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Pottery Production in the Bay of Naples

PROBLEMS, HISTORY OF RESEARCH AND CURRENT STRATEGIES

INTRODUCTION

For more than a thousand years the Bay of Naples was not only one of the most important and dynamic areas of the antique Mediterranean, but also a region well known for its production of pottery. The first testimonies for local production of ceramics refer to the Late Geometric period at the site of Pithekoussai and the latest to Late-Antique and Byzantine periods, e.g. at Cuma, at Naples or in the territory of Pompeii.\(^1\) Many of the pottery workshops in the Bay of Naples produced for export, as for example the workshops for tiles of the late archaic period at Ischia or those at Naples for the ubiquitous Campana A ware of the second and first c. B.C.E. that has been found all around the Western Mediterranean. In most cases provenance from the Bay of Naples has been determined by the specific morphological repertory that could be brought into connection with wasters as indicators of workshops (Campana A) or by potter’s stamps and/or decoration motifs (so-called sigillata Puteolana). In some cases authors also refer to the peculiarities of the clay, rich of volcanic inclusions, which could be discerned also with the naked eye. While it does not seem too difficult to recognize the general provenance from the Bay of Naples, it has proven to be much more complex to distinguish between the various possible production sites within that region, such as Naples or Cuma, to name only the most important centres where wasters or moulds indicate probable local production.

Thus, to understand the local dynamics of the area and to gain better insight into regional exchange patterns, further research was needed. The following studies soon were confronted with considerable difficulties.\(^2\) As secured workshops with kilns, wasters or spacers as indicators of local production are rare, the identification of different production sites could be expected foremost from archaeometric analyses and in particular from the comparison of ceramics with local clay resources. Due to the specific geological situation of the Bay of Naples, determined by the volcanic nature of this area and a series of repeated volcanic eruptions of Mount Vesuvius, it turned out to be very difficult and sometimes impossible to find relevant clay sediments, which are often assumed to be hidden under deep lava strata. The dense urbanization of modern Naples and a large part of the region also did not facilitate these attempts.

---

1 For early Pithekoussai, see Olcese 2012, 345–47 with bibliography; for Cuma, see Caputo and Regis 2009; de Rossi 2008; for Naples, see Arthur 1998; Carsana 2009, for the territory of Pompeii: De Carolis et al. 2009 and in general Olcese 2012, 342–70.

2 See below “History of Research” and in general Olcese 2012, 342–70.
On the contrary, clay sediments are frequent and of good quality on the island of Ischia. Thus it is not amazing that as early as in the 1960s it was suggested that the potters’ workshops in Naples imported their clay from this island. This assumption, widely accepted in most studies of the following years, has to be re-examined, however, as according to anthropological studies the importation of clay would present a rather unique situation. Further, it also results in the fundamental question of: What is the definition of “local production” and by which methods can we identify it in archaeological research? Normally, we speak of “local production” if we have secure archaeological indicators for the existence of potters’ workshops such as kilns or misfired pieces. But what about when the raw materials, used in this production have been imported from another place, as is generally supposed for Ischia? In this case, the theoretical basis for the identification of a production site by archaeometric analyses, the assumption that the site where raw materials were excavated and the place where pottery was produced are more or less identical or at least close to each other, would no longer be true. Actually, this discrepancy cannot be solved on a theoretical level, but it is to be hoped that further exploration of the geological situation and the possible individualization of slight differences between raw materials of the various sites within the Bay of Naples will bring advances in this complex question.

HISTORY OF RESEARCH

Evidence for the local production of ceramics in the Bay of Naples have been reassumed recently by G. Olcese. The following overview therefore focuses only on the most important sites without claiming to be complete.

Pithecoussai/Ischia

Local production of ceramics at Ischia has been assumed for Late Geometric and Archaic pottery in Euboian, Corinthian and Attic tradition and proven by a kiln excavated under the church of S. Restituta at Lacco Ameno. Of certain importance was also the production of tiles, which have been found as imports in many centres of the Tyrrhenian coast from the Late Archaic

---

3 Buchner 1994; see now also Olcese 2012, 345–49 with reference to modern pottery workshops on the island between Casamicciola and Lacco Ameno, see also Hampe 1965, 38.
5 In recent times potteries were normally situated in the immediate vicinity of clay deposits, see e. g. the anthropological study of Arnold 1985, in particular 38–40, but contra, see Hampe for Casamicciola at Ischia and Cutrofiano and Lucugnano in Apulia: Hampe 1965, 38, 57, 62.
6 The problematic of transport of clay has been widely discussed in archaeology, e. g. Dupont 2000, note 39. Usually the importation of clays is seen as an exception in regions without good natural clays, like Egypt, where trade with clays is attested by literary sources: Porten and Yardeni 1993, 82–291; Yardeni 1996; Briant and Desca. See also Boardman 1956; Gill 1987; Ampolo (1996), 247.
7 Geological surveys have been carried out recently by A. De Bonis (Naples), and Roman Sauer (Vienna), and will hopefully be presented in the next edition of FACEM in 2013.
8 Olcese 2012, 342–70.
period onwards. Though the beginning of the pottery workshop under the church of S. Restituta at Lacco Ameno might have been very early, the phase of main activity ranges from the fourth to the second c. B.C.E. onwards when glazed ware, transport amphorae and tiles were produced.

*Kyme/Cuma*

Secure attestations for the local production of pottery at Cuma are rare and belong mainly to the Roman and Late Antique period. While the production of Italian terra sigillata has been assumed on the basis of the discovery of three moulds of N. Naevius Hilarus, the local production of *ceramica a vernice interna rossa* has been supposed because of the existence of wasters. Archaeometric analyses confirmed the provenance of the clays from the Bay of Naples but could not prove an origin from the area of Cuma. For the earlier periods we mainly rely on studies of pottery from the new excavations at Cuma, carried out from 2001 onwards, where local production has been assumed for coarse wares, glazed wares and Ionic cups. These materials have also been sampled for the present analysis of the local production of Cuma.

*Neapolis/Naples*

Though the existence of good clays at Naples has always been doubted, the local production of pottery, namely of black glaze ware, has been assumed already for the 5th c. B.C.E. soon after the foundation of the town. As the morphological repertory of this supposed production is so close to Attic models, the immigration of Attic craftsmen has even been conjectured, this attribution actually can be regarded only as a hypothesis. Only from the third and second c. B.C.E. onwards is there evidence for the production of glazed ware (so-called Campana A), coarse ware and amphorae of the MGS type. Already in the 1950s, excavations on Corso Umberto

---

10 Rescigno 1998; for archaeometric analyses, see Sauer and Gassner 1999; for the distribution in the export area, see Gassner 2003, 225–27.
11 See now Olcese 2010, 25–31; and Olcese 2012, 345–49 with bibliography.
13 Soricelli 1982; Soricelli 2004, 302; see also Kenrick 2002.
15 For the excavations of the Università Napoli Federico II, see now Gasparri and Greco 2007; Gasparri and Greco 2009; for those of the Università Orientale, see Cuozzo et al. 2006, in particular p. 12; for those of the Centre Jean Berard, see P. Munzi et al. in this edition of FACEM; For the complex situation concerning the production of amphorae, see Sourisseau 2011, 149–73; Gassner, Hommages Bats (forthcoming).
17 Morel 1985; for pottery of the 5th c. B.C.E., see Boriello et al. 1985, 232; Bragantini 1991, 29; Pontrandolfo 2000, 122 fig.1.
19 See in general Olcese 2012, 349–60 with bibliography. For the definition of Campana A, see Lamboglia 1952; Lamboglia 1954, 65, and Morel 1981, 47.
and in nearby Vico S. Marcellino brought evidence for the existence of workshops.\textsuperscript{20} The recent excavations for the construction of the new metro line made clear that this artisanal quarter lay near the ancient harbour. They also explored another workshop area in Piazza N. Amore, active from the first half of the third to the early second c. B.C.E.\textsuperscript{21} Samples of glazed ware from the potter’s quarter of Corso Umberto have been analysed by M. Picon and compared to samples from Ischia with the result that the latter show a matrix rich of carbonates, which seem rare in the samples from Naples.\textsuperscript{22}

The export-oriented production of fine table ware at Naples continued also to the Roman Imperial period if we accept the localisation of Campanian Orange Ware ("produzione A di Napoli" or so-called Tripolitanian Sigillata) at Naples.\textsuperscript{23} This ware, first identified at Berenice in Libya and considered to be local, is now generally located in the Bay of Naples due to archaeometric analyses and the discovery of two misfired samples in the historic centre of Naples.\textsuperscript{24} According to contexts mainly at Pompeii, the beginning of this ware can be assumed about the middle of the first c. B.C.E. and it flourished at least until the Late Augustan/Tiberian period. Again on the basis of contexts at Pompeii it cannot be excluded, however, that the production continued on a smaller scale at least until the Claudian period.\textsuperscript{25}

\textit{Puteoli/Pozzuoli}

At the end of the first c. B.C.E. we see the appearance of another production of terra sigillata, located in the Bay of Naples. Traditionally it is denominated terra sigillata Puteolana, the terminus "Puteolana" deriving from the discovery of a considerable number of decorated and plain sigillata vessels and of moulds for relief bowls in the north of the Flavian amphitheatre at Puteoli/Pozzuoli in 1873/1874.\textsuperscript{26} There was no evidence for kilns or wasters and, as the following analyses of stamps and decoration made clear, the collection also comprised a considerable number of importations from other production sites of Italian Sigillata. Unfortunately, the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[20] These excavations have been directed by W. Johannowsky and are partially published by Accorona et al. 1985; Morel 1985; Laforgia 1986; see also Olcese 2012, 351–2, pl.47–8, with bibliography.
\item[21] De Caro and Giampaola 2004; Giampaola 2005, Febbraro and Giampaola 2009; G. Olcese mentions also spacers and wasters of ceramics from the second half of the fourth c. B.C.E. and wasters of e. g. Campana A, coarse ware, tiles, and moulds which indicate an duration of potters’ activities in this area to the first c. B.C.E., see Olcese 2012, 358.
\item[22] Picon 1988; Morel and Picon 1994; Olcese et al. 1996, 16–7; Olcese 1999, 292–3. Olcese 2004. For archaeometric analyses in the consumption area, see Mirti and Davit 2001 (Calabria); Belvedere et al. 2006 (Sicily); Trapichler 2006, 38 graphic 5 (Velia).
\item[23] For the first definition of the ware as "Tripolitanian Sigillata", see Kenrick 1985; Kenrick 1987; for the identification as a Campanian product, see Soricelli 1987a; Soricelli 1987b; Ettlinger 1990, 12–3; Soricelli et al. 1994, Soricelli – Schneider – Hedinger 1994; Hedinger 1999, 171–83; Hedinger et al. 1999, 347–65; Schneider and Daszkiewicz 2006, 174; McKenzie-Clark 2012; summing up Soricelli 2004, and Olcese 2012, 352–55. Kenrick suggested the term "Campanian Orange Ware" which is also used in this article, see Kenrick 1996, 43. The terminus „Produzione C“ was created by Soricelli 1987b (Libyan Studies), 74, but then discarded by the same Soricelli when it became clear that “produzione C” is identical with “produzione A”, see Soricelli et al. 1994, 81.
\item[24] Found in the area of Chiesa dei Girolamini resp. Chiesa di S. Maria Maggiore, see Arthur 1985; Soricelli 1987a; Soricelli 1987b; Olcese 2012, 352.
\item[25] Soricelli 1987b; Soricelli et al. 1994; Soricelli 2004, in particular 301.
\end{footnotes}
find was divided and brought partly to Paris, partly to Berlin and other museums so that it remained difficult to have an overview of what has really been found as a full publication of all the vessels is still missing.\textsuperscript{27} In the following more than hundred years the so-called “Sigillata Puteolana” has been discussed widely. The question has even been raised if a workshop for sigillata existed at Puteoli at all, or if the so-called Puteolana were possibly produced at nearby Cuma where moulds for N. Naevius Hilarus have also been found.\textsuperscript{28} All authors, however, agree that the morphological language and the repertory of decoration allow distinguishing sigillata Puteolana from workshops in Central or Northern Italy.\textsuperscript{29} The chronological distribution pattern assumed for this production relies strongly on the contexts of the military bases in Germania (camps on the river Lippe, like Oberaden and Haltern) and thus proposes a date from the Late-Augustan to the early Tiberian period. Soricelli argues for a continuation of this production until the middle or even into the second half of the first c. A.D., named “terra sigillata tardo-puteolana”.\textsuperscript{30}

Archaeometric analyses started soon, but always found it rather difficult to detect a homogeneous pattern for this production.\textsuperscript{31} This would argue for more than one production centre in the Bay of Naples or Campania, which now no longer seems improbable.\textsuperscript{32}

\section*{THE CURRENT APPROACH OF FACEM}

The objectives of our current investigations have been twofold: First we aimed at the definition of \textit{fabrics} within various ware groups of representative materials from Naples and from Cuma according to the methodology normally used in FACEM\textsuperscript{33}. In a second step we wanted to deal with the question of whether these \textit{fabrics} could be attributed to single production centres in the area of the Bay of Naples. While the classification according to the \textit{fabric} is routine work, though sometimes difficult due to the very fine nature of some of the table wares, the identification of the different production centres within the investigated area posed serious difficulties: The direct comparison of these \textit{fabrics} with that of misfired pieces and spacers is difficult, as wasters normally have been exposed to very different firing conditions. On the other hand, spacers are made of coarse clay and can only be compared to samples of coarse ware or tiles, but are not very helpful for fine table wares. To a large degree we also took into consideration archaeological arguments, like the frequentness of \textit{fabrics} among coarse wares, often thought to be local, or the chronological range, as \textit{fabrics} in use in the Late Geometric and Archaic period are supposed to come rather from Cumae or Ischia than from Naples or

\begin{footnotes}
\item[27] For this part of the history of research, see Comfort 1963-64 who also presents photos of decorated sigillata and moulds at the Louvre, Paris as well as a list of stamps.
\item[28] Comfort 1973; see also Soricelli 1982, but contra Pucci 1975.
\item[29] See e.g. Ettlinger 1990, 11 who argues for the use of the terminus “Puteolana”.
\item[31] See from the beginning Lasfargues and Picon 1982, 21, but also shortly Schneider and Hoffmann 1990, 31; Schneider 2006, 165 to his group III.
\item[32] For possible other workshops producing terra sigillata in Campania, see the résumé of Soricelli 2004, 304–5 and recently McKenzie-Clark 2012.
\item[33] Gassner and Trapichler 2011.
\end{footnotes}
Pozzuoli based on archaeological reasons. Also the occurrence of similar characteristics in fabrics of different ware groups (e.g. black glaze ware and finer banded and coarse ware) has been observed and can be taken as an indication for an origin from the same, probably local production centre.

In recent years Italian and Austrian geologists also carried out several geological surveys in the region, mostly in the area of Cuma (Campi Flegrei) and at Ischia, the Volturnus Valley and the peninsula of Sorrent, but to a minor degree also in Naples itself. So hopefully in the future we will have the possibility to compare our fabrics to local raw materials, but as the analysis and evaluation of these studies is still going on at the moment, for this second edition of FACEM we decided to concentrate on the first topic and give only an overview of supposed local/regional fabrics from the Bay of Naples from the Archaic Period to the first c. A.D. in regard to fine and coarse wares, leaving also transport amphorae for the next edition.

The code chosen for these fabrics is rather generic and reflects our current (poor) state of research: BNAP, short for Bay of Naples (Baia di Napoli), includes the Bay of Naples from Pozzuoli to Naples and the southern plain as far as the peninsula of Sorrentum, but at the same time also the territory of Kyme/Cuma and the island of Pithekoussai/Ischia. However, in our papers suggestions for the possible attribution of fabrics or groups of fabrics to specific sites are made. It is clear that they have to be regarded as preliminary for the moment.
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