The Destruction Date of the Bulla Archive at Daskyleion
Reconsidered: The Evidence from the Black-Glazed and
Partially-Glazed Pottery*

Discussions about the identification of the site of Daskyleion, the satrapal centre in northwest Anatolia, where the palace of Pharnabazos (Xen. hell. 4, 1, 15–25) was located, came to an end when bullae were uncovered in 1952 to 1955. The pottery, which was uncovered in the same context as the bullae and some of which has been taken under the protection of the Bandırma Museum in 2001, has been mentioned but never published. An evaluation of this pottery may suggest forth a new proposal for the closing date of the satrapal archive.

Daskyleion, which was one of the four satrapal centres in Anatolia at the time of the expedition of Xerxes I into Greece, is located on top of Hisartepe Höyük to the west of Ergili village on the southwest coast of Manyas Lake (Daskylitis Limne). Hisartepe/Daskyleion was an administrative centre containing residential buildings together with the nearby paradeisos.

The seal impressions which cleared up the debate concerning the identification of Daskyleion were uncovered in the »burnt level« in Trench C; only one came from the sounding excavated on the south slope of Hisartepe in 1952. Trench C (50 × 12.5 m) and its extension Trench C1 (50 × 5 m), located on the southwest of Hisartepe constitute a large trench as seen in the topographic plan of the site (fig. 1). Excavations initiated in 1952 in Trench C continued until 1959. In the course of the 1955 campaign, the foundations of...
1 Topographic plan of the site of Daskyleion
a building first thought belonging to the palace of Pharnabazos and then a megaron-type temple. But finally due to the absence of an altar, it is considered a »large house of megaron layout« which is dated to the first half of the 2nd century B.C.7. The trench was extended southwards when large foundation blocks of another building were discovered in the east of it; and the terrace wall, partially standing today, and built of reused blocks from a late 6th century B.C. building and from the mid-5th century satrapal palace, was uncovered8. In the course of excavations in Trench C, architectural fragments of Ionic order dated to the 4th century B.C.9 and also fragments of Attic black-figure pottery dated between the first quarter of the 6th century and 480/470 B.C. were documented10.

Other finds, which were recorded together with the seal impressions, include bronze and silver coins of Kyzikos, Attic black-glazed pottery, a glass unguentarium fragment, leaf shaped spear heads and fragmentary horse-bits11.

The clay seal impressions, which bear traces of the fire they were exposed to, bear inscriptions in cuneiform12, Aramaic13 and Greek and their obverses have depictions from Persian and Greek art. The Achæmenid bullae with inscriptions uncovered from 1952 to 1955 were first published by K. Balkan14. Balkan linked the seal impressions with cuneiform inscriptions containing the name of Xerxes to the first decade of his reign and considered them as proof for his close connections with the Daskyleion satrapy during his expedition to Greece15. D. Kaptan, however, disputed this suggestion16; while R. Schmitt proposed that the Daskyleion bullae should be dated to the last years of Xerxes’s reign if they were to be dated to his reign at all17.

The most comprehensive study of the style of the Daskyleion bullae is that of D. Kaptan18. The collection has 185 seal impressions on 406 bullae and 74% of them display Achæmenid and Persianising stylistic features19. The seal impressions in question are grouped by her in terms of their styles as in the following:

---

7 Akurgal 1957a, 350; Akurgal 1957b, 662; Akurgal 1958, 632; Akurgal 1959, 692.
8 Akurgal 1959, 692; Akurgal 1961, 168. 171 fig. 115; Bakir 1988, 83 fig. 14. For the architectural elements of the terrace wall s. Bakır-Akbaşoğlu 1997, 236; Ateşlier 2001, 147–160 figs. 1–21; Ogan 2007, 6–13 pls. 3 a–b, figs. 1–7; pl. 4 a–b, figs. 8–9; 16–18 pl. 10 a, fig. 18 a; 20–23 pls. 2. 3 a–b. 12 b–15 a, figs. 19 b. 20–24. 26 b; 38–39 pl. 17 a, figs. 26 b. 30 b. 31 a; 48–53; A. Erdoğan, Beobachtungen zur achämenidischen Architektur Daskyleions, in: I. Delemen (ed.), The Achæmenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (Sixth–Fourth Centuries B.C.), Papers Presented at the International Workshop Istanbul 20–21 May 2005 (Istanbul 2007) 181–183 figs. 4–76. E. Akurgal claimed that the architectural elements re-used in the construction of the terrace wall must have come from the palace of Pharnabazos. Later, S. Ateşlier dated the pieces with cyma with egg-and-darts, dentils and window lintels of the Prokonnesian marble to the 2nd quarter of the 5th c. B.C., while the architrave blocks were dated to the last quarter of the 6th c. B.C. Ateşlier proposed a reconstruction based on the hypothesis that this building, which was built in the reign of Artabazos I (477–468 B.C) and reused the blocks of another building constructed in the last quarter of the 6th c. B.C., was a palace or an andron that stayed in use for a long time, until the reign of Pharnabazos. Based on the presence of a single Persian element (a horn-shaped fascia) on the window lintel while all the rest were Ionian elements S. Ateşlier suggested that an Ionian architect was employed for the construction by Artabazos (Ateşlier 2001, 156–157. 159–160 fig. 21). G. Bakir, the director of the excavations, considers the proposal of an andron more plausible (Bakır 1995, 276; Bakır-Akbaşoğlu 1997, 236; Bakır 2001, 171). On the other hand D. Ogan proposed a new point to the reconstruction by Ateşlier based on a new lintel fragment uncovered in 2005 (Ogan 2007, 49–50 figs. 11, 37).
9 Akurgal 1956a, 50–51; Akurgal 1957a, 350.
10 For more information on the Attic black-figure pottery comprising mostly cups and skyphoi s. Görkay 1999, 4–7.
11 Kaptan 2002, I, 9–10 n. 46. In the course of writing the article, it has not been possible to access the other materials uncovered together with the seal impressions.
14 Balkan 1959, 123–128 figs. 1–3 pls. 33–34.
15 Balkan 1959, 127.
Neo-Babylonian style (group 1); Court style (group 2); Achaemenid Persian koine styles (groups 3–15); Persiansing styles (groups 16–29); Greek styles (30–36). Considering the bullae together with the pottery they were found with, Kaptan dated the seals, according to their stylistic features, to the period between the reign of Xerxes (486–465 B.C.) and the first quarter of the 4th century B.C.20. Apart from the single seal in the Neo-Babylonian style21, the earliest examples in the Daskyleion bulla collection are those containing the name of Xerxes in the Groups 2, 3 and 422. According to D. Kaptan, the latest bullae are those in groups 35 and 3623.

After D. Kaptan, G. Coşkun, in his doctoral study on the activities of Daskyleion in the Middle Achaemenid period, suggests a new date based on the Agesilaos’s destruction level of 395 B.C., which was unearthed in 2004. The destruction was attested over a wide area to the south of the »large house of megaron layout« but did not extend inside the building itself, where the sounding by E. Akurgal was done; G. Coşkun, however, accepting that the archive room containing the seal impressions burnt in the fire by Agesilaos of 395 B.C. argued that the seal impressions must be placed in between 477 and 395 B.C.24.

Evidence from the black-glazed and partially-glazed pottery uncovered together with the bullae

In the excavation reports, E. Akurgal mentions Greek pottery dated to the beginning of the 4th century B.C. and uncovered together with the bullae25. D. Kaptan dated these Attic black-glazed pottery fragments, including bolsal and fish-plate fragments, to the turn of the 5th and the first half of the 4th century B.C.26. 18 pieces of the pottery found together with the bullae could be accessed – 6 of them (Cat. 1; 2; 8; 15; 16; 18) are at the Bandırma Museum and 12 (Cat. 3–7; 9–14; 17) are at Ankara University.27 The destruction was attested over a wide area to the south of the »large house of megaron layout« but did not extend inside the building itself, where the sounding by E. Akurgal was done; G. Coşkun, however, accepting that the archive room containing the seal impressions burnt in the fire by Agesilaos of 395 B.C. argued that the seal impressions must be placed in between 477 and 395 B.C.24.

It is worth noting that Daskyleion, as a Persian satrapal centre, imported notable amounts of figured28 and black-glazed pottery29 produced in Attica in the 5th century B.C. By the 4th century B.C. the imported wares decreased, while non-Attic local production pottery increased considerably. According to G. Coşkun, this decrease in imported pottery was linked with the decline in the economic power and shrinking relations of the satrapy and its inclination to non-Attic production30. In the 4th century B.C. with the local workshops gaining superiority over the market, the imported Attic pottery lost its market share gradually31. Now the

20 Kaptan 2002, I, 27. Furthermore, Kaptan takes her suggestion a step further and proposes 479/478 B.C., narrowing the possible beginning date, by relating the earliest bullae containing the name of Xerxes to the period when Artabazos was appointed the satrap following the defeat at Plataia in 479/478 B.C.
25 Akurgal 1956b, 335.
26 Kaptan 2002, 9–10: »These finds, which consist of Attic black-glazed pottery sherds, some of which are bolsal and fish plate fragments dated to the turn of the fifth and first half of the fourth centuries B.C., and a few bronze and silver coins which are heavily corroded due to exposure to the conflagration, were labelled: «trench C together with the bullae»,«
27 I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Coşkun Özgünel and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kutalmuş Görkay for their help during the work at the Ankara University.
31 The emigration of the potters from Athens during, and soon after, the Peloponnesian Wars in the late 5th c. B.C. negatively affected the distribution of Attic pottery (Cook 1965, 143; B. B. Macdonald, The Emigration of Potters from Athens in the Late Fifth Century B.C. and Its Effect on the Attic Pottery Industry, AJA 85, 1981, 159–168). Evidence of local productions appearing as a result
market, which had once been under Athenian hegemony, was full of inexpensive products, easily accessible, due to the increasing number of local workshops, and almost as good in quality as the Attic products. The reasons for the dominance of the locally manufactured Attic-imitation pottery in comparison to their Attic counterparts at Daskyleion in the 4th century B.C. must have been the easy access and the lower prices, which were due to the availability of various alternatives in the market rather than due to the decline in the economic power of the satrapy. This was also the case in many other sites. In the Troad region, for instance, recent excavation results from Ilion indicate the presence of Atticizing pottery with forms very similar to those found in the Athenian Agora in the 4th century B.C. 32.

Attic-type skyphos (Type A; fig. 2, 1)

Attic-type skyphoi emerged in Athens under the influence of Corinthian-type skyphoi of the mid-6th century B.C. and attained their canonical forms in the early years of the 5th century B.C. 33. The standard form of Attic-type skyphoi has a 5-shaped body and handles rising immediately below the rim. The body tapers down towards the foot, which has the form of a ring foot with a torus. The handles were bell-shaped at the beginning but, in imitation of the Corinthian-type, they also became horseshoe-shaped. Towards the end of the 5th century B.C. they became triangular. Attic-type skyphoi first appeared at Daskyleion from 500 B.C. onwards; late examples dated to the 4th century B.C. are also found 34. Furthermore, it is possible to find partially glazed versions of skyphoi at the satrapal centre 35.

The rim and body fragment belonging to a skyphos (Cat. 1) has an out-turned rim and a body profile making a considerable curve starting from the bottom of the handle and tapering down toward the bottom. Handles are attached just below the rim and rise, their roots approaching each other. On both surfaces wheel marks are visible and not well finished. The clay and glaze properties of this skyphos point to non-Attic production. Although the poor preservation of the form prevents dating precisely, its shape suggests a date in the third quarter of the 4th century B.C. 36.

Bolsal (figs. 2, 2–3)

The shape appeared in large numbers at Daskyleion during the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. 37 and partially glazed examples are also seen in the 4th century B.C. 38. There are two examples of bolsal uncovered together with the bullae; one piece (Cat. 2) gives full profile while the other is a rim fragment (Cat. 3).
This vessel form, with a shallow bowl-shaped body, two horizontal handles and an elaborate low ring foot, is attested at the Athenian Agora from the third quarter of the 5th century B.C.\textsuperscript{39}. Bolsals gained in popularity from the third quarter of the 5th century B.C. and their popularity reached its zenith in the late 5th century B.C. Although the popularity of the shape declined in the 4th century B.C. with the appearance of the kantharos, a new drinking vessel, its production continued until the end of the century even into the early years of the 3rd century\textsuperscript{40}.

The bolsal fragment displayed in Cat. 2 is entirely black-glazed except for the concave profiled reserved band in the lower part of the body. Its rim is slightly out-turned. It has a reserved groove on the lower part of wall. The inner face of the flaring foot is black-glazed and the underside is reserved with a glazed circle. The roots of the handles, which join the rim horizontally, are closer to each other. The early 4th century examples from the Athenian Agora\textsuperscript{41} and the specimens from Daskyleion are very similar\textsuperscript{42}. The rim, body, reserved groove beneath the body and the concave profile right below it match the example from Daskyleion. On the other hand, the handles of the example from the Athenian Agora get thinner as they extend while the handles of the bolsal (Cat. 2) are short and wide. Cat. 2 can be dated to the early 4th century B.C. judging from its form.

Fish plate (fig. 2, 4)

Only few examples of body and foot fragments from Daskyleion belong to fish plates\textsuperscript{43} and one rim and body fragment from the assemblage were uncovered within the bullae context (Cat. 4). The fish plate has a reserved band on the transition from the lip to the body both on the interior. These plates, named after the red figured fish motifs which decorated them, have a deep lip hanging down, a body descending with a slope down toward the centre, a depression in the centre and a wide ring foot\textsuperscript{44}. The earliest fish plates are dated to the end of the 5th century B.C. and the black-glazed examples, which appeared just before 400 B.C., continued well into the Hellenistic period. Changes are observed on the fish plates in the course of the 4th century B.C. The 4th century B.C. examples from the Athenian Agora have a sharp angle at the junction of the rim and the body but in the 3rd century B.C. this angle softened\textsuperscript{45}. The vertical rim became gradually sloped and the curve reached about 45° in the late 3rd and 2nd century B.C.\textsuperscript{46}. The rim fragment (Cat. 4) has a clay in reddish yellow and somewhat dark grey due to firing (5 YR 6/6–5 YR 4/1) and black glaze (5 YR 2.5/1). Its rim is neither vertical as with the early examples of the 4th century B.C. nor sloped as much as the Hellenistic examples.

Partially glazed bowls with projecting rims\textsuperscript{47} (fig. 3, 5–10; fig. 4, 11–18)

The majority of the pottery uncovered together with the bullae belongs to bowls with projecting rims. This type of bowl has a delicate projecting rim and a wide and shallow body resting on a low ring foot. Their entirely glazed forerunners appear in the last quarter of the 5th century B.C. according to the examples from the

\textsuperscript{39} For more information about the shape and its development s. Sparkes – Talcott 1970, 107–108.
\textsuperscript{40} Sparkes – Talcott 1970, 108; Rotroff 1997, 97.
\textsuperscript{41} Sparkes – Talcott 1970, fig. 6, no. 557.
\textsuperscript{42} Coşkun 2006, fig. 2, no. 20.
\textsuperscript{43} Coşkun 2004, 100 fig. 7, no. 76; Coşkun 2006, 94 fig. 3, nos. 38–40.
\textsuperscript{44} For more information s. Sparkes – Talcott 1970, 147–148; Rotroff 1997, 146–148.
\textsuperscript{45} Rotroff 1997, 148.
\textsuperscript{46} Rotroff 1997, 148.
\textsuperscript{47} The term of »out-turned« (Cook 1965, 148; Sparkes – Talcott 1970, 147; Rotroff 1997, 156–160), »out-rolled« (Waagé 1948, 9) and »projecting« (Rotroff – Oliver 2003, 24) are used in describing the shape of the rim. S. Rotroff and A. Oliver’s terminology is preferred in this article.
Athenian Agora\textsuperscript{48}. They gained popularity in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. and continued into the Hellenistic period\textsuperscript{49}. Besides Attic examples, the non-Attic products of the bowls with projecting rim are found in many sites from Greek mainland, islands, Anatolia and to Levant by starting from the 4\textsuperscript{th} to through out the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C.\textsuperscript{50}. Most probably, the Daskyleion examples\textsuperscript{51} had been produced locally; unfortunately the comparisons with the Attic material and distant parallel are not useful for dating.

It is indeed not surprising as they formed the dominant group of the Daskyleion’s ceramic repertory from the second quarter of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. Partially glazed pottery, a less expensive alternative to the entirely glazed pottery, became a standard of local production in the Hellenistic period\textsuperscript{52}. These bowls were dipped into the glaze by holding them from their foot and their interiors are usually glazed. As they were left to rest standing before firing, on most examples there are traces showing that the glaze flowed from the middle of the body down towards the foot\textsuperscript{53}.

The bowls with projecting rim found together with bullae have a rim diameter of about 15–16 cm and a foot diameter varying from 5.5–8 cm. The bowl Cat. 5 has a full profile and a height of 5.4 cm. The clay is hard and non-porous, sometimes may be fairly porous, refined and usually does not contain any mica. One example has very little amount of lime temper (Cat. 18, body fragment). The colour range varies from red and its shades (10 R 5/8; 2.5 YR 6/8; 2.5 YR 6/3; 5 YR 5/6) to reddish brown shades (5 YR 6/3–6/4; 5 YR 4/4; 10 YR 6/3). One example (Cat. 5, 5 YR 4/1) has the clay core in grey shades due to firing. The unglazed lower part of the bodies are usually yellowish red (5 YR 5/6) and light reddish brown (5 YR 6/4). The glaze on the exterior surface is usually black (5 YR 2.5/1; 2.5 YR 2.5/1) but can sometimes be in the shades of brown (7.5 YR 3/2; 5 YR 3/2) due to firing. The glaze on the interior is in the shades of red (2.5 YR 4.8), black (2.5 YR 2.5/1; 5 YR 2.5/1; 10 YR 2/1) and brown (7.5 YR 3/2; 5 YR 3/2–3/3).

Cat. 6–7, 9, 13–14 have a projecting rim slightly downward with a round turn while Cat. 5 and 10 terminate more sharply. Bowls Cat. 11 and 12 have a more concave sloped junction of rim and the upper body. Bowl Cat. 8 has a junction from the mouth to the body with a considerable thinning of the profile. Bowl Cat. 5 has a rounded transition to the resting surface on the exterior of the foot. Cat. 16 has a foot thinner than those of Cat. 5 and 17 and the inner surface of the foot is slightly concave. The bowl Cat. 5, which gives a full profile, resembles the partially glazed bowl with projecting rim from the Samian Heraion\textsuperscript{54}. Its rim, body and foot profiles suggest a date between 375 and 350 B.C. The fragments of Cat. 6–17 do suggest a date in the second and third quarters of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. based on analogies with similar profiles despite the fact that they do not give full profiles.

**Evaluation**

The fact that numerous bullae providing evidence for the recording of bureaucratic and economic activities within the satrapy were uncovered together in the same place reveals the presence of a satrapal archive at

\textsuperscript{48} Sparkes – Talcott 1970, 128.
\textsuperscript{49} Rotroff 1997, 156.
\textsuperscript{50} The bowls with projecting rim appeared at Eretria (Metzger 1978, 229) in the early 4\textsuperscript{th} c. B.C and at Thasos (Blondé 1985, 294 fig. 8, nos. 61–66) in the 1\textsuperscript{st} quarter of the 4\textsuperscript{th} c. B.C. The non-Attic bowl with out-turned rim uncovered in the Well H at Kofinà Ridge, Khios, is dated to the last quarter of the 4\textsuperscript{th} c. B.C. (J. K. Anderson, Excavation on the Kofinà Ridge, Chios, BSA 49, 1954, 123–181 fig. 15, no. 145). Bowls with projecting rim occurred in Antiokheia (Waagé 1948, 9 pl. 1, nos. H9–10) in the late 4\textsuperscript{th} c. B.C. and 3\textsuperscript{rd} c. B.C. at Dura-Europos (D. H. Cox, The Greek and Roman Pottery. The Excavation at Dura-Europos, Final Report 4 [London 1949] 3–4 figs. 10–11). At Samaria, these series begins with bowls with rolled rims in the early 4\textsuperscript{th} c. and survived until the 3\textsuperscript{rd} c. B.C. (J. W. Crowfoot – G. M. Crowfoot – K. M. Kenyon, The Objects from Samaria. Reports of the Work of the Joint Expedition in 1931–1933 and of the British Expedition in 1935, Samaria-Sebaste 3 [London 1957] 245–246 fig. 48). The partially-glazed bowls with projecting rim uncovered in Sardis and dated to the 4\textsuperscript{th} c. B.C. due to their similarity in form with the black-glazed one-handler of the Classical period and due to the quality of both their clay and glaze (Rotroff – Oliver 2003, 25 pl. 10, nos. 51–53).

\textsuperscript{51} For further information about Daskyleion examples s. Tunuz 1993, 11–21.
\textsuperscript{52} Rotroff – Oliver 2003, 24.
\textsuperscript{54} Technau 1929, fig. 33, no.1.
Daskyleion\(^55\). For the time being, any archaeological evidence is recorded by the excavators that be firmly linked to a fire or a destruction taking place in 375 B.C., which would have damaged the seal impressions and coins in the satrapal centre. On the other hand, D. Kaptan considers the possibility that records were kept here at the satrapal centre until its invasion by Alexander the Great, in which case there could have been another later archive on the mound\(^56\). The available excavation on the site, however, does not reveal any archive belonging to the later times. G. Coşkun had proposed the date of the destruction of the archive as 395 B.C., which is the date for the destruction of satrapal centre by Agesilaos. But it is known that three more satraps\(^57\) came to power from this date until the invasion by Parmenion\(^58\). The reigns of the first two satraps, namely Ariobarzanes and Artabazos II, stand out particularly because of the revolts. Diodoros mentions that the people living in the western part of the Persian Empire revolted against the Persians and that some Achaemenid officials in office in Anatolia joined them\(^59\). In addition to economic activities, we must also take into consideration the need for archiving the correspondence with the Great King, other governors and local leaders in the region, which must have been intensive during that disturbance in between 395 and 334 B.C.

It is obvious that there must have been correspondences in the following years after the destruction by Agesilaos in 395 B.C. Furthermore, the lack of available archaeological evidence that does not indicate a fire causing damage at the site in 375 B.C. and the latest finds from the same level that go down to the third quarter of the 4\(^{th}\) century B.C. suggest that the archive may have been destroyed down at the end of the satrapy. Most likely, it can be associated with 334 B.C. when Parmenion invaded the city. The above analysis pointed out that the skyphos fragment is the piece with the latest date, indicating a date in the third quarter of 4\(^{th}\) century B.C. However, it must be kept in mind that the coins and any remaining pottery, uncovered together with the bullae but which could not be accessed for this study, may lead, in the future, to new interpretations for the closing date of the archive at Daskyleion.

56 Kaptan 2002, 1, 27.
57 Ariobarzanes (388–363/2 B.C.): Diod. 15, 90, 3; 17, 17, 6; Xen. hell. 1, 4, 5–7; 5, 1, 28; Xen. Kyr. 8, 8, 4; Dem. or. 23, 14; 1; Artabazos II (363/362–352 B.C.): Arr. an. 3, 21, 4; Diod. 16, 52, 4; Plut. Alexandros 21; Xen. hell. 5, 1, 28; Xen. Ag. 3, 3; Arsites, vice satrap (?)(352–334 B.C.): Arr. an. 1, 12, 8–9; 1, 16, 3; 2, 14, 5; Diod. 16, 75, 1; Paus. 1, 29.
58 Alexander the Great set off on his expedition onto Hellespont in the spring of 334 B.C. (Arr. an. 1, 11, 3). Crossing the Dardanelles he set foot on Asia Minor, presented his offering to the deities at Troy and continued his march (Arr. an. 1, 11, 7–8). He defeated the joint Persian army of Arsites, the last officer (vice satrap?) of Daskyleion, and Spithridates, the satrap of Lydia-Ionia, at Granikos (modern Biga) 90 km west of Daskyleion (W. Judeich, Die Schlacht am Granikos, Klio 8, 1908, 372–397; K. Lehmann, Die Schlacht am Granikos, Klio 11, 1911, 230–244; N. Th. Nikolitsis, The Battle of the Granicus [Stokholm 1974]; N. G. L. Hammond, The Battle of the Granicus River, JHS 100, 1980, 73–88). Following the victory at Granikos, Parmenion, the commander of Alexander, captured Daskyleion. We learn from Arrianos – supported until recently by the excavations at Daskyleion – that Parmenion captured an »already abandoned city«: »He also sent Parmenion to take over Daskyleion, and this he duly did, the guards having evacuated the place.« (Arr. an. 1, 17, 2). However, a destruction level of this period has been recently uncovered and this suggests that we have to approach the account by Arrianos with some doubt now (Bakır 1995, 278). The evidence reveals that the satrapal centre was not deserted by the habitants before Macedonians attacked to the city.
Catalogue

Attic-type (Type A) skyphos

**Cat. 1**
Rim and body fragment  
Find spot: Ergili C, level of the bullae  
Bandırma Museum inv. 99  
Diam. of rim 10.4 cm, PH 7.3 cm  
Clay: Fairly hard, non-porous, slightly shiny (contains mica-like inclusion) 5 YR 6/8 reddish yellow.  
Glaze: Exterior slightly metallic 5 YR 2.5/1 black; interior 7.5 YR 3/2 dark brown; around rim 5 YR 2.5/1 black.  
Publication: Bulut 2007, fig. 21b. 6.

Cf.: Sparkes – Talcott 1970, fig. 4, no. 352; Pemberton 1989, fig. 7 pl. 12, no. 80; C. K. Williams, II – J. E. Fisher, Corinth 1975. Forum Southwest, Hesperia 45, 1976, 120 no. 37 pl. 21; Edwards 1975, pl. 13, no. 320; C. Abadie – Th. Spyropoulos, Fouilles à Helléniko (Elia de Thréaïside), BCH 109, 1985, 385–466 fig. 86, inv.147; J. L. Caskey, Objects from a Well at Isthmia, Hesperia 29, 1960, 168–176 pl. 54, no. 2; Sabattini 2000, fig. 2, 2, 5 (Fat Boy Group); Blonde 1985, fig. 17, no. 138.

**Bolsal**

**Cat. 2**
Rim, body and base fragment  
Find spot: Ergili C, level of the bullae  
Bandırma Museum inv. 98  
Diam. of rim 13.2 cm, H 6.8 cm, Diam. of foot 8 cm  
Clay: Hard, non-porous, slightly shiny 2 YR 4/1 dark grey partly 2.5 YR 6/8 light red because of the firing.  
Glaze: Exterior lustrous 5 YR 2.5/1 black, in the junction of the wall and foot 5 YR 3/2 dark reddish brown; interior mat soot-black.

Cf.: Sparkes – Talcott 1970, fig. 6, no. 557; Coşkun 2006, fig. 2, no. 20.

**Cat. 3**
Rim and upper body fragment  
Find spot: Ergili C, together with the bullae  
Diam. of rim 12.2 cm, PH 3.3 cm  
Clay: Hard, non-porous, slightly shiny 2.5 YR 6/8 light red.
Glaze: 2.5 YR 2.5/1 black.

Similar Cat. 2.

**Fish Plate**

**Cat. 4**
Rim and body fragment  
Find spot: Ergili C, together with the bullae  
Diam. of rim 21 cm, PH 1.8 cm  
Glaze: 5 YR 2.5/1 black.

Publication: Bulut 2007, fig. 21b.7–7a.

**Partially-glazed bowls with projecting rim**

**Cat. 5**
Rim, body and base fragment  
Find spot: Ergili C, level of the bullae  
Diam. of rim 15.2 cm, H 5.4 cm, Diam. of foot 8 cm  
Clay: Hard, 2.5 YR 6/4 light reddish brown – 5 YR 4/1 dark gray.  
Glaze: Exterior 5 YR 2.5/1 black; interior metallic 2.5 YR 2.5/1 black.

Publication: Bulut 2007, fig. 21c.9–9a.  
Cf.: Py – Sabattini 2000, fig. 3, no. 1904 (375); Technau 1929, fig 33, no.1; Rotroff – Oliver 2003, pl. 10, no.53.

**Cat. 6**
Rim and body fragment

**Cat. 7**
Rim and body fragment  
Find spot: Ergili C, level of the bullae  
Diam. of rim 14.6 cm, PH 4.2 cm  
Clay: Hard, non-porous 5 YR 6/4 light reddish brown.  
Glaze: 5 YR 2.5/1 black.

Publication: Bulut 2007, fig. 21b.8–8a.

Cf.: Py – Sabattini 2000, fig. 3, no. 1904 (375); Technau 1929, fig 33, no.1; Rotroff – Oliver 2003, pl. 10, no.53.
Cat. 8
Rim and body fragment
Find spot: Ergili C, level of the bullae
Bandırma Museum inv. 102
Diam. of rim 16.6 cm, PH 5 cm
Clay: Hard, non-porous 5 YR 5/6 yellowish red; partly 10 YR 6/3 pale brown because of the firing.
Glaze: 7.5 YR 3/2 dark brown.

Cat. 9
Rim and body fragment
Find spot: Ergili 1955, C1, together with the bullae
Diam. of rim 14.4 cm, PH 4.4 cm
Clay: Fairly hard 2.5 YR 6/8 light red.
Glaze: Exterior 5 YR 2.5/1 black, interior 2.5 YR 4/8 red, partly black.
Cf.: Metzger 1978, fig. 3, no. 12.

Cat. 10
Rim and upper body fragment
Find spot: Ergili C, level of the bullae
Bandırma Museum inv. 101
Diam. of rim 16 cm, PH 4.7 cm
Clay: Hard, non-porous 2.5 YR 6/3 weak red 5 YR 6/3, 6/4 light reddish brown.
Glaze: 5 YR 3/2 dark reddish brown.
Reserved surface: 5 YR 6/4 light reddish brown.

Cat. 11
Rim and upper body fragment
Find spot: Ergili 1955, C, together with the bullae
Est. diam. of rim 16 cm, PH 2.9 cm
Glaze: 10 YR 2/1 black.

Cat. 12
Rim and upper body fragment
Find spot: Ergili 1955, C1, together with the bullae
Diam. of rim 16.2 cm, PH 2.5 cm
Clay: Hard, non-porous 2.5 YR 6/6 light red.
Glaze: mat 5 YR 2.5/1 black.

Cat. 13
Rim and upper body fragment
Find spot: Ergili 1955, C1, together with the bullae
Diam. of rim 16.4 cm, PH 3.1 cm
Clay: Fairly hard, 2.5 YR 6/8 light red.
Glaze: mat 5 YR 2.5/1 black.

Cat. 14
Rim and upper body fragment
Find spot: Ergili 1955, C1, together with the bullae
Diam. of rim 14.8 cm, PH 2.8 cm
Clay: Hard, 5 YR 6/8 reddish yellow, partly 2.5 YR 6/8 light red.
2 Cat. 1–4

3 Cat. 5–10
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