

PRASUNITZ: Well, as far as Akhziv is concerned, in the city the Cypriot material is very rare, quite insignificant, may be at 1% or even less, and this process goes until the end of the 8th cent. There is a very rapid increase of foreign pottery which is rising to very high percentages (the important is the Greek Attic pottery), and this experience is shared by Prof. Dothan at Acre now. I was going to ask actually what sort of grey-burnished wares you have, because I showed to one of our Spanish friends a piece of a grey-burnished impressed ware and he said, it looks exactly like a Spanish piece. It is probably 7th cent. And in the course of today or tomorrow I was going to ask that question, what your grey-burnished ware really looks like. Because this is supposed to be a Spanish piece and I found it in Akhziv. It is definitely a good ware, it's a slip which is varnished, and I think the edge had some sort of incised or impressed decoration near the rim but on the globular part of the body.

COLDSTREAM: Perhaps the area of Greek enclaves goes round the corner of the Mediterranean as far as Soloi in Cilicia. I have two reasons of this suggestion, although Soloi has never been excavated below the Roman levels as far as I know. First, the later memories concerning a Rhodian colony there⁴³. Surely no Greek colonists would have been allowed to settle there after the Assyrians had annexed Cilicia in 709. Secondly, there is the large number of Greek imports at Tarsus a few miles inland from Soloi, starting with pendent-semicircle skyphoi like those illustrated by Prof. Riis. They must have been conveyed there through a coastal outpost. Possibly the ridicule poured on the Soloikoi for their outlandish *soloikismoi* may have been the consequence of living in a beleaguered outpost of Hellenism, cut off at an early stage from contact with other Greeks.

Abbildungsangabe:

Abb. 1, 3, 13: Zeichnung des Verf.; Abb. 2: AnatSt 9, 1959, 165; Abb. 4: Sūkās I 159 Abb. 54; Abb. 5: Sūkās I 160 Abb. 55; Abb. 6: Sūkās I 153 Abb. 51; Abb. 7: Sūkās I 163 Abb. 57; Abb. 8: IEJ 20, 1970, 184 Abb. 2; Abb. 9: JHS 58, 1938 Plan 3; Abb. 10: Megiddo I 62 Abb. 72; Abb. 11: Sūkās I 59 Abb. 19; Abb. 12: Sūkās VI 19 Abb. 41, 43.

43 See Polybius XXI 24, 10 and Strabo XIV 671.

Phonizier im Westen (1982)
H.G. Nieweyer (ed.)
Vlag Philip ben Zabeen Mainz
JOHN NICOLAS COLDSTREAM

Greeks and Phoenicians in the Aegean¹

As one of the Hellenists in this company, I am very glad to have this opportunity of discussing the Aegean as seen through Phoenician eyes. The Aegean world, in the context of the general theme of our Symposium, forms the central part of that long maritime route between the homeland of the Phoenicians and their western outposts in Sicily, in Sardinia, in Africa, and in Spain. The period of which I shall speak coincides with the first great expansion of the Phoenicians into the western Mediterranean, and its immediate antecedents – that is to say, the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. I begin by making one fundamental assumption: that any Phoenicians sailing to the western Mediterranean would have been foolish to avoid the Aegean altogether²; the only alternative route within sight of land would have taken them along the north African shore where there are hardly any good harbours for staging posts, where no anchorage could protect them from the north wind, and where there was danger of running aground in the sands of the Syrtes.

Fourteen years ago I read a paper on almost the same topic to various local societies in the United Kingdom³. In those days my title, Phoenicians in the Aegean, had to be followed by a question mark. I had first become involved in the subject during a period of extreme scepticism. This scepticism, in its turn, was the child of an earlier period of uncritical belief in ancient Greek authors from Herodotus onwards; authors who inform us that in early times the Phoenicians had indeed established themselves in permanent settlements on various Aegean islands: Rhodes, Thera,

1 I thank the Managing Committee of the British School at Athens for permission to describe and discuss new finds from the School's excavations at Lefkandi and Knossos, in advance of their final publication. The excavators of Lefkandi, Messrs. M. R. Popham and L. H. Sackett, have kindly supplied me with particulars of the small finds from the cemeteries and photographs for Taf. 25, 26a, d; and I am also grateful to Dr. R. A. Higgins for allowing me to consult and refer to his discussion of these finds in the volume Lefkandi I, which is now in press (April 1979). For permission to reproduce other illustrations I am indebted to the Agora Exca-

variations (Taf. 26b), to the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Athens (Taf. 26c), and to Professor J. Boardman (Taf. 26c, 27f).

2 Abbreviations, other than those in general use:

GG = J. N. Coldstream, *Geometric Greece* (1977)

GGP = J. N. Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery* (1968)

LSAG = L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (1961)

2 GGP 389f.

3 This paper was incorporated in my discussion of Phoenicians in GGP chapter 14.

Thasos, and Kythera, among others⁴. These Phoenicians were first thought to explain any features in early Aegean art which seemed oriental; thus Orientalizing pottery, Geometric pottery⁵, and even the Mycenaean treasures of Schliemann⁶, have all been called Phoenician at some time during the nineteenth century. But, in the first half of this century, as the study of Greek art advanced, so the claims for Phoenician penetration quickly receded. Excavation failed to produce the slightest trace of Phoenician settlement, either at the places mentioned by Herodotus, or anywhere else in the Greek homeland. So the impact of the Phoenicians on Greek civilisation, in the minds of many scholars, was drastically reduced. There was still the transmission of alphabetic writing, which no one could deny; otherwise there were a few imported objects, calling to mind the Phoenician visitors in the Odyssey, who hawked their trinkets in Greek waters; and there were certain eastern influences which transformed the course of Greek art in the late eighth and seventh centuries, thereby confirming the high regard for Phoenician craftsmanship implied in various other passages in the Homeric poems. But in the 1930's, scepticism went even further. Art historians of the Near East argued that Phoenician art was itself highly derivative, and had much less effect on the Greeks than the stronger and more individual art of north Syria. And then came the discovery of Al Mina, the Levantine emporium founded in the late ninth century⁷, and containing a small enclave of resident Greek merchants from the very beginning. Thus many Hellenists came to believe that, after the Greek Dark Age, the recovery of contact with the Orient should be attributed almost entirely to the initiative of the Greeks in the Levant. Through Al Mina they could have succumbed to the influence of north Syrian art; at Al Mina they might have learned alphabetic writing from resident Phoenician neighbours⁸; at Al Mina they might even have heard the oriental myths incorporated in Hesiod's Theogony⁹; at Al Mina they could have purchased not only the oriental imports found in Greece, but also the raw materials of gold and ivory¹⁰ for their craftsmen to produce orientalizing luxuries at home.

And so the role of the Phoenician trader in the Aegean was in danger of disappearing altogether. In a book published in 1961, Chester G. Starr, one of the latest of the sceptics, put his case by analogy with other periods. "The Mycenaean Greeks" he says "sought out Syria and Egypt, rather than the reverse; the same pattern was true in later, classical times. . . : there are no logical grounds" he continues "for postulating an inverse flow during the eighth century alone"¹¹. Now let us grant that Greece is poor in raw materials, especially in most metallic ores; for this reason alone, there was greater urgency for Greeks to travel eastwards than for orientals to visit them. Yet, for the period under discussion, Starr's view is a Hellenocentric one, which ignores the Phoenician movement to the western Mediterranean – a movement which, as we have seen, cannot have

- 4 For the most recent survey of Greek literary evidence concerning the Phoenicians, see G. Bunnens, *L'expansion phénicienne en Méditerranée* (1979) 92ff.
- 5 See R. M. Cook, *Greek painted pottery* (1972) 297, 302ff.
- 6 See W. A. McDonald, *The discovery of Homeric Greece* (1968) 71f.
- 7 JHS 58, 1938, 1ff. 133ff.; JHS 60, 1940, 2ff.; on the foundation date see J. du Plat Taylor, *Iraq* 21, 1959, 91 and cf. GGP 312.
- 8 ISAG 11f.; R. M. Cook – A. G. Woodhead, *AJA* 63, 1959, 175ff.; cf., however, Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (1976) 26.
- 9 M. L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony* (1966) 18ff.; P. Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East* (1966) 122ff.
- 10 K. R. Maxwell-Hyslop, *Western Asiatic Jewellery* (1971) 230, on gold from the Melas valley near Al Mina; on the complete elephant's tusk found at Al Mina, J. Boardman, *JHS* 85, 1965, 13 n. 28.
- 11 C. G. Starr, *The origins of Greek civilization, 1100–650 B.C.* (1961) 214.

bypassed the Aegean altogether. But the strongest reason for dropping the question mark from my title is the new knowledge obtained from recent excavations, concerning not only the Phoenicians themselves, but also the most active of the Greeks with whom they had dealings – that is to say, the Euboeans. In many respects, these two peoples were curiously similar to one another. Like the Phoenicians, the Euboeans too were compelled by a shortage of arable land to take an active part in maritime commerce and colonization. As traders, both peoples were energetic middlemen, frequently meeting one another in most parts of the Mediterranean, except perhaps the extreme west; thus the record of Tyre, Kition, and Motya is complementary to that of Eretria, Lefkandi, Pithekoussai, and eastern Sicily. Both peoples were middlemen, too, in art, preferring to imitate existing fashions rather than creating their own – and this has often led to considerable doubts over the accurate diagnosis of their artifacts, especially since both peoples are still better known in their overseas outposts than in the metropolitan settlements; for Tyre, Sidon, and Chalcis are largely covered by modern cities. Nevertheless, two books forthcoming in 1979 should help to remedy this situation. The first is by Patricia Bikai¹², presenting the results of an excavation at Tyre, with a continuous sequence from the Late Bronze Age to the seventh century containing many Greek imports. The second is the volume dealing with the early Iron Age at the large Euboean site of Lefkandi, excavated and published by my colleagues of the British School at Athens, Mervyn Popham and Hugh Sackett¹³.

In reviewing the archaeological evidence for Phoenicians in the Aegean, I shall deal separately with their two different functions, remembered in the anachronistic¹⁴ passages of Homer: first the Phoenicians as traders, and then the Phoenicians as craftsmen. I hope to show that both kinds of evidence take us back to a period considerably earlier than the first commercial ventures of the Greeks at Al Mina or anywhere else in the Levant. Four Aegean sites, all of them cemeteries, are especially important for these early signs of eastward contact. First, the well-known Kerameikos cemetery of Athens, with its group of rich aristocratic graves just south of the river Eridanos, mainly of the ninth century¹⁵ – and there is an equally aristocratic plot of graves of the same period on the north slope of the Areopagus. Secondly, the three Dark Age cemeteries of Lefkandi in Euboea, known as Skoubris, Tumba, and Palaia Perivolia; these graves form a continuous sequence from the eleventh century down to about 830, ending with an outstandingly rich group of burials. Thirdly, in Crete, the northern cemetery of Knossos, a cemetery of collective chamber tombs which now prove to extend almost continuously from one of the Fortetsa groups published by J. K. Brock¹⁶ as far as the outlying village of Teke. During the rescue excavations of the last four years, well over eighty more chamber tombs have been cleared by the British School at Athens in this area, first at Teke, and then (only last year) on the site chosen by the new University of Crete for its Medical Faculty. Especially important for us is Teke tomb J, the unplundered chamber which produced the bronze bowl with a Phoenician inscription, among sixty Protogeometric pots¹⁷. My fourth site is the Seraglio cemetery of Cos, excavated by the Italian School at Athens but

- 12 P. Bikai, *The pottery of Tyre* (1979).
- 13 M. R. Popham – L. H. Sackett, *Lefkandi I, BSA Suppl. Vol. 11* (1980).
- 14 That they are anachronistic has been clearly demonstrated by J. D. Muhly, *Berytus* 19, 1970, 19ff.; cf. GGP 390 and Bunnens op. cit. (n. 4 supra) 97ff.
- 15 K. Kübler, *Kerameikos V* 1 graves 2, 38, 41–43.
- 16 J. K. Brock, *Fortetsa* (BSA Suppl. Vol. 2) 1, tombs L, TFT. II; others marked in M. S. F. Hood, *Archaeological survey of the Knossos area nos. 21–2, 25–7*.
- 17 H. W. Catling, *Arch. Reports* 1977, 12ff. figs. 22–31.

not yet fully published; hence comes the only continuous sequence in the Dodecanese for the early Iron Age, including a series of Cypro-Phoenician imports from the middle of the ninth century onwards; and in the eighth century there are many more imports of this nature from Ialysos in Rhodes.

Looking at these four places from a Phoenician point of view, we can make a broad geographical distinction. Crete and the Dodecanesian islands lie on obvious trade routes, offering points of entry into the Aegean, and also many useful staging posts for ships on their way further west. Athens and Lefkandi, on the other hand, seem more like terminal points, thought worth a detour for their own sakes. It is no accident that, when Greek wares begin to travel outside the Aegean, the exported pottery comes from Euboea and Attica, the commercially active parts of the Aegean; meanwhile, the Cretans and the Dodecanesians export no pottery, but wait to receive the oriental visitors who must inevitably pass their way.

Let us now examine a selection of the Levantine imports in Aegean contexts, none of them later than the arrival of the Greeks at Al Mina, and most of them datable to the middle of the ninth century. For a long time almost the only known object in this category was the Syro-Phoenician bronze bowl from Kerameikos grave 42¹⁸, which is also the earliest known oriental bowl with embossed figured decoration inside. Then, in 1967, came the discovery of the Rich Lady of the Areopagus¹⁹. Her massive gold earrings are probably local work, and we shall consider them in another context; but among her other goods are a large Phoenician bead of variegated glass, in a necklace also containing over a thousand faience discs. But these Athenian finds are now far surpassed, in quantity and quality, by the contemporary imports found in the cemeteries of Lefkandi. In faience, several thousands of these disc beads come from one grave²⁰. From another, a necklace consists of fifty-three faience figurines in the form of a lion-headed goddess, itself a Phoenician variation on an Egyptian type (Taf. 25a, left and right)²¹; the centrepiece is the figure of Isis nursing the infant Horus (Taf. 25a, centre). Another Lefkandi grave produced a grotesque figure, much worn, but recognizable as Ptah-Seker-Osiris (Taf. 25b)²²; there are parallels among the faiences offered to Athena at Lindos²³, but before the discovery of the Lefkandi cemeteries, no one would have ventured to date the Lidian figurines as early as the ninth century.

The Lefkandi graves have also yielded three Levantine seals of considerable interest. One, in steatite, is a four-sided prism representing a shrine (Taf. 25c.1)²⁴, with intaglios on all four sides – a prowling lion, a bird, two recumbent lions and on the fourth side, two standing men; in the same dry, Egyptianizing style is another import, a pyramidal seal in faience found in a contemporary grave at Ialysos²⁵. The second seal, also in steatite, takes the form of a recumbent lion (Taf. 25c.2),

and the third is a faience scarab mounted in gold (Taf. 25d)²⁷, which bears garbled Egyptian hieroglyphs in its intaglio underneath.

The Lefkandi finds which I have so far mentioned belong to the final generation of the cemeteries, c. 860–830; yet some oriental imports already occur in a considerably earlier grave, Palaia Perivolia no. 22. It is dated by Attic Protogeometric imports to the late tenth century. There is also a Cypriot flask of Bichrome II, the oldest Iron Age vessel from that island to reach the Aegean²⁸. It is surely no coincidence that this is also a time of revival in the Aegean Bronze industry, after a lapse during the earlier part of the Dark Age²⁹. With the recovery of communications with Cyprus, a supply of copper was assured. But Cyprus may have supplied more than just the raw material: for in the same generation as this grave belong the mould fragments from the Lefkandi settlement, bearing the impressions of a false-spiral design which recalls the legs of the widely-exported Cypriot rod tripods³⁰.

To return to the same grave: it also contains the first objects in gold from anywhere in the Aegean for over a century: two finger rings, and a pair of very thick spiral hair ornaments in lead covered with gold, probably imports from the east³¹. During the last two generations of the cemeteries, the frequency of gold at Lefkandi is really striking, and greater than anywhere else in Greece at the time, occurring in at least twenty graves. The forms are finger rings, earrings, pendants, hair spirals, diadems, headresses, one fibula, and bracelets for children with bronze core. Although the material must have come from the eastern Mediterranean, many of the ornaments must have been made in local workshops: the fibula, for example, is a rather old-fashioned adaptation of the Mycenaean violin-bow type, and one pair of earrings takes the form of tightly-packed spirals of wire reminiscent of Macedonian work³². The finger rings, however, are chiefly of Cypriot type³³, especially those with convex profile, and with one or more carinations. One of the most striking pendants (Taf. 26a)³⁴ is of very fine quality, and could well be Phoenician work; it is drop-shaped, made of rock crystal, furnished with a gold collar, and a gold lining inside.

Such, then, is the evidence for Phoenician traders in Aegean waters during the hundred years before the foundation of Al Mina, at a time when Greek exports to the eastern Mediterranean were still very rare³⁵. The oriental goods supplied to Lefkandi consist largely of faience trinkets; gold was also provided in some quantity, sometimes as finished artifacts, sometimes as raw material to be worked locally. These oriental luxuries imply more than a single chance visit; their contexts, spread as they are over a whole century, surely indicate regular commercial exchange, if only on a small scale. What, then, had the Greeks to offer in exchange? For Attica one possible answer is the silver from the Laurion mines, which was indeed being processed at just this time in the nearby settlement of Thorikos³⁶. Silver is hard to obtain in the eastern Mediterranean; and, according to

- 27 Lefkandi I pl. 235d, Tumba grave 36.20; Arch. Reports 1971, 8 fig. 10, left; Archaeology 25, 1972, 19.
- 28 Lefkandi I, Palaia Perivolia grave 22.19; Archaeology 25, 1972, 17.
- 29 A. M. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece* (1971) 237ff.; GG 41.
- 30 Excavations at Lefkandi, Euboea, 1964–66 (1968), preliminary report 28f. fig. 67.
- 31 Lefkandi I, Palaia Perivolia grave 22.33, 34.
- 32 Lefkandi I, Tumba grave 13.15–17; Arch. Reports 1970, 9 fig. 13; GG 42 fig. 10.
- 33 SCE I pl. 155 nos. 16, 19, 20.
- 34 Lefkandi I pl. 234c, cf. Tumba grave 31.19.
- 35 Two Euboean (?) Protogeometric vessels exported to Amathous, Desborough, JHS 77, 1957, 214ff. fig. 4; for ninth-century exports to Tell Abu Hawam (Euboean?) and Megiddo (Attic) see GGP 302ff.
- 36 J. Bingen, *Thorikos III* (1965) 31ff.

- 18 Kerameikos V I, 237f. pl. 162.
- 19 E. L. Smithson, *Hesperia* 37, 1968, 77ff.; on gold, ivory, faience, and glass, see 82f. 111ff.
- 20 Lefkandi I, Tumba grave 27.16.
- 21 Op. cit. pl. 233d. e; Tumba grave 22.28.
- 22 Op. cit. pl. 235a, Tumba grave 32.17.
- 23 C. Blinkenberg, *Lindos I* 340ff. nos. 1216–26.
- 24 Lefkandi I pl. 235e, Tumba grave 36.21; Arch. Reports 1971, 8 fig. 10, centre; Archaeology 25, 1972, 19.
- 25 CIRh VIII 164 no. 14 fig. 151.
- 26 Lefkandi I pl. 235c, Tumba grave 27.15; Arch. Reports 1971, 8 fig. 10, right; Archaeology 25, 1972, 19.

Herodotus, the quest for this metal later attracted the Phoenicians as far as the northern extremity of the Aegean, to the mines of Thasos³⁷. Euboea has no similar attractions, but a convincing argument has been put forward by Desborough³⁸ that the Euboeans themselves were already commercially active over a wide area, from the shores of Macedonia and Thessaly to the northern Cyclades; this theory is based on the wide diffusion of a common pottery style with its centre in Euboea, and might also account for the evident prosperity of Lefkandi indicated by the range and the quality of the oriental imports.

And yet one wonders whether these exchanges were exclusively commercial. When Greeks of any period are confronted with sophisticated foreign models, it is not long before they conceive the wish to emulate these models and eventually to surpass them; but sometimes the foreign techniques are too difficult to be learned without a teacher. A good example is the technique of granulation, a technique forgotten in Greece since the fall of Mycenaean civilisation. Its first reappearance is in a pair of gold earrings from Lefkandi, datable to the second quarter of the ninth century (Taf. 26d)³⁹. Their design, with three pendent clusters of granules, is wholly oriental; but they will also have a considerable interest for Homeric scholars, being by far the most plausible prototypes for the earrings worn by the goddess Hera and also by Penelope – earrings adorned with *triglena morienta*, three clusters of drops resembling mulberries. Since the corresponding Mycenaean type has only one cluster, it follows that these passages must be added to the list of Homeric anachronisms, referring to oriental finery of the poet's own day⁴⁰. In this pair, however, the granulation is not very skilfully done, the granules being large and clumsily attached; this looks like the work of a local beginner, following a Phoenician model, and, in view of the difficulty of the technique, instructed by a visiting Phoenician craftsman. After this experimental beginning, progress was very rapid indeed. Hardly any later are the superb Athenian earrings worn by the Rich Lady of the Areopagus (Taf. 26b)⁴¹, adorned with elaborate designs in granulation and filigree. Here the Phoenician element is confined to the pendent pomegranates with their granulated calyx leaves; on the other hand the angular plates, with their zoned ornament, conform to local Geometric taste, and the S-pattern can be matched on contemporary Greek fibulae⁴². Nevertheless, the later Geometric jewellery of Greece still preserves a strong Phoenician character, strong enough to suggest the residence of a few master jewellers from the eastern Mediterranean, especially in Attica and Crete. A well-known pair of granulated earrings (Taf. 26e)⁴³ was buried around 800 with another lady of high rank, at Eleusis. Her most exotic possession, after which her grave has been named, was a figurine of Isis in Egyptianizing faience⁴⁴; to judge from her unusually copious offerings, the lady herself may well have served the related deity, Demeter, as a priestess of the local cult. Her earrings follow the oriental crescent form, and no less oriental are the cloisons for inlays, which are of rock crystal and amber. And yet the form has no precise parallels in the Levant, and the amber must be of northern origin; so, once again, these seem to be the work of Attic smiths,

37 Hdt. vi. 47; cf. A. J. Graham, BSA 73, 1978, 88ff.

38 V. Desborough, *The background to Euboean participation in early Greek maritime enterprise*, in: *Tribute to an antiquary: Essays presented to Marc Fitch*, ed. F. Emmison and R. Stephens (1976) 25ff.

39 Lefkandi I pl. 231d, Troumba grave 5.10.11.

40 See C. Kardara, AJA 65, 1961, 62ff.

41 Hesperia 37, 1968, 113 no. 77 pls. 30, 32; Higgins, BSA 64, 1969, 144f. pl. 34j, k.

42 Cf. A. Greifenhagen, *Schmuckarbeiten in Edelmetall I* (1970) pl. 4, 5.

43 AEphem 1898 pl. 6; BSA 64, 1969, 145f. pl. 35b.

44 AEphem 1898 pl. 6.1; cf. GG 79f.

on this occasion learning both style and technique from oriental teachers. Starting from the earrings of the Isis grave, Higgins has succeeded in tracing the subsequent work of this orientaling Eleusis School right down to the late eighth century⁴⁵.

The corresponding Cretan school begins with the treasure of Teke, buried with the first occupant of a reused Minoan tholos tomb at the northern edge of the main Knossian cemetery⁴⁶. The ornaments were found undisturbed in two plain pots, sunk in small cavities below the floor and just inside the chamber. For a native Cretan, such luxuries would have been placed inside the cremation urn; as Boardman has shown⁴⁷, the idea of burying them separately, in a foundation deposit to sanctify the tomb, is as oriental as the character of the jewellery. Furthermore, the treasure includes many gold and silver dumps, unworked, suggesting that the dead person was himself a master-jeweller who came from the Levant to teach and practise his art at Knossos; at his funeral, his stock-in-trade was buried with him. His masterpieces are the two large pendants, which would have been far beyond the technical capacity of the local craftsmen without oriental assistance. One pendant is yet another lavish improvisation on oriental themes, combining crescent forms, strip cloisons for inlays, and patterns in granulation and filigree (Taf. 26c). The inlay materials hint at the sun-and-moon imagery of the original oriental conception – amber for the sun discs, and rock crystal for the huge central crescent. A second pendant, even more elaborate, is framed by a crescent enclosing a cross, covered in cloisons outlined with granulated dots, and taking the form of oriental cables; but perhaps there is some concession to local taste in the Geometric-looking birds, and in the rather triangular female heads wearing flat polos crowns. These ladies remind us of the curious reincarnation of the Minoan snake goddess on a contemporary Knossian cremation urn (Taf. 27b)⁴⁸; and at this point we should also observe the strong impact of oriental metal and ivory motifs, such as the cable, the spiral, and other freehand curvilinear designs, on the contemporary local pottery of Knossos and central Crete: an impact which was felt in no other local school at this time, when austere Geometric ornament was elsewhere the universal rule. This style is seen at its most ebullient during J. K. Brock's Proto-geometric B phase; there follows, at the end of the ninth century, a brief Early Geometric stage, not always easy to distinguish from its predecessor⁴⁹, but so named because of the few Geometric rectilinear motifs which begin to mingle with the wild curvilinear decoration of eastern origin.

To return to the Teke treasure: a third ornament of great interest is the diadem of sheet gold. The diadem is another form of oriental finery which made its first appearance at Athens, Lefkandi, and Knossos⁵⁰ during the middle of the ninth century. Local versions were quickly evolved, at first decorated with nothing but simple Geometric motifs, but eventually – in Late Geometric times – with animal and human scenes. Here it was the Attic smiths who led the way, with animal friezes borrowed from larger matrices designed perhaps for the facing of funerary jewel-boxes⁵¹, and perhaps already at several removes from the oriental originals. But in the ninth century we know

45 Higgins, BSA 64, 1969, 146ff.

46 R. W. Hutchinson, BSA 49, 1954, 215ff.; J. Boardman, BSA 62, 1967, 57ff. 68f. A and B, pls. 7, 8.

47 Boardman art. cit. 58, 63.

48 Fortetsa no. 1440 pls. 77, 163; GGP pl. 51g.

49 Cf. J. N. Coldstream in: *Stele Kondoleonos* (1979) 408ff.

50 The oldest diadem from Knossos (Fortetsa no. 336 pl. 21) is from a mid-ninth-century context, and may be a Cypriot import.

51 D. Ohly, *Griechische Goldbleche des 8. Jhs. v. Chr.* (1953) 53ff. pls. 15, 16.

of only two figured diadems, and both are oriental work. One is a Phoenician import from a very late grave at Lefkandi; it is not well preserved, but a lively animal scene can just be made out.⁵² The other is the diadem from the Teke treasure, perhaps made locally, but wholly oriental in style and theme: two Mesopotamian heroes, perhaps Gilgamesh and Enkidu, stand back to back as each one slays a lioness (Taf. 26f). This diadem has a double importance for the later history of the Cretan school. It gave the local craftsmen an early glimpse of eastern mythological imagery; and it helped to start a local Knossian tradition of figured metalwork, which continues in a semi-hellenized style all through the eighth century, seen for example in the bronze reliefs from Fortetsa and Kavousi, and on some of the bronze votive shields from the cave shrine on Mount Ida.⁵³

And so, in our search for Phoenicians in the Aegean, we must add the resident craftsman to the visiting trader. It was Dunbabin⁵⁴ who first suggested this explanation for the persistence of oriental features in the Idaean shields of the eighth and seventh centuries; and his hypothesis has more recently been applied to the much earlier oriental expertise of Attic and Cretan jewellery beginning in the ninth century. We need not suppose that these eastern craftsmen dwelt apart from the local population, working in exclusive guilds; on the contrary, to judge from the speed with which their techniques were assimilated in Attica and Crete, there is every reason to think that they at once shared their expertise with their Greek pupils, merging quite quickly with their new environment, and eventually passing on their craft to their Hellenized sons and grandsons. It may well have been the presence of these master-craftsmen in the Aegean, and the admiration which their skills had earned for them among the Greeks, which gave rise to the anachronistic references to Phoenician craftsmanship in the Homeric poems.

One other form of Phoenician enterprise, involving both traders and craftsmen, can be reconstructed from the archaeological record. I refer to the imports and the local imitations in the Aegean of various Cypro-Phoenician fabrics, mainly in the Dodecanese and in Crete. The shapes in question are always closed, and usually slow-pouring vessels, suitable as containers for unguents; the most frequent form is the small Black-on-Red juglet. This activity begins in the second half of the ninth century soon after the foundation of the Tyrian colony at Kition, which would have served the Phoenician traders as a forward base.

The earliest Black-on-Red imports occur in the Seraglio cemetery on Cos, soon after 850. Presumably the juglets were imported for their contents of unguents – the sort of commodity which, during the Late Bronze Age, the Mycenaeans had exported in the other direction in their small stirrup-jars. Very soon the Coan potters produced local imitations, decorated in the Middle Geometric style of eastern Greece⁵⁵; but if they, too, contained unguents, it would seem that the Phoenicians had by now set up a small unguent factory on Cos, and were bottling their produce locally with the assistance of Greek potters. The same pattern can be traced at Knossos, starting in about 800. First, the demand was created through imports, and later it was satisfied by unguents locally bottled in a small factory staffed by resident Phoenicians. These specialists would have made themselves at home among an outward-looking community which had already received the Teke goldsmith and other eastern master-craftsmen in the various kinds of metalwork. The

52 Lefkandi I, Tomba grave 33.7.

53 J. N. Coldstream, *Sphinxes and Griffins from Geometric Knossos*, in: *Antichità Cretesi. Studi in onore di Doro Levi II* (1978) 164; GG 284ff. figs. 92a, 93a.

54 T. J. Dunbabin, *The Greeks and their eastern neighbours*, JHS Suppl. 8 (1957) 41.

55 GGP pl. 59b, c.

containers for the unguents, as in Cos, were made by local potters, rather clumsily at first, but after 750 with the same professional crispness which distinguishes the Cypro-Phoenician originals⁵⁶.

By this time, however, a new pattern begins to emerge at Ialysos in Rhodes. There the local imitations begin to assume a much more oriental look, following their eastern prototypes in fabric and decoration as well as in shape⁵⁷. In addition to Black-on-Red forms, we now see faithful copies of the Red Slip mushroom-topped flask (Taf. 27a). It would appear that the unguent factory on Ialysos was now employing eastern potters, and this is also the impression given by another new form of container, based on the Cypriot White Painted IV juglet which itself follows a North Syrian prototype with a polished yellow surface. The Rhodian imitation ignores the traditional ridge on the neck, but reproduces the spaghetti-like ornament of the Cypriot version, and often emulates the shiny surface of the North Syrian original. In the Aegean, and in the newly-founded western Greek colonies, this form enjoyed a wide distribution second only to its contemporary the Early Protocorinthian globular aryballos; but its extraordinary frequency in Pithekoussai, where over eighty examples have been found, calls for a special explanation⁵⁸. At all events, Rhodes continued to receive immigrant Phoenician craftsmen long after 700; only in this way can we account for the establishment of a local industry in orientaling faience objects, which flourished greatly in Archaic times⁵⁹. Rhodes, the nearest Aegean island to the Phoenician homeland, was also the island where traces of a Phoenician community lasted longer than in any other part of Greece⁶⁰.

Of all the skills which the Greeks learned from the Phoenicians, immeasurably the greatest is the mastery of alphabetic writing after four centuries of illiteracy (Abb. 1). This skill could not have been learned through imports bearing Phoenician graffiti, or even through brief contacts in the course of casual trade. The minimum requisite is that either one literate Phoenician should be living among Greeks, or that one Greek should have learned to write among a community of literate Phoenicians. In the days of extreme scepticism concerning Phoenicians in the Aegean, it was the second alternative which was more frequently aired. Al Mina, with its mixture of Euboean and Phoenician merchants, was thought to have been a likely place for the transmission, partly on the grounds that it was the merchants who had most to gain from the acquisition of literacy. Against this theory, one should observe that not a single early Greek graffiti was actually found at Al Mina⁶¹; illiterate traders have flourished from time immemorial; and when we consider the eighth-century graffiti found in Greece, not a single one has any obvious connection with commerce: any text long enough to have meaning either establishes the ownership of a vessel, or refers to various social occasions in hexameter verse⁶².

So the time has come to reconsider the other hypothesis, that the transmission occurred somewhere in Greece; for it follows from our previous discussion that any intelligent Greek of the eighth century has no need to travel as far as Al Mina to acquire his alphabet. In Attica, in Euboea, in Crete, and in the Dodecanese, Phoenician specialists of various kinds had made themselves at

56 J. N. Coldstream, *Some Cypriote traits in Cretan pottery, c. 950–700 B.C.*, in: *The relations between Cyprus and Crete, 2000–500 B.C.*, International Symposium, 1978 (1979).

57 J. N. Coldstream, *The Phoenicians of Ialysos*, BICS 16, 1969, 2ff.

58 D. Ridgway in: *XVIII Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia*, Taranto 1978.

59 Dunbabin op. cit. (n. 54 supra) 49; V. Webb, *Archaic Greek Faience* (1978).

60 For Phoenician inscriptions in Rhodes of Hellenistic date see P. M. Fraser, *BSA* 65, 1970, 31ff.

61 P. J. Riis, *Sikās* 1 158 n. 642, mentions a Greek graffiti of c. 600 from Sikās.

62 LSAG pl. 1, 1–2; pl. 47, 1; pl. 67, 1; GG chapter 11.

To advance this debate, we now have a helpful new source of evidence: several cursive Phoenician graffiti of the relevant period have been discovered in recent years, sometimes in a Greek context⁶³. It had long been recognized that the alphabet must have been transmitted in a cursive rather than in a monumental form; yet, for information on cursive Semitic letters, previous research had to rely to some extent on non-Phoenician sources, such as the Israelite ostraka of the reign of Jeroboam II from Samaria. Now, this may no longer be necessary. For example, the *yōd* on Samarian ostraka used to be quoted as the nearest equivalent of the crooked *iota* in the early Attic and Cretan scripts⁶⁴; but now we have a closer model in the ninth-century graffito from the sanctuary of Astarte at Kition⁶⁵, where the cross-bar has already become detached, leaving the curved stem to be copied by the Greeks. Also worth noting is the *wāw*, with a vertical stem and a hook to the left – the nearest parallel to the earliest Attic and Euboean form of *upsilon*. Now I am not suggesting that the Greek alphabet was born in Kition; for although Attic and Euboean exports from the late ninth century onwards⁶⁶ suggest that the Phoenician colony was occasionally visited by Aegean traders, there is no sign of any Aegean residents. We should, however, remember that Kition is the most likely origin for the Phoenician unguent merchants who established factories in Rhodes, Cos, and Crete.

Another recent discovery has such a surprising context that I must first quote the dating evidence: I refer to the inscribed bronze bowl from the unlooted Knossian chamber, Teke tomb J. The use of the bowl must go back into the tenth century, since nearly half the pots on the chamber floor are Attic imports of Late Protogeometric, twenty-six in all. But the two burials in the tomb must have been separated by about a generation, since about twelve of the local pots take us into the early ninth century, including three bowls with pendent-semicircle decoration. It was among a group of these later pots that the bronze bowl (Taf. 27d) came to light. The shallow hemispherical shape is of Cypriot origin, but also occurs in several Athenian burials of this time, when plain bronze bowls were used to seal the cremation urns⁶⁷. But our bowl, when cleaned, revealed a graffito of twelve archaic Phoenician letters (Taf. 27c), dated by M. Sznycer⁶⁸ on epigraphical grounds to c. 900, and thus by far the earliest alphabetical inscription to be found in Greece. Not all the letters have been read; but in Sznycer's provisional reading, it is reassuring that the first word, KS, signifies 'bowl'. There follows what appears to be a personal name with patronymic: as the seventh and eighth letters BN, 'son of', can be clearly made out. If the inscription, then, reads 'the bowl of X son of Y', the bowl is less likely to be an article of commerce than the possession of an early Phoenician resident at Knossos – a predecessor of the goldsmith who is thought to have been buried in the Teke tholos tomb less than fifty metres to the north of tomb J. In any case, it is tantalizing to know that the Phoenician alphabet was on view to

- 63 To the examples discussed below, add the graffito from Pithekoussai first published as Greek by M. Guarducci in *ArchCl* 16, 1964, 129 pl. 40.2, but more recently identified as Phoenician: P. K. McCarter, *AJA* 79, 1975, 140f.; also G. Garbini, *PP Fasc.* 179, 1978, 130ff. If McCarter and Garbini are correct, the alleged 'sidelong alpha' and 'curved pi' from this inscription should be removed from the Euboean column in Abb. 1, which is taken from GG 297 fig. 94.
- 64 LSAG 18 n. 4; 29.
- 65 Dupont-Sommer op. cit. (n. 72 infra) 9ff.; M. G. G. Amadasi in: V. Karageorghis, *Kition II* (1977) 149ff. D 21 pl. 17; cf. GG 296 fig. 94 column 3.
- 66 V. Karageorghis, *Pottery from Kition*, in: E. Gjerstad, *Greek geometric and archaic pottery found in Cyprus* (1977) 61f. nos. 1.3–5 pl. 1.
- 67 E. g. GG 32 fig. 4a.
- 68 M. Sznycer, *Kadmos* 18, 1979, 89ff.

PHOENICIAN		GREEK, 8th CENTURY B.C.									
		Shipthebaal inscription (c. 925–900 B.C.)	Mesha inscription (c. 830 B.C.)	Kition inscription (c. 850–800 B.C.)	Kara Tepe inscriptions (8th cent. B.C.)	Cyprus Bronze bowl (c. 730 B.C.)	CRETAN (Hieroglyphic)	ATTIC (Dipylon oinochoe)	EUBOEA (Pithekoussai Lekandi)		
'Aleph	𐤀	𐤀	𐤀	𐤀	𐤀	𐤀	𐤀	𐤀	𐤀	Alpha	Α
Bet	𐤁	𐤁	𐤁	𐤁	𐤁	𐤁	𐤁	𐤁	𐤁	Beta	Β
Gimel	𐤂	𐤂	𐤂	𐤂	𐤂	𐤂	𐤂	𐤂	𐤂	Gamma	Γ
Dalet	𐤃	𐤃	𐤃	𐤃	𐤃	𐤃	𐤃	𐤃	𐤃	Delta	Δ
He'	𐤄	𐤄	𐤄	𐤄	𐤄	𐤄	𐤄	𐤄	𐤄	Epsilon	Ε
Waw	𐤅	𐤅	𐤅	𐤅	𐤅	𐤅	𐤅	𐤅	𐤅	Digamma	Ϝ
Zayn	𐤆	𐤆	𐤆	𐤆	𐤆	𐤆	𐤆	𐤆	𐤆	Upsilon	Υ
Het	𐤇	𐤇	𐤇	𐤇	𐤇	𐤇	𐤇	𐤇	𐤇	Zeta	Ζ
Tet	𐤈	𐤈	𐤈	𐤈	𐤈	𐤈	𐤈	𐤈	𐤈	Theta	Θ
Yod	𐤉	𐤉	𐤉	𐤉	𐤉	𐤉	𐤉	𐤉	𐤉	Iota	Ι
Kapp	𐤊	𐤊	𐤊	𐤊	𐤊	𐤊	𐤊	𐤊	𐤊	Kappa	Κ
Lamed	𐤋	𐤋	𐤋	𐤋	𐤋	𐤋	𐤋	𐤋	𐤋	Lambda	Λ
Mem	𐤌	𐤌	𐤌	𐤌	𐤌	𐤌	𐤌	𐤌	𐤌	Mu	Μ
Nun	𐤍	𐤍	𐤍	𐤍	𐤍	𐤍	𐤍	𐤍	𐤍	Nu	Ν
Samek	𐤎	𐤎	𐤎	𐤎	𐤎	𐤎	𐤎	𐤎	𐤎	Xi	Ξ
'Ayin	𐤏	𐤏	𐤏	𐤏	𐤏	𐤏	𐤏	𐤏	𐤏	Omicron	Ο
Pe	𐤐	𐤐	𐤐	𐤐	𐤐	𐤐	𐤐	𐤐	𐤐	Pi	Π
Sadē	𐤑	𐤑	𐤑	𐤑	𐤑	𐤑	𐤑	𐤑	𐤑	San	Ϻ
Qop	𐤒	𐤒	𐤒	𐤒	𐤒	𐤒	𐤒	𐤒	𐤒	Qoppa	Ϙ
Resh	𐤓	𐤓	𐤓	𐤓	𐤓	𐤓	𐤓	𐤓	𐤓	Rho	Ρ
Sin	𐤔	𐤔	𐤔	𐤔	𐤔	𐤔	𐤔	𐤔	𐤔	Sigma	Σ
Tau	𐤕	𐤕	𐤕	𐤕	𐤕	𐤕	𐤕	𐤕	𐤕	Tau	Τ
										Phi	Φ
										Chi	Χ

Abb. 1 Comparative table of Phoenician and earliest Greek alphabetical scripts.
All letters shown in retrograde form.

home since the ninth century. They must have acquired enough of the local Greek dialect to have made themselves understood; and I can hardly believe that they were all illiterate. Nor can it be a coincidence that all four of these regions have produced eighth-century graffiti in Greek, and furthermore they are the only certain sources of such inscriptions – if we include with the Euboeans their colonial outposts in Pithekoussai and Kyme. At any one of these places, a literate Phoenician craftsman could have taught the alphabet to a Greek pupil; alternatively, a bilingual son of a mixed marriage could have applied his father's literacy to his mother's language. So there are several Greek regions which could have been the birthplace of the Greek alphabet. Epigraphists will continue to look for a single birthplace, because of the divergences from Phoenician sound values which every local Greek script shares in common – i.e. the universal confusion over Phoenician sibilants, and the universal adaptation of Phoenician glottal stops and semivowels to serve as Greek vowels. But as to where this birthplace should be, the debate is likely to continue for many years.

Knossians well before 850, and over a century before the earliest known use of the Greek alphabet. Nevertheless, the Cretans can hardly have learned their alphabet as early as this, from the letter forms on the Teke bowl; if they had done so, there would surely be some trace in their script of the archaic *kapp* and *'alep* as seen in this graffito. In fact, these forms are considerably older than the versions of these letters which were imitated in the earliest Greek inscriptions. In brief, the new Phoenician graffiti have not shaken the orthodox view that Greek alphabetic writing began in the eighth century.

Everything that I have described forms a prelude to the great Orientalizing movement of the seventh century, which transformed the character of Greek art and civilisation. But men do not suddenly copy the art of complete strangers through casual imports. From the middle of the ninth century onwards, Greeks and Phoenicians had been getting to know one another, partly through Greek traders settling in Syria, but at least as much through Phoenician master-craftsmen coming to live in the Aegean, and also through Phoenician merchants setting up small unguent factories in the Aegean islands nearest to their homeland. In ways like these, the Greeks came to know their eastern neighbours as residents in the same communities; came to know them well enough to break the language barrier, well enough to learn the difficult refinements of the goldsmith's art, and well enough to learn the virtues of a simple and practical system of writing which was quite foreign to their own long-forgotten Bronze Age tradition, but far better suited to the genius of their own language.

DISCUSSION

BUHL: I was most interested in the jewellery you showed, because some of the things reminded me of those found at Tell Abu Hawam. But I'm not sure that the bead must be Phoenician, it might just as well be Egyptian, because the small disk-shaped beads are so well-known merchandise in Egypt. Then there is the question about Isis and Horus and the small pendants. Couldn't they have passed Phoenicia coming from Egypt? There are so many small things on the Phoenician coast which are really of Egyptian origin.

COLDSTREAM: They might indeed – except for the scarab with meaningless hieroglyphs which must be a Phoenician imitation.

BUHL: The scarab makers evidently tried to write Egyptian, but it says nothing. And then concerning the piece of amber: could it not be from the Mediterranean itself?

RUS: There is native amber in the Lebanon and Rumania among other places.

COLDSTREAM: Does it actually come from the Lebanon?

RUS: It exists naturally somewhere in the Lebanon and worked amber has been found in Ugarit/Hama, Tell Abu Hawam and Assur⁶⁹. But, let me first say this:

69 Brit.Mus.Cat., Strong, Carved Amber (1966) 20; Gnomon 39, 1967, 408–411; Archaeology 23, 1970, 7–11.

I want to thank you very much for this highly illuminating lecture with very much new material. As an addition I would like to quote an old letter from the late Prof. Webster, after having received *Sukas I* he wrote: "I was fascinated with your discussion of early Greek trade and settlements in the Levant and the devastating idea that Greeks imported olive-oil. It suddenly hit me the other day when I had a black-figure seminar that the early Attic black-figure lekythoi, both the Deaneira shape and the round-bodied one, must derive from Phoenician prototypes with the ridge-handle converted into a drip-ring. I suppose this is obvious, but I had not seen it clearly before. And this presumably means that in the seventh century perfumed oil was imported in bottle: the Attic lekythos (with its Corinthian contemporary copies) seems a new development. This seems to fit your picture, and Coldstream's recent article on Phoenicians in Rhodes."

SHEFTON: We might add here another and perhaps even closer descendant of the Phoenician oilbottle, namely the East Greek lekythos, widely found during the earlier 6th century, also in Sicily and Magna Graecia⁷⁰.

RUS: May I be allowed to make just another remark, that's on the alphabet. As far as I understand, both Robert Cook and my late friend J. A. Bundgaard found that there are so many epichoric differences in the earliest alphabet in Greece that it could not have been derived from one single source⁷¹. That would be an argument against its being learned for instance only at Al Mina or at some other place, and that would fit very well into your general view, according to which we have to reckon with Phoenicians from several parts of Phoenicia.

COLDSTREAM: One reason which made me think of places other than Al Mina was the total absence of Cretan pottery there, even though the Cretan alphabet preserves several letter forms unusually near to the Phoenician originals. The lack of Cretan imports outside the Aegean makes me think rather of those oriental visitors to Crete as the bringers of alphabetic writing to that island from the late eighth century onwards.

As far as I understand the epigraphical arguments for a single place of origin (I am no epigraphist), they appear to stem from the confusion between the four Phoenician sibilants which was reproduced in all Greek epichoric scripts. These errors were repeated uniformly wherever the knowledge of the Greek alphabet spread.

RÖLLIG: I don't think that the Phoenician alphabet could have been taken over in different places, at different times, and nevertheless emerge as one Greek alphabet. The transmission to the language and the differentiation is much too complex, but if you look on the beginning of the Phoenician alphabet, you see different shapes of the letters. And so it's not surprising that you will find the same difference of shapes in the Greek alphabet. But it's not the problem of the shape, it's the problem of the taking-over of an alphabetic script. And this can only have been done at one place and scattered over the whole regions and not in many places at different times. Another thing is very surprising though Mr. Coldstream mentioned it in half a sentence only: we are always looking for the transmission of the oriental myth to Greece. For many decades on end it was commonly thought that the Phoenicians have done this transmission. And later on it was assumed to have gone through Anatolia and to the Ionian Greeks etc. But now it seems that the older thinking about this transmission was right. If Phoenician craftsmen have been in the Greek cities they have brought the tradition of their own myth to these places too.

70 I may perhaps refer to my comments in: T. J. Dunbabin, *Perachora II* (1962) 375 on Nr. 4057; cp. P. Zancani Montuoro, *ArchCl* 24, 1972, 372ff.; CVA Gela, Nat. Mus. (2) Taf. 39, 3 (lt 2376), with bibliog-

raphy. For the Phoenician model see also W. Culican, *Levant* 7, 1975, 145ff.
71 *AJA* 63, 1959, 178; *AnalRom* 3, 1965, 56.

STAGER: Perhaps the Phoenician red-slipped bowl found at Kition, Cyprus in a 9th century B.C. context might be considered at this point. It bears an incised inscription of almost seven lines (many very fragmentary) of Phoenician script. Dupont-Sommer interpreted the inscription to be an offering of hair to Astarte from a person named *ML*. Read as Phoenician the text is very enigmatic. The personal name *ML* is unattested in Phoenician or Hebrew. The word meaning to shave off (*gib*) is a questionable reading. (The *gimel* is damaged and could be *peh* or some other letter.) Professor Teixidor has suggested that the inscription may not even be Phoenician. The pottery vessel is surely 'Phoenician' in type, the script is either Phoenician or related to Phoenician, the language, however, may be non-Semitic, perhaps from one of the 'Greek' spheres⁷².

SHEFTON: May I turn to another point: does the Aegean have a special status in the immigration and settlement of Phoenicians, shall we say a status which differentiates it from the Italian peninsula?

COLDSTREAM: My impression is that nowhere in the Aegean did the Phoenicians form a separate community; on the contrary they mixed quite freely with the locals.

SHEFTON: Can such settlement by Phoenicians be paralleled in the Italian peninsula? Also, what of the Phoenician objects found there? Should any of them be considered local work by immigrant craftsmen?

COLDSTREAM: Dr Giorgio Buchner may perhaps present a new interpretation of this question. But since you mention Italy, I think there is a comparable situation when some Greeks settled in Etruria from the late eighth century onwards. Of these, some may have married local wives – for example the nobleman Demaratos from Corinth, who took an Etruscan wife and became the father of Lucius Tarquinius Priscus (Polybius vi.11a.10). This tradition is supported by archaeological finds analogous to those under discussion, i.e. the fine local imitations of Greek pottery shapes from the eighth century onwards.

G. PICARD: Je voudrais simplement rappeler que les plus anciens dépôts archéologiques que nous connaissons à Carthage (on l'appelle la chapelle Cintas, que Cintas d'après ses dernières indications a cherché à détruire, mais je ne crois pas qu'il y soit arrivé) contiennent, comme tout le monde sait, du géométrique des Cyclades, en particulier un askos qui a été identifié comme tel par Pierre Demargne et c'est qui semblerait indiquer, que parmi les premières personnes qui ont fréquenté Carthage, la colonie de Carthage, il y avait des gens qui étaient en rapport avec l'Égée.

COLDSTREAM: J'ai l'impression qu'il y a maintenant la possibilité que quelques-uns de ces soi-disant vases 'cycladiques' en effet ne le sont pas, mais en revanche étaient fabriqués dans la colonie eubéenne de Pithekoussai. Mais je n'ai pas examiné moi-même ces vases.

Rus: Parlant de la chapelle de Cintas, il y a plusieurs années que j'ai visité Carthage, mais alors j'ai fait des notes sur la céramique de cette chapelle, et comme M. Coldstream apparemment n'a pas vu les objets, je me permets de donner quelques détails. Il y a une grande amphore avec des anses tordues, et l'argile de cette amphore est rougeâtre, presque orange avec un vernis rouge lustré, mais assez mate. Je me suis demandé moi-même si elle serait une production italienne, c'est-à-dire: italo-corinthienne; ça conviendrait très bien avec ce qu'a dit M. Coldstream. Alors il y a les deux skyphoi ou kotylai, dont l'un est, peut-être, un vrai proto-corinthien d'une argile grise assez claire; mais l'autre a une argile rougeâtre avec le même vernis mat rouge que l'amphore. Et enfin il y a le

72 A. Dupont-Sommer, Une inscription phénicienne archaïque récemment trouvée à Kition (Chypre).

Mémoires présentés à l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres 44, 1970, 1–28.

vase thétiomorphe, d'oiseau, et son argile est également assez rouge, presque orange; j'ai eu l'impression que c'est aussi un objet italien⁷³.

COLDSTREAM: Quant aux deux petites oinochoés, c'est une espèce de vase qui ne se trouve pas en Grèce, mais seulement dans le monde colonial.

CULICANI: Once more I looked at these pots last year and I have the impression that only the oldest (as Prof. Coldstream has said) is of entirely Italic type. But I begin to think myself that that curious carafe with the long neck and the circular body is perhaps closely related to Italian types. I can't find any Greek carafes of that shape but there are one or two in Italy; nothing close. And I thought in fabric – I'm no judge of Greek pottery-types – it appeared rather close to geometric wares which I saw coming from Capua, actually in the Museum of Capua. But one thing, I think, we must not forget in all this discussion of where the geometric comes from (unless of course it can be precisely identified with Ischia) is that it could be a geometric style produced near by, perhaps at Torre Galli in Calabria. On the whole the dice now are loaded in favour of its being an Italic geometric or the work of geometric potters working in the west. The search for parallels in Greece has by now been fairly exhausted.

73 Déjà P. Cintas, Céramique punique (1950) 496, 498, a observé qu'il s'agit de deux différentes sortes

d'argile, l'une représentée par les vases pl. 65, 1.4.5.7.10.13, l'autre par pl. 65, 3.6.8.9.