

CHIOS WITHIN THE NETWORK OF PRODUCERS OF ZEEST'S "PROTOHASIAN" LINEAGE OF TRANSPORT AMPHORAE

Pierre DUPONT

ArArLab, Maison de l'Orient, Lyon, France; e-mail: pierre.dupont15@orange.fr

Keywords: East-Greek transport amphorae, Zeest's "Protohasian" type, Chian variant, Late Archaic period

Abstract: Lab results suggest the existence, side by side with the canonical lineage of the archaic Chian transport amphorae, of a local variant of containers of Zeest's "Protohasian" type.

Cuvinte-cheie: transport de amfore din Grecia estică, tip Zeest „Prototasian”, producție Chios, perioadă Arhaică Târzie

Rezumat: Rezultatele de laborator sugerează existența, alături de descendența canonică a amforelor arhaice de transport din Chios, a unei variante locale a amforelor de tip Zeest „Prototasian”.

Whereas recent lab results invite today to reattribute to mainland North-Ionian centres of manufacture the major part of Zeest's "Samian" and "Protohasian" varieties of archaic transport amphorae¹, the connected question to be asked lies in the contribution of Chios island to the chorus.

Even if no categorical answer can be given to this keen question at the present stage, some lab advances can be put forward, which suggest the existence of a Chian branch within the class of these widely distributed containers².

Typologically, the involved shapes are only specifically recorded as such *apud* Monakhov's "amphoras from undetermined North-Aegean centres, with multibevelled foot ("Protohasos"), 4th series"³, all dated in the first quarter of the 5th century B.C. (Fig. 2).

The Lyon lab data base for Chios gathers some 160 samples or so, the chemical patterns of which are divided into several separate groups, some of them corresponding to the products of contemporary workshops (Siderounta, Pyrgi, Armolia), others to those collected on ancient sites (Chios town, Limnia, Emporio...).

The data processing of this collection of samples from various parts of the island has evidenced a partition into several groups of chemical patterns⁴, all distinct from those of opposite North-Ionian centres of manufacture, viz. Clazomenae, Erythrae and Teos, despite the fact that the island, on both the geological and geomorphological points of view, appears as the extension of the facing Erythraean peninsula, separated from it by a narrow channel. Some of these Chian groups appear more or less connected with the

above-mentioned modern pottery workshops, the others with ancient sites, first of all Emporio and Chios Town.

In comparative tests operated between our samples of both Zeest's "Samian" and "Protohasian" jars from Black Sea settlements (Fig. 3: samples OLV 11–12, DUP 556) with this Chian data base, one cluster (referred to as "Chios 2") (Fig. 1), gathering both various "canonical" archaic and classical Chian amphorae fragments from an extra-muros potters' workshop's dump from Chios lower town⁵ and a complete set of the archaic variant of Zeest's "Protohasian" type, often bearing at the upper part of the neck the well-known painted circle already attested on standard Chian series of jars (Fig. 3 center down: sample DUP 560), thus strongly suggesting a common Chian origin.

The fact that all our samples of this special variant of Zeest's "Protohasian" included within this cluster were all collected on Pontic settlements, raises two types of questions, viz. both the representativeness of similar products among the finds of Chios island itself and of their exact place of manufacture throughout the island.

As concerns the first point, even if pieces of evidence at our disposal are still sparse, some fragments brought to light in the above-mentioned potters' workshop's dump from Chios town can be put forward, viz. those represented *apud* Tsaravopoulos 1986 contribution: the rim fragment pl. 31:7 as well as the two multi-bevelled feet pl. 31:5 (Fig. 4). An additional example might be represented by a single fragment of a rim from Chios upper-town, the chemical pattern of which also falls within the same Chian cluster, though rather ascribable to a possible imitation of Zeest's standard "Samian" type (Fig. 5).

Conversely, the fact that these samples of Zeest's "Protohasian" type all fall into a group together with

¹ Dupont 2010; Dupont 2017; Dupont 2019, p. 55–58.

² Dupont 2019, p. 57, fig. 8.

³ Monakhov *et alii* 2019, p. 117–118, NA. 10–12.

⁴ Thus confirming Whitbread's former mineralogical investigations (see Whitbread 1995, p. 134–153, esp. p. 143–144).

⁵ Tsaravopoulos 1986, p. 136–139, pl. 30–31, 37.