

to between the second century and the beginning of the first century B.C.⁸²

SU 7027: This SU produces some fragments of a small thin-walled pitcher, *Atlante* 1/102 type, three fragments of an *olletta* with rounded rim,⁸³ a fragment of Olcese 37-type *olla* with out-turned and hollowed rim,⁸⁴ and some walls from amphorae of African production (probably of “Punic tradition”).⁸⁵

Activity 4: The strata relating to this phase yield no significant pottery material.

Activity 5: SU 7019: The only identifiable fragments belong to a cup with thin “egg-shell” walls, decorated with a wheeled motif (*VH-PS/2: fig. 19*), analogous to the

Atlante II type XXX,⁸⁶ datable to the period between the Flavians and Hadrian.

SU 7026: The ceramic finds are mostly residual. Among them are one fragment of a small jug, with thickened and slightly out-turned rim,⁸⁷ and a fragment of an *olletta* with rounded rim;⁸⁸ both are datable to the period between the second and first century B.C.

SU 7040: This stratum contains a large quantity of fragments belonging to a single example of an amphora of small dimensions, of an unidentified type, perhaps attributable to Italic production on the basis of the *impasto*. The rest of the ceramic material (particularly the thin-walled ware) also points to a similar dating. An *olletta* (VH 148, **fig. 24**; see also Macaulay, D.3.1.1), cylindrical-ovoidal in shape, reused as a flower-pot, finds fairly close analogies in late Republican and early imperial contexts.⁸⁹ In addition there is a certain quantity of residual material (common and black-glazed pottery) datable to the late Republican period.

SU 7041: This SU contains a small quantity of ceramic material, including some walls of Iberian-production amphorae (probably of the Beltran II type, already attested in other locations at the site) and a fragment of a lamp with volutes, generically datable to the Julio-Claudian period.

Activities 6-9: These strata do not contain significant ceramic material.

82. On this type of amphora, see J. H. van der Werff, “Amphores de tradition punique à Uzita,” *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 52-53 (1977-78) 172, fig. 3, 23-27; fig. 4, 2; 194, fig. 10, 9 and fig. 5, 6, 11; Carandini, 82; V. Guerrero Ayuso, “Una aportación al estudio de las anforas púnicas Mana C,” *Archaeonautica* 16 (1986) 147-186, at 162 fig. 6, 2-4, type C1/2; and 167, fig. 7, 1-3; J. Y. Empeur and A. Hesnard, “Les amphores héllenistiques,” *Céramiques héllenistiques et romaines* 2 (Paris 1987) 9-54, at 37-40; A. M. Bisi, “Le anfore puniche e di tradizione punica di Pompei: problemi e prospettive della ricerca,” in *Ercolano 1738-1988. 250 anni di ricerca archeologica. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Ravello-Ercolano-Napoli-Pompei 30 ottobre - 5 novembre 1988* (Rome 1993) 529-536. Analogies: Luni (*Luni II*, tab. 140, 24-25); Ostia, Casa del Protiro (J. Boersma, et al., “Excavations in the House of the Porch (V.II.4-5) at Ostia,” *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 61 [1986] 109-112, fig. III, 7, nos. 47-48); Narni (D. Monacchi, “Materiali da un contesto di età tardo-repubblicana di Narni,” *Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università degli studi di Perugia* 24 [1986/1987] 143-168, at 149, Tab. III, 1); Carthage, Byrsa (*Byrsa I. Rapports préliminaires des fouilles (1974-1976)* [Rome 1979] 222, fig. 70, A 151-32-34). For a synthesis of the finds of amphorae of this type, particularly widespread in the Tyrrhenian areas of Italy, see Angelelli and Perissinotto, 17.

83. Angelelli and Perissinotto, 24, fig. 10, 52.

84. Olcese, 198, fig. 35, 37.

85. Olcese, 198, fig. 35, 37.

86. *Atlante* II type 2/416, tab. XCIII, 14.

87. Angelelli and Perissinotto, 31, fig. 15, 105.

88. Dyson, fig. 61, 82; cf. also Piraino, 298, fig. 230, 194.

89. Carandini, tab. 28, 6 and 28, 10; Olcese, 190, fig. 31, 14.