

VRG_Folder_0009

June 8, 1982

Aide-memoire for Virginia Grace, today's conversation with G. R. EdwardsAthens, Agora, date of construction of Middle Stoa

Our professional relationship has been very difficult over the years (35?) because of our differences of opinion on this matter. Let us try to regard it more dispassionately in our old age.

GRE original report, ca. 1947, to Homer Thompson: survey of pottery in Middle Stoa Building Fill (MSBF):

HAT had suggested that I do this. He suggested that even though the construction filling was badly disturbed one should bear in mind that the filling probably had never been disturbed between the time it was laid down in Hellenistic times and the time the building was destroyed by the Herulians in 267 A.D. Therefore the Hellenistic material, of the time of construction, could easily be distinguished from the material of post-Herulian times. It was on this basis that I selected the latest Hellenistic material which seemed relevant and suggested a date for the construction of the building. I no longer have a copy of this report. Presumably it is in the files somewhere. Since I had done this at Homer's request I was much astonished at your attitude in the Mending Room that day ca. 35 years ago. I was very indignant. I was not aware at the time of my survey that you had worked on the SAH material as a group and was certainly unaware of your opinion as to the date.

I do not intend to question that the MSBF handles which you include in the group are of the dates you suggest. I do think their lower date is not the date of the construction of the Middle Stoa. In my opinion the date of construction is later in the century.

1. I think that probably the Middle Stoa construction fill is incomplete. I.E. that we may have only about 1/3 to 1/2 of the original fill. This is indicated at the existing west end of the building where a marker shows the original floor level at that end, high above the highest existing foundation blocks. The construction fill would have existed up to the floor level but obviously did not at the time of excavation.
2. The construction fill thus being incomplete and very badly disturbed anyway, in my opinion the best evidence (the pieces I isolated in my report, however, being indicative) for dating the time of construction are the two following:
 1. The contents of the Well in the Road West of the Middle Stoa. A well obviously put out of use by construction of the Stoa and sealed by the road. The filling included SAH's dated by you in the 60's, as I recall.

16.8.82

(No recollection

of this)

2. 1947
1982
- 35
1947

2. Agora P 23095 (CHP p. 175, n. 31; p. 177, n.38), early Long petal Megarian bowl.
Prior to construction of Middle Stoa. I believe this bowl was excavated by E. Vanderpool. At any rate it was he who pointed out its stratigraphical significance for the date of construction of the Middle Stoa.

I have emphasized in my book that it is highly probable that there will be a different development in the pottery produced in different centers. Both S. Rotroff and C.M. Edwards have suggested that Athenian LP bowls may begin later in Attic than in Corinthian. Properly Rotroff will have to decide on the date of P 23095. Perhaps she has already in her book, which has just now appeared. At any rate in her account in Current Anthropology vol. 19, no. 2, June, 1978, p. 337, she suggested that LP bowls (Xerox) "may first have been produced in Corinth but were being manufactured in Athens by 140 B.C." Her reasons for so late a date are not given but presumably has to do with the date of construction of the Stoa of Attalos. To me P23095 is a very early, if not the earliest of LP bowls.

3. I would have thought myself that the Middle Stoa might have, on this evidence, been constructed within the decade 160-150, with the Stoa of Attalos ca. 150. I have perhaps arbitrarily adopted a date ca. 150 for the beginning of LP bowls in Athens as a median date within the reign of Attalos II, evidence being provided by the Stoa of Attalos construction fill.
4. Strictly speaking, except as an outside scholar, the date of construction of the Middle Stoa is no longer any of my business. I do not suppose that the above will necessarily cause you to change your mind in any way. But I point out these reactions as ones which you should be prepared to meet in your final draft of your article.

Other Hellenistic remarks:

C.M. Edwards' statistics: beginning of mfg. of LP bowls in Corinth

He suggests late 2/4 II B.C.

To me the statistics and percentages indicate only that LP's were very popular in 146 B.C. I.e., they come from a Mummian fill (in situ initial(?) or secondary(?) does not matter greatly) in which the greatest bulk of the material would be closely contemporary with the destruction. How long it takes for a new style to become popular is anybody's guess, but I would think not necessarily long.

Corinth: in situ Mummian destruction fills.

None has been identified as such prior to articles by C. Williams, P. Russell, and C. M. Edwards in Hesperia L, 1981. A pity that CME and PR did not (apparently) isolate the material ~~from~~ theirs. The fills spoken of by me as Mummian have all been secondary, i.e. reaching their final place of deposit some time after 146, even into the time of the early Roman colony after 44 B.C.

Stoa of Attalos fills

I am rather surprised that you did not elect to study the handles from the Stoa of Attalos construction fill and the levels preceding construction. Surely of all the fillings available to you in the Agora these are by far the best. I believe you have the complete construction fill (within the foundations) as well as numerous valuable stratified fills sealed tight by it (Fill over floor of Square Building; Construction fill of Square Building etc.). They were well excavated by EVanderpool. The date of construction is historically attested, ktl, ktl. Why break your head on such an unsatisfactory filling as the MSBF when these impeccable ones are available and crying to be made known? People would be so grateful, and think how credible the report would be!

Date of construction of S. Stoa, Corinth

Xerox of recent comment by C.K. Williams (Hesperia XLIX, 1980, p. 107). CKW later visited me and indicated that he thought that the date of construction should be moved back to the general period which I adopted in my book. This would restore credibility to my chronology which was sadly lacking at the time the book appeared.

Peter Callaghan

Australian. Has done much work with Cretan Hellenistic. Nicolas Coldstream, who lectured here this spring, tells me that he has there many sites with good historical destruction dates. Also that he has been able to redate the Great Altar at Pergamon from ca. 180 to 150 B.C. Review of my book attached. I do not understand his remarks about my chronology but regard his review otherwise as the best from the point of view both of perception and perspective.

Roger

About the Middle Stoa: I have gone into this only because you brought up the matter in our conversation on the 5th.

CORINTH EXCAVATIONS

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

54 SOUIDIAS STREET, ATHENS, 140

CABLES, AMSCHOOL ATHENS



ΑΝΑΣΚΑΦΑΙ ΑΡΧΑΙΑΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΟΥ

ΑΜΕΡΙΚΑΝΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ

ΟΔΟΣ ΣΟΥΔΙΑΣ 54, ΑΘΗΝΑΙ, 140

ΤΗΛ. 736-313

18 March 1979

Prof. G. Roger Edwards
the University Museum
The University of Pennsylvania
33 and Spruce Streets
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104

Dear Prof. Edwards,

Although we have had an Athenian mail delivery strike, that has nothing to do with my late answer to your letter of 27 January. My tortoise-like speed is the result of not wanting to write before I had completely worked out my Corinthian spring dig season schedule. More logic exists behind this statement than is immediately evident.

But first, I personally feel that you are taking on the full criticism of Mr. Callaghan's review, much of which really may well be Callaghan's expression of unhappiness with Corinth's lack of ever having published pottery deposits as groups, and especially at the time when these deposits were dug. As I wrote to you when your book came out, few people but those at Corinth will ever know and appreciate how much organization of material, how much storeroom rummaging, how much initial deposit study you had to put into that book before even beginning to write the book. Callaghan may well have seen for the first time in your Corinth volume how much material Corinth did have but wondered why, since it was so important, it wasn't better reported as it was found. His statement on our comparative lack of closed deposits, I feel, is a result of not really knowing our site.

As a belated try to remedy Callagan's impressions about the weakness of our deposits, I'm trying a new sort of dig programme this spring. We will have two training seasons, one 3 weeks, one 4 weeks; the regular session will be converted into a pottery study period for 5 students, four of whom will examine material according to statistics and types. The studies will tell what shapes are popular in which deposits, which ones are coming in, which going out, which shapes get imported, which are peculiarly Corinthian. The deposits I will use are your Deposits 79 and 80, my drain deposit between Buildings I and 2 and, probably, the 'votive pit' of 1976 Hesperia report. We will use your dating evidence, Herbert's, McPhee's, and Sparkes-Talcott's. If we cannot give a complete publication of each of the deposits, we'll give a good coverage in each case. You did the lion's share already; our work, I hope, will supplement that for two of your deposits. If the programme works, I hope to get all of your deposits out so that people will see the full range of material with which you worked, even though it might take a number of years so to do.

I have every expectation that your dating will be strengthened by this planned study. I still am inclined to think the South Stoa is later than the 330's. But this does not change the dates of the individual deposits. And that must be made clear. I see clearly one destruction, possibly two, in the area of the South Stoa before the stoa itself was laid out. There is indication of some sort of heavy destruction

or general damaging of buildings in the 370's. Could this be part of the 373 shake that got Helike? With this destruction I would put your deposit 79. I don't know about deposit 80, that probably is too late, for McPhee dates one R.F. serd rather positively about 370-360 B.C. (Hesperia, 1976, p. 387, no. 18.) I see the destruction between Bldgs I and II as the second disaster, and I see tries here and there to patch up the buildings. This patching phase apparently left little-----almost no ----- pottery, but casting pits, patched floors, etc., show that something was tried. Apparently none of those efforts succeeded. The deposits you use and date all fit into this history and should not be tampered with. I hope that a little more description of the deposits will make this clear.

If this year's plan works out I hope that we can nibble away at other deposits to give similar exposure. I am afraid, however, that my project may be a bit overambitious, considering the amounts of pottery that we will study. What do you think about this programme? Don't consider my theories about building phases and the South Stoa as part of it. I give that to you to show you why I very much feel that my attack of the pottery really goes along with your trail-blazing. Any hints or suggestions would be much appreciated.

I also hope that the study that we will do this spring might show how much Attic pottery was imported to Corinth (percentages) and in what types, at what times. In other words, what I am getting more interested in is the economics of pottery, an outgrowth of having dug up a Corinthian who traded with Punic cities. That story you'll see in Hesperia, 1979, fasc. 2. It's too bad that you haven't come over to see this fish-house that we're now digging! It raises all sorts of questions about Corinthian economics. And then there is the question which I am beginning to see appear at Corinth about how much the Macedonian controle stagnated the Corinthian economy. I feel that it controled Corinth to such an extent that it forced us to pull back in foreign trade. That in turn caused the city to become more and more depressed. Don't you see something of that evolving poorness in the Corinthian Hellenistic pottery? Well, that is another letter, or better, a Christmas conversation. But if you do have time, I would appreciate your opinions. Until then, I wait...

with my very best to you,

W. H. H.

cc: Thompson

THE UNIVERSITY MUSEUM



UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THIRTY-THIRD AND SPRUCE STREETS
PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19104

CABLE ADDRESS "ANTIQUE"
TELEPHONE: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ 243-4071
(AREA CODE 215)

January 27, 1979

Mr. Peter J. Callaghan
British School of Archaeology
52 Souidias Street
Athens, 140, Greece

Dear Mr. Callaghan:

Recently the Editor of Publications of the ASCS sent me a clipping of your review (in the J.H.S. for 1978) of my book on Corinthian Hellenistic Pottery. Our mutual friend, Jim Wright, and Homer Thompson have supplied your address so that I am able to send you the comments which occur to me. I hope you don't mind even though some time may have elapsed since you wrote the review.

I am most appreciative of the favorable comments you were able to make. I do thank you for these. My main concern in writing, however, as you might suppose, has to do with your remarks on my chronology. I feel that there are misunderstandings which I would like to clear up. I have given considerable thought to them and have come to the conclusion that the difficulties of which you speak are in part at any rate a matter of a failure of communication on my part: things I might have pointed out in the book which I didn't. There are also matters which have become clear to me later. I hope you will tolerate a few remarks to straighten out these matters. My expressions of or on chronology, at any rate, were intended to be contributions toward an ultimate chronology based on what I had, with the thought that my chronology could be carried on and refined in subsequent generations of scholars when better evidence became available. It was, I think I said, a beginning.

My comments on chronology come under two headings: (1) the South Stoa; and (2) methods of arriving at dates expressed in the book.

"The fact that the manuscript was substantially completed as long ago as 1966."

"Recent developments at both Corinth and Athens have done much either to alter or confirm statements made in this book. E. himself admits that the down-dating of the South Stoa construction programme should affect the earlier stages of many sequences [actually I said "certain shape series"]. The reader must be prepared to view with caution any material found in the Stoa wells which is dated to the fourth century."

About the South Stoa it is my present feeling that a change in the date of construction would not seriously affect the dating of the pottery in the book. I have often thought of a remark in Talcott and Sparkes, Black and Plain Pottery, p. 46, which expresses the idea far better than I could have: "No single group, however large or well dated, is of more than limited usefulness in an extended

study: the deposits listed here are of value as cumulative or interlocking evidence." Their material in categories and character was comparable to mine and the same problems and methods of attack would have existed. Certainly the Corinthian deposits and other forms of evidence are, I can thoroughly attest, no less cumulative and interlocking.

There are two other factors. First, only the material from the period of use fillings of the Stoa wells would be affected by a change of date for the completion of construction from ca. 330 to later in the century. These deposits afford only very wide dating, from the time of the completion of the Stoa to the time of the destruction of Corinth by Mummius in 146 B.C. The material from the use fillings cannot be dated very closely on the evidence of the deposits themselves. Secondly, as you may have noted, many series begin much earlier than the time of construction of the Stoa, in the 4th, 5th or 6th centuries B.C. In such long series there would be much non-Stoa evidence for dating and the dating of Stoa material would not necessarily depend on Stoa deposits.

About the dating of the Stoa in any case: as I understand it from Charles Williams by letter, the dating which he suggested in *Hesperia* XLI, 1972, was not intended to be definitive, but more as a warning of a possibility. It was not intended to be regarded as a fait accompli. I last heard from Charles in June, 1978, when he was engaged on a final season connected with pre-Stoa material. I do not know what he may think now. I have, in any case, urged him to consider all the evidence, of which there is a great deal (I have listed it in my book) connected with the construction of the Stoa, not just part of the evidence. I have mentioned to him, for instance, closed and sealed deposits covered by the cobble paving in front of the Stoa (my deposit numbers 79, 80, 88, 91, and 92). It seems to me possible that the Stoa was constructed over a considerable period (east to west because of terrain). As comparison we may cite the Stoa of Attalos and the Middle Stoa at Athens both of which apparently have extensions constructed after the main part of each had been constructed.

With regard to dating expressed in the book your remarks suggest that you think that the sole means of dating the individual pieces is the deposits, to wit:

"The dating evidence for the different shapes is, of course, uneven, but it will be found that the deposits often cannot support the absolute dates proposed for each pot."

"Both the deposit summaries and the general discussion on each shape have to be consulted also in order to establish the degree of probability for every date."

Before proceeding I should like to comment that the dates expressed in the book are usually not absolute (that term is reserved for historical dating) but relative. They are in fact estimated dates based on all the various criteria for dating (comparable to pottery dating in the Classical and earlier periods). It would not be surprising indeed if there were dates not directly supported by deposits.

There are in fact many kinds of evidence for arriving at dates. The most important, to be sure, are the deposits, the shape series, and the attested shape developments. Many others have emerged in the course of writing the book. I wrote and rewrote the book three times and some parts four times. Each time it was because new varieties of evidence came to light in the course of writing. I have listed many, if not all of them, on p. 3 ff. The various kinds of evidence are indeed interlocking and supplementary as Talsott and Sparkes said. Initially deposits contribute to setting up shape series but later, as often as not, the shape series may serve to set up or refine the dating of the deposits. It would

not be possible to publish all the reasons for dating of each shape series. Too many accumulate as a study advances. The editor would not stand for it, I am sure. I did, however, endeavor to set forth the complete reasoning behind the dating of one shape series in an article I published with Margaret Thompson (AJA 74, 1970, pp. 343-350). It concerned a black glaze saucer (in my book p. 42) found over a hoard of gold coins of Philip and Alexander. Martin Price had suggested that the coins of Alexander could date anywhere in the Hellenistic period. Accordingly I got Margaret to work up the chronology of the coins and I wrote up the dating of the saucer: independently, without knowledge of the other's ideas until after both were finished. The result was that our dating came out within a handful of years. This should serve to give you an idea of the various kinds of evidence for pottery dating in Corinthian. It should serve as a sample illustration at least that close dating is possible with the various kinds of evidence which pottery affords and that dating need not be achieved through deposit evidence alone. I am sending you a reprint separately. (the profile illustrations are defective: the printer suspended them from their rims!)

I hope that these remarks will serve to allay the concerns you expressed in the quotations from your review above. If not, do let me know, with specific instances, and I will be glad to try again.

I shall be interested to see your work on Cretan Hellenistic.

With good wishes, sincerely,

G. Roger Edwards

G. Roger Edwards

P.S. I am sending copies of this letter to three other people who may be interested or concerned.

cc: Marian McAllister
Homer Thompson
Charles Williams

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

February 6, 1979

SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

Professor G. Roger Edwards
The University Museum
33rd and Spruce Sts.
Philadelphia, Penna. 19174

Dear Roger:

I'm sorry not to have found time to talk with you on Sunday about Peter Callaghan's review of Corinth VII.3. Dorothy, I believe, was able to fill you in a little on the author of the review. My own comments can be quite brief.

In the first place the review seems to me very favorable on most of the fundamentals. C's criticism of your treatment of the chronology appears to me rather captious and portentous. My feeling was that you had given the reader enough in the way of warning signals, and also that you had made clear the tentative nature of your dating at many points. I'm sure that you will be the first person to welcome adjustments in your proposed dates that may be made possible by new evidence. Certainly that has been my own attitude toward the chronological scheme that I proposed long ago for the Attic material.

I look forward very much, as I'm sure you do also, to the time when Charles will be able to collate the various masses of evidence that his excavations have produced in recent years, and so give us firmer dates for such matters as the construction of the South Stoa and its terrace and the introduction of long-petalled bowls.

Susan Rotroff's MS on the Agora bowls is now in Marian's hands. Marian's hope is that the book may appear about one year from now. You will be glad to know that the Agora bowls are to be called "mould-made relief bowls of the Hellenistic period,"--long but honest.

Have you and I ever discussed the origin of the jewellery on the long-petal bowls? I am inclined to believe that it derives very directly from metal wine strainers. Some years ago I came across but failed to make note of such a strainer of just the right type. But I have no doubt that a little library work would reveal other possible prototypes.

It was good to see you on Sunday. Do let us know of any developments in the history, both ancient and modern, of your little statue.

Best wishes as ever.

Homer

cc M. McAllister
C. W. Williams

copied 14. I. 81

2

16 On the Middle Stoa, see Thompson 1952.86-90. A great deal more of its earth
cf.
filling was excavated in 1953, ~~xxx~~ Thompson 1954.50, in which over a thousand additional stamped handles were found. Following study of these together with the earliest finds, my present belief is that the date of the stamps to be attributed to this filling is in the second decade of the 2nd century B.C. For a brief note on these and contemporary stamped fragments at the Agora, see [Grace apud] Weinberg 1956.97. It should be stated that the date of the filling is not yet established.

Grace apud H. D. Colt and others, Excavations at
Nessana I, London 1962, p. 124. It follows a statement about the
Koan in the MSPP, in connection with Koan from Nessana.

1. 7. 7. 7
Hesp. 1934, p. 208, vq on Hell. clay fill in Section B (late 4th and 3rd)
Hesp 1952, pp. 86-90, HAT suggests late 6th and Aristonellus

#. 10.58

3.02

Further publication references to Middle Stoa

Asperia XXII, 1954, p. 50 (annual report for 1953)

1956

Goldman Festchrift, p. 97, in connection with the Y well at 20/MB in which the Hell. Phoenician were found, and some oriented Latin from the MSBF.

Asperia XXVI, 1957^(IV), Edwards on Hellenistic Panathenaic vases; date some fragments for MSBB as ca. 150 B.C.

KEEP FRONT

3.01

14 I. 81

MSBF - publ. references

Vol. I (1958¹⁹⁶²), see under vq in (24) on no. 24

Hesp. Suppl. X¹⁹⁶², p. 90, 91 (G.R.E.): "There is now a large volume of material from the Agora additional to that published by H. A. Thompson. It comes in part from the construction, fillings of large buildings, esp. the Stoa of Attalos II (159-138 B.C.) and the Middle Stoa which were both under construction about the middle of the second century B.C."

27. IX. 61

3 bid ↑ vq refers to items for fill under Paus. nos. 113, 118, 126, 199 "Imports from Pamphylia", note 7 but without any statues/moulds & first graves.

30. XII. 63

See HAT, The Athenian Agora, a guide, Athens, 1962, pp. 105-6.

[OVER]

KEEP FRONT

3.01

14 I.81

MSBF — publ. references

Hesp. 1934, p. 208, vq on Hell. clay fill in Section D (between 4th and 3rd)

#. 10.58

Hesp 1952, pp. 86-90, HAT suggests late 60s and Ariarathes

3.02

Further publication references to Middle Stoa

Hesperia XXIII, 1954, p. 50 (annual report ^{for} 1953)

1956

Goldman Festschrift, p. 97, in connection with the Y well at 20/MB in which the Hell. Phoenician were found, and some oriented Latin from the MSBF.

Hesperia XXVI, 1957^(IV), Edwards on Hellenistic Panathenaic zones; date some fragments for MSBF as ca. 150 B.C.

Howland vol.

Excavations at Nessana, Vol. I (¹⁹⁶²~~1958~~), see under vq n. (24) p. 124, comment on no. 24

Hesp. Suppl. X⁽¹⁹⁵⁶⁾, p. 90, 91 (G.R.E.). "There is now a large volume of material from the Agora additional to that published by H. A. Thompson. It comes in part from the construction, fillings of large buildings, esp. the Stoa of Attalos II (159-138 B.C.) and the Middle Stoa which were both under construction about the middle of the second century B.C."

27.IX.61

3 bid ↑ vq refers to items for fill under Purge nos. 113, 118, 126, 199 but without any statement of whether beds are first graves.

30.IX.63

See HAT, The Attic Agora, a guide², Athens, 1962, pp. 105-6.

[OVER]

(30.XII.63)

Hesperus 1963, p. 317, DBT quote
app'ts HAT in context of contents:

"Middle Stoa Building Filling: Main Part - & ca 160 B.C. (15)
Over Waterclock - & ca. 125 B.C. (4), (20)."

Now (4) is T 3254 } Look up and see what if
(20) " T 3252 } any SAH found in same
place.

1.II.68

See now chapter for Delos, Maison des Comédiens.

[See now Agnus XIV
- agnus w. SAH]

15.I.81

See F. S. Kleiner, "The Earliest Athenian New Style Bronze
Coins, some evidence from the Athenian Agora," Hesperia, 1975,
pp. 302-330. On p. 302, he dates the start to
the 2nd decade of the 4th cent., citing Agnus XIV, pp. 66-68,
103-104. On p. 303, he cites Numismatica I and EAD 27.

4. vi. 77
See Agas XIV, pp. 67-8
(1972)

20.81.41

3.04

1st St's book (ms.)

Section on Middle Sts (pp. 66, 67)

Supp. 71 pp. Not under Sts, but
under Low Courts

"The architectural style of the middle
Sts, combined with the evidence of
a vast quantity of pottery, S.H. and
coins from the construction fill, points
to a date late in the 1/4 [sic] of the
2nd cent. B.C. for the start of construction.
The body was finished with the closing of
the west end some after the middle of the
same century. The city of Athens
is not likely to have undertaken such
a costly project at the time. A technical
fraternal union foreign to Athens practices
Hall, p. 111

Ref. to Dils 27 can be
the passage, in vol 179, for
p. 68

OVER

Blanchinaga

4
VI. 77

See new Jones article, ms. Documentation

- 6, under no. 2;

" — a 5 with 500

constructing, i.e. context of not later
 than the 2nd decade of the 2nd century (cf.
 Agassiz SW, p. 66, note 179, and below
 p. 67) "

"The city set me up, a truthful monument to
 show all mortals the measure of their journeying; the
 distance to the Altar of the Twelve Gods from the harbor is
 45 stades (9 kilometers). From a nucleation of the 5th
 cent. B.C. (I.G. II, 2640)." From J. McK. Camp, II,
Gods in Heron & the Altar of the Twelve Gods, Pacta Boche No. 19,
 1980, p. 17.

More on the Middle Stone

20.8.80

But also
on the stone
Pencil
in Dols,
I have
seen both
sides

It turns out that there are ^{groups of letters} quite many letters cut on the stones of this Bdg., pointed out years ago to Marion McAllister by HAT or EV. In this, it resembles an Iouis? bldg of the mid 2nd cent. at Pergamon. She has been planning, if she can manage, it, to report on these letters in an article in the HAT postscript, seeing whether it looks as if the MS was a Pergamene effort.

I have heard of these letters before, and in fact she tells me there has been no word about their publication. I thought she might as well see my text of 1956 on the MS. Now she has.

H-K 12-14 Middle Stoa Building Fill

to ca. 180

Construction fill under floor of west end of Middle Stoa and between Middle Stoa and Heliaia to south. Date based on Grace's analysis of ca. 1500 stamped amphora handles in fill. ^{also coins} None of nearly 900 Rhodian handles later than 183 or 182. Dating based on comparison with handles in Pergamon deposit, currently dated 210-176 or 175 (see p. 00). Seven of the 12 or 13 latest eponyms in Pergamon deposit not represented in construction fill of Middle Stoa, implying Stoa fill closed ca. seven years earlier than Pergamon deposit, i.e. in 183 or 182 (Délos XXVII, pp. 290-291). Latest Rhodian eponym is either Nikasagoras I or Theaidetos. ³⁸² None of approximately 400 Knidian handles bear title "phrourarchos" characteristic of period IV A (188-167), but five names which occur elsewhere with this title appear (Archestratos, Philophron, Philippos, Sokrates, Theuphantos); see Délos XXVII, p. 320; latest Knidian handles therefore date shortly after 188. Analysis of amphora handles does not support contention, suggested by architectural evidence, that far west end was finished substantially later than rest of stoa (see I 14:2). Latest coins date 200-180 (Kleiner 2c, 9). Five fragments of long-petal bowls and one fragment of figured bowl of M Monogram Class come from disturbed area of fill at west end of building. Otherwise bowls similar to those in other deposits of early 2nd century. Fragments of six molds.

#37, 50, 63, 65, 83, 114, 131, 137, 140, 164, 182, 196, 198, 220, 223, 229, 232, 264, 278, 282, 283, 294, 296, 314-316

Agora IV; VIII; XII; XIV, pp. 66-68; Hesperia 32, 1963, p. 317; Kleiner I, pp. 303-311, deposits I-II; Kleiner II, pp. 29, 32; Délos XXVII, pp. 290-291, 382; The Aegean and the Near East: Studies Presented to Hetty Goldman, pp. 97, 109, nos. 9-11.

I 14:2 Pithos settling basin

2nd century?

Fill of pithos which served as settling basin in front of west end of north side of Heliaia. Basin probably covered during final phases of construction at west end of Middle Stoa. [Architecture of west end of Stoa suggests it was finished later than rest of building; this later building activity has been associated with Hellenistic fill south of Middle Stoa (Kleiner I, pp. 311-313, deposit III: H-I 14:1) in which one of three stamped amphora handles dates in third quarter of 2nd century (Knidian eponym Philippos: KT 1735: SS 13540). Analysis of amphora handles from building fill of Stoa, however, shows no chronological difference between those from west end and those from elsewhere in the fill.] Pottery from settling basin nondescript. Single bowl is unusual type which may be early form of long-petal, but also resembles imbricate bowls of ca. 200.

*The
Camp applied
John
brackets
6.18.79*

#344. = P 23095

I 16:5 Cistern

2nd century, disturbed

Single Knidian stamped amphora handle dates around 108 (Hesperia 3, 1934, p. 274, no. 218: SS). Tyrkish pottery indicates disturbance.

165

Agora IV.

L 17:7 Cistern

3rd and early 4th quarter of 3rd century

Cistern with little pottery. Severn stamped amphora handles; Rhodian eponyms date in 3rd quarter of 3rd century (eponyms Aglokritos, Pausanias(?): SS 14279, SS 14282). Latest coin dates in 1st third of 3rd century. One small fragment of moldmade bowl of undetermined type.

Agora XII.

6.03

Athens, Nov.10, 1979

Dear Susan,

Many thanks for your two pages of revised text on deposits, sent with your letter of Oct.18. I am very glad to have them; have still a few comments.

On MSBF: the reference in line 13 to Delos 27, p.320, is misleading, as it should document the list of names you give, whereas those names don't appear there. In fact they come from my working paper of 1956, and one, Sokrates, has since been taken off the list of phourarchoi, he turns out to be another kind of eponym in whose term phourarchoi are also named, the title goes with the other name in each case, as we now see. See Delos 27, p. 319, where this is stated. (You have this tome.) You can fix this even in proof by replacing the word Sokrates with the word Philtatos, as he turns out to belong in the list. And you can make your reference less misleading - more general - by closing your parenthesis after Theuphantos, and putting a semicolon after it instead of a colon. Although all this wd go in proof, Marian might like it better now.

On I 14 : 2, I remain mystified as to why SS 13538-40 were selected by Fred to relate to a group of coins attributed to H - I 14. There seem to be alot more handles found in that rather large area, and ~~there~~^{five} more from exactly the same grid position (Section K, 20/AA, on the old grid, as entered on their SS cards) as SS 13538-40: these are SS 13503-508; they include a stamp of the duoviri period, SS 13503, ex. of KT 1785, like Delos 27, E 164-5. I can't think he and I ever discussed the SAH assigned by him to Dep. III. I expect there is nothing to be done by you about this. Section K, 20/AA, is 9 or 10 meters west of your pithos settling basin. Ti na kanome.

What I must do is to get up and go, as it is 7:30, and who knows whether as it gets later they really lock the garden gate. This is Saturday night, and Monday I leave for Boston. How nice it will be if we can meet at the Meetings. My best to Bob. My address: Care pf Mrs. F. R. Grace, 113 Lakeview Ave., Cambridge Mass 02138.

Yours,

MOUNT ALLISON UNIVERSITY
SACKVILLE, NEW BRUNSWICK
CANADA
EOA 3C0

October 18, 1979

Dear Miss Grace,

Thank you very much for your letter; I have made the necessary additions and changes in my manuscript. I have also rewritten note 195, on p. 401, making it clear that your "Revisions" article supports the attribution of the coins from Koroni to Ptolemy II. I enclose my revised account of the Middle Stoa Building Fill and the related deposit from the pithos settling basin I 14:1.

According to my notes, the last deposit we went over together was M-N 15:1 (South Stoa II building fill) on p. 328 of my manuscript. Marian already has the manuscript, and I believe she plans to send it to the printer quite soon, though I have not spoken to her for a month.

I hope you will come to the meetings in Boston. Bob and I both plan to be there and are looking forward to it, despite the grim realities of job hunting. Teaching part time is not very satisfactory in the long run; there is talk of expanding the Classics Department here, but I doubt they will do so, so I guess we will both be nosing around to see if there are any openings elsewhere.

Meanwhile we are keeping busy here. I am scheduled to give a talk on Megarian bowls in the "faculty seminar" series, which is supposed to function as a sort of showcase for faculty research. Most of the people who attend won't even know what Hellenistic means, so it will be a challenge to keep them interested. The music school has begun an excellent series of concerts; this week one of the faculty members gave a talk on the last three sonatas of Beethoven, and then played all three in concert the following evening. It really is a privilege to have the opportunity of hearing such pieces played.

Thank you again for your speedy reply to my questions; I hope to see you in Boston.

Love,
Susan

S I Rotroff Classics
MOUNT ALLISON UNIVERSITY

SACKVILLE, NEW BRUNSWICK

CANADA

E0A 3C0

6.05a



PAR
AVION

Miss Virginia Grace
American School of Classical Studies
54 Souidias St.
Athens 140
GREECE

AIR MAIL

6.056

AIR MAIL



13538 Klein, F. VIII. 79
 Thas. Saturos, "Def. III"
 13539 - Rhod. 92p. ? *Atropomydes*, Act. [maybe for Act. I]
 13540 Rhod. [Epheas] *Atropomydes*, Act. [maybe for Act. I]
 (in my 1)

KT 1735-

Do not
 E 15:3 (no dup)
 (ann)

E 14:1
 E 14:3

2 T 100 100 100 100

55 39 79 - 5984

For C. Houser

14.VIII.78

(for J 5:1)

The two Knidian types impressed respectively on SS 14759 (KT 955) and on SS 14763 (KT 1410) are both found in the Middle Stoa construction filling in the Athenian Agora. The eponyms in whose terms the two types are dated, respectively HOAIOY(XH\Xi) and $\text{KAA(AI\Xi\text{TO}\Xi)}$, are both well represented ^{also} on other types in that filling, a context not later than the second decade of the 2nd century, cf. Agora XIV, p. 66, note 179, and bottom of p. 67. On the ^{Knidian} amphora stamps in the filling, cf. Explor. Arch. de Delos 27, p. 320, where HOAIOYXH\Xi is cited ~~etc~~ as one of the latest eponyms of a period which must have ended in or about 188 B.C. On KT numbers, see ibid. p. 323.

VG

3, 76
Published by F.S. Kleiner
MSBF by F.S. Kleiner
enclose ANS Museum Notes,
20, 1975, p. 3

MSBF

Xerox to S.H. 7/92
17.11.77
Has there
ever been a
answer to
this?
9.01

Athens, February 13, 1976

Professor F. S. Kleiner
Department of Art
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Va. 22903 U.S.A.

Dear Fred:

He seems
not to know.

I was interested to see your article in Hesperia (3, 1975), and hope you can send me an offprint, when the time comes for those. I am impressed to see that ~~the~~ ^{my} proposed date for the Middle Stoa filling works out for you. When we talked about these various fillings, at the beginning of October of 1973, you were doubtful (I thought) about so early a date as the second decade, and told me that some numismatists put the latest coins in that filling after 166.

⊗ Filed in
folder
"Square Bldg."
+ S. Stoa
- relative
fills.

In my notes on that chat of 1.X.73, I see that we took up the South Stoa II filling as well as the Middle Stoa filling; and that you asked me for a count of eponyms, Knidian, found in the Stoa of Attalos filling and not in that of the Middle Stoa, which was as you have reported on p. 314 of your article, and an interesting point to make.

There has been some confusion, however, about stamps to be associated with your Deposit III. I have no notes of our having discussed such a group. As you say (p.311) that it was a small group, it would have been wise to give the inventory numbers. If they are SS 13767-13796, of which the finding-place area is also H-I 14 (though I had no deposit number for them), the date of these, if at all later than that of the stamps in the Middle Stoa filling, is only very ^{slightly} ~~slightly~~ so, i.e. not as late as the 2nd quarter by my books. The date you quote from me on p. 311 on stamps associated with your Deposit III is probably what I gave you for stamps from South Stoa II; if I gave it to you with doubt or hesitation, it is because I have not succeeded in getting a firm full and final list of the stamps (SS II) from this filling, but only a series of partial lists, from various excavators.

Please straighten out this matter of stamps to be associated with Dep. III. Because in fact I would say for the stamps exactly what you say for the coins

in your note 6: "The [stamp] finds do not, however, substantiate a later date for the construction fill of the west end of the stoa. The latest [stamps] from the west end of the building fill are similar in character to those from the remainder of the fill." I am surprised that we did not get together about this; but perhaps you got to this point after leaving Athens.

I have been admiring your Picture Book, but just en passant so far, as there seems to be only one copy around, maybe belonging to your collaborator EV Jr.? We hear that you and Diane, though having those nice jobs, are a bit homesick, which I guess I understand, being a birthright N. Yorker myself. Weather here lately has been sometimes startling: last Sunday we awoke to see the world covered with snow, and more fell all day.

Yours sincerely,

Virginia R. Grace

Received by Virginia R. Grace (11/11/11)

In MS 7, the title of our EAT
chap. is not given in full (both authors)

Prof. Fred S. Kleiman
Dept. of
U. of Va.
Charlottesville

Write to F.S. Kleiman
on Aug. 1975, pgs. 302 ff.
His Dep. III, p. 311

Do not identify the stamps the associates
with them. My definite analysis of ~~H-14~~ H-14
is of \$ SS 13767 - 13796, which are only a
train's breadth later than the MSBF paper,
if that. I have never found the SAT at
the west end in the MSBF any later than
the rest (HAT has given a list).

What he represents quotes VQ on the above
might rather be what I said about stamps
from SS II. On this letter, he doesn't
quote me.

6.11.76
The number of ^{the} responses in ^{in Canada?} SATF and
not in MSBF, I do remember counting for
him, and 31 may be the number. Of
course, this does not mean years,
as lists were later, changed 3 to a year.
Of course, the reason to suppose misrepresentation is to complete.

9.11

It is interesting to see that MSBF data holds
solidly

OK! See paper of 1.8.73 filed at front of folder on Square
Bldg. and Related Files. We took up MSBF, and then 31

spongy - between 135BF and 146; also ss II fill.

There is no mention of the fill in cells Deposit II -

7. VII. 75 10.01
Middle Stoa Building Fill: The latest Rhodian eponym in the fill is probably

ΝΙΚΑΣΑΓΟΡΑΣ 1st OR ΘΕΑΙΑΗΤΟΣ.

MSBF handles naming ΝΙΚΑΣΑΓΟΡΑΣ: SS 11909
12022
12245
12247
12490
12787
12807
12872

MSBF handles naming ΘΕΑΙΑΗΤΟΣ: SS 764

12451
12453
12472
12515
12865

These four

all come from
one part of
the fill.

(5 - then R. 532/17
found 17-18. IV. 53.
File of the find is
called "distributed")

ΘΕΑΙΑΗΤΟΣ is known with more secondary stamps than is ΝΙΚΑΣΑΓΟΡΑΣ 1st, so Θ.
may be the later. There is a possible question whether Θ. should be counted with
the MSBF proper, since 2/3 of the handles with his name come from a single part of
the fill (whereas those naming N. 1st are scattered.

VS

I understood from Susan R. that she had been asked by TLS jr. to ask me for the foregoing information. So a copy of these pages goes to him.

Before any publication, I should see any statements to be included that are derived from these three pages, which are by no means druckfertig; i.e. I should see in manuscript what it is proposed to publish about the SAH in these deposits.

VG

On date of MSBF

Discussing with F. Winter - as Agave XII
still says to ca 150 BC - He remarked
that he had had the impression that there
was a body of material datable in the
2nd quarter, or toward 150 BC, mentioned
in publication. - He identifies this in
GPE in Suppl. ¹⁹⁵² ~~X~~, pp. 90-91: "the
pieces have been to light beneath the floor level
of the closely contemporary Middle Stoa of the
Agave¹⁴ [P 21048, 22858, and 23095]. These rep-
resent a very early stage in the development of
the long-petal type which would therefore
seem to have been commencing in Athens
at just this time, i.e. ca. 150 B.C."

9.11.71

Note p. 90, note 12, a few names listed.
F.W. got out the cards. The others are all for "distinct"
fill in O, 1933.

22.11.71

⊗ Back of H & T's book, ins. p. 71 - "late in
1/4 of 2nd"

14. IV 66

Arbe HAT later

1.) in the actual position for
in SBF (p. 3)

— can be given in a
position in which
the might be also
SAH

2.) SS II cat. fill. wh.
has long-petalled bowls —
is this the fill for
which diameters can
(also p. 3)

13.01

[14.VI.66]

HAT

This has not
yet been posted,
so if you
would like some
change made,
please tell
me.

June 14, 1966

on Pergamon context for 16 of your stamped
the Asklepion. I have not yet made a
it will be useful in my chronological
the sample of your catalogue text, and
it not too heavy, and what you say about

With regard to the construction filling at the Athenian Agora
in relation to your finds: I should remark that this deposit contained 13
examples of Rhodian stamps naming the eponym $\Theta\text{IAOAA}\text{MOZ}$, as in your AS 242, as well
as 22 of the fabricant NIKAFIE as previously mentioned, so that two of the three
items in your Bauphase 9 are paralleled. The third, the Sinoean AS 247, I have
believed to be of the 3rd century for reasons outlined in my note of 1961 to
Dr. Schaefer. The most recent published study of Sinoean dating known to me,
that of Professor Brashinsky of Leningrad in 1963, dates in 220-183 B.C., the group to
which AS 247 belongs. Whether he is right or I am, the date would correspond
well enough with that of your Bauphase 9, "ca. 200-191 B.C." which you propose on
historical grounds and on the basis of silver coins the latest of which seemed to
date about 200 B.C. Your date would also correspond with what I believe to be
that of the main body of the stamped handles from the Middle Stoa-filling, since this
latter group is closely related to the group in the original Pergamon deposit

13.01

[14. VT 66]

HAT

This has not
yet been posted,
so if you
would like some
change made,
please tell
me.

O.K. by me

HAT

V

June 14, 1966

Miss Gioja de Luca
Universita di Genova
Istituto di Archeologia
Genova, Italia

Dear Miss de Luca:

Thank you for the information on Pergamon context for 16 of your stamped handles found at various levels in the Asklepion. I have not yet made a full study of this, but I see that it will be useful in my chronological studies. I was interested also to see the sample of your catalogue text, and I agree that it is desirable to keep it not too heavy, and what you say about the stamps there seems enough.

With regard to the Middle Stoa construction filling at the Athenian Agora in relation to your finds: I should remark that this deposit contained 13 examples of Rhodian stamps naming the eponym $\Phi\Lambda\Omega\Delta\Lambda\text{M}\Omega\text{Z}$, as in your AS 242, as well as 22 of the fabricant $\text{NIK}\alpha\text{P}\text{I}\text{Z}$ as previously mentioned, so that two of the three items in your Bauphase 9 are paralleled. The third, the Sinopean AS 247, I have ~~had~~ believed to be of the 3rd century for reasons outlined in my note of 1961 to Dr. Schaefer. The most recent published study of Sinopean dating known to me, that of Professor Brashinsky of Leningrad in 1963, dates in 220-183^{B.C.} the group to which AS 247 belongs. Whether he is right or I am, the date would correspond well enough with that of your Bauphase 9, "ca. 200-191 B.C." which you propose on historical grounds and on the basis of silver coins the latest of which seemed to date about 200 B.C. Your date would also correspond with what I believe to be that of the main body of the stamped handles from the Middle Stoa filling, since this latter group is closely related to the group in the original Pergamon deposit

(called 220-180 B.C.) save that 1) the Middle Stoa filling includes a fair amount of older material, 3rd century and earlier, and 2) the latest Rhodian eponyms named in the Pergamon deposit are missing from the Middle Stoa deposit, so that one would assume that its date of being assembled and laid down was a little earlier than that of the filling in Pergamon.

Moving on to your Bauphase 10, "after 191 to 2nd quarter 2nd B.C.", AS 238, with rose stamp of the Rhodian fabricant ΔΑΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ, also fits well with its context at Pergamon according to my chronological scheme. 46 handles of this potter were found in the Middle Stoa filling and 55 in the original Pergamon deposit. The date I gave you for this ΔΑΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ was simply "late 3rd or early 2nd century", but actually a lot is known of his products, including numerous whole amphoras to show shape-development and name-connections, and it is clear that his activity continued somewhat beyond the end date of the Middle Stoa filling, since he sometimes uses secondary stamps with letters, which are not known in the Middle Stoa filling, but are just starting in the Pergamon deposit. In that deposit they appear on two handles that bear main stamps naming ΑΠΙΕΤΩΝ and (probably) ΑΠΙΕΤΕΙΑΑΣ, two of the Pergamon eponyms missing from the Middle Stoa filling. These main stamps are rose stamps, and very likely the handles are from amphoras of ΔΑΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ.

My proposed absolute date for the latest part of the mass of handles from the Middle Stoa filling is actually more dependent on the Knidian than on the Rhodian handles included. Those from the Middle Stoa apparently stop just when phrourarchoi were beginning to be named on Knidian stamps. See Hesperia Suppl. X, p.146, for a note on the phrourarch stamps, which presumably belong to the period of Rhodian occupation of the mainland including Knidos (188-167 B.C.). There is much evidence which should be demonstrated in a publication, and this is not the place to discuss it.

The stamped handles from the Middle Stoa building fill were about 1500, and to me they constitute in themselves a context, as a hoard of coins is a context for its individual coins. It must be stated, however, that for these handles as a group

I cannot cite an excavator's context as early as the date, before about 180 B.C., which the handles now suggest to me. For a recent published date given to the context, see Hesperia XXXII, 1963, p.³¹⁷~~222~~: "to ca. 160 B.C." (Dorothy Burr Thompson, from Homer Thompson). Further, I have passed on to Homer Thompson himself your request for a ceramic date for this filling, and he has been good enough to respond with his present views, which I enclose here. As you will see, the date he would now give to the filling as context may be summed up as "before about 150 B.C."

You should use Professor Thompson's date as the excavator's terminus date. You may perhaps cite also my present belief on the date of the handles which were part of this very extensive and varied filling. Although the basis of my opinion has not been published, the opinion itself has been stated in publications: see S.S.Weinberg, ed., The Aegean and the Near East, Studies Presented to Hetty Goldman, Locust Valley, 1956, p.97; and H. D. Colt, ed., Excavations at Nessana, Vol. 1, London, 1962, p. 124, in the comment on no.24.

Yours sincerely,

Virginia Grace

For Professor Brashinsky's publication cited above, p.1, see Ancient Town, Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Science of the USSR, Moscow, 1963; a table with the dates of the various date-groups of Sinopean stamps is on p.133.

M 2 =

"Gymnasium of Ptolemy"

Xerox taken
5/12 7/82

10. VI. 66

14.01

DATE OF THE MIDDLE STOA AND RELATED STRUCTURES

The following statement is based primarily on the architectural and topographical evidence. In the final analysis account must also be taken of the evidence of the coins, pottery and stamped amphora handles.

The relative sequence of the construction along the south side of the Agora that resulted in the South Square, a complex comprising two old and three new buildings, is fairly clear; it may be described briefly as follows:

The first item in the program was the Middle Stoa. This was a double colonnade which faced north on the main square of the Agora and southward on a lesser square which appears to have been for long a temenos of Theseus. The stoa took its orientation from a rectangular building of the second quarter of the 5th century B.C., now believed to be the sekos of Pausanias' Theseion (I,17,6), at the southwest corner of the South Square. This is one of several indications which suggest that the Middle Stoa was intended primarily for the embellishment of the old Sanctuary of Theseus. Work on the stoa began at its east end and proceeded westward.

When the construction of the Middle Stoa was already well advanced a decision was taken to erect new buildings also on the east and south sides of the South Square. Marble chips from the working of the gutter along the south side of the Middle Stoa were used in the construction fill of the East Building, a clear indication that there was no long interval between these two parts of

the program. The East Building comprised a loutron, an exhedra and an apodyterion. Through its middle passed the main entrance to the South Square in its new form.

The East Building was followed immediately by South Stoa II, a replacement of South Stoa I of the late 5th century B.C.

The Theseion, previously a rectangular enclosure, was now remodelled, and given the form of a simple palaestra. A water clock that had previously stood against its north wall was dismantled. The original intention was to end the new complex at this point, i.e. with four buildings; retaining walls were started southward from the southwest corner of the Middle Stoa and westward from the northwest corner of the Theseion, clearly with the purpose of closing the west end of the South Square on this line.

Before these retaining walls were completed the program was extended to include the Southwest Fountain House. The interior architecture of the old building was demolished and a new fountain house of more modest proportions was erected in the angle between the old fountain house and the Theseion. To the north of this again was inserted a wash room. The plan of the Southwest Fountain House was turned from an L into a square, and the building appears to have been converted into a swimming pool. The west end of the South Square was now closed with a wall running between the northwest corner of the "swimming pool" and the southwest corner of the Middle Stoa.

The complex of buildings thus completed has all the essential features of a Hellenistic gymnasium. There is good reason to believe that it was in fact the Gymnasium of Ptolemy mentioned by

Pausanias (I,17,2) as he left the Agora on his way toward the Acropolis and described by him as "not far from the Agora".

The Stoa of Attalos on the east side of the main square was clearly oriented with respect to the Middle Stoa. The southern extremity of the Attalid building aligns with the central axis of the Middle Stoa, and the terraces of the two buildings are on approximately the same level. In preparation for the construction of the Stoa of Attalos the Square Peristyle of the late 4th century B.C. was demolished. One of the geisa of the Square Peristyle was re-used as a bedding block in the long east room (apodyterion) of the East Building in the Gymnasium. The colonnade of South Stoa II was made entirely of material taken from the same Square Peristyle.

The latest pottery from the construction fill of the Middle Stoa is indistinguishable from various groups of pottery that accumulated in the area of the Stoa of Attalos between the demolition of the Square Peristyle and the start of construction on the Attalos Stoa. The lower limit of the pottery from the undisturbed parts of the Middle Stoa building fill, insofar as our present knowledge of Hellenistic pottery now permits a judgment, is slightly earlier than that from the Stoa of Attalos. On the other hand the pottery from the construction fill of South Stoa II is slightly later than that from the Attalos Stoa (as indicated for example by the common occurrence of long-petalled Megarian bowls in South Stoa II as against their non-occurrence in the Attalos Stoa). In the debris of South Stoa I, which was demolished to make way for South Stoa II, was found a coin of Attalos II, 159-138 B.C. (Section T, May 8, 1953, no. 1). The pottery associated with the final grading operations

at the west end of the South Square is contemporary with that from South Stoa II. It may be noted in passing that this pottery is also closely contemporary with the latest found in association with the Hellenistic Metroon.

In this line of argument the most secure fixed point for the absolute chronology is provided by the Stoa of Attalos, securely attributable to Attalos II (159-138 B.C.). It is commonly and probably rightly assumed that such activities are most plausibly datable in the early part of his reign. We shall probably not go far wrong in placing the building program of this stoa in the years around 150 B.C. In this connection one may note that the long-petalled type of Megarian bowl which is not represented in the Stoa construction fill was just coming into vogue in Corinth before the destruction of 146 B.C.

Having regard to the tempo of the building program around the South Square I venture to believe that it began about a quarter century before 150 and ended about a quarter century after 150.

We have observed above the likelihood that the Middle Stoa was designed primarily to embellish an old sanctuary of Theseus. It may be significant in this connection that a series of ten decrees dating between 160/59 B.C. and ca. 130 B.C. attest a remarkable revival of the festival of Theseus (the Theseia) at this time. (Agora III, Testimonia, No. 360).

We have also noted above the probability that the Gymnasium called the Ptolemaion was installed in the old sanctuary of Theseus. The earliest possible reference to this building dates from the very middle of the 2nd century; indubitable and closely datable

epigraphic references begin in 122/1 B.C. (Agora III, Nos. 456-463). Although Pausanias does not inform us as to which Ptolemy was responsible for the establishment, the collation of the available evidence increasingly points to Ptolemy VI Philometor, 181-145 B.C. The statues of the Ptolemies seen by Pausanias (I,8,6) in front of the Odeion of Agrippa are in all likelihood to be brought into connection with the foundation of the Gymnasium. Originally, no doubt, placed in immediate proximity to the main complex they were probably given a place of greater prominence when, ca. 15 B.C., the Odeion was added as a large lecture hall to the old gymnasium. The statues mentioned by Pausanias were of Ptolemy I Soter (304-283/2 B.C.), Ptolemy II Philadelphos (285-246 B.C.) and his sister Berenike, Ptolemy VI Philometor (181-145 B.C.) and his one legitimate child, Berenike.

If the above argument is sound we have still to consider exactly what part Ptolemy played in the protracted building program. The part of the complex that most clearly bears the stamp of a royal benefaction is the Middle Stoa. A number of technical details in this building cannot be matched elsewhere in Athens and strongly suggest foreign participation (e.g. design of the geison, manner of dowelling the columns, the use of a high screen with elaborate crown between the outer columns). The archaeological evidence points to a date when the royal families friendly to Athens were expressing their esteem in the form of splendid buildings: Eumenes II of Pergamon (197-159 B.C.) erected a great stoa in association with the Theatre of Dionysos; Antiochos IV Epiphanes of Syria (175-164) renewed construction on the Temple of Olympian Zeus. In this context, the Middle Stoa, designed to adorn both the Agora and

the Sanctuary of Theseus, the hero founder of Athens, would have been a suitable contribution from the Ptolemies. The Stoa of Attalos that followed so soon was evidently designed to outdo the Middle Stoa by both the height and the rich material of its two-storeyed marble facade. This may well be interpreted as a demonstration of the lively rivalry between the royal houses of Egypt and of Pergamon.

We have argued above that the idea of extending the program to include the construction of a gymnasium was a slightly later conception. One need not hesitate to believe, however, that the extension was also financed by Ptolemy, and that in consequence the whole complex bore his name.

H.A.T.

H. A. Thompson

June 1966

GILBERT BOND

25% COTTON FIBRE

MADE IN U.S.A.

June 9/66

XCVN 10512 7/82

8.VI.66

15.02

15.01

Dear Virginia:

Many thanks for
your helpful comments on
the sketch of the South
Square building program.
I have removed some of
the obscurities from the text.

As for Miss de Luca,
the formula you suggest
would certainly be safe and
might suit her present
needs: before the middle
of the 2nd cent.

Yours

H.A.T.

script on the date of the Middle
interests me very much, and I appreciate
account in figuring out sequences and
topographical and historical background
ence to tell her a little more plainly
is given to objects by their having
fill? Would you now say simply "before
and your p.4 here not entirely clear.
of pottery is "slightly earlier" than
pottery from the "final phase" of the
vary with that from South Stoa II,
the Attalos Stoa.
Is for a stamp of NIKAFIZ (Rhodian)
in the MSBF.
west end of the Middle Stoa building
whole, cf. our investigation of August
ly as from "construction fill" of
than the Stoa of Attalos. But there
por of SS II" (SS 6579-6585 and SS 14136.

14138) which I believe do go into the third quarter of the 2nd century.

June 9/66

15.01

Dear Virginia:

Many thanks for
your helpful comments on
~~the~~ sketch of the South
Square building program.
I have removed some of
the obscurities from the text.

As for Miss de Luca,
the formula you suggest
would certainly be safe and
might suit her present
needs: before the middle
of the 2nd cent.

Yours

H.A.T.

8.VI.66

15.02

(H49)

Thank you for letting me see your manuscript on the date of the Middle Stoa and related structures. This of course interests me very much, and I appreciate the more what a lot has to be taken into account in figuring out sequences and absolute dates in this area, and how much topographical and historical background is needed for proper evaluation of the data.

Can we give Miss de Luca a summary sentence to tell her a little more plainly your present opinion as to what context date is given to objects by their having been found in the Middle Stoa construction fill? Would you now say simply "before about the middle of the 2nd century" ? I find your p.4 here not entirely clear. It seems to say the "lower limit" of the MSBF pottery is "slightly earlier" than that of the Attalos Stoa, but then that the pottery from the "final phase" of the construction of the Middle Stoa is contemporary with that from South Stoa II, which you are putting a little later than the Attalos Stoa.

Miss de Luca is concerned with parallels for a stamp of NIKAPIZ (Rhodian) recent excavations in found in Pergamon; and 22 of them were found in the MSBF.

You know that stamps did not show the west end of the Middle Stoa building fill as ~~much later~~ later than the filling as a whole, cf. our investigation of August 1964. Also that those described specifically as from "construction fill" of South Stoa II did not suggest ^{SS II} ~~it~~ was later than the Stoa of Attalos. But there is a series of stamps described as "from floor of SS II" (SS 6579-6585 and SS 14136-14138) which I believe do go into the third quarter of the 2nd century.

Notes on HAT "a"
ms. ^{ca 2. VI. 66} on dating of MSBF

I see I shd assemble the few SAH assigned to the MSBF but datable up to say 180 BC. List them with exact provenances.

this p. 4:

- ? The latest pottery from the constr. fill of the Middle Stoa is indistinguishable from various groups of pottery that accumulated in the area of the Stoa of Attalos between the demolition of the Square Peristyle and the start of construction of the Attalos stoa. The lower limit of the pottery from the Middle Stoa, insofar as our present knowledge of Hellas pottery now permits a judgment, is slightly earlier than that for the Stoa of Attalos. On the other hand the pottery from the constr. fill of South Stoa II is slightly later than that for the Attalos Stoa (as indicated for example by the common occurrence of long pedalled Megarian bowls in S. Stoa II as against their non-occurrence in the Attalos Stoa.) The constr. fill of S. Stoa II has also yielded a coin of Attalos II. The pottery

MSBF
SAH

U. little
containing
pottery
SAH
some
GRE
the

7.VI.66

(2)

Three passages from pp. 1-2 marked II
 seem to me to conflict: 1) MSBF is earlier than EABF
 2) SSBF is later than EABF
 3) MSBF, lost and is contemp. w. SSBF

associated with the final phase of
 const. of the Middle Stoa at the extreme
 west end of the building and the grading
 operations at the west end of the South
 Square is contemporary with that for
 S. Stoa II, " "

Check II

p. 5

He thinks EA probably about 150
 B.C., acc. to historical probability.
 He notes no long-petalled Meg. in
 EABF, whereas does exist in Carnelia,
 hence before 146 B.C.

p. 5

He dates the overall activity "around
 the South Square" from ca 175 to 125
 B.C. Does this mean fall was in place by
 175?

MS likely designed to embellish an old
 sanct. of Theseus. So note series of 10
 decrees of bet. 160/159 B.C. and ca 130 B.C.
 attesting a remarkable renewal of festival of
 Theseus. (Agon III, Testimonia, no. 360)

p. 6

"The earliest possible ref. to [the Ptolemaic]
 date for the very middle of the 2nd cent. is
 indubitably and closely datable epigraphic
 ref. to begin in 122/1 B.C. (Agon III,
 nos. 456-463)" Paus. does not
 say which PT., but "the collation of

the available evidence increasingly points
to P8. VI, Philometor, 181-145 B.C."

p. 7. What part ^{of the complex} was Pt. 1? M.S. is
clearly a ^{ROYAL} benefaction. Technical
details that strongly suggest foreign
participation (design of gable, mass of
dovelling cols. w. high screen w.
clab crown bet. outer cols.)

p. 8 He seems to imply that the M.S.
alone, first thought of, was not just
a gymnasium. Extended to that, Pt.
financed & named whole complex.

M-CP

Yere to S12 7/82

28.VIII.64

16.03

SAN FROM WEST END OF MIDDLE STOA

September 1, 1964

DATED 28.VIII.64 by HAT: 35 13660-13666; 13893-13912; 13963-13966

HAT

16.01

21.VIII.64

West of Middle Stoa

So the wall that closed the wall
to the one now ending to the S with a
numbered block: K 3674, A 3330?

When was the wall i.e. N-S?

(how - (down))

Note this wall, ^{seem} heavy for
a keep-out fence. None suitable to
take weight, as if earth for
scaffolding. Also it is wing on E
side, like a terrace wall.

(I'm sure I thought this all out
before, but when we were there.)

There is a crumbly wall between this
and the stoa's finished W. side.

- of earlier bldgs. but ^{fault} II.

⊗ DIST says it is to drain
after lunch, I would back with him and OVER

not discern a ~~at~~
selected group

road west of the
ly consistent

while the
at continued the
e quality as the
y suggests a
mass of earth.

while construction
way? Otherwise
l, impractical
ace was later
azzling "non-
contemporary,

31. VIII. 64

West of Middle Stoa

So the wall that doesn't the wall
the one now ending to the S with a
numbered block: K 3674, A 3330?

When was the wall: i.e. N-S?
(how is it covered)

Note this wall ^{is} ~~seem~~ heavy for
a keep-out fence. More suitable to
take weight, as of earth for
scaffolding. Also it is wing on E
side, like a terrace wall.

(I'm sure I thought this all out
before, but when one is to write.)

There is a crumbly wall between this
and the stoa's finished W. side.
- of earlier bldgs? but ^{fault} (1).

⊗ DBT says it is to draw
after lunch, I would bed with her and OVER

we looked at the same together.

Returning to the store, we met
HAT, who spoke of sculptured
groups probably set up at
the west end, and the horrible
possibility that they were Ptolemies,
and to whom compare the
baths of Ptolemy mentioned by
the ancients. Should be P. II
(I think) whose reign began about
181 BC.

September 1, 1964

HAT

As I am sure you have gathered from my casting about, I cannot discern a ~~at~~ difference in date between the MSBF handles in general and your selected group from the west end, on which here are notes.

In contrast, the handles from H 13 : 1, the K well in the road west of the Middle Stoa, continue to stand out as a very small but remarkably consistent group of a little later than the Stoa filling.


Is it possible that the well continued to serve for a time while the northern part of the N-S wall was already in use? The ^{block} ~~stone~~ that continued the wall over the well looks in the photo perhaps not quite the same quality as the rest. The wall as a whole, wide as it is, and one-faced, surely suggests a rather heavy retaining wall such as might be needed for a good mass of earth. Would not a temporary terrace at the west end be a requirement while construction of the upper parts of the building at that end ~~was~~ was under way? Otherwise surely a tremendous height of scaffolding would have to be used, impractical and terribly expensive. If the filling of the temporary terrace ~~was~~ later used to tidy up to the south, might not this account for the puzzling "non-MSBF" fills in K on which I have given you notes - some seemed contemporary, some slightly later, etc., and a pattern did not seem to emerge.

SAH FROM WEST END OF MIDDLE STOA FILLING

Listed 27.VIII.64 by HAT: SS 13650-13656; 13898-13912; 13983-13986

*1) mostly inside west end of Middle Stoa
2) some, and W. end, N. end**(138901-13905 incl. 4
twelve figs)*

fabricant	device	eponym	month	KT or Bon	SS	shape etc.
Thasian	ΚΛΕΟΓ(ΕΝΗΣ)	ΤΕΛΕΣ			13898	
	ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΗΣ	cock			13908	
	ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΩΝ	horn		376	13902	
	ΚΡΙΝΟΜΕΝΗΣ	scorpion			13901	
Rhodian	ΑΓΗΣΙΚΑΗΣ				13906	
		rose	ΑΙΣΧΥΛΙ(ΝΟΣ)	ΔΑΔ.	13910	⊙
	ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ				13655	
	ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ				13651	
	ΔΙΟΡΘΕΟΣ				13900	
		ΙΕΡΩΝ	ΘΕΣ.		13984	"Trans. of St. John's Cathedral, 1891"
	Head of Helios	ΚΛΕΩΝΥΜΟΣ			13985	"Trans. of St. John's Cathedral, 1891"
	ΜΕΝΩΝ	thyrsos	ΠΑΝ.		13909	
		ΟΝΑΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ	ΘΕΣ.		13986	"Trans. of St. John's Cathedral, 1891"
	ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ	burning torch			13899	
	UNREAD				13911	
Knidian	ΕΠΙΧΑΡΜΟΣ		ΑΡΧΙΠΡΩΤΑΣ	1656	13903	in MSB as a whole
	ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ		ΕΥΚΡΑΤΗΣ	75	13912	only in MSB as a whole
		monogram	ΘΕΜΙΣΤΕΡΝΑ(ΤΟΣ)	2074	13983	4 other
	ΘΕΥΔΩΡ(ΚΛΕΥΚΡΑ(742	13905	only in MSB as a whole
	ΑΡΙΣΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ		ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ	1727	13652	both in MSB
	ΑΣΚΑΝΗΙ(ΦΙΛΑΤΑΤΟΣ	312	13653	only in MSB as a whole

	fabricant	device	eponym	month	KT or <u>Bon</u>	SS	shepe etc.
Unclassified	ANT(prow?				13656	
	ATIOA]A2					13904	
	A				2185	13907	
		monogram				13654	
		head in profile	(incuse)			13650	

This group of handles was mostly covered in the study of MSBF handles assembled in 1956, see typed summary of 26.VI.56, and lists of various categories made at different times a little earlier. The previous listing had omitted SS 13985-6, both Rhodian; and a third Rhodian, SS 13984, though listed had not until now been read; however the names are not new to the group, and these three handles do not change the evidence on date.

For this class as here represented, APHEIKAHZ is about contemporary with the Koroni Rhodian; Δ2POΘEOZ and the eponyms IEPCN and KAE2NYMOZ are late 3rd or early 2nd and otherwise well established in the fill; and the rest are between, i.e. 3rd century B.C. This lot does not include Rhodian eponyms thought to be the latest in the MSBF. It is interesting that two or more handles of Δ2POΘEOZ have been found in the area of the Stoa of Philip on Delos: cf Vallois, L'Arch. Hell. de Delos (1942) p.68, note 1, on one found in the "galerie à l'ouest"; and two, TD 6263 and 6281, come from anastylosis operations in the Stoa of Philip in 1958.

The Thasian are datable in the 4th century and (SS 13898) perhaps before 400; on the date of TEAEZ(see Hesp. Suppl.X., p.126 with references. Three out of four Thasian in this lot are the only examples with their readings, but the names and styles of the stamps are familiar. Later Thasian have been found in other parts of the MSBF, including some which may go down to its time of shovelling in.

Not much information can be got from the Unclassified of this selection. The first may be Early Knidian, and would date before 200 B.C. (SS 13656). The reading of SS 13904 is doubtful; no parallel has been found. The combination A plus T in a monogram recurs several times in the MSBF on handles which like SS 13907 resemble Thasian and may be as early as the 4th century. SS 13654 is duplicated on SS 14436 from K, "clearing trench of inner rectangle in peristyle court of Heliaia, p.3551". The incuse mark on SS 13650 seems to be the impression of a coin, not well impressed; a similar impression, but not from the same coin, was found in Antioch. On SS 13650, DBT makes out a line of neck and chin which suggests a head thrown back relatively far, which as I understand it indicates a 2nd rather than a 3rd century date.

Of the Knidian, ΕΥΚΡΑΤΗΣ and ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ are among the commonest eponyms in the MSBF, see p.4 of the typescript of VI.56, and ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΣ is also quite well represented in the fill. The examples here are the only MSBF handles naming the eponyms ΑΡΧΙΜΗΔΕΑΣ and ΚΑΕΥΚΡΑ(; the first of these is probably earlier than the bulk of the Knidian in the MSBF; the fabricant of the second (recently read in this type) is common in the MSBF. An eponym ΦΙΛΑΤΑ(ΤΟΣ) is named on one other attested handle of the filling beside SS 13653. (A duplicate of SS 13653 is SS 12969 from a group of handles called "MSBF disturbed in early Roman times", not covered in MSBF SAH lists.) The name ΦΙΛΑΤΑΤΟΣ should be added to the few listed p.5 of the typescript of VI.56 as MSBF names which in some (non-MSBF) types appear with the title phourarchos; the persons named on these MSBF handles may (as stated in the typescript) actually be phourarchoi, perhaps of the earliest period, second decade of 2nd century, or they may be other eponyms with the same name. Other eponyms named by ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙ(are ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΣ), ΙΑΣΩΝ, and ΠΡΟΜΑ(ΘΙΩΝ), all ~~other~~ known in the MSBF, and not known as phourarchoi.

In sum, I don't think that the handles of this lot are of a later date than those of the filling as a whole.

2.10.62

long

17.01

Small notes with ref. to MSBFConnection with Group C, HAT (A, cistern at 23/A):

The only handle from " " ^{Kura} SS 282, belongs to KT 1784. Unfortun. this type not yet read. But belongs to a group largely repr. in MSBF, these being round stamps with monograms.

GRE in 1957 on Group C: see Hesp. 1957, p. 336, "ca. 200 B.C."

15.10.62

Later we thought perhaps the name in SS 282 is Itantadion.

31.10.63

still 15.10.

See now
Hesp., 1963,
p. 317,

apparently
Area G13

(both ducts,
became
"pore blocks"
now appear
the under
"area H 5")

Indirect numismatic evidence: DBT against recently about dating from SS 13665-6, a Phoenician and a Knidian much liked in the MSBF. This is a small not very tight deposit I believe, without as yet a marginal no. (2, 10-15/A-T, from filling on porous rocks; p. 3326). See said there was a New Style Attic coin in it, and pointed out that Margaret Thompson thinks they don't begin till - 196 I think it is. Did that suit? It did.

OVER

18.V.63

See letter of today to Prof. Brashinsky files
under SINOPEAN, on contract for Gyathoides Gyp. VI.

Notes for Dr. Schaefer's report

In PERGAMON folder,
 typescript of 9.XI.61

Altar Sondage : one Knidian handle

AS 264

thyrsos right
 LAPIZTO

The restoration is based on identifying AS 264, from rubbings, as an
 (stamp)
 example of Knidian Type 239, best represented at the Agora by SS 4280. (No example

of this stamp type has been published.) *The identification is not absolutely certain, but very probable. (*)*

Agora context suggests a date in the third quarter of the 3rd century B.C.

for type Knidian Type 239, a variant of 239 in which the thyrsos has its

top
~~head~~ to the left; i.e.,
 An example of 240 was found in a filling, K 6-7 : 1, probably to be
 , one each,

so dated. Examples of both 239 and 240 have been found in the Middle Stoa Building

Fill, and of 239 in the apparently contemporary filling of the well M 18:10; the lower

the great Middle Stoa terrace filling as a whole
 terminus of ~~this context~~ seems to me to be in the second decade of the 2nd century.

~~For this date would be better~~ So I should date AS 264: ^{perhaps} ~~probably~~ third quarter of
in any case (unless it is wrongly identified)
 3rd century B.C., and not later than second decade of 2nd century.

(*) The rubbings all seem to show rather too much
 margin between the device and the upper edge of
 the stamp; but this may be because it is deeply
 impressed - is it? (No plot, as yet.) A deep
 impression might account for not being able to read
 any letters below the device; but they are ^{usually} ~~often~~
 seen in this type.

MSBF

Note on MSBF dating

While M. Thompson was here recently, and we had some
 talk on her book, almost out, on Altein New Style coins,
 with chronology for yearly types, I noted the Altein
N.S. coin listed p. 12 of my MSBF ms. of 1956, which
 had been called ca. 172 B.C. ^{26.VI.56} "class 15" I got out this coin (Mar. 9,
 1933, #1) and found on the envelope the Svoronos ^{pl. 81, #14} reference,
 and fetched the plate of Svoronos & M.T., then laid up with
 a turned article.

Actually as this is a bronze coin, and her book with its
 chronol. series of annual issues is on silver only, she did
 not have a precise date to propose. She said however
 that the coin could perfectly well be dated as early as
 e.g. 185 B.C. in her opinion, in fact I think almost
 as early as the beginning of N.S. (196?)

She had promised Josephine not to touch the bronzes,
 in her book etc.

I remarked that I had the impression that the coin was
 not quite the same die as shown in Svor. pl. 81, #14
 (though I did not look at coin and book together). She said
 Oh yes, these references were not necessarily to same
dies. If I had to prove, it was O.K.

Chesh Vallis, Delos VII^(X), pp. 66-68, 184

See if he really suggests date for Middle Stoa

6. X. 61

(X) Li Portique de Philippi (1923). pp. 66-68 on construction and origin of materials of P. & Ph. A series of blocks of "gneiss" used only "pour le parement externe du soubassement précité" are imported. ^(found with big plan) ^{son of ?} Style of cutting of ^{the} various blocks. These blocks bear a series of masonic marks, cf. p. 64.

P. 164 question of ^{what part} statues in Atticians lived in the atr.

as to date of this Stoa: see pp. 154 ff. The deduction by Philby concerns only the east gallery. On p. 165, both he comes in favor of 180 or before — (but I have no time now to elucidate for exactly what. Look up in Vallis's ground beds.

(when did I get this rep. from ??)

Note on MSBF dating

Yesterday late afternoon, HAT gave us a talk on his excavations of this year in the SW corner of the ancient Agora - Heliaia (?) and related buildings - very interesting things I did not get it all, and would like to hear it through again. (Went to work & do all day.)

One thing he made quite clear, and that was that he now believes the area between Heliaia and MS¹ ^{at western front} remained un-terraced - i.e. with a big drop south of the MS¹ ^{and - generally, nearly appearance} until late (160? 150?). This would account for the early Meg. bowl in the settling basin, as he says to me today: the " " would have remained accessible.

He continued to point out differences in west foundation of MS and to explain that this end of the foundation was constructed - then filled - later than the rest. Today I remarked again that the content was not later.

20.IX.61

HAT's Section Report on Section K is now circulating. (H. left 2 days ago). ~~For the notes, see other.~~

Note to 3 examples
 of "Antimachos" in the
 MSBF (SS 11727, 12708,
 12835) all have
 the caduceus
 below.

Only 5 are V.
 Copies: Attica - Hel. de.
 MSBF
 (P. 11727)

2.VI.61

Note on a stamp of ANTIMACHOS found lately at Porto Raphti for Mme. Varoucha

The reading is as follows:

caduceus left
 ANTIMACHOS



About 12 handles with stamps of this fabricant were found in the Pergamon deposit which has been dated about 220-180. On the date, and for references of this deposit, to the publication, see M. Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, p.1479, note 68. Presence of his name in this deposit indicates for a potter that he was active some time between 220 and 180. In the case of this potter, I think that though he started before about 180, most of his work fell after that date.

Among whole jars with stamps of ANTIMACHOS with caduceus, we know of two dated (in different months) in the term of the eponym APIETON. The fabricant stamps on these are not identical, and neither of them is an exact duplicate of the stamp from Porto Raphti, but in all three cases the device is placed over the name, with its top left, which is not its position in the stamps of the same potter on amphoras dated in other eponym terms. I think it likely that the other handle of the jar from which the Porto Raphti handle came had a stamp naming the eponym APIETON.

About 20 handles in the Pergamon deposit (see above) name the eponym APIETON, which indicates his term fell probably between 220 and 180. There are no handles with his name among the 1500 from the construction filling of the Middle Stoa in the Agora, the latest of the handles from which seem to be a little earlier than the latest in the Pergamon deposit. For this and other reasons (as for instance because of the secondary stamps occasionally found on handles naming this eponym), I think his term fell about 180 B.C.

The handle from Porto Raphti is therefore to be dated not far from 200 B.C., and I believe about 180 B.C.

3.VI.61
 Y. this dir with
 c.g. SS 12828
 of S. Str
 Bery. Fil

BALLIOL COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

Feb. 22, 1960

Dear Virginia:

Would you consider the following as another possible line of approach to the dating of the Middle Stn?

In pondering the implications of last summer's discovery that South Stn II was built of material taken from the Square Building I have come to feel that what we have been calling the Commercial Agora may in fact have been a monumental replacement of the old and unfinished Square Building, intended primarily, like the Sq. Bldg., for the ^{USE} use of the lawcourts. On this hypothesis the Middle Stn would have been erected entirely of new material, as the first unit, and only when this new space was available were the two old buildings, i.e. the Sq. Bldg. and South Stn I, demolished and South Stn II begun. This hypothesis ~~will~~ also help in the identification of South Stn I,

4.68
This line can
be shown by joining
Parthenon to the
Middle Stn &
South Stn I &
South Stn II

303.000 20.1.1958

UPPER

tending as it does to confirm our earlier idea that this building may have been the seat of the Thermocharitai who ~~had~~ so many responsibilities in connection with the law courts and particularly with the Heliaia.

If the above be admitted, one may go on to infer some connection between the reorganization of the law courts and the setting up of the marble Stoaeria. ^{SINCE} several of these were found in low levels at the foot of the retaining wall of the middle stoa, they may be assumed to have stood on the terrace of that building. Those for which epigraphic evidence is available (and possibly the whole lot) have been dated by S. D. to the 160's and 150's (Stesperia, Suppl. I, p. 209).

We are greatly enjoying a few days visit from Dick Stillwell who is taking his mother's death philosophically & is not returning to the U. S.

Lower

upper

Best wish.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

reply, see folder
of ITALY,
under COSA

SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

July 9, 1959

Dear Virginia:

Thank you for yours of ..
set forth

24.01

14.IV.81

use perhaps list of list of my letter to
GRB of 25.VI.59, letter of 12 July
- top of 2nd

views on these early ... is
reemphasize that the MSBF is a ... undependable
points of view of source and archaeological disturbance and that
take a risk, however well calculated, in building arbitrarily upon it.

Having delivered myself of this I will leave you all to your moutons
on this subject and return to mine.

Yours,

GRB

c: Agora Deposit File

was, ...
to a depth
of meters,
where area
was
excavated.
29.VI.59
of Section K
Summer 1958
p. 2: "95"

stood to a maximum
height of ... a
meter or so below the
level to which it
originally rose."

(writes this, ... stating he is still thinking of ...
by the time of using my fountain) ... and the people in their ...
consecutive groups of ... the stage in the Middle Ages, but

24.01

(4. IV. 81

Use perhaps list of list of my list &
GRB of 25. VI. 59, better of 12th May
= top of 2nd

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

July 9, 1959

Dear Virginia:

Thank you for yours of the 25th. I count it a gain that we have all set forth our views, in any case.

I do not feel at the present, with the evidence as stated, that I can subscribe to the hypothesis of a long-extended period of construction for the Middle Stoa. It is my thought that the Stoa of Attalos and the Middle Stoa may be contemporary parts of a single plan, and that the discrepancies in date may perhaps be accounted for by the omission of some handles dating later than 180 from the body of what you regard as the evidence. I do not, in any case, find it possible to visualize circumstances which would permit an MSBF deposited ca. 180 to remain exposed pending construction yet pure and undefiled in a busy market place for 20 or more years.

Be that as it may, the proof will be in the eating. Having made clear our differences, the degree of our agreement or discord in other groups prior to 150 should be informative. When I am ready to disgorge we can perhaps compare our views on these earlier groups. For the present it is perhaps enough to reemphasize that the MSBF is distinctly undependable from the points of view of source and archaeological disturbance and that you take a risk, however well calculated, in building arbitrarily upon it.

Having delivered myself of this I will leave you all to your moutons on this subject and return to mine.

Yours,

GERG

c: Agora Deposit File

stood to a maximum height of 11.11 m. a meter or so below the level to which it originally rose."

(with this, a note stating he is still thinking of using my fountain)

reply: see fact of ITALY, under COSA

14. VII. 59
(The top of this fell, which may or may not have been pulled, was gone, to a depth of meters, where area was excavated.)
29. VII. 59
G. Senter K
Summer 1958
p. 2: "95"

MSBF

Athens, June 25, 1959

Dear Roger,

I have been thinking these days about the problems raised by your letter dated "January 1959" on the Middle Stoa filling, which came with covering note of June 3. Since Homer has written to you at length on its subject (his letter of June 15, 1959) there is the less for me to say just now.

It occurs to me that in speaking loosely, or just too briefly, I may sometimes have given the impression that I think the SAH in this filling indicate for the actual erection of the colonnades, etc., of the Middle Stoa a date of before 180 B.C. Of course they can only give a terminus. For myself I should not be surprised if you were quite right that the construction of the Stoa proper fell between ¹⁶⁰ 160 and 150. At any rate, the area in general clearly did not present a tidy appearance before levelling was complete in front of the Heliaina, or before the temporary light wall west of the Stoa had done its job and could be removed. From the evidence of the stamps listed by the excavators as MSBF, and the small contrasting group from the well under the wall to the west, what seems to me to have happened is that the fill for the foundations was brought from the dump a little before 180, but - no doubt due to shortage of funds - the project was not completed for perhaps about 20 years.

The date arrived at for the handles is not dependent on their association with this building, but comes from a combination of evidence outlined in my typescript of 1956. Not to go into all those details here, perhaps looking at the Knidian will show the difficulty one would have in bringing the date down later than the second decade: the fact is that we know the eponyms of 188-167 B.C. (the $\Phi\text{POYPA}\text{P}\text{X}\text{O}\text{I}$, cf. Fraser and Bean, The Rhodian Peraea and Islands, p.93; several of these date the Knidian in the well west of the Stoa); and, distinct from these, we know another group of eponym names that take us on from there to the middle of the century (dated by the Stoa of Attalos, Corinth, and other contexts) and the people in these two successive groups of dating officials do not date the stamps in the Middle Stoa, but

these stamps are dated by a third distinct lot of eponyms for whom there is not possibly room between 180 and 150 B.C.

If you want to review the evidence in detail, and haven't a copy of my 1956 summary, I have one that is expendable, and shall be glad to send it, and later examine with you points you may find questionable.

It may be worth remarking that with the amphorai, at least, the change in shape in 50 years at this period, though it can be followed, is very slight. For purposes of comparison, I replace MSBF fragments with whole jars similarly stamped.

It is all a very interesting puzzle, though time-consuming.

How nice that you have that lovely apartment that Eva had. I wonder if you went to the Shear wedding; I would like to hear about it. Many guests must have been saddened by Harry Hill's death coming so shortly before.

Yours,

Virginia

cc HAT, Agora Deposit file.

Not sent

Xerox - SIR 7/82
[24.05] copy of this

Athens, June 20, 1959

ADT
but showed that
to Eon Coram
who thought I would
stop a
particular
argument

Dear Roger,

I have been thinking these days about the problems raised by your letter dated "January 1959", which came with covering note of June 3, 1959. Since Homer has written to you at length on its subject, there is the less for me to say just now. I refer to his letter of June 15.

You are obviously right that at the time when the well west of the Middle Stoa was being filled, and apparently for a while thereafter, the area could not have presented a tidy finished appearance. Evidently levelling was not complete in front of the Heliaia, cf. Homer's letter. I for one should not be surprised if you were right in assigning the actual erection of the Stoa proper (colonnades, etc.) to "the decade 160-150." To date this construction, the filling below naturally gives only a terminus.

Though of course including much earlier material, the SAH found in this filling, and in more of the same put in to make the terrace to the south, do still stand out to me as stopping with remarkable consistency before the end of the second decade of the second century. It is possible to be uncommonly precise in dating SAH, especially Knidian, during the first half of the second century, because observable changes in the pattern of stamping evidently reflect administrative changes which took place in 188 and 167 B.C. (cf. Fraser and Bean, The Rhodian Peraea and Islands, p.93). Further relatively fixed points are provided by the overlapping Pergamon deposit at one end, and the Stoa of Attalos and the destruction of Corinth at the other; and fabricant-eponym connections fill out between. I get something also from shape-development in the jars, since for purposes of comparison I can replace the stamped fragments in the fill with similarly stamped whole jars from elsewhere; but I must say that for the Rhodian at least, which had been in production with the same general system of stamping for a hundred years or so, there is remarkably little development to be seen in thirty years at this period.

I think you are over-pessimistic in your impression of serious conflict between our datings of other groups of the first half of the second century. We seem to have been in good enough agreement on the wall west of the Stoa, at any rate. As you say, let us take up the rest of them when you get to that point.

Naturally I have read with as much interest as yourself Homer's discussion of the Stoas and related buildings in his letter to you of June 15. For me the troublesome factor is the very consistency of the SAH, since even from the filling at the west end I cannot identify the later stamp types dated by Corinth and the Stoa of Attalos. Among the 1000-plus handles, identified by the excavators as MSBF, from 1953 finds in K and M2, there seem to be only 2 which I think may be datable in the second quarter of the second century, and these come from a part of the fill "possibly disturbed by drain B" (SS 12295 and SS 12422). As far as I can see, either the difference in time between the main part of the ^{foundation} ~~building~~ and its west end was too little to be noticeable in the finds, or somehow the fill remained uncontaminated, or nearly so, through the later operations.

The light wall preserved west of the Stoa looks to me, as to you, like a retaining wall, and I'd like to think that along this stretch it did retain a temporary terrace on which to set up the scaffolding for the west end columns and their entablature. This end of the building is restored as coming right to the edge of its platform, as probably you remember (though I did not); and the west foundation under it is finished nicely outside as a retaining wall, which was of considerable height. A temporary terrace against this wall would surely save the cost of a lot of timber. In that case, our wall to the west, over which the light wall passed, dates the erection of at least the western colonnades, etc. To put it after 160 B.C. would suit a possible connection with Pharnaces (cf. my typescript of 1956), since the public appeal made to him by the Athenians, to fill out payments according to his promises, is now dated 160/159 B.C. (Durrbach, Choix d'Inscriptions de Délos, 1921, no.73; cf. *Hesperia* IV, p.91). I should still like to associate the

beginning of the job, including the moving in of all that fill from the dump you mention, with his original benefactory gesture, which was assigned by Durrbach on historical grounds to about 183 B.C.

Evelyn tells me you have excellent quarters, Eva's nice apartment in a now practically empty house, and an airconditioner available at the Institute. Think of us withering away, and invaded by an unusually large Summer School, as well as by an unusually large Directorial family.

Yours,

Virginia

[24.08]

18.VI.59

type and show to
HAT

Alterations made for
final text

Dear Roger,

I have been thinking these days about the problems raised by your letter dated "January 1959", which came with covering ^{note} ~~letter~~ of June 3. Since Homer has written at length, ~~on the excavation evidence~~ there is the less for me to say just now.

You are obviously right that at the time when the well west of the Middle Stoa was ~~filled~~ being filled, and apparently for a while thereafter, the area could not have Evidently levelling was not complete in front of the Heliaia. presented a tidy finished appearance. [^] I for one should not be surprised if you were right in assigning the ^{actual erection} ~~construction~~ of the Stoa proper (colonnades, etc.) to "the decade 160-150." To date this construction, the filling below naturally gives only a terminus.

The SAH found in this filling, and in more of the same put in to make up the terrace (though of course as you say including much earlier material) filling to the south of the Stoa, [^] do still stand out to me as stopping with remarkable consistency before the end of the second decade ~~of~~ the 2nd century. It is possible to be uncommonly precise in dating SAH, especially Knidian, during the first half of the 2nd century because of administrative changes which evidently took place in 188 and 167 B.C. (cf. Fraser and Bean, The Rhodian Peraea and Islands, p.93). Further relatively fixed points are provided by the overlapping Pergamon deposit at one end, and the Stoa of Attalos and Corinth at the other; and fabricant-eponym connections fill out between. I get something also from shape-development in the jars, since ~~ixsan~~ for purposes of comparison I can replace the stamped fragments in the fill with similarly

stamped whole jars from elsewhere; but I must say that for the Rhodian at least, which had been in production with the same general system of stamping for a hundred years or so, there is jolly little development to be seen in 30 years at this period.

I think you are over-pessimistic in your impression that my estimate of the date of this filling brings me into serious conflict with your views on the dates of other deposits of the first half of the 2nd century. We seem to have been in good enough agreement on the well west of the Stoa, at any rate. As you say, let us take up the rest of them when you get to that point.

Naturally I have read with as much interest as yourself Homer's discussion of the Stoas and related buildings in his letter to you of June 15. I have a suggestion by which I hope to fit in my findings with the other data on which his outline is based.

The troublesome factor with me is the very consistency of the SAH, since even at this west end I cannot identify the later stamp types dated by Corinth and the Stoa of Attalos. Among the 1000-plus handles from 1953 finds in K and ME, there seem to be only two which I think may be datable in the second quarter of the 2nd century, and these come from a part of the fill "possibly disturbed by Drain B" (SS 12295 and SS 12422).

As far as I can judge, the excavation evidence would permit a guess that the last tie-wall foundation (between Piers 1 and 2), mentioned by Homer as of later construction

than the rest

than the rest, was actually put in when the fill was already in place, by shovelling away in the looser upper part, and by cutting through the bottom. In this way there might be no noticeable contamination in the shovelled-back fill. One would have to imagine that the old buildings to the west had been acquired a little earlier, and that the difference in time indicated by the change in construction of the outer foundations toward the west was not enough to show, in the finds in the fill. Further, that when these foundations were built, it was not intended that the filling they ~~en~~^{as they rose} enclosed should be covered right to its west end by the Stoa, but there would be a terrace space there, as there was eventually to the north.

The light wall preserved west of the Stoa does (as you remark) look like a retaining wall, and I'd like to think that ^{along this stretch} ~~at this point~~ it did retain a temporary terrace on which to set up the scaffolding of the west columns, which otherwise would have to be awfully high.

I'm asking Homer what he thinks about this.

20. VI. 59

24.11

After inspection

MSBF

Sub 20. VI. 59

Note again that
the settling basin
is really very
deep not to
have been
covered
when floor-
level of K5
was reached
by the fill,
near as the
same to each
other.

Tollings for K section Vol. XI

on point of P 23095 (K 2700)

(apparently the grid pt. is 30/AA)
(ref. K section plans) (date IV. 29.53)

See photos, pp. 2076-9

Pp. 2083-4 in a cut further east. "No real break was
detected over the drains B and C as was dug, so this fill
must count as disturbed."

(p. 2098, photo of the old houses)

//

Pp. 2121-4 description of the position (IV 29.53)SAH which come nearest to this position:

SS 12805-12919 (K 2396-2508, 2515-16)

"IV. 23.53 28.AT Hall. fill west of
Water Basin"

Find no journal mention of this. The cut
contained a drain handle, SS 12918.

SS 12482-12538 (K 2144 -

"IV. 18.53 32/AT Hall. fill over water basin
North of Drain B. Working floor to ca. level
of bottom of drain. p. 2077"

This seems to be pure.

SS 12637-12729 (K 2207 -

"IV. 20.53 32/AT Hall. fill over water basin north
of drain B and below level of its bottom,
p. 2077"

C.S (SS 12705) SS 12727 ^{Ku.} possibly - with bit

SS 12755 - 12804 (K 2339 -

"TV. 21.53 32/11 Below bottom of Drain B,
p. 2078." On p. 2078: "We then go
down in southern part of area below bottom of
Drain B. Much pottery. K 2339 -"

Seem to be nothing wrong with this fill

I don't quite identify this position, nor that of
Drain B. How can the same grid point do for both
N and S of the drain?

(K 2396 -

SS 12805 - 12919, see previous page.

20.11.59 To sum up, don't find any group of handles attributed
to the ^{MSBF} fill and named as coming from over this
settling basin. Although E.W. says finds in settling
date MSBF, he does not describe a strata on top of it, this
would exclude the likelihood of its having been open
at a later date than that of the characteristic MSBF.

pp. 2130 - 2134 (TV. 27.53)

Note that a Bygg. wall went down to bedrock just
north of the Water Basin (27-33; 12)

p. 2131 "When working the Hall. fill ^{with} of the wall, we
left a protection strip 0.10 - 0.15 wide against the face
of the wall."

Anyhow, probably no strata over this corner -

From upcast, cutbooks, and summaries
on west end of Middle Sts

M2 (Vol. III), pp. 425-6 ^{N-S} "stratigraphic in line of
Pier 2 to S foundation opposite. The tie wall does
appear to have been put in through existing fill,
cf. also section p. 439, ground, pp. 535-6
Section p. 509

M2 1953 Summary, p. 17;

"In area S 2 [the area between Piers 1 and 2,
south of line of piers] the earth was thrown in against
the foundations, apparently all across the area,
and then the trenches for the piers was cut [→]
up to the level of the top of Layer III, but
then the tie wall and upper part of the pier 2 was
built and earth thrown in against it in the
upper course. . .

June 15, 1959

Dr. G. Roger Edwards
Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, New Jersey
U. S. A.

Dear Roger:

I am, naturally, very much interested in your memorandum on the date of construction of the Middle Stoa since it has to do with a matter of major importance not only for the history of ceramics but also for the history of the development of the Agora.

Having heard the cases for both the early and the late date argued with deep conviction by well informed scholars I have come to feel that there must be some reasonable explanation for such a considerable diversity of opinion, and I shall attempt to suggest a way out.

We are all agreed, I assume, that of the two buildings the Middle Stoa is the earlier, or at least was begun earlier. Quite apart from the ceramic evidence, this is indicated by topographical considerations. The Stoa of A. differs strikingly in orientation from its major predecessor on the site, viz. the Square Peristyle; nor does it conform in the least to the lines of the nearest major thoroughfares, viz. the Panathenaic Way and the east to west road across the north side of the square. It would seem clearly to have taken its orientation from the Middle Stoa (with which it is precisely aligned in both plan and floor level); and the orientation of the Middle Stoa had been fixed by elements indubitably earlier than either Stoa, viz. the "Heliaia" and the east to west line of division suggested by the original course of the East Branch of the Great Drain.

What we have to decide then is by how much the one stoa preceded the other. I am inclined to believe that the Stoa of A. was not yet envisaged when the M.S. was laid out. This is shown by the presence of the Brick Building beneath the Stoa of A. The Brick Building, to judge from the associated pottery, must be closely contemporary with the beginning of the M.S., and yet it appears to have taken its orientation from the M.S., hence it should be a trifle later. But the Brick Building was never properly finished (witness the condition of one of its threshold blocks) though it was certainly carried to the point where it could be used and was in fact used for a while. I infer, therefore, that the decision to build the Stoa of A. was made after the start but before the final completion of work on the Brick Building.

In its original conception the Stoa of A. appears to have been a good deal more modest than it eventually became. Only the central section, a length of 14 shops, appears to have been intended in the original project. In its double colonnade backed by shops this unit looks in plan much like South Stoa I; it may well have been conceived as a replacement for that building at a time when South Stoa II was in the planning stage; the second storey in the new building would, of course, have afforded a prudent amount of additional accommodation. In its original conception the Stoa of A. may well have been purely Athenian; the aid of Pergamon may have been invoked, or accepted, only in connection with the much larger and more splendid final design. In this connection it may be noted inter alia that the Donor's Monument, though it doesn't fall precisely on the axis of the Stoa even in its final form, is much closer to the axis in that phase than in the earlier phase.

The above considerations suggest to me that the Stoa of A. was begun quite some time after the M.S. How is it then that in the M.S. Building Fill there should be elements as late as or even a little later than anything from the Stoa of A.?

I gather that you regard the material from the well to the west of the M.S. and that from the settling basin at the foot of the west end of the stepped retaining wall (of the Heliaia) as the latest evidence that may safely be used for dating the M.S. The appreciable difference in date between these two lots of material and the generality of the M.S.B.F. is probably due in large part to the fact that the west end of the MS was the last part of the building to be erected, and the time interval may have been quite considerable. The evidence is given by a striking difference of material in the foundations of the Stoa in the westernmost two major bays; the conglomerate in this part comes from a different quarry. Furthermore the foundation for the screen wall in these bays is put together in quite a different way. By stopping their building temporarily at this point the Stoa builders left undisturbed not only the old buildings to the west but also the north to south thoroughfare that ran past the east front of those old buildings.

Eventually the old buildings to the west were acquired and demolished, and the course of the north to south road was shifted to the west. It was at this stage that the light north to south wall was erected some 10 feet to the west of the final west end of the M.S. The wall was designed to give a firm eastern limit to the new roadway and to keep people out of the area of construction. At the same time a low flight of steps was built in the new roadway at a point to the southwest of the southwest corner of the M.S. so as to keep the road in the stretch adjacent to the west end of the M.S. as nearly level as possible.

In both the stairway and the wall bordering the east side of the new road occur limestone blocks taken from the long pedestal that had been erected in the 5th century against the mid part of the old stepped retaining wall of the Heliaia. This implies that only at

3 still
undisturbed
material
evident

this stage was the level between the Heliaia and the Stoa appreciably raised and the north front of the Heliaia modified.

It becomes clear therefore that the filling of the well to the west of the M.S. as also of the settling basin at the northwest corner of the Heliaia may be referred to a late phase in the construction of the M.S.

Thus far we have been dealing only with relative chronology, and I'm afraid that I can't help much with the absolute. It is commonly said that Attalos II is likely to have done most of his building early in his reign, but the evidence for this view is of a rather general nature. It is well to keep in mind that a comparison between the Stoa of Eumenes and of Attalos reveals enough significant differences, e.g. in the kind of marble, in the scheme of masonry in the walls, in the design of the cornice, to suggest an interval of some length between the construction of the two buildings.

I doubt whether architectural style is likely to prove a very effective criterion for the more precise dating of the buildings in absolute terms or even in a relative way since it is difficult to compare a poros building with one of marble and since the two structures are clearly the work of two quite different schools.

The upshot of all this is that I would expect an appreciable difference in date between the main mass of M.S.B.F. and the Stoa of A. fill, and I'm not at all surprised by the late date of the material from the west end of the M.S. I very much hope that you and Virginia can arrive at some mutually acceptable conclusion about the more precise absolute dating.

Yours ever,

Homer A. Thompson

cc: V. Grace ✓

HAT/ak

13.VI.59

N.C. & HAT

Anent p.5 of the ms. of your letter: (EGRE)

Would you expect to find the whole fill west of Pier 2, and south to the Heliaia, as of later date than "the generality of the MSBF"?

I am not very clear how large a proportion of the total finds from the filling would thus be involved. Actually, of the 1000-plus handles dug in 1953, and attributed by the excavators to the MSBF, only two struck me as datable between about 185 and 146 B.C.; these were SS 12295 and SS 12422, both from K, at 37/AF, "Hellenistic fill, possibly disturbed by Drain B."

The fill of the well just west of the Stoa, I do of course think is consistently later than the MSBF, and do not see why water sources would not have been kept accessible, even after the foundations and their filling were in place, for the uses of the workmen erecting the columns, etc. I suppose the filling can only give a terminus for the upper construction.

Notes on middle str.

i.e. HAT's letter to GRE, ultimately dated 15. VI. 59

p. 2 of ms. Date of Brick Bldg. "closely contempor. with the beginning of the M.S." It had been my impression that the cstr. fill went down to front 166; SS 11076 sp. $\Pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\chi\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon$; and SS 11621, Plumb. fr under floor of Brick Bldg, through 56 2nd $\frac{1}{4}$.

p. 4 of ms. "elements ^{as late as and} probably a little [later than] anything from the str. of Athens?"

"the [latest] safe evidence for the time of cstr. of the M.S." Is this deliberate? GRE certainly means earliest.

"The appreciable difference in date between these 2 lots of material and the generality of the M.S.B.F. is..." GRE does not believe in this, of course.

13. VI. 59

Plains near west end which includes later-seeming stuff:

SS 12227-12430 37/117 "provided by Drain B" Includes 2 bundles of before 150 BC rejected by VG as post M.S.B.F.

SS 12805-12919 28/117 Hill fill west of water basin: SS 12918, early 1st BC Krieder

But of SS 12959, also 1st BC, from 55/12

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

June 3, 1959

Miss Virginia Grace
The American School of Classical Studies
Athens, Greece

Dear Virginia:

I enclose herewith a full account of my views on the evidence of the excavations for the date of construction of the Middle Stoa which I prepared in letter form last January. It seems now, after a decent interval of hibernation, as valid as it did then. It is put forth in the interests of ascertaining the truth and I trust you will regard it in this light.

Yours,

GRG

January, 1959

Miss Virginia Grace
The American School of Classical Studies
Athens, Greece

Dear Virginia:

As you know I have not been willing for some time to enter into discussions of the dating of Hellenistic deposits. It has not seemed to me desirable to do so until I have completed the typological layout of the pottery. It is my hope to do a complete review of all worthy groups after this is done. They will then be available to any interested parties.

It is my belief, however, that the dating of the construction of the Middle Stoa will be basic in any discussion of the dating of groups of the period before the middle of the 2nd century. As an interim effort, therefore, in the general interest, I invite you to give serious attention to the enclosed which has bearing on its date. It is still my opinion that the decade 160-150 witnessed its erection, its completion falling in the latter part of this decade. The principal enclosure here has to do with the Well in the Road West of the Middle Stoa, which, from the archaeological point of view, was put out of use by the construction of the Stoa. The analysis of the filling of the well with your dating of SAH from it suggest to me that, given a slight allowance for use, the decade 160-150 for the abandonment of the well and the construction of the Stoa is supported by the evidence of the SAH.

I invite you also to consider the character of the building filling which has caused us so much difficulty in the past. I think others would bear me out in the belief that the nature of a filling has considerable pertinence to the dependability of the dating provided by the material in it. That is to say, if the filling within the foundations of the Stoa had accumulated layer by layer from inhabitation on the spot the latest object in it should most certainly be regarded as serious evidence for the date of the structure. In this case, however, I do not think anyone would question the statement that the Middle Stoa filling for the most part was transported to the site of the building from some source elsewhere. It is a filling full of pottery especially of more durable varieties (cf. K Excavation Report, 1953, p. 3), and was particularly well suited to the purpose it served, i.e. to form a firm basis for the floor and terraces of the Stoa. The filling includes a good amount of material derived from the manufacture of pottery and related objects. And the datable pottery from it is consistently of long range, covering, with a consistent representation throughout, over 150 years, in my view, from the last quarter of the 4th century. Fillings of such a character and of as considerable range are known elsewhere in the Agora area. It is probable that the filling of the Third period of the

Assembly Place on the Pnyx is such a one, of the third quarter of the 4th century. It seems to me reasonable to assume that there was a dump located in an area directly accessible from the Potters' Quarter from at least the 4th century B.C., possibly earlier, where rejects from the potters' workshops and other discards from the life of the city accumulated, something in the nature of the Monte Testaccio outside Rome. It seems likely that contractors and probably private individuals alike were in the habit of drawing on this when material was needed for construction or filling in circumstances where stability of support was important. Such a source would account for the numerous fills encountered in the Agora which are of such consistent long range, so heavily replete with pottery which does not mend up, and so ideally suited for construction of all kinds where a dependably solid support was wanted. It seems to me that the Middle Stoa Filling is of such a character and had such a source. I think you will agree that under such circumstances we cannot place as strong dependance on the dating provided by the objects in this filling.

The filling was, of course, badly disturbed. We both have made the effort to isolate the original core of evidence, with differing results. The very unhappy excavational picture, with many disturbances which the excavators found impossible to detect, can, I think, at best only be approached from the point of view which HAT suggested to me in 1950 when I attempted to deal with the pottery from it. That is to say, to recollect that the building was in active use from the time of its construction until the time of the Herulians, and that it seems likely, considering the character of the building, that little of the material of the period between the time of construction and that of destruction would have been allowed to accumulate in the area or would have been introduced into the original construction fill. Hence that it would be probable that the disturbed building filling from within the foundations and the terrace would contain primarily pre-construction or post-destruction (267 AD) material, the one of which should be easily separable from the other. The implication is that any Hellenistic material found within the area of the Stoa foundations or its terraces, whether in disturbed contexts or not, is liable to have been a part of the Middle Stoa Building Fill, introduced at the time of its construction. This reasoning may help you to reconcile the dating for the construction of the Stoa which you proposed earlier with that which is provided by the Well in the Road West of the Stoa.

In my attempts to establish the original construction fill of the Stoa, at HAT's request, in 1950 I now feel that I did not follow out his suggestions as fully as I should have and that I excluded material as from disturbed contexts which should properly have been included for consideration. It seems to me now that the only really honest list of the construction fill, if a revision seemed desirable, would be one which included all the Hellenistic material from within the physical confines of the Stoa and its terraces. In view of the preceding paragraph, however, it seems to me evident that we should not place ultimate reliance on the results obtained from such a list. Not even, in fact, from a list of the purest of undisturbed building fills derived from such a source. Particularly if there is good on-the-spot inhabitational evidence available.

-3-

It seems to me that the best and most reliable evidence for the date of the construction of the Stoa is that provided by the material from the Well in the Road West of the Middle Stoa (H 13:1) already discussed, and the Settling Basin (Pithos) in front of the west end of the Stepped Retaining Wall (), which was covered at the time of filling in the terrace behind, to the south of the Stoa. These were in use up to the time of the construction of the Stoa and contain the material most nearly contemporary with the time of construction. It seems possible that further scratching within the confines of the Stoa or in its immediate vicinity might well supplement this slender evidence from other deposits existing in the area at the time of the construction of the Stoa.

I am moved to go into this particular matter at this particular juncture and at such length since I have noted in your comments on other deposits that you have placed great reliance on the MSBF in relating them to it. The consequences of this are thus far reaching and in my view are harmful to you as well as to the rest of us in what we are trying to do. I should most like to have a cordial meeting of minds when the time comes to discuss the dating of groups. The date of the construction of the Middle Stoa will, however, it now seems, be heavily influential on your dating of groups of the period prior to the middle of the second century. The difference now existing between our dates for this group with the numerous dependant groups which you have attached to it is thus extremely crucial. It seems important to all of us, for this reason, for me to put forward these comments at this time, and to try to emphasize the need for a realistic down-to-earth archaeological approach to the dating of deposits and in the evaluation of evidence.



G. Roger Edwards

cc: Virginia Grace
Homer A. Thompson
Agora File

-4-

Depth: 4.80

Well in Road ^KWest of Middle StoaLower Fill (water level and below)

P 19519 Unstamped Knidian amphora (VG: beginning of 2nd century)

Upper Fill (top to 2.85; Boxes 1-3)Box 3P 19518 Meg. bowl: leaves and tendrils
SS 10452 KnidianBoxes 2-3P 19517 Large unglazed pitcher
P 19516 2 handled BG bowlBox 2

SS 10451 Knidian

Boxes 1-2

P 19515 BG plate

Box 1P 19514 Saucer, grooved rim
P 19513 BG bowl, outturned rim
SS 10450 Knidian
SS 10441 Knidian
SS 10442 Knidian (VG: KNEYTONIS: double axe: ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ)#

"All the eponyms in the well here listed appear with this title (i.e. ΦΡΟΥΡΑΡΧΟΣ), so probably the group dates 188-167 B.C. None of the eponyms appear in the MSBF; the name ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ does appear, but it is plainly a different ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ, having quite different connections from the one named by KNEYTONIS who uses the double axe, a fabricant most of whose activity fell near the middle of the century, according to the other eponyms he names."

6.VIII.56

"SAH from K Well at 18-19/MH in
ROAD WEST OF MIDDLE STOA

				SS 10441-2 10450-2 P 19519	
<u>KNIDIAN</u>					
fabricant	device	eponym	KT	SS	Shape etc.
ΘΡΑΣΩΝ	caduceus	ΦΡ. ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΗΣ	795	10452	
ΗΡΟΔΩΤΟΣ	caduceus	ΕΥΚΡΑΤΙΩΝ	684	10441	
ΑΡΙΣΤΙ(ΩΝ)		ΔΑΜ. ΘΕΥΓΕΝΗΣ ΦΡ. ΕΠΙΝΙΚΙΔΑΣ	211	10450	retr.
ΑΡΕΤΟΓΟΡΑΣ		ΚΛΕΑΝΑΡΙΔΑΣ	192	10451	
ΚΛΕΥΤΟΛΙΣ	double axe	ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ	909	10442	
UNSTAMPED				P 19519	jar

(There were no non-Knidian SAH.)

Listed by GRE in list of 16.II.51 as "2nd c., first half."

The stamps belong to the period of the Combined List of predestruction Corinth and Stoa of Attalos construction. The eponym ΕΥΚΡΑΤΙΩΝ who does not appear in that list is supplied by SS 13220 from a pre-Stoa of Attalos group, the name having there the title ΦΡΟΥΡΑΡΧΟΣ. All the eponyms in the well here listed appear with this title, so probably the group dates 188-167 B.C. None of the eponyms appear in the MSBF; the name ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ does appear, but it is plainly a different ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ, having quite different connections from the one named by ΚΛΕΥΤΟΛΙΣ who uses the double-axe, a fabricant most of whose activity fell near the middle of the century, according to the other eponyms he names.

The unstamped Knidian jar P 19519 according to its proportions is a little earlier than the stamped fragments, should probably date at the beginning of the century. I.e. it is closer to SS 7542, period of MSBF, than to SS ΦΡΟΥΡΑΡΧΟΣ. (new jar from ΠΠ cistern at 6/14), period of ΦΡΟΥΡΑΡΧΟΣ."

SS 14142

K
Well in Road West of Middle Stoa

Section K, Excavation report, 1948

p. K - 5.

"Well in Street West of Middle Stoa (18-19/MH)

A tiled well just west of the Middle Stoa was apparently filled up at the time the Stoa was built, for it could hardly have existed in the middle of the street which passed here after that time. It was only 4.80 m. deep, and contained no well deposit. Owing to its shallowness, it was probably kept clean. It produced only five boxes of pottery, which seems to belong to the advanced second century B.C. and may be a valuable check on the date of the Stoa. The southernmost block of the N-S peribolos (?) wall west of the Middle Stoa partly covered the mouth of the well.

Peribolos (?) Wall West of Middle Stoa

West of the Middle Stoa and at the level of the original street a long thin line of wall appeared. It is almost, but not quite parallel to the west end of the Stoa, being slightly nearer towards the north, farther away towards the south. The last preserved block of this wall at the south overlay the mouth of the well at 18-19 MH. Towards the north the wall can be traced almost to the northwest corner of the retaining wall in front of the Stoa (but the northernmost three or four meters are at a slightly different angle). The wall is built of re-used blocks of various kinds laid as a single row of stretchers. The tops of many of these blocks are polished by the traffic of the street.

This wall from its position must be earlier than the Stoa. It will not be much earlier, however, if it is all contemporary with the

Well in Road West of Middle Stoa

southernmost block which overlay the mouth of the well at 18-19 MH.
Is it possible that we have here part of a temporary building or enclosure used by the builders of the Stoa during the period of construction?"

Note:

1. The Well in Road West of Middle Stoa and the Peribolos(?)
Wall West of Middle Stoa are still visible (Dec., 1958), much as they appear in the photograph K p. 1779.
 2. The so-called Peribolos Wall is now (Dec., 1958) regarded as a possible or probable lower course of a sort of temporary retaining wall for constructional work on the Middle Stoa, raised course by course as the courses of the Stoa were put in place.
- by whom?*

-8-

K

Well in Road West of Middle StoaK p. 1772. IV.20.48 Road West of Middle Stoa

We resume work on the mass of fill left at the end of last season west of the drain at the west end of the Middle Stoa, digging Level IV. The fill is loose, gravelly and stony: not hard packed. It seems not to be road metal but fill thrown or washed in at one time. Quantities of pottery, early Roman (Arretine, etc.).

B 260

IV.22.48. The same fill continues down without strosis or obvious change. Late Hellenistic sherds seem to predominate, but there is also an occasional early Roman.

Well
18-19: MH
p. 1867

#see phot.
p. 1779.

At 18-19: MH we suddenly fall upon the mouth of a tiled well. The upper part (half the top set of tiles) is empty, the well fill having settled after the gravel had been thrown in and hardened over the mouth. The topmost tiles are roughly at the level of the euthynteria of the Middle Stoa. #Our cut, when we fall into the well is at about half the height of the orthostates.

A row of blocks running N-S parallel with the west end of the stoa appears. The southernmost of these blocks runs partly across the mouth of the well.

IV.23.48. At and slightly below the level of the N-S row of blocks a firm strosis appears, its projecting stones polished by traffic. We stop at this point. East of N end of row of blocks, between them and TC drain, a soft pocket contains III c AD pottery, which will account for the occasional LR sherd from the early Roman fill above. We failed to pick up this pocket in the loose stony gravelly fill above.

IV.24.48. Cleaning further north we expose more of the N-S row of blocks "parallel" to the west end of the Middle Stoa. It is not exactly parallel but is a little nearer the Stoa at the north than at the south. It is now evident that some stones exposed in Section Z years ago belong to the same wall, which is thus seen to run to a point a little beyond the NW corner of the Stoa proper. It is apparently a peribolos wall.

p. 1775

Road West of Middle Stoa: Catalogued objects

K 1437-1454 IV.21.48
K 1455-1474 (1584-5) IV.22
K 1475-1493 IV.23 (A.M.)
K 1494-1505 IV.23 (P.M.)
K 1506-1511 IV.23 (lowest)
K 1513-1520 (1556) IV.23 (at north)
K 1607-9 (IL 1175, 1176, 1177)

K

Well in Road West of Middle Stoap. 1867. Well in Road West of Middle Stoa (at 18-19:MH)

We start to dig this well whose mouth had appeared last week (p. 1772). Photograph and remove the block of the N-S wall which partly covered mouth of well. At level of second set of tiles a rough, very worn slab. Sherds Hellenistic. Two amphora handles near top (K 1525-6: SS 10441-10442). Lower down another rough slab. Many shapeless lumps of iron. K 1545-7 (SAH: SS 10450, SS 10451, SS 10452). Depth 2.85.

Boxes 1-3

IV.27.48. In the morning a box and a half of pottery, mostly coarse, then sand with a few sherds. We strike water in the morning. Bottom in the afternoon at 4.80.

Boxes 4-5

May 1948.

The pottery from this well has now been through the mending room. A few representative pieces have been catalogued (K 1577-83), one tray (four compartments) has been kept in pottery storage, the rest discarded.

263 (B)

Catalogued objects:

K 1525-6
1545-7
1577-83

K

Settling Basin (Pithos) in front
of the West End of the Stepped
Retaining Wall

P 23095 Megbowl, earliest
type long petals

NB p. 2121

Container: B 155

P 23096 Lid of cooking pot

Phot.: NB p. 2126

- - - - -

K, Excavation Report, 1953: pp. 3-4

. . .

In undisturbed parts of the fill I saw no pottery that need be later than about the middle of the second century B.C. The Megarian bowls were in general of the normal figured variety and there were none of the long petalled variety which is common in later second century save one and this not typical and undoubtedly early of its kind (K 2705, P 23095). This was found in the settling basin in front of the west end of the Stepped Retaining Wall, not in the general filling, and, though covered to a considerable depth by the general filling, it may be later than most of the things in the general filling, for the settling basin seems to have been in use right down to the time of the filling; the bowl K 2705, P 23095 may therefore be a strictly contemporary piece that got into the settling basin in the last days of its operation shortly before the general filling started."

Ku. Tar shepi in MSBF and
Later in 1st half

MSBF:

- 1.) SS 7542 *Συρίδας*, cf. *Nekcipovdas*
dim. 0.364 HH ca. 25-
- 2.) *Am Künden in Sayra*

188-166 BC

new gr., *Ἀρισταγόρας* cf. *Φιλίσκος*
dim. 0.348 HH ca. 27-

Ca 146 BC

new gr., *Ἀνδρόκλος* cf. *Κλεοφύλων*
dim. 0.338 HH ca. 275

L.I.T.

This item has been listed as
part of a MSBF in Section A
but apparently by error? see
the finding place on the card;
described as "upper Helt. layers",
not like the others (also attached).

The stamp belongs to the
early duroni period, ~~ca~~ end
of 2nd cent.

V.G. Over

This item, SS4031 (A560)
 was on Murray's lost note for
 the purpose. Original list now in
 back pocket of A, vol VI; see
 also his note on A, p. 1109.

Would not like to throw this out
 without speaking with her; but you
 might well put MEBF (disturbed?),

at 1:1 The Tripod in 2 and 5 is Ancient but
 and Fourteenth Centuries B.C. in Greece and Egypt.

in other cases

75.XI.7

See M.C.'s note;
 from disturbed fill

ions for Plates

Nov SS 4031

[Ενὶ Πεδίῳ Ἀποκατάστατος [K]
ῥιόνου

30. VII. 56

27.04

ΠΟΥΚΡ.

listed, but to card says
"upper Hall. layers"

MSBF in A - Summary

Photo.

Ἀναστάσιον

SS 3896

and. left

Ἐνὶ [Θε]ῶ

SS 4301

δα[ρ]ῶ

Ἐνὶ Ἐνοστρά[του] Δαδίου

SS 4302

Παυσανία

SS 4299

Τεμα ? (early)

SS 4365

Εὐα δά[ρ]ῶ

ῥασι. II ?

Θου[

Chian

Ἐγυρίον

SS 4300

Kritini

ΚΗ

SS 4366

ΧΗ

Ἐνὶ Πεδίου

SS 3897

(KT 273)

Ἀριστομένειον

Εἰδεν

[Κη]ρίον

(Κη.Κη.)

AGORA EXCAVATIONS
AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
ATHENS, GREECE



July 13, 1956

Miss Virginia Grace
Agora Excavations
Athens.

Dear Virginia:

I am, naturally, very much interested by your persistent feeling that the Middle Stoa is appreciably earlier than the Stoa of Attalos, and that the difference may be as much as 30 years.

Your evidence is certainly very impressive both in its volume and its consistency, if you can manage the re-dating of the Pontic handles and of the few troublesome coins, particularly the so-called Delian. I have but cf. E.V. { little doubt that the Megarian bowl which bothers Roger can be regarded as intrusive. I should like, however, to know how Roger now feels about the overall comparison of the pottery from the Attalos and the Middle Stoas.

In support of your hypothesis of a considerable interval between the two stoas, you might stress the fact that the so-called Brick-Building discovered by A.W.P. beneath the Stoa of Attalos - a row of five double shops running E-W. - would seem from the ceramic evidence to be exactly contemporary with the Middle Stoa. At this time when this building was laid down, the Stoa of Attalos, at any rate in the form in which we know it, could scarcely have been conceived. The little building was razed by Attalos' workmen before it had been completely finished but after it had been in use for a little while.

If you can make your early dating of the MSBF stick, Pharnaces I must indeed be regarded as a serious candidate for its authorship. In times past I had looked longingly at Durrbach No. 73, but had been put off by two considerations

1. The benefaction in question would appear to have been a regular annual contribution more appropriate to the maintenance of an institution or a festival than to a building program.
2. Why should the honorary statues and decree have been set up on Delos if the benefaction had been so definitely localized in Athens?

I do continue to believe that the Middle Stoa was a royal foundation and I shall rejoice greatly if its authorship can be established with certainty.

Yours ever,

Homer

Homer A. Thompson

HA T/ak

Book bldg!

Guide 3, p. 119 (Plan 43)

see also esp. p. 316

Ag. 20, p. 172 "see A 2 - small stage"

[5.XI.79. The report seems to be I 14:2]

7/82 - SIK took
XEROX

July 12/56

30.01

V.G.

On the Middle Itoa Building Fill.

I continue to regard the early long-petalled
Megarian bowl (K2705, P23095) found in the
settling basin in front of the west end of the
north front of the Hekleia as one of the few
strictly contemporary pieces that can be
associated with the middle Itoa. It will
have been ^{a new piece} in use as work was starting on the
building. It will have been broken and discarded
after the settling basin had been
disconnected from its water supply and
just before it was buried under the
building fill; (note that most of the pieces
of the bowl were on top of the sand in the
basin, one piece was on the strosis just
outside).

Most of the MSBF was not strictly
contemporary fill. Some layers were
archaic and earlier. The layers of with
masses of pottery and handles must have
been drawn from some old dump.
after all, where would you go if you wanted
such a lot of fill all at once.
The strictly contemporary pieces from

The fill are relatively few, but if you add to the bowl the bundles you are forced to reject in order to maintain the early date, the evidence gains weight.

That the fill rose in step with the laying of the foundation courses is shown by the fact that in some places we observed wedge shaped layers of conglomerate chips at each course. Therefore the whole space between the MS and the Heliana was filled in while the foundations were being laid.

E. V.

July 12, 1956

SEE ALSO FOLDER "SQUARE BLDG AND RELATED"

27.10.56

On middle Stoa, see Hesperia XXI,
1952, pp. 86-90. (HAT)
p. 88: ^{guess} ~~that~~ it was "under construction
in the late 60's of the 2nd century"
by Ariarathes V, King of Cappadocia
162-130 B.C.
Says pottery, coins, and amphora
stamps suggest the date.
*Also VII. a Vallis pp 66-68, 164
of which Stoa of Philadelphus as excavated in the
excavation of the 2nd cent. B.C. and any other of the site*



214.22

April 1953

ME records MSBF handles in
K notebooks

Something which really ought to appear separately from the Ocean volume,
and preferably beforehand, is an account of the handles in the Middle Stoa
building fill.

Vq 6 HAT 30. IX. 57

(Page
Report)

M.S.B.F.