

The transport amphoras Lamboglia 2 and Dressel 6A: a central Dalmatian origin?

Adam Lindhagen

Lamboglia 2 and Dressel 6A: background and the problem of origins

The Lamboglia 2 transport amphora, together with Dressel 1, was the most common type in the Mediterranean in the late 2nd and 1st c. B.C., being found in Late Republican contexts from Spain to Egypt. There is some uncertainty regarding the date of the beginning of production but it is generally presumed to have begun in the last third of the 2nd c. B.C.¹ Production ceased around a century later, probably c.25-20 B.C. Since the identification of the form by N. Lamboglia in 1950, the type has usually been regarded as of Apulian or W Adriatic origin.² The Apulian hypothesis was reinforced by the discovery of a kiln site at Apani where several Lamboglia 2 stamps were found (included already by Mommsen in *U/L*),³ although there was some early doubt regarding their Apulian origin. In 1987, J.-Y. Empereur and A. Hesnard underlined the scanty evidence for many of the published forms from Apani and concluded that some of them were not manufactured there.⁴ The year before, J. van der Werff had underlined the meagre evidence from Apani and Apulia, pointing out some major reasons why the Lamboglia 2 stamps and those from Brindisi cannot be part of the same production.⁵

1. Lamboglia 2 stamps occur normally on the rim, sometimes on handles, whereas the ones from Brindisi are almost exclusively on handles.
2. Stamps are very much rarer on Lamboglia 2 types than on the ones from Brindisi.
3. Both types have stamps which often refer to slaves, but the ones from Brindisi often juxtapose the name of a slave with that of an "entrepreneurial" name on the other handle of the same amphora, something which is only rarely the case on Lamboglia 2.
4. The Lamboglia 2 stamps are always written in Latin, whereas the ones from Brindisi commonly have Greek letters.

It is true that some of the slave names from stamps of both productions are identical, but this is because these names are very common. There are thus no indications that Lamboglia 2 was produced in Apulia: the hypothesis was based on superficial similarities in fabric, stamps and distribution between the Brindisi type and the Lamboglia 2.⁶ Too little attention has been paid to the fabric of the Apani amphoras. However, although van der Werff was able to rule out an Apulian origin, he still proposed an origin for the Lamboglia 2 on Italy's Adriatic coast between N Apulia and Ravenna, and this, along with suggestions of additional production sites on the N Adriatic coast, remains the *opinio communis*. An Apulian origin is still referred to occasionally, which can lead to confusion.⁷

1 Bruno 1995, 27. I doubt that the Lamboglia 2 fragment which was allegedly found in a pre-146 B.C. context at Carthage actually could be pre-Roman (Martin-Kilcher 1993, 278; Rakob *et al.* 1991, Abb. 44, 70). Lamboglia 2 were not produced before c.150 B.C., probably not until c.130 B.C., and it seems unfeasible that they would have been diffused to Carthage already at this early stage. Moreover, the fragment is not of the transitional type reminiscent of Greco-Italic amphoras, which would be expected of the earliest Lamboglia 2 variants.

2 Zevi 1966, 23-27.

3 *Ch.* IX 6079.

4 Empereur and Hesnard 1987, 33.

5 van der Werff 1986, 103-4.

6 Empereur and Hesnard 1987, 33-34.

7 A recent example of this is the important publication of Spanish amphora finds (Marquez Villora and Molina Vidal 2005) which considers both the Lamboglia 2 and the Brindisine type as originating in Apulia, with the consequence that these very similar fabrics are regarded as one and the same. Both productions were fabricated in very well levigated clays, with the same colour variations. It is telling, however, that the most typical variant of the Lamboglia 2 fabric with large reddish *cinnette* was not assigned to the Brindisine amphoras.