009). The basic units of study are potsherds, they are broken up into attributes and then clustered and reassembled as abstract “types” which are acted upon by the forces of culture process or cultural history. But an archaeologist studying the evolution of ceramic technology is interested in rather different aspects of vessels than an archaeologist interested in ceramic decorations. The former will focus on evidence for construction techniques and identification of raw materials, whereas the latter will consider colour, placement and shape of designs, and so on. The characteristics of a vessel that we choose to focus on depend a large amount on what we ultimately wish to learn from the vessels. Mainly temporal changes in ceramic forms can be used to construct chronological sequences, but such classifications may be based on
Bridging the Gap: Continuity and Innovation in Ceramic Kiln Technology from the 6th c. BC to the Beginning of the 7th c. AD in the Territory of Bulgaria

Alexander HARIZANOV

Abstract: This contribution explores the archaeological evidence for the development of the two-chambered updraught ceramic kiln in the territory of modern Bulgaria, from the 6th century BC to the beginning of the 7th century AD. On the one hand, its aim is to examine the possibilities for continuation in kiln building technology, from the Late Iron Age through the Roman and Late Antique periods. On the other, to highlight the innovative technological practices, which appear in the region after the Roman conquest, and to assess their effect on the local traditions in ceramic production.

The data base of this study includes 340 kilns of the time period in question, divided in two groups in accordance with their dating. The first one comprises the structures from the Late Iron Age, while the second incorporates the facilities from the Roman and Late Antique periods. The thorough description of their morphological characteristics made it possible to trace the development of the various kiln building techniques, from the time of their supposed appearance. In addition, some observations are made on the possible territorial and/or cultural background of the most influential practices, attested in the territory of Bulgaria.

Key words: ceramic kiln technology, Bulgaria, Late Iron Age, Roman and Late Antique periods.

INTRODUCTION

The two-chambered updraught ceramic kiln was introduced in the territory of modern Bulgaria around the beginning of the Late Iron Age. During that period it was popular mostly in towns with Greek inhabitants or in settlements under Greek influence. After the Roman conquest of Thrace, in the first half of the 1st century AD, this type of kiln became the most popular among the ones, used for the firing of clay-made objects (Harizanov 2016a).

So far there is no secure evidence for a continuation in the organisation of ceramic production from the Hellenistic through to the Roman period in nowadays Bulgaria (Харизанов 2015, 48). However, there are indications for persistent technological practices that remained in use during the second period. Furthermore, the Roman occupation brought a significant number of new techniques, which seem to have had a profound impact over the local traditions in kiln building.

I. THE LATE IRON AGE KILNS

There are less than 40 two-chambered ceramic kilns from the 6th century BC to the first decades of the 1st century AD found in the territory of modern Bulgaria. Parts of several structures have been discovered in the filling of pits (waste and deposit?), while the ones found in situ are approximately 32 and originate from 15 archaeological sites.
D.1. Kiln superstructure

The superstructure of the kilns of the Roman and Late Antique periods in the territory of Bulgaria was similar to the one of such constructions throughout the Empire\(^2\). The analysis of the available data provided four possibilities for the types of cover of the firing chamber of the structures in the studied territory: 1) a permanent cover with side opening/s; 2) permanent vertical walls and a temporary (flat) cover; 3) permanent walls in the shape of a truncated cone or dome and a temporary cover; 4) an entirely temporary cover (Харизанов in press).

---

\(^2\) For the superstructure of the kilns in Britain see Grimes 1930, 53-54; Corder 1957, 14; Bryant 1977, 109-110; Swan 1984, 34-35. For the ones in Italy – Cuomo di Caprio 1972, 401-402; in France – Le Ny 1988, 23; in Greece – Hasaki 2002, 91-92; Raptis 2012, 39. For general remarks, following experimental firings, see Dawson / Kent 1985, 70-79.
‘*Infectam usque fatale exitium*’: The Milestones of Emperor Julian in the Territory of *Serdica* and the Conflict of Paganism and Christianity

Nicolay SHARANKOV

Abstract: The paper examines a series of eleven milestones from the territory of *Serdica* honouring Emperor Julian and dated to late AD 361. The columns have been found along the main road from *Turres* (modern Pirot in Serbia) to *Serdica* (modern Sofia in Bulgaria) and the occasion for their erection was seemingly the emperor's passage through the territory of *Serdica* on his way from *Naissus*, where he received the news of Constantius' death, to the imperial capital Constantinople. The most peculiar part of the text on the milestones is its end which praises the emperor for recovering the state which was 'infected to a fatal disaster' and restoring it to its 'ancient morality and dignity'. Subsequently, the phrase about the infection was intentionally – and carefully – erased, so there can be no doubt that it concerned Emperor Julian's actions against Christianity, often referred to as 'disease' in the writings of Julian and other pagan authors of the period. The emphasis on the emperor's religious policy in the text of the milestones could be connected with the flourishing of pagan cults in the territory of *Serdica* throughout the fourth century AD.

Key words: Emperor Julian, *Serdica*, milestones, Late antiquity, Paganism, Christianity

Introduction

In late AD 361, Emperor Julian was honoured with a series of milestones in the territory of *Serdica*. Their findspots suggest that they were originally set up along the main road, the so-called 'Via Militaris' (or 'Diagonalis'), between *Turres* (modern Pirot in Serbia) and *Serdica* (modern Sofia in Bulgaria).

My interest in these inscriptions was provoked by two fragments found in the vicinity of Sofia which had to be included in *L’Année épigraphique*. Further research led me to the discovery of other milestones belonging to the series which were previously misread and overlooked, so their number has now risen from five to ten or eleven. The present article provides a new edition of the inscriptions and examines the reasons and circumstances of their erection.

The ten or eleven columns honouring Julian have been found within a relatively small section of the road: the distance from *Turres* to *Serdica* is about 52 miles, i.e. there is one column for each 5-6 miles (fig. 1). The two columns from Pirot (## 1-2) – where *Imperatori Caesarii* and the victory titles as well as *consul scribas* were written in full and the victory titles seemingly had different order – were probably made by a local stonecutter. It would have been much easier to send the text to *Turres* with an order to make and set up the milestones than to transport columns made in *Serdica* at a distance of more than 50 miles, especially since after Dragoman the road goes into the mountains. The lost milestone from Caribrod (# 3) also had *Imperatori Caesarii* written in full, so it could have been locally made as well.

---

1 See my initial restoration in *AE* 2010, 1459, and # 7 below for the complete text. The fragments which I recognised as parts of a column for Emperor Julian were published as belonging to two different milestones, and one of them was incorrectly connected with Emperor Constantine and his sons (Петрова / Иванов 2008).

2 Probably, it would be not exaggerated to say that the study of these milestones has been marred with confusion and misunderstanding since its very beginning nearly 130 years ago.

3 The new readings and interpretation of the inscriptions were briefly presented by the author at conferences in Niš (June 2016) and Komotini (October 2018).

4 Cf., in # 1: [Francico] (=? maximo, Alamani[co maximo], Germanico maxim[o, Sarmatia]co (?) <max>i<m> (?:); the order of the titles in # 2 is uncertain; the other milestones of the series, where this part of the text is well-preserved (# 4, # 6, # 9), give them in the order Germanico maximo, Alamanico maximo, Francico maximo, Sarmatico maximo.

5 Numerous stone monuments in Pirot and its region attest the presence of experienced local stonecutters.
the left. End of l. 10, l. 11, and beginning of l. 12 intentionally erased.

S. Petrova and R. Ivanov did not recognise the two fragments as belonging to the same column. On the lower fragment, they believed to have seen remains of three different inscriptions: 1) ‘two Greek letters’ (not specified) from an earlier text; 2) three lines from a Latin inscription, possibly for Emperor Constantine the Great and his sons: ---ISS--- | ---CONSTA--- | ---BIL---, i.e. probably [nobil]iss[i]mo, part of the name Constantinus, Constantius, or Constans, and again [no]bil[issimo]; 3) part of a name, from the third quarter of the fourth century AD. For the upper fragment, Petrova and Ivanov only mention an obliterated inscription of 6–7 lines, with part of an emperor’s titulature, containing pontifex maximus.

In my note in AE 2010, I recognised the two fragments as parts of a column for Emperor Julian and proposed an approximate and rather inaccurate restoration: [Imp. Caes. d. n. Fl. Claudio Iuliano] Pio Felici [venerabili | a]c triumphatori [semper Augui]sto, pontific[i] maximo, German. (? | m]ax[i]mo, [Alaman. (?) maximo, Franc. (?) | ma]x[imo, [Sarmat. (?) maximo, imp. –, | c]ons. (sic) III, p[a]tri patriae, | proconsuli, [recuperata re | p]ublica | vacat31 | in antiquam censura] | tatem(que) re[vocavit]. After re-examining the stone, I can now give the following text:

![Fig. 12a-b. Lower part of the milestone from Gurmazovo (# 7). Sofia, National Archaeological Museum (photos: N. Sharankov)](image)

28 For me, there are no traces from an earlier Greek inscription on the stone.
29 Actually, these are remains of l. 8–10: [C]ONSSI, <P>ROCONSVL, and PVBLICA.
30 This must be the part of the text after the erasure (l. 12–13).
31 This is actually the erasure, quite inappropriately denoted as vacat.
Pottery from a Closed Context at the Late Antique Site of Dodoparon, Yambol Region (SE Bulgaria)

Abstract: The excavation of a central part of the Late Antique settlement of Dodoparon revealed a one-room house with a set of 57 ceramic containers, preserved in situ by the house destruction at the end of the 6th c. AD. The pottery was heavily affected by fire, but still, the majority of the vessels could be partly or fully reconstructed into complete profiles, and their capacity thus measured. The character of the table ware, cooking ware and storage vessels from the site is similar to other pottery assemblages known from inland settlements of the Diocese of Thrace, especially those from northern Bulgaria and Dobrudzha. Over 50% of the vessels feature the same morphological types as the finds from Sadovec near Pleven, and to a slightly less degree, as those from Gradishteto near Dichin. The imports at the site are represented by one Phocaean red slip dish of the late type Hayes 10; and by seven transport amphorae, five of the Late Roman 2 Amphorae and two of Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant 1 / Opaiț Bv.

Key words: Bulgaria, Dodoparon, Late Roman, settlement, pottery.

Introduction

The archaeological site known best as Dodoparon was excavated in cooperation between the Regional Historical Museum in Yambol (RIM) and the Tundzha Regional Historical Project (TRAP) within a five-week season in 2010 (Бакърджиев 2011; Sobotkova et al. 2018). The site is located in the Yambol Region, about 21 km to the west of the Tundzha River, north of the village of Golyam Manastri, at the highest peak (600 m.a.s.l.) of the so-called Manastirski Vazvisheniya (fig. 1). The site might also be referred to as Gradishteto or Kaleto, but most frequently it is associated with the name of Dodoparon (or Dodopara) mentioned in one of the three inscriptions found near the site, all dated between the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (IGBulg 3.2, # 1794, 1795 and 1796; Велков 1991, 26; Михаилов 1964, 254).

The settlement itself stretches over the hilltop in a north-south (585 m) and an east-west (80-40 m) direction, covering an area of 4.2 hectares. Within the excavation, two test trenches were placed along the massive fortification walls (T1 and T2), still highly visible in the terrain, one trench was placed in the central part of the settlement (T3) (fig. 2). Based on the material from these three trenches, occupation of the settlement was determined to be from the 3rd c. AD to the end of the 6th c. AD (Sobotkova et al. 2018, 209). Pottery of mixed chronology (Roman and Late Antique) came from the two areas along the walls (T1 and T2), while the central trench (T3) revealed a closed context – a one-room house with a deposit of about 49 vessels and 8 lids. This pottery assemblage from the well dated context is the topic of the following study which presents the reconstructed vessel forms, if possible, with their approximate capacity, weight and function. Each vessel is supplemented with a thorough morphological and fabric description to provide a functional comparison for the following Late Roman pottery studies, especially the
Fig. 12. Capacity of selected vessels reconstruction based on *Calcul de capacité d’un récipient à partir de son profil.*
Here: 1-2, 4-7, 15-18 and various possible scenarios

Fig. 13. Capacity of selected vessels reconstruction based on *Calcul de capacité d’un récipient à partir de son profil.*
Here: 22-23, 29-30, 33-38, 41, 57 and various possible scenarios
Notes on the Identification of an Earring with Monogram from the Benaki Museum in Athens

Stanislav STANILOV / Georgi SENGALEVICH

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to present a reading of the monogram on a gold lunate earring from the Benaki Museum, and to propose a connection with three pendants from the Preslav Treasure in the context of a luxurious Early Byzantine workshop group. The centrepiece of the decorative composition of the openwork lunate is a medallion, flanked by peacocks, and filled with a cruciform monogram. The composition with the peacocks is repeated on other lunate earrings, worked out in the opus interrasile style. The monogram should be deciphered as the name (Λ)ΕΟΝΤ(Ι)Α(Κ), thus the jewel’s owner could be the empress Leontia, wife of emperor Phocas (602-610). Certainly, the direct connection with the Preslav Treasure openwork pendants is expressed through a very characteristic common detail: the holders of the outer pearl strings are round (ellipsoid) extended length ‘eyelets’ made of folded half-ellipsoid wires. As a result, their date must be reconsidered as it might be much earlier than previously thought.

Key words: Byzantine jewellery, earring, monogram, Leontia, Preslav Treasure.

Description

The subject of this study is a luxury gold earring of a lunate type from the collection of the Benaki Museum in Athens (1809). It was made in openwork technique with a string of pearls and emeralds (?) and representing the composition of a monogram and peacocks. The earring is crescent-shaped (fig. 1/1, 2/1), with the upper half of the hoop broken off at the base and missing, with a hook-and-eye closure of which only the eye survived. This indicates that it is the kind of earrings worn over the pinna, because the hook could not pass through an opening in the soft lobe of the ear. The concave curve of the lunate part is a four-sided wire, and the convex one is a beaded imitation of a pearl row. To the short concave arc a second four-sided wire is soldered (?) and the mentioned fastening “eye” is mounted at one of its ends. To the convex arc soldered are nine holders, which represent round/oval extended length “eyelets” so that there is a gap between the pseudo-pearl row and the string. They are made of a folded flat wire (narrow strip) with smoothed edges. The holders themselves are arranged asymmetrically, so that, in view, the pearls and precious stones (glass beads or emeralds) alternate in the string. The stones are shaped like multiwall cylinders and require more space in the string. Consequently, a short (with pearl) section alternates with a long one (with bead) from left to right, beginning with a pearl but ending with a bead. In the field, two openwork peacocks are presented facing each other, holding in their beaks a round frame enclosing a monogram. They are symmetrically positioned, with breasts resting against the frame of the medallion. Their heads are disproportionately large for the body, with the characteristic “crown” turned into a large feather growing on the bird’s nape and coiled in voluted scrolls. The tail and the
NOTES ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF AN EARRING WITH MONOGRAM... 117

2000, 170-171 # 58.8, 58.9; Puhle 2001, 456-457, VI.58; Das Goldene Byzanz 2013, 315-316, # XI 25, 26). There is a relatively general commentary in the work of the discoverer T. Totev, but no attempt at a deeper study concerning the genesis of the three jewels (Totev 1983, 26-27, 72-75, fig. 25-26; Totev 1986, 101-102, tables XVII, 1-3; Totev 1993, 107, fig. 96; Totev 1993a, 60, fig. 33-35, 63, fig. 39; 71-73). A. Bosselmann-Ruickbie is more involved with them, but despite her erudition, she fails to identify them with both direct and indirect parallels (Bosselmann-Ruickbie 2011, 21-22). The pendants represent a rhomboid and two round medallions composed of gold plated frames embedded in each other with precious stones and pearls mounted between them and strings of pearls along the outer edge. The pendants are dated to the second half of the 10th century with 15 coins of the emperors Constantine VII Porphyrogennetus and Romanus II (945-959) that are part of the treasure; under that attestation they were also “socialised” by both T. Totev and A. Bosselmann-Ruickbie, and thus entered the mentioned catalogues of various exhibitions. The direct connection with the lunate earring from the Benaki Museum (fig. 4/1) is expressed through a very characteristic detail of their morphology. The holders of the outer pearl strings are round (ellipsoid) extended length “eyelets” made of folded half-ellipsoid wires (fig. 4/5), similar to those of the earring. Among the famous artefacts of Byzantine jewellery there are only two of such decoration, and these are the completely identical gold bracelets from the Metropolitan Museum in New York (fig. 4/6) which are believed to have been part of the treasure of Assiût (Dennison 1918, 157,

Fig. 4. Comparison table: 1 earring with peacocks and monogram from the Benaki Museum in Athens (photo: G. Sengalevich); 2 rhomboid pendant from the Preslav Treasure at the Veliki Preslav Museum (photo: S. Steidl, RGZM); 3-4 round pendants from the Preslav Treasure at the Veliki Preslav Museum (photo: S. Steidl, RGZM); 5 graphic look of the attachment of the pearl strings on the pendants from the Preslav Treasure at the Veliki Preslav Museum (St. Stanilov); 6 Bracelet with pearl strings from the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City (photo: Metropolitan Museum of Art)