

medieval Bulgarian state and its control over the Danube and its debouchments. Although trade contacts between the newcomers and Byzantium are attested, no amphora material from this period has been found until now.

Amphorae on the Lower Danube reappear at the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century when the Empire could recover the Northern Balkans and establish its border on the river. Preslav and Silistra were the administrative centers of the new theme. The late antiquity strongholds on the Danube River were repaired. They were used both as military outposts and marketplaces through which the Byzantines tried to control and restrain the attacks of the Petchenegs southwards. A considerable quantity of Günseini I and II amphorae which have been dated from the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> and the 11<sup>th</sup> century was found in all the above mentioned fortresses. They were used for the transportation of food supplies for the soldiers and the commercial contacts with the barbarians. Very few sherds of Günseini III and IV amphorae (12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries) came out from the excavated area in Silistra. Perhaps it is due to the orientation of Byzantine commercial interests toward Eastern Crimea and Russia. The Venetians and the Genoese merchants, who had the wheat trade in the Byzantine markets in their hands and were controlling the Danube mouths, are also another reason for the scarcity of the amphorae. They have introduced the wooden barrels as a means of maritime transport, which appear to be more advantageous.

The amphora material from Silistra and the Lower Danube sites should be regarded mainly as a proof for the military and administrative presence of Byzantine power in the region and then as containers for bulk goods destined for international trade.

## AMPHORAE FROM A ROMAN-BYZANTINE EDIFICE IN CAPIDAVA

**Zaharia COVACEF**  
**Tiberiu POTĂRNICHE**

Among the ceramic discoveries in Capidava, amphorae (complete or fragmentary) are prevailing. They were used for different purposes, having different shapes and measurements. A series of these containers were described in excavation reports, others are included in the volume dedicated to Late Roman ceramics in Capidava (by Ioan C. Oprea, *Late Roman and Early Byzantine Pottery at Capidava in the Context of Lower Danube Discoveries (4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> cent. AD)* București, 2003, in Romanian). One can observe that amphorae brought to the fortress in the Roman-Byzantine period can be found in almost all Dobrujan centers; there are Pontic amphorae as well as Oriental ones. The group of 16 described amphorae was entirely discovered in the same room of a large edifice; one must stress that only the ones which could be completed are dealt with. They are consisting of provincial Pontic amphorae (Opaït B/ Bjelalac XXIV/ Kuzmanov XVI, variant I/ Oprea XI and Antonova V/ Kuzmanov XVI/ Opaït B I D/ Oprea X); Oriental

amphorae (Carthage LR 1/ British B II/ Kuzmanov XIII/ Scorpan 8B/ Benghazi LR1/ Keay LIII/ Peacock, Williams class 44/ Oprüş II/ and Carthage LR4/ Almagro 54/ Kuzmanov XIV/ Peacock, Williams class 49/ Oprüş V), as well as a single West-Mediterranean *spatheion* amphora (Peacock, Williams class 51/ Benghazi LR Amphora 8/ Keay XXVI/ Scorpan VIII B/ Kuzmanov XIII/ Oprüş I), to which a table amphora can be added (Opaıt I / Kuzmanov XIX / Oprüş II). All of them are dated to the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> centuries.

## A WEB-BASED INFORMATION SYSTEM OF POTTERY FABRICS IN THE CENTRAL MEDITERRANEAN (FACEM)

Verena GASSNER

Kurt SCHALLER

### *Archaeological objectives of the project*

The identification of the provenance of ancient pottery represents one of the main topics of actual pottery research in archaeology as the place of origin of a certain object can be used as an indicator for cultural contacts, economic exchange, or change in political power, to mention only a few. Whereas for some classes the origin of an object can easily be determined by decoration or by potters' stamps, these possibilities lack for common wares and most classes of amphorae, but also for undecorated or simply decorated table wares. In the last ten to fifteen years adequate instruments to face this problem have been developed both on theoretical and practical levels, resulting in a classification of pottery according to its fabric<sup>1</sup>. These collections of fabrics, however, remain normally restricted to the respective teams of excavations or museums, each of them creating a system of their own. Exchange of expertise between colleagues or correlation of the various systems remained therefore until now restricted to an informal level depending mostly on personal contacts.

The project Facem = **F**abrics of the **C**entral **M**editerranean intends to create a coherent system of fabrics for the Central Mediterranean, based on production sites that have been identified by archaeometric analyses, comparing samples either with pottery of secured provenance (e.g. potters' stamps or decoration<sup>2</sup> or wasters of pottery workshops<sup>3</sup>) or by comparison with raw materials. The current basis for that project is given by a large database at the Institute of Classical

---

<sup>1</sup> For the definition of „fabric“ see ORTON, TYERS, VINCE 1993, 67 ff. 132 ff.; PEACOCK 1977, p. 21 - 34; for the possibilities of description see GASSNER 2003, p. 25-34 with bibliography.

<sup>2</sup> A good example for this is the classification of fabrics of Western sigillata, cf. DONAT & RADBAUER 1999, p. 208-209; GASSNER & RADBAUER 2003, p. 41-75; RADBAUER, *Provenienzstudien zu reliefverzierter und glatter Terra Sigillata im mittleren Donauraum* (in Vorbereitung).

<sup>3</sup> E. g. GASSNER, GRECO, SAUER 2003, p. 199-205 or LADSTÄTTER & SAUER 2002, p. 323-333.