Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας

Τομ. 37, 2016

ΔΕΛΤΙΟΝ
ΤΗΣ
ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΙΚΗΣ
ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗΣ
ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑΣ

ΠΕΡΙΟΛΟΣ Δ' ΤΟΜΟΣ Δζ'
2016

ΛΟΙΠΑ 2016

Μεσοβυζαντινά αυτοθερμαινόμενα σκεύη απο την Αργολίδα.

VASSILIOU Anastasia  Δρ Αρχαιολόγος, Εφορεία Αρχαιοτήτων Αργολίδας

http://dx.doi.org/10.12681/dchae.10702

Copyright © 2016 Anastasia VASSILIOU

To cite this article:

VASSILIOU, A. (2016). Μεσοβυζαντινά αυτοθερμαινόμενα σκεύη απο την Αργολίδα. Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας, 37, 251-276. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.12681/dchae.10702
Chafing dishes constitute an elaborate type of clay vessel of the middle Byzantine period. They appear both in white and red fabric and were primarily distributed along the coast and in urban areas in the central and eastern Mediterranean. In Argolis, and in particular Argos, we have so far recorded 53 specimens, the majority of which bear a close resemblance to corresponding vessels from Corinth, Athens and Thebes and are datable on the basis of parallels mainly to the 10th-11th centuries. They would probably have been used by members of the local elite, attesting to the existence of a level of sophistication in the dining habits of the Byzantine periphery.
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The region of Argolis, located in the northeastern Peloponnesse, preserves a vast number of archaeological remains dating back to prehistory (Fig. 1). During 4
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For an indicative presentation of the archaeological remains of Argolis and especially Argos, see M. Piérart – G. Touchais, Argos.
the middle Byzantine period Argolis formed part of the theme of the Peloponnese, while from the 11th century it formed part of the theme of Hellas until its capture by the Franks in 1211. The region’s administrative and ecclesiastic center par excellence was Argos, and Nauplion was its main harbor. After the so-called ‘‘Transitional period’’, especially from the 10th century onwards, the region enjoyed a revival chiefly attested in its central and western parts and confirmed mostly by archaeological finds, including the present material.

The present unpublished material emerged from rescue excavations from the 1970s down to the present, conducted mainly by the 5th Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities under the direction of the late archaeologist Anastasia Oikonomou-Laniado. The great majority of our specimens come from Argos, thus confirming once more the city’s preeminence in the region during the middle Byzantine period.

I. General remarks on chafing dishes and their function

Chafing dishes are rightly considered the most elaborate Byzantine clay vessels. They appear from the 7th to the

---

6 The Argive specimens formed part of my dissertation at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, see Vassiliou, Μεσοβυζαντινή εφαρμοσμένη κεραμική οριζ. (n. 5), I, 195-201, 206-208 and elsewhere, while the subject was presented at the 38th Symposium of the Christian Archaeological Society, see A. Vassiliou, «Πίνακα αντανακλώμενης σειρής από τη μεσοβυζαντινή Αργολίδα», 35ο Συμπόσιο ΧΑΕ (Αθήνα 2015), 29-30.


---


2 For the Byzantine history of the region, see A. Bon, Le Péloponnèse byzantin jusqu’en 1204, Paris 1951. For a concise presentation of the Byzantine sites of Argolis with their monuments, see V. Konti, «Συμβολή στην ιστορική γεωγραφία τοῦ νομοῦ Ἀργολίδας», Σύμμεικτα, Ναύπλιο 2001, 205-214. A. Vassiliou, «Argos from the Ninth to Fifteenth Centuries»,

---
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12th century at various sites in the Byzantine Empire and areas within its sphere of influence, thus reflecting common dining habits (a Byzantine *koinē*), as has already been noted by Paul Arthur. They appear both in white and red fabric and combine elements of both open and closed forms. Their upper part, depending on its depth, resembles a dish or bowl and is set on a conical stand, which on one side has a large opening for the placement of fuel and on the other carries small holes for the necessary ventilation. The upper part of the

---


11 When it is shallow it resembles a dish, when it is deeper it resembles a bowl. As a rule, the upper dish or bowl was glazed on its interior, as it contained the food. However, as we shall see below, in rare cases it was left unglazed.

12 Bakirtzis, op. cit. (n. 9), 64. From these holes and the separation of the walls of the inner bowl and the stand, one can usually identify the vessels when they are found in a fragmentary condition.
vessel was normally closed with a lid in order to keep the food warm\textsuperscript{11}. In addition, it had two vertical handles, suggesting its portability\textsuperscript{14}.

Our knowledge of the vessel's function is limited and largely based on its morphology. It is certain that its lower part (namely the stand) served for the placement of the means of providing heating – possibly a piece of charcoal, a small candle or a small lamp, which would have kept the food in the upper bowl/dish warm. This is confirmed by the burn traces normally found on the vessel's inner walls\textsuperscript{15}.

Our knowledge is equally limited as regards the kind of food prepared or served in chafing dishes. It is probable that they were used for warming and serving sauces, and for this reason Greek experts, following Charalampos Bakirtzis, have called them σαλτζάρια (salters)\textsuperscript{16}, especially for the most «famous» Byzantine fish sauce, the γαράρια\textsuperscript{17}. We know from written sources that there were vessels named γαράρια γαράριον, but it is not certain whether these can be identified with chafing dishes\textsuperscript{18}. In any case, chafing dishes could have been used for the diluting, warming, and serving of γαρον\textsuperscript{19}. Furthermore, they would have served for other kinds of food, such as soups, chopped meat, fish etc.\textsuperscript{20}. The use of the fork (περόνιον) at the Byzantine table, especially the type with two long tines, has been connected with serving dishes. Maria Parani and Charalambos Bakirtzis claim that it may have served as an actual fondue pot, being placed on top of a vessel filled with the γαρον, and eaten by spooning the food back into the bowl. It is not easy to conclude which material was used in each case; it is possible that they were made from metal, wood or ceramic, but it is certain that some dishes could have served as lids, see for example Ph. Koukoules, «Βυζαντινή τροφή και ποτά», op.cit. (n. 16), 57-64. Generally, with the exception of Corinth, lids constitute a rare find, see for example J. W. Hayes, Excavations at Sarayçhane in Istanbul, 2: The Pottery, Princeton, N.J. 1992, 17. They were probably made from other material, such as metal or wood. There is also a possibility that some dishes could have served as lids, see François, op.cit. (n. 9), 340-342 (referring though to cooking pots).

Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 56. In rare cases, the vessels had one handle, as in Rome (op.cit. 63, pl. 136) or even three, as on Aegea, see Καθημερινή ζωή στο Βυζάντιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, Λευκός Καθημερινή, Θεσσαλονίκη, Λευκός Καθημερινή, Θεσσαλονίκη, Λευκός Καθημερινή, Θεσσαλονίκη, Λευκός Καθημερινή, Θεσσαλονίκη, Λευκός Καθημερινή, Θεσσαλονίκη, Λευκός Καθημερινή, Θεσσαλονίκη, Λευκός ΕΕΒΣ 17 (1941), 15 n. 5. Ph. Koukoules, «Βυζαντινή τροφή και ποτά», EEBE 10 (1933), 113. Ph. Koukoules, «Βυζαντινή τροφή και ποτά», EEBE 17 (1941), 15 n. 5. Ph. Koukoules, Βυζαντινά κύπελλα και πολιτισμός, 5, Athens 1952, 154. However, we do not know whether the term σαλτζάρια refers to chafing dishes or to another type of vessel.

11 Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 56. The term σαλτζάρια is attested in Byzantine written sources, see Ph. Koukoules, «Βυζαντινή τροφή και ποτά», EEBE 10 (1933), 113. Ph. Koukoules, «Βυζαντινή τροφή και ποτά», EEBE 17 (1941), 15 n. 5. Ph. Koukoules, Βυζαντινά κύπελλα και πολιτισμός, 5, Athens 1952, 154. However, we do not know whether the term σαλτζάρια refers to chafing dishes or to another type of vessel.

12 Garum or γαράρια had deep roots in the Mediterranean extending back to Antiquity. It is a kind of sauce or condiment with many uses. As it is attested in Geoponica, it was made of the offal of large fish, and from smaller fish. Both were put in a vessel and with the addition of a large quantity of salt, they were set in the sun and left to ferment. Afterwards, with a basket (χολώνιον), the sauce (λιπονότιον) was separated from the fish, see Geoponica sive Cassiani Bassi scholastici de re rustica ecologe, ed. H. Beckh, Stuttgart – Leipzig 1895, 528-529, 2046 (Γαράρια ποταμος). The relevant bibliography is extensive, see mostly Koukoules,
where someone would stick a piece of meat or bread on their fork and dip it into the warm sauce in the upper part.\textsuperscript{21}

II. White Ware Chafing Dishes

According to John Hayes, the earliest white ware chafing dishes are attested in Constantinople around 700 or earlier.\textsuperscript{22} On the basis of the published material, white ware specimens are found mostly in Constantinople, though not in large quantities; apart from St. Polyeuktos (Sarcalhan), they are attested at the Great Palace,\textsuperscript{23} the Hippodrome,\textsuperscript{24} Saint Eirini,\textsuperscript{25} and Kalenderhane Camii.\textsuperscript{26}


\textsuperscript{22} A few specimens found during the excavations of St. Polyeuktos (Sarcalhan) are attributed to Hayes’s Glazed White Ware (GW W) I, see Hayes, op.cit. (n. 13), 17 and elsewhere. However, they are found mostly in GW W II, which are dated mainly to the 10th c. and should have served as a model for similar vessels made from red fabric, see Hayes, op.cit., 23. For another specimen from St. Polyeuktos, see also R. M. Harrison – N. Fıratlı, «Excavations at Sarcalhan in Istanbul Second and Third Preliminary Reports», Dop 20 (1966), 231 fig. D.6, 233.


\textsuperscript{25} U. Pechlow, «Byzantinische Keramik aus Istanbul. Ein Fundkomplex bei der Irmenenkirche», IstMitt 27-28 (1977-1978), 396-399 (nos 76-85, fig. 10, pls 136.5-138.4), 406 (no. 104, fig. 16, pls 141.3-4). It should be noted that at Saint Eirini numerous specimens of chafing dishes were found, in contrast with other sites in Constantinople. For the dating of the pottery from Saint Eirini, see Hayes, op.cit. (n. 13), 13, who places it mostly in the 10th – early 11th c., with the latest specimens dated to the early 12th c.


II.1. Finds from Argos

In Argolis only four white ware sherds have been found which we may suppose formed part of chafing dishes. All of them were discovered at Argos, No. 1 in the most interesting as it preserves most of its upper part; its interior is covered with the yellow-brown glaze typical of and at recent excavations.\textsuperscript{27} White Ware chafing dishes are also attested at Cherson,\textsuperscript{28} Thessaloniki,\textsuperscript{29} Corinth,\textsuperscript{30} Aegina (Kokola),\textsuperscript{31} and Athens.\textsuperscript{32} An important specimen was found in a destruction level (probably dated to the 10th c.) of a Byzantine house at Thebes; this is a nearly intact example preserving its lid.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{27} Gün İşgına İstanbul’un 8000 Yıls. Marmara, Metro, Sultanahmet Kazıları, ed. B. Öztuncay, Istanbul 2007, 150 nos SC11 (Sultanahmet Eski Cazavi), 280 no. Y.45 (Yenikapı).


\textsuperscript{30} Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 192 (no. 146), 193 (nos 152-161, pl. VIII), 195 (no. 178), 196 (no. 174), 231 (no. 576, fig. 180). D. Athanassouli – E. G. Manolesou, «Ιστορική Κοψιχή», Το Κορινθια και το Νότιο Πελοπόννησον. Τοπογραφία και Ηistrosκοπία από την Προϊστορική Αιώνια μέχρι το 1900. Εκδόσεις Ελληνικής Ακαδημίας Πειραιώς, Athens 2007, 60-61.

\textsuperscript{31} F. Feltén, «Die christliche Siedlung», Alt.-gōna, 1,2, ed. H. Wälter, Mainz 1975, 76, no. 158, fig. 20; see also Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 60-61.

\textsuperscript{32} Frantz, op.cit. (n. 9), 434, fig. 22, see also Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 60.

\textsuperscript{33} AD 49 (1994), B1 Chronika, 119, pl. 49 b (Ch. Kolliakou). Kηθομομνήμων ζωή στο Βυζάντιο, op.cit. (n. 14), 327-328, cat. no. 361 (Ch. Kolliakou). Ch. Kolliakou, «Κηθομομνήμων με λεπτό πηλό από συγκεκριμένη ζωή», DChAE 33 (2012), 310, no. 4, fig. 4. The lid is hemispherical in shape with a comb handle and has its interior decorated with an impressed eagle.

\textsuperscript{34} Numbers correspond to the catalogue numbers employed in the present article, see pages 273-283.
of white wares35 (Fig. 2 a, b). Unfortunately, we do not know the form of its lower part36. As regards decoration, it preserves a tiny part of its central medallion and an incised line running beneath its lip37. The other three sherds (nos 2-4, Figs 3-5) are small. We presume that they belong to chafing dishes, due to parallels from Corinth with similar decoration (plastic on the outer walls of the vessel)38. Finally, there is a part of a handle (no. 5, Fig. 6), decorated with round clay pellets, which could have belonged to a chafing dish as well39.

Our specimens’ fabric seems rather uniform, medium fine, white (10R 8/1, 7.5 YR 8/1) to rose (7.5 YR 8/4), medium hard to very hard, with some pores and whitish-grey inclusions (Fabric 1)40.

The dating of the Argive specimens is primarily based on well-dated assemblages from other regions, due to the lack of undisturbed strata from Argos dating between the medieval and modern period41. According to similarities with Saruçhane’s GWW II type 8, no. 1 could be dated to the 10th century42. As for our specimens with plastic decoration, we may compare them to relevant specimens from Corinth, dated by Morgan to the 10th-11th centuries43 and by Sanders to the first half of the 12th century44. For the Argive specimens we suggest a dating in the 11th-early 12th century, though not later, as their individual elements (fabric, glaze) seem early when compared to glazed pottery of the 12th century.

As for their origin, one possibility is Constantinople, generally accepted as the main site of white ware production45. Another is neighboring Corinth, given the limited quantity of white ware sherds found at Argos, which are insufficient per se to support the hypothesis of a direct commercial link with the capital of the Byzantine Empire (without of course excluding it)46. Moreover, nos 2-4 resemble specimens found at Corinth47.

III. Red Ware Chafing Dishes

In the regions beyond Constantinople and its immediate sphere of influence, red ware chafing dishes are mostly found. Early examples, probably of local origin, have been found on Samos (first quarter of the 7th c.)48, on the islet of Pseira (late 8th-early 9th c.)49, in central

should be noted that white wares bearing plastic figures are mostly found at Corinth oddly enough, they are rarely attested in Constantinople.


42 See Vassiliou, Μετοχικές περιοχές στην Κωνσταντινούπολη, op. cit. (n. 5), 1, 320-321.

43 See indicative parallels in n. 38 of the present article.

44 E. Gerousi, «Κεραμικά παλαιοχριστιανικών χρόνων από την περιοχή του "Επισκοπείου" της Σάμου», AD 47-64 (1992-1993), A. Melets, 258-259, 266-267, figs 7, 8, pl. 50a. See also N. Pou loup-Papadimitriou, «Βυζαντινή κεραμική από την αρχαία Ελληνική περιοχή της Πελοπόννησου (7ος-9ος α.): Μια προσέγγιση πρόοδος», Οι Σκοτεινοί αιώνες του Βυζαντίου (7ος-9ος α.), ed. E. Kontogianni-Galaki, Athens 2001, 238 N. Pou loup-Papadimitriou, «Η περιοδική χρυσιλή. Νέα έκτοσις για την ιστορία της εφυαλωμένης κεραμικής στο Βυζαντίον», Προμηθευτική Ελεύθερη. Ταμείων Σ. P. Themelis, I, Athens 2004, 212-213. The Samos chafing dish is the earliest red ware specimen identified to date. It was found in a closed deposit, dated to the first quarter of the 7th c., see Gerousi, op. cit., 266-267.

45 Pou loup-Papadimitriou, Βυζαντινή κεραμική από την νησιωτική χώρα, op. cit. (n. 48), 239, fig. 9 a-b. N. Pou loup-Papadimi triou – E. Nodarou, «La céramique protobyza nienne de Pseira: la
and southern Italy (8th-9th c.) on Sicily (8th-9th c.), on Mallorca (8th-9th c.), at Amorium (late 8th-early 9th c.) and at Corinth (late 8th-early 10th c.).

During the 10th and 11th centuries the vessel is found mostly in eastern mainland Greece (Thebes and the wider Bocotian region, Athens) and the Peloponnese (Corinth, Malagari of Perachora, wider region of Sikyon, Nemea, Argos, Nauplion, Chonika, Ano Epidaurus, Sparta and the wider Laconian region).
Chafing dishes of various dating also have been found on Aegina (Kolona)\(^\text{9}\), Crete (Heraclidion\(^\text{10}\), Ekuther-

na\(^\text{11}\)), Cyprus (Paphos\(^\text{12}\)), in Asia Minor (Hierapolis\(^\text{13}\), Aphrodisias\(^\text{14}\), Sagalassos\(^\text{15}\)), at Naples\(^\text{16}\), Otranto\(^\text{17}\), Bur-


14 R. Hodges – J. Vroom, «Late Antique and Early Medieval Ce-
mamics from Butrint, Albania», La circolazione delle ceramiche nell'Adriatico tra tarda antichità e altomedioevo, III Incontro di Studi Ceram., eds S. Gelichi – Cl. Negrelli, Mantova 2007, 379, J. Vroom, «Dishing Up History. Early Medieval Ceramic

Finds from the Triconch Palace in Butrint», Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Moyen âge 120-122 (2008), 294, fig. 6. S. S. Ka-

man, «Butrint in the Mid-Byzantine Period: A New Interpre-

Coast to Another to Another, op.cit. (n. 9), 365, fig. 11.

17 M. Comşa, «La céramique de type byzantin de Bucov-Ploiești», Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines (Bu-
carest, 6-12 septembre 1971.), Bucarest 1976, 206, figs 2.4, 5.9. M. Comşa, «Die Keramik vom byzantinischen Typus aus den Sied-
lungen von Bucov-Ploiești», Dacia 24 (1980), 323-335, figs 1-4, 6. See also Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 62, pl. 13.4. The case of Bucov is quite interesting, given its large number of chafing dishes and the fact that they are made from red fabric instead of white.

18 Hayes, op.cit. (n. 13), Deposit 31p. 106 no. 34 (?), Deposit 34p. 109 no. 14 (?), Deposit 37p. 115 no. 27, Deposit 47p. 130 no. 37 (?).

This may be partly due to the fact that this vessel has not been so far the object of systematic publication, as was the case of Argos until now.

19 Frantz, op.cit. (n. 9), 433, Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 36.

20 Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 60-63, 236-239.

21 Vroom, After Antiquity, op.cit. (n. 9), 147. J. Vroom, Byzantine to Modern Pottery in the Aegean, 7th to 20th Century. An Intro-

22 For the specific category of pottery, see mostly Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 36-42, Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 60-

62, 236-237, Vroom, Byzantine Pottery, op.cit. (n. 80), 72-73.

23 Hayes, op.cit. (n. 13), 41.
in part to the so-called ceramica a vetrina pesante, with its sub-group Forum Ware, which bears similarities to Unslipped Glazed Red Ware or Brown Glazed Ware.  

III.1. Finds from Argos and other sites of Argolis

In Argolis we have to date recorded 48 pieces of chafing dishes, the great majority of which were found at Argos itself, whereas only a few specimens have been found at Nauplion, and at other sites of Argolis such as Akronauplia Castle including the «Frankish Castle», see W. Schaefer, "Archäologische Anzeiger" 76 (1961), 161-162 fig. 1 (site B).

One specimen (no. 14) from the excavation conducted by A. Oikonomou-Laniado was included in the catalogue. Nineteen specimens have been found in the ARGOS plot. Only seven were found in the OTE plot, and even fewer (one or two each) in the following plots: Demou – Provataki, Dini, Phlouros, Galetsi, Kechagia, Kontogianni, Kontogianni – Paraskevopoulos, Makrygianni, Moukiou, Skliris' Heirs, Tsitsou, Xakousti – Xihi, Xixi. One specimen (no. 29) is of unknown provenance and another (not included in the present catalogue) was found during the excavations of the French Archaeological School (I warmly thank Prof. Gérald Touchais, archaeologist Anna Philippa-Touchais and Prof. Ioannis Varnalis for their willingness to show me this specimen).

The majority of our specimens have a double or grooved lip, with variations in its shaping; sometimes the groove is sharper, sometimes it is shallower, and sometimes it has an inward or an upward inclination. Beveled or simple (without a specific shaping) rims seldom appear.

Handles are rarely preserved. When they do, they are vertical and vary in cross-section (mostly strap or ellipsoid, in few cases cylindrical or oval). They are attached to the rim or slightly below, and conclude at the mid or the lower part of the vessel. Inverted handles, characteristic of many chafing dishes, are not attested (or possibly not preserved) in our material.
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Chonisika and Ano (Upper) Epidaurus (site Lalioteika) (Fig. 1).

Shape

In most cases the fragmentary state of our specimens does not allow the secure deductions (only a small part of body and rim usually is preserved). Nevertheless, we can make some observations, such as the fact that most of the fragments come from large chafing dishes, with rim diameter of 17-24 cm and in some cases of 26-30 cm. There are also some mid-sized vessels with rim diameter of 14-16 cm.

The majority of our specimens have a double or grooved lip, with variations in its shaping; sometimes the groove is sharper, sometimes it is shallower, and sometimes it has an inward or an upward inclination. Beveled or simple (without a specific shaping) rims seldom appear.

Handles are rarely preserved. When they do, they are vertical and vary in cross-section (mostly strap or ellipsoid, in few cases cylindrical or oval). They are attached to the rim or slightly below, and conclude at the mid or the lower part of the vessel. Inverted handles, characteristic of many chafing dishes, are not attested (or possibly not preserved) in our material. In some

---

68 Ceramic a vetrina pesante and its sub-group Forum Ware were popular in central and southern Italy. The relevant bibliography is extensive, see indicatively D. Whitehouse, «The Medieval Glazed Pottery of Lazio», Papers of the British School at Rome 35 (1967), 48-53. Pardi, La ceramica invetriata tardo-antica, op.cit. (n. 50), 43-58. Pardi, Ceramiche invetriate, op.cit. (n. 50), 332-339. Romei, op.cit. (n. 50). For the similarities between ceramica a vetrina pesante and Unslipped Glazed Red Ware, see mainly Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 60, 237, 262, 265 and elsewhere.

69 At Argos we have to date recorded 43 specimens, of which 36 are included in the catalogue. Nineteen specimens have been found in the ATE plot. Only seven were found in the OTE plot, and even fewer (one or two each) in the following plots: Demou – Provataki, Dini, Phlouros, Galetsi, Kechagia, Kontogianni, Kontogianni – Paraskevopoulos, Makrygianni, Moukiou, Skliris’ Heirs, Tsitsou, Xakousti – Xihi, Xixi. One specimen (no. 29) is of unknown provenance and another (not included in the present catalogue) was found during the excavations of the French Archaeological School (I warmly thank Prof. Gérald Touchais, archaeologist Anna Philippa-Touchais and Prof. Ioannis Varnalis for their willingness to show me this specimen).

70 The majority of these plots are located in the medieval center of the city and were excavated by Anastasia Oikonomou-Laniado with the assistance of the archaeologists Chrysa Argyraki, Dr. Konstantina Gerolymou, Kalliopi Katri, and Dr. Evangelia Pappi, while the latter, see Ch. Bouras – L. Boura, Η ἑλλαδική ναοδομία κατά τόν 12ο αἱώνα (Ἀργος, 30 Μαΐου – 1 Ιουνίου 1986), Athens 2002, 325-328 with extensive bibliography

71 One small specimen (no. 44) from an excavation conducted by A. Oikonomou-Laniado for the excavation, see A. D. Oikonomou, «Συμβολή στην τηπογραφία της περιοχής Λαος Έποδοντος τούτου τών τούτου του Β Τοιχικού Συνδέσμου Αργολικών Σπονδών (Ἀργος, 30 Μαΐου – 1 Ιουνίου 1986), Athens 1989, 303-307. During this excavation a basilica was found, dated by A. Oikonomou-Laniado to the 7th-10th c., see Oikonomou, op.cit., 303-309.

72 For the latter case, see nos 18, 30.

73 Nos 6, 7, 16, 17, 22, 24, 34.

74 The double or grooved lip is connected with the placement of the lid, see indicatively Jakitzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 56.

75 Nos 6, 7, 29. Nos 26, 36, and 45 have such shallow corrugation that their lip seems beveled.

76 For the inverted handles, see indicatively Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 261.
There is a protuberance on the upper part of the handle (as if 'pinched')\textsuperscript{94}, while there is an added piece of clay (like a projection) of unknown function on no. 18\textsuperscript{95}.

In some cases the bowl of the upper part is deep\textsuperscript{96} and hemispherical, in others it is shallow\textsuperscript{97}, resembling a dish. In the rare instances where the upper bowl/dish’s bottom is preserved, it is flat with visible circular traces of the instrument for the alignment of its outer surface\textsuperscript{98}.

The vessel's outer walls are either oblique or nearly vertical Nos 30 (Fig. 31 a, b) and 31 (Fig. 32 a, b) are distinguished for the tapering in their lower part\textsuperscript{99}. Wall thickness normally ranges between 0.8 and 1.1 cm, though there are some vessels with thin wall\textsuperscript{100}. On the other hand, no. 41 (Fig. 42 a, b) is distinguished for its notably thick outer walls. The vessels’ outer walls have triangular, round or even rectangular perforations on one side and a large hole on the other; the latter is usually horseshoe-shaped or semicircular\textsuperscript{101}.

The fabric of our specimens is as a rule coarse, very hard, and reddish brown (10 R 5/6-5/8, 4/6) or red (2.5 YR 5/6-4/6). It contains white—mostly large—as well as sparkling inclusions. In some specimens there are also black and grey inclusions\textsuperscript{102}. This is Fabric 2.1, which characterizes the majority of our specimens\textsuperscript{103}. A common feature is the dark grey color of the wall’s core\textsuperscript{104}, which was due to inadequate firing conditions, viz. a short firing duration and abrupt rise in firing temperature\textsuperscript{105}. There are also a few pieces of a similar, though more fine-grained fabric (Fabric 2.2)\textsuperscript{106}, whereas three pieces are differentiated by their intense orange-red color (2.5 YR 5/6, 4/6, 6/6) and many sparkling inclusions (Fabric 3)\textsuperscript{107}.

There are also some pieces with particular/individual fabric, such as nos 6 and 7, which as we shall see below seem to be earlier compared with the rest.

As time passed, technical expertise evolved and ceramists processed their clay better and controlled firing conditions more effectively\textsuperscript{108}. As a result the ves-

\textsuperscript{94} Nos 16, 17, 22.

\textsuperscript{95} It reminds us the projections of a related vessel, the brazier (\textit{γασείον}), where the rim projections served for the support of cooking vessels, see indicatively Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 67-69. G. Kapitán, «Three Terracotta Braziers from the Sea Of Sicily», The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration 9 (1980), 127-131, esp. 130-131, fig. 5. A similar projection is probably attested on a chafing dish from Hierapolis, see Arthur, «Un gruppo di ceramiche», op.cit. (n. 20), 532, no. 2, fig. 5.2. This kind of projection (due to its shallowness) does not seem to be connected in our case with the «small bowls» mentioned by Morgan [The Byzantine Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 39] which he presumed served for the placement of condiments.

\textsuperscript{96} Nos 6, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 36.

\textsuperscript{97} Nos 18, 26, 44, 45.

\textsuperscript{98} Nos 6, 29.

\textsuperscript{99} Guy Sanders describes it as follows: «In the mature form the dish sits upon rather than within the stand» [Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 261]. Sanders, revising Morgan’s typology, proposed three forms (I-III) in the chafing dish evolution, focusing mostly on the rim formation and the depth of the upper bowl/dish, see Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 261-264. Sanders, New Chronologies, op.cit. (n. 58), 165, fig. 7. G. D. R. Sanders, «An Overview of the New Chronology for 9th to 13th Century Pottery at Corinth», To Διαθήκη Ζωής Του Μεσαίωνα Και Καλλιτεχνικής Μνημείως 11-16 Οκτωβρίου 1999 ed. Ch. Bakirtzis, Athens 2003, 40-41. In general, the majority of the Argolic specimens bear similarities with Form II in Sanders’ typology (Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. [n. 9], 263-264). For Morgan’s typology see Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 57-60; cf. Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 56-58.

\textsuperscript{100} Nos 32, 39.

\textsuperscript{101} Sometimes, as in the case of no. 29, there are also perforations at the part of the large hole.

\textsuperscript{102} Nos 39, 40, 42.

\textsuperscript{103} It is possible that some of the inclusions were added as temper, but this can be attested only by archaeometric analysis.

\textsuperscript{104} Nos 8-30, 32-38.

\textsuperscript{105} Nos 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17-23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32-40, 43, 45.

\textsuperscript{106} Many sparkling inclusions (Fabric 3)\textsuperscript{107}, whereas three pieces are differentiated by their intense orange-red color (2.5 YR 5/6, 4/6, 6/6) and many sparkling inclusions (Fabric 3)\textsuperscript{108}.

\textsuperscript{107} See R. S. Gabrieli – B. McCall – J. R. Green, «Medieval Kitchen Ware from the Theatre Site at Nea Pafos», RDAC 2001, 338, 351:

\textsuperscript{108} «... it is normal for Medieval vessels to have a thick dark core at least on part of the body, as a result of a quick rise in firing temperature which did not allow complete burning out of carbonaceous material. We seem to have shorter firing with less control over the firing conditions.» This constitutes a common characteristic of chafing dishes in general. See also Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 36. Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 236.

\textsuperscript{109} Nos 39, 40.

\textsuperscript{1010} Nos 31, 32, 41, 42 mostly no. 42.

\textsuperscript{1011} See indicatively Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 236.
sels’ fabric became more uniform in texture and color, as is the case of nos 43 and 44.

Traces of fire

Many pieces bear traces of the heating material, which served for the warming of the food contained in the upper part. Most times, burn traces are detected on the bottom of the vessels’ upper bowl110, on the inner side of the vessels’ outer walls111, and around the hole and perforations112.

Wash – Glaze

One of the major features of this ware is the fact that it is not slip-covered. However, there are about 15 pieces whose exteriors were covered with a thin wash of varied color (mostly whitish or grey-white)113. This wash is completely different from the thick white slip, attested in glazed ceramics from the 12th century onwards114. One exception to this is partly no. 24, but mostly nos 44 and 45, whose surface is covered entirely by a thick layer of white slip115.

As for the glaze, this specific ware is characterized by a thick yellowish or greenish lead-glaze, which when applied directly to the vessels’ surface (without the mediation of a white slip), acquired a dark brown or dark green color, respectively116. In our specimens olive-brown117 and dark brown118 glaze prevail, while green is rarely attested119. Moreover, the glaze of some pieces has a shiny/lustrous effect120. On the simple vessels with elementary incised decoration on their outer surface, the glazing covers only the inner surface of the upper bowl or dish, including the lip, whereas on more elaborately plastic decorated ones the outer surface is also glazed121. On certain specimens, small spots in a darker hue are observed122. These may be due to the pores on the vessel’s surface123.

Finally, it should be noted that two vessels (nos 6 and 45) are completely unglazed. On rare occasions this feature is also attested on chafing dishes from other regions, e.g. Amorium124, Crotone125, Butrint126, and Laconia127.

Decoration

The decoration of our specimens invariably covers the vessels’ outer surface128. There are two main decorative techniques, the incised and the plastic129. More than half of our specimens are decorated with incised motifs, which we would characterize as elementary130. They are mostly linear (cross-hatched, oblique, vertical, or wavy lines, herringbone etc.) and resemble the decoration on unglazed coarse wares (jugs, etc.)131.

would initially have had a shiny glaze, but it would have been corroded by its deposition in the soil.
110 In the first case the glaze was utilitarian while in the second, it was also decorative.
111 Nos 7, 8, 29, 33, 39, 40.
112 See Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 60.
113 Three pieces of early chafing dishes, locally made and dated to the late 8th-early 9th c., see Böhlendorf-Arslan, Amorium 3, op.cit. (n. 53), 157 nos 43-44, 158 no. 56.
114 Cacciaiuern, op.cit. (n. 51), 291-292, with relevant bibliography.
115 Nevertheless, there are chafing dishes known from other regions with incised decoration on the inner surface of their bowl or dish, see for example Geniou, op.cit. (n. 48), 258, fig. 8 Böhlendorf-Arslan, Die Keramik aus Amorium, op.cit. (n. 9), 346, fig. 3. Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 38, 178 no. 4, fig. 161.
116 Three pieces of early chafing dishes, locally made and dated to the late 8th-early 9th c., see Böhlendorf-Arslan, Amorium 3, op.cit. (n. 53), 157 nos 43-44, 158 no. 56.
117 See indicatively Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 62-63.
118 Nos. 8-31, 44. Sanders names this kind of decoration «Incised Decoration», see Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 62-63, 239. However, we should not confuse chafing dishes’ incised decoration with the so-called «Sgraffito Ware» of the 12th c.; the latter depends on the contrast that derives between the thick white slip and the red fabric of the vessel.
119 See for example an 11th c. jug from Thessaloniki in Kethvygavpr
ANASTASIA VASSILIOU

Plastic decoration is attested on fewer specimens\(^\text{132}\), including two lids\(^\text{133}\) and one handle\(^\text{134}\). Unfortunately, due to our specimens’ fragmentary condition, it is almost impossible to identify the original composition. Human figures are probably rendered on nos 37 (face?) and 43 (hand?). Other specimens are decorated with animals\(^\text{135}\) and in one case there may be a figurative theme depicted\(^\text{136}\). The difficulty in identifying these figures is owed not only to their fragmentary state but also to their unrealistic rendering. Based on published specimens from other parts of the Byzantine Empire we know that popular motifs were griffins and eagles, as well as grotesque figures of musicians, acrobats etc., which in some cases protrude like sculptures. The most relevant specimens are known from Corinth\(^\text{137}\) and secondly from other regions such as Athens\(^\text{138}\). Another popular simple decorative theme is plastic clay pellets, usually found on handles (no. 34), as on white wares\(^\text{139}\).

In the present material there is also one specimen (no. 42) decorated with small circles, possibly made by impression.

At Corinth there are also a few chafing dishes decorated with the *Slip Painted*\(^\text{140}\), the *Green and Brown Painted* (combined with plastic decoration)\(^\text{141}\) and the *Spatter Painted*\(^\text{142}\) technique. Finally, we should note that the present material also includes three undecorated vessels (nos 6, 7 and 45).

From all the above, we can deduce that among the specimens found at Argos and wider in the Argolid, a main group numbering nearly two-thirds of our specimens stands out\(^\text{143}\). This group shares common characteristics of shape, fabric, firing, and decoration, which may be summarized as follows: coarse fabric with dark grey core, thick glaze – mostly olive-brown or dark brown – on the interior of the upper bowl/dish, whitish wash and elementary incised decoration (in fewer cases plastic) on the vessel’s exterior. In our material the color of the glaze does not seem to affect our grouping\(^\text{144}\). Furthermore, their shaping (particularly of the rim) and the depth of the bowl/dish of the upper part do not appear as standardized as one might have expected\(^\text{145}\).

Apart from our main group, there are specimens which differ from one another to a greater or lesser extent. Nos 30 and 31 differ in shape, with tapering walls that resemble Sanders’ Form II. Furthermore, no. 31 has a distinctive fabric, which along with nos 41 and 42 could be attributed to a different workshop (or workshops)\(^\text{146}\).

The unglazed chafing dish (no. 6), which has the basic characteristics of cooking ware, presents even sharper differences. As for the slipped unglazed chafing dish (no. 45), it seems that we have here an unfinished product,

\(^{132}\) Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 246, nos 744-745. We do not know whether the brush of white slip on no. 16’s outer surface is decorative or just random. In any case, it differs significantly from the *Slip Painted* Ware.

\(^{133}\) Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 246, nos 744-745. We do not know whether the brush of white slip on no. 16’s outer surface is decorative or just random. In any case, it differs significantly from the *Slip Painted* Ware.

\(^{134}\) Ibid., 230 no. 571.

\(^{135}\) Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 246, nos 744-745. We do not know whether the brush of white slip on no. 16’s outer surface is decorative or just random. In any case, it differs significantly from the *Slip Painted* Ware.

\(^{136}\) Ibid., 230 no. 571.

\(^{137}\) Nos 8-30, 32-37.

\(^{138}\) For instance, nos 10, 11 and 13 have similar fabric, shape and decoration, but their glazes differ.

\(^{139}\) See a.o. Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 37, who refers to «the independence of form» of some *Brown Glazed* pieces. See also Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 56, for a similar observation concerning chafing dishes from different regions. For this reason, we believe that creating a typology of chafing dishes with interregional applications but without excluding important elements would be a rather difficult task.

\(^{140}\) Another distinctive feature of no. 31 is its rouletting decoration combined with the typical incised.
given the cracked surface of its upper dish, as well as the fact that the thick layer of its white slip tends to crumble and seems unsuitable for warming food without a glaze covering.

Remarks on the Argolic vessels’ dating and provenance

As it is already mentioned, the present material does not offer us dating evidence. That is why we base our chronologies on other well-dated assemblages, especially of Corinth. Our main group of Argolic chafing dishes displays similarities with chafing dishes from Corinth, Athens, and Thebes, which date to the 10th or early 11th centuries. Therefore, we suggest for our main group with coarse characteristics a similar dating, with an even earlier date for nos 6 and 7.

As for some specimens with plastic decoration, based on parallels from Corinth, they could date to the 11th-early 12th century. However, we should point out that at least from the macroscopic examination of our material, plastic decoration does not constitute per

16 Unfortunately, the same applies to Nauplion, Chonika, and Ano Epidaurus.
18 The Argolic specimens do not seem to resemble the earliest versions of the vessel as attested on Samos, Pseira, Amorium, and Rome.
19 Nos 8-30, 32-37. To these we may add no. 31. For the dating of the Corinthian specimens to the late 10th or early 11th c. (Form II), see Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 263. For the Athenian specimens, see Frantz, op.cit. (n. 9), 433, who states that Brown Glazed Ware has been found «almost invariably in early contexts».
20 No. 6 presents elements of an early date (similarities with Byzantine pottery of the 9th c.), while no. 7 was found with a small jug possibly dating to the 9th c. Moreover, its shape resembles a chafing dish from Amorium, which is dated to the late 8th-early 9th c., see Böhndorf-Arsalan, Die Keramik aus Amorium, op.cit. (n. 9), 347, fig. 2.5. It also bears similarities to the Pseira chafing dish (late 8th-early 9th c.), see n. 49 of the present article (I warmly thank the reviewer for the valuable remark).
21 Nos 38-40. For the dating of plastic decorated pottery in Corinth to the last decades of the 11th and the early years of the 12th c. see Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 234. To this dating we should add a chafing dish with plastic decoration from Thebes that was found with coins of Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078-1081), see AD 50 (1995), B1 Chronika, 81 (Ch. Koilakou).
22 se evidence for later dating, as there are plastic decorated specimens, such as no. 36 (Fig. 37 a, b), which do not differ in fabric and shape from other vessels in our «coarse» main group and which might thus have similar dating and even the same provenance.
23 For nos 43, 44 and 45 (Figs 44-46) we propose a later dating, possibly towards the end of the 11th-early 12th centuries, due to the fact that they have a different, more fine-grained fabric and more even shape. Moreover, nos 44 and 45 have a thick layer of white slip, while no. 44’s glaze is thin; both would suggest a later dating, possibly as late as the first quarter of the 12th century (or even later for no. 45).
24 As for the identity of the workshop or workshops, we have little evidence at our disposal. At Argos and Argolis, no clearly-identifiable workshop remains which could be connected with the production of chafing dishes have been found to date, and our specimens do not include any flawed or misfired products, with the exception of no. 45, which should be an unfinished product. Given the resemblance of the majority of our specimens to Corinthian products and taking into consideration the proximity of the two regions, we assume that some of our chafing dishes may have originated from Corinthian workshops, without excluding the possibility of local production given the homogeneity of our main group. As for the small number of specimens with orange-red fabric (Fabric 3), they seem to have been imported from a different workshop (or workshops).
IV. Concluding Remarks

In Argolis (mostly Argos) we have recorded to date a rather large sample of chafing dishes, mostly red ware, with a few white ware specimens. Our main group appears relatively homogeneous in its general rendering, displaying similarities with vessels from Corinth, Athens, and Thebes and dating mostly to the 10th-11th centuries. Without excluding the possibility of local origin, there are some specimens which are definitely imports.

The exact function of the vessel remains hypothetical. It is certain that it was used for warming food and keeping it warm. However, it seems to have been used not only for liquids such as sauces or soups, but also for semi-liquid or even solid foods, given the presence of unglazed chafing dishes, as it is attested at Argos as well.157

The present previously-unpublished material offers us valuable evidence for Argolis, if we consider the scarcity of written sources for the region during the Byzantine period. It confirms the close ties of the central-western Argolis mainly with Corinth, but also with other centers of the theme of Hellas (Thebes, Athens), either through commerce (in the case of imports) or in the form of influences (in the case of local production).158 At the same time it attests that Argos, besides being the centre of the Argolic region, followed the dining trends of the capital. As for the identity of the «followers», they could have been the members of the local elite (e.g. local administrative or ecclesiastical officials, large landowners), who would have resided in Argos and to a lesser extent, Nauplion.159 The discovery of a small number of specimens in the vicinity of Byzantine churches (Chonika, Ano Epidaurus) is rather intriguing.160

The gradual abandonment of the vessel from the early 12th century has been connected with changes in dining habits throughout the Byzantine Empire. To this we should add the possibility that the workshops producing such vessels closed down, given the fact that glazed pottery changed radically from the beginning of the 12th century.161

In any case, research on chafing dishes still poses many unanswered questions concerning their function, the connection between white and red ware vessels (cf. the similarities of the plastic decorated specimens), the identification of various workshops,162 and the vessel’s «disappearance» (at least in clay form). Further study and publication of new material will contribute much to research and lead to a better understanding of this particular Byzantine vessel.

157 The evidence of no. 6 is important, as it bears clear traces of usage (traces of fire at its openings and at the upper bowl’s bottom), making thus certain that it is not an unfinished or flawed product.
158 According to the ceramic evidence, these ties will strengthen during the 12th c., see Vassiliou, Μεσοβυζαντινή ερυθρωμένη αγγειοπλαστεία, op.cit. (n. 5), 1, 311-312, 321-322 and elsewhere.
159 The urban distribution of the vessel is attested elsewhere too, see Indicatively François, op.cit. (n. 9), 353. For a map of the distribution of chafing dishes, see Arthur, Pots and Boundaries, op.cit. (n. 10), 22 fig. 1. Vroom, From One Coast to Another, op.cit. (n. 9), 366 fig. 12.

160 Probably connected with a monastic foundation or a minor settlement?
161 Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 261. Pamela Armstrong does not exclude the possibility that it was replaced by vessels made from other material, see P. Armstrong, «The Byzantine and Later Pottery», Kalapodi. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen im Heiligtum der Artemis und des Apollon von Hyampolis in der antiken Phokis, ed. R. C. S. Feuch, I, Mainz 1996, 357 n. 92.
162 Nevertheless, there are regions, like Albania, where the vessel survived, see Vroom, Dishing Up History, op.cit. (n. 74), 294 n. 8. In modern times, in the Aegean, another vessel, which resembles chafing dishes and more to φουφοβραζιον, has survived, known as φουφωκα, see Indicatively B. Papadopoulos, Τέκτονες της αρχαιότητος: Αθήνα και η Μικρή Ασία, I, Athens 1989, 158 fig. 46.
163 Indications of local production are attested (apart from Corinth) in central and southern Italy, Amorium, eastern Crete, and Athens, see respectively Paroli, La ceramica invernita tardo-antica, op.cit. (n. 50), 45-58; Höhendans-Früh, Amorium I, op.cit. (n. 53). 162 and elsewhere; Pouliou-Papadimitriou – Nodaros, op.cit. (n. 49) and Profou-Papadimitriou, Τεράτευσις μικροσκοπικά, op.cit. (n. 9), 392. Saraga, op.cit. (n. 57), 273.

Provenance of Figures
All photos, drawings and the map are by the author.
Fabrics

1. Medium fine, white (10 YR 8/1, 7.5 YR 8/1) to rose (7.5 YR 8/4-7/4). Medium hard to hard. Few to frequent small to medium whitish-grey inclusions. Few to frequent small to medium pores.

2.1. Coarse/medium coarse, reddish brown (10 R 5/6-5/8, 4/6) to red (2.5 YR 5/6-4/6). Hard to very hard. Frequent to common medium to large white inclusions. Few to frequent small black and sparkling inclusions. Few to frequent small to medium pores.

2.2. Medium coarse to medium fine, hard to very hard. Red (10 R 5/6) to light red (2.5 YR 6/6). Few small/medium to large white inclusions and frequent small few medium pores.

3. Coarse to medium coarse, hard to very hard, orange-red (2.5 YR 6/6, 5/6-4/8). Few medium to large white and frequent small to medium grey inclusions. Common sparkling inclusions and few to frequent small/medium to large pores.

White Ware Specimens (Cat. nos 1-5)

1. Chafing dish, upper body and rim fragment, White Ware, 10th c. (Fig. 2a, b).
   Argos, Xakousti – Xixi plot.
   Fabric 1.
   Oblique walls, rim internally thickened. White wash (?) all over.
   Interior: Incised central medallion contains traces of thin dark brown strokes; thick yellow-brown glaze to over lip.

2. Chafing dish, small body fragment, White Ware, 11th – early 12th c. (Fig. 3).
   Argos, ΑΤΕ plot.
   Pres. L. 3.9, pres. W. 4.2.
   Fabric 1; few small to medium red inclusions.
   Exterior: Plastic decoration (human face in front view and human hands?) with details in pin prick holes and impression (small circles); light olive green glaze, in places yellow-brown.

* D.=diameter, dim.=dimensions, estim.= estimated, H.=height, L.= length, pres.= preserved, W.=width. All measurements are in centimeters.

Additional information is given, when it is not included in the general description of the fabrics.
3. Chafing dish, small body fragment, White Ware, 11th – early 12th c. (Fig. 4).
Argos, Papathanassiou plot.
Pres. L. 2.85, pres. W. 5.15.
Fabric 1.
Exterior: Plastic decoration (bent human hand?) enriched with short incisions; thin green glaze.

4. Chafing dish, small body fragment, White Ware, 11th – early 12th c. (Fig. 5).
Argos, OTE plot.
Max. dim. 4 x 2.2.
Fabric 1.
Exterior: Plastic motif, enriched with small circles; thick glossy green glaze.

5. Chafing dish, vertical cylindrical handle, White Ware, 11th – early 12th c. (Fig. 6)
Argos, Kechagia plot.
Pres. L. 4.7.
Fabric 1.
Exterior: Three plastic pellets with impressed concentric circles; thin yellow-green glaze.

Red Ware Specimens (Cat. nos 6-45)

6. Chafing dish, middle and upper part, Red Ware, unglazed, 9th c. (?)(Fig. 7a, b).
Argos, Moukiou plot.
Fabric red, 2.5 YR 5/6, with common medium to large white inclusions.
Cylindrical body with a large horseshoe-shaped opening and small circular hole opposite, deep upper bowl with flat bottom, two vertical strap handles. Traces of fire in various parts.

7. Chafing dish, upper part, Red Ware, 9th c. (Fig. 8a, b).
Nauplion, Castle of Akronauplia.
Fabric medium coarse, very hard, red, 10 R 5/8-4/8, with few medium to large white inclusions.
Beveled rim, oblique walls, beginning of vertical ellipsoid or strap handle below the rim.
Interior: Brown glaze to over lip outside.
Exterior: Burnt wash. Traces of fire on the upper bowl’s bottom.
8. Chafing dish, small upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 9a, b).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1; few small black inclusions.
Double rim.
Interior: Thick glossy dark olive-brown glaze to over lip outside.
Exterior: Incised crosshatching.

9. Chafing dish, small upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 10).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Double rim.
Interior: Thick dark brown glaze with black spots to over lip.

10. Chafing dish, small upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 11).
Argos, OTE plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Slightly beveled rim, nearly vertical walls.
Interior: Slightly glossy brownish glaze to over lip.
Exterior: Incised wavy line below rim.

11. Chafing dish, two rim fragments, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 12).
Argos, Kontogianni plot.
Fabric 2.1; light red, 2.5 YR 6/6.
Double rim.
Interior: Green glaze to over lip.

12. Chafing dish, small upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 13).
Argos, Kechagia plot.
Fabric 2.1; light red, 2.5 YR 6/6.
Double rim.
Interior: Dark brown glaze to over lip.
Exterior: Traces of oblique incisions.
13. Chafing dish, small upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 14).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Double rim.
Interior: Dark brown glaze to over lip.
Exterior: Whitish wash (?); incised wavy line below lip, traces of oblique incisions lower.

14. Chafing dish, small upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 15a, b).
Chonika, outer area of the Church of the Dormition of the Virgin.
Fabric 2.1.
Interior: Dark olive-brown glaze to over lip outside.
Exterior: Incised wavy line below lip.

15. Chafing dish, small upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 16).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Double rim.
Interior: Olive-brown glaze to over lip.
Exterior: Incised crosshatching below lip.

16. Chafing dish, upper body, handle and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 17).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Double rim, vertical ellipsoid handle with protuberance on its upper part.
Interior: Glossy dark olive glaze with black spots to over lip and protuberance.
Exterior: Whitish wash; oblique incisions on the protuberance; brush stroke of white slip (possibly random).
17. Chafing dish, small upper body, handle and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 18a, b).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Double rim, vertical ellipsoid handle with protuberance on its upper part.
Interior: Thick glossy dark olive-brown glaze to over lip and protuberance.
Exterior: Whitish wash; traces of oblique incisions below lip.

18. Chafing dish, large upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 19a, b).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1; few large black inclusions.
Double rim with projection.
Interior: Thick olive-brown glaze to over lip and projection.
Exterior: Incised crosshatching below lip.

19. Chafing dish, three upper body and rim fragments, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 20a, b).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1; few large black and grey inclusions.
Double rim.
Interior: Glossy dark brown glaze with black spots to over lip outside.
Exterior: Incised crosshatching below lip.

20. Chafing dish, upper body, handle and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 21).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Double rim, nearly vertical external walls.
Bowl interior: Olive glaze to over lip.
Exterior: Whitish wash; incised crosshatching below lip and oblique lines lower.
21. Chafing dish, two middle/upper body and rim fragments, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 22a, b).
   Argos, ATE plot.
   Fabric 2.1; few medium black inclusions.
   Double, almost beveled, rim, conical body.
   Interior: Thick glossy olive-brown glaze with black spots to over lip.
   Exterior: Whitish wash; incised crosshatching.

22. Chafing dish, two middle/upper body, handle and rim fragments, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 23a, b).
   Argos, ATE plot.
   Fabric 2.1.
   Double rim, conical body, vertical strap handle with protuberance.
   Interior: Glossy dark olive-brown glaze to over lip and protuberance.
   Exterior: Whitish wash; vertical and oblique incisions, herringbone.

23. Chafing dish, middle/upper body and rim fragments, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 24a, b).
   Argos, Phlorou plot.
   Fabric 2.1; few large black inclusions.

24. Chafing dish, body fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 25).
   Argos, Makrygianaki plot.
   Fabric 2.1.
   Upper part of large hole with traces of fire.
   Exterior: White slip; incised crosshatching and zigzag line below.

25. Chafing dish, large upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 26a, b).
   Argos, Tsitsou plot.
   Fabric 2.1; frequent medium black inclusions.
   Double rim, deep hemispherical bowl, beginning of handle.
   Interior: Dark olive-brown glaze with many black spots to over lip outside.
   Exterior: Whitish wash; incised wavy line below lip.
26. Chafing dish, upper part, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 27a, b).
Argos, OTE plot.
Fabric 2.1; frequent medium black inclusions.
Almost beveled rim, deep hemispherical upper bowl with wheel marks on its interior.
Interior: Thick, slightly glossy, brown glaze to over lip.
Exterior: Whitish wash; incised herringbones below lip.

27. Chafing dish, large upper body fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 28).
Argos, Galetsi plot.
Fabric 2.1; light brown, 5 YR 6/6.
Oblique walls.
Interior: Green glaze.
Exterior: Vertical short cuts.

28. Chafing dish, base, body and handle fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 29a, b).
Argos, OTE plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Discoid base, vertical ellipsoid handle, oblique walls with small triangular ventilation holes.
Exterior: Whitish wash; Oblique incisions alternating with deep grooves.

29. Chafing dish, middle and upper part, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 30a, b).
Argos (without further indications).
Fabric 2.1; few small black inclusions.
Conical body, large upper dish with flat bottom, beginning of vertical oval handle, beveled lip. Large semi-circular hole and smaller triangular one on the same side of the stand.
Interior: Thick glossy dark brown glaze to over lip.
Exterior: Incised wavy line below lip. Traces of fire on the dish’s bottom.
30. Chafing dish, large body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 31a, b).
Argos, Kontogianni – Paraskevopoulou plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Double rim, tapering walls.
Interior: Dark brown glaze to over lip outside.
Exterior: Incised wavy line below lip.

31. Chafing dish, body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 32a, b).
Nauplion, Castle of Akronauplia.
Fabric 3.
Double rim, tapering walls.
Interior: Dark brown glaze to over lip.
Exterior: Incised crosshatching framed by horizontal incisions above and rouletting below. Traces of fire inside and outside.

32. Chafing dish, upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 33).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Double rim. Dark red wash and dark olive glaze all over.
Exterior: three plastic pellets below lip.

33. Chafing dish, base and body fragment, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 34a, b).
Argos, Makrygianni plot.
Fabric 2.1; few medium black inclusions.
Concave walls, discoid base.
Exterior: Plastic pellets with impressed small circles around the base; thick dark olive-brown glaze. Traces of fire on the interior.

34. Chafing dish, handle, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 35).
Argos, OTE plot.
Pres. L. 7.1.
Fabric 2.1; light reddish-brown, 2.5 YR 6/4, few small black inclusions.
Vertical cylindrical handle.
Exterior: Plastic pellets with impressed small circles; olive-brown glaze.
35. Chafing dish, lid handle, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 36a, b).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric 2.1; light red, 2.5 YR 6/4.
Exterior: Olive-brown glaze.

36. Chafing dish, two upper body and rim fragments, Red Ware, 10th – early 11th c. (Fig. 37a, b).
Argos, Xixi plot.
Fabric 2.1.
Almost beveled rim, deep bowl. Dark olive-brown glaze all over.
Exterior: Plastically rendered opposing quadrupeds, incised zigzag lines.

37. Chafing dish, small upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 10th – 11th c. (Fig. 38).
Argos, ATE plot.
Possibly fabric 2.1 (grey-black, due to overheating).
Double rim. Thick glossy very dark olive-brown (almost black) glaze all over.
Exterior: Plastic decoration, human head in profile (?) below lip.

38. Chafing dish, small (lid?) fragment, Red Ware, 11th – early 12th c. (Fig. 39).
Argos, ATE plot.
Pres. L. 5.2, pres. W. 5.5.
Fabric 2.1 (?), light reddish brown, 2.5 YR 6/4, with few small to medium black and frequent medium grey inclusions.
Exterior: Plastically rendered long-necked animal (?); thick, glossy, dark brown glaze.

39. Chafing dish, small lid fragment, Red Ware, 11th – early 12th c. (Fig. 40).
Argos, Demou – Provataki plot.
Fabric 2.2.
Very thin walls. Glossy olive-brown glaze all over.
Exterior: Plastically rendered bird (griffin?) in profile.
40. Chafing dish, two lid fragments, Red Ware, 11th – early 12th c. (Fig. 41a, b).
Argos, Dini plot.
Fabric 2.2.
Oblique walls.
Interior: Traces of burn.
Exterior: Plasticly rendered bird in profile and possibly traces of the wing of another bird; glossy olive-brown glaze.

41. Chafing dish, large body and rim fragment, Red Ware, 11th – early 12th c. (Fig. 42a, b).
Argos, OTE plot.
Fabric 3. Few medium to large black and dark red inclusions.
Double rim with jagged finish, slightly oblique walls.
Interior: Greyish wash.
Exterior: Plasticly rendered indeterminate figural theme. Thick glossy dark brown glaze inside and outside and on part of the stand’s inner walls.

42. Chafing dish, small lid fragment, Red Ware, 11th – early 12th c. (Fig. 43).
Argos, OTE plot.
Fabric 3.
Exterior: Incised circular motifs (possibly impressed), traces of rouletting decoration; brown glaze.

43. Chafing dish, upper body and rim fragment, Red Ware, late 11th – first quarter of the 12th c. (?) (Fig. 44a, b).
Argos, ATE plot.
Fabric medium orange-brown, 2.5 YR 6/8, very hard, with frequent small and few medium white, few small black, and sparkling inclusions.
Double rim, thin oblique walls. Olive glaze all over.
Exterior: Plastic decoration (hand?).
44. Chafing dish, small fragment of perforated walls, Red Ware, late 11th – first quarter of the 12th c. (Fig. 45).
Año (Upper) Epidaurus, site Lalioteika.
Pres. dim. 5.3×2.5.
Fabric medium to fine, light red, 2.5 YR 6/6-6/8.
Small triangular hole and traces of others. White slip and thin light green glaze all over. Exterior: Oblique incisions between the perforations.

45. Chafing dish, almost intact, Red Ware, late 11th – 12th c. (or even later) (Fig. 46 a, b).
Argos, Skliris’ Heirs plot.
Fabric reddish-brown 2.5 YR 5/6, with frequent small/medium to large white inclusions.
Bell-shaped vessel, slightly corrugated lip, shallow upper dish, beginning of two vertical oval handles, two opposite openings (one horseshoe-shaped and one small rectangular), conical base. Thick white slip all over. Traces of fire and cracks on the interior of the dish. Possibly unfinished product.
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ΜΕΣΟΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΑ ΑΥΤΟΘΕΡΜΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΑ ΣΚΕΥΗ ΑΠΟ ΤΗΝ ΑΡΓΟΛΙΔΑ

Το άγνωστο μέχρι πρόσφατα παρόν υλικό προέρχεται από οικτικές ανασκαφές της Αρχαιολογικής Υπηρεσίας από τη δεκαετία του 1970 έως σήμερα, οι οποίες έφεραν στο φως ένα αντιπροσωπευτικό δείγμα πήλινων αυτοθερμαινόμενων σκευών κυρίως από το Άργος και δευτερευόντως από άλλες περιοχές της Αργολίδας (Ναύπλιο, Χώνικα, Άνω Επίδαυρος).
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Η χρήση των σκευών δεν έχει ακόμη διευκρινιστεί. Ενδέχεται να χρησιμοποιούνται για το ζέσταμα των περιχυμάτων/σαλτσών, με ελάχιστη διάρκεια, καθώς και για τη διακόσμηση των πίνακων ή των πλακών.

Το πιθανότερο είναι να χρησιμοποιούνται και για άλλα χρήσιμα, ενώ δεν είναι επαρκώς σαφές να λειτουργούσαν επιπρόσθετα σαν το σημερινό "fondue".

Τα αυτοθερμαινόμενα σκεύη από ερυθρό πηλό, αντίθετα, επιχωριάζουν στην Αργολίδα. Ιδίως στο Άργος έχουν βρεθεί εντός της περιόδου του 10ο-11ο αιώνα, με ελάχιστα δείγματα από την Ναύπλειο, το Χώριο και την Άνω Επιδαύρο. Ξεχωρίζει μία ευρεία ομάδα με κύρια χαρακτηριστικά τον χονδρόκοκκο, αδρά επεξεργασμένο, πηλό, που είναι συχνά παραψημένο, τη στοιχειώδη εγχάρακτη διακόσμηση (ενίοτε και έξαεργή ανάγλυφη), καθώς και το παχύ στρώμα εφυάλωσης. Η συγκεκριμένη ομάδα παρουσιάζει ομοιότητες με αντίστοιχα σκεύη από την Κόρινθο, την Αθήνα και τη Θήβα, που χρονολογούνται κυρίως στον 10ο-11ο αιώνα. Ορισμένα σκεύη με πιο λεπτόκοκκο πηλό και έξαεργή ανάγλυφη διακόσμηση θα μπορούσαν να χρονολογούντο, βάσει παραλλαγών, στον 11ο–12ο αιώνα.

Τέλος, η ύπαρξη μιας μεταξόνιους πιρού, της κούπας ή πινάκιος, που εγκλείεται μέσω εξωτερικών τοιχωμάτων σε ενός είδους στάντ, φέρει ένα μεγάλο άνοιγμα στη μία πλευρά για την τοποθέτηση της θερμαντικής ύλης και μικρότερες οπές αντικριστά, απαραίτητες για τη διατήρηση της πυράς ή της φλόγας.

Η χρήση των σκευών δεν έχει ακόμη διευκρινιστεί. Ενδέχεται να χρησιμοποιούνται για το ζέσταμα των περιχυμάτων/σαλτσών και μάλιστα για τον περίφημο γάρο. Το πιθανότερο είναι να χρησιμοποιούνταν και για άλλα χρήσιμα, ενώ δεν είναι επαρκώς σαφές να λειτουργούσαν επιπρόσθετα σαν το σημερινό "fondue".