

Pots and Politics: Reflections on the Circulation of Pottery in the Ptolemaic and Seleukid Kingdoms

John Lund

The distribution of ancient pottery was determined by several factors, of which the most important may have been the spatial distance of the vessels from their source,¹ but others such as “the function of the find-site, topography and method of transport, or the situation of the markets and marketing methods” evidently influenced the pattern as well.² This contribution considers whether political entities could have played a role too, focusing on the Eastern Mediterranean in the Hellenistic period.

My interest in this issue was kindled by Michael Pfrommer’s assertion in 1996 that “the provenances [of Gnathia pottery in the Eastern Mediterranean] cover more or less the regions and territories controlled by the Ptolemies in the middle and the latter half of the third century” BC. According to Pfrommer it is “hardly in doubt that the distribution of Gnathia ware reflects Ptolemaic economic connections and that we should see Gnathia-type pottery in the eastern Mediterranean primarily under a Ptolemaic viewpoint.”³ This observation has not been the subject of a broader discussion so far.

The aim of this contribution, then, is to investigate through eight case studies whether the circulation of pottery was affected by the Ptolemaic and Seleukid kingdoms. The case studies involve table wares as well as transport amphorae, and comprise ceramics manufactured within the kingdoms as well as imports. Any conclusions to emerge from such a limited review of the evidence are of course preliminary, but this paper is offered in the hope that it may stimulate future research into this issue.

Prolegomena

The present inquiry is made difficult both by the uneven rate of investigation of the countries involved, and by the scarcity of quantified publications of Hellenistic pottery from the Eastern Mediterranean.⁴ Moreover, short-term developments and specific events are unlikely to have left a mark in the ceramic record,⁵ except in the case of so-called ‘life assemblages’.⁶ Yet similar methodological constraints apply to most other classes of archaeological material, and ought not deter us from pursuing research based on what is currently (even if imperfectly) known, provided that the uncertainties are recognized.

The frequent border changes of the Hellenistic kingdoms constitute another challenge. In the 3rd century BC, the Ptolemaic kingdom comprised a good deal of the Eastern Mediterranean, including Cyrenaica, large parts of Western Asia Minor, Rough Cilicia, Cyprus and most of the Syrian coastline.⁷ But only Egypt, Itanos in easternmost Crete and Cyprus were left in the 2nd century BC.⁸ It is no less difficult to keep track of the changing borders of the Seleukid kingdom,⁹ particularly from the 2nd century BC onwards, when Phoenicia and Palestine were battlegrounds for the two regional superpowers on a background of rising regional entities.¹⁰

The historical record bespeaks a long-term friendly relationship between the Ptolemies and Rhodos,¹¹ some of the cities in Crete,¹² and Athens.¹³ The Seleukids oriented themselves towards the east and south after the loss of Asia Minor in 190 BC,¹⁴ but, on the whole, had a good relationship with Athens¹⁵ and apparently also with Rhodos until the second quarter of the 2nd century.¹⁶

Pottery produced within the Seleukid kingdom

The mouldmade bowls of Antiocheia

Several workshops produced mouldmade bowls in Syria,¹⁷ but we are best informed about the ones located in Antiocheia.¹⁸ Antiochene mouldmade bowls have a diameter of between 12 and 16 cm¹⁹ and rather distinctive ornaments such as lines of beading separating zones of decoration,²⁰ the 'cœurs à fleurons avec axe médian',²¹ and others.²² Their production seems to have been confined mainly to the 2nd century BC.²³

The largest number of Antiochene bowls has turned up in Antiocheia itself, followed by Gindaros and Tarsos. Finds are also recorded at Porsuk in Cilicia, Hama in Syria, and along the coast at Ras ibn Hani and Beirut.²⁴ In 1993, Pia Guldager Bilde envisaged a restricted distribution of these bowls,²⁵ and later finds have confirmed this as far as the bulk of the production is concerned, but the evidence now available shows that some reached a wider area comprising the Lebanese coast, Israel and Jordan.²⁶

Eastern Sigillata A

Eastern Sigillata A (ESA) Ware emerged in its classic red gloss form about or shortly after the middle of the 2nd century BC.²⁷ Two possible precursors have been claimed for it: the so-called Black Slipped Predecessor, defined by Kathleen Slane,²⁸ and the "Red Slip Predecessor", identified by Sandrine Élaigne.²⁹ Unfortunately, too little is currently known about their source and distribution for them to be included in this review.

The kilns producing ESA have not been discovered, but in 2000 Gerwulf Schneider concluded on the basis of X-ray-diffraction analyses, "the region between Tarsos and Antiocheia seems a more likely source than Cyprus."³⁰ Traditional archaeological methods point in the same direction, and few would

now dispute that ESA was produced in North Western Syria or Smooth Cilicia, presumably within the *chora* of Antiocheia, one of the Seleukid capitals.³¹

The earliest ESA vessel forms were traditional Levantine ones, but a new repertoire emerged about 130-120 BC, and the ware circulated from then on in the Eastern Mediterranean and beyond in huge quantities, reaching a maximum in the second half of the 1st century BC, but continuing through the 2nd century AD in the Levant.³² Quantified information is hard to come by, but ESA apparently was distributed mainly within the borders of the Seleukid kingdom.³³ Still, very considerable quantities reached Ptolemaic Alexandria³⁴ and Cyprus.³⁵ Something similar can be said about Israel.³⁶

Pottery and faience vessels produced in the Ptolemaic kingdom

The Ptolemaic queen's oinochoai

A characteristic class of fine faience wine pitchers carries a relief image of a Ptolemaic queen pouring a liquid offering on an altar. According to a recent study by Marie-Dominique Nenna and Merwatte Seif el-Din, these oinochoai can be dated between 270 and 150 BC.³⁷ 113 examples have been found in Egypt – the majority (106) in Alexandria, where they were presumably manufactured.³⁸ But 15, i.e. ca. 11 % of the total, came to light outside Egypt: in the Athenian Agora (5), Crete (2),³⁹ Benghazi (1), Canossa (1), Carthage (1), Corinth (1), Kourion (1), Samaria (1), Rhodos (1) and Xanthos (1).⁴⁰

Cypriot Sigillata

Cypriot Sigillata is a characteristic red-gloss ware that emerged in the late 2nd century BC,⁴¹ perhaps in the area of Nea Paphos,⁴² a theory supported by the "rich repertoire of early Cypriot sigillata forms" that has recently been excavated in the island of Geronisos off the coast of Cape Drepanon.⁴³

Cypriot Sigillata was distributed outside Cyprus from the 1st century BC onwards.⁴⁴ Crete seems to have been a large 'consumer' of the ware. The second largest concentration has been found at Oboda, and there are scattered occurrences in other parts of Israel. The ware occurred in limited quantities at Hama in Syria and Petra in Jordan. Corresponding finds are rare in Asia Minor, with the exception of Rough Cilicia.⁴⁵ Occurrences in the Aegean are also fairly rare: Athens, Tenos, Rhodos, Amorgos and Kenchreai are among the find spots. Cypriot Sigillata is also distributed along the North African coast, from Alexandria and Marina el-Alamein in Egypt to Berenike in Libya and Carthage in Tunisia. A few examples reached the Western Mediterranean.⁴⁶

Pottery produced outside the Ptolemaic and Seleukid kingdoms

Gnathia vases

Gnathia pottery was originally manufactured in the area of Taranto and later in other Apulian centres.⁴⁷ The specimens found in the east were formerly thought to predate the Roman destruction of Taranto in 272 BC, but it is now known that Gnathia ware continued to be made through the 3rd and into the 2nd century BC.⁴⁸

This was the first Italian ware to reach the Eastern Mediterranean in some quantity.⁴⁹ In Benghazi, Gnathia pottery (and other wares with painted decoration) accounts for nearly 16 % of the fine wares datable between 250 BC and 100 BC,⁵⁰ and at least 200 such finds are reported from Alexandria.⁵¹

'Hadra vases'

The name 'Hadra vases' designates "Clay-ground vases with painted decoration in the usual Greek lustrous black clay-paint ... The most prominent shape among the material left is the hydria."⁵² Until fairly recently such vessels were believed to have been made in Alexandria, where a large number has been found in the Hadra cemetery and elsewhere,⁵³ but it is now known that most of the Hadra vases were made in Central Crete between about 260 and 197 BC.⁵⁴

Arnold Enklaar has established that nearly 80 % of the Hadra vases have been unearthed in Alexandria. 1 % were found at other sites in Egypt, 13.5 % in Crete, ca. 1.5 % in Cyprus, 1 % in Rhodos, in Southern Russia and in Cyrenaica respectively, and 0.5 % in Eretria, in Athens and in Kelenderis.⁵⁵

Greco-Italic amphorae of Will type 1a

The earliest Greco-Italic wine amphorae (Will type 1a), dated between about 330 and 260 BC, are represented among the finds from the Ptolemaic encampment at Koroni in Attica, which seems to have been established during the Chremonidean war (between 267 and 262/1 BC), and they were also found in a context at Eretria, which has also been associated with the same conflict.⁵⁶

Rhodian transport amphorae

Rhodian amphorae were made in Rhodos itself as well as in her territorial possessions in Asia Minor.⁵⁷ They were exported widely in the Mediterranean and beyond because of their contents, presumably wine.⁵⁸

A tally of 128,549 Rhodian stamped amphora handles (from all periods) found at a range of well-published sites in the Mediterranean East conveys an impression of their frequency in the individual regions.⁵⁹ Egypt accounts for about 80.71 %, Greece (including Rhodos) for about 10.73 %.⁶⁰ Israel and Cyprus comprise 3.95 % and 2.31 %, respectively. By contrast, the figure for North Western Syria (including Antiocheia) does not amount to more than 0.69 %, and Cilicia to 0.12 %.⁶¹

The scarcity of Rhodian amphorae in the Seleukid area (0.81 % for Cilicia and North Western Syria) contrasts markedly with the extremely high number in the Ptolemaic kingdom (83.02 % for Egypt and Cyprus).⁶² Archaeologists have investigated Antiocheia far less intensively than Alexandria, and the imbalance will no doubt be redressed somewhat as this situation changes.⁶³ But substantial excavations have, after all, been carried out at Tarsos, Seleukia ad Pieria, Antiocheia, as well as in Hama on the Orontes, where seven excavation campaigns only yielded 25 stamped Rhodian handles. Also, the Rough Cilicia Survey Project only yielded two specimens.⁶⁴

Preliminary conclusions

1. The case studies involving the Antiochene mouldmade bowls, ESA, and Cypriot Sigillata suggest that the bulk of these table wares circulated in the areas of their manufacture, be it the Ptolemaic or the Seleukid kingdom.
2. The numerous occurrences of ESA in Cyprus and Alexandria suggest, however, that political borders presented no barrier to the distribution of ceramic fine wares.⁶⁵ It is true that Cypriote Sigillata is rarely found in the Seleukid kingdom, but this may simply be because it could not compete with ESA on the latter's own turf.
3. The three other fine wares considered here mainly circulated within the Ptolemaic kingdom (and cities which were friendly towards it): 92 % of the Ptolemaic queen's oinochoai and 95.5 % of the Hadra hydriai were distributed within the Ptolemaic kingdom and Crete – and hardly ever reached areas under Seleukid rule. True, the circulation of the oinochoai may have been determined by cult practices, and the Hadra hydriai were hardly trade items either: they served as cremation urns, and about 10 % have official inscriptions showing that they contained the ashes of persons who had come to Alexandria from elsewhere on official business.⁶⁶ But the Gnathia vases were presumably objects of trade, and they are indeed mainly found in regions and territories controlled by the Ptolemies,⁶⁷ an ambience that was clearly favourable to the exchange of goods and peoples – including mercenaries. Some of the Greco-Italic amphorae of Will type 1a found in the Eastern Mediterranean may have been brought there by Ptolemaic mercenaries.⁶⁸
4. Political boundaries did not constitute insurmountable barriers to the transport amphorae either, but unless the extremely high number of Rhodian amphorae found in the Ptolemaic kingdom and their scarcity in the Seleukid kingdom is an illusion created by the uneven rate of exploration in the two regions, then their circulation must have been guided by a mechanism facilitating the sale of Rhodian wine in the Ptolemaic kingdom and hindering its access to territories dominated

by the Seleukids. This seems supported by the situation at Akko in Israel, where the largest number of Rhodian amphorae falls between 220 and 200 BC, explained by Gérald Finkielsztein with reference to the importance of the city under Ptolemaic rule – in particular between 217 BC and 200 BC.⁶⁹

5. According to Strabo (14.5.2) the Rhodians were not friendly to the “Syrians”,⁷⁰ and Kay Ehling observed that Rhodos adopted a hostile policy towards the Seleukids after 167 BC.⁷¹ This may explain why the bulk of the Rhodian amphorae found in North Western Syria predate that year,⁷² but the case of Pergamon warns us against tying the chronological distribution of Rhodian amphorae at a given site to specific political events.⁷³ State regulation of imports and exports of foodstuffs may provide another (and perhaps the main) explanation of the apparent scarcity of Rhodian amphorae in North Western Syria.⁷⁴ Phillip Stanley has suggested that ancient Greek states could impose import sanctions on an enemy, arguing that the notion of an embargo was not alien to Greek thinking.⁷⁵ He referred *inter alia* to the Thasian wine laws of the 5th century BC, which forbade Thasian ships to import foreign wine into a specific part of the north-western Aegean.⁷⁶ Other factors might also have come into play, as witnessed by an inscription from Teos informing us that Antigonos Monophthalmos was reluctant to allow the importation of corn into Lebedos, giving as a reason that “we were not willing to have the cities spend for this purpose large sums of money unnecessarily; we did not wish even now to give this permission, for the crown land is near and if a need of grain arose, we think there could easily be brought from there whatever one wishes.”⁷⁷ Gary Reger has noted that “the Greek cities under the Seleukid kings had to obtain permission to import grain is ... well attested in many documents.”⁷⁸ Indeed, if the Seleukids were eager to regulate the importation of grain, might they not have had a similar policy with regard to wine?

True, these preliminary conclusions provide no easy answers to the question posed by this paper, but they confirm what has long been suspected, namely that the circulation of transport amphorae and ceramic fine wares was to some extent guided by different ‘rules’.⁷⁹ They suggest, also, that it may often be a mistake to expect simple solutions to problems posed by complex societies.⁸⁰

Notes

- 1 Rice 1987, 197-200; Orton et al. 1993, 197-206.
- 2 Peacock 1982, 167-169.
- 3 Pfrommer 1996, 180-181.
- 4 For this and more, see Peacock 1982, 166; Stissi 1999.
- 5 Cf. Lund 2005.

- 6 Peña 2007, 18-19.
- 7 Hölbl 2001.
- 8 Spyridakis 1970; Mueller 2006, 45-46, fig. 2.1.
- 9 Buschmann 1989; Aperghis 2004, 35-58; Capdetrey 2007.
- 10 See the contribution by Berlin, Herbert and Stone to this volume.
- 11 See Berthold 1984, 62-66, 69, 73-74, 76-79, 92-93, 97, 188-189; Gabrielsen 1997, 21-22, 35-36, 71-74, 76-77, 156-157 note 19, 169 note 63, 181 notes 45-47; Hölbl 2001, 29, 53, 132 and *passim*; Wiemer 2002, 97-109; 357-358; Gabrielsen forthcoming. Rhodos was at war with Ptolemy II Philadelphus at some time between 262 and 246 BC, cf. Berthold 1984, 89-91 and Gabrielsen 1997, 165-166 note 35, but this seems to have been exceptional.
- 12 Spyridakis 1970, 92-103; Stefanakis 2000; Chaniotis 2005a, 9-12.
- 13 See Rotroff 1982a, 11-13 and 1988; Habicht 1992.
- 14 Held 2002, 245-247 and *passim*.
- 15 Habicht 2006.
- 16 Mittag 2006, 114.
- 17 Christensen 1971, 24.
- 18 Waagé 1948, 29 and *passim*; Byvanck-Quarles van Ufford 1954; Jentel 1968, 15-16; Callaghan 1996; Kramer 2004, 136-157; Chalier 2008.
- 19 Chalier 2008, 96 note 3 and 98.
- 20 Callaghan 1996, 372 note 12, figs. 1-4; Chalier 2008, 99 note 29.
- 21 Cf. Chalier 2008, 99, fig. 4.a.
- 22 Callaghan 1996, 372; Chalier 2008, 98-100. For a more cautionary approach, see Rosenthal-Heginbottom 1995a, 215.
- 23 Callaghan 1996, 372-374; Chalier 2008, 100-101.
- 24 See Chalier 2008, 98-101 with references to the individual find spots. For Hama, see Christensen 1971, 25, 29, 36-37, nos. 120-125, 141 and 156, figs. 13-17. The 'cœurs à fleurons avec axe médian' motif is (*pace* Chalier 2008, 99 note 20) present on a black gloss fragment from Hama, Christensen 1971, 37-38, no. 156, fig. 16-17.
- 25 Guldager Bilde 1993, 196, 201-205, figs. 3-4.
- 26 Beside the reference in Chalier 2008, 99 note 21, see also Rosenthal-Heginbottom 1995a, 215-216, nos. 53-56, fig. 5.5.13-16 and pl. 5.20-21 and Kenrick 2000, 235-236; 242, no. 30, figs. 1 and 4; 246, nos. 63-65, figs. 2 and 6.
- 27 Hayes 1985b, 9-48; Slane 1997, 269-346; Lund 2005; Hayes 2008, 13-30.
- 28 Slane 1997, 272-282; Élaigne 2007a, 114-115.
- 29 Élaigne 2007a, 113-114; this may correspond to the "proto-ESA" defined by Andrea M. Berlin at Kedesh and discussed in her contribution to this publication.
- 30 Schneider 2000, 532.
- 31 For references, see Lund et al. 2006; for a different view, see Regev 2007, 192-194.
- 32 See Lund 2005, 239-242, figs. 10.4-5.
- 33 It would seem that more than 85,000 such sherds were excavated by Danish archaeologists at Hama on the Orontes, cf. Lund 2005, 238-239. At Tell Barri in the area of Aleppo, this ware seems to have made up more than 98 % of the sigillata finds, cf. Martucci 2008, 306 and *passim*.
- 34 Élaigne 2007b, 203-205.
- 35 Hayes 1991, 35.
- 36 Cf. Lund 2005, 240-242. For the western Mediterranean, see Malfitana et al. 2005.
- 37 Thompson 1973; Nenna & Seif el-Din 2000, 396-402 with bibliography.
- 38 Nenna & Seif el-Din 2000, 31-33 and 422-431.

- 39 I am grateful to Cristine Rogl for drawing my attention to an oinochoe in Kassel, i.n. T 1018, allegedly from Lasaiia in Crete, Busz & Gercke (eds. 1999), 368-370, no. 212, which is not listed by Nenna & Seif el-Din 2000.
- 40 Nenna & Seif el-Din 2000, 432-434. A further specimen is on display in the Palace of the Magister in the City of Rhodos.
- 41 The classic treatment of Cypriot Sigillata is Hayes 1985b, 79-91; see also Lund 1997; Hayes 2008, 53-54; see further Hayes 1991, 27 and 37.
- 42 Lund 1997, 203; 1999, 3; 2002; Schneider 2000, 533-534.
- 43 Cf. Connelly 2005, 168 and 2007, 43 where the similarities between this ware and Cypriot Sigillata are said to "argue strongly for a western Cypriot origin for Cypriot sigillata." See, too, Młynarczyk 2009, 353.
- 44 For distribution maps, see Lund 1997, 204-207, figs. 3-5.
- 45 For an updated review of the circulation of Cypriot Sigillata in Cilicia, see Lund 2013.
- 46 References to find spots may be found in Lund 1997.
- 47 See Kotitsa 1998, 57-71 with references to previous literature.
- 48 Cf. Kenrick 1985, 67-69; Kotitsa 1998, 57-58.
- 49 See Lund 2004, 3-5, fig. 1 for a distribution map and references.
- 50 Kenrick 1985, 66-77 and 1987, 138-142, fig. 2.
- 51 Green 1979 with references to previous literature; Morel 1995, 371-372; Green 1995; Pfrommer 1996, 180 note 39; Enklaar 1998, 263; Morel 2008, 164.
- 52 Enklaar 1992, 5-6.
- 53 See Enklaar 1992, Appendix B and C.
- 54 Enklaar 1985; 1986; 1992; Rotroff 1997, 223-224; Kranz 1999; Lungu 1999-2000; Portale 2000; Eiring 2001. Production seems to have continued longer in Crete, see Englezou 2005, 297.
- 55 For Crete, see now Englezou 2005, 295-313 and 414-415, and for Alexandria, see Enklaar 1998 and Ballet et al. 2001.
- 56 Cf. Lund 2000, 78-80; Lawall 2006, 270.
- 57 Şenol et al. 2004.
- 58 Cf. Lund 2011b.
- 59 The figure comprises actual counts as well as an educated guess in the case of Alexandria, for which the figure includes the 100,000 specimens kept in the Museum of Greek and Roman Antiquities according to Jean-Yves Empereur (1998, 398).
- 60 A large number of stamped handles from Rhodos could not be included in the count, since no information about their number has been published.
- 61 The calculation is based on publications of Rhodian amphora stamps from the following localities: Greece (Athens, Delos, Eretria, Pella, Rhodos, Tenos); Western Asia Minor (Didyma, Halikarnassos, Ilion, Labraunda, Pergamon); Cilicia & Northwestern Syria (see below, note 62); Cyprus (the Akamas Survey, Kition, Nea Paphos, Polis, Salamis); Lebanon (Beirut, Jal el-Bahr, Tyros); Israel (Akko Ptolemais, Ashdod, Bethel, Beth-Sour, Gezer, Jaffa, Jerusalem, Lachish, Marissa, Nessana, Samaria, Skythopolis, Shikmona, Tell Abu Hawam, Tell Anafa, Tel Dor, Tell Keisan); Jordan (Gadara, Pella, Petra); Egypt (Akoris, Alexandria, Koptos, Krokodilopolis, Tanis, Tel Atrib); Libya (Benghazi, Euesperides). References to the relevant publications may be found in Lund 2011b, note 33, except for Bounni et al. 1976, 1978 and 1981; Clarke 2005 and 2008; Courbin 1986, 208; Étienne 1990, 212-220; Kawkabani 2008, Monsieur & Poblome 2010; Şenol & Alkaç 2007. Moreover, I have included stamps to be published by myself from the Akamas Survey

- in Western Cyprus, the Danish excavations at the site of the Maussolleion of Halikarnassos in Bodrum and from Tall Sukas in Syria.
- 62 Cilicia: Kinet Höyük (Monsieur & Poblome 2010); Nagidos (Şenol & Alkaç 2007); Tarsos (Grace 1950). Syria: Antiocheia (Grace 1950, 135 note 4); Gindaros (Kramer 2004, 88-96); Hama (Christensen 1973, 50-54); Jebel Khalid (Clarke 2002 = 37 examples, 2005 = 48 examples, and 2008 = 21 examples); Ras el Basit (Courbin 1986, 208); Ras Ibn Hani (Bounni et al. 1976, 253; Bounni et al. 1978, 292; Bounni et al. 1981, 227-227 and 271); Tall Sukas = 10 examples; Tel Mardikh (Mazzoni 1984, 115: "I materiali rodi a tutta questa fase appaiono del tutto eccezionali").
- 63 Şenol & Alkaç 2007; the relations seem to have decreased after the first quarter of the 2nd century BC, *ibid.* 426.
- 64 Cf. the "Ceramics Study Collection" on the project's website: https://engineering.purdue.edu/~cilicia/SC_website_03/SC_Title.htm.
- 65 Cf. Hannestad 2005, 168.
- 66 Enklaar 1985, 145-146 fig. 23; see also Chaniotis 2005b, 97-100.
- 67 Morel 2008, 164-165 ponders whether the presence of Gnathia pottery of the "Alexandria Group" in Alexandria was due to an initiative taken by a pottery producer in Apulia or a tradesman in Alexandria. He discusses the possibility that the specimens found in Benghazi could have been re-distributed via Alexandria.
- 68 Lund 2000, 78-80. This does not apply to the specimens found at Euesperides, Göransson 2007, 122-128, since this city seems to have been outside the Ptolemaic orbit. Chaniotis 2005b, 98-100 suggests that mercenaries were involved in the distribution of amphorae from Hierapytna in Crete; see also Chaniotis 1999, 184-185.
- 69 The chronological pattern was confirmed by Donald Ariel's subsequent publications (Ariel 2005; Ariel & Messika 2007) of more stamped handles from Akko.
- 70 Wiemer 2002, 128-129.
- 71 Ehling 2008, 186.
- 72 Cf. Clarke 2002, 288; 2005, 184; and 2008, 113; Kramer 2004, 86-87.
- 73 See Lawall 2002, 305-309 and 320-321.
- 74 Port dues are attested to by the decision of Seleukos II in 227 BC (Polyb 5.89.2) to exempt "merchandise destined for Rhodes ... from customs dues in the ports then under Seleukid authority", even if this pertains to goods going out – not coming in.
- 75 Stanley 1976, 275-280; I wish to thank Mark L. Lawall for having drawn my attention to this publication. See further Bissa 2006.
- 76 Salviat 1986; Reger 2003, 350-351.
- 77 Reger 2003, 349; Bagnall & Derow (eds.) 2004, 13-14.
- 78 Reger 2003, 349.
- 79 As witnessed, e.g. by Peacock 1982, 154, cf. Peacock & Williams 1986, 2.
- 80 See, for instance, Tainter 2005.