2 – RESEARCH INTO POST-ROMAN POTTERY IN THE AEGEAN: A METHODOLOGICAL-HISTORICAL SURVEY

2.1 Introduction

Before entering into a detailed discussion of the Post-Roman ceramics (ranging from ca. the 7th to the 20th century) which were sampled in the course of the Boeotia Project, it seems appropriate to present an overview of the history of research concerning Medieval and Post-Medieval pottery in the Aegean. Here, I will list and review the publications which have been – or still are – important for the study of Post-Roman ceramics in the area.

The purpose of this chapter, however, is not to get lost in an exhaustive bibliography, but rather to focus attention on ground-breaking publications from the past, which have been crucial for methodological advances or the opening-up of new material. In general, the emphasis will be on studies relating to the Aegean and to Constantinople/Istanbul (as Capital of the Byzantine Empire and of the Ottoman Empire respectively), and of course on studies relating to Greece in particular. (See for the most important places mentioned in this chapter figs. 2.1 and 2.2.)

I will start with the publications regarding the classification of pottery from excavations and museum collections, beginning with the humble but pioneering steps made in the 19th century. Thereafter, more recent discussions of these topics will be summarized. In the end a summary of current developments will be given, including research into material recovered from shipwrecks, into bacini (embedded bowls in church walls), into burial offerings and into the published ceramics of surface surveys.

2.2 The pioneers

For a long time a major handicap for Post-Roman archaeology in Greece seems to have been that it remained a mere branch of classical archaeology, and indeed a much neglected branch. In the early days of archaeology in the Aegean area, excavators focussed almost exclusively on Classical sites and their monuments – Byzantine, Medieval and Ottoman remains were often hastily destroyed in order to reach the Classical strata, or they were disposed of because of their supposed lack of artistic value (fig. 2.3).

During the late 18th and 19th centuries archaeologists working in Greece were so occupied by the Classical and Hellenistic periods (some modern critics tend to say that they were blinded by a hellenocentric obsession), that their perspective was not even affected by the Age of Romanticism and the Gothic Revival in Western Europe and America, which triggered in other fields of society a keen interest in and glorification of Medieval times. The result was, that it remained for long time standard procedure at most excavations to simply throw away all pottery which was considered to be Post-Classical.

It needs no explanation that this approach was not very helpful in preserving and documenting the Post-Roman remains, but it was only in the early 1940s that the first questions were raised. The American specialist in Byzantine pottery Charles H. Morgan described in no uncertain terms his views on the traditional archaeological methods: ‘The spirit of irreverence which cheerfully overthrew Byzantine walls and Frankish churches can hardly have been expected to show any concern for the less conspicuous ceramic remains from the same periods. Plates and bowls, fragmentary and whole, were consigned to the dump, their bright green or yellow glazes signalling them for oblivion as Medieval rubbish’ (Morgan 1942, 1).

2.2.1 Art-historical approaches

The first mention in print of the existence of Post-Classical ceramics appears to date from 1897 AD, when Wladimir De Bock as curator of the Hermitage in Saint Petersburg published 31 fragments of glazed pottery from the Caucasus and the Crimea (De Bock 1897). These ceramics had been excavated on the North-Eastern coast of the Black Sea, especially at the site of Cherson in the Crimea.

De Bock tried to classify the pottery into six types, based on their decoration and production techniques.
Fig. 2.1 The Mediterranean and Cyprus, showing location of the most important places mentioned in the text.
His tentative classification in figural and geometric designs was in the words of Charles Morgan 'neither greatly varied nor well documented' (Morgan 1942, 1), but it lasted for thirteen years until a new classification was proposed for finds from excavations in Constantinople/Istanbul (Ebersolt 1910). Here, glazed sherds were collected as curiosities, and they found their way into various private collections and museums in Istanbul and Europe (such as the Imperial Museum in Istanbul and the Kaiser Friedrich Museum in Berlin, which owns one of the finest collections of Medieval wares in Western Europe).

At the beginning of the 20th century the first systematic publications on Post-Roman pottery from the Eastern Mediterranean appeared, although this area of study was still regarded as a very minor branch of art history. A good example of the art-historical perspective is the study by the British scholar Henry Wallis of some 10th-16th century glazed wares excavated at the 'new Post Office' at Constantinople/Istanbul, which were acquired by the South Kensington Museum in London (the later V&A) and the Kaiser Friedrich Museum at Berlin (Wallis 1907). Wallis tried to classify these decorative wares according to the evolution of designs. To this end he brought in comparative material from Italy with respect to the various art-historical influences which affected the pottery. His book was rounded off with a presentation of the complete pots in a handsome catalogue with elegant illustrations. This was no artistic frivolity, because Wallis was convinced, as he wrote, that 'on matters of ornamental motives, technique and the like, they [the pots] have much to tell' (Wallis 1907, 5).

The interest aroused by Henry Wallis’ Byzantine Ceramic Art resulted in the production of the catalogue of Byzantine and Anatolian ceramics in the Imperial Museum at Istanbul, published by Jean Ebersolt three years later (Ebersolt 1910). This volume is a systematic and well-illustrated presentation and classification of 158 pieces of pottery from excavations at the Old Palace, from the Botanical Garden and from the New Museum in Constantinople/Istanbul, as well as from other regions of the Ottoman Empire (e.g. Edirne, Izmir, Pergamon). All the finds (147 glazed and 11 unglazed fragments) were collected in the Imperial Museum at Istanbul.

Although these two elaborate catalogues laid the foundation for the study of Medieval pottery in Greece, research in those days was still exclusively focused on the
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typeology of decorated fine wares. Fragmentary and (undecorated) domestic material was continuously disre-
garded at excavations, notwithstanding the fact that it
normally constituted the overwhelming majority of the
excavated ceramics.

2.2.2 The first ‘systematic’ approach: sparta
An exception to the general neglect of Post-Roman
domestic pottery was the publication of an article by
R.M. Dawkins and J.P. Droop on some glazed pottery
fragments from ancient Sparta (Dawkins & Droop 1910-
11). For the first time, efforts were made 'to publish all
the pieces of any interest as material for further study',
and as a result of this systematic approach, to introduce
new styles and wares. The short article was about a small
collection of Medieval glazed fragments ('usually called
Byzantine') which was found in trial pits on and around
the Acropolis of Sparta during excavations carried out
by the British School from 1906 to 1910. The sherds
were especially abundant outside the East end of the
Late Roman fortifications. Seven decoration techniques
were distinguished by Dawkins and Droop: the first five
being varieties of *graffiato*, and the last two painted
sherds – with or without glaze (see Appendix A1).

Dawkins and Droop were still doubtful about the
dating of these artefacts: they laid 'no claim to speak as
experts' about pottery 'whose date and general relations
are still matters of some doubt' (Dawkins & Droop 1910-
11, 23). In their article they drew parallels to 11th-12th
century pieces from Cairo as well as to 13th-14th century
material from Pergamon and Constantinople/Istanbul,
which is now all in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum at
Berlin (Altmann 1904; Wulff 1909-11; the second,
revised edition of Wulff’s publication is in Volbach 1930).
For the dating they also relied heavily on the
1907-publication by Henry Wallis and on the catalogue
of Byzantine and Anatolian pottery in the Imperial
Museum at Istanbul (Ebersolt 1910).

Nowadays, these early publications on Post-Classical
wares (such as Dawkins and Droop 1910-11; Wulff 1909-
11 and Volbach 1930) are very much outdated, and the
French ceramicist Jean-Michel Spieser describes them
even as ‘essentiellement des pièces de musées’, ‘essentially
museum pieces’ (Spieser 1991, 249). That may be true,
but perhaps one has to admit that these pioneers showed
at least the courage to publish their material, even
though they were no experts on the subject.[6] They
were archaeologists for whom all periods seem to have been interesting – even pottery from Greece which fell outside the canonical styles of the Classical era. Perhaps this interest can be explained by the fact that Dawkins and Droop belonged to the last generation of broad-minded scholars (of the Victorian and Edwardian periods), who were not real classical archaeologists with an exclusive focus on Antiquity, but also ‘ethnoarchaeologists’ and generalists who were trying to understand every aspect of Greek society. It was no coincidence that Wace and Dawkins were also involved in publications on Greek embroideries (Wace 1914; 1935; Wace & Dawkins 1914). According to Peter Mackridge (Dawkins’s biographer), Dawkins was a medievalist or folklorist rather than a Byzantinist. He published several short papers on Byzantine finds, as well as articles in the journal Folk-Lore and three substantial volumes of Greek folk-tales (Mackridge 1995, 185-86).

2.3 The Interbellum

During the First World War (1914-1918) the growth of scientific research and publication on Mediterranean archaeology, and especially on Post-Classical pottery, actually lapsed. And the troubled times that followed in the Eastern Mediterranean area were often not conducive to further extensive work.\[7\] However, during the Interbellum the French Armée d’Orient started large excavations in the Manganas area of Constantinople/Istanbul, East of the Old Serai (1921-1923). Their example was followed by British archaeologists in the Hippodrome (1927-1928) and at the Great Palace (1936-1937) (cf. Demangel & Mamboury 1939; Talbot Rice 1930; Stevenson 1947). In the same period Andreas Xyngopoulos collected glazed sherds from various places in Thessaloniki, and in particular from the trenches then being dug for installing the sewerage system (cf. Bakirtzis 1980c, 394; Bakirtzis & Papanikola-Bakirtzis 1981). Eventually, the first processing of Post-Roman finds from excavations in Corinth and Athens also took place in this period (Philadelphos 1924; Frantz 1938). Similar material also came to light in Cyprus, Cilicia and the Near East (Du Plat Taylor 1933; Du Plat Taylor & Megaw 1951; Volbach 1930; Johns 1934; Lane 1937).

2.3.1 The Importance of David Talbot Rice

The first attempt at a more systematic level of study for Post-Roman ceramics in the Aegean region was undertaken by David Talbot Rice, a specialist on Byzantine and Near Eastern art (fig. 2.4). After studying archaeology and anthropology at Oxford, Talbot Rice dug on behalf of the British Academy in the Hippodrome and later in the ‘Great Palace’ of Constantinople/Istanbul. In 1930 he published his path-breaking book Byzantine Glazed Pottery, which included an extensive bibliography of older publications. In this study Talbot Rice presented what was then the state of knowledge of the subject, basing himself mainly on material from the 1927-28 excavations in the Hippodrome at Constantinople/Istanbul (fig. 2.5).\[8\]

In Byzantine Glazed Pottery the glazed wares were classified into two principal classes. This classification was based on the colour of the fabric: the white wares were grouped under class A, the ‘faïence’\[9\]; the red wares under class B, the ‘earthenware’ (see Appendix A2). Within these two classes several subgroups were distinguished by Talbot Rice, according to a numerical system. The ‘faïence’ was divided into five main groups (A1 Polychrome ware, A2 Petal ware, A3 Plain glazed ware, A4
White inscribed ware and A₅ Impressed ware) and two subsidiary ones (A₆ Models and A₇ Pottery icons), while the 'earthenware' was divided into five main subgroups (B₁ Early Sgraffito ware, B₂ Elaborate incised ware, B₃ Late Sgraffito ware, B₄ White painted ware and B₅ Marbled ware) and three subsidiary ones (B₆ Samsoun ware, B₇ Deep-green glazed ware and B₈ Turkish incised ware). This system devised by Talbot Rice had great advantage for pottery specialists: it was now possible to use a shorthand notation for each ware.

The introduction of Byzantine Glazed Pottery was written by Bernard Rackham, then curator of the Victoria & Albert Museum in London and an expert on Italian Maiolica. His diagnosis was clear and to the point when he flatly stated that 'Byzantium is the name written over one of the uncharted regions on the map of ceramic history'. His conclusion may be called something of an understatement: ‘Towards the exploration of Byzantine pottery, little has hitherto been done’ (Talbot Rice 1930, ix-x).

Except for the very early pioneering publications (Wallis 1907; Dawkins and Droop 1910-11), Talbot Rice had nothing else at his disposal than the recent archaeological finds from the Hippodrome at Constantinople/Istanbul. His book is nothing less than a rather heroic effort to use these as basis for a completely new ordering of the Aegean material, vastly surpassing previous attempts of classification (De Bock 1879, Ebersolt 1910 and Dawkins & Droop 1910-11).

This having said, it is now clear that the solid evidence available at the time was, to state it mildly, rather pitiful. The gaps in what was proposed by Talbot Rice as a single continuous ceramic story are now only too evident. Currently, pottery specialists value Byzantine Glazed Pottery therefore only on its historical merit as a landmark in the development of an archaeological specialisation (Spieser 1991, 249; Hayes 1992). Still, there is no denying that the classification of Talbot Rice served as the basis for most subsequent discussions in the field. He was perhaps the first scholar to recognize the beauty of Byzantine pottery, as well as 'its value in dating related material' (as stated by the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres in his foreword in Talbot Rice’s Festschrift by Robertson & Henderson 1975).

2.3.2 ‘FOLLOWERS’ OF THE TALBOT RICE VIEW

During the 1930s some articles appeared in which Talbot Rice’s classification was closely followed. One of these
detailed studies was Frederick Waagé’s publication of pottery from the first season’s work of the American excavations in the Athenian Agora (Waagé 1933). It described the wares used in Athens from about the 1st century B.C. (Late Hellenistic times) to the 18th century after Christ (Late Ottoman times), and included therefore a number of new wares for which no categories had as yet been assigned (see Appendix A3).[10] However, no attention was given to Post-Roman coarse wares; all the published vessels were either slipped or glazed.

Because of the problems of stratigraphy and the shortage of comparative material or coins at hand, Waagé presented the Medieval and Post-Medieval ceramics in a less comprehensive classification than his frequently praised scheme for the Late Roman Red Slip Wares (see also fig. 3.1).[11] He did not try to hide the lack of solid ground for his section on Medieval pottery: ‘It is less complete, lacks in large part the better wares, and is without evidence for chronology. Even more than in the deeper Roman levels had modern pits, cellars and cisterns disturbed the Medieval fill’ (Waagé 1933, 308).[12]

Nevertheless, Waagé suggested that during the American excavations in the Agora, only occasional pieces of coarse glazed pottery were found which seemed to bridge the gap between the Late Roman pottery and the earliest Sgraffito Wares, although these sherds were too fragmentary to determine any shapes.[13] On the basis of the recovered coins, it was thought that only in the 11th century had the Athenian Agora been inhabited again to any degree.

A non-follower (but admirer) of the Talbot Rice view of Post-Classical pottery was the Greek archaeologist Andreas Xyngopoulos. In the early 1930s he presented some sherds from ancient Olynthus in Macedonia, which were discovered in 1928 by D.M. Robinson at the South projection of the Meghali Tōumba (Xyngopoulos 1933). Xyngopoulos grouped the finds from this hill-site according to his own classification system of decoration techniques (see Appendix A4), although he favoured the classification devised by Talbot Rice ‘for it allows of distinction both in technique and style to a greater degree’ (Xyngopoulos 1933, 285, note 4).

The stratigraphy of the Meghali Tōumba was as follows: the lowest level, at a depth of about 0.50 m., was marked by a layer of plinths and tiles which, according to Xyngopoulos, ‘must belong to Early Christian times’ (Xyngopoulos 1933, 291). On top of this level coins were found, one of which belonged to Justinian and the others to the period between the 11th and the 14th centuries. The sherds, found at a depth of 0.10-0.50 m. below surface, were not numerous and belonged to different periods. Two fragments could be attributed to the 11th century, the rest were placed in the 14th century. Finally, the top layers were from the Turkish period, marked by some clay pipes and coins. Xyngopoulos concluded that the bulk of the material showed many similarities to the finds from Thessaloniki, and were probably produced there.

2.3.3 A new step ahead: the excavations at Athens

In addition to the Agora and Olynthus publications, a number of other articles on Medieval and Post-Medieval pottery in Greece which appeared before 1945 are noteworthy. Among them is a second piece on Byzantine pottery from the American excavations in the Athenian Agora, this time written by M. Allison Frantz (Frantz 1938). Her study dealt with a number of closed deposits (i.e. refuse dumps of pottery), and presented a modification of dates and classifications proposed by Waagé in 1933 (see Appendix A6).

Frantz selected five groups of pottery, ranging in date from the 10th or early 11th to the 13th century. These groups included the contents of a cistern dating to the first half of the 11th century, and two contexts dating to the first half of the 12th century. The dating by Frantz was based on coins found with the pottery. The wares were divided into Plain-Glazed Wares, Impressed Ware, Painted Wares, Sgraffito Wares and Coarse Ware (see Appendix A6). The article of Frantz was of great importance for establishing a firmer chronology, and supplied many useful parallels for the pottery from Corinth, where such information based on stratigraphy and coin dates was still sadly lacking.

Equally important was a publication written a few years later by the same author regarding some Turkish pottery from the Athenian Agora excavations (Frantz 1942; see Appendix A7). Here, for the first time archaeological attention was paid solely to the centuries following the conquest of Greek lands by the Ottomans. However, the 16th-18th century levels at Athens had been so severely disturbed that the material (from ten
different deposits in the Agora) was presented by Frantz with only tentative suggestions for dating. In the groups she discussed there were a few slight indications of absolute dates, and the coincidence of different wares gave a certain relative chronology. Most important was Frantz’s recognition of a locally made type of tin-glazed Maiolica which she called ‘blue and white painted ware’, but which is nowadays known as ‘local Maiolica’ (Frantz 1942, 1).

2.3.4 A major contribution:
The excavations at Corinth
In the same year 1942 in which Frantz published the Ottoman pottery from the Athenian Agora, Charles H. Morgan published almost 1800 fragmentary and complete glazed vessels from the American excavations at Corinth (fig. 2.6). In his Byzantine Pottery he discussed pottery from a few sealed deposits, which enabled him to propose an improved and more consistent classification, as well as a chronology for the various groups (Morgan 1942; preceded by the very short notes Morgan 1935; 1938).[14] Dissatisfied with Talbot Rice’s classification system (for being too simple, inflexible and sometimes misleading), Morgan tried to construct a chronology for the Middle Byzantine phases at Corinth which would be of practical use for ceramicists all over the Aegean. Therefore he introduced a nominal rather than an alphabetical or arithmetical terminology.

Morgan’s basic principle in the classification of ceramics was to put the emphasis on decoration techniques – a method already used by Dawkins & Droop in 1910-11 and Frantz in 1938 (see Appendix A8).[15] He distinguished four main groups (Plain-Glazed Wares, Painted Wares, Sgraffito Wares and Unglazed Wares) with several subtypes (based on design) in a provisional chronological order. Furthermore, Morgan defined a new and uniform terminology for shapes (bowl, chafing dish etc.), parts of shapes (base, foot etc.) and patterns of design (chevron, Kufic etc.).

As far as the treatment of styles, designs and forms is concerned, Byzantine Pottery still stands as a basic reference work on 11th-12th century wares of the Middle Byzantine period, although ceramics of the later (Frankish and Ottoman) periods found at Corinth are not particularly well presented or at least not well identified in this publication.[16]

Only quite recently stratigraphical excavations have been applied to Medieval layers, most specifically in Corinth. The new data suggest that the earlier relative chronologies were all suffering from their subjective foundations (unavoidable considering the constraints the pioneers where working under). With regard to Morgan’s views, various new suggestions have been forwarded recently on the reintroduction of lead-glaze production in the Aegean (Spieser 1991 and François 1995), on the nomenclature of some Corinthian wares (Sanders 1995, 18 note 39 suggests revision for the term ‘Imitation Lustre’), as well as on the classification of Medieval and Post-Medieval wares (cf. Megaw 1968b, 1975 on Zeuxippus Ware and Aegean Ware; Bakirtzis 1980 on Ottoman wares). Also, Morgan’s lack of interest in domestic wares is now seen as outdated (Bakirtzis 1989 shows convincingly that one can do more with these wares than Morgan thought possible).

According to the current director of the Corinthian excavations, Guy Sanders, there is little ground left to follow Morgan’s dates without reservation. The still persisting practice among some archaeologists to refer
with confidence to Morgan’s chronology is met with regret by him, because it ‘seldom contributes new evidence to our understanding of the pottery production of the Medieval Mediterranean, and can perpetuate errors, for not infrequently the Corinthian published record, where old, is insecure or even wrong’ (Sanders 1993, 251-2).

Morgan’s chronology is now subject of constant refinement after new finds at Corinth and other places. John Hayes proposed, for instance, late 12th century dates for wares and types listed by Morgan as mid 12th, and he also placed Morgan’s late 12th century types in the early 13th century (Hayes 1992, 4). Guy Sanders offered three examples illustrating Morgan’s misdating of material from the early 9th to 12th centuries (Sanders 1995, 19-20). In addition, David Whitehouse suggested rather convincingly that the Corinthian glass workshop (in the South centre of the Agora) would be rather 13th-14th century instead of Morgan’s dating to the 11th-12th century. He based himself on new Medieval glass finds in Southern Italy and Tarquinia, and on a detailed re-examination of the stratigraphy of the old excavations at Corinth (Whitehouse 1991).

Notwithstanding these considerations, Corinth remains one of the very few sites in Greece with an outstanding overall monograph on Byzantine ceramics (although it must be used with some caution). While Morgan’s chronology is under serious revision, it is understandable that at present most scholars still follow his system of classification.

### 2.4 The period after the Second World War

Another major step forward for the study of Post-Classical ceramics came with Robert B.K. Stevenson’s post-war publication of the pottery from the 1936-37 excavations in the Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors in Constantinople/Istanbul (Stevenson 1947; later followed by Talbot Rice’s shorter and somewhat less informative section on the pottery in 1958). Due to a purely archaeological treatment of the pottery fragments – with an emphasis on rims and bases, as opposed to that of the traditional art-historical approach of studying complete vessels – Stevenson’s presentation of the Great Palace material provided a basis for a much more refined chronological division of Byzantine glazed pottery (fig. 2.7).

![Fig. 2.7 Drawing from The Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors I (after Stevenson 1947).](image)

In The Great Palace I the ceramic material (about 7000 sherds) was divided into five chronological ‘stages’, which were distinguished typologically and by their provenance from the different layers of the stratification established during the excavations. The evidence for the dating of these stages was provided by the associated coins. The excavations yielded datable deposits covering the period from the Late Roman period down to about AD 1200. Thanks to close study of the stratigraphy, Stevenson was able to produce a much improved chronology for the various groups of Byzantine glazed wares, especially for glazed pottery found in the Constantinople/Istanbul region.

Despite these developments, the study of Medieval and Post-Medieval pottery made little progress in the decades following the Second World War. It seemed as if the minds of archaeologists were again almost entirely concentrated on fine wares, particularly on the later,
more ornamental ones (Sgraffito Ware and the like). Notable contributions to this art-historical approach were especially made by the Anglo-Irish archaeologist Peter Megaw, one of the most active archaeologists of his time in the field of Medieval pottery. From the 1960s onward, he produced not only an excellent summary of the state of knowledge of Byzantine pottery for a more general public (Megaw 1968a, 100-106), but also various important if perhaps old-fashioned articles in which he tried to isolate particular groups of 13th century pottery on stylistic criteria, introducing new designations such as ‘Zeuxippus Ware’ and ‘Aegean Ware’ (Megaw 1968b; 1975; 1989). Megaw’s approach to trace these wares to specific places and potters seems to have been influenced in particular by the ‘workshop-model’ of John Beazley in his study of Black- and Red-Figure vases in Classical Greece (Beazley 1956; 1963).

More innovative was Megaw’s analysis of fabrics of Byzantine and allied pottery from the Eastern Mediterranean, which he made together with the British scientist Richard Jones, Director of the Fitch Laboratory in Athens during the 1980s (Megaw & Jones 1981; 1983). Especially noteworthy is the interim report on the ‘Spectrographic Analyses of Byzantine and Allied pottery’ which they published in 1982 in the XVI. Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress (Vienna). A second article on the same subject followed in the Annual of the British School at Athens in the succeeding year (Megaw & Jones 1983).

Megaw and Jones took seven groups (three from Cyprus and five from Mainland Greece) of kiln wasters and tripod stands from attested production centres and usually from the kilns themselves. The fragments were tested by chemical analysis (Optical Emission Spectroscopy, or OES for short). In doing so, Megaw and Jones tried to set up a series of fabric analyses of Byzantine and related production centres in the Aegean and then test unprovenanced wares against them. Their initiative has since been continued by a team from Oxford University, which included Helen Hatcher and Pamela Armstrong, who will extend the analytical work to cover material from additional production sites in Turkey, Syria and Israel (Armstrong and Hatcher 1997).

All this has resulted in a clear shift in research on Byzantine pottery, from a purely art-historical emphasis on shape and decoration to a more technical approach based on the chemical compositions of fabrics and glazes. This shift is very evident in Materials Analysis of Byzantine Pottery, a collection of nine articles presented at a colloquium which was held at Dumbarton Oaks in April 1995 (Maguire 1997; see also 2000c). The articles in this book illustrate the newest archaeometric methods for determining clay sources, glaze compositions, and manufacturing technologies in pottery and tiles. Most papers use hard-science techniques, such as neutron activation analysis (NAA) or X-ray diffraction, in their research into the physical aspects of pottery, and do not bother much with the historical and cultural context of the artefacts. The scope of the contributions varies from the investigation of the site Qal’at Sem’an in Northern Syria as a possible manufacturing site of pilgrim’s tokens (Gerard et al. 1997) to the determination of trade patterns of Sgraffito Wares in Northern Greece (Papanikola-Bakirtzis et al. 1997).

Armstrong and Hatcher’s paper in Materials Analysis of Byzantine Pottery touches, among other things, upon a new scientific technique called ICP-AES (short for: Inductively Coupled Plasma Atomic Emission Spectrometry). This approach uses small drilled samples from the examined sherds, to make measurements of a range of elements found in ceramics (including the major elements as well as many of the trace elements), so that a fairly complete picture of the bulk composition of the clay can be obtained. Taking at least 20 samples from each production centre, Armstrong and Hatcher hope to build up eventually well-defined groups of pottery, arranged by their material contents. However, no hard results of the research they initiated are yet presented in the paper.

2.4.1 underwater archaeology
Since the 1960s the study of Post-Classical pottery has not only benefited from a shift away from a purely art-historical approach, but also from new archaeological techniques such as underwater investigation of sunken coastal sites and shipwrecks (fig. 2.8). Artefacts from these ships were fully in use when they were covered with mud, sand and clay. The wreck is like a time capsule in which life has stopped suddenly, so there is no distortion of the archaeological information by later rubbish dumps, mixed layers or secondary use of the site. The main task is to divide the finds into ship’s inventory and cargo. This is important because only artefacts from the cargo can be used for the study of trade and have roughly the same date as the sinking of the ship.
from the ship’s inventory could have been on board for a much longer period of time and have a less clear date.

As a consequence of the increased activities of underwater archaeologists, interest was stimulated in Byzantine trade amphorae and other domestic wares. A good example of this development is the study of the Late Roman – Early Byzantine shipwreck of Yassi Ada (near Bodrum in Turkey), excavated by G.F. Bass in 1961-4 for the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania (Bass 1962; Bass 1982 with references to earlier publications; Van Doorninck 1989). The ship carried a cargo of approximately 850 to 900 Byzantine amphorae, among which two basic shapes could be distinguished: type 1 (a Late Roman amphora 1 variant) and type 2 (a Late Roman amphora 2 variant) (see Appendix A12). The latest dated coin from the wreck gave a terminus post quem of 625/26 AD.

The underwater excavation at Yassi Ada also identified the shipwreck’s galley, in which all of the cooking, eating, and pantry wares of crew and passengers were found. A reasonably accurate inventory of these 7th century wares comprised several (glazed) bowls, plates and dishes, and a considerable number of cooking pots (both pottery and bronze), storage jars and resin-lined pitchers. Other items included a pipette (‘wine thief’) for drawing liquid from large containers like amphorae or fermentation-jars. According to the excavators, most of the galley wares were of types found on the Western coast of the Black Sea, Constantinople/Istanbul, and the islands of Chios and Samos, suggesting that the ship’s home port would lie somewhere to the North of Yassi Ada (Bass 1982, 188).

More recently, other shipwrecks have yielded further information about the distribution of amphorae during the Byzantine period. An important example is the ‘glass wreck’ dating from the 11th century at Serçe Limani, South-West of Marmaris on the Turkish coast, which was excavated in 1977-79 by the same G.F. Bass and F. Van Doorninck for the Institute of Nautical Archaeology (Bass & Van Doorninck 1978; Van Doorninck 1989, 253; 1991; 2002). Besides some 89 Byzantine piriform amphorae (of which many had been used on more than one occasion as transport jars) the Serçe Limani wreck had a mixed cargo of glazed ceramics and three tons of broken glass vessels and glass cullet (packed in cylindrical baskets), which most probably came from Fatimid Syria.

The discovery of two other important shipwrecks with cargoes of fine tableware may be noted here. One was found off the island of Pelagonnisos (Pelagos) near Alonnesos in the Northern Sporades (Kritzas 1971 and Ioannidaki-Dostoglou 1989), and the other between Kastellorizo and Rhodes in the Dodecanese (Philothoeu & Michailidou 1986, summarized in Philothoeu & Michailidou 1989 and Loucas 1989). These wrecks yielded very diverse finds for the 12th and 13th centuries (although we lack further information about find spots and find conditions which might provide important clues for the exact dating of these vessels). However, the publications seem to be somewhat biased in favour of certain classes of decorated glazed bowls (i.e. Fine Sgraffito Ware and Aegean Ware; see for an example of the first ware fig. 3 g), while the coarser wares receive little attention. This is a feature which unfortunately has been not uncommon in underwater archaeology of the
second half of the 20th century, and which was recently rightly criticized by John Hayes, who flatly stated: ‘Too many wrecks have been plundered for their decorated items’ (Hayes 1992, 4).

2.4.2 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS
Since the early days of its inception as a minor branch of art-history, the study of Post-Roman pottery in Greece has changed substantially. In recent years archaeologists working in the Aegean have had their eyes opened to the wealth of information represented by the material remains of the twelve centuries of Post-Classical Greek history. Nowadays, the sherds from the Medieval and Post-Medieval periods are no longer discarded, but carefully collected at excavations and surveys. More important, sometimes they even reach the stage of publication: either in excavation reports, museum catalogues or in separate articles.

As a result of this development, the last two decades have seen the publication of quite a number of studies and the organization of even more symposia and exhibitions. In 1987 the French Archaeological School at Athens organized the first symposium which was dedicated exclusively to Byzantine pottery found in the Eastern Mediterranean (Déroche & Spieser 1989). This landmark gathering of specialists was followed by a conference at Siena in 1991 about 11th-15th century ceramics in the Eastern Mediterranean and their relationships with Italy (Gelichi 1993). In addition, a first monograph on the archaeology of Medieval Greece has recently been published, with some interesting contributions on pottery (Lock & Sanders 1996). The important Ph.D. thesis of Guy Sanders on the Byzantine glazed wares from Corinth to ca. 1125 AD still awaits publication (Sanders 1995).

On the occasion of the 7th international congress on Medieval ceramics in the Mediterranean, which was held in October 1999 in Thessaloniki, both the Benaki Museum in Athens and the Museum of Byzantine Culture in Thessaloniki organised a temporary exhibition on Byzantine and Post-Byzantine tablewares. Both exhibitions were accompanied by a fully illustrated catalogue, presenting in all 664 vessels from all over Greece: from Thrace to Crete (Papanikola-Bakirtzis 1999; Papanikola-Bakirtzis & Mavrikou & Bakirtzis 1999). The long-awaited Benaki catalogue appeared 68 years after the Museum opened its doors to the public in 1931. Both catalogues give good overviews of the published (and unpublished) glazed and sgraffito wares from the 11th to the 17th centuries, as well as technical information on the pottery manufacturing processes of these wares in Greece (see Appendices A17 and A18). In his review of the Benaki Museum publication, Archibald Dunn stated that the volume is an ‘example of a welcome trend, the publication of catalogues of Byzantine pottery (essentially of fine wares), sufficiently well illustrated and annotated to serve as works of reference’ (Dunn 2000, 304).

Finally, a stimulating study by Abadie-Reynal of trade systems in the Late Roman – Early Byzantine world, especially of Late Roman sigillata wares and amphorae from the 4th to the beginning of the 7th century from the Aegean area, showed how the distribution of ceramics in the Eastern Mediterranean can contribute to the discussion about the transition of the Late Roman economy into the Byzantine economic system, and about relations between Constantinople/Istanbul and the rest of the Empire (Abadie-Reynal 1989a and 1989b; recently updated by Sodini 2000). This represents a pioneer attempt for the Eastern Mediterranean to propose social and economic models by using ceramic evidence.

The traditional tendency of classifying Medieval and Post-Medieval pottery solely on the basis of decorative techniques has now given way to issues of fabric, provenance and manufacture. In recent years attention has also been given to the technology of the Medieval workshops in Greek lands and the Eastern Mediterranean area, mainly from information derived from excavations at Serres and Thasos in Northern Greece (Papanikola-Bakirtzis 1992; François 1994), at Sparta in the Peloponnesus (Sanders 1993), on Cyprus (Papanikola-Bakirtzis 1993; 1996) and at Pergamon in Turkey (Spieser 1996). From these studies it appears that two approaches for locating centres of pottery production are now used: the study of the remains of kilns, and the study of refuse from the pottery-making process. In Thessaloniki, for example, a local workshop of 13th-14th century pottery with bird designs in a champlévé technique was recognized by the study of wasters alone, while no kiln was yet located (Papanikola-Bakirtzis 1983).

If the archaeology of Medieval Greece today is anything, it is perhaps best described as a new branch of research, trying to find a solid typo-chronological foot-
hold in an historical period in which mainly byzantinists, text-scrutinizers, and icon-researchers showed interest. Its main focus is – or should be – on establishing a chronology. For this, excavations (and publication of these excavations) are essential. New information derived from stratigraphical context and statistical information on the ceramics is sure to result in the need to amend existing views expressed in earlier publications.

However, although the quest for improved chronology is paramount, field researchers are also focussing on locating workshops and recording the characteristics of their products, as well as on the problem of the provenance of yet unidentified groups of wares. In addition, modern developments in ceramic studies, such as the emphasis on the aspects of production, use and distribution of pottery, also play a fruitful role in current archaeological publications on Medieval pottery from Greece (Bakirtzis 1989).

2.4.3 TOWARDS A NEW TYPO-CHRONOLOGY

Excavations at the remains of the church of Agios Polyaeuktos (now also known as Sarachane in Istanbul) under the auspices of Dumbarton Oaks in the 1960s have shed new light on the Byzantine period from the beginning of the 5th till the beginning of the 13th century (Hayes 1968). Eventually, the finds at Sarachane resulted in a typology for all Early and Middle Byzantine pottery to 1204 AD, put forth in a really excellent publication by John Hayes which presents the best up-to-date review of this material so far (Hayes 1992; preceding by Hayes 1968; see Appendix A13). Invaluable as the finds at Sarachane are, the chronology however stops abruptly at 1204 AD, the year of the Fourth Crusade. The material record shows a gap till Early Ottoman times (16th century), and Late Turkish material is virtually absent.

In recent years some quite substantial reassessments of dates have been made regarding the chronology of Post-Classical pottery. In general the tendency has been to move the Middle Byzantine chronology to somewhat later dates. The Sarachane finds confirm this trend: Hayes suggests, for instance, that wares which were formerly dated as late 12th century types, should in fact be dated to the early 13th century, which is in line with the evidence provided from the castle of Saranda Kolones (‘The Forty Columns’) at Paphos on Cyprus (Hayes 1992).

Recently, there has been a growing recognition of the so-called bacini as a potential source of information for the chronology of Medieval and Post-Medieval pottery in Greece. Bacini is the Italian term for decorated bowls which were embedded in church façades in both Italy and Greece since the 11th century (Gelichi 1991a; 1991b; see fig. 2.9). Hayes especially has stressed the fact that these bowls can sometimes provide cross-dating between one glazed ware and another, since several wares and styles may be present on a single campanile’ (Hayes 1992, 4).

In Greece, the bacini had never been systematically examined until the publication by Megaw of bowls from three Byzantine churches. These churches were dated on architectural arguments from the 11th to the 13th century (Megaw 1964; preceded by Megaw 1931-32, 126). According to him, the glazed bowls were used to enrich the facades of Greek churches especially in the 11th and 12th centuries, usually as focal ornaments in window tympana. The practice continued after the Latin occupation, notably at Mistra.

Megaw’s contribution concerned the church of Agios Georgios at Loukisia in Boeotia, the church of the Panagia Katholiki at Gastouni in Elis and the church of the Panagia at Merbaka in the Argolid. Especially his dating of this last church to the 12th century has led to some discussion in recent years. Instead of dating the Merbaka church on the basis of its architectural decoration, Sanders used its bacini, which were mostly Proto-Maiolica wares from Southern Italy, to propose a late 13th-early 14th century dating of the building (Sanders 44).
In addition, Sanders observed that the name of the place may well have been derived from that of William of Meerbeke, who was bishop of Corinth from 1277 to 1286 (Sanders 1989, 188; based on Struck 1909, 236).

The general opinion seems to be that the custom of immuring decorated pottery in church walls started in Middle Byzantine times (from the 11th century onwards) in Athens, and spread rapidly to the Peloponnese and Eastern Greece (Nikolakopoulos 1978, 22; see also Ince & Koukoulis 1989, 412 with more literature). According to the Greek archaeologist K. Tsouris, who studied bacini in the architecture of 13th century churches in North-Western Greece, ‘they are more rarely encountered in Thessaly and Macedonia, and we know of no examples at all from Constantinople/Istanbul, its surrounding area, or Asia Minor’ (Tsouris 1999, 614 and 620-621 which contains an extensive catalogue of 83 churches with bacini in Northern and Central Greece).

For the rest of Greece, the custom remained popular until Ottoman times. Bacini of much later date, such as the Turkish and Early Modern periods, were inlaid in the walls of several churches in Attica and on the islands of Salamis and Hydra (Nikolakopoulos 1988; 1989 and Korre-Zographou 1995, 69-76), at Methana (Koukoulis & Ince 1986), on Mount Athos (Carswell 1966), on the island of Euboea/Evvia (Kiel 1990), and on the Cyclades (A. Vionis, pers. comm.).

Apart from the bacini, another useful source for fixed dates in the study of Medieval and Post-Medieval ceramics in Greece is the custom of placing decorated cups, dishes and bowls in or above graves, as some sort of burial offering. Joan Du Plat Taylor made the first major contribution to the study of Cypriot glazed pottery by her careful excavation in 1934 of a number of burials at Episkopi, near Limassol (Du Plat Taylor 1938). By relating single bowls in these burials to the stratigraphical and coin evidence, she established for the first time fixed points in the chronology of the Medieval wares on Cyprus.

Until recently, hardly any Post-Classical cemetery had been studied in Greece (an exception is Ivison 1996), but the importance of the burial bowls for the dating of pottery again became clear during excavations carried out by the Byzantine Ephorate of Thessaloniki in the church of the 14th century Vlatadon Monastery, where a section of the monastery’s cemetery was brought to light.

A total of nine graves were discovered inside the church amongst the foundations of the earliest construction phase, whilst another nine graves were found in the vicinity. Sixteen of these eighteen graves contained burial vessels: fifty-five bowls in total. The earliest finds from the graves have been dated to the 2nd half of the 14th century and the latest to the beginning of the 16th century (Makropoulou 1985).

The use of pottery in Late Byzantine/Frankish tombs as grave-goods also occurred at the excavations of Sarachane in Constantinople/Istanbul, in Ephesus and in Cyprus (e.g. Hayes 1992; Parman 1989).

2.4.4 THE RISE OF SURFACE SURVEYS

In the last 25 years, the blossoming of surface survey projects all over Greece has led to a substantial change in the emphasis of archaeological field studies (fig. 2.10). Nowadays, instead of focussing mainly on excavating the stratigraphy of single sites (often focussing on one cultural period), the approach to the history of habitation of Greek lands implies as a matter of course not only a regional, but also a longue durée perspective on settlement history, in many cases embracing the evidence of human occupation from Prehistoric to Modern times. As a result, interest in material from the Byzantine, Frankish, Turkish and Early Modern periods has risen significantly (for a discussion of these see Bintliff 2000).

Examples of surveys with a special interest in Medieval and Post-Medieval artefacts are those undertaken at Palaeopaphos on Cyprus (Sørenson & Guldgården 1987, 1991), at Mallia on Crete (François 1991), at Methana (Mee & Forbes 1997) and at Berbati-Limnes in the Peloponnese (Hahn 1996), in Eastern Phokis (Armstrong 1989) and in Lakonia (Armstrong 1996a), as well as the island of Keos in the Aegean (Hayes 1991). Not all of these publications seem to follow, however, recent results in the refinement of the chronology of Post-Classical pottery, and some dating is still based on the traditional, but outdated pottery handbooks of Corinth and Athens such as the one published by Morgan more than half a century ago.

It cannot be denied that surface surveys have contributed greatly to our knowledge of the history of habitation in Greek lands. The quantitative data available from surveying large areas without excavation has been widely used to establish diachronic patterns of settlement, networks of forts, villages, and agricultural
installations. Field research in the Mediterranean area is now unthinkable without surface surveys. At the same time, however, the fact remains that many surveys have produced quite an amount of discussion on sampling techniques and strategies, as well as quite a few statistical and theoretical models, but much less hard ceramic evidence in the form of systematic publications of pottery to sustain any detailed long-term history of habitation in Greece beyond the Roman period.

On a more general level, the relation between survey finds and historical developments remains one of the most important challenges for field workers. Some critics, among them Peter Lock, have even raised doubts whether the emphasis on processual change in most survey projects fits easily into historical analysis based on scrutiny of the written sources. Anonymous scatters of pottery, Lock remarks, ‘lack the relationship which excavated material provides and are of course dependent on the current knowledge of ceramics’ (Lock 1995, 27).

This may be too pessimistic, but even among the most ardent advocates of surface surveys the conviction has grown that the first and foremost stumbling block for all efforts to reach detailed conclusions on the basis of survey material is the still fragmentary knowledge of the typo-chronology of Medieval and Post-Medieval ceramics in Greek lands.

### 2.5 Summary

Since the first publication on Medieval and Post-Medieval pottery by De Bock in 1887 much has been done as far as the classification, description and dating of glazed wares is concerned. Substantial progress has been made, especially thanks to landmark publications such as *Byzantine Glazed Pottery, Excavations at Corinth XI: The Byzantine Pottery* and *Excavations at Saraçhane in Istanbul II: The Pottery*. On the other hand, the bulk of the material upon which our knowledge is based, is still limited to poorly described museum objects (often of unknown provenance), to finds of sparse and unstratified excavations (wells and fills), and to surface survey ceramics. At this moment there are no more than two large, multi-period urban centres whose pottery has been studied and published in such a way that we can use it as measure for the chronology and classification of Medieval and Post-Medieval ceramic finds in the Aegean: Constantinople/Istanbul (Stevenson 1947 and Hayes 1992) and Corinth (e.g. Sanders 1987; 1995 and Williams & Zervos 1988-1996).

Furthermore, most studies of Post-Classical pottery in the Aegean have been (and some still are) written from a purely art-historical perspective, showing little concern for the humble but vast genre of domestic and transport pottery. The history of research began with the development of classification systems, based on decorative techniques. Another but similar approach was to isolate groups of pottery, which, owing to certain shared features, may be attributed to the same workshop (Megaw 1968b; 1975; 1989). From this originates the quest for centres of pottery production, together with the problem of the provenance of certain groups of wares. Also imitating classical art-historical ‘workshop’ methods, it emphasises the fine tableware.

Lately, the study of Medieval and Post-Medieval ceramics in Greece has quickened its pace somewhat and quite a number of smaller publications have appeared on the subject, in particular on decorated glazed ware. There have been scholarly meetings and the relatively new science of archaeometry has also been applied in this field. Approaches such as chemical analysis of glazed and domestic pottery are also now opening up new areas of research in the study of Medieval and Post-Medieval pottery in the Aegean (see Megaw & Jones 1983; Jones 1986; Tite 1989; Waksman 1995 and especially Maguire 1997).
However, research on the social dimensions of pottery, which has in recent years become a concern of archaeology in its widest sense, is still completely lacking in the study of Medieval and Post-Medieval pottery in Greece. In spite of the recent ‘renaissance’ of the research subject, it is in this respect still lagging far behind studies generated, for instance, from Italian and British material. Virtually nothing is known about the relation between changes in the artefact, and changes in production and distribution patterns, or changes in eating and drinking habits.

Archaeological ceramicists specializing in other periods have already shown that pottery can be used as more than a mere aid to archaeological dating, and that it is worthwhile to explore its technological, socio-economic and cultural aspects. There can be no doubt that this holds true also for the ceramics of Medieval and Post-Medieval Greece. Questions with regard to the organisation of the pottery workshop, the changing focus of supply and demand, the importance of the road system and the settlement pattern to the distribution of pottery, the taste among the elites and the poorer classes, as well as the cultural values of food and drink in relation to changing shapes may all be considered in order to answer questions about Post-Roman society in Greek lands.

If ceramicists working on Medieval and Post-Medieval pottery in Greece have the ambition to say anything worthwhile beyond fabric and decoration and date (which in itself is an Herculean task), they will probably try to do so by combining the information obtained by typo-chronological research of the ceramics sampled during surveys and excavations, by scrutinizing the textual sources, by using scientific techniques, and even by looking with a critical eye at the socio-historical representation of Medieval pottery on icons and frescoes. Such an approach may eventually point the way to reaching new and tenable conjectures about the past, or at least offer the parachute with which to jump with some confidence into the still rather black hole of Medieval Archaeology of Greece in general, and of Boeotia in particular.

NOTES

1. I will use the designation ‘Constantinople/Istanbul’ here strictly to describe the archaeological site, when referring to excavations or excavated finds from the city centre. The names ‘Constantinople’ or ‘Istanbul’ will be used in a historical context in the Byzantine or Turkish periods respectively.

2. Ian Morris (1994) gives a good survey of this ‘classicism’ in the intellectual history of Greek archaeology.

3. Cf. e.g. Tanoulas (1987, 461-76) and Sanders (1995, 4) for the destruction of these Post-Roman monuments in Athens and Delphi. Official interest in the fate of Byzantine and Medieval ceramics and architectural remains did not come until 1914 with the foundation of the Byzantine and Christian Museum in Athens (Kotsakis 1991, 67). It may also be noted that until 1950 archaeological legislation in Greece only protected antiquities before 1453 AD, the year of the Fall of Constantinople.

4. Other early publications with an art-historical approach are, for instance, Von Stern (1906) about Post-Roman glazed ceramics from Russia (Theodosia-Caffa) and Wulff (1909; especially 1911, 100-124) about Post-Roman glazed ceramics from Constantinople/Istanbul, Priene, Miletus, Pergamon, Lycia, Thessaloniki and Southern Russia.

5. Dawkins & Droop (1910-11, 24.) introduced in their article the term ‘graffiato’ for incised wares of the Middle Byzantine period, but they did not explain from where this term derived. The term ‘sgraffiato’ (from the Italian word ‘sgraffiare’ = ‘to scratch’) was introduced by the Victorian scholar J. C. Robinson in his Catalogue of the Special Exhibition of Works of Art of the Mediaeval, Renaissance and More Modern Periods, on Loan at the South Kensington Museum (1863) and is afterwards also used by B. Rackham in his Catalogue of Italian Maiolica (1977, 422-52). However, since David Talbot Rice used the term ‘sgraffito’ in his Byzantine Glazed Pottery (1930, 32) ceramicists working in the Aegean nowadays prefer the term ‘sgraffito’ to ‘sgraffiato’ or ‘graffita’ which are used by their colleagues in Italy to describe the same type of ware.

6. In contrast, the German archaeologist W. Altmann (1904, 293) considered the glazed ware found in the lower Agora and middle Gymnasium of Pergamon even as ‘Bauernware, die mit der in der Farbenwirkung oft erstaunlich reizvollen thüringischen sich vergleichen lässt’.

7. Noteworthy also was Schneider’s publication of Late Roman – Early Byzantine material from Samos in 1929. Cf. Schneider (1929).
8. The pottery from these excavations was published by D. Talbot Rice in *Reports of the British Academy Archaeological Expedition to Constantinople, 1928 and 1929*, Oxford.

9. The term 'faïence', used by Talbot Rice in his 1930 publication for glazed white wares from the Byzantine period, is not the same as the modern ceramic term. Nowadays, faience is the French name for tin-glazed earthenware, called after *bianco di Faenza* ware. This is maiolica with a thick white glaze introduced in the 1540s in Faenza, one of the biggest pottery making centres in Italy.

10. Waagé (1934) also introduced the name ‘Proto-Maiolica’ for a group of 13th and 14th century painted pottery from Corinth.

11. Waagé’s classification of the Late Roman Red Slip Wares was considered by Hayes (1972, 4-5) as a ‘major step forward’.

12. According to Waagé (1933, 309) there were no sherds of Polychrome Ware or Petal Ware from the Constantinople excavations in his collection. The Agora pottery had more similarities with that from Corinth (*Deltion tis Christianikis Archaeologikis Etaireias* 11 1923, 21ff), Sparta (Dawkins & Droop 1910-11, 23) and Thebes (unpublished; although Keramopolous already published in 1926 some grave-material from Thebes).

13. Although Waagé (1933) acknowledged that the absence of a slip (especially over red clay) was an indication of early date in general, he also admitted that it was not necessarily valid in the case of the rougher kitchen ware.

14. The excavations at Corinth started in 1896 AD, and Morgan also excavated parts of the site in 1929 and 1936-37 (Sanders 1995, 15). Previous to Morgan’s 1942-publication there were two articles about ceramics from Post-Roman Corinth, aside from some odd pieces published in excavation reports in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (Philadelphos 1924; Shear 1929; De Waele 1930 and Bronner 1933), followed by the study of Waagé (1934) on Proto-Maiolica wares. According to Megaw (1964, 145 n. 4) ‘only 30 of the 1788 items described were found before 1929’.

15. However, Morgan changed Frantz’s system by incorporating her second category of decorative styles (impressed ware) in his ‘Plain-Glazed Wares’-group.
