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 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 1211/2. The region’s administrative and ecclesiastic center par excellence was Argos3, and Nauplion was its main harbor.4 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 material5.

For the importance of Argos during the Middle Byzantine period, see Piérart – Touchais, op.cit. (n. 5), 191-201, 206-208 and elsewhere, while the subject was presented at the 35th Symposium of the Christian Archaeological Society, see A. Vassiliou, «Πήλινα αυτοθερμαινόμενα σκεύη από τη μεσοβυζαντινή Αργολίδα», 35ο Συμπόσιο ΧΑΕ (Αθήνα 2015), 29-30.

Anastasia Oikonomou-Laniado’s contribution to the discovery and study of the Byzantine remains of Argolis and especially of Argos was seminal. For her contribution to the study of the Argolic Byzantine pottery specifically, see P. Petridis, «Η Τασούλα Οικονόμου και η συμβολή της στη μελέτη της βυζαντινής κεραμικής της Αργολίδας», Μνήμη Τασούλας Οικονόμου (1998-2008), ed. J. Chalkia, Athens 2012, 191-192 and elsewhere.

The Argive specimens formed part of my dissertation at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, see Vassiliou, Μεσοβυζαντινή εφυαλωμένη κεραμική, op.cit. (n. 5), I, 195-201, 206-208 and elsewhere.

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 εφυαλωμένη κεραμική, op.cit. (n. 5), I, 195-201, 206-208 and elsewhere. For Nauplion during this period, see M. G. Lambrynidis, Η Ναυπλιά, Αθήναι, 1902, 29-30. For a brief presentation of the history and archaeology of Argos during this period, see Piérart – Touchais, op.cit. (n. 5), 92-94. G. Tsakos, «Το Άργος στην παλαιοχριστιανική και μεσοβυζαντινή περίοδο» (1st ed. 1898), 18-38.

7 For Nauplion during this period, see M. G. Lambrynidis, Η Ναυπλιά, Αθήναι, 1902, 29-30. For a brief presentation of the history and archaeology of Argos during this period, see Piérart – Touchais, op.cit. (n. 5), 92-94. G. Tsakos, «Το Άργος στην παλαιοχριστιανική και μεσοβυζαντινή περίοδο» (1st ed. 1898), 18-38.

8 The Argive specimens formed part of my dissertation at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, see Vassiliou, Μεσοβυζαντινή εφυαλωμένη κεραμική, op.cit. (n. 5), I, 195-201, 206-208 and elsewhere.

9 Anastasia Oikonomou-Laniado’s contribution to the discovery and study of the Byzantine remains of Argolis and especially of Argos was seminal. For her contribution to the study of the Argolic Byzantine pottery specifically, see P. Petridis, «Η Τασούλα Οικονόμου και η συμβολή της στη μελέτη της βυζαντινής κεραμικής της Αργολίδας», Μνήμη Τασούλας Οικονόμου, op.cit. (n. 3), 119-128.

6 For the importance of Argos during the Middle Byzantine period, see Vassiliou, Μεσοβυζαντινή εφυαλωμένη κεραμική, op.cit. (n. 5), I, 195-201. For a brief presentation, see Vassiliou, Μεσοβυζαντινή εφυαλωμένη κεραμική, op.cit. (n. 5), 195-201, 206-208 and elsewhere.

7 For Nauplion during this period, see M. G. Lambrynidis, Η Ναυπλιά, Αθήναι, 1902, 29-30. For a brief presentation of the history and archaeology of Argos during this period, see Piérart – Touchais, op.cit. (n. 5), 92-94. G. Tsakos, «Το Άργος στην παλαιοχριστιανική και μεσοβυζαντινή περίοδο» (1st ed. 1898), 18-38.
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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 koiné), as has already been noted by Paul Arthur.10 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 bowl11 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 ventilation12. 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. In addition, it had two vertical handles, suggesting its portability.

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.

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 Charalambos Bakirtzis, have called them σαλτζάριον (saltsers), especially for the most «famous» Byzantine fish sauce, the garum or γάρος. We know from written sources...

13 Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 57, 64. Generally, with the exception of Corinth, lids constitute a rare find, see for example J. W. Hayes, Excavations at Saraciane 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).

14 Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 56. In rare cases, the vessels had one handle, as in Rome (op.cit., 63, pl. 13.6) or even three, as on Aegina, see Kathimerini, θησαυρός στο Βυζάντιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, Λευκός Πόλις, Οκτώβριος 2001 – Ιανουάριος 2002 (Exhibition catalogue), ed. D. Papanikola-Bakirtzi, Athens 2002, 328 cat. no. 362 (F. Felten).

15 It is not easy to conclude which material was used in each case; experimental archaeology would be very useful here.

16 Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 55, 64. The term σαλτζάριον or σαλτζουρόν is attested in Byzantine written sources, see Ph. Koukoules, «Γέμισμα, δέσπα και στιγμάτα των Βυζαντινών», EEBΣ 10 (1933), 113. Ph. Koukoules, «Βυζαντινών τροφών και πιτών», EEBΣ 17 (1941), 15, n. 5, Ph. Koukoules, Βυζαντινών βιος και πολιτισμός, 5, Athens 1952, 154. However, we do not know whether the term σαλτζάριον refers to chafing dishes or to another type of vessel.

17 Garum or γάρος 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 (κάρφος), the sauce (λιτισμός) was separated from the fish, see Geoponica sive Cassiani Bassi scholarstici de re rustica ecolagae, ed. H. Beckh, Stuttgart – Leipzig 1895, 528-529, 20:46 (Γάρων ποίησις). The relevant bibliography is extensive, see mostly Koukoules, that there were vessels named γαράρια or γαρερά, but it is not certain whether these can be identified with chafing dishes. In any case, chafing dishes could have been used for the diluting, warming, and serving of garum. Furthermore, they would have served for other kinds of food, such as soups, chopped meat, fish etc. The use of the fork (περόνιον) at the Byzantine table, especially the type with two long tines, has been connected with chafing dishes. Maria Parani and Charalambos Bakirtzis claim that it may have served as an actual fondue pot, and for this reason Greek experts, following Charalambos Bakirtzis, have called them σαλτζάριον (saltsers), especially for the most «famous» Byzantine fish sauce, the garum or γάρος. We know from written sources...


19 Furthermore, we do not know whether the γαρέλαιον can be identified with the σαλτζάριον of the written sources. For γαράρια, see Koukoules, Βυζαντινών βιος και πολιτισμός, op.cit. (n. 16), 41. Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 55. For a large two-handled deep pot with cylindrical walls that has been found in Morocco, dating to the Roman period and possibly connected with garum production, as well as for a similar vessel still in use in Cetara in Campania, see Carannante – Giardino – Savarose, «In search of garum. The ‘Colatala d’alici’ from the Amalfitan Coast (Campagna, Italy): An Heir of the Ancient Mediterranean Fish Sauces», Atti del 4o Convegno Nazionale di Etnoarcheologia (Roma, 17-19 maggio 2006), eds F. Lugli – A. A. Stoppiello – S. Biaggi, Oxford 2011, 69-79.

20 P. Arthur, «Un gruppo di ceramica alta medievale da Hierapolis (Pamukkale, Denizli), Turchia occidentale», Archaeologia Medievale 24 (1997), 538-539. Arthur, Form, Function and Technology, op.cit. (n. 9), 180. Vroom, From One Coast to Another, op.cit. (n. 9), 367. It has even been proposed that they were used in the preparation of aromatic wine, see Arthur, «Un gruppo di ceramiche», op.cit., 538. For the connection of chafing dishes with a metallic vessel, known as αὐθήψα, see Br. Pitarakis, «Survivance d’un type de vaisselle antique à Byzance: les auepsae en cuivre des Ve-VIIe siècles», TM 15 (2005), 686; see also Vroom, op.cit., 367. For further suggestions about the vessel’s use, see ibid.
where someone would stick a piece of meat or bread on their fork and dip it into the warm sauce in the upper part.  

II. White Ware Chafing Dishes

According to John Hayes, the earliest white ware chafing dishes are attested in Constantinople around 700 or earlier. On the basis of the published material, white ware specimens are found mostly in Constantinople, though not in large quantities: apart from St Polyeuktos (Saraçhane), they are attested at the Great Palace, the Hippodrome, Saint Eirini, and the Excavations Carried Out in and near the Hippodrome of Constantinople in 1928 on Behalf of the British Academy. For the dating of the pottery from Saint Eirini, combed lugs of chafing dishes were found, in contrast with other sites in the Byzantine Emperors, Being a First Report on the Excavations Carried Out in Istanbul on Behalf of the Walker Trust (The University of St. Andrews), 1935-1938, eds G. Brett – W. J. Macaulay – R. B. K. Stevenson, London 1947, 36, 39, 40, pls 15.12, 21.17 (Stages II-III, 8th-9th c.).


23 U. Peschlow, «Byzantinische Keramik aus Istanbul. Ein Fundkomplex bei der Irenenkirche», IstMitt 27-28 (1977-1978), 389-399 (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.


29 F. Felten, «Die christliche Siedlung», Alt-Ägina, I, 2, ed. H. Wätter, Mainz 1975, 76, no. 158, fig. 20; see also Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 60-61.

30 Frantz, op.cit. (n. 9), 434, fig. 22; see also Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 60-61.

31 AD 49 (1994), B1 Chronika, 119, pl. 49 b (Ch. Koilakou). Καθημερινή ζωή στο Βυζάντιο, op.cit. (n. 14), 327-328, cat. no. 361 (Ch. Koilakou). Ch. Koilakou, «Κέραμικα με λευκό τρύπα από ανασκαφές στη Θήβα», 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.

32 Numbers correspond to the catalogue numbers employed in the present article, see pages 273-283.
of white wares\textsuperscript{35} (Fig. 2 a, b). Unfortunately, we do not know the form of its lower part\textsuperscript{36}. As regards decoration, it preserves a tiny part of its central medallion and an incised line running beneath its lip\textsuperscript{37}. 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)\textsuperscript{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 well\textsuperscript{39}.

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)\textsuperscript{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 period\textsuperscript{41}. According to similarities with Sarachane’s GWW II type 8, no. 1 could be dated to the 10th century\textsuperscript{42}. As for our specimens with plastic decoration, we may compare them to relevant specimens from Corinth, dated by Morgan to the 10th-11th centuries\textsuperscript{43} and by Sanders to the first half of the 12th century\textsuperscript{44}. 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 production\textsuperscript{45}. 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)\textsuperscript{46}. Moreover, nos 2-4 resemble specimens found at Corinth\textsuperscript{47}.

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.)\textsuperscript{48}, on the islet of Pseira (late 8th-early 9th c.)\textsuperscript{49}, in central

\textsuperscript{35} When we refer to glaze in the present article, it is always lead-glaze.

\textsuperscript{36} It should be noted that it bears traces of glaze in the outer part of its bottom. This feature is also attested in a white ware chafing dish from Athens, see Frantz, op.cit. (n. 9), 434 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{37} Its central medallion preserves traces of dark brown strokes.

\textsuperscript{38} See indicatively Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 195, no. 157, pl. VIII a; no. 158, pl. VIIIId. Plastic decoration was sometimes applied separately to the vessel. Along with impressed, it constituted the main decorative technique of white ware chafing dishes. Other techniques were incision and painting with red pigment, sometimes in combination. In rare cases, attested at Constantinople, there were also polychrome chafing dishes, see Peschlow, op.cit. (n. 25), 406, no. 104, fig. 16, plk 141.3-4.

\textsuperscript{39} As we shall see below, similar handles are also attested for red ware chafing dishes.

\textsuperscript{40} Our fabric description (see the Catalogue below) is based on macroscopic and microscopic examination and not archaeometric. This is why we are referring to inclusions and not to temper.

\textsuperscript{41} To this we should also add the brief records of excavation journals, especially from past excavations. On this, see Vassiliou, Μεσοβυζαντινή εφυαλωμένη κεραμική, op.cit. (n. 5), I, 38-39.

\textsuperscript{42} See Hayes, op.cit. (n. 13), 23, fig. 8.9 (type 8).

\textsuperscript{43} Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 51.

\textsuperscript{44} Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 258, 279. It should be noted that white wares bearing plastic figures are mostly found at Corinth; oddly enough, they are rarely attested in Constantinople.


\textsuperscript{46} See Vassiliou, Μεσοβυζαντινή εφυαλωμένη κεραμική, op.cit. (n. 5), I, 320-321.

\textsuperscript{47} See indicative parallels in n. 38 of the present article.

\textsuperscript{48} E. Gerouzi, «Κεραμικά παλαιοχριστιανικών χρόνων από την περιοχή του “Επισκοπείου” της Σάμου», AD 47-48 (1992-1993), A, Meletes, 258-259, 266-267, figs 7, 8, pl. 50a. See also N. Poulou-Papadimitriou, «Βυζαντινή κεραμική από τον ελληνικό νησιωτικό χώρο και από την Πελοπόννησο (7ος-9ος αι.) Μια πρώτη προσέγγιση», Οι Σκηνειαίοι ιδιώτες του Βυζαντίου (7ος-9ος αι.), ed. E. Kountoura-Galaki, Athens 2001, 238. N. Poulou-Papadimitriou, «Η εφυαλωμένη κεραμική Νέα στοιχεία για την εμφάνιση της εφυάλωσης στο Βυζάντιο», Πρωτοβυζαντινή Ελεύθερη, Τόμους I, ed. P. G. 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 Gerouzi, op.cit., 266-267.

\textsuperscript{49} N. Poulou-Papadimitriou, Βυζαντινή κεραμική από τον νησιωτικό χώρο, op.cit. (n. 48), 239, fig. 9 a-b. N. Poulou-Papadimitriou – E. Nodarou, «La céramique proto-byzantine de Pseira: la
and southern Italy (8th-9th c.)\(^{10}\), on Sicily (8th-9th c.)\(^{11}\), on Mallorca (8th-9th c.)\(^{12}\), at Amorium (late 8th-early 9th c.)\(^{13}\) and at Corinth (late 8th-early 10th c.)\(^{14}\).


60 Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 37-38. Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 262 (Form I). As Sanders states, they are only a few sherds with uncertain dating.

61 P. Armstrong, «The Byzantine and Ottoman Pottery», Continuity and Change in the Byzantine and Islamic Worlds, op.cit.
Chafing dishes of various dating have also been found on Aegina (Kolona)\(^4\), Crete (Heraklion\(^5\), Ekatherina\(^6\)), Cyprus\(^7\) (Paphos\(^8\)), in Asia Minor (Hierapolis\(^9\), Aphrodisias\(^9\), Sagalassos\(^10\)), at Naples\(^12\), Otranto\(^13\), Byza

tint\(^7\), and even in Rumania (Bucov\(^15\)), while only a few specimens seem to have been found in Constantinople\(^16\). However, it should be mentioned that with the exception of Corinth, at the other sites chafing dishes account for only a limited number of examples\(^17\).

Typologically, most specimens belong to the earliest version of Byzantine glazed pottery made from red fabric, known as Brown Glazed Ware\(^18\), Unslipped Glazed Red Ware\(^19\) or Plain Glazed Ware in a Red and Grey Fabric\(^20\). Its basic characteristic is that it is not covered with a thick white slip and its basic form is the chafing dish\(^21\). Hayes includes this ware in Saraçhane's Coarse Glazed Wares\(^22\). In Italy this ware corresponds


\(^{75}\) M. Comşa, «La céramique de type byzantin de Bucov-Piœşti», Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines (Bucarest, 6-12 septembre 1971), Bucureşti 1976, 296, figs 2.4, 5, 9. M. Comşa, «Die Keramik vom byzantinischen Typus aus den Siedlungen von Bucov-Piœşti», Dacia 24 (1980), 323-335, figs 1-4; 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.

\(^{76}\) Hayes, op.cit. (n. 13), Deposit 31: p. 106 no. 34 (?), Deposit 34: p. 109 no. 14 (?), Deposit 37: p. 115 no. 27, Deposit 47: p. 130 no. 8 (?).

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 Argolis until now.

\(^{77}\) Frantz, op.cit. (n. 9), 433. Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 36.

\(^{78}\) Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 60-63, 236-239.


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.

\(^{80}\) 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 Ware83.

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 itself84, whereas only a few specimens have been found at Nauplion85, and at other sites of Argolis such as

80 Ceramica 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. Paroli, La ceramica intarsiata tardo-antica, op.cit. (n. 50), 43-58. Paroli, Ceramiche intarciate, op.cit. (n. 50), 352-359. 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.

81 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, Phlorou, Giatres Kechagia, Kontogianni, Kontogianni – Paraskevopoulou, Makrygianni, Moukiou, Skliris‘ Heads, Tsitsou, Xakouasti – Xisti, Xisti. 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. Gilles Touchais, archaeologist Anna Philippa-Touchais and Prof. Ioannis Varalis for their willingness to show me this specimen). 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 Chryssa Arryragi, Dr. Konstantina Gerolymou, Kalliopi Katri, and Dr. Evangelia Pappi, while the plot of Demou – Provataki was excavated by Dr. Anastasia Panagiotopoulou, the Kontogianni – Paraskevopoulou by Georgios Tsikes, the Skliris‘ Heads plot by Dr. Akis Papadimitriou, the Xisti plot by Dr. Erotiris Kolias, and the Xisti plot by Christos Piteros. For the location of the plots, see Vassiliou, Argos, op.cit. (n. 3), 218 fig. 191. Pariente – Touchais, op.cit. (n. 1), pl. XIV.

82 Three specimens were found at the Akronauplia Castle, two of which are included in the catalogue (nos 7 and 31). They were found at the central enclosure of Akronauplia (known as the «Frankish Castle»): no. 7 is from the inner side of the eastern wall at the entrance of the «Frankish Castle» (excavation of the 25th Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities, conducted by archaeologist Maria Amiliou under the direction of Dr. Demetrios Athanasoulis) and no. 31 from the northwestern part of the so-called «Traversa Gambello» in the middle part of the «Frankish Castle» (excavation of the 5th Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities, conducted by Dr. Konstantina Gerolymou under the direction of Anastasia Oikonomou-Laniado). For a plan of the Akronauplia Castle including the «Frankish Castle», see W. Schaefer, «Neue Untersuchungen über die Baugeschichte Nauplias im Mit-

Chonika86 and Ano (Upper) Epidaurus (site Laliotei-ka)87 (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 cm88. There are also some mid-sized vessels with rim diameter of 14-16 cm89.

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 inclination90. Beveled or simple (without a specific shaping) rims seldom appear91.

Handles are rarely preserved92. 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 material93. In some
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cases, there is a protuberance on the upper part of the handle (as if ‘pinched’), while there is an added piece of clay (like a projection) of unknown function on no. 18. In some cases the bowl of the upper part is deep and hemispherical; in others it is shallow, 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.

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. Wall thickness normally ranges between 0.8 and 1.1 cm, though there are some vessels with thin walls. 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.

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), 67-69]. Sanders, revising Morgan’s typology, proposed three forms (I-III) in the chafing dish evolution, focusing mostly on 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 Off 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.

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 projections served for the support of cooking vessels, see indicatively Bakirtzis, 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>, Το Διεθνές Συνέδριο Μεσαιωνικής Κεραμικής της Με­νογιόν (Θεσσαλονίκη, 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), 37-40; cf. Bakirtzis, op.cit. (n. 9), 56-59.

Only two vessels preserve their base; no. 28 (Fig. 29 a, b) has a discoid base with diameter of 14.5 cm and no. 45 (Fig. 46 a, b) has a conical/divergent base with diameter of 10 cm.

There are only three lids in the recorded material from Argolis. They have oblique walls and we assume that they belonged to chafing dishes. No. 38 (Fig. 39) may also belong to a lid, while no. 35 (Fig. 36 a, b) is a lid handle.

**Fabric**

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. This is Fabric 2.1, which characterizes the majority of our specimens. A common feature is the dark grey color of the walls’ core, which was due to inadequate firing conditions, viz. a short firing duration and abrupt rise in firing temperature. There are also a few pieces of a similar, though more fine-grained fabric (Fabric 2.2), whereas three pieces are differentiated by their intense orange-red color (2.5 YR 5/6, 4/8, 6/6) and many sparkling inclusions (Fabric 3).

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 ceramicists processed their clay better and controlled firing conditions more effectively. As a result the ves...
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 bowl, on the inner side of the vessels’ outer walls, and around the hole and perforations.

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). This wash is completely different from the thick white slip, attested in glazed ceramics from the 12th century onwards. 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 slip.

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, respectively. In our specimens olive-brown and dark brown glaze prevail, while green is rarely attested. Moreover, the glaze of some pieces has a shiny/lustrous effect. 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 glazed. On certain specimens, small spots in a darker hue are observed. These may be due to the pores on the vessel’s surface.

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. Amorium, Crotone, Butrint, and Laconia.

Decoration

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

would initially have had a shiny glaze, but it would have been corroded by its deposition in the soil.

In the first case the glaze was utilitarian while in the second, it was also decorative.

NOS 7, 8, 39, 33, 39, 40.

See Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 60.

Three pieces of early chafing dishes, locally made and dated to the late 8th-early 9th c., see Böhndorf-Arslan, Amorium 3, op.cit. (n. 53), 157 nos 43-44, 158 no. 56.

Cacciaguerra, op.cit. (n. 51), 291-292, with relevant bibliography.

Kamani, op.cit. (n. 74), 124-125, figs 6, 7.


Nevertheless, there are chafing dishes known from other regions with incised decoration on the inner surface of their bowl or dish, see for example Gerousi, op.cit. (n. 48), 258, fig. 8. Böhndorf-Arslan, Die Keramik aus Amorium, op.cit. (n. 9), 346, fig. 3.

Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 38, 178 no. 4, fig. 161.

See indicatively Sanders, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, op.cit. (n. 9), 62-63.

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.

See for example an 11th c. jug from Thessaloniki in K tetugyveni
ANASTASIA VASSILIOU

Plastic decoration is attested on fewer specimens, including two lids and one handle. 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, and in one case there may be a figural theme depicted. 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, and secondly from other regions such as Athens. Another popular simple decorative theme is plastic clay pellets, usually found on handles (no. 34), as on white wares. 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, the Green and Brown Painted (combined with plastic decoration) and the Spatter Painted 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. 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. 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.

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). 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.
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\(^147\). That is why we base our chronologies on other well-dated assemblages, especially of Corinth\(^148\). 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\(^149\). Therefore, we suggest for our main group with coarse characteristics a similar dating\(^150\), with an even earlier date for nos 6 and 7\(^151\).

As for some specimens with plastic decoration, based on parallels from Corinth, they could date to the 11th-early 12th century\(^152\). However, we should point out that at least from the macroscopic examination of our material, plastic decoration does not constitute per 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.

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).

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\(^153\). Given the resemblance of the majority of our specimens to Corinthian products\(^154\) 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\(^155\). 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)\(^156\).

\(^147\) Unfortunately, the same applies to Nauplion, Chonika, and Ano Epidaurus.


\(^149\) The Argolic specimens do not seem to resemble the earliest versions of the vessel as attested on Samos, Pseira, Amorium, and Rome.

\(^150\) 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. Frantz, op.cit. (n. 9), 433, who states that Brown Glazed Ware has been found «almost invariably in early contexts».

\(^151\) 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 Böhendorf-Arslan, 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).

\(^152\) 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), 238. 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. Koliakou).

\(^153\) However, we should remember that to date this is an individual (and perhaps later) product not connected with our main group.

\(^154\) Nos 7, 8, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28-30, 34-39, 41-43, 45.

\(^155\) At Corinth, thorough archaeometric analyses have shown that there was local production (further supported by a misfired piece), in addition to imported chafing dishes. See Sanders, New Chronologies, op.cit. (n. 58), 165. Sanders, An Overview, op.cit. (n. 99), 41. Morgan, op.cit. (n. 9), 42 (who refers to Brown Glazed wasters, although these were not chafing dishes). See also Vassiliou, Μεσοβυζαντινή εφυαλωμένη κεραμική, op.cit. (n. 5), 1, 280-282 (group A).

\(^156\) This fabric bears a macroscopic resemblance to the fabric of Northern Italy («Protogeometric» Ware, Veneto Ware). I owe this remark to Dr. Guy Sanders. See Sanders, New Chronologies, op.cit. (n. 58), 165. Sanders, An Overview, op.cit. (n. 99), 41, for a related case from Corinth.
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 the 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.161 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.162

In any case, research on chafing dishes still poses many unanswered questions concerning their function, the connection between white and red ware vessels (c.f. the similarities of the plastic decorated specimens), the identification of various workshops,163 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 bowls' 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 εφυαλωμένη κεραμική, op.cit. (n. 5), I, 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. Feke, 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 φουφοβραζείς, has survived, known as φουντό φλούδα, see indicatively B. Parapoulou, Τελευταίοι τσου κα­λάδες του ανατολικού Αιγαίου, Nauplion 1986, 105, 177. K. Kor­re-Zografou, Τά αχρισμένα τοῦ έλληνικοῦ γαίου, Athens 1995, 252 (fig. 459), 283 (fig. 526), S. Papadopoulos, Παραδοσιακά γε- γειο πλαστεία της Θάσου, Athens 1999, 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 invernata tardo-antica, op.cit. (n. 50), 43-58. Böhlerndorf-Arslan, Amorium 3, op.cit. (n. 53), 162 and elsewhere. Poulou-Papadimtriou – Nodorou, op.cit. (n. 49) and Poulou-Papadimtriou, Τεχνίτη σιλήνος πολιτισμού, op.cit. (n. 9), 392. Saraga, op.cit. (n. 57), 273.

Provenance of Figures

All photos, drawings and the map are by the author.
CATALOGUE*

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, ATE 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.
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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. 4×2.2.
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, Makrygianni 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: Plastic decoration, 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: Plastic 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: Plastic rendered bird (griffin?) in profile.

Fig. 36a, b.
Fig. 37a, b.
Fig. 38.
Fig. 39.
Fig. 40.
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: Plastically 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: Plastically 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).
Ano (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, Skliiris’ 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.

Το ανώτατο μέχρι πρόσφατα παρόν υλικό προέρχεται από σωστικές 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).

Τα αυτοθερμαινόμενα σκεύη, γνωστά στην ελληνική λογοτεχνία ως «σαλτσάρια», εμφανίζονται από τον 7ο έως τον 12ο αιώνα σε διάφορες περιοχές της βυζαντινής αυτοκρατορίας και στη σφαίρα επιρροής της. Συνιστούν ένα σύνθετο σκεύος, όπου συνδυάζονται στοιχεία τόσο των ανοιχτών όσο και των κλειστών αγγείων. Το ανώτατο μέχρι πρόσφατα παρόν υλικό προέρχεται από σωστικές 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).
Η χρήση των σκευών δεν έχει πλήρως διευκρινιστεί. Ενδέχεται να χρησιμοποιούνταν για το ζέσταμα των περιχυμάτων/σαλτσών και μάλιστα για τον περίφημο γάρο. Το πιθανότερο είναι να χρησιμοποιούνταν και για άλλα φαγητά, ενώ δεν αποκλείεται να λειτουργούσαν επιτόκως σαν το σημερινό «fondue».

Στο Άργος έχουν βρεθεί με τα έως τώρα δεδομένα λιγοστά δείγματα χειρισμής από λευκό πηλό, που πιθανολογούμε ότι προέρχονταν από το συγκεκριμένο σκεύος. Χρονολογούνται, είτε με γαρικά, είτε ως αριθ. 45, όπως σημειώνει η ακόλουθη λίστα: Δόξα, Χάνια και το Ναύπλιο, το Χώρι, και τον Αθήνα, Ναύπλιο και την Αναπαραβιάσμα. Διευκρινίζει μία ευελιξία εποχής, με ελάχιστα δείγματα από τον 10ο-11ο αιώνα, και δεν αποκλείεται να προέρχονται από την Κορινθία και ειδικά από την Κόρινθο, Οθόνη, Θήβα, Παράλληλα, μας δείχνει και ότι η κατασκευή του σκεύους τοποθετούνται σε σαφώς μεγαλύτερη ποσότητα.

Τα αυτοθερμαινόμενα σκέφτηκαν από ερυθρό πηλό, αντίθετα, επιφανείς εντοπίζοντας στην Αρχολίδα. Ωστόσο, οι αρχαιολόγοι είχαν σημειώσει πως οι σκέφτες αυτοθερμαινόμενα εκπέμπουν σε πιο όψιμη χρονολογία από τα τέλη του 11ου έως το α’ τέταρτο του 12ου αιώνα (το αριθ. 45 ύστερα και αργότερα). Οπότε, η θέση των σκευών δεν έχουν έως τώρα βρεθεί βάσει στοιχεία ταπεινής παραγωγής στο Άργος ή στην ευρύτερη περιοχή της Αργολίδας. Ωστόσο, η υπάρξεια μιας αντιπροσωπευτικής ομάδας με αριθ. δείγματα, καθώς και ενός ημιτελούς σκεύους, δεν μας επιτρέπει να αποκλείσουμε αυτό το ενδεχόμενο.

Δρ Αρχαιολόγος, Εφορεία Αρχαιοτήτων Αργολίδας, natasavasiliou@yahoo.gr
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