

SVENSKA INSTITUTEN I ATHEN OCH ROM  
INSTITUTUM ATHENIENSE ATQUE INSTITUTUM ROMANUM REGNI SUECIAE

---

# Opuscula

Annual of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome

II  
2018

STOCKHOLM



**EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:**

Prof. Gunnel Ekroth, Uppsala, Chairman  
Prof. Arne Jönsson, Lund, Vice-chairman  
Mrs Kristina Björkstén Jersenius, Stockholm, Treasurer  
Dr Susanne Berndt, Stockholm, Secretary  
Dr David Westberg, Uppsala  
Dr Sabrina Norlander-Eliasson, Stockholm  
Prof. Peter M. Fischer, Göteborg  
Prof. Anne-Marie Leander Touati, Lund  
Dr Lena Sjögren, Stockholm  
M.Phil. Lewis Webb, Göteborg  
Dr Jenny Wallensten, Athens  
Dr Kristian Göransson, Rome

**EDITOR:**

Dr Julia Habetzeder  
Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies  
Stockholm University  
SE-106 91 Stockholm  
editor@ecsi.se

**SECRETARY'S ADDRESS:**

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies  
Stockholm University  
SE-106 91 Stockholm  
secretary@ecsi.se

**DISTRIBUTOR:**

eddy.se ab  
Box 1310  
SE-621 24 Visby

For general information, see [www.ecsi.se](http://www.ecsi.se)

For subscriptions, prices and delivery, see <http://ecsi.bokorder.se>

Published with the aid of a grant from The Swedish Research Council

The English text was revised by Rebecca Montague, Hindon, Salisbury, UK

*Opuscula* is a peer reviewed journal. Contributions to *Opuscula* should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee before 1 November every year. Contributors are requested to include an abstract summarizing the main points and principal conclusions of their article. For style of references to be adopted, see [www.ecsi.se](http://www.ecsi.se). Books for review should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee.

ISSN 2000-0898

ISBN 978-91-977799-0-6

© Svenska Institutet i Athen and Svenska Institutet i Rom

Printed by Göteborgstryckeriet, Mölndal, Sweden 2018

Cover illustrations from Lindblom *et al.* in this volume, p. 82.



## Contents

- 7 REBECCA WORSHAM, MICHAEL LINDBLOM & CLAIRE ZIKIDI | Preliminary report of the Malthi Archaeological Project, 2015–2016
- 29 PETER M. FISCHER & TERESA BÜRGE | The New Swedish Cyprus Expedition 2017: Excavations at Hala Sultan Tekke (The Söderberg Expedition). Preliminary results. With contributions by M. Ausiayevich, B. Placiente Robedizo, V. Barrera Alarcón, L. Recht & D. Kofel
- 81 MICHAEL LINDBLOM, GULLÖG NORDQUIST & HANS MOMMSEN | Two Early Helladic II terracotta rollers from Asine and their glyptic context
- 97 GINA SALAPATA | Tokens of piety. Inexpensive dedications as functional and symbolic objects
- 111 SIGNE BARFOED | The use of miniature pottery in Archaic–Hellenistic Greek sanctuaries. Considerations on terminology and ritual practice
- 127 KATIA MARGARITI | Painting early death. Deceased maidens on funerary vases in the National Archaeological Museum of Athens
- 151 SUSANNE BERNDT | The hand gesture and symbols of Sabazios
- 169 CHRYSANTHOS KANELLOPOULOS & MANOLIS PETRAKIS | Cella alignment and 4th century BC Doric peripteral temple architecture in Mainland Greece
- 201 Book reviews
- 211 Dissertation abstracts 2017–2018



discussion would have greatly benefitted the study and paved the way for future work both in Pergamon and at other sites.

The study is unfortunately limited in the sense that it incorporates almost no comparative material except during the first half of chapter nine (pp. 321–345). Moreover, even in this short discussion the comparanda are distinctly limited in terms of origin and painted in very broad strokes in stark contrast to the detailed treatment of the Pergamon material in this volume. John Camp's still important Ph.D. thesis *The water supply of ancient Athens from 3000 to 86 B.C.* (1977) is not cited, the many cisterns at Delos are not mentioned, and no material from the German excavations at Kerameikos is used. The lack of outside views is also manifested by a large proportion of the references being internal to the work. Moreover, referring to the (sub)chapter instead of the relevant pages makes it difficult to navigate the book. Another issue is that human actors in the area of the *Stadtgrabung* are conspicuous in their absence. Interpretation only stretches as far as to how the water management functioned technically; the effects of humans using water is not taken into consideration. Finally, there are some typographical errors in the book, the most serious being that Table 5-6 is a duplicate of Table 5-7 and Figure 6-25 of Figure 6-26.

Wellbrock provides a unique and highly useful study of the water management in a section of a Greco-Roman city. The level of detail, the sheer amount of material made available, as well as the reconstruction of the development is well executed and laudable. The lack of a human component and comparative material, however, lowers the overall value of this otherwise important contribution to the study of ancient water management.

PATRIK KLINGBORG  
Department of Archaeology and Ancient History  
Uppsala University  
Box 626  
SE-751 26 Uppsala  
Sweden  
patrik.klingborg@antiken.uu.se

R. Fleischer, *Die Felsgräber der Könige von Pontos in Amasya* (Istanbuler Forschungen, 56), Tübingen: Ernst Wasmuth 2017. x + 155 pp., 122 figs. ISBN 978-38-03-01777-2.

<https://doi.org/10.30549/opathrom-11-13>

The rock-cut chamber tombs of Anatolia are found in many different provinces and are of rather varying types. Those of Pontus have not received much interest and have never been the subject of a concise treatment. The most important ones from Pontus, the five in the capital Amasya dealt with in this book, have a unique position inasmuch they are mentioned

in ancient literature. Strabo, who was a native of the city, says rather laconically that “within this circuit are both the palaces and monuments of the kings”, monuments (*mnemata*) being a common word for tombs. Amasya and its tombs have been well known for many years. Dozens of travellers in the 19th and 20th centuries, and some before that, have mentioned the tombs in their accounts, sometimes with mistaken information but sometimes also with interesting reflections.

After a short description and a commentary of Strabo's text the book gives a thorough research history with comments on all references from previous travellers. Then follows a thorough and detailed description of the five tombs A–E. These are thought to be the royal tombs belonging to the kings from Mithridates I, who created the kingdom in about 302 BC in the turmoil after the division of the realm of Alexander the Great, to Pharnaces I who moved the royal residence to Sinope after conquering it in 183 BC.

Besides the five royal tombs, four more are dealt with, three of them in Amasya and the fourth at Laçın in western Pontus. These are not the only other tombs in Pontus, but the reason for their selection here is the clear affinity with the royal tombs, especially with Tomb E.

Then follows over a dozen short chapters on subjects such as tomb owners, stepped tunnels, façades, dowel-holes, chambers, technical processes, and later fate. The book ends with a short conclusion, abstracts in English and Turkish, an index, and an ample bibliography. It is a thorough and well-documented study with excellent illustrations and almost without misprints.

Among the previous travellers the three-man expedition of G. Perrot is conspicuous. It visited Amasya in 1861 and made a thorough exploration of the tombs in a remarkably short time in bad weather, managing to produce good drawings despite the conditions. Following that expedition, the tombs were visited and mentioned many times, all referred in the book, but nothing of importance has been added to our knowledge of them: on the contrary details that were observed by Perrot seem in some cases to have been overlooked in the intervening years and had to be rediscovered. The idea of the present study on the royal tombs was conceived already in 1976 but not accomplished then; the scheme was renewed in 2001 and performed by a three-man group with aid of a photogrammetric examination, with ample photographic and drawn documentation.

The tombs that can be approached from one side from one tomb to another are designated A–E from right to left, and it is suggested that the chronological order should be ACBDE instead of ABCDE, with the tomb of the third king crammed in between A and C where there was barely room for it. It is no doubt correct, and it means that when two tombs, including the last one, have an archivolt instead of a gabled roof it can be seen as a return to Anatolian tradition from Greek influence.

A point to be discussed is the difference between the present condition of the tombs and their original appearance. Today they completely lack parts of preserved decoration or ornamentation, although some were preserved in the early 19th century and were commented by travellers. Nevertheless the ornamentation can partly be reconstructed from dowel-holes and other holes in the floor or walls, marks from a separate anta base, and scratched grooves showing the positions of column bases with or without plinths. Part of this was observed by Perrot's expedition but was later covered by debris; it has now been thoroughly studied. From these traces it can be deduced that Tomb A had a hexastyle front *in antis* and Tombs B and D a tetrastyle front *in antis*, whereas Tombs C and E with their archivolts had no columns. Tomb E has a large number of dowel-holes on the façade showing that it was covered with slabs laid in courses of different heights, nothing of which is preserved.

The reconstructions are shown in plans, façades and sections (partly repeated in Abb. 119) where the reconstructed parts are indicated in a red colour. The only members that can be reconstructed with the aid of holes and other marks are the façade, the column bases and anta bases, and we must observe that they must have been separate members, not cut out of the living rock as usual in rock tombs. Moreover there are marks that show members that cannot be identified. For column shafts and capitals, anta capitals, architraves, tympana, simas and acroteria which are lavishly represented in the reconstructions it should perhaps have been stressed more that we have no documentation at all although there was evidently still something preserved in the 19th century (a block with parts of a dentil and a geison now lying below Tomb D [Abb. 73] is considered much too small to belong to the tombs). Of course there is nothing that contradicts the elaborate reconstructed appearance which reminds one of Carian temple-façade tombs, but nevertheless I feel sceptical when I see them—could not the entablatures just as well look like the clumsier façades in for example Paphlagonia?

As for the façade slabs and other similar separate additions it is certainly correctly suggested that they were made of limestone and not of marble, and the author has in fact identified a quarry not far from Amasya that probably provided the material.

Traces on the archivolt of the unfinished Tomb E were interpreted by Perrot as marks for fastening letters showing King Pharnaces' name. This raises many questions concerning when the letters were executed and when they were removed, as the tomb was not used by Pharnaces who lived on many years after his move to Sinope. It is also noteworthy that in a suitable place close to and above the tomb an inscription has been cut in the rock face telling that the *phrouarchos* Metrodoros has dedicated an altar and a flower bed to the gods on behalf of King Pharnaces.

The most interesting of the three other tombs in Amasya dealt with in this volume is a large tomb called the Mirror tomb by the inhabitants because of its polished and reflecting surface. It was mentioned by several travellers and has two inscriptions on the pronaos wall. One gives simply the name of the *archiereus* Tes, the other later one below it has evidently parts of names and is partially erased. Whether it is an addition to the original one adding new names or an entirely separate one is a point for discussion. The tomb has a chamber that is not only square but has an added niche with a rock-cut sarcophagus. There are numerous remnants of medieval frescoes in the chamber, and such frescoes were also on the pronaos walls as attested by travellers but now no longer survive. A similar tomb located elsewhere in Pontus features the name Hikesios in huge letters on the pronaos wall. These tombs, no doubt later than the royal tombs and much influenced by Tombs C and E, support the idea that Pharnaces' tomb may have had the name inscribed in the same way.

The rock-tombs in Pontus are not very numerous, and the book provides an excellent treatment of a small number of them. Of the rest many have not been studied or published, and in fact little is known about the previous tomb tradition. Although few of them can provide an interest comparable with the royal tombs it can be hoped that they may also be the subject of a similar treatment and be published in the same excellent way as the present study.

PAAVO ROOS  
Department of Archaeology and Ancient History  
Lund University  
Box 192  
SE-22100 Lund  
Sweden  
paavo.roos@gmail.com

A. Bellia & C. Marconi (eds.), *Musicians in ancient coroplastic art. Iconography, ritual contexts, and functions* (Telestes. Studi e ricerche di archeologia musicale nel Mediterraneo, 2), Pisa & Rome: Ist. Editoriali e Poligrafici, 216 pp., black and white ills. ISBN 978-88-8147-458-5

<https://doi.org/10.30549/opathrom-11-14>

The terracotta figurines featuring musicians and music-making have often been rather neglected in the iconographical studies of ancient music. This makes this volume all the more important, since it in various ways demonstrates how these, usually fairly small and often undistinguished objects, may be used as a source material for different scholarly approaches and thus can reveal a lot about music and music's place in a society. The background to the volume is a conference in New York in 2015 that was devoted to the functions of representa-