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Abstract

This thesis examines the role of fineware in overseas exchange through an analysis of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in the Archaic western Mediterranean. By considering stylistic analysis more broadly, as well as the archaeological contexts of the ware, I evaluate the role of the pottery in the Western settlements of Massalia and Saint Blaise, and consider questions of the production and export of the ware. This approach highlights the problematic nature of conclusions drawn about the economic progression of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as a declining ware. I argue that the source of such conclusions is a previous conception of Etruscan inferiority to the Greeks, and that this stereotype has also extended to discussions of Etruscan agency in the West. I assert that Etruscans in the West are functioning within a cosmopolitan world of exchange, and that the Etruscans are visibly active in this market, as demonstrated through the continued demand and consumption of Etrusco-Corinthian sympotica by populations of the West. Based on the archaeological contexts, the consumers of imported wares appear to have been crucial in shaping this demand by actively seeking a varied collection of imported fineware. Questions remain regarding precisely how the production process of the ware relates to export. Despite this, the study of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in the West clearly establishes the fineware as a commodity, both in Etruria and abroad, and also concludes that Etruscan wares circulated within the cosmopolitan Mediterranean network on an equal, not subordinate, level to Greek wares.
Introduction

Throughout the Archaic period, the western Mediterranean experienced a transformative growth of cross-Mediterranean contact and exchange.¹ The settlement of Massalia by the Greeks in 600 BCE was a benchmark of the increasing regularity of foreign interaction in the West, but Greeks were not the sole influence in the region. Material evidence scattered across various colonies, *emporia, oppida*, and even in the Mediterranean Sea itself (see figures 1.1 and 1.2 for a map of relevant sites), points to the interaction of Greeks, Etruscans, and indigenous populations in the western Mediterranean. The nature of the exchange is complex: Homer writes about exchange in the form of elite reciprocity and gifts, but archaeology shows subsistence commodities and non-prestige goods crossing the sea from an early period. Etruscan wine amphorae in Gaul, alongside bucchero and early Greek fineware, indicate that the Greek presence in the West was not as independent as previously thought, as they had an Etruscan counterpart as early as 625 BCE. And, in addition to the more easily traceable groups and goods, archaeologically undetectable items such as agricultural products, the potential role of other groups such as the Phoenicians, and a lack of written sources all complicate our understanding of Archaic exchange. Despite this, the material evidence that does remain, particularly in Gaul, can contribute to our understanding of the developing exchange structures in the west.

The topic of overseas exchange can be approached through various perspectives on agency and scales of analysis. Recent studies on consumption focus on individuals and their independent acts within the social context of colonization.² Studies of hybridity approach the

¹ I would like to thank Bryan Burns for his continual support, patience, and feedback throughout my writing process, as well as Kimberly Cassibry for her thoughts regarding an early draft of my second chapter and the direction of my overall project at that point.

² My research is especially informed by Michael Dietler’s recent work (2010): *Archaeologies of Colonialism: Consumption, Entanglement, and Violence in Ancient Mediterranean France*.
colonial identity and “Hellenism” through the mix of material, whether a compilation of local and “Greek” goods, or the presence of “hybrid” objects that incorporate multiple influences in a single production. Rather than aiming to characterize the identity of the consumers or the influence of individuals, my work aims to reassess the role of groups of actors within the wider system. My thesis will consider the economic interaction between the parties involved in Gaul, the structure of Archaic exchange more generally, and the nature of the Mediterranean network by examining how Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as a fineware, non-subsistence commodity, fits into these structures of exchange.

Fineware is the most abundant remaining class of evidence that can inform our conception of Archaic exchange, but its place in overseas trade has been long-debated. The masses of Attic pottery discovered in Etruscan tombs led to a commonly held belief that pots were highly valued objects of prestige. Scholars overlooked alternate possibilities that could explain the pots’ place both in tombs and trade—as carriers of desirable content, a more economical option than bronze or precious metals, or as symbolic rather than economically prestigious markers in the tombs—and branded the pots as a collectable item for foreign populations. Though the core of this theory was built around Corinthian and Attic black-figure vases, the impact of the assumption extended to decorated fineware more generally. Gill and Vickers, among others, refuted the popular interpretation of pottery’s place in society by evaluating the class of objects in perspective with the relative quantities and value of other items that were traded overseas. The assumption of pottery as a prestige item consequently faded, as

---

4 Gill (1994), Vickers (1985). While the primary focus of these articles is the overstated value of pottery due to ritual contexts such as tombs and over-assertion of their “artistic” nature, the discussion touches briefly on exchange. This is especially true of Gill (1994), who discusses pottery as carriers of commodities such as perfume, rather than strictly prestigious units of “art,” and in relation to other goods that travelled on ships (104-106).
well as the assessment of fineware as an item of substantial importance in the economy of overseas trade.

Upon the discovery and excavation of the Pointe Lequin IA shipwreck from 1991-1993, the topic of the exchange-value of pottery received fresh data. The Pointe Lequin IA (520-515 BCE) carried over two thousand fineware cups, alongside at least 68 amphorae and potentially substantial quantities of unknown perishable cargo. Ulrike Krotschek used the wreck to re-evaluate the place of pottery in the Archaic trade system in her analysis of the cups and wreck in her 2008 dissertation: “Scale, Structure, and Organization of archaic maritime trade in the western Mediterranean.” In brief, she concludes that the fineware of the Pointe Lequin IA provides evidence for the mass shipment of pottery as a commodity in the Archaic period, and that merchants were aware of demand for products on some level and catered to this. The extent to which production and shipment was catered to the consumer is a question which I will explore further within my thesis, but Krotschek’s conclusion that fineware can be considered an economically productive item of exchange in the Archaic period is fundamental for my discussion of the exchange of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. Although the overstatement of the value of pottery has lessened in light of logical comparison with other commodities during the Archaic period, the Pointe Lequin IA renews the question of the value of fineware pottery in the ancient economy. The wreck provides a concrete example of fineware being traded in mass quantity in response to some demand, but as functional objects rather than solely prestigious or

---

5 Krotschek 2008. The estimated ship size is due to the difference between the preserved hull and the archaeological material remaining. The common hypothesis is that the difference is made up by the presence of perishable cargo on the ship.

symbolic ones. This expands the range of possibility for the purpose and economic status of fineware, warranting an evaluation of other types of fineware and their place in exchange.

The limited range of production and distribution of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery makes it uniquely suited for considering the production and/or exportation of goods for a specific group of consumers, as well as the concept of varying values of exchange-worth possessed by fineware ceramics. The characteristics of the pottery’s production and consumption offers a contrast to the greater number of contexts of the Attic and B2 cups on the Pointe Lequin 1A, which can only lead to broad conclusions about fineware production patterns and exchange in the Archaic period. The cups from the Pointe Lequin are created throughout Sicily and the Italian peninsula, and are found at virtually every Greek site in the western Mediterranean, making it difficult to analyze exchange paths and specific patterns of consumption context. The same problem arises in the consideration of bucchero-style pottery, as it is widely found in many settlements and contexts in the Mediterranean: tombs, indigenous settlements, colonies, etc. Production of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, however, can be traced to one of the three regions in which it was produced by identification of “workshops.” In the West, Etrusco-Corinthian pottery is distinctly concentrated in non-funerary contexts in Massalia, Saint Blaise, the Cap d’Antibes (La Love) shipwreck, and Emporion. Knowledge of these specific production and distribution points is extremely useful for the consideration of paths of exchange between Etruria and the West in the Archaic period.

Although the scatter of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in the West is confined, the cargo of the Cap d’Antibes wreck suggests that it can be evaluated as a fineware that has a regular place within exchange between the Greeks, Etruscans, and indigenous people. The nine cups and plates on the wreck shows that Etrusco-Corinthian vessels are not isolated incidences of prestige items
travelling independently, but were shipped as a group class of objects. The ship also contained 40 bucchero vessels, and 160 Etruscan amphorae. Consequently, we can consider Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as a part of the same exchange structures within which amphorae, raw materials, bucchero, prestige small goods, and potentially bronzes were transported. 

In order to approach questions of agency, scale, and the organization of exchange during the Archaic period, my thesis addresses the production, transport, and consumption of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as an element of the larger trade structures and the questions recognized above over a span of four chapters. The first three chapters analyze Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in the scheme of scholarship and the overarching scene of the western Mediterranean, while the fourth chapter draws conclusions that extend to broader ideas of production and exchange structures during the Archaic period.

The first chapter establishes Etrusco-Corinthian pottery of the west and its iconography within the history of scholarship and the general focus of analysis. I characterize the ware, the history of its research, and provide the standard stylistic analysis that is primarily used to analyze the vessels. I then discuss the bias and pitfalls of the stylistic approach due to considering the pottery as distinct works of different “hands,” when the bird-kylikes and plates of the West clearly display a unity in shape and decoration. I conclude the chapter with an alternate approach, identifying the obvious patterns of iconography, the potential contribution that workshop identification and locations of production can provide, as well as the potential contribution of scientific analysis of the ware as an avenue for future research.

My second chapter sets the scene of the Gulf of Lyon and its surrounding settlements in the sixth century BCE. After establishing the three primary types of settlements in Gaul: emporion, colony (apoikia), and indigenous settlement (oppida), I outline the presence of
Etruscans in Gaul. This is a current hot topic in scholarship, and an aspect of the Western Mediterranean that has long gone un-emphasized. Within this discussion, I consider the Etruscan presence in Gaul in terms of the complex chronology of the multicultural network, and the structures of identity that are contributing to the material evidence. I then approach the effect of the wish of scholars to attribute precise agency of shipping, with the result in skewed interpretations of agency that are unsupported. After exploring the variety of shipwrecks that complicate the question of identity, I conclude by establishing the continual multi-cultural nature of settlements and objects in the western Mediterranean, which is supported by the settlements, existence of *emporia*, and the varying types of shipping practices.

The third chapter forms the core of evidence for my thesis. I analyze the pottery on the grounds of its distribution and accompanying archaeological contexts in the West. By examining the ware in the broader scheme of imported sympotica in which it is found, I highlight the mixed context of Greek, Etruscan, and indigenous goods in the everyday, domestic establishments of Massalia and Saint Blaise. Rather than attempting to project the material onto the identity of its consumers, I utilize the characteristics of the mix to consider the place of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in an overseas culture and in a Greek-Etruscan dominated exchange culture.

Finally, the concluding chapter returns to the questions posed throughout my thesis. I address issues of how purposefully the Etruscans were asserting themselves into the market, and the extent that we can judge overseas demand affecting production and shipping. I conclude by assessing how the role of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery and fineware exchange and shipping fits into the cosmopolitan exchange network of the Mediterranean, which consists not only of Greeks and “others,” but of colonists, Etruscans, and indigenous populations as well.
Figure 1.1: Relevant shipwrecks and settlements in the western Mediterranean
1.2 Relevant Settlements in Gaul
1. Stylistic Analysis

The core of Etrusco-Corinthian research to date has been the identification and stylistic analysis of the ware. As a precursor to approaching Etrusco-Corinthian pottery within the framework of Gaul and its specific archaeological contexts, this chapter examines the information that the vessels can independently provide through a review of past research. I first present a formal description of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery and the classification of the Gaul wares as detailed by Szilagyi. I discuss the patterns that stylistic analysis highlights, and then depart from the typical aesthetic evaluation in order to make larger conclusions about the pottery in Gaul throughout the rest of this thesis.

![Figure 1.3: Map of relevant sites in Etruria.](image)

Etrusco-Corinthian pottery is an Etruscan imitation of Corinthian fineware produced in regions of Caere, Vulci, and Tarquinia (see fig. 1.3) from 630-540 BCE (+/- 10 years). It
primarily follows the Corinthian black-figure technique, which defines figures with incised lines in black glaze and uses white and red paint to further enhance the figural decorations. Though this style was present throughout the entire span of production of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, a polychrome version distinguished by its wider range of paint colors dominated the first generation.\(^1\) After a short transitional “bilingual” period during which some workshops used both, Etrusco-Corinthian pottery became exclusively black-figure with only “isolated phenomena” of polychrome.\(^2\) The decoration of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery is generally limited to animals, “Orientalizing” friezes similar to those of Corinthian pottery, or linear decoration. Also much like the decoration of Corinthian pottery, the painting style becomes less precise as the style progresses.

Since the identification of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as a Corinthian imitation ware in the early 20\(^{th}\) century, scholarly attention has focused on stylistic analysis and classification of workshops. Payne was the first to make more than a brief comment on the ware in his foundational work *Necrocorinthia*.\(^3\) His volume focuses on Corinthian pottery, but begins to establish the division of “Italo-Corinthian” pottery as well, also in the fashion of Beazley’s system of classification based on similar execution of stylistic details. Beyond initial group identifications, however, Etrusco-Corinthian pottery scholarship didn’t progress significantly until the 1960s. Notably, G. Colonna’s work on the *Rosoni* painter is still considered the go-to source for the painter.\(^4\) D.A. Amyx’s three comprehensive volumes on the classification of Corinthian pottery are the successors of Payne’s Corinthian pottery work, and assert the

---

\(^1\) Gaultier (2000): 426-430.
\(^2\) Szilagyi (1986): 145.
\(^3\) Payne (1931).
\(^4\) Colonna (1961).
“Etrusco-Corinthian” identity of the ware for the first time. Janos György Szilagyi has made the greatest contribution to Etrusco-Corinthian pottery scholarship. His two volumes on the entire corpus of figural Etrusco-Corinthian pottery discuss the iconography of each painter, workshop, and their artistic “following,” as well as chronology and production centers in extensive detail.

In the primary research available for Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in Gaul, Dominique Frere departs from the typical arrangement of scholarship by listing vessels by findspot rather than by painter or workshop. The chapter is a full updated list of the pottery in Gaul, including pieces which had been misidentified as Corinthian pottery, pottery with linear decoration that are not included in Szilagyi’s volumes, or other previously unidentified sherds and vessels Frere found within the store-rooms of the Massalia and Saint Blaise excavations. Through Frere’s work, it is possible to return to Szilagyi’s volume for a comprehensive understanding of the iconography and group classification of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery at Massalia and Saint Blaise. Ultimately, this organization yields the realization of very distinct trends in pottery shape and decoration at these sites.

With the exception of two to three examples, the corpus of decorated Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in the western Mediterranean is limited to three workshops of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery: Codros cycle, Maschera Umana group, and Senza Graffito painter (see table 1.2 for chronology). The vessel shapes at Massalia and Saint Blaise are also limited. Plates and kylikes are the primary find, though other examples of aryballoi or oenochoai are occasionally found in the rest of Gaul, and a couple examples of each do exist at Massalia and Saint Blaise. The

---

5 Amyx (1988).
8 The various names following the group name (painter, cycle, group) are not relevant to the actual evaluation of the ware. They simply mark how loosely linked or removed the group is from a primary painter of the iconography type.
breakdown of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery at the sites with which my thesis is concerned is provided in table 1.1 below.\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Figural, Unattributed</th>
<th>Code Annodate (k. pnter)</th>
<th>Codros (k)</th>
<th>Maschera Umana (k)</th>
<th>Senza Graaffito (p)</th>
<th>Linear (k)</th>
<th>Linear (p)</th>
<th>Other Shape</th>
<th>Total # EC at Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint Blaise</td>
<td>1(^1^0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21 (6(^1^1))</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap d’Antibes Wreck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (or erased figural)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massalia (totals)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TOTAL 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Etrusco-Corinthian plates and kylikes, divided by archaeological site and decoration group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painter/Group</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Generation Vulci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosoni Painter</td>
<td>590-580/70 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Annodate Painter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigoni: Codros Cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seguaci and maniera of the Code Annodate,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macchie bianche group</td>
<td>585/80-565/60 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poggio Bucco group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celleno group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magliano group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarquinia Painters: Senza Graaffito</td>
<td>585/80-565/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cycle: Maschera Umana</td>
<td>565-555 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Chronology of Etrusco-Corinthian painters/workshops that appear in the west.

The kylikes in the western Mediterranean all share slight variations of the same motif: two right-facing birds (see fig. 1.4 below for full profile example). Like the rest of Etrusco-Corinthian

---

\(^9\) All analysis of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in Gaul in this chapter, such as quantity calculations and workshops identified are based on Frere’s list (Frere: 2006). Iconography observations are based primarily on Szilagyi’s analyses (Szilagyi: 1998) of the workshops, as they are considered the most up-to-date and reliable resource for Etrusco-Corinthian pottery.


\(^1^1\) ‘?’ denotes questionable attribution, as noted by Frere.
pottery, Szilagyi groups the kylikes and plates stylistically, according to the artistic details of the painting that attribute it to a specific painter or workshop. In the case of the bird motif on the kylikes, this has allowed him to trace the progression of the motif across workshops. I will focus on the kylikes for a discussion of the stylistic analysis approach, and will use the plates of the Senza Graffito painter later in the chapter to introduce questions of provenance and exchange. As I discuss, while the overall stylistic approach is problematic for the interpretation of pottery, the attributions to workshops are especially useful for identifying trends in production place, which can then be considered in relation to ports and trade routes that involved Etrusco-Corinthian pottery.

Figure 1.4: kylix of the Maschera Umana group, restored. From the Place Villeneuve-Bargemon excavation. Long et al. (2002): 99.\(^\text{12}\)

Szilagyi attributes the earliest bird-decorated kylikes to the Rosoni painter of the third generation, who was based in Vulci alongside the two other major workshops of the time, the

\(^{12}\) Also listed in Frere (2006): 272, #30.
The painter is named for the large rosettes that fill the space between figural decoration, mostly birds and panthers, on his vessels. The painter primarily produced kylikes, phialai, and plates, and in smaller quantities, olpai and kraters. Although only one vessel produced by the painter has been found in the western Mediterranean, an aryballos at Massalia, his decorations are adapted by many later groups. His bird motif is the source from which many other figural bird decorations evolve, including the majority of groups found in the West. The aryballos fragment from Massalia preserves the incised plumes of a bird figure, with alternating red and white overpainted feathers. Though the bird decoration fits the trend of figural decoration on Etrusco-Corinthian pottery found in southern Gaul, as I will discuss, the sherd is overall a unique instance. It is one of the few Etrusco-Corinthian closed-vessels found in southern Gaul, as well as one of the few earlier third generation vessels that reached the west.

The Code Annodate painter, or “knotted tails” painter, is also a third generation Vulci-based painter. Colonna hypothesizes that the Code Annodate painter is contemporary with the Rosoni painter and Olpai cycle because the vessels of each of these groups are sometimes found within the same tombs. However, the Code Annodate painter is considered to be derived from the other two cycles, as his vessels include decoration derived from both the Olpai and Rosoni cycles—including the overpainting style of the Olpai cycle and the rosette-banded vessel necks, bird, and lion style of the Rosoni painter. The painter is named for the “knotted” or curly tails found on his quadraped figures, particularly lions. Though these curly-tailed lions composed

---

13 Rosette painter, Pittore dei Rosoni, Fr. peintre des Rosaces. The names of Etrusco-Corinthian cycles, workshops, and painters are far from standardized. For ease of potential reference back to the main sources on Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, I refer to the artists by the Italian nomenclature, giving translations and explanations when the names are relevant to iconography content of the group. English translations of group names initially given are provided in Gaultier (2000).
14 Frere (2006): 265, n. 1, fig. 11.
approximately 50% of the figures he painted, the only works related to the *Code Annodate* painter found in southern Gaul are those with birds. The bird figures of the *Code Annodate* painter mark the first derivations from the Rosoni painter bird iconography, which is adapted and continued by following workshops. Like the Rosoni painter, the *Code Annodate* birds were primarily two right-facing birds on a kylix (see fig. 1.4), separated by a rosette or white mark. Slight differences in style of portrayal and incision distinguish the two. The *Code Annodate* birds are marked by the double semicircle from which the feathers stem at the base of the head, long and oblique feathers that only get slightly wider as they approach the head, and a long elevated neck which tapers into the beak.\(^{17}\)

No vessels by the hand of the *Code Annodate* painter are found in southern Gaul other than the aryballos fragment mentioned above, but one kylix classified as being in the fashion of the painter (*maniera del Pittore delle Code Annodate*) was found at Saint-Blaise (see fig. 1.5).\(^{18}\) It is interesting to note that this following of the *Code Annodate* painter is dominated by birds and not the popularly represented lion and other quadrupeds of the *Code Annodate* painter himself. Though the general style and content of the following group is the same, with rosettes between or flanking of two birds on a kylix, the birds of the *maniera* are stockier and more square, with two incised lines at the neck rather than one. Shorter, semicircular feathers attach to two horizontal, uncurved incisions. The feathers also exhibit white spots on every other feather rather than entirely-overpainted feathers of the *pittore* himself.

\(^{17}\) Szilagyi (1998): 376.

The work of the Rosoni painter and the Code Annodate painter is followed by a workshop cycle that is categorized specifically for the iconographical characteristics that indicate close following of these two earlier groups. The Codros cycle, named half and half for the Code Annodate and Rosoni cycle, primarily consists of kylikes and cups/bowls with a stem and base (coppette su piede), but includes the occasional closed vessel as well. The cycle is subdivided into six groups and an “unattributed” group based primarily on the difference of details of the bird motif: incisions in the wings, the design of the head and feet of the birds, and other incised or painted details, such as the style of spots or rosettes between the birds. Fragments and vessels from Massalia and Saint Blaise have been identified as belonging to five of the six:

Vessels of the seguaci (followers) of the Code Annodate painter closely follow the style of the bird-painted kylikes of the original painter and the earlier following (maniera) mentioned above. The body of the bird is even more rectangular than the maniera. However, the feathers

---

19 In early years of identification, the Codros cycle named “Ciclo dei Rosoni.” Szilagyi renamed the cycle to reflect its dual source of both the Rosoni and Code Annodate painters, rather than just the Rosoni painter. Szilagyi (1998): 519.
are similar, with a white spot in every other feather. The birds also have articulated claws like the
*maniera*, rather than clawless legs similar to the original painter. The *seguaci* birds have a
thicker neck and bowed head, and often a curve at the head-end of the double incision to which
the feathers are attached. This follows the original *Code Annodate* style more closely, and
contrasts the earlier following (*maniera*), which used simply straight, horizontal double incisions
across the body.

The *Macchie Bianche* group, or “white markings” group, connects feathers to a double
horizontal incision, like the earlier *maniera*. The bottoms of the feathers incline right, rather than
being strictly vertical. In addition, the bodies and head are shorter and the heads larger than
earlier bird motifs. The group is named for the un-incised white spots that are between the birds,
which take the place of rosettes. In addition, there are white spots on feathers, sometimes
alternating with red, as on many other bird decorations.

The *Celleno* group is distinguished by pointed feet and lack of claws, a large head and
sharp beak transitioning toward the later *Maschera Umana* group, two incised lines at the neck,
and feathers that tend to be longer than those of the *Macchie Bianche* that are vertical and
attached to two horizontal lines. In addition, the feathers are not always entirely drawn or
connected, though the white dots or alternating white and red dots do appear on the feathers.

---

22 The white spots on the wings are not the source of the name, though scholars sometimes mistake this reference.
The Poggio Bucco group aligns more directly with the Rosoni painter rather than the Code Annodate, and often exhibits rosette-like incised patches on either end of the birds (see figs. 1.6 and 1.7 above). However, the birds tend to have longer, necks, flatter heads and more pointed beaks, and squatter bodies, with claws almost always shown at the base of the legs. The Poggio Bucco birds also have a double incised line which separates the head from the neck, but the feathers tend to be tilted backward (to the left) rather than toward the head, and the wings are sometimes left open without rounded tips to the feathers.

Finally, the Magliano group, only one vessel fragment of which is found in southern Gaul, has feathers inclined toward the feet, like the Poggio Bucco group. However, it resembles the Macchie Bianche and Celleno groups in the style of the head and neck.

The identification of vessels by specific workshops or groups is useful for considering the comparative chronology, decoration, and production place among groups and generations. It highlights the probability that multiple hands were working to create very similarly decorated vessels.

---

24 The Poggio Buco painter aligns most closely with the Painter of the Kraters, which may or may not be the same as the Rosoni painter.
vessels during the same time period. By categorizing subgroups under the title of “Codros,” the classification also recognizes the extension of earlier Etrusco-Corinthian pottery motifs into later periods. Finally, the nomenclature allows for a simple means to discuss contemporaneous kylikes being produced in Vulci. Realistically, however, the differences between the groups of the cycle are slight, and the birds are so similar that the distinct “hand” that created it is difficult to distinguish. The list of unattributed kylikes within the “following” is just as long or even longer than the lists for most of the groups. It is highly unlikely that one group was more highly sought than others, or that the ancient consumer even took note of details such as whether the birds had claws. I will discuss the implications of the incredibly similar iconography later in this chapter.

The *Maschera Umana*, or “Face-Mug” group, was the last group to continue the bird motif in the style of the *Rosoni* painter and *Codros* cycle. The group is named for the plastic vessels of molded animals, in the tradition of Corinthian plastic vessels, but open vessels like kylikes and footed-bowls make up a significant portion of the group. The kylikes in the group are exclusively decorated with two-right facing birds. The group adapts details that tend to be exceptions in the *Codros* groups and become standard in the *Maschera Umana* group. The heads of the birds are larger, with a beak sometimes arched, no claws shown on legs, and wings indicated by oblique horizontal lines that are simply paralleled and not connected. If the birds are separated by a spacer, it tends to be spots of white, sometimes incised, following the general concept of the *Rosoni* painter. The rims of the kylikes tend to be undecorated unlike earlier

---

25 The point is recognized in a roundabout way by Szilagyi (1998): 520. He acknowledges the likelihood that birds painted by the same hand are found in multiple groups.
cycles, although they are sometimes painted with red and white lines in a basic manner. The group is dated to 565-555 BCE, +/- 5 years.

Figure 1.9: (left) Example of the late Maschera Umana Group, from Civita Castellana. Szilagyi (1998): 588.
Figure 1.10: (right) fragment of a Maschera Umana kylix from Saint Blaise, identifiable through an undecorated and un-rounded feather markings. Bouloumie (1978): 53, fig. 1.

In the past, scholars have discussed the bird decoration on the kylikes of the third generation, *epigoni*, and the late *Maschera Umana* cycle as a progression and, more specifically, a decline, in the style. This observation is often placed within discussion of production trends and decoration of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. Szilagyi asserts the “obvious inferiority” of the *Codros* cycle to the original two masters, and Gaultier labels the *Codros* cycle as representative of the “greater standardization and diminished quality” of the third generation. In addition, he associates the decline in numbers of the final generation with a parallel decline of style, in which the decoration is “mediocre and mostly destined for export.” Such language used to describe the stylistic “decline” of the ware adheres to the traditional attitude toward the ware. The

---

29 Gaultier (2000): 430. The “decline” of Etrusco-Corinthian style should be asserted cautiously. The Swallow Painter, who sat on the brink of the movement from subgeometric to Etrusco-Corinthian pottery along with the Bearded Sphinx painter, shifted from producing subgeometric, Orientalizing pottery in a precise style to the Etrusco-Corinthian style. It is therefore not unreasonable to think the shift to less precise figures was an aesthetic choice that, according to the assessments of Brown, Payne, Gaultier, and Amyx, may simply be unappealing to the 20th century eye.
evaluation of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, logically, has placed the ware in direct comparison with Corinthian pottery. This has included a qualitative comparison rather than a solely objective, stylistic perspective, so that the pottery’s inferiority to Corinthian artistry has been frequently noted.

In objective comparison with Corinthian pottery, however, the difference from Corinthian pottery is slight. The subject matter of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery is certainly more limited: it does not include many human figural representations, and is generally restricted to animals, friezes of animals, or linear decoration. The “Orientalizing” friezes of stock animal characters, fillers such as rosettes, and the method of creation align the Etruscan ware with its Corinthian inspiration. Overall, though the Etrusco-Corinthian artistry tends to be less precise than Corinthian vessels, the differences between the two are minor details or overall differences in the corpus of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery that could only be recognized by the scrutiny that modern scholars such as Szilagyi can apply. The possibility that the looser style is an aesthetic choice that corresponded to the tastes of the consumers, painters, or was meant to align the pottery with the developing Corinthian style, or simply satisfactorily fulfilled an established market for bird cups, are options that that haven’t been taken into consideration.

Instead, the hierarchizing stylistic description of the pottery has affected the interpretation of the worth and role of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. The aesthetic value attributed to the pottery has consistently been used to define the economic value of the pots, as well as the consumer profile. Gaultier asserts that the standardization of the Codros cycle reflects “the most cost-effective response to the demand of a middle class that aped the tastes and lifestyle of the elite.”\(^{30}\) Szilagyi similarly suggests that the lesser quality of cycle classifies it as a less expensive product.

that was more accessible to a wider population. He consequently attaches a more basic functional purpose (i.e., everyday eating and drinking) to the bird motif, in opposition with perhaps more prestigious or symbolic value attached to the “original” art of the Rosoni and Code Annodate painters.\(^\text{31}\) The mediocrity of the *Maschera Umana* group is associated with export, as already noted.

The economic associations that have been attached to the looser style and progressive “decline” of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery are problematic for the consideration of its role in overseas trade. The classification of the *Codros* cycle and all subsequent bird motifs as pottery of deteriorating quality automatically attaches a value judgment to the artistic tastes of the receiving populations, or assigns a lower socio-economic status to those groups on account of the supposedly lesser quality of products they are consuming. In the case of southern Gaul, the interpretation upholds the stereotypes of a barbaric western population with substandard tastes to primary Greek cultures. Even this reading is complicated, however, because Greeks overseas are also consuming the Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. In addition, as I will discuss more thoroughly in relation to the value of fineware in exchange in my concluding chapter, the low value that scholars have assigned to the pots, as exported items for the middle class masses, contradicts the low quantity of Etrusco-Corinthian exports dispersed in the west in comparison to bucchero. Preliminarily, the act of shipping Etrusco-Corinthian pottery overseas most likely attaches some value or symbolic value of association with Greek or Etruscan society. The decorated Etrusco-Corinthian pottery most likely would have contrasted the value of a strictly functional monochrome, local-made ware.

The close attention to stylistic differences that has been used to classify Etrusco-Corinthian kylikes stresses the differences in each of the “groups” of artists, which allows for the economic interpretation of a parallel decline in style, production, and consumer status. This obstructs an obvious but never-stated key point: all of these Etrusco-Corinthian kylikes are essentially the same. Despite slight differences in feathers, neck-length, and the existence of claws or peg-legs, it’s clear that the same vessel was being repeatedly produced and consumed over a 20-30 year time span as a distinct type of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. Of 375 Etrusco-Corinthian figural kylikes we have today, 366 are from the groups highlighted above. The Code Annodate, Codros, and Maschera Umana kylikes all primarily sported this motif. The two-right facing birds on a kylix were not just one of the trends on Etrusco-Corinthian kylikes, but were a defining element of that vessel type.

Szilagyı does address the nature of a potential demand for this type, but positions the analysis in the same unhelpful terms of aesthetic judgment. To Szilagyı, the Maschera Umana bird kylikes are produced for the “cultic target.” He suggests that the Maschera Umana group recognized that it was the end of the line for Etrusco-Corinthian pottery and more or less gave into shoddy but efficient craftsmanship to respond to kylix demand. This was allegedly in contrast to the other major group of the late period, the Galli Affronti group, which is composed of the popular closed vessel shapes with much more Corinthianizing iconography, including friezes and quadrupeds. Szilagyı argues that the other group was attempting to continue the tradition. Again, the aesthetic-based theories strip the development of decoration and production of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery of any purposeful shifts or active response to the market.

---

For the remainder of my thesis, I depart from the traditional stylistic analysis of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery and instead consider the continual export of a uniform corpus of material to Gaul. By moving beyond the traditional language of the “master” painter and his “following workshop,” and sidestepping the aesthetic judgments of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, patterns of production and export are clearly visible. As discussed above, the decoration exported to Gaul is notably singular, but the uniformity of shapes exported is also unique. The “followers” of the third generation produce significantly larger quantities of closed vessel shapes than kylikes. Approximately twenty times more olpai, alabastra, and aryballoi are produced than kylikes of the Codros cycle. The fact that the bird motif persists over at least twenty years and that the shape most-exported to Gaul is a distinct departure from the most popular shapes of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery suggests that the bird kylikes were produced to fulfill a specific demand.

The export of the primarily later groups of bird kylikes (the Codros cycle and Maschera Umana group) to Gaul may support Szilagyi and Gaultier’s analysis that the later “workshops” were produced for wider distribution and/or exportation, though whether a streamlining of the decoration occurred specifically for this purpose is questionable. In comparison with the three vessels in Gaul documented as belonging to third generation “masters,” 47 vessels are attributed to the Codros cycle and Maschera Umana group. Again, this supports the possibility that the bird kylikes were being exported to fulfill an increasing demand, but the exact nature of this demand and the assessment of a functional difference or lower class consumer cannot be assumed without examining the contexts of the finds. Chapter three will consider the distribution of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, particularly the bird kylikes, in tandem with the patterns of shape and decoration of the exported ware that have been considered in this chapter.
The Etrusco-Corinthian plates exported to Gaul cannot be considered in the same terms of coherence as the kylikes, as significantly fewer are found, but they do raise questions of production location and consequently the trade routes by which Etrusco-Corinthian pottery was exported. The decorated plates that are attributable uniformly belong to the *Senza Graffito* painter, though many exhibit linear decoration that cannot be attributed or do not preserve decoration. The majority of vessels from the workshop use red and white overpainting rather than incising to define figural decoration.\(^{34}\) The group is chronologically similar to the *Codros* cycle, dating to 585/580-570/65 BCE based on findspots of the group in Tarquinia tombs. The workshop does include some kylikes, but the majority of vessels attributed to the group are plates.\(^{35}\) The decoration of plates typically consists of multiple different animals in a frieze around the center of the plate.\(^{36}\) The plates found in Massalia are fragmentary, but three are certainly works of the *Senza Graffito* workshop. The rest are not attributable or have linear decoration.

The four kylikes that are associated with the *Senza Graffito* painter, though only found in Tarquinia and not abroad, raise an interesting question of the process of standardization for Etrusco-Corinthian bird kylikes. These kylikes do include birds in their decoration, but they are not the typical two-right facing birds of the motif that becomes standard for all kylikes, and especially those exported to Gaul. The one example with bird decoration depicts two birds facing each other, and is useful for noting that other decorations are found on kylikes, but are extremely rare. The *Senza Graffito* painter is contemporary with the early end of the *Codros* cycle, which may demonstrate the standardization of the kylike decoration by the end of the second and third

\(^{34}\) Szilagyi (1998): 451. The group is not truly without incising, as the name would suggest. Incision is also used for separating features, like rosettes/patches/amorphous blobs, etc.

\(^{35}\) Plates, *piatti* (Italian), *prises a laterales plats* (French).

\(^{36}\) The most frequently painted figures is birds, but the high tally is helped by the fact that birds serve as filler characters. Szilagyi (1998):451.
generations according to demand. However, the Senza Graffito painter is also considered to be one of the more creative, “original” Etrusco-Corinthian painters with a higher degree of artistry.  

This reinforces the possibility that the uniform Etrusco-Corinthian kylix decoration develops out of aesthetic preference rather than laziness that is accepted by a lower class market.

The production location of the Senza Graffito painter is securely established as Tarquinia, which differs from the other groups of bird kylikes primarily produced in Vulci. Though the Senza Graffito workshop only makes up a small portion of imports in southern Gaul, its presence in the west indicates that exports of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery were coming from multiple locations. The Senza Graffito painter is the only painter with vessels in the west that can be concretely located. In the earlier Codros cycle, the vessel production seems to be divided between Vulci and Caere, with no studies completed on specific vessel shapes in relation to location. Overall, scholars see a migration of the workshop south from Vulci to Caere. The production base of the Maschera Umana group is not concretely known. Both of the major cycles of the late period (the other being the Galli Affronti group) are based on Vulci workshops—the Rosoni painter and the Bobuda painter, so it would make sense for both late groups to be tied to Vulci. The Galli Affronti group is also found at Tarquinia, though the Maschera Umana group is not.

The cargo of the Cap d’Antibes wreck, which is the only Archaic wreck that provides evidence of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, raises questions regarding the route of exchange and place of shipment of the pottery. The wreck only carries one attributed group of kylikes that belong to the Maschera Umana group, and the plates have linear decoration or unattributable figural, so the Etrusco-Corinthian pottery alone cannot suggest that the ship is carrying vessels

---

from multiple locations. However, the amphorae of the *Cap d’Antibes* wreck can be attributed to several production sources in southern Etruria. In addition, Tarquinia is not associated with the production of any amphorae. With the understanding that Etruria’s primary export during 6th century is wine in Etruscan amphorae in conjunction with the evidence of shipwrecks, it’s safe to assume that fine ware pottery during the period would always travel with amphorae. Consequently, the Etrusco-Corinthian plates of the *Senza Graffito* painter in Tarquinia must either have traveled to make it onto a ship, or suggest multiple stops at ports on the Etruscan coastline.

In addition, the uncertainty of the location places of the *Maschera Umana* and *Codros* cycles allow for the possibility of considering shifting workshops in response to intent for the produced objects. While the earlier bird kylíke cycles of the *Rosoni* and *Code Anmodate* painters belong in Vulci, could the migration south to Caere be a result of the increasing export of the kylíkes? Vulci did have a port, Regisville, but as it was further inland, the ports of Gravisca and Pyrgi (Tarquinia and Caere ports respectively) were better positioned to be the production location of goods intended for export. Both ports were very active centers during the 6th century. The question of intent of production of the kylíkes, already raised by the distinctively uniform vessel shapes being exported and the bird decoration of the kylíkes, is consequently also a question raised in relation to the production of the vessels.

While the stylistic analysis of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery does help consider this issue, as we can see with the *Senza Graffito’s* connection to Tarquinia, significant remaining questions require further provenance work. Scientific provenance analysis is increasingly being used to confirm the place of production and the evolution of Etruscan pottery production more generally. In a study completed by the Department of Inorganic Chemistry of the University of Milan,
Etruscan depurata ware from the Pian di Civita excavation in Tarquinia were tested using plasma optical emission spectrometry and flame atomic emission spectrometry to determine whether samples of various types of pottery were local or imported.⁴⁰ Seven Etrusco-Corinthian sherds were included in the study, as well as control samples from the Corinthia and local clays. The study showed that Tarquinian production can be confirmed through chemical study, which is a useful conclusion that suggests it would possible that chemical analysis could also help clear up the geographical progression of third generation Etrusco-Corinthian painters, and their movement from Vulci to Caere. Significant work would have to be done in creating a baseline of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery known to be produced at Vulci, Caere, and Tarquinia, with which the questionable pieces could be compared. The result, however, could be very useful information that could elucidate trade paths of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery and the organization of maritime trade on the Etruscan coast more generally. The work could also help create a provenance base for linear Etrusco-Corinthian pottery.

Significant work on Etrusco-Corinthian pottery has been completed over the past century, and with a more objective and overarching focus, this work contributes to helpful observations in the decorations and shapes of vessels and export. There is still ample room for developing Etrusco-Corinthian analysis that could be useful in the consideration of production and export. The identification of provenance of linear vessels would be significant progress that would allow more comprehensive analysis of all exported vessels, and would be extremely useful to conclusions of shipping organization. However, until scientific research on the ware progresses, the examination of the distribution of the ware in the west allows for consideration of some of the same issues of trade structure, and can also contribute to questions of consumption, intent of

production, and analysis of ancient reception of Greek versus Etruscan wares which I will discuss in chapter three.
2. Evidence of Etruscan Exchange and Mediterranean Identity in the West

In order to evaluate Etrusco-Corinthian ceramics as a class of objects within the Archaic exchange structure, it is necessary to establish a fuller picture of the network of exchange in the western Mediterranean. Consequently, this chapter provides a comparative framework for my analysis of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. I discuss Etruscan exchange broadly, including the range of Etruscan objects found in the western Mediterranean, the geographical extent of these objects, the archaeological contexts that inform our conception of Greek-Etruscan exchange, and the chronological patterns of exchange. I also approach the concept of identity in the Mediterranean to emphasize the cosmopolitan nature of interaction and exchange in the west. Following this, I discuss how identity and exchange have been discussed in terms of material evidence, through shipwrecks that are typically associated with Greek and Etruscan agents of exchange. In order to explore each of these topics, I first briefly establish the nature of various settlements to provide the background.

There are three types of settlements in Archaic Gaul: indigenous, *emporia*, and colonies (see figure 1.2). Etruscan artifacts are found at all of these. For obvious reasons, indigenous settlements are the longest established of all these types. However, it should also be noted that new indigenous settlements continued to appear throughout the 6th century, the prime example being *Lattara* (modern Lattes), which was founded at the end of the century. Indigenous settlements in the western Mediterranean are labeled as Iberian, Celtic, or Ligurian depending on the language spoken.¹ My thesis is concerned primarily with the region of Gaul and the zone settled by “Celtic” people roughly between the Herault River and the edges of Liguria in

¹ For the danger in using labels with modern associations, as well as considering settlements with an “indigenous” versus “colony” framework of terminology, see Deitler (2010): 75-82.
northwestern Italy. In terms of overseas exchange, 6th century Iberia shows frequent contact with Punic people, but there are only scattered Etruscan finds, with the exception of the non-indigenous site of Emporion.\(^2\) In contrast, the Celtic region of the Lower Rhone Basin exhibits the second largest concentration of Etruscan material in the Mediterranean, after Italy itself. The first imported objects in Gaul arrived at Celtic indigenous sites at the end of the 7th century (ca. 625 BCE), but this is not indicative of any established exchange patterns.\(^3\) More likely, the earliest imported objects represent the occasional Phocaean, Etruscan or Phoenician merchant. Bronzes in tombs of indigenous settlements in northern Gaul, which exist in the north beyond the geographical concentration of Etruscan pottery, raise the possibility of early overland exchange as well.\(^4\) Etruscan amphorae and fineware that arrived to the coastal indigenous sites by ship after the initial scatter are products of more regular exchange patterns and will be discussed in conjunction with the fineware in other settlements of Gaul later in this chapter.

*Emporia*, a second type of Mediterranean settlement, are the result of increasing exchange in the Mediterranean. Demetriou characterizes *emporion* as “nodes along trade networks that connected the Mediterranean on the local level, as redistribution centers that had contacts with their immediate surroundings, the regional level, as stopping points on regional, and the Mediterranean level, as export and import centers.”\(^5\) The core of the *emporion* is its commercial nature. Greek *emporion* could exist either within the establishment of the city or as an independent stopping point.\(^6\) Emporion, settled by the Massaliotes in 575 BCE, is the primary example of the independent trade settlement, but many others such as Agathe and Antipolis were also settled by

\(^2\) Dietler (2009): 7-8 for an overview.
\(^3\) For the remainder of my thesis, the use of the term “indigenous settlement” refers to the “Celtic” settlements and people, unless otherwise noted. For a more extensive discussion of indigenous cultures in the Western Mediterranean, including Liguria which had active *emporion* connected by overland routes, see Dietler (2010): 75-82.
\(^4\) Shefton (1994): 67. Scattered Etruscan ceramics past approximately 30 km inland were found only in funerary contexts (Dietler 2009: 9).
\(^5\) Demetriou (2011): 272
\(^6\) Demetriou (2011): 262.
the Greeks beginning in the second half of the sixth century. Until recently, Etruscans had not been credited with the settlement of any of their own emporia. Instead the evidence shows that they operated within the Greek structures. However, concentrations of Etruscan pottery at indigenous sites, particularly at Lattara and potentially at Saint Blaise, have led scholars to consider the possibility of Etruscan residents. Lattara shows the most compelling evidence of this possibility. Although Dietler characterizes Lattara as a “trade diaspora” and does not use the term “emporia,” the situation he describes would be very similar to emporia such as the Greek-inhabited emporia at the Etruscan port city Gravisca.

The concentrations of Etruscan ceramics at Saint Blaise, Lattes, and Massalia all suggest cross-cultural interaction, but of these Lattes is the only settlement that appears to adhere to a primarily commercial nature that categorizes a site as an emporion. Massalia’s primary identity, as I discuss below, is a Greek colony, but theoretically it could have an emporion within the colony. The coastal location is a prime feature and the settlement receives a significant amount of commercial traffic, but there is currently no evidence that can concretely suggest multiple ethnicities living alongside each other, or a strictly commercial area of the site. A status of emporion is highly unlikely for Saint Blaise, at least for the 6th century BCE. It is inland and the Archaic imported ceramics all appear within domestic contexts. It’s more productive to consider each of these sites as participants of the cross-cultural interaction, instead of trying to characterize each as an exclusively commercial site.

---

7 Emporia can be independent trade settlements in the sense of a separate settlement established for the purpose of exchange and not functioning within an indigenous or colonial structure.
9 Dietler (2010): 97. The lack of the term “emporia” in Dietler’s explanation may result from his stance that colonial relations require an analysis beyond the solely economic structures for a more nuanced and accurate understanding of these relationships; Gravisca as an emporion is discussed in detail by Demetriou (2005): 83-133.
10 Demetriou (2011) establishes that the difference between the apoikia (colony) and emporion, doesn’t actually exist. Thus, the possibility of Massalia as both a colony and an emporion is not contradictory.
The final type of settlement in Archaic Gaul is the Greek colony. While other Greek colonies did exist later, notably Rhode in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, the scope of this thesis limits the category to Massalia alone. Scholars agree that the archaeological material dates the founding of Massalia to 600 BCE, though many ancient texts provide a later date of 545 BCE.\textsuperscript{11} It was settled on the north side of the \textit{Vieux Port}, and became the point of access for goods to reach inland, indigenous communities. Its place only a few kilometers away from Saint Blaise at the base of the Rhone River is highlighted by the similarity of imported material, and introduces questions of colonial and indigenous relations. Massalia’s increasing foothold in the Mediterranean over the course of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century results in the formation of many \textit{emporia}, as discussed above. The growing influence is documented by Massalia’s own production and dissemination of amphorae later in the sixth century, which affects and eventually replaces the widespread use of Etruscan amphorae.

Regardless of the settlement type, Etruscan imports in Gaul are limited in functional range. The objects are always bronzes, amphorae, or fineware table service. Etruscan bronzes appear only in funerary settings of indigenous sites, so do not cross paths with the fineware considered in this thesis.\textsuperscript{12} However, they are worth mentioning for their steady import throughout the sixth century. The bronze basins and discs found in the \textit{Grand Ribaud F} shipwreck (510-490 BCE) toward the end of the age of Etruscan prominence in the western Mediterranean are the same items of bronzes that were being imported at the end of the seventh

\textsuperscript{11} Massalia’s Phocaean founding was told by Herodotus 1.164, Strabo 6.1.1; Justin, \textit{Hisioriarum} 43.3, and Athenaeus \textit{Deipnosophistae} XIII.576 date the founding to 600BCE. The later date of foundation by texts is attributed to a second wave of Phocaeans who arrive at the colony in 545 BCE. cf. Demetriou (2012): 29 for the common explanation.

\textsuperscript{12} Riva (2010): 213. Some fineware does appear in tombs alongside these bronze objects, even with the early imports, but don’t correspond to concentrations of pottery in inhabited sites. Janin (2006): 95-97.
In addition to relaying the continuity of bronze imports, the consistent typologies suggest shipments organized for targeted native consumers in a regular trade route.\textsuperscript{14}

The Etruscan fineware and amphorae found in Gaul also exhibit what Dietler calls “functional homogeneity,”\textsuperscript{15} and indicate an Etruscan awareness of a specific market. The vessels are all wares for the drinking and pouring of wine: bucchero vessels are *kantharoi*, *olpai* or *oenochoai*; Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, as already mentioned, appears almost exclusively in plate and kylix-cup form. While the drinking ware is typically imported, the cooking ware in the region is locally made.\textsuperscript{16} The affinity for very specific imported shapes is not coincidental. Dietler’s work on consumption emphasizes that “demand is never an automatic response to the availability of goods.”\textsuperscript{17} He argues that the merchants were highly aware of their consumer audience and developed their cargoes to reflect their tastes.\textsuperscript{18} The drinking vessels in Gaul align with this theory. The predominant type of imported fineware shifts throughout the sixth century, but is always some form of cup. The bucchero *kantharos* is the overwhelmingly dominant imported shape beginning in 600 BCE, until 530 BCE when Ionian cups become most prevalent, mirroring the trend in Etruria proper.\textsuperscript{19} Etrusco-Corinthian pottery appears in Gaul during the period of bucchero’s predominance. Though it appears in smaller quantities, the same sort of shape specialization is exhibited.

Because the majority of Etruscan transport amphorae and fineware in Gaul chronologically aligns with the foundation of Massalia, Etruscan imports are often evaluated in

\textsuperscript{13} Long et al. (2006): 465.
\textsuperscript{14} Morel (2006): 31.
\textsuperscript{15} Dietler (2010): 135.
\textsuperscript{17} Dietler (2010): 193.
\textsuperscript{18} Dietler (2010): 194.
\textsuperscript{19} Though the Ionian cups circulating the Western Mediterranean are visually identical to the ones made in Ionia, the majority of the cups in the Western Mediterranean were actually made in Magna Graecia according to chemical analysis by Krotschek (2008).
relation to Massaliote expansion in Gaul. Recent scholarship, particularly the presentations in the Genoa-Ampurias conference of 2002 at Marseille, emphasizes the re-evaluation that must occur on account of emerging evidence of ceramics and transport amphorae that appear before the foundation of Massalia. While Etruscan ceramics don’t begin to appear at Massalia until the second phase of settlement (580-560 BCE), indigenous sites such as St. Blaise, and Cap Couronne\textsuperscript{20} and Tamaris began seeing Etruscan transport amphorae from 625 BCE onward.\textsuperscript{21} In addition, while the material evidence at some indigenous sites reflects the introduction of Massaliote amphorae as the new alternative to Etruscan amphorae in the second half of the 6th century,\textsuperscript{22} other sites maintain a strong presence of Etruscan amphorae.\textsuperscript{23} The transport amphorae in Lattes remained almost solely Etruscan into the first quarter of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{24} The \textit{Grand Ribaud F}, which contained 800-1000 Etruscan amphorae and was probably bound for Lattes,\textsuperscript{25} also attests to the thriving exchange of Etruscan goods even after the introduction Massaliote amphorae. J.P. Morel uses the continuation of Etruscan amphorae in the Mediterranean to argue that the rise of Massalia did not include taking over complete control of the dissemination of imports to all indigenous sites in the vicinity.\textsuperscript{26} In general, the scholars who take this stance

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item In the Martigues area; listed under L’Arquet/Martigue on figure 1.2.
\item Evidence of Massaliot wine and amphorae dates no earlier than 540 BCE. Shefton (1994): 65; The case at Saint Blaise is summarized by Camporeale (2006). Sandra Duval (2006) provides a more in-depth study of this trend: pp. 103-119.
\item Etruscan habitation at Marseille has been posited by Sourisseau, and Saint Blaise by a few scholars, although this tends to be an argument which is not given much consideration anymore. Lattes is the only site where this habitation is supported by a number of Etruscan inscriptions and an overwhelming presence of Etruscan amphorae into the 5\textsuperscript{th} century. See Aymerich (2002): 214 for the inscribed pottery, Dietler (2010): 119, and Py and Dedet (2006) for a discussion of amphorae at Lattes in comparison to other sites.
\item Sourisseau (2002).
\item Morel (2006): 30-32.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
promote the idea of independent Etruscan trade even during Massaliote dominance in the second half of the 6th century.\footnote{Michael Bats is the primary scholar who actively opposes the stance of independent Etruscan trade, for support of a more cross-cultural model of interaction, Bats (1998).}

That Etruscan exchange in Gaul may have begun independently of Greek colonizing forces has significant implications for the agency of Etruscan trade. The settlement of Massalia, however, as the first of many Phocaean-settled areas, resulted in the reorganization of the structure of cross-cultural exchange within the western Mediterranean. As discussed earlier, many indigenous settlements in southern Gaul frequented by Phocaeans early on became places of Greek \textit{emporia} in the mid-6th century. Between the growing network of Massaliote sites in western Gaul and the increasing dissemination of Massaliote amphorae in the second half of the century, Massaliotes and Phocaeans were clearly increasingly participants in the exchange of material cultures.

Rather than over-emphasizing Etruscan independence in trade to counteract previously held and culturally imperialistic beliefs that Greece civilized the barbarian West, it’s necessary to recognize the coexistence of multiple cultures that participated in exchange, including Greeks, Etruscans, and the indigenous population. The Pech-Maho tablet is just one example that attests to the multi-cultural nature of exchange in the west. One side of the lead tablet is inscribed in undeciphered Etruscan, but with the term for “Massalia” clearly visible.\footnote{Demetriou (2005).} The other side, translated below, holds a Greek legal contract and details the selling of a ship:

“So-and-so (Kyprios?) bought a boat from the \textit{Emporitans}. He also bought [three (?) more] (i.e. from elsewhere). He passed over to me a half share at the price of 2.5 \textit{hektai} (each). I paid 2.5 \textit{hektai} in cash and two days later personally gave a guarantee. The former (i.e., the money) he received on the river. The pledge I handed over where the boats are moored. Witness(es): Basigerros and Bleruas and...
Golo.biur and Sedegon; these (were) witnesses when I handed over the pledge. But when I paid the money, the 2.5 *hektai*, . *auaras*, Nalb..n.” 29

The tablet, which dates between 480-460 BCE, again demonstrates the presence of Etruscans in the western Mediterranean exchange circuit throughout the expansion and rising predominance of Massaliote and Eastern Greek imports. More importantly however, the inclusion of Iberian names illustrates that this exchange actively involved multiple ethnic groups.30 Exchanges were not only occurring in a two-way, Greek—indigenous or Etruscan—indigenous format.31 Irad Malkin is surely correct when he asserts that *emporia* should be understood as “networks [which] were complex, multidimensional, and multidirectional.”32

Though this rare textual evidence contributes to our understanding of the multicultural nature of exchange in the west, it also complicates it. The use of the term *Emporitai*, residents of Emporion, as a label of actors in the exchange raises questions regarding the precise identity of groups involved in the exchange, and more specifically, of how they identified themselves. As the trading settlement of a Greek colony, Emporion can be considered a “Greek” trading post, with links back to Phocaea through the settlement of the *emporion* by Massalia. However, the only explicit identity provided by the tablet does not establish Greek, Etruscan, or indigenous actors. Instead, “Emporitai” connects the participants with the settlement itself, which, because of the multicultural nature of *emporia*, could describe people with associations from any of these groups. The topic of ethnicity in the ancient Mediterranean has been much-discussed in recent years, particularly accompanied by a question of the extent of a regional versus overarching

31 Malkin (2011): 166.
Generally, the debate is framed in terms of Greek identity, but the tablet and nature of Emporion extends this debate to the identity of groups in the wider Mediterranean. Consequently, though I will discuss Massalia’s Greek identity, I use this discussion of identity more generally as a background for analysis of the reception and consumption of material culture and exchange in the West.

The textual and archaeological evidence of Massalia suggests that its people did not limit themselves to a strictly “Greek” identity, or a concept of overarching Hellenism, though this may have also existed. In a discussion of Mediterranean identity, Demetriou demonstrates that the shared cult of Massalia and Emporion—Artemis of Ephesus—links the settlements back to Phocaea, where Artemis of Ephesus filled the role of a city-protecting goddess, giving both settlements a notable connection to Ionian identity. However, other evidence suggests that the colonists to some degree (or maybe primarily) considered themselves “Massaliote” as well. Textual evidence for this as a city-ethnicity does exist, though at a much later date, on two stelae in Emporion that display the word “Massaliote.” One of these is a first century BCE funerary stele, and the other is a stele marking the contribution of a Massaliote to the construction of a temple. These occur at a later date than the period in focus for this thesis, but they show that a distinct identification with the Massaliote identity developed. The example of “Emporitai” on the Pech-Maho tablet provides the possibility that a settlement like Massalia could identify itself similarly at an earlier time than its first written appearance. Overall, the evidence of identity in the western Mediterranean suggests that the residents identified themselves on more than one level. For Massalia, if an overarching concept of “Hellenic” identity did exist, it was also accompanied by connections with Ionia and the independent aspect of the “Massaliote” identity.

33 See Hall (2003) and (2004), Malkin (2011), and for a summary on how these viewpoints interact and a broader Mediterranean perspective, the introduction of Demetriou (2012).
In all likelihood, such distinctions also existed for indigenous populations and for the Etruscans, though our textual evidence is too limited (or nonexistent) to support such discussions.

Recently, scholars have turned to the concept of hybridity to more precisely define the colonial identity that is influenced by both the mother city and the culture of the new environs. The model approaches identity through the archaeologically visible manifestation of a hybrid identity found in the material the colony has or produces. Hybridity is established on the basis that there is a middle ground in which colonial interaction takes place, and where colonial Greeks and indigenous populations mingle. This middle ground becomes evident through an assemblage of both Greek and local artifacts, or the development of colonial-made forms which feature characteristics of both cultures. Thus the colonist takes on the identity of Sikeliote or Massaliote rather than just “Hellene” or a regional identity, as already discussed above, and it becomes evident in material culture, as discussed below. The concept of hybridity is certainly a step in a positive direction for considering the mingling of identities and mutual cultural influences in the west compared to previous notions of Greek versus the “other.” In addition, the concept addresses the important question of how material culture plays a part of identity expression. Identity is not only relevant to the people involved in the act of exchange, but also plays a significant role in the perception and consumption of the goods being exchanged.

The concept of hybridity is a phenomenon easily recognizable in Massaliote pottery. In addition to imported Etruscan and Greek wares, which will be discussed more thoroughly in my next chapter, Massalia used pottery produced in Gaul itself. A narrow range of hand-modeled cookingware produced by indigenous populations (CNT), was consistently used by the residents of Massalia for the first two centuries of the colony’s existence. This included
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36 Ceramic non tournee (non-imported ceramics).
consistently produced cooking shapes, urns, jattes and lids, as well as bowls (coupes) which represented the only indigenous-produced tableware. However, from a very early period, Massaliotes began producing their own tableware in addition to importing Greek and Etruscan fineware. Massaliote cream ware (ceramique claire), and gray monochrome ware (ceramique grise monochrome), were both wheel-thrown and kiln-fired wares. Cream ware was the standard tableware of the region, though it wasn’t produced across a wide geographic area, with Massalia as the main center of production and lesser output from perhaps only two other sites. Some had linear painted decoration. Gray monochrome was only produced ca. 575-375 BCE, and it was widely produced by indigenous settlements across southern Gaul. Decoration of gray-monochrome is either channeled or incisions in a wavy pattern.

Whereas the forms of locally produced cookingware are very limited and were not impacted by Greek and Etruscan imports, the Massaliote cream-ware and gray-monochrome exhibit significant influence from the imported tableware, as well as from local pottery. According to Dietler, the gray-monochrome sherds often copied indigenous forms. However, the more standard, popular ware – Cream-ware—consisted primarily of tablewares such as cups that could only be based on the Greek and Etruscan imports. Both wares reflect the model of hybridization as they have both adapted Greek and Etruscan and indigenous models, but the hybridization in the sense of assemblage is also visible. As I discuss in chapter three, the Massaliote ware and CNT existed alongside significant quantities of Greek and Etruscan imports.

As a model of establishing colonial identity, however, the concept of hybridity is limited. As Antonaccio herself notes, “the presence of Corinthian pottery, for example, on a given site
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does not necessarily indicate Corinthian colonists.” Pottery is not representative of actual people, and she warns against considering it emblematic of the populations present. However, though supporters of hybridity are more careful about asserting the ethnicity that can be associated with pottery, scholars are still willing to consider style and the mix of styles as representative of this intermediary—somewhere between Greek and indigenous—ethnicity.

While the production or assemblage of pottery certainly does speak to the mingling of cultures in the colonial setting, the interpretation of a strictly colonial identity that is absorbed from multiple cultures into one new, hybrid identity is a flat model. As discussed already, identity could exist on multiple levels. The model also de-emphasizes any aspect of choice or intent in production and consumption of material, neglecting how this may help to express multiple hybrid identities. The focus of local production strictly on tableware for the first two centuries of Massalia’s existence, for example, is unlikely to be a coincidence. The colony is equally, if not more, exposed to CNT cookingware, but chose to reproduce the all-imported tableware. Rather than an interpretation of identity as absorbed from multiple cultures, more discussion of the purposeful production or export on the part of the Etruscans and Greeks, and of purposeful demand and consumption on the part of the colonists and indigenous Celts is necessary.

The next two chapters will discuss production, consumption, and imported material within the network of exchange, specifically through Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as an imported object. Both imports and locally-made wares can be positioned within larger trends in the Mediterranean to shed light on the issues being raised, as I will discuss further in my concluding chapter. The importation of both Etruscan and Greek drinking ware—wine and the fine ware cups

41 Antonaccio (2005): 102 “Recent research indicates that style does not reliably express ethnicity per se.”
and pouring vessels—were targeted for exchange with native Gauls, who seemed to have an affinity for foreign-produced drinking vessels. While the shapes imported do reflect the local demand, as discussed by Dietler, the types imported reflect broader trends within Etruria. Thus the shift from bucchero to Ionian and Attic cups in Gaul in the late 6th century may not be a result of shifting agents of trade or power in the region, but could be a reflection of changing demand and production in the wider Mediterranean. When considering the value of fineware as a commodity in international exchange then, it’s less important to consider the hierarchy of agents in the trade and how they ethnically identified, but rather more important to consider how highly the fineware was valued, whether it held symbolic or actual economic value, and whether the fabric and make of the vessel (i.e. Etruscan-produced bucchero vs. Etrusco-Corinthian pottery vs. Greek-made Ionian cups) had hierarchical value in the structure of imported material culture in the west.

The cargos of Archaic shipwrecks in the western Mediterranean help to further our understanding of these patterns of exchange for Etruscan and Greek goods in Gaul, and contribute to our knowledge of how these groups of evidence coexist. Scholars frequently use the wreck to address questions of identity and agency in exchange. The level of homogeneity or heterogeneity of the assemblages is used to posit the identity of the merchants and home port. The result of this approach is often assertions of a hierarchy of exchange dominance in Mediterranean. For example, the homogeneous “Etruscan” wrecks along the Gulf of Lyon are largely responsible for raising awareness of Etruscan activity in overseas exchange, and have been used to pose Etruscan control of exchange in the second phase (580-560 BCE) especially. However, the assumption that Etruscan cargoes accompany Etruscan merchants and activity is a
mistaken one. As already discussed, pottery does not reveal the identity of the consumer, or in this case, the shipper.

While the cargos complicate the question of identity in the western Mediterranean further, they can also contribute to the understanding of commodities and objects circulating in the exchange network. They are particularly useful for considering the major subsistence commodity of the period: wine. However, they also encourage the approach of the topic of fineware exchange. Previously, and especially on boats with heterogeneous cargos, fineware has been used to assert identities of the crew. Once the issue of identity is recognized as inconclusive, however, the fineware can be considered in the broader scope of exchange, as demonstrated below and throughout this thesis.

Twelve Archaic shipwrecks have been uncovered in the western Mediterranean, six of which are along the coast of Gaul, two off the coast of Italy (see table 2.1 for summary).\(^42\) The evidence of these shipwrecks is often incomplete, due to looting allowed by the shallow depth of the wreck, or to partial excavations of sites for reasons of funding or extreme depth. In addition, while some material, particularly organic, can be uniquely preserved by the conditions of the seabed, the evidence is also subject to dispersion by the waves.\(^43\) In areas where there is more than one wreck, such as the Bon Porte I and the Pointe Lequin IA, this can also contribute to questions of whether all artifacts in the bounds of the excavation space actually belong to that wreck.\(^44\) Though the remaining cargo of most shipwrecks is incomplete for one reason or another, the remaining evidence provides a good idea of the relative qualities and quantities of items being shipped across the western Mediterranean.

\(^42\) For a summary of Archaic shipwrecks, see table 1.3 in the appendix.
\(^43\) Dietler (2010): 133.
\(^44\) The Pointe Lequin 1A, for example, was categorized as part of a single wreck, the “Pointe Lequin I,” until it was realized that actually 2 cargoes were present—IA from 520-510 BCE and IB at the end of the 5\(^{th}\) c. BCE. Krotschek (2008): 65.
Preserved Cargo does not include any Etruscan amphorae

The majority of the amphorae in cargo is Etruscan

Table 2.1 Chronological list of Archaic shipwrecks in the western Mediterranean, organized by latest date provided by scholarship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shipwreck</th>
<th>Date (BCE)</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochelongue*</td>
<td>Late 7th-mid 6th</td>
<td>No hull preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giglio **</td>
<td>600-580</td>
<td>25 m. (speculation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Love**</td>
<td>560-550</td>
<td>No hull preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecueil de Miet 3**</td>
<td>600-525</td>
<td>No hull preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Porte</td>
<td>540-510</td>
<td>8-10 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe Lequin IA</td>
<td>520-515</td>
<td>No hull preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Dattier</td>
<td>540-500</td>
<td>No hull preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cala Sant Vincenc</td>
<td>520-500</td>
<td>20-22 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ribaud**</td>
<td>510-490</td>
<td>30 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galbucina</td>
<td>Unexcavated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jules Verne 7*</td>
<td>Late 6th C.</td>
<td>8-10m. (fishing boat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jules Verne 9*</td>
<td>Late 6th C.</td>
<td>8-10 (fishing boat)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preserved Cargo does not include any Etruscan amphorae
**The majority of the amphorae in cargo is Etruscan

The majority of the 12 archaic shipwrecks uncovered in the western Mediterranean are characterized by a main cargo of amphorae—Greek, Etruscan, or Massaliote, accompanied by some Greek or Etruscan fineware and miscellaneous objects that are generally attributed to the consignment of the sailing crew. There are a few exceptions to this generalization. The Rochelongue wreck contained 800 kg of copper ingots and 1700 bronze artifacts of various proveniences, including Iberian, Italic, and Punic. The Pointe Lequin IA shipwreck consists of a main cargo of fineware in the form of Ionian and Attic cups, accompanied by a smaller consignment of various amphorae. Both these exceptions are incredibly useful in our overall understanding of exchange. The Rochelongue wreck demonstrates the possible return cargo of metals that may have been the commodity exchange for wine, or the continued route that some merchantmen might have taken to Iberia. The Pointe Lequin IA demonstrates irrefutably that
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Bertram 47

exchange of non-subsistence commodities existed.\textsuperscript{46} It also raises the possibility that fineware could be an economically valuable commodity by itself, rather than only occupying a tag-along role to a subsistence commodity.\textsuperscript{47}

The homogeneity of the cargo’s source varies between ships and is often used to posit the different types of exchange that occurred. Multiple small wrecks (8-15m.) only preserve cargoes of between twenty to forty amphorae, with various amphorae types often including Etruscan, Corinthian A & B, Clazomenian, Massaliote, and Samian. The \textit{Bon Porte I} wreck is typically considered the most representative of this type of exchange, with twenty Etruscan amphorae, two Corinthian type B amphorae, three East Greek amphorae, and as many as ten Massaliote amphorae. Ships such as the \textit{Bon Porte} and \textit{Du Dattier}, on the same scale with a more homogeneous cargo, or ships on larger scales but with extremely varied cargos are considered to be ships that practiced “cabotage.” This practice involved stopping along the coast at various \textit{emporia} and loading/offloading at each point. In the smaller types of these ships especially, fineware is typically interpreted as cargo for the crew’s use. In the case of the \textit{Giglio}, which exhibits a large quantity of varied fineware, most of the fineware is explained away as the property of an aristocratic merchantman, since it doesn’t belong to a homogeneous group of sellable units.\textsuperscript{48}

Consignments of fineware that may have been shipped as a commodity, however, are identifiable among the shipwrecks with more homogenous Etruscan cargoes. The \textit{Grand Ribaud F}, \textit{Cap d’Antibes}, and \textit{Ecueil de Miet 3} all show a strong majority of Etruscan amphorae as the

\textsuperscript{46} Krotschek (2008).
\textsuperscript{47} This point is less concrete than the prior. The rudder of the \textit{Pointe Lequin IA} was fit for a ship of approximately 20 tons, but the cargo found only accounts for approximately 5 metric tons. Scholars hypothesize that perishable goods such as slaves or grain accounted for the remaining weight. Krotschek (2008): 72-75.
\textsuperscript{48} The only group of fineware on the \textit{Giglio} considered to be for commodity purposes was a range of Corinthian \textit{aryballoi}. Bound (1991): 14-16.
main cargo, accompanied by fineware. The 800-1000 amphorae of the *Grand Ribaud F* are all Etruscan except for a distinct unit of a couple Greek amphorae, thought to belong to the crew, excavated toward the back of the ship. Other contents of the ship included Attic Bloesch type C cups, bucchero bowls, urns, and *ollae*, 40 bronze Etruscan basins, and bronze discs with beaded rims. The *La Love* wreck contained approximately 180 Etruscan amphorae, as well as 65 bucchero *kantharoi* and *oenochoai*, and 10 Etrusco-Corinthian cups, and various impasto and cooking vessels. The *Miet 3*, not fully excavated, contains approximately 100 Etruscan amphorae and 3-5 bucchero vessels. Both the *La Love* and the *Miet 3* were looted prior to excavation, which likely decreases the diversity of goods among the boats’ original contents.

The previous hesitation to consider fineware, particularly bucchero and Etruscan fineware, as part of the exchangeable commodities aboard the ships probably stems from the lack of seemingly sellable units or consignments of Etruscan fineware that were travelling together. Some of the examples of fineware cargoes listed above, such as the bucchero and Etrusco-Corinthian pottery of the *La Love* and the bucchero and Attic pottery of the *Grand Ribaud F*, are more readily considered to belong to sellable units. However, the smaller quantities of bucchero, such as the 3-5 vessels on the *Miet 3*, leave this point as questionable. While we can never really know if there was a greater number of fineware vessels on the *Miet 3* and the more heterogeneous ships, the *Pointe Lequin IA* shipwreck, excavated in 1991-1993 and only recently
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49 Sourrisseau (2006). Although this shipwreck is not fully excavated due to recent discovery and lack of funds, the homogeneity of the rest of the cargo is not in question, as they appeared to be a part of a singular, bound shipment going to one place.

50 Attic Bloesch C cups are a second cup analyzed in Kotscheck’s dissertation on the *Pointe Lequin IA* (2008: 127), which shows that most originated in Magna Graecia. Although determining this for certain for the *Grand Ribaud F* would also require chemical analysis on the cups, it’s not unreasonable to think that the cups are consistent with a Central Mediterranean/Etruscan origin, given the extremely homogenous contents of the rest of the cargo; for a summary of the cargo of *Grand Ribaud F*, cf. Long et al. (2006).

fully published, does much to alleviate the need to solve this problem. Over two thousand fineware vessels were excavated in the cargo, validating hypotheses that fineware could function as saleable ballast. These cups are produced in Magna Graecia, however, so the question of Etruscan fineware remains. As I discussed earlier in this chapter, the cups were being consumed by the same groups. Does this allow us to forego the boundary between Etruscan and Greek pottery, or is there a hierarchical value? The demand and use of Etruscan fineware in a Greek colony, various levels of “luxury” or prestige which could apply to different pottery types, and the nuances of the consumer context of Etruscan exchange are all aspects of exchange that will be considered in the next two chapters.

52 Krotschek (2008): 64.
3. Distribution

Of the nearly 120 Etrusco-Corinthian vessels found across nineteen settlements in southern Gaul, 85 vessels (70.2%) are found at Saint Blaise, Massalia, and the *Cap d’Antibes* shipwreck [see figure 1.1]. The token Etrusco-Corinthian vessel or two identified at many more sites across the western Mediterranean demonstrate the geographic reach of contact with the major coastal sites of the Archaic period. The three sites highlighted, however, have yielded significantly greater concentrations of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery that prompt consideration of the ware and exchange interactions between Greeks, Etruscans, and indigenous populations in the west. In this chapter, I examine the archaeological contexts of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery at these sites. For each settlement or archaeological site, I provide a brief description of the site, its excavation, and its role in the 6th century developments, as well as an overview of archaeological remains relevant to the period and questions under discussion. Following this, I focus on the specific contexts and accompanying material of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. Throughout the chapter, I consider how the consumption contexts can inform concepts of demand and production, as well as how Etrusco-Corinthian pottery fits into the broader range of imports in the West, and the modes of these exchanges.

Though the *Cap d’Antibes* shipwreck was not found in the Gulf of Lyon, the ship was undoubtedly on its way to the port of Massalia. Etrusco-Corinthian pottery only appears in great quantities in Italy, Sicily, and southern Gaul, and as already discussed, no significant concentrations of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery are found outside of Saint Blaise and Massalia. Consequently the shipwreck is useful for considering both the economic aspects of Etrusco-
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1 Numbers calculated from Frere (2006). As in chapter 1, the term ‘vessels’ is a count of pottery per vessel, so an individual sherd, or multiple sherds composing part of one vessel. The completeness of the vessel varies broadly on account of the archaeological contexts.
Corinthian pottery in exchange, as well as for considering the manner in which Etrusco-Corinthian reached Massalia. In comparison to the other two archaeological contexts of Gaul, which are markedly mixed with Greek and local material, the Cap d’Antibes wreck provides a uniquely homogeneous unit of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in the west.

The Cap d’Antibes wreck is the only excavated shipwreck that contains Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. It lays 15 meters deep off the coast of Antibes (ancient Antipolis), and had already been looted at the time of discovery. George Pruvot, an archaeology enthusiast, recovered the most vulnerable of the remaining evidence in a series of amateur excavations spanning 1955-1969. In 1977, the Département des Recherches Archéologiques Subaquatiques et Sous-Marines (DRASSM) returned to the site and formally completed an excavation. After extensive work to recover the results of Pruvot’s excavations, Bouloumie published the first comprehensive summary and analysis of the wreck in 1984, followed by further work completed by Colonna, on the Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, and Sourisseau on the shipwreck as a whole.2 Along with seven Etrusco-Corinthian cups and one plate, the wreck preserves a minimum of 180 Etruscan 3A and 3B amphorae, three or four Ionian amphorae whose precise provenance is unknown,3 40 bucchero kantharoi and 25 bucchero oinochoai, and various cooking wares. Two Phoenician-Punic lamps and three stone anchors are also part of the consignment.4

The attributions of the Etrusco-Corinthian ware on the ship are unfortunately not complete enough to contribute information to the question of production and export, but the consignment nevertheless proves to be useful for conveying the other goods that traveled with
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2 Bound and Yellowlee (1984): 350. Bouloumie’s comprehensive analysis of the wreck is a noteworthy feat, as the artifacts had been lost in transport and were divided among multiple locations after the excavation, including “en depot chez Pruvot.” Wreck publications: Bouloumie (1982)  Sourisseau (2002).
3 Thought to be Corinthian type B amphorae, which were produced around Magna Graecia as well as in Greece proper (Corinth and Corcyra). Daniel (2009): 23.
4 A lead anchor in the area was also excavated but can’t be concretely attributed to ship. Long (2002): 31.
Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. The Etrusco-Corinthian kylikes on the ship are attributed to the *Maschera Umana* group; the plate has linear decoration and is not attributed to a production workshop by prior Etrusco-Corinthian scholarship. Because the *Maschera Umana* group does not have a definite source in Etruria and the plate’s production is untraceable, the *Cap d’Antibes* can’t be used to consider routes of multiple stops in Etruria, or provide the information of whether pottery from different cities are found on the same boat. Both of these are questions raised by the stylistic analysis and grouping of production discussed earlier.

However, the wreck does demonstrate that the plates and *kylikes* travelled together. The Etrusco-Corinthian pottery on the ship can be viewed as a unit among other clear sets of commodities: amphorae, bucchero, and Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. The grouped nature of the ship’s items suggests that the pottery was being shipped as a uniform consignment of saleable ballast that would be appealing to an overseas market. This proves to contrast previously held hypotheses of the pottery as filler items that could serve as a bartering tool or part of elite exchange, which assigned the pottery a role of little relevance among the other market-g geared goods aboard the ship. Essentially, the *Cap d’Antibes* shipwreck is an earlier and much smaller-scale wreck than the *Pointe Lequin 1A* that supports the concept that fineware was actively functioning as a commodity in overseas exchange.

The evidence of fineware within archaeological contexts in southern Gaul, especially Etrusco-Corinthian fineware, contributes further to our understanding of maritime trade and the role of fineware pottery within the Greek-Etruscan exchange structure. I will return to the evidence of shipwrecks and shipping in my concluding section in order to discuss how the Greek fineware found alongside Etruscan pottery can reflect back to our knowledge of shipping and the exchange process. The contextualized evidence of the Etrusco-Corinthian pottery at Massalia
will contribute to this discussion as a very heterogeneous assemblage in comparison to the homogeneous cargo of the shipwreck.

![Map of ancient Massalia; present Vieux-Port marked by dashes. Euzennat (1982).](image)

The Phocaean colony Massalia was established on the peninsula to the north of the *Vieux Port*, and eventually extended over three hills: the *Butte Saint Laurent*, *Butte Les Moulins*, and the *Butte les Carmes* (fig. 3.1). Phocaean settlement began with the westernmost hill, the *Butte Saint Laurent*, though the port area also preserves occasional material dating back to the late Bronze Age. The exact impetus for Massalia’s foundation is unclear. Presumably, the site could supply its Phocaean settlers and other maritime traders with some category of natural resource(s). Massalia’s location at the base of the Rhone River is optimal for contact with the inland indigenous sites, which could facilitate harvesting of such materials in the hinterland. Some scholars also posit that Massalia was ideally placed to transport and exchange tin from the north
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in the area of modern Britain. The scatter of a few pieces of Etruscan and Greek pottery to indigenous sites further inland does demonstrate contact with Massalia and/or nearby Saint Blaise. Apart from this, however, evidence of contact or use of the land’s natural resource is non-existent. Whatever the primary reason for establishment, Massalia flourished and gained an increasing influence in its region over the 6th and 5th centuries, documented by the development of their own amphorae and wine production and distribution beginning in the second half of the sixth century.

The nature of excavations at Marseille is consistently problematic for scholars. Most of the excavations took place as emergency excavations in the 20th century. As new civic structures were installed, archaeologists excavated remains that date through the medieval period. Consequently, a great deal of space has been (hastily) excavated, but the sheer quantity of excavations has resulted in a lag of published reports. The problem is being slowly remedied by works such as the 2001 volume of excavation summaries and overall analyses of the topography and material of Marseille. The summaries establish the nature of the site and architectural overviews, but do not provide comprehensive summaries of material evidence, or provide the excavation documentation system, making it difficult to relate specific objects to the stratigraphy of the site.

Frere’s work on Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, as the only scholarship that deals directly with Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in Gaul, is crucial to this study. The organization of her lists from Massalia excavations is especially helpful. She relays the excavation source of each sherd or vessel, along with its inventory number and the context number if available. From her work,
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6 cf. Krotschek (2008): 41. That Massalia was placed for access to tin is a reasonable suggestion because Massalia’s own colony, Emporion, was also well placed to be a potential stop on the route to Tartessos in Iberia.
7 For a brief summary of Massalia’s contact with the hinterland, Shefton (1994): 66. There are no clear choices of agricultural goods from Massalia that could drive exchange.
8 Bouiron and Treziny: (2001).
we know that the pottery is found within at least five different excavation sites, marked on the map (figure 3.2), but primarily concentrated at the rue de la Cathedrale site. The distribution of kylikes and plates at Massalia is given in table 3.1 below. The only other Etrusco-Corinthian pottery found at Massalia is a fragment of a globular aryballos by the Rosoni painter found at the rue de la Cathedrale excavation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Figural, unattributed</th>
<th>Code Annodate (k-hand)</th>
<th>Codros (k)</th>
<th>Maschera Umana (k)</th>
<th>Senza Graffito (p)</th>
<th>Unatt./linear (k)</th>
<th>Unatt./linear (p)</th>
<th>Context Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rue de la Cathedrale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vieux Port</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saint Jean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villeneuve Bergamon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De la Rue Negrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Etrusco-Corinthian kylikes and plates found at Marseille, divided by excavation location and painter/group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites with Etrusco-Corinthian pottery</th>
<th>Context 600-550BCE</th>
<th>Number on Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saint Jean</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglise Saint Laurent</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rue de la Cathedrale</td>
<td>Craftwork/domestic</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rue Negrel</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Villeneuve Bergamon</td>
<td>Dock</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other discussed sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jules Verne</td>
<td><em>Vieux Port</em></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 List of relevant sites and corresponding number on fig. 3.2.
Figure 3.2 Map of excavations at Marseille, dating from the Archaic period to the medieval period. Relevant Archaic sites listed in table 3.2. Bouiron and Treziny (2001): 417.

Fragments of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery belonging to approximately seven vessels have been found over the area of the Archaic Vieux Port. These can be subdivided into two contexts: the dock area of the Villeneuve Bergamon, and the general area of the Vieux Port, which may
include fragments that could have been underwater during the Archaic period. During the Archaic period, the Massalia’s *Vieux Port* extended further east and north, as shown in fig. 3.1.9

Excavations of the *Place Villeneuve Bergamon* (48 on the map) revealed an Archaic dock structure. Greek ceramics date the site to the late 7th/early 6th c. BCE, the phase of Massalia’s foundation by the Phocaeans. The area also includes bucchero, primarily *kantharoi* and *oenochoai*, alongside the Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, all of which can be dated to the first half of the 6th century.10 Three Etrusco-Corinthian vessels11 were found at the site, including one plate with worn away decoration dated to 575-550 based on stratigraphy,12 an almost-complete kylix of the *Maschera Umana* group dated to 590/580-550 BCE,13 and the lower part of a kylix with no preserved decoration.14 The kylikes are found within the same level, but no available documentation associates the two beyond that.

Of the remaining four Etrusco-Corinthian finds around the *Vieux Port*, only one has a documented context. A rim piece of a plate with a line on the upper portion (linear decoration and thus unattributed) was documented in excavation II (area 55 on the map). The other three fragments, all plates without preserved decoration, could be from any one of over ten excavations completed by F. Benoit in the ancient port area.15 In the review of the port area in *Les Etrusques en Mer*, Gantes provides dates for the pottery. Unfortunately he only applies dates

---

9 For a sense of the excavations in relation to ancient topography, it may be helpful to note that the *Place Jules Verne*, 42 on the excavation map, is a silted-up harbor space, preserving two later Archaic ships. Many of the excavation labels along the edge of the modern *Vieux Port* are excavations of late Antique or Medieval material, established after the harbor silted up. The *Place Villeneuve Bergamon* would have been at the edge of the ancient coastline.
10 See Long et al. (2002): 99-103 for representative examples of Etruscan material found at the ports of *Jules-Verne* and *Villeneuve Bergamon*.
11 Use of the term “vessel” for the remainder of this thesis should be understood to refer to anything representative of a single vessel of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, which ranges from a single sherd a full vessel. Frere has matched sherds belonging to the same vessel.
to some of the pieces, and the instances where he does assign dates are not consistently based on style or stratigraphy. Consequently, the chronology is not consistent enough to consider questions of staggered arrival, and the dates are so close that the standard rule of a date +/- 10 years for the ware could easily negate the conclusions drawn.

In some ways, the significance of Etrusco-Corinthian ceramics in the port area of Massalia echoes the contribution of the *Cap d’Antibes* shipwreck. The two kylikes in the same stratigraphic context at the dock area of the *Villeneuve Bergamon*, whatever that context translates to, reinforce that the cups were likely transported in multiples rather than as individual items. Departing from the evidence of the homogeneous wreck, however, the Etrusco-Corinthian ceramics around the port are in a context that emphasizes co-existence of Greek and Etruscan ceramics at the Massalia. The Greek and Etruscan pottery found in and around the port is most likely a result of incoming or outgoing ships. In light of shipwrecks such as the early *Giglio* shipwreck and later *Bon Porte* wreck, both of which demonstrate a heterogeneous cargo in which both Greek and Etruscan items could have simultaneously reached the West, the mix of contemporary Greek and Etruscan material is unsurprising. The mix at the *Vieux Port* serves as a reminder that these wares were arriving in Massalia simultaneously and by the same means, possibly even on the same ships. Though Massalia’s primary identity is a Greek colony, it may also be considered a multi-cultural space of *emporion*.

The mix of Etruscan and Greek material extends inland to domestic sites. The majority of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery found at Massalia is found in the first three phases of a domestic site that exhibits such a mix, the *rue de la Cathedrale*, also known as lot 55 (number 14 on the
map).\(^{16}\) The trench is 370m\(^2\) on the North side of the rocky *Butte Saint Laurent*.\(^{17}\) The archaeological material can be divided into five phases in twenty year units (see first three phases in fig. 3.3). Etrusco-Corinthian pottery is found in the three earliest levels of the site (600-540 BCE).

The first phase, 600-580 BCE, dates to the earliest phase of Phocaean settlement. Ceramic material is associated with two small 6.70m x 5m wattle and daub buildings.\(^{18}\) Postholes, circular ashy lenses and a fireplace-pit, along with remaining slag were interpreted by the excavators as indicative of craft production in a domestic space.\(^{19}\) The two buildings of phase 2 are the same NW-SE orientation, but the architecture progresses to include stone foundations with mudbrick walls. A 3.60m x 3.50m “quadrangular” building is built directly above the east end of the west building. A two-room structure to the east is also built over the earlier singular room structure.\(^{20}\) By 550/40 however, the site receives two terrace walls that shift the orientation to the north-south rather than following natural topography. The new orientation is used through the Medieval period.\(^{21}\) These early phases of the site have all been identified as domestic spaces, although the possibility of sacred space has been raised due to the unusual quantities of imported pottery at the site.

\(^{16}\) The remaining two examples of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery are at Ft. Saint Jean, on the Westernmost tip of the promontory, and at Rue de Negrel, which is a site of pottery production starting between 550-525 BCE. Neither sherds are associated with stratigraphy.

\(^{17}\) Gantes (1990): 14-17.

\(^{18}\) See Dietler (2010) 268-278 for wattle and daub versus stone and mudbrick constructions and perceptions of Greek versus indigenous housing.


\(^{20}\) For the spatial summary of the two phases, Gantes (1990): 17.

\(^{21}\) Hesnard et al. (2001): 421.
Of the 35 Etrusco-Corinthian kylikes or plates identified in Marseille excavations, 25 (65.7%) are from the Rue de la Cathedrale excavation. L.F. Gantes processed all imported Archaic pottery at the site.\textsuperscript{22} His study shows that Etrusco-Corinthian pottery is found in all three early phases. Unfortunately, Gantes’ study of the pottery took place prior to Frere’s work, so he discusses fewer pieces of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery than the total of 25 that Frere identified. Despite this, his work still yields valuable information about Etrusco-Corinthian pottery and accompanying imported material:

At the rue de la Cathedrale excavations, both kylikes and plates appear in all three phases, and the number of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery pieces in each phase increases. Gantes identifies a kylix and plate in the first phase, a plate and four kylikes in the second phase, and seven kylikes and one plate in the third phase. The pottery at the site also includes examples from all three periods of production of bird kylikes: the third generation, its followers, and the late cycle. In addition, wares from both Vulci (\textit{kylikes} especially) and Tarquinia (plates and potentially some \textit{kylikes}) are found at this site.\textsuperscript{23} The \textit{aryballos} is notable as the only aryballos at Marseille, as well as the only pot attributed to the Rosoni painter. Though it is an anomaly, it

\textsuperscript{22} Gantes (1999).
\textsuperscript{23} This cannot be determined due to the unknown production sites of the \textit{Codros cycle} and \textit{Maschera Umana} painter as discussed in chapter 1.
does have a documented context and is not an undocumented piece found in storage space, as is the case for some of the closed Etrusco-Corinthian vessels at Saint Blaise.

The chronology assigned to the pottery is problematic: a kylix attributed to the *macchie bianche* painter, stylistically dated from 570-550 BCE but associated with an Attic banded cup with black figures that dates to around 550-525 BCE, and found in the phase three (560-540 BCE) context, demonstrates that the stratigraphic dates and stylistic dates of pottery do not consistently line up. This could mean that the pottery was shipped past dates of production, but also serves as a demonstration of how stylistic dating can be useful to think about progression of iconography and painting, but is not reliable as the sole indicator of the chronology for the contexts of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery’s consumption.

Despite the problem of chronology and a general lack of information that makes it difficult to examine the progression of specific Etrusco-Corinthian pottery groups found in each phase, general conclusions can be drawn. First, Etrusco-Corinthian pottery was exported to Massalia over sixty years since it is found in the excavation site’s first three phases. While we know from the *Cap d’Antibes* shipwreck that the pottery was shipped in groups, the *rue de la Cathedrale* excavation suggests the shipment of the pottery was a repeated occurrence and not limited to just one or two other instances. This continual importation indicates that the pottery wasn’t being shipped to Massalia only during the supposed period of standardization for mass exportation, which would fall around the years 560-540 according to stylistic analysis. The number of bird kylikes does increase over time, but the bird motif is clearly present from the earliest phases of the site. Perhaps a more fitting way to characterize the increase in the production and exportation of the bird kylikes in Etruria is in part as a response to increasing demand for imported drinking vessels abroad.
The Etrusco-Corinthian pottery at the rue de la Cathedrale site is part of a larger corpus of imported fineware that can aid in the consideration of demand and consumption of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, and especially the bird kylikes. According to Gantes’ study, 382/1121 pieces of fineware at the site were imported during the first four phases. This number consistently hovers between 30-35% of the pottery for each phase, with the heaviest concentrations of imports (136 and 156 sherds/vessels respectively) during the middle two periods of 580-560 and 560-540 BCE. The imports are from a spread of Greek regions, including Corinth, Athens, and “East Greek,” as well as from the Etruscan sphere. There is also a range of vessel shapes. The rue de la Cathedrale site preserves multiple closed vessel shapes such as alabastra and aryballoi, pots, and plates or dishes. By far, however, the most imported vessels are various forms of cups: kylikes, skyphoi, “komast cups,” Ionian A2 and B1 cups make up the majority of imported pottery at the site. 51-64.7% of imported vessels for each period are drinking vessels. In the context of the other Greek drinking vessels at the site, it’s clear that the demand and consumption of the Etrusco-Corinthian bird kylikes was part of a larger corpus of imported sympotica.

Whereas the rest of Massalia tends to include heavier concentrations of Greek pottery than Etruscan, the rue de la Cathedrale is atypical in its especially strong showing of Etruscan fineware. Etruscan fineware imports make up approximately 25% of fineware at the site for the first half of the 6th c. BCE, while they only compose approximately 3% of fineware from the first two phases of the rest of Massalia.24 Luc Long has suggested that the unusually high concentration of Etruscan pottery could be indicative of an “Etruscan quarter” or otherwise indicates a place frequented by Etruscans, such as a sanctuary. While the possibility of the latter

24 Gantes (1999), Long et al. (2002): 95. Note that the most present Etruscan import at Massalia is Etruscan amphorae.
is not necessarily ruled out, no evidence remains that could substantiate the presence of a sanctuary in the early years of Massalia’s foundation. The presence of an “Etruscan quarter” is not provable either, but it is worth discussion in light of Massalia’s position as a the major port in the region and the consequent cross-cultural interaction that was very likely to take place there as a result of this.

While the concentration of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery at the rue de la Cathedrale excavation is notable, the existence of the concentration does not necessitate the conclusion that Etruscans must have been living there to use it. Much like the issue of whose ships (Greek or Etruscan?) were sailing goods across the Mediterranean, it is tempting to associate the source of material found as an identifier of the nationality of its consumer. However, just as easily as a Phoenician could be sailing around and distributing Etruscan material, a Greek, Massaliote, Etruscan, or Celt could have been living on the Saint Laurent and displaying his worldliness and elite status through the ownership of a large quantity of exports.

The hypothesis that “Etruscans could be living on the Saint Laurent” fits into the recent trend of scholarship discussed in chapter two that attempts to adjust previous conceptions of the mix of regions taking part in the commerce of the West, and give Etruscans their due credit. It makes sense to look for some of the same emporion characteristics that demonstrate the place of Greeks at overseas ports like Gravisca. At Gravisca, sanctuaries exhibit evidence of Greek integration in Etruscan culture and cult, and this contributes to a strong body of evidence, including text and Greek graffito and names, that places Greeks at the port for conducting commerce. The same sort of evidence is not available for the Etruscans in the western

---

25 The only evidence of monumental sanctuary complex on the hill is a single ionic column capital that dates to the 2nd c. BCE.
26 See Demetriou (2012): 64-104 for Gravisca as an emporion.
Mediterranean during the early 6th century. This does not negate the probability of Etruscan involvement in early maritime exchange though. Although Etruscans cannot be verified as inhabitants in the west, it’s clear that they were participating in the network of exchange from an early point in these interactions. The ceramics at the Rue de la Cathedrale is just one body of evidence that demonstrates this.

Rather than pushing the prominence of one culture over another at the site, it’s more productive to consider the mix of material as a whole to gain a sense of the network of material the west was functioning with. This is not restricted to Massaliotes, Greeks, and Etruscans, as indigenous cultures are also documented as a part of the material mix. The oldest domestic structure at Massalia, found nearby a church on the Saint Lawrence hill at the excavation Église Saint Laurent (#5 on map), is often utilized to highlight the peaceful co-existence of the Greeks and indigenous peoples. The site preserves a three-room building with stone foundations and mudbrick walls. The ceramics include an indigenous urn alongside Massaliote cream monochrome cup bowls, an Etruscan amphora, and imported Corinthian and other Greek ceramics. The indigenous urn especially is interpreted with the Massaliote ware as a demonstration of the interaction of the locals and Massaliote colonists. Beyond this, the accompanying Greek and Etruscan wares at the site support the concept that it was a standard case to have imported wares from a variety of sources. The higher quantities of imported ware at the Ilot de Cathedrale perhaps indicate that the particular domestic context was inhabited by more elite figures.

---

27 Later, ca. late 6th-5th c. BCE, Lattes could be an example of an Etruscan emporion. See Dietler (2010): 138-156 for discussion of indigenous emporia and trade.
28 And receives further support by the Etruscans dominating the amphorae/wine trade during the first half of the century until Massaliotes begin making and dispersing their own wine.
The contexts of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery at Saint Blaise further highlight the consumption of Greek and Etruscan imports by both colonial Massaliotes and local indigenous populations. Saint Blaise, a now-abandoned indigenous site, was primarily excavated by H. Rollands between 1935 and 1970. Past Rolland’s death in 1970, a number of scholars have used Rolland’s records and further explored the site in order to publish finds. Rolland subdivided his excavation by stratigraphic levels (niveaux) that correspond to a 50 year span of time. Etrusco-Corinthian pottery was found in layers he attributed as VII (650-600 BCE), and VI (600-550 BCE), but cases of associated sherds in both levels suggest that the stratigraphy is more mixed than it initially seems.31 This is potentially why the material from the excavation has been processed chronologically en masse by Bouloumie under the overarching Archaic period division “Saint Blaise III” that spans from 600-475 BCE. In addition to the broad assigned chronology, many of the ceramics do not have excavation contexts. Fortunately, from those that do, a few have listed associated objects which give a sense of imported groupings within the domestic contexts at Saint Blaise.

Etrusco-Corinthian pottery found at the Maison des Jarres provides a good idea of the other imported pottery that accompanies the ware at the oppidum. The domestic structure is one of the few Archaic contexts at Saint Blaise that has preserved documentation of excavation and ceramic material.32 Two Etrusco-Corinthian cups are associated with the structure, and both are attributed to the de Codros cycle, and one more specifically to the maniere delle Code annodate.33 The cup attributed to the maniere is associated in context to two oenochoai—one

31 e.g. Etrusco-Corinthian cup fragments attributed to couche VIb2 and couche VII2, in terms of Bouloumie’s terminology/chronology translation. Sourisseau (2003): 61.
33 In different sector areas and not listed as associated objects. Sourisseau 2003 p. 65 for Saint Blaise contexts. Corresponding numbers with Frere’s list: Sourisseau’s #1-1 to #3 attributed by Frere to the maniere delle Code.
Rhodian and the other bucchero, as well as a bucchero *kantharos* and Ionian cup.\textsuperscript{34} Other pottery from the same sectors and stratigraphic layers include Chian kylix fragments of the Middle Wild Goat style,\textsuperscript{35} as well as other bucchero *kantharoi* and Ionian cups. The grouped contexts attest to the fact that Etruscan and Greek pottery were used alongside each other, and the fact that the same types of pottery, i.e. Ionian cups, bucchero, Chian, etc., were being used at both Massalia and Saint Blaise shows that the settlements are receiving imports from the same ships.\textsuperscript{36} The material consequently emphasizes the occurrence of economic interactions between colonists and indigenous populations that are consistent with the conclusions derived from the domestic contexts such as the *Eglise Saint Laurent* and the *rue de la Cathedrale* in Massalia. Though the chronology of the material from Saint Blaise is unfortunately only concretely established to a very broad chronology, the presence of every group of bird cup at the site from the progression of the *epigoni* to the late cycle, suggests that contact is a repeated and standard occurrence.

The import of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery to these western sites must consequently be considered within the same framework of cross-cultural contact and imports. The *rue de la Cathedrale* excavation, as the context with the most representative and documented Archaic evidence including Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, can be utilized for the discussion of the export and production of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery within this exchange structure. Though Etrusco-Corinthian pottery only composes 6.5\% of the fineware imports at the *rue de la Cathedrale* excavation, the ware clearly marks Etruscans asserting themselves in the market to satisfy

\textsuperscript{34} See Rhodian oenochoe entry Sourisseau (2003): 72 , #1-37 (Rhodian) with #1-11 (bucchero) and Etrusco-Corinthian kylix #1-1. The bucchero *oenochoe* is in turn associated with a *kantharos* and Ionian cup.

\textsuperscript{35} Sourisseau (2003): 73, #1-36.

\textsuperscript{36} This is a point already quite solidified because Massalia has the only port through which Saint Blaise could have received imports. The evidence at Saint Blaise confirms the assumption, and also emphasizes that all the groups would have had to interact at some point in order to attain the wares. Pottery in excavation storage from Saint Blaise also confirms this further, as it expands provenances of imported ware to include Corinthian and Massaliote pottery.
demand for imported sympotica. In comparison even to other Etruscan ware, Etrusco-
Corinthian pottery appears to distinctly cater to the demand for cups and banqueting ware. A
discussed in chapter one, the very limited shape and decoration of Etrusco-Corinthian vessels
exported to the west opens discussion of the possibility that production took the overseas market
into account.

The decoration of Etrusco-Corinthian kylikes is a unique instance among the other
imported decorated fineware at Massalia and Saint Blaise. Though slight differences in the
portrayal of birds may be present, the iconography of the cups is overall consistently the same.
This is not the case for Greek imported wares, which display a wide range of styles, provenance,
and decoration. The iconography ranges widely from human figures such as a warrior or a nude
dancer, to animals such as goats or mythological animals like a Corinthian cup with a griffin
decoration. Other than monochrome vessels such as bucchero or Ionian cups (although these can
still display differing overpaint), decorated wares do not demonstrate patterns in decoration.

While the Etrusco-Corinthian bird cups may initially have existed as a singular example
among many decorated cups in the first phase, by the second phase multiple cups with this near-
identical bird decoration are documented, and similarly seven cups have been recovered from the
third phase. The contexts of the cups cannot be associated based on the excavation information
available, so the bird cups within the same phases should not be considered as “sets” that reached
the sites all at once. Much like the other imported Greek ware, the consumption of these cups
was likely as part of the other imported sympotica as an individual, decorated Etruscan import.
This raises questions regarding the knowledge of the consumer and the level with which Etrusco-
Corinthian potters engaged with the overseas demand.

---

37 Bucchero is found in larger quantities, Particularly in phase 2, when 11% of imported ware is bucchero kantharoi. It demonstrates participation in this market through a strong presence of kantharoi in the west, but not as exclusively as Et-C. pottery. Other shapes of bucchero frequently found are oenochoe, urns, lids, mortars, etc. Gantes (1999).
The repeated appearance of the cups at the port and site introduces the question of whether these cups were recognizably “Etruscan” to consumers: were they being imported as a valuable item of import from Etruria, or were they being passed off as a product all the way from Greece? There is no way to concretely answer this question, but the possibility should not be ruled out that if members of the settlement were meeting shipments like the Cap d’Antibes that were distinctly Etruscan in the Vieux Port, the cups may have been recognized and appreciated as Etruscan. Even if this is not the case, the Etruscan decorated fineware still appears on the same plane of association as the Greek ware. It is imported, and thus in a separate class than locally made fineware. The demand for imported sympotica was being repeatedly met in part by the Etruscan exportation of bird cups, and to a lesser extent, the decorated plates.

The “decline” of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as supposedly manifest in the quality of bird decoration on kylikes is thus an unsupported theory in light of the archaeological contexts. The cups cannot be a testament to the poor taste of the western populations or the sub-par quality of Etruscan craftsmanship, as the material is being consumed by the same groups of people who are consuming the Greek imports. And, as just noted, these cups clearly successfully fulfilled demand, because they were continuously imported and used. The distribution of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery among the phases of the rue de la Cathedrale indicates that if anything, the demand for the bird cups as imported sympotica initially increased and then remained steady in the last phases of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. Rather than writing off Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as a subpar imitation of Corinthian ware, as many stylistic analyses do, the Etrusco-Corinthian pottery should be viewed as an example of Etruria actively participating in the Archaic exchange system. As I will discuss in my concluding chapter, this system is multidimensional and demonstrates overarching Mediterranean connections between cultures that are impacting the
nature of exchange and giving it a much more significant purpose than the provision of subsistence commodities. The exchange network was to an extent responding to as well as supporting the construction of Massaliote identity.
4. Conclusions

Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in the western Mediterranean is part of a much larger corpus of imported fineware, both in Gaul and across the Mediterranean more generally. Relatively little is known about how this group of travelling finewares functioned in the exchange system. To date, imported fineware has primarily been considered within a cultural framework of prestige that results from the misconception of pottery as a luxury item,\(^1\) or has been interpreted as representative of the consumer’s identity in some way or another, though it is now commonly acknowledged that pottery is not emblemic of the consumer.\(^2\) The economic aspect of fineware exchange is an arena of analysis that is largely overstated or entirely neglected.

As I have shown throughout my study, Etrusco-Corinthian pottery is a useful representative ware for considering the role of fineware in the exchange structure. It is clear that not all fineware was produced and exported on a horizontal plane of value. This is attested to by the varying quantities of fineware exported: bucchero and Ionian cups are more widely exported throughout the West, whereas smaller quantities of exported painted vessels are found. Etrusco-Corinthian pottery exhibits several qualities that encourage various characterizations of its position of this spectrum of finewares. As a decorated fineware, it would seem to be among the most “valuable” or “luxury” types of pottery in a framework where imported pottery is considered a prestigious item. However, as I discussed in chapter one, the Etruscan production of the pottery has been considered a mark against its value in scholarship of stylistic analysis, and pitches the ware in opposition with the traditional assertion of painted pottery as a more valuable

---

\(^{1}\) Gill (1994): 101-103.

\(^{2}\) Discussion provided in Antonaccio (2005):101-106. Though pottery is no longer considered emblemic, studies from approaches of consumption or hybridity, as discussed in the introduction and chapter 2, still utilize pottery as representative of identity or cultural identity.
ware. Thus the consideration of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in cross-cultural exchange introduces questions not only of the varying values of decorated pottery, but also of a hierarchy of Greek and Etruscan wares and imports. Over the past three chapters, I have considered Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in its contexts of production, transport, and consumption in order to examine the (in)validity of previous assumptions of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery’s value. By utilizing an archaeological context-based approach, the examination of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in Gaul has provided revised understandings of the hierarchy of wares in exchange, and the hierarchy (or lack there-of) of powers in Mediterranean exchange. The analysis of the pottery in the West has also revealed further questions and avenues for future research that would provide even more clarity on the organization of Etruria’s fineware trade.

Due to the solely-stylistic approach of previous scholarship, assessing the value of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as a fineware pottery begins by gauging the demand for the ware. Was Etrusco-Corinthian pottery a declining, standard, middle-class object, as scholarship has portrayed it, or did a lasting demand encourage continued production? As I discussed in chapters one and three, the persisting demand of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery is clearly visible from the analysis of both production in Etruria and consumption in Gaul. Stylistic analysis of trends in production, instead of emphasis upon differences in style, shows that multiple hands were creating the uniform bird kylikes, and that this production continued through multiple stages of the ware until the end phases of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery production. The consistent decoration and vessel shapes that were exported, as well as the continual place of the Etrusco-Corinthian cups and plates among other sympotic vessels in Massalia and Saint Blaise highlights a distinct demand for the Etrusco-Corinthian sympotica from the west. The previous analyses of
Etrusco-Corinthian pottery as a declining ware with a middle-class audience can clearly be judged as unsupported by their basis in aesthetic judgment.

Confronting the assumption of a difference of value between wares from Greece and Etruria, which accompanied these previous interpretations of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, results in questions about ancient reception. To what extent is the Etrusco-Corinthian ware in demand because it was Etruscan, or because it looks Greek? Could and would an ancient consumer make the distinction? The possibility certainly exists that the pottery could be recognized as Etruscan. The evidence of the Cap d'Antibes wreck points to its arrival to the port among a homogeneous Etruscan shipment of goods, which would facilitate its identification. However, examination of the distribution of the ware suggests that this is not a point of utmost importance, despite the emphasis that scholars have placed on hierarchy of cultures and the differences in their material. The Etrusco-Corinthian pottery appears in mixed contexts of Greek, Etruscan, and Massaliote tablewares in each context of southern Gaul. The associated groupings of pottery from the Maison des Jarres at Saint Blaise are especially useful in demonstrating the contemporary use of Greek and Etruscan fineware. The place of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery among these sets of fineware seems to be that of another decorated, imported fineware. There is no evidence to suggest that it carries special prestige because of its Greek appearance, nor evidence of a lesser value due to its Etruscan production.

Instead, it seems that Etrusco-Corinthian pottery in the west was in demand for its contribution to forming a varied, multi-cultural set of sympotica. The extent to which the consumer was able to associate the wares to their specific ethnic identities cannot be determined, but this does not obstruct an overall interpretation of the importance attributed to achieving a visual mix of sympotica. The copious imports of Greek and Etruscan sympotica easily show that
Etrusco-Corinthian pottery was helping to fulfill a demand for imported drinking wares. That this demand wasn’t out of strict necessity for any sort of sympotic wares, but instead out of a desire for an international set, is supported by the continual import of tableware even after Massalia began producing its own. The manner in which Etrusco-Corinthian pottery was distributed also supports this reading. Though the pottery arrived in homogeneous cargos such as the Cap d’Antibes wreck, the archaeological contexts show that it was not used within a “set” of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. Instead, the pottery was dispersed into mixed contexts, so that the bird kylikes, and the occasional Etrusco-Corinthian plate, would make up a piece or two of a varied sympotic set.

Etrusco-Corinthian pottery was distinctly different than black, shiny bucchero, the figural decorations of black-figure Attic ware, and the red and white overpainting on black Ionian cups. The demand from the ware appears to stem from its ability to function as another varied type of imported cup within this mix. Moreover, the evidence of shipwrecks suggests that the mix of sympotica would have been actively sought. In order to achieve a sympotic set that included the variety of styles of Greek, Etruscan, Massaliote, and indigenous pottery, the consumer would have had to collect wares from multiple incoming ships and other local sources. The demand for this mix shows that Etruscan pottery was valued equally among Greek ware. In its function as an import, Etrusco-Corinthian pottery can be viewed as contributing to a set that would allow the consumer to connect to elite sympotic activity of cultures across the Mediterranean.

The extent to which Etruscan potters were aware of this overseas source of demand, and the nature of that demand, is difficult to assess. Out of 391 Etrusco-Corinthian kylikes recovered and identified by Szilagyi, 3 71 (18.5%) are found in the western Mediterranean. In addition, even

---

3 Base number adjusted to include linear decorated kylikes or other examples that are not counted in Szilagyi, based on Frere’s listings of bibliography.
as the quantities of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery declined in final generations, kylikes were one of the few vessel shapes that continued to be produced. Kylikes of the *Maschera Umana* cycle compose approximately a tenth of the 1,050 vessels attributed to the late period of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. These statistics show that a significant portion of the vessel shapes were being exported, which would have supported continued demand in production, but there’s no way to concretely gauge how involved the potters were in the sale or export of their pottery.

The lack of parallels in Corinthian pottery and exports to the Etrusco-Corinthian kylikes suggests that the production of the kylikes was in tandem with at least an awareness of the lack of open Corinthian shapes exported to Etruria. The potters filled that space with the production of the bird kylikes. This could indicate an awareness of the pottery producers to the shipments of pottery, though there is no way to tell whether the production is tied to filling a gap in the receiving end of Corinthian pottery, or whether the production of the kylikes responded to this gap with a specific intent to export and fill the gap in the market for open, Corinthian-style drinking cups. Further provenance analysis of the *Maschera Umana* and *Codros* kylikes would contribute a greater understanding of the role of potters in this overseas economic market. As discussed in chapter one, the more concrete attribution of the groups to a location could inform understanding of the movement of groups. The determination that groups were moving toward areas of port exchange, or a realization of the opposite, would be valuable information for assessing how and where Etrusco-Corinthian pottery was shipped overseas, and would also shed light on the relationship between production and shipping.

Despite the fact that the role of the potter in establishing the exchange market is unknown, the shipping of fineware even in this early period of exchange can be clearly seen to align with an awareness of the overseas market. The homogeneous cargo of fineware on the *Cap*
d’Antibes wreck, both bucchero and Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, as well as the shipment of almost exclusively plates and kylikes to the west suggests that merchants were well aware of the demand for sympotica. In addition, the presence of heterogeneous wrecks demonstrates an acknowledgement that the wares were targeting the same audiences. Clearly, the Greek and Etruscan imports were co-existing in the same cosmopolitan sphere of exchange outlined in chapter two, and neither imports were favored due to associated culture over the other. The evidence points to an awareness of the Etruscans about the overseas market, and an assertion of that knowledge to become a significant group of actors during Archaic exchange.

While the size of the fineware ballast of the Cap d’Antibes wreck is small, it indicates that fineware was an actively circulating sector of exchange from an early period. This didn’t necessarily have to be an economically lucrative aspect of the exchange, but the shipping of fineware occurred with demand and not just as a “filler” object or spare gift exchange item. This establishes that even before the large fineware-filled wreck of the Pointe Lequin 1A, pottery was travelling as a non-subsistence commodity that played an active role in cross-cultural exchange. Some group of actors in Etruria, whether merchants or potters, was clearly aware that fineware was an active part of the exchange system in the west, and asserted Etrusco-Corinthian pottery into this market. Consequently, the analysis of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery and its place in western Gaul not only supports the idea of fineware in early exchange, but also supports the probability of Etruscan agency in a multi-cultural exchange sphere in the west.
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