
MARK L. LAWALL

RHODIAN AMPHORA STAMPS FROM GORDION 189 BC

I first met Niculae Conovici at a conference on Black Sea archaeology in Varna, Bulgaria in 1997. At that conference, I presented some archaic amphora finds from the inland Turkish site of Gordion, and in a comment after another paper mentioned some of the Hellenistic finds too. These later finds, in particular the Rhodian handles, were of great interest to Conovici, and he frequently asked me when I would complete that publication. It is appropriate, therefore, to present a preliminary report on the Rhodian handles from the abandonment phase at Gordion in this volume.

Virginia Grace made the initial study of the amphora stamps at Gordion from rubbings and photographs sent to her either by the director of the excavations, Rodney Young, or by Frederick Winter who wrote a dissertation on the Hellenistic pottery from the site¹. Winter's dissertation mentions these Rhodian stamps but

¹ For an overview of the archaeology of Hellenistic Gordion, see DeVries, *Gordion*, p. 400-405. Works cited repeatedly are abbreviated as follows:

Darbyshire <i>et al.</i> , <i>Galatian Settlement</i>	G. Darbyshire, S. Mitchell, and L. Vardar, <i>The Galatian Settlement in Asia Minor</i> , AS 50, 2000, p. 75-97.
DeVries, <i>Gordion</i>	K. DeVries, <i>The Gordion Excavation Seasons of 1969-1973 and Subsequent Research</i> , AJA 94, 1990, p. 371-406.
Finkielsztejn, <i>Chronologie</i>	G. Finkielsztejn, <i>Chronologie détaillée et révisée des éponymes amphoriques rhodiens, de 270 à 108 av. J.-C. environ: Premier bilan</i> , BAR International Series 990, Oxford, 2001.
Grainger, <i>The Campaign</i>	J.D. Grainger, <i>The Campaign of Cn. Manlius Vulso in Asia Minor</i> , AS 45, 1995, p. 23-42.
Habicht, <i>Rhodian</i>	Chr. Habicht, <i>Rhodian Amphora Stamps and Rhodian Eponyms</i> , REA 105, 2003, p. 541-578.
Jöhrens, <i>Amphorenstempel</i>	G. Jöhrens, <i>Amphorenstempel im Nationalmuseum von Athen zu den von H.G. Lolling aufgenommenen "Unedierten Henkelinschriften."</i> Mit einem Anhang: <i>Die Amphorenstempel in der Sammlung der Abteilung Athen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i> , Athens, 1999.
Laube, <i>Die Amphorenstempel</i>	I. Laube, <i>Die Amphorenstempel</i> , in H. Abbasoglou and W. Martin (eds.), <i>Die Akropolis von Perge I. Survey und Sondagen 1994-1997</i> , Mainz am Rhein, 2003, p. 131-137.
Lawall, <i>Amphoras and Aegean trade</i>	M. Lawall, <i>Amphoras and Aegean trade: structure and goals for future research</i> , in R. F. Docter and E. M. Moorman (eds.) <i>Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Amsterdam, July 12-17,</i>

does not go into any details². I was invited to study the Greek amphoras at Gordion in 1996 as part of an effort to publish the finds from the earlier Rodney Young excavations and the more recent excavations by Mary Voigt and T. Cuyler Young³.

The most significant point about the site of Gordion for the study of Rhodian amphora chronologies is the abandonment of the site in 189 by the Galatians just ahead of the advance of Cn. Manlius Vulso. The Roman army had recently defeated Antiochus III at Magnesia on the Maeander in 190 BC, and Manlius set off on a campaign against Antiochus' allies, the Galatians. Manlius is said to have found Gordion empty of its inhabitants but 'filled with an abundance of all things [*refertum idem copia rerum omnium invenerunt*]'⁴. There is one amphora stamp (the Rhodian fabricant **Ménandroß**), a few fragments moldmade bowls, and some evidence for new Galatian building at the site after 189⁵. In the first century BC Strabo described Gordion as a village only slightly larger than others in the region⁶. Of primary interest in this paper, however, are the independently datable amphoras of the late 3rd and the early part of the 2nd centuries. This group is clearly distinct from the few post-abandonment fragments. Rhodian stamps dominate this period to the exclusion of nearly all other amphora types, and they form a strikingly homogenous and chronologically discrete group.

One excavated context in particular, the southeast trench level 2 houses (SET house)⁷, produced 34 separate Rhodian fragments, including five certain connections between eponym and fabricant. Other handles within the group may belong to pairs as well, so the SET house is of particular importance both for pairing eponyms and fabricants as well as for its cluster of stamps dating no later than 189 BC. Other contexts likely to be associated with the abandonment of the site contribute further Rhodian stamps from this period.

Winter, *Pottery*

1998, Allard Pierson Series, 12, Amsterdam, 1999, p. 229-232.

F.A. Winter, *Late Classical and Hellenistic Pottery from Gordion: The imported black glazed wares*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Ann Arbor, MI, 1984.

² Winter, *Pottery*, p. 21-25.

³ L. Kealhofer (ed.) *The Archaeology of Midas and the Phrygians: Recent Work at Gordion*, Philadelphia, 2005 provides a series of papers discussing both past and present excavations at Gordion.

⁴ Livy 38.18.

⁵ M.M. Voigt, *Celts at Gordion. The Late Hellenistic Settlement*, Expedition 45, 2003, 1, p. 14-19 surveys the Galatian presence in general and the evidence for re-habitation after Manlius' arrival.

⁶ Strabo 12.5.3. On Roman Gordion, see A.L. Goldman, *The Roman-Period Settlement at Gordion, Turkey*, Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, 2000; idem, *A Roman town Cemetery at Gordion, Turkey*, Expedition 43, 2001, 2, p. 9-20; idem, *Reconstructing the Roman-Period Town at Gordion*, in L. Kealhofer (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 56-68. Strabo does include the nearby site of Pessinus in his list of the major Galatian emporia of his day, and the amphora record there is much richer in the late Hellenistic and early Roman imperial periods, see P. Monsieur, *Note préliminaire sur les amphores découvertes à Pessinonte*, *Anatolia Antiqua* 9, 2001, p. 73-84, especially figs. 11-17; and P. Monsieur and P. De Paepe, *Amphores de Cos et amphores italiques à Pessinonte: Croiser les données archéologiques et pétrographiques*, *Anatolia Antiqua* 10, 2002, p. 155-175.

⁷ This area of the excavation is described by Winter, *Pottery*, p. 312-313.

Finds from SET House

The following Rhodian stamps were found in the excavation of the abandonment phase of the SET house:

Eponym	Fabricant
	Ménwn II
Qeufánhß II (and once alone)	Sqemídaß
	'Agoránac (3 times)
'Aglóúmbrotoß	
Qarsípoliß	'Aristiwn
	'Aristokráthß (2 times)
Sýdamoß	Swkráthß
Sýdamoß (and 8 times alone)	'Aristiwn (and 2 times alone)
Kleitómoxoß (and once alone)	Swkráthß (and 7 times alone)
	Filáinioß
	Diskoß
	Parmeniwn

Table 1. Eponym and fabricant pairs and isolated handles found in the SET excavation area, with eponyms and fabricants in approximate relative order. **Parmeniwn** is listed at the end, but I know of no associated eponyms that would allow a specific placement of this fabricant.

The eponyms from the SET deposit cluster in the early 2nd century according to Gérald Finkielsztein's chronology and subsequent modifications. The earliest of these in Finkielsztein's chronology is **Qeufánhß II**, who was initially dated near 203 BC. Niculae Conovici questioned such an early date for this eponym on account of the name's presence, alongside other eponyms dated by Finkielsztein to the 190s, in Tumulus B at Murighiol⁸. Christian Habicht provides epigraphical evidence in favor of 198 as the year for the priesthood of **Qeufánhß II**⁹, and such a date fits both the evidence highlighted by Conovici and the tendency for the Gordion stamps to cluster in the 190s. **'Aglóúmbrotoß** follows as the next eponym in the group with Finkielsztein's suggestion of a date ca. 197 BC¹⁰. Both **'Aglóúmbrotoß** and **Kleitómoxoß** appear in one example each in the Pergamon deposit, and then both of them should be close to **Sýdamoß** and **Qarsípoliß** on account of similarities of style and their association with the fabricant **Ménwn II** (and note the presence of **Ménwn II** in the SET assemblage). Finkielsztein suggests the following chronology:

⁸ N. Conovici, review of Finkielsztein, *Chronologie*, Dacia N.S. 46-47, 2002-2003, p. 222 with reference to V. Lungu, *Nouvelles données concernant la chronologie des amphores rhodiennes de la fin du III^e siècle au début du II^e siècle av. J. C.*, Dacia N. S. 34, 1990, p. 209-217.

⁹ Habicht, *Rhodian*, p. 556-557.

¹⁰ Cf. *ibidem*, p. 557 coming to agreement with Finkielsztein's date after first noting Louis Robert's suggestion that the eponym should date after 188 BC.

'**Agloúmbrotoß** (197 BC) – appears once at Pergamon; uses Helios head style T3, with 'gothic' font for legend; associated with **Ménwn II**.

Qarsípoliß (196 BC) - uses Helios head styles T3 and T4a, with 'gothic' font for legend; associated with **Ménwn II**.

Sýdamoß (195 BC) - uses Helios head style T3 and T4a, with 'gothic' font for legend.

Kleitómaxoß (193 BC) – appears once at Pergamon; uses Helios head style T3 with 'gothic' font for legend.

No particular constraints, however, fix the specific order of the eponyms found at Gordion within the general period 197 – 190. The styles of lettering, styles of the Helios head, and the careers of the associated fabricants **Ménwn II** and **'Aristiwn** (both appearing in this assemblage) all span these years. The Gordion names could fall late in the period or spread out fairly evenly across it as Finkielsztejn proposes. None of these eponyms, in Finkielsztejn's view, is to be associated with the fabricant **Diskoß**, the earlier of two defining fabricants for the subsequent period IIIb and the Villanova deposit on Rhodes. **Diskoß** and **Ménwn II** are both associated elsewhere with the proposed first eponym of the Villanova deposit, **Cenofánhß**, who also shares the Helios head styles T3 and T4a, and the gothic lettering styles with our period IIIa eponyms. An inscription places **Cenofánhß** around 189 BC (see below), so his date at the starting point for the Villanova group is reasonably secure. The fact that **Sýdamoß** is so well represented could mean that he should be placed as close to 189 as possible, but this is not an absolute necessity.

While the eponyms from the SET group seem to fall somewhat short of the actual date of abandonment, two fabricant stamps, **Diskoß** and **Fil ainióß**, either belong to precisely the year of abandonment or their presence at Gordion requires a slight adjustment in the current Rhodian chronology. Both fabricants are associated with eponyms found in the Villanova deposit¹¹, and this group is only thought to begin in 189. The historical circumstances at Gordion raise the strong possibility that **Diskoß** and **Fil ainióß** began working before 189. If this is the case, then either these fabricants should be associated with late period IIIa eponyms (even though there is otherwise no evidence for such an association), or the earliest period IIIb eponyms, such as **Cenofánhß**, must be moved a year or so earlier. **Cenofánhß** does share many traits with the period IIIa eponyms and so such a move may be possible. The same name appears as a priest of Helios (as son of **§érwn**) on the magistrates' list from Camiros in the position of 189 BC with a five-year margin of error¹². **Cenofánhß** could date some time shortly before the abandonment of Gordion in 189. The stamps of **Diskoß** and **Fil ainióß** are the latest stamps at Gordion with both dating (by arguments entirely independent of Gordion's historical record) very near the year of Gordion's abandonment.

¹¹ For eponyms associated with **Diskoß** see A. Maiuri, *Una fabbrica di anfore rodie*, ASAtene 4–5, 1921–2 [1924], p. 249–269; for **Fil ainióß** see Jöhrens, *Amphorenstempel*, p. 75, cat. nos. 97–98.

¹² Habicht, *Rhodian*, p. 547 with further references. Cf. Finkielsztejn *Chronologie*, p. 179 with references for more on the treatment of this eponym by specialists in amphora stamps.

Other finds from other contexts

The general collection of other Rhodian stamps at Gordion largely reflects the dominance of period IIIa eponyms and periods II-IIIa fabricants seen in the SET excavations. Three eponyms overlap between general collection and SET (one example each of **'Agloúmbrotob** and **Kleitómaxob**, and **Sýdamob** in two examples), and two fabricants also occur both within and outside the SET house (**'Agoránac** with three examples outside the SET house, and **Swkráthb** with one more example outside the SET house). The general collection also adds one more Period IIIa eponym, **Sýstratob**, dated by Finkielsztein to 194 BC. Most surprising in the general collection is the period VI (107-86 BC) fabricant stamp of **Ménandrob**¹³. Unless there is an earlier homonym, then this stamp should be taken as evidence for habitation at Gordion — in some fashion — after 189 and during the period when Gordion was considered simply a village by Strabo.

The presence of these Rhodian stamps in contexts associated with the abandonment of Gordion in 189 largely supports Finkielsztein's revisions to the Rhodian chronology. At the same time, the group draws our attention to some problems in the details of that chronology: the positions of **Qeufánhb** and then the eponyms and fabricants associated with the Villanova deposit on Rhodes. Of course, changing the position of certain names has the further effect of displacing other names, and this is not the appropriate venue for exploring those implications. Given Conovici's interests in both Greeks and non-Greeks in central Europe, it seems fitting instead to turn to the question of how Rhodian amphoras may have arrived at Galatian Gordion.

Explaining the Rhodian presence at Gordion

Modern commentators on ancient trade confidently assert that overland shipping was unlikely due to high costs with the result that movement of freight would have been limited to ca. 30 km from waterways¹⁴. Gordion provides an exception to this rule¹⁵, but it may be overly simplistic to consider the Rhodian material as 'evidence for trade'.

Pre-hellenistic Gordion's geopolitical importance on the Persian Royal Road (or at worst a contributing artery¹⁶) helps explain the diversity of Aegean and

¹³ On this fabricant and with stamps showing the same double line arrangement seen here at Gordion, see, Jöhrens, *Amphorenstempel*, p. 92 with cat. no. 246; Laube, *Die Amphorenstempel*, p. 134 with cat. no. 10.

¹⁴ E.g., J. K. Davies, *Cultural, social and economic features of the Hellenistic world*, in F.W. Walbank, A.E. Astin, M.W. Fredriksen, and R.M. Ogilvie (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd ed., vol. VII, pt. 1: *The Hellenistic World*, Cambridge, 1984, p. 271.

¹⁵ The Sangarius (modern Sakkarya) river, which flows past Gordion towards the Pontic coast was only navigable as far inland as the northern coastal plain in Strabo's day (12.3.7).

¹⁶ There is some debate as to the precise path of the Royal Road. Rodney Young thought he had found a paved section of the Road near Gordion (R.S. Young, *Gordion on the Royal Road*, ProcPhilSoc 107,

Pontic imports to the site¹⁷. Sometime in the early 260s BC, however, Galatian settlement in and around Gordion appears to have cut off the region from Aegean and Pontic merchants – at least as far as the amphora record shows¹⁸. The sudden appearance of the Rhodian amphoras just described is all the more striking in terms of the preceding decades with very few Greek amphora imports. Noteworthy, too, is the extreme scarcity of any amphora stamps or otherwise diagnostic amphora fragments independently datable after 189 BC and before the late 1st century BC despite other evidence for Galatian re-habitation.

Three possibilities can be considered by way of trying to explain the unusually clear Rhodian presence at the site in the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC. First, amphoras belonging to the abandonment phase may not have been in the area long enough to become dispersed through the general mass of artifacts. They may be over-represented in the finds. A common phenomenon at sites where major interruptions of activity are known is that the datable material will tend to cluster in the decades just before the break. In some cases, large scale clean-up after the event led to this clustering of artifacts (e.g., the Persian sack clean-up deposits in Athens, or dumped fills at the West Sanctuary at Ilion following the sack of that city in 85 BC)¹⁹; in other cases the major event, whether a widespread building program, a destruction, or abandonment, seems to stop the dispersal of debris such

1963, p. 348-364), and David Graf reviews the various theories concerning the path of the Road from Sardis to Susa (D. Graf, *The Persian Royal Road System*, in H. Sancisi-Weerdenberg and M. Cool Root [eds.], *Achaemenid History VIII. Continuity and Change*, Leiden, 1994, p. 175-180; and P. Debord, *Les routes royales en Asie Mineure occidentale*, Pallas 43, 1995, p. 89-97, especially fig. 4). Even if the Royal Road itself did not pass through Gordion, other routes did (D. Graf, *op. cit.*, p. 177, provides the ancient references).

¹⁷ I provide a preliminary view of these earlier imports in M. Lawall, *Greek Transport Amphoras at Gordion*, in M. Voigt et al., *Gordion Excavations 1993-1996*, *Anatolica* 23, 1997, p. 21-23; idem, *Amphoras and Aegean trade*, p. 231; and idem., *Ceramics and Positivism Revisited: Greek transport amphoras and history*, in H. Parkins and C. Smith (eds.) *Trade, Traders and the Greek City*, London, 1998, p. 87-90. Another article providing a more detailed overview of Greek amphoras at Gordion from Archaic through Hellenistic times will appear in the publication of the conference *Production and Trade of Amphorae in the Black Sea*, held in Batumi and Trabzon in 2006.

¹⁸ The date of the arrival of Galatians at Gordion in particular is not knowable with precision, but for an extensive discussion of both the political and socio-economic history of the region of Gordion at this time, see Darbyshire et al., *Galatian Settlement*; cf. M. Arslan, *The Impact of Galatians in Asia Minor*, *Olba* 6, 2002, p. 41-55 providing an uncritical summary of ancient testimonia hostile to the Galatians. On the resulting break in imports from the Aegean, see Winter, *Pottery*, chapter 1, especially p. 21-25, and DeVries, *Gordion*, p. 401. The Thasian stamps found at Gordion tend to date late in the 4th or into the first quarter of the 3rd century.

¹⁹ On the Athenian clean-up deposits, see T.L. Shear Jr., *The Persian destruction of Athens: evidence from Agora deposits*, *Hesperia* 62, 1993, p. 383-482 (in response to earlier attempts to date the material significantly later; references given by Shear). On debris from the sack of Troy in 85 BC, see B. Tekkök-Bicken, *The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery from Troia: The Second Century B.C. to the Sixth Century A.D.*, Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri-Columbia, Ann Arbor 1996, p. 12-72 (though this includes earlier strata as well); J.W. Hayes, *Two Kraters 'After the Antique' from the Fimbrian Destruction in Troia*, *Studia Troica* 5, 1995, p. 177-184. The abandonment and subsequent sack of Maresha gives a similar pattern, see G. Finkielsztejn, *Du bon usage des amphores hellénistiques en contextes archéologiques*, in F. Blondé, P. Ballet, and J.-F. Salles (eds), *Céramiques hellénistiques et romaines. Productions et diffusion en Méditerranée orientale (Chypre, Égypte et côte syro-palestinienne)*, *Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient*, 35, Lyon, 2002, p. 231-232.

that more material is found 'in phase'. Earlier at Gordion there was an interruption in activity with the arrival of the Galatians, and in this case late 4th and early 3rd century material is frequently encountered²⁰.

The second point to consider is that amphora material at Gordion from the late 3rd to early 2nd centuries is undeniably more plentiful than in the middle decades of the 3rd century. There are only four amphora fragments that are securely datable after ca. 270 BC and before ca. 230 BC²¹; however there are some other amphora fragments that *could* date within this period. While there was clearly no actual abandonment of Gordion ca. 275-240 as Winter had suggested²²; nevertheless, given this clear drop in imported Aegean pottery, there was a significant disruption in access between Gordion and Greek exporters following the arrival of the Galatians. Gareth Darbyshire and colleagues, however, have pointed out that the Galatian presence was not limited to a small band of troublesome warriors, and that these substantial immigrant populations appear to have fit themselves into the pre-existing political and economic structures of the region. Darbyshire *et al.* may overstate the degree of continuity at Gordion ('temporary disruptions may have occurred during the initial settlement phase'²³), but the evidence does not require a complete abandonment and then Pergamene-inspired resettlement after 241 as Winter suggested. Instead, one possibility is that the indigenous populations and the immigrant Galatians spent roughly a generation and a half coming to terms with one another to such an extent that pre-existing economic ties and systems could start anew. Livy's comments both that Gordion, though lacking people, was full of all things and that it was an unusually prosperous market town imply a substantial commerce at the site by the early 2nd century.

And yet, thirdly, it is equally if not more probable that the amphoras do not represent the results of normal trade at all. Livy's description of Gordion must be considered in its context²⁴. A dominant theme of Livy's narrative of Manlius' campaign is the seizure of supplies and booty. In March or April 189, not long after the Roman victory over Antiochus III at Magnesia on the Maeander in December 190, Manlius arrived and soon thereafter led the army against the Gauls. The official reason for the campaign may have been Galatian support of Antiochus, but

²⁰ Some indication of this phenomenon is provided by Winter, *Pottery, passim*; the Thasian stamps at Gordion tend to cluster in the first quarter of the 3rd century.

²¹ The latest two Thasian names before the arrival of the Galatians are two examples of **Skúmmoß I** (dated by Y. Garlan, *En visitant et revisitant les ateliers amphoriques de Thasos*, BCH 128-129, 2004-2005, p. 269-329, to ca. 288 BC) and two examples of **Puqiwn IV** (ca. 275 BC); the next Thasian stamps name **'Aristoklêß I** (ca. 248 BC), **Kádmoß** (ca. 240 BC) and **'Erátwn** (two examples, ca. 228 BC).

²² Winter, *Pottery*, p. 47-48.

²³ Darbyshire *et al.*, *Galatian Settlement*, p. 94. It should be noted that Darbyshire and his colleagues, through no fault of their own, were unfortunately dependent on out-dated information about the patterns of amphora imports to the site when they prepared their article.

²⁴ The main lines of the narrative appear in Livy 38.12-27 and a more fragmentary version is provided by Polybius 21.34-36. Despite its fragmentary nature, Polybius' text clearly placed less emphasis on Manlius acquisitive nature.

Manlius' interest in gaining booty is often cited as a contributing factor²⁵. Indeed his ancient critics in the Roman senate accused him of entering into the campaign solely out of greed (he was only grudgingly voted a triumph on his return, and only after much debate and the interventions of friends and relatives)²⁶. Livy lists numerous examples of Malius' extracting money and/or grain from various cities. He left Ephesos heading west, turned southwest after meeting with Seleucus (son of Antiochus) near Antiocheia, proceeded as far southwest as Termessos in Pamphylia, then turned north through Pisidia and eventually into Phrygia from the south²⁷. By the time he entered Phrygia he was 'Dragging after him a column which was now overloaded with booty and barely accomplishing a march of five miles in a whole day...' (38.15). By this point in Livy's account, Manlius' accumulation of goods includes 275 talents (and he demands another 200 from the ambassadors of Oroanda before he arrives at Gordion) and 60,000 medimni of grain (mostly wheat, but also 20,000 medimni of barley). Gordion is the third of three examples of sites abandoned by their inhabitants but full of all good things²⁸. After describing Manlius' arrival at Gordion and his setting up a base there (*Ibi stativa habentibus...* 38.18), the narrative turns to military affairs almost exclusively and we hear no more about his accumulations. He returned to winter base in Ephesos in mid autumn (38.27). It is in Livy's interests to portray the path of Manlius' march as a land of plenty. Otherwise, Livy could not build his case against Manlius as a typically greedy later Republican aristocrat, symptomatic of a long-term decline in Roman moral standards. References to extractions of grain and money, and the description of the army column barely able to move as it is burdened with so many ill-gotten gains, all set up the later debate between Manlius and the Senate over the reward of a triumph.

John Grainger has shown the profound difficulties with much of Livy's description and the implication of base greed on the part of Manlius. Among his other points, and the point most directly relevant to the present topic, Grainger notes that the 60,000 medimni accumulated by Manlius en route to Galatia would have just fed his ca. 35,000 men for the duration of the journey. Additional supplies from the area of Ephesos at start of the march and further grain (of unspecified amount) given by Seleucus at the meeting near Antiocheia would have meant that the accompanying 2800 men from Pergamon could also be fed (Manlius appears to have an interest in seeing to their provisions as well²⁹), along with the accompanying horses and supply train animals³⁰. At least the attested seizures of grain suffice for the journey as far as Galatia, and it seems reasonable to assume that acquisitions of provisions continued. Far from evidence for Manlius' greed, this grain was simply part of the process of feeding his army.

²⁵ Winter, *Pottery*, p. 12; and see references provided by Grainger, *The Campaign*, p. 23; and see G. Zecchini, *Cn. Manlio Vulson e l'inizio della corruzione a Roma*, in M. Sordi (ed.), *Politica e religione nel primo scontro tra Roma e l'Oriente*, Milan, 1982, p. 159-178.

²⁶ Livy 38.45-38.50; Manlius is described as a *consul mercenarius* (38.45.9).

²⁷ For a map of Manlius' march see Grainger, *The Campaign*, fig. 1.

²⁸ Lagos and Darsa are similarly described by Livy (38.15).

²⁹ Livy 38.13.

³⁰ D. Engels, *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army*, Berkeley, 1978, p. 126 suggests a horse's daily ration would be roughly 10 pounds of grain per day.

Of course, an army does not travel on bread alone. There is nothing so far to provide for the wine, oil, or other foodstuffs also required by the troops³¹. Earlier, Livy (37.27) attests to the offer of 5,000 jars of wine from Teos for the supply of Antiochus III's army in 190 BC. Cato the Elder (*de Agricultura* 56) recommended between a half- and one-and-a-half liters of wine per day as the ration for slaves. Again, assuming 35,000 men in Manlius' army, and then using a ration of 1 liter per day, the army needed 1,050,000 liters (equivalent to nearly 43,000 amphoras³²) for just the month of marching before arriving at Gordion. Or put another way, each amphora could provide wine for just under 25 men per day, so Manlius' troop train must have stocked ca. 1,400 amphoras each day³³.

These jars (or other containers — skins are a possibility though not without problems³⁴) must have been either forcibly requisitioned, like the grain, or purchased from locally available markets or travelling merchants³⁵. If more Hellenistic amphora assemblages were known along Manlius' route from Ephesus, through Pamphylia and Pisidia and back up into Phrygia, then it would be possible to judge the likelihood of Manlius' army gathering Rhodian amphoras along the route or whether the army or accompanying merchants brought these jars specially from the coast (where they are of course quite plentiful). Unfortunately for the modern pursuit of this particular question, Manlius avoided major centers (e.g., he remained on the river bank opposite Antiocheia rather than confront Seleucus directly)³⁶. Thus, while some amphora material has been published recently from Perge in Pamphylia³⁷, we know very little about the smaller centers and hinterland areas traversed by Manlius. Manlius' army had been in central Ionia with easy access to Rhodian merchants, and it would not be surprising to find amphoras dating to the late 190s accumulating as part of this army's supplies. In addition, Manlius' Pergamene allies clearly had good access to Rhodian wine as attested by the ca. 900 Rhodian stamps in the so-called Pergamon deposit, a dumped fill possibly representing the stocks of Pergamene royalty during the time period under consideration here³⁸. The fact that Manlius' campaign lasted less than a single year

³¹ H. Van Wees, *Greek Warfare. Myths and Realities*, London, 2004, p. 74, notes mercenaries' expectations of grain, wine, olives, garlic and onions, citing Xenophon, *Anabasis* 7.1.37. The situation is clearly somewhat unusual, but it may be significant that the men are shown 20 loads of barley, 20 of wine, 3 of olives, and one each of garlic and onions.

³² Using a standard size of 24.5 liters (excluding room for stoppering) as determined by P.M.W. Matheson and M.B. Wallace, *Some Rhodian Amphora Capacities*, *Hesperia* 51, 1982, p. 295-296.

³³ Note that this figure makes the Teian gift to Antiochus III appear rather modest as supplies for only a few days at best.

³⁴ H.R. Immerwahr, *New wine in ancient wineskins: The evidence from Attic vases*, *Hesperia* 61, 1992, p. 121-132; this article while often cited in the discussion of transportation of wine in skins actually focuses on the production of wine using skins.

³⁵ On markets and other sources of supply for Xenophon's 10,000, see R. Descat, *Marché et tribut: l'approvisionnement des Dix-Mille*, *Pallas* 43, 1995, p. 99-108; A. Dalby, *Greeks abroad: Social organization and food among the 10,000*, *JHS* 112, 1992, p. 16-30; and on moving these goods, see M. Gabrielli, *Transports et logistique militaire dans l'Anabase*, *Pallas* 43, 1995, p. 109-122.

³⁶ This point is observed (for other reasons) by Grainger, *The Campaign*, p. 34-37.

³⁷ I. Laube, *Die Amphorenstempel*, p. 131-137 only publishes 13 legible Rhodian stamps.

³⁸ On this deposit and in particular its archaeological context, see M. Lawall, *Early Excavations at Pergamon and the Chronology of Rhodian Amphora Stamps*, *Hesperia* 71, 2002, p. 294-324.

whereas there are multiple years represented by the eponyms at Gordion does not exclude the possibility that these jars came with the army. Even in single shipwrecks (e.g., Kyrenia) or military camps of short duration (e.g., Koroni), amphoras of multiple years are present³⁹. That Manlius then made Gordion his forward base of operations could also contribute to explaining the accumulation of jars at the site.

These possibilities raised by the archaeological and historical situation at Gordion complicate any interpretation of the commerce through Gordion. In an earlier and very preliminary discussion of amphoras at Gordion, I followed what was at the time a common theme of interpreting such spikes of imports, as we have with both the Rhodian and the Thasian amphoras at Gordion, as exemplifying ‘pulsatile’ trade. The term was coined by Iozef Brashinskiy, and taken up, first, by Yvon Garlan and then others such as John Lund and myself to try to explain why amphora stamps found at sites tend to cluster at certain points and become quite rare at other times⁴⁰. This general idea drew attention to a general phenomenon, but each site and its historical and archaeological circumstances, once explored in more detail, provides various other important explanatory possibilities.

³⁹ For Kyrenia, see M. Lawall, forthcoming publication of a paper delivered at the 7th Hellenistic pottery conference; for Koroni, see E. Vanderpool, J.R. McCredie and A. Steinberg, *Koroni: A Ptolemaic Camp on the East Coast of Attica*, *Hesperia* 31, 1962, p. 26-61.

⁴⁰ I.B. Brašinskiy, *Grečeskij keramičeskij import na nižnem Donu v V-III vv. do n.e.*, Leningrad, 1980, p. 96-97; then discussed by Y. Garlan, *Greek Amphorae and Trade*, in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins and C. Whittaker (eds.), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*, Berkeley, 1983, p. 31; and see J. Lund, *Rhodian Amphorae as Evidence for Relations Between Late Punic Carthage and Rhodes*, in *Aspects of Hellenism in Italy*, *Acta Hyperborea* 5, Copenhagen, 1993, p. 363, and p. 369, noting a similar pattern but not using the same terminology; and Lawall, *Amphorae and Aegean Trade*, p. 231. Now, cf. Y. Garlan, *Les timbres amphoriques de Thasos I. Timbres protothasiens et thasiens anciens*, Paris, 1999, p. 90.