Roman ceramics from Pievina

1. Introduction

A detailed analysis of the ceramic assemblages from the 2009 excavation at Pievina will be the subject of a specific paper; on this occasion we aim at proposing a general discussion of the main contexts which will focus on the formation process, chronological issues, functional and economic changes through the period. One main aim will also be a broader comparison of the processed Late Republican-Early Imperial context versus the Late Roman ceramic assemblages in order to shed light on how the site connections changed in the long term.

The functional analysis of typologies both dating to Period I and Period II (respectively SU 2003 and 1006) will be compared to the data deriving from the archaeo-zoological study undertaken by Michael McKinnon.

A representative sample of the chronologically and typologically crucial ceramic assemblages from 2009 excavation at the early and late Roman site of Pievina has been catalogued and analysed in detail in 16 working days during the 2010 season of the Roman Peasant Project. Ceramics were catalogued after having selected diagnostic shards and wall fragments which had joins with diagnostics or were linkable (according to surface treatment, fabric, shape and thickness) to identified vessels. All these shards were hence analytically catalogued and data was entered into a data base linked to the GIS base. Quantification criterion was the Minimum Number of Individuals. On the other hand, non-diagnostic shards were separated per ceramic classes, counted and weighted.

Most effort has been paid to the analysis of the late Roman contexts which represented the vast majority of excavated contexts. Nevertheless two stratigraphically fundamental contexts respectively dating to the 1st century BC (2003) and 1st century AD (1004) were analysed. The considerable unbalancing between the early Roman and late Roman contexts is due to the fact that later occupation has developed directly on earlier phases, possibly damaging them at least in part. In addition, the most important early building evidenced by the L-shaped structure could not be revealed in its extension and dug in depth because of the raising water-table.

General data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Catalogued fragments</th>
<th>Weight of catalogued fragments (grams)</th>
<th>MNI (according to catalogued fragments)</th>
<th>Non-catalogued fragments</th>
<th>Weight of non-catalogued fragments (grams)</th>
<th>Weight per fragment (considering diagnostics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>4590</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2142</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>11465</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>13829</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2646</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4765</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>12750</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Issues of residuality

Some 1\textsuperscript{st} to early 2\textsuperscript{nd} AD residual ceramics are documented only in context 1018 which dates to the 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD. In this context residual ceramics represent 18.4\% (12 MNI) of the total amount of MNI (65). Context 1018 is identified as a levelling layer which sealed the collapse of the LR house. Soil for levelling was probably removed from different areas of the site and the 1\textsuperscript{st} AD residual ceramics from this level are totally comparable with the ones analysed in context 1004, which in turns can be identified as a colluvium/alluvium deposit that covered the main early Roman building. Residuality, apart from context 1018, appears to have been no incident in the formation process of the excavated contexts at Pievina. We think that the presence of specimens of the ARS dish Hayes 50B (dated AD 350-400 (+)), in contexts 1019 and 1006, respectively dating to the first half and second half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD and the small dish Hayes 52 (dated AD 280/300 to late 4\textsuperscript{th} with late variants reaching the early 5\textsuperscript{th} AD) can be interpreted as a prolonged use of these forms in late antique Pievina. Indeed the Tunisian fine ware, with its quality, was probably considered as an “exotic” good in the inland site of Pievina and hence people there had paid much attention to the preservation of these vessels. It is hard to consider these forms residuals as we did not identify any 4\textsuperscript{th} century AD level to which forms in ARS C could be attributed. More doubtful is the presence of a small rim fragment of a 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD Tunisian amphora (Africana I Piccolo dated from the second half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} to the end of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD, with later variants which continued to be produced during the 4\textsuperscript{th} AD) in SU 1019.

3. Functional cross-analysis of the major late Republican-early imperial and late antique dumps

Alongside with contexts 1004, 1026, 1019 and 1018 which are respectively colluvium, abandon/collapse and levelling layers, two major rubbish pits were catalogued in detail: SU 2003 dating to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC (possibly second half of the 1\textsuperscript{st} BC) and SU 1006 which represents the last activity carried out at Pievina in late antiquity. Both contexts were very interesting in terms of information concerning the material culture and ceramic profile of the site during its two periods of occupation. Nevertheless the formation process of these two contexts have to have been very different. Context 2003 has produced an average value per diagnostic of 85.3 grams while 1006 produced a value of 50.1 grams per diagnostic. This rough calculation completely reflects the level of fragmentation and preservation of shards from the two assemblages. SU 2003 produced a total number of 162 diagnostics corresponding to 30 shards which means a ratio of 5.4 shards to 1 MNI. In context 1006 the ratio is 1.37 shards to 1 MNI. It is clear how low the number of joins is in SU 1006 by considering an average. The level of good preservation of ceramics from SU 2003 can be easily perceived by looking at the presence of vessels for which we can reconstruct a almost complete profile by drawing. In SU 2003 percentages of preserved diameters of the rims are systematically bigger than in SU 1006.
Even though both contexts are definitely a kind of rubbish disposal, SU 2003 is definitely a primary dump, probably deriving from a table/store (note the presence of 2 MNI of amphorae). On the contrary the level of fragmentation of sherds from SU 1006 (shards are sometimes very worn and slip is very bad preserved in ARS as well as in color coated ware) prompts to a re-deposition of materials which had been already deposited during the late antique occupation of the site. Indeed, it is well worth noting the complete absence of residual early Roman ceramics in SU 1006 (differently than in the levelling layer 1018) which allows for considering materials from SU 1006 as re-deposited from one or (more likely) some “uncontaminated” late Roman contexts. The quite chaotic composition of ceramics composing the majority of finds from the rubbish disposal (SU 1006) alongside with the dark colour of the soil, its sticky, plastic and highly organic consistency could prompt to its interpretation as a cesspit which at a given point was filled by re-deposited rubbish coming from different parts of the site (for possible comparisons Peña 2007, p.308).

In order to compare the ceramic repertoire to archaeo-zoological finds from both dumps, vessel function has been analysed.

In the table above the complete sample of MNI from both dumps were grouped per function in order to shed light on possible differences between the two periods of occupation at the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SU 1006</th>
<th>SU 2003</th>
<th></th>
<th>SU 1006</th>
<th>SU 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pots</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cooking pots</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casseroles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Casseroles</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking juglet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cooking juglet</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bead-baking pans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bead-baking pans</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucepans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Saucepans</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cooking bowl</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking lids</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cooking lids</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table jugs/bottle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Table jugs/bottle</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table jar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Table jar</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flask</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flask</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table bowls</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Table bowls</td>
<td>31.34%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table basins</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Table basins</td>
<td>20.89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table lid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Table lid</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table flanged bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Table flanged bowl</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dolium</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finewares</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Drinking cup (FW)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphorae</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small bowl (FW)</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNI</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Small bottle (FW)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large and shallow bowl (FW)</td>
<td>5.97%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small shallow dish (FW)</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amphorae</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MNI</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to compare the ceramic repertoire to archaeo-zoological finds from both dumps, vessel function has been analysed.
site. What clearly emerges is a total similarity of vessel functions throughout the two periods. The repertoire of table wares is mainly characterised by bowls, large bowls and basins, but even more interesting in terms of implications on eating habits is the long-lasting success of cooking pots which are totally overwhelming in comparison to other cooking vessels such as casseroles (absent in SU 2003, 1 MNI in SU 1006). Paul Arthur in a recent paper (Arthur 2007, pp.15-27) focusing on the relationship between eating habits and ceramic functional forms in late antiquity and early middle age has pointed out that in Mediterranean regions sheep/goats dominated together with open forms, very suitable for cooking foods found in warmer climates through water evaporation and braising, while in Northern regions, where pig raising was dominant, there was a widespread use of pots more suitable for preparing foods for cooler climates through water retention. According to the comparison of the ceramic and archeo-zoological record at Pievina this model seems to be too schematic. Indeed at Pievina adult sheep-goat increased in late antiquity alongside with adult cattle to the detriment of pigs (see McKinnon) in comparison to the early Roman phase. Nevertheless cooking pots continued to dominate the ceramic repertoire of KITCHEN WARE. In my views it can be mainly due to the fact that cooking pots are much more suitable for cooking semiliquid foods such as puls, also the main foods consumed off the tableware, or for boiling dried meats; on the other hand casseroles, pans and bowl lids were used for frying or stewing. The fact that at Pievina young butchered animals are very rare in both phases could explain the success of cooking pots through the ages. Cooking pots used for cooking not tender meat deriving from old animals (cattle and sheep/goat) together with a liquid (whether it is a soup or spiced water) were definitely more suitable for the available meat cuts, which, not being tender, could have been better consumed if boiled and made a bit less hard.

Graph 1. Functional vessels from SUs 2003 and 1006: a comparative analysis
4. The formation process of contexts 1026 and 1019

Two particularly interesting contexts are SUs 1026 and 1019 which have been respectively interpreted as the abandon layer of the Late Roman house and the collapse of its tile roof. Although the two contexts were distinguished during the excavation we have to consider the notable presence of ceramic finds in SU 1019 which can be explained as a consequence of the crushing of the latest level deposited inside the house after its abandonment and the subsequent upwards movement of the ceramics embedded in it. An almost complete large bowl in color coated ware imitating the Hayes 61 type in ARS was found broken in 35 fragments (875 grams) underneath the collapsed tiles. As the accumulation inside the house is quite tiny we can guess that the collapse of the roof and pisé walls did not take place much later after the abandonment. It is also well worth noting that ceramics from SU 1026 have the second highest ratio between diagnostic fragments and MNI which is about 3.6/1. It is second only to the Late Republican context SU 2003 with a ratio of 5.4/1. As regards the analysed late antique contexts it is far higher than the others which are in order SU 1019 (1.4/1), 1006 (1.37/1) and 1018 (1.2/1).
Referring to the analysed contexts dating to the late antique occupation of the site, SU 1026 appear to be the only clear primary deposition, as SU 1019 is a collapse layer (although containing ceramics from the layers below it, including SU 1026), while 1018 is a levelling layer composed of soil which had been removed from elsewhere (including 1st to early 2nd AD residuals) in the site and re-deposited to seal the abandoned house and raise the new utilised surface up and 1006 has been interpreted as a secondary deposition of domestic materials (as showed by the high level of fragmentation and abrasion of pot sherds).

5. The late Republican/early Imperial occupation at Pievina: analysed contexts

The number of complex and variegated ceramic assemblages dating to Period 1 is much lower than that of contexts referred to Period 2. For this reason the reconstruction of the ceramic profile of the site from the 1st BC to 1st AD is necessarily based on a less strong evidence.

**Context 2003**

The functional analysis of ceramics from SU 2003 has been already discussed above. Here the discussion will concern chronology and sources. From the chronological point of view this context can be dated to the 1st century BC and more precisely possibly in the second half of it. This date is provided by the presence of BGW (2 MNI) in association with a small cup and a possible bottle/flask in *Arretine Sigillata* which, although very fragmentary, can be dated to the Augustan period until the first half of the 1st AD. Two diagnostic fragments can be referred to the same specimen of bowl with ring foot, characterized by a not very lustrous glaze which tends to be quite thin and hence badly preserved. The color of the fabric is buff and levigated. This form presents a carinated bottom on a ring foot; the rim is slightly everted, and rounded, the junction between wall and floor is very gentle and smoothed. This form is similar to Morel Série 2654a1 which with several variants dates from the end of the 2nd through to the third quarter of the 1st BC.\(^1\) Another rim fragment can be tentatively referred to the same type but with a slightly thinner rim. A very important confirmation to this date is provided by the presence of a complete rim of a Campanian (volcanic glass) Dressel 1B amphora, whose date is quite similar to that of the BGW bowls, indeed it was produced from the late 2nd BC to the second quarter of the 1st BC.\(^2\) The general date of the coarse ware and kitchen ware documented in SU 2003 is generally compatible with a date from the 1st century BC until the early 1st AD. According to this evidence we can hypothesize a primary deposition of ceramics mainly datable in the 1st century BC, although the presence of Arretine Sigillata tends to move the date toward the mid/second half of the 1st BC.

As regards the ceramic sources the only clearly extra-regional import is the Dressel 1C amphora mentioned above, while coarse, kitchen and fine wares are all compatible with a regional production. Another specimen of Dressel 1 amphora is represented by many fragments that allowed us to recompose shoulder, handle attachments and part of the body.

---

\(^1\) See Morel 1981, p.202 and Plate 64.
\(^2\) Peacock-Williams 1986.
cannot be assigned to a precise variant. According to the fabric we would suggest a regional production.

**Context 1004**

Context 1004 represents an alluvial/colluvial layer which completely sealed the building in very good masonry dating to the late Republican/early Imperial period, whose function could not be identified as excavation was made impossible by the raising water table. Context 1004 was dug just partially in a very small sondage along the southern side of the long E-W wall. The ceramic assemblage produced by this deep test pit cannot be considered completely representative of the ceramic consumption at the site during the late 1st BC and the first half of the 1st century AD as the excavation interested only a small percentage of SU 1004. The date in the 1st century AD is provided by a minimum number of 4 bowls in Arretine Sigillata, which because of the high level of fragmentation were identifiable only in the case of a partly recomposed small carinated bowl. This small bowl, characterised by a finely moulded vertical rim and a rouletted decoration on the outer face of the rim, is identifiable with type Conspectus 21.3, whose date is between the Augustan and late Tiberian/early Caludian periods.

Some interesting information about the nature of the unexcavated building could derive from the quantification of context 1004, which although produced by a natural phenomenon of alluvium/colluvium contained a ceramic assemblage which is perfectly compatible with a domestic building. I have already mentioned the 4 bowl in *Arretine Sigillata*, other forms for table/storage purposes were represented by 5 small-mouth closed forms (definitely jugs in 3 cases), one thick large base referable to a table or storage jar and one large bowl in coarse ware with purified fabric. Kitchen ware is represented by 4 cooking pots with clear trace of smoke due to their actual use and 2 lids. All these forms are morphologically compatible with an early Imperial date. In addition it is well worth noting the presence of a thickened and flat rim of a dolium (whose mouth has a diameter of 31 cm). Amphora finds are represented by a minimum number of 3 Spello or its variants types. Interestingly the shape of the amphora handles and their fabrics are not much different than those of the late Roman types at Pievina which we assigned to a local/regional production, possible evidence for a long-lasting production tradition.

Although quantitatively limited (21 MNI as a whole) the ceramic assemblage from context 1004 is quite interesting as it allows us to suggest a domestic function of the big unexcavated building dating to Period 1 at Pievina.

**Residual materials in SU 1018**

A total amount of 12 minimum number of residual ceramics was found in SU 1018 (whose total record is 65 MNI). This phenomenon is easily explainable in light of the nature of this context which represent a raising and levelling layer (Period 2, phase 3) sealing the collapse

---

3 See Ettlinger et alii, p.89, Tav.19, n.21.3.
of the late Roman house at Pievina (Period 2, phase 2). It means that earth was taken from several different points of the site (including an area with early Imperial deposits) and then re-deposited all throughout part of the area where the late Roman occupation has been identified.

Ceramics prompt to a date in the 1st century AD (possibly first half). *Arretine Sigillata* is represented by 5 MNI. This record includes two rims referable to the bowls Conspectus 20 and 21 (both dating from the Augustan to the late Tiberian/early Claudian periods), two very small ring foots of cups which, in one case, can be tentatively referred to the Conspectus 28 (first half of the 1st AD), and finally a small grooved handle.

Quite variegated is the amphora record, represented by 4 MNI. A rim can be attributed to a Van der Werff amphora 3, produced in the Sahel region⁴ and also possibly on the island of Jerba.⁵ This production at Jerba is dated, as well as type 2, from the late 2nd BC until the Flavian period or perhaps the beginning of the 2nd century AD.⁶ The author suggests a use for carrying oil although this assumption is not based on residue analysis but on morphology and the presence of pitch on the interior of some Van der Werff 2 which was supposed to not be compatible with olive oil. So Fentress hypothesizes that a morphological difference between the two types would have corresponded to different agricultural products.⁷ Another rim, according to the shape and fabric can be assigned to a variant of a Spello type. A hollow spike in a very buff fabric could belong to a fish-sauce amphora from Betica, possibly a Dressel 7, whose date is 30 BC-AD75. Finally a “bifido” handle of a regional or central Italic Dressel 2/4 was identified.

The small record of coarse wares can be assigned to regional/local products.

The amphora record from SU 1018, although small is an interesting evidence of the Spanish and Tunisian connections of the site in the 1st century AD.

### 6. Chronological and typological issues concerning the late Roman occupation at Pievina

The late antique occupation of Pievina (Period 2) has been divided in 4 main phases:

Phase 1. Construction of the late Roman farmstead which includes working surfaces, drains and systemisation;

Phase 2. Abandonment and collapse of the house;

Phase 3. Levelling and raising of the late Roman surfaces;

Phase 4. Rubbish pit cutting the new surface.

⁴ Van der Werff, 1978.
⁶ Ibidem p.262.
⁷ Ibidem, p.262.
The analysed ceramics would prompt to a 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD date of the late Roman occupation of Pievina, and although the analysis of coarse ware can show some variations through phases 2-4 it not easy to base any further chronological differentiation on locally and regionally produced ceramics. When we had to provide the analysed contexts with a date we focused our attention on the whole series of ceramic classes.

**Mediterranean imports**

Some possible suggestions can derive from the analysis of the distribution of some variants of ARS forms through the different late antique contexts (see the Table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type/variant</th>
<th>MNI</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1026</td>
<td>Hayes 67B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>late 4\textsuperscript{th}-early 5\textsuperscript{th} through to mid 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Hayes 67B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>late 4\textsuperscript{th}-early 5\textsuperscript{th} through to mid 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Hayes 61B2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>First half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Hayes 50B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>mid 4\textsuperscript{th} to early 5\textsuperscript{th} AD, and later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Hayes 50B, n.61 \textit{similis}/61B2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>first half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Hayes 67B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>late 4\textsuperscript{th}-early 5\textsuperscript{th} through to mid 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Hayes 61A/B2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>early to mid 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Generic Hayes 91 (A or B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>late 4\textsuperscript{th} to mid 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Hayes 67C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>mid to late 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Hayes 61A/B4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>first third of the 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Hayes 50B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mid 4\textsuperscript{th} to early 5\textsuperscript{th} AD, and later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Hayes 52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AD 280/300 to late 4\textsuperscript{th}, late variants early 5\textsuperscript{th} AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although it is clear that all the documented forms mainly range from the late 4\textsuperscript{th} -mid 5\textsuperscript{th} c.AD (Map 2, nn.1,3,5-7), a possibly significant change in the ARS supply of Pievina took place in the latest late Roman phase (phase 4) when the variant Hayes 67C was introduced (this form is documented by 3 MNI in SU 1006). This variant, recently dated by Bonifay (Bonifay 2004) to the mid-second half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD, parallels the latest stratigraphic date of SU 1006 (Map 2, nn.2,4). The ARS data would hence suggests a date between the late 4\textsuperscript{th} and mid 5\textsuperscript{th} of phases 2 and 3, while phase 4 could be tentatively assigned to the mid/second half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD.
Amphora evidence cannot be used to make this sequence more precise as the presence of Mediterranean amphorae is very low and represented by two MNI of a type of 5th century spathion Keay26 respectively in SU 1026 and 1019 (Map 2, nn.9-10), two Portuguese amphorae (Almagro 51A/B and Almagro 51C) whose production continued well into the 5th century AD (Map 2, nn.12-13) and a handle-fragment referable to a Cilician LR1 amphora according to its morphology and fabric. Interestingly in the 4th to early 5th century assemblages of the North Hill of Roselle type Almagro 51C is the most documented imported amphora with 5 MNI out of a total number of 20 amphorae.

The excavated area at Pievina showed a long gap in the occupation after the 1st century AD until the late 4th-early 5th. This long gap, alongside with a slight chronological differentiation of Tunisian fine ware through the period, the very low change of the regional table wares (infra) and finally the very clear late antique sequence characterised by a little accumulation process from phase to phase are, in our views, good evidence for suggesting a short chronological range during which all the late antique phases took place in the shape of a kind of generational changes.

**Regional Acroma Depurata and Color Coated wares**

The distinction between color coated and acroma depurata wares was obviously based upon the presence/absence of a very thin red slip, although a more detailed observation of the specimens has revealed that fabrics are generally similar, as in both classes they are soapy and porous, levigated and characterised by the presence of rare golden mica inclusions and very rare limestone. The similarity of the fabric alongside with the very low quality of the slip, which, in general, is very badly preserved and tends to flake off easily, makes the distinction between the two classes quite arbitrary as we cannot exclude that specimens apparently uncoated had originally a thin red slip which peeled away because of post-depositional processes. As observed in late antique contexts of Roselle, where the level of preservation of slips is better and distinction between coated and uncoated wares easier, the similarity of fabrics and morphologies in the repertoire of color coated and acroma depurata wares would be evidence of their production in the same workshops. They were possibly involved in the production of a wide-range of ceramics that included red slip vessels, that in spite of the low-medium quality of the slip recalled the higher quality Mediterranean fine wares, and also uncoated vessels which did not need any aesthetic quality and were just functional. This differentiation, although the two classes of products are generally found in association in the consumption sites, possibly reflected a diversification of the demand in the market, as it happens nowadays between daily use and Sunday’s table wares.

If we observe the repertoire of local/regional table wares we immediately realise how frequent are the same types through the sequence. Although some slight variants are documented they can mainly be due to the fact that the level of standardisation in the local and regional workshops cannot be compared to the “industrial” organisation of ARS production. One main exception is represented by the introduction of the flanged-bowl,
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recalling the Tunisian type Hayes 91B, from phase 3 on, while, apparently, it is not documented in the analysed contexts dating to phase 2 (Map 2, n.25). The introduction of the flanged bowl might represent a relevant information for chronological purposes, it is not strong enough to assess any marked transformation in the repertoire of table and storage wares, especially because the incidence of this form is generally very low (1 MNI in SU 1018 and 1 in SU 1006). Interestingly in the town of Roselle the evidence from some analysed contexts respectively dating 4th-early 5th and 6th-early 7th AD shows that the flanged bowl produced in color coated wares and other ceramic classes is common in the 6th AD, and not earlier. However the lack of analysed contexts dating well into the 5th AD at Roselle, would possibly prevent us from the identification of the first introduction of this form in the domestic repertoire of the town. From this point of view it is well worth considering another urban site, that of Fiesole in inland Tuscany, where a version of flanged bowl in color coated ware is documented as early as the mid 4th-5th AD. In Rome, for example, the mid 5th century context of the Crypta Balbi mithraeum reveals the presence of flanged bowls.

Apart from that, the table and storage wares profile seems to be quite consistent and constant all throughout Period 2 and the presence of little morphological variants does not seem to be attributable to an actual chrono-typological development, rather to the elaboration of the same ceramic model by different potters. A very successful form, which is encountered in every late Roman phase at Pievina, is the large bowl with inverted rim imitating the Tunisian prototype Hayes 61 (Map 2, nn.16-17 and 22). The considerable success of this form is also confirmed by its production in both repertoires of the acroma depurata and color coated wares. It is a very easy-making and functional vessel at the same time, whose shallow body compatible with serving and consuming meals based on solid food (such as meat and fish, but in the case of Pievina, possibly just meat according to its distance from the sea) ensured its success in the long period. At Roselle for example, this form is still documented in the first half of the 6th century AD.

Another successful form throughout Period 2 is a type of shallow bowl with everted and almost indistinct rim, characterized by multiple parallel grooves on the outer surface (Map 2, nn.18-23). This type, produced in color coated and acroma depurata wares, is known at Pievina in different size-variants. This form is documented in the urban site of Fiesole in the second half of the 4th century AD. The considerable presence of this type in SU 1006 (the most recent excavated context) prompts to the continuation of its production until the mid or late 5th AD.

A similar function for containing solid foodstuff and/or sauces was probably carried out by a type of shallow dish characterized by a very thin rim documented in SU 1006 (Map 2, n.19). It is a form very common in Roselle in the 4th-early 5th AD, although there it is documented in the higher quality ceramic class sigillata chiara tarda dell’Italia centro settentrionale.
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The presence of a flattened rim is quite uncommon in the shallow dishes and bowls and it appear documented in a type of bowl (Map 2, n.20), which resembles the ARS prototype Lamboglia 57/Hayes 73A, whose date is AD 420-475.

The very variegated repertoire of open vessels in table and storage ware is completed by deeper large bowls and carinated basins such as the types illustrated in Map 2, nn.21 and 24, which according to their shape were more suitable for containing (and storing?) liquid foods. Similar forms are documented in the urban site of Fiesole in phases dating to the second half of 4th-early 5th AD.13

Closed forms, such as jugs (Map 2, n.26), juglets and table jars are produced in color coated and acroma depurata wares, a clear evidence for the fact that workshops specialised in their production were able to put a complete repertoire of table and storage wares in the market.

Regional transport and storage amphorae

We decided to include in this class a series of amphora fragments in a pink-orange fabric characterised by more and less abundant limestone inclusions and mica flecks, which generally recalls fabrics used for producing table and storage vessels in color coated and acroma depurata wares. The class of regional amphorae is well documented throughout Period 2 with a total number of 12 specimens corresponding to 6.15% of the Minimum Number of 195 Individuals identified from phase 2 to 4. This is a remarkable data especially if compared to the total number of imported amphorae (2 from Tunisia, 2 from Portugal and one from Cilicia) which corresponds to 3% of the total number of identified specimens. Interestingly the contribution of regional foodstuffs (probably wine according to the shape of these small amphorae) in supplying Pievina was more than double that of other extra-regional sources. The very fragmentary status of the regional amphorae documented at Pievina does not allow us to reconstruct their typologies precisely. We definitely have identified at least two different modules, which can be distinguished through the neck width. One common pattern is the presence of quite thick strap handles with longitudinal shallow grooves along the upper surface, while the bases are hollow and slightly concave in their profile. In one case fragments of a rim, neck, handle and base were found in association in the same context, and although fragmentary, their fabric prompt to the identification of them with the same vessel. The rim is slightly everted and rounded, neck has the shape of a truncated cone and the thick strap handles is attached on it and the shoulder. The spike has the typical slightly concave profile (Map 2, nn.14-15). This amphora type re-elaborates some morphological elements which, in turn, are typical of the early to mid imperial Spello type (grooved handles) and the late Roman Empoli type (the shape of the spike); nevertheless it can be assigned to a new, previously unknown, regional (in light of its fabric) wine amphora. This is another discovery supporting the development of the regional wine production, which so far has been mainly related to the 5th century boom of the Empoli type but had to have been more widespread as a phenomenon and not only linked to the production areas of the Empoli type

13 For a comparison of the large bowl with flat, slightly pendent rim see De Marinis (ed.) 1990, p.367, Tav.22, n.6 while for the carinated basin see ibidem, p.369, Tav.24, n.18.
(Arno valley and Ager Volaterranus). The discovery of a previously unidentified amphora types in inland southern Tuscany parallels, with the due proportions, the very remarkable finds from inland territories of the medium Tiber Valley, where new wine-amphora types produced at a local-scale have been recently identified. There, a remarkable tradition of amphora production, rooted in the early to mid Imperial periods with the Spello type and its variants, lasted until the 6th and 7th centuries AD, although a possible gap between the 3rd and 5th AD has been pointed out alongside with the re-emergence of products in the 5th-6th AD. Nevertheless, as it has been suggested, that the apparent lack of continuity in the 4th could be due just to a research lag rather than an actual absence of evidence.  

**Kitchen ware**

Although more subject to a morphological variation a clear linear development of the cooking pots cannot be easily identified in the late Roman ceramic assemblages from Pievina. It is mainly due to the general low level of standardisation of the cooking pots even when they are documented in the same context and also to the fact that all the late Roman phases identified at Pievina took place successively within quite a short chronological range, possibly a century or less. The low level of standardisation of kitchen ware is a phenomenon which theoretically might be related to the existence of some different workshops working at a regional or sub-regional scale, although a preliminary analysis (by using a 10x magnifying lens) has revealed the similarity of the majority of the fabrics used for this production. Another possibility is that less than the expected number of workshops were documented in the region although the involvement of different potters in the same workshop could have produced cooking pots according to their personal taste and expertise.

Types illustrated in Map 2 find many comparisons in other ceramic assemblages of southern Tuscany. If we consider stratified contexts, the cooking pot n.28 is morphologically identical to type 1 of Roselle documented as early as the 4th to early 5th century AD in the excavated contexts of the North Hill. This type, characterised by a band shaped rim is largely documented at late antique surface sites of southern Tuscany. This type continued to be documented also later as revealed by its presence in a ceramic assemblages from the late antique occupation of the cave at Scoglietto between AD 450-550. The Cooking pot 31 represents a variant of CP 28/Roselle type 1, characterised by a more thickened and everted rim. The Cooking pot n.27, characterised by a marked seat for lid (a lid compatible with the cooking pot for morphology and fabric was found in association in context 1026) and a pointed lip is documented in the North Hill of Roselle in a context dating c. AD 500-550 while it does not appear to be documented in earlier contexts from Roselle so far (Type 5). Nevertheless this type is found at Fiesole and dated to the mid 4th-5th centuries AD.  

Cooking pot n.30 with oblique-cut and slightly everted rim is similar to Type 6 in Roselle, found in association with Type 5 in a context dating to the first half of the 6th AD. The Cooking pot n.29 characterised by an everted and slightly pendant thickened rim is not found in the coastal sites of southern Tuscany, but it can be paralleled to a type of cooking pot from
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the late antique fortified village of Filattiera-Sorano near Luni in a phase dated to the 5\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD\textsuperscript{16} and also in the ancient town of Fiesole with a date between the mid 4\textsuperscript{th} and early 5\textsuperscript{th} AD\textsuperscript{17}. Some of the cooking pots documented in the late antique occupation of Pievina find parallels in the urban excavation at Santa Maria della Scala in Siena, but generally in a later period than that proposed for Pievina. It is the case of cooking pot 28, which in Siena was found in a late 5\textsuperscript{th}-mid 6\textsuperscript{th} century AD context as well as cooking pot n.29.\textsuperscript{18} This late date is NOT COMPATIBLE with the ARS series at Pievina unless we hypothesise a trade of ARS vessels from sea-ports and market places along the coast of southern Tuscany, which took place later than the final date of the types documented at Pievina. Although it is not possible to exclude this \textit{phenomenon a priori} it is well worth bearing in mind that it has not been observed elsewhere. As the publication of the materials from the Santa Maria della Scala contexts refers to materials yielded by excavated contexts dating from the late 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD onwards it is not possible to say if some typologies of coarse wares were already attested in earlier (5\textsuperscript{th} century AD) contexts as we hypothesise for the materials from Pievina. At Pievina, there is no evidence to propose a date later than the 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD for the different late antique occupational phases.

Other forms in kitchen ware are very rare, a kind of cooking pan or deep \textit{testo} with more and less everted walls and slightly thickened rim is documented in three different contexts with one specimen per each. In every case traces of smoke have been observed, an evidence for its use as a kitchen vessel, probably for stewing rather than boiling. The same function can be suggested for two different types of casseroles, one of them illustrated in Map 2 (n.32), was found in context 1018. Interestingly the large cooking pan/deep \textit{testo} is not documented in the 4\textsuperscript{th} to early 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD assemblages form the North Hill in Roselle, where large casseroles with flattened rim were utilised for preparing stew. If the difference between Pievina and Roselle in the repertoire of large open vessels in kitchen ware prompts to slightly different eating habits it is hard to say in light of the available evidence. However it is well worth considering that in another urban site, that of Fiesole\textsuperscript{19} (which has yielded a late Roman ceramic profile comparable, although far more variegated, to that of Pievina), large casseroles with flattened rims similar to the Roselle types are not documented at all, while the presence of cooking pan/\textit{testi} is well documented.

7. \textbf{Discussion of the ceramic sources documented in the late Roman Pievina and comparanda from Roselle}

As shown in Map 2, the vast majority of ceramics (88.12\%) documented throughout Period 2 at Pievina can be referred to regional and local sources. A sample of late Roman ceramics from the site are currently object of thin section analysis, and we hope to be able to start to

\textsuperscript{16} Giannichedda 1998, p.122, Fig.91, n.73.
\textsuperscript{17} De Marinis (ed.) 1990, p.230 and p.388, Tav.43, n.20.
\textsuperscript{18} Cantini 2005, respectively, Tav.27, n.5.49 and Tav.28, n.5.57.
distinguish between local and regional sources in the near future. This distinction is make
particularly challenging by the lack of excavated late Roman ceramics kilns in Tuscany
which would allow for a better definition of the distribution of the workshops and their
 ceramic repertoire. The absolutely overwhelming contribution of the local/regional ateliers in
supplying Pievina with ceramics leaves, anyway, some space to other extra-regional sources.
Among them Tunisian imports played, as one could expect, a major role (10,2%). ARS is
documented with a total of 16 MNI (including 12 forms in D and 4 in C production),
Tunisian kitchen ware is documented by only one specimen of the very common casserole
Hayes 197, while Tunisian amphorae are attested by 2 MNI of the spathion Keay26 and one
ascrivable either to Keay25 or Keay26. The attestation of other Mediterranean sources
appears quite occasional like in the case of two Portuguese amphorae for transporting fish-
sauce (Almagro 51 A-B and Almagro 51 C) and one specimen of a Cilician LR1. If we look
at the typologies of Mediterranean amphorae we immediately realise they all are small or
medium amphorae whose moderate weight made them suitable for inland trade by using carts
or other transport means. Although mainly oriented towards regional and local systems of
trade the late antique site of Pievina, a quintessential peasant settlement characterised by a
very poor small farmstead which perfectly adapted to its environmental context (see the
complex and typically-peasant system of drainage), was able to engage a wider,
Mediterranean system of exchange. It is something quite unexpected if we consider that the
site is not directly connected to any major road and is located about 30 aerial kilometres far
from the sea (many more in terms of actual terrestrial distance).

If we look at the ceramic profile of the Roman town of Roselle and especially to some well-
quantified contexts from the area of the North Hill we can realise that a possible major role in
redistributing imported goods inland was played by the town itself in late antiquity.
Unfortunately as noted above the study of ceramic assemblages from Roselle, so far, has been
mainly focused on periods which only partially overlap the late antique occupation at Pievina.
Indeed contexts SU 5147=5170 and US 5141 are dated 4th to early 5th AD while other
analysed contexts SU 1262 and SU 1260 are respectively dated to the first half of the 6th and
mid 6th to early 7th AD. Nevertheless a comparison with the composition of the 4th to early 5th
ceramic assemblages from Roselle can provide us with some insights. In the North Hill of
Roselle, in-phase Tunisian imports (including ARS, amphorae and Tunisian kitchen ware
related to ARS) are documented with 16.84%. Interestingly this percentage is not much
higher than that at Pievina (10,2%) as one would expect considering the very different socio-
economic status of the two sites (a town and a farmstead) and the geographical position
(Roselle is very well connected to the main Roman road of coastal southern Tuscany and to
the sea-ports of the area). The interpretation of the archaeological context where the 4th-early
5th century AD ceramic assemblages were excavated is of an artisanal quarter specialised in
recycling metals. It is not a luxury urban building and this could, theoretically determine a
major orientation towards regional and local products rather than Mediterranean. Nonetheless
I tend to think that in the case of a well connected urban site where Mediterranean goods
arrived in high quantity because of a vigorous urban market, the in-site distribution of
imported ceramics does not necessarily represents different status of consumers. Once the
trade had been activated, imported ceramics reached the urban site and they became available
for its population as a whole. An urban elite, if we assume it existed in Roselle, probably did not tend to show their prosperity through their ceramics but by using other symbols such as buildings, prestige goods and eating habits. For this reason I think that the ceramic repertoire from the North Hill can be taken as quite exemplificative of the ceramic consumption in the late Roman town. In addition, in a period when Elban mines had already closed down²⁰, the activity of metal recycle in order to produce new metalwork had to be quite specialised and, speculating, it assured some wealth to people involved in it and hence the capacity of purchasing imported goods in the urban market.

The ARS evidence from Pievina (see table supra) documents 7 MNI of Hayes 67 (4 variant B and 3 variant C), 3 MNI of Hayes 61 (2 variant A and 1 variant B), 3 Hayes 50 B, 1 Hayes 91 A/B, 1 Hayes 52 and finally 1 Hayes 50B, n.61 similis/61B2. The study of ceramics from the North Hill did not just interest the complete quantification and analysis of the contexts mentioned above but also the complete analysis of the ARS evidence whatever was the context of provenance. This study aimed at reconstructing the “ARS profile” of that sector of the town and comparing it with other sites in southern Tuscany can now be used in order to understand if the overall quantified data from Roselle can reflect the inland redistribution of the most common types. Interestingly every type documented at Pievina is attested in the North Hill of Roselle, where 121 MNIs of ARS (including all productions from the early 2nd until the late 6th AD) were identified and classified. In general type Hayes 50 with variants A, A/B and B is documented with 23 MNI and at least two specimens of variant B are in phase in the analytically quantified contexts SU 5147=5170 and US 5141. Types Hayes 61A and 61B are respectively documented by 2 and 10 MNIs, while type Hayes 91A/B is documented with 2 MNI as well as variant Hayes 91B. Quite peculiar is the low presence of type Hayes 67 in Roselle since this type is very commonly found on the late Roman surface sites in the coastal area between Osa and Alma valleys.

Interestingly, another parallel between the North Hill contexts in Roselle and Pievina is represented by the third highest source of ceramics, which is represented by Portugal. On the North Hill, indeed, at least 6 minimum number of amphorae, out of a total of 20 in-phase amphorae, were imported from Portugal and interestingly they are of the same types (1 MNI of Almagro 51 A-B and 5 MNI of Almagro 51) as those documented at Pievina.

The fact that the two most common extra-regional imports at Roselle are the same as those documented at Pievina would prompt, in my views, to a redistribution process of imports from the urban market towards the rural sites of inland areas of southern Tuscany.

²⁰ McCormick 2001 XXX.
Distribution Map 1. Late Republican/early Imperial ceramics at Pievina: the evidence from SU 2003
Distribution Map 2. Late Roman ceramics at Pievina: selected types and sources in Period II phases 2-4
Final consideration for Kim

Hi Kim, about your first point, I produced a new hopefully clearer graph in which you will be seeing the fineware (FW) divided in proper functional categories. This graph would show that large bowls in finewares are attested in the late Roman period while they are absent in the Late Republican period, at least as concerns the fineware. The presence of a bowl in coarse ware in SU 2003 versus 21 table bowls and 14 table basins in SU 1006 clearly document the very marked increase of this two types of functional vessels in late antiquity. When I spoke about the persistence of the same functional vessels between the late Republican period and late Antiquity I mainly referred to the persistence of the functional types in KITCHEN WARE, which represents the most important class when we try to look at eating habits. You remember Paul Arthur’s paper focused on the different eating habits which may be reconstructed in light of the dominance of cooking pots (boiled foods) and casseroles (stews and fried foods). What I tended to say was that (as the zoo-archaeological record tends to show too) the kind of meats they used and the way they processed them at Pievina did not change a lot through the time.

As regards food consumption, that is another story and yes, the huge increase of table vessels (whether finewares or coarsewares) would definitely prompt to a marked difference, which I cannot exclude can be due to the different formation process of SUs 1006 (secondary deposition) and 2003 (primary deposition), but apart from that when we observe a much higher presence of table vessels in a context we cannot relate this phenomenon to particular eating habits apart from the fact that, in the case of SU 1006 (and the rest of the late Roman contexts) the presence of a higher number of table bowls would suggest a higher number of people eating food at our site in comparison to the people who can be addressed by using context 2003. Obviously it does not mean that more people lived at Pievina in late antiquity rather than earlier, as we do not have as many late Republican assemblages as the late antique ones. That pattern of the huge amount of late Roman table vessels is the same I observed in Roselle during the 4th-5th AD, the problem when we want to compare is that we do not have enough well quantified late Republican/early Imperial ceramic assemblages. I would wait until I have processed the stuff from Case Nuove to say if we have real marked increase of table vessels in late antiquity or if it is a trend which can be tracked back in the late Rep period. In general the high amount of table vessels and their different morphologies would prompt to a wide variety of the ceramic repertoire which probably met a still complex system of demand, although a large bowl imitating the Hayes 61 form probably was not assigned to a different function than an original Hayes 67 large bowl.

Again as “cooking pots outnumbering many other categories” I referred to KITCHEN WARE, meaning that cooking pots outnumber casseroles, pans and so on....It is again due to the fact that, in my views, KITCHEN WARE is more reliable if we want to try to address the eating habits as the link with food is closer than for table ware (at least in general terms). The preponderance of large bowls (mainly shallow) and deep basins should be seen mainly as complementing each other in the sense that I would assume a use of deep basins for serving foods or preparing some of them, like smashing or so (NOT COOKING), while the large bowls were mainly used for direct consumption, which means quite a complex system of serving and eating foods even in a rural site like Pievina.

My point about cooking pots and the preparation of old (and hence not tender) meats (sheep/goat/cattle) is related to the fact that they tended to cook them in cooking pots through boiling (rather than roasting or frying them in the casseroles which are more suitable for these purposes and indeed they are rarely documented in our ceramic
assemblages of both periods) in order to make that meat a bit more tender, which is something we do nowadays too. Indeed when we want to prepare a roast we use young lamb or pig, while when you want a "bollito" you can easily use a low quality (and cheaper) beef.

I apologise if all these points were not clear enough. I gave for grant that what was in my mind was clear (mainly the predominance of cooking pots which I meant in relation to other functional vessels in kitchen ware) but I now realise that I had to better explain my ideas. Hopefully now it is all clear.