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KEIMÊLIA: OBJECTS CURATED

IN THE ANCIENT MEDITERRANEAN (8\textsuperscript{th}-5\textsuperscript{th} CENTURIES B.C.)

Amanda S. Reiterman

Ann Blair Brownlee

Archaeologists occasionally encounter artifacts that might be described as “curated” in antiquity either because these objects significantly predate the other items in their assemblage or exhibit ancient repairs. While easily overlooked or dismissed as residual, these anomalous artifacts have the potential to inform us about the intimate relationships between people and things in antiquity and ancient attitudes toward the past. This dissertation develops an interdisciplinary approach to identifying and interpreting such artifacts, referred to here by their ancient Greek name—keimêlia, meaning valued things that were kept or stored for extended periods. The corpus of keimêlia gathered for this investigation is drawn primarily from 8\textsuperscript{th} to 5\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. contexts across the Mediterranean, and encompassing the Greek heartland, colonies, and non-Greek communities. This broad chronological and geographic scope reveals a spectrum of behaviors toward old or damaged objects in diverse cultural contexts. The idiosyncratic nature of keimêlia and their uses requires that they be evaluated qualitatively rather than quantitatively. Case studies focusing on individual keimêlia explore how archaeologists might disentangle the motives for ancient curation (e.g. function, economics, aesthetics, and sentiment) and recognize the nuanced roles of keimêlia as companion objects, mementoes, heirlooms, entangled objects, antiques, and found objects. Comparative archaeology, ethnographic research, and modern consumer studies place keimêlia within
a larger framework by illuminating cross-cultural parallels in the attributes of objects from the past and their uses, including the assignment of magical or mythic significance to things from remote antiquity, the recurrent association of children with older objects, and the frequent curation of non-local or rare objects. These intersections suggest that the potential meanings of objects from the past—as talismans, mechanisms for articulating layers of a person or group’s identity, and mnemonic apparatuses—are related to different types of distance: temporal, cultural, and interpersonal. Although portable objects have been largely neglected in the recent wave of scholarship examining memory in the ancient Mediterranean, the study of keimēlia indicates that people here did, in fact, use objects to map their personal histories and to negotiate the place of that past in their present.
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EXPLANATORY NOTES

Standard reference works, journals, and book series are abbreviated according to the American Journal of Archaeology’s standards.

Greek spellings are preferred except in cases where another transliteration is more commonly accepted (i.e. Achilles instead of Akhilleus) and in the case of translated works.

Keimêlia documented in this survey are catalogued in several appendices: an archaeological appendix (Appendix 2), which includes artifacts that predated their depositional contexts significantly; an epigraphic appendix (Appendix 3), which gathers together artifacts with inscriptions narrating the objects’ prolonged life histories or their interconnectedness with human actors; a literary appendix of keimêlia (Appendix 4), which compiles testimonia describing objects with complex pasts; and a literary appendix of repair (Appendix 5), which gathers references to the breaking, mending, and repurposing of objects. References to the catalogue entries appear in bold in the text. Each numerical catalogue entry is preceded by a letter as a shorthand to direct the reader to the appropriate appendix. The following abbreviations are used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix Number</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Epigraphy</td>
<td>E.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>Keimêlia Testimonia</td>
<td>KT.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Repair Testimonia</td>
<td>RT.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

When Achilles bestows a phiale on the elderly King Nestor at the funeral games of Patroklos, he refers specifically to the mnemonic potential of “keimêlia”\(^1\)—objects that were kept in circulation or stored for extended periods. This episode of gift-giving marks merely the opening chapter in the phiale’s life story, yet other prestige goods described in the Homeric epics have more complex histories, punctuated by diverse events that may include their production, exchange, capture as booty, or disposal—all of which are moments when object and human worlds came into alignment.\(^2\) Because the lives of keimêlia are entangled with the lives of individuals, things frequently serve as oral cues in the epics, prompting speakers to recount not just object histories but human histories.\(^3\)

While the treasure with an elaborate biography is a recurrent trope in ancient Greek testimonia, objects have received relatively little note in the recent wave of

---

1 This term appears in the epics, the origins of which are traced to the second millennium B.C., although the poems were not written down until perhaps the Archaic period (West 2011, 108). As discussed below, the nuances of the word make it an appropriate shorthand for examples of ancient curation, both Greek and non-Greek, that are the focus of this investigation.

2 For example, Agamemnon’s scepter (\textit{Il.} 2.100-108) was made by Hephaistos for Zeus, given to Hermes and then to Pelops, Atreus, Thyestes, and Agamemnon. The silver krater Menelaus gives Telemachos (\textit{Od.} 4.611-655) was a gift from Phaidimos, king of Sidon. The silver krater offered as a prize at the funeral games of Patroklos (\textit{Il.} 23.740-749) was also from Sidon, transported by the Phoenicians, given to Thoas and then given to Patroklos by Priam’s son Euenos as a ransom for Lykaon.

3 Crielaard 2003, especially 56; see also Grethlein 2008, 36.
scholarship focused on perceptions of the past in the ancient Mediterranean. Yet archaeologists occasionally encounter candidates for actual *keimêlia* in the form of artifacts with signs of protracted use-lives. Such finds, which either predate their context significantly or exhibit ancient repairs, might be described as “curated” in antiquity. Lewis Binford is credited with introducing the term “curate” to anthropological and archaeological discourse. In a series of 1970’s ethnographic studies, he used the word—long associated with the worlds of art collecting and museums—to describe the behavior of the Nunamiuts, a modern hunter-gatherer group in north and northwestern Alaska. Instead of leaving the implements for hunting and processing game at kill sites, the Nunamiuts “curated” their equipment, meaning they brought tools home to be used on future hunting trips, repaired them when broken, and recycled or repurposed—rather than discarded—they at the end of their use-lives. In the last decade, the word “curate” has been recast in popular culture and the media. As one *New York Times* writer puts it, “[Curate] has become a fashionable code word among the aesthetically minded, who seem to paste it onto any activity that involves culling and selecting.” However, the definition adopted in this study adheres to the word’s Latin root *curare*: “to look after and preserve.”

Anachronistic and anomalous artifacts from ancient Mediterranean contexts have received uneven treatment in modern scholarship; some have been overlooked entirely or dismissed as “residual,” while others have been highlighted as curiosities or special

---

4 An observation also made by Hartmann (2010, 38).
6 Binford 1971; 1977, 34-6; 1978, 452. Binford’s ethnographic studies had significant ramifications for archaeologists’ understanding of taphonomy; he highlights discrepancies between the human activities at sites and the material remains of these behaviors.
7 Williams 2009.
8 OED, s.v. “curate.”
phenomena. Unlike previous discussions, which have approached this class of artifacts through isolated case studies, this dissertation examines *keimêlia* as a corpus, by first compiling a catalogue of artifacts with marks of ancient curation and then scrutinizing these objects’ microhistories in order to explore what *keimêlia* can tell us about the relationships between people and things in antiquity, the commemorative value of portable goods, and ancient attitudes toward the past in different Mediterranean communities.

The artifacts discussed here were identified through the systematic survey of excavation reports and museum catalogues. The specimens—the majority of which are ceramics for reasons discussed later—are drawn primarily from 8th to 5th century contexts in the Greek heartland, colonies, and non-Greek communities,9 including those of Etruria and Celtic and Iberian territories. This broad chronological, geographic, and cultural scope reveals a spectrum of behaviors toward old or damaged goods, and the patterns that emerge allow this investigation to address questions regarding the types of objects selected most often for preservation, the people with whom they were most frequently associated, and the circumstances in which they were deployed. A series of case studies illustrates how archaeologists might synthesize observations based on the physical attributes and contexts of *keimêlia* to access the motives underlying these ancient acts of object care. Because *keimêlia* found through excavation were curated by (now) anonymous individuals, the chapters of their object biographies remain mostly irrecoverable. Nevertheless, close readings of Greek thoughts and narratives articulated in textual sources, when taken into account alongside anthropological studies, ethnographic

---

9 The primary focus of this research is Greek settlements and colonies. Phoenician, Celtic, and Iberian remains were not studied systematically and are anecdotal, when mentioned.
research, and analyses of modern consumer practices, can suggest a range of meanings for *keimêlia* unearthed through archaeological investigations.

1. **Scholarship on the Past in the Past**

   Over the last three decades, scholarly interest in questions of social memory has soared within the humanities and social sciences. Students of the ancient world have embraced “memory” as a new lens through which old material can be refracted to yield alternative views of the past and through which we can assess the historical consciousness of early cultures. Some have noted, however, that “memory” is a problematic descriptor for the phenomenon of ancient people engaging with their past, and the term is used selectively in this study for cases where the processes of recollection

---

10 Debate continues over the origins of the so-called “memory boom,” as A. Huyssen (2003, 18) has dubbed it; see Nora 2002, 2001, xiv-xvii; Klein 2000, 143-5; Grethlein 2010, 1-4. Current memory discourse stems in large part from the works of Pierre Nora (2001), Maurice Halbwachs (1992), and Jan Assmann (2007). Assmann in particular integrates sociological analyses of memory into archaeological case studies; for commentary, see D. Berliner (2005, 199). It is generally accepted that the social and political conditions of the last century laid a fertile ground for questions of memory to take root (Nora 2002; Huyssen 2003, 14-8; Erll 2011, 3-5). Nora (2002) attributes the surge in memory studies to the “acceleration” of history-making in the rapidly changing modern world and the 20th century “democratization” of history. In the 1960’s, for example, formerly disenfranchised subjects of colonial powers began producing their own historical narratives, as did ethnic minorities and members of other oppressed social classes. Major anniversaries of World War II and debates over the Holocaust in the 1980’s and 1990’s fostered a milieu of reflection (Huyssen 2003, 12-3). On the academic front, postmodern thinking altered prevailing views of history by characterizing it as a human construct. This shift has undermined the archetype of the grand historical narrative and created a new paradigm of history based on multiple, sometimes contradictory, accounts (Klein 2000; Erll 2011, 5). Lastly, changes in the media and technology have increased our capacity to store information exponentially through hard drives and the Internet, yet the vastness of these data vaults has cultivated new anxieties about what is remembered and forgotten (Erll 2011, 12-3; Assmann 2007, vii).

11 As anthropologist Berliner observes, “memory” has come to denote not only the remembrance of past historical events but any element of the past that persists in the present (Berliner 2005, 200-1). Simply put, “Memory is a synonym for cultural storage of the past.” The prevalent use of the term “memory” makes an uncomfortable leap in logic that things which were preserved over time automatically prompted the recollection of the past. It assumes, for example, that memory is at play in the survival of an object for a century or the use of a monument 200 years after it was built, even when these things lack inscriptions to illuminate their significance. G. Algazi (2014, 29) notes that the “inflationary” modern use of the term memory assumes a dichotomy between memory and forgetting that glosses over more complex engagements with the past within a given society. These may include processes such as selective assimilation, imitation, disregard, or erasure, among others.
or remembrance might be operative. Nevertheless, the multitude of recent books,\textsuperscript{12} articles,\textsuperscript{13} and conferences\textsuperscript{14} devoted to Mediterranean peoples’ engagement with the events, monuments, and people of the past indicates that Classical philologists, historians, and archaeologists alike have been swept up in the wave of memory studies. This discourse mostly has taken shape independently among the sub-disciplines of Classical studies, yet each has made important contributions that inform the present interdisciplinary investigation.

1.1 Ancient Literature and Inscriptions

Greek testimonia—writings in multiple genres, as well as inscriptions—provide clear evidence that “the Hellenes were a memorious people”\textsuperscript{15} who contemplated the peoples and events of their past, as well as the relationship of the past to the present. Material and visual culture were keys to their commemorative ethos. At Greek cities and sanctuaries across the Mediterranean, inhabitants expressed deep interest in the physical remains of the past, whether real or invented. Often physical remains—both monuments and purported relics—served as proofs of the roles of different communities within pan-

\textsuperscript{12}Arrington 2015a; De Vivo 2014; Steinbock 2013; Low 2011; Schmitz 2011; Shear 2011; Grethlein 2010; Clarke 2008; Dunn 2007; Higbie 2003; Alcock 2002; Boardman 2002; Minchin 2001.


\textsuperscript{14} The Seventh Penn-Leiden Colloquium on Ancient Values, “Valuing Antiquity in Antiquity,” Leiden University, 15-16 June 2012 (Ker and Pieper 2014); the conference, “Attitudes toward the past in antiquity,” at Stockholm University, 2009 (Alroth and Scheffer 2014); the Sixth A.G. Leventis conference, “History without Historians: Greeks and their Past in the Archaic and Classical Era,” University of Edinburgh, 5-7 November 2009 (Marincola, Llewellyn-Jones, and Maciver 2012); a workshop, “Commemoration, Communal Memory, and Gender Values in the Ancient Greco-Roman World,” at the University of Gothenburg, 2008 (Whitaker 2011); a conference at the Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster (20-21 January 2006) which focused on Greek sanctuaries as \textit{lieux de mémoire} (Haahe and Jung 2011); and the international conference on death and commemoration from antiquity to the 18th century held at the University of Sheffield in 2006 (Carroll and Rempel 2011).

\textsuperscript{15} Alcock 2002, 23.
Mediterranean myth and history. Pfister offered an early, though still essential catalogue of testimonia referring to material remains (homes, weapons, sculptures, and body parts) that served as the focus of cult. In recent decades, the focus of inquiries into ancient views of the past has shifted, in part as a result of developments in the social sciences regarding the nature of individual and collective memory. Historians, once absorbed by matters such as the reconstruction and historicity of events recorded in the ancient texts, now acknowledge that all accounts of the past are, to some degree, interpretations. Because the reporting of the past in antiquity involved elements of invention or reworking, attention has turned to other questions, such as how these episodes—whether real or invented—were explained and what purpose they served in the ancient present. In addition, scholars now recognize that the past was conceptualized in

---

16 Examples are numerous. Hartmann (2010, 91-106) provides an overview and discusses temples in particular (107-19). The Lindian Chronicle is a key case of local residents claiming a rich past and creating a catalogue of dedications by famous visitors to the temple as evidence (Higbie 2003). Pretzler (1999, 107) discusses the sanctuary of Athena Alea and the significance of the objects, including some relics, in the formation of Tegean identity.

Although a later source, Pausanias abounds with stories of relics, often related by local guides (Pretzler 2007, 55). The histories of the cities he visits unfold as he discusses their monuments, relics, and artworks (Pretzler 2007, 118-48). It is noteworthy that many of the relics mentioned are objects of use, such as weapons, armor, vessels, and jewelry, made sacred by the fact that they were owned or dedicated by a famous individual. I thank A. Kuttner for reminding me of this distinction.

As C. Higbie (2014) notes, the practice of creating histories through relics was so widespread that forgeries abounded in some periods, particularly the 1st through 3rd centuries A.D.

18 See n. 10.

19 Marincola 2012, 12 (although, as he reminds us, concern persists for more practical matters, such as when and how events unfolded). Remembering is a “dynamic mental process” (Steinbock 2013, 11). The retrieval of memories requires the “re-forming or re-structuring of the ‘original’ memory” (Thomas 1989, 12).

20 For example, Steinbock (2013) examines the image of Thebes in the social memory of 5th century Athens. He focuses on several noteworthy episodes, including Thebes’ medizing (480-479 B.C.) and the Thebans’ failure to allow the fallen Argives who marched against their city to be buried. Reductionist versions of these events were invoked rhetorically in Athens into the 4th century, painting Thebes into a negative exemplum.

In another case study, McInerney (2014) argues against the positivistic interpretation of the Pelasgians as early inhabitants of the Mediterranean. Instead, he proposes that these mythical people were a flexible construct. In some accounts, the Pelasgians represented a group from the distant past (the “plupast”) and thus allowed Greeks of the historical period to imagine different communities coexisting in their landscape.
Greek (and Roman) antiquity at different scales: a mythical or legendary, distant past (the ‘plupast’); a nearer past, perhaps a generation or two removed; and a past within living memory.\(^{21}\) As we will see, temporal distance is also a key determinant of the potentialities of *keimêlia*.

The past was not solely the domain of historians; Greek poets, elegists, tragedians, and orators cultivated a broad historical consciousness even prior to the advent of quasi-historical writings, such as those of Herodotus and Thucydides.\(^{22}\) In addition to this public discourse, private families transmitted information about their lineages orally. Although sources suggest that this ancestral knowledge rarely extended beyond an awareness of grandfathers or great grandfathers, except in the case of aristocratic clans,\(^{23}\) it is important to be mindful of these largely lost private histories. Citations of historic events in the context of interregional conflicts of the 6\(^{th}\) and 5\(^{th}\) centuries further attest to the authority of the past.\(^{24}\) As C. Higbie has shown, the invocation of tradition to resolve issues between Archaic and Classical Greek communities indicates that historical precedent was a meaningful form of argumentation. Moreover, the fact that far-flung Greek-speaking peoples maintained local histories confirms the importance of propagating an awareness of the past\(^{25}\)—and perhaps also reflects anxieties regarding the fragility of memory. The past could be revitalized at key moments; for example, J. Shear argues that the past—embodied by law codes,

\(^{21}\) Dunn 2007, 12-36.

\(^{22}\) In general, Marincola 2012 (1-13); Minchin (2001) focuses on oratory; Grethlein (2010) examines references to the past in several genres; Steinbock (2013) and Shear (2013) are concerned primarily with oratory.

\(^{23}\) Thomas 1989, 106.

\(^{24}\) Higbie 1997.

\(^{25}\) Clarke 2008.
monuments, and public rituals—was marshalled in Athens in the wake of the oligarchic revolution at the end of the 5th century in order to forge a direct link between the new Athenian democracy and the city’s now-ancestral constitution. At the same time, F. Dunn has argued persuasively that the authority of the past was not monolithic in Classical culture. He observes a turn toward the present at the end of the 5th century in philosophical writings, tragedy, and even the ways in which people accounted for the passage of time. In sum, testimonia of the 6th and 5th centuries show that the past was contemplated and mobilized in complex ways at all levels of society. The omnipresence of the past in public discourse was also reflected materially, as we will see below.

1.2 Archaeology

Archaeologists working in various parts of the Mediterranean have mapped a range of ways in which inhabitants of diverse landscapes interacted with the physical traces of earlier generations at different historical moments. Testimonia both confirm and shed light on many of these behaviors, which include curation, reuse, augmentation and monumentalization, destruction, and neglect. Material remains are critical for illuminating ancient attitudes toward the past, since commemorative acts are not always recorded in testimonia, and physical evidence is sometimes at odds with official, written documents.

---

26 Shear 2011.
27 Dunn 2007.
28 For example, temple inventories record objects that were curated in the gods’ treasuries: for treasuries in general, Hamilton 2000; the Temple of Athena Lindia, Shaya 2005, Higbie 2003; the Epidaurian iamata, LiDonnici 1995. Finds from Troy, Samos, and Messenia suggest that fossils also may have been preserved in temple storerooms (Mayor 2000, 178-91).
29 E.g., the traveling temples of the Roman period in Greece (Alcock 2002, 54-8); the reuse of Bronze Age graves in the historic period (Antonaccio 1995).
30 E.g., the Agora of Athens in the Roman period (Alcock 2002, 58-64).
32 For a brief survey of the variety of commemorative acts, see Crawford 2007.
Possible links between the etiology of certain Greek myths and physical remains have been proposed by A. Mayor and J. Boardman. Mayor develops the intriguing hypothesis that fossil bones discovered in antiquity may have inspired tales of monsters, fantastical creatures like griffins, and the enormous bones of heroes. Boardman incorporates Mayor’s ideas into his *Archaeology of Nostalgia*, a popular treatment of the past in the past, but he expands upon her ideas by including the remains of earlier human occupants of Mediterranean landscapes. He suggests, for example, that Bronze Age assemblages uncovered by Greeks of the historical period might have given rise to specific myths and stories, such as the murder of Agamemnon in the bath or the gods’ cooking of Pelops’ shoulder blade. If accepted, Mayor and Boardman’s hypotheses indicate that the Greeks’ relationship with their past was a dialectic; ancient material remains shaped Greek myth, but, in turn, these relics were deployed selectively to validate such stories.

Much of the archaeological research concerning the past in Greek antiquity consists of case studies focused on ancient engagements with the monuments of earlier generations or permanent topographical features. C. Antonaccio’s survey of post-Bronze Age activity at prehistoric tombs has revealed distinctive regional patterns for the Greek mainland, Cyclades, and Ionian islands from the 11th through 7th centuries B.C. Her research suggests that, in at least some regions, such as Messenia, the past was invoked to
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33 Mayor 2000; Boardman 2002.
34 Boardman 2002.
35 He makes some interesting, though speculative, proposals: the account of Agamemnon’s murder in the bath perhaps was spurred by the discovery of Mycenaean *larnakes* (52); the story of the cooking of the shoulder blade of Pelops may have originated with the discovery of cremation urns in Bronze Age tombs (54).
36 Boardman 2002, 189.
37 Antonaccio 1995.
bolster political and territorial claims.\textsuperscript{38} S. Alcock has examined “memory communities” in several regions of Greece where the past was used to different effects: Old Greece in the early Roman Empire; Hellenistic Crete; and Messenia from the Archaic through the Hellenistic periods.\textsuperscript{39} Although the Romans destroyed many landmarks in the Greek province of Achaia, they preserved and reappropriated others which could be syncretized with Roman values. For example, the efflorescence of the cults of Aphrodite and Ares during the Roman occupation of Greece reflects the importance of Venus and Mars in the Roman pantheon, and the ancient sociopolitical hub of Athens—particularly the Agora—became a center for learning for Roman intellectuals and tourists.\textsuperscript{40} The ideology underlying Cretan activities around Bronze Age architecture, tombs, and artifacts in the Hellenistic period is more obscure, yet Alcock proposes that warring polities and rivaling aristocratic families turned toward the \textit{cadre matériel} of distant prehistoric periods to make territorial claims in the tumultuous 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.\textsuperscript{41} For the mainland, she argues that generations of oppression by Spartan overlords fostered a sense of community among the Messenians based on notions of a shared past. Following the liberation of the helots by Epaminondas (370/369 B.C.), this long dormant solidarity could be expressed

\textsuperscript{38} Antonaccio convincingly associates increased activity at Bronze Age tombs in Messenia with later sociopolitical struggles. Tomb cult is attested there almost continually from the end of the Bronze Age but shows a sharp decline in the late 8\textsuperscript{th} century—the time of the Spartan conquest. Activity centered on Bronze Age tombs renewed following the expulsion of the Lakonians in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century. Antonaccio offers two possible explanations: the newly liberated Messenians reclaimed monuments from the past in order to assert their identity as the rightful heirs of the region; or the power vacuum gave rise to competition between individuals or groups who used the prehistoric tombs to negotiate status (Antonaccio 1995, 142). However, Boardman (2002, 60-1) cautions against assuming that the reuse of Bronze Age tombs was expressly political and not simply circumstantial; population expansion likely brought people into contact with forgotten structures of earlier epochs.

\textsuperscript{39} Alcock 2002.

\textsuperscript{40} Alcock 2002, 36-98.

\textsuperscript{41} Alcock 2002, 99-131.
materially. Hence, the number of dedications at early (Bronze Age) tombs increased, and new myths were invented for ancient landmarks.42

Greece in the aftermath of the Persian invasions of 480/479 B.C., which directly touched upon Thrace, Macedon, the Cyclades, Euboia, and Attika, has proven especially fruitful for examinations of attitudes toward the past via archaeological remains, particularly in Athens and Attika. In the three decades immediately following the attacks, the Athenians and the people of Attika adopted several approaches to the sculpture and architecture damaged in the siege; they left some burnt walls and statues in ruins on the Akropolis as perpetual reminders of the horrors endured; other broken statues were buried in deposits now known as Perserschutt; parts of the older Parthenon and the Temple of Athena Polias were incorporated into the north wall of the citadel; and blocks from the older Parthenon were set into the foundations of the Parthenon of Perikles.43 R. Kousser encourages us to imagine that the column drums, blocks of entablature, and other spolia in the citadel walls were selected not simply for practical reasons but because they would be easily recognizable as components of temples from a distance as they are today. The fragments would have stood out in the masonry due to their distinctive forms and color, whether they were white marble or painted. In this manner, the architectural elements would have fostered remembrance. The Persian destruction debris thus assumed a key place in the walls of the Akropolis, which already served as a veritable museum of the city’s history; also preserved were sections of the Mycenaean fortifications that later were showcased in hollows built into the Classical Nike bastion.44 By contrast, Kousser

42 Alcock 2002, 143-73.
44 Rhodes 1995, 39-40. I thank A. Kuttner for reminding me of the relevance of the Mycenaean remains on the Akropolis to the treatment of the debris from the Persian invasions.
notes, debris from the invasion in the Agora and Kerameikos was disposed of quickly or reused as building material. Beyond Athens, Miles has documented evidence of temples burnt by the Persian invaders in greater Attika, including the sites of Eleusis, Rhamnous and Sounion. The trauma of the foreign invasion thus elicited a range of responses that shifted over time: in the close aftermath, non-interference, cleanup, and the disposal of debris; and decades later, the curation of vestiges of the attacks and the creation of monuments, such as the Parthenon, that were at least partially commemorative in their original intention. Damaged or displaced architectural elements were conspicuous reminders of the widespread, violent upheavals that had struck Hellenic communities. The display and recycling of architectural fragments might have expressed different ideologies simultaneously—“an eternal lament” for the injuries suffered and a declaration of the Greeks’ enduring strength.

1.3 **Common Ground: The Nature of the Past**

Although philologists and Classical archaeologists have tapped into different evidence to explore ancient attitudes toward the past, they have arrived at several common conclusions, which align closely with current thinking about the nature of memory in general. First, the past is “constructed,” meaning that all records of the past—historical and oral accounts, monuments, landscapes, and portable objects—are interpreted in the eyes of the present. Second, memories of the past are activated and maintained through “performance,” including activities that are both routine and ritual or
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45 Miles 2014.
46 Hurwit 1999, 70.
47 Kousser 2009, 271.
48 Yoffee 2007, 4; Connerton 1989.
exceptional.\textsuperscript{49} Third, because of the malleability of memory, a plurality of readings is possible for each event or vestige of the past.\textsuperscript{50} Finally, the activation of memories can be highly structured (as when official ceremonies commemorate past events) or highly personal (as when individuals recall their past whether consciously or subconsciously).\textsuperscript{51} The idiosyncratic nature of remembrance means that it often defies patterning and is therefore difficult to detect archaeologically.\textsuperscript{52}

1.4 \textit{The Neglect of Portable Goods}

Despite archaeologists’ explicit concern with the material remains of the past, portable goods have been largely left out of the dialogue regarding the past in antiquity, or they have been conflated with monuments.\textsuperscript{53} Alcock, for example, defines monuments as “places, structures, or objects deliberately designed, or later agreed, to provoke memories.”\textsuperscript{54} She lists an array of examples: cenotaphs, columns, tombs, trees, statues, weapons, votives, obelisks, inscriptions, unworked stones, henges, and tumuli. As she explains, all of these entities have the potential to forge a link between past, present and future by virtue of their enduring material presence.\textsuperscript{55} Through their physicality, things can effect “folds” in time,\textsuperscript{56} collapsing past into present and integrating the past into the present in potentially meaningful ways. While things in general serve as a stabilizing

\textsuperscript{49} Yoffee 2007, 3.
\textsuperscript{50} Hartmann 2010, 28.
\textsuperscript{51} For example, Foxhall (2012, 201-4) has discussed how weaving implements used regularly by women in ancient communities might have been the focus of women’s remembrance.
\textsuperscript{52} Button 2007, 96.
\textsuperscript{53} This practice begins with Pfister (1909; 1912). Exceptions include Nizzo 2010; Grethlein 2008; Whitley 2002.
\textsuperscript{54} Alcock 2002, 28. Although writing from a philological perspective, Grethlein, when discussing the mnemonic potential of material culture in the Homeric epics, treats portable objects as if on equal footing to fixed monuments (Grethlein 2012, 22-3).
\textsuperscript{55} Alcock 2002, 28.
\textsuperscript{56} Witmore 2006, 278-81.
force for human life,\textsuperscript{57} different objects have different affordances, and portable goods like weapons and votives are inherently different from fixed monuments like obelisks and henges. Not physically anchored to any one place, moveable objects can be recontextualized in myriad ways, including being incorporated into ceremonies, worn, displayed, exchanged, amassed, dedicated, or—most fundamentally—owned.\textsuperscript{58} Monuments require people to go to a fixed locus for remembrance, whereas portable goods allow people to decide when and where memories might be activated. Among other capacities, objects can encourage remembrance by conjuring up images of past bodily interactions, as when people imagine those who are now old or deceased having actually held, touched, or worn an object. In essence, portable goods offer a greater degree of control over commemoration.

Hartmann traces the neglect of portable goods in recent discussions of perceptions of the past in the antiquity to the Renaissance and Reformation, when learned scholars began questioning the validity of relics.\textsuperscript{59} Additional factors may be cited for the paucity of objects in archaeological discussions of the past in the past in Greco-Roman antiquity. First, artifacts frequently play an ancillary role in archaeological research, with small finds serving principally as the means for dating and characterizing sites.\textsuperscript{60} Often unearthed in a fragmentary state, artifacts can be difficult to identify and interpret in and of themselves, much less be placed into a cognitive framework of remembrance. The dim view of things that emerges from the material record is matched by Archaic and Classical testimonia, which rarely discuss things at length—that is, with the exception of sanctuary

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{57}Arendt 1958, 137.
\textsuperscript{58}Lillios 1999, 242.
\textsuperscript{59}Hartmann 2010, 40.
\textsuperscript{60}White and Beaudry 2009, 211.
\end{footnotesize}
inventories and the *ekphraseis* in epics. Historical sources typically do not touch much upon daily life, including people’s interactions with objects. The anthropocentric nature of written sources might be construed as indication of objects’ relative insignificance in everyday life and commemorative practices. However, this is an *argumentum ex silentio*: ancient authors continually tout the importance of their writings, while objects lack the voices to proclaim their own value. Moreover, 4th century writers, such as Aristotle (*Pol.* 1278A, 1337b8), cast the makers of objects in a negative light, characterizing craftsmen as *banausoi* (individuals who did not own land but earned a living only through manual labor for others).  

Lastly, the downplaying of portable objects in discussions of the past in antiquity may be to some degree a response to criticisms of the discipline of Classical archaeology and, in particular, the study of Greek painted pottery. In the 1980’s and 1990’s, Michael Vickers and David Gill developed a powerful thesis asserting that modern regard for figured pottery—epitomized by the exorbitant prices fetched by Greek pots on the art market and connoisseurs’ painstaking attempts to identify vase-painters’ hands—reflects contemporary values rather than the ancient reality. They argue that Greek painted pottery was, in fact, of little monetary value in antiquity; rather, true wealth was counted in plate (gold, silver, and bronze) vessels, purple and figural textiles, and ivory. Although such objects might well have been kept as *keimêlia*, they mostly cannot be taken into account for this study because of their poor survival rates owing to the fact that valubles of organic materials deteriorated and those of metal frequently were recycled.
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61 Ulrich 2013, 802.
62 For a useful summary of the critique of Beazley’s methods of attribution and its subsequent application, see Sparkes (2010, 106-9).
64 Vickers and Gill 1994, 33.
According to Vickers and Gill, scholars, in essence, have projected modern esteem for Attic black- and red-figure pottery onto ancient consumers. Their characterization of vase-painting as a “craft” aimed at producing utilitarian vessels, rather than “art” for art’s sake, resonated with many students of vase-painting, who recognize that not all pots are meticulously drawn, and many might be described as derivative. Nevertheless, a small percentage of vases, such as those of Exekias, the Berlin Painter, and the Meidias Painter, among others, exhibit exceptional craftsmanship and consistent, original artistry, in line with works that would be categorized as “art” according to traditional definitions. Although the scholarly community mostly has rejected Vickers’ and Gill’s hypotheses as extreme, this attack on the tenets of vase-painting studies has led to a re-centering of research agendas, resulting in a greater focus on pots in their archaeological contexts, the vase trade, and technical studies. The minimal inquiry into the mnemonic value of portable goods—especially pottery—may be an extension of the effort to separate modern archaeological research from the pursuits of the antiquarians, long reviled for fetishizing ancient art.

As the most abundant and ubiquitous category of surviving archaeological evidence, artifacts deserve a more substantial role in the dialogue regarding the uses of the past in antiquity. While monuments and landscapes tend to reflect public behaviors that can be connected to larger historical narratives, things presented an ownable, movable past. Nevertheless, we should note that objects may have been exposed at some point to a communal gaze, as, for example, when people at a funeral take in the grave
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65 Sparkes 2010, 96; Robertson 1992, 2-3; Robertson 1991, 3-5.
68 Sparkes 2010, 96; Oakley 2009.
goods assembled or when an individual wears something in a public ceremony or when a seasoned serving vessel is used in a symposium. Curated objects, like these, provide windows into the active role of the past in the lives of individuals in antiquity.

2. **Keimêlia in Context: Approach and Structure**

This dissertation develops an interdisciplinary approach for identifying and analyzing ancient examples of curated objects in the material record and illustrates the methodology through a series of case studies. The introduction (Chapter 1) outlines the aims and challenges of the project, defines key terms, and lays out theoretical foundations, including recent research in both archaeological and anthropological circles on the value of “things,” materiality, object biography and memory. It briefly describes a methodology for identifying and interpreting curated objects (*keimêlia*) in the material record and explains the theoretical underpinnings of the decision to present several possible interpretations for the data rather than a single narrative. This approach is informed by postcolonial and feminist thinking, which encourage the investigation of alternative points of view. Also influential is multivocality, a way of writing about culture that acknowledges the existence of multiple narratives. This type of approach is well suited to capture the dynamic interrelationships of human and object worlds and the ambiguity inherent to our archaeological evidence.

Chapter 2 focuses on artifacts that can be designated *keimêlia* in the most basic sense of the ancient term: things laid up in store. The reexamination of diverse archaeological assemblages and close dating of their components has yielded a corpus of candidates for *keimêlia*, which were at least several decades old at the time of deposition and, therefore, may have either spanned an individual’s lifetime or bridged generations.
These objects are presented in Appendix 2, along with detailed information about their contexts. For a guide to the appendices and the numbering of the catalogue entries, see explanatory notes (p. viii). The catalogue entries serve as points of departure for case studies exploring the function and significance of storied objects at a given site. The values proposed for the *keimêlia* discussed are diverse, including functional, magical, economic, socio-political, and emotional.69

Chapter 3 examines others forms of curation attested in antiquity, particularly acts of repair, reappropriation, and the keeping of objects in a fragmented state. Ancient mending practices have begun to receive greater scholarly attention recently, but most studies have focused on technical—rather than social—aspects of repair. This two-part chapter consists of a survey of mended artifacts (mostly Greek ceramics) culled from publications of excavation data and museum collections worldwide. Although the findspots of many specimens are unknown, the wares, shapes, and styles represented most frequently among the repaired objects point to the characteristics that contributed to their longevity. The second part of this chapter presents a handful of case studies illustrating how attention to the use-contexts of repaired artifacts, and not solely their chronological and geographic contexts (the focus of previous studies), might move analyses beyond economic explanations toward more nuanced inquiries into the sociopolitical and emotional significance of things in antiquity. Both Chapters 2 and 3 integrate ancient testimony regarding antiques, repairs, and the narratives associated with objects kept across time.
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69 Researchers on modern consumer practices break down the sources of the value of objects into different categories: utility; enjoyment; reflections of interpersonal relationships; expressing identity and selfhood (Richins 1994, 507).
Chapter 4 probes recurrent themes in the uses and forms of *keimêlia*, and considers them in light of research in anthropology, ethnography, and modern consumer practices. Although some may question the decision to introduce studies based on other cultures and modern society to the investigation of the ancient Mediterranean, as Mary Helms observes, we seldom have a complete record for any given society, and these sources serve as a font of new ideas. Discussing such comparative material cautiously is a “middle ground between speculation and extreme rigidity.”\(^{70}\) The broader trends identified include the magical qualities of things from deep antiquity, the association of children with curated objects, and the prominence of exotic or distinctive objects among those selected for preservation. Chapter 5 concludes by presenting working models of the different types of *keimêlia* and their potentials based on types of distance (temporal, cultural or geographic, and relational). The aim is to provide scholars with a broadly applicable framework for evaluating the significance of objects from the past uncovered through archaeological investigation.

### 2.1 Defining Terms

The word “*keimêlion*” (κειμήλιον; pl. κειμήλια) is used throughout this dissertation as a succinct descriptor for objects with signs of ancient curation. The term, which denotes “anything stored up as valuable,” “treasure,” “heirloom,” or “relic,”\(^{71}\) derives from the verb κειμα, meaning “to be situated,” “to lie,” or “to be laid up in
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\(^{70}\) Helms 1988, 7.

\(^{71}\) Liddell and Scott 1996, s.v. “κειμήλιον.” Bichler (2007) uses the word as a catchall term for his discussion of luxury goods in the *Odyssey*, although he also briefly discusses select occurrences of the word in the epic (37-8).
store.” 72 For a full list of ancient citations, see Appendix 1. “Keimêlion” is attested as early as the Homeric epics. 73 Much controversy surrounds the origins of the poems, including who Homer was (e.g. whether there was indeed one poet Homer or there were many authors as the epics were transmitted orally), when and where he lived, and what society is reflected in the narratives (e.g. a Bronze Age society, so-called ‘Dark Age’ society, an imagined view of the Bronze Age, or a hybrid culture that draws elements from both the Bronze and Dark Ages). 74 Tackling these Homeric Question(s) is beyond the scope of this study, but suffice it to say that, although the epics were transmitted orally perhaps as early as the later second millennium B.C., they carried panhellenic resonance for many centuries and were regarded as the cornerstone of Greek education by the historic period. 75 The ideas expressed in the epics regarding objects and their potentials were familiar to Greeks of the Archaic and Classical periods and may have been adopted to some degree by people of these historical periods. A short discussion of keimêlion’s usage in antiquity reveals that it is a capacious and nuanced term appropriate for the artifacts that comprise the core of this study. I use it even for objects in non-Greek contexts, since it is a valuable single word for describing things kept and cared for across time.

Keimêlia in the surviving Greek epics seem to be equated with inalienable possessions, things that are so intrinsically linked to their original owner(s) that they cannot be fully disassociated even as they are transmitted from one generation to the next. Annette Weiner develops the concept of the inalienable possession, the value of

72 Liddell and Scott 1996, s.v. “κείμαι.”
73 The word is used today by modern Greek speakers to describe family heirlooms.
74 The bibliography is vast: for the Homeric Question, see West 2010. Essays in Morris and Powell (1997) by Bennet, Morris, and Raaflaub treat various aspects of the question of Homeric society.
75 For an exegesis of the complexity of dating the epics, see West (2011).
which stems not only from its material worth or fine craftsmanship but from its links to a series of owners united by their knowledge of the object’s history. Inalienable possessions travel not via short term, commodity exchanges, such as sales, but through long-term exchanges, which are based on principles of reciprocity (e.g. gifts between guest friends). Hektor, in trying to communicate the devastation at Troy to his audience, remarks that the *keimêlia* of the kingdom have now been sold, i.e. not gifted (*Il.* 18.288-292). In other words, these inalienable possessions were transmitted from the realm of long-term exchange to short-term exchange—two spheres that ought to be kept separate. The fact that the fate of the *keimêlia* is tantamount to the demise of the kingdom shows how intrinsically linked these objects were to the royal household. Indeed, the search for *keimêlia* was the reason why the residences of the wealthy were targeted in invasions. *Keimêlia* were stored wealth that could be liquidated at times of distress (e.g. when a city was under siege) or under other exceptional circumstances (e.g. to pay a ransom).

Even in its earliest occurrences, the word *keimêlion* carries a connotation of remembrance. The term appears most often in the plural in the works of Homer and Hesiod, where it describes undifferentiated masses of treasures, whether valuables stored in rich men’s dwellings, spoils, ransoms, or gifts acquired through guest friendships. In fact, owning *keimêlia* seems to be one of the criteria for membership in the elite class of the Homeric age. Yet, the few passages that mention specific objects expose other shades of meaning. The excerpt from the *Iliad* cited in the opening of this chapter, for example, describes a phiale as a “*keimêlion.*” Achilles bestows the vessel—intended for
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76 Weiner 1985, 6-7.
77 Gottesdam 2010.
80 Bichler 2007, 38.
the fifth place contender in the chariot race at the funeral games of Patroklos — on Nestor, although the elderly king had not competed. As he hands over the phiale, Achilles explains his gift: it is a small compensation for the burdens the Pylian king must endure in his old age and a “keimêlion” to be kept as a “mnêma,” or memento, of the event (Il. 23.618). The notion that a stored object could be a vehicle of memory is echoed in the Odyssey, when Penelope surveys the “keimêlia” (Od. 21.9) in the storerooms of Odysseus. Here, she beholds the distinctive bow and quiver that Iphitos of Messene had given to Odysseus in an exchange between friends. Homer expressly notes that Odysseus did not take these weapons to Troy but kept them in Ithaka as a mnêma of the alliance (Od. 21.40). The pan-Hellenic resonance of the Homeric epics, which served as status markers of elite culture for many centuries, suggests that these and other capacities of long-lived objects might have been adopted into mainstream practice in the historical period; see below for a discussion of the 8th century cup of Nestor (p. 108).

The 6th century philosopher and poet Xenophanes also invokes the commemorative connotation of keimêlia in a fragmentary elegy (fr. 2.9) decrying the lavish treatment of Olympic winners by their home towns. A victor was given a front row seat at future games, food at state expense, and a gift (dôron) to be kept as a “keimêlion” (although the writer does not disclose what types of objects were offered as gifts). In this passage, the term can denote a stored treasure, but Lescher’s translation “keepsake” is also apt, since this single object commemorated a pivotal event in the athlete’s life that defined his future within the city.
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81 As Crielaard (2003, 56-7) notes, Odysseus’ decision to not take the bow to Troy underscores its significance and demonstrates how individuals became curators of objects by deciding what would be removed from circulation.

Later 5th and 4th century authors apply the term to a broader set of referents, including people and abstract concepts. In Euripides’ *Heraklidai* (591), for example, when Makaria the daughter of Herakles sacrifices her life to save the race of the Heraklidai, she proclaims that her deeds will be the “*keimêlia*” (rewards) she gains instead of the joys of her maidenhood and future children. The king in Euripides’ fragmentary *Erechtheus* (*Fr. Nauk.* 362, 4), as a final act before death, conveys to his adopted son the kernels of wisdom (“*keimêlia*”) he amassed over his lifetime. The tragedian plays here with the epic connotations of *keimêlia* as material rewards for heroic exploits to heighten the *pathos* and emphasize the nobility of his protagonists, who extol the virtues of spiritual rewards instead.

Instances of “*keimêlia*” and its variants in Plato’s *Laws* (mid-4th century) suggest that valuables stored over time held a sanctity—almost a magical power. In a dialogue regarding property (913.8), the Athenian interlocutor states that if someone comes across *keimêlia* belonging to another person or family, he should not touch these things unless he has permission. Although removing these treasures could bring financial gain, the finder would receive a superior spiritual reward if he were to leave them alone. The Athenian goes on say: “And men ought also to believe the stories told about these matters—that such conduct is injurious to the begetting of children.” The phrasing implies that knowledge of the risks of tampering with another family’s treasures was commonplace, and the consequences were serious—tantamount to curtailing a lineage. The discussion also implies that such practices were common enough to warrant oversight. The Athenian then describes the penalties prescribed by the law (for those who

---

83 Trans. R.G. Bury (1926).
do not fear the wrath of higher powers). The word appears in adjectival form in another passage that also intimates the talismanic power of such things. In a section discussing the importance of honoring one’s parents, bedridden parents are called “keiméloi” (Laws 931a.5). The association between elders and relics goes beyond their immobility; members of the older generation, like Nestor, were living archives, safeguarding knowledge and memories for their family or community.84 According to the passage, these elders deserve the utmost respect, since they can bring the greatest blessings to their children or the greatest curses. Whether inanimate or human, things described with variants of the word keimêlion are stationary entities that paradoxically were thought to exercise significant agency. Moreover, it appears that their old age corresponded to their perceived inviolability and power.

“Keimêlion” is attested only twice in the epigraphic corpus, and in both cases, poor preservation prevents us from grasping the true sense of the word. The earliest example appears on an Attic black-figure lekythos said to be from Cyprus.85 On the body is a coarsely rendered banqueting scene, typical of the Class of Athens 581 ii, the early 5th century workshop to which the vessel is attributed. The inscription was incised post-firing below the shoulder: “Ερμαῖος με εὔρε κείμηλιον ἄλλων…”86 The reading of the first four words is uncontroversial; however, the last word is disputed. The original publication of 1862 gives ἄλλων (“Hermaios found me, a treasure of others”), whereas Volioti and Papageorgiou propose several alternatives, including a proper name in the

84 I thank T. Tartaron for reminding me of this interesting connection.
86 ΗΕΡΜΑΙΟΣ ΜΕ ΕΥΡΕ ΚΕΙΜΕΛΙΟΝ
dative (“Hermaios found me, a treasure for [someone]”) or a misspelling of ἄϑλος (“Hermaios found me, trophy for a contest”). Without contextual data or comparable inscriptions, it is difficult to assess these possibilities. In the second epigraphic occurrence, keimêlia is interpreted more convincingly as “prizes.” This late 4th century epigram on the base of an honorary statue in Argos states that the athlete Kleainetos was given keimêlia to be placed in his home after his victories in the Pythian, Nemean, Lykaian, Heraian, and Asklepian games—as well as the Isthmian games, if a revised transcription by Ebert is accepted. Cherneux proposes that the epigram’s author selected keimêlia, a rather uncommon word in the epigraphic corpus, specifically for its epic undertones, which would have likened the victor to the heroes of the distant past, who won riches—also described as keimêlia—through their exploits. Presumably, educated onlookers, who were conversant in the epics, would have grasped this nuance.

This brief foray into the meanings of keimêlia establishes the utility of the word for describing the phenomena that this study aims to explore: objects with values beyond their material worth. Keimêlia were not simply old things placed in storage. They were objects preserved for their capacity to stimulate remembrance, to encapsulate knowledge, and—perhaps in some instances—to deflect harm. These potentialities were acquired over time, as things developed patina and became enmeshed in the lives of different individuals. The significance of keimêlia derived at least in part from their connections, whether their routine use, contact with important people (e.g. the bequest of jewelry from Volioti and Papageorgiou 2008, 22. SEG 35-267. Charneux 1985. Charneux 1985, 370-2. Charneux 1985, 370-2.
a mother to her daughter), involvement in meaningful occasions (e.g. coming-of-age rites and marriage), or—in some cases, as we will see—their projected role in the future.

2.2 Methodology

Both identifying and interpreting keimêlia in the material record pose significant methodological challenges. Before embarking on a discussion of the data, it is important to address these concerns and to provide a simple outline of the approach adopted here. First, keimêlia were, by definition, extraordinary objects and comprised a very small subcategory of the material world even in antiquity. They do not abound in the archaeological record, and many of the most treasured pieces undoubtedly were made of perishable materials which have not survived or metals that were melted down for plate. Hence, the absence or paucity of keimêlia should not be taken as indication of the unimportance of things from the past within a given household or community. For these reasons, keimêlia must be evaluated qualitatively rather than quantitatively.

Second, taphonomic processes introduce a complex set of issues, so that only a limited range of archaeological contexts are useful for detecting keimêlia through chronological discrepancies. Objects may survive by chance through multiple periods of occupation, or, alternatively, they may come to the surface as a result of natural or anthropogenic processes. This phenomenon—residuality—is especially pronounced at multi-phase sites where inhabitants’ activities were liable to disturb earlier strata.91 As Evans and Millett observe, both residuality and object curation can account for the presence of earlier artifacts in later contexts. They are rightfully skeptical about the
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91 Evans and Millett, 225.
feasibility of identifying so-called heirlooms in archaeological contexts, since it is highly difficult to infer intentionality from mute, fragmentary evidence and, thus, to make a distinction between artifacts that were churned up over time and those that were curated. As a result, many of the objects that can be identified positively as *keimêlia* come from graves, a fact that raises interesting interpretive issues, since these objects had been removed from circulation (i.e. alienated from the living world) ritually. Nevertheless, we may still refer to chronologically out-of-sync objects in graves as *keimêlia* because temporal discrepancies indicate that these objects had been kept or treasured above ground for an extended period.

Third, in order to designate an artifact as a *keimêlion*, the object as well as the other items from the context must be datable within a narrow enough time frame to detect a difference of some two decades or more. Dating artifacts with precision is a perennial difficulty for archaeologists, but achieving this type of chronological resolution is even thornier. This study aims to use the most accurate dates possible for the artifacts catalogued, often relying on specialists’ assessments in matters of chronology; however, we must recognize the limitations of dating based on typologies. Whereas the tight chronology worked out for Attic figured pottery allows us to locate some vases within a decade or two based on painters’ hands, other classes of artifacts cannot always be assigned to a sufficiently narrow range. With rarer object types, such as metals and jewelry, or understudied classes, such as native Italic ceramics, a full typological seriation may not be available. In addition, many of these artifact classes exhibit conservative morphologies, making it difficult to anchor them within an absolute
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chronology. When chronological precision is not possible for these reasons—or because the context is disturbed—ancient repairs can serve as indicators of an object’s value to its ancient owners. The decision to restore rather than discard a damaged object implies a desire to prolong its life. In this sense, a mend is a first step toward making something a keimêlion. Both an artifact’s age in relation to the date of its context and signs of ancient use or restoration are features that can facilitate the reconstruction of an object’s biography. As will be discussed below, object biography is a key analytical framework for this investigation, since it allows archaeologists see artifacts as diachronic entities with the potential to accumulate histories.

The factors that compelled people to keep old or broken objects (especially when they had the option of acquiring new, undamaged products) are diverse and potentially overlapping. Bilde and Handberg break down the possible motives usefully into four main groups (“aesthetic, functional, sentimental, and economic”93) that will be treated in depth later. At this juncture, it is important to acknowledge what is perhaps the most controversial aim of the present project: endeavoring to understand ancient people’s reasons for curating their possessions when our sole pieces of evidence are the mute artifacts that survive. Boardman rightly points out the problematic nature of attempting to extrapolate the former significance of an archaeological anachronism without the aid of an inscription. He writes: “An object placed in a far later tomb or dedicated in a far later shrine may never have been recognized as belonging to an heroic past, rather than having been a family heirloom or simply a curiosity, and for the most part we are looking for

93 Guldager Bilde and Handberg 2012, 473.
reasons which go beyond simple family possession.” It would be inadvisable to automatically infer heroic or mythical connotations for temporally out-of-sync artifacts. Yet to dismiss them as fundamentally incomprehensible and, therefore, unworthy of further examination is to deprive ourselves of a valuable set of informants about the role of the past in antiquity. As we will see, even rather humble objects, such as loom weights, that were kept across time owing to their utility can become repositories of memories. By shifting our gaze away from monuments and toward portable objects, with which people interacted closely and regularly, we are afforded critical glimpses into the “memory and identity practices of ordinary individuals.” This, Meskell has suggested, is the next frontier for “memory studies” in archaeology. Indeed, many of the *keimêlia* identified in this survey come from funerary assemblages that appear to range in wealth, from what might be considered rich “elite” burials to sub-elite or “ordinary.”

Interpretation is a final step that may not be appropriate for some—and perhaps most—of the artifacts identified in this survey as potential *keimêlia*. The pursuit of meaning or some deeper significance in the analysis of artifacts privileges human interests and risks applying reductionist explanations to artifacts in order to fit them into the metanarratives provided by texts. As Appadurai writes: “our own approach to things is conditioned necessarily by the view that things have no meanings apart from those that human transactions, attributions, and motivations endow them with.” Lately, a subgroup of anthropologists and archaeological theorists has called attention to the pervasive
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94 Boardman 2002, 21. He expresses a similar sentiment regarding the absence of inscriptions on grave monuments (52, 62), a point echoed by Button (2007, 95) with reference to Iron Age activity at Bronze Age ruins.
95 Meskell 2007, 223-4.
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anthropocentrism in our research agendas, which has the undesirable effect of “silencing” the voices of things. Instead, these scholars encourage us to envision things with meaningful lives apart from our social lives and to recognize that these object worlds might not be comprehensible to us. There are, of course, issues with applying these principles to archaeological research, which will be considered in greater detail in the next section. Nevertheless, an object-oriented approach is ideal for this project because it grounds analysis on the artifacts themselves, allowing things first to narrate their own biographies before placing them into a framework based on human cognition.

3. Theoretical Perspectives

The post-processual critique initiated in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s paved the way for a renewed focus on physical matter after a longtime emphasis on social and cultural processes. This concern for landscape and material culture has become an overarching theme of archaeological discussions in the last decade or more. By challenging the New Archaeology’s positivism, post-processual critics turned attention toward relativistic approaches. As a result, archaeologists seem to show a greater willingness to embrace confusing, disorderly data, and to confront evidentiary paradoxes head-on. The relationship between humans and things is one of the issues problematized in this new wave of scholarship. Anthropologists and archaeologists now are grappling to capture the complex and fluid interplay between people and objects without deploying paradigms that present humans and things as separate entities and give
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primacy to human narratives. Two major theoretical strands concerned with people-thing dynamics have emerged in this changing milieu: materiality and the new ontology, both of which inform the present study.

The conception of objects promoted under the blanket term “materiality” has destabilized the long-standing dichotomy between the material and human world, with objects standing as props to human action.\textsuperscript{103} Ian Hodder, Lynn Meskell, Chris Gosden, and Carl Knappett, among others,\textsuperscript{104} have led this new wave of scholarship, which encourages archaeologists to recognize the active role that material culture plays in shaping human activity; people may create objects, but their actions evolve in the context of this material world, so that humans and things mutually constitute each other.\textsuperscript{105} The blurring of the boundaries between people and things is reflected in the vocabulary of materiality: “enmeshed,” “bundled” or “entwined.”\textsuperscript{106} Some scholars, noting that discussions seem to shift quickly into abstract theory and away from the tangible things that are purportedly the main focus of materiality, have questioned the utility of the concept.\textsuperscript{107} The weight of theoretical discourse deadens artifacts, which we should imagine instead are electrified with synaptic currents. Although this criticism regarding the writing of materiality is fair, translating dynamic processes into academic prose is a perennial issue. Materiality as a term and as a principle is intended to encapsulate the vibrant blurring of human and object life-worlds.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{103} Meskell 2005; Miller 2005; Gilchrist 2013, 171.
\textsuperscript{104} For an overview of materiality in archaeological discourse, see Knappett 2014. Key works include Hodder 2011; Meskell 2005; Knappett 2005; DeMarrais, Gosden, and Renfrew 2004.
\textsuperscript{105} Boivin 2008, 3-26
\textsuperscript{106} Meskell 2005, 4-5.
\textsuperscript{107} Ingold 2007. Also, see Pétursdóttir 2012, 578, who describes materiality as “an ill-defined and elusive concept.”
\end{flushleft}
Another vocal community of archaeological theorists and anthropologists has advocated over the last decade for a greater focus on tangible things. This movement—variously referred to as the “Return to Things,” the ontological turn, the ontology of objects, symmetrical archaeology and anthropology, relational archaeology, among others—is rooted largely in the work of French anthropologist, Bruno Latour. The so-called turn to things aims to correct the reigning processualist and post-processualist emphases on cultural processes and human agents. Champions of things claim that, despite archaeology’s explicit devotion to the study of the physical remains of the past, things have been “marginalized.” Artifacts are treated “as just a means to reach something else, something more important”—namely, the reconstruction of the human elements of extinct societies. Adherents of the new ontology thus detect an anti-material undercurrent in contemporary archaeological research, including materiality. They attribute some of the purported marginalization of things to archaeologists’ self-consciousness about the discipline’s origins with antiquarian collectors, long disparaged for venerating the aesthetics of antiquities but disregarding matters of cultural context. According to proponents of symmetrical approaches, in an effort to correct past biases, archaeologists have overemphasized the human elements of past society while
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108 “Ontology” is a general term denoting the nature of being, but it has come to signify the ways in which different groups conceptualize their world. The “ontological turn” in the discipline of archaeology is part of a larger trend in the humanities and sciences of inquiring into metaphysical questions about reality and the nature of existence (Alberti 2011, 896). The ontology of things refers to “how things are, how their differences affect our lives, how their being challenges our conceptions of time and history and why things have been ignored” (Olsen 2010, 17).

109 Alberti et al. 2011, 896.
111 Major discussions include: Olsen 2003; Shanks 2007; Witmore 2007; Olsen 2010; Alberti et al. 2011; Olsen et al. 2012.
113 Olsen 2010, 8, 23-6, 88, 92-4; Olsen et al. 2012, 7.
minimizing attention to material traces.\textsuperscript{114} This criticism is not entirely fair for the ancient Mediterranean; as we will see throughout this study, a number of scholars have grounded their research on close empirical observations of artifacts, including form, use-wear, and context, only secondarily moving outward toward matters of the social lives of things. Moreover, the publication of raw data from excavations and surveys has become increasingly comprehensive, with a number of projects offering access online to field notebooks and artifacts.\textsuperscript{115} This type of open access policy gives equal attention to distinctive artifacts and unexceptional ones, such as non-diagnostic potsherds, fragmentary lithics, early 20\textsuperscript{th} century brandy bottles, and other things that might not fit tidily into interpretive frameworks. Such “faceless minions”\textsuperscript{116} typically are treated as “anonymous, disenfranchised artefacts…excavated simply to do the hard work of manufacturing raw data for the sake of the celebrity non-humans on the canonized heritage lists, contextualizing, illuminating and framing the celebrity non-humans.”\textsuperscript{117}

The drive to give these minions a place in archaeological research has the dual effect of democratizing the research process and acknowledging the importance of things \emph{qua} things, a major tenet of the new ontology.

\textsuperscript{114} Olson 2010, 97.
\textsuperscript{115} For example, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens has websites devoted to the online publication of field notebooks and material for the Agora Excavations (http://agora.ascsa.net/research?v=defautl; accessed July 19, 2016) and the Corinth Excavations (http://ascsa.net/research?q=collection%3ACorinth; accessed July 19, 2016). The Antikythera Survey Project has published its data online (http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/antikythera_ahrc_2012/index.cfm; July 19, 2016). This type of open access is also offered for the long-lived research project at Çatalhöyük (http://www.catalhoyuk.com/database/catal/).
\textsuperscript{116} Witmore 2007, 552.
\textsuperscript{117} Sørensen 2013, 6.
Defenders of things present their ideas as revolutionary polemics, yet it is fair to ask what new ideas the ontological turn has actually brought to the table, other than continuing the destabilization of traditional disciplinary tenets that has been underway for decades. Like materiality, the ontological turn calls for the blurring of boundaries of various sorts—between people and objects, between past and present, between disciplines (i.e. archaeology, philosophy and political science). Indeed, members of this school characterize their project as an exercise in “bricolage,” which draws together the “useful bits” of different theoretical frameworks (i.e. poststructuralism, phenomenology, and Actor Network Theory) to deal with the immense body of things that comprises the material world.

Actor Network Theory is a popular means for advocates of object-oriented philosophies to map the diverse, overlapping connections between people and things without dividing the world into two opposed ontological spheres; the resulting heterogeneous admixtures are dubbed “imbroglios.” The “symmetry” envisioned in people-thing relations is not a geometric symmetry, but rather a balanced approach, which allows things to play a corresponding role to humans. Adherents to the new ontology make a plea for attention to the unique qualities and capacities of things. It is through these “affordances” that things exert agency of a sort and, thus, can stand on a
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118 Take, for example, the language in Alberti et al.'s 2011 review article: “upheaval” (896); “an immense project of physical renegotiation” (Whitmore, 897); “manifesto” (Whitmore 2007).
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level ground with humans. Hodder also has developed a model regarding human-thingelations, only he focuses on “dependencies”: humans’ dependencies on things, things’
dependencies on other things, and things’ dependencies on humans. Rather than
“networks,” he prefers the term “entanglement” for the webs of connections between
people and the material world. As he observes, the amount of force exerted by people and
things can alternate over time, resulting in a tension that is not communicated by the term
“network.” “Entanglement,” on the other hand, captures the vitality of these webs.

Although defenders of things have pointed out flaws in past research agendas,
they have offered few practical applications for their sometimes nebulous ideas. The
analysis of a Corinthian aryballos by Olsen, Shanks, Webmoor, and Witmore offers some
inroads for the present project. Beginning “in medias res”—with the object itself—the
authors trace out various lines of enquiry, giving equal weight to disparate features such
as the vessel’s form, iconography, size and function, and context. This type of
“humble” approach does not privilege any one angle of analysis, be it aesthetic,
archaeological, art historical, or historical. The authors claim to avoid overdramatizing
this one vessel’s role in history, by portraying it as the nexus of associations:

We can say that in tracking these associations, the aryballos appears in
multiple guises, or, more strongly, is a motley, heterogeneous thing. We
call it heterogeneous because tracking the acts of making and use, the
manufacture and consumption, of an aryballos combines achievements,
goods, experiences, materials and psycho-political commitments, which
are treated as quite different and even comparable. This makes the
aryballos a multiplicity.

123 Alberti et al. 2011, 909.
124 Hodder 2012, 94.
125 A criticism also raised by Martin 2013, 7.
One of the risks of this type of analysis which conceptualizes objects as bundles of shifting relations is the neglect of the object as a physical, bounded entity that endures across time and space. Fowler and Harris\textsuperscript{128} have proposed a middle ground of sorts for discussing things without retreating entirely to the realm of abstraction. Drawing upon principles of quantum physics, they suggest that we envision things in their different modes: as waves, particles, and indeterminate entities. Waves are an analogy for the dynamic processes by which things come into being or “unfold.” Particles are an analogy for assemblages—particularized, nameable, bounded entities that have “mass, extent, and position.”\textsuperscript{129} Both modes of narrating a thing’s life history are critical. As Fowler and Harris explain, “We cannot study an object as both a particle and a wave at once, at least ‘not both sharply at once’. However we can shift from studying the particularity of an entity to studying how it is unfolding as a wave or line that is becoming, acknowledging that the phenomena change in the process of this shift.”\textsuperscript{130}

In sum, while materiality encourages us to imagine the intimate ties between people and things, the principles of symmetrical archaeology are more suitable for dealing with all forms of archaeological evidence. Whether artifacts are excavated scientifically or come to us without a known provenience, these things are the gathering points for threads of connections that ultimately lead to human producers, consumers, and curators. Although these webs of contact are complex and diverse, they can be modeled using common approaches such as object biography and multivocality.

3.1 Approaches to Things

\textsuperscript{128} Fowler and Harris 2015.
\textsuperscript{129} Fowler and Harris 2015, 9.
\textsuperscript{130} Fowler and Harris 2015, 9.
Object biography and multivocality are two of the most powerful analytical frameworks that have emerged from the post-processual paradigm shift. As mentioned above, archaeologists rely on small finds for dating and characterizing sites. However, they also have come to recognize that individual artifacts may relate only obliquely to metanarratives but can speak more directly of people’s personal narratives.\(^{131}\)

### 3.1.1 Object Biography

Object biography is both a “metaphor and a method,”\(^ {132}\) which assumes that objects, like living things, have life trajectories: they are born at the time of manufacture, age throughout their use-lives, and die when they are discarded or lost.\(^ {133}\) Artifacts also have an afterlife when they are discovered in the archaeological record. An object-focused schema like this allows us to explore the meaning of things beyond their immediate archaeological context. The foundational articulation of this concept is Igor Kopytoff’s 1986 article, “The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process,”\(^ {134}\) which expands upon the object “life history” approach developed by Schiffer.\(^ {135}\) Kopytoff stresses that things accumulate meaning through life events beyond their production, exchange, and consumption, stages that typically have been the focus of archaeological and anthropological research.\(^ {136}\) As things move through time and space, other episodes, such as changes in ownership, involvement in rituals or rites-of-passage,\(^ {137}\) or the enduring presence of objects in the backdrop of daily life can promote
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\(^{131}\) Whitley 2002, 227; Hoskins 1998; also see, Pétursdóttir 2012.
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\(^{133}\) Gosden and Marshall 1999, 169.
\(^{134}\) Kopytoff 1986.
\(^{135}\) Schiffer 1972.
\(^{136}\) These preferences stem from Western cultural biases, which tend to privilege capitalist concerns (i.e. exchange value, saleability) over other non-quantifiable forms of value (i.e. sentimental, familial) (Kopytoff 1986, 65).
\(^{137}\) Hallam and Hockey 2001, 43.
their singularization, the process by which commodities with definite use-value and exchange-value are “sacralized” or transformed into things with non-monetary value. According to Langdon, the primary aim of a biographical approach is to probe broader questions about a given culture revolving around rituals or rites-of-passage, but as we will see, there is value in contemplating simply the life of an object in itself.

Since Kopytoff’s seminal article, other scholars have applied the principle of object biography effectively to diverse cultural spheres and offered refinements to the model, often by pointing out the ways in which object lives are different from those of humans. Holtorf, for example, reminds us that we generally think only of an artifact’s “short” life history, beginning at the time of manufacture and ending at its time of deposition in a stratigraphic context. A more comprehensive representation (“long” history) works backwards through an artifact’s life, including both its excavation and layers of modern interpretation. Joy spins out the microhistory of an Iron Age mirror discovered in Portesham, Dorset, to show how we might make inferences based on the physical forms and use-wear of artifacts to animate the lives of objects from preliterate societies and reintroduce drama.

A primary marker of a singularized object’s special status is its “dislocation” in time and space (i.e. contextual asynchronicity). While an object need not undergo physical changes as a part of its singularization, one of the most telling indicators of
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changes in an object’s meaning is “patina”—a catchall term for signs of use, age, and repair. \[^{145}\] Analysis of use-wear is especially important for capturing intermediary events in an object’s life. \[^{146}\] Style may also provide clues to an object’s special status. As tastes evolve, something with a markedly “older” style may appear outdated, even though it continues to function. While style is a primary concern for art historians, many of the subtle shifts in consumer preferences may go undetected by modern scholars.

Both more traditional contextual approaches and biographical approaches are critical to the study of *keimêlia*. \[^{147}\] A biographical framework encourages scholars to consider the physical transformations an artifact underwent throughout its use-life and the concomitant changes in its meaning. Some life events are culturally patterned (i.e. manufacturing, purchase, use, display in rites or prescribed events, inheritance, deposition); however, meaning also can be ascribed through more idiosyncratic interactions between objects and agents. \[^{148}\]

3.1.2 **Multivocality**

The post-processual critique has led to renewed interest in the project of using the material record to learn about the lives of individuals. Multivocality—the allowance for numerous, diverse narratives—ultimately fosters a more representative portrait of the past. \[^{149}\] By permitting multiple “voices,” multivocal discourse problematizes traditional, dominant narratives and provides a more nuanced portrait of personal experiences. As a result of new efforts to integrate multivocality into research in the social sciences, the


\[^{146}\] Joy 2009, 142.

\[^{147}\] Lillios 1999, 239.

\[^{148}\] Lillios 1999, 240.

\[^{149}\] White and Beaudry 2009, 3-16.
stories of marginalized groups—women, people living under colonial rule, ethnic minorities, and oppressed classes, to name a few—have come into the spotlight. Multivocality comes into play in several ways in the present investigation. First, as will be discussed below, objects are a means for tapping into those different, sometimes unofficial narratives of the past, and keimêlia specifically can tell us about commemorative practices in the lives of ordinary individuals. Second, we should consider the applicability of the concept of multivocality to individual artifacts. What different stories do they tell? How did their meanings shift across time as they came into contact with different people, objects, and environments? We must be open to the possibility that objects carried different, shifting significances, not all of which will be nameable linguistically because the boundary between cognition and material culture is fuzzy. As Knappett describes the breakdown of the dichotomy between the ideas and objects, “The mind and cognition are not confined to the brain but seep out of the body and into the world.”

3.2 An Archaeology of Emotion

One of the elements of cognition that deserves a central place in the discussion of objects from the past is emotion. Long neglected by processualists as subjective, “irrational,” and, therefore, inaccessible, emotion is now recognized by scholars as critical to understanding the human experience in antiquity. As we will see, the study of keimêlia makes clear that people in the past did develop attachments to objects for reasons beyond these items’ function as tools or symbols of power and status. Bodily engagement with things inspired complex feelings and cultivated an awareness of the
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associations between objects and the self or others. Many of the artifacts with long lives identified in this study derive from funerary contexts. Although the rituals surrounding death, including its material culture, often have been interpreted in terms of power and sociopolitical maneuvering, loss of life was an emotionally charged experience, and *keimêlia*—by virtue of their entanglement in the lives of people—helped to mediate this juncture. Imagining that long-lived objects evoked feelings and inspired memories of specific events and people is critical to the exploration of the potentials of *keimêlia*. The principles of ambiguity, vagueness, and multivocality discussed next best help us to envision these subjective and largely unknowable but nonetheless crucial sentiments.

3.3 *Writing Things*

How we narrate objects’ histories is a not a neutral decision. In antiquity, as today, when objects interacted with humans, other objects, and their environment throughout their use-lives, they became enmeshed in complex networks of associations.\(^{153}\) No single storyline can capture the full texture of these dynamic webs of contact, replete with emotions, memories, and history. Furthermore, as Gero has asserted, ambiguity is inherent to the discipline of archaeology, which attempts to understand the dynamics of past societies through their partially preserved remains.\(^{154}\) She views ambiguity as central to feminist practices in archaeology, which strive to produce nuanced portraits of the past. Resisting definitive interpretations and closure are keys to this paradigm.\(^{155}\) More recently, Sørensen\(^{156}\) has expanded upon Gero’s critique by decrying what he calls the “new empiricism,” a revival of positivism that stems from the
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surge in archaeometric research. He advocates ambiguity and introduces the concept of “vagueness.” Whereas ambiguity implies that an object or context may be interpreted in several “distinct” ways, vague ness refers to our inability as scholars to define sensory phenomena either because we do not have the terminology, or the object in question cannot be reduced to traditional categorizations. Ambiguity and vagueness are fundamental to studying people’s subjective experiences with objects, although the description of these experiences is based largely on inference that cannot be tested empirically. Keimêlia are a class of objects that benefit from analyses which take into account ambiguity and vagueness because curation is a process that involves sensory interactions, emotions, and memory. Keimêlia are objects with fuzzy boundaries par excellence; they can embody multiple temporalities, events, people, or groups.

Anthropologists have attempted to accommodate this innate uncertainty and to allow for the possibility of diverse experiences between objects and people through multivocality. This dissertation strives to capture the same spirit when exploring the “complex, complicated, shifting and nuanced realities” of the past, by weighing multiple possible meanings for the artifacts examined. In her study of medieval heirlooms, Roberta Gilchrist gives several illustrations of this interpretive model. To cite one example, she submits two scenarios for a set of stoneware jugs that were 20 to 70 years old when they were recovered from a barber-surgeon’s chest in the wreckage of the warship Mary Rose which sank in A.D. 1545. Either these utilitarian vessels simply remained functional for the decades, or they were passed down from one generation to
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the next, perhaps along with medicinal skills.\textsuperscript{159} Ambiguity and vagueness as principles in archaeological interpretation thus encourage us to imagine freely and foster a milieu for multivocal discourse.

The reporting of artifacts’ lives is not the only opening for multivocality; artifacts in themselves may be alternative documents that can either corroborate or contradict mainstream historical narratives—or they may broaden our view of the past by offering entirely different perspectives.\textsuperscript{160} Sometimes alternative accounts may be structured along gender lines. In a number of cultures known to us from modern ethnographic literature, the modes of history production differ between males and females. For example, P. Lane has documented divergent patterns of memory-making among the Dogon of Mali, a society with patrilineal descent and patrilocal inhabitation after marriage.\textsuperscript{161} This emphasis on the male line was expressed materially: the residence of the lineage’s head was meticulously maintained for future leaders. It served as both the repository of the lineage’s wealth and the embodiment of its history. Whereas Dogon men could trace their continuity through both time and space via the architecture of the clan’s primary dwelling, women curated their personal belongings—sometimes even in a broken or damaged state—as the representations of their own identities. These items accumulated throughout a woman’s lifetime were displayed at her funeral and distributed to kin as heirlooms, a practice that resulted in the commingling of objects of different styles and chronologies in Dogon material culture. Similarly, among the Kodi of Indonesia, women

\textsuperscript{159} Gilchrist 2013, 173.  
\textsuperscript{160} Lubar and Kingery 1993, ix.  
\textsuperscript{161} Lane 2006.
narrated their personal histories through domestic goods such as cooking vessels and even animals.¹⁶²

Male voices dominate the ancient Greek oral and written tradition, yet these sources do allude to neglected media where women might have had a role in preserving stories and memories: textiles and heirlooms.¹⁶³ The Iliad (3.125-128), for example, presents Helen at the loom weaving images of the battles between the Trojans and Achaeans, events that she herself might have witnessed from within the walls of Troy.¹⁶⁴ The myth of Philomela and Procne (Apollod. Bibl. 3.14.8) makes explicit the communicative power of textile imagery; King Tereus of Thrace raped Philomela, the daughter of the King of Athens, and then ripped her tongue out to prevent her from reporting his crime. She was able to share her suffering with her sister Procne by weaving it into a tapestry, and the two women had their revenge. Similarly, textiles serve as tokens of recognition in several dramas: Kreusa is able to identify her grown son Ion through the sampler she left with him as an infant (KT.33; KT.34); and Elektra recognizes Orestes as her brother when he produces a textile she wove (KT.25). Other examples of textiles that communicated narratives may be cited: the tapestries decorated with mythological episodes which were used were used to embellish an enormous outdoor pavilion at the sanctuary of Apollo in Euripides’ Ion;¹⁶⁵ and the garment embroidered with the battle of gods and giants for the statue of Athena Polias on the Akropolis.¹⁶⁶ Two Cypriote men—
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Akesas and Helikon—were said to be the artists who designed the first robe for Athena Polias.\textsuperscript{167}

Archaeological finds of textile fragments and pseudomorphs in diverse settings demonstrate the ubiquity of this ephemeral class of objects in antiquity, and historical accounts indicate that textiles sometimes were curated across generations. Pseudo-Aristotle’s \textit{De miris auscultationibus} (96.838a) recounts a himation once owned by a Sybarite Alkisthenes, who lived either during the late Archaic or Classical period. The cloth was adorned with both mythological and historical motifs, including the image of the original owner. This remarkable textile had a complex biography: it was transferred to the treasury of Hera Lakinia and later captured by Dionysios the Elder, tyrant of Syracuse and collector of textiles, in the second quarter of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century, after which he sold it to the Carthaginians for 120 talents.\textsuperscript{169} Textiles, thus, were an alternative means of recording history, and while men often were involved in their production as commodities, weaving is typically presented as a feminine, domestic craft.\textsuperscript{170} An early 3\textsuperscript{rd} century dedicatory epigram from southern Italy offers a window into the narrative potential of textiles. It discusses a linen woven by a certain Theophilis and her child Nossis. Here, the textile does not illustrate a grand historical narrative; rather, it makes a human relationship

\textsuperscript{167} Ath. 2.48b; Zen. 1.56; for the art of weaving, see Pollitt 1993, 209.
\textsuperscript{168} For a recent review of textiles preserved in Greek archaeological contexts, see Lee 2015, 90-1. Some specimens have survived in the dry conditions of the Crimean Peninsula; one 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. example that was found draped over a sarcophagus shows the goddesses Athena and Nike with mythic figures Phaidra, Jocasta, and Mopsos, all with labels (Barber 1991, 378-9, fig. 16.15). Recently an intricate textile was found covering a dinos that held the cremated remains of three people (an approximately 25-year-old woman, 35-year-old man, and 10-year old child) in a 5\textsuperscript{th} century burial in Kalyvia, Attika. Not only did the cloth combine different techniques but it included a band of purple, a highly costly pigment (Moulherat and Spantidai 2007). Other examples of textile remains on diverse objects are described by J. Unruh (2007).
\textsuperscript{169} von Hofsten 2011, 8.
\textsuperscript{170} Reeder 1995, 200-2.
material.\textsuperscript{171} It is unfortunate that so few textiles have survived from antiquity, since they might have been a means for women to express stories and perpetuate memories. Other types of curated objects, however, were more durable, and these sometimes survive to tell the stories of women, children, and other groups that lack voices in our written sources.

Several passages from Classical Greek literary sources also allude to women’s roles as the keepers of things within a household, including heirlooms. Indeed, in Athenian drama, women are presented as curators of heirlooms, narrators of these objects’ histories, and, thus, repositories of a family’s past. Women’s intimate understanding of heirlooms facilitates their recognition of male members of their respective households in two of Euripides’ dramas. In the \textit{Ion}, for example, Kreusa buried her son with gold snakes in accordance with Erechtheid tradition (\textit{KT.33; KT.34}); these objects were part of the assemblage that later allowed her to identify Ion as her son. In addition, she wore an heirloom gold bracelet (\textit{KT.31}), which might be construed as a type of performance that kept the family’s history alive.\textsuperscript{172} Euripides’ \textit{Iphigenia in Tauris} offers a profound example of an heirloom unlocking a male protagonist’s identity. When he encounters Iphigenia in Tauris far from their home, Orestes must convince his sister of his identity. Although he offers several proofs, it is his mention of the ancestral spear of Pelops hanging in the innermost quarters of the palace that persuades Iphigenia (\textit{KT.30}).\textsuperscript{173} These dramas seem to allude to what was an ancient reality: women were tasked with caring for the objects brought into the home, a point expressed in Xenophon’s 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. \textit{Oikonomikos} (7.21-8.1), which portrays the wife as a queen bee guarding and keeping track of objects that the husband introduces from outside. We

\textsuperscript{171} Foley 2003, 118
\textsuperscript{172} McClure 2015, 232-3.
\textsuperscript{173} McClure 2015, 231-2.
might imagine that heirlooms, as part of the female domain, were additional vehicles for women to narrate the past in antiquity.

4. Listening through the Noise

This dissertation aims to demonstrate that by asking the right questions, archaeologists can make meaningful inferences from the “noise”\textsuperscript{174} generated in the material record by artifacts that were curated in antiquity. Such anomalous elements provide insights into the values assigned to objects from the past in discrete historical contexts and, as a corollary, the place of the past within ancient communities. The proposals offered for the significance attached to storied objects—as talismans, as instruments for constructing and maintaining different layers of identity, and as vehicles for commemorating a personal past—emerge through the consideration of temporal, geographic or cultural, and relational distances between \textit{keimêlia} and their keepers. In an effort to translate the findings from this approximately four-century period in the Mediterranean to the archaeology of other regions, the concluding chapter will model an approach for assessing the value of \textit{keimêlia} recovered through excavation. It argues that curated objects are critical sources for the study of antiquity, since it was through \textit{keimêlia} that people were able to map their personal histories. In doing so, they became the narrators of their own pasts and were able to position that past—physically—in the present.

\textsuperscript{174} Gilchrist 2013, 170; Thomas 1976, 128.
CHAPTER 2

CHRONOLOGICAL KEIMÊLIA:

CURATED OBJECTS IDENTIFIED THROUGH TEMPORAL GAPS

One of the primary indicators of ancient curation is a substantial gap between an artifact’s date of manufacture and its date of deposition. *Keimêlia* identifiable through significant asynchronicities are few and scattered and, for this reason, examples from the ancient Mediterranean for the period under discussion (8th-5th centuries B.C.) have been examined mainly through isolated case studies rather than large syntheses. Yet, studies of the archaeology of the prehistoric Mediterranean and the New World, as well as ethnographic research, have shown the value of considering objects curated across time as a corpus. When investigated as a body, *keimêlia* hint at some trends regarding the types of objects selected for special preservation and the contexts where they were deployed. Moreover, *keimêlia* have the potential to inform about the role of the past within diverse communities. While defining patterns such as these is one aim in the study of ancient curation, equally important insights emerge from the study of the microhistories of individual *keimêlia*. These objects, which encapsulate both memories and the passage of time, communicated different messages according to their context of use (habitation, sanctuary, or grave) and final associations (with a man, woman, divinity, or child).\(^\text{175}\) Furthermore, *keimêlia* can reveal the idiosyncratic relationships between people and things in the past—dynamics that frequently go unmentioned because they lie

\(^{175}\) Nizzo 2010, 100.
outside the purview of traditional anthropological models of economic exchange and are best accessed through fine-grained studies.\textsuperscript{176}

Objects older than their contexts frequently are described as “heirlooms”; however, this is something of a misnomer, since an heirloom, according to common English-language usage of the word, is a specific type of survival from the past—one rooted in a family’s history.\textsuperscript{177} It is important to remember that not all objects with long life histories are heirlooms, since numerous other circumstances can account for the presence of an artifact significantly earlier than its context.\textsuperscript{178} Residuality, the turning up of artifacts accidentally from earlier strata as a result of cultural or natural processes, is one possibility that will be discussed below. But this investigation focuses on objects from earlier periods that were kept in circulation or were purposefully reintroduced to circulation after a hiatus. No distinction is made between objects that were curated because of their utility and those that were earmarked for special significance;\textsuperscript{179} rather, all instances of object care are accepted as potentially meaningful.

This chapter develops an approach to identifying and understanding \textit{keimêlia} in the material record. It begins with an outline of the methods for recognizing artifacts that are significantly earlier than their contexts, followed by a discussion of the challenges of this endeavor and a review of the scholarly literature on chronologically anomalous artifacts in the Mediterranean and beyond. Insights drawn from ethnographic research and modern consumer studies shed further light on some of the potentialities of objects

\textsuperscript{176} Thomas 1976, 30-1.
\textsuperscript{177} See also, Lillios 1999, 241; Gilchrist 2013, 172; Boardman 2002, 80.
\textsuperscript{178} Lillios 1999, 255; Whitley (2002, 226) notes that the silver kraters in the Homeric epics, for example, are not heirlooms \textit{sensu strictu}.
\textsuperscript{179} Although it is important to remember that things may have protracted use-lives in communities where supply was limited (Gilchrist 2013, 172).
curated across time. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to a series of case studies based on artifacts selected from Appendix 2, the catalogue of keimêlia identifiable through their high date. For an explanation of the appendices and the catalogue numbering system, see p. viii. The case studies show that, in antiquity, objects from the past exhibited great variation in terms of their form, temporal depth, and contexts of use or disposal. Nevertheless, these artifacts, as well as keimêlia documented in inscriptions (Appendix 3) and ancient literary sources (Appendix 4), fit relatively comfortably into categories that ethnographers and scholars of modern consumer habits use to describe curated objects: companion objects, mementoes, heirlooms, entangled objects, antiques, and found objects. Exploring the microhistories of the keimêlia in the archaeological record exposes some of the varied, shifting, and overlapping roles that objects from the past may have played in antiquity. Among the examples documented are cases where we might propose that keimêlia served as functional tools, anchors for remembering people and events of the past, mechanisms for encoding personal or familial identities, and supernatural agents.

1. Methods for Identifying Keimêlia in the Material Record

1.1. Criteria for Identification

Chapter 1 discussed the etymology and nuances of the word keimêlion in Greek testimonia (pp. 19-26), and it is only fitting that this chapter—which focuses on examples of curated objects from archaeological contexts—begins by explaining the criteria for applying this ancient term to artifacts recovered through excavation. As many have
observed, the archaeological record is a palimpsest. Artifacts within a given context are rarely synchronous. Objects of different ages frequently coexist, since things are acquired, become worn, break down, drop out of use, and are recovered or recycled at different intervals. Although these temporal discrepancies are critical to isolating examples of keimêlia, they often are overlooked or ignored in archaeological analyses in the interest of assigning a single date to a given context.

The phenomenon of time lag (“the difference between the date of manufacture and the date of deposition [of an artifact]”) is a key concern in the interpretation of archaeological sites and one which has considerable impact on our ability to detect ancient examples of curation. For the purpose of this study, any artifact that can be placed two to three decades prior to its assemblage—approximately the span of a generation in pre-modern cultures—is considered a potential keimêlion. The aim in using a generation as a metric is to capture both items that may have been kept over an individual’s lifetime and intergenerational objects—those that might have been transmitted across generations. In the case of the former, the object might have belonged to a single person and was viewed as as intrinsically linked to that individual’s personal history or identity, and, in the case of the latter, a group such as a family may have served collectively as the stewards of the object. These distinctions are not hard and fast; for example, a personal belonging could become a family’s inalienable possession (defined

180 See Olivier 2011, 70, 129-45, especially n. 2 for references to the origins of the metaphor; Yoffee 2007; Lucas 2005, 37-43; Olivier 1999; Shanks 1996, 156; Binford 1981. In the discipline of archaeology, “palimpsest” may refer variously to the phases of building at a site, the stratigraphic layers at a site, the composition of assemblages, or even individual artifacts, which may betray signs of different events in their life histories in their physical composition (Olivier 2011, 129-31).
182 Adams 2003, 41.
183 A generation typically is defined as thirty years or three generations per century (Snodgrass 2000, 11).
and vice versa. Thinking about hypothetical situations like these can help us imagine the potentially complex and meaningful lives of long-lived objects. However, it also should be noted that many factors other than conscious curation may affect objects’ lifespans; historical data and ethnographic documentation have shown that the use-lives of artifacts vary considerably according to the type of object (e.g. ceramic, metal, textile), function, and cultural context. And even within these artifact categories, lifespans can vary. Ethnographic research has shown, for example, that cooking vessels in so-called traditional societies often are used for just a year or so, whereas fine wares, taken down off the shelves only on special occasions, were generally longer-lived (i.e. over a decade old).

Some may object that a span of a few decades is not sufficient for an object to earn the status of a distinguished belonging. While 20 or 30 years perhaps does not seem remarkably old in a calendrical sense, an object owned for this duration could nonetheless have an advanced “social age.” The principle of social age, as applied in biographical approaches to material culture (pp. 37-9), recognizes that things age not only according to a traditional linear chronology but also through diverse life experiences. Something that had been present for nearly a generation might have been considered a fixture in a person’s life or within a home. Whether this thing was involved in major rites...

---

185 Adams 2003, 40.
186 To a Western audience, this time frame may seem too abbreviated; however, contingencies different from those of today governed the lifespans of people and things in antiquity. Thanks to technological advances, modern industrial communities live surrounded by a surplus of possessions, many made from highly durable materials, such as plastics and metals that can last well beyond a human lifetime. Furthermore, human lifespans have been extended significantly due to advances in medicine and improved food pathways. Whereas 20 to 30 years may have represented a large proportion of a person’s lifetime in antiquity, today it generally is a much smaller fraction. For these reasons, a narrow span of two to three decades is an appropriate framework for evaluating the significance of curated objects in antiquity.
and celebrations or simply existed in the background of everyday life, it had the potential to be implicated both consciously and subconsciously in dense webs of associations linking the past, present, and future.

We might also contemplate to what extent people in antiquity recognized the age of an older artifact. As will be discussed further in Chapter 4 (pp. 188-205), inscriptions and literary sources reveal that materials, techniques of manufacture, and artistry could mark an object as belonging to an earlier period. Some major stylistic changes—that is, changes in the “look” of things—undoubtedly were perceptible to contemporary Greek audiences as they are to art historians today. For example, a fairly dramatic shift occurred in the appearance Attic ceramic fine wares around the last quarter of the 6th century when the red-figure technique supplanted the black-figure technique for most shapes of Attic pottery. Another noticeable change was the more naturalistic mode of representing the human figure (the so-called Severe Style) that developed in sculpture and the minor arts following the Persian invasions—a major departure from the comparatively stiff Archaic style. As mentioned above, artifacts within a given context were rarely synchronous, so we might imagine that the juxtaposition of objects of different “looks” fostered the recognition of age-based styles, as for example at sanctuary or civic spaces like cemeteries where sculptures and monuments of different periods coexisted. The same may be true for the private sphere, evident from the mixed chronologies of artifacts in domestic and funerary assemblages. When style or an inscription did not reveal an object’s relative age, the curator or curators must have preserved and communicated this information. In this manner, a *keimêlion* served as a bundle—to invoke the terminology

---

188 For bibliography and an important review of the evidence supporting the dates and finality of this shift, see Stewart 2008a, 2008b.
used in the new ontology—by creating a community of people aware of its unique past.

Another point worth clarifying regards matters of continuity. Whereas ancient testimonia for the most part imply an unbroken awareness of the life histories of *keimêlia* mentioned, this study counts objects as possible *keimêlia* even when their pasts were interrupted. When the date of an object’s creation preceded its deposition by thousands of years, it is unlikely that knowledge of that object’s history had been transmitted unbroken to its ultimate curators. Yet remote relics, such as these, show how the deep past was integrated into the ancient present. Because they provide critical windows into the perceptions of deep time in antiquity, they hold a special place in this investigation.

Similarly, we cannot assume a continuous path for *keimêlia* with shallower life histories. While it was perhaps most common for objects to be kept by the same person or within a family, objects might also have arrived with a person obliquely, if they were purchased or received as gifts, for example. Literary and epigraphic sources attest to these alternative mechanisms of transfer.

In practice, the dating of artifacts hinges largely on stylistic classification (a matter to be discussed in greater detail below); however, in theory, chronologically anomalous *keimêlia* can be recognized in several ways. Occasionally, an object’s survival may be inferred indirectly from its impression on a later object. Examples include some Tarantine rhyta, which were produced from molds made directly from Attic prototypes

---

190 I thank A. Kuttner for these observations.
191 For example, a Tarentine rhyton dated to the second half of the 4th century (Paris, Musée du Louvre H 84: Hoffmann 1966, 12, No. 32) was produced from a mold made from a 5th century rhyton attributed to the Attic vase-painter Sotades. Examples of other derivative rhyta are found in collections in Edinburgh (1956.457: Hoffmann 1962, No. 43), Vienna (IV 4401: *ARV* 453, 12; Hoffmann 1962, No. 42, pl. IX, 2, 4),
manufactured a century earlier. The Attic originals—or molds formed from them—must have been kept for several generations before the derivatives were made.\textsuperscript{192} Another way of accessing \emph{keimêlia} indirectly is through impressions preserved on clay artifacts, such as loom weights, which attest to the survival of heirloom signet rings and stamps.\textsuperscript{193}

Heirloom status also may be confirmed scientifically. Thermoluminescence dating of snuff bowls from the West Indies island of Carriacou places specimens within the window of 40 B.C.—A.D. 240. However, the one provenanced example comes from strata dated to A.D. 1000—1200. In other words, the bowl predated its context by perhaps a millennium and also preceded the settlement of the island circa A.D. 400—a benchmark established through radiocarbon dating. These data, combined with stylistic and petrographic analysis, indicate that the bowls were non-local. The vessels may have traveled to the island as centuries-old antiques, after having been kept in circulation for hundreds of years prior to deposition.\textsuperscript{194} A second investigation demonstrates the value of an approach that combines stylistic approaches, archaeological science, and the principles of materiality. Overholtzer and Stoner’s survey of figurines at the central Mexican site of Xaltocan revealed that, although the figurines date stylistically to the Formative and Classic periods (1250 B.C.—A.D. 600), they were curated centuries later by Postclassic

\textsuperscript{192} Hoffmann 1966, 105.
\textsuperscript{193} For example, a number of loom weights from the survey of the Metapontine countryside in southern Italy bore the impressions of seals that were significantly older than the weights themselves: \textbf{A.55} and \textbf{A.57-9}. Examples also are known from other parts of the Greek world: a later 5\textsuperscript{th} century pyramidal loom weight from the excavations of the Pnyx in Athens was impressed with a 6\textsuperscript{th} century metal bezel picturing a charioteer in a biga (Davidson, Thompson, and Thompson 1943, 84, No. 56); and at Corinth, a gem five decades old was used to make an impression on a loom weight (Davidson 1952, 152).
\textsuperscript{194} Fitzpatrick et al. 2009.
(A.D. 950-1521) inhabitants of the settlement.\textsuperscript{195} Moreover, these figurines were displaced geographically; INAA (Instrumental Neutron Activation Analysis) on ten of the figurines recovered from known strata showed that all were manufactured at the important ceremonial center of Teotihuacan. The evidence suggests that Xaltocanos made pilgrimages to Teotihuacan—the professed birthplace of the gods—and collected figurines from the ruins which they then used in household shrines.\textsuperscript{196} Although scientific technologies have not been applied to the study of curated objects in the ancient Mediterranean to my knowledge, there is potential to use these rigorous dating and sourcing techniques to detect objects that were chronologically and geographically displaced.

1.2. \textit{Methodological Concerns}

Objects curated for extended periods are an inherently challenging class of material. \textit{Keimêlia} are difficult to isolate in the archaeological record for many reasons, some of which were touched upon in Chapter 1, and others which are detailed below. To recapitulate, \textit{keimêlia} were, by definition, exceptional objects. Many were singular possessions, and their survival depended not solely on their utility but also on idiosyncratic matters such as their social role and emotional pull. As a class of archaeological finds, therefore, \textit{keimêlia} do not exhibit strong patterning and, thus, tend to resist the types of quantitative analyses that are so pivotal to processualist research agendas.\textsuperscript{197}

\textsuperscript{195} Overholtzer and Stoner 2011.
\textsuperscript{196} Overholtzer and Stoner 2011. The Florentine codex may offer insights into this practice; it reports that later Aztecs went to sites including Teotihuacan, where they made offerings and excavated ancient relics, such as jade (182).
\textsuperscript{197} Lillios 1999, 239.
As artifacts that defy the norms of stratigraphy, *keimêlia* pose interpretive challenges to archaeologists. Typically found as isolated chronological anomalies, *keimêlia* have been overlooked or dismissed as contamination or “residual.”¹⁹⁸ Such readings are especially common at multi-phase sites, where anthropogenic processes may have turned up artifacts from earlier levels.¹⁹⁹ Natural taphonomic processes, such as alluviation and erosion, also may be suspected as the origins of these intrusions. When not relegated to the category of residual finds, *keimêlia* have been noted fleetingly as “heirlooms,”²⁰⁰ a problematic designation (see above p. 49).

Nevertheless, these anachronisms have received greater attention in recent decades as archaeologists have become increasingly aware of the complexities of site formation processes,²⁰¹ including the ways that recycling and lateral cycling affect the structure of the archaeological record by diverting objects from conventional linear life paths. Recycling involves “the routing of an element at the completion of use to the manufacture process of the same or a different element,”²⁰² whereas lateral cycling refers

---

¹⁹⁸ Evans and Millett 1992; Gilchrist 2013, 170; Jeffreys 2003, 196. Residuality, for example, has been a common explanation for the numerous Formative and Classic period figurines (1250 B.C.-A.D. 600) recovered from Mesoamerican Postclassic sites that were mentioned above. Scholars have suggested that centuries-old figurines were introduced through the soil used in mud-bricks and other construction materials. In the case of the man-made island of Xaltocan, which lacks Formative and Classic period strata, this rationale cannot be supported. In fact, it appears that the recovery and curation of early figurines was a widespread practice there (Overholtzer and Stoner 2011, 177).

¹⁹⁹ The primary factor influencing levels of residuality is the amount of activity at a site (Evans and Millett 1992, 238).

²⁰⁰ Examples are numerous: a mug found in a late 5th century well at Corinth (A.41); a Panathenaic prize amphora from Cyrenaica (A.113); a bell-krater from Athenian Agora (A.24); a scarab of Queen Tiye from the Shrine of the Idols at Mycenae (Morgan 2005, 169), to name a few.

²⁰¹ Evans and Millett (1992, 225) attribute the growing interest in residuality to the increasing number of excavations centered on urban sites with deep strata and the rise in quantitative pottery studies, which are concerned with a whole diachronic assemblage and not just the latest pottery that supplies the *terminus post quem*.

²⁰² Schiffer 1972, 158.
to the cessation of an object’s use in one set of activities and the beginning of it use in others, usually without major physical modification.\textsuperscript{203} See Schiffer’s diagram (Fig. 1).

In light of the hazards of trying to distinguish between residual artifacts and curated objects, a closed context would seem the optimal locus for identifying keimêlia through their high date.\textsuperscript{204} Yet closed contexts are not always straightforward to interpret.\textsuperscript{205} Moreover, they introduce further issues, since, aside from wells and destruction levels, the most ubiquitous closed contexts are graves.\textsuperscript{206} Heirlooms in graves are exceptions par excellence to Worsaae’s Law, the logical assumption that objects within the same grave are contemporaneous.\textsuperscript{207} While single burials would appear to be the ideal laboratory for examining keimêlia, curated objects may not be found in graves, since they were kept in the realm of the living in many communities.\textsuperscript{208} For example, the necropolis at the site of Morgantina in central Sicily yielded no definite examples of

\textsuperscript{203} Schiffer 1972, 159.
\textsuperscript{204} Keimêlia could be removed from circulation both purposefully (i.e. dedicated in graves or sanctuaries) and accidentally through loss, for example. In the ancient Mediterranean, the dedication of personal effects to deities was a normative practice, and we should expect to find objects from a broad timespan in sanctuaries. Keimêlia can be difficult to detect in these contexts due to the mixed chronology of deposits.
\textsuperscript{205} For example, even when a grave contains a single burial, there is the possibility that the grave was reused, and items from the original tomb group were kept in the later burial. Grave 402 from the Corinth North Cemetery can illustrate. This sarcophagus burial had a terminus post quem of the late 6th century given by an Attic cup; however, the grave also contained a jug of the second half of the 5th century. The assemblage could be explained either if the cup had been curated for several decades (i.e. the “heirloom” explanation) or if the sarcophagus had been reused, the original skeleton removed, and the cup retained. Mends with lead clamps on the sarcophagus lid might favor the latter hypothesis. See Blegen, Palmer, and Young 1964, 264. Another example, discussed in the catalogue here, is a plastic rhyton from a Hellenistic grave (A.45).
\textsuperscript{206} Where multiple burial was practiced, grave groups are generally not useful for locating chronologically anomalous artifacts, unless the different interments were placed in discrete spaces.
\textsuperscript{207} See Rowe (1962). Nineteenth century Danish archaeologist Jens Jakob Asmussen Worsaae is credited with making this deduction although, as Rowe points out, Worsaae merely stated that objects in a grave were in use at the same time.
\textsuperscript{208} We can cite numerous ethnographic examples of precious objects that were traditionally inherited rather than interred with the deceased. Among the Yoruba of Nigeria, prominent, wealthy priests of some cults had elaborate funerals, which involved the display of valuables that were then distributed to living priests instead of buried (Ucko 1969, 267). Gilchrist’s survey of medieval heirlooms (2013) yielded only examples from domestic contexts (destruction levels, household rubbish pits) and no examples from mortuary contexts.
curated objects, yet excavation of the settlement revealed a fine Attic red-figure volute-krater by Euthymides (A.104) that had been in use for some five decades (and had ancient mends to show for it) when the city was sacked by the Sikel leader Douketios in 457 B.C., preserving this large, imported vessel in the destruction layer. Ideally, it would be possible to compare the finds from the settlement and cemeteries of a site to better understand where objects from the past were deployed or considered meaningful. However, because data often are not available for both the settlement and the cemetery of a given site, *keimêlia* likely are underrepresented archaeologically. And the specimens recovered from funerary contexts raise difficult questions about how the act of removing an older object from circulation should be understood.

In addition, many of the items selected for preservation across generations probably were composed of materials that have not survived in the archaeological record. Metal objects, for example, were an important means of storing wealth in antiquity; however, they were liable to be melted down and recycled, rather than discarded, when outdated or damaged, or when they were captured as booty or robbed from graves. The necropoleis of the Italic port city Spina offer a cautionary illustration of how the paucity of metals goods in the archaeological record affects our assessment of *keimêlia*. A large proportion of the Spina graves contained bronze objects used for banqueting (i.e. candelabra, vessels, stands). Frequently, these bronzes—along with the largest and finest examples of imported Greek pottery—predated the other items in a given tomb by several 209

---

209 This is evident from the fact that many of the metal objects recorded in temple inventories were manufactured according to standard weights (Vickers and Gill 1994, 48-54).
decades up to a century.\textsuperscript{210} We might imagine that jewelry was another class of artifacts that was frequently curated but is underrepresented in the catalogue of \textit{keimêlia}.

Wood and textiles are other categories of objects that may be underrepresented in the logs of \textit{keimêlia}, since they usually decompose in the Mediterranean climate.\textsuperscript{211} Some of the earliest artistic productions were said to be cult images made of wood (\textit{xoana})\textsuperscript{212} or ivory that were treasured for generations, and it is possible that wooden objects owned in the private sphere were valued similarly over long periods. Textiles are known to us mainly through testimonia, which offer insights into the history-producing capacity of woven cloths and the mnemonic potential of this largely absent class of materials.

Detecting \textit{keimêlia} also is complicated by the imprecision of our dating methods.\textsuperscript{213} Achieving the resolution necessary to place an artifact within a decade or less is difficult when chronologies are based largely on style,\textsuperscript{214} an admittedly subjective and problematic gauge.\textsuperscript{215} Although we have a fairly complete seriation worked out for

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{210} Hostetter 1998, 80-1.
\item \textsuperscript{211} Gilchrist (2013, 174) also calls attention to the lamentable absence of textiles among documented examples of medieval heirlooms; written records, on the other hand, mention the transmission of textiles from mothers to daughters as dowries.
\item \textsuperscript{212} Attested first in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century, the word \textit{xoanon} refers to a variety of early carved wood figures. Very few examples of wooden sculpture have survived in Mediterranean archaeological contexts, but those that have are small in scale. Statuettes, such as the trio of females from Palma Montechiaro (Syracuse, National Museum 47134, 47135, 47136) preserved in a sulfuric spring and the 7\textsuperscript{th} century Hera from Samos may be the tip of the proverbial iceberg, providing evidence of valuables in wood that once circulated in the Mediterranean (Donohue 1988, 215-8). For discussions of these and other surviving sculptures with bibliography, see Donohue 1988, 23-32.
\item \textsuperscript{213} Lillios 1999, 255. For the process of dating based on typological sequences, see Renfrew and Bahn (2008, 124-8).
\item \textsuperscript{214} This is particularly the case with jewelry, a class of valuables one would expect to be handed down from generation to generation; see commentary by Lee (2015, 142) and Jeffreys (2003, 204), whose statements about ancient Egypt ring true for Mediterranean cultures as well.
\item \textsuperscript{215} Biers 1992, 30. Archaeologists and art historians must determine where artifacts fit into an existing stylistic sequence. Biers (1992, 25-6) discusses the pitfalls of dating based on style. Stylistic development is often assumed to follow an evolutionary pattern, yet this is not always the case, particularly when it comes to artistic productions. For example, sculpture—and, we might add, vase-painting—“can be affected by what might be called the ‘problem of the generations’” (Biers 1992, 27). Artists of different generations may be active simultaneously, so that older and newer styles are produced at the same time. Also, the ages
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
some artifact classes, such as Corinthian and Attic decorated pottery, the vernacular wares of other regions can be dated only within broader swaths, in part because many of these artifact types exhibit conservative morphologies, and in part because these wares have been less studied historically. Attic pottery often has served as the touchstone for establishing the dates of bronzes and locally manufactured fine and coarse wares for sites across the Mediterranean. However, synching chronologies on the basis of imports is problematic, since exotic products frequently were the ones curated over long periods and, as a result, may lag behind locally manufactured goods. Tools and other mundane objects, such as coarse wares or cooking pots, tend to change little over time, since their forms hinge on utility rather than taste; once their usefulness had been established, there was little need to alter their shape. Because of these difficulties in dating many classes of artifacts (e.g. jewelry) stylistically, a large percentage of the keimêlia documented in the catalogue are Attic pots. Nevertheless, we must be mindful of the possibility that other vernacular ceramics, metals, and tools, were also curated over long periods but now go undetected. This raises a problem: if things belong to a class that changed little, did people recognize their age due to visual differences? Or did such “undiagnostic” objects require people to narrate their history?

216 Attic painted pottery can be pegged with relative certainty to known historical horizons, such as the Persian invasions. Because the chronology is based on the attribution of stylistic details to individual painters’ hands, artifacts can be placed within the span of a craftsman’s work life.
217 See, for example, the controversy between Catling (1984) and Matthäus (1988) over the dating of Cypriot bronze stands discussed below. Scholars working on material from historical periods also have demonstrated that typological changes occur at irregular intervals that do not keep pace with chronological time; see, for example, Olivier’s discussion of the evolution of 19th century miners’ lamps (2011, 164-5).
218 This is the case for the Bronze Age in the Eastern Mediterranean, as well, where chronologies are hinged on the stylistic seriation of Aegean imports (Van Wijngaarden 2005, 408).
In sum, the exceptional nature and diversity of *keimēlia*, the complexity of stratigraphic interpretation, lacunae in the archaeological evidence, and the imperfection of our dating methods all pose problems for the identification of these objects. Even so, scholars of the Mediterranean and beyond have successfully isolated probable instances of ancient curation. A brief critique of their approaches can set the stage for the case studies by showing how others have confronted and mediated the difficulties inherent to this class of materials.

2. *The Study of Objects Curated in the Ancient Mediterranean*

To date, no publication has surveyed archaeologically-attested *keimēlia* in the ancient Mediterranean comprehensively; however, a number of studies do highlight chronologically anomalous objects. The frameworks adopted in these analyses depend in part on the data available and in part on the authors’ interests. Some scholars have focused on curation practices within specific time periods, while others have concentrated on a particular class of objects, and still others have evaluated individual artifacts in their contexts. More rarely, a scholar will assemble a corpus of *keimēlia* from a site or several, sometimes drawing inter-site comparisons of curation practices. A brief review of their findings reveals the merits of each avenue. The ideal approach, it seems, is a multi-scalar one, which combines close contextual analysis of individual artifacts with a broader site or regional perspective.

Scholars of Mediterranean prehistory have been especially attentive to chronological gaps between artifacts and their depositional contexts.\(^{220}\) Without the aid of [\(^{220}\) As Whitley (2013, 195) observes, scholars of Mediterranean prehistory are more inclined to draw upon anthropological and ethnographic research, since prehistory has been viewed as “more ‘ethnographic’ than fully historical periods or the shadowy region sometimes known as protohistory.” Numerous examples of prehistorians’ interest in anachronisms can be cited: a Middle Minoan pithos found in association with a]
texts, prehistorians must rely largely on material remains to illuminate ancient thought processes, including attitudes toward the past.\textsuperscript{221} Whitley, for example, has explored the ideological uses of objects with rich life histories from Bronze Age and Iron Age contexts.\textsuperscript{222} Although he is careful to point out the differences between excavated artifacts and the biographical objects described in the Homeric epics, at times, it seems that the lines between the archaeological finds and the written record are blurred in an effort to animate to mute evidence. Van Wijngaarden, on the other hand, steers clear of the epics in his examination of “antique” Mycenaean imports in the Levant and Cyprus. Instances of curated Aegean objects occur in the eastern Mediterranean at centers of cultic activities\textsuperscript{223} and in domestic contexts,\textsuperscript{224} but Van Wijngaarden makes little comment on the social role of these singular objects in their foreign settings.

\textsuperscript{221} Van Wijngaarden 2005. His study is useful in that it highlights a number of chronologically out-of-sync objects from the prehistoric Aegean in eastern Mediterranean contexts. However, his assessment of the meaning of these imports is problematic, in part because he uses definitions for “souvenirs,” “antiques,” or “heirlooms” (407) that diverge from the terms’ more widely accepted meanings. For example, he characterizes a souvenir as an object exported when it was already old and kept in a new territory as a treasured object. However, strictly speaking, a souvenir is an object marked by its capacity to evoke remembrance. A souvenir could therefore be a new object kept as a memento of some recent event. Similarly, Van Wijngaarden does not mention a familial connection as being a criterion of an heirloom. Instead he considers what otherwise might be called “found objects” (i.e. things “deposited in the archaeological record for a substantial period before they came back into circulation” as “heirlooms”).

\textsuperscript{222} Whitley 2002; Whitley 2013.

\textsuperscript{223} Aegean objects (stirrup jars, pictorial kraters, among others) were recovered from deposits rich in other imports, including Egyptian antiques at Deir ‘Allah and Beth Shean (both in Jordan) and Myrtou-Pigadhes in Cyprus (Van Wijngaarden 2005, 412). A LH IIIA2 conical rhyton found on a LC IIC-LC IIIA floor in a sanctuary at Myrtou-Pigadhes on Cyprus may have been a ritual item used at the sanctuary for decades (Van Wijngaarden 2005, 411-2).

\textsuperscript{224} Although antique Mycenaean vessels found in domestic contexts at Ugarit in northern Syria or Enkomi in Cyprus may have surfaced from earlier stratigraphic layers at the time of the sites’ destruction, it seems probable that the two intact LH IIIA2-LH IIIB alabastra from the settlement of Ugarit had been curated.
Some classes of artifacts may have been kept regularly for long periods of time, as several scholars have observed. In the case of a series of bronze stands, which were manufactured first in Cyprus in the late 13th or early 12th century but also found in 10th to 8th century contexts throughout the western Mediterranean, Catling’s proposal that they were curated in antiquity is controversial, since the stands’ dating is based on style, construction, and geographic distribution. Catling asserts that knowledge of brazing did not survive the upheavals at the end of the Bronze Age, so the presence of hard-soldered stands in post-Bronze Age contexts points to their conscious preservation over time. Matthäus raises questions about this thesis and instead asks whether Iron Age Greek craftsmen produced bronze stands inspired by Bronze Age Cypriot models. More recently, scholars have acknowledged that, while Catling’s “heirloom theory” cannot serve as a universal explanation for bronze stands in Iron Age contexts, some examples, such as the four-sided stand from the Subminoan tomb in the Knossos North cemetery, were indeed antiques in their Aegean setting. Archaeometric testing might be able to reveal elemental or technological differences between the Bronze Age stands and their supposed Iron Age imitators. Yet even if the stands from later contexts had been forged in the Iron Age, their proximity to Bronze Age examples seems to suggest continuity in
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225 Catling (1984) proposes that the stands were valued as “marvels” in part because of the complex techniques used in their production.

226 Matthäus (1988) notes that stands in Iron Age contexts have embellishments uncharacteristic of those from Bronze Age levels, and most of the purported heirloom stands were recovered from Crete and other parts of Greece rather than Cyprus (the supposed source of these objects).

227 Catling 1996, 517-8, No. 201.f1, figs. 165-6, pl. 276; Papasavvas 2012, 132.

228 See Whitley (2013, 406 Tables 2 and 4) for a summary based on an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation by George Papasavvas (“Χαλκινοί Υποστατες απο την Κυπρο και την Κρητη: Τριποδικοι και Τετραπλευροι Υποστατες απο την Υστερη Εποχη του Χαλκου εως την Πρωιμη Εποχη του Σιδερου,” University of Cyprus, Nicosia [2001]). Cypriot bronze rod tripods range in date from 1200-1050 B.C. but were found in contexts of 950-700 B.C.; the 100-400 year gap represents 3-16 generations. Cypriot four-sided stands, manufactured between 1200-1050 B.C., were found in contexts from 1050-950 B.C. and were perhaps 50-100 years old at the time of deposition, a span of two to four generations.
the craft of metallurgy between the Bronze and Iron Ages. Alternatively, the physical survival or recovery of earlier specimens that were used as models could account for the Iron Age products. The manufacturing of stands based on centuries-old prototypes might be viewed then as another symptom of Iron Age and Geometric period interest in Bronze Age remains, which has been the focus of much recent research.

Hostetter also concentrates on curated bronze artifacts only for the Classical period at the Adriatic port of Spina. With ample contextual data available, he is able to draw some fascinating conclusions about the shifting lifespans of banqueting bronzes in the Spina necropoleis. In the 5th century, bronzes in tombs typically predate the pottery by several decades—and sometimes as much as a century. Unique, heavy, and probably difficult to acquire, these pieces may have been handed down through several generations before deposition, and many exhibit ancient repairs indicative of their special status. During the first half of the 4th century, however, a change occurred as the chronological gap between the bronzes and the other contents of the tombs closed. At the same time, the quality of bronzes declined. Now lighter, they were less valuable materially. Moreover, their formal similarities suggest that they were “stock products,” no longer singular. These factors might have compelled the owners to remove them from circulation after much shorter intervals.

Other scholars have conducted effective microanalyses of anachronistic artifacts within their social context. Combining diverse lines of evidence, including available osteological data, contextual data such as the accompanying finds, and historical
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231 Hostetter 1998, 80-1.
233 Hostetter 1998, 81.
testimonia, these researchers have probed the social and emotional value of objects curated in the past. Most detailed is a study by Susan Langdon,\textsuperscript{234} which takes two distinctive Geometric period vessels as the points of departure for a discussion of how artifacts may simultaneously narrate their own life histories and those of their owners. The first, a large (1.0 m in height) pyxis manufactured between 750 and 730 B.C., was some twenty-five years old when it was deposited in the grave of a 35-year-old woman in Argos.\textsuperscript{235} Langdon speculates that the pot, which dates to the woman’s teenage years, may have been acquired at the time of a transitional rite, such as the woman’s marriage.\textsuperscript{236} In contrast, a pithos (720-700 B.C.) uncovered during excavations of the Pyri suburb of Thebes had several ancient repairs, which hint at its protracted life prior to its use as a coffin for a child.\textsuperscript{237} The unusual imagery shows an adult lyre-player, two small figures, and a group of six women in long skirts. As Langdon observes, the children are central to the composition. She suggests that the vase may show the peculiarly Theban festival of the Daphnephoria, and the young male, therefore, is the \textit{daphnephoros}, a noble boy who acted as the priest of Apollo for a limited period and as a \textit{choregos}, along with a young female.\textsuperscript{238} The \textit{kalathiskos} (a small version of the basket that held wool) also found within the grave could indicate that the deceased child was a female. The inclusion of the pithos which may illustrate an important local rite-of-passage could suggest that the child interred had fulfilled the role of \textit{choregos} in the Daphnephoria, or was destined to do so. The signs of use and repair, indicators of the vessel’s prior use-life, suggest that the vessel had been curated and perhaps was earmarked as an intergenerational object. If

\textsuperscript{234} Langdon 2001.
\textsuperscript{235} Argos Museum C. 209. Langdon 2001, 585, fig. 2.
\textsuperscript{236} Langdon 2001, 589-90.
\textsuperscript{237} Langdon 2001, 592-5, fig. 6.
\textsuperscript{238} Langdon 2001, 595.
we follow Langdon’s hypothesis, the vessel was an heirloom that linked members of a family who had held this honorary position or were intended to. Other examples of curated objects offering clues about the lives of the people with whom they were associated will be discussed in greater detail below and in the catalogue. These include a Lakonian column-krater found in a grave in ancient Cumae (A.51), a lekythos from Selinous (A.112), and a pithos fragment from Gela (A.91).

Although few, site-wide surveys of potential *keimêlia* offer important corollaries to the more numerous explorations of the microhistories of individual artifacts mentioned above. These expansive site studies have confirmed, firstly, that artifacts from a wide range of dates can coexist within a given deposit. Second, they have shown that *keimêlia* are idiosyncratic; at a single site, evidence for the curation of objects as different as scarabs, fine drinking vessels, fibulae, razors, pithoi, and lithics was uncovered. These seasoned items served different purposes, including protection, personal adornment, storage, everyday eating and drinking, and formal eating and drinking. Contextual data suggest their meanings were similarly diverse. Nizzo’s exhaustive survey of the grave goods from three Geometric cemeteries on the Italian peninsula (Osteria dell’Osà, Veii, Pontecagnano) and offshore at Pithekoussai allows him to ascertain moments when older objects—sometimes by as little as fifteen or twenty years—were deployed in tombs. 239 By disentangling the complex horizontal and vertical stratigraphies, and cross-dating each artifact with parallel examples from the site where it was found and other contemporary sites, he produces a refined relative chronology for the different classes of objects. Although one would expect a site-wide analysis of this sort to yield significant
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239 Nizzo 2010.
patterns in terms of the types of artifacts curated over time, in fact, the study revealed mostly singletons. In other words, even when surveyed systematically, keimêlia may defy classification and, therefore, must be treated and interpreted as the singular possessions that they were. Other studies worth mention are those that offer not just a single date for a tomb based on the last of the grave goods but also the chronological span of the tomb’s contents.\footnote{Carter 1998; Kustermann Graf 2002.} For example, the detailed study of the tomb contents at the Metaponto necropoleis has revealed no certain examples of “heirlooms,”\footnote{Morter and Hall 1998, 450.} but the chronological span of the grave goods in many tombs is somewhat broad (i.e. twenty-five or thirty years), due to the fact that a large percentage of the vessels interred were plain wares that cannot be placed more precisely.

Two major points emerge from this brief summary of scholarship on chronologically anomalous artifacts in ancient Mediterranean contexts. First, while site-wide surveys of keimêlia at some locations, such as Pithekoussai, reveal the diversity of objects curated, still others show strong patterning. Hostetter’s diachronic look at metal objects in the Spina graves was able to show shifting practices in preservation, which he posits may be linked to changes in the production and availability of metal banqueting equipment between the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries. Where possible, therefore, it is advantageous to attempt large-scale inquiries, even though the results may underwhelm. Second, when informed by testimonia and anthropological research, the micro-analysis of individual artifacts in their contexts can afford glimpses into the social as opposed to economic reasons for curation. Some aspects of Langdon’s conclusions regarding the two Geometric vases may be criticized as speculative, but to dismiss these objects as
fundamentally incomprehensible would mean neglecting important sources for understanding how objects from the past were employed for the construction of personhood. Such objects can illuminate the lives of women and children or other groups that receive little comment within the ancient literary record. By probing the points of intersection in the lives of these vessels and the deceased with whom they were interred, Langdon effectively reanimates these artifacts’ rich biographies. In contrast, Van Wijngaarden’s look at Mycenaean antiques in the East floats comfortably on the surface, pointing out anachronisms and their contexts but not approaching questions of their social meaning. The few previous studies of *keimêlia* in Mediterranean contexts thus show that this class of artifacts deserves discussion at different scales in order to access the fullest range of their significance.

3. *Comparative Archaeology and Anthropology*

Other important insights can be gleaned from the study of intergenerational objects by archaeologists, anthropologists, ethnographers, and theorists of consumer behavior working in different parts of the globe and in different time periods. Archaeological case studies from pharaonic Egypt, medieval Europe, and Latin America show different patterns in curation among diverse cultural groups, some of which confirm expectations, while others defy them. Anthropologists and ethnographers who study populations of the more recent past or of still living communities have the advantage of working from eyewitness or oral accounts, or of actually interviewing informants about their behaviors. Similarly, scholars of consumer behavior have surveyed broad cross-sections of (usually Western) populations in order to understand why people elect to keep things over time. These more contemporary ethnographies can help us understand how
heirlooms and other curated objects operate within different societies, as well as the processes by which these objects became singularized

3.1 *Comparative Archaeology*

The presence or absence of heirlooms within a given culture depends in large part on the social structures in place. In Edwardian Britain (A.D. 1272-1327), for example, where inheritance was sometimes disputed, objects from the past rose to prominence as witnesses to the births of heirs, as John Bedell has shown in his study of “proof of age” records.\(^{242}\) If a vassal died leaving an underaged heir, the heir became a ward of the vassal’s lord until the heir had come of age (generally at 21 years old for males). Because no birth records were kept in this period, the heir’s age was established through inquest by a jury of twelve men, who stood before a judge and recounted memories of pivotal events in their personal lives (i.e. storms, pilgrimages, wars, accidents, births, marriages and deaths) that happened within a year of the heir’s birth. In some cases, the jurors recounted giving gifts, such as jewels, cows, or other valuables, to the messengers who came bearing news of a birth.\(^{243}\) In other cases, fathers who were anxious about the possibility of leaving an underaged heir “resorted to ritual enhancement of memory” through gift-giving upon the occasion of the heir’s baptism; swords, bows and arrows and cows are all attested.\(^{244}\) The neighbors and comrades in attendance could be called upon during the proof-of-age inquest and perhaps even show the objects as proof.

The social and religious structures operative within a community also were partially responsible for the timing and settings of the transfer of heirlooms. Gilchrist, in

\(^{242}\) Bedell 1999. This case would seem to fit Lillios’ model of the circumstances of heirloom transmission (1999, fig. 1). As she notes, in societies where hereditary rights are contested, heirlooms are more common and circulate for longer periods.

\(^{243}\) Bedell 1999, 14.

\(^{244}\) Bedell 1999, 26.
her study of heirlooms in Tudor Britain (12th-16th centuries A.D.), found little mention of the transmission of these objects in medieval wills, which suggests that they instead were bequeathed prior to death, possibly during other transitional rites, such as baptisms, coming-of-age ceremonies, and marriages. Accordingly, her survey of archaeological contexts turned up no clear examples of long-lived objects in graves but some from household destruction levels, rubbish pits, and shipwrecks, which implies that these items were kept within living communities. Another interesting pattern she noted was the bequest of personal belongings to parish churches in medieval wills. Whereas men gave books and other objects related to worship, women offered textiles and jewelry from their own trousseaux to dress statues of the saints. Archaeological evidence seems to corroborate these accounts; at the Scottish nunnery of Iona, established in 1203, a set of four silver spoons dated to 1150 were found in special deposit, and other personal effects, such as gold wedding rings or fillets from headdresses of the type worn by brides, were also found in excavations of sacred spaces. Gilchrist posits that because these objects played a role in Christian rituals such as baptisms or marriages, they were viewed as consecrated and could be disposed of only through dedication to the church itself. Giving to the church was also a means of keeping inalienable personal possessions out of the spheres of exchange by rendering them “sacred objects.” These findings underscore the importance of considering all context types when seeking examples of curated objects. They also draw attention to the fact that heirlooms—which we generally think of as possessions kept within a family—can cross over from the private domain to a public

245 Gilchrist 2013, 175.
246 Gilchrist 2013, 176.
247 Gilchrist 2013, 177-8.
248 Gilchrist 2013, 178.
domain. In the ancient Mediterranean, deposits at sanctuaries may contain objects that had been curated by individuals and households, but because these contexts are typically of mixed chronology, it is generally difficult to identify *keimêlia* among them. In addition, inventories note damage on objects in temple storerooms that might have occurred post-dedication but also could have happened when these items were in the hands of their original owners.  

Although we might expect that heirlooms were prevalent in a society like pharaonic Egypt, where social stratification was pronounced and lineage was emphasized, there was no word for heirloom, only words for heir, heiress and inheritance. A diachronic survey of archaeological finds yielded few candidates for heirlooms—mostly functional or magical implements like bone or ivory wands used in birthing ceremonies. These charged objects were deployed only occasionally and, therefore, were likely to be preserved across generations. The Tomb of King Tutankhamun, who died at a young age, was anomalous in that it contained a number of objects with signs of long use-lives (amphorae that had been broken and mended, travertine vessels with ownership inscriptions of Tuthmosis III, a lock of hair from Tutankhamen’s grandmother Tiye). One might question whether the insertion of heirlooms was a practical measure that can be attributed to the pharaoh’s premature death or whether these older objects played some ideological role. Despite the paucity of possible heirlooms, Jeffreys concludes that heirlooms were present in pharaonic Egypt and served as “a means of conferring status and perpetuating memory in all sectors of
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249 See below, p. 176. Jewelry was a class of object that might be dedicated by a woman to the gods in thanksgiving for ushering her through various transitions (e.g. from girlhood to womanhood, childbirth).  
250 Jeffreys 2003, 196. See also Stevenson (2006, 190) for discussion of heirlooms in predynastic Egypt.  
251 Jeffreys 2003, 199.  
252 Jeffreys 2003, 209-10
society” but were rarely placed in the tomb.\textsuperscript{253} The case of Egypt suggests that the lack of a word for heirloom in a given language need not imply that objects did not function as heirlooms within that society, a point relevant for Latin, which also has no obvious term for heirlooms.

3.2 Anthropology, Ethnography, and Consumer Behavior

While archaeologists can theorize about the significance of objects curated in the past (generally by anonymous individuals), anthropologists, ethnographers and students of consumer behavior are able to ask targeted questions about the motivations underpinning these behaviors. Approaching the body of evidence from different perspectives, these scholars have emphasized diverse aspects of curated objects, including their role in the negotiation of authority, their part in constructing personal identities, and their appeal to consumer tastes.

A number of social scientists have anchored discussions of heirlooms—or, we might say more generally, “curated objects”—on moments of exchange or transmission. Among the Haya of Tanzania, following the death of the male head of the household, his clothing plays an important role in the ceremonial installation of the new heir. After the funeral, the chosen successor would don an animal skin of the deceased individual and sit in his chair. The skin was in essence an article of clothing, but it was also tangible symbol of familial authority and, as such, it facilitated the transmission of power from the dead leader to the living successor.\textsuperscript{254} Belinda Straight, on the other hand, has explored the movement of heirlooms across geographic and cultural boundaries.\textsuperscript{255} Since the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, Venetian trade beads (mporo) in Kenya were passed down through

\textsuperscript{253} Jeffreys 2003, 211.
\textsuperscript{254} Weiss 1996.
\textsuperscript{255} Straight 2002.
generations of women on the occasion of their marriages. These foreign imports were assimilated into the Samburu social structures as symbols of fertility and abundance. In recent decades, however, these beads have made their way to the international market, where they are purchased by European and American women not solely as exotic fashion but as New Age ritual objects. For these women, the distant origins and patina—the dirt and age—of the beads gives them a “fictitious inalienability,” meaning a sanctity that is completely detached from their Samburu significance. We see then that the transfer of objects with known pasts could be an effective means of communicating continuity between generations, whereas objects with unknown or discontinuous pasts could still be powerful agents, if they were invested with imagined or invented meanings.

In her sweeping survey of archaeological and ethnographic literature, Lillios stresses the role of heirlooms in legitimizing claims to socio-political authority.\textsuperscript{256} She observes that heirlooms tend to play a large part in chiefdom level societies, where ascribed rather than achieved status is a primary determinant of a person’s future rank, rights, and responsibilities. Under such conditions, the intergenerational transmission of objects that serve as symbols of hereditary status is an important strategy for creating and maintaining the social order. In contrast, heirlooms are less important in communities where rank is determined by achievement. Lillios’ model suggests that heirlooms become prominent at moments when tension arises between achieved and inherited rank as the primary means of negotiating social identity.\textsuperscript{257} For further discussion of this model, see Chapter 5 (pp. 250-1).

\textsuperscript{256} Lillios 1999.
\textsuperscript{257} Lillios 1999, 256, fig. 1.
Anthropologists Walker and Schiffer have theorized about the specific mechanisms by which objects such as heirlooms or mementoes, which have no religious significance or economic value, become sacralized possessions. They propose that these objects hold an animate power, similar to objects thought to have a supernatural force. This “residue,” which stems from previous owners’ social power, prevents later parties from discarding these items even when they are no longer useful; in essence, it transforms them into inalienable possessions.\(^{258}\) Equally, the same system that encourages the curation of an object might lead to its destruction, if the person or group whose “residue” is encapsulated in the object has fallen out of favor.

While objects from the past may have a public role in helping individuals navigate social structures, they also can have a more private function as “biographical objects” (sometimes known as “history objects”), which assist with the construction and maintenance of people’s personal identities.\(^{259}\) Biographical objects are a specific kind of object intrinsically linked to individuals. As companions at important junctures (births, marriages, rites-of-passage), biographical objects serve as prompts for people to relate these pivotal episodes in their lives. The impulse to assign autobiographical significance to portable goods is in part the product of cultural patterning, but it is also, to some degree, innately human. One society where personhood is linked intimately to objects is that of the Kodi on the western tip of the East Indonesian island of Sumba. J. Hoskins has documented the nuances of how the Kodi narrate their personal histories through their possessions.\(^{260}\) For example, one of her informants believed that the betel bag given to him by his grandfather during a rite-of-passage contained not only the betel compound

\(^{258}\) Walker and Schiffer 2006, 84.
\(^{259}\) Hoskins 1998.
\(^{260}\) Hoskins 1998, 112.
but the grandfather’s words of wisdom. For the Kodi, the betel bag is so closely tied to
the owner that its burial would be tantamount to the owner’s social death. 261 Biographical
objects are not heirlooms belonging to a family: they are private in nature, their
significance rooted in a very specific time and place and tied to a unique owner. 262
Biographical objects thus simultaneously embody a person’s past, present, and future. 263

Lillios, Walker and Schiffer, and Hoskins adopt functionalist views, attributing
the presence or absence of heirlooms or biographical objects to societal structures, but
one must also be mindful of the materiality of curated objects and their emotional pull.
Gilchrist’s aforementioned study stresses the phenomenological aspects of heirlooms,
including their composition and their emotive force. 264 Her survey reveals that heirlooms
frequently are composed of unusual or exotic materials with possible “cosmological”
significance, 265 a pattern attested also for keimèlia as we will see in Chapter 4 (pp. 188-
204).

While archaeologists and anthropologists generally assume an anthropocentric
approach to “heirlooms,” by focusing on the role of these objects within social systems,
researchers of modern consumer practices adopt more of an artifact-centered approach,
which explores the narratives associated with individual artifacts and the attributes that
transformed these things from exchange goods into inalienable possessions. These
investigations concentrate on contemporary communities, but a number of the patterns
observed have ancient parallels that make them anecdotally useful for the present study.

262 Hoskins 1998, 8, 11.
264 Gilchrist 2013.
265 Gilchrist 2013, 173. For example, 200-year-old blue glass sherds from the Peloponnese that were several
centuries old; or a sword pommel carved from a whale bone that was perhaps two centuries old at the time
of disposal (174).
Furthermore, they introduce a new and helpful set of terms to describe phenomena surrounding acts of intergenerational curation. Interviews with modern consumers about their favorite possessions reveal, unsurprisingly, that people form attachments with diverse objects and for a panoply of reasons.\textsuperscript{266} Even so, three common situations seem to foster attachment: intimate interactions across time; ongoing effort to learn or maintain an object’s functionality; and the esteem for an object as a member of a collection, which represents a person’s values.\textsuperscript{267} Objects that are unique or rare, imbued with personal histories or memories, or won through some accomplishment, are most conducive to attachment.\textsuperscript{268}

Other studies that explore various aspects of heirlooms’ physical forms and the process of singularization reveal the many layers of complexity to human-thing attachment. Epp has shown that the trajectories of heirlooms or other singularized objects within a family are not necessarily predictable; things that were once considered inalienable can be recommodified (i.e. reenter exchange networks) as the interests of a family change or as new things are introduced to the home. Likewise, families can attempt to revitalize the sacred nature of things which have been displaced temporarily.\textsuperscript{269} Through an in-depth look at the process by which personal keepsakes become a family’s inalienable wealth, Curasi, Price and Arnould make a distinction between objects that were curated by individuals versus families.\textsuperscript{270} A number of scholars have shown that objects from the past assume a greater importance in the definition of personhood at times when people are physically uprooted or in emotional turmoil, such as refugee

\textsuperscript{266}Jung et al. 2011, 66.
\textsuperscript{267}Jung et al. 2011, 65-6.
\textsuperscript{268}Jung et al. 2011, 67.
\textsuperscript{269}Epp and Price 2009.
\textsuperscript{270}Curasi, Price, and Arnould 2004.
situations\textsuperscript{271} and migration,\textsuperscript{272} since things become anchors for various aspects of the self, the homeland, and the family left behind. The values at play within a given culture may dictate what types of objects were kept across time. For example, immigrants to the United States from India, where there is less emphasis on individualism than in Western societies, often identified what might be considered communal objects (e.g. photos of ancestors, religious paraphernalia) as their favorite possessions.\textsuperscript{273} Although these findings cannot be applied uncritically to ancient case studies, they can be kept in mind when approaching material from antiquity for which we lack comprehensive narratives.

4. Case Studies

The following case studies center on diverse artifacts selected from the catalogue of over 100 potential \textit{keimêlia} in \textbf{Appendix 2}. The catalogue was assembled through a review of excavation reports and scholarly articles, as well as the survey of objects with ancient repairs discussed in Chapter 3. The intention is not to be comprehensive but instead to present an array of artifacts within diverse cultural contexts, which show different approaches to curation in antiquity. Each artifact is given an alphanumerical designation beginning with an A. The catalogue entries provide basic information about the object (bibliography, material, object type, place of origin, current museum location and inventory number), followed by available information on the artifact’s condition (including signs of ancient repair and wear), a description of the iconography or decoration (if any), attribution, and date. Next follows a short description of the findspot, the assemblage, and its date. A discussion section presents different possible

\textsuperscript{271} Parkin 1999. At times when other people cannot be trusted to maintain an awareness of an individual’s personal and cultural identity, he or she may inscribe these sentiments on objects (308).
\textsuperscript{272} Mehta and Belk 1991.
\textsuperscript{273} Mehta and Belk 1991, 408.
interpretations for each artifact in light of its immediate archaeological context and the site-wide context. The organization of the artifacts in the catalogue — by region, site, and chronology — is designed to facilitate the detection of site- or regional-patterns. The aim in the discussion section and the organization is to balance different scales of analysis. The artifacts in the case studies illustrate different types of *keimêlia* represented in antiquity and show the range of functions for these objects from the past in the ancient present.

4.1 *Defining Terms*

Archaeologists, anthropologists, folklorists, and scholars of modern consumer behaviors have grouped material survivals from earlier periods according to different systems, based on factors such as an object’s age at the time of curation, mode of acquisition, purpose, emotional hold, history of ownership, and the intentionality of curation. This study uses the following terms, drawn from some of these different disciplines, to classify objects that predate their contexts: *companion objects, mementoes, heirlooms, entangled objects, antiques, and found objects*. These categories are by no means mutually exclusive, and, indeed, items may shift from one type to another during the course of their lifetimes or occupy two categories simultaneously. Nevertheless, establishing a common vocabulary is useful heuristically as we move from the identification of *keimêlia* toward their interpretation. Often it is difficult to assign a specimen to a single category when discussing excavated artifacts, which generally are mute regarding their histories. Instead, we can weigh multiple different possibilities.

4.2 *Loom Weights as Companion Objects*
Many of the objects with extended biographies mentioned in ancient testimonia were considered treasures worthy of keeping likely due to their valuable material composition or fine craftsmanship; however, some are more modest, utilitarian goods. It can be difficult to detect archaeologically the everyday objects that were curated in the past, since these items often have plain or conservative morphologies that prohibit precise dating. Loom weights are one class of utilitarian artifact that scholars have been able to place within a sufficiently narrow chronological framework to establish their protracted use-lives.\textsuperscript{274} The integration of the principles of materiality and \textit{chaîne opératoire} to the study of loom weights introduces the possibility that these tools were deeply embedded within social networks, and, therefore, were encoded not only with technological knowledge but familial and personal identities.

In the survey of Metaponto in southern Italy, several examples of loom weights were collected that had remained in use for a generation or more. One (A.55) was a part of a set of six found at the site of a Greek farmhouse (site 309). While the other five weights were unmarked and comparable in terms of fabric and size, the specimen under consideration was slightly lighter, was composed of a finer clay, and bore the impression of an unusual stamp: an Orientalizing deity riding between two horses with rays emanating from her head.\textsuperscript{275} Considering the physical differences between the impressed loom weight and the others at site 309, Foxhall suggests that this singleton, which belongs morphologically to the late 5\textsuperscript{th} or early 4\textsuperscript{th} century, had once been a part of

\textsuperscript{274} Although one should note that loom weights can be difficult to date because they are often coarsely made (Davidson 1952, 158) and, as utilitarian items, their form does not change very much over time. See Biers (1992, 54-5) for a discussion of the stylistic development of Corinthian loom weights.

\textsuperscript{275} The stamp has no definite parallels but appears most similar to motifs of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century; it was an heirloom perhaps as much as a century old when it was impressed on the late 5\textsuperscript{th} or early 4\textsuperscript{th} century loom weight (Foxhall 2011, 546).
another set made two or three decades earlier than the others, which date to the second half of the 4th century.276 A second example (A.56) is the inscribed late Archaic loom weight found in the excavation of the late 4th century levels at the Fattoria Fabrizio farmhouse. It had been kept for a long period, probably over a century.277 The inscription (IN) is drawn with a cursive iota, which is not found much later than 500 B.C. and is more typical of cities south of Metaponto such as Rhegion. Foxhall proposes that this loom weight was perhaps two centuries old when the house was abandoned. It may have been transported to Metaponto by a woman from another city.278 The Metapontine examples are not the only loom weights that were kept for decades; a loom weight found in the excavation of a shop in the South Stoa at Corinth was a century older than its context,279 which was dated to c. 250 B.C.280

Loom weights are highly durable and, as Davidson notes, “they could be used for centuries.”281 For this reason, they might be considered examples of Binford’s “curated technology,”282 kept for their continuing utility. Yet attention to the chaîne opératoire and the archaeology of emotion allows us to appreciate the complex ways in which these objects became entangled with networks of people and operated in memory practice. The concept of chaîne opératoire, as it is broadly applied, is more than a framework for reconstructing the sequence by which artifacts were manufactured from raw materials through to the final product. It considers the ways in which objects were sold,

279 It was stamped with the word ΜΕΛΙΣ (Davidson 1952, 158, No. 1166). These weights have been dated to the second half of the 4th century B.C. based on a closed deposit from the Potters’ Quarter.
280 Davidson 1952, 146.
281 Davidson 1952, 146.
transported, used, reused, broken down and disposed of, along with the decision-making processes and the behaviors (routine and otherwise) of the human agents who interacted with these things at each stage. This heuristic device effectively animates lifeless archaeological remains by helping us envision the dynamic processes that fed into artifacts’ existence. Tracing the chaîne opératoire reveals specific moments where human-object lives came into alignment.

It appears that loom weights from Metaponto and her environs were often personalized already in the manufacturing phase, which suggests that these tools were viewed as special, individualized belongings from the beginning of their use-lives. A large portion of the Classical loom weights collected through the Metaponto surface survey and excavation had stamped impressions; 37% of the disk-shaped weights were marked, a percentage somewhat higher than in the mainland of Greece. Of these, 64% bore impressions from seal rings or stamps, which Foxhall argues should be understood as ownership marks rather than manufacturers’ trademarks, since the stamps are so numerous and diverse. Implicit in the practice of stamping is the consumer or user’s choice of an object to preserve through the impression, which would be viewed continuously across time as the weights were used, and the consumer’s involvement in production. Notably, almost all loom weights recovered had traces of wear.

Foxhall contends that the impressions identified the loom weights as the possessions of a particular family; however, we might imagine other scenarios, such as that the marks helped to distinguish weights of a set or of the same mass. Impressing a loom weight with the image of a deity may have placed it under his or her auspices, thus

---

283 For a succinct overview, see Schlanger 2005. Also see Lemonnier 1992, especially pp. 25-50.
284 Foxhall 2011, 545.
285 A proposal made by Davidson for loom weights from Corinth (Davidson 1952, 152).
transforming a utilitarian object into a talisman of sorts, which brought success in the craft. Whether these impressions were family or personal signets, served a practical purpose, or had a tutelary function, they transformed an otherwise plain object into something distinctive and, therefore, heightened its mnemonic potential. Women who used these tools would have encountered the marks each time they strung the loom, and, as Foxhall notes, these singularized objects might have conjured up memories of female kin for younger generations of women, who learned to weave from their elders and perhaps spent time at the loom with their mothers and grandmothers sharing knowledge and stories. The chronological and geographic displacement proposed for one loom weight (A.56) from the Metaponto project lends support to Foxhall’s proposal that these unassuming objects may have become a physical focus for networks of female kin to remember their families as they were dispersed through the landscape through marriage and migration. This theory, while admittedly hypothetical, highlights the potential of ordinary possessions to produce alternative histories. Moreover, we might imagine the same type of transmission along lines of female kinship for other objects like jewelry, which are less frequently preserved in the material record.

Loom weights, according to the above analysis, would be prime examples of *companion objects*—inconspicuous, steadfast presences usually found in domestic settings. As Kirshenblatt-Gimblett explains, “such objects are not ‘saved’; they are allowed to grow old and, however humble, they accumulate meaning and value by sheer dint of their constancy in life.” Companion objects are some of the most intimate kinds of possessions, since they are used regularly and, therefore, age in tandem with their
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286 I am grateful to A. Kuttner for this suggestion.
287 Foxhall 2012, 204.
owners. Any type of mundane object—a utilitarian jug, a tool of one’s trade, a cooking utensil, a storage jar, or a loom weight—may become a companion object. These types of things often fly under the radar in studies focused on the significance of objects from the past, since “it is extremely difficult to disentangle the use-related function from the symbolic meanings in even the most practical objects. Even purely functional things serve to socialize a person to a certain habit or way of life and are representative signs of that way of life.”

Within the catalogue, it is possible that other artifacts, which predate their contexts but do not stand out as particularly fine or unusual (A.21; A.78) may have carried some kind of sentiment for their owners, simply because they had existed within a household as companion objects for an extended period. And probably many other companion objects go completely undetected in archaeological research. As Crooke explains, “It is rare that any object is purely functional; instead even the most mundane and everyday will have layers of associations and meanings waiting to be revealed.”

4.2 Prizes as Mementoes

While companion objects become repositories of individual and collective memories informally through practice, other types of objects are curated more purposefully. Mementoes are items kept deliberately as prompts for future remembrance of specific events. Like companion objects, mementoes have highly personal significance. In modern U.S. society, mementoes are critical to the maintenance of personal identities because they serve as proofs of past accomplishments, and, as we will see, the majority of the mementoes identifiable in the archaeological and epigraphic
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292 Curasi 2011, 111.
records of the Archaic and Classical Mediterranean were prizes won in competitions. Agonistic practice was a cornerstone of ancient Greek culture, and physical objects were given as prizes in cultural and athletic competitions both for pan-Hellenic and civic games.

We know from testimonia that the concept of a memento was operative in antiquity; Chapter 1 opened with the quote from the Iliad in which Achilles offers Nestor a phiale as a memento (mnêma) of the funeral games of Patroklos (T.18). The gesture is especially poignant, since Nestor acts as an historian for a younger generation of Greeks, recounting events beyond the scope of their memory. With this gift, Achilles both honors the elderly king and, we might surmise, establishes his fallen comrade’s place within the Greeks’ lore. Also in Chapter 1 (p. 22), we looked at a passage from Xenophanes (fr. 2.9), who notes that an Olympic victor received a gift from his city to be kept as a keimêlion or a remembrance of his victory. Many of the athletic competitions in antiquity offered durable material rewards that might have become mementoes for the victors and their kin. Perhaps best known are the Panathenaic prize amphorae, the ceramic containers for the sacred oil awarded to victors of the Panathenaic games beginning slightly before 560 B.C. The vessels were produced in large numbers; accounts suggest that winners sometimes received over 100 vessels. Although valued for their content, they may have been kept as trophies as well. Pindar also writes of the

293 The epics do not seem to associate old age with forgetfulness.
294 Pind. N. 10.35-6 seems to allude to Panathenaic prize amphorae: γαία δὲ καυθείσα πυρὶ καρπόξελαίας ἐμολεν Ἡρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν ἐν ἀγγέωνέρκεσιν παμποικίλοις “and in earth baked by fire olive oil came to the fine men of Hera's city in jars with richly painted sides” (Trans. J. Sandys, 1937).
295 For the Panathenaic prize amphorae, see Bentz 1998 and Tiverios 2007.
Sikyonian silverware distributed as prizes for the Lykaian games.²⁹⁷ One must not forget that these commemorative prizes had definite economic value: Panathenaic amphorae for their contents, and metal vessels for their material.

Inscriptions on a number of objects corroborate these testimonia. A tentative example was already mentioned in Chapter 1—the coarse lekythos from Cyprus, inscribed with the word *keimêlion*: “Ερμαίος με εὑρές κειμήλιον ἀθλω: (“Hermaios found me, trophy for a contest”²⁹⁸). As noted, the final word is uncertain, but this particular transliteration of the text would indicate that the vessel was a memento of some contest won. An eye-cup said to be from Taranto but now in the Metropolitan Museum offers a less ambiguous example of an object won as a prize (E.9); the inscription states that the cup was won by Melosa in the girls’ carding contest, a hitherto unattested competition for untangling wool. The inscription on an aryballos from Corinth (E.4) suggests that this vessel might have been a prize in a dancing competition. Similarly, the inscription on a bronze kalpis now in the collection of the Rhode Island School of Design Museum states that it was a prize for the Theban games (E.16).

Whereas we can cite several testimonia and inscriptions referring to objects that served—or were intended to serve—as mementoes of particular events, it is far more difficult to isolate examples from the archaeological record. A bronze dinos (A.25) from the so-called Tomb of Aspasia, a tumulus burial near the Piraeus, Attika, contained the ashes of the deceased. The vessel, now in the British Museum, was at least three decades older than the grave’s other contents and bore an inscription stating that it was a prize [for

²⁹⁸ Volioti and Papageorgiou 2008, 22.
the games of] Argive Hera. The RISD kalpis and the British Museum dinos, as metal vessels, were objects of definite monetary value as well.

The Panathenaic prize amphora (A.113) found in a tomb in Barka, Libya (ancient Cyrenaica), is another example of an object that was curated, perhaps as a memento of an athlete’s victory. Even with the down-dating of the vessel from 500-490 B.C. to 480-470 B.C as a result of its reassignment from the Kleophrades Painter to the Painter of the Montauban Centaurs, the amphora would have predated the assemblage (425 B.C.) by over half a century. A certain Amesinas of Cyrene, a celebrated wrestler, is attested as an Olympic victor in the pentathalon of 460 B.C., which is quite close to the date of the amphora, yet Vickers and Bazama caution against assuming that the deceased was Amesinas himself. The broad span between the amphora’s date of manufacture and date of deposition would suggest either that the vessel was a family heirloom passed down through perhaps two generations or that the deceased himself had won the vase as a very young man. The imagery would seem to support the latter proposal; the discus thrower pictured on side B is unbearded and shorter in stature than the adult flute-player and judge beside him. If the amphora had served as a prize in the boys’ pentathlon, then the deceased could have been the victor.

A victory in an athletic competition was a key moment in an individual’s life, often commemorated at the time of the funeral. With osteological evidence lacking for the Cyrenaica grave, we cannot prove that the deceased man was indeed the winner of the amphora, yet the prize vessel was an integral component of his presentation as a victorious athlete through the funerary assemblage, which also included an alabastron, a

300 Vickers and Bazama 1971, 82.
301 Vickers and Bazama 1971, 82.
strigil, and a gilded wreath. Success in athletics figured largely not only into an individual’s personal identity but also into his civic identity. Funerary monuments, which were designed for the public gaze, sometimes portray men as athletes; for example, an Archaic Athenian stele in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, (11.185a-c, f, g) shows a youth holding an aryballos hanging from his wrist beside a young girl who is likely a younger sister. Epinician poetry and testimonia suggest that a victory brought fame not only to the winning athlete but also served as a blessing to his city.

If the amphora was indeed a prize dating back to the man’s adolescence, its display at the time of his funeral might have prompted the audience to recall this earlier moment in his life, an event that that resounded of his own glory, his family’s, and perhaps even the city’s. In this scenario, the presentation of an object from the past might have collapsed time, bringing a distant moment in the man’s life near and countering his present state of old age with his idealized, youthful past. The capacity of mementoes to promote the recollection of particular events in this manner is one important reason why some objects were curated across time in antiquity.

4.4 *Ancient Heirlooms*

According to the scenario outlined above, the use-life of the Panathenaic prize amphora from Cyrenaica ended at the time of its owner’s death, yet, in other instances, *keimêlia* remained in circulation, as they were passed along to living kin. *Heirlooms* are objects curated ceremonially and transferred within a family. “Heirloom” is a compound word derived from the Middle English *heirlome*, meaning a tool for making heirs (heir + loom [tool, utensil]). It refers to “any piece of personal property that has been in a family
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302 Oakley 2003, 180, fig. 19.
303 Kurke 1993.
for several generations” or “anything inherited from a line of ancestors or handed down from generation to generation.” By definition, heirlooms are portable and heritable. Because they are kept in circulation across generations, they have the potential to communicate information about a collective past, whether this past is of historical significance or of importance only within a given clan. The formal transfer of these objects from the past and their use by living generations can help to maintain the ties between the living and the deceased members of a lineage.

As with mementoes, it is difficult to establish that artifacts earlier than their contexts are heirlooms that had been passed down within a family. One of the circumstances where we might infer heirloom status, however, is when keimêlia were interred with children. Infants and sub-adults would not have reached a stage in social and physical development where they had been able to accumulate very old objects independently. In all likelihood, they received these items from close relatives who counted the objects among their own possessions. The present survey revealed a number of instances of possible heirlooms associated with children’s graves, several of which are selected for discussion here to highlight different potentials of keimêlia that were transmitted within a family.

The name-vase of Beazley’s Hypobibazon Class of Attic vase-painters was a keimêlion that had a definite practical function in its funerary context but also may have been a vehicle for mobilizing the past for the purpose of expressing a child’s ancestral identity. This fine black-figure amphora was approximately three decades old when it

---

304 OED, s.v. “heirloom.”
became the coffin for a child in the Kerameikos cemetery in Athens (A.20). In a preindustrial society, where child mortality was presumably high, one might imagine that a used pot was the logical, cost-effective option, yet a survey of child interments in 6th and 5th century Athens has shown that these youngsters were treated with the utmost care. Not only did they receive special offerings, but they were given privileged positions near the major civic gates. This large vase, with its distinctive decoration (side A: warrior mounting a horse; side B: komasts), may have been a fixture in the family’s household for several decades (approximately the span of a generation). It is generally assumed that the figural images on banqueting wares were meant to be discussed. We can imagine that the members of a household, who studied the vessel closely, developed a familiarity with its images and perhaps even an affection toward the vessel. The fact that the amphora was a communal vessel shape may support the inference that the vessel belonged to the family rather than to any one individual. Anthropologists, ethnographers, and researchers of consumer behaviors have shown that possessions accumulate meaning as they are involved in social performances, ranging from everyday activities to major events and milestones. A long-lived object, such as the amphora, may have been laden with associations and thus served as a symbol of the household. The burial of this vase could have been a means of extending the family’s comfort and protection over the child eternally, as Kreusa did when she constructed Ion’s grave using amuletic objects that could be traced to both her ancestors (the bracelets) and her personal history (the sampler) (KT.33; KT.34). Moreover, the dedication of this object, a veritable receptacle of the family’s past, may have been a means of extending a family’s identity to a child.

who had not lived long enough to realized various stages of maturation and to be recognized publicly as a full adult member of the family.

Just as significant as the vessel’s presence in the child’s burial may have been its absence in the home. We might imagine that for at least some interval, the void left by an object that had served a family for a generation or more would have created a space for commemorating the deceased child. Object and human histories became entwined; the amphora’s “life” effectively ended with the child’s death, and the child then assumed a key place in the vessel’s biography as its final recipient. The insertion of the child into the narrative of a long-lived object was a means of perpetuating the youngster’s memory. Since the vessel was integrated into the family’s praxis, the living when noting its absence would inevitably recall instances of its use, and this would lead them to reflect on the circumstances of its deposition. Although our discussion of the Kerameikos amphora remains in the realm of conjecture, this is precisely how biographical objects operate in the ancient literary record. For example, the gold urn given by Dionysos to Peleus and Thetis on the occasion of their wedding served as the ash urn for Achilles and Patroklos (KT.19). The famous François Vase may allude to this linking of disparate events through an object, since it shows Dionysos arriving at the wedding with the vessel and pictures events from the life of Achilles, culminating with his death on the handles.\textsuperscript{310} The vessel forged a link between disparate events so that if someone were to recall either the wedding or the burial, his attention would then turn to the other occasion. Similarly, the Lindian Chronicle catalogues temple dedications no longer present at the sanctuary of

\textsuperscript{310} Stewart 1983.
Athena. In doing so, it shifts focus from the physical objects to their histories—the events and people they commemorated.

More of a forward-looking aspect is evident from the *keimêlia* found in another child’s burial unearthed at the town of Gümüşçay in northwest Turkey. Within the same tumulus as the famed Polyxena sarcophagus was a second undecorated sarcophagus, which contained the remains of a nine or ten-year-old child—almost certainly a female, to judge from the accompanying grave goods. Her jewelry was some two to three decades old at the time of the deposition (A.1; A.2; A.3); stylistically, the pieces belong to the first quarter of the 5th century, although the grave itself dates to the middle of the century. In addition, the jewelry showed signs of use: the bracelets were bent, and some of the gold pendants on one of the necklaces were missing granulation and were dented and scratched. A second necklace had a gold leaf repair, as well as an uneven number of elements to either side of the central element, which may hint at a loss of in antiquity. Despite the damage and wear, these gold ornaments were materially valuable, and their dedication can hardly be construed as a cost-cutting measure.

We can imagine several possible—and potentially overlapping—motives for the inclusion of this jewelry in the child’s grave. The necklaces and bracelets were elements that adorned the child for her burial. They also might have been gifts offered by older relatives. Indeed, the burial contained eight gold earrings, more than the child could have worn at any one time. Alternatively, the young girl at Gümüşçay may have been the intended heir of the jewelry, so it was fitting that she should be the ultimate recipient of these valuables despite her early death. The analysis might be taken a step further if we
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312 For the necklace and a detail of the repair, see Rose 2013, fig. 4.5a-b.
313 Rose 2013, 111-2.
The excavators suggest the jewels may have been intended for the girl’s bridal trousseau or dowry, and their bequest was perhaps a poignant gesture which allowed the girl to fulfill her unrealized nuptial rites symbolically in death. Paradoxically then, we might propose, objects from the past could carry a future aspect if they were curated for a specific person or purpose.

The Lakonian krater from Cumae (A.51) illustrates the capacity of a *keimêlion* to connect a child and an older relative—two individuals separated by time and space. In this case, the vessel explicitly mentions two different owners with inscriptions of different orthographic traditions: “I belong to Euphronios” (480 B.C.); “Of Biotos” (420 B.C.). Although detailed osteological data for the burial is lacking, P. Lombardi posits that the inscriptions may have referred to a grandfather and a grandson a half century removed. The specificity of the inscriptions implies that the krater was the possession not of a collective such as a family but that it was transferred between individuals. Hence, we might imagine that it had the capacity to confer not just a corporate identity but a personal identity or a social role on the deceased. Its presence may have marked his place within a line of male descent as the heir of the former owner. In a similar way, Astyanax is buried on his father Hector’s shield in Euripides’ *Trojan Women* (KT.26). In death, he inherits the trappings of the warrior and symbolically fulfills his preordained social role.

The preceding pair of case studies based on *keimêlia* associated with children illustrates the temporal depth that objects from the past could hold within a family, since these objects were, in essence, the nexus of the family’s past, present, and future. The
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fourth and final example of a possible heirloom to be considered here may show the process of singularization in practice in antiquity, as a functional object was transformed into a family’s inalienable wealth. Ultimately, however, it was displaced. The object in question is a type B amphora (A.26) found in the modern town of Trachones in Attika, the ancient deme of Euonymon. The vessel had been discarded not in a grave but in a rubbish pit between the 3rd and 1st centuries B.C. after over a century of use. Numerous ancient repairs—both holes and lead clamps—preserved on the neck and conical foot further confirm that it had been curated prior to disposal.

The amphora’s unusual imagery deserves a full description. Around the mouth are painted ivy leaves. Side B pictures the goddess Athena overseeing the measuring of what is probably the state’s oil, produced from the sacred olives by private citizens. The men’s short chitoniskoi clearly indicate that they are farmers and not government officials. The central figure, with the unparalleled label “Alkimos,” pours the contents of his transport amphora into a type B amphora identical in form to the vessel on which it appears. Side A has received less scholarly attention, as it is more fragmentary. It appears to show Hades, Persephone, and Triptolemos, who played a key role in the Eleusinian mysteries and was strongly associated with the cultivation of grain by the 5th century.315

The vessel’s singular imagery and the unparalleled inscription “Alkimos” suggest that it was a special commission, quite possibly by an Alkimos who lived in the deme of Euonymon and was involved in the cultivation of the state’s olive trees.316 M. Tiverios suggests that the owner of this particular amphora used the vessel as a means of pre-

measuring the volume of oil that he delivered to the state for official use.\textsuperscript{317} In support of this idea, he notes that vessel’s shape is the same as the one shown on the vessel itself. In addition, the form and dimensions are equal to those of an amphora in Munich (Staatliche Antikensammlungen 9406) decorated with an owl and inscribed ΔΕΜΟΣΙΟΣ, a label which almost certainly marks the Munich vase as an official volume measure.\textsuperscript{318}

If Tiverios’ proposals are correct, the amphora from Trachones had a definite functional value from the outset as a means of pre-measuring the amount of oil to be conveyed via transport amphorae to the officials in the Athenian civic center. The personalization of the imagery would have promoted the vessel’s curation over such a long period and its careful conservation after injury that probably rendered it unusable. The measures taken to restore the piece are even more remarkable when one considers the fact that a replacement could be acquired in central Athens just to the north of Euonymon. The vessel may have come to be regarded as a family heirloom worthy of preservation for such a long period because it bore the representation of an ancestor Alkimos and depicted the family’s special trade, which happened to provide an important service to the state. As studies of modern heirlooms have revealed, objects that become inalienable possessions frequently embody aspects of a group’s social identity, particularly those that make the group distinctive.\textsuperscript{319} We can only speculate about the circumstances that led to the amphora’s ultimate disposal in a rubbish pit. Whether the memory of Alkimos had faded over time, the family was no longer involved in the oil trade, or they had acquired a newer, intact vessel to serve the amphora’s original purpose,

\textsuperscript{317} Tiverios 2007, 13 n. 80.
\textsuperscript{318} Tiverios 2007, fig. 20.
\textsuperscript{319} Curasi, Price, and Arnould 2004, 614, Table 1.2
it seems clear that at some point between the 3rd and 1st centuries B.C., this particular pot no longer was perceived as a significant instrument in the family’s self-definition.

In literary testimonia, there are numerous examples of heirlooms, several of which facilitate protagonists’ claims to their inherited status. Some heirlooms mentioned were passed down from parents to their children, such as the amphora that was a wedding gift to Peleus and Thetis from Dionysos and later a burial urn for their son Achilles (KT.19), Theseus’ tokens of investiture (KT.36; KT.37), Medea’s robe (KT.29), and Kreusa’s woven sampler (KT.33; KT.34). Of these, Ion’s antipêx and Theseus’ gnôrismata were critical to verifying these heroes’ ancestry. The relics of Ion’s semi-divine birth (the basket, gold amuletic snakes, Kreusa’s textile, and the olive crown) were the keys that unlocked both his past and his future; upon seeing the objects, Kreusa recognized him as her son. Once she had acknowledged him as a member of the Erechtheid dynasty, Ion could assume the throne of Athens and his future identity. Similarly, the sandals and weapons left by king Aegeus under a rock for Theseus were the trappings that aided the hero on his journey to Athens, and they served as the proof of his royal descent once he arrived to take the throne. Objects transmitted between family members—only this time from a sister to a brother—also are instruments of recognition: In Aeschylus’ Libation Bearers (KT.25), Orestes produces a textile woven by his sister Elektra in order to prove his identity to her. In Euripides’ Iphigeneia in Tauris (KT.30), Orestes makes a series of statements to convince Iphigenia that he is in fact her brother. He reserves for the climax a description of an heirloom sword that once belonged to Pelops and was now housed in the private quarters of the Atreid family home. These

heirlooms, which arrive on the stage in their respective plays as *res ex machina*, are dramatic devices first and foremost; however, they also imply the audience’s awareness that objects from the past, by virtue of their enduring physicality, could stand as indices of a person or group’s identity across time and space. In addition, the plays shed light on a key requirement for a *keimêlion* to operate effectively in matters of social definition: someone to narrate that object’s unique history.

The attributes of the possible heirlooms documented in this survey dovetail with findings regarding families’ inalienable wealth from studies of modern consumer practices. Heirlooms tend to be unique and infused with personal memories. Perhaps most critically, the time gap between the date of manufacture of these artifacts and their date of deposition is not large, and, therefore, we can infer an unbroken awareness of the history of the object within a family.\(^\text{321}\) Due to this temporal and emotional proximity, heirlooms could be perceived as extensions of the people and groups with whom they were associated. As a result, these *keimêlia* could be deployed as a means of conferring an ancestral identity, ascribing an unrealized social status, and expressing a corporate identity.

4.5 *A Lekythos from Selinous*\(^\text{322}\) and other Inscribed Entangled Objects

The more general concept of the *entangled object* is appropriate when the transfer of objects is structured not along the lines of descent but via other pathways, such as political succession, guest-friendships, or diplomacy, to name a few. The term “entangled object” owes its popularity to Nicholas Thomas, whose important study of Pacific Island economies undermined the long-held notion in anthropological circles of a fundamental

\(^{321}\) Curasi, Price, and Arnould 2004, 614, Table 1.4

\(^{322}\) Reiterman 2014, 162-3.
divide between gift-based and commodity-based exchange. His research draws attention to the critical effects of social transformations on an object’s value. In essence, a thing retains prior associations even when it is exchanged or given away. The ways in which an object becomes “entangled” in human social and cultural networks throughout its use-life can be just as significant in determining its worth as physical characteristics, such as material composition and craftsmanship. More recently, Hodder has elaborated upon the metaphor of entanglement by stressing the connotation of dependency, whereby people and things are not simply interconnected as in a web comprised of loose threads; rather, these lines of connectivity are drawn taut because humans and things exert a mutual pull. Envisioning entanglement as a dynamic process, such as this, acknowledges the active role that things play in our lives.

Although the concept of the entangled object is based on ethnographic studies of cultures far removed from those which form the core of this study, the term has utility for describing interregional dynamics in the ancient Mediterranean. As Whitley notes in his study of curated objects in the Iron Age, Homer describes 22 objects with extended biographies in the *Iliad* and 14 in the *Odyssey*. Many of these are not heirlooms sensu strictu (i.e. they were not transferred between individuals within the same family), instead, we might think of them as entangled objects, which have narrative force because their lives were so intimately connected with those of the epics’ protagonists. Many
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323 Thomas 1991, 38-39. Although he still sees the binary definitions of “gift” and “commodity” as heuristically useful (14-6, 33-4).
325 Hodder 2012, 94.
326 Whitley 2013, 399.
327 The burial urn of Achilles would be one important exception.
328 KT.3; KT.4; KT.5; KT.6; KT.7; KT.10; KT.11; KT.12; KT.13; KT.14; KT.15; KT.16; KT.19; KT.20; KT.21; KT.22; KT.23.
329 Whitley 2013, 400.
entangled objects in the epics, such as the boar’s tusk helmets, bronze vessels, and tripods, have real-life Iron Age counterparts that were significantly older than their archaeological contexts. This confluence of the literary texts and material record seems to suggest that the notion of the entangled object is not merely a literary trope but a constituent of contemporary thought processes and belief systems.

Inscriptions are the primary means of identifying entangled objects in the material record. A famous inscribed Attic black-figure lekythos from a tomb at the Greek colonial site of Selinous (A.112) can serve as a point of departure. This is a rare example of an artifact that we know was curated across time, and it has an inscription revealing how it united the lives of two individuals. Both the style of the vase and the orthography of the inscription place the vessel in the third quarter of the 6th century; however, the accompanying grave goods belong to the first decade of the 5th, a difference of approximately a generation. Through metrical verses, this “talking object” gives insight into its unique value:

‘Αριστοκλείας ἐμὶ τὰς καλὰς, καλὰ
hausta de m˚ Pithakos aitēsas ἔχει

I belong to Aristokeia, and I am as beautiful as she;
But she does not own me. Pithakos, having asked, possesses me.

The first line refers to the beauty of the lekythos, likening the vessel’s beauty to that of Aristokeia, and the second describes a change in ownership. Guarducci has suggested that a two-character graffito on the shoulder, originally interpreted by Tusa as a

331 For the following transcription and translation, see Guarducci 1986.
332 Another vessel which compares the owner to the vessel itself is a kantharos from Boiotia (E.17).
333 Guarducci 1986, 142.
trader’s mark, the may be a pi (rather than an eta) and an alpha for Pithakos and Aristokleia. If her hypothesis is correct, then it seems likely that the graffito and the lengthy inscription were created at two different moments in the life of the vessel, perhaps the former at the time of the ownership transfer, and the latter, sometime afterwards as a means of narrating the vessel’s history more explicitly.

The lekythos was compared to Aristokleia, bears witness to an exchange, and, in a sense, symbolizes an interpersonal bond, the nature of which we cannot know with certainty. Whereas Tusa posits a strong friendship or kinship, the giving of gifts between a woman and a man—and, more specifically, a vessel that was a container for perfumed oil—seems more indicative of an amorous relationship. The presence of this vessel, with its strong association to Aristokleia, in a grave may be understood as a means of perpetuating the ties between two individuals, when it was no longer physically possible.

The Aristokleia lekythos is unusual both with respect to the detail of the information provided by the inscription and the fact that we know its context; however, numerous other gift-giving inscriptions on diverse artifacts, ranging from strigils to bronze and ceramic vessels, commemorated human-object entanglements throughout the Archaic and Classical Mediterranean. Steinhart and Wirbelauer have argued plausibly that inscriptions found on nearly four dozen objects document instances of gift-giving. The epigraphic catalogue in the present study (Appendix 3) includes a number of these artifacts with inscriptions naming more than one individual and sometimes narrating the
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334 Tusa 1982, 176.
335 Tusa 1982, 178.
336 Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000. In particular, they make a case for understanding inscriptions with the construction para+ name in the genitive as “from the giver” rather than a manufacturer’s mark (255-62).
circumstances of the ownership transfer. As the physical and conceptual nodes linking two or more people, these objects were the manifestation of entanglements of various sorts. Within this corpus are examples of simple gifts from one person to another (E.3; E.8; E.10; E11; E.12; E.13; E.14; E.15), gifts of love (E.7), and bespoke objects, which name the maker, giver and recipient (E.5; E.6). Whereas the Homeric epics supply ample testimony of objects with rich biographies that linked actors across time and space (KT.3; KT.4; KT.5; KT.6; KT.7; KT.11; KT.12; KT.13; KT.14; KT.15; KT.16; KT.18; KT.19; KT.20; KT.21; KT.22; KT.23), these inscribed artifacts from the 6th and 5th century Mediterranean demonstrate that people actually did map out interpersonal relationships through material means. Moreover, there are several clear signs that these entangled objects were especially valued. First and foremost, the act of inscribing is an indication of esteem for the object and what it represented. Although most of these inscribed artifacts lack known proveniences, the Aristokleia lekythos was kept for perhaps a generation, and a white-ground pyxis (E.12) also given as a gift had signs of ancient repair suggestive of a protracted use life. At least one object catalogued certainly came from a tomb (E.8), and the intact state of others may suggest that they came from funerary contexts as well. It thus can be inferred that these items were disposed of in a meaningful, ceremonial manner rather than discarded haphazardly. We are only privy to these entanglements thanks to the inscriptions, but it is reasonable to assume that other, uninscribed objects were enmeshed in similar networks, and these attachments may have encouraged their preservation across time.

4.6 Antiques in Antiquity
The histories of companion objects, heirlooms, and entangled objects are intrinsically linked to those of their owners, past and present, but antiques and found objects discussed in this section and the next have disconnected pasts due to the geographic, temporal, or emotional gap separating their original owners from their later curators. Antiques accumulated a history prior to coming into the hands of their later collector(s). That earlier past—rather than a past shared with the owner—is part of what gives antiques value. Once they arrive in a new context, however, antiques acquire significance in relation to the new owner.\textsuperscript{337} Here, I am adopting a slightly different meaning for “antique” than is used typically for the word, which generally refers to older objects, irrespective of origin, mode of transmission, and meaning.\textsuperscript{338} In common parlance, many heirlooms would also be considered antiques because they are simply old objects; however, I apply the term specifically to objects with disconnected histories. Examples of antiques in antiquity would include objects that were purchased second-hand or taken as booty.\textsuperscript{339}

Antiques are rather difficult to recognize in the material record. Although slightly earlier than this survey, one famous case of a likely antique comes from the so-called Lefkandi heroon, where a female was buried wearing an Old Babylonian necklace,\textsuperscript{340} which was nearly a millennium old at the time of deposition. With such a substantial span between the necklace’s date of manufacture and its date of deposition, in addition to the fact that it hails from the distant East (the closest comparanda derive from 1760-1600

\textsuperscript{337} Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1989, 332.
\textsuperscript{338} “An article of old furniture, or a picture or piece of china, etc., esp. as sought after and collected by amateurs,” (\textit{OED}, s.v. “antique”).
\textsuperscript{339} The Homeric epics mention several treasured objects that were stolen or taken as booty (\textit{KT.4}; \textit{KT.7}; \textit{KT.11}; \textit{KT.22}; \textit{KT.23}).
B.C. Ebla in Syria), it seems highly improbable that this artifact had been passed down within the Euboean aristocracy in an unbroken chain through the centuries. And yet it seems equally unlikely that an object of such valuable materials (gold, faience, and rock crystal) and special manufacture would have been forgotten or buried during the interceding centuries. A more plausible scenario is that the necklace was acquired at some point from overseas when it was already of an advanced age.

Another example of a possible antique would be a bronze vessel from a tomb at Falerii, the handle of which survives and preserves a Neo-Babylonian inscription (A.52). The inscription is a century-and-a-half older than the tomb and seems to record a gift from a certain royal Nabu-iddin. Although Kistler has suggested that the object might have reached its destination in Italy through the movement of elites across cultural boundaries,³⁴¹ the vessel might have been acquired as a valued as an antique.

Panathenaic prize amphorae are another class of artifacts that have disjointed histories of ownership. Although many lack sound provenance, oftentimes they can be traced at least generally to areas of Italy inhabited by non-Greek populations, who were famously ineligible to participate in the Panhellenic games. One specimen from Spina (A.82) assigned to the Berlin Painter was approximately a generation older than the tomb. While it is conceivable that the amphora belonged to a Greek inhabitant of this port city, the fact that the funerary assemblage compares closely with those of other graves from Spina may suggest that the deceased was an Etruscan.

Such objects were no doubt valued as exotica, difficult to acquire, and, therefore, considered prestige goods, but their patina also may have contributed to their worth.

³⁴¹ Kistler 2014.
Signs of age—whether physical marks of wear or a recognizably older style—were reminders of an object’s prior affiliations and accumulated meanings, vaguely known though they may be.\textsuperscript{342} In purchasing an antique object or using it as a grave offering, people integrated themselves into that object’s biographical web. In doing so, they were able to tap into a wider network of elites and to promote their membership within circles larger than their own community. An antique with specific associations could take on a generic meaning when displaced, as Bassett reminds us in her analysis of the sculptural program of the Hippodrome at Constantinople. Here, victory monuments, such as bronze tripods seized from the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, in all likelihood lost their association with specific victors when they crossed the Mediterranean Sea and served as “generic” symbols of victory.\textsuperscript{343}

4.7 \textit{Found Objects as Utilitarian Items and Magical Implements}

\textit{Found objects} are another type of \textit{keimêlion} with a disconnected past. The term “refers to an existing object or artifact that is picked up (found) and generally not bought or originally intended as art, yet it is also considered to have some value (e.g., aesthetic, novelty, remembrance) to the finder.”\textsuperscript{344} Although found objects have a legacy in modern artwork, beginning with Duchamp’s “ready-mades” and continuing with the Surrealists, psychologists only recently have examined the process by which discarded materials are transformed into possessions of certain value to ordinary individuals.\textsuperscript{345} Based on a nonclinical survey submitted by modern curators of found objects, Camic divides this creative process into phases: 1) “discovery” (whether by chance or through a treasure

\textsuperscript{342} Karanika and Hogg 2013, 913.  
\textsuperscript{343} Bassett 1991, 89.  
\textsuperscript{344} Camic 2010, 82.  
\textsuperscript{345} Camic 2010, 82.
hunt), which can stimulate emotions of surprise and excitement; 2) “enjoyment” from the unanticipated discovery; 3) and “metamorphosis,” as the finder starts to envision a rebirth of the object and assigns it new meaning. Most critical for the present investigation is Camic’s discussion of the discovery of objects from earlier periods, which prompt discoverers to reflect on “previous owners’ unknown but speculated lives.” While modern—mostly Western—audiences reported intrigue at the thought of found objects’ pasts, ethnographers have documented cases in which the chance discovery of an artifact from an earlier period was viewed as a matter of divine intervention. These and other implications of found objects will be considered in the case studies below.

One example of what was likely a found object is the Late Minoan IIIC pithos that was reused in a Late Archaic dwelling, East Corridor House B300, at the high altitude settlement of Azoria in Eastern Crete (A.42). The site had been inhabited continuously from the Early Iron Age onward but underwent a major reorganization in the 7th century. The excavators believe that residents uncovered the pithos during this massive building operation and opted to recycle it (although we should note that it is possible that the pithos remained in circulation throughout these centuries). The repair and reuse of pithoi was not uncommon. These were expensive vessels to manufacture; often inhabitants would dig through destruction levels to retrieve them rather than buy them new. Furthermore, at Azoria, it may have been especially preferable to acquire a pithos already at the site rather than to transport one up the steep slopes to the rocky

347 Camic 2010, 89.
349 Haggis et al. 2004, n. 47
350 Cahill 2001, 226.
settlement. In the case of the pithos from Azoria, we can thus posit a definite functional purpose.

However, the pithos might have conveyed an ideological message as well. The excavators note that pithoi at Archaic Azoria often were often displayed in high-traffic areas of the home, possibly as a means of actively signaling the wealth of the household.\textsuperscript{351} We might ask whether the vessel, its antiquity recognizable both in its form and decoration (particularly when juxtaposed to Archaic pithoi), also may have been a means of marking the home as one of the older ones at the settlement. In sum, if the excavators’ hypothesis is correct, and the pithos at Azoria was a found object, it had a definite utilitarian purpose, but also, we might contemplate, communicated the family’s legacy at the settlement, which was perhaps especially important at a time when new construction had reconfigured the historic core.

Another probable found object, an Eneolithic (4000-2300 B.C.) flint point (A.65) recovered from Tomb 488, a Late Geometric II inhumation grave (725 B.C.) at the necropolis of Pithekoussai, was put to a different purpose. It is the earliest of the keimêlia catalogued for this survey; morphological parallels indicate that it belongs to the Gaudo culture of the Italic mainland, which predated this funerary assemblage by well over a millennium and perhaps as much as three millennia. This immense temporal gap, combined with the artifact’s western origins, strongly suggests that it was not an heirloom curated by the residents of the Greek colony. Although we cannot dismiss the possibility that this relic had been in circulation for a few decades before deposition, it is highly unlikely that it had been curated continuously since the time of its manufacture. Instead,

\textsuperscript{351} Haggis et al. 2004, 379-80.
we might imagine, as the excavators Buchner and Ridgway did, that 8\textsuperscript{th} century inhabitants accidentally uncovered this distant artifact—perhaps in a grave—during construction activities and decided to give it another phase of life.\textsuperscript{352} It appears then that this Eneolithic point is a found object par excellence, and a deeper inquiry into its depositional context can shed light on the significance assigned to it and the distant past.

The careful structure of the assemblage in Tomb 488 resists residuality as an explanation for the presence of this prehistoric artifact. The point was found on the chest of a female child’s skeleton beside a shark’s tooth, another rare object of a similar size and shape.\textsuperscript{353} The assemblage as a whole has intimations of the occult. Both the point and tooth are characterized by their sharp edges, which were unsuitable for young children. Although one might explain them as gifts from adult family members, it does not seem that they were common possessions; in fact, each is singular at Pithekoussai. The placement of the objects on the child’s chest—the same position where scarabs, a class of object frequently used as amulets for young people throughout the early Mediterranean,\textsuperscript{354} typically appear—encourages us to contemplate an analogous apotropaic function. Likewise, two of the other \textit{keimêlia} documented at Pithekoussai—the bronze lunate razor interred with the sub-adult in Tomb 381 (\textbf{A.66}) and the ivory double-axe pendant buried with the infant in Tomb 495 (\textbf{A.80})—seem like odd dedications for young children, but may be explained as similarly protective.

In sum, all of the objects mentioned above (the point, the shark’s tooth, the razor, and the pendant) share weapon-like qualities, which would be important if they served a talismanic function for the sub-adults with whom they were associated. These artifacts

\textsuperscript{352} Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 491.
\textsuperscript{353} The child also wore two bronze fibulae, two bronze bracelets, and two bronze ring-shaped pendants.
\textsuperscript{354} De Salvia 1978.
also are united by their antiquity in relation to their respective contexts, a feature that can be explored further with the aid of one of the most famous written sources from this period: the cup of Nestor (E.1). An example of a “talking object,” the Rhodian kotyle claims to be a relic from the mythic past through its lengthy inscription (I am the cup of Nestor good for drinking / Whoever drinks from this cup, desire for beautifully / crowned Aphrodite will seize him instantly), although it was perhaps only a decade or two old at the time of deposition.\textsuperscript{355} Controversy surrounds the restoration and translation of the verses, as well as scholarly understanding of their meaning.\textsuperscript{356} A key issue is the identity of the cup’s owner, whether the legendary Pylian king or an individual by that same name who lived and died at Pithekoussai; however, the fame of Nestor’s cup in literature and the reference to Aphrodite in the last verse favor a mythical reading. A number of scholars have detected humorous irony in the inscription on several notes: the sympotic cup was buried with a child, who likely was not yet a participant in the symposium and had no interest in erotic activities; and this simple clay vessel is a far cry from the elaborate gold chalice that Nestor alone could lift (Il. 11.732-7).\textsuperscript{357} Indeed, it is a rather unprepossessing vessel, lacking figural imagery. Instead the inscription served as the primary distinguishing ornament. On the other hand, Faraone makes a case for “taking the Nestor’s cup inscription seriously” and accepting it as a curse.\textsuperscript{358} He observes that the early Greeks feared being overpowered by erotic forces, and the meter of the inscription—hexameters—is typical of incantations in later periods. The ancient authors truly may have believed that the verses could animate this cup, transforming it into an

\textsuperscript{355} In the first line, the verb’s central letter has been damaged, but parallels with other eighth-century “talking objects” suggest the verb ought to be restored as \textit{eimi} (I am).
\textsuperscript{356} For bibliography and a summary of these debates, see Faraone 1996, 78 n. 3
\textsuperscript{357} Hansen 1976; and see Faraone 1996, n. 4.
\textsuperscript{358} Faraone 1996.
agent capable of exacting vengeance on anyone brazen enough to meddle with the tomb and its contents.

It is only fitting that the owner of this potent vessel would be King Nestor, since he was a member of an earlier race of men who had powers far greater than those of the living generation, the Homeric heroes. Likewise, the personal possessions of men in the epic plupast were endowed with strengths and abilities beyond those of ordinary objects. The inscription on Nestor’s cup thus harmonizes with the epics’ portrayal of objects from the deep past as miraculous entities. The inscription on Nestor’s cup and testimonia from the epics imply a belief in the magical potential of things from a distant past, and we might ask whether this kind of conviction inspired the deployment of archaeologically-attested *keimêlia* at 8th century Pithekoussai, particularly the Eneolithic point.

Found objects, such as the prehistoric arrowhead, are defined by a gap in their biography—a blank page where the later curators could inscribe new, invented meanings as they initiated another phase in the object’s life. The juxtaposition of the Eneolithic point at Pithekoussai and the shark’s tooth highlighted the mysterious origins of the primitive lithic and perhaps the curators’ uncertainty over whether it was natural or manmade. Very ancient objects, like things with an unfamiliar or foreign appearance, were therefore conducive to magical or mythic interpretations as will be discussed further in Chapter 4. Attention to the breadth of the chronological span between an artifact’s date of manufacture and deposition can guide us toward more examples of objects from deep antiquity that were deployed as magical or divine implements.

---

359 Hartmann 2010, 54.
5. Conclusions

The preceding case studies propose a range of potentially overlapping meanings for objects that were preserved for a generation or more in the ancient Mediterranean: tools; prompts for memories; vehicles for expressing different layers of an individual or a group’s identity, whether social persona, ancestry, or personal history; and talismans. Tools, such as loom weights, were above all functional items that endured for long periods owing to their continuing utility. And yet they may have become companion objects, implicated in human social networks through praxis. At the same time that mementoes, like the Panathenaic prize amphora from Cyrenaica and other inscribed awards commemorated particular events, they also could be integral to a person’s self-definition. Heirlooms present a particularly interesting class of object from the past, since they were, by definition, entwined in networks of kinship. However, as possible examples from children’s graves suggest, heirlooms could be bequeathed to an individual in order to impart an ancestral identity or to fulfill an unrealized future social persona. In this way, heirlooms served as nodes linking past, present, and future. The amphora from Trachones, on the other hand, does not appear to have made the transition from a family’s inalienable possession to an individual’s belonging. Instead, it was removed from circulation after decades of curation for reasons that cannot be known, but we might suggest that its relevance to the group’s identity had become attenuated. Entangled objects, such as the Aristokleia lekythos and various inscribed gifts embodied interpersonal relationships materially; such objects commemorated associations between individuals separated by time and space. Antiques and found objects, on the other hand, are characterized by their discontinuous pasts and often vague association with prior
owners or users. When an antique, such as the Old Babylonian necklace from Lefkandi or the Panathenaic prize amphora from Spina, was acquired, it began a new phase of life. An object’s prior history may be evident from the knowledge that was transmitted regarding its past, from its patina, or from its antiquated appearance. Often rare or valuable commodities, antiques could bring prestige to their owners and allow them to assimilate into a wider circle of elites. Found objects, however, were items that had been discarded or lost, and it was the finder who assigned them new value, whether that was a functional value as in the case of the pithos from Azoria, or a mystical value, as was proposed for the flint point from Pithekoussai. The case studies discussed above show that *keimêlia* do not always fall neatly into categories used by modern scholars to describe curated objects (companion objects, mementoes, heirlooms, entangled objects, antiques, found objects) but may shift from one class to another during the course of their use-lives or may occupy more than one type simultaneously.

Our understanding of the different significances of *keimêlia*, as well as the mechanisms by which they accumulated these meanings, hinges on a few key considerations. First, the type of object can indicate the mode by which a *keimêlion* was integrated into memory practices. A tool or mundane household item was likely to become a memory object subconsciously through practice, while possessions used more infrequently, such as jewelry, elaborate table wares, or other special objects curated deliberately may have been earmarked for their mnemonic potential. Second, the length of time between an artifact’s date of manufacture and deposition reflects the curators’ awareness of a *keimêlion*’s unique history. Found objects and antiques far removed from their original temporal, geographic, and cultural contexts are more likely to be assigned
invented meanings. On the other hand, objects only a generation or two old are likely to carry the social or emotional “residues”—to use Walker and Schiffer’s terminology\textsuperscript{360}—of prior owners. Under these circumstances, \textit{keimêlia} can effectively mobilize associations with specific past people or events for ideological purposes. Although \textit{keimêlia} are challenging to detect and interpret, attention to these factors can guide us toward a better understanding of these anachronistic artifacts.

\textsuperscript{360} Walker and Schiffer 2006.
CHAPTER 3

REPAIR IN ANTIQUITY:

CASE STUDIES AND TESTIMONIA

When an object becomes damaged or worn during the course of its use-life, the owners arrive at a crossroads where they must decide whether to allow this deterioration to continue, to actively combat it through acts of maintenance and repair, to assign the object a new function, or to discard it entirely. While the presence of ancient repairs or their vestiges cannot prove that an artifact was once a treasured possession, these signs of intervention imply an early desire to prolong its life, and, in this sense, can serve as indicators of an object’s former status as a keimêlion. Repair and repurposing are fundamentally acts of “compromise,” since they imply that the owner accepted the object in an altered state, whether that meant a changed appearance or functionality. To an archaeologist, these instances of compromise can signal shifts in the meanings of objects.

In order to identify a corpus of potential keimêlia for this study, a survey was conducted for artifacts with mending holes, metal clamps, reworked seams, and missing parts. Ceramics were the primary focus, but instances of repaired metal objects, including vessels and jewelry, were recorded as well. Subsequent analyses of the form and frequency of repairs, the types of objects selected to be preserved, and their contexts, reveal patterns that can help archaeologists disentangle the diverse—and potentially overlapping—reasons why people chose to keep things in an imperfect or visibly repaired

361 See the essays in Jervis and Kyle 2012.
state. Some of the possibilities considered below are: function (if the object continued to be useful in its damaged state or could be recycled to perform a different duty); aesthetics, meaning the enduring appealing appearance of the object; social significance; and sentiment, meaning an object’s emotional pull. While the significance of the majority of artifacts with ancient mends detected in the survey is lost to us, contextual data can provide some clues. The phenomenon of repair in the Archaic and Classical Mediterranean is further illuminated by the consideration of Greek testimonia and iconography, archaeological parallels from other parts of the world, ethnographic analogies, and modern historical accounts, which provide invaluable insights into the decision-making underpinning acts of repair, maintenance, recycling and disposal.

The chapter begins with a brief history of the modern study of ancient repairs. Once considered blemishes marring the appearance of artifacts, ancient interventions now are appreciated as key-holes that afford us glimpses into the intimate relations between humans and things in the past. The core of the chapter is devoted to a survey of artifacts with ancient repairs and the discussion of trends revealed by the data. Several of these mended artifacts with known proveniences are examined in case studies, which illustrate how scholars might probe the microhistories of these objects to arrive at a better understanding of their value within their social context. A foray into Greek written and visual sources on breakage and repair offers a very different view of damage to objects. Whereas actual mending practices imply the enduring value of broken goods, these
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362 The Archaic and Classical Mediterranean still lacks a comprehensive synthesis of repairs analogous to Peña’s groundbreaking study of Roman pottery (2007), which merges diverse sources to arrive at a nuanced model of the life cycles of ceramics, specifically Roman amphorae.
testimonia primarily emphasize the uselessness of damaged objects and thus underscore the poignancy of repairs on actual artifacts.

1. *Modern Studies on Ancient Repairs*

Although the ancient repair of Greek pottery was noted and described as early as the late 18th century, the phenomenon generated relatively little discussion until the last three decades. It is perhaps no surprise that conservators—professionals who regularly encounter artifacts with ancient rivets and clamp holes—were some of the first scholars to offer detailed analyses of repair mechanisms. Their interest in early restorations was in part the product of a critical paradigm shift underway in the conservation sciences by the late 1970’s and articulated most fully in a document adopted by the Conservation Committee of the International Council of Museums (ICOM) in 1983: “The Conservator-Restorer: a Definition of the Profession.” Historically, the goal of restoration had been to return artifacts to their original, pristine state. This involved not only cleaning away natural accretions, such as dirt and corrosion, but also effacing signs of earlier restorations. Many ancient metal rivets were removed from pots, and clamp-holes filled with plaster, in accordance with these earlier standards. The new guidelines of ICOM

---

363 Near the turn of the 19th century, Polish collector Stanislaw Kostka Potocki viewed the repairs on a cup of the Tleson Painter both as proof of its antiquity and of its value in ancient times (Dobrowolski 2007, 37). See also Birch (1858, 220-1).

364 The bibliography on ancient repairs is now extensive and growing. Several conferences have explored the phenomenon, both from the point of view of conservators (Bentz and Kästner 2007) and archaeologists (Lawall and Lund 2011; Jervis and Kyle 2012).


367 For general descriptions of earlier (modern) restoration practices: Albert 2012, 4; Cronyn 1990, 8-9. The primary goal in these restorations was to produce a complete vessel, which would fetch a higher price on the antiquities market than a fragmentary pot. To give the illusion of a pristine vase, restorers frequently would remove ancient repairs, fill gaps with alien fragments and plaster, and paint over these additions. In recent decades, many of these pastiche restorations have been dismantled; see, for example, the description of the restoration of a red-figure stamnos in the collection of the University of Pennsylvania Museum (MS 4830) by Koob (1988). An amphora by the Affecter at the Walters Art Gallery (48.11) also had been
instead touted the “documentary nature” of artifacts and called for restorations that preserved artifacts’ “aesthetic and historic integrity.” Hereafter, ancient repairs—and even modern restorations from earlier periods—have been viewed as integral chapters in artifacts’ life histories, worthy of study in their own right.

Conservators have taken different approaches to the study of ancient repairs, focusing on artifacts of a single medium (either ceramics or bronze or marble), from a specific museum collection, time period, or site. These discussions provide thorough descriptions of the intricacies of different repair systems and occasionally deduce information about the manufacturing process. Yet they are less concerned with broader questions, such as the economic and cultural implications of acts of repair. Two major factors have shaped discourse in the conservation sciences. First, a large percentage of the ancient Mediterranean artifacts available for conservators’ scrutiny lack known proveniences, since they came to light on the art market or were acquired before the systematic recording of contextual data had become orthodox. Second, a disciplinary

---

restored with alien fragments that were painted over. When the 19th century restorations were dismantled in the 1980’s, traces of dirt confirmed the antiquity of the numerous clamp holes that had been filled with plaster (Snow 1986, 4). In the case of a black-figure calyx-krater by Exekias (Athens, Agora Museum AP1044; BAPD 310401; ABV 145, 19; 672, 4; Para 60; Add 2 40), practical reasons—rather than aesthetics—necessitated the removal of ancient lead clamps from the foot and handle. Bronner (1937, 468) reports that the fragments, found in a well on the Akropolis, could not be joined if the early repairs were left in place.

370 E.g., an online note by Dooijes (2012/3) describes different methods for repairing bronze objects and illustrates them with three Greek bronzes, hailing from Sicily, Cyprus, and Greece and dating from the 8th to 5th centuries B.C.
372 E.g., a study of Archaic sculpture by Frel 1982.
373 E.g., studies on marble sculpture of the Akropolis by Leka (2003), mended pottery at Gela by Nadalini (2004), and pottery at Olbia by Guldager Bilde and Handberg (2012).
374 Elston 1990, 53.
divide persists between archaeology and conservation, which remains primarily a technical, object-focused field.

The relatively recent surge of interest in repairs among archaeologists coincides with a growing awareness of the complexity of site formation processes, already mentioned in Chapter 2 (pp. 57-8).\(^{375}\) As researchers have become increasingly sensitive to the intricacies of objects’ life cycles, they have devoted more attention to intermediate events in artifacts’ histories, including repair and other acts of curation.\(^{376}\) Ancient interventions illuminate fleeting moments when human and object worlds intertwined. As Hodder puts it, “The falling apart of things draws humans into their care.”\(^{377}\) Furthermore, our understanding of the phenomenon of repair might be enhanced by consideration of the archaeology of emotions. When objects are imbued with personal significance or represent an emotional bond between individuals, the care for an object can be understood as an act of curating those relationships and interpersonal feelings. The social aspects of repair will be considered in greater depth below, after a discussion of the survey and its findings.

2. The Survey

Over 470 artifacts with ancient mends were catalogued as a part of this larger project of identifying and classifying *keimêlia*. The specimens span the 8\(^{th}\) through 4\(^{th}\) centuries B.C., and include objects that were manufactured and deposited in diverse locales, including mainland Greece, East Greece (Asia Minor), Italy, Sicily, Gaul, and Iberia. Ceramics were the focus, since they present the most durable and abundant class of archaeological finds, whether in burial assemblages or above-ground contexts. Also

\(^{375}\) Schiffer 1972.
\(^{376}\) See, for example, the essays in Jervis and Kyle 2012.
\(^{377}\) Hodder 2012, 69.
repairs on pottery are fairly easy to identify; they leave lasting marks (typically mending holes) and stand out because they usually were made of metal, a material different from the objects themselves. Repairs on metal artifacts were recorded as well, but they present interpretive issues. Artisans made metal patches to remedy imperfections that cropped up during the manufacturing process, and it can be difficult to distinguish between the mends that addressed damage during production versus use. Moreover, because metal objects often were repaired with the same metal as that of which they were composed, these mends can go undetected, particularly if corrosion was an issue. For these reasons, ceramics comprise the core of the survey.

2.1 Ceramic Repairs

Ceramics were the ubiquitous, portable companions of everyday life in the ancient Mediterranean. Because the use-life of pottery was centered in the household, where people and pots interacted on a regular basis, ceramic objects were well positioned to become singularized through their involvement in events both ceremonial and mundane. Unfortunately, many of the vases housed in museum collections today lack proveniences or inscriptions that might hint at their former significance to their owner(s). That being said, the intact state of a large number of the pots in museum collections strongly suggests that they came from tombs and were, therefore, specially selected for a ritual context. From ancient mends, both minor and substantial, we can infer that the owners had to alter the ways they used these objects, and that willingness to compromise signals a care for the object whether for practical, economic, social, or emotional reasons.

---

378 Hemingway 2001, 44.
In lieu of contextual data or inscriptions, ancient repairs may signal these objects’ former status as *keimêlia* and make a problematic corpus of decontextualized artifacts informative. To explore this hypothesis, a database of repaired ceramics was compiled from two main sources: archaeological reports examined for *keimêlia* identified as chronologically earlier than their context (see Chapter 2); and the volumes of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (CVA), a publication project begun in 1922 under the aegis of the Union Académique Internationale. The series now includes nearly four hundred volumes, cataloguing some 100,000 vases from museums in twenty-four countries.

Excavation reports provide critical information about the use and depositional contexts of mended objects and can support their identification as *keimêlia* through chronological discrepancies. In contrast, the CVA catalogues many artifacts with dubious, vague, or completely unknown origins. Although stripped of contextual data, these artifacts can be examined as documents in themselves, which speak of the measures owners would take to salvage their possessions, as well as the types of things deemed worthy of exceptional intervention. Applying the principles of object-oriented approaches mentioned in Chapter 1, we may observe patterns in terms of the form, style, quality, and geographic origin of these repaired artifacts to isolate features that made these *keimêlia* worth keeping in diverse settings. The focus of this investigation was mainly fine wares, as opposed to coarse wares, due to the availability of published material.

380 For the history of the CVA, see Rouet 2001, 124-137. Also see the description of the project on the Union Académique Internationale website: http://www.uai-iua.org/cgi?lg=en&pag=1145&tab=195&rec=1&frm=0 &par=secorig1114 (Accessed October 9, 2013).

381 Statistics provided by the CVA online publication project (www.cvaonline.org/cva/), managed by the Beazley Archive, Oxford University (Accessed January 15, 2013). The majority of the series now has been digitized and published online by the Beazley Archive.
For each mended object, a standard set of data was gathered in a Microsoft Access database. Basic factual information included the object’s current location, inventory number, date and location of excavation or acquisition (if known), and any other details available regarding its history in different collections. Next the vessel’s shape, ware (i.e. place of manufacture), and style of decoration were recorded. Also taken into consideration were any graffiti, which might be expressions of ownership or the object’s special status. The iconographic motifs on the different decorated surfaces (neck, shoulder, sides A or B, tondo, subhandle, etc.) were noted, and the painter and potter signatures or attributions were logged. The assessment of repairs consisted of a concise characterization of the system (or systems), a tally of the elements involved (usually the number of staples or dowels), a description of their location, and a note as to whether they were intact. An estimation of the vessel’s functionality (insofar as modern scholars understand the purpose of the various ceramic shapes) was made based on the severity of the fractures. Another subjective criterion was quality; the craftsmanship was judged on a spectrum from coarse to fine, based on the intricacy of the vase imagery and the accuracy of the drawing or incisions.

382 Lone sherds with evidence of repair holes were classified and counted as fragments, even when it was possible to determine the shape from which they came. The primary reason for omitting sherds from the tallies was to avoid counting the same vessel twice.

383 The place of manufacture listed in the publication generally was accepted, although, ideally, archaeometric tests should confirm the origin of ceramic wares. Errors crop up, especially in early volumes of the CVA, when the differences between fabrics were poorly understood, and connoisseurship studies were in their infancy. For example, a black-figure column-krater, once in the Joseph C. Hoppin collection and now in Harvard University’s Sackler Museum (1925.30.125; ABV 108, 9; Add2 29), was identified as Chalkidian in the original CVA publication (CVA Hoppin and Gallatin Collections 1, 4, pl. 3.1-2), although it now is recognized as a work of the Attic vase-painter Lydos.
The discussion below focuses on the corpus of mended objects rather than objects that lacked repairs,\textsuperscript{384} due to biases in the sample set, which was culled primarily from the CVA. All volumes published prior to 2012 were examined for this study except for a handful not accessible at the time of research. The majority of the collections included in the CVA series were formed when antiquarian—as opposed to archaeological—interests reigned. As a result, wares that appealed to modern tastes, such as Attic black- and red-figure pottery, are overrepresented at the expense of other ceramic traditions, prolific though they may be. Despite the thorny nature of the data, mapping repair trends in gross terms can suggest some of the material attributes that contributed to the perceived value of pots in antiquity.

Several factors complicate the identification and assessment of ancient repairs on ceramics. First and foremost, they often have been neglected in publications. One would expect the underreporting of these ancient interventions in early studies, before ancient repair had won recognition as a significant phenomenon; however, the problem persists. In the 2010 CVA volume of the British Museum’s Geometric pottery, for example, the dozen or so very conspicuous mending holes on the neck of an 8\textsuperscript{th} century Rhodian jug receive no comment,\textsuperscript{385} and the catalogue of ceramics from the Spina necropoleis makes no mention of the numerous mending holes on several cups that are the focus of full-page

\textsuperscript{384} To provide a sense of the relative frequency of the ceramics repairs, counts of the artifacts \textit{without} ancient mends were recorded for approximately the first 23,000 objects surveyed. However, with only a very small percentage of vases in this sample displaying ancient mends (less than 1.22\% out of 23,709 vases), it became clear that tracking objects without repairs made little sense statistically.

\textsuperscript{385} British Museum 1860.0404.10 (CVA London 11, 57, pls. 82-83). See also Dooijes and Nieuwenhuyse 2007, 16), who suggest that the underlying reason for this scholarly neglect is that ancient repairs are considered so “self-evident” as to warrant little further comment.
color illustrations. Early conservation practices also have hindered the recognition of ancient repairs. Telltale mending holes—viewed as violations of an artifact’s aesthetics—frequently were filled with plaster by earlier generations of restorers. A third obstacle is the proximity of the techniques used in ancient repairs to those of earlier, modern porcelain restorations. The practice of mending pottery fragments with metal clamps inserted into small holes drilled on either side of a fracture has continued from antiquity well into the last century, although recent decades have witnessed the abandonment of these invasive modes of restoration in favor of less conspicuous methods involving adhesives. In many cases, modern mending holes can be distinguished from ancient ones only through close examination. The former are generally smaller and more precise, having been bored with a mechanical drill, and the latter are often conical in profile, having been made with a palm-drill. The following section lists some of the typical and more unusual repairs observed in this study before attention turns to trends detected with respect to the objects repaired.

2.2 Forms of Repair

Because ceramic objects could fracture in myriad ways, ancient restorers developed an array of inventive methods to fix them. These mended objects are early examples of “make-dos,” a term used by modern collectors to describe “broken objects

---

386 The Penthesilea Painter’s cup (Ferrara, Museo Nazionale di Spina 9351: Berti and Guzzo 1993, no. 779, fig. 57) and a cup attributed to Onesimos (Ferrara, Museo Nazionale di Spina 246: Berti and Guzzo 1993, no. 151, fig. 141). Omissions also noted by Morel 1994, n. 20.
387 A dramatic example is a cup by the Amphitrite painter in Vienna (1847: BAPD 210312; ARV2 830, 1; Add2 295; CVA Wien 1, 18-19, pl. 17). Dozens of ancient repair holes went completely unnoticed until the cup’s recent restoration when the plaster—which had extensive overpainting—was removed. On the prejudices against ancient repairs among earlier modern restorers, see Albert 2012, 1, 7.
repaired in artful ways” (an increasingly sought-after category of collectibles).\textsuperscript{392} Despite the diversity evident in ancient repairs, the techniques employed can be classified in several basic categories described in order of frequency below: clamps; dowels; substitution; and modification. Artifacts that preserve evidence of ancient mends illustrate the lengths to which owners would go in order to prolong the life of a valued object.

By far the most common form of ancient restoration on ceramics involved drilling holes on either side of a fracture and using some method to hold the fragments together. In the earliest instances, the perforations were quite large, having been drilled with imprecise tools like obsidian or flint. Organic materials, such as leather or twine, or perhaps sometimes metal wire, then secured the fragments, and bitumen or gypsum might have been applied to the seams in order to make the vessels watertight.\textsuperscript{393} With only simple technology required, these rather rudimentary repairs probably were within reach of the average household. For this reason, they are attested across a broad chronological and geographic span, ranging from the Late Neolithic in Greece and Syria\textsuperscript{394} to the Roman period in Egypt.\textsuperscript{395}

\textsuperscript{392} See, for example, essays in Jervis and Kyle 2012, which examine ancient make-dos. Modern examples are discussed by Codrington Lippke 2010 and the blog “Past Imperfect” (http://andrewbaseman.com/blog/), authored by Andrew Baseman, a prolific collector of “make-dos,” who chronicles examples of creative repairs.

Current interest in broken pottery is evident from popular culture. In “Broken,” a line of dinnerware designed by Paola Navone and produced by Richard Ginori porcelain manufacturer, white dishes are decorated with trompe-l’œil fractures and staples. It is something of a modern celebration of more primitive forms of repair (Andrew Baseman, “Richard Ginori ‘Broken’ Dinnerware,” Published January 5, 2011, http://andrewbaseman.com/blog/?p=3708#).

\textsuperscript{393} Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys 2007, 16; Guldager Bilde and Handberg 2012, 464-5.

\textsuperscript{394} Greece: Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys 2007, 16, fig. 1. It should be noted, however, that strings or threads do not survive for mended pots in Greece (Guldager Bilde and Handberg 2012, 463). Syria: Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys 2009, 8-9.

\textsuperscript{395} Guldager Bilde and Handberg 2012, 463.
People began joining ceramic fragments with metal staples around the time that bronze metallurgy developed in the Early Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{396} The staples (sometimes also called clamps or rivets) were inserted into finer and more precise mending holes than in the prehistoric period to create stronger and more durable joins. In the majority of cases, the staples do not survive, but we can infer from green discoloration in and around mending holes that they once housed copper alloy elements, while the absence of color may indicate lead.\textsuperscript{397} Louvre conservator Gianpaolo Nadalini outlines the different varieties of the staple method (Fig. 2).\textsuperscript{398} Most coarse was the *sutura a lingotto* (“bar repairs”; Fig. 2a),\textsuperscript{399} whereby thick bar-shaped clamps of lead were inserted into holes c. 0.5 cm in diameter. The ends were then melted, fusing the clamps to the pot and forging a tight join. It is not possible to tell how clamps of this type began; the restorer might have prefabricated \Pi-shaped fittings, created the clamps *in situ* by pouring the metal into small molds, or inserted lead wire into the holes and then melted the ends. For the second, less common method (*sutura a rivetto*; “rivet repairs”; Fig. 2b),\textsuperscript{400} metal plates of iron or bronze were placed perpendicular to the crack on the vessel’s interior and exterior. Small metal pins driven through the mending holes locked the *lamellae*—and the fragments—in place (Fig. 3a-c). A variation on this method is classified by Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys as staple “Type C”;\textsuperscript{401} a red-figure calyx-krater in the Louvre can illustrate (Fig. 4).\textsuperscript{402}

\textsuperscript{396} Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys 2007, 16.
\textsuperscript{397} Nadalini 2007, 29.
\textsuperscript{398} Nadalini 2007, fig. 2. Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys 2007, 16-17) describe a similar array of repairs that utilize clamps in conjunction with mending holes.
\textsuperscript{399} Nadalini 2007, 29. This is the ‘Type A’ metal staple repair, according the classification system outlined by Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys 2007, 16-8, fig. 3.
\textsuperscript{400} Nadalini 2007, 30, fig. 2b.
\textsuperscript{401} Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys 2007, 16-7, fig. 6.
\textsuperscript{402} Paris, Musée du Louvre G 480: *ARV*\textsuperscript{2} 1084, 12; *Add* 160; *Add*\textsuperscript{2} 327; Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys 2007, Taf. 1, 3.
The mending holes do not penetrate the walls completely in Type C repairs, and the plates are found only on one side of the vessel.

A final technique (*sutura alveolare*, “channel repairs”; Fig. 2c)\(^{403}\) aimed to make repairs less conspicuous. Channels were hollowed out between pairs of mending holes to house clamps embedded in a vessel’s walls. For open shapes, like cups and kraters, the channels would be carved on both the interior and exterior, whereas they were found only on the exterior—the sole accessible face—of closed vessels, like amphorae and hydriai.

Although, in many cases, the clamps do not survive, Nadalini claims that lead would have been the most plausible material,\(^{404}\) presumably because no evidence of copper is preserved, and lead could be manipulated in small quantities appropriate for such fine cavities.

The channel method is found most often in Etruria.\(^{405}\) The high rate of repair to Greek ceramics in this region demonstrates that these imported vases were deemed valuable even when in an imperfect state (see also Chapter 4, pp. 232-43). In other words, aesthetics regularly trumped function (i.e. watertightness) in this corner of the Mediterranean. This concern for appearance is evident also in the placement of the mending holes and staples. While the primary determinant of the position of staples was the location of the fracture, restorers usually were at liberty to decide where the clamps would be arranged along the break. Elston,\(^{406}\) Nadalini,\(^{407}\) Pfisterer-Haas,\(^{408}\) and

\(^{403}\) Nadalini 2007, 31. For clamps in general, see Koob 1998, 55. The channel system is Dooijes and Nieuwenhuyse’s metal staple repair ‘Type B’ (2007, 17, fig. 5).

\(^{404}\) Nadalini 2007, 31-2.

\(^{405}\) Nadalini 2007, 31-2

\(^{406}\) Elston 1990, 55.


\(^{408}\) Pfisterer-Haas 2002, 54.
Rotroff\textsuperscript{409} all note instances of ancient restorers avoiding the figured decoration, instead placing the clamps in black glaze fields and preserving the composition. Since lead grows darker with age, the repairs would have become less prominent over time.\textsuperscript{410} Examples of conscientiously concealed repairs are numerous. A few can be cited here. On a cup in the Louvre, the restorer confined clamps to the black ground in the interior, but, on the exterior (where the figural decoration could not be avoided), he took care to set one clamp within the very narrow black swath of a snake shield device (Fig. 5).\textsuperscript{411} On a stamnos from Orvieto now in Mannheim, the staples of a substantial repair across the wall also were limited to the black ground (Fig. 6).\textsuperscript{412} In addition, restorers could make mends less obvious by reducing the size of the staples and channels. A skyphos from Narce,\textsuperscript{413} for example, had no fewer than thirteen tiny staples across its walls (Fig. 7). The staccato of these delicate clamps—although numerous—did not interrupt the composition appreciably.

Related to the channel-clamp technique were “mortise-and-tenon” repairs, which employed a technology similar to the system for joining stone blocks in Archaic and Classical architecture.\textsuperscript{414} Instead of anchoring the metal clamps in holes drilled along the breaks, shallow double swallowtail-shaped cuts were carved out of the vessel’s surface. Fragments of a red-figure krater from Olbia can illustrate (Fig. 8). A high degree of skill was required to make the intricate and shallow cut into the surface of a vessel without

\textsuperscript{409} Rotroff 2011, 132. On nine vases from the Agora, the figured decoration was avoided.
\textsuperscript{410} Dooijes and Nieuwenhuyse 2007, 18.
\textsuperscript{411} Paris, Musée du Louvre G 152: ARV 245, 1; ARV\textsuperscript{2} 369, 1; Para 365; Add\textsuperscript{2} 224; Nadalini 2007, fig. 8 (mislabeled as a krater).
\textsuperscript{412} Mannheim, Reiss-Museum Cg 60: ARV 190, 7; ARV\textsuperscript{2} 296, Add\textsuperscript{2} 211; CVA Mannheim 1, 40, pl. 29.1-3.
\textsuperscript{413} Rome, Villa Giulia 5235: CVA Rome 3, 24, pl. 47.1-2.
causing further damage. Such repairs generally are found on Archaic and Classical fine wares and on “thick-walled” vessels of all periods.\textsuperscript{415} The staple method, in its various forms, was highly versatile. Although commonly applied to the smooth walls of vessels, it could be adapted for the reattachment of handles, feet, and other appendages. However, for serious structural breaks, such as the severing of a cup’s stem from the bowl, staples were not always enough, and restorers often resorted to more robust repair systems. Sometimes a simple dowel was inserted into a hole drilled through the center of the cup and the cone, and the dowel’s end was “crimped” to prevent it from coming out.\textsuperscript{416} Several of the cups documented in this survey had a solid lead or bronze cone within the foot, which connected the stem to the bowl via a hole bored through the cup’s center; see, for example, the lead plug in the foot of a cup in Amsterdam (\textbf{Fig. 9}). When the liquid metal was poured into the cone of the foot, the molten metal flowed into the bowl, where it met a barrier that prevented the lead from spreading throughout the cup’s interior.\textsuperscript{417} The foot on a large red-figure cup in the Getty attributed to the Onesimos Painter has a more refined variation of this type of mend (\textbf{Figs. 10-11}).\textsuperscript{418} A bronze “sleeve”—essentially an inverted metal cup—was inserted into the stem. The foot then was connected to the bowl by a rivet pushed through a hole in the center of the sleeve and another in the stem. Another cup in the Allard Pierson collection reveals a third technique for mending a broken stem (\textbf{Fig.12}).\textsuperscript{419} Here, a bronze strip that

\textsuperscript{415} Guldager Bilde and Handberg 2012, 464.
\textsuperscript{416} Elston 1990, 56. For example, an Attic red-figure cup by Douris in Malibu: J. Paul Getty Museum 83.AE.218; Elston 1990, fig. 9.
\textsuperscript{417} For example, a black-figure Little Master cup in Amsterdam (Allard Pierson Museum 8944: \textit{CVA Amsterdam} 2, 50-51, figs. 22.3, pl. 95, 96.1); a red-figure cup of Type B in Leipzig (Antikenmuseum der Universität T 3361: \textit{CVA Leipzig} 3, 34, pl. 13.7-9)
\textsuperscript{419} Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 2293: \textit{ARV} 586, 76; \textit{ARV}\textsuperscript{2} 866, 120; \textit{CVA Amsterdam} 1, 85-86, pls. 45.1, 5, 6; 43.4, 5.
tapers at the top was inserted into the stem. Horizontal pins were inserted through the bronze strip via holes drilled horizontally through the stem on either side of the break.\textsuperscript{420} Perishable materials, such as wood might have been used as a substitute for the bronze strip on other cups.\textsuperscript{421}

Several additional vessels deserve special mention here, as they illustrate unusual approaches to repair. Most often, a vase’s original fragments were used in its reconstruction, yet conservators have documented rare cases in which alien fragments were substituted in antiquity. Feet were vulnerable elements,\textsuperscript{422} and cups, for example, occasionally received a replacement foot from another vessel (e.g. a droop cup in the Agora\textsuperscript{423}). Many of these substitutions likely go undetected due to the similar morphology and simple decoration of the feet, which made them relatively interchangeable. The incorporation of alien fragments of other vessel parts was less common. One fascinating example is a black-figure neck-amphora in Malibu attributed to the Bareiss Painter (530-520 B.C.).\textsuperscript{424} The neck was replaced in antiquity with another from a different neck-amphora manufactured some 20 years later (\textbf{Fig. 13}),\textsuperscript{425} so in this one unprovenanced vessel, we see evidence of curation of two types: repair and keeping things over time. The ancient restorer not only located a vessel with a neck of equal exterior circumference but found one with a comparable decorative motif, consisting of the same number of lotus and palmette elements. The mender carefully filed down the

\textsuperscript{420} Nadalini 2007, 32.
\textsuperscript{421} See, for example, Elston’s discussion of a black-figure cup in the Villa Giulia (50712: \textit{ABV} 196; \textit{Add} \textsuperscript{2} 53). Elston 1990, 55-6.
\textsuperscript{422} Moore and von Bothmer 1972, 10.
\textsuperscript{423} Rotroff 2011, 126 and n. 47.
\textsuperscript{424} Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.85: \textit{CVA Malibu} 1, 26-28, pls. 27.1-2, 28.1-5, 29.1-2.
\textsuperscript{425} Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.85: \textit{CVA Malibu} 1, 26-28, 82, fig. 22, pls. 27.1-2; Moore and von Bothmer 1972; Dooijes and Nieuwenhuyse 2007, 18.
joining edges and the interior circumference (which was slightly thicker). Then he aligned the circles surrounding the palmettes to make the join convincing at first glance.\footnote{Moore and von Bothmer 1972, 9-10.} While the alien neck on the Malibu vase was masked fairly successfully, the substitutions on other pieces were more difficult to conceal. Examples include a Nikosthenic amphora from the Banditaccia necropolis, Cerveteri, with a substitute handle of a yellowish fabric (\textbf{Fig. 14}),\footnote{Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia 47492: BAPD 200047; \textit{ABV} 319, 8; \textit{Para} 139; \textit{Add} 41, Add. 151; Ricci 1955, 989-90, no. 86, fig. 246.} a skyphos from Narce in the Louvre with a fragment from a black-figure krater inserted in its rim (\textbf{Fig. 15}),\footnote{Paris, Musée du Louvre G 567: Pottier 1906, 292, pl. 156; Moore and von Bothmer 1972, 10. Fragments of an earlier black-figure krater were used to fill a large section of the rim and body of this red-figure skyphos, which was unearthed in controlled scientific excavations conducted by French archaeologists.} a red-figure stamnos in the Vatican with a fragment of a cup by Douris inserted in the wall (\textbf{Fig. 16}),\footnote{Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 16527: \textit{ARV}² 432, 53, 1653; \textit{Add}² 237. Sannibale 2007, 49-50, figs. 3-4.} and a red-figure pelike\footnote{J. Paul Getty Museum 79.AE.174. Two clamp holes and a large circular hole (4.5 cm in diameter) attest to the insertion of an alien fragment. Elston 1990, 63, fig. 22.} and a black-glaze eye-cup\footnote{The black-glazed rim sherd stands out prominently against the red ground of this black-figure cup. J. Paul Getty Museum 87.AE.22. Elston 1990, 63, fig. 23.} in Malibu, both with black-glaze fragments inserted into their walls (\textbf{Figs. 17 and 18}).

The legitimacy of the alien mends on the Nikosthenic amphora in the Villa Giulia and the Louvre skyphos are certain since these vessels were unearthed in scientific excavations and never altered by modern conservators. However, the fact that 19th century restorers also used alien sherds to complete fragmentary vessels raises questions about the authenticity of mends on other vessels mentioned above which have unknown proveniences.\footnote{Koob and Matheson 1994; Koob 1988; Phillips and Ashmead 1988. See, for example, a neck-amphora in the Royal Ontario Museum (923.13.30: \textit{CVA} Toronto 1, 14, pl. 19.3-4).} Nevertheless, the joining techniques and the repairs’ aesthetics argue for the antiquity of the interventions. First, the alien fragments were joined via the same
system employed when sherds native to a vase were available: holes, staples, and
sometimes channels to house them. Moreover, the mends were conspicuous despite the
ancient restorers’ efforts to make them somewhat less prominent through the alignment
of ornament (e.g. the Getty neck-amphora) and the selection of substitute sherds
comparable in size, thickness, and curvature. In contrast, restorations from earlier epochs
of the modern period aimed to conceal fractures entirely. Restorers filled gaps between
the sherds with plaster and carefully painted over the plaster and alien fragments to match
the existing decoration and give the illusion of an intact pot. Because of this plaster and
overpainting, fragments from vessels of a vastly different shape, decoration or
manufacture could be incorporated and go undetected. As Koob and Matheson explain,433
this approach to restoration was born out of the Neoclassical movement with its idealized
view of Classical culture. Collectors preferred pristine vases, viewing them as material
expressions of the perceived perfection of Greek culture.434 The joins on pots restored in
this manner are sometimes so convincing that collectors and scholars believe the vases
were found undamaged.435

A substitution of a different kind was found on a Little Master Cup said to be
from Vulci and now in Boston.436 One of the handles was lost in antiquity, and the
ancient restorers fashioned a replacement entirely of lead (Fig. 19). To my knowledge,
the Boston specimen is an isolated case in the world of ancient ceramic restorations,
although instances of craftsmen creating metal replacement parts for bronze vessels are

433 Koob and Matheson 1994.
434 See Koob (1998, 55-6) for a discussion of ancient and modern repairs with alien fragments.
435 Bourgeois 2007, 43.
436 Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 60.640a (the cup) and 60.640b (the handle, since removed): ABV 227, 17;
Para 107, 17; CVA Boston 2, 32, pl. 89; Museum of Fine Arts website
known from antiquity. While somewhat outside the geographic scope of this survey, a bronze cauldron from Iron Age Germany is a remarkable example of a “make-do.” One of the three recumbent bronze lions on the rim of the enormous Greek vessel (c. 530 B.C.) in the Halstatt D Hochdorf tumulus (Baden-Württemberg, Germany) was manufactured by local craftsmen. With its pointed snout and shallow features, this replacement lion has been said to resemble a “rat” more than its two Greek counterparts. The juxtaposition of the (presumably original) Greek lions and the Celtic pretender would have made the differences obvious to the artisan, the patron, and the banqueters who used the vessel. We are left to wonder whether the Celtic lion was viewed as a poor replacement, inconsequential, or perhaps even meaningful in that it showed a clear local interpretation of the original.

In other cases, the damage or loss of part of an object resulted in its modification. The rim of a rhyton from Capua (now in the British Museum), for example, must have been broken beyond repair in antiquity. Rather than discard this elaborate plastic vase, composed of a statuette of a seated satyr holding on his lap an oversized drinking horn with red-figure decoration, the owner(s) filed the rim down to just below the necks of the figures (Fig. 20). Although the vessel could still hold liquids, the frieze of headless figures betrayed its incompleteness to any viewer, and the lack of a proper rim might imply a shift in function; now, we might speculate, it was treated as an objet d’art rather than a drinking cup. The preservation of this import despite its disfigurement suggests that it was “cherished by its ancient owner in life.”

439 Cohen 2006, 265.
can be seen on an 8th century Geometric amphora from the 5th century fill below the floors of the Hephaisteion in Athens. The amphora did not travel far from its place of deposition, since the reconstructed fragments formed a nearly complete vessel. Perhaps, Papadopoulos and Smithson propose, it was exhumed from a nearby grave during the construction of the temple in the Archaic period. Various indicators—potting marks, gouges on the rim, and comparisons to similar amphorae—reveal that the vessel’s plain lip is not original. Traces of a mending hole suggest that the rim was once damaged and reattached with a conventional staple repair, but ultimately the owners must have given up on salvaging the rim and instead filed down the neck to make it even, whether in the Geometric period or the Archaic. The rhyton and the amphora were “make-dos,” or compromises, par excellence.

An unusually inventive repair was made on an Attic Siana cup found in Tomb 17 of the Crocefisso del Tufo necropolis in Orvieto. The foot had been separated from the bowl, and the ancient restorer plugged the hole with lead. Afterwards, he affixed a round gold plaque impressed with the image of a gorgoneion to mask the repair. Although Bizzarri does not specify whether the lamella was placed on the interior or the underside of the foot, the images imply the underside (Fig. 21). The application of gold to a pot indisputably points to the high regard for an object, even though it was ceramic. Recent research on Attic eye-cups has suggested that the Etruscans were a receptive market for vessels with apotropaic elements. This embellishment of a repair transformed an otherwise typical band cup into an talismanic device, and, in a sense, converted an import into an Etruscan object.

442 Bizzarri 1963, 87, No. 311 and tav. V.c (cup); 87, No. 3 and figs. 23b and 28 (plaque).
Several remarkably creative repairs on imported Attic vessels have been found in Celtic burials of the late Early Iron Age (5th century) in Germany and France. Two appear on Attic cups unearthed in a grave in the tumulus of Kleinaspergle near Stuttgart. Both are stemless cups, one with red-figure decoration attributed to the Amphitrite Painter, and the other in plain black glaze. Numerous features indicate that the two should be considered a pair: they were found adjacent to each other in the grave, are of similar shape and size, and exhibit comparable damage and repairs. Fifteen mending holes, which housed bronze clamps, pierce the bowl of the decorated cup, and nine perforations cluster around the handle of the undecorated one. The clamps then were concealed by cut-outs of gold leaf, embossed with ornamental vegetal motifs of the local La Tène culture (Figs. 22 and 23). Only a few lamellae still clung to the cups at the time of excavation; most of the ornament having become detached lay beside the vessels.

Some of the appliqués probably were anchored to the mending clamps, since the arrangement of perforations on some of the gold leaf ornament corresponds neatly to the arrangement of mending holes on the cups. The absence of holes through other appliqués may indicate that they were affixed with an adhesive. Today the cups are largely stripped of their ornament as a result of their restoration in 1986. Conservators removed all appliqués that could not be positioned with certainty based on the excavators’

---

43 Stuttgart, Württembergisches Landesmuseum KAS 113: CVA Stuttgart 1, 33-34, pl. 28.1-3; Kimmig 1988, Taf. 25, 28-29 (after the 1879/1880 restoration), 26 and 27 (after the 1986 restoration); Böhr 1988, 176-7.
44 Stuttgart, Württembergisches Landesmuseum KAS 114: CVA Stuttgart 1, 36.1.3-4; Kimmig 1988, Taf. 30 (after the restoration of 1880), Taf. 31-32 (after the restoration of 1986); Böhr 1988, 177-8.
45 Schaaff (1988, 191), noting that both cups were broken around a handle, suggests that they might have been damaged during a game of kottabos; however, this idea is highly speculative, especially since we do not know whether this drinking game was assimilated into Celtic culture.
49 Schaaff 1988, 191.
descriptions. Although a more responsible presentation of the cup’s embellishments, the current restoration minimizes the dazzling effect of the ancient repairs. In fact, the more liberal restorations of the 1880’s may have better captured the spirit of the cups’ 5th century curation. Recently, a princely tomb uncovered at Lavau (Aube) in France yielded an impressive banqueting set that included another Attic vessel with decorative metal repairs. According to preliminary reports, along with a bronze cauldron of probable Etruscan manufacture was an Attic black-figure oinochoe with a gold crimped band applied to the rim. The foot, which had been lost in antiquity, was replaced with a composite foot made of gold and a white metal (either silver or tin). The substitute foot was further embellished with a row of palmettes.450

The extraordinary artistry of the mends on the Kleinaspergle vessels may be missing from the majority of early repairs; however, the cups serve as important reminders to look for the ingenuity in every example of an ancient “make-do” or mend. Each intervention was the result of a series of choices, beginning with someone deciding that a thing was worth saving in an imperfect state. Next, the ancient restorer studied the object to determine the best way to mediate the damage, while preserving the integrity of the composition—that is, if aesthetics was a concern. Sometimes the solution involved a minimally invasive procedure, such as filing down a chipped rim. But often the breaks required a complex systems of clamps, which regularly called for the restorer to perform delicate drill work and to work in a different material (copper alloy, lead, or—rarely—iron) from that of the thing being mended. Owners frequently had to make adjustments to the ways in which they handled or used objects in their new mended state. In sum, an

450 Dubuis, Josset, Millet, and Villenave 2015.
ancient repair, whether simple or highly elaborate, is the outcome of a chain of decisions, the proverbial tip of the iceberg, pointing to an underlying concern for an object.

2.3 Adhesives and Impermeability

Even if the clamp systems described could stabilize broken vessels successfully, they did not necessarily restore full functionality (i.e. watertightness), which would require some kind of sealing agent. The evidence for adhesives in the Mediterranean is equivocal, but bitumen regularly was employed as a glue in the Near East from the Neolithic onward, sometimes in conjunction with mending holes secured by other materials.\textsuperscript{451} Some repairs documented in the Mediterranean likely created an adequate seal. For example, a pair of coral red cups excavated from a well deposit near the Athenian Agora (\textbf{Figs. 23 and 24}) had been broken in antiquity and mended through an elaborate repair system that utilized mending holes and lead clamps in conjunction with lead strips positioned along the breaks. Since clamps usually were sufficient to consolidate a broken vessel, we might infer that the additional lead strips sealed the fractures and thus permitted the vessels to continue to serve as drinking cups at the symposium.\textsuperscript{452} Rotroff speculates that the practice of lining breaks with lead plates could have been more widespread but often goes undetected because the lead plates left no traces on areas decorated with plain black glaze as they did on the fragile coral red surface treatment.\textsuperscript{453} A red-figure Apulian bell-krater by the Sisyphos Group offers another example of lead being implemented to make a vessel watertight (\textbf{Fig. 26}).\textsuperscript{454} The

\textsuperscript{452} A.22, A.23.
\textsuperscript{453} Rotroff 2011, 126.
\textsuperscript{454} Paris, Musée du Louvre G 493: CVA Louvre 5, 23, pl. 34.3, 34.6.
ancient restorer applied a lead patch to a small hole in the wall of the pot; drill holes on either side suggest that it was further secured by a clamp.

The possibility that other organic—and, therefore, fugitive—adhesives, such as resin, operated together with clamps remains open. Rotroff has observed a white substance on the edges of sherds that were mended in antiquity,455 and, similarly, Nadalini has suggested that brown discoloration on others may be the vestiges of ancient adhesives.456 These tantalizing hints of ephemeral glues have not been corroborated by residue analysis. In fact, only one study to my knowledge has confirmed and characterized scientifically adhesives used in ancient repairs. Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) analyses of pottery from a Romano-British town (1st-2nd centuries A.D.) at Springfield in southeast England and in other parts of the British Isles have identified birch-bark on mended pots.457 Future researchers may attempt GC-MS analysis on ancient mends from the Agora and Etruscan sites, among others, to determine whether glues were employed in repairs during the Archaic and Classical periods in these more southern latitudes and to identify the composition of these glues. This type of data could provide valuable insights regarding the functional capacities of mended objects in the ancient Mediterranean.

The pottery workshop is one setting where the use of adhesives for repairs has been proven definitively in the ancient Mediterranean. Potters could salvage pots that cracked during the drying phase by applying clay slips to the edges of fractures and then

455 Rotroff 2011, 126.
firing the vessels.\textsuperscript{458} It is difficult to know how common this practice was, since the “adhesives” generally were composed of the same material as the vessels’ fabric and would be invisible once fired. Yet, in a few cases, potters applied the same black paint used for ornamental and figural decoration to the breaks, which resulted in dark seams along the cracks. This phenomenon can be observed on several Archaic sherds from the Potters’ Quarter at Corinth. One convincing specimen has survived with the join intact: the mouth of an Early Corinthian alabastron.\textsuperscript{459} A thin line of dark glaze bubbles up along the upper and lower surfaces (\textbf{Fig. 27}). The piece must have cracked while drying, and the potter, recognizing the adhesive qualities of clay slips, applied the same paint to the breaks as he used to render the decoration on the vase.\textsuperscript{460} The choice of material may have been deliberate,\textsuperscript{461} or it might have been a hasty move reflecting the insignificance of the small perfume jar among the multitude of other vessels manufactured in the shop. The painter also may have picked up the black paintbrush accidentally, when he intended to apply a neutral slip. As Noble explains, “When damp, the unfired black glaze matter is quite close in color to the background clay body making it difficult to see what one is painting under these conditions.”\textsuperscript{462} The fracture and repair on a red-figure pelike in

\textsuperscript{458} Repairs were undertaken in manufacturing contexts not only in the ancient Mediterranean but also the Near East. Dooijes and Nieuwenhuys 2009.

\textsuperscript{459} Corinth Museum KP 1430: Stillwell and Benson 1984, 249, No. 1377, pl. 57. The glue used in the conservation of the context pottery during the 1930’s has darkened with age, sometimes making it difficult to distinguish between modern and ancient repairs. Other examples are an aryballos from the Northwest Angle Deposit (KP 275: Stillwell and Benson 1984, 153, No. 153), an oinochoe from Well I (KP 1427: Stillwell and Benson 1984, 257, No. 1425, pl. 59), and a plastic vase in the shape of a quadruped also from Well I (KP 1062: Stillwell and Benson 1984, 257, No. 1425, pl. 59).

\textsuperscript{460} Peruzzi and Reiterman 2012.

\textsuperscript{461} Hemelrijk notes that Attic potters frequently used black glaze to attach the foot to the bowl on Type B cups. This becomes apparent only when the bowl has separated from its foot. Hemelrijk 1993, 158-62.

\textsuperscript{462} Noble 1988, 114.
Berlin likely also originated in the workshop. This fine vessel attributed to the Syriskos Painter developed a crack during the drying phase, which was sealed with lead—without mending holes or clamps. It is uncertain whether products with conspicuous flaws like the alabastron and the pelike were sold or kept for use within their respective workshops. Although outside the scope of this study, finds from the later, 3rd century potters’ dumps near the Athenian Agora included several vessels with clamp repairs, which imply either that the craftsmen had a market for mended pots or found uses for these imperfect specimens in their shops.

While ample attention has been devoted to the durable vestiges of ancient repairs (e.g. mending holes, clamps, and dowels), there is a pressing need for more research on adhesives in different cultural contexts across the ancient Mediterranean. Traces of ephemeral glues provide important clues about the function of mended objects that would help us approach the question of their value. If vessels could be restored to full service, then repair was a functional, economic measure. However, if mends did not create an adequate seal, other motives emerge as more plausible explanations.

2.4 Ceramics Survey Results

Shifting focus now from the diverse repair mechanisms documented in this survey, we can explore trends regarding the objects selected for interventions. The data suggest that the ware, shape, style of decoration, and geographic displacement of vessels are all features that may have prompted owners to salvage pots.

2.4.1 Wares

---

According to the survey of CVA volumes and excavation reports, Attic vessels were by far the most commonly repaired ceramics, with over 370 examples counted in this survey. Distant seconds include Apulian and Campanian vases, with ten and six examples, respectively, Etruscan bucchero, and various other south Italian wares. One to three pieces of mended ceramics in each of the following fabrics also were documented: Boiotian, East Greek (Rhodian, Milesian), Iberian, and Argive. The predominance of Attic pots among the objects repaired warrants further scrutiny, since, historically, Attic ceramics have received a disproportionate share of attention at the expense of the pottery from other regions.

The fetishization of Attic vessels, described by Michael Vickers as a “cult of simplicity,” likely has its origins in mid-19th century antiquarianism but the phenomenon continues to reverberate.\(^{465}\) In fact, the serious analysis of other ceramic wares in the Mediterranean, such as figural South Italian pottery, only began in the middle of the last century.\(^{466}\) The early preferences for Attic pots was a major factor that has shaped museum collections worldwide, populating them with Attic red- and black-figure vases and influencing curatorial choices in the acquisition and display of artifacts. Yet, with repairs on over two percent of Attic pots surveyed and less than half a percent of vases in other fabrics in the first 23,000 vessels examined, the discrepancy is substantial enough to suggest that the higher repair rate for Attic ceramics is not solely a product of the collectors’ and researchers’ enthusiasm but reflects an ancient reality. Attention to the shapes, styles, and provenances of mended pots can refine our understanding of the vessels’ use-value within these contexts.

\(^{465}\) Vickers 1987, 103.
\(^{466}\) Vickers and Gill 1994, 1-32.
Like Attic wares, Corinthian pots were widely exported, only they saw their heyday during the 7th and earlier 6th centuries. In contrast to Attic ceramics, Corinthian vessels were nearly absent from the logs of mended vessels. Only a few examples were catalogued: a kantharos from Pithekoussai, which dates to the Geometric period, before the acme of Corinthian pottery,467 an olpe (c. 640 B.C.) with three pairs of mending holes across the lower body;468 and a hydria from the Banditaccia necropolis of Cerveteri which had its walls and foot repaired in antiquity.469 Interestingly, no repairs were documented on aryballoi or alabastra, the unguent jars found in large numbers at sites throughout the Mediterranean. With relatively thick walls compared to their small size, they were perhaps less prone to breakage. Yet their design and function would suggest otherwise. The rounded bases often seen on aryballoi and alabastra were suitable for portable objects, but, once set down, the vessels were liable to roll off any surface. In vase-painting scenes (albeit on Attic pots),470 they typically are pictured dangling from the wrists of their owners or hanging on walls, both rather vulnerable positions. The paucity of repairs on small Corinthian vessels may suggest that consumers of Corinthian vessels valued them more for their contents than their aesthetics or that these small vessels were too difficult to mend. Other factors may have been at play, however. For example, the heyday of Corinthian pottery was decades before that of Attic pottery, and mending as a practice may have truly emerged during the peak of the latter.

2.4.2 Shapes

467 Pithekoussai Excavations Inv. 166830: Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 230 no. 177, pl. 78.
468 Toledo Museum of Art 63.36: CVA Toledo 2, 6, pl. 70.
469 Ricci 1955, 600 n. 4.
470 For these vessels in Attic imagery, see, for example, the exterior of a red-figure cup in St. Petersburg (B 1535: ARV 2 626, 107), the athletic scene in the interior of a red-figure cup in Boston (Museum of Fine Arts 0.3652; ARV 3 349, 4), and the pair of athletes in the interior of a cup in the collection of the University of Pennsylvania Museum (MS 5693: Expedition 36 [1994] 2-3, A28).
Fragility and function are both considerations that must be taken into account when trying to understand why repairs concentrate on certain ceramic shapes. The results of the present survey both confirm and defy expectations, with drinking vessels exhibiting the most repairs both in terms of the total number of repaired objects and proportionally, while large and special purpose vessels displayed the least.

Drinking vessels comprised the largest proportion of the mended vessels encountered in this survey, with cups accounting for 54% (n=241), skyphoi, 9.3% (n=42), and kantharoi 1.6% (n=7) of the total number of mended objects; for a chart of the distribution of repairs according to shape, see Fig. 28. Proportionally, cups and skyphoi had higher repair rates as well. Of the first 23,000 vessels examined, where vessels both with and without ancient mends where tracked, 4.8% (n=167) of cups (n=3,503) and 1.6% (n=18) of skyphoi (n=1,128) examined had some signs of intervention. Kraters had similarly high rates (3.60% of the 1,386 examined were mended). In contrast, less than 1% of the amphorae (19 of 2612), hydriai (3 of 348), oinochoai (1 of 1977), and pelikai (2 of 483) were mended.

Fewer repairs were noted on other types of small vessels and ceramic objects. With a handful of examples or fewer, choes (n=1), kyathoi (n=1), lekythoi (n=4), pyxides (n=1), phialai (n=1), plates (n=4), and tripod stands (n=1) each accounted for less than 1% of the mended vessels catalogued. Alabastra, aryballoi, and amphoriskoi yielded no examples, although these small shapes are some of the most abundant in collections worldwide. Among the larger vessels intended for communal serving, kraters were the most common objects of repair, comprising 17.2% (n=78) of the corpus of mended artifacts. Other shapes had a lower incidence of repair: amphorae (5.8% of documented repairs; n=26); Panathenaic prize amphorae (1.17%; n=5); hydriai (1.3%; n=6); lekanides (0.7%; n=3); oinochoai (0.9%; n=4); pelikai (0.4%; n=2); and stamnoi (1.56%; n=7).

\(^{471}\) Cf. n. 383.
In sum, analysis of gross trends in this admittedly imperfect data set suggests that certain shapes were selected for repairs more frequently than others. An exploration of the underlying reasons must take into account both the physical characteristics of the different vessel forms and the nature of their use. These practical concerns were important determinants of mendability, which can be assessed with the aid of data collected on the location of mends and the projected functionality of the repaired vessels.

The high incidence of repairs on cups and skyphoi is unsurprising considering their construction and function. Relatively light, open shapes, they had thin walls that were prone to breakage (as the clamps traversing the sides of countless specimens can confirm). Moreover, handles and feet were vulnerable appendages. Not only did they protrude, but they were potted separately and attached during a more advanced stage in the drying process—the “soft-to-firm leather-hard stage.”\(^{472}\) Differences in the moisture content of the pot’s body and appendages could lead to cracking as the vessel dried or create points of weakness in the finished pot that would fracture down the road.\(^ {473}\) The greatest risks, however, arose from the contexts of their use—the symposium and other fora for drinking and eating. To judge from vase imagery and testimonia, personal-sized drinking vessels were in constant motion, as they were filled, passed, lifted to the lips for a draught, flung in a game of *kottabos*,\(^ {474}\) balanced by inebriated symposiasts and komasts, and washed afterwards. It is no wonder, then, that we encounter more mended

\(^{472}\) Schreiber 1999, 155.

\(^{473}\) Schreiber 1999, 158-9; Elston 1990, 53.

\(^{474}\) R. Hurschmann, s.v. “Kottabos.” *Brill’s New Pauly*, Antiquity volumes edited by: Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. Brill Online, 2013; Sparkes 1960; Lissarrague 1987, 68-86. Illustrations of the *kottabos* game are many; for example, the symposiasts in the interior of a red-figure cup attributed to the Foundry Painter (ca. 480 B.C.). Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 01.8034: *ARV* 264, 11; *ARV*\(^ 2\) 401, 11; *Para* 370; Topper 2012, 11, fig. 2.
cups and skyphoi than larger vessels, such as the krater, which we assume remained stationary at the banquet.\textsuperscript{475}

The higher repair rates for cups and skyphoi present something of a paradox, since the fractures in many cases would have compromised the vessels’ function of holding liquids—that is, unless the cracks could be sealed completely.\textsuperscript{476} If we assume that no adhesives were used, the breaks on nearly half (44.5\%) of the cups and skyphoi documented in this survey were so severe that the vessels were judged “unlikely” to function as receptacles for liquids.\textsuperscript{477} Approximately 33\% had lesser damage (i.e. a broken handle or foot) that left them “likely” to function. For the remaining 22.5\% of specimens, it was not possible to determine how the repair affected function; most examples in this category were either fragments or vessels that lacked descriptions or images of the repairs. As a point of comparison, the repairs seen on the very few mended hydriai (n=8), olpai (n=5), and oinochoai (n=4)—shapes also designed to hold liquids—concentrate at the handles, feet, or rims and upper bodies.\textsuperscript{478} Because the fractures did not compromise the integrity of the vessels’ bodies, it seems likely that they could continue serving as containers for liquids. At least half of the mended amphorae (n=26) likely

\textsuperscript{475} Lissarrague 1987, 19-46.
\textsuperscript{476} For adhesives, see discussion above (pp. 133-7).
\textsuperscript{477} Inferences were made based on the severity and location of the breaks. With minor damage, like a crack or chip along the rim, a cup probably could be used as a drinking vessel. In other cases, the repair might have restored the impermeability of a vessel. For example, often a hole was bored through the center of a cup’s bowl to reattach the stem. While this type of intervention undermined the cup’s structural integrity, such repairs usually were executed with lead, which would melt and spread, plugging the hole completely. When the break cut through the wall of a vessel, however, clamps were likely unable to seal the fracture entirely.
\textsuperscript{478} For example, a hydria in Leiden (Rijksmuseum van Oudheden PC 33: CVA Leiden 1, 10-11, pls. 10, 12.3, 16.7) had a repaired handle but presumably could hold water as long as the person pouring avoided the damaged handle. Other examples are hydriai in Berlin (Antikensammlung F 2851: CVA Antikensammlung 9, 77, fig. 21, pls. 52.1-3, 59.4), Paris (Musée du Louvre F 291: CVA Louvre 6, III.He.49, pl. 70.1), and Florence (Museo Nazionale 3824: CVA Florence 5, III.H.5-6, pls. 9.1-2; 10.1-2; and 3790: ABV 260, 30, 264, 691; Para 114; CVA Florence 5, III.H.12-13, pls. 26.1-2, 28.1-2). The repair on the Berlin hydria is on the foot, and the repair on the Paris hydria is on the foot, while the rest of the mends are on the handles.
remained watertight, while the repairs on one-third did not restore their impermeability, and the functionality of the rest could not be determined. The location of the mends may correspond simply to the points of weakness on these larger vessels, but the somewhat lower incidence of repairs across the body also could reflect ancient sentiments regarding the mendability of these larger, closed shapes. When they broke in ways that undermined their utility, perhaps their value diminished so considerably that owners opted to discard them and, hence, we encounter fewer examples with mends to serious breaks across the body.

To assess this hypothesis, we can turn to kraters, the vessel type with the most documented repairs after smaller drinking vessels, such as cups and skyphoi. According to the location of the mends, less than half of the repaired kraters catalogued for this survey would have been watertight, a proportion similar to that of cups. One plausible reason why restorers repaired open shapes with greater frequency is that they could place clamps on both the interior and exterior of the vessels, thus forging stronger joins.

Other explanations are also possible. The high rates of repair observed for kraters, cups, and skyphoi, and the slightly greater tolerance for their permeability mirror the patterns of mending practices at Pueblo Indian sites in Northern Arizona (A.D. 1100-1300), one of the few areas where a regional study of the phenomenon of repair has been conducted. In one village, the total ratio of bowl-to-jar sherds (i.e. open-to-closed shapes) was less than 2:1, whereas the ratio of mended bowl-to-jar sherds was 3:1.

479 Guldager Bilde and Handberg (2012, 468) also observed that open shapes were more likely to be mended for the Classical and Hellenistic period at Olbia.
480 I thank A. Kuttner for this observation.
481 Young and Nagrant 2004.
482 Young and Nagrant 2004, 58. Because the pottery was very fragmentary, the number of rim sherds was used to determine the ratio of bowls to jars (i.e. open-to-closed vessels).
the other village as well, bowls clearly dominated the corpus of repaired vessels by a ratio of 11:1. The natural explanation is that bowls were more likely to be repurposed for other tasks, such as holding or displaying solid material, than jars. The patterns suggest that inhabitants of the ancient Mediterranean had similar attitudes toward broken vessels, opting to repair and retain wide, open shapes despite the limits to their function. A related possibility is that vases were treated as *objets d’art*, either as a matter of practice or once broken. The famous wall paintings of the Tomba dei Vasi Dipinti and the Tomba della Nave in Tarquinia, a region that yielded large quantities of repaired vases, show figured vases set on tables and cups hanging from walls as if on exhibition. The large surface areas of cups made them effective vehicles for imagery, and they were easily displayed on walls thanks to their light weight and shallow profile.

Function is also perhaps the root cause of the paucity of repairs to lekythoi, a term applied to unguent bottles of all kinds. As mentioned earlier, aryballoi and alabastra had no documented repairs, and only four lekythoi out of the many thousands examined exhibited ancient mends. Two were squat lekythoi, a less common type than the ubiquitous cylindrical shoulder lekythos, which was the form of the other mended lekythoi. Cylindrical lekythoi had strong funerary associations; they were deposited

---

483 Young and Nagrant 2004, 62.
484 Young and Nagrant 2004, 56. F. Scott Fitzgerald articulates the same logic in a short essay published in *Esquire*, in which he likens his post-breakdown self to a cracked plate: “Sometimes, though, the cracked plate has to be retained in the pantry, has to be kept in service as a household necessity. It can never again be warmed on the stove nor shuffled with the other plates in the dishpan; it will not be brought out for company, but it will do to hold crackers late at night or to go into the icebox under leftovers” (Fitzgerald 1936).
486 Richter and Milne 1935, 14.
487 Cleveland, Cleveland Museum of Art 1982.142 (CVA Cleveland 2, 35-37, pls. 72-74); Moscow, Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts II 1b 217 (CVA Moscow 6, 46, pls. 1-2); Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Skulpturensammlung ZV 2600.G.42 (a Campanian lekythos); an unnumbered black-glaze Attic lekythos from a large tomb (T. 88) containing multiple burials in the Gaggera cemetery at Selinous (Kustermann Graf 2002, 154-5, No. 88/ O 502, pl. 43).
regularly in graves throughout the Mediterranean and were pictured in scenes of mourning, funerals, and grave monuments.\textsuperscript{488} Many cylindrical lekythoi were decorated in the white-ground technique and/or designed with hidden interior repositories which reduced the volume of oil necessary to fill them and, thus, the cost of the dedication.\textsuperscript{489} The absence of repairs on vessels designed economically for quick disposal makes sense, and yet, according to vase imagery, cylindrical lekythoi also had a place in the realm of the living. In numerous interior scenes, they are carried or exchanged or hang precariously from the walls in the background.\textsuperscript{490} Testimonia also suggest a low value for lekythoi, which were carried on the person, where they were liable to be lost or—we might add—broken.\textsuperscript{491} One must not forget, however, that lekythoi, like aryballoi, may have been too difficult to mend.

It is noteworthy that the two mended squat lekythoi lack the attributes of the shoulder lekythoi, which made them cheap and, therefore, perhaps appropriate for the undiscerning deceased. The spherical bodies of squat lekythoi would have held a good amount of oil, in contrast to their slender counterparts, and, as the name suggests, squat lekythoi had a wide base that kept them from tipping over but also made them less portable and more difficult to hang. Although the provenience of these mended squat

\textsuperscript{488} Shoulder lekythoi are seen frequently in mourning scenes on white-ground lekythoi of the 5th century (Oakley 2004, 5-6). Numerous examples can be cited: a lekythos in Tampa (86.79: \textit{ARV}^{2} 749,10; \textit{Add}^{2} 285; \textit{Para} 413) shows a woman carrying a lekythos toward a tomb; a lekythos in Berlin (3262: \textit{ARV}^{2} 845, 168; \textit{CVA} Berlin 8, 28-29, pls. 15.1.4-6, 17.1-2) pictures several lekythoi standing on the base of a funerary monument; and another in Paris considered further below (Louvre CA3758: Kurtz 1975, pl. 23.3) shows lekythoi among the vessels toppled over in the scene of an unkempt grave.

\textsuperscript{489} Schreiber 1999, 179-83.

\textsuperscript{490} To cite a couple of examples, a lekythos hangs at a slant above a seated woman on the exterior of a cup by the Penthesilea Painter in the University of Pennsylvania Museum (MS 5670: \textit{ARV}^{2} 839, 37), and a lekythos rests on a chest in an all-female scene on a lebes in Brussels (A 1380: \textit{ARV}^{2} 841, 74; \textit{CVA} Brussels 3, III.D.7-III.D.8, pls. 12.9 A-C, 14.2). A cup in Winchester (19: \textit{ARV}^{2} 923, 21; \textit{CVA} Winchester 1, 7-8, pl. 6.5-8) shows shoulder lekythoi as the objects of exchange between men and women; on one side of the exterior, a man presents one as a gift, and on the other, a woman holds a lekythos as if she has just received it.

\textsuperscript{491} Oakley 2004, 4.
lekythoi is unknown, we might infer that because they had been fixtures in the household for some time, the owners opted to mend the broken handle in one case, and a chipped mouth in another.

2.4.3 Style

The unusual techniques used to manufacture some vessels may have prompted owners to repair them even when function could not be restored. Special decorative effects, such as coral red, white-ground, and Six’s technique, all are attested multiple times in the corpus of mended objects. Plastic vases deserve mention in this category as well, since they, too, were distinctive vessels that required unique skills and tools to produce. In turn, the exceptional appearance and craftsmanship that contributed to the value of these vessels made through special techniques may have promoted their long lives.

Coral red gloss (also known as intentional red) was a relatively rare technique that gave vases a glossy reddish-orange surface. With less than 150 specimens surviving, the process likely was practiced by a limited number of craftsmen, probably because the finish was difficult to achieve, to such a degree that modern scientists have had difficulty replicating the effect. Three examples of mended coral red vessels—all cups—were documented in the survey: the pair of Attic cups from a well near the Athenian Agora mentioned earlier (Figs. 24 and 25); and the famous eye-cup in Munich signed by

---

492 Cohen 2006, 44-52.
495 A.22; A.23.
Exekias.\textsuperscript{496} It revealed the image of Dionysos on a boat when the symposiast took a drink. The foot had broken off in antiquity and was reattached.

Six’s technique—the addition of polychrome decoration on top of a black ground—is attested on several mended vessels: an eye-cup in Munich (the eyes are rendered in white paint);\textsuperscript{497} a large (41 cm in height) column-krater in Copenhagen with a plain black glaze body but \textit{gorgoneia} on the handles that were painted white over the black background;\textsuperscript{498} and a phiale mesomphalos in Berlin with a rather coarse representation of a stag hunt in orange, cream, and brown.\textsuperscript{499}

White-ground vessels with ancient mends are few.\textsuperscript{500} They include a fragmentary cup by Euphronios with a representation of Dionysos\textsuperscript{501} and a cup by the Lyandros Painter picturing a seated woman (Aphrodite?) flanked by \textit{erotes}.\textsuperscript{502} As mentioned above, the absence of repairs on white-ground lekythoi likely reflects the limited use-lives of these vessels, which had primarily funerary associations. The restoration of white-ground cups, on the other hand, implies an extended use-life above ground.

Plastic vases doubled as functional items and sculpture.\textsuperscript{503} Although the modeled components of plastic vases were thicker, sometimes having been mold- or hand-made, the mending techniques applied to these vases were the same as those used on more conventional ceramic forms. An eye-cup in the Ashmolean Museum (\textbf{Fig. 29}),\textsuperscript{504} for example, looked like an ordinary drinking vessel until viewed from the side or bottom,

\textsuperscript{496} Antikensammlung 8279: \textit{ABV} 146, 21; \textit{Para} 60; Add\textsuperscript{2} 41.
\textsuperscript{497} Antikensammlung 2089: \textit{ARV} 237, 1; CVA Munich 13, 100-102, pl. 65.1-6.
\textsuperscript{498} Copenhagen, National Museum 3835: \textit{CVA} Copenhagen 3, 102, pl. 124.2; Cohen 2006, 84, No.16.
\textsuperscript{499} Berlin, Antikensammlung V.I, 3311: \textit{CVA} DDR 3, 79, pl. 51.6, 52.4; Cohen 2006, 91, No. 19.
\textsuperscript{500} For the technique, see Cohen 2006, 186-193.
\textsuperscript{501} J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.313: \textit{CVA} Getty 8, 72, pl. 463; Cohen 2006, 123-4, No. 30.
\textsuperscript{502} Florence, Museo Archeologico Etrusco 75409: \textit{ARV}\textsuperscript{2} 835, 1, 1672; \textit{Para} 422; Add\textsuperscript{2} 145; \textit{CVA} Florence 2, III.J.3, III.J.4, pl. 1.1.
\textsuperscript{503} Cohen 2006, 240-9.
where the foot, in the form of male genitals, could be seen. It has several holes on one side of the bowl from an ancient repair. The sculptural component on a rhyton in St. Petersburg is much more prominent; the conical container rests on the back of a bird (dove?), which had the tip of its beak broken off in antiquity (Fig. 30). It was reattached through a system of vertical drill holes connected by a channel.

2.4.4. Geographic Trends

Only a fraction of the mended vessels documented in this survey were uncovered through scientific excavations, although the findspots of many can be approximated based on our knowledge of the history of their respective collections. When the context of a repaired artifact can be established, often it is far from the place of manufacture. This pattern, which is borne out by ethnographic parallels and studies of modern consumer practices, will be discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 226-32).

The most logical explanation for the repair of pottery is that it was expensive or difficult to replace, but these possibilities must be weighed differently for the home market and the market abroad. We have some sense of the cost of Greek painted pottery in Athens according to prices inscribed on the bottoms of pots, although the examples are few, the prices seem to range over time, and we frequently do not know how intricate the decoration was since the prices refer to batches rather than specific pots. The costs are typically not very high, if we estimate that drachma in the 5th century was the equivalent of a day’s wage for a skilled worker or hoplite (Thuc. 3.17.4). A graffito on the bottom of a red-figure bell-krater attributed to the Kadmos painter, for example, lists the prices

---

505 St. Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum B 1876: ARV² 391; Para 512; Add² 229; Cohen 2006, 280-1, No. 85.
507 Pritchard 1999, 7.
for a batch of vessels: six kraters for four drachmas, 20 bathea (a small vessel of some sort) for one drachma and one obol.⁵⁰⁸ The highest recorded prices come from two 5th century red-figure hydriai, which cost two and three drachmas, respectively. A krater (42 cm in height) was ten obols, a little over 1.5 drachmas. Even a pot by the Berlin Painter, who was is recognized by modern students of Greek vases as one of the most skilled members of the ceramics quarter, has a recorded price of only seven obols—a little more than a drachma or a day’s wage⁵⁰⁹. The relatively low cost of pottery within Athens may imply that pots mended close to their source were salvaged for non-monetary reasons. Indeed, as we have seen, often unique physical characteristics emerge as the ostensible reasons for the special preservation of these vessels; hence, we might infer that replaceability was a key determinant of what was repaired by Athenians. We cannot extrapolate the cost of Greek pottery abroad from the prices inscribed on vases, but the intricacy of ancient repairs, some of which involved gold embellishments, seems to suggest that these pots were either so expensive or irreplaceable that it was preferable to salvage them.

A few recent studies have brought mending practices at sites in different corners of the Mediterranean into sharper focus. They supplement our impressionistic knowledge of the distribution of artifacts with ancient repairs. The well-known high rates of repair to Attic vases in Etruscan communities diverge from the lower incidence of repairs on vessels manufactured locally;⁵¹⁰ Etruscan mending habits will be the focus of a more detailed discussion in Chapter 4 (pp. 232-43). To the west, in the regions of modern France and Spain, imported fine wares from both Greece and the Italic peninsula alike

⁵⁰⁸ Boardman 201, 156-7, fig. 183.
⁵¹⁰ Reusser 2002, 35.
were mended. In the Black Sea region, imported Attic vessels were mended with some frequency among both local and Greek colonial communities. Petrakova recently has reconstructed several tomb groups from kurgans along the Yuz-Oba ridge on the Kerch Peninsula with the aid of 19th century excavation reports. She found that the Attic vases typically predate the rest of their mortuary assemblages by a decade or more and often had ancient repairs indicative of their extended use-lives. Moreover, these imported vessels were placed near the sarcophagus in a position that implies their importance, perhaps even an intimacy with the deceased. The systematic survey of artifacts with ancient repairs from the colony of Olbia Pontica found that Attic vessels were more likely to be curated across time and mended than other wares, although at Phanagoria nearby on the Taman Peninsula, only one Attic cup out of over 400 Attic vessels documented was mended. Morgan claims that “undue significance should not be attached to the repair,” since vessels of all kinds were salvaged in Athens, but the situations are not equivalent, since in Athens we are talking about local products. The discrepancy in mending habits of Black Sea communities deserves further exploration. In general, however, objects from geographically distant origins, especially when they cross cultural lines, appear to be mended with greater frequency than their local counterparts. On the one hand, imported objects were difficult to replace and, therefore, merited mending. On the other hand, the frequency with which imported objects were repaired may suggest

For example: several Campanian kraters from the hillfort of Oppidum d’Ensérune (S/N; CVA Mouret Collection 1, 20-22, pls. 15.3, 18.1); an Etruscan skyphos from the site of Empúrias (Barcelona, Museu d’Arqueologia de Catalunya 608; CVA Barcelona 1, 39, pl. 36.2). Petrakova 2012, 157. An example is the lekanis (A.12) from Kurgan ‘I’, crypt 50. It was at least a decade older than the rest of the assemblage and had a handle that was mended in antiquity (Petrakova 2012, 154-5, fig. 4). Dating to 360-350 B.C., the lekanis pictures a group of women surrounded by erotes. Guldager Bilde and Handberg 2012, 471. Morgan 2004, 102, no. 262. Morgan 2004, 207-8.
that, even if others were available, each import was was of such high value that deserved mending.

3. Social Aspects of Repair

The objects that were selected for repair present avenues for understanding the value systems operative within different cultures, if we assume that the things which people invested time, resources, and energy to mend—or continued to use despite reduced functionality—were some of their more valued possessions. The attributes and contexts of repaired artifacts can help us to deduce the qualities that warranted intervention. Repairs can be either a source or a symptom of an object's singularization—the point when a shift in status occurs for a thing, and it is transformed from a commodity with an exchange value to a sacralized entity of non-quantifiable significance. Yet in many instances—even from recent decades—the circumstances of an object’s deterioration and rebirth have not been transmitted from its curators to its later keepers. Although details about the decision to repair and maintain possessions are mostly lacking for antiquity, ethnographic studies and reports on modern consumer practices supply anecdotal information about the logic underpinning decisions to repair, recycle, or discard objects, or to use them in an imperfect state. They encourage us to contemplate the potentially complex thought processes and emotions embodied in each ancient mend. While we cannot extrapolate ancient motivations from modern case studies, analogous examples shed light on the social aspects of repair, including the identities of the menders.
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516 Peña 2007, 210; Young and Nagrant 2004, 54-5. However, as Young and Nagrant point out (55), repairs are fallible indicators of value. Owners were less likely to repair items if cracks diminished their utility significantly. As a consequence, things like cooking pots and containers for liquids, might be underrepresented among artifacts with ancient mends, although they were highly valued by their owners.

517 Kopytoff 1986, 83.
and the range of possible reasons for restorations, which will be discussed in the case studies below.

3.1 Menders

Little is known about the individuals responsible for mending objects in antiquity. Simple repair technologies were probably within the reach of the average household. These include the use of twine, leather straps, or wires in conjunction with drilled holes. Lead—with its low melting point (327.5º C)—could be transformed into its malleable, molten state by simple exposure to a flame, and it could be worked in small quantities. Furthermore, lead was easy to soften and press into a void, like a swallowtail-shaped cut. These and other features made lead a more viable material for domestic repair than other metals, such as bronze or iron, which had higher melting points and required special skills and equipment to manipulate.

On the other hand, the uniformity, precision, and thoughtful execution evident in many mended ceramic vessels suggest the hands of skilled professionals at different sites during the Archaic and Classical periods. Testimonia (RT.10; RT.3) reveal that, in 5th century Greece, the task of repair fell within the purview of some artisans; a bronzeworker would repair a metal stand, and a goldsmith, a necklace. One can assume that the materials for the repairs mentioned in both passages were the same as the objects being mended, so craftsmen who manufactured these items were enlisted to fix them.

Pottery, on the other hand, was typically was mended with metal, which begs the question of which craftsmen carried out these restorations.

---

518 Guldager Bilde and Handberg 2012, 463.
The china-mending industry of the past few centuries offers an instructive point of comparison for discussions of the organization of ceramic repairs in the ancient economy. The techniques utilized recently by menders of porcelain are similar to those employed in antiquity, with the primary difference being that the holes drilled into modern china only partially penetrate the wall of the vessel, and the rivets were stabilized within these holes by plaster. Photographs and brief notes preserve snapshots of the people who once executed repairs in the modern period. For example, an early 19th century ethnographic study reported that men called Fia-Con-Culk-Tziang traveled through China with their tools, fixing porcelain, locks, and pipes. The author of the text extols the high precision of their work, which he attributes to their use of a diamond point for drilling and extremely fine wire to connect fragments. The phenomenon of itinerant china-menders was not unique to Asia; an early 20th century photograph in the multi-volume Peoples of All Nations pictures one such craftsman mending a jug at his encampment in a forest in Scotland. The caption explains that he moves from town to town “making a trifle at each village where thrifty folk may prefer the sight of a riveted jug to the cost of buying a new one.” Prior to the advent of restoration as a trade, such “artisans, craftsmen, and ‘neat-handed housemaids’” were the individuals responsible for restoration of ceramic vessels. By the late 18th century, the industrialization of pottery manufacture and concomitant surge of eastern imports to the West had made a variety of ceramics accessible to the average household in Europe and the Americas. Consequently, a market for repairs arose, and professional menders could hang their shingles.

519 Breton 1812, 73-4.
520 Hammerton 1920, vol. 6, 4518.
522 Albert 2012, 1-3.
The evolution of the china-mending profession in recent centuries illustrates how market forces could affect the industry. A low demand for ceramic repair within a given settlement might lead craftsmen to expand the range of objects they would mend (as was the case in China), or they could specialize in the repair of one type of object. Either way, they benefited from moving between communities. Alternatively, non-specialists, such as members of the household staff, could be enlisted to perform these duties. When demand was sufficient, repair specialists could establish themselves and make a living within a single community. The passages from Lysias and Aristophanes (RT.10; RT.3) referring to repairs by metalworkers and goldsmiths allude to yet another possibility within populous regions: those involved in the production of a class of objects could perform maintenance operations as well. Repairs by these craftsmen were perhaps most feasible when the mending process emulated manufacturing procedures in some way. Equipped with the appropriate tools, materials and knowledge, artisans such as metalworkers were well positioned to fix the things they made.

4. Case Studies

People elected to interrupt or reverse the deterioration of objects through acts of maintenance and repair for diverse reasons, which are difficult to deduce when the only available evidence is the mute material record. However, a number of recent archaeological studies of repaired artifacts illustrate how contextual data can aid in disentangling different motives for repair. While regional or site-wide, diachronic surveys of repairs can point to economic and functional reasons, small-scale analyses, which focus on mended objects within assemblages, have a resolution that allows scholars to posit probable emotional motives. Both types of investigations lay the
groundwork for the case studies to follow, each of which examines the microhistory of a repaired object or a group of repaired objects to explore the social contexts of mending practices.

Among the important, recent large-scale treatments of repairs in a settlement context are studies from Olbia Pontica, Gela and its environs in southern Sicily, and the Agora in Athens. Guldager Bilde and Handberg’s study of mended ceramics from ancient Olbia, a Milesian apoikia in the north Black Sea, suggests a correlation between rates of repair and socioeconomic conditions; the fewest mends were attested at times when the community flourished (late 4th–early 3rd centuries B.C.), while the most occurred in the 2nd century when the region experienced difficult economic conditions, partially due to threats from barbarian groups. The study makes a substantial contribution to our understanding of ancient repair, particularly because most of the material analyzed was excavated systematically during a brief time frame by a single body—the Institute of Archaeology of the Ukrainian National of Sciences, Kiev. In contrast, data on repairs from other sites, such as the Athenian Agora and Corinth, were collected over longer time spans, often by different excavation teams each with its own collection policy. The resulting data is of anecdotal rather than statistical value; for example, Rotroff’s attempt to quantify mended pottery from the Agora from the Bronze Age through the Roman period offers only a general conclusion—repair was relatively uncommon in all periods. However, because of the longevity of the site and its multiplicity of purposes, the Agora showed a spectrum of mending practices, applied to vessels of all shapes, qualities, and wares. Still, the absence of clear patterns makes it difficult to draw

523 Guldager Bilde and Handberg 2012.
524 Rotroff 2011.
universal conclusions for repair at the site. Nadalini’s research at Gela revealed similarly low rates of mends, and many of the specimens were produced locally. On the other hand, at the nearby native Sicilian community of Sabucina, decorated Attic vases were the most common objects of repair, likely because these non-local vases were so highly esteemed.\textsuperscript{525} Not only were they imports, but they may have been viewed as culturally exotic.

By endeavoring to quantify rates and draw intra- and inter-site comparisons, these investigations help us to understand the scale of the phenomenon of repair. Despite an explicit concern for context, however, these studies have been less successful at integrating specific information about findspots that can help to move interpretations beyond economic and functional interpretations and into the realm of the ideological and emotional. The following section presents a series of case studies to illustrate how attention to the use-contexts of repaired artifacts—and not solely their chronological and geographic setting—might deepen our understanding of the intricate relationships between people and things in antiquity.

4.1 A Pair of Coral Red Cups from the Athenian Agora

Many of the mended vessels manufactured via special techniques have uncertain or vaguely known provenances. Fragments of the aforementioned coral red Attic cups with elaborate repairs (\textbf{Figs. 24 and 25; A.22 and A.23}) are exceptions.\textsuperscript{526} They were recovered from a well near the ancient Agora, which had been filled with debris from a Late Archaic home following the Persian invasion of 480 B.C. As Lynch notes, “the

\textsuperscript{525} Nadalini 2004.

\textsuperscript{526} Athens, Agora Museum P 32344: Lynch 2011a, 228-9, No. 87, fig. 84, ill. 10; Rotroff 2011, 126, fig. 16; Cohen 2006, 62-3, No. 10, figs. 1-3. Athens, Agora Museum P 33221: Lynch 2011a, 229-30, fig. 85.
extensive ancient restoration means that they [the cups] were very highly valued,” and the archaeological context can provide additional insights into the roots of this value. The fact that a new pair of cups could be acquired easily through a trip to the adjacent Kerameikos underscores their significance. The primary trait distinguishing these cups from the rest of the well assemblage was their decoration. No other coral red fragments were found in the well deposit, which indicates that this decorative style was unusual within the household, just as it was in the more global ceramic market. Moreover, as Lynch notes, similarities between the two pieces suggest that the two constituted a set, which “probably contained only two members.” In addition to the repairs and coral red technique, the cups’ decorative syntax is analogous (a figural tondo surrounded by a wide coral red ring; the rim and exterior solid black), and athletes are featured in both tondos. The better preserved of the pair (Fig. 24), attributed by Lynch to Euphronios as painter and Kachrylion as potter, pictures a seated draped male holding a sponge and aryballos in the tondo, while the other, more fragmentary cup (Fig. 25) shows a jumper holding halteres. Last, the pieces had been in the household for some twenty to thirty years when the Persians sacked the city. The Euphronios cup can be dated within the painter’s oeuvre to ca. 515 B.C., while Lynch gives the other cup a wider chronological range of 510-500 B.C. She does not address the discrepancy in dating in the text, although it is surprising, considering how forcefully she argues that the cups were a set. One would expect that two vessels united by so many similarities were manufactured within a narrower window, a discrepancy that reminds us of the thorniness of dating ceramics by attribution.

527 Lynch 2011a, 95.
528 Lynch 2011a, 93.
529 Lynch 2011a, 228-30.
Ostensibly, it is the cups’ unusual decoration and irreplaceability that made them candidates for this extensive restoration, but the same features that marked them as exceptional pieces in the home’s “china cabinet” may have also earned them a place in important events of the household. As Lynch notes, the selection of rare or distinctive objects for important social interactions can underscore the significance of events, such as “business agreements, private alliances, celebrations of victories, and even the meeting formalizing the *engye*, the betrothal contract between a future father-in-law and groom prior to a wedding.”

Equally, the restricted use of such objects helped to ensure that those special occasions would be remembered with clarity. These objects would help to perpetuate memories, by creating a direct line linking the past to the present and future through their enduring physical presence. The remarkable care that the Agora cups were afforded hints at their rich history, the details of which we will never know. However, through them, we learn that people in Archaic Athens developed strong attachments to their belongings.

4.2 *A Mended Bowl from Gela*

Within the hundreds of graves explored at the Greek colonial site of Gela on the southern coast of Sicily were several examples of ancient repairs to both ceramic vessels and terracotta sarcophagi. Tomb 211 on the Via Salerno stands out for what appears to have been the pointed use of a mended object in a child’s burial. Here, a repaired bowl served as a cover for a pithos (0.74 m in height) containing a child’s skeleton (*Fig. 31*). The *terminus post quem* for the *encytrismos* burial is provided by a Corinthian aryballos and alabastron dated to c. 630 B.C., but the pithos and its mended cover are considerably
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530 Lynch 2011, 95 nn. 150-151. Lynch cites an interesting modern analogy from a Finnish friend (n.151), whose family owns a pair of heirloom cups that were used only on wedding days—twice in a generation.

531 Orsi 1906, 124-5. Unfortunately, photographs of the Corinthian vases are not published.
earlier (A.91). The conical shape of the bowl, its narrow base, straight flaring sides, and ornament of rosettes and bands, find parallels in the sub-geometric and proto-orientalizing ceramic traditions of Arkades in central Crete. Pending archaeometric analysis, the question of whether it was an import or a vase of local manufacture remains open, but comparanda place it within the first decades of the colony, which was founded in 688 B.C. by a group of Rhodian and Cretan settlers (Thuc. 6.4.11). These immigrants may have carried the bowl with them or created the piece in the likeness of the wares of their homeland.532

One might imagine that a broken vessel—perhaps already slated for disposal—would have been an appropriate choice for an individual who died young, before he or she had passed certain milestones on the path to adulthood. As an individual moves through rites of passage, new layers are added to his or her social identity, which might be represented or acknowledged in some way during the funeral. As Cesarano summarizes, “Grave goods constitute an indissoluble collection of elements, an original composition in which every component has a necessary place and which cannot be differentiated from how it defines the role of the individual and his identity within the group.”533 The small number of grave goods, therefore, could reflect the child’s social status and the achievements left unrealized. Yet the attendant circumstances undermine simple economic explanations.

First, in the western Greek colonies during the 8th–6th centuries, children were afforded some of the most elaborate and costly burials (i.e. high in metal wealth and

532 Lo Porto 1974, 179.
533 Cesarano 2011, 162
imports), and Gela was no exception. Although Gela’s cemeteries boasted fewer rich burials than other colonial sites, metals were interred with children at higher rates than with adults, and some of the most extravagant burials belonged to children. Second, the pithos that served as a burial urn was also a curated object: a Cretan import dating back as far as the Late Geometric (the later 8th century). Since the colony was said to have been founded by Rhodian and Cretan settlers, the vessel may have been an heirloom brought West by some of the colony’s founders. And this would not be the only case of an object of some antiquity in the Gelone necropoleis; Lentini dates a fragment of a Rhodian relief amphora from Gela to the late 8th century, as much as two decades prior to the colony’s foundation (A.90). Although it was a surface find from a cemetery, the established funerary patterns suggest that it, too, was the receptacle for the enchytrismos burial of an infant or young child within the Archaic cemetery. Lentini speculates that this rare and old pithos was a “bene di famiglia,” perhaps used in the funerary ceremony to signal the identity of the child as a member of one of the colony’s founding families.

These factors invite an alternative reading of the repaired bowl. When focus shifts from the damage it had sustained to the fact that it was a curated object, deployed in conjunction with another curated object, the significance of the bowl’s presence in the child’s burial can be appreciated. The repairs were the outcome of the time and energy the owners had invested in the bowl’s maintenance, and, similarly, the pithos was an object kept over many decades, despite its age. At first glance, both the broken bowl and the old vessel would seem to be logical, cost-effective choices for burial with a child who

534 Shepherd 2007.
535 Shepherd 2007, 102.
536 Orsi 1906, 125, Tav. V.2; Lo Porto 1974, 179.
537 Museo Archeologico di Gela 8602; Lentini 2005, Fig. 1.
538 Lentini 2005, 305.
had lived only a short time, but the care they were afforded suggests instead that they were cherished possessions of the household, and their dedication was perhaps a means of honoring this young life. Although it is impossible to know how those who deposited these vessels viewed their act, one might contemplate whether these curated objects represented the family’s care for the youngster. These and other possibilities will be considered further in Chapter 4 (pp. 205-26).

4.3  A Pair of Cups with Gold Repairs from Kleinaspergle

The gold embossed repairs on two Attic cups (Figs. 22 and 23) from the Celtic tumulus of Kleinaspergle were described briefly above, but the social implications of the mends warrant further discussion. In this case, an episode of destruction or deterioration became an opportunity for the embellishment and beautification of an object. While ancient parallels for repairs that actually enhance the appearance of an object are few, mended objects from other historical moments can be cited. These exceptional mends offer an important reminder of an oft forgotten aspect of any repair. As Bartlett explains, “Whether or not the story of how an object came to be mended is known, the affection in which it was held is evident in its rebirth as a mended object.” Furthermore, the act of repair was an opening for different individuals to insert themselves into an object’s history through its customization.

Some porcelain restorations from recent centuries are so ornate and fine that they might be considered artworks in their own right. To cite a few specimens: the fragments of a 17th century plate in a family’s collection are held together by tiny brass rivets in the form of elongated lozenges, arranged in pairs in narrow rows that resemble sutures or

539 For another example from an Etruscan tomb, see above, n. 442.
540 Bartlett 2008, 10.
541 Martin 2012.
elaborate stitching (Fig. 32),\textsuperscript{542} perhaps a riff on mending practices in different media. N. Williams also describes a whimsical repair, where the rivets “had been skillfully sculpted so that they looked like three small, metal cats crouching on the [plate’s] surface.”\textsuperscript{543}

These careful and clever porcelain restorations did not aim to conceal fractures but made them focal points, by transforming damage into elements of charm and humor. Oral or written records explaining the subtexts of these creative porcelain repairs are lacking; however, a rich documentary corpus survives for another restoration tradition, which also gave a new aesthetic dimension to repaired objects—the Japanese mending technique of \textit{kintsugi}.

\textit{Kintsugi}—literally, “to patch with gold” —involved mending ceramic sherds with glues made from lacquer mixed with gold or silver.\textsuperscript{544} By highlighting the fractures with reticulate metallic designs, \textit{kintsugi} repairs transformed cracked vessels into gleaming centerpieces (Fig. 33).\textsuperscript{545} When applied to plain, monochromatic vessels, the golden seams became unique decoration (Fig. 34).\textsuperscript{546} Poetry charting the circumstances of the breaking and mending of vessels for the tea ceremony reveals that \textit{kintsugi} conferred new value on objects.\textsuperscript{547} Undoubtedly, the incorporation of precious metals into the fabric of mended ceramics added to their material worth and made them more attractive, but the

\textsuperscript{542} Williams 2002, 17.
\textsuperscript{543} Williams 2002, 16.
\textsuperscript{544} Iten 2008, 18.
\textsuperscript{545} For a description of the technique, see Iten 2008.
\textsuperscript{546} If the vase already had ornament, the restorer might use lacquer to complete lost elements of the motif, as was the case with the bird on an 18\textsuperscript{th} century teabowl (Fig. 35).
\textsuperscript{547} In one poem, a host decided to include a treasured \textit{chaire} (tea jar) among the serving vessels at his tea ceremony; however, he was greatly disappointed when no one—but particularly the guest of honor—took special interest in the jar. Angered and frustrated, the host smashed the vessel to bits. This act certainly caught the attention of the guests who then collected the many pieces and mended them with the \textit{kintsugi} technique. At a subsequent gathering, the guest of honor who previously had overlooked the \textit{chaire} lauded it as “magnificent” (Bartlett 2008, 9). The repairs had rendered an unexceptional vessel extraordinary.
writings also suggest the objects’ value stemmed in part from their capacity to serve as aides-mémoire for the events that led to their fragmentation and reconstruction.\textsuperscript{548}

The poems also indicate that ceramics mended through kintsugi were viewed as material expressions of certain ontological truths. In their unapologetic display of cracks, chips, and other injuries acquired over the course of their existence, these vessels came to embody the passage of time, a force to which humans are vulnerable as well. They illustrate an idealized response to the life’s vicissitudes. Having emerged from misfortunes intact yet transformed, with a new, distinctive and more remarkable appearance, kintsugi-mended vessels embody the principle of mushin (“equanimity amid changing conditions”).\textsuperscript{549} In addition, they serve as symbols of a specific kind of rebirth or rejuvenation which retains part of the old. By showing their frailty at the same time that they defy it, kintsugi–mended objects epitomize an ethos of “vitality and resilience.” And because of their transcendence in the face of disaster, kintsugi-repaired vessels were considered effective talismans.\textsuperscript{550} It was the conspicuousness of kintsugi mends that made utensils repaired through this method effective vehicles for communicating complex ideas such as these.

With the symbolic potential of repairs in mind, we can turn our attention westward and back in time to the Celtic tumulus of Kleinaspergle, the source of another set of objects with strikingly prominent mends—only, in this case, from an

\textsuperscript{548} As Bartlett (2008, 8) puts it, “Mending gave the bowl new life, and in doing so forever immured a neophyte’s awkward hands, a warrior’s quick temper, a poet scholar’s brilliant mind in its sturdy body.” The commemorative potential of these objects may explain why they were mended multiple times, since the act of re-repairing an historic object allowed new parties or younger generations to participate in its curation, thus integrating them into the object’s life history.

\textsuperscript{549} Bartlett 2008, 10.

\textsuperscript{550} Bartlett 2008, 9.
archaeological context. The two gold-emblazoned Attic cups mentioned above lack inscriptions; however, the relatively well-documented mortuary assemblage from which they came is a rich source in itself. When considered in light of our basic knowledge of Celtic customs and beliefs systems, the tomb group allows us to explore the cups’ social significance and other abstract concepts they might have embodied.

The remarkable pair was uncovered in 1879 by naturalist and geologist Oscar Fraas, during the exploration of a tumulus some 15 kilometers north of Stuttgart for the Königliche Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens at Stuttgart. The main grave in the tumulus dates to the Hallstatt D period (650-475/450 B.C.) but was plundered sometime in the 13th century. However, a secondary burial chamber, dating to the La Tène A period (475-400 B.C.), was left undisturbed. In this two-by-three meter wood-lined chamber, Fraas and his team uncovered ashes and bone fragments (likely indicators of a cremation burial), several large bronze vessels, two drinking horns, and the famous pair of Attic cups. A schematic drawing (Fig. 36) made at the time of the discovery shows the grave goods lined up along the chamber’s east wall. From north to south (Fig. 37), these are: a large bronze basin, a kiste, a stamnos, and an oinochoe, two gold-plated drinking horns, and—beside them—the Attic cups. The location of the cups
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551 Both in the collection of the Stuttgart Württembergisches Landesmuseum. 1) KAS 113: CVA Stuttgart 1, 33-34, pl. 28.1-3; Kimmig 1988, Taf. 25, 28-29 (after 1879/1880 restoration), 26 and 27 (after 1880 restoration); Böhr 1988, 176-7. 2) KAS 114: CVA Stuttgart 1, 36.1.3-4; Kimmig 1988, Taf. 30 (after 1880 restoration); Böhr 1988, 177-8.
552 For an overview of the Hallstatt period and culture, see Koch and Minard 2012, s.v. “Hallstatt Culture” and Koch 2006, s.v. “Hallstatt”.
553 For the La Tène period and culture, see Koch and Minard 2012, s.v. “La Tène Period”.
554 There are some inconsistencies between the plans made at the time of excavation and the written reports (Kimmig 1988, 68-9), although these do not change the interpretation of the objects significantly.
adjacent to the two drinking horns seems to indicate that the objects were meant to be used together.

The curated Attic cups illustrate a distinct approach toward mending, in which damage was embraced as an opportunity not only to fix but to improve upon—and even personalize—a broken object. The cups had substantial, glaring breaks across their bowls and handles. As discussed earlier, the ancient restorers first consolidated the fragments through the conventional system involving mending holes and bronze clamps, but then masked these interventions in an unusual manner, with gold cut-outs embossed with vegetal motifs.\(^{556}\) This gold leaf ornament was decidedly local; the repoussé technique and the curvilinear geometric designs are typical of the La Tène phase of the Early Iron Age, an artistic and cultural tradition pervasive in Europe north of the Alps during the later 5th century.\(^{557}\) The application of indigenous techniques both beautified and naturalized these imports, in the same way that the gorgoneion lamella on the Little Master band cup from Orvieto brought a specifically Etruscan element to an non-local object.\(^{558}\)

The cups were not the only mended objects in the tomb; the bronze basin (Fig. 38) and the Etruscan bronze stamnos (Fig. 39) also had ancient repairs that imply use-lives prior to deposition. The basin,\(^{559}\) which was made of very thin (0.6-1 mm) sheet bronze relative to its volume (135 L),\(^{560}\) has two metal patches close to its base (Fig. 38).

\(^{556}\) For the repairs, see Schaaff 1988
\(^{557}\) Metalworking in repoussé is well attested in the Northern and Central European Late Bronze Age, as are curvilinear geometric motifs (Harding 2007, 34).
\(^{558}\) Supra, n. 442.
\(^{559}\) Kimmig 1988, 153-60, Taf. 18-20.
\(^{560}\) Kimmig 1988, 154.
The two handles of the stamnos have a satyr head, cast in bronze, at the base of each of the four attachments. All of the attachments had once been soldered to the vessel, but three were separated from the stamnos body at some point in antiquity and reattached with bronze rivets (Fig. 41). Although Kimmig posits that the repairs were made after the Etruscan vessel had reached the Celtic world, Shefton notes that an Etruscan workshop equally might have been responsible for the rivets, crude though they may be. The similar appearance of the rivets securing the patch on the bronze basin—a local product—and the rivets on the Etruscan stamnos may lend support to Kimmig’s claim, but we cannot discount the possibility of an Etruscan origin for the stamnos’ repairs.

The four repaired objects—the two cups, the basin, and the stamnos—comprise a significant proportion of the total offerings in the grave. Celtic burials invoked multiple temporal horizons through their location and contents. And the mended objects, with their complex histories, may have contributed to the chronological layering of the tomb. Here, we also might consider whether the restored objects communicated other messages relating to the life and afterlife of the deceased. Since no written record survives for the Iron Age in this region, scholars rely on archaeological finds, Classical authors’ external reports, later mythic traditions, and ethnographic analogy to try to understand the underlying belief systems. Especially problematic are the later, etic sources, although they provide tantalizingly relevant passages. For example, writing centuries after the
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561 Kimmig 1988, Taf. 19 (center).
563 Kimmig 1987, 257.
564 Shefton 2000, 105.
565 Arnold 2002; Olivier 1999.
566 It should be noted that finds of gold leaf appliqués from other Celtic tombs (i.e. Lindenschmitt) suggest that intact vessels were also decorated in this manner (Kimmig 1987, 259).
Kleinaspergle burial, Diodorus Siculus (V.28) reports that among the Gauls, “the belief of Pythagoras prevails, that the souls of men are immortal and that after a prescribed number of years they commence upon a new life, the soul entering into another body.”

We might contemplate whether the gold repaired vessels were fitting symbols of this eschatology, in a similar manner to the kintsugi-mended vessels. Having been broken, these Attic cups were restored to a new, more magnificent state. In addition to being materially valuable, their presence in the funerary ritual might have expressed the belief and hope in the physical Otherworld where the deceased, too, would be reborn to a more beautiful life.

4.4. The Many Mends of the Purgatorio Necropoleis, Apulia

In the preceding case studies, the form and context of the repairs imply an investment in specific objects, but this is not always the case. At the central Apulian site of Purgatorio, for example, a number of the mortuary assemblages suggest a lesser degree of connection between mended objects and their curators. Nearly a score of repaired artifacts was recovered from the extensive necropoleis located near modern Rutigliano in the province of Bari. The Purgatorio case also illustrates how the intra-site distribution of mended objects might be used to explore the range of potential motives for ancient restoration. This type of analysis is especially important since inconsistencies in the collection and reporting of archaeological data have generally hindered comparisons of repair rates between sites. Following a brief review of the available information about the site and the region’s inhabitants, different motivations for the repairs will be weighed,
including the possibility that mended objects in the Purgatorio necropoleis were valued as constituents of drinking sets or saved for economic reasons.

Nearly 400 tombs of the Purgatorio necropolis were excavated in the 1970’s, and most still await full publication.\textsuperscript{568} Initial reports reveal that the graves almost universally conformed to native Italic funerary customs, even after the foundation of the Greek colony at nearby Tarentum in the late 8\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{569} Typically Peucetian features of the tombs include the repertoire of objects in the corredi, the position of the deceased (contracted and on the side), and the burial structures, among which were simple fosse, tufa sarcophagi, limestone chests, and urns.\textsuperscript{570} The burials span the late 8\textsuperscript{th} to early 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries B.C., but frequent reuse of graves has resulted in a complex horizontal stratigraphy, which makes assigning most tombs a single date impossible. Reused tombs are marked by the presence of artifacts belonging to several different phases. The objects associated with graves probably represent both the offerings to the deceased and vestiges of the funerary ritual. They generally are found in discrete chronological groupings in different zones within and around the tomb (\textit{i.e.} inside the burial structure, along any of the four sides of the tomb’s exterior, or in a separate, square, slab-built receptacle known as the ripostiglio). Significant temporal breaks observed between the different deposits reveal that periods sometimes as long as a century had passed before the tomb was reused. Since the material in the ripostiglio is usually the oldest, De Juliis has posited that

\textsuperscript{568} A Taranto Museum publication (De Juliis 2006) catalogues the full Purgatorio tomb groups summarily, although it provides little stratigraphic information and lacks a synthesis of this large, multi-phase site.
\textsuperscript{569} De Juliis 2006, 13-4.
\textsuperscript{570} De Juliis 2006, 14.
these accessory chambers contained the original contents of the tombs which were emptied to accommodate new burials, usually dating to the 4th century B.C.\textsuperscript{571} The Purgatorio necropoleis stand out for a relatively high incidence of repair; some 14\% of the graves (13 of 94) published in the 2006 catalogue contained at least one artifact with ancient mends,\textsuperscript{572} for a total of 17 repaired objects (Fig. 42). In contrast, most cemetery sites surveyed for this study produced no more than a handful of mended objects. The cursory treatment of repairs in the available publication limits discussion here to the context and object type, rather than the intricacies of the repair mechanisms.\textsuperscript{573} While a few mended artifacts belong to the 6th century, most date to the 5th and early 4th centuries. A tally of the artifacts with mends in the Purgatorio necropolis reveals some noteworthy trends which suggest that different motivations seem to be at play.

More than half of the repaired objects were skyphoi (9), while only one or two examples are attested for each of the other classes of artifact: a footed bowl (1); a fibula (1); a basin (1); ceramic kalathoi (2); belts (2); and a cup (1). The silver fibula\textsuperscript{574} and the two bronze belts\textsuperscript{575} were natural candidates for repair. They were composed of valuable and readily mendable materials, making repair an economical, expedient act. As items of personal adornment, the fibula and belts were worn close to the person and may have come to be regarded as the deceased’s inalienable possessions.\textsuperscript{576} When objects accompany a person through life’s transitions, aging in tandem, they accumulate histories.

\textsuperscript{571} De Juliis 2006, 14.
\textsuperscript{572} De Juliis 2006.
\textsuperscript{573} Although repairs are mentioned in the text, they are not described in detail. Information about their location and nature therefore derives from tiny images of objects among photographs of the tomb groups.
\textsuperscript{574} From Tomb 18. Taranto, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Inv. 171128. De Juliis 2006, 60, 6, no. 18.53.
\textsuperscript{575} From Tomb 33. Taranto, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Inv. 171485. De Juliis 2006, 101, 5, no. 33.42.
\textsuperscript{576} Jervis and Kyle 2012, 3.
that align with the chapters in their owner’s biography. Inalienable possessions may have intrinsic value as commodities, but it is their history that also makes them worthy of curation. Higher mending rates often are observed for inalienable objects, since owners would prefer to keep these storied possessions—even in an imperfect state—than to replace or discard them. Indeed, one of the few acceptable ways to dispose of inalienable objects is to bury them with their deceased owner, and that is precisely what may have happened with the fibula and belts from the Purgatorio necropolis.

While these personal ornaments may have been mended because of their special status as singularized possessions of the deceased, various indicators suggest that some of the ceramic vessels in the necropolis were repaired for less sentimental reasons. The nine mended skyphoi can illustrate. Some were the components of displaced burials, found in secondary contexts outside the tomb. Others, recovered from undisturbed burial chambers, are more instructive, since their assemblages seem to represent discrete episodes of interment. Because these closed deposits presumably preserve the complete durable elements of the tomb, they allow us to assess the role of the repaired objects in context. Tomb 19, for example, was a mid-5th century fossa grave containing an adult inhumation and over a dozen ceramic vessels placed on top of the skeleton (Fig. 43). About half were of a local ware decorated with simple bands (Fig. 43, above, n. 1-7: an olla [krater-like shape], a wide shallow bowl, two small kantharoid vases, two small jugs, and a one-handled cup), and half were Attic black-glaze wares (Fig. 43, above, nos. 8-
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577 Martin (2012) has explored this process in a study of repairs on early Anglo-Saxon brooches (5th-7th centuries A.D.).
580 Riccardi 2006, 351.
14: a stemless cup, a trefoil oinochoe, three skyphoi, an askos, and a footed dish). The kantharoid vases and jugs are so similar in shape, size, and decoration that they surely constitute pairs. The skyphoi are also comparable in terms of shape and decoration (plain black glaze), but only the mended skyphos and one of the others have nearly identical dimensions (10.9 cm and 11.6 cm in height, respectively; diameter with handle, 13.6 cm), which suggests that they, too, were a pair. In contrast, the third skyphos is significantly smaller (8.5 cm in height; diameter of 10.4 cm).

An import in its Apulian setting, the mended skyphos (no. 171214) may have been a commodity of sufficiently high demand to make repair a more attractive option than discard; however, the circumstances of its deposition and its appearance belie its special status. The skyphos does not appear to have been afforded special treatment in the burial; it was placed in the tomb within an undifferentiated mass of objects. Moreover, it was a redundant element in the corredo, devoid of decoration, graffiti, or other features that might distinguish it from its mate. Instead, we might posit that the significance of this particular skyphos stems from the fact that it belonged to a set of imported Attic black-glaze vessels. The owners may have elected to repair it—despite the fact that they had another, nearly identical specimen—because they were concerned with the integrity of the set as opposed to the condition of the individual pieces. Thus, the curation of the skyphos in Tomb 19 may denote not a special affection for the object, but rather an attachment to the set of which it was a part.

581 Palmentola 2006, 463.
582 Taranto, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Inv. 171214. De Juliis 2006, 70, 2, no. 19.4. fig. 15, above, no. 14.
583 Taranto, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Inv. 171209. De Juliis 2006, 70-1, no. 19.9. fig. 15, above, no. 9.
584 Taranto, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Inv. 171206. De Juliis 2006, 70, 2, no. 19.3. fig. 15, above, no. 3.
Economic interests also may have prompted the repair of many of the mended artifacts in the Purgatorio necropoleis. Each tomb was populated with what appears to be a full table service comprised of at least a handful of ceramic vessels, but most often more than a dozen. Different numbers of vessels and a wide variety of shapes and wares are seen among the tombs, and even within the same tomb. This eclecticism suggests that, while normative burial practices called for a large set of tableware in each tomb, there were no strict standards regarding the number and types of vessel. Sometimes, it appears that a set (or several sets) of vessels, marked by the same decoration, was offered, as was the case with Tomb 19. If a uniform group of vessels was not available, it seems that the deceased’s kin gathered an array of objects to fulfill various functional categories: large containers (e.g. kraters, ollas, amphorae, basins); individual serving vessels (e.g. skyphoi, cups), pouring vessels (e.g. oinochoai, jugs), and serving platters (plates, shallow bowls), among others.

Some of the mended vessels from Purgatorio appear to have fulfilled these functional needs. For example, Tomb 10, dated to the first half of the 5th century, included a small collection of black-glaze vessels: two skyphoi, a footed cup, and a juglet (Fig. 44). In this case, the repaired skyphos\textsuperscript{585} (Fig. 44 no. 6) was considerably larger (18.3 cm in height; 17.3 cm in diameter) than the other\textsuperscript{586} (Fig. 44 no. 5) (6.2 cm in height; 13.1 cm in diameter), and is, in fact, the largest preserved object in the tomb. The two skyphoi then should not be considered a pair per se; rather, the mended specimen operated as a large container. Each tomb seems to have included at least one high-volume vessel—a krater, olla, or amphora—and the skyphos likely served this purpose, despite

\textsuperscript{585} Taranto, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Inv. 170855. De Juliis 2006, 38-9, No. 10.6.
\textsuperscript{586} Taranto, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Inv. 170853. De Juliis 2006, 39-, No. 10.4.
the crack running straight down its side. Tomb 18 offers another instructive case.\textsuperscript{587}

Within the assemblage were four Attic black-glaze skyphoi, some plain black, and others decorated with light colored vegetal motifs (\textbf{Fig. 45} nos. 42, 43, 45, 46). Two are comparably small (no. 43 and 46), while two (no. 42 and no. 45) are similarly large (11.3 and 14.3 cm in height and 14.2 and 17 cm in diameter, respectively). The differences between the skyphoi suggest that they were not acquired as a set, and yet, it seems likely that the two smaller vessels operated as a pair, as did the two larger vessels, one of which had been broken and mended in antiquity.\textsuperscript{588} While the possibility that the skyphos was an esteemed object cannot be discounted, the heterogeneity of the assemblage suggests instead that the tomb group was cobbled together from items at hand.

We might contemplate whether the large numbers of repaired objects from the Purgatorio necropoleis relate to the quantity of vases required for each burial. Economically minded inhabitants may have mended broken vessels and were inclined to keep them in an imperfect state in anticipation of this final purpose. On the other hand, items of personal adornment, such as the the mended fibulae and belts, are more readily interpreted as inalienable possessions of the deceased, kept and restored because they were considered integral to the person’s identity. If these interpretations are accepted, the Purgatorio necropoleis provide examples of repairs driven by economics and sentiment, among other motives, thus illustrating how different rationales for mending may be operative simultaneously at a given site.

5. \textit{Written and Visual Evidence on Breakage, Repair, and Repurposing}

\textsuperscript{587} De Juliis 2006, 58-60.
\textsuperscript{588} Taranto, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Inv. 171121. De Juliis 2006, 60, 5.
The many examples of anciently mended objects preserved in archaeological contexts and museum collections worldwide clearly demonstrate that Mediterranean peoples of the Archaic and Classical periods did not view damage as the end of an object’s life. Moreover, the scrutiny of the contexts of several artifacts with ancient repairs seems to suggest an affection underlying these acts of curation. This archaeological evidence largely contradicts Greek visual and written testimony, which underscores the uselessness of broken objects and portrays those who use them as lowly.

5.1 Breaking Things

Greek testimonia and Attic vase imagery related to the breakage, repair and reuse of objects are important sources for exploring the dynamics of consumption in the ancient world—and ones which have remained largely untapped by scholars of the Classical world to date. Although these sources primarily reflect 5th century Athenian views, they shed some light on attitudes toward damaged objects in different media and their perceived functionality once broken. While textual and visual representations of broken things mostly stress their inefficacy, these damaged objects make regular appearances in the epigraphic record, where they are presented in a more positive light.

Precious few references to broken objects have survived in the literary record (Appendix 5). Unsurprisingly, many come from ancient Greek comedy, a genre that invoked the humor of the day-to-day in contemporary narratives. Remarks on chipped or shattered pots in several Aristophanic comedies allude to the insignificance of damaged ceramics. In the Frogs (405 B.C.), during the competition between the playwrights Aeschylus and Euripides for a seat in Hades, Dionysos suggests that Euripides’ brand of storytelling has made an impact on the city, since Athenians are reportedly concerned
with minor household losses, such as a bite taken from an olive or last year’s plate being smashed (RT.1). According to the dichotomy set up in the play, Euripides’ drama revolves around quotidian matters, whereas Aeschylus’ plays trace heroic sagas. Equating a vessel breaking to someone sneaking a morsel implies not only the low value of damaged pots but the frivolity of the notion that such an object would be repaired. Moreover, the reference to the plate as “last year’s” indicates the short life of pottery.

Another instructive excerpt from the Acharnians (425 B.C.) presents the protagonist Dikaiopolis, hoping to disguise himself as a beggar, going to the home of Euripides in search of a costume. After the tragedian turns him away empty-handed, Dikaiopolis makes one last plea for a tiny cup with a broken lip (RT. 2). His request indicates an association between chipped vessels and the destitute. Whether the poor had to settle for discounted items damaged in the manufacturing phase (i.e. factory seconds), could not afford replacements after an accident occurred, or scavenged pots from the rubbish heap, the implication is that imperfections betray a lack of means.

The comedies also allude to the settings where breakage took place. A gold necklace mentioned in the Lysistrata lost its pin when the woman wearing it was dancing (RT. 3). Characters in the Acharnians refer to packing merchandise carefully for a journey, lest it break. They later use a pot damaged during manufacturing as the basis for a comic interlude (RT.4). In this humorous parody of interregional commerce, Dikaiopolis offers a Boiotian trader an Athenian sycophant as a commodity for exchange. Dikaiopolis describes his human cargo as he would a vessel, claiming that it has a “babbling ring.” This is probably a reference to a quality test for pottery, which involved tapping the sides of finished pots; those which had cracked in the kiln were said to make
a babbling sound. Here, however, Dikaiopolis likens the noisy cracked vessel to the loquacious sycophant.

Greek testimonia also record instances of the recycling or repurposing of broken objects. In the *Acharnians* (RT. 5), Dikaiopolis indicates the multi-purpose nature of ceramic fragments when he is asked what function a pot with a crack from the kiln might serve: “As a mixing bowl for evil, a mortar for pounding lawsuits, a lampholder to show up outgoing officials, and a cup with which to stir trouble.” The tasks he lists are mostly idiomatic abstractions, but the success of his play-on-words hinges on the truth of his statement: a cracked pot could act as any one of the actual implements named. In the *Frogs*, Aristophanes parodies Euripides’ *Hypsipyle* by casting an old woman dressed as a prostitute in place of the princess of Lemnos. Euripides’ princess had famously played castanets to calm the baby she nursed, while the geriatric impersonator plays broken pot sherds (RT. 6). Both the old woman and the ostraka are understood as poor substitutes, again underscoring the low value of broken objects. The same notion is echoed in a passage from Aristophanes’ *Wealth* (RT. 7), when Chremylos wants to impress upon his audience the effects of poverty. He explains how the poor have no stools but must sit on broken amphora toes and use cracked pots for kneading-troughs. In the *Frogs*, the protagonist Aeschylus describes how the infant Oedipus was exposed in a broken pot (RT. 8). A vessel perhaps already earmarked for disposal would be an appropriate container for a life to be cast away. In contrast, Euripides’ *Trojan Women* (KT.26) records a use of an intact object in the burial of a valued child. Here, the herald Talthybius brings the body of Astyanax on Hektor’s shield and recounts how
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Andromache begged Neoptolemos not to take the shield as spoils but to allow it to serve as the child’s coffin.

Whereas Classical Greek literary sources referring to broken pottery almost universally confirm its low value, temple inventories frequently describe dedications in poor condition. Examples of objects described as crushed (*suntettrimmenos*, *sunpephlasmenos*), smashed (*suntethlasmenos*), broken, or having missing parts, are too numerous to catalog here.591 Temple inventories also record the presence of garments that were “‘old’ (palaios)…‘useless’ (achreios), ‘frayed’ or ‘in pieces’ (katakekommenos).”592 The clothing inventories from the Temple of Artemis at Brauron list many worn textiles (*rhakoi*), which Lee reminds us probably represent old dedications and *not* the dedication of tattered garments.593 Brøns encourages us to understand these details of the conditions of textiles not as evidence that treasuries were full of “junk” textiles but rather as indicators of the great importance of textiles, to such a degree that each detail mattered.594

Since metal objects were fundamentally stored wealth, keeping track of their condition perhaps was a critical part of the temples’ accounting. A missing leg on a tripod, for example, could represent a significant sum. In the case of garments, however, the benefit of recording worn or torn dedications is less clear. On the one hand, describing signs of age or damage is a way of distinguishing one dedication from another. On the other hand—and this suggestion may apply equally to textiles as to other kinds of dedications—the presence of aging offerings alongside new ones may have been a way of

---

591 For the terms, see Hamilton 2000, 351. Numerous examples of damaged objects are found in his translation of the inscriptions recording the Delian inventories.
594 Brøns 2015, 55.
demonstrating visitors’ devotion to the cult across time. In a sanctuary context, then, patina might be considered a desirable quality which contributed to the impression of the worshippers’ enduring piety.

The Attic Stelai, the inscriptions recording the sale of the property of the *Hermokopidai*, list several objects that were mended. Pithoi are described as “sound” or cracked. Owners would prefer to mend these large and costly vessels than to replace them. Another vessel (*mukê*), probably intended for holding liquid, is described as “bound or fastened with lead,” which has been interpreted as a reference to a repair. These references remind that mending objects was a part of the economy of Greek households—even those of aristocratic families.

Depictions of broken vessels on Greek vases offer another avenue for exploring ancient sentiments toward damage to ceramic goods. Although cracked pots are not common elements in vase imagery, they do recur in several canonical compositions, where they fulfill different roles: as indicators of time, as sources of visual humor, and as functional items.

The motif of a broken hydria appears in numerous 6th-5th century representations of Achilles’ ambush of the Trojan prince Troilos at a fountain house. The known accounts of this episode—namely, the Archaic *Kypria* and Sophocles’ 5th century *Troilos*—have not survived, but the basic narrative has been reconstructed with the aid of images on pots and summaries by the later scholars Apollodoros (*Bib. E.3.32*) in the 2nd
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596 Amyx 1958, 209-10.
century B.C. and Eutychios Proklos (Fr. 1) in the 2nd century A.D. Polyxena daughter of Priam left the city walls of Troy to fetch water with her brother Troilos accompanying on horseback. Achilles was stalking the youth because a prophecy that the Greeks had received stated that Troy would not fall while the prince was living. As the sibling pair approached the fountain house, Achilles made a surprise attack and slew Troilos. Dozens of illustrations, primarily on vases dating to the 6th century and decorated in the black-figure technique, show the pursuit that preceded the murder. A typical version pictures Polyxena running in front, followed by Troilos on horseback, and tailed by Achilles. Even the earliest extant representations of the scene, including those on the François Vase (c. 570-560 B.C.) and a Siana cup by the C Painter (575 B.C.) (Figs. 46 and 47), feature a hydria lying on the ground, as both a reminder of the task interrupted and a testament to the suddenness of the attack. The fact that the fallen vessel on the François Vase received a label (\textit{HYΔPIA}, retrograde), just like the multitude of characters, highlights its importance to the composition. The absence of cracks on the dropped vessels in these early representations may indicate that they were made of metal, and, hence, the horizontal banding should be read as incised decoration or ribbing.

---


598 Florence, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Etrusco 4209: BAPD 300000; \textit{ABV} 76, 1; 682; \textit{Para} 29; for updated bibliography and excellent images, Shapiro, Iozzo, and Lezzi-Hafter 2013.

599 New York, Metropolitan Museum 01.8.6: BAPD 300381; \textit{ABV} 51, 4; 681; \textit{Para} 23; \textit{CVA} New York 2, 1-2, pls. 2.2a-d, 36.2.

600 See, too, a slightly later type B amphora in the British Museum attributed to the Swing Painter (540 B.C.): 1928.1-17.41: BAPD 301518; \textit{ABV} 306, 38; \textit{Add} 81; \textit{CVA} London 5, IIIc.13, pl. 78.4.;

601 On the François Vase, the hydria is the only vessel with a preserved label, although other inanimate objects have inscriptions (i.e.: KRENE, the fountain, side A frieze 4-5, Shapiro, Iozzo, and Lezzi-Hafter 2013, pl. 41; \textit{LITH}OS “stone” on side B neck frieze 2, Shapiro, Iozzo, and Lezzi-Hafter 2013, pl. 11; BO[MOS], “altar” on side A main frieze, Shapiro, Iozzo, and Lezzi-Hafter 2013, pl. 26).
By the last quarter of the 6th century, the fallen hydria had begun to appear with a crack cutting across its belly, a subtle shift suggesting that vase-painters had started to think of the dropped vessel as pottery. The break—rendered as a reserved band in black-figure and as black line in red-figure—was represented variously by irregular (Fig. 48), scalloped (Fig. 49) or straight lines (Fig. 50). A fracture so severe would have diminished the functionality of any ceramic vessel, but such damage on a hydria—a pot designed to hold water—would have rendered it entirely unusable. In fact, as noted above, in the survey of actual vases with ancient mends described, hydriai had a very low incidence of repair, and the mends tended to concentrate on the feet, rim, and handles, rather than the body. The location of repairs may be a product of the shape’s weak points but also could reflect beliefs regarding the mendability of this vessel type. While the simple fallen hydria in the ambush scene conveyed the surprise of the attack and the haste with which Polyxena and Troilos fled, the broken vessel adds an element of
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602 The oinochoe in the University of Pennsylvania Museum is one of the earliest representations of the ambush scene with a cracked vessel.Attributed to the BMN Painter, it belongs to the third quarter of the 6th century. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Museum MS 4857: BAPD 302849; ABV 227, 12; Add 59.

Hydriai: London, British Museum 1899.7-21.4 (BAPD 203082; ARV 191, 14; ARV 297, 15; 296; 1643; CVA London 5, III.1c.13, pl. 78.4) and 1837.6-9.41 (BAPD 302012; ABV 361, 17; Para 161; CVA London 6, III.H.4, pls. 76.4, 80.1); Berlin, Antikensammlung F 1895 (BAPD 320041; ABV 268, 31; Add 70); Munich, Antikensammlung 1722 (BAPD 320043; ABV 269, 33; Add 70); Hannover, Kestner Museum 1965.30 (BAPD 340472; Para 119, 27; Add 70; CVA Hannover 1, 29-30, pls. 18.2-3, 19.1-2). Cups: Paris, Cabinet des Médailles 330 (BAPD 11356; CVA Bibliothèque Nationale 2, 40, pl. 54.3-7); Paris, Musée du Louvre G 154 (BAPD 203902; ARV 246, 3; ARV 297, 3; Add 111; Add 224); Athens, Akropolis Museum A173 (BAPD 46671). Kraters: Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale Tarquiniense RC 2438 (BAPD 8129). Oinochoe: Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Museum MS 4857 (BAPD 302849; ABV 227, 12; Add 59). Lekythos: Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1976.68 (BAPD 3506).

604 The scalloped black band on the hydria in the representation of the ambush by Troilus Painter (Fig. 49) should not be confused with decoration. The location and shape of the break are in line with earlier, black-figure representations of cracks. Moreover, the drawing is highly skilled. The painter was attentive to details, even rendering a line of minute black dots along the rim of the hydria. He clearly understood how to differentiate elements in red-figure; for example, he added a handle to the body of the fallen hydria in black paint. Most likely, he would have recognized that the band across the fallen hydria’s mid-section would read as a crack unless he distinguished the vessel’s edges from the background with a reserve band.
foreshadowing. The irreversibility of the damage mirrors the inescapability of the events that have been set in train. The injury to the vessel—its functional death—anticipates the violent end of the Trojan prince and perhaps the city’s fate.

Representations of broken vessels also add a temporal dimension to a number of funerary scenes on 5th century vases, only here with a gaze toward the past. Fragmentary lekythoi—and a hydria, in one instance 605—are shown having toppled over on the steps of grave monuments on several lekythoi and one loutrophoros. 606 Kurtz rightly concludes that the broken vessels are not the result of graveside rites involving the smashing of objects; rather, they “are best explained as a realistic record of contemporary burial practice,” 607 which called for the deposition of small vessels containing perfumed oils. More can be said about the juxtaposition of complete and fragmentary vessels in these images. In each of these scenes, except for that of the Paris lekythos (Fig. 51), visitors are shown arriving with baskets filled with wreaths, fillets, and lekythoi to adorn the grave monument (Fig. 52). Because the incomplete and fallen vessels are not swept away, they read as the vestiges of commemorative activities performed at an earlier date and, thus, imply both the disposability of the offerings and the curation of the grave across time. The accumulation of offerings from different temporal horizons is a testament of family members’ enduring devotion to the dead. The images, intended for the grave, may have
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605 Munich 2170.
606 Kurtz 1975, 38 n. 4) counts five examples, although one by the Thanatos Painter (Boston Museum of Fine Arts 00.359; BAPD 216364; ARV² 1229, 23; Add² 351) does not appear to have a broken vessel in the image. Clear instances of the motif are found on: a lekythos in Athens by the Beldam Painter (National Museum 1982: BAPD 209259; ARV² 571, 1; Add² 285; Kurtz 1975, pl. 21.3-4); Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 2703 (BAPD 42147; CVA Amsterdam 4, 65-66, pl. 210.6); Paris, Musée du Louvre CA 3758 (BAPD 3032; Kurtz 1975, pl. 23.3); Munich 2170; and a red-figure loutrophoros in the manner of the Talos Painter in Berlin (Antikensammlung 3209: BAPD 5280).
607 Kurtz 1975, 38 n. 4.
offered a comforting message to the deceased, by assuring that he or she had not been forgotten, even if the tomb was neglected between visitations.

A cracked pot does not always carry a deep symbolism of the type proposed here for the Troilos motif and the funerary images. Broken vessels are the sources of humor in the comical vignettes on two red-figure choes. The first pictures a slave boy crouching over a pot with a crack across its body, as his master raises a sandal to strike him (Fig. 53). The second shows Dionysos threatening a satyr with a sandal, while the satyr cowers beside the fragments of a jug that he has presumably broken (Fig. 54). The choice of a broken pot as the inspiration for a comic scene suggests that mishaps involving tableware were commonplace in ancient households. The humor may be rooted in the notion that these were such frequent occurrences that they typically did not warrant punishment. The weapon reinforces this idea, since sandals are wielded most often by women fending off unwanted advances or school masters disciplining their pupils. Equivalent to a slap on the wrist, this light punishment is appropriate for an event that was more of an annoyance than a calamity.

Images on vases also attest to the reuse of ceramic vessels. Broken amphorae contribute to the sense of chaos in a few red-figure depictions of the centauromachy. On the exterior of two nearly identical cups in Boston (Fig. 55), centaurs grip the handles of broken amphorae. They threaten Lapiths with the vessels’ jagged edges and with lamp stands, also seized during the mêlée at the wedding banquet of Perithoos. These

---

610 Berlin, Private Collection: Mitchell 2009, 205, fig. 108.
612 Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 00.344: BAPD 220534; ARV² 1319, 2; Para 478; Add² 363. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 00.345: BAPD 220535; ARV² 1319, 3; Para 478; Add² 363.
makeshift weapons are juxtaposed to swords and axes—proper weapons wielded by the Lapiths—perhaps to underscore the primitive nature of the centaurs.

A more formal repurposing of ceramic vessels is pictured on two squat lekythoi dated to the late 5th or early 4th centuries. Both show the rites of the Adonia, an annual mid-summer festival commemorating the short life of the hero Adonis. Born from an incestuous relationship between Myrrha and her father, Adonis was given by Aphrodite to Persephone to be raised. However, he was killed tragically at a young age in a boar hunt. During the Adonia, women planted fennel, lettuce, and other fast-growing seeds in broken pots (ostraka) that were set on the rooftops, where the shoots, deprived of water, dried out in the hot summer sun. The squat lekythos in Karlsruhe attributed to the circle of the Meidias Painter shows this phase of the ritual (Fig. 56); a winged figure hands the upper half of a broken upside-down amphora to a woman standing on a ladder. White dots along the scalloped fracture denote the vegetation growing in this improvised planter. At night during the festival, the women would gather to wail laments for both the plants and Adonis, which were doubles in that both the herbs and the youth perished at a tender age. Although scholars are divided over the purpose of the ritual, the broken vessels can be interpreted plausibly as metaphors for the womb. Their fragmented state is one aspect of the hostile environment that dooms the fragile herbs planted in the ostraka to failure, along with the shadeless rooftop, the hot summer temperatures, and the lack of water. The rites of the Adonia, therefore, underscore the inefficacy of broken vessels.

613 1) Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B 39: CVA Karlsruhe 1, 32-33, pl. 27.1-4; Reeder 1995, 236-8, No. 61. 2) Paestum, Museo Archeologico 195.173: BAPD 9027198; Torelli 2012.
615 Reeder 1995, 236-8, No. 61.
The view of broken objects presented in vase imagery of the 6th through 4th centuries is primarily negative, emphasizing the finality of fragmentation. The decisiveness of this damage made broken pots effective symbols of impending doom, neglect, barbarism, and infertility, thus perpetuating the negative portrait of broken vessels offered by literary sources.

5.2 Mending Things

While many examples of broken objects are preserved in the written and visual record, the evidence for ancient repair for the Archaic and Classical period is meager, with only a few texts and no images surviving to my knowledge. Instead, the hundreds of artifacts with ancient repairs confirm that repair was an alternative pathway for things that broke.

Aristophanic comedy records instances of everyday wear and tear necessitating repair and maintenance. Two bawdy anecdotes relate tales of object curation in the *Lysistrata* (411 B.C.). A magistrate, wishing to alert husbands that they themselves promote their wives’ licentious behavior and scheming, describes two hypothetical situations where a man naively invites a craftsman into his home to attend to broken objects—a gold necklace and sandals (*RT. 3*). Through double entendres, the magistrate implies that such visitors performed services of a sexual nature instead. It is noteworthy that the item selected for repair in this Athenian context was a gold necklace, an object of definite material worth, which could be restored to full functionality by the goldsmith who had made it. Much of the ancient jewelry in collections worldwide is
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616 Gardner 1989, 55.
unprovenanced, but signs of repair indicate that it was indeed used in real life.\textsuperscript{617} Similarly, a metal stand was returned to the foundry for mending,\textsuperscript{618} according to an excerpt from a roughly contemporary speech, “On the Vessel-stand” attributed to the Athenian orator Lysias and quoted by Athenaeus (\textbf{RT. 10}). Two references to mending pottery are found Aristophanes’ \textit{Wasps}, the first with plaster, and the second with rivets. In the first (\textbf{RT. 11}), Philocleon states that he does not have anything to plaster a hydria and, during the trial, Philocleon starts a joke “Do you know the one about the woman from Sybaris who broke a jug?” The jug then calls a friend to witness, and the woman replies, “If you spent less time calling people to witness and went out and brought a rivet, you’d show more sense” (\textbf{RT. 12}).

The \textit{iamata}—the miracle inscriptions of Epidauros (later 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.)\textsuperscript{619}—record the circumstances of a cup’s breaking and miraculous mending (\textbf{RT. 13}).\textsuperscript{620} The tale unfolds as follows: a porter fell on route to the sanctuary at Epidauros only to find that his master’s drinking cup had shattered inside his bag. After sitting down and trying in vain to reassemble the pieces, he continued on his way. Yet when he arrived at his destination and reached into the bag, he discovered that the cup was intact. The miracle was a testament not only of the god’s power to heal but of the futility of trying to mend ceramic vessels and—as a corollary—their worthlessness once broken.

\textsuperscript{617} Williams and Ogden 1994, 31.
\textsuperscript{618} The verb \textit{ἐπισκευάζω} can be translated as “equip,” “make afresh, repair, restore,” or “reconstruct” (\textit{LSJ}, s.v. “ἐπισκευάζω”). The next sentence refers to its cast embellishments (satyrs and bulls’ heads), forms that this particular workshop manufactured. The logical deduction is that the speaker sought out a foundry that was able to replicate the stand’s existing ornament. The passage suggests that the act be classified as a repair rather than a regular maintenance procedure, such as polishing.
\textsuperscript{619} LiDonnici 1992; LiDonnici 1995.
\textsuperscript{620} Stele A10. LiDonnici 1995, 92-3.
6. Conclusions

*One can’t help but wonder about the stories behind their brokenness, which only add to their interest. Was it a case of butterfingers? A lovers’ quarrel? Rough seas on an export ship?*\(^6^2^1\)

These sentiments, written in a *New York Times* article about modern “make-dos,” could apply equally to artifacts with evidence of ancient mends. Repairs invite onlookers to contemplate both the moment when an object broke and the human-object relationship underlying the act of mending. As one collector of antiques with repairs explains, “These objects show affection made material by transfiguring artistry. Everyone who encounters the conversion from common object to holy object is witness to incredibly vital experiences.”\(^6^2^2\) Although Archaic and Classical sources seldom mention repairs specifically, their emphasis on the uselessness of broken things highlights the poignancy of ancient attempts to rehabilitate damaged objects, particularly ceramics. The survey of artifacts with ancient interventions draws attention to the intricate mechanisms of early repairs, which employed fine drill-work, metallurgy, substitutions of alien parts, and other modifications. Whether the repairs restored watertightness remains an open question in many cases. It seems that items of intrinsic worth (metals) and things with unusual decoration or from distant geographic origins were the most common objects of curation, a pattern explored further in the next chapter. These trends may stem from the difficulty of replacing these items, but they also may speak of these objects’ social significance.

\(^6^2^1\) Codrington Lippke 2010.
\(^6^2^2\) Codrington Lippke 2010.
CHAPTER 4

BROADER PATTERNS IN ANCIENT CURATION

The two forms of curation examined in the preceding chapters—the preservation of objects across time and the repair of damaged goods—are attested across a broad temporal and geographic span in the ancient Mediterranean. The case studies presented thus far have probed these practices within circumscribed archaeological contexts in order to characterize diverse acts of object care, to differentiate the various types of keimêlia, and to better understand the potentialities of these curated objects in antiquity. Despite the idiosyncratic nature of instances of ancient curation documented here—and acts of curation in general—some patterns appear to cut across cultures, time, and space. These include: the attribution of magical or mythic significance to objects from the very remote past; the recurrent association of objects from the past with children; and the prevalence of artifacts of non-local origin, unusual material composition, or unique shape or manufacture among the items selected for curation. Analogous phenomena in archaeological contexts outside the Mediterranean, ethnographic parallels, and testimony from contemporary cultures can shed light on the trends documented in this study.

1. The Magical Potential of the Distant Past

People in the ancient Mediterranean continually confronted the material remains of their landscapes’ earlier inhabitants, both human and animal.\(^{623}\) One of the most pronounced patterns to emerge from the data set is the repeated interpretation of artifacts from deep antiquity as magical implements or as mytho-historic relics. This observation

\(^{623}\) Often, as with the prehistoric objects described above, the precise meaning assigned to these curiosities evades modern scholars (Hartmann 2010, 15).
is consistent with early testimonia, many of which allude to an association between the mythological plupast and artifacts from the remote past. According to these ancient accounts, relics were recognized as distinct from contemporary material culture through their patina, unusual material composition, and unfamiliar craftsmanship. Parallels for the deployment of distant found objects as supernatural agents are readily available from archaeological, ethnographic, and historical literature, spanning settings as diverse as medieval Europe, 20\textsuperscript{th} century Native American culture, and modern Maya communities.

In these far-flung societies, the peculiar appearance of very archaic objects and the gaps in their biographies became openings for later curators to inject interpretations anchored not in contemporary realities but in the occult or divine realms.

Six of the objects documented in the catalogue (\textbf{Appendix 2}) predated their archaeological contexts by more than a millennium. The Eneolithic flint point from an 8\textsuperscript{th} century grave at the Greek colonial site of Pithekoussai was discussed in-depth in Chapter 2 (\textbf{A.65}; pp. 105-9). To briefly summarize, the lithic was found beside a shark’s tooth on the chest of a child, the position where amuletic scarabs typically were found at Pithekoussai. The placement, the point’s similar morphology to the shark’s tooth (another unique object at the site), and its sharp edges, hint at its protective function. One of our few contemporary written documents from the site may lend support to this suggestion. The inscription on the “Cup of Nestor”, plausibly understood as a defensive curse, implies the animate nature of objects from the remote, mythological past in the 8\textsuperscript{th} century Greek worldview (\textbf{E.1}; pp. 108-9). We might propose that the Eneolithic point was assigned a similarly magical value, perhaps in part due to its dissimilarity from anything produced during the Geometric period at the site. The later finders may have
understood the artifact as an old stone weapon. Prehistoric lithics were also found in two Etruscan tombs at Orvieto (A.62; A.63). These were chamber tombs that contained multiple interments, and the lithics are merely listed as “varia” in the publication without detailed contextual information, but the fact that both prehistoric artifacts were found with unusual naturalia—one with a boar’s tusk (A.62) and the other with a shark’s tooth (A.63)—may signal the assemblages’ occult nature.

The other objects from deep antiquity catalogued here are the three Middle Neolithic or Early Bronze Age stone axes recovered from Iron Age levels at Monte Polizzo in Sicily. All are made of non-local stone—a granite from Northern Italy. One of the axes (A.101) derives from 6th century floor levels at House 1, a large residential complex, where evidence of feasting points to a public or sacred function. Two similar, though smaller and perforated, stone axes (A.102; A.103) were recovered from the Portello Sant’ Anna, a gate at the entrance of what might be considered an administrative rather than private building. Mühlenbock analyzes these very ancient lithics from the perspective of exchange relations.624 Removed from their original spatial and temporal contexts, the axes were assimilated into local material culture at Monte Polizzo. He proposes that the axes were considered “charged with a life history” derived from their past users. The Archaic curators of the axes may not have known precisely how old the objects were, but they recognized that these stone weapons were distinct from the metal weapons of their own age. In this way, these objects mobilized a distant past and placed the 6th century curators within that ancient lineage. Moreover, he posits that their morphology as weapons implies their symbolic amuletic function. The smaller,
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624 Mühlenbock 2008, 184.
perforated axes, he suggests, may have been “satellites”—portable versions of larger axes such as the one from House 1—which expressed membership within a distinguished group of ancestors. If so, they may have been thought to carry the same protective force for the owner as he or she traveled away from home.

Mühlenbock’s ideas regarding the significance of the axes cannot be proven, but various factors imply the special significance of these Neolithic stone tools in the 6th century: first, their composition of non-local material marks them as distinct; second, their pristine condition strongly suggests that they were not used as tools but were kept as symbolic devices; finally, the perforation of the two specimens indicates that they were used in adornment or display. Although the two perforated axes constitute a very small “collection,” they should be considered one, since they were the products of selection, plucked out of the world and linked imaginatively as a pair,625 ostensibly due to their formal similarities. Implicit in the act of collecting is the process of sacralization.626 In sum, despite the paucity of information about the assemblages of the early stone axes from Monte Polizzo, the available contextual data suggests that they were objects kept for ceremony rather than utility.

Testimonia and archaeological finds from Greek sanctuaries appear to corroborate these proposals by suggesting that naturalia and artifacts from a very distant past often were interpreted within the magical or mythic frameworks. These sources, which presumably reflect shared views, imply that this conception of the distant past was a part
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625 Pearce 1995, 23.
626 “Collections are gathered together for purposes which are seen by their possessors as lifting them away from the world of common commodities into one of special significance, one for which ‘sacred’ seems the right word” (Pearce 1995, 27).
of broader thought patterns. In this sense, they may serve as instructive analogues to the
Pithekoussai point and the Monte Polizzo axes.

The most ancient objects encountered by the Greeks were the fossilized remains
of extinct creatures, which Mayor has argued were the inspiration for numerous myths
and legends.\textsuperscript{627} Finds of fossils within sacred precincts indicate that these seemingly very
old objects were associated with divinities, heroes, or other mythical beings, and served
as tools in the narration of civic or regional histories. These finds generally belong to
very large animals not recognizable as those which roamed the earth in the historical
period. Among the plausible connections Mayor draws between known fossil remains
and ancient traditions are: the \textit{Protoceratops} skeletons and nests of fossilized dinosaur
eggs from Asia which might have been the wellspring of myths of gold-guarding
griﬃns;\textsuperscript{628} ﬁnds of fossilized mammoth and elephant tusks from Megalopolis, which may
lie at the heart of reports of large bones in Peloponnesian temples (a huge shoulder
blade\textsuperscript{629} and a pair of enormous tusks at Tegea);\textsuperscript{630} and Miocene fossil beds on Samos,
which contain mammalian remains in reddish sediments that may have been identiﬁed as
the ancient landmark of Panaima (“Blood-Soaked Field”), where Dionysos battled the
Amazons. Mayor proposes that the Greeks interpreted the fossils there as the Amazons’

\textsuperscript{627} Mayor 2000.
\textsuperscript{628} Mayor 2000, 38-53.
\textsuperscript{629} Mayor 2000, 104-10. Pausanias’ account (5.13.4-7) of the convoluted path of the shoulder blade of
Pelops from Pisa to Troy and back to Olympia offers an interesting tale of a found object. Lost in a
shipwreck off the coast of Euboia on its journey home from Troy, the bone was recovered by a fisherman
Demarmenos, who consulted the Delphic oracle about what should be done with it. At the time, an embassy
from Elis was visiting Delphi, and the fisherman passed the bone off to them to return to Olympia.
Demarmenos and his descendants were honored as the guardians of the bone, which had disappeared by the
time of Pausanias’ visit. The chance discovery of the bone earned the ﬁnder and his family a special role in
the sacred life of Olympia. Similarly, the discovery of ancient Mayan artifacts are seen in some
contemporary Latin American communities as divine sanction for the ﬁnder to conduct ritual activities
(Brown 2000, 328-31).
\textsuperscript{630} Mayor 2000, 98-9.
enormous corpses and the bodies of dead war elephants, which purportedly could be seen on the plain (Plut. *Quaes. Gr.* 35).\textsuperscript{631}

Examples of fossils from archaeological sites frequently go unrecognized during the course of excavations,\textsuperscript{632} but zooarchaeologists have identified several: an elephant molar from the medical school in Kos;\textsuperscript{633} a fossilized vertebra of a Miocene marine mammal that Schliemann uncovered near an early burial ground (13\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.) at Troy;\textsuperscript{634} oversized hippo teeth from the Heraion of Samos, as well as a large femur bone from the 7\textsuperscript{th} century levels of the temple, renowned for the display of enormous animal bones in antiquity;\textsuperscript{635} and an exceptionally large fossilized femur of a Pliocene or Miocene elephant from the public or sacred space of the acropolis of Messene.\textsuperscript{636} The enormous size of these fossils, as well as their stony composition would have marked them as the stuff of lore, such as the stories of Kadmos sowing dragon’s teeth (Apollod. iii.4.1; Paus. ix.5.1, 10). Whereas any person—a farmer tilling his field, a worker digging a foundation trench, or a shepherd traversing the countryside—could come across the miraculous oversized bones of extinct creatures, it is telling that these unusual finds frequently made their way to public or sacred precincts in the Greek world. Perhaps because they were understood as charged objects, large fossil curios did not linger in the
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\textsuperscript{631} Mayor 2000, 54-5.
\textsuperscript{632} Mayor 2000, 186.
\textsuperscript{633} Mayor 2000, 169, 190-91.
\textsuperscript{634} Mayor 2000, 179-80. Mayor suggests a tentative link between a tale related by Pausanias (5.13.4) and the fossil. According to lore, the Greeks at Troy were told by prophets that they would not be able to take the city until they had the bow and arrows of Herakles and a bone of Pelops in their possession. Presumably because the petrified bone was recovered from a charged funerary context, she claims that (180) “Schliemann’s find suggests that the concept of numinous fossils and relics was indeed familiar to the Trojans of that era.”
\textsuperscript{635} Mayor 2000, 183, fig. 4.11.
\textsuperscript{636} Mayor 2000, 185-90, fig. 4.12.
possession of private individuals but were relinquished to the custody of communities and deities.

Mythological explanations were supplied for manmade material remains from distant earlier epochs as well. Most frequently cited are the walls of Tiryns, which Pausanias (2.25.8) famously reported were the work of the mythical race of giants, the Cyclopes. Implicit in this claim is the notion that Greeks of the historical period were incapable of moving stones so large and erecting fortifications so massive. As noted above, Boardman aspeculates that other myths stemmed from the discovery of artifacts from the Bronze Age (*supra*, 9 n. 35). The descriptions of relics at temples also may signal that early artifacts were curated by Greeks of the historical period (Paus. 6.19.6); the sword of Pelops at Olympia was said to have a gold hilt, a feature that recalls Mycenaean swords.637

Modern archaeological discoveries from ancient temples and sanctuaries further suggest that very ancient objects were interpreted within mythical frameworks or considered numinous by their (usually anonymous) curators and, therefore, appropriate for containment within sacred precincts. Temple A at Ayia Irini on the Aegean island Kea provides a profound example. Prior to the destruction of the structure in the Late Minoan IB/ Late Helladic II period, visitors had deposited 32 large-scale (one-half to three-quarter life-size) female statues over more than a century (the statues span the Middle Minoan III to the Late Minoan IB/ Late Helladic II periods).638 Cultic activities resumed in the Iron Age after the building’s Bronze Age abandonment. A new pavement

637 Boardman 2002, 81. Tantalizing as these suggestions may be, it cannot be certain that encounters with very ancient remains compelled later Greeks to invent mythical explanations except as in cases like the walls of Tiryns where literary sources make the link explicit.
638 Caskey 1986, 34.
was laid in the 8th century, and the head of a Bronze Age statue—\textsuperscript{639}in all likelihood salvaged from prehistoric levels—was mounted in a ring base in Room IA, where it appears to have become a focal point.\textsuperscript{640} The excavators propose that the head served as a cult image before the crudely built structure collapsed at the end of the 8th century.\textsuperscript{641}

However, the most ubiquitous survivals from the Bronze Age are much less monumental: seal stones. Inherently durable, some appear to have served as the models for the forms and imagery of Archaic gems,\textsuperscript{642} and dozens made their way to sanctuaries as offerings to divinities.\textsuperscript{643} Dedications of Mycenaean tools\textsuperscript{644}—a bronze double axe from Pallantion (Arkadia) with a 5th century dedicatory inscription\textsuperscript{645} and a Mycenaean chisel from Boiotia with a 6th century inscription “Hieros”\textsuperscript{646}—add to the corpus. Two Boiotian swords of a Bronze Age type were also labeled “Hieron” and a Neolithic greenstone axe\textsuperscript{647} dating to around 2000 B.C. was found in the historic period strata of the temple at Ephesos.\textsuperscript{648} This curation of very old artifacts in sanctuaries may have been much more widespread than modern archaeological investigations have revealed, since votive deposits are frequently of mixed chronology, and many prehistoric objects were

\textsuperscript{639}Caskey 1986, 45-6, No. 1-1.
\textsuperscript{640} Gorogianni 2011, 642-4, fig. 6; Caskey 1986, 39.
\textsuperscript{641} Caskey 1986, 39.
\textsuperscript{642} Boardman 1963, 95; 7-101. Archaic peoples may have found these seal stones “in their fields or in plundered tombs” (95).
\textsuperscript{643} Sakellarakis 1976. Five sanctuaries with Bronze Age seal stones have no known evidence of prehistoric occupation (304).
\textsuperscript{644} These objects have been designated “Mycenaean” on the basis of style.
\textsuperscript{645} Athens, National Museum Br. 17439: Boardman 2002, 80 fig. 49.
\textsuperscript{646} Athens, National Museum s/n: Boardman 2002, 80, fig. 50.
\textsuperscript{647} Liverpool Museum 49.18.47: Boardman 2002, 82, fig. 51.
\textsuperscript{648} It may be illuminated by a passage from the Acts of the Apostles (19.35) which claims that the temple keeper at the Artemesion held a sacred stone that had fallen from the sky (axe heads in antiquity were sometimes interpreted as thunderbolts [Boardman 2002, 82]). The source is late, however, and the connection tenuous.
recovered during the course of early archaeological campaigns, in which the contextual data was not always collected.\textsuperscript{649}

The Lindian Chronicle, the famous lengthy inscription set up in 99 B.C. by the people of Lindos to document the dedications once housed in the Temple of Athena, confirms that the unusual composition or craftsmanship seen in relics from deep antiquity prompted mythological interpretations. The two earliest dedications listed in the Chronicle are a phiale from the town’s eponymous founder Lindos and a vessel from the Telchines, all figures with divine roots. Lindos was the child of the nymph Rhodos and Helios,\textsuperscript{650} and the Telchines were sons of Thalatta, according to Diodorus Siculus (5.55.1-3). In addition, Diodorus reports that the Telchines were associated with the manufacture of very archaic images. Strabo (14.2.7) adds to the lore surrounding the Telchines by characterizing them as sorcerers or craftsmen. They were, he claims, the first to work iron and bronze, and they made a “reaping hook” for Kronos. Both the dedications of Lindos and the Telchines are described in the Lindian Chronicle with a variation of the phrase “no one was able to discover what it is [made] from.”\textsuperscript{651} The

\textsuperscript{649} Van Damme 2012, 42.
\textsuperscript{650} For references, see Higbie 2003, 66.
\textsuperscript{651} 1) The phiale dedicated by Lindos (B.I.1-2; Higbie 2003, 20-1):

\begin{verbatim}
Λίνδος φιάλαν, ἄν οὐδεὶς ἔδύνατο γνώμειν
ἐκ τίνος ἔστι
\end{verbatim}

Lindos, a phiale. Which no one was able to discover what it is [made] from…

2) The vessel dedicated by Telchines (B.II.9-10; Higbie 2003, 20-21):

\begin{verbatim}
Τελχέινες κροσόν, ἄν οὐδεὶς ἔδύνατο
ἐπι[νώμειν ἐκ] τίνος ἔστι
\end{verbatim}

Telchines, a vessel. Which no one was able to discover what it is [made] from
qualifier indicates that an aura of mystery surrounded these most ancient dedications due to their unusual material composition and perhaps, we might speculate, the process by which they were made. Implicit is a loss of knowledge between the Lindians of the historic period, who were recording the offerings, and the heroic dedicators. In other words, the unfamiliar appearance of these objects led the Lindians to associate them with the deepest past of their community, when immortals made visits to the island’s famous temple. In the *Iliad* (2.811-14), Homer refers to an analogous lacuna in the understanding of the nature of objects from remote antiquity when describing a landmark where the Trojans gather: “This men call the Hill of the Thicket, but the immortal gods have named it the burial ground of dancing Myrine.”652 The passage implies that what was originally a tomb came to be understood as a natural feature in the landscape by humans many generations removed.

The notion of a gap separating the living generation of humans from an early race of semi-divine and divine beings is pervasive in Greek literature, and material goods frequently are cited as proofs of this disconnected past. In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, speakers regularly allude to an “epic plupast,” an earlier era when a race of superior men inhabited the earth.653 The belongings of this prior generation fittingly exhibited extraordinary weight and strength, so that only the most powerful of the Trojan War heroes could handle them. Examples include the cup that Nestor alone could lift (II. 11.632-7), the spear of Peleus which only Achilles was able to wield (II. 16.141-4 and 19.388-91), and Eurytos’ bow (Od. 21.11-41) that no man other than Odysseus could

---

Higbie sees the phrase as denoting the antiquity of the dedications or implying that the objects were made of an unfamiliar metal. Higbie 2003, 64.
652 Grethlein 2008, 30-1.
string (Od. 21.11-41).\textsuperscript{654} Such descriptions serve several purposes: to designate those objects as the singular possessions of their owners; to highlight the strengths of both the earlier race and the Trojan War heroes who could handle these items; and to suggest the remarkable, almost magical, qualities of objects from deep antiquity. The epic plupast is a literary trope undoubtedly, but it also may have its roots in the physical world. Boardman suggests that myths of Giants or an earlier generation of heroes were invented in response to the discovery of enormous fossil bones,\textsuperscript{655} and, if so, the Greeks must have imagined these goliaths equipped with correspondingly massive weapons and other possessions.

Comparative archaeology and anthropological research reveal that the ancient Mediterranean is not the only setting where natural curiosities and artifacts from the distant past were viewed as constituents of the divine realm or were considered otherwise imbued with preternatural powers. In far-flung communities of different eras, objects with discontinuous biographies were called back into use regularly as medicinal cures, apotropaic devices, tools for divination, and symbols of authority. For cultures of the modern historical period, textual sources and ethnographic interviews enlighten us about the perception of these very ancient objects, whereas we rely on contextual data to inform us about the role of archeia in cultures known to us through archaeological remains. Frequently, such artifacts were viewed as exotica and underwent a change in function indicative of their reworked meaning. These archaeological and ethnographic analogies shed light on considerations when approaching temporally-distant found objects in the ancient Mediterranean, and they seem to confirm that a broad temporal gap between the

\textsuperscript{654} Grethlein 2008, 39.
\textsuperscript{655} Boardman 2002, 34.
use of an object and its curation promoted the assignment of mythological or mystical significance.

In a number of Latin American communities, both modern and ancient, artifacts from the distant past are viewed as *sacra*. For example, according to interviews conducted in the last century, the Huichol people of San Sebastián, Teponahuastlán, Mexico, associated artifacts such as projectile points, ceramic whistles and painted bowls “with a group of near demi-gods that inhabited the area before them and long before the Conquest.” One particular point was offered at a cave shrine in the year 1967, when many children in the village fell ill with the measles, and traditional healing sessions had failed to ameliorate the epidemic. When archaeologist Phil Weigand inquired about the event, his informant explained that “anything that old, i.e. pre-Huichol, was bound to have power which would in turn make the offering more powerful and attractive.”\(^{656}\) The informant also stressed that the deployment of antiquities in ritual action was not common practice; villagers could name only two precedents. Although we can infer that the people of San Sebastián encountered pre-Conquest artifacts at least occasionally, these objects were not reintroduced to circulation except in response to dire circumstances. This contemporary analogy may shed light on what appears to be a low incidence of the reuse of very ancient artifacts in the area surveyed for this study, despite the fact that the remains of earlier epochs—particularly the Bronze Age—were plentiful and conspicuous in the landscape. If the most ancient of artifacts were viewed as products of the divine realm, people may have been apprehensive about handling such charged

\(^{656}\) Weigand 1970, 367.
objects, which were either avoided or treated as sacrosanct and, therefore, worthy of dedication in sanctuaries.

In some contemporary cultures, ancient artifacts are viewed as channels by which ritual practitioners communicate with the gods. Ritual specialists in the Maya Highlands and Lowlands, for example, collect and carry Pre-Columbian artifacts (found objects) as “personal sacra”—tools for divination, healing, midwifery, and communication with ancestors.\(^{657}\) Both the mode of acquisition and the antiquity of these artifacts contribute to the belief in their supernatural powers. In many cases, ritual specialists see their chance discovery of antiquities as proof of their divine appointment to practice the sacred arts. At the same time, as Brown explains, “becoming a Maya ritual practitioner through the process of divine election primarily involves a process of self-ascription. Individuals undergo a series of personal experiential events that eventually are resolved through self-identification with a new social status, that of ritual specialist.”\(^ {658}\) The possession of objects so distinct from contemporary material culture helps to establish and reinforce the demarcation between the ritual practitioners and other members of the community. The practice of ritual collecting frequently occurs in communities where wealth-based social differentiation is minimal; instead, individuals legitimize their privileged position as mediators with the supernatural realm by owning unique objects acquired through good fortune and divine intervention rather than purchase.\(^ {659}\) Beyond the Maya region, peoples in the American Southwest and South America, also collect projectile points, sherds, and

---

\(^{657}\) Brown 2000, 324-7.  
\(^{658}\) Brown 2000, 328.  
\(^{659}\) Brown 2000, 329.
lithics for ritual purposes. Brown has argued that the profusion of ethnographic parallels may illuminate puzzling, anachronistic assemblages uncovered in excavations of Classic Maya sites. These, too, may be collections of personal *sacra*.

A similar phenomenon has been documented in China during the Han and Early Tang Dynasties (206 B.C. — A.D. 750); however, in this case, it was rulers who rediscovered objects from deep antiquity and used these finds to legitimize their authority. A number of pseudohistorical narratives recount the recovery of *ding*—inscribed bronze vessels, manufactured between 1500 and 221 B.C. The vessels were said to have been cast and owned by mythic sage emperors, and, perhaps as a result of their legendary origins, *ding* served as character judges of sorts, miraculously “appearing” for virtuous rulers and “disappearing” for those who had acted improperly. Later, in the Yuan and Ming Dynasties (A.D. 1280-1644), interest in the collecting of bronzes shifted from emperors to wealthy individuals, who hailed the talismanic properties of these ancient vessels.

While some of the ethnographic anecdotes described above refer to the healing powers of antiquities according to mystic traditions, the curative properties of objects from the deep past also were recognized in early science. The *Chirurgia Magna* of Lanfrank of Milan, a surgical treatise produced in Paris c. 1245-1306, prescribes the

---

660 Brown 2000, 327-8. For a review of ethnographic literature discussing the collection of artifacts for use as personal *sacra*, see Brown’s Table 2 (p. 325). Also see Thomas (1976) for the use of a 1,500-year-old projectile point in a shaman’s wand in the American Southwest.

661 A volcanic eruption around A.D. 600 sealed a deposit in a building believed to have a ceremonial function at Cerén, El Salvador. The assemblage included diverse objects, including obsidian tools, a greenstone disk, a miniature frog effigy paint pot, spindle whorls, a sherd, crystals, shells, gourds, a female figurine, ceramic animal head, partial ceramic double ring, and a left antler from a white-tailed stag. All have signs of use and breakage, and some exhibit chemical weathering, which suggests that they had been recovered from a different archaeological context (Brown 2000, 321-4). The female figurine, clay ring, and animal head date stylistically to an earlier period (Brown 2000, 323, Table 1).


663 Rawson 1993, 63-5.
ingestion of centuries-old Roman pottery, terra sigillata, in powdered form to minimize swelling. Its application as a poultice, on the other hand, was a treatment for ulcers and enlarged breasts. The belief in the fired clay’s medicinal properties might explain the presence of Samian ware fragments in 15th and 16th century levels at the site of Carrickfergus, Co. Antrim in Ireland, and may even account for finds of Samian ware sherds centuries earlier—in the Early Medieval and Early Christian periods—in Ireland.664 Samian ware was a red gloss pottery (terra sigillata) produced in Gaul primarily from the 1st centuries B.C. through the 3rd centuries A.D., so these examples would have been at least a millennium old and imports in these Irish contexts. If these hypotheses are correct, Samian ware was a commodity of limited circulation, sought by a small group of specialist medicinal practitioners. We can speculate that the pottery’s distant origins (both temporally and geographically), its unusual, brilliant red color, and the quality of the clay when pulverized, were all features that may have contributed to the belief in its medicinal efficacy. Another example of folkloric medicine involving antiquities is the use of prehistoric seal stones as “milk-stones” by the women of Crete in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Nursing mothers believed that wearing these millennia-old, colorful gems would help them maintain their milk supply.665

Ethnographic sources and archaeological case studies reveal that, in some cultures, artifacts from the deep past are thought to carry protective value or good fortune to their owners. Some are isolated cases; for example, in the Dongola province of Sudan, archaeologist William Ward encountered a family that owned a scarab dating to the

664 Bradley 1981/1982. Bradley further notes that Samian sherds with ground edges from Early Christian contexts may have been used in medicinal kits, although they predate the treatise.
middle of the second millennium B.C. This heirloom had been passed down through seven generations and was thought to be a source of good luck. Other times, the reuse of artifacts was so widespread that it appears to have been part of the culture’s mores. For example, centuries-old Roman artifacts, including coins, brooches and pottery, are found in graves across Britain dating to various times in the 1st and 2nd millennia. Apparently, antiquarians mistook many Anglo-Saxon graves for Roman burials because of the presence of Roman artifacts. In their discussion of the reuse of Roman artifacts in 5th through 7th century Britain, Eckardt and Williams note that, while these artifacts may have served as inexpensive substitutes for contemporary burial goods, they occur in both wealthy and poor graves. The fact that Roman artifacts sometimes are found in association with prehistoric objects and fossils suggests that they too were classified with a distant, disconnected past, even though the Anglo-Saxon discoverers likely knew the sources of the Roman objects, whether graves, hoards, or abandoned settlements. These remote origins may have imbued the recovered artifacts with a numinous aura, so that even functional items could serve as amulets. Gilchrist extends this discussion, noting that the inclusion of artifacts in Later Medieval burials concentrate in the graves of women and children (11th-15th centuries), the most vulnerable members of society. At this time, when Christianity had taken hold, charms might have been employed to protect or

---

667 Gilchrist 2008; Eckardt and Williams 2003. Dickinson notes the presence of 1st and 2nd century Samian ware in graves, where she speculates the earlier pottery might have served as “talismans.” Another sherd of Samian ware was associated with a 9th century altar of a church. Nearby was a 4th century coin. Taken together, the sherd and the coin “are likely to reflect some form of eighth/ninth century antiquarianism” (Dickinson 1997, 293). Possibly these items were linked to a 3rd or 4th century saint who was revered at the site (Dickinson 1997, 45).
668 Eckardt and Williams 2003, 147.
669 Apparently, antiquarians mistook many Anglo-Saxon graves for Roman burials because of the presence of Roman artifacts (Eckardt and Williams 2003, 147).
670 Eckardt and Williams 2003, 163.
heal the body, preparing it for its passage through purgatory to heaven.\textsuperscript{671} As Gilchrist argues, it seems that “the very antiquity of some objects lent them a magical quality, perhaps equivalent to the occult power of natural objects. The significance of these objects seems to be their antiquity, rather than their status as found objects.”\textsuperscript{672}

The recontextualization of objects in both space and time promotes the “reworking” of their meanings,\textsuperscript{673} but it is things from the deep past that seem to be recast regularly as sacred relics or magical implements. The few \textit{keimêlia} catalogued in this survey that were millennia old at the time of curation appear to have been deployed in this manner. This interpretation finds ample parallels in the reuse of very ancient objects in diverse cultures documented by ethnographers, anthropologists, and archaeologists. The treatment of such artifacts—found objects—varied: some were viewed as magically or dangerously charged due to their association with the divine realm; others assumed a dialectic relationship with ritual practitioners who used them both as tools in sacred rites and as a means of legitimizing their spiritual authority; and still other relics were thought to have special powers to heal, bring good fortune or deflect evil. Two attributes promoted the attachment of magico-mythic meanings to the most ancient finds. First, their appearance, including material, mode of manufacture, and patina, gave them an aura of otherness. And second, their discontinuous biographies offered openings for later curators to insert new meanings anchored not in reality but in mystical realms. Even if people did not understand precisely what an object was or how it had been used in the distant past, they were aware of the fact that it had endured a significant span of time.

That staying power must have provided some proof of its quasi-magical force.

\textsuperscript{671} Gilchrist 2008, 153
\textsuperscript{672} Gilchrist 2008, 144.
\textsuperscript{673} Eckardt and Williams 2003, 142; see also Appadurai 1986, 15, for the original formulation of this idea.
2. *Children and Keimêlia*

Another pattern documented in this study was the occasional deployment of *keimêlia* alongside children. Many of the objects catalogued here come from funerary contexts, and it may come as little surprise that deceased infants and children regularly received used objects as grave goods, since they had neither the time on earth nor the abilities to accumulate possessions independently. These ostensibly economical offerings presumably were selected from the belongings of adult relatives. However, literary accounts and archaeological and ethnographic parallels encourage an exploration of ideological factors that compelled adults to bestow kept belongings on youngsters. Greek testimonia present the intergenerational transfer of objects as a powerful means of legitimizing a child’s identity. Moreover, the association between children and older objects is not limited to the ancient Mediterranean but is attested in cultures worldwide from antiquity to the present. While some of the *keimêlia* in Greek contexts buried with children may have been deployed as amulets in the manner described in the previous section, it is argued here that others may have served as material doublets for children, who simultaneously embody the past, present and future.\(^674\) The chronological depth of *keimêlia* made them effective instruments for ascribing ancestries and expressing hopes—in essence, for negotiating different temporalities.

Interest in the material culture of infancy and childhood has grown over the last three decades in tandem with developments in anthropological circles, including the rise of the feminist critique and gender research.\(^675\) Once marginalized or subsumed under the umbrellas of population demographics and women’s studies, the archaeology of

---

\(^{674}\) Mizoguchi 2000.

\(^{675}\) Grubbs and Parkin 2013, 2-4; De Lucia 2010, 608-9; Lewis 2011, 1; Becker 2006; Baxter 2005, 22-30; Neils and Oakley 2003, 2; Korbin 2003; Lillehammer 2000, 17.
childhood has emerged as its own important subdiscipline. Archaeologists and anthropologists have developed a nuanced understanding of childhood, which is not a unitary phase but subdivided according to culturally-defined criteria for maturation, such as age, abilities, appearance, and sexual development—milestones that often align with the rites-of-passage celebrated within a given society. Evidence for the treatment of deceased neonates, children, and adolescents in the archaeological record thus has the potential to illuminate a culture’s view not just of the youngest members of society but of the human lifespan in general and, more broadly, of the dynamics of continuity and change.

The use of curated objects in the graves of children has been documented archaeologically in cultures worldwide. Interpretations—some of which may be cited here—are equally diverse. At Ayios Stephanos in Southern Lakonia, an infant burial dating to the early Late Helladic IIIC period (12th century B.C.) contained a lentoid seal belonging stylistically to the Late Helladic IIIA2 period (14th century B.C.), which the excavators declare summarily “must be an heirloom,” a dubious claim that implies the stone’s uninterrupted history within a family for some two centuries. Artifacts that cross the threshold from the Greek Bronze Age to Iron Age sometimes have been implicated in the debate over cultural continuity for these periods. A Late Minoan I amethyst seal stone from an Iron Age tomb in the North Cemetery of Knossos was found in association

676 The number of monographs and symposia dedicated to the archaeology of infancy and childhood continues to grow: Hermary and Dubois 2012; Nenna 2012; Lally and Moore 2011; Guimier-Sorbets and Morizot 2010; Baxter 2006; Baxter 2005; Neils and Oakley 2003; Sofaer Derevenski 2000. For a succinct overview of recent developments in the study of childhood in archaeology and anthropology, see Schwartzman 2006.
678 Taylour et al. 2008, 125 n. 13, 458 fig. 10.5.
679 See the discussion of metal stands in Chapter 2 pp. 63-5, for example.
with what was likely a child burial;\textsuperscript{680} M. Pomadère questions whether this may represent an extension of the Late Minoan III practice of interring infants with seal stones as amulets.\textsuperscript{681} For Bronze Age Britain, D. McLaren has gathered several examples of older, broken pots that were selected specially for children’s burials.\textsuperscript{682} She asserts that these fragments—even if they were not particularly old—forged a link to the past. As she explains, “By burying this special pot within this grave it does suggest that the community was acknowledging the child’s lineage and using the pot to delineate social relations.”\textsuperscript{683} At Xaltocan, a Postclassical site in the northern basin of Mexico occupied from A.D. 950 to the present, some “antique” figurines dated stylistically to the Formative and Classical periods (1250 B.C. —A.D. 600) were found buried with deceased children under house floors. Overholtzer and Stoner have argued that these were considered charged relics because they came from the spiritual center of Teotihuacan.\textsuperscript{684} It is noteworthy that children (who already were given special treatment in their intramural burial) were the occasional recipients of these rare artifacts. Also in the New World, a deceased child (four to six years old) in the Moquegua Valley in southern Peru, a provincial center of the Tiwanaku culture (A.D. 500-1000), was interred wrapped in four remarkably well-preserved textiles, some of which were considerably older than the burial and all four of which had been mended. Baitzel and Goldstein propose that the garments articulated different layers of the child’s identity: closest to the

\begin{footnotes}

\textsuperscript{680} Coldstream and Catling 1996, 604-5.
\textsuperscript{681} Pomadère 2010, 102.
\textsuperscript{682} McLaren 2004. At Doune, Perth and Kinross, a five- to eight-year-old child was buried with a miniature battle-axe and two vessels, one of which was fragmentary and considerably older than the rest of the assemblage. At Beckhampton, Wiltshire, United Kingdom, a child was interred with a fragmentary pot, two flint points, and a chalk plaque; and at Noranbank, Tannadic, a broken vessel served as the ash urn for an adult and child.
\textsuperscript{683} McLaren 2004, 300.
\textsuperscript{684} Overholtzer and Stoner 2011, 176
\end{footnotes}
body was a small panel possibly worn by the child in life; next was a ragged striped tunic that appears to have been curated by the family as an heirloom; outside this was another adult tunic in good condition which the child might have inherited had he or she lived to adulthood; and finally, the outermost, visible layer was a finely woven tapestry from the highlands with intricate iconography comparable to that found on large-scale public sculptures of the Tiwanaku state. As Baitzel and Goldstein note, this last textile might have expressed the child’s ties to Tiwanaku, despite the family’s home in the Moquegua Valley. Such case studies reveal that the deposition of aged objects with children in funerary contexts is a recurring, though diffuse, phenomenon which must be considered within a cultural context. Interpretations offered for these antiques—as numinous relics, family heirlooms, and instruments in socio-political maneuvering—are just some that may be considered for the keimêlia documented in the present survey, to which we turn now.

Among the artifacts catalogued here that were found in the graves of infants or children are: the jewelry in the sarcophagus of a child buried in the 5th century at Gümüşçay in Anatolia (A.1; A.2 A.3); a pair of Attic black-figure skyphoi from the burial of a child at Apollonia Pontica (A.4; A.5); Attic black-figure amphorae with horse imagery used as burial receptacles for children in Athens (A.17; A.19; A.20); a Lakonian black-glaze column-krater from Cumae (A.51); the aforementioned Eneolithic point from the 8th century grave of a child at Pithekoussai (A.65); a lunate razor interred with a sub-adult at late 8th century Pithekoussai (A.66); two silver bracelets and a scarab pendant buried with an infant at Pithekoussai in the later 7th century; two silver bracelets buried

---

685 Baitzel and Goldstein 2014.
with an infant in the mid-7th century also at Pithekoussai (A.67; A.68); two bronze fibulae buried with a female infant at Pithekoussai (A.70; A.71); a faience scarab buried with a youth in late 7th century Pithekoussai (A.75); a silver spiral from the grave of an infant at 7th century Pithekoussai (A.76); a black-glaze kotyle from a later 8th century urn burial of an infant at Pithekoussai (A.78); an oinochoe and ivory double-axe pendant from a late 8th century tomb at Pithekoussai (A.79; A.80). An 8th century pithos (A.91) at the necropolis at Gela was much older than the Archaic child burial it contained, and a fragment of another 8th century amphora with relief decoration (A.90) was a surface find also at the Geloan necropolis, but we might infer that it was the receptacle for a child burial as well. A mid-5th century rhyton (A.114) was found in association with a late 4th century child’s grave at the foot of a royal pyramid at Kush.

The most obvious explanation for the deposition of older objects in the graves of sub-adults is practicality. Having been culled from the belongings of adult relatives, these offerings were both available and inexpensive. Some objects may also have played a part in the birthing process and were considered polluted, as Rotroff and Liston have suggested for the numerous lekanides found with the neonates in a Hellenistic well in Athens. In a circular way, the interment of used items with deceased children reinforces the pervasive assumption that the ancients invested minimal resources in the

---

686 It may be possible to test for practical motives scientifically, although this line of inquiry has not been pursued for Greek contexts to my knowledge. Analyses of the composition, technique, and use-wear on gold jewelry successfully demonstrated qualitative differences between the jewelry worn by an adult female and a child buried in the same 16th century B.C. tomb at Qurneh in Egypt (Troalen, Tate, and Guerra 2014). The child’s jewelry was made of low quality alloys, and its necklace was composed of an assortment of beads that originally belonged to other pieces.

687 Liston and Rotroff 2013.
burials of youngsters, since rates of infant and child mortality were so high. Our few testimonia referring to the customs for mourning and burying children seem to corroborate the notion of demographic determinism: Aristotle (Hist An. 7.588a8) stated in the 4th century that most children were taken away within a week of their birth and, therefore, were not named until then; Socrates, in describing reports of the afterlife in Plato’s Republic (10.615b-c), considers children who died in infancy unworthy of discussion; and Plutarch reports a prohibition on mourning children under the age of three. We know relatively little about the formal rites surrounding the birth a child except in Athens, but, there, parents observed a waiting period before performing ceremonies to welcome a child into the household: the Amphidromia, on the fifth or seventh day after birth, when the father carried the child around the hearth; and the Dekate, on the tenth day after birth, when the child was named. Such institutionalized delays, we might imagine, corresponded to the window when the majority of postpartum losses occurred. The high rates of early death may relate directly to the frequent absence, paucity, or low quality of grave goods in child burials. One might speculate, for example, that the kotyle from the infant’s grave in Tomb 684 at Pithekoussai (A.78) was not so much a treasured object as a simple pot, no longer of much service to the

---

688 Estimates of infant mortality rates in antiquity range from 30 to 50%; for a review of major hypotheses, see Golden 2004, 147.
689 Becker 2011, 24-5. Ancient writers generally either neglect or express disinterest in childhood and infancy, leaving modern historians to cobble together disparate sources in order to arrive at a murky view of childhood in antiquity (Neils and Oakley 2003, 1).
690 Neils (2003, 144) suggests that scarcity of visual representations of the ceremonies surrounding birth stems from the pollution associated with birth.
691 For the Amphidromia, see Golden 2003, 13; Neils 2003, 144. For the timing of the Amphidromia, whether the fifth or seventh day after birth, see Hamilton 1984.
692 Neils 2003, 144.
693 Collin-Bouffier 1999, 91.
694 A related phenomenon may be the underrepresentation of children in formal burial grounds, although they may have been placed elsewhere until they had achieved a certain level of personhood (Dasen 2013, 33; Becker 2011, 28; Golden 2004, 153; Golden 2003, 22-3).
owners since its handles were lost. Similarly, practicality is often the preferred explanation for the burial of children in old storage vessels (although other meanings will be considered below).  

While a low investment in the graves of youngsters would seem the logical response to the demographic trends that the ancients faced, one must not forget the other non-quantifiable factors at play. It is often claimed that the objects included in a grave tell more about the living than they do about the dead, and numerous motives may have compelled adult relatives to bequeath older objects to deceased youngsters. As Grubbs and Parkin note, children and infants must have comprised a large—and noisy—segment of the population in antiquity that could not be ignored. Ethnographic analogies indicate that, despite children’s poor odds of survival in preindustrial societies, parents and other caretakers nonetheless did develop powerful emotional attachments, and archaeological data would seem to corroborate. Although responses to infant and child death vary among cultures, communities, and individuals, certain practices recur throughout the ancient Mediterranean. The placement of deceased neonates in and

---

695 Peña 2007, 166-70. To cite one example, Garland (1985, 78, fig. 17) wrote of the use of a beehive as a 1st century A.D. child’s coffin in the environs of Marathon: “it is difficult to resist the impression that any serviceable container was acceptable for the body of a child.” For critiques of this view, see Golden 1988 and Becker 2011, 25.


697 Grubbs and Parkin 2013, 42.

698 In fact, Golden (2004, 146; 1988, 155-6) cites ethnographic parallels where parents are exceedingly attentive and develop particularly strong attachments precisely because their children face so many risks. Scholars have been somewhat late to recognize how these emotional responses to child mortality shape the material record. As Murphy (2011, 63) explains, “Archaeologists are often guilty of ignoring the powerful physiological responses that are associated with pregnancy, birth and certainly motherhood. As archaeologists we are trained to be objective in our work and to ensure that we do not let our own Western ethnocentric 21st century experiences impinge upon our interpretations.”

699 Houby-Nielson has noted the relative conservatism of child burial practices in Athens for the 700-year period she studied (Houby-Nielson 2000, 154).
around dwellings \(^{700}\) or in special cemeteries, \(^{701}\) and the provision of toys, miniature and specialized vessels and the sacrifice small animals in child graves \(^{702}\) are all acts that seem to reflect a desire to protect and provide for these youngest members of society. In her diachronic study of child burials in Athens, Houby-Nielson observes: \(^{703}\)

One is immediately struck by the care characterizing the arrangement of grave goods and the disposal of the small body. No less striking is the way in which the age of the deceased child significantly influenced the choice of burial type and grave goods. From 1100-400 BC, those who buried children found it natural and necessary to express through burial customs the fact that a child (as opposed to an adult) had died.

---

\(^{700}\) Mazarakis Ainian (2007-8) has surveyed intramural infant burials from the Iron Age for much of the Greek world. He proposes that in the majority of cases, children were buried close to the family dwelling because they were not yet considered social beings. In a few rare cases, however, such as at Minoa and the West Gate necropolis at Eretria, and the site of Vita in Epiros, the graves of children were included among other burials that served as the focal points of cults of the elite or community founders. See also Mazarakis Ainian (2007-8, 388-91) and Blandin (2010, 52, 56) for 8th century infant burials from Eretria and Kyme-Vigla touri on Euboia.

Archaeologists working in other regions have developed evocative hypotheses regarding the significance of the practice. Some have suggested that this tradition should be viewed as integral to a culture’s memory practice. The pre-Hispanic Maya regularly interred the deceased of all ages beneath the floors of dwellings in order to “curate” souls, as Gillespie (2002) puts it. Houses were critical points of social reproduction, as the seats of families; the integration of the dead into the fabric of the home was a means of ensuring that the soul would be reincarnated into a new generation. In other communities, this practice was reserved for the young, as in the ancient Greek world. This generally is regarded as an attempt on the part of the living to keep those who died young near. In discussing the numerous infant burials in houses at Iron Age Dürrnberg bei Hallein near Salzburg in Austria, Karl and Löcker (2011, 42) speculate that the practice may be rooted in the belief that a child lost might be reborn in another body.

701 In Attika, specialized infant necropoleis are attested from the 7th century onward at Phaleron, Marathon and Eleusis, or they were separated at larger sites such as the Kerameikos (Alexandridou 2012). Rescue excavations on the island of Astypalaia exposed a large children’s cemetery, which contained over 2,700 enchytrismos burials, spanning the Geometric through Roman periods. Osteological analysis of a sample indicated that the majority of the deceased (c. 90%) died right before or after birth. It seems possible that this specialized cemetery might be connected with the cult of Artemis Lochia and Eileithyia, both of whom are mentioned in inscriptions from the island (Michalaki-Kollia 2010; Clement, Hillson, and Michalaki-Kollia 2009). New excavations at the Kerameikos in Athens uncovered a mass burial dated to the later 5th century. Although disturbed, the grave probably once contained approximately 150 skeletons thrown into a pit haphazardly. The excavators propose these were the victims of the plague that struck Athens c. 427/6 BC. On top, however, were eight infants carefully interred (Bazziotopoulou-Valavani 2002, 190).


703 Houby-Nielson 2000, 152.
Similar conclusions are reached by the excavators of other cemeteries, such as those of Sparta and its environs. In fact, child burials constitute some of the richest in the western Greek colonies. Furthermore, testimonia from Classical Athens and images on Attic vases occasionally capture expressions of deep sorrow upon the loss of a child. In light of these gestures attested in the archaeological, literary, and iconographic records, we might contemplate the possibility of deeper meanings for keimêlia connected with children, including the use of older objects as apotropaia or as instruments for imparting different layers of a child’s identity.

The use of charms or amulets for children at all stages of development was widespread in the Greco-Roman world, as the visual, material, and literary records show. Indeed, it is unusual to see a child in Greek art not wearing a bracelet of some sort; these objects generally are interpreted as amulets. Iconographic evidence for amulets comes largely from Attic painted pottery; choes in particular often show crawling and toddling children bedecked with strings of amulets. These small pitchers, probably

704 Themos and Zavvou 2010. For one Archaic infant burial, adults included baby feeders and fine vessels (“the best tableware in the household” [230]).
705 For example, the necropoleis of the Klazomenian and Tean colony of Abdera in Thrace (Kallintzi and Papaikonomou 2006). Shepherd (2007) notes the unusual richness of some child burials in the Greek colonies of Magna Graecia. In the Greek colonies of southern Italy, at the end of the Archaic through the Classical periods, the offerings in many infant graves appear to be standardized and modest, which is reflective of the young age of the deceased. However, Elia (2012) still notes that a few burials were afforded rich, “adult” grave offerings which suggests that these children were presented in death not as the youngsters they were but as the adults they would have become.
707 For general discussions of amulets, see Dasen 2003a; Dasen 2003b; Neils 2003, 143; Neils and Oakley 2003, No. 75, 96-9; and Bouffier 2012, 138-9. Amulets (periammata, periapta) were worn on the person and had different properties. The power of some derived from their material composition (e.g. gold, amber, animal teeth), while the shape (lunula, scarab, Herakles club, etc.) was critical to the efficacy of others (Dasen 2015, 185-8). Amulets were particularly important for children undergoing transitional rites, such as teething, puberty, and marriage.
708 Neils 2003, 144.
709 Neils and Oakley 2003, no. 96-9; Dasen 2003a, 278-9; Beaumont 2000, 40. Castor (2006) sees the amulets worn by children on the Athenian choes as 1) markers of civic identity intimately tied to the myth of Erichthonios and 2) signs of divine protection.
produced for the Anthesterion festival, present naturalistic portraits of children at play. Considering all the hazards surrounding the birth and raising of children, it is no wonder that parents employed charms and amulets to protect their youngsters. The relative rarity of protective bracelets and charms in the archaeological record may be explained if these were made of perishable materials; however, metal versions have been recovered from some necropoleis. Alternatively, metal amulets may have been passed down from generation to generation and are, therefore, scarce in the material record.

In some cases, the amulets or charms found in child graves are considerably older than their assemblages, which may suggest that age contributed to their perceived efficacy (whether the amulets had been newly discovered or had been family heirlooms for generations). Several of the *keimêlia* discussed in the previous section as amulets from the remote past were recovered from the graves of children. To these objects from deep antiquity, we may add two scarabs (A.69 and A.75) that probably functioned as talismans or magical implements and were found with youngsters at Pithekoussai. Both scarabs were approximately a century old at the time of deposition and had been mounted in silver, an additional form of curation indicative of their special status. The amuletic properties of scarabs (the actual beetles and representations of them) were recognized throughout the Mediterranean from prehistory through the Roman period. The repeated
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710 Neils 2003, 145.
711 Dasen 2015, 178.
712 Dasen 2003a, 281-2. Recent excavations at Apollonia Pontica have uncovered a number of objects that might be considered amulets, including strings of beads, among which were glass paste pendants of bearded males, beads in the shape of eyes, animal teeth and coins (Chacheva 2015, 7-11).
713 Dasen 2003a, 288.
714 For a general treatment of scarabs in the ancient Mediterranean, see De Salvia 1978. Arrington (2015b, 15-6) notes the frequent inclusion of scarabs and other “trinkets”—small, cheap exotica—with child burials at Iron Age Lefkandi. He posits their magical meaning based on their placement on or near the deceased, their forms traditionally associated with protective function, and parallel contextual data from other Mediterranean societies.
association of scarabs with children would seem to reinforce the interpretation of this object class as protective, since caretakers might want to enlist charged objects as proxies to safeguard the bodies of these most vulnerable members of society.\footnote{In the ancient world, child illness and death and reproductive issues often were conceptualized as the work of demons or boogeymen, such as as Gellô, Mormô, Lamia and Empousa. See Johnston 2001; Dasen 2003a, 277-8.} It was the form of scarabs first and foremost that carried magico-religious meaning, yet the long histories of the antique scarabs from Pithekoussai may have added to their aura, if these objects had ushered other children through the perils of childhood into adulthood. One must not forget that the scarabs were also exotica, if not in manufacture then in form. We might imagine that the trinkets’ distant geographic origins went hand-in-hand with their antiquity to promote the view of them as carrying an occult power.

The practice of parents using keimêlia to protect children in funerary contexts is established in the literary record. As mentioned before (pp. 46, 90), in Euripides’ Ion, Kreusa exposes her infant son Ion on the slopes of the Akropolis after equipping him with protective gold snakes and a textile on which she herself had embroidered a gorgon head (T.33; T.34). The gold snakes were not necessarily antiques but stemmed from an age-old Erechtheid tradition of furnishing children with serpentine ornaments for protection;\footnote{These objects allude to the actual snakes that Athena sent to watch over the infant Erichthonios (Mueller 2010, 382).} in other words, the mother harnessed deep-seated power to guard her son in her absence. The sampler, on the other hand, was an older object—an artifact of Kreusa’s youth. The iconography of the textile explicitly conveyed its ability to avert evil, and the fact that Kreusa had curated it, as well as the descriptor “rich” (χλιδὴν 26) imply that this was not simply an old piece of cloth to be cast off. Mueller has explored the ways in which the assemblage Kreusa constructs for Ion’s exposure endows him with an identity...
as an Athenian and an Erechtheid. It is perhaps not too farfetched to suggest that with
the sampler, Kreusa was also leaving him with a little piece of herself to watch over her
child. Indeed, the imperfections of the sampler later allowed her to recognize it as her
own and identify Ion as her son. Marks of distinction on objects and people, such as
flaws, patina, or scars, are key features in drama that facilitate recognition.

The *Ion* provides a clear case of objects from the past being used as protective
devices and also as mechanisms for bestowing an identity—in this case, ancestral—on a
youngster who had not yet been assimilated into his family. In fact, ancient Greek authors
refer to several instances where children interact with older objects in a way that
anticipates their roles in their community. An obvious example of the identity-forging
potential of *keimêlia* would be Theseus’ tokens of investiture, also mentioned in Chapter
2 (pp. 96). The boots and sword were literally *keimêlia*, having been placed under a rock
by his father King Aegeus for Theseus to claim upon his entry to adulthood (*KT.36;
KT.37*). These inherited objects were both practical and symbolic; the sandals carried
him on his journey to Athens, the sword provided protection, and collectively they served
as proofs, allowing Aegeus to recognize his son and Theseus to assume his throne.

Theseus’ *gnôrismata* thus hold a past significance, a present relevance, and a future
aspect. It is noteworthy that for Ion and Theseus, the *keimêlia*—although inanimate—
exert considerable authority. They direct these heroes to their respective destinies before
the youths themselves know their life’s path. In Euripides’ *Herakles* (*KT.35*), we hear of
a parent grooming his children through their interaction with his personal possessions; as
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717 Mueller 2010.
718 McClure 2015. McClure has argued persuasively that Athenian drama portrays women as the keepers of
“tokens of identity”; through the curation of domestic objects and intimate knowledge of people in the
household, women maintain an awareness of the past that allows them to recognize male members of the
household.
Megara prepares her sons for death, she reflects on the lives that they would have led. In the process, she recalls how their father Herakles (now in Hades) used to drape his lion skin over his children and place his carved club in their hands, as if it were a gift. Thus, aside from the use of long-lived objects as apotropaia for children, we also find them in the literary record serving two different capacities: suddenly unlocking a youth’s identity; and preparing him gradually for his inherited position.

Evidence from grave assemblages and funerary inscriptions indicate that parents’ contemplation of a child’s unfulfilled destiny at the time of death was not just a dramatic device meant to evoke pathos but an ancient reality. Pre-adult burials spanning centuries and extending across a broad swath of the Greek world included “adult” objects such as weapons, weaving equipment, pyxides and mirrors, all items that alluded to the deceased’s anticipated social role. Already in the 10th century B.C. in Athens, grave goods had assumed a gendered character. Between the 10th and 8th centuries, girls ages ten to eighteen typically received a “maiden kit,” as Langdon describes it, consisting of ceramic dolls and boots, hair spirals, kalathoi, and chests—all items laden with symbolism pertaining to marriage rites (the definitive transition from girlhood to womanhood). Houby-Nielson’s diachronic study of child burials in the cemeteries of Athens has revealed that in the Archaic and Classical periods, older children—between three and ten years of age (i.e. post-weaning)—typically were buried with objects that
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719 Dasen 2010, 25-9; Elia 2012; Bouffier 2012, 138-9. Moliner (2012, 191) highlights the case of Tomb 194 in Sainte-Barbe, where a 10- to 14-year-old child was cremated and buried with items from the toilette, including a bronze spatula, an iron strigil, an unguentarium, and an alabastron. In this case, the biological age of the child does not match the social age suggested by the burial rite and the nature of the offerings.

720 Langdon 2007, 182.

721 Langdon 2007, 182.

722 Langdon 2007, 182-9. After the 8th century, a shift in grave goods occurs, and a greater emphasis is placed on the wealth and status of female adolescents through the inclusion of objects such as horse pyxides, for example.
related to their future gender roles, whereas infants and children below three years
received gender-neutral objects such as generic vessels and small toys.\textsuperscript{723} Young girls, for
example, might be buried with items for their toilette, such as mirrors, combs, and
perfume bottles, or the equipment of household industry, such as spindles or cooking
pots. Nude figurines could allude to a girl’s sexual identity.\textsuperscript{724} At the Clazomenian colony
of Abdera, inhabitants began to present children as gendered beings also at a very early
age; Kallintzi and Papaionomou suggest that the presence of gendered objects—a maiden
kit for girls or a strigil for boys—in the graves of children as young as three reveals that
weaning was the threshold when the sexual identity of children was expressed
materially.\textsuperscript{725} At Apollonia Pontica, three quarters of the Archaic and Classical child
graves contained a single earring, a practice that Chacheva notes was employed for
unmarried women in later periods.\textsuperscript{726} Inscriptions also indicate that a premature death
was an occasion for kin to meditate over a youth’s unrealized potential.\textsuperscript{727} Greek
epigrams, for example, often present the deceased girl or young woman (and sometimes
young men\textsuperscript{728}) as unmarried or married to Hades, a metaphor that alludes to the major

\textsuperscript{723} Oakley 2003, 177; Houby-Nielson 2000.
\textsuperscript{724} Dasen 2010, 25. Examples are numerous. Kallintzi and Papaikonomou (2006, 481) draw attention to the
iconography of a bone necklace worn by a girl buried at the colony of Abdera in Thrace. While the charms
could be viewed as toys for the amusement of the deceased child, they also could allude to her impending
though unrealized womanhood. The authors highlight the cicada in particular as polysemic and appropriate
for the setting; these insects were incubated within the earth before emerging to life, a process that could
refer to the girl’s latent womanhood or express the hope for a beautiful afterlife.
\textsuperscript{725} Kallintzi and Papaikonomou 2010, 137-8.
\textsuperscript{726} Chacheva 2015, 9.
\textsuperscript{727} Clairmont, 1970, 33 no. 10, 142 no. 64. Foley 2003, 119. An epigram by the Hellenistic poet Anyte for a
young woman who died unmarried reads:

\begin{quote}
No bed-chamber and sacred rites of marriage for you.
Instead your mother put upon this marble tomb
A likeness which has your girlish shape and beauty,
Thersis; you can be addressed even though you are dead.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{728} Clairmont 1970, 163-4, no. 88.
milestone for females.\textsuperscript{729} For example, the famous inscription (530-520 B.C.) belonging to a \textit{kore} grave monument at Merenda south of Marathon reads: “Marker of Phrasikleia. I shall be called a girl always in place of marriage allotted that name by the gods.”\textsuperscript{730}

The selection of \textit{keimêlia} for children’s grave goods might have advanced this ideology by presenting deceased children not as they were but as who they might have become. For example, the Attic black-figure amphora that was a coffin for a child in the Kerameikos (A.20), the black-glaze Lakonian column-krater buried with a youth at Cumae (A.51), and the jewelry buried in the sarcophagus of a girl at Gümüşçay (A.1-3), each discussed in Chapter 2 (pp. 89-93), all had protracted use-lives prior to deposition.

Their age coupled with their decidedly “adult” nature strongly suggests that they were not originally intended for the children with whom they were buried. Instead, they may have carried a symbolism that encompassed past and future simultaneously. As discussed earlier, the amphora from the Kerameikos and the Lakonian krater may have alluded to their respective recipients’ future—though unrealized—roles as participants in the symposium, since both vessels were key components in a drinking service. In the same way, the jewelry entombed with the girl at Gümüşçay may have been used within a family for an extended period and kept for her bridal trousseau. When \textit{keimêlia} were curated with a particular recipient in mind, they became a focus for the family to imagine the heir as an adult in his or her ideal role. As we have seen, envisioning a child’s future was an essential part of mourning a young life lost in ancient Greek communities, and the temporal depth of \textit{keimêlia} made them particularly effective vehicles for presenting that image of the deceased at the time of the funeral.

\textsuperscript{729} Foley 2003, 132.
\textsuperscript{730} It was signed by Aristion of Paros as sculptor. Athens, National Museum 4889. \textit{SEG} 29-65; \textit{CEG} 24=IG i\textsuperscript{3} 1261. Trans, N. Livingstone. Livingstone 2011, 32-7; Svenbro, 1993.
*Keimêlia* were intimate objects, through which relatives found a means for expressing private sentiments of grief surrounding the death of a child. However, some *keimêlia* also may have had public resonance. These were able to communicate information about status of the deceased and, by extension, the family. Recently, Paleothenodoros has drawn attention to a small but cohesive group of Attic pots used as containers for child burials in Athens and Attika during the Archaic and Classical periods. \(^{731}\) Whereas the majority of vessels used for *encytrismos* burials were plain or coarse wares, these particular pots were decorated with figural imagery, mostly in the black-figure technique. Signs of ancient curation—both ancient mends \(^{732}\) and chronological discrepancies \(^{733}\)—further suggest that these were not cast-offs but rather cherished possessions. The twenty vases Paleothenodoros catalogues in his survey of decorated burial urns are almost exclusively belly amphorae of type B and have imagery that seems to revolve around the themes of horses and horsemanship. Protomes of horses appear on many of the earliest examples (Beazley’s “Horse-head amphorae”) dating to the first half of the 6th century, while the next generation was decorated with horsemen (“Horsemen amphorae”) and begins in the second quarter of the 6th century. The name vase of the Hypobibazon Class (A.20) counts among the latest of his examples. Noting the dominant themes of horses and horsemanship and the indications of curation, Paleothenodoros suggests that some of the vessels—particularly the Horse-head
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\(^{731}\) Typically the vessels selected as burial urns were coarse, undecorated wares, although the use of decorated pots is known in these instances from Athens, as well as ancient Mende in the Chalkidike, and a few other sites (Moschonissioti 2010, 214 n. 76).

\(^{732}\) An amphora excavated at the Academy of Athens (Paleothenodoros [forthcoming 2017] No. 4; *Para* 10; *Ergon* 1960, 6-7, fig. 3); a Horse-head amphora from Panepistimiou Street in Athens (A.17); a Horse-head amphora from Athens (Athens, National Museum 1003; BAPD 300174; *ABV* 16, 3; *Add* 24; Paleothenodoros [forthcoming 2017] No. 9); a horseman amphora from Athens may also have been the container of an *encytrismos* burial (*ArchDelt* 17, 1961-1962, B (1963), 22-23, pl. 26r; Paleothenodoros [forthcoming 2017] fig. 5).

\(^{733}\) A.17; A.18.
amphorae—may have been prizes in equestrian competitions. He hypothesizes that the display of these vases at the time of the funeral may have celebrated a family’s illustrious past and expressed their enduring aristocratic values visually and their status at a time when funerary displays were curbed by sumptuary laws. If so, the removal of a valuable object from circulation would have made a powerful statement. The iconography of *keimêlia* thus may provide a window into the beliefs of a small but cohesive subset of the population.

While our analysis thus far has concentrated on the social and political significance of *keimêlia* given to children, one must not forget the difficult-to-access but nonetheless critical emotive force of long-lived objects. The repurposing of various used vessels, such as beehives, cooking pots, sections of drain, and large vessels, such as amphorae, pithoi, hydriai, and cooking pots,\(^{734}\) as coffins for children’s burials may be interpreted as economical, but a closer look sheds light on the potential symbolism of the act beyond the usual supposition that the vessel served as a metaphor for the womb.\(^{735}\) Many of the containers used for child burials are difficult to date because the tombs contained no other objects, but this change in function implies an earlier history in a household. And as Lindenlauf points out, the fact that some of these forms, such as amphorae, were regularly reused as containers once emptied of their original contents indicates that, as a class of object, they were not simply rubbish.\(^{736}\) In addition, to counter Garland’s dismissal of the use of a pair of beehives for the burial of a child near Marathon in the early 1\(^{st}\) century B.C. as opportunistic,\(^{737}\) Dasen reminds that honey was
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\(^{734}\) For a list of some examples, see Lindenlauf 2001, 91.
\(^{735}\) Michalaki-Kollia 2010, 164; Paleothodoros (in press) n. 4.
\(^{736}\) Lindenlauf 2001, 92.
\(^{737}\) Garland 1985, 78.
a preservative in antiquity and was implicated in the quest for immortality in the story of Glaukos.\textsuperscript{738} Indeed, storage is a socially meaningful activity connected with memory production in many cultures. As Hendon observes,\textsuperscript{739} in anumber of archaeological communities, spanning from Mesoamerica (1500 B.C.—A.D. 200) to Iron Age Europe, household valuables were stored alongside surplus foodstuffs. On some occasions, burials were also placed within out-of-use food storage pits. Hendon suggests that the quotidian acts of food storage, the ritualistic caching of valuables, and the burial of the dead are related practices that contribute to the construction of a group’s unique identity through shared knowledge. Storage vessels thus were not purely utilitarian but were integrated into memory creation. Viewed in this light, the use of storage vessels—both decorated and undecorated—as receptacles for child burials in the ancient Mediterranean may have been meaningful acts that treated deceased youngsters in the same ways as a family’s valuables. Containers that were essentially permanent fixtures within a home could be mobilized for the special purpose of a child’s burial in order to place the youth literally and metaphorically in the seat of the family’s collective memory.

In another New World case study similar to that of the Attic \textit{enchytrismos} burials, DeMarraïs draws attention to the emotional import of the use of storage vessels as coffins. She refers to the “affecting presence” of figural decorated vessels used as urns for the intramural burial of infants at Borgatta, a pre-Hispanic (A.D. 950-1430) settlement in northwest Argentina. In other words, these objects were “deliberately non-ordinary, created to evoke emotions and interest.”\textsuperscript{740} She asserts that archaeologists can—and should—infer that decorated vessels used as coffins for children were selected for

\textsuperscript{738} Dasen 2010, 20. \\
\textsuperscript{739} Hendon 2000. \\
\textsuperscript{740} DeMarraïs 2013, 115.
their complex pasts, and that the imagery carried messages to the members of that household and culture. The urns, inscribed with memories through their use both in public ceremonies and daily praxis, mediated charged moments such as premature death and facilitated the commemoration of the young individuals with whom they were interred. Like the figured pots that housed select Greek *ENCHYTRISMOΣ* burials, the Argentinian urns present a clear example of “art in action,” and we should imagine that other curated objects with and without images were mobilized in the ancient Mediterranean not just for their symbolism and political message but for their power to affect ritual participants emotionally.

The *KEIMELIΩ* from children’s graves examined here must be understood in their historical context first and foremost, but archaeological and ethnographic parallels cited encourage an exploration of more universal motives for coupling young humans with old objects. Since scholarly discussion of the association between children and intergenerational objects is limited, we might gain insights from another phenomenon of relating children to the past in mortuary contexts—namely, the burial of the young among the old. This practice is attested in a number of archaeological cultures in different ways. Examples from the Greek world include a mass grave at the Kerameikos and the over two dozen *ENCHYTRISMOΣ* child burials found inside the precinct wall of a significant elite intramural grave monument at Messene (K3). At the Middle Neolithic cemetery Ajvide on the Baltic Island Gotland, the majority of the eleven elderly deceased (defined as ages 50-60+) were buried on top of younger people; Fahlander proposes that this comingling of bodies from different generations was intended to provide the elderly with help from
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741 DeMarrais 2013, 104.
742 In 430 B.C., eight infant pot burials were interred atop 89 adult burials below: Delt 49 B’l (1994) 34-6.
743 Bourbou and Themelis 2010, 115.
the young. Mizoguchi has studied child burials in the cemeteries of the Fukuoka Prefecture in northern Japan at the sites of Nagaoka and Kuriyama for the late early to early middle Yayoi period (3rd to 1st centuries B.C.). At Nagaoka, it appears from the high number of child burials that the majority of children were buried formally. Moreover, they were interred in jars placed into pit graves of adults buried earlier. As many as four or five infants sometimes were sunken into a single adult grave. Stratigraphic analysis indicates that the several child burials associated with an adult grave were approximately contemporaneous, so it seems less likely that the adult was a parent and more probable that this was a relative or, generally, an elder in the community.

Children are “[temporally] plural beings,” as Mizoguchi puts it; in other words, their existence draws together the past, present, and future. Raised according to past tradition, they become “repositories of experiential knowledge acquired over time.” Because children require unwavering care, they dominate their parents’ present, and they inspire a gaze toward the future, which elders are able to envision according to the culture’s norm and their own experiences. A child’s death is a moment of rupture that might cause the surviving community to reflect on its past and the fragility of the future. Mizoguchi proposes several possible explanations for the practice of burying children with adults and intimately linking young and old. On the one hand, people may have believed that adult ancestors would care for the children in the afterlife. On the other
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744 Fahlander 2013.
745 This hypothesis has not been confirmed by ancient DNA analysis.
746 Mizoguchi 2000, 141.
747 Mizoguchi 2000, 141.
hand, the children may have been marshalled as “a symbol of communal well-being,” alongside the predeceased adult who would have been visible during the funeral. This latter hypothesis is historically contingent. The late early to early middle Yayoi period (3rd to 1st centuries B.C.) saw rapid increase in population and the nucleation of settlements likely due to advances in agricultural technology. Because the new generation was critical to sustaining this growth, the death of a child was an event that threatened to interrupt forward progress. The viewing of the adult ancestor during the child’s funeral was a potent reminder of the community’s longevity and forward momentum.

_Keimêlia_ may have played a starring role in the tomb, which Kallintzi and Papaoikonomou have likened to a stage set, where the audience of mourners took in “the view of an open grave, with goods intentionally arranged around the body.” They go on: “In images, as in tombs, objects seem to work as a system and form a silent, coded message understandable only by people belonging to the same culture.” We have discussed how _keimêlia_ found with children could have conveyed special messages regarding the unrealized status of the deceased and the history of the family. The insights drawn from the Nagaoka cemetery introduce the additional possibility that the juxtaposition of a _keimêlion_ and a child could—paradoxically—communicate a message of continuity and symbolize a community’s well-being. These older objects reminded onlookers of deep history at a time when a young life had been cut short.
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748 Mizoguchi 2000, 147. Unfortunately information about the sex of the individuals is not available in this study.
749 Kallintzi and Papaikonomou 2006, 480-1
750 Kallintzi and Papaikonomou 2006, 481.
Heirlooms perpetuate memories of the previous owner, shape the narrative that is told, and serve as teaching tools to impart set values on the living generation.\textsuperscript{751} The deposition of *keimêlia* in a child’s grave is in many ways akin to other practices attested in the Greek world that emphasized the continuity between generations, such as a father’s formal introduction of his son to his phratry, the grooming of a child by the placement of a weapon such as a club in his hand (\textbf{KT.35}), the common practice of naming a Greek boy after his father,\textsuperscript{752} or the teaching of wool-working by a mother to her daughter. Children were critical to continuity, but they were also “outsiders in the adult mortuary world.”\textsuperscript{753} Their graves could be highly personalized, and the inclusion of *keimêlia* was one aspect of that individualization. To give a *keimêlion* to a child was an expressive gesture that could convey tenderness, hope, ambition, or countless other messages communicated in a code understood at different scales, from the individual to the culture at large.

3. \textit{The Attributes of Keimêlia}

Many artifacts identified here as *keimêlia* stood out within their respective contexts as rare, due to their unusual appearance, remarkably fine craftsmanship, non-local manufacture or material composition, or a combination of these features. On the one hand, some bias is almost certainly inherent to the identification of outlier artifacts as *keimêlia*, since these objects draw greater attention in archaeological investigations. Moreover, the seriations for widely traded goods, such as ceramic fine wares, are often more precise than those of local products, which means that chronological discrepancies

\textsuperscript{751} In modern North American society, older people curate their possessions selectively with the understanding that these objects will be passed on to members of the next generation (Curasi 2011).
\textsuperscript{752} Golden 2003, 21. For the Nahuas of modern Mexico, the naming of children after their ancestors is a means of conferring a part of the relative’s soul to the child (De Lucia 2010, 2010).
\textsuperscript{753} An observation made by Crawford (2000) in her study of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries.
are easier to detect for imports. On the other hand, studies of heirlooms in anthropological and ethnographic literature—sources not prone to the same problems with dating as the archaeological record—indicate that intergenerational objects frequently are exceptional within their cultural context. Although admittedly predictable, the selection of unique or unusual objects for curation is a pattern that warrants further examination, since it offers a window into the reasons why keimêlia were valued in antiquity.

Value is a notoriously thorny concept that often is vaguely defined in archaeological inquiries. Nevertheless, discussions of value in anthropological literature provide useful paradigms and terms for investigating the characteristics that made keimêlia worth keeping in antiquity. When discussing an object, one must keep in mind that different value systems may be operative concurrently, including “market, historical, sentimental, artistic, and entertainment.” Evidence of curation is a means for approaching the question of “gradations of value” quite directly. This term—coined by Lesure—acknowledges that value is not a binary phenomenon. People do not classify things in simple terms (i.e. “non-elite or elite”; “ceremonial or utilitarian”) but instead rank similar goods in different registers related to objects’ social uses and degree of alienability. Lesure proposes two complementary methods for archaeologists to identify these gradients. First, they might look for traits that differentiate artifacts of the same class. Possibilities include artifacts’ “size, form, composition and specificity.” “Specificity” refers to an object’s uniqueness, which can be a function of the
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757 Lesure 1999, 31. Lesure notes, however, that all of these metrics are fallible indicators.
workmanship and resources involved in its production. Second, archaeologists can search
for signs of “ritual manipulation,” such as an artifact’s use in sanctuaries, burials, or
other meaningful settings. Attention to these specialized contexts helps us understand
how artifacts of different echelons of value were integrated into social practice, even
when we cannot understand their precise significance. As Lesure explains:

Valuable objects, both alienable and inalienable, encode social principles,
cultural values, and sacred tenets. When such objects are used, displayed,
or exchanged, they maintain, enhance, or create social relationships. In
archaeological cases, much of the rich symbolic implications of valuables is lost to us. But this does not mean that archaeologists shouldn’t consider the implications of the observation that artifacts they recover were probably symbolically “entangled” objects whose meaningfulness was a significant element of social reproduction and change. While much of the meaning of these objects is lost, we may be able to investigate the structural effects of their meaningfulness.

Case studies in Chapters 2 and 3 have already highlighted some of the attributes
that made *keimêlia* worthy of curation in diverse cultural settings, and to these we may add others. To recapitulate, several Attic vases from the heart of Athens and Attika were deemed worthy of curation although close to their source: the pair of cups from a well near the Agora were repaired extensively and kept in circulation for several decades perhaps because they were limited editions decorated in the rare coral red technique (*A.22; A.23*); and the amphora from Trachones with unique iconography that may have illustrated the role of a family in the cultivation of olives for sacred oil was therefore mended and kept for generations (*A.26*). In these cases, the specificity—the rare technique of manufacture and personalization—of these vessels likely promoted their longevity, since they would have been difficult or impossible to replace. Attic plastic

758 Lesure 1999, 30.
vases were another class of object that regularly curated (A.45; A.114; pp. 148). They merge several special techniques; formed through molds, they were decorated in the black- or red-figure style (or, rarely, white ground). Although all vases with figural imagery could function as art objects even when damaged, this is particularly the case for plastic vessels, which doubled as sculptures.

One of the coral red cups from the well near the Agora was signed by Euphronios (A.22), and even though we have no evidence that the works of particular potters and painters were sought after in antiquity, other artisans were renowned.760 We might consider the possibility that the works of famed craftsmen were collected and curated. Nadalini has noted the high rates of repair on pots assigned to the skillful potter-painter Euphronios; approximately a fifth of his surviving corpus had ancient mends of some sort.761 The very fine engraved gemstone signed by Dexamenos of Chios (A.6) was cherished for half a century before being deposited in a 4th century grave at Pantikapaion perhaps in part because of the stonecutter’s reputation. From Kurgan I at Pantikapaion come two additional curated gems: a scaraboid bezel picturing a running Medusa that may have been valued as a talisman (A.14); and a jasper stone with the image of a running horse (A.15) attributed to the workshop of Dexamenos. Both date to the 5th century but were found in a tomb belonging to the second half of the 4th century. Neither is signed, but the workmanship is exceptional, and the owners may have known the identity of the lapidary responsible.

760 Beginning with Daidalos (Pollitt 1990, 13-5), numerous artists received acclaim (see Pollitt 1990 for testimonia). By the Hellenistic period, gem-carvers were recognized by the Macedonian royalty as renowned artists (Kuttner 2005, 145).
761 Nadalini 2004, 203. Although the high rates of repair on vessels by attributed to Euphronios may be in part a function of the fact that so many were recovered from Etruscan contexts where Attic pots were mended at high rates.
In this survey, the majority of objects catalogued that were kept across time, as well as the lion’s share of the artifacts with ancient mends, were imports within their respective contexts. Here, we may briefly recall the range of imports documented in the survey of *keimêlia* identifiable through temporal gaps. Some hailed from neighboring communities, such as the Attic cup found at Rhitsona (A.30), the preservation of which is consistent with the high regard for Attic pottery in Boiotia.\(^{762}\) The Panathenaic prize amphorae found in the House of the Mosaics at Eretria traveled a similarly short journey (A.31-9), as did a black-glaze Attic mug found in a well at Corinth (A.41). In other cases, *keimêlia* were far removed from their point of manufacture. From the East were: Attic skyphoi from a child’s burial at Apollonia Pontica (A.4; A.5), an Attic lekanis attributed to the Marsyas Painter from a 4\(^{th}\) century burial in Kurgan VI (A.7), another Attic lekanis from Kurgan V (A.8), Pantikapaion; a series of three Attic vessels (a krater, a lekythos, and a hydria) also from Kurgan V (A.9; A.10; A.11); an Attic lekanis and pelike from Kurgan ‘I’ (A.12; A.13). From the West were an Attic red-figure cup and skyphos (A.47; A.48) from the so-called Brygos Tomb in Capua, the Lakonian column-krater from Cumae (A.51); an Attic stemless cup and hydria from Nola (A.60); a Corinthian Thapsos type skyphos from Pithekoussai (A.77); an Attic Sub-Deianeira lekythos from Gela (A.92); a set of three Attic black-figure Hermogeneian skyphoi from Gela (A.93; A.94; A.95); an Attic red-figure pelike from Gela (A.99); an Attic black-figure neck-amphora from Gela (A.100); an Attic volute-krater from Morgantina (A.104); an Attic red-figure volute-krater from Silbión (A.81); a series of black-glaze Attic Vicups, skyphoi, kraters and lekythoi, an Attic red-figure column krater, an Attic black-figure lekythos from

\(^{762}\)Sabetai 2012.
Selinous (A.105-111). From Cyrenaica came a Panathenaic prize amphora (A.113) and a lekythos from Tocra (A.115). Also generations old at the time of deposition was an Attic rhyton from Meroë (A.114). Even more numerous are examples of imports with ancient mends, a subset of which will be considered below.

The curation of non-local objects is part of a broader cultural pattern indicative of the esteem for foreign products shared by many communities worldwide. The pervasive tendency to keep imports for long periods (even once they are outdated or are no longer useful), to salvage them when they break, or to preserve them in an imperfect state is often taken for granted, perhaps in part because of the difficulty of disentangling the multiple factors that may be at play, including economics, fashion, and sentiment. Recent discourse on consumption, taste, regimes of value, and object entanglement, can inform the present investigation by allowing us to qualify the values of imported keimêlia within their contexts.

The last three decades have seen a noticeable shift in the direction of investigations into the interregional movement of goods. While is widely accepted that the possession and display of objects from distant lands as “prestige goods” can be important mechanisms for creating and maintaining hierarchies, the processes by which these items acquired their diacritical role often is more difficult to define. Still important are analytical frameworks involving the quantification, sourcing and mapping of the distribution of commodities—established methodologies of the processualist agenda. However, archaeologists and anthropologists have become increasingly
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Multiple factors may be at play, but chief among them is the fact that collecting exotic objects is so integral to Western culture that it warrants little further examination. An exotic provenance generally adds to an object’s value, and museums are filled with antiques and antiquities from across the globe.

Lesure 1999.
concerned with the mechanisms of trade, the symbolic and ideological aspects of exchange and consumption, and the cultural contexts of the appropriation of exotic goods and institutions. Curation is a practice that ties into this new wave of scholarship, since it offers a point d’entrée into matters of the social and the individual. Below we consider some of the special circumstances for the curation of imported goods—one that is rather circumscribed and the other which is attested across a broad region. First, we will explore the consumption of Attic pottery in Etruria, a topic of much debate that an examination of curation practices may help to illuminate, and then we will turn our attention to the widespread phenomenon of immigrants preserving objects as mementoes from their homeland.

3.1 Attic Pots in Italic Kylikeia

A prime case for the curation of non-local goods is the frequent repair of Attic pots among non-Greek peoples in Italy, particularly the Etruscans. As noted in Chapter 3, our understanding of the scale of the practice is limited, due to the scores of pots that were unearthed in campaigns before scientific documentation had become the norm. Nevertheless, the origins of a large proportion of the Attic vases with ancient repairs in collections worldwide can be traced to the region of Etruria, and the fact that many of

---

765 For general trends in research on exchange and consumption, see the introduction in Robb 1999, and McCall 1999; both authors highlight the growing concern with agency. Walsh (2014, 79-94) offers a useful review of theoretical literature. A number of insightful case studies on material from the ancient Mediterranean have highlighted the active roles local communities play in the consumption of non-local goods, which shaped production via feedback: Antonaccio 2004; Paleothodoros 2007; Walsh and Antonaccio 2014.

766 Hannestad 1988, 115. To give some sense of the enormity of the problem, it is estimated that Lucien Bonaparte’s activities at Vulci yielded some 3,000 painted pots in just over a year (von Bothmer 1983, 39), and these were distributed to museums in Europe and North America. A huge portion of the mended pots catalogued for this study were unearthed in these campaigns.

767 For example, the cores of many collections in Europe were vases discovered between 1828 and 1829 on Lucien Bonaparte’s property in Vulci. He sold off many of his finds at auctions in Paris (von Bothmer 1983, 37-8). Marchese Gianpietro Campana followed a couple of decades later; the catalogue of his
these pots were intact strongly suggests that they came from tombs.Indeed, at least one-third to half of the mended vases catalogued for this study come from the general region of Italy or from collections known to have been assembled through early campaigns in the Etruscan heartland. More recent excavations of Etruscan settlements and sanctuaries have added to the census of pots mended by their ancient owners. The preponderance of ancient repairs on Attic vases from Etruria has been cited in various explorations of the ancient economy, although less attention has been paid to the Etruscans’ reasons for curating Attic pots. The examination of the contexts of mended pottery has the potential to inform us about market dynamics from the consumer’s perspective and the gradations of value operative in ancient Etruria.

In his important study of Attic pottery in Etruria, Reusser quantifies repairs and demonstrates the veracity of the perceived high rates. First, he documents numerous examples of mended Attic pots from settlement contexts. Second, he calculates the percentage of repaired Attic pots in known grave assemblages at different sites, while noting the smattering of instances of repairs on ceramics of local Italic origins: 4.72% at Vulci, 4.62% at Cerveteri (of which 3.15% come from the Tomba dei Vasi Attici), 4.83% at Saturnia, 4.04% at Genoa. Rates for San Martino ai Colli and Bisenzio are high (7.69%)
collections includes nearly 4,000 vases and fragments (von Bothmer 1983, 39). A number of other 19th century antiquarians also helped to populate museums (see von Bothmer 1983, 39)
768 It is estimated that 80-90% of fine painted pottery was from tombs (Gill and Vickers 1995, 226 n. 1); see also Paleothodoros 2007, 167 and 2002, 142.
769 However, few mended vessels have been found in sanctuaries, and these were exceptionally fine (Reusser 2002, 35, 45).
and 9.67%, respectively), although the sample sizes are small. On the other hand, some sites have very low rates: Bologna 1.92% (Certosa, 1.59%), Todi (1.66%), and Aléria (0.59%).\textsuperscript{772} At the various sites, certain preferences were detected: most mended objects from Vulci were Attic cups,\textsuperscript{773} whereas the majority of vessels mended at Cerveteri were Attic black-gloss cups,\textsuperscript{774} and at Bologna, over half of the mended Attic vessels were kraters of some sort.\textsuperscript{775}

Several explanations—some more plausible than others—have been offered for the high repair rates, but scholars have yet to tackle the question head-on. In his seminal study of trademarks on Greek vases, Johnston suggested that Attic pots broke on their journeys overseas and were mended before being sold to an Etruscan clientele.\textsuperscript{776} In a later article, he reminds that the pots also may have broken in Attika at the hands of their original Greek owners,\textsuperscript{777} an idea that gives credence to Webster’s theory of the secondhand trade in Athenian vases.\textsuperscript{778} Both Johnston and Hemelrijk note that vessels

\begin{itemize}
  \item Reusser 2002, I, 118.
  \item Reusser 2002, I, 52.
  \item Reusser 2002, I, 60.
  \item Reusser 2002 I, 69.
  \item Johnston 1979, 65.
  \item Johnston 1991, 219.
  \item Webster 1972. Webster’s proposal hinges on the presence of pots outside Attika with imagery that seems geared toward a Greek population. He interprets these pots as special commissions. The fact that so many Attic vessels in Etruria were repaired in antiquity might support the hypothesis that they were used before arrival. A secondhand vase trade was undoubtedly responsible for the distribution of Panathenaic prize amphorae (since Hellenes alone could compete in the games); Bentz 1998, 91, 5-7, 111; also Rasmussen 2008, 219 n. 42. However, Athenian craftsmen were also producing pots that appear to have been destined for Etruria alone (Sparkes 2010, 119; Paleothodoros 2002, 142). Oft cited evidence includes the fact that certain shapes, such as Nikosthenic amphorae (Tosto 1999, especially 204-6), kyathoi, and stamnoi, are found almost exclusively in Etruria (Walsh and Antonaccio 2014, 56; Rasmussen 2008, 218). And one group of late 6th century vase-painters—the Perizoma Group (Beazley 1956, 343-346; Beazley 1971, 156-158) created images that catered to an Etruscan clientele. Shapiro (2000) has identified two different lines of products, one for Athenians and the other for Etruscans. While the vases intended for the Greek audience pictured familiar scenes on typical shapes, including neck-amphorae, olpai, oinochoai and lekythoi, those destined for the market abroad depicted foreign customs on Etruscanizing stamnoi and kyathoi. The images feature athletes in loincloths rather than nude, women and men partaking in the symposium side-by-side, \textit{ekphorai} in which the corpse is supported by men rather than conveyed in a chariot, and armed warriors performing funeral dances. In addition, some shapes with clearly ritual
could have been damaged within potters’ workshops and were then marketed as factory seconds.⁷⁷⁹ Although vessels may have been broken and mended while still on Greek soil or in the hands of Greek merchants, a few key observations suggest otherwise. First, if a rough passage were to blame, we might ask why repair rates do not appear to be similarly high for Attic vases in the East, for example. Furthermore, the special repair technique involving clamps set into channels (pp. 125-6) seems to be largely confined to Etruria. Also distinctive is the use of bronze rather than lead, an easily workable material preferred throughout much of the Mediterranean for ceramic repairs.⁷⁸⁰ Master Etruscan bronzesmiths would have been capable of executing these intricate sutures. Finally, if the repairs stemmed from earlier use in Greece, we might expect to see greater uniformity of mending techniques represented on Attic vessels across the Mediterranean. The soundest conclusion drawn from the preponderance of repairs on Attic pots in Etruria (including specimens from sanctuaries and settlements) is that the vessels were used in life in Etruria and were not solely surrogates for plate destined for the grave.⁷⁸¹ In addition to the frequency of mends, the absence of the original lids on Attic amphorae used as ash urns at Tarquinia, and the chronological discrepancies of pots in some tombs also have been cited as indicators that Attic pots were used above ground in Etruscan settlements.⁷⁸²

Shifting the act of repair from producers, merchants, or fictive original Greek owners to the ancient Italic consumer opens up new possibilities for understanding the place of Attic painted pottery in Etruscan society. Mending is a key indicator of an

⁷⁸² Hannestad 1988, 123; Paleothodoros 2002, 143. Bologna (Reusser 2002, 18) has been a particularly important source for information regarding the use of Attic pots in domestic contexts.
object's inalienability, since a restored object “is as likely to be treated with reverence and care broken as intact.” Inhabitants of Etruria had a number of options for ceramic table wares, including local coarse wares (impasto), local fine wares (bucchero, imitation black- and red-figure pottery), imported fine wares, and plate, but it was Greek painted pottery specifically that regularly was restored in an elaborate manner. Anthropological and ethnographic discussions of the consumption of foreign goods shed light on the economic, social and emotional factors underlying these acts of object care.

A fall-off model is one way of conceptualizing the tendency to restore imports. Attic pottery far from its source was difficult to replace and, therefore, more likely to be salvaged than discarded. Hodder and Lane offer a striking illustration of the principle in their study of British Neolithic axes, which became smaller more distant from their source. The authors develop two hypotheses to explain the pattern: either the axes had to be reworked as they were handled by more and more users and passed down the line, or the material was scarcer far from the source and, therefore, manufacturers opted to make smaller artifacts. Regardless, scarcity and difficulty of access promoted activities that would maximize the distribution and prolong the lives of imported goods.

However, purely economic explanations, such as this, neglect the social and symbolic significance of imports. As Walsh and Antonaccio remind, “The foreignness of an import carries with it the implication that these goods were probably, on some level at least, prestigious novelties. The added value connected with the consumption of an imported vase is unlikely to have been related to its functional aspects, as local copies

---

784 Elston (1990, 55) speculates that the reasons craftsmen devised intricate mechanisms for repairing a large Attic cup could be “aesthetic, ritualistic, or monetary.”
785 Hodder and Lane 1982.
could presumably mimic those qualities relatively easily.  

Noting the frequency with which imports are kept as inalienable objects, several anthropologists and ethnographers have discussed the socio-political factors underlying the curation of non-local goods in general terms. Lillios finds great diversity in the types of objects that became heirlooms, according to her survey of ethnographic and archaeological literature, but she highlights their imported status or non-native composition as common features. She suggests that an exotic origin encourages the perception of an object as “imbued with the symbolism of an ancestral place or time.”

In a wide-ranging anthropological study of the symbolic perception of distance in societies, Helms observes that, in traditional societies, goods from far-off, exotic lands frequently carry mythic or symbolic meanings because they derive from realms inaccessible to most. She points to several reasons why such objects might bring prestige to their owners. Sometimes, for example, the owners themselves traveled to far-off places—and acquired esoteric knowledge in the process—to acquire these special objects. Other times, the owners did not have to leave home but were able to afford these difficult-to-acquire items. However, the quasi-magical aura of exotic goods in traditional societies is an improbable reason for the curation of Attic pottery in Etruria—a ware that enjoyed widespread distribution from the 6th century onward. Attic ceramics had percolated to communities large and small, and their presence in both rich and modest tombs implies that they were accessible to people of different social strata.

---

786 Walsh and Antonaccio 2014, 60.
787 Lillios 1999, 240.
788 Lillios 1999, 240.
789 Helms 1988, especially 118-9.
Gradients of value emerge from the examination of the archaeological contexts of mended Attic pots in Etruria. Whereas most repaired ceramics from settlements are fragmentary or were found in mixed or disturbed deposits, grave groups are discrete, intentionally constructed assemblages where like objects placed side-by-side invite comparison. The reconstruction of grave assemblages containing mended Attic pots indicates that, in the majority of cases, these were special objects within their tomb group. Some had been kept for a generation or more. Others were the only import within a tomb, or one of a pair or three examples of the same form or class. Sometimes the wealth of a tomb suggests that cost was no object; the fact that those burying the deceased were willing to place an imperfect object alongside bronze, ivory, and gold goods, suggests that the Attic vessel retained its significance even when damaged. Occasionally, damage to an Attic vase warranted exceptional intervention, as was the case with a neck-amphora of the Nikosthenic type (Adikia Sub-class) from Tomb 791 Reusser 2002, 117-9. A.64. For example, the black-figure eye cup from Tomb 13 at Narce Sepolcreto di Monte Soriano (Rome, Villa Giulia 5205: CVA Villa Giulia 3, III.H.e.22, pl. 41.1-3); the plain black glaze cup from Tomb 398, a fossa tomb at the Banditaccia necropolis, Cerveteri (Ricci 1955, 889 nr. 1). The Colmar Painter’s red-figure cup in Tomb 102 at Aléria (Aléria, Musée Archéologique 2359A; Jehasse 1973, 523, no. 2191, pl. 32); an eye-cup from Vignanello Tomb II (Villa Giulia 26038: CVA Villa Giulia 1, III.H.e.19, Tav. 32.4-5); another eye-cup from Falerni Veteres Celle Necropolis Tomb LX (Villa Giulia 865: Para 101, 11; CVA Villa Giulia III.H.e.22, pl. 40.2-3); a Little Master band cup from Tomb 17 of the Crocifisso del Tufo necropolis, Orvieto (Bizzarri 1963, 87, no. 312, Tav. Ve); a Nikosthenic amphora (Rome, Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia 20747: BAPD 302791; ABV 221, 42; CVA Villa Giulia 3, III.H.E.15-6, pls. 23.1-4, 24.3) from Tomb 9 (“Tomba dei vasi attici”) at the Banditaccia necropolis of Cerveteri (Ricci 1955, 244-7, no. 1, figs. 20A); an Attic red-figure cup from Tomb 211 at the Monte Abatone Necropolis, Cerveteri (Gli Etruschi e Cerveteri 1980, 186, no. 17). A cup by the Penthesilea Painter from Tomb 2 at the Crocifisso del Tufo necropolis, Orvieto (Bizzarri 1963, 62-4, no. 6, tav. 1 and fig. 23a) This is particularly so for the tombs of the Banditaccia necropolis of Cerveteri, which boasted high rates of repair on Attic imports (4.62% according to Reusser’s calculations [Reusser 2010, I, 60]). Because the tumuli and chamber tombs generally contained multiple burials, it is not possible to assign the mended pots to discrete internment episodes. Nonetheless huge quantities of imports and metals in a number of the tombs imply the means of the occupants (e.g. Tomb 9 [“Tomba dei vasi attici”]; Tomb 375 [Ricci 1955, 869-73]; Tomb 425 [Ricci 1955, 967-78]). An Attic black-figure skyphos from Tomb 3 of the Contrada Morgi, Narce (Rome, Villa Giulia 5235: CVA Villa Giulia 3, III.H.e.24, pl. 47.1-2) is another example.
426 of the Banditaccia necropolis of Cerveteri; as mentioned above, the handle was replaced by another in a different, yellowish fabric when the original was lost. The loss of the foot from a Little Master band cup found in Tomb 17 at Crocifisso del Tufo became an opportunity to embellish and “Etruscanize” the vessel by concealing the repair with a gold lamella featuring a repoussé gorgoneion. The imagery of the patch added a sought-after apotropaic quality to an otherwise neutral vessel. The application of gold to ceramic is an eloquent testament of the perceived value of an imported Attic pot, since it juxtaposed clay to one of the most prized materials. Etruscan graffiti further indicate the personal value of some mended Attic pots in Etruria. Examples include the Nikosthenic amphora (signed by Nikosthenes) from Tomb 9 of the Banditaccia necropolis at Cerveteri, which bore the inscription “mi Culnaial” (I belong to Culna). Another example from the same necropolis is a large (32 cm in diameter) Attic red-figure cup attributed to the Euaion painter.

Also instructive are repairs on vessels of non-Greek manufacture. Tombs at the Etruscan colony of Aléria on Corsica produced mended pots of Italic origin, but these are components of large sets of a half dozen or more and plain black-glaze with no distinctive decoration to suggest their singularity. An unusual case of a bucchero cup

---

796 Rome, Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia 47492 (BAPD 200047; Ricci 1955, 989-990, fig. 246; ABV 319, 8; Para 139; Add² 151).
797 Bizzarri 1963, 87, n. 313, fig. 23b.
798 Bundrick (2015) has suggested that the Etruscans had a marked preference for vessels with evil-averting motifs and even stimulated the production of eye-cups in Athens.
799 Rome, Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia 20747 (BAPD 302791; ABV 221, 42; CVA Villa Giulia 3, III.H.E.15-6, pls. 23.1-4, 24.3; Ricci 1955, 244-7, no. 1, figs. 20A). For the inscription, see Lyons (2009, 169-70), who notes that ten of the banqueting vessels in the tomb have female ownership inscriptions.
800 Rome, Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia 48355 (BAPD 209734; ARV² 790, 26; Ricci 1955, 1029, no. 28, fig. 266b).
801 For example, a Campanian cup from Tomb 69 was one of eight cups of nearly identical size and dimensions (Jehasse 1973, 361, no. 1292). A skyphos decorated with impressed palmette motifs was one of eleven in Tomb 73, although it is one of three of a larger size (Jehasse 1973, no. 1382).
with an ancient mend from the Crocifisso del Tufo necropolis of Orvieto was found in a
tomb that contained only bucchero vessels. In terms of gradients of value, bucchero
was the only ware represented, and we might posit that it occupied the highest rung and,
therefore, was considered worthy of repair.

By teasing out the circumstances of the mended vases in Etruria, we can see that
the act of restoration was appropriate for Attic vases, which were otherwise rare or
singularized objects within these mortuary contexts. At the risk of introducing a straw-
man to the conversation, the contexts of mended vases seem to contradict Gill and
Vickers’ statement minimizing the practice: 

Of course a repair to a pot might well show that it was a useful
commodity, but need not necessarily attest to its «value» in the eyes of the
ancient consumer. This confusion between a useful pot and a valuable one
makes us feel that the question of repairs might show that it was important
within an Etruscan funerary context to place a complete, even if repaired,
pot within the tomb.

It has been suggested that the use of imported table wares was a means for the
Etruscan elite to distinguish themselves, and this may well have been the case,
especially for the initial wave of imports; however, by the second half of the 6th century,
it would appear that Greek pottery enjoyed a wide enough distribution to not be
considered a restricted luxury. Somewhat analogous is the mending of Chinese import
porcelain in Europe. In a study of material from a dump in Copenhagen (c. 1650-1760),
Kristensen notes only two high quality pieces with signs of repair. On the one hand, such

802 Bizzarri 1963, 102, no. 511.
pieces may continue to serve as status symbols, while on the other hand, the owners may have simply wanted to preserve a set of a difficult-to-acquire tea service. Such social, practical, and economic motives may have also compelled the ancient restoration of Attic pots in Etruria.

The deposition of mended Attic vessels in Etruscan tombs presents a paradox: on the one hand, they were esteemed enough to be restored and included in these ritual contexts; on the other hand, they were expendable enough to be removed from circulation permanently. Considering these imports within the framework of “taste” may reconcile these seeming contradictions. Taste ties in with current discourse on interregional exchange in the Mediterranean, with its greater emphasis on cultural—as opposed to economic—value. The new wave of consumption studies envisions an active role for western Mediterranean communities, which selectively assimilated imports into their existing material culture and traditions and even shaped production abroad through feedback. Stahl cites the phenomenon of “taste” to model consumption in a similarly cross-cultural setting for a series of commodities (beads, cloth, pipes) in the Banda region of Ghana. One of the advantages of talking about consumers’ choices in terms of taste is
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806 The decision to repair these specific porcelain items may also be based on the fact that they represented a status value for the owners, even if they would no longer appear in perfect condition” (Kristensen 2014, 164).
807 Kristensen 2014, 165.
808 As formulated by Bourdieu (1984) and adapted by Stahl (2002).
809 Tsingarida 2013. Debate has moved beyond questions of primitivist and modernist economies, and scholars now strive to capture the more complex and nuanced dynamics of the ancient market based on contextual analyses. It is clear that pots were valued enough to be traded on their own and were not solely secondary to cargoes of other commodities.
810 Walsh 2014, 80-5. Paleothodoros (2007) has argued that the production of Attic red-figure pottery was spurred not by demand in Athens but by its success in the West. Bundrick (2015) has suggested that Etruscan communities were the primary consumers of large eye-cups that were too big for drinking and instead were used as display. Walsh and Antonaccio (2014) have argued that black gloss Castuló cups were manufactured in response to demand for ceramics imitating metal prototypes.
that it resists the need to describe verbally unnamable elements of selection that are rooted in cultural preferences. As she explains:811

What distinguishes taste is that it is embodied and manifest in practices shaped by choices made among an array of possible practices and properties. Taste is therefore embodied preference, a form of practical (and, most often unconscious) comprehension that is often revealed through refusals (things that are “not to one’s taste”). Embodied taste thus emerges dialectically through an encounter with object worlds. The sedimented world of past choices shapes the reception of newly encountered objects. These preferences are not fixed but are, rather, locked in a dance of supply and demand, production and consumption, shaped by past choices and dispositions, but continually reframed by social tensions both within and outside the local setting.”

While novel techniques of manufacture, artistry, imagery, famous makers, exotic origins, and local tastes emerge as the ostensible grounds for the curation of a number of keimêlia catalogued here, one must remember that their value extended beyond these physical attributes. Objects singular in appearance are more prone to become integrated into memory practice. The process is circular: the restricted use of distinctive objects as instruments in social rituals (i.e. as gifts, serving wares, regalia for rites of passage) contributed to the pageantry of these occasions; and the special pieces, in turn, would serve as prompts for actors to recall these events of the past. Repairs suggest personal ties to artifacts, about which we may only speculate. Kristensen ruminates over the possibilities for the small sample of mended Chinese porcelain from a 17th to 18th century refuse deposit in Copenhagen: “Did these particular porcelain items hold a special value for the owner on a personal level, inspiring them to prolong the objects’ use-lives and keep them even though they were damaged? Was it a sentimental memory linked to these specific objects which initiated the repair? Maybe the owners had personally brought

them home from China? In such cases would those who could afford to buy more special decorated porcelain have chosen repair?”

Thus, the materiality of these objects—meaning their physical appearance and social significance—were intrinsically linked. The following section explores a small subset of artifacts where we may be able to discern emotional value.

3.2 Keepsakes from a Far-off Homeland

In a handful of cases, where *keimêlia* derived from a distant, though not necessarily strange, origin, we might propose that they were kept as relics of a far-off homeland. Two of the pithoi found at the necropoleis of Gela hail from the colonists’ purported mother territories: an intact Cretan pithos (A.91) that contained the burial of a child; and fragments of a Rhodian relief pithos (A.90) which, although a stray find, probably served the same purpose. Both were significantly older than the surrounding material culture and, in fact, appear to predate the foundation of the colony. Lentini has suggested that the Rhodian pithos fragment was a “beni di famiglia” used as the coffin for the child in order to signal that he or she belonged to a family of founders, a proposal which, as we will see below, is consistent with the sentiments migrants attach to their belongings. Another example is an Etruscan black-figure oinochoe that was approximately a generation old when it was placed alongside a male skeleton in a tomb at the Etruscan colony at Aleria on Corsica. Whereas the pithoi from Gela were much older than the deceased, the man interred at the Alerian tomb may have brought the oinochoe with him when he immigrated to the island, according to Paleothodoros (A.46). We might contemplate whether the oinochoe was not simply tableware but a means of
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812 Kristensen 2014, 164.
813 Paleothodoros 2010, 4-5.
representing the deceased man as a native of the Etruscan mainland, just as the spearhead that accompanied him might have expressed another facet of his identity. At the Certosa necropolis, a woman was buried with an Etruscan neck-amphora that was also a generation older than the context (A.50). The curvilinear script on a loom weight from Metaponto (A.56) indicates that it was over a century old at the time of deposition in Metaponto and also that it was from another community, perhaps Rhegion, Foxhall suggests. She has proposed that the weight was introduced to the settlement when a woman from the south married into a Metapontine family.

Research in archaeology, anthropology, and modern consumer behavior attests to the pervasive practice of migrants curating objects as relics of their journey or as links to their former lives. Physical relocation creates an opening for people to reflect on the role of their possessions and to place them in categories (e.g. useful, no longer useful, mnemonic) that dictate how these objects will fit into their new existence. A common theme in historical narratives of migration is that the belongings brought from a homeland assume special value as “transitional objects.” The term—which is also applied in the context of rites of passage—refers to things that bridge a geographic or developmental shift and facilitate change by allowing people to retain elements of their past within the next phase of their lives. Objects of migration provide physical anchors for corporate and personal identities in a new locale, as well as foci for the recollection of
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814 The Middle Iron Age Arras culture of Yorkshire, U.K., presents one case where archaeologists have identified heirlooms brought by immigrants to a new homeland. Although the pottery is of local Yorkshire manufacture, the metalwork is made in the La Tène II style of northern France. It is found in burials not of the first generation of immigrants but the second and third generation, who appear to have interred heirlooms (Wait 1995, 500).
815 Marcoux 2001; Parkin 1999.
816 Mehta and Belk 1991.
817 Marcoux 2001, 72.
818 For a description of the term, see: Grubbs and Parkin 2013; Mehta and Belk 1991, 407.
the past as it became increasingly distant. As Mehta and Belk explain, “When possessions are seen as a part of the individual or family identity, they may allow immigrants to ‘transport’ part of their former identities to a new place.” The study of transitional objects within living communities shows that these objects are reflections not just of individual migrants’ experiences but of their culture’s worldview. For example, Mehta and Belk found through interviews with Indian immigrants to the United States that the migrants’ most treasured belongings from their homeland were overwhelmingly collective in nature. This concern with the family as opposed to the individual stands in contrast to the tenets of American culture, which extols individualism.

The significance of possessions varies culturally, and we cannot assume that the communities known to us through archaeological research placed the same emphasis on their material world as modern Western consumers. However, studies of the materiality of historical migrations seem to suggest that the tendency to attach deep meanings to objects is innately human, since people engage in this practice even when it runs counter to a culture’s mores. For example, the Mormon faith called for adherents to disavow the importance of worldly goods, yet documentary evidence from the private sphere (letters, diaries, and journals) reveals that many 19th century Mormon refugees saw the objects that accompanied them on their journey West as imbued with sacred, familial, personal, and communal meanings. In other ways, the Mormon migration

---

819 Belk (1992, 339) elaborates: “We ideally select materials from our past that will form a vessel to bear us safely into the future, with our more desirable memories and identities intact and with material reminders of our less desirable past jettisoned.”
820 Mehta and Belk 1991, 399.
821 Mehta and Belk 1991. Other important insights are emerging from the Migrants’ Belongings project initiated by Flinders University and the Migration Museum of South Australia. Researchers are documenting the histories and contents of the trunks brought by Greek and Italian immigrants to Australia in the post-World War II era. The items studied include everything, from domestic tools and perishable goods to textiles, heirlooms and more. Agutter et al. 2013
822 Belk 1992, 341.
narratives are instructive because they show how ordinary objects became treasures in the context of population displacement. For example, the loss of one beloved belonging was considered worthy of description. A certain Ann was swept away while crossing a stream, and when she was rescued, “she found that she had lost a cherished tin cup she had brought from England and which she always carried around her waist.” Because of the difficulties of transporting goods across long distances, people had to cull their belongings, whittling them down to what was truly necessary. As a result, utilitarian goods sometimes became the transitional objects by default. One account of the Mormon trek reveals that the migrants circumvented baggage limitations imposed on them by stuffing belongings into their clothes. Indeed, “one old sister carried a teapot and colander on her apron string all the way to Salt Lake.” The fact that these mundane items were featured in migration narratives illustrates how an object’s survival through a journey was a cause for its sacralization. These histories of migration from the modern period give some sense of the values that might have been attributed the artifacts identified in this survey as possible relics from a distant homeland. Such relics might have been revered as nodes connecting settlers to the distant mother territory and kin left behind, as receptacles for memories, or as fellow survivors of the journey.

Keimêlia had the potential to serve as “pieces of movable heritage” and “carriers of cultural values,” as heirlooms have for immigrants of the historical period. Although we do not know to what degree individuals within ancient communities attached their sense of self to their possessions, the curation of objects from a far-off mother city and the deployment of these relics in meaningful contexts such as the grave suggest that
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823 Belk 1992, 345.
824 Belk 1992, 346.
825 Agutter et al. 2013, 321
imports may have been operative in the maintenance of individual or corporate identities. Moments of change and trauma have great potential to transform everyday objects into sacred relics.\textsuperscript{826}

4. Conclusions

The \textit{keimêlia} catalogued for this investigation mostly occur as isolated cases, but our consideration of objects with extended histories in other cultures known to us through archaeological, anthropological, ethnographic, and historic research opens up new possibilities for understanding the deployment of storied objects in the ancient Mediterranean. Among the recurring patterns identified were: the interpretation of objects from the remote past in magical or mythic terms, the presentation of old objects at the time of a child’s burial; and the selection of distinctive goods for curation. The parallels from other societies suggest that \textit{keimêlia} were highly effective, malleable tools for expressing diverse ideologies because of their temporal depth and layered histories, which could be amplified or suppressed to different ends. Without claiming universal readings for \textit{keimêlia}, the broad-brush exploration adopted here nonetheless can guide archaeologists to questions key to assessing solitary \textit{keimêlia} that crop up occasionally in the material record. These questions, as well as a discussion of how archaeologists might model the different types of \textit{keimêlia} and their meanings, will be the subject of the next and final chapter.

\textsuperscript{826} Crooke 2012.
CHAPTER 5

“THINKING THROUGH THINGS”827 IN THE ANCIENT MEDITERRANEAN


These fruits are mine—
Small bitter drupes
Full of the golden past and cured in brine.
A.E. Stallings, “Olives”828

Clay loom weights, millennia old stone axes, intricately mended ceramic pots, undecorated cups, finely carved gemstones, inscribed prize vessels, gold necklaces, and scarabs set in silver bezels, are a few of the many examples of keimêlia found in the archaeological record of the ancient Mediterranean (8th-5th centuries B.C.). The corpus of keimêlia gathered for this study are united by the fact that they were the focus of human care, evident from their prolonged circulation or ancient restorations. Some were inherently appealing from an aesthetic perspective, materially valuable, or finely wrought, while others were appreciated perhaps only by those who held and used them on a regular basis. Yet all were seasoned objects marked by a patina that hints at their unique stories, most of which remain irrecoverable to modern scholars. As has become clear throughout this study, what people elected to preserve into the future is relatively unpredictable, since curation was not solely culturally mediated or driven by practical concerns, such as the desire to prolong the life of a useful object. Rather, subjective considerations, including habit, webs of association, and personal sentiment figure prominently. While keimêlia were a heterogeneous class of material that often seem to defy patterning, the preceding chapter discussed some characteristics shared by curated objects in the ancient Mediterranean and cultures worldwide. These convergences

827 The idea of “thinking through things” has been developed by a number of scholars, including Knappett 2005, Henare et al. 2006, and Turkle 2007.
828 Stallings 2012, 5.
encourage efforts to model the universal potentials of curated objects, which is the focus of this final chapter. A review of the different kinds of *keimêlia* and their trajectories suggests how archaeologists might approach chronologically out-of-sync artifacts. This is followed by a working diagram, which relates various types of distance (temporal, cultural or spatial, and interpersonal), to illustrate how formal and contextual information might be synthesized to approach the question of a *keimêlion*’s meaning.

While *keimêlia* create discordant “noise” in the material record and have often been dismissed as residual or anomalous, inquiries into their microhistories hint at the rich and nuanced roles that they played in the lives of the humans with whom they came into contact. Analyses of these outlier artifacts benefit from object-oriented approaches to material culture that have come to the fore in the last decade: materiality, which acknowledges the active role that things play in shaping human culture; and symmetrical archaeology, which foregrounds objects, treating them as “bundles”—dynamic webs which unite things, people, and the environment. Shifting away from anthropocentric approaches to material culture, the new ontology recognizes that objects have lives independent of human actors and sometimes incomprehensible to us. This study integrated the principle of objects’ autonomy in part by cataloguing a number of artifacts older than their contexts without attempting to explain their significance within a framework of human cognition. In addition, it strived to honor the ambiguity and vagueness inherent to archaeological evidence by offering multiple interpretations for the *keimêlia* identified. Although single solutions traditionally have been preferred in archaeological analysis, presenting several explanations is a more honest approach, particularly when discussing the fluid relationships between things and people.
1. *Modeling Keimêlia*

The significance(s) of *keimêlia* could be formalized, as was the case with prizes like Panathenaic prize amphorae or jewelry kept as dowries, but often it seems that these objects were highly personal, their significance known perhaps only to the owners or the members of a close circle such as a family. The idiosyncratic nature of *keimêlia* stressed throughout this study makes it difficult devise models applicable to the entire class. Lillios developed one paradigm, which maps out the role of heirloom transmission in creating and maintaining social hierarchies.\(^{829}\)

This schema (Fig. 57) relates the circulation of heirlooms to the primary mode of establishing rank (either ascribed [i.e. inherited] status or achieved status) according to Service’s typology of sociopolitical groups. Condition 1 is typical of tribes or bands, where achieved status is dominant and ascribed status is less significant for attaining social goals. Understandably, heirlooms are of minimal importance in societies where ancestry is downplayed. Situation 2 is an unstable, competitive society, where inherited status is coming to play a greater role than ascribed status and ultimately surpasses it as the primary determinant of personhood. In such situations, heirlooms are critical because they serve as indicators of hereditary rank. Situation 3 aligns with chiefdom level societies where rank is hereditary. Although somewhat counterintuitive, in such societies, heirlooms are not prominent because there is consensus regarding succession, and objects are not required as proofs to determine who holds positions of authority. In Condition 4, competitors challenge claims based on hereditary rights, and heirlooms again emerge as legitimizing forces. In sum, Lillios argues that unstable social and political conditions,
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\(^{829}\) Lillios 1999, 256, fig. 1.
where conflict arises over the basis of status claims (e.g. whether inherited or achieved), promote the circulation of heirlooms for long periods. In stable societies, heirlooms are less important and might be disposed of quickly, as burial goods, for example.

Lillios’ project is particularly admirable because she synthesizes data from archaeological and living communities in order to understand how heirlooms factored into the development of different kinds of sociopolitical organization, but her anthropocentric approach misses much of the rich variability in this class of objects. Because Lillios is concerned primarily with the function of heirlooms in creating and perpetuating inequalities, she treats them as an undifferentiated category. However, as this study has suggested, objects that were curated across time could have a number of nuanced roles, as companion objects, mementoes, heirlooms, entangled objects, antiques, and found objects. The heirlooms Lillios considers belong primarily to the public sphere, a realm where they serve as effective tools in social and political competitions. In contrast, a large portion of the *keimêlia* identified here were uncovered in more intimate settings (e.g. the household or the grave) reflective of these objects’ personal meanings. Finally, Lillios’ focus on sociopolitical process, as Gilchrist observes, results in a neglect of heirlooms’ sensory or emotional significance.

The object-centered approach adopted in this investigation revealed subtle differences in the types of *keimêlia* and also ample openings for human-object entanglements that promoted curation. Charting the different pathways that *keimêlia* might have taken on the road to curation can help scholars to better recognize the various types of *keimêlia* in the material record and to understand the similarities and differences.
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830 Gilchrist 2013.
between them. The following diagrams, which draw inspiration from Ted Peña’s model of the life cycle of Roman pottery, attempt to merge the primary forms of curation examined in this investigation—keeping things across time and repair.\textsuperscript{831} The horizontal lines represent chapters in an object’s life, with the solidity of the lines indicating the degree of human attachment. The thickness of the line represents the object’s accumulated history; a very thick line indicates a rich history (i.e. the object had been in circulation for some time, and the owners were aware of its past). The fading of a horizontal line denotes a dwindling human concern for the object and/or a gap in the awareness of its history. Dashed lines represent optional pathways in a \textit{keimêlion}’s life cycle, and a pair of red slashes signifies breakage or substantial wear. A pair of green arrows indicates a transfer of the object from one party to another in which an awareness of the object’s history is maintained, whereas a jagged orange line signifies a transfer in which minimal or no awareness of the object’s past life preserved. These visuals are merely starting points; the actual lives of objects can include far more twists and turns, which may involve the crossing over from one type of \textit{keimêlion} to another. At various stages, as owners confront the tension between an object’s diminishing utility or growing obsolescence and its enduring social or emotional value, they may be forced to make a decision regarding its ongoing care or disposal.

Several of the artifacts considered in this study, such as loom weights (A.\textit{55}; A.\textit{56}; A.\textit{57-9}) and vessels (A.\textit{78}), were interpreted as companion objects—things earmarked not for their communicative potential as symbols but valued for their utility as tools (primary use); for their trajectory, see Fig. 58. Because tools in general might

\textsuperscript{831} Peña 2007, fig. 1.2.
remain in use for long periods, companion objects can easily escape the notice of archaeologists; however, attention to signs of wear and age can help scholars identify tools that might have assumed an emotional or symbolic importance to their owners and transitioned into companion objects. As the diagram above illustrates, any tool may lose value if it comes to be viewed as worn or outdated. If broken, it may be discarded, repaired, or repurposed for a secondary use. A repair that alters an object’s functionality may also compel the owners to apply it to different purpose (i.e. a secondary use). Prolonged primary use and secondary use may lead to further wear and tear that ultimately result in discard. Alternatively, the attachments that develop through frequent and regular interactions may compel the owner(s) to continue using the tool as a companion object for long periods, perhaps ultimately curating it by keeping the object but retiring it from active service.

Mementoes, on the other hand, were acquired with the expectation that they would be curated to serve as prompts for future remembrance; see Fig. 59 for their life cycle. The Greek literary record preserves ample testimony describing objects that commemorated key moments and accomplishments for individuals, and the search for mementoes in the archaeological record revealed numerous real-life examples, such as Panathenaics prize amphorae and keimêlia bearing inscriptions indicating that they were prizes for competitions of all kinds, from athletics to wool-working. We might imagine several circumstances that would cause owners to reevaluate the meaning of a memento. If it broke, by chance, it could be kept in that imperfect state or repaired, but presumably it would return to the same role of promoting the remembrance. Some mementoes appear to have been removed from circulation ceremoniously at the end of their owner’s life if
they were considered his or her inalienable possession, as was perhaps the case with the Panathenaic prize amphora interred with the man at Barka (A.113). Others might have been inherited by living kin and, therefore, morphed into heirlooms. None of the mementoes catalogued in this survey appears to have been discarded casually, but we might infer that a memento could be melted down for plate, relegated to the rubbish heap, or taken off the shelf, so to speak, and put to functional use, if it had lost its significative value, meaning its mnemonic force had diminished.

Heirlooms are objects that may or may not be acquired with the expectation that they will be preserved for a long period; see Fig. 60 for their life path. Although “heirloom” is often used as a catchall term for an object curated across time, an heirloom sensu strictu is transmitted within a family. The layers of association may affect an heirloom’s longevity in different ways; hence, the two separate horizontal lines after each episode of transmission denote two potential paths. On the one hand, an heirloom’s protracted life history may amplify its value in the eyes of the heirs, who serve as custodians not only of the object but of its history. With each transmission, the heirloom becomes more laden with associations (evident from how the upper line grows thicker with each successive transmission), a process that could go on for many generations. However, the failure to communicate an heirloom’s history to the succeeding generation or changes in family values could disrupt an heirloom’s path, as was the case perhaps with the Trachones amphora which was discarded in a well after a century or more (A.26). Heirlooms that have become disassociated from their past are vulnerable to disposal via the rubbish heap or the market (if they are of intrinsic value). Identifying heirlooms archaeologically without the aid of an inscription is difficult, but the inclusion
of *keimêlia* in the graves of children might be one case where heirloom status is a plausible proposal.

Unlike heirlooms, which were transferred within a lineage, the contours of an entangled object’s history can be formed through a variety of events, such as ransom and raiding (activities described in the Homeric epics) or gift-giving between individuals with no obvious kinship, attested in the epigraphic corpus by objects such as the Aristokleia lekythos from Selinous (A.112) and inscribed bespoke objects, which tell of the relationship between producers and consumers. See Fig. 61 for their life path. An inscription is thus the chief clue to the story of an entangled object, but repair or other forms of maintenance are episodes that can further enrich an entangled object’s biography by drawing different parties into its care. The Kleinaspergle cups (p. 162) and the cup from Orvieto (n. 442) were eloquent examples of imported objects that were naturalized to the Celtic world and Etruria, respectively, through the application of gold lamellae decorated with local motifs to conceal repairs. When the life history of an entangled object was strongly intertwined with that of a human actor, the object might be considered an inalienable possession to be deposited with that individual at the time of his or her death. Otherwise, an entangled object that had sustained significant damage or perhaps lost relevance might be removed from circulation unceremoniously.

Antiques, according to the definition developed in this study, were not simply old objects but ones transferred via exchanges that preserved little understanding of the object’s prior history; see Fig. 62 for their life cycle. Antiques never went below ground; rather, they were always kept in circulation. They can be difficult to identify in the archaeological record, but a few examples from the archaeological record were proposed:
the Old Babylonian necklace from Lefkandi (pp. 102-3), the numerous Panathenaic prize amphorae that made their way to non-Greek communities in Etruria and other parts of the Mediterranean, and the bronze vessel with a Neo-Babylonian inscription (A.52). In these cases, the intercultural transfer suggests a lapsus in the knowledge of that object’s past. After each episode of acquisition, the new curators had the choice of highlighting that vaguely known past and inserting themselves into the object’s history or of emphasizing the antique’s new chapter and creating new meanings.

Found objects, by contrast, experienced a hiatus in circulation; they were lost or forgotten entirely before being salvaged by later curators who gave them a new phase of life (see Fig. 63 for their life cycle). The meanings assigned to found objects could range from the practical to the ideological or mystical. Several examples were cited in this study. The Bronze Age pithos from Azoria in Crete was reused during the Archaic period (A.42), perhaps for purely economic reasons or perhaps as an expression of the household’s longevity at the site at a time of population flux. The Eneolithic point from Pithekoussai interred in an 8th century burial (A.65), the Neolithic stone axes from Monte Polizzo (A.101; A.102; A.103), and the prehistoric lithics recovered from Etruscan chamber tombs in the Crocefisso del Tufo necropolis at Orvieto (A.62; A.63) appear to have been understood as magico-religious implements. As was discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 188-205), the interpretation of objects from the very distant past as having preternatural powers harmonizes with testimonia and archaeological remains, which indicate that objects and monuments from deep antiquity habitually were interpreted as constituents of the divine or mythic realms in cultures worldwide.
When people curated *keimêlia*, they curated not just objects but a past. When they disposed of *keimêlia*, they decided where that past should be placed. As sketched above, a *keimêlion* could move from its use context to its depositional context via a number of different avenues. The mode of disposal is a key consideration for understanding the value of a *keimêlion* at the time of its removal from circulation. In some cases, such as the pair of coral red cups from the well near the Agora (A.22; A.23) or the type B amphora from a well near Trachones (A.26), long-lived objects were discarded unceremoniously; their fragmentary remains were found mingled with dozens of other objects. When recovered from ritual contexts, such as sanctuaries or graves, we can infer that *keimêlia* articulated an underlying ideology. Although the multi-phase nature of most sanctuary sites largely prohibits the detection of *keimêlia*, graves are generally closed contexts and also happen to be the source of the majority of the *keimêlia* identified through this survey. Studies on death and bereavement underscore the role of objects in mediating the crisis of death by externalizing emotions, relationships, and memories.\footnote{Hallam and Hockey 2001, 1-17.}

Objects with long lives are laden with specific associations, and their placement in the wake of death is a prime way for the living to navigate this rupture. As a part of the process of mourning, survivors classify the belongings of the deceased. We have observed several different strategies. The deposition in a grave of an old object that might have been a biographical object belonging to the deceased acknowledged that object as the deceased’s inalienable possession, but the inheritance of the deceased’s belongings by kin might have created a focus for people’s remembrance of the dead. The deployment of
*keimêlia* in the graves of children was a poignant way of acknowledging their unfulfilled social roles and conferring upon them an ancestral or adult social identity.

2. Distance and Meaning

Despite the diversity evident in the types of *keimêlia* found in the ancient Mediterranean, comparative archaeology, anthropology, and ethnographic studies revealed analogous meanings and uses for objects from the past. Among them were the frequent assignment of magical or mythic meanings to things from remote antiquity, the association of older objects with children, and the selection of rare or difficult-to-acquire objects for curation. These parallels point toward key questions that might guide archaeologists’ analyses of chronologically out-of-sync objects encountered in the material record: Which past was being invoked—a past that was known and near or foreign and remote? Who owned or received *keimêlia*? Under what circumstances were *keimêlia* deployed? What were the attributes that made *keimêlia* worth keeping?

The meanings proposed for the various types of curated objects—as talismans, as instruments for articulating different valences of a person’s identity, and as apparatuses for commemorating events and relationships of the past—emerge through the consideration of several types of distances that *keimêlia* may straddle: temporal, cultural, and interpersonal. These are visualized in Fig. 64. While *keimêlia* are defined principally by their endurance for a span of time (temporal distance), many—though not all—of the examples identified in this study had far-off cultural or geographic origins (cultural distance), which marked them as constituents of a restricted class of difficult-to-access goods. Because *keimêlia* often remained in circulation beyond an individual’s lifetime, they were transferred from one person or group to another through exchanges that
inscribed these objects with new associations. These changes in hands might be said to increase a *keimêlion*’s interpersonal distance—the relational span between a *keimêlion*’s original and later owners. As we have seen throughout this study, the artifacts selected for curation often were situated at the overlaps of these spheres of distance; to cite one example, the Lakonian krater from Cumae (A.51) was an imported vessel (cultural distance) inscribed with two different ownership inscriptions that signal its involvement in the lives of different parties (interpersonal distance) across time (temporal distance).

The valences of meaning that might be assigned to a *keimêlion* seem to relate in many cases to these distances (Fig. 65). An object from the past with a history that was known and near was likely to hold emotional or mnemonic value. Its associations with particular individuals and events could be mobilized for the creation or maintenance of personal or corporate identities. Things that were very remote, temporally, culturally, spatially, and relationally were prone to interpretations within magical or mythic frameworks because their usually foreign appearance and the gaps in their biographies promoted the invention of meanings.

3. *Thinking through Things*

Ample cautionary tales remind us not to assume exact parallels between ancient and modern institutions and practices, such as colonization, the economy, democracy, and slavery, to name a few. Yet the evidence overwhelmingly suggests that people in antiquity did, in fact, think through objects or assign them significance beyond their function. S. Turkle has coined the phrase “evocative objects” to describe things which serve “as companions to our emotional lives or as provocations to thought.”[^1] The

[^1]: Turkle 2007, 5.
exploration of *keimèlia* in the material, epigraphic, and literary record reveals dozens of examples of objects that seem to merge intellect and feelings in this manner. To form a relationship with the objects that coinhabit one’s world is inherently human.\(^{834}\)

Turkle has noted modern scholars’ “reticence to examine objects as centerpieces of emotional life,”\(^{835}\) which she attributes to their fear of being accused of materialism or fetishism. Portable goods have been disregarded similarly in much of the recent scholarship on commemorative practices in antiquity and ancient perceptions of the past. This neglect may stem in part from archaeologists’ self-consciousness about the discipline’s antiquarian roots and their desire to distance themselves from their collector-forerunners. In philological circles, this neglect is perhaps less surprising, since ancient authors continually extol the oral and written transmission of history and emphasize the pursuit of *kleos* (fame) over material rewards. In addition, as we have seen, *keimèlia* are a challenging class of material to identify and interpret but, of course, well worth the effort.

*Keimèlia* were a powerful, democratic means of tracking time. Time is an abstract concept,\(^{836}\) frequently characterized as a “construct” by scholars in both the humanities and sciences,\(^{837}\) since humans have devised myriad complex systems to measure and describe its passage. Although time often is classified “cyclical” or “teleological,”\(^{838}\)

\(^{834}\) Gosden 2004, 34.
\(^{835}\) Turkle 2007, 6.
\(^{836}\) Although, as Mills and Mills point out (2005, 13), “the ‘abstract’ nature of time is partly an artefact of changing technology.” The invention of mechanical clocks and computers has taken time keeping duties out of the hands of actors; as a result, time appears to march forward autonomously.
\(^{837}\) Dunn 2007, 12.
\(^{838}\) Rosen chooses the terms “cyclical” and “teleological” (2004, 6), while Clarke (2008, 5) prefers “recurring” and “progressive.” Cyclical time would include recurring phenomena, such as the seasons, day-night, lunar and solar cycles. Teleological time involves the progression toward an end point. Events or entities that move according to this temporal trajectory have a finality: for example, a human’s life from birth to death or a knife cutting through a loaf of bread.
scholars in the last century have brought attention to alternatives to this dichotomy, one of which is memory—a “flexible means of mapping time.” With their many and shifting associations, *keimêlia* were a means of activating memories and tapping into this non-linear mode of tracking time. It is the hope that this study of *keimêlia* will help to bring things out of the shadows and shed light on the many uses of objects from the past in antiquity, including their role as apparatuses for remembering events and relationships of the past. Although *keimêlia* are difficult to access, the study of this class of objects is critical to understanding the ancients’ historical consciousness, since people in antiquity did, in fact, chart their personal histories through portable goods, and through their uses and deployment of *keimêlia*, they were able to negotiate the place of their past in the present.

---

839 Time is the subject of many longstanding philosophical debates, which lie outside the purview of this study. A chief concern among anthropologists is whether time is culturally embedded, as Durkheim argued, or intrinsically linked to the world’s natural rhythms (Gell). As Mills and Mills observe (2005, 8), tension arises from attempts to reconcile the “plurality” of different time scales and collective versus individual conceptions of time.

840 Bradley 2003, 223.
APPENDIX 1

"KEIMÊLIA": CITATIONS AND CONNOTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Connotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>Iliad 6.47</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Adrastos, a Trojan, offers Menelaus <em>keimêlia</em> from his father's stores if his life is spared.</td>
<td>treasures stored up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>Iliad 9.330</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Achilles replies to the Greek envoys who try to persuade him to rejoin battle; he counts the cities he has conquered and the <em>keimêlia</em> taken from each.</td>
<td>booty; treasures stored up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>Iliad 11.132</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Peisander and Hippolochos, sons of Antimachos, beg Agamemnon for their lives, promising their father's <em>keimêlia</em>.</td>
<td>treasures stored up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>Iliad 18.290</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
<td>Hektor refuses the suggestion of Polydamas, who wants to retreat to the city. Hektor notes that the city's once famous wealth (gold and bronze) had been plundered, including <em>keimêlia</em> from homes, which had been sold to Phrygia and Maeonia.</td>
<td>treasures stored up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>Iliad 23.618</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
<td>Achilles gives Nestor 5th prize—a new two-handled phiale—at the funeral games of Patroklos, although the old man does not race. He instructs Nestor that it will be a mnêma (a remembrance or memorial) of the funeral games of Patroklos.</td>
<td>distinctive object to be kept for the purpose of commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>Odyssey 1.312</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
<td>Athena comes disguised as Mentes, a Taphian sailor, to Telemachos who offers her hospitality and promises to give her something of great beauty and value: a <em>keimélion</em> (&quot;a keepsake&quot;); trans. S. Lombardo. He says that it is the type of thing that dear friends who are <em>xenoi</em> give to each other.</td>
<td>distinctive, precious object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 2.75</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Telemachos addresses the Ithakan assembly asking for assistance against his mother's suitors. He claims that it would be better if it were Ithakans rather than suitors eating up his <em>keimêlia</em> and cattle because he could exact some retribution.</td>
<td><em>keimêlia</em> can be consumed in the same way as cattle; the passage seems to contrast inanimate and living wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 4.600</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
<td>Telemachos begs Menelaus to let him leave and return to Ithaca; he asks that if Menelaus give him a gift, it is a <em>keimêlion</em> and not horses.</td>
<td>object from one guest-friend to another; again there seems to be a distinction between inanimate and animate wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 4.613</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Menelaus replies to Telemachos' request; instead of horses as a parting gift for the youth, the king chooses something very beautiful and valuable from his home. This gift is a silver krater with a gilded rim. It was made by Hephaistos and given to Menelaus by the warrior Phaidimos, king of the Sidonians.</td>
<td>a treasure of great value and beauty with a long and distinguished life history (beginning with its creation by the god Hephaistos himself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 10.40</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>After Odysseus and his crew visit Aiolos, the crew members complain that it is Odysseus who has gained <em>keimêlia</em> from Troy while they come back empty-handed.</td>
<td>treasures, both spoils of war and gifts of guest-friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 14.326</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Odysseus in disguise as a Cretan comes to Eumaios. Prior to landing in Ithaka, this Cretan claims to have met Pheidon, king of the Thesprotia. The king had hosted Odysseus. Odysseus had left his κειμήλια (gold, iron, and bronze), enough to support 10 generations of his children, at the palace while he ventured to Dodona to consult the oracle of Zeus.</td>
<td>treasures stored up and acquired as spoils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 15.91</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
<td>Telemachos pleads with Menelaos that Telemachos must depart from Sparta immediately lest some noble <em>keimélion</em> be lost from his father's stores in Ithaka.</td>
<td>a precious object stored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 15.101</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Menelaus went to where the <em>keimélia</em> lay (i.e. his treasury) and picked out a <em>depas</em>, while his son Megapenthes carried out a silver krater. Helen selected the most beautiful textile from the deepest part of the chest.</td>
<td>treasures stored up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 15.113</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Menelaus states that, of all the <em>keimélia</em> lying stored in his treasury, he will give Telemachos the finest and most costly: the silver and gold mixing bowl made by Hephaistos. Helen gives Telemachos the textile stating that it will be a memento <em>mnēma</em> of the encounter for Telemachos' future bride to wear.</td>
<td>treasured objects with long biographies stored in a treasury. Helen's gift suggests that <em>keimélia</em> can have a diachronic aspect: remembrance of the past; and an intended (future) purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 15.159</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Departing from Menalaus, Telemachos states that he wishes he would return to to Ithaka and find Odysseus at home. Telemachos would then tell his father about the kindness and <em>keimélia</em> (many and noble) from Menelaus.</td>
<td>objects that are gifts of guest-friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 17.527</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Odysseus disguised as a Cretan sailor is introduced to Penelope as having word of Odysseus and the treasures he will bring.</td>
<td>objects acquired abroad (spoils and gifts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 19.272</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Odysseus disguised as a Cretan speaks to Penelope about the treasures or <em>keimélia</em> he brings home.</td>
<td>treasured objects acquired abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 19.295</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Odysseus disguised as a Cretan states that the treasures or <em>keimélia</em> of the real Odysseus lie stored in the halls of the Thesprotian king.</td>
<td>treasured objects acquired abroad and stored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td><em>Odyssey</em> 21.9</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Penelope goes to the storeroom and finds the <em>keimêlia</em> of Odysseus; these are very distinctive gifts, including the curved bow and quiver that friends of Odysseus had given him in Lakedaimon; Odysseus did not take the bow to Troy. It was kept at home as a memento (<em>mnêma</em>) of his friend Iphitos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesiod Fragmenta</td>
<td><em>Catalogue of Women; West &amp; Merkelbach</em> 75.23</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Schoineus, the father of Atalanta refers to the treasures Hippomenes would carry home if he were to win the race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesiod Fragmenta</td>
<td><em>Catalogue of Women; West &amp; Merkelbach</em> 200, 4</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Menestheus, son of Peteos, tried to woo Helen with the treasures he possessed (gold, cauldrons, beautiful things)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophanes</td>
<td>Fr. 2.9</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
<td>Xenophanes issues a statement regarding the honors bestowed upon Olympic victors by the city, including a keepsake (<em>keimêlion</em>). He asserts that wise men, like himself, who create a good government deserve civic honors greater than those who use their strength alone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td><em>Trag. Fragmenta (Nauk)</em> 362, 4</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Erechtheus gives his parting words to his adopted son. He offers the following <em>keimêlia</em> (words of wisdom stored from his lifetime): to be kind to rich and poor people alike; when two matters are before you, attach your opinion to one and dismiss the other; do not acquire possessions unjustly if you want them to remain a long time in your dwelling, for those that enter a house wrongly do not have permanence; try to accrue possessions, for they endow the owner with nobility and allow him to make the best marriage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>Trag. Frag.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Phaethon observes the slave-girls leaving the palace of Merops and states that they sweep the house daily and clean the <em>keimêlia</em>.</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>objects stored within a palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>Trag. Frag.</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Kappa reconstructed. The term here perhaps refers to a lock of hair of Phaethon (Commentary, C. Collard 1995, 233).</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
<td>a memorial token of a person?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>Heraclidae</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>Makaria gives her life to save the Heraklidai after King Demophon, who is sheltering the Heraklidai from Eurystheus, receives an oracle stating that the tribe will only be saved if a maiden is sacrificed to Persephone. Makaria asks for a proper burial when the Heraklidai are able to return to their homeland. Until then, she states, her just and good deeds will be the <em>keimêlia</em> she receives instead of future children or coming-of-age.</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
<td>Here, <em>keimêlia</em> are equated with noble acts. These rewards are earned, as opposed to the experiences that a young woman from a distinguished family would expect to accomplish: maidenhood and motherhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>Rhesus</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>Athena disguised as the Trojan ally Kypris encounters Paris. Paris speaks to Kypris and calls him a <em>keimêlion</em>, or treasure to the Trojans.</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
<td>The word is applied to a person, who was won onto the side of the Trojans through effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles</td>
<td>Electra</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>Chrysothemis approaches the tomb of Agamemnon bearing offerings from Clytemnestra; Elektra urges her not to dedicate these things but bury to them as <em>keimêlia</em> or treasures for when Clytemnestra dies; they are considered treacherous offerings</td>
<td>κειμήλι᾽</td>
<td>objects intended to be buried and lie as a store in anticipation of the future owner finding them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>3.41.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amasis encourages Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos, to throw away which of his treasures he values most and that he would grieve most to lose. Polykrates chooses a seal set in gold crafted by Theodoros son of Telekles of Samos.</td>
<td>κειμηλίων</td>
<td>something valuable, special and irreplaceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>6.62.9</td>
<td>κειμηλίων</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Ariston of Sparta tricks his friend Agetos into giving Ariston Agetos' very beautiful wife. They make a pact to give one another a prized possession (<em>κειμηλίων</em>) of the other man's choosing. Ariston chooses the wife of Agetos. The trick does not hinge on <em>κειμηλίων</em> denoting inanimate versus human possessions; rather, Agetos did not suspect that Ariston would choose his wife because Ariston already had a wife.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plato</th>
<th><em>Laws</em> 913.8</th>
<th>κειμήλιον</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Athenian interlocutor makes a statement about property rights: if someone comes across a <em>κειμήλιον</em> (something laid away in store) and does not have permission to touch it, then he should not. The passage seems to refer to things left unattended. It forecasts severe punishments for those who meddle with such items; this type of conduct is said to be &quot;injurious to begetting children.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here, <em>κειμήλια</em>—treasured objects stored for the future—have innate agency to do harm if moved, and those who move them will be punished. Any objects left unattended willingly or unwillingly are considered dedicated to Hecate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plato</th>
<th><em>Laws</em> 931a.5</th>
<th>κειμηλίοι</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly parents laid up bedridden in the home bring good will to those who house them according to the Athenian speaker. The reason is that parents' curses against their children are very strong. But parents' requests for the gods to bless their children are equally potent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly parents bedridden are described as <em>κειμηλίοι</em>. They act as talismans if they are treated well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycophron</td>
<td>Alex. 884</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycophron</td>
<td>Alex. 1264</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theocritus</td>
<td>Idylls 21.55</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theocritus</td>
<td>Idylls 24.123</td>
<td>κειμήλια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaen</td>
<td>Deipnosophistai 3.26.31; Olson 3.84a.3</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaen</td>
<td>Deipnosophistai 10.6.11; Olson 10.414a.7</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaen</td>
<td>Deipnosophistai 11.16.6; Olson 11.781c.10</td>
<td>κειμηλίοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
<td>Deipnosophistai 14.69.24; Olson 14.654c.8</td>
<td>κειμήλιον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

KEIMÊLIA FROM THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD

N.b. The catalogue is organized according to geographic region, city or site, and the approximate chronology of the possible keimêlia, from earliest to latest. Sometimes a single context contained more than one artifact that was a chronological anachronism; a dotted line separates the different assemblages. References to Attic painted pots begin with the Beazley Archive Pottery Database number (BAPD) and are followed by references to Beazley’s ARV or ABV.

ANATOLIA

GÜMÜŞCAY

A.1 Two Gold Bracelets: Çanakkale Museum 7674 and 7675 (Fig. 66)
Seviç and Rose 1999, 497, no. 12, figs. 11-12.
Described as “worn and bent.” Antelope terminations.

Date of Bracelets: 500-475 B.C.

A.2 Gold Necklace: Çanakkale Museum 7677 (Fig. 67)
Seviç and Rose 1999, 498-9, no. 13, fig. 13, 14.
Gold seed or cone pendants alternating with red glass beads. Wear on the pendants; six are missing granulation, and some have dents or scratches

Date of Necklace: 500-475 B.C.

A.3 Gold Necklace: Çanakkale Museum 7676 (Fig. 68)
Seviç and Rose 1999, 499-500, no. 14, figs 15-18; Rose 2013, 104.
Sixteen lotus and palmette elements and lion head terminals. One lotus spiral has a gold leaf repair. Unequal number of elements on either side of the central lotus-palmette may suggest the loss of element(s) in antiquity.

Date of Necklace: 500-475 B.C.

Findspot: Child’s sarcophagus of marble (2.25 m by 88 m; 1.07 m in height) found intact within the same tumulus (Kizöldüün) that contained the famous Polyxena sarcophagus

Assemblage: Osteological analyses were unable to verify the sex of the deceased; however, the grave goods suggest that it was a female between nine and ten years of age. The gold necklaces were found near the neck and the bracelets on either arm. Within the sarcophagus were also: a wooden female protome (doll? [Rose 2013, 110]), wooden pyxis, flask, terracotta alabastron, gold earrings, silver ladle and phiale, and alabastra. The silver ladle and phiale were located on the pelvis, where they presumably were held in her hands. The position may suggest that she was prepared for “sympotic activity,” according to one of the excavators (Rose 2013, 107).
Date of Assemblage: c. 450 B.C.

Discussion: The jewelry had signs of use and wear, and stylistically predated the rest of the contents of the sarcophagus by a quarter of a century or more. The excavators cautiously propose that the jewelry may have been intended as the girl’s dowry, or the items were simply typical for the burials of children at this period (Sevinç and Rose 1999, 502). For further discussion, see Chapter 2, pp. 92-3.

BLACK SEA

APOLLONIA PONTICA
A.4 Skyphoi, Attic Black-figure (Fig. 69)
A.5 Koeller and Panayotova 2010, 256, fig. 5.
Two miniature vessels that appear to be a pair.

Lindos Group

Date of Skyphoi: 500-450 B.C.

Findspot: Grave 301, Apollonia Pontica

Assemblage: Within this child burial were two miniature skyphoi by the Lindos group, a black-glaze mug, two black-glaze lekythoi, fragments of a figurine in terracotta, and a small iron object, perhaps a key.

Date of Assemblage: 425-400 B.C.

Discussion: The two skyphoi appear to be about a generation older than the rest of the tomb’s contents. Their scale perhaps made them suitable dedications for the child’s grave, and they were selected from the relatives’ belongings for that reason.

PANTIKAPAION
A.6 Gem: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.24 (Fig. 70)
Trofimova 2007, 259, no. 154; Petrakova 2012, 153.
Engraved very delicately with the image of a crane. Gold ring attached. Signed by Dexamenos of Chios

Dexamenos [signed]

Date of Gem: 450-400 B.C. (Erroneously assigned by Petrakova to 350-300 B.C.)

Findspot: Kurgan V, crypt 48, Chamber 2

Assemblage: The second chamber in crypt 48 held a wood sarcophagus with a “stone with the depiction of a griffin” (gem?) near the head of the deceased and a gold hairpiece.
Three gold rings were by the left hand: one plain, one depicting Aphrodite (Althaus and Sutcliffe 2006, 132, no. 14) and assigned to the 4th century, and one by Dexamenos (Petrakova 2012, 153). Also included in the grave were a black-glaze pelike, a black-glaze bowl, a gilt bronze mirror, and several alabastra. It is possible that the deceased was a female considering the lack of weapons and the presence of a mirror.

Date of Assemblage: 4th century B.C.

Discussion: This very fine gem is signed by the lapidary Dexamenos and was probably half a century old at the time of deposition. It might have been curated as a work of a famous craftsman as well as a personal (inalienable) possession of the deceased. Seals were not just ornaments but functioned as personal identification (Lee 2015, 151).

PANTIKAPAION
A.7 Lekanis, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.32 (Fig. 71)
Trofimova 2007, 255, no. 151; Petrakova 2012, 152, fig. 1.
On lid, women and erotes.

Marsyas Painter

Date of Lekanis: 360-350 B.C.

Findspot: Kurgan VI, crypt 47

Assemblage: Crypt of limestone slabs containing a gilt-decorated wood sarcophagus; no osteological information available. At the deceased’s right hand was a gold olive twig, and near the left was a gold finger ring with the image of a Nike charioteer. At the feet were a black-glaze pelike (Inv. Yu-O.31; 4th century B.C.; Trofimova 2007, 252-3, no. 149) and the lekanis. Also within the crypt were two alabastra, a black-glaze bowl, and a silver coin from Pantikapaion (340-325 B.C.) (Petrakova 2012, 152 and n. 20).

Date of Assemblage: 340-325 B.C.

Discussion: The lekanis was a decade or two older than the rest of the contents of the tomb (Petrakova 2012, n. 20). Not only an import, it also was the only ceramic object in the tomb with figural decoration. The form and imagery of the lekanis strongly are associated with female adornment. The object may have been used by the deceased at the toilette and was considered an intimate belonging.

PANTIKAPAION
A.8 Lekanis, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.18 (Fig. 72)
Althaus and Sutcliffe 2006, 132, no. 16; Petrakova 2012, 152, fig. 2.
Dionysiac scene: newborn Dionysos with maenads.
Herakles Painter

*Date of Lekanis:* 380-370 B.C. (Petrakova); 370-360 (Althaus and Sutcliffe)

*Findspot:* Kurgan V, crypt 48, Chamber 1

*Assemblage:* Limestone crypt with one corridor and two chambers. The first chamber housed a wooden sarcophagus with three Attic vases nearby: a black-glaze pelike, a black-glaze bowl, and the above described lekanis which held prune pits. Close to the head of the deceased were an iron knife, a strigil, and a black-glaze bowl, and at the left hand were two gold rings. At the right hand was a long cane. Alabastra lay on either side of the skeleton, and leather boots were found near the feet (Petrakova 2012, 152-3).

*Date of Assemblage:* 350-300 B.C.

*Discussion:* Similarly to crypt 47, the lekanis was older than the other items in the assemblage (dated by the gold objects to the middle to end of the 4th century). It appears that the lekanis was in use for some two to three decades prior to deposition (Petrakova 2012, 153). The lekanis may have been used in personal adornment and was therefore considered an intimate possession of the deceased.

PANTIKAPAION

A.9 Krater, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.28 (Fig. 73)

Trofimova 2007, 256-7, no. 152; Petrakova 2012, 153-4, fig. 3.

Judgment of Paris.

Kadmos Painter

*Date of Krater:* c. 400 B.C.

A.10 Lekythos, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.27 (Fig. 73)

Petrakova 2012, 153-4, fig. 3.

Paris seizes Helen.

Helena Painter

*Date of Lekythos:* 380-350 B.C.

A.11 Hydria, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.26 (Fig. 73)

Althaus and Sutcliffe 2006, 133, no. 17; Trofimova 2007, 253, no. 150; Petrakova 2012, 153-4, fig. 3.

Paris and Helen surrounded by erotes.

Helena Painter
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Date of Hydria: 380-350 B.C.

Findspot: Kurgan V, crypt 48, burial mound

Date of Assemblage: 350-300 B.C.

Discussion: The krater, hydria, and lekythos were found in fragments on the top of the mound, probably having been broken during the burial ceremony (Petrakova 2012, 153). All show scenes from the Trojan cycle, which is unusual in the iconographic repertoire at Pantikapaion. Although two of the vases are attributed to the same painter, it appears that the owners took pains to collect objects with scenes related to the saga of Paris and Helen (Petrakova 2012, 154). There is some disagreement over the dating of the vessels. Nevertheless, the iconography suggests that this was a curated collection and that the krater at least was manufactured a few decades earlier than the other vessels. Perhaps it was the foundational piece in a collection of pots depicting the cycle of Helen and Paris.

PANTIKAPAION

A.12 Lekanis, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.9 (Fig. 74)
Petarakova 2012, 154 fig. 4.
Ancient repair on one handle. Imagery of women and erotes.
Eleusinian Painter

Date of Lekanis: 360-350 B.C.

A.13 Pelike, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.10 (Fig. 74)
Petarakova 2012, 154 fig. 4.
Zeus, Athena and other gods.
Eleusinian Painter

Date of Pelike: 350-340 B.C.

A.14 Gem, Scaraboid, East Greek: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu.O.6 (Fig. 75)
Kalashnik 2004, fig. 30; Althaus and Sutcliffe 2006, 131, no. 12; Petarakova 2012, 154.
Engraved with a running Medusa. Gold chains attached. The imagery suggests that it might have been used as an amulet.
Craftsman of the Leningrad Gorgon

Date of Gem: late 5th century
A.15  Gem, Scaraboid Jasper with Running Horse: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu.O.7 (Fig. 76)
Althaus and Sutcliffe 2006, no. 155; Petrakova 2012, 154.
Attached to a gold ring.

Workshop of Dexamenos

_Date of Gem: 450-400 B.C._ (Erroneously assigned by Petrakova to 350-300 B.C.)

Findspot: Kurgan ‘I’ crypt 50

Assemblage: Sarcophagus covered with a textile and containing a skeleton believed to be a female. The Attic pottery was found near the sarcophagus. Also associated with the grave were a pair of gold earrings in the form of maenads (350-300 B.C.), a gold necklace, two gold rings, a gilded bronze mirror (350 B.C.), a bronze hair pin, a bone spindle, a clay vessel (lamp?), and three iron blades. The locations of these items in the tomb were not described in detail (Petrakova 2012, 154).

_Date of Assemblage: 350-300 B.C._

Discussion: The Attic red-figure pottery predated the rest of the assemblage by over a decade, and the lekanis showed signs of ancient repair, which further indicates its long use-life. The Attic vases were found closest to the sarcophagus, which might imply the deceased’s personal connection to these objects.

The locations of the various objects in the tomb are not well recorded, but it appears that the gems, both of which date to the 5th century were the earliest items by far. As Althaus and Sutcliffe (2006, 131) suggest, the Medusa gem may have functioned as an amulet. Gems are also highly durable, personal objects, worn close to the body. These may have been passed down through several generations or were acquired secondhand.

KERCH PENINSULA

A.16  Gold Armlet: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum KO 18 (Fig. 77)
Williams and Ogden 140, no. 82.
Formed from sheet-gold. Reliefs show Peleus wrestling Thetis, a winged woman moving right and holding a boy. The scene likely shows the capture of a beautiful youth—either Kephalos or Tithonos—by the goddess Eos.

_Date of Armlet: 475-450 B.C._

Findspot: Kul Oba Kurgan

Assemblage: The chamber of the Kul Oba kurgan contained three skeletons. The male who wore the armlet was placed in a large wood sarcophagus divided into two parts: one contained the the man’s skeleton. He wore a felt hat, a torque, and the armlet, as well as armbands in a local style on each wrist. The second chamber contained his weapons (an iron sword with gold hilt and inscribed scabbard cover, greaves, whip handle, a phiale,
and a touchstone). A female skeleton with similarly rich grave goods was found on a couch alongside the sarcophagus. A servant was also interred in the tomb.

**Date of Assemblage: 400-350 B.C.**

**Discussion:** Williams and Ogden write (140), “This armlet was found on the man’s upper arm and was no doubt an heirloom of considerable family or even tribal importance. The pale gold from which it is made suggests an early date and the style of the reliefs point to the second quarter of the fifth century BC. The armlet also shows considerable signs of wear.” The other items contained within belong to the first half of the 4th century. The individual with whom the armlet was buried appears to have been a person of considerable importance. He carried with him a tapering cylindrical stone with a gold cap, identified as a touchstone or whetstone. The removal of a long-lived object from circulation was an act that may been another expression of the man’s status.

---

**GREECE**

**ATTIKA**

**ATHENS**

**A.17 Horse-head Amphora, Type B, Attic Black-figure (Fig. 78)**

*ArchDelt* 27, 1972, B1 (1976), 71-75, pl. 55.1; Paleothodoros (forthcoming [2017]), no. 7.

A and B, horse protome. Missing the base, but the remains of four lead clamps on the bottom indicate that it had been repaired in antiquity.

**Date of Amphora: c. 550 B.C.**

**Findspot:** Grave II. 13 Panepistimiou Street.

**Assemblage:** Child *encytrismos* burial. Inside the amphora were the child’s skeleton and two mid-5th century lekythoi.

**Date of Assemblage: c. 450 B.C.**

**Discussion:** The amphora was approximately a century old when it was used as a coffin for a child; the repairs are additional indicators of the vessel’s age and value. Paleothodoros has identified this vessel as one of several with imagery of horses or horsemanship selected for *encytrismos* burials in the Archaic and Classical periods. He suggests that these vessels might have been prizes in equestrian competitions, and their inclusions in the funeral made a statement about the family’s status and values, particularly at a time when sumptuary laws limited exhibitions of wealth. The fact that the vessel was interred with a child is also noteworthy, since it suggests that the pot may have been an heirloom valued by a family and conferred upon a youngster. For further discussion, see Chapter 4 pp. 220-1.
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A.18 Horse-head Amphora, Type B: Athens, National Archaeological Museum 903
(Fig. 79)
BAPD 300176; ABV 16, 5; Para 9, 5; Add 4; Tiverios 2012, 138-42, figs 2-3; Paleothodoros
(forthcoming [2017]).
A and B: horse protomes.

Date of Amphora: 600-570 B.C. (first decades of the 6th century)

Findspot: Velanideza, tomb marked by the stele of Aristion

Assemblage: The amphora was at least five decades old when it was used as a cinerary urn for the grave of Aristion.

Date of Assemblage: 510 B.C.

Discussion: The famous stele pictures a man in hoplite uniform and bears inscriptions stating that it is “Of Aristion” and “the work of Aristokles” (Athens, National Museum 29). Because the vessel predates the grave by at least a half a century, Tiverios suggests the vessel may have belonged to the father of the deceased. The use of a possible heirloom as a cinerary urn may have contributed to the heroic image of the deceased expressed by the imagery of the stele and the burial rite (cremation). Furthermore, it has been suggested that horse-head amphorae were the antecedents of the canonical Panathenaic prize amphorae prior to 566 B.C. (Kyle 1993, 23). As a memento of a successful race, the amphora might have carried the connotation of victory as well.

A.19 Amphora, Type B. No number available.
A and B: riders on horses.

Date of Amphora: 550-530 B.C.

Find Spot: 10 Diamantopoulou St., Athens

Assemblage: Child enchytrismos burial contained within the amphora. Also inside the pot were four miniature vases, including a kotyliskos, a small lekanes, a squat lekythos, and a small oinochoe.

Date of Assemblage: 5th century BC.

Discussion: The vessel and the tomb’s contents are unpublished, but Paleothodoros suggests that the presence of the aryballic (squat) lekythos places the grave in the 5th century, which would mean that the amphora was several decades old at the time of deposition. This would be yet another example of a curated amphora with horse imagery used as a coffin for a child. Again, he proposes, the vessel may have been a prize in an equestrian competition, and its display during the child’s funeral was a means of expressing the child and the family’s status and values.
A.20  Amphora, Type B, Attic Black-figure: Kerameikos Museum 48 (Fig. 80)
BAPD 301866; *ABV* 339, 2; *Add*² 92; Kunze-Götte, Tancke, and Vierneisel 1999, 36-7, Taf. 20.1-2; Reiterman 2014, 155-6, fig. 6.2.
A: Warrior mounting a horse; B: 3 dancing ephebes.

Hypobibazon Class

*Date of Amphora: 520 B.C.*

*Findspot:* Kerameikos, Tomb 76

*Assemblage:* Child burial in the amphora. Other grave goods include a chytra, two black-figure lekythoi, a one-handle pyxis with lid, and a skyphos of Corinthian type (Kunze-Götte, Tancke, and Vierneisel 1999, 36).

*Date of Assemblage: 490 B.C.*

*Discussion:* See Chapter 2, pp. 89-91.

ATHENS

A.21  Jug, Argive Monochrome: Athens, Agora Museum P 33557 (Fig. 81)
Lynch 2011a, 165, 274, no. 171, fig. 135.

*Date of Jug: 575-525 B.C.*

A.22  Cup, Type B or C, Attic Coral Red: Athens, Agora Museum P32344 (Fig. 82)
Cohen 2006, 62-3; figs. 10.1-3; Lynch 2011a, 93-5; 228-9, no. 87, fig. 84, Ill. 10; Lynch 2011b, 126, fig. 16.
Interior: draped man seated with staff; Exterior: undecorated.

Euphronios as Painter [Pfaff]

Kachrylion as Potter [Lynch]

*Date of Cup: c. 515 B.C.*

A.23  Cup, Type B or C, Attic Coral Red: Athens, Agora Museum P33221 (Fig. 83)
Lynch 2011a, 229-30, fig. 85.

Interior: athlete with halteres, discus in bag; Exterior: undecorated.

*Date of Cup: 510-500 B.C.*

*Assemblage:* Well J 2:4, which was filled with debris following the Persian destruction.

*Date of Assemblage: A little after 479 B.C.*
Discussion: Lynch argues persuasively that the well’s contents were the debris cleared from a house following the Persians’ invasion of Athens. The assemblage provides a window into the types of vessels that an Athenian household might have deemed worthy of special preservation. The jug’s status as a probable import and the cups’ unusual coral red decoration are the ostensible motives for their preservation for several decades and the elaborate repairs on the cups. See Chapter 3, pp. 157-9 for a more extensive discussion of these cups’ curation in antiquity.

ATHENS

A.24 Bell-krater, Attic Red-figure: Athens, Agora Museum P 25284 (Fig. 84)

Rotroff 1983, 275, no. 73, pls. 57, 58; Moore 1997, 217 no. 543
Seventeen non-joining fragments; ancient mends (three lead clamps preserved);
A, symposium; B, two cloaked figures with stele between.

Date of Krater: 325-300 B.C.

Findspot: Cistern, Kolonos Agoraios; South Chamber Upper Fill

Assemblage: Mix of pottery, including amphora handles which provide the date for the assemblage.

Date of Assemblage: late 3rd century-1st half of the 2nd century

Discussion: Rotroff states that the krater “was apparently a prized heirloom, for it had been mended in antiquity” (275). The drawing on the krater is not particularly fine but it was deemed worthy of preservation across time and extensive repair nonetheless. Little more can be said about the role of the krater considering mixed nature of the assemblage.

PIRAEUS

A.25 Dinos, Bronze: London, British Museum GR 1816.0620.115 (Fig. 85)

Williams and Ogden 1994, 58, fig. 41; British Museum website: 
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=461829&partId=1&searchText=bronze+dinos&page=1
Inscription on rim.

Date of Dinos: 450-425 B.C.

Findspot: Tumulus near Piraeus, Attika (the so-called Tomb of Aspasia)

Assemblage: Lord Elgin’s agent, Giovanni Battista Lusieri unearthed the dinos in 1804 in a tumulus with a circumference of 76 m and height of 24 m. Three meters below the surface was the dinos contained within a marble vase. The dinos held some bones, probably representing the cremated remains of the individual interred. On top of the dinos was a gold myrtle spray that dates the tomb to the first half of the 4th century.

Date of Assemblages: 400-350 B.C.
Discussion: The dinos had been kept for a generation or more. The inscription on the rim tells us of its significance. It reads: “I am one of the prizes of Argive Hera.” It appears that the dinos was a memento, whether won by the deceased or a member of the deceased’s family. Also we should note that the dinos was a prize of definite monetary value due to its bronze composition. For discussion of the dinos as a memento, see p. 86.

TRACHONES (=ancient deme Euonymon)

A.26 Amphora, Type B, Attic: Archaeological Museum of Piraeus 343 (Fig. 86)
BAPD 215292; ARV² 1154, 38 bis; Fink 1963; Steinhauer 2001, 105, ill. 92-6; Tiverios 2007, 12-4.
Nearly intact; ancient repairs, with some lead clamps intact, on foot and upper part of body, described summarily in publications.
A, Triptolemos departing, Persephone with a scepter, Hades, and Demeter with a torch (all identified by inscriptions); B, two men carrying transport amphorae, an olive tree, and Athena; the central man (ΔΛΚΙΜΟΣ) pours the contents of his amphora—undoubtedly oil—into a Type B amphora in front of the goddess.

Dinos Painter

Date of Amphora: 420-410 B.C.

Findspot: Discovered on the property of Johannes M. Geroulanos in 1961. Rubbish pit dug in the 3rd century B.C. rubbish pit and in use through the 1st century B.C. (Fink 1963, 133)

Date of Assemblage: 3rd-1st century B.C.

Discussion: See Chapter 2, pp. 93-6.

MARATHON
SOROS

A.27 Neck-amphora, Attic Black-figure: Athens, National Museum 1036 (Fig. 87)
BAPD 305061; Add² 10; ABV 38, 2; 681; CVA Athens 1, III.H.8, pl. 13.1-2; Steinhauer 2009, 132-3.
A: winged Artemis between lions, boars, floral friezes; B, lions between sirens; friezes of animals and florals on neck

Sophilos

Date of Amphora: 570 B.C.

A.28 Tripod Pyxis, Attic Black-figure: Athens, National Museum 1040 (Fig. 88)
BAPB 14318; CVA Athens 1, III.H.7, pl. 10.7-8; Steinhauer 2009, 125-7.
A, Athena mounting chariot and Poseidon, man; B, goddess mounting chariot, Apollo with lyre, seated figure, woman; C, Apollo plying the kithara, goddess with flowers, man.

*Date of Pyxis: 530-520 B.C.*

**A.29  Lekanis, Black-figure: Athens, National Museum 1043 (Fig. 89)**

BAPB 14271; CVA Athens 1, III.H.8, pl. 12.1-2; Steinhauer 2009, 124.

*Date of Lekanis: 550-500 B.C.*

*Findspot:* Offering trench, Marathon tumulus

*Discussion:* Among the burnt ashes and bones uncovered in Staïs’ late 19th century excavation of a part of the Marathon tumulus were a number of black-figure lekythoi dating to the decades around the battle in 490 B.C. Offering trenches sunken into the tumulus contained the Sophilos amphora, which was nearly a century old at the time of burial and the pyxis that predated the grave by three or four decades, as well as other objects.

According to the ancient sources, the *Marathonomachoi* were afforded an exceptional burial at the site of the battle (Thuc. 2.34; Paus. 1.29.4). The Soros of Marathon is generally accepted as the final resting place of these warriors, owing to its location, size, the presence of bone and ash, and the date of the lekythoi found within. Recently, however, some scholars, beginning with Mersch (1995), have refuted the identification of the tumulus as the grave of the Athenians; see also Alexandridou 2009 and Hsu 2008, who believes that the monument has origins in the Bronze Age. Instead, they argue that the tumulus belonged to a local aristocratic family, and they invoke the presence of these 6th century vases as evidence of the early date of the tumulus. Mersch (1995, 59), in particular, is troubled by the presence of a pyxis—typically a grave good for females—as a dedication to deceased male combatants.

Valavanis (2010) has effectively dismantled these arguments, noting firstly that the paucity of pottery might be explained by the fact that the burial was an emergency circumstance. Second, the polyandron at Chaironeia also contained pottery older than the grave; a black-figure lekythos attributed the Painter of Haimon was manufactured a century and a half prior to the battle. Finally, he cites the presence of offerings that might be considered female in character in other warrior graves; the polyandron on Salamis Road 35 in Athens contained pyxides and alabastra, which also might be associated with women, and the Thespiae warrior grave yielded a red-figure pyxis with female iconography (women and erotes).

If Valavanis is correct, and the Soros did serve as the monument for the Athenian dead, then we might ask what purpose the older vases served in the funeral. He proposes that the items, including the *keimēlia*, were dedicated by local inhabitants of the region who participated in the burial. The use of older objects may have been a purely economic measure. Alternatively, these curated household possessions may have been a large gesture of respect fitting for the fallen who had sacrificed so much.
Perhaps, too, these heirlooms were part of the heroizing ideology, already articulated by the method of burial: cremation with a tumulus monument. The monument may have revived 6th century aristocratic funerary rituals in Attika (Whitley 1994) but also hearkened back to the burial of Homeric heroes, such as Patroklos and Hektor (Whitley 1994, 228-9). Moreover, objects with extended biographies played a part in the Homeric funeral. In one famous case, the trajectory of a treasured object was curtailed with its owner’s heroic death. This is, of course, the golden amphora that served as the burial urn of Patroklos first and then Achilles. Made by Hephaistos, it had been a wedding gift for Peleus and Thetis from the god Dionysos, and its life ended with that of Achilles (KT. 19). The inclusion of 6th century objects within the 5th century Marathon tumulus, if it is the tumulus, could be a translation of Homeric practices in an Archaic context and an ideological deployment of keimelia.

BOIOTIA

RHITSONA

A.30 Cup, Attic Red-figure: Thebes, Archaeological Museum 23425 (R.18.255) (Fig. 90)
BAPD 24930; Burrows and Ure 1907/1908, 294, no. 55; CVA Thebes 1, 80, pl. 73.1-3; Sabetai 2012, 93, fig. 12.
Interior: nude woman carrying basin; Exterior: plain.

Agora Chairias Group

Date of Cup: 520 B.C.

Findspot: Rhitsona, Tomb 18

Assemblage: Included in a tomb containing 270 objects: black-figure and black-glaze pottery from Attika, Boiotia and Euboia. Vessel shapes include Boiotian cups, small skyphoi, aryballoi, kotha, lekythoi, and kantharoi. Also present were figurines and worked bones. At least one black-glaze cup was repaired in antiquity, although the excavators do not specify which one (Burrows and Ure 1907/1908, 287-298)

Date of Assemblage: c. 500 B.C.

Discussion: The cup is the earliest object within this very richly appointed tomb group. It predates the other items by some 20-30 years. The probable curation of this cup for several decades is consistent with the special esteem for Attic red-figure pottery in Boiotia. Here, it was imitated and deployed sparingly in high status burials, such as those of fallen warriors and women who died young (Sabetai 2012).

EUBOIA

ERETRIA

A.31-9 Panathenaic Prize Amphorae, Nine Complete and Five Fragments
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Valavanis 1991; Bentz 1998 (fragments).
Several with images of wrestling.

Date of the Amphorae: 363/2-360/59 B.C.

Findspot: House of the Mosaics

Assemblage: The nine complete vases were found in a pit on the processional way adjacent to the House of the Mosaics. The fragments were recovered from the area of the peristyle of the house in front of the banqueting rooms with mosaic decoration. The vessels were probably on display when the structure was destroyed in the first half of the 3rd century B.C. Holes drilled through the mouth and feet of the vessels may indicate that they were mounted for display rather than used for holding liquids in this setting.

Date of Assemblage: 300-250 B.C.

Discussion: Two possible explanations may account for the presence of so many Panathenaeic prize amphorae from these particular years at Eretria (for these hypotheses, see Bentz 1998). If the winner himself came from Eretria, the vessels were mementoes of the victory and later became heirlooms. Hardiman (2001) has argued that the decorative program, including the mosaics and sculpture may support the hypothesis that the household boasted a Panathenaic victor.

On the other hand, a dealer from Athens might have acquired a number of prize vessels from this set of games and sold them to Eretrian elite, when the vessels were new or a few years old. The vessels might have complemented the decorative program of the house.

A.40 Mycenaean? Spearhead (Fig. 91)

Date of Spearhead: Late Helladic III A2? 14th century B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 6, the West Gate Heroon

Assemblage: Tomb 6 was one of the earliest graves in the necropolis just outside the West Gate of Eretria, which was later monumentalized into what has been interpreted as a heroon. A bronze cauldron contained the remains of the dead and small objects, while a second cauldron was used as a cover. Around the cauldrons were a silver ring, fragment of a gold fibula, a Phoenician scarab seal of green serpentine, knives of iron (folded and burnt), four iron swords, an iron lance, and a bronze lance head.

Date of Assemblage: c. 750 B.C.

Discussion: Bérard and Coldstream see the bronze spearhead as a Mycenaean relic, possibly an heirloom that had been passed down for generations and served as a symbol of the deceased’s authority. By this time, iron had supplanted bronze as the choice
material for weapons, so the spearhead would have evoked a distant era (Bérard 1970, 16). Alternatively, it might have been a found object, perhaps recovered from a Mycenaean tomb, and that distant temporal origin might have contributed to the understanding of the spearhead as a charged object fitting for a leader.

More recently, Bettelli has challenged this interpretation of the weapon and suggested that the object was more contemporary with the burial. Bronze spearheads of the Early Iron Age in Europe may provide parallels, specifically for the relief around the base of the spearhead. Dated to the Hallstatt B3 period (10th-9th centuries), the parallels predate the grave by a span of several decades but not centuries. He also notes that the spearhead had been “ritually killed” by having its point broken off; the act conferred the object irrevocably to the deceased and may have suggested that it was his personal possession. It was an exotic object like the Phoenician scarab, also found in the tomb. These imports signaled the owner’s access to other, far-off cultures, but the spearhead’s martial character may have been a symbol of success in overseas military campaigns.

Whether the spearhead was a Mycenaean or central European, it was undoubtedly recognized as very different from contemporary material culture. That foreignness—whether it stemmed from temporal or geographic displacement—marked the spearhead as a rare object and a prestige good in the Geometric period at Eretria appropriate for an individual who was the recipient of elaborate funerary rites.

CORINTH

CORINTH
A.41 Mug, Attic Black-glaze: Corinth, Archaeological Museum 1064 (Fig. 92)
Pease 1937, 281, fig. 17.

Date of Mug: 460-450 B.C.

Findspot: Well

Date of Assemblage: 420 B.C. (based on the most recent pot)

Discussion: The mug, an import, predates the rest of the well’s contents by at least a decade and likely two. It has an unusual form, which might have contributed to its value in the eyes of the owner, and this may have been the grounds for its prolonged survival. The other Attic pottery in the well was also earlier (430 B.C.) than the locally made material, which dates to approximately 420 B.C. (Pease 1937, 258). The mug fits into the pattern seen throughout this study of imports being kept for longer periods than locally made products.

CRETE

AZORIA
A.42 Pithos (Fig. 93)
Haggis et al. 2004, 354, fig. 8, n. 47; Haggis and Mook 2011, 379.
Incised chevron bands and rope decoration
Date of Pithos: 1200 B.C.

Findspot: East Corridor House (B300)

Assemblage: The pithos was found alongside an Archaic pithos on the north wall of the East Room, along with two groundstone tools. Flotation of the associated soil yielded wheat grains and grape pips, which suggests that it was in active use.

Date of Assemblage: 500-475 B.C.

Discussion: See Chapter 2, pp. 105-6.

PAROS
PAROIKIA
A.43 Amphora, Parian Geometric (Fig. 94)
Zapheiropoulou and Agelarakis 2005, 34; Zapheiropoulou 2000, 287-8, fig. 6 a–δ; Paleothodoros 2009, 45-6.
Geometric figural decoration on the belly: battle, including chariots, men on horseback and warriors on foot.

Date of Amphora: 750 B.C.

Findspot: Polyandrion at Paroikia in Paros

Assemblage: Found in one of two burial pits (one rectangular, one trapezoidal) in the civic cemetery. Two hundred cremation burials in large vessels covered by shallow bowls were recovered from the two communal graves, which contained 120 and 40 amphorae, respectively. All of the deceased individuals have been identified as males approximately 30 years old, who likely perished in battle.

Date of Assemblage: 730 B.C.

Discussion: The amphora predated the assemblage by approximately two decades and was one of only two urns with figural decoration in the mass burial. The other figured vase was an amphora contemporary to the rest of the vessels in the tomb. It had images of: A-B, warriors marching to battle and a fallen corpse being defended by an archer; neck, removal of a corpse and prothesis, which suggests that it may have been commissioned for the burial (Paleothodoros 2009, 46-7). The motifs on the amphora catalogued here, however, are of a more generalizing heroic nature. For this reason perhaps, the vessel, which had been in circulation for nearly a generation, was deemed appropriate for the circumstances.

RHODES

KAMIROS
A.44  Gem, Chalcedony Scaraboid: British Museum: BMCG 553 (Fig. 95)
Williams and Ogden 1994, 90-91; British Museum website:
Engraved with the image of a heron with stag antlers.

   Date of Gem: 5th century B.C.

Findspot: Tomb, Kamiros, Rhodes

Assemblage: The tomb was excavated by Auguste Salzmann and Alfred Biliotti in 1862. Within the grave was an Athenian red-figure pelike attributed to the Marsyas Painter and dated to 360-350 B.C. (British Museum E 424: BAPD 230422; Para 495; ARV² 1475, 4; 1695), as well as a marble pyxis which contained the gem. Also inside the pyxis was a pair of gold ear reels (350-330 B.C.), now split between the British Museum and the Louvre.

   Date of Assemblage: c. 350 B.C.

Discussion: The pelike dates to the middle of the 4th century, as do the gold reels, but the gem belongs perhaps five decades or more earlier. Its durability, as well as its possible use as a personal signet, may have promoted its curation for several decades. The seal may have been considered an inalienable possession of the deceased and was therefore interred with him/her.

CHALKI
A.45  Plastic Rhyton, Attic Red-figure: Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 13876 (Fig. 96)
BAPD 216976; Jacopi 1932, 126-30, no. 13876; ARV² 1251, 39; 1538, 5, 1547, 7; Lezzi-Hafter 1988, 349, n. 264, taf. 178c-d, Abb. 2, 2.
Janiform kantharos: one head, Herakles; the other, a satyr; red-figure decoration on A and B, satyrs.

Eretria Painter

   Date of Rhyton: 450-400 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 6, Pontamo Necropolis

Assemblage: Chamber tomb containing an adult inhumation with head to the south against the door which rested on a stratum of ash and bones that Jacopi suggests belong to an earlier grave. On the floor of the chamber were two coarse amphorae. Also within were a black-glaze kantharos with white dolphins painted over the black ground, two small aryballic lekythoi decorated with palmettes, a pyxis in a red clay, a one-handed kothion, two black-glaze kotylai, a little black-glaze bowl, and the rhyton.
Date of Assemblage: 275-225 B.C.

Discussion: The dolphins and the waves on the West Slope ware kantharos (Inv. 13868) align closely with those of the Shark Group (see Rotroff 1991, 81-85), the works of which date to the second to third quarters of the 3rd century B.C. The rhyton, then would be well over a century earlier than the rest of the assemblage. Jacopi (1932, 130) suggests that the vessel was kept as “un oggetto di curiosità” for two or three generations. However, because the tomb shows signs of an earlier interment, we might also consider the possibility that it was plucked out of the original corredo and selected for use in this later burial. If so, the rhyton would be not an heirloom but a found object deployed in the ritual context of the grave. Perhaps because of its unique form, it was not discarded as readily as the grave’s other contents.

ITALY

ALÉRIA, CORSICA

A.46 Oinochoe, Etruscan Black-figure: Aléria 67/458 (Fig. 97)

Jehasse and Jehasse 1973, 468, no. 1892, pl. 21; Paleothodoros 2010, 4-5.

Two satyrs and a woman dancing.

Kyknos Painter

Date of Oinochoe: 490-480 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 91, Aléria

Assemblage: Tomb containing two burials. On the north bench was the skeleton of a child—a female, to judge from the offerings, which included a gold necklace, earrings, bronze mirror, situla, and an Attic black-figure lekythos. On the east bench was another burial, with an Etruscan black-figure oinochoe (490-480 B.C.) showing Dionysiac imagery, an Attic red-figure cup by the Penthesilea Painter (460-450 B.C.), a brazier, an impasto plate, two bronze handles, a phiale, an iron spearhead and three ivory dice. The south bench had additional Attic vases (a rhyton by the Brygos Painter, a cup by the Antiphon painter, and a cup by the Wedding Painter), bronze vessels, iron weapons, a late Attic black-figure skyphos, an askos by Makron, impasto vases and stone amulets.

Date of Assemblage: 460-450 B.C.

Discussion: The oinochoe—a product from the Etruscan heartland—predated the other items in the tomb by some three decades, approximately the span of a generation. As Paleothodoros observes, the vessel was perhaps brought from the Italic mainland with the settlers who came to Corsica. It may have been kept as a transitional object—a reminder of a distant homeland. For this interpretation, see Chapter. 4, pp. 243-7.

CAPUA

A.47 Cup, Attic Red-figure: London, British Museum E65 (Fig. 98)
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BAPD 203912; *ARV* 247, 13; *ARV* 2 370, 13, 398, 1649; *Para* 365, 367; *Add* 111; *Add* 2 224; *CVA* British Museum 9, 58-60, pls. 62a-b, 63a-b, 65a-c.

Interior: warrior (Chrysippus) at left holding a phiale and a woman (Xeuxo) at right who dips a ladle into the phiale. Exterior: A, Satyrs (Terpon, Babakhos, Hydris, Styon?) approach three gods (Hera, Hermes, Herakles); B, Satyrs (Dromis, Echon?, Ephsis?) attack Iris, Dionysos with a kantharos stands before an altar.

Brygos as Painter [Beazley]
Brygos as Potter [signed]

*Date of Cup: 490-480 B.C.*

**A.48 Skyphos, Attic Red-figure: London, British Museum E140 (Fig. 99)**

BAPD 204683; *ARV* 2 459, 3, 481, 1654; *Para* 377; *Add* 119; *Add* 2 243; *CVA* British Museum 4, III.IC.3-III.IC.4, pl. 28.2a-d.

A, Triptolemos on his winged chair between Demeter and Persephone; B, Zeus, Dionysos, and Amphitrite; under the handles, Poseidon and Eumolpos.

Makron as Painter [Beazley]
Hieron as Potter [signed]

*Date of Skyphos: 490-480 B.C.*


*Date of Assemblage: 480-470 B.C.*

*Assemblage: Large cist tomb plundered in antiquity (Williams 1992; Beazley 1945; Helbig 1872). Single inhumation with the above two vases and four other vessels:*

1. Rhyton, Attic red-figure in the form of sphinx: London, British Museum E788 (*ARV* 2 764, 8; *Add* 140; *Add* 2 286; *CVA* British Museum 4, III.IC.8, pl. 40.1a-d, 42.1a-c)

Sotades as Potter and Sotades as Painter; *470-450 B.C.*

A-B, seated youth paired with woman holding a scepter, a male figure with the body of a snake (Kekrops) extends a phiale toward a winged woman holding an oinochoe, running women.

2. Rhyton, Attic red-figure in the form of a ram’s head: London, British Museum E800 (*ARV* 2 766, 12; 1669; *Add* 140; *Add* 2 286; *CVA* British Museum 4, III.Ic, 9, pl. 43.2).

Manner of the Sotades Painter; *470-450 B.C.*

Around the cup: vine of ivy leaves.

3. Stamnos, Attic red-figure: New York, Metropolitan Museum 18.74.1 (*ARV* 2 498, 2, 1656)
Discussion: All of the Capuan tombs published by Helbig in the 1872 *Bullettino dell’Instituto* had been looted in antiquity, but the robbers took only the metal goods, leaving these rich troves of ceramics. Beazley first designated Tomb II at Capua the “Brygos Tomb,” when he presented a reconstruction of its contents (which had been dispersed to museums in both Europe and America) based on Helbig’s description. Williams, after a close reading of notes by Castellani, then added a second sphinx rhyton to the group (British Museum E787).

The Brygos cup and the skyphos were older than the other vessels in the tomb by a decade or two. The ram’s head rhyton dates to around 480 B.C., whereas the sphinx rhyta and the stamnoi are later (c. 460 B.C.) (Beazley 1945, 158). Beazley posits that the older vessels had a special significance: “The cup and the skyphos must have been treasured for many years before they were placed in the grave. Treasured, it may be, by more than one owner—father and son, father and daughter’s husband. Treasured as wonders, not of minor art or industrial art (in the shoddy jargon of today or yesterday), but of art pure and simple: not πάγκρυσα, although there are touches of gold on the Brygos cup; but peak of possessions, κορυφὰ κτείνων” (Beazley 1945, 158).

The ethnic origins of the tomb’s occupants are unknown; recently de la Genière (2002) and Cerchiai (1997) have argued that the assemblage suggests that the deceased was an Etruscan rather than Greek origin. Regardless, the Attic vessels had distant origins—at least geographically if not culturally as well—and these may have encouraged their preservation over time.

CERTOSA

A.49 *Situla, Bronze Embossed: Bologna Museo Civico Archeologico 17169 (Fig. 100)*


Horizontal friezes showing (from top to bottom): warriors marching, a procession probably religious in nature, workers in a field, and animals processing.

*Date of Situla: 600-550 B.C.*

*Findspot:* Bologna, Certosa necropolis Tomb 68
Assemblage: The situla was the ossuary in a women’s grave; the handles were removed prior to deposition. Other grave goods include an Attic black-figure lekythos, a bowl, and two bronze fibulae, which place the burial in the early 5th century.

Date of Assemblage: c. 500 B.C.

Discussion: The situla was long dated to the 5th century in accordance with the other grave goods but has been reassigned to the first half of the 6th century based on iconographic and stylistic parallels from the 6th century bronze workshops of the region of Bologna. Various interpretations of the iconography have been submitted: either a victory celebration (Bartoloni and Morigi Govi) or a funerary procession. The interpretation of the imagery as a depiction of a victory seems more compatible with the long life of the vessel prior to deposition. If so, vessel may have been kept as a memento of a victory.

The vessel was of definite material worth, and its craftsmanship appears similarly exceptional. These were probably also reasons for its protracted preservation.

CERTOSA
A.50 Neck-amphora with Lid, Etruscan Black-figure: Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico 28846 (Fig. 101)
Pellegrini 1912, 232, no. 822; Govi 2003, 44-55, fig. 1a, tav.8a-b; Paleothodoros 2010, 5.
A: palaestra scene; B: three nude ephebes.
Painter of Monaco 892

Date of Neck-amphora: 490-480 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 360, Certosa necropolis

Assemblage: The tomb contained the remains of an adult female, who was buried in a wood coffin. Next to the clavicle were two silver fibulae and five amber beads. Next to the head were the Etruscan amphora and an undecorated amphoretta. Lower down on the body were an Attic red-figure cup by the Calliope Painter (450 B.C. or later), an Attic black-figure oinochoe, and an Attic black-figure skyphos, two small plates, and an undecorated bowl of local production.

Date of Assemblage: 445-440 B.C.

Discussion: The neck-amphora predated the assemblage by approximately three decades (a generation). Govi (2003, 50) claims that the unexceptional artistic quality argues against the vase having special artistic value. Instead, she proposes that it was perhaps kept as an heirloom (“bene di famiglia” [51]) and was deposited in the grave to emphasize the deceased’s origins at an inland Etruscan center to the South. The possibility that it was a memento from a distant homeland is considered further in Chapter 4, pp. 243-7.

CUMAE
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A.51 Column-krater, Lakonian Black-glaze: Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli 128835 (Fig. 102)
Lombardi 2000.
Six lead clamps reattached the foot (now missing) in antiquity (Lombardi 2000, n. 7). Two inscriptions on the two handles: ΒΙΟ-ΤΟ (“Of Biotos”), with one syllable on the top of each handle; and on the side of one handle, ΕΥΦΡΟΝΙΟ ΕΜΙ (“I belong to Euphronios”).

Date of Krater: 480 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb CCXX, excavated by Emilio Stevens on the property of Michele De Costanzo, June 13, 1884

Assemblage: Tomb CCXX was a simple grave cut in the earth. The krater, which contained small vases and a bronze mirror, was found in a pit at the foot of the skeleton.

Date of Assemblage: 420 B.C.

Discussion: The two ownership inscriptions can be dated orthographically to different phases in the krater’s life. The first (ΕΥΦΡΟΝΙΟ ΕΜΙ) dates to close to the time of manufacture (480 B.C.), while the second (ΒΙΟ-ΤΟ) was made some six decades later. Lombardi posits that the vessel was a family heirloom, passed down from grandfather Euphronios to his grandson Biotos with whom the vessel was interred. Although we cannot be certain of a familial connection between the two owners of the krater, the fact that the earlier inscription was left intact rather than scratched out suggests that the prior ownership did not detract from—and perhaps even contributed—to the value of this imported vase in the eyes of the owner(s). Through the inscriptions and repairs, this otherwise plain vessel became a distinctive piece, which displayed its biography prominently. See discussion of this piece as a possible heirloom, p. 93.

FALERII
A.52 Handle, Bronze: Florence, Museo Archeologico 73772/a
Cristofani 1971, 317, no. 26, fig. 6, tav. LXVIII; Kistler 2014, 189-90.
Fragment of the handle of a bronze vessel with Neo-Babylonian inscription preserved.

Date of Vessel: mid-7th century B.C.

Findspot: A very ancient tomb a cassone or a fossa in the Montarano necropolis at Italic / Etruscan settlement of Falerii

Assemblage: Little is known about the tomb other than a general description of the assemblage, which included a number of vessels. A bucchero cup gives the terminus post quem of 500 B.C. The Neo-Babylonian inscription is dated by the letter forms to the mid-7th century.
**Date of Assemblage:** 500 B.C.

**Discussion:** A century-and-a-half separates the vessel’s inscription and deposition; hence, we might infer a substantial gap between the removal of the vessel from the Near East and its burial in an Italic tomb. Cristofani has proposed that the inscription names not the Italic owner of the vessel but the giver of the gift, an individual with a royal title Nabu-iddin, son of Baniya. The object thus had a complex biography, as it had been displaced in both time and space, and the inscription—which was likely illegible to the tomb’s occupant—strongly suggests that it was an entangled object that had been brought as an antique to its new ultimate context. On the other hand, Kistler (2014) has suggested that the vessel might be understood as evidence of the interregional movement of elites in the 6th and 5th centuries. See also the discussion on p. 103.

**GENOA**

**A.53 Cup, Attic Red-figure (Fig. 103)**


Fragmentary. Interior, warrior standing in front of a base (of a herm?); A and B, athletes.

Graffito on underside of foot: star with five points.

Circle of the Penthesilea Painter

**Date of Cup:** 425-400 B.C.

**Findspot:** Genoa, San Silvestro, pre-Roman levels of the Church of Santa Maria in Passione; stratum Q1 VII.

**Assemblage:** Stratum containing diverse materials including black-glaze skyphoi and cups, Massaliote and Etruscan amphoras, and various local bowls and vessels. Some of the fine wares have Etruscan graffiti.

**Date of Assemblage:** 350-330 B.C.

**Discussion:** The cup predated the other items in the deposit by some 70-80 years, which reflects its long use-life. The 6th and 5th century levels at the settlement had a variety of imports, many with Etruscan inscriptions. The character of the finds points to the activity of merchants at the site during the 5th century, and the cup may be a relic from that period. As one of few imported fine wares in this stratum, the cup’s preservation is ostensibly due to its rarity as a non-local product. Without architectural remains or more substantial evidence of the activities that occurred in this area, it is difficult to say more about the role the cup played. The graffito on the foot could be a trader’s mark, but it could also be the signet of the owner, which would suggest that the cup was of personal significance to the owner.

**IRSINA (APULIA)**
A.54 Basin, Copper Alloy, Etruscan (Fig. 104)
Bracco 1947; Kistler 2014, 184.
Shallow bronze basin that had been repaired in antiquity in nine different places
with copper patches.

*Date of Basin: c. 500 B.C.*

*Find Spot: Grave at Irsina (Apulia).*

*Assemblage:* The grave was discovered and excavated along with another grave during
the course of the construction of a road. The skeletons were placed in the earth without
any obvious signs of coffins. The tomb groups were somewhat ill-defined, but the basin
was assigned definitively to the first grave which also contained the lower part of a
krater. The other objects contained in the tombs belonged clearly to the middle of the 4th
century.

*Date of Assemblage: c. 350 B.C.*

*Discussion:* The bronze basin predates the rest of the tomb’s contents by approximately a
century and a half. It was materially the most valuable object among the grave goods, and
the many repairs are reflective of its long life. How it arrived in Apulia from Etruria is
uncertain. Its non-local manufacture and material value undoubtedly were causes of its
curation, but social factors also may have come into play. The vessel might have been
purchased formally when new, an entangled object that was a gift of guest friendship or
diplomacy, or an antique acquired when it was already of an advanced age. Kistler (2014)
has suggested that the vessel may be evidence of the intercultural movement of elites in
the 6th and 5th centuries.

METAPONTO
A.55 Loom Weight, Clay: Metaponto Survey Lo 309-L6 (Fig. 105)
Foxhall 2011, 546, 51 no. 27 Foxhall 2012, 205, fig. 11.5; Quercia and Foxhall 2014, 71-2, fig.
5.2.
Disc-shaped loom weight with stamped impression of a deity between two horses.
Rays emanate from the deity’s head.

*Date of Loom Weight: 4th century B.C.; Date of Stamp: 6th century B.C.*

*Findspot: Metaponto Survey*

*Assemblage:* Surface find. The stamped loom weight was found alongside five other
slightly heavier, plain loom weights of the same dimension. Foxhall (2012, 204) posits
that these plain weights might have been made as a set to match the slightly earlier
stamped example.

*Date of Assemblage: 4th century B.C.*
Discussion: The shape of the loom weight places it in the 4th century B.C., but the form of the stamp is closest to gems of the 6th century, and the iconography finds its nearest parallel in lead figurines from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia in Sparta also of the 6th century (Foxhall 2012, 204). For these reasons, Foxhall proposes that the weight was impressed with an heirloom stamp.

The personalization of loom weights with the impressions from signet rings, gems, and other jewelry was a practice that began in the late 6th century throughout the Greek world. In the Metaponto countryside, these stamps converted otherwise utilitarian items into ones with personal significance, thus tying the weights permanently to their owners. Furthermore, they suggest that owners took part in 80-4.

A.56  Loom Weight, Pyramidal Clay S/N (Fig. 106)
Foxhall 2012, 202, fig. 11.4.
Incised (pre-firing) with two letters (IN). The cursive form of the iota is attested circa 500 B.C.

Date of Loom Weight: c. 500 B.C.

Findspot: Metaponto, excavation of the Fattoria Fabrizio farmhouse

Date of Assemblage: late 4th century

Discussion: Orthographically, the weight should be placed over half a decade prior to its depositional context. According to Foxhall, the cursive iota occurs more frequently in Rhegion and other areas south of Metaponto. She goes so far to suggest that the loom weight might have been brought by a woman from another community who married someone from the region of Metaponto (Foxhall 2012, 202). For discussion, see pp. 79-84.

A.57  Three Loom Weights, Discoid, Clay: Metaponto Survey 531-L1, 531-L2, 532-L1 (Fig. 107)
A.58  532-L1 (Fig. 107)
A.59  Foxhall 2011, 553, no. 39, 40, 41; Foxhall 2012, fig. 11.3a-b.
Stamped with the impression of a rosette.

Date of Loom Weights: late 3rd / early 4th century; Date of Stamp: late 7th / early 6th century B.C.

Findspot: Metaponto Survey

Assemblage: Surface find.

Date of Assemblage: Mixed

Discussion: Loom weights stamped with identical rosette impressions were recovered from two nearby sites. The form of the weights suggests that they are earlier than the stamp; Foxhall (2012, 203) proposes that the discrepancy indicates that the stamp was
preserved among women in a family and used on different sets of loom weights for generations (Foxhall 2012, 203), although the fact that they were surface finds prevents us from positing the preservation of the weights themselves over time.

NOLA

A.60 Stemless Cup, Attic Red-figure: London, British Museum E 129 (Fig. 108)
   ARV² 1414, 89; Para 490, Add² 375; Corbett 1960, 59, 1; pls. V-VII.
   Interior: Dionysos with lyre, Ariadne, and Eros. A and B: seated Dionysos, satyrs and maenads.
   Meleager Painter [Beazley]

   Date of Cup: c. 390 B.C.

A.61 Hydria, Attic Red-figure: London, British Museum F 90 (Fig. 109)
   ARV² 1417, 1; CVA London 6, III.I.C.10-III.I.C.11, pls. 101.2a-c, 102.1a-b; Corbett 1960, 59, 1; pls. IV.2, V-VII.
   Intact, with intricate imagery covering the body of the vessel: Aphrodite and a goddess in chariot pulled by eros and satyrs.
   Painter of London F 90 [Beazley]

   Date of the Hydria: c. 390 B.C.

Findspot: Nola, the “Blacas Tomb”; excavated by the Duc de Blacas d’Aulps no later than 1839—the date of the Duc’s death.

Assemblage: Nothing is known about the burial structure or the deceased, but three other vases have been associated with the tomb. These include an Attic red-figure hydria, a Paestan red-figure hydria, and two Paestan red-figure skyphoi.

Date of assemblage: 375-350 B.C.

Discussion: The Paestan vases belong to the second quarter of the 4th century, perhaps as much as three decades later than the cup (Corbett 1960, 60). The curated vessels may have been valued especially as imports in their Italic context.

ORVIETO

A.62 Flint Flake
   Bizzarri 1963, 86, no. 299.
   Flake of white flint, 1.2 cm. long (not illustrated).

Date of Flint: Neolithic

Findspot: Tomb 15, Crocefisso del Tufo Necropolis
Assemblage: Included in the tomb were an Attic black-figure amphora picturing the gigantomachy on A and three kitharodes on B, an Attic black-figure amphora showing Herakles and the Nemean lion on A and a thiasos on B, three Attic Little Master cups, a number of bucchero vessels, three clay basins, bronzes (terminal acorn, ring, eight keys, two oval plates, fragments of a belt, rectangular buckle, nine keys, and five studs), several ornately carved bone plaques and some undecorated bone cylinders, iron (dagger head and spear head), a boar’s tooth, and a brown, elongated, carinated pebble formed in a river.

Date of Assemblage: 550-500 B.C.

Discussion: Donati (1984, 8-9) mentions this tomb as an example of an Etruscan Archaic tomb which included a Neolithic lithic. The tomb’s contents are only described in a catalogue, and the lithic in question is not pictured; however, it seems noteworthy that the assemblage also included a boar’s tusk. If the lithic was a found object, it might have been used as a charm along with a boar’s tusk, as so many found objects seem to be.

ORVIETO
A.63 Flint Point
Bizzari 1963, 111, no. 585
Point of reddish color flint, 2.3 cm long (not illustrated).

Date of Flint Point: Neolithic

Find Spot: Tomb 26, Crocefisso del Tufo Necropolis

Assemblage: The tomb contained an Attic red-figure cup with an erotic scene on the interior, an Attic Little Master cup, an amphora used as an ossuary, a gold earring, a number of pieces of bucchero, undecorated ossuaries, bronzes (a panther, fragment of a grater, a buckle, and a fibula), a bone disc, iron (spear point, andiron, knife, and poker), and a tooth of a shark (3.7 cm in length).

Date of Assemblage: 6th century B.C.

Discussion: Donati (1984, 8-9) mentions this tomb as an example of an Etruscan Archaic tomb which included a Neolithic lithic. Although detailed information regarding the spatial distribution of the finds is lacking, it is tempting to wonder whether the point was considered a part of a pair with the shark tooth—another unusual object of similar morphology. An interesting parallel is seen in a grave assemblage at 8th century Pithekoussai where an Eneolithic point and a shark’s tooth were placed on the chest of a deceased child, a position that strongly suggests they were used as amulets (see A.65). The Orvieto found object and peculiar naturalia might have functioned together as charms as well.

ORVIETO
A.64 Stamnos, Attic Red-figure: Mannheim, Reiss-Museum Cg 60 (Fig. 110)
A Nike with Zeus; B, three mantled youths. Repaired in antiquity with mending holes, channels and clamps.

Troilos Painter

Date of Stamnos: **480 B.C.**

Findspot: Orvieto, tomb.

Assemblage: The grave from which the stamnos came was said to have been plundered in antiquity. Within the grave were the stamnos, a red-figure cup (Cg 62) near the Ancona Painter (c. 460 B.C.), and an oinochoe (Cg 61) attributed to the Mannheim Painter (c. 460-450 B.C.).

Date of Assemblage: c. **460-450 B.C.**

Discussion: The editors of the *CVA Mannheim* I (36) express some skepticism over the assignment of the three vessels this grave, although they do not give a reason. The grave was excavated in the late 19th century and, therefore, specific contextual data is lacking. Nevertheless, the repairs on the stamnos may lend support to the high date of the stamnos in relation to the rest of the *corredo*, since they are signs of a prior use-life, possibly as long as thirty years. The curation of this vessel across time is consistent with the high regard for Attic pots in Etruria.

PITHEKOUSSAI

The cemeteries at Pithekoussai, the Greek colonial settlement founded on the island of Ischia in the first half of the 8th century B.C., were investigated in a series of campaigns between 1952 and 1961, and again in 1965. The 1300 graves explored represent a small sample—perhaps 10%—of the settlement’s necropoleis, and, of these, only 723 have been studied in depth. The site poses unique challenges. First, thermal volcanic soils degrade pottery “to the consistency of soft cheese” (*Ridgway* 1992, 45), complicating the dating of ceramic finds. Second, the burials are clustered in tumuli with later internments superposing—and sometimes cutting into—the earlier ones. This layering effect resulted in a highly complex stratigraphy (*Ridgway* 1992, 53). The excavators treated each tomb as its own stratigraphic unit, but this approach neglected the horizontal relationships between tombs. Recently, Nizzo (2007) has offered a detailed reassessment of the excavation data in order to better understand the site-wide chronology. Through the close dating of nearly 3,000 finds, he has developed a chronological range for each object type and, thus, has been able to create a relative sequence for the burials.

Burial rites included both inhumation and cremation. The former was more common for infants and youths, whereas the latter was primarily for adults (*Ridgway* 1992, 48). The excavators determined the sex of the individuals interred mainly through grave goods. Fibulae were considered especially diagnostic, with simple arc fibulae.
found most often in female graves and serpentine bow fibulae in male graves (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 19; Ridgway 1992, 67).

PITHEKOUSSAI

A.65 Eneolithic Flint Point: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167920 (Fig. 111)


Date of Point: **4000-2300 B.C.**

Findspot: Tomb 488

Assemblage: Pit grave containing the inhumation of a youth, probably a girl based on the contents of the *corredo*. The point was found on the child’s chest beside a shark tooth (Inv. 167921)—very similar in size and shape to the arrowhead. The deceased was also adorned with the following: two bronze leech fibulae, two bronze bracelets, and two ring-shaped bronze pendants (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 491-2; tavv. CLXV, 6, 145).

Date of Assemblage: Late Geometric II; Nizzo level 21 (**725-700 B.C.**)

Discussion: The point predated the assemblage by several thousand years. An almost identical point (Livadie 1990, tav. 36, Inv. 227201) was found in the *corredo* of Tomb 2, an Eneolithic grave in the area of Trinità a Piano di Sorrento (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 491). It is quite likely that the projectile came from a prehistoric tomb of the Gaudo culture. Buchner and Ridgway note that an Eneolithic tomb was uncovered on Ischia during construction in the 1950’s, only a short distance from the ancient metallurgical quarter of Mazzola-Pietro.

The point almost certainly was an *objet trouvé*, although one cannot dismiss the possibility that it had been in circulation for some time before deposition. Its position on the child’s chest, where scarabs—objects used as amulets throughout the Mediterranean—were usually placed, suggests an apotropaic function for this unusual found object. For further discussion, see pp. 105-9 and 188-90.

PITHEKOUSSAI

A.66 Razor, Bronze Lunate: Ischia Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167624 (Fig. 112)

Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 419, no. 381-1; tav. 132; Nizzo 2007, 114 A150; Nizzo 2010, 92, esp. n. 89.

Date of Razor: first half of the 8th century (**800-750 B.C.**)

Findspot: Tomb 381

Assemblage: Inhumation of a sub-adult of indeterminate sex. The razor was placed on the deceased’s right clavicle (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 418, tav. 132; Nizzo 2010, 92).

Date of Assemblage: Late Geometric II; Nizzo level 22 (**700 B.C.**)
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Discussion: The razor was kept for some 50-70 years prior to deposition with the deceased. Morphologically, it belongs to the Caracupa type of southern Latium. Production of these razors began in the second half of the 9th century and did not extend beyond the first half of the 8th century (Bianco Peroni 1979, 99-100). Hence, this object would have been highly unusual in its Pithekoussan context.

Tomb 381 was in group A05, an anomalous cluster of tombs in that some of the deceased were buried in a contracted position, and the corredi were either poor or absent. Nizzo floats the idea that this particular set of tombs may have belonged to an indigenous group. He proposes that, in the multicultural Pithekoussan context, the razor might have assumed a symbolic value as a marker of ethnic distinction. In support of this thesis, he notes that the razor would serve no practical value for a youth (Nizzo 2010, 92-93).

Alternatively, the razor may have been an item exchanged between Greek and indigenous populations. As such, it may have been considered an exotic item like the many other non-local artifacts recovered from the site.

PITHEKOUSAI

A.67 Two Silver Bracelets: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167130,
A.68 167131 (Fig. 113)
Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 305, no. 245-4.5, Tav. CXLIII, 96; Nizzo 2007, 112 A80B1a3
Both restored; one with terminal globe that preserves filigree.

Date of Bracelets: Late Geometric I/II (750-680 B.C.)

A.69 Scarab, White Steatite, Silver Pendant: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167133 (Fig. 114)
Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 305, no. 245-7, Tav. CXLIII; Nizzo 2007, 104 A40B1; Nizzo 2010, 94.
Probably of Asiatic production after an Egyptian model; Hölbl 1979 II, 179, 752, tav. 9/2.

Date of Scarab: Late Geometric I; Nizzo level 15 (725 B.C.)

Findspot: Tomb 245

Date of Assemblage: Late Early Corinthian; 625-600 B.C.

Assemblage: Pit inhumation of an infant, presumably female; the skeleton had decomposed entirely. Included within were an oinochoe of local manufacture to the right of the head, a Corinthian ring aryballos to the left of the head, and an Ionic unguentarium in the form of an owl next to the feet. A silver necklace and the scarab set in a silver mount were probably worn around the neck, and the silver bracelets were placed on each arm (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 304-7; tav. CXLIII, 96).

Discussion: The excavators note that the bracelets and the scarab set in the pendant were likely “heirlooms” from a much earlier period (Late Geometric I-II) (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 305), and Nizzo’s microanalysis has confirmed that the objects were preserved for some 50-100 years prior to deposition. The removal of these long-lived
objects from circulation was perhaps a means of expressing the child’s privileged social status (Nizzo 2007, 204 n. 59). In addition, the scarab probably served as an amulet.

PITHEKOUSSAI
A.70 Two Bronze Fibulae a navicella: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae
A.71 167827 and 167828 (Fig. 115)
Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 473, no. 470-11, -12; tav. 139; Nizzo 2007, 92 A10D1; Nizzo 2010, 93 and n. 92.

Date of Fibulae: Late Geometric II; 700-680 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 470

Assemblage: Pit grave of a female infant. This was a rich tomb which contained a local oinochoe, a Middle Protocorinthian skyphos, Middle Protocorinthian kotyle, 6 ovoid Middle Protocorinthian aryballoi, and a KW aryballos. The fibulae were placed one on each shoulder (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 471-3, Tav. XXXVIa, LVIIb, 139; 3. Nizzo 2010, 93)  

Date of Assemblage: Advanced Middle Protocorinthian (c. 650 B.C.)

Discussion: The bracelets predated the other elements in the corredo of this well-appointed tomb by some 30-70 years. The richness of the tomb, which included multiple exotica, makes a case against economic explanations for the inclusion of the fibulae in the infant burial. The fibulae were used in dressing the deceased for burial, but the infant might also have been the projected heir of the ornaments.

PITHEKOUSSAI
A.72 Fibula a navicella: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167199 (Fig. 116)
Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 323, no. 270-1; tav. CXLVIII; Nizzo 2007, 92 A10E2 BR

Date of Fibula: Late Geometric II; 700-675 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 270

Assemblage: Pit grave of an adult, probably male. The fibula was the only item in the grave, which was placed slightly on top of Tomb 272, a burial dating to the Middle Protocorinthian (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 323, tav. CXLVIII; Nizzo 2010, 93-4).

Date of Assemblage: Middle Protocorinthian; Nizzo level 31 (670-650 B.C.)

Discussion: Nizzo states that it is unlikely that the fibula belonged to the deceased, since it is a type usually associated with female burials. Instead, it may have been a dedication from a woman used to fasten the burial shroud. This type of fibula was in production for a fairly long period—from the Late Geometric II through the Middle Protocorinthian I
(Nizzo’s levels 23-29; 670-650 B.C.), so the temporal discrepancy between the fibula and the context might not be as pronounced as with some of the other Pithekoussan keimêlia.

PITHEKOSSAI

A.73 Two Fibulae a navicella: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae

A.74 167190 and 167191.


*Date of Fibula:* Late Geometric II; **700-680 B.C.**

*Findspot:* Tomb 266

*Assemblage:* Grave of a woman around 18 years old. Also included were a local oinochoe to the left of the head, a piriform aryballos of the Late Protocorinthian. The fibulae were found one on each shoulder. Tomb 266 cut into the earth above Tomb 140, which dates to the Middle Protocorinthian (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 320, tav. CXLVII; Nizzo 2010, 93-4).

*Date of Assemblage:* Late Protocorinthian; Nizzo levels 34-35 (650-625 B.C.)

*Discussion:* The fibulae were some 30-40 years old at the time of deposition. They were perhaps gifts to the deceased and may have been family heirlooms.

A.75 Scarab, Faience, set in a silver pendant: Museo archeologico di Pithecusae

167334 (Fig. 117)

Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 348, 779, no. 286-21; tav. CLII. Nizzo 2007, A40C1a2; Nizzo 2010, 94.

Perachora-Lindos Type (Höbl 1979 II, 179, n. 753 tav. 99/1); produced in the Aegean region after an Egyptian model.

*Date of Scarab:* Late Geometric II: Nizzo levels 24-25 (700-675 B.C.)

*Findspot:* Tomb 286

*Assemblage:* This pit grave contained the inhumation of a young (male) child, approximately two years old. Also included in the burial were: a local coarse oinochoe, three Corinthian kotylai, one Corinthian kotylidion, a Corinthian conical lekythos, a Corinthian alabastron, an Ionian alabastron, a Corinthian ring aryballos, seven Corinthian aryballoi, an unguentarium in the form of a phallus, a silver alabastron, and a silver ring (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 345-8; Nizzo 2010, 94)

*Date of Assemblage:* Late Early Corinthian; c. 600 B.C.

*Discussion:* The scarab was almost certainly in circulation for many decades prior to deposition with the child. This class of object habitually was used as amulets for young
people throughout the Mediterranean (Nizzo 2010, n. 96). One might wonder whether this same amulet had protected other members of the same family for several generations.

A.76  **Spiral, silver with gold plating, used as an earring: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 158209**

Buchner and Ridgway 552, no. 555-8 (not illustrated); Nizzo 2007 110, A70A1a1; Nizzo 2010, 94-5.

*Date of Earring:* End of the Late Geometric II (700-680 B.C.)

*Findspot:* Tomb 555

*Assemblage:* Pit grave containing the inhumation of an infant, presumably female. Also within the grave were a local imitation of a Corinthian olpe, four Corinthian kotylai, a Corinthian aryballos, and an alabastron of silver (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 551-2, tav. LXVIa, CLXXV, 9, 165; Nizzo 2010, 94-5).

*Date of Assemblage:* Beginning of the Early Corinthian; Nizzo level 36 (625-600 B.C.)

*Discussion:* Nizzo proposes that the earring was a family treasure. The ornament had been preserved for some 60-80 years prior to deposition within the tomb (Nizzo 2010, 95). The earring might have been ornament for the deceased neonate, or perhaps she would have inherited the item. However, the fact that it was just one rather than a pair may suggest that this was a token from an adult relative left with the child as a gift or as an expression of affection.

A.77  **Skyphos, Corinthian Thapsos type with panel: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167390 (Fig. 118).**


*Date of Skyphos:* Late Geometric II; Nizzo level 14-16 (725-710 B.C.)

*Findspot:* Tomb 309A

*Assemblage:* At the time of discovery, Tomb 309 was thought to be a single grave, but later, two burials were recognized in the complex and designated A and B. Tomb 309A was a pit inhumation of a person of uncertain sex. A group of vases was found at the south end of the tomb: a local oinochoe, a local imitation of a Protocorinthian kantharos (placed within the Thapsos skyphos), and a small amphora of local production (Ridgway and Buchner 1993, 363-7, tavv. XLVd, f, CLIV, 116; Nizzo 2010, 95).

*Date of Assemblage:* Late Geometric II; Nizzo level 25-26 (700-680 B.C.)

*Discussion:* The imported skyphos predated the tomb by 20-25 years (Nizzo 2010, 95). It is not the only example of a Thapsos type skyphos that was preserved for some time. Another specimen recovered from a burial at Monte Cerreto in the Faliscan area was also kept for approximately a quarter of a century (Nizzo 2010, 99).
A.78 Kotyle, local manufacture, black glaze: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 168678 (Fig. 119)
Handles lost in antiquity.

Date of Kotyle: Late Geometric I / first half of the Late Geometric II; Nizzo levels 14-20 (730-710 B.C.)

Findspot: Tomb 684

Assemblage: Tomb 684 contained the *ENCHYTRISMOΣ* burial of an infant who survived for some time after birth. Within the coarse imported amphora without handles and mouth were a local kotyle, two little local jugs, a scarab seal of the Lyre-player group, and a steatite scarab (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 662-3; tavv. CLXXXVI, CXCII, 189, 206)

Date of Assemblage: Late Geometric II; Nizzo levels 17-20 (725-700 B.C.)

Discussion: The chronological gap between the kotyle and its context is rather slim; however, the kotyle had definite signs of use. Its handles had been lost in antiquity. Items in graves with signs of use probably were dedicated by a relative to whom they belonged (Nizzo 2010, 95-6). In this case, the deposition of a broken object, perhaps already slated for disposal, looks like an economic act; however, we should also consider the possibility that the vessel was broken intentionally (i.e. ritually killed).

PITHEKOUSAII

A.79 Oinochoe: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167934 (Fig. 120)

Date of Oinochoe: Late Geometric I; 740-720 B.C. (Nizzo levels 11-17)

A.80 Ivory pendant in the form of a double axe: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167938 (Fig. 121)

Date of Pendant: Late Geometric I; 750-725 B.C. (Nizzo levels 11-14)

Findspot: Tomb 495

Assemblage: Pit grave of a female infant or young child. Also included were a Protocorinthian A kotyle, two bronze fibulae, and a faience scarab. The ivory pendant and scarab were found on the chest of the child (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 495-6, tavv. CLXVIII, 146).

Date of Assemblage: Late Geometric II; 710-700 B.C. (Nizzo level 20)
Discussion: The pendant is a singular object, although it has parallels in bronze and bone which date to the first phases of the necropolis, and, for this reason, Nizzo believes it should date to an earlier period (Nizzo 2010, 97). The object was offered perhaps as an ornament to adorn the deceased child, but the weapon-like form may also imply its protective, talismanic function.

Silbión

A.81  Volute-krater, Attic Red-figure: Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale

76127 (Fig. 122)


Neck: Pursuit of Oreithyia by Boreas and animal frieze of lions, bull, boar, deer, tree; youth in petasos with spears pursues a woman. A: men (one wearing a petasos), a youth who attacks a woman on an altar, women (one fleeing, and a white-haired elderly woman in mourning (sacrifice of Iphigenia Diomedes and Odysseus, Agamemnon and Clytemnestra); B, man in petasos and chlamys pursuing a woman who flees, draped man with scepter.

Boreas Painter

Date of Krater: 460-450 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 3, Silbión

Assemblage: Tomb 3 was a chamber tomb that had been disturbed in antiquity but contained a complete drinking set, including a number of imported Attic vases (cups), a Proto-Lucanian amphora of Panathenaic type, and black-glaze vases of Greek colonial production. Other objects in the tomb included bone and glass ornaments, bronze nails and other fittings for the wooden coffin, a finger ring of bronze, parts of a bronze object (belt?), and a bronze sheet with a decorative element in the form of a hippocamp. The presence of weapons (a lance and a sword) and the bronze sheet, possibly belonging to a helmet, may suggest that the deceased was a male, but this cannot be confirmed because no bones remained.

Date of Assemblage: 440-430 B.C.

Discussion: The krater had been used for some time as is evident from the chronological gap and the ancient restorations on the foot; Mannack (2012, 114) suggests a two decade gap between the krater and the rest of the contents of the tomb, while Ciancio (1997, 79) sees three decades. The krater was the largest item in the tomb and pictures a highly unusual scene thought by many to be the sacrifice of Iphigenia at Aulis, although it might also show the Theseus attacking Aithra. The vessel may have been acquired for serving wine, but the imagery made it equally appropriate for the funeral. According to most versions of the Iphigenia myth, the sacrifice was interrupted and a substitute—either a cow, a bear, or an old woman—was slain instead of the maiden. In another version...
recorded by Proklos, Iphigenia became a priestess of Artemis and was given immortality (for the versions of the myth and its interpretation, see Ciancio 1997, 88).

Ciancio (1997, 102-113) notes that themes of immortality—and specifically heroes overcoming death—were popular in the imagery on vases found in elite tombs of Apulia during the 5th century. Although the scenes on this particular pot focus on death, Ciancio suggests that the vessel might have been appropriate for life as well. Like the heroes who were predestined to undergo trials that would lead to their apotheosis, the deceased may have prepared all of his or her life to confront death with the hope of salvation. The vase may have been curated for decades because it expressed a deep-seated religious belief regarding life and the afterlife.

SPINA

A.82  Panathenaic Prize Amphora: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 9356 (Fig. 123)
BAPD 202140; ARV² 214; Para 177, 2 bis; Add³ 197; Uggeri Patitucci 1973; Berti and Guzzo 1993, 154, figs. 23-4; Bentz 1998, 96, 144, no. 5.072.
A, Athena to left between columns; B, chariot race.

Berlin Painter [Beazley]

Date of Amphora: 480-470 B.C.

Findspot: Grave 11 C, Valle-Pega-Necropolis; excavated 1957

Assemblage: Within the tomb were: an Attic red-figure dinos on a stand attributed to the Kleophon Painter (430 B.C.); an Attic red-figure dinos on a stand attributed to Polygnotos (430 B.C.); an Attic volute-krater attributed to the Niobid Painter (450 B.C.); two Attic red-figure cups attributed to the Eretria Painter; two Attic red-figure cups attributed to the Koropi Painter; two Attic red-figure oinochoai attributed to Polion; two Attic red-figure askoi in the form of a duck; four Attic red-figure plates; five Attic black-glaze bowls; a utensil stand of bronze with a statue of a maenad; part of a candelabra; a bronze oinochoe; a bronze grater; a marble cippus; and bone dice (Nilsson 1999, n. 50).

Date of Assemblage: 450-425 B.C.

Discussion: The amphora was a generation older than the other items in the grave. The grave could have belonged to a Greek resident of this port city. Since Greeks were the only group eligible to participate in the Panathenaic games, it is possible that the deceased or his kin won the vessel. However, the fact that the funerary assemblage compares closely with those of other Spina graves may suggest that the interred was an Etruscan, which would mean that the vessel was acquired secondhand, but we cannot say whether the exchange happened immediately after the games or closer to the time of burial. In all likelihood, the vessel was an antique, according to the definition developed in this study (p. 103). It was valued perhaps more as a symbol of victory than as a prize won by a specific person.

SPINA
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A.83  **Bronze Tripod with Human and Animal Groups: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 2899**
Hostetter 1986, 15-8, no. 1, pls. 1f-g, 2a-c, 3a-d.
Attributed to a Vulci workshop.

*Date: 500-490 B.C.*

A.84  **Bronze Krater Handles and Ring Foot: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 2314, 2315, 2320**
Hostetter 1986, 18-9, no. 2, pls. 4a-d, 5a-c.
Probably Etruscan manufacture. The handles show two groom (Dioscuri?).
Vessel mostly lost.

*Date: 500-490 B.C.*

A.85  **Bronze Krotalistria Utensil Stand: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 2898**
Hostetter 1986, 32-33, no. 8, pls. 11b-d, 12a-c, 91 and color pl. 2.
Vulci workshop.

A.86  **Oinochoe, Attic Red-figure in the Form of a Head: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 1896 (Fig. 124)**
*ARV*² 1536, 8-9; *Add*² 386; Parrini 1993, 289, no. 273; Aurigemma 1960, 55, tav. 36.
Class J: The Marseilles Class

*Date of Vase: 480-470 B.C.*

A.87  **Oinochoe, Attic Red-figure in the Form of a Head: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 1897**
*ARV*² 1536, 8-9; Parrini 1993, 289, no. 274; Aurigemma 1960, 55, tav. 36.
Class J: The Marseilles Class

*Date of Vase: 480-470 B.C.*

*Findspot: Tomb 128, Valle Trebbia*

*Assemblage:* Inhumation (supine) in a fossa with finds crowded around, including a tripod stand, candelabra and utensil stand, handles and foot of a large krater, an Attic red-figure calyx-krater assigned to the Manner of the Peleus Painter, an Attic red-figure volute krater assigned to the Group of Polygnotos, an Attic red-figure stamnos with plastic phalluses, two Attic red-figure cups by the Eretria Painter, an Attic red-figure askos, various Attic plates and bowls, a pair of silver fibulae, a bronze situla, a bronze basin, a bronze strainer, and various other bronze implements (See Parrini 1993 and Aurigemma 1960, 42-62, tavv. 19-48).

*Date of Assemblage: 420-400 B.C.*
Discussion: Tomb 128 was one of the richest tombs of the necropolis (Parrini 1993). The finds range in date from the late 6th/early 5th century through the end of the 5th century, and these bronze objects, as well as the two Attic head vases, count among the oldest items in the tomb. The vessels are special in that they double as sculptures.

SPINA
A.88 Bronze Candelabrum in the form of a Pankratiast: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 24159 (Statuette), 44746 (Candelabrum) (Fig. 125)
Hostetter 1986, 67-8, pl. 45a-f, 97a; Askoi 155-7, pls. 36.1, 79.3.
The leg of the stand had been broken in antiquity and repaired via direct casting.

Date of Pankratiast: 460-450 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 713 A, Valle Pega
Assemblage: Inhumation.
Date of Assemblage: 380-370 B.C.

Discussion: The ceramics in the tomb belong to the earlier 4th century, but the statuette compares most closely with mid-5th century bronze figures from Felsina. A neighboring 4th century tomb (53) had an athlete statuette on the candelabrum, but stylistically it belongs to the same period as the pottery. As Hostetter puts it (68), “the pankratiast candelabrum from Tomb 713 A may have been a valued item preserved as an heirloom for more than one generation.” The mend further suggests that it was a long-lived and cherished possession.

TARQUINIA
A.89 Mirror, Bronze: Florence, Museo Topografico dell’Etruria 83728/c (Fig. 126)
Pernier 1907, 335; Delpino 1998-1999.
Flat, round disc (diam. 12-13 cm.) with triangular attachment of tang, held by three rivets.

Date of Mirror: Late Helladic II (15th century B.C.)

Findspot: Tomb 77, Poggio Selciatello
Assemblage: Simple pit grave containing an ossuary and two bronze objects: the mirror and a fibula. No signs of disturbance.

Date of Assemblage: Villanovan (late 9th century B.C.)

Discussion: The best parallels for the round part of the mirror come from the Peloponnese in the Late Helladic II. Aegean comparanda also exhibit the direct attachment of the tang to the disc with rivets that perforate the disc.
Tomb 77 was relatively simple. Aside from the mirror, the only grave goods were a biconical urn, a bowl as its cover, and a serpentine arch fibula, which is typically associated with male graves. Mirrors, however, were associated primarily with female graves and burials of males of high rank.

The mirror shows signs of intentional damage; it had been dented, and the tang was bent (Delpino 1998-1999, 32). This dedication of such an unusual object and the fact that it had been “ritually killed” prior to burial are strong indicators of its value. Both the burial of this rare item and its decommissioning through damage were ways of marking it as the inalienable possession of the deceased. (Delpino 1998-1999, 46).

Delpino (49) hypothesizes that the mirror may have arrived in Italy during the period when Aegean traders were frequenting the Tyrrhenian ports in search of metals. The item could have been handed down from generation to generation. Alternatively, we might propose, it was a found object recovered from a Bronze Age grave.

**SICILY**

**GELA**

Established in 688 B.C. by colonists from Rhodes and Crete, Gela was the third major colony founded in Sicily by the Greeks (Panvini 1996, ix-xvii, 22-4). In accordance with the customs of Rhodes and Crete, the earliest burials in the necropoleis were primarily cremations, with the exception of enchytrismos inhumations for children.

---

**GELA**

A.90 Amphora fragments with Relief Decoration, Rhodian: Museo Archeologico di Gela 8602 (Fig. 127)

Lentini 2005.

Three fragments of an amphora, similar in size and decoration to vessels assigned by the Lindos I Group

*Date of Amphora: 710-700 B.C.*

*Findspot:* Archaic necropolis of Villa Garibaldi, excavated by Orlandini and Adamesteanu in 1956

*Assemblage:* Sporadic find

*Date of Assemblage:* Unknown, likely Archaic

*Discussion:* The amphora fragments may be sporadic finds, but they were recovered during the course of scientific investigations at the Archaic necropolis at the Villa Garibaldi. The circumstances suggest that the amphora predated its surroundings by several decades or perhaps as much as a century. Moreover, this amphora was probably manufactured several decades prior to the foundation of Gela by colonists from Crete and Rhodes in 688 B.C. Only one other example of a relief amphora of this type has been found at Gela.
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Lentini suggests that one of the founding families may have brought the piece from the homeland. Large storage vessels, such as this, frequently were used as burial urns for children. Lentini encourages us to think of this vessel as not just a utilitarian piece but as a “bene di famiglia” (heirloom), possibly placed in the funerary context to signal the deceased’s membership in a founding family. See also pp. 160-1; 243-7.

GELA
A.91  Pithos, Cretan (Fig. 128)
Orsi 1906, 124-5, Tav. V.2; Panvini 1996, 39, fig. 21.
Decorated with registers of concentric circles

*Date of Pithos: 8th century B.C.*

*Findspot:* Tomb 211, Borgo Necropolis

*Assemblage:* This large vessel contained a child’s inhumation. The mouth of the pithos was covered with a bowl decorated with bands and rosettes. The bowl had been broken and mended in antiquity. Within the vessel was a Protocorinthian aryballos (decoration: lion’s head), and outside were a Protocorinthian alabastron (decoration: harpy) and four cups (Orsi 1906, 124-5). These vessels are dated to approximately 630 B.C. (Lo Porto 1974, 179).

*Date of Assemblage: 630 B.C.*

*Discussion:* The pithos, one of the few Cretan imports identified at Gela, has parallels among sub-geometric and proto-orientalizing pithoi from Arkades, Crete, and dates to the 8th century. It may have been carried to Sicily by the first wave of colonists (Lo Porto 1974, 179). Orsi (1906, 125) draws parallels between the preservation of large storage jars by modern Sicilian and Neopolitan families for several centuries. The cover, which had been mended and repaired, also appears to have had a long use life.

For discussion of the pithos and the cover as heirlooms, see Chapter 3, pp. 159-62. For the interpretation of the pithos as a keepsake, see Chapter 4, pp. 243-7.

GELA
A.92  Lekythos, Attic Black-figure Sub-Deianeira: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 8679 (Fig. 129)
Sphinx with person in himation

*Date of Lekythos: c. 550-525 B.C.*

*Findspot:* Tomb 7, Via Francesco Crispi Necropolis

*Assemblage:* Sarcophagus with a tile cover. Beside the head was a black-figure shoulder lekythos (Gela, Museo Archeologico Regionale 8677) with the image of Peleus and
Thetis, attributed to the Group of Haimon and dated to 500-475 B.C. (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 457 p F56).

**Date of Assemblage: 500-475 B.C.**

**Discussion:** The Sub-Deianeira shape of lekythos was a rather uncommon, early form (Haspels 1936, 1-6). With its ovular body, it had a greater volume than shoulder lekythoi, which frequently made their way to the tomb. The vessel may have been used as a container for several decades prior to burial.

GELA

A.93  **Skyphos, Attic Black-figure, Hermogeneian type: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 24673 (Fig. 130)**

Orsi 1906, 282-3, fig. 210; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 250, C9; Para 87, 13.

A-B: Pegasos flanked by two youths

Group of Rhodes 11941

**Date of Skyphos: 550-525 B.C.**

A.94  **Skyphos, Attic Black-figure, Hermogeneian type: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 24674 (Fig. 130)**

Orsi 1906, 283; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 251 C10; Para 87, 24.

A-B: Herakles and the Nemean lion

Group of Rhodes 11941

**Date of Skyphos: 550-525 B.C.**

A.95  **Skyphos, Attic Black-figure, Hermogeneian type: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 24672 (Fig. 130)**

Orsi 1906, 282, fig. 209; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 251 C11.

A-B: Herakles and the Nemean lion

Group of Rhodes 11941

**Date of Skyphos: 550-525 B.C.**

**Findspot:** Tomb 22, Predio Lauricella

**Assemblage:** Small pit dug in the earth; no information about the skeleton. A black-figure hydria (Inv. 24671: Orsi 1906, 282-4, fig. 208; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 437, pD61) found at the feet of the skeleton provides the terminus post quem of c.500 B.C.

**Date of Assemblage: c. 500 B.C.**
Discussion: It is highly likely that the skyphoi were a set acquired at the same time. They were potted to the same dimensions (9.5 cm in height; 11.5 cm in diameter), can be assigned to the same painter’s hand, and bear a similar decorative scheme (a miniature frieze below the lip with palmettes alongside the handles). In fact, two of the skyphoi picture the same motif of Herakles and the Nemean lion. Assigned to the Group of Rhodes 11941, which was active toward the middle of the 6th century (540-530 B.C.; Smith 2003, 355), they appear to predate the hydria in the tomb by at least two decades.

GELA

A.96 Neck-amphora, Attic Black-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale
Paolo Orsi 21928 (Fig. 131)
Orsi 1906, 465; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 437, pD60.
Palmettes on neck; plain black body

Date of Amphora: 525-500 B.C.

A.97 Neck-amphora, Attic Black-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale
Paolo Orsi 21962 (Fig. 132)
Orsi 1906, 466; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 420, pD15.
A, Chiron, Peleus and Thetis; B, Fragmentary scene probably of Apollo with two female figures

Leagros Group

Date of Amphora: 525-500 B.C.

A.98 Neck-amphora, Attic Black-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale
Paolo Orsi 21926 (Fig. 133)
Orsi 1906, 466; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 420-1, pD16.
A, Warrior carrying the body of a fallen comrade; B, Dionysos and maenads

Leagros Group; Painter of Oxford 569

Date of Amphora: 525-500 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 19, Capo Soprano Necropolis

Assemblage: This highly complex assemblage, which included at least two burials, could be interpreted in several different ways. Orsi (1906, 461-74) characterized the three strata as follows: modern levels (upper); a layer of ash and cremated bones contained within an amphora (middle); a lower layer of sand, sherds and vases around the head of an inhumation burial of a juvenile. The black-figure neck-amphorae all date to the last quarter of the 6th century and were found in association with the skeleton; however, the tomb also contained an Attic red-figure column-krater attributed to the Painter of Bologna 228 and dated to 475-450 B.C. (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 472, pI2; Orsi 1906) and red figure fragments. Under the inhumation was a 5th century defixio, which may
record names written in retrograde (Jordan 1985, 173, no. 90). Also within the tomb were several Attic black-figure lekythoi and a large hemispherical bowl.

Different scenarios might account for the assemblage. The interments might have occurred in close succession, meaning that the black-figure vases associated with the inhumation had been kept within a family for some time before they were buried here. The similar size and shape, and the fact that two can be attributed to the same group of painters suggest that they operated as a set. On the other hand, the 5th century cremation may have been inserted into the 6th century tomb, and the defixio was deposited under the earlier skeleton at this later date. Why the Geloans would want to associate a later burial with an earlier one is unclear.

GELA

A.99 Pelike, Attic Red-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 21193 (Fig. 134)

Orsi 1906, 328, fig. 243; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 472 pI3.

A, Nike holding phiale; B, man with staff. Graffito on underside of foot.

Close to the Painter of Alkimachos

Date of Pelike: 480-470 B.C.

Findspot: Tomb 1, Predio Fratelli di Bartolo

Assemblage: Clay sarcophagus with vases on the cover. At one side were the abovementioned pelike and a large red-figure amphora (unpublished) showing a bearded man on one side and a young man on the other. At the other end of the coffin were two coarse amphorae. Inside were two lekythoi next to the arms of the deceased, a white ground lekythos, and a large (34 cm in height) red-figure lekythos (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 393 L43) attributed to the Phiale Painter (decoration on the shoulder only: woman with phiale and man wearing petasos). Oakley dates the second lekythos narrowly to 440-435 B.C. (1990, 88, n. 137). A white ground alabastron was found next to the head of the skeleton (Orsi 1906, 328-30).

Date of Assemblage: 440-435 B.C.

Discussion: A chronological gap of three decades or more separates the pelike on the exterior of the sarcophagus and the vessels on the interior. The graffito on the foot of the vessel could be either a trademark or ownership mark, which would suggest that it was a singularized possession. The fact that the pelike was found on the outside of the coffin might indicate that it was used in the funerary ritual and that the consumption of an object from the past was a meaningful part of the mortuary display.

GELA

A.100 Neck-amphora with Lid, Attic black-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 21965 (Fig. 135)

Orsi 1906, 334, tav. 9; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 257, D9.
Foot broken in antiquity and repaired with two lead clamps. Plain black body and figured decoration on neck: A, Herakles and the Calydonian boar; B, Eurystheus stepping into a pithos and a woman

Leagros Group

**Date of Amphora:** 525-500 B.C.

**Findspot:** Tomb 19, Predio di Bartolo

**Assemblage:** Clay sarcophagus (E-W orientation) with cover in two parts. Different vessels were found distributed across the lid of the sarcophagus: the above described amphora broken into fragments (SE corner); a large jug with red bands on the body (SW corner); a small Attic lekythos decorated with palmettes and a female figure (NE corner); and an Attic red-figure Nolan amphora (Inv. 21967; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 325 I6) showing Theseus and Procruste, attributed to the Painter of Deepdene (475-450 B.C.). At the center was a skyphos with a red band at the base. Within the coffin were an alabaster alabastron and an Attic red-figure pelike (Inv. 21968; Panvini and Giudice 2003, 338 I 47) attributed to the Leningrad Painter and dated to 475-450 B.C. (decoration: cock on a column; ephebe running) (Orsi 1906, 334-6).

**Date of Assemblage:** 475-450 B.C.

**Discussion:** The Leagros Group neck-amphora predated the rest of the assemblage by at least a quarter of a century and had ancient repairs that tell of its protracted use-life. As the sole black-figure vase in the *corredo*, the neck-amphora would have been noticeably older in style. Its presence on the lid of the sarcophagus may indicate that it was used in the funerary display. The neck-amphora may have been considered an inalienable possession of the deceased or a belonging of the household removed from circulation and dedicated to honor the deceased.

---

**MONTE POLIZZO**

**A.101 Polished Stone Axe, Granite (Fig. 136)**


**Date of Axe:** Middle Neolithic or Early Bronze Age; 5300-1500 B.C.

**Findspot:** House 1, Room IV

**Assemblage:** House 1 was a large structure of six rooms (200 m²) where finds suggest that cooking, weaving, and milling occurred. Also an abundance of drinking and eating vessels suggest that feasting took place here.

**Date of Assemblage:** Iron Age; c. 550 B.C.
Discussion: The axe must be an import, since this type of granite is found not in Sicily but in Northern Italy. Axes of this form were manufactured in the Middle Neolithic or Early Bronze Age (Mühlenbock 2008, 121), but the Monte Polizzo specimen comes from the mid-6th century levels of House 1, a large, complex structure (200 m²) with evidence of diverse activities, including milling, animal husbandry, weaving, cooking, and feasting. The structure may have been residential but also appears to have had a public or sacred function (De Angelis 2006-2007, 180)

The excellent condition of the axe suggests that it was not used for practical reasons and perhaps had a symbolic purpose. As Mühlenbock points out, it is unlikely that this object circulated continuously for over a millennium. Instead, we might imagine that the axe was recovered somewhere in the environs of the settlement and kept as a curiosity, a symbol of the past, or or perhaps as a relic, which created a link between the axe’s Iron Age owner and earlier inhabitants of the landscape. For further discussion of the axe as a found object, see pp. 190-1.

MONTE POLIZZO
A.102 Two Small Polished Stone Axe Pendants (Fig. 137)
A.103 Mühlenbock 2008, 120, fig. 38; 43.

Date of Pendants: Middle Neolithic or Early Bronze Age; 5300-1500 B.C.

Findspot: Portella Sant’Anna (gate at the entrance point of the city)

Assemblage: Little information available, but they came from what was probably an administrative building.

Date of Assemblage: Iron Age; c. 550 B.C.

Discussion: The axes differ from the one in House 1 (A.101) in that they are smaller and perforated. Also the context suggests that the building where they were found had a public function and that they were used perhaps as symbols of authority. See discussion, pp. 190-1.

MORGANTINA
A.104 Volute-krater, Attic Red-figure: Morgantina, Museo Archeologico di Morgantina 58.23 (Fig. 138)
BAPD 200145; ARV² 28, 10; 1620; Add² 156; Stillwell 1959, pls. 43.24, 44; Neils 1995.
Large (59-60 cm in height) volute-krater with plain black-glaze body; found burnt and fragmentary. Neck divided into two horizontal register. Above, palmettes set on their sides. Below: A, amazonomachy; B, banqueting scene. Ancient repairs with lead clamps preserved on the left handle and the foot.

Euthymides as Painter

Date of Krater: c. 515 B.C.
Findspot: Fill in a large building in the Cittadella, Archaic settlement of Morgantina.

Assemblage: Destruction level dating to the sack of the city by the Sikel Douketios (Neils 1995, 444; Holloway 1991, 93).

Date of assemblage: 457 B.C.

Discussion: The krater both predated its context by about a half century and had ancient repairs indicative of a prolonged use-life. The precise function of the building with which the krater was associated is uncertain; however, the elaborate architecture, including decorative terracotta revetments, signals the structure’s importance within the community. The building was divided into four large rooms (5.75 x 6.50 m.), each with a stone pillar in the center. The lack of windows and uneven floor levels suggest that these were the basement storerooms, perhaps for a communal dining facility. The large, fine, imported krater stands out as the only krater by the Pioneer group of Athenian red-figure vase-painters to be found yet in Sicily. At this inland Sicilian settlement with mixed Sikel and Greek population, the Euthymides krater might have served as an exotic centerpiece at banquets. Its unique form and role in social ceremonies likely were causes of its curation across the decades and its ongoing use after damage. For discussion, see p. 58.

SELINOUS
In the 5th century tombs of the Gaggera cemetery, many of the vessels showed signs of use and repair which suggests that they had been in service for some time before becoming part of the corredo; of the Attic vases, half of the skyphoi and around 20% of the cups had wear on the feet (Kustermann Graf 2002, 75 and n. 2). Due to poor preservation, signs of use could not be detected on vessels of the 6th century or on locally manufactured wares of the 5th century (Kustermann Graf 2002, n. 72).

A.105 Two Vicups: Palermo Museum, No inv. Number; Excavation Nos.: 90/ A.106 O 273; 90/ O 320 (Fig. 139)
Plain black glaze.

Date of Vicups: 475-450 B.C.

Findspot: Gaggera Necropolis Tomb 90

Assemblage: Secondary cremation contained in an Attic red-figure bell-krater. Also within the krater were the Vicups, a pair of small black-glaze Attic bowls, and a pair of larger Attic bowls with stamped decoration in the interior (Kustermann Graf 2002, 162-164, tavv. 5, 46-47).

Date of Assemblage: 425-400 B.C.

Discussion: The Vicups, which are a common vessel type in the Gaggera cemetery, predate the rest of this assemblage by perhaps 30-40 years. The date of the tomb is given
by the krater, which is attributed to the Odeon Painter (late 5th century). Although plain, the Vicups are distinguished by the fact that they are imports and constitute a pair. They, along with the pairs of Attic bowls of two different sizes, appear to be a part of a set of tableware, which included the krater that served as the cremation urn. We might hazard that the cups were curated and valued as a set.

SEINIOUS

A.107  Two Skyphoi, Attic, Type A: Palermo Museum, No inv. no.; Excavation Nos: A.108  123/O 440 and 123/O 441 (Fig. 140)
Kustermann Graf 2002, 192, no. 123/O 440 and 123/O 441, pl. 66.
Plain black glaze.

Date of Skyphoi: 475-450 B.C.

Findspot: Gaggera Necropolis Tomb 123

Assemblage: Rectangular fossa; burial type could not be determined but probably inhumation. Also within were two small Attic bowls and two local bell kraters (Kustermann Graf 2002, 192-3).

Date of Assemblage: 425-400 B.C.

Discussion: The pair of skyphoi predate the latest items in the assemblage, the small bowls, by a quarter of a century or more. They complement the pairs of small bowls and kraters to create what appears to be a set.

SEINIOUS

A.109  Krater, Lakonian Black-glaze (Fig. 141)

Date of Krater: late 6th century B.C.

A.110  Lekythos, Attic White Ground (Fig. 141)

Date of Lekythos: early 5th century B.C.

Findspot: Gaggera Necropolis, Tomb 127

Assemblage: Unclear whether this was an inhumation or cremation. Also within the tomb were three Attic Vicups.

Date of Assemblage: 475-450 B.C.

Discussion: The Lakonian krater was likely the oldest object in the tomb by a quarter century. The Attic Vicups (475-450 B.C.) provide the terminus post quem. All of the items in the assemblage were imports. The krater, a large pot that probably served as the
centerpiece of banquets, was a natural candidate for curation. Although one cannot dismiss the possibility that the lekythos had some personal significance to the deceased or the family, it appears to have functioned within a pair with another, later, specimen and perhaps was curated because it completed the set of two.

SELINOUS

A.111 Column-Krater, Attic Red-figure: Palermo Museo Archeologico Regionale

CAT2835 (Fig. 142)


A, Zeus pursues Aegina; B, mantled youths

Tyszkiewicz Painter

Date of Krater: 480-470 B.C.

Findspot: Gaggera Necropolis Tomb 182

Assemblage: Cremation contained in the column-krater with a fragment of tile as a cover. Also within the urn were an Attic red-figure lekythos, a local lamp, and a local bowl (Kustermann Graf 2002, 223).

Date of Assemblage: c. 450 B.C.

Discussion: The krater predates the other items in the assemblage, including the Attic red-figure lekythos attributed to the Seireniske Painter, by two to three decades. It is a large and finely-drawn piece, and the fact that it was used as the cremation urn for the deceased underscores its special status.

SELINOUS

A.112 Lekythos, Attic Black-figure: no number available (Fig. 143)

Tusa 1982; SEG XXIX 938.


Date of Lekythos: 530-520 B.C.

Findspot: Manicalunga Necropolis

Assemblage: Terracotta sarcophagus containing an inhumation. The sole piece of the corredo within the sarcophagus was a plain black-glaze skyphos to the right of the head of the skeleton. The rest of the grave goods were on the exterior of the sarcophagus: west, two skyphoi, pyxis with cover, four poorly preserved lekythoi, two shells, three bronze pins with spherical heads; east, black-figure lekythos decorated (quadriga guided by a woman), black-figure lekythos (winged female); south, the inscribed black-figure lekythos (Theseus and the Minotaur).

Date of Assemblage: 500-490 B.C.
Discussion: The lekythos is approximately contemporary with its inscription, which Tusa dates to circa 530-520 B.C. on the basis of the presence of the qoppa, the lines of the theta, and the kappa (Tusa 1982, 176). The rest of the corredo, on the other hand, belongs to the first decades of the 5th century (Tusa 1982, 176).

The tomb was one of the richest found at Selinous (Tusa 1982, 171). For the inscription and further discussion of the lekythos as an entangled object, see pp. 99-101.

NORTH AFRICA

CYRENAICA

A.113 Panathenaic Prize Amphora: Tolmeita/ Ptolemais Museum S/N (Fig. 144)

A, Athena between two columns; B, youth holding a discus between a flute player at left and a judge holding a stick at right.

Kleophrades Painter [Vickers]
Painter of the Montauban Centaurs [Kunze-Götte]

Date of Amphora: 500-490 B.C. [Kleophrades Painter]; 480-470 B.C. [Painter of the Montauban Centaurs]

Findspot: Tomb uncovered in a salvage operation at Asklaia (Barka) in 1969

Assemblage: Wooden sarcophagus containing a skeleton; no additional information about the deceased available. Also within the sarcophagus were two Chiote amphoras, an Attic red-figure pelike, five pieces of black-glaze pottery, a huge (40 cm in height) alabaster alabastron, a bronze strigil, and a silver gilt olive wreath.

Date of Assemblage: 425 B.C.

Discussion: Although originally attributed to the Kleophrades Painter, more recently, the amphora has been reassigned to the Painter of the Montauban Centaurs (Kunze-Götte 1992, 84-5), which pushes its date down by a decade. Even so, this Panathenaic prize amphora was some five decades older than the rest of the grave assemblage, dated by the black-glaze pottery to approximately 425 B.C. (Vickers and Bazama 1971, 74-6). The vessel may have been an heirloom or perhaps an inalienable possession of the deceased. For a discussion of its potential significance as a memento, see Chapter 2, pp. 87-8.

MERÔ, SUDAN

A.114 Rhyton, Attic Red-figure: Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 21.2286 (Fig. 145)
BAPD 209548; ARV² 1669; Para 416; Add 141; Add² 287; Sanborn 1930; Hoffmann 1997, 89-96, figs 50a-c, 2-4; Cohen 2006, 284, no. 87.

Amazon on a horse; red-figure cup attached showing Persian horseman attacking a Greek warrior and Greek hoplite being attacked by a peltast.
Sotades [signed]

**Date of Rhyton: 440 B.C.**

*Findspot:* Pyramid 24, South Cemetery. Excavation by Harvard University-Boston Museum of Fine Arts Expedition (1921).

*Assemblage:* Found on top of a child’s grave at the foot of a royal pyramid at Kush. The tomb had been looted in antiquity, but the rhyton was left at the foot of the pyramid.

**Date of Assemblage: c. 300 B.C.**

*Discussion:* The rhyton was some 150 years old at the time of its deposition and had traveled across the Mediterranean from Greece, perhaps via Alexandria, approximately 1300 miles away, to reach the tomb. Although the subterranean burial chamber had been plundered, the thieves abandoned the rhyton outside at the base of the pyramid; Sanborn (1930, 82) speculates that the robbers may have left this exotic object behind out of fear that it carried some kind of pernicious powers. We cannot know the network of exchanges that led to the presence of an object so displaced temporally and geographically. Cohen (2006, 287) offers two possibilities: it could have been a precious heirloom passed down within a family for generations or a newly purchased antique.

---------------------------------------------

**TAUCHEIRA**

A.115  Conical Oinochoe, Corinthian (Fig. 146)

Boardman and Hayes 1966, 26, no. 1, pl. 3

Fairly complete. Frieze of sphinx, bird, sphinx, lion, bull, lion.

*Date of Oinochoe: Advanced Middle Protocorinthian (c. 650 B.C.)*

*Findspot:* Sanctuary, Deposit II

*Date of Assemblage: c. 560 B.C.*

*Discussion:* The vessel, according to the excavators (Boardman and Hayes 1966, 21), is “an unusually clear example of the ‘heirloom’ survival-piece in an archaeological context,” which was preserved for some 80 years or more before deposition in the 560’s B.C. Boardman and Hayes suggest that the piece was introduced to Tocra by some of the first colonists who then dedicated it at the sanctuary.
APPENDIX 3

EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FOR ENTANGLED OBJECTS

N.b. The following inscriptions are arranged according to chronology beginning with the earliest, as they can be dated by context and letter form. Included are inscriptions on actual artifacts that narrate some aspect of the object’s history, as well as inscriptions which record the inscribed labels on objects that relay some aspect of their history.

E.1 “The Cup of Nestor”: Lacco Ameno, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 166788 (Fig. 147)
Kotyle, Rhodian, with the following inscription across the body (Faraone 1996, 78):

Νέστορός : ε[ι][μ] : ε̣δ̣ποτ[ον] : ποτέριον :
何必 δ’ ἀν τὸ δεί πέσι : ποτερίον : αὐτίκα κένον
ἵμερος ἱαιρέσει : καλλιστε̣[φά]ν̣ο : Ἀφροδίτες

I am the cup of Nestor good for drinking.
Whoever drinks from this cup, desire for beautifully crowned Aphrodite will seize him instantly.

Date of the Cup: 720-715 B.C.; for the date of the cup and the tomb, see Pavese 1996.

Findspot: Pithekoussai, Tomb 168

Assemblage: Cremation burial of a young male, either ten years old or 12-14 years old. Also within the tomb were twenty-seven other vessels, including four kraters, an unusual shape at the site’s necropolis, particularly for a youth. For the description of the tomb and its contents, see Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 212-24.

Date of Assemblage: 720-710 B.C.

Discussion: See Ch. 2, pp. 108-9.

E.2 Skyphos, Black-glaze: Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 11760 (Fig. 148)
Jacopi 1929-1930, 223-4, 3, fig. 19.
Inscribed on the resting surface: ownership inscription with the first part of the name erased:

[.....]ικοῦ ἐμι
Inside the foot (boustrophedon):
Τελεσιγέροντός 'εμι

*Date of Skyphos:* late 6th century B.C.

*Find Spot:* Tomb 212, Drakidis plot, Chalki

*Assemblage:* Tomba a cassa with skeleton inside. Also within the grave were an Attic black-glaze amphora attributed to the Madrid Painter and covered by a black glaze cup and two other cups.

*Discussion:* Whereas the history of ownership appears to have contributed to the value of other entangled objects, the erasure of one ownership inscription—presumably the first—implies that the original ownership of the skyphos was perhaps no longer desirable or no longer relevant.

**E.3 Skyphos: Location unknown (Ex. Coll. Colonel William Martin Leake; once in the Fauvel Museum Athens) (Fig. 149)**

*CIG* I, 545; Vanderpool 1967.

Inscription on the bottom of the foot:

Κηφισοφώντος ἡ κύλιξ· ἐὰν δὲ τίς κατάξῃ, δραχμὴν ἀποτείσε, δώρον ὁν παρὰ Χενύλ[ο]υ.

Kephisophon’s kylix; if anyone breaks it he is to pay a fine of a drachma since it is a gift from Xenyllos.

*Date of Skyphos:* 600-550 B.C.?

*Date of Inscription:* 450-400 B.C.?

*Findspot:* Said to be from Athens.

*Discussion:* Although the present location of this inscribed cup is unknown, in 1967, Vanderpool published a sketch of the vessel from one of Colonel Leake’s notebooks in Cambridge (Vanderpool 1967, pl. 55). The drawing shows what appears to be a skyphos, similar to those manufactured in Corinth in the first half of the 6th century B.C., which would predate the letter form of the inscriptions by a century-and-a-half. Vanderpool, noting the schematic nature of the sketch (189), dismisses the possibility that such an ordinary cup was an “heirloom”; however, the discrepancy between the date of manufacture and the orthography could suggest that it was a curated object. Visual examination would be needed to confirm.

The inscription both issues a curse and narrates a chapter in the cup’s biography, revealing that it was a gift from Xenyllos to Kephisophon. While the tone of the curse—whether humorous or serious—cannot be established, it implies a concern for the vessel.
The juxtaposition of the curse to information about the ownership transfer suggests that the value of the cup was linked at least in part to its history of ownership.

### E.4  
**Aryballos, Corinthian: Corinth, Archaeological Museum C-54-1 (Fig. 150)**

At left, a pipe player labeled “Polyterpos” (“very pleasing” plays a double aulos as a figure in front of him dances. The following inscription painted before firing snakes around the dancer.

> »Πυρφιας προχορευομενος, αυτο δε, τοι ολπα
> (This is) Pyrwias the dancer, and this (is) the olpa.

*Date of Aryballos*: early 6th century B.C.

*Discussion*: The vessel is generally thought to be a prize for a dance competition and, therefore, a memento.

### E.5  
**Aryballos, Attic Black-figure: Athens, National Museum 1055 (Fig. 151)**
BAPD 301944; *ABV* 347; *Add* 94; Von Bothmer 1985, 196-7, fig. 103a-e; Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 267, 83, Cat. 19.

Sphinx, draped men and women, including one seated. Pre-firing inscription on the outer edge of the foot:

> Κεάλτες ἐγράφεσεν · Μνεσ[ικλε]ίδες ἔδοκεν Φοκι.
> Kealtes painted [me]; Mnesikleides gave [me] to Phokis.

*Date of Aryballos*: 550/540 B.C.

*Discussion*: The vessel is said to be from Petreza, east of Athens, but no further information about its depositional context is known, so it is unclear whether this is a *keimêlion* in a chronological sense. The fact that the inscription was painted onto the foot prior to firing indicates that the aryballos was specially commissioned with the recipient—a female, Phokis—in mind. The form of the vessel, with its prominent foot, is unique; one might wonder whether the exceptional foot was added in order to display the details of the object’s biography conspicuously.

### E.6  
**Fragmentary Dinos, Attic Black-figure: Rome, Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia 50599 (Fig. 152)**
BAPD 310402; *ABV* 146, 20; *Add* 61; Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 283, Cat. 20; Mackay 2010, 215-9, pls. 52-54.

Frieze of warships; inscription on shoulder.

> Ἐχεοκίας μ’ ἐποίεσε. [Attic]
> Ἐπα[ι]νετος μ’ ἐδοκεν Χαρόποι. [Sikyonian]
Exekias made me.
Epainetos gave me to Charopos.

Exekias as Potter and Painter

Date of Dinos: 540 B.C.

Discussion: The dinos comes from Cerveteri, but no further information about the context is available. The inscription was incised before firing in two different scripts. The inscriptions in both dialects are assigned to the hand of Exekias: the first verse, in Attic letters records his signature; and the second, in the Sikyonian alphabet, the donor inscription.

The inscriptions link Exekias the potter to the giver Epainetos and the recipient Charopos; all were “entangled” in this distinctive object. Although we do not know the circumstances of the bequest of the vessel by Epainetos to Charopos, it seems that the dinos was bespoke. The adoption of a non-Attic script by an Athenian potter contributes an extra layer of personalization, perhaps indicating that either Epainetos or Charopos or both were Sikyonians. The fact that the script was not the norm for Exekias is underscored by the fact that he initially incised the Ε in the second line in the word ΜΕ as an Attic epsilon but corrected it (Mackay 2010, 215).

The purported findspot of the dinos was Cerveteri, the Etruscan heartland and not Sikyon or Attika. The cultural displacement implied by it provenance may suggest that the dinos had become separated from Charopos. Perhaps it was the gift in an intercultural exchange or was acquired on the secondhand market as an antique.

E.7  Ring Aryballos, Boiotian: Kilchberg, E. Peters Collection (Fig. 153)
Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 283, Cat. 21; Osborne and Pappas 2007, 148-9, fig. 5.7.
Ornamental decoration; incised inscription:

Μνασάλκες π[οίες]έ Εμπεδιόνδαι·
αύ[t]άρ ho δόκε φέρω φιλοτάσιον Αισχύλωι αὐτό.

Mnasalkes made [me] for Empediondas, but he took and gave the same to Aiskhylos as a love gift.

Date of Aryballos: 550-525 B.C.

Discussion: This inscription on this small vessel names the giver, the recipient, and the somewhat convoluted circumstances of the exchange. The writing is incised around the bottom of the exterior. As Osborne and Pappas note, the inscription runs along a dark band and would be legible to anyone pouring the oil into his hands from the vessel.

E.8  Cup-skyphos, Attic Black-Figure: Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 12894 (Fig. 154)
BAPD 350961; CVA Rhodes 2, III.H.E.1, pl. 20.1; *Para* 90, 54; *Add* 54; Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 283-4, Cat. 22.

Simple decoration: frieze with palmettes. Inscribed on foot:

```
Ἀφράθητος ἔδοκη ταῖ Λυέτο γυναικί
Akrathetos gave me/ it to the wife of Lyetos.
```

**Date of Cup:** 550-525 B.C.

**Findspot:** Camiros Necropolis, Macrì Langoni Tomb 72

**Assemblage:** This *tomba a cassa* with a flat cover held the remains of an adult. At the feet were: the inscribed cup and an aryballic lekythos, while next to the head were a coarse amphora decorated with spirals, a small pierced clay disk, and a small aryballic lekythos (Jacopi 1929-1930, 169-70, figs. 74-6).

**Date of Assemblage:** Unknown.

**Discussion:** The finds from the tomb are not fully published, so it is uncertain whether this vessel is a *keimêlion* in a chronological sense. The cup is unusual in that the inscription unites not only the giver (Akrathetos) and the recipient (the wife) but also the husband of the recipient (Lyetos).

**E.9  Eye-cup, Attic Black-figure:** New York, Metropolitan Museum 44.11.1 (Fig. 155)

BAPD 13330; Milne 1944; *CVA New York* 2, 15-16, pls. 25.39a-d, 26.39e-f, 40.39.

Interior, dot and two concentric circles; exterior, battle between eyes. Incised inscription in Doric dialect on underside of foot:

```
Μελοσας · ἐμι · νικατεριον · ξαινοσα · τας · κορας · ἐνικε
I am Melosa’s prize; she won the girls’ carding contest.
```

**Date of Cup:** c. 530 B.C.

**Findspot:** Said to be from Taranto.

**Discussion:** According to the inscription, the cup was a prize in a contest for girls to disentangle wool fibers. This is the only testament we have for such a competition. For discussion of the cup as a memento, see Chapter 2, pp. 86.

**E.10  Two Plates, Attic Black-figure:** Palermo, Museo Archeologico Regionale 314 and 315 (Fig. 156)

Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 284, Cat. 23.

314: BAPD 8618, Callipolitis-Feytmans 1974, pl. 80.28.

315: BAPD 8617; Callipolitis-Feytmans 1974, 80.29.
Plate 314: interior, palmette-lotus ornament; Plate 315: interior, palmette-lotus ornament; exterior, band of lions and deer. Incised inscriptions on interior rim:

Plate 314: Ηπ(π)οδρόμης τόδε δόρον Πεδιο.  
Plate 315: Αρφόλες τόδε δόρον Πεδιο.

Plate 314: This is a gift of Hippodromê for Pedio.  
Plate 315: This is a gift of Arkyle for Pedio.

*Date of Plates*: c. 500 B.C.

*Discussion*: No contextual information is available, but the plates are similar in form and size. They appear to be a pair given to the same Pedio—possibly a female deity—by two different individuals (Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 270).

E.12 *Pyxis, Attic White-ground: Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 65.1166 (Fig. 157)*  
BAPD 3345; Truitt 1969; Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 285, Cat. 28.  
The knob had been repaired in antiquity with what appears to be a lead join.  
Exterior showing women engaged in domestic tasks. Inscription on the inside of the lid:

Λυσάνδρα ἔδοκε Λυσιμαχίδι.  
Lysandra gave [it] to Lysimachis

Painter of London D12

*Date of Pyxis*: c. 440 B.C.

*Discussion*: The pyxis, it appears, was an entangled object—a gift between two women who have very similar names. The fact that it was a treasured object is further implied by the ancient repair on the knob. There is no further information available about its provenience other than the fact that it is said to have been found with a white ground phiale (MFA 65.908) by the same painter. This phiale was decorated with a similar all-female scene, only of women dancing around an altar.

E.13 *Hydria, Bronze: Thasos, Museum 1517*  
Diehl 1964, 218, B116; Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 285, Cat. 29.  

Διογένες Νικίππαι ἔδοκε.  
Diogenes gave [it] to Nikippa

*Date of Hydria*: 450 B.C.

*Discussion*: The hydria was a gift from a man to a woman.
E.14 Kantharos, Boiotian: S/N
Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 285, Cat. 31.

Χάρες ἔδοκε Εὐπλοίνί με.
Chares gave me to Euploeine.

*Date of Kantharos:* 450-400 B.C.

*Discussion:* Little information is available about the vessel other than the fact that the findspot was Boiotia.

E.15 Kantharos, Boiotian Black-glaze: Paris, Louvre K 198 (Fig. 158)
CVA Paris 17, 47, fig. 18, pl. 46.1, 3; Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000, 286, Cat. 32.

*Date of Kantharos:* 450-430 B.C.

Μογέα δίδοτι ταὶ γυναικῆς δόρων Εὐχάρι
teὐτρετιφάντο κότυλον, ὃς χάδαν πίε.

Mogea gives as a gift to his wife Eucharis, the daughter of Eutretiphantos, this cup, that she may drink her fill.

*Findspot:* Said to be from Thespiae.

*Discussion:* Other translations are possible, but it appears that this vessel was a gift from a husband to wife. Also note how her father is included as a part of the exchange.

E.16 Kalpis, Bronze: Providence, Rhode Island School of Design (Fig. 159)
Inscribed on rim in a Boiotian script:

τὸν Θέβας ἀίθλον
From the Games at Thebes

*Date of Kalpis:* c. 470 B.C.

*Discussion:* The inscription indicates that the vessel was a memento—a prize for the Theban games. The vessel had both a monetary and mnemonic value.

E.17 Kantharos, Black-glaze, Boiotian: Location unknown (Fig. 160)
Rolfe 1891.
Inscription in Boiotian alphabet just below rim:

Γοργίνιός ἐμι κότυλος · καλὸς κ[αλ]δ
I am the kotylos of Gorginos; the beautiful cup of a beautiful owner.
**Date of Kantharos:** 360 B.C. or possibly much earlier

**Discussion:** The vessel was not found through scientific excavations; a peasant discovered it allegedly in a tomb in Kakosia, a village in southwestern Boiotia (ancient Thisbe). This talking object refers to itself as a kotylos, although the form is what we typically refer to as a kantharos.

The comparison set up by the verse suggests the intimate connection between the vessel and its owner, as if the two are synonymous.

**E.18 Lindian Chronicle B 101-6**
Higbie 2003, 183.

Ἀρετάκριτος καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς ἔχινέαν, ᾧ τὸν πυθμένα κρατήρος ἔχε, καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ χείλευσι αὐτὰς ἐπεγέγρα· "Παλτοῦ Ἀδραστος ἔθηκε ἄθλον ἐπʼ Αἰγιαλεῖ", ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ πυθμένος Ἰ."Ἀρετος καὶ παῖδες Ἀθαναἰα Λινδίαι δεκάταν ναὸς ἕκε Ἐρίτας"

Aretakritos and his sons, a vase [ekhnea]. Which had the base of a krater and on its lip had been inscribed, ‘Adrastos, son of Paltes, established a contest in compensation for the death of Aigialeus’; on the base, ‘Aretos and children to Athena Lindia a tenth from the ship, the one from Crete’.

**Discussion:** This votive, known from the Lindian Chronicle, narrates its history of ownership through two different inscriptions. Aretakritos and his sons dedicated a vase that had been an award at the funeral games for Aigialeus held by his father Adrastos. As Higbie notes (2003, 183), the bequest of a relic from the distant past both demonstrated the wealth of the family and forged a link between them and the family of the Theban cycle.

**E. 19 Lindian Chronicle C 21-7**
Higbie 2003, 184-5.

Φάλαρις ὁ Ἀκραγαντίνων τυραννεύσας κρατήρα, οὗ ἐτερόρευτο ἐν μὲν τῷ ἐτέρῳ μέρει Τιτανομαχίᾳ, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐτέρωι Κρόνος λαμβάνων παρὰ ἔρεας τα τέκνα κ[α]ὶ κ[α]ταπείνων, καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ χείλευς ἐπεγέγραπτο ὡς "Δαίδαλος ἔδωκε ξείνι-
όν μὲ Κωκάλωι”, [ἐπ]ὶ δὲ τὰς βάσιος: “Φάλαρις ἐξ Ἀ-
κράγαντος τὰ [ι Α]νδ[ι]αι Ἀθάνατ”

Phalaris, the tyrant of the Akragantinoi, a krater.
On one side of which had been embossed the Titanomachy,
on the other Kronos taking from
Rhea his children and swallowing them down. And on its
lip had been inscribed, ‘Daidalos gave me as a
xeinion to Kokalos’; on the foot ‘Phalaris from
Akragas to Lindian Athena.’

Discussion: In this case, an entangled object—a gift of guest friendship from Daidalos to
Kokalos—was dedicated by the tyrant Phalaris to Athena. The Daidalos mentioned
probably refers to the famed craftsman; we can assume that the krater is an object valued
not only for its material worth but for its association with him and its fine manufacture
(Higbie 2003, 184-5). The gift also may have commemorated the role of Kokalos in
saving the life of the craftsman. According to literary sources, Daidalos fled from Crete
to Sicily with Kokalos, the king of Akragas. Kokalos then saved Daidalos from Minos by
having Minos burned in the hot water of his bath; for the references, see Higbie 2003,
229 n. 61.
N.b. Passages are arranged in chronological order, with the earliest works first. In the case of the Homeric epics, which make repeated references to the same object or class of objects, these are grouped together. Each entry is given a unique number preceded by a KT (=keimêlia testimonia), by which it is referenced in the text of the chapters. At times, a brief discussion follows the excerpt and translation in order to contextualize the verses or to highlight significant insights that emerge regarding the commemorative potential of objects.

HOMER*

The Armor of Achilles

KT.1  
Il. 17.192-7  
στὰς δ’ ἀπάνευθε μάχης πολυδακρόου έντε’ ἄμειβεν:
ήτοι δ’ μὲν τὰ δ’ δώκε φέρειν προτὶ Ἱλιον ἱρήν
Τρωι φιλοπτολέμοισιν, δ’ δ’ ἀμβροτά τεύχεα δύνε
Πηλείδεω Ἀχιλής ᾧ οἱ θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες
πατρὶ φίλω ἔπορον: δ’ δ’ ἄρα ὄ παιδὶ ὀπασσε
gηράς: ἀλλ’ οὐχ υἱός ἐν ἐντεσὶ πατρὸς ἐγήρα.

There, on the edge of war’s horrors, he [Patroklos] changed armor. He gave his own to be carried back to the city By his fighting men, and he put on the inhuman gear Of Peleus’ son Achilles that the gods of heaven Had given to his father, and he to his son When he had grown old in them, as his son would not.

KT.2  
Il. 18.82-5  
tὸν ἀπώλεσα, τεύχεα δ’ Ἐκτωρ
δηώσας ἀπέδυε σε πελώρια θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι
καλὰ: τὰ μὲν Πηλήθι θεοὶ δόσαν ἄγλα ἀγώρα
ἤματι τῷ ὅτε σε βροτοῦ ἀνέρος έμβαλον εὖνή.

And the armor— Hector cut him [Patroklos] down and took off his body The heavy, splendid armor, beautiful to see,

*Translations of Homer by S. Lombardo (Iliad, 1997; Odyssey, 2000).
That the gods gave to Peleus as a gift
On the day they put you to bed with a mortal.

**Iron Club/ Mace of King Areithous**

*Il. 7.142-50*

αλλὰ σιδηρεῖ κορύνη βήγνυσκε φάλαγγας,
tὸν Λυκόργος ἐπεφνε δόλω, οὗ τι κράτει γε,
στεινωπῷ ἐν ὄδυ θῇ ἄρ’ οὐ κορύνῃ οἱ ὀλεθρον
χραίσμε σιδηρεῖν: πρὶν γὰρ Λυκόργος ὑποφθάς
δουρὶ μέσων περόνησεν, ὃ δ’ ὑπτιος οὐδεὶ ἐρείσθη:
tεύχεα δ’ ἔξεναριξε, τὰ οἴ πόρε χάλκεος Ἀρης.
καὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἔπειτα φόρει μετὰ μῶλον Ἀρηος:
αὐτὰρ ἔπει Λυκόργος ἐνι μεγάροισιν ἐγήρα,
δῶκε δ’ Ἐρεθαλίωνι φίλῳ θεράπον φορῆναι:
tοῦ δ’ ὑπτεί ἐξων προκαλίζετο πάντας ἀρίστους.

Before he could react
Lycurgus skewered him [King Areithous] with his spear.
Down he went, and Lycurgus stripped from him
The armor he had gotten from bronze Ares,
And he wore that armor whenever he went to war.
And when Lycurgus was an old man in his halls
He gave it to Ereuthalion, who had been his squire.

**Helmet**

*Il. 10.260-71*

Μηριόνης δ’ ὄδυσση δίδου βιὸν ἠδὲ φαρέτρην
καὶ ξύφως, ἀμφὶ δὲ οἱ κυνέην κεφαλῆριν ἔθηκε
ρίνου ποιητήν: πολέσιν δ’ ἐντόσθεν ἴμασιν
ἐντεῖτατο στερεώς: ἐκτοσθε δὲ λευκοὶ ὀδόντες
ἀργιόδοντος ὑὸς θαμέες ἔχον ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα
ἐν καὶ ἐπισταμένως: μέση δ’ ἐνὶ πῖλος ἄρηρει.
τὴν ρὰ ποτ’ ἐξ Ἑλεώνος Ἀμοῦντορος Ὄρμενίδια
ἐξῆλετ’ Ἀὐτόλυκος πυκνὸν δόμον ἀντιτορῆσας,
Σκάνδειαν δ’ ἄρα δῶκε Κυθηρίῳ Ἀμφιδάμαντι:
Ἀμφιδάμας δὲ Μόλῳ δῶκε ξεινήσιον εἶναι,
αὐτὰρ δ’ Μηριόνη δῶκεν ὡ παιδὶ φορῆναι:
δὴ τὸτ’ Ὀδυσσηὸς πύκασεν κάρη ἀμφιτεθείσα.

Meriones gave to Odysseus a bow,
A quiver, and a sword, while on his head
He put a helmet made of hide, stiffened
With numerous taut leather thongs inside
And faced outside with the gleaming white teeth
Of a tusker boar set thick in alternate rows
Cunningly and well. It was lined with felt.
This helmet had been stolen by Autolycus
From Amyntor’s palace in Eleon,
And he gave it to Amphidamas of Cythera
To take to Scandeia, and Amphidamas
Gave it as a guest gift to Molus,
Who gave it to his son Meriones to wear.
Now it protected the head of Odysseus.

Then he [Agamemnon] covered his chest with a corselet,
A gift from the Cypriot king, Cinyras.
News had reached Cyprus that the Greeks
Were launching a fleet for Troy, and Cinyras
Sent this corselet as homage to the warlord.
It had ten bands of dark blue enamel,
Twelve of gold, and twenty of tin.
On either side were three enameled dragons
With arching necks—iridescent as rainbows
That Zeus anchors in cloud as portents for men.

KT.6  Il. 15.529-33
δς τότε Φυλείδαο μέσον σάκος οὐτασε δουρὶ
ἐγγύθεν όρμηθεις; πυκνὸς γε οἱ ἦρκεςε θώρηξ,
530τόν ρ´ ἐφόρει γυάλοισιν ἀρηρότα: τόν ποτε Φυλεύς
His [Dolops’] spear ground through Meges’ shield
From close range, but the corselet saved him [Meges],
The intricate, plated corselet he wore.
His father Phyleus had brought it home
From Ephyre, on the river Salleïs,
Having received it from lord Euphetes,
A guest-friend, to protect him in war.

I’ll give him the corselet I took from
Asteropaeus. It is bronze plated with circles
Of bright tin, and something he will value.

He [Patroklos] left behind the massive battle pike
Of Aeacus’ incomparable grandson.
No one but Achilles could handle this spear,
Made of ash, which the centaur Chiron
Had brought down from Mount Pelion and given
To Achilles’ father to be the death of heroes.
Πηλιάδα μελίην, τὴν πατρὶ φίλω πόρε Χείρων
Πηλίου ἐκ κορυφῆς φόνον ἐμμεναι ἡρώεσσιν:

He pulled from its case
His father’s spear, the massive, heavy
Spear that only Achilles could handle,
Made of Pelian ash, which the centaur Chiron
Had brought down from Mount Pelion and given
To Achilles’ father to be the death of heroes.

Warrior’s belt
KT.10  Il. 6.219-21
Οἶνεῦς μὲν ζωστῆρα δίδου φοίνικι φαεινόν,
Βελλεροφόντης δὲ χρόσεον δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον
καὶ μὲν ἐγὼ κατέλειπον ἰὼν ἐν δώμασ’ ἐμοῖς.

Oeneus gave
A belt bright with scarlet, and Bellerophon
A golden cup, which I left at home.

Discussion: In this passage, Diomedes and Glaukos discuss the exchange of gifts by their relatives. Diomedes and Glaukos are the heirs to these treasures.

Sword
KT.11  Il. 23.807-8
ὁππότερος κε φθήσιν ὅρεξάμενος χρόα καλὸν,
ψαύσῃ δ’ ἐνδίνων διὰ τ’ ἐντεα καὶ μέλαν αίμα,
τῷ μὲν ἐγὼ δόσω τόδε φάσγανον ἀργυρόηλον
καλὸν Θρῆκιον, τὸ μὲν Ἀστεροπαῖον ἀπηύρων:

The first man to reach the other man’s skin,
Pierce the armor and draw blood, is the winner
And gets as his prize this silver-studded sword,
Good Thracian work, I took from Asteropaeus.

Bow
KT.12  Od. 11-40
ἐνθα δὲ τόξον κεῖτα παλίντονον ἡδὲ φαρέτρη
ιοδόκος, πολλοὶ δ’ ἔνεσαν στονόντες ὁίστοι,
δύρα τά όι ξείνος Λακεδαίμονι δύκε τυχήσας
’Ιφιτος Εὐρυτίδης, ἐπιείκελος ἀθανάτοις.
τῷ δ’ ἐν Μεσσήνῃ ξυμβλήτην ἀλλήλοιουν
οίκῳ ἐν Ὄρτιλόχοιο δαίφρονος, ἢ τοι Ὅδυσσεύς ἠλθε μετὰ χρέιος, τὸ ρά οἱ παῖς δήμος ὄφελλε: μῆλα γὰρ ἦξ Ἰθάκης Μεσσήνιοι ἄνδρες ἅειραν νησιο πολυκλήσι τριηκόσι᾽ ἢδὲ νομῆς. 

tὸν ἐνεκ᾽ ἐξεσίνην πολλῆν ὅδὸν ἠλθεν Ὅδυσσεύς παιδνός ἦλων, πρὸ γὰρ ἦκε πατήρ ἄλλοι τε γέροντές. Ἰφίτος αὐθ᾽ ἢππους διζήμενος, αἱ οἱ ὄλοντο δώδεκα θήλεια, ὑπὸ δ᾽ ἡμίονοι ταλαεργοί: αἱ δὴ οἱ καὶ ἐπείτα φόνος καὶ μοῖρα γένοντο, ἐπεὶ δὴ Διὸς υἱὸν ἀφίκετο καρπερόθυμον, φῶθ᾽ Ἡρακλῆς, μεγάλων ἐπιστήρος ἔργων, ὡς μιν ξείνων ἕόντα κατέκταν ὃ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ, σχέτιος, οὐδὲ θεῶν ὅπιν ἤδεατ᾽ οὐδὲ τράπεζαν, τὴν ἦν οἱ παρέθηκεν: ἐπείτα δὲ πέφνε καὶ αὐτόν, ἢππους δ᾽ αὐτὸς ἔχε κρατερώνυχας ἐν μεγάροις. 

tὰς ἐρέων Ὅδυσηὶ συνήντετο, δῶκε δὲ τὸζον, τὸ πρὶν μὲν ρ᾽ ἐφόρει μέγας Εὐρυτὸς, αὐτάρ ὁ παιδὶ κάλλιπ᾽ ἀποθνήσκων ἐν δώμασιν ὑψηλῶσι. 

tῷ δ᾽ Ὅδυσσεύς ξύφος ὃξο καὶ ἄλκιμον ἔγχος ἔδωκεν, ἀρχὴν ξεινοσύνης προσκηδέος: οὐδὲ τραπέζῃ γνώτην ἄλληλῳ: πρὶν γὰρ Διὸς υἱὸς ἐπερνὲν Ἰφιτὸν Ἐὐρυτίδην, ἐπείκελον ἀθανάτοισιν, ὡς οἱ τὸζον ἔδωκε. τὸ δ᾽ οὐ ποτε διὸς Ὅδυσσεύς ἐρχόμενος πόλεμόνδε μελαιάνων ἐπὶ νηῶν ἦρεῖτ᾽, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτοῦ μνήμα ξείνοιο φίλοιο κέσκετε ἐνι μεγάροισι, φόρει δὲ μιν ἦς ἐπὶ γαῖς.

And there [in the storeroom] lay the curved bow
And the quiver, still loaded with arrows,
Gifts which a friend of Odysseus had given him
When they met in Lacedaemon long ago.
This was Iphitus, Eurytus’ son, a godlike man.
They had met in Messene, in the house of Ortilochus.
Odysseus had come to collect a debt
The Messenians owed him: three hundred sheep
They had taken from Ithaca in a sea raid,
And the shepherds with them. Odysseus
Had come to get them back, a long journey
For a young man, sent by his father and elders.
Iphitus had come to search for twelve mares
He had lost, along with the mules they were nursing.
These mares turned out to be the death of Iphitus
When he came to the house of Heracles,
Zeus’ tough-hearted son, who killed him,
Guest though he was, without any regard
For the gods’ wrath or the table they had shared—
Killed the man and kept the strong-hoofed mares.
It was while looking for these mares that Iphitus
Met Odysseus and gave him the bow
Which old Eurytus had carried and left to his son.
Odysseus gave him a sword and spear
To mark the beginning of their friendship
But before they had a chance to entertain each other
Zeus’ son killed Iphitus, son of Eurytus,
A man like the gods. Odysseus did not take
The bow with him on his black ship to Troy.
It lay at home as a memento of his friend,
And Odysseus carried it only on Ithaca.

And when Melanthius crossed the threshold,
Carrying a beautiful helmet in one hand
And in the other a broad old shield,
Flecked with rust—a shield the hero Laertes
Had carried in his youth but that had long since
Been laid aside with its straps unstitched…

And when Melanthius crossed the threshold,
Carrying a beautiful helmet in one hand
And in the other a broad old shield,
Flecked with rust—a shield the hero Laertes
Had carried in his youth but that had long since
Been laid aside with its straps unstitched…

And when Melanthius crossed the threshold,
Carrying a beautiful helmet in one hand
And in the other a broad old shield,
Flecked with rust—a shield the hero Laertes
Had carried in his youth but that had long since
Been laid aside with its straps unstitched…

And when Melanthius crossed the threshold,
Carrying a beautiful helmet in one hand
And in the other a broad old shield,
Flecked with rust—a shield the hero Laertes
Had carried in his youth but that had long since
Been laid aside with its straps unstitched…
He weighed and brought out ten talents of gold,  
Two glowing tripods and four cauldrons with them,  
And an exquisite cup, a state gift from the Thracians  
And a great treasure.

Discussion: The cup, a gift from the Thracians, was a part of Priam’s ransom for Hector.

KT.15  
Od. 4.590-2
καὶ τότε σ’ εὖ πέμψω, δώσω δέ τοι ἄγια ἡώρα,  
τρεῖς ὅππως καὶ δίφρον ἐύξοον: αὐτάρ ἔπειτα  
dώσω καλὸν ἄλεισον, ἵνα σπένδῃσθα θεοῖσιν  
ἄθανάτοις ἐμέθεν μεμνημένος ήματα πάντα.

And then I [Menelaus] will give you [Telemachus] a royal send-off  
And these splendid gifts: three horses  
And a polished chariot, and a beautiful cup,  
So that you can pour libations to the deathless gods  
And remember me all the days of your life.

Kraters  
KT.16  
Il. 23.741-7
Πηλεΐδης δ’ αἶψ’ ἄλλα τίθει ταχυτήτος ἀεθλα  
ἀργύρεον κρητεία τετυγμένον: ἔξ δ’ ἄρα μέτρα  
χάνδανεν, αὐτάρ κάλλει ἐνίκα πᾶσαν ἐπ’ αἰαν  
pολλάν, ἐπεὶ Σιδόνες πολυδαίδαλοι εὖ ἤσκησαν,  
Φοίνικες δ’ ἄγον ἄνδρες ἐπ’ ἥροειδέα πόντον,  
στήσαν δ’ ἐν λιμένεσι, Θάντι δὲ δώρον ἐδωκαν:  
ὕνος δὲ Πριάμιοι Λυκάονος ὄνον ἔδωκε  
Πατρόκλῳ ἦρωϊ Ἰησοῦς Εὐνής.  
καὶ τόν Ἀχιλλεῦς θήκεν ἄεθλον οὐ ἔταροι,  
ὅς τις ἐλαφρότατος ποσοὶ κραίπνοις πέλοιτο:

Then Peleus’ son set out prizes for a sprint.  
He had a silver mixing-bowl, highly wrought.  
It held six gallons and was the most beautiful  
On earth, a masterpiece of Sidonian art.  
Phoenician merchants had carried it over  
The misty sea to the harbor of Lemnos.  
There they gave it as a gift to Thoa,  
And Jason’s son Euneus gave it as ransom
For Priam’s son Lycaon to the hero Patroclus
This bowl Achilles offered as a prize
To the winning sprinter, in honor of his friend.

KT.17

Od. 4.613-19=15.115-19
δώρων δ’ ὅσσ’ ἐν ἐμῷ οἶκῳ κειμήλια κεῖται,
δῶσω δ’ κάλλιστον καὶ τιμήστατον ἔστιν:
δώσω τοι διηνήθη τετυγμένον: ἀργύρεος δὲ
ἔστιν ἄπας, χρυσῷ δ’ χείλεα κεκράανται,
ἔργον δ’ Ὑφαίστου. πόρεν δὲ ἐ Φαύδιμος ἢρως,
Σιδονίων βασιλεύς, ὃθ’ ἐος δόμος ἄμφεκάλυψε
κείσε με νοστήσαντα: τείν δ’ ἔθελω τόδ’ ὀπάσσαι.

Of all the gifts that lie stored in my house
I will give you the most beautiful—
And the most valuable—a well-wrought bowl,
Solid silver, with the lip finished in gold,
The work of Hephaestus. The hero Phaedimus,
King of the Sidonians, gave it to me
When I stayed at his house on my way home.
Now I want you to take it home with you.

Phiale
KT.18

Il. 23.615-8
πέμπτον δ’ ὑπελείπετ’ ἀεθλον,
ἀμφιθέτος φιάλη: τὴν Νέστορι δὼκεν Ἀχιλλεὺς
’Ἀργείων ἀν’ ἀγώνα φέρων, καὶ ἔστε παραστάς:
‘τῇ νῦν, καὶ σοὶ τούτο γέρον κειμήλιον ἐστω
Πατρόκλοιο τάφου μνήμ’ ἐξεμεναι:

But the fifth prize,
The two-handled bowl, was left unclaimed.
This bowl Achilles gave to Nestor,
Bringing it to him through the crowd and saying:
“Take this, reverend sir, as your keepsake
And memorial of Patroclus’ burial…”

Amphora
KT.19

Od. 24.71-5
αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ δῇ σε φλόξ ἤνυσεν Ὑφαίστου,
ἡωθεν δῇ τοι λέγομεν λεύκ’ ὅστε’, Ἀχιλλεῦ,
οἴνῳ ἐν ἀκρήτῳ καὶ ἀλείφατι: δῶκε δὲ μήτηρ
χρύσεων ἀμφιφόρητο: Διωνύσοιο δὲ δώρον
φάσκ’ ἐμεναι, ἐργον δὲ περικλυτοῦ Ἡφαίστοιο.

We gathered your white bones at dawn, Achilles
And laid them in unmixed wine and unguents.
Your mother had given us a golden urn,
A gift of Dionysos, she said, made by Hephaestus.

Basket
KT.20
Od. 4.125-7

Another maid, Phylo, brought a silver basket—
A gift from Alcandre, wife of Polybus,
Who lived in Thebes, the city in Egypt
That has the wealthiest houses in the world.
Polybus had given Menelaus two silver baths,
Two tripods, and ten bars of gold.
And his wife, Alcandre, gave to Helen
Beautiful gifts of her own—a golden spindle
And a silver basket with gold-rimmed wheels.

Diadem
KT.21
Il. 22.467-72

She [Andromache] reeled backward, grasping, and her veil
And glittering headbands flew off,
The diadem golden Aphrodite
Gave her on that day when tall-helmed Hector
Led her from her father’s house in marriage.

Drugs

Od. 4.220-30

אָוְתִיקְאָרְיֵאָיִסְילָאֲרָפְרְמַאֲקָוְאָוְיֵאָов

She [Helen] threw a drug into the wine bowl
They were drinking from, a drug
That stilled all pain, quieted all anger
And brought forgetfulness of every ill.
Whoever drank wine laced with this drug
Would not be sad or shed a tear that day,
Not even if his own father and mother
Should lie there dead, or if someone killed
His brother, or son, before his eyes.
Helen had gotten this potent, cunning drug
From Polydamna, the wife of Thon,
A woman in Egypt, where the land
Proliferates with all sorts of drugs,
Many beneficial, many poisonous.

Lyre

Il. 9.186-9

τούν δ’ εὐρόν φρένα τερπόμενον φόρμιγγι λιγείη
καλῆ δαιδάλει, ἐπὶ δ’ ἀργύρεον ζυγόν ἦν,
τὴν ἄρετ’ ἐξ ἑνάρων πόλιν Ἑτύωνος ὀλέσσας:
τῇ δ’ γε θυμόν ἔτερπεν, ἀείδε δ’ ἀρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν.

And found him [Achilles] plucking clear notes on a lyre—
A beautiful instrument with a silver bridge
He had taken when he ransacked Eëtion’s town—
Accompanying himself as he sang the glories
Of heroes in war.

Lump of Iron
KT.24  II. 23.826-9
αὐτὸς Πηλείδης θήκεν σόλον αὐτοχώρων
ὁ πρὶν μὲν ῥίπτασκε μέγα σθένος Ὅητίωνος;
ἄλλ’ ἣτοι τὸν ἐπεφνε ποδάρκης δίος Ἀχιλλεύς,
τὸν δ’ ἀγετ’ ἐν νήυσσι σὺν ἄλλοισι κτεάτεσσι.

Then Peleus’ son set out a rough lump of iron
That mighty Eëtion once used to hurl.
When brilliant, swift-footed Achilles killed him,
He took it to his ship with his other possessions.

AESCHYLUS

Elektra’s Textile as a Token of Recognition
KT.25  Libation Bearers 225-34
Ὀρέστης

αὐτὸν μὲν οὖν ὀψε θυμαθεῖς ἐμὲ:
κουράν δ’ ἰδοῦσα τήνδε κηδείου τριχὸς
ἰχνοσκοποῦσά τ’ ἐν στίβοις τοῖς ἐμοῖς
ἀνεπτερώθης κάδοκες ὑπὸν ἐμὲ.
σκέψαι τοιῷ προσθείσα βοστρυχοντριχὸς
σαυτῆς ἀδελφοῦ σύμμετρον τῷ μῷ κάρα.
ἰδοῦ δ’ ὑφασμα τούτῳ, σῆς ἔργον χερὸς,
σπάθης τε πληγάς ἢδε θῆρα ἱν γραφήν.
ἔνδον γενοῦ, χαρᾷ δέ μὴ ἱπλαγῆς φρένας:
τοὺς ρήτατους γάρ σίδα νῦν ὄνταπτικοῦς.

Now, even though you see him in me, you are slow to learn. Yet at the
sight of this tress cut in mourning, and when you were scrutinizing the
footprints of my tracks, your thought took wings and you knew you had
found me. Put the lock of hair, your own brother’s, in the spot it was cut
from and observe how it matches the hair on my head. And see this piece
of weaving, your handiwork, the strokes of the batten and the beasts in the

340
design. Control yourself! Do not go mad with joy! For I know that our nearest kin are bitter foes to us both. (Trans. H.W. Smyth, 1926)

Discussion: When Elektra encounters Orestes at their father’s grave, she does not believe that it is he. He proves his identity materially, by comparing the lock of hair which he had dedicated at the tomb earlier to the hair on his head and by showing her a textile, which Elektra herself had woven. Although we do not know how long ago she wove this fabric, it facilitates the sister’s recognition of her brother and, thus, shows how objects from earlier periods might function as proofs of family relationships for relatives separated by time and space.

EURIPIDES

Hector’s Shield

Trojan Women 1192-99
KT. 26

ἀλλ’ ὁν πατρὸν ύν λαχῶν ἐξεις ὃς
ἐξ ἦ ταφήση χαλκόνωτον ἰτέαν.
ὡς καλλίπηχυν Ἐκτορὸς βραχίονα
σῶζου’, ἀριστὸν φύλακ’ ἀπώλεσας σέθεν.
ὡς ἦδος ἐν πόρπακι σῶ κεῖται τύπος
ἵτως τ’ ἐν εὐτόρνοισι περιδρόμοις ἱδρὼς,
ὅν ἐκ μετώπου πολλάκις πόνους ἔχων
ἔσταξεν Ἐκτωρ προστιθείς γενειάδι.

No, though you lose your father’s heritage, you shall have
His broad, bronze-fronted shield to make your earthly bed.
Dear shield! You guarded Hector’s splendid arm, as he
Courageously kept you; but you have lost him now.
Here on your handgrip is the dear print of his palm;
Here, where his beard pressed on your round rim, ran the sweat
Which in the heat of battle flowed from Hector’s brow.
(Trans. P. Vellacott, 1954)

Discussion: Hekuba, addressing the corpse of her grandson Astyanax, states that he will not inherit his father Hector’s wealth but will receive his shield in death. The passage gives an illustration of a deceased child receiving an object from the past which he would have inherited had he reached adulthood. Hecuba also graphically describes the ways in which the shield is connected intimately with Hector: the grip still bears the impression (τύπος) of his palm. Her description of Hektor’s interaction with the shield evokes a sense of pathos in that it encourages the audience to imagine how Astyanax’s hand would have fit comfortably into the grip.
Astyanax’s Inheritance
KT. 27 Trojan Women 1209-1215

Dear child, your father’s mother lays on you these gifts;
Not as a prize for chariot-race for archery—
In honouring such things Phyrgians use due restraint;
But these gifts are the remnant of what once was yours,
Now robbed from you by Helen, whom the gods abhor,
Who took your life, and laid your father’s house in dust.
(Trans. P. Vellacott, 1954)

Discussion: Hecuba again expresses the idea that Astyanax receives his due inheritance in death.

Astyanax’s Wedding Raiment
KT. 28 Trojan Women 1218-1225

I fasten on you the Phrygian splendor of this robe
You should have put on for your wedding, to lead home
The royalist bride in Asia. And you, Hector’s shield,
Triumphant once, mother of many victories,
Receive your crown—an honour far more richly earned
Than any the cunning coward Odysseus’ arms could win.
Earth shall receive you, the undying, with the dead.
(Trans. P. Vellacott, 1954)


Discussion: In death, the boy wears a robe from the stores, one that he would have donned for his wedding. Although Hecuba does not recount the lineage of the garment, we might assume that it had been in the family’s possession for some time. The dedication of an “adult garment” to a child upon the occasion of his death is linked explicitly to his unrealized future as a husband.

**Medea’s Heirloom Robe**

**KT.29**

*Medea* 952-55

εὐδαιμονήσει δ’ οὐχ ἔν, ἀλλὰ μυρία,
ἀνδρός τ’ ἀρίστου σοῦ τυχοῦσ’ ὀμευνέτου
κεκτημένη τε κόσμον ὅν ποθ’ Ἡλιος
πατρὸς πατήρ δίδωσιν ἐκγόνοισιν οἷς.

She will have not one happiness but countless, getting in you an excellent husband to share her bed and possessing raiment which my grandfather Helios gave to his descendants. (Trans. D. Kovacs, forthcoming)

Discussion: The robe that Medea uses to exact revenge on Jason by killing his new wife Glauke was an heirloom. It was given by Helios to Medea’s grandfather and eventually was transferred to Medea (Mueller 2010, 386).

**Orestes’ Proof of Identity for Iphigenia**

**KT.30**

*Iphigenia in Tauris* 800-25

Ὁρέστης

ὦ συγκασιγνήτη τε κάκ ταῦτοῦ πατρὸς
’Αγαμέμνονος γεγώσα, μή μ’ ἀποστρέφου,
ἔχουσ’ ἀδελφόν, οὐ δοκοῦσ’ ἔξειν ποτέ.

Ἱφιγένεια

ἔγω σ’ ἀδελφόν τὸν ἐμὸν; οὐ παύσῃ λέγων;
τὸ δ’ Ἀργος αὐτοῦ μεστὸν ἢ τε Ναυπλία.

Ὁρέστης

οὐκ ἔστ’ ἐκεὶ σός, ὦ τάλαινα, σύγγονος.

Ἱφιγένεια

ἀλλ’ ἢ Λάκαινα Τυνδαρίς σ’ ἐγείνατο;

Ὁρέστης

Πέλοπὸς γε παιδὶ παιδός, οὐ ’κπέφυκ’ ἐγώ.
Ἰφιγένεια
tί φής; ἔχεις τι τώνδε μοι τεκμήριον;

Ὀρέστης
ἔχω: πατρώων ἐκ δόμων τι πυνθάνου.

Ἰφιγένεια
οὐκοῦν λέγειν μὲν χρὴ σέ, μανθάνειν δ’ ἐμέ.

Ὀρέστης
λέγοιμ’ ἂν, ἀκοῆ πρῶτον Ἡλέκτρας τάδε: Ἀτρέως θυέστου τ’ οἶσθα γενομένην έριν;

Ὀρέστης
ἔχω: πατρῴων ἐκ δόμων τι πυνθάνου.

Ἰφιγένεια
οὐκοῦν λέγειν μὲν χρή σέ, μανθάνειν δ’ ἐμέ.

Ὀρέστης
λέγοιμ’ ἂν, ἀκοῆ πρῶτον Ἡλέκτρας τάδε: Ἀτρέως θυέστου τ’ οἶσθα γενομένην έριν;

Ὑφηναὶ καὶ τὸδ’ εἶδος εὐμίτοις πλοκαῖς.

Ὀρέστης
καὶ λούτρ’ ἐς Αὖλιν μητρὶ ἀνεδέξω πάρα;

Ὀρέστης
τί γάρ; κόμας σὰς μητρὶ δούσα σήφερειν;
Ἰφιγένεια
μνημεῖά γ’ ἀντὶ σώματος τοῦμοῖ τάφῳ.

Ὀρέστης
α ὃ εἶδον αὐτός, τάδε φράσω τεκμήρια:
Πέλοπος παλαιὰν ἐν δόμιοι λόγχηνπατρός,
ἠν χερσὶ πάλλων παρθένον Πισάτιδα

ἐκτήσαθ’ Ἰπποδάμειαν, Ὀινόμαοκτανόν,
ἐν παρθενῶσι τοῖσι σοῖσι κεκρυμμένην.

.................................................................

Orestes
My own sister, born from my father Agamemnon, do not turn away from me, when you hold your brother and thought you never would!

Iphigenia
You are my brother? Stop this talk! He is well known in Argos and Nauplia.

Orestes
Unhappy girl, your brother is not there.

Iphigenia
But did Tyndareus' daughter, the Spartan, give birth to you?

Orestes
Yes, and my father was Pelops' grandson.

Iphigenia
What are you saying? Do you have some proof of this for me?

Orestes
I do; ask me something about our father's home.

Iphigenia
Well, it is for you to speak, for me to learn.

Orestes
I will say first what I have heard from Electra. Do you know of the strife that was between Atreus and Thyestes?
Iphigenia
I have heard of it; the quarrel concerned a golden ram.

Orestes
Did you not weave these things in a fine-textured web?

Iphigenia
O dearest, you are bending your course near to my heart!

Orestes
And the image of the sun in the middle of the loom?

Iphigenia
I wove that shape also, in fine threads.

Orestes
And you received a ceremonial bath from your mother, for Aulis?

Iphigenia
I know; for no happy marriage has taken that memory from me.

Orestes
What about this? You gave locks of your hair to be brought to your mother?

Iphigenia
As a memorial, in place of my body, in the tomb.

Orestes
What I myself have seen, I will say for proof: an old spear of Pelops, in my father's house, which he brandished in his hand when he won Hippodamia, the maiden of Pisa, and killed Oenomaus; it was hung up in your rooms. (Trans. G. Murray, 1913)

Discussion: In this dialogue, Orestes has come from Argos to the Temple of Artemis in Tauris in order to steal the cult image at the request of Apollo. He and his comrade Pylades are captured by the Taurians and brought before the priestess of Artemis to be sacrifice. Unbeknownst to Orestes, the priestess is his sister Iphigenia. She probes the travelers for information about her family in Argos and learns that Orestes is alive (although she does not realize that he stands before her). Upon hearing of her brother’s fate, she decides to free Pylades and send him back to Argos with a letter for Orestes, asking him to come rescue her.

Orestes, who now understands that the priestess is his sister, reveals himself to her, and she demands proof in the form of knowledge regarding their home. He recalls a tapestry that she wove with images of the battle between Atreus and Thyestes over the golden ram with a sun in the center, the ceremonial
bath Klytemnestra gave Iphigenia prior to setting off for Aulis, and the lock of hair that Iphigenia sent to her mother as a memorial. He also recalls the sword, which their great great grandfather had carried in the chariot race when he won the hand of Hippodamia and established the dynasty.

Whereas the stories regarding Iphigenia’s weaving and her marriage are known to Orestes secondhand through his sister Elektra, the spear is an heirloom, which hung in the family home and which he had seen personally (Kyriakou 2012, 267, 74). As Kyriakou points out (2012, 268), all of the proofs mentioned relate uniquely to the family’s past, both recent and distant. As in the Ion, here we see heirlooms serving as tools for recognition between two individuals separated by time and space. The fact that Orestes mentions the sword—a family relic—as a proof of his identity suggests that it was not a part of the public sphere; rather, it was something known only to members of the household (Kyriakou 2012, 270, 274-5).

Kreusa’s Heirloom Bracelet

KT. 31 Ion 999-1009

Κρέουσα

Ἐριχθόνιον οἶσθ’, ἦ —; τί δ’ οὐ μέλλεις, γέρον;

Πρεσβύτης

ἄν πρώτων ὑμῶν πρόγονον ἐξανήκε γῆ;

Κρέουσα

tούτῳ δίδωσι Παλλὰς ὄντι νεογόνῳ —

Πρεσβύτης

τί χρήμα; μέλλον γάρ τι προσφέρεις ἐπος.

Κρέουσα

dισσοὺς σταλαγμοὺς αἵματος Γοργοῦς ἀπο.

Πρεσβύτης

ἰσχῦν ἔχοντας τίνα πρὸς ἀνθρώπου φύσιν;

Κρέουσα

tὸν μὲν θανάσιμον, τὸν δ’ ἀκεσφόρον νόσων.

Πρεσβύτης

ἐν τῷ καθάψασ’ ἀμφὶ παιδὶ σώματος;
Κρέουσα
χρυσοῖσι δεσμοῖς: ὁ δὲ δίδωσ᾽ ἐμῷ πατρί.

Πρεσβύτης
κείνου δὲ κατθανόντος ἐς σὲ ἀφίκετο;

Κρέουσα
ναί: κἀπὶ καρπῷ γ’ αὖτ’ ἐγὼ χερὸς φέρω.

Kreusa
Do you know Erichthonius? But of course you do, old man.

Slave
The one whom the earth brought forth, first of your race?

Kreusa
To him while an infant Pallas gave—

Slave
What did she give? Your speech has such delays!

Kreusa
Two drops of blood from the Gorgon.

Slave
And what power do they have over mortals?

Kreusa
One is deadly, the other heals disease.

Slave
In what did she hang them around the infant's body?

Kreusa
In gold chains; and he gave them to my father.

Slave
And when he died, they came to you?
Kreusa
Yes; I wear them on my wrist.
(Trans. R. Potter, 1938)

Discussion: The bracelet that held the Gorgon’s blood was an heirloom given from Athena to Erechtheus. He then passed it down to his daughter Kreusa. The passage provides testament of jewelry being transferred between living generations.

KT. 32  Ion 1029-1034
χειρὸς ἐξ ἐμῆς λαβὼν
χρῡσῷ Ἀθάνας τόδε, παλαιόνδργανον,
ἔλθὼν ὑν’ ἦμιν βουθυτεῖ λάθρα πόσις,
δείπνων ὅταν λήγωσι καὶ σπονδᾶς θεοῖς
μέλλωσι λείβειν, ἐν πέπλοις ἔχων τόδε
κάθες βαλὼν ἐς πῶμα τῷ νεανίᾳ —

Here is the gold bracelet from my wrist, the same piece of work that Athena gave me many years past: go with it to these furtive celebrations of my husband’s; and when the feast is over, and they are going to make libation to the gods, take it from under your cloak and pour this drop into the young man’s cup. (Trans. P. Vellacott, 1954)

Discussion: Kreusa has a bracelet given to her by the goddess Athena, which holds two drops of gorgon blood. It is both an heirloom and a lethal weapon, which Kreusa instructs a slave to use against Ion.

Ion’s Antipêx (The Basket Containing Tokens of Recognition)
KT. 33  Ion 18-27
Κρέουσα, κάκτιθεισιν ὡς θανοῦμενον
κοίλης ἐν ἀντίπηγος εὐτρόχῳ κύκλῳ,
προγόνων νόμον σφιζοῦσα τοῦ τε γηγενοῦς
Ἐριχθονίου. κεῖνῳ γὰρ ἢ Διὸς κόρῃ
φρουρῷ παραζεύξασα φύλακε σώματος
dισσῷ δράκοντε, παρθένοις Ἁγλαύρισι
δίδωσι σφῖξιν: ὅθεν Ἐρεχθείδας ἐκεῖ
νόμος τις ἔστιν ὃφειν ἐν χρυσηλάτοις
tréfein tékna. ἀλλ’ ἦν ἐχε παρθένος χλιδὴν
téknoi prosφασα’ ἐλιπεν ὡς θανουμένω.
Then she [Kreusa] bore her son in her own home, and afterwards conveyed him to the same cave where Apollo lay with her; and there, in a deep rocking-cradle, she left him to die.

There was a tradition in her [Kreusa’s] family which said that when Erichthonius was born of his mother Earth, Athena set a pair of entwined serpents as his bodyguard to watch him, and so entrusted him to the care of the daughters of Aglauros; and from that time to the present day the descendants of Erechtheus duly adorn their children with a necklace of golden serpents. Kreusa observed this custom; she also wrapped round the infant a rich shawl woven by herself as a girl; and so left him to die (Trans. P. Vellacott, 1954).

Discussion: The passage describes the process by which the mother came to place objects from the past in the grave of her infant. Kreusa constructs her newborn son’s burial assemblage using items that are rooted in both the Erechtheids’ family tradition (the golden snake necklace) and her personal history (a sampler). These items were curated by the priestess of Apollo and later will become Ion’s tokens of investiture, which allow him to recognize his mother and his mother to recognize her son as an adult. Mueller (2010, 392-3) also notes that the items within the basket were symbols of the Athenians’ religions and civic traditions: the gorgon on the textile recalls the aegis of the city’s patron deity; the amuletic snakes reference the snakes that guarded Erichthonius on the Acropolis; and the olive branch alludes to the goddess Athena’s gift of the olive tree to the city.

KT. 34  
Ion 1399-1435  
Κρέουσα

οὐκ ἐν σιωπῇ τάμα: μή με νουθέτει.  
ὁρῶ γὰρ ἄγγος οὗ ’ξεθῆκ’ ἐγώ ποτε —  
σέ γ’, ὦ τέκνων μοι, βρέφος ἐτ’ οὖντα νήπιον,  
Κέκροπος ἐς ἄντρα καὶ Μακρὰς πετρηρεφεῖς.  
λείψω δὲ βωμὸν τόνδε, κεὶ θανεῖν με χρή.  

"Ἰων  
λάζυσθε τήνδε: θεομάνης γὰρ ἠλατο  
βωμοῦ λιποῦσα ξόανα: δεῖτε δ’ ὀλένας.

Κρέουσα

σφάζοντες οὐ λήγοιτ’ ἄν: ως ἀνθέξομαι  
καὶ τήσδε καὶ σοῦ τῶν τε σῶν κεκρυμένων.
"Ἰων
τάδ᾿ οὐχὶ δεινά; ῥυσιάζομαι λόγῳ.

Κρέουσα
οὐκ, ἀλλὰ σοῖς φίλοισιν εὐρίσκη φίλος.

"Ἰων
ἐγὼ φίλος σός; κἀτά μ᾽ ἔκτεινες λάθρα;

Κρέουσα
παῖς γ’, εἰ τόδ᾽ ἐστὶ τοῖς τεκοῦσι φίλτατον.

"Ἰων
παῦσαι πλέκουσα. — λήψομαι σ’ ἑγὼ καλῶς.

Κρέουσα
ἐς τοῦθ᾽ ἱκοίμην, τοῦδε τοξεῦω, τέκνον.

"Ἰων
κενὸν τόδ᾿ ἄγγος ἢ στέγει πλήρωμά τι;

Κρέουσα
σά γ’ ἐνδυθ’, οἰσί σ’ ἔξεθηκ’ ἑγὼ ποτε.

"Ἰων
καὶ τοῦνομ’ αὐτῶν ἔξερεις πρὶν εἰσιδεῖν;

Κρέουσα
κάν μὴ φράσω γε, καθανεῖν ύφίσταμαι.

"Ἰων
λέγ’: ὡς ἔχει τι δεινὸν ἢ γε τόλμα σου.

Κρέουσα
σκέψασθ’: ὁ παῖς ποτ’ οὖσ’ ὑφασμ’ ύψην’ ἑγὼ —
Ἴων
ποίόν τι; πολλὰ παρθένων ύφασματα.

Κρέουσα
οὐ τέλεον, σίον δ᾽ ἐκδίδαμα κερκίδος.

Ἴων
μορφήν ἔχον τίν'; ὡς με μὴ ταύτη λάβης.

Κρέουσα
Γοργὼ μὲν ἐν μέσοισιν ἠτρίοις πέπλων.

Ἴων
ὡ Ζεῦ, τίς ἡμᾶς ἐκκυνηγετεῖ πότμος;
Κρέουσα
κεκρασπέδωται δ᾽ ὀφεσιν αἰγίδος τρόπον.

Ἴων
ἰδού:
τόδ᾽ ἔσθ᾽ ύφασμα, θέσφαθ᾽ ώς εὐρίσκομεν.

Κρέουσα
ὡ χρόνιον ἱστῶν παρθένευμα τῶν ἐμῶν.

Ἴων
ἔστιν τι πρὸς τῷδ᾽, ἢ μόνῳ τῷδ᾽ εὐτυχεῖς;

Κρέουσα
δράκοντες: ἄρχαίον τι παγχρύσω γένει
dῷρημ' Ἀθάνας, ἢ τέκν' ἐντρέφειν λέγει — Ἐριχθονίου γε τοῦ πάλαι μμήματα.

Ἴων
τί δρᾶν, τί χρῆσθαι, φράζε μοι, χρυσώματι;

Κρέουσα
δέραια παιδὶ νεογόνῳ φέρειν, τέκνον.
Creusa
I cannot be silent; do not give me advice. For I see the cradle, in which I once exposed you, my son, when you were still an infant, in the caves of Cecrops and the overhanging rocks of Macrai. I will leave this altar, even if I must die.

Ion
Seize her; for she has been driven mad by the god and has left the wooden images of the altar; bind her hands.

Creusa
Do not hesitate to kill me; I shall lay claim to this vase, and you, and your concealed tokens.

Ion
Isn't this terrible? I am being seized by your talk.

Creusa
No, but you have been found to be dear to your own.

Ion
I am dear to you? And you were trying to kill me secretly?

Creusa
You are my child, if that is most dear to parents.

Ion
Stop weaving your plots; I will certainly catch you out.

Creusa
May I come to what I am aiming at, my child!

Ion
Is this vessel empty, or does it cover something?
Creusa
Yes, your clothes, in which I then exposed you.

Ion
And will you name them to me, before you see them?

Creusa
If I do not say them, I consent to die.

Ion
Speak; your daring has something strange in it.

Creusa
Look; cloth that I wove as a child.

Ion

Creusa
Not completed, like a practice-work from the loom.

Ion
What appearance does it have? You will not catch me in this way.

Creusa
A Gorgon in the middle threads of the robe.

Ion
O Zeus, what fate hunts me down!

Creusa
And, like an aegis, bordered with serpents.

Ion
Look! That is the robe, as we are finding out the oracle.

Creusa
O long-lost work of my loom when I was a girl!

Ion
Is there anything else besides, or are you lucky in this only?

Creusa
Serpents; an old gift of Athena, in gold; she tells us to rear children, in imitation of Erichthonius of long ago.
Ion
Tells you to do what with the gold, how to use it? Explain it to me.

Creusa
Necklaces for the new-born baby to wear, my child.

Ion
They are here; I long to know the third thing.

Creusa
I put an olive crown around you, from the tree that Athena first brought out of the rock; if it is there, it has not lost its green, but flourishes, born from an immortal olive tree. (Trans. R. Potter, 1938)


KT.35  
_Herakles_ 464-71
σοι μὲν γὰρ Ἀργος ἔνεμός τοῦ κατθανὼν πατήρ,  
Εὐρυσθέως δὲ ἔμελλες οἰκήσειν δόμους  
tῆς καλλικάρπου κράτος ἔχων Πελασγίας,  
465στολήν τε θηρός ἀμφέβαλλε σὺ κάρα  
λέοντος, ἢπερ αὐτός ἔξωπλίζετο:  
σὺ δὲ ᾿Ησθα Θηβῶν τῶν φιλαρμάτων ἄναξ,  
ἐγκλήρα πεδία τὰμά γῆς κεκτημένος,  
ως ἔξεπείθες τὸν κατασπείραντά σε:  
ἐς δεξιάν τε σὴν ἀλεξητήριον  
ξύλου καθίει δαίδαλον, ψευδή δόσιν.

To you your dead father was for giving Argos; and you were to dwell in the halls of Eurystheus, lording it over the fair fruitful land of Argolis and over your head would he throw that lion’s skin with which he himself was armed. And you were to be king of Thebes, famed for its chariots, receiving as your heritage my broad lands, for so you coaxed your dear father; and to your hand he used to resign the carved club, his sure defence, pretending to give it to you. (Trans. E.P. Coleridge, 1938)

PLUTARCH

_Theseus’ Tokens of Investiture_

KT.36  
Plutarch, _Theseus_ 3.4-6
ἐπεισεν αὐτόν ἢ διηπάτησε τῇ Ἀἴθρασυγγενέσθαι. συνελθὼν δὲ καὶ γνοὺς  
ἐκεῖνος ὃτι τῇ Πιτθές θυγατρὶ συγγέγονε, καὶ κύειν αὐτὴν ὑπονοήσας, ἀπὲ
Theseus’ Tokens of Investiture

Aegeus [had intercourse with Aethra], and then learning that it was the daughter of Pittheus with whom he had consorted, and suspecting that she was with child by him, he left a sword and a pair of sandals hidden under a great rock, which had a hollow in it just large enough to receive these objects. He told the princess alone about this and bade her, if a son should be born to her from him, and if, when he came to man’s estate, he should be able to lift up the rock and take away what had been left under it, to send that son to him with the tokens, in all secrecy, and concealing his journey as much as possible from everybody; for he was mightily in fear of the sons of Pallas, who were plotting against him, and who despised him on account of his childlessness; and they were fifty in number, these sons of Pallas. Then he went away. (Trans. B. Perrin, 1914)
This is the first Troezenian legend about Theseus. The next is that Aegeus placed boots and a sword under a rock as tokens for the child, and then sailed away to Athens; Theseus, when sixteen years old, pushed the rock away and departed, taking what Aegeus had deposited. There is a representation of this legend on the Acropolis, everything in bronze except the rock. (Trans. W.H.S. Jones, 1918)

Necklace of Harmonia

KT.38 Apollod. Bib. 3.4.2

μετὰ δὲ τὴν θητείαν Ἀθηνᾶ αὐτῷ τὴν βασιλείαν κατεσκεύασε, Ζεὺς δὲ ἐδωκεν αὐτῷ γυναῖκα Ἀρμονίαν, Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Ἄρεος θυγατέρα. καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καταλιπόντες τὸν οὐρανόν, ἐν τῇ Καδμείᾳ τὸν γάμον εὐωχούμενοι καθύμνησαν. ἐδωκεδὲ αὐτῇ Κάδμος πέπλον καὶ τὸν Ἡφαιστότευκτον ὄρμον, ὃν ὑπὸ Ἡφαίστου λέγουσι τίνες δοθέναι Κάδμῳ, Φερεκύδης δὲ ὑπὸ Εὐρώπης: ὅν παρὰ Δίος αὐτὴν λαβεῖν.

After his [Cadmus’] servitude Athena procured for him the kingdom, and Zeus gave him to wife Harmonia, daughter of Aphrodite and Ares. And all the gods quitted the sky, and feasting in the Cadmea celebrated the marriage with hymns. Cadmus gave her a robe and the necklace wrought by Hephaestus, which some say was given to Cadmus by Hephaestus, but Pherecydes says that it was given by Europa, who had received it from Zeus. (Trans. J.G. Frazer, 1921)

KT.39 Paus. 9.41.2

ἀνακεῖσθαι δὲ ἐνταῦθα λέγουσιν ὀρμὸν Ἀρμονία μὲν δοθέντα ἔξ ἄρχης, καλοῦμενον δὲ Ἕριφύλης, ὅτι αὐτῇ δώρων ἔλαβεν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ: ὃν ἀνέθεσαν μὲν οἱ παῖδες ἐς Δελφοὺς οἱ φηγέως—τρόπων δὲ ὡντινα ἐκτήσαντο αὐτόν, ἐδήλωσεν ἢδη μοι τὰ ἐς Ἀρκάδας ἔχοντα—, ἐσυλήθη δὲ ὑπὸ τυράννων τῶν ἐν Φωκεύσιν.

In Cyprus is a city Amathus, in which is an old sanctuary of Adonis and Aphrodite. Here they say is dedicated a necklace given originally to
Harmonia, but called the necklace of Eriphyle, because it was the bribe she took to betray her husband. It was dedicated at Delphi by the sons of Phegeus (how they got it I have already related in my history of Arcadia), but it was carried off by the tyrants of Phocis. (Trans. W.H.S. Jones, 1918)

Discussion: Accounts of the necklace of Eriphyle give some indication of the long and rich histories that jewelry might have. The necklace was allegedly made by Hephaistos for Harmonia, the daughter of Ares and Aphrodite. It was given to Harmonia on the occasion of her marriage to Kadmos, king of Thebes. The necklace was given by Harmonia to Polyneices, who bribed Eriphyle to influence her husband to join the campaign against Thebes.
APPENDIX 5

TESTIMONIA ON BREAKAGE, REPAIR, AND RECYCLING

RT. 1 Aristophanes, Frogs 980-88

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ
νὴ τοὺς θεοὺς νῦν γοῦν Ἀθηναίων
ἀπας τις εἰσὶν
κέκραγε πρὸς τοὺς οἰκέτας
ζητεῖ τε, 'ποῦ 'στιν ἡ χύτρα;
τίς τήν κεφαλὴν ἀπεδήδοκεν
τῆς μαίνιδος; τὸ τρύβλιον
τὸ περυσιὸν τέθνηκέ μοι:
ποῦ τὸ σκόροδον τὸ χιτίζον;
τίς τῆς ἐλάας παρέτραγεν;

Heavens yes, these days each and every Athenian
comes home and starts yelling at the slaves,
demanding to know “Where’s the pot? Who chewed
the head off this sprat? The bowl I bought last year is
shot! Where’s that garlic from yesterday? Who’s been
nibbling olives?” They used to sit there like
dummies, gaping boobies, Simple Simons.
(Trans. J. Henderson, 2002)

RT. 2 Aristophanes, Acharnians 458-9

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ
μάλλὰ μοι δὸς ἐν μόνον,
κοτυλίσκιον τὸ χεῖλος ἀποκεκρυμένον.

No, but give me just one thing more, a little goblet
with a broken lip.
(Trans. J. Henderson, 2006)

RT. 3 Aristophanes, Lysistrata 408-13

ΠΡΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ
νὴ τὸν Ποσειδῶν τὸν ἁλυκὸν δίκαιά γε.
ὅταν γὰρ αὐτοὶ ξυμπονηρευμέθα

359
By Poseidon the Salty, it serves us right! When we ourselves abet our wives’ misbehavior and teach them profligacy, these are the sort of schemes they bring to flower! Aren’t we the ones who go to the shops and say this kind of thing: “Goldsmith, about that choker you made me: my wife was having a ball the other night, and now the prong’s slipped out of the hole. Me, I’ve got to cruise over to Salamis, so if you’ve got time, by all means visit her in the evening and fit a prong in her hole.” Another husband says this to a shoemaker, a teenager sporting no boyish cock: “Shoemaker, about my wife’s tootsy: the thong is squeezing her pinky winky, where she’s tender. So why don’t you drop in on her some lunchtime and loosen it up so there’s more play down there?”

(Trans. J. Henderson, 2000)

**RT. 4 Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 929-4**

ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟΣ
Ενδησον, ὦ βέλτιστε, τῷ
ἐξέλθων καλῶς τὴν ἐμπολὴν

360
όντως ὅπως
ἂν μὴ φέρων κατάξῃ.

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ
ἐμοὶ μελήσει ταῦτ’, ἑπεί
toi καὶ ψοφεῖ λάλον ti καὶ
πυρορραγές
cάλλως θεοίσιν ἑχθρόν.

CHORUS LEADER
Dear fellow, pack the merchandise
nicely for our foreign friend,
so that he can carry it
without breaking it.

DIKAIOPOLIS
I’ll take care of that, because
—listen—it makes a chattering
and fire-cracked noise,
altogether godforsaken.
(Trans. J. Henderson, 2006)

RT. 5 Aristophanes, Acharnians 935-40

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ
πάγχρηστον ἄγγος ἔσται,
κρατὴρ κακῶν, τριπτὴρ δικῶν,
φαίνειν ὑπευθύνους λυχνοῦ—
χος καὶ κύλιξ
τὰ πράγματ’ ἐγκυκάσθαι.

DICAEOPOLIS
It will be a pot for every purpose:
a bowl for mixing evils, a mortar for pounding
lawsuits,
a lampstand to expose outgoing officials,
and a cup
for blending trouble.
(Trans. J. Henderson, 2006)
RT. 6 Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1305-6

ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ τοῖς ὀστράκοις
αὕτη κροτοῦσα;

Where’s that female percussionist who plays potsherds?
(Trans. J. Henderson, 2002)

RT. 7 Aristophanes, *Wealth* 543-6

ἀντὶ δὲ μάζης φυλλεῖ ἰσχνῶν
ῥαφανίδων,
ἀντὶ δὲ θράνου στάμνου κεφαλῆς κατεαγότος, ἀντὶ
dὲ μάκτρας
πιθακής πλευρᾶν ἐρρωγυῖαν καὶ ταύτην ἀρά γε
πολλῶν
ἀγαθῶν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀποφαίνω σ’ αἰτίον
οὐσαν;

We sit not on chairs
but on broken crocks, and instead of a kneading
trough we get one side of a barrel, and that’s broken
too. Now haven’t I revealed the many blessings you
bring to all humanity?
(Trans. J. Henderson, 2002)

RT. 8 Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1188-91

ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΣ
μὰ τὸν Δί᾽ οὐ δῆτ’, οὐ μὲν οὖν ἐπαύσατο.
πῶς γάρ; ὅτε δὴ πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὸν γενόμενον
χειμῶνος ἄντος ἐξέθεαν ἐν ὀστράκῳ,
ἵνα μὴ ’κταφεῖς γένοιτο τοῦ πατρὸς φονεύς

AESCHYLUS

Considering that as a newborn
they put him in a pot and exposed him in the dead of
winter, so he wouldn’t become his father’s murderer
when he grew up.
She begged him also not to bring this bronze-backed shield, the Achaeans’ terror, which this boy’s father used to hold against his side, to the home of Peleus or to take it into the same chamber where she will become his bride [the mother of this dead boy, Andromache, so as to see grief], but to bury the boy in it instead of a cedar coffin and a stone tomb.


RT. 10 Athenaeus 209f-210a

φαμὲν αὐτῷ ὅτι καὶ λόγος
tis eis Lusiān ēnaphēretai ton ῥήτορα Peri Ἐγγυθήκης ἐπιγραφόμενος, oũ h ἀρχή eî mēn dīkaiοn ἔλεγεν h métrιon, ἄνδρες δικασταί, 
Lusiμéνης, ēn ō προελθὼν φησίν: oûk ēn ἐσπούδαζον περί αὐτῆς τῆς ἐγγυθήκης 
dikaiologeisthēs, h oûk éstin ἄξια τριάκοντα 
δραχμῶν, ὅτι δὲ χαλκῆ ἢ ἡ ἐγγυθήκη έξης φησίν: 
πέρυσιν δὲ ἐπισκευάσαι αὐτὴν βουλόμενος 
έξεδωκα eîs tî χαλκείον: ἐστὶ γὰρ συνθετὴ καὶ 
σατύρων ἔχει πρόσωπα καὶ βουκεφάλια <..>
ἀλλὰ ἕτει μέγεθος τὸ αὐτὸ. ὦ γὰρ αὐτὸς τεχνίτης πολλὰ σκεύη ταύτα καὶ ὤμοια ἐργάζεται.

I say to him that there is a speech attributed to the orator Lysias entitled On the Enguthēkē (fr. XLII Meddu) which begins: If Lysimenes were arguing something just or reasonable, gentlemen of the jury . . . And further on in it he says: I would not have been eager to make a courtroom speech about the enguthēkē itself, which is not worth 30 drachmas. Immediately after this he says that the enguthēkē was made of bronze: Last year I wanted to have it repaired, and I turned it over to the foundry; for it is made of a number of pieces and has satyrs’ faces and bulls’ heads on it . . . yet another one of the same size; because the same craftsman produces many pieces that are the same or similar.

(Trans. S. Douglas Olson, 2009)

RT. 11 Aristophanes, Wasps 926

ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΩΝ
ἐμοὶ δὲ γ’ οὐκ ἔστ’ οὐδὲ τὴν υδρίαν πλάσαι.

LOVECLEON
And me without enough plaster to patch my water pot!


RT. 12 Aristophanes, Wasps 1435-40

ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΩΝ
ἀκουε, μὴ φεῦγ’. ἐν Συβάρει γυνὴ ποτεκατέαζ’ ἐξίνον.

ΚΑΘΗΓΟΡΟΣ
ταῦτ’ ἐγὼ μαρτύρομαι.

ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΩΝ
οὐχίνος οὖν ἔχων τιν’ ἐπεμαρτύρατο.
eἰθ’ ἡ Συβαρῖτις εἶπεν· “εἰ ναὶ τὰν Κόραν
tὴν μαρτυρίαν ταύτην ἐάσας ἐν τάχει
ἐπίδεσμον ἐπρίω, νοῦν ἂν εἶχες πλείονα.”

LOVECLEON
“Do you know the one about the woman from Sybaris who broke a jug?”.

ACCUSER
Witness, take note!

LOVECLEON
“If you spent less time calling people to witness and went out and brought a rivet,
you’d show more sense”
(Trans. D. Barrett, 1964)

RT. 13 Iamata of Epidauros, Stele A10
LiDonnici 1995, 92-3 (text and translation).

The cup. A baggage carrier was walking into the sanctuary, but he fell down near the ten stadia stone. Getting up, he opened his bag and looked at the shattered things. When he saw that the cup from which his master was accustomed to drink was broken into pieces, he grieved and sitting down, tried putting the pieces together. Some passerby saw him. “Why, fool,” he said, “are you fruitlessly putting that cup together? For not even Asklepios in Epidauros would be able to make that
cup whole.” Hearing this the boy, having put the pieces into his bag, walked into
the sanctuary. When he arrived he opened the bag and took out the cup, which had
become whole. He explained to his master what had happened and what had been
said. When he heard it, he dedicated the cup to the god.
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Figure 1: Flow chart showing the life cycle of artifacts (Schiffer 1972, fig. 1).

Fig. 2: Repair types according to Nadalini: a) sutura a lignotto; b) sutura a rivetto; c) sutura alveolare; d) sutura alveolare contrapposta. IMAGE: Nadalini 2007, fig. 2.
Fig 3: a) Apulian red-figure bell krater with mends. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 78.AE.256; b) Drawing showing cross-section of mended krater; X-ray of the mends. IMAGES: Elston 1990, figs. 26-8.
Fig. 4: Attic red-figure calyx-krater with repairs made of copper alloy plates and nails. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 480: ARV² 1084, 12; Add 160; Add² 327. IMAGE: Dooijes and Nieuwenhuyse 2007, Taf. 1, 3.
Fig. 5: Attic red-figure cup with ancient repairs placed inconspicuously. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 152. Details from interior (left) and exterior (right). IMAGES: Nadalini 2007, figs. 7-8.

Fig. 6: Attic red-figure stamnos with staples limited to the black ground (Mannheim, Reiss-Museum Cg 60). Attributed to the Troilus Painter (c. 480 B.C.). Note how close the staple comes to the cloak of the central figure’s left side. IMAGE: CVA Mannheim 1, pl. 29.5.
Fig. 7: Attic black-figure skyphos (525-475 B.C.) from Narce with numerous tiny ancient staples (now lost) once set in channels (Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia 5235). IMAGE: CVA Rome 3, 24, pl. 47.1-2.

Fig. 8: Fragment of a red-figure krater from Olbia with the mortise-and-tenon clamp (center) and lead bars on either side. IMAGE: Guldager Bilde and Handberg 2012, fig. 2.
Fig. 9: Attic black-figure cup by Tleson (c. 550 B.C.; Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 8944). The lead that was poured into the cone of the cup to reattach the foot to the bowl is clearly visible. IMAGE: CVA Amsterdam 2, 50-51, pl. 95.

Fig. 10: Attic red-figure cup attributed to the Onesimos Painter (Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 83.AE.362). Inside the cone of the foot, the bronze “sleeve” is visible. IMAGE: Elston 1990, fig. 1.
Fig. 11: Drawing showing the cross section of Fig. 10. IMAGE: Elston 1990, fig. 4.
Fig. 12: Fragments of an Attic red-figure cup attributed to the Penthesilea Painter. Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 2293 (c. 450 B.C.). Above side view showing the bronze strip holding together the bowl and foot (IMAGE: CVA Amsterdam 1, pl. 45). Below drawing showing a cross-section of the stem, just above the foot. The channels are where the metal pins were inserted to secure the bronze strip (IMAGE: CVA Amsterdam 1, 85).
Fig. 13: Left Attic black-figure neck-amphora with alien neck attached via ancient repair (Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 86.AE.85). Attributed to the Bareiss Painter (530-520 B.C.). IMAGE: Moore and von Bothmer 1972, fig. 23. Right Detail showing the neck of the neck-amphora with the vertical channels and mending holes. IMAGE: Moore and von Bothmer 1972, fig. 22.

Fig. 14: Attic black-figure Nikosthenic amphora from the Banditaccia necropolis, Cerveteri. The left handle was replaced with a substitute handle in a yellowish fabric. Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia 47492. IMAGE: Ricci 1955, fig. 246.
Fig. 15: Attic red-figure skyphos repaired with an alien fragment from a black-figure krater on side B. Paris, Musée du Louvre G 567. IMAGE: Pottier 1906, pl. 156.

Fig. 16: Left alien fragment from a cup by Douris, since removed from a red-figure stamnos, shown at right in a drawing made close to the time of acquisition. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 16527: ARV₂ 432, 53, 1653; Add₂ 237. IMAGE: Sannibale 2007, 49-50, figs. 3 and 4.
Fig. 17: Left Attic red-figure pelike with a round hole where an alien black-glaze fragment was inserted (Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 79.AE.174). Right Detail showing the channel connecting the alien fragment and the pelike. IMAGE: Elston 1990, figs. 21-2.

Fig. 18: Attic black-figure eye-cup with a plain black-glaze fragment inserted to repair the rim (Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 87.AE.220). IMAGE: Elston 1990, fig. 23.
Fig. 20: Attic black-figure Little Master cup with replacement handle fashioned from lead in antiquity (now removed) at right. Signed by Nikosthenes (545-540 B.C.). Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 60.640a (the cup) and 60.640b (the lead handle). IMAGE: MFA website (http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/drinking-cup-kylix-153482; Accessed December 27, 2013).
Fig. 20: Attic red-figure plastic rhyton. The rim of the drinking cup had been filed down (London, British Museum GR 1873.8-20.267: CVA British Museum 4, III I c, 7, pl. 37 1a-d). IMAGE: Cohen 2006, 264-5, Cat. 77.
Fig. 21: Attic Little Master band cup from the Crocefisso del Tufo necropolis, Orvieto. Gold repoussé gorgoneion that concealed the repair. IMAGES: Bizzarri 1963, tav. V.c (cup); 87, fig. 28 (plaque).

Image redacted due to copyright restrictions

Fig. 22: Attic red-figure cup with gold leaf repairs from the Kleinaspergle tumulus (Stuttgart: Landesmuseum Württemberg KAS 113). Attributed to the Amphitrite Painter (c. 450 B.C.). IMAGE: Museum Archive.

Image redacted due to copyright restrictions
Fig. 23: Exterior (left) and interior (right) of the Attic black-glaze cup with gold leaf repairs from the Kleinaspergle tumulus (Stuttgart: Landesmuseum Württemberg KAS 114). IMAGE: Kimmig 1988, Taf. 31-2.
Fig. 24: Coral red cup from the Agora attributed to Euphronios as Painter (c. 515 B.C.). Traces of mending holes and lead *lamellae* are visible along the breaks. Athens: Agora Museum P 32344. IMAGE: Cohen 2006, fig. 10.1-2.
Fig. 25: Unattributed coral red cup from the Agora (510-500 B.C.). Athens: Agora Museum P 33221. IMAGE: Lynch 2011a, 229, Fig. 85.

Fig. 27: Mouth of a Corinthian alabastron from the Potters’ Quarter at Corinth. The black paint along the breaks is evidence of repairs made prior to firing. Corinth, Archaeological Museum of Ancient Corinth KP 1430. IMAGE: Author.
Fig. 28: Distribution of repairs by shape according to the present survey.
Fig. 29: Type A cup with foot in the form of male genitals (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1974.344). Attributed to the Manner of the Lysippides Painter and Andokides as potter (c. 520 B.C.). IMAGE: Cohen 2006, 258-9, Figs. 74.1-2.

Fig. 30: Rhyton in the form of a bird (dove) with red-figure cup inserted on back (480-470 B.C.). “From Capua.” St. Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum B 1876. IMAGE: Cohen 2006, 280, Fig. 85.

Image redacted due to copyright restrictions
Fig. 31: Pithos with conical bowl used as a cover. From Tomb 211 on the Via Salerno, Gela. The cover has ancient mends (not visible). IMAGE: Orsi 1906, Tav. V (center).
Fig. 32: Brass rivet repairs on the back of a large 17th century A.D. dish. IMAGE: Williams 2002, 17.

Fig. 33: Tea container (18th century) with kintsugi repair. IMAGE: Bartlett and Holland 2008, 41.
Fig. 34: Teabowl (17th century) with *kintsugi* repair. IMAGE: Bartlett and Holland 2008, 26.

Fig. 35: Teabowl (18th century) with *kintsugi* repair. Rim of bowl reconstructed with silver, and gold designs complete the lost bird motif. IMAGE: Bartlett and Holland 2008, 35.
Fig. 36: Schematic drawing (1879) of the intact burial chamber at Kleinaspergle. The Attic cups are indicated by a red arrow. IMAGE: Kimmig 1988, Abb. 13.

Fig. 37: Modern drawing showing the position of the objects in the Kleinaspergle chamber: a. cremation remains; b. spoon; c. lignite ring; d. gold fittings; e. belt fitting; f. two Greek cups; g. two gold horns; h. beak-spouted jug; i. stamnos; k. bronze stamnos; l. bronze basin. IMAGE: Kimmig 1988, Abb. 18.
Fig. 38: Bronze basin from the Kleinaspergle tumulus. IMAGE: Kimmig 1988, Taf. 18.

Image redacted due to copyright restrictions

Fig. 39: Etruscan bronze stamnos from the Kleinaspergle tumulus. IMAGE: Kimmig 1988, Taf. 15.

Image redacted due to copyright restrictions
Fig. 40: Detail showing the bronze patch on the bronze basin from the Kleinaspergle tumulus. IMAGE: Kimmig 1988, Taf. 19.

Fig. 41: Handle of the Etruscan stamnos from the Kleinaspergle tumulus with arrows indicating the position of circular rivet heads. IMAGE: Kimmig 1988, Taf. 13 (above).
Fig. 42: Breakdown of the classes of mended objects (n=17) in the Purgatorio necropoleis.
Fig. 43: Tomb 19 of the Purgatorio necropoleis (below) and its contents (above), including the mended skyphos (n. 14) and its ‘mate’ (n. 9). IMAGE: De Juliis 2006, 70.
Fig. 44: Tomb 10 of the Purgatorio necropoleis (below) and its contents (above), including the mended skyphos (n. 6). IMAGE: De Juliis 2006, 38.
Fig. 45: The contents of the deposit found outside Purgatorio Tomb 18 on its western side. Number 42 is the mended skyphos. IMAGE: De Juliis 2006, 60.

Fig. 45: Detail from the François Vase (signed by Kleitias as Painter and Ergotimos as potter, c. 570-560 B.C.). Pictured is Troilos on horseback following Polyxena on foot. Below the horses is a hydria with a label (HYΔΡΙΑ). Florence, Museo Archeologico Etrusco 4209: BAPD 300000; ABV 76, 1; 682; Para 29. IMAGE: Shapiro, Iozzo, and Lezzi-Hafter 2013, pl. 42.
Fig. 47: Attic black-figure Siana cup attributed to the C Painter (575 B.C.). Beneath the feet of Achilles lies the fallen vessel. New York, Metropolitan Museum 01.8.6: ABV 51, 4; 681; Para 23; CVA New York 2, 1-2, pls. 2.2a-d, 36.2; BAPD 300381. IMAGE: Metropolitan Museum online http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/246931?rpp=30&pg=1&ft=troilos&pos=3 (Accessed May 28, 2014).

Fig. 48: Detail of the shoulder of an Attic black-figure hydria attributed to the Antimenes Painter (520-510 B.C.) showing the Polyxena fleeing at right, followed by Troilos on horseback, and Achilles in pursuit. Beneath the horse lies the discarded hydria on its side, separated into two parts across the mid-section. Hannover, Kestner Museum 1965: Para 199, 27, Add 70. IMAGE: CVA Hannover 1, 29-30, pl. 19.1.
Fig. 49: Detail of hydria showing the ambush of Troilos. Below the prince’s horse is a fallen hydria with a scalloped break. Attributed to the Troilus Painter. London, British Museum 1899.7-2-4: BAPD 203082; ARV 191, 14; ARV² 297, 15; Add² 211; IMAGE: BAPD 203082.

Fig. 50: Exterior of an Attic red-figure cup showing Achilles slaying Troilos. Beneath the horse at left is a hydria with a wide back band across its middle—a stylized break. Attributed to the Brygos Painter (c. 480 B.C.). Paris, Musée du Louvre G 154: BAPD 203902; ARV 246, 3; ARV² 369, 3; Add 111; Add² 224. IMAGE: BAPD 203902.
Fig. 51: Attic white ground lekythos and detail showing the base of a tomb with lekythoi, alabastra, and other dedications knocked over on their sides. The overgrown vegetation may be another indicator of the neglect of the tomb. Unattributed (500-450 B.C.). Paris, Musée du Louvre CA 3756. IMAGE: Kurtz 1975, pl. 23.3.

Fig. 51: Attic white ground lekythos picturing women arriving at a tomb with dedications of an alabastron and a basket with wreaths and fillets. On the ground line, in front of the woman at left is the upper half of a lekythos, broken just below the shoulder. Attributed to the Beldam Painter (475-450 B.C.). Athens, National Museum 1982. IMAGE: Kurtz 1975, 202, pl. 18.2.
Fig. 52: Detail from an Attic red-figure chous showing a man threatening a boy with a sandal over a cracked wine jug (480-470 B.C.). Paris, Musée du Louvre CA 493. IMAGE: Mitchell 2009, fig. 107.

Fig. 54: Detail from an Attic red-figure chous which pictures Dionysos holding a sandal and threatening a satyr over a broken wine jug. Berlin, Private collection. IMAGE: Mitchell 2009, fig. 108.
Fig. 55: Exterior of a red-figure cup in Boston featuring the battle between the centaurs and Lapiths. The centaur at left wields the upper half of an amphora that has been broken off crosswise leaving jagged lower edges. The centaur at right holds a lamp stand. Signed by Aristophanes as painter and Erginos as potter (420-410 B.C.). Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 00.344. IMAGE: Museum of Fine Arts website, https://www.mfa.org/collections/object/drinking-cup-kylix-153693/(Accessed May 29, 2014).

Fig. 56: Attic red-figure squat lekythos showing the rites of the Adonia (Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B 39 [278]). A winged figure hands a woman on a ladder a broken amphora top to be carried up to the roof. Below the pair is another planter made from the upper half of an amphora. Attributed to the circle of the Meidias Painter (c. 390 B.C.). IMAGE: Reeder 1995, fig. 61.
Fig. 57: Evolutionary model for the circulation of heirlooms in different sociopolitical orders (Lillios 1999, 256).

![COMPANION OBJECTS](image)

Fig. 58: Model showing the potential life cycle of companion objects.
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Fig. 59: Model showing the potential life cycle of mementoes.
Fig. 60: Model showing the potential life cycle of heirlooms.

Fig. 61: Model showing the potential life cycle of entangled objects.
Fig. 62: Model showing the potential life cycle of antiques.

Fig. 63: Model showing the potential life cycle of found objects.
Fig. 64: Working model showing the types of distance that must be taken into account in the study of *keimêlia*.

Fig. 65: Working model showing how the different potential meanings of *keimêlia* may relate to different types of distance.
Fig. 66: Two Gold Bracelets: Çanakkale Museum 7674 and 7675 (Sevinç and Rose 1999, figs. 11 and 2).

Fig. 67: Gold Necklace: Çanakkale Museum 7677 (Sevinç and Rose 1999, fig. 13).

Fig. 68: Gold Necklace: Çanakkale Museum 7676 (Sevinç and Rose 1999, fig. 15).
Fig. 69: Skyphoi, Attic Black-figure (Koeller and Panayotova 2010, fig. 5).

Fig. 70: Gem: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.24 (Trofimova 2007, No. 154).

Fig. 71: Lekanis, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.32 (Petrakova 2012, fig. 1).
Fig. 72: Lekanis, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.18 (Petrakova 2012, fig. 2).

Fig. 73: Krater, lekythos and hydria: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.28, 27, 28 (Petrakova 2012, fig. 3).

Fig. 74: Lekanis, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.9; Pelike, Attic Red-figure: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu-O.10 (Petrakova 2012, fig. 4).
Fig. 75: Gem, Scaraboid, East Greek: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu.O.6 (Althaus and Sutcliffe 2006, 102).

Fig. 76: Gem, Scaraboid Jasper with Running Horse: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum Yu.O.7 (Althaus and Sutcliffe 2006, 259).
Fig. 77: Gold Armlet: St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum KO 18 (Williams and Ogden 1994, 140, fig. 84).

Fig. 78: Horse-head Amphora, Type B, Attic Black-figure (ArchDelt 27, 1972, B1 (1976), pl. 55.1).
Fig. 79: Horse-head Amphora, Type B: Athens, National Archaeological Museum 903 (Tiverios 2012, figs. 2-3).

Fig. 80: Amphora, Type B, Attic Black-figure: Kerameikos Museum 48 (Kunze-Götte, Tancke, and Vierneisel 1999, Taf. 20.1-2).

Fig. 81: Jug, Argive Monochrome: Athens, Agora Museum P 33557 (Lynch 2011, fig. 135).
Fig. 82: Cup, Type B or C, Attic Coral Red: Athens, Agora Museum P32344 (Lynch 2011, Ill. 10).

Fig. 83: Cup, Type B or C, Attic Coral Red: Athens, Agora Museum P33221 (Lynch 2011, fig. 85).
Fig. 84: Bell-krater, Attic Red-figure: Athens, Agora Museum P 25284 (Rotroff 1983, pl. 57).

Fig. 85: Dinos, Bronze: London, British Museum GR 1816.0620 (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=34503001&objectId=461829&partId=1).
Fig. 86: Amphora, Type B, Attic: Archaeological Museum of Piraeus 343 (Tiverios 2007, figs. 15 and 19).

Fig. 87: Neck-amphora, Attic Black-figure: Athens, National Museum 1036 (Steinhauer 2009, 132).
Fig. 88: Tripod Pyxis, Attic Black-figure: Athens, National Museum 1040 (Steinhauer 2009, 125).

Fig. 89: Lekanis, Black-figure: Athens, National Museum 1043 (Steinhauer 2009, 124).

Fig. 90: Cup, Attic Red-figure: Thebes, Archaeological Museum 23425 (Sabetai 2012, fig. 12).
Fig. 91: Mycenaean? Spearhead from Eretria (Bérard 1970).

Fig. 92: Mug. Attic Black-glaze: Corinth, Archaeological Museum 1064 (Pease 1937, fig. 17).

Fig. 93: Pithos from Azoria, Crete (Haggis et al. 2004, fig. 8).
Fig. 94: Amphora, Parian Geometric (Zapheiropoulou 2000, 288, fig. 6).
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Fig. 95: Gem, Chalcedony Scaraboid: British Museum: BMCG 553 (Williams and Ogden 1994, 91 fig. 43).
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Fig. 96: Plastic Rhyton, Attic Red-figure: Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 13876 (Jacopi 1932, figs. 9-11).

Fig. 97: Oinochoe, Etruscan Black-figure: Aléria 67/458 (Jehasse and Jehasse 1973, pl. 21).

Fig. 98: Cup, Attic Red-figure: London, British Museum E65 (Williams 1992, figs. 3-4).
Fig. 99: Skyphos, Attic Red-figure: London, British Museum E140 (Williams 1992, fig. 6).

Fig. 100: Situla, Bronze Embossed: Bologna Museo Civico Archeologico 17169 (Bartoloni and Govi 1995).
Fig. 101: Neck-amphora with Lid, Etruscan Black-figure: Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico 28846 (Govi 2003, pl. 8a-b).

Fig. 102: Column-krater, Lakonian Black-glaze: Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli 128835 (Lombardi 2000, figs. 1-2).
Fig. 103: Cup, Attic Red-figure (Milanese 1987, fig. 121).

Fig. 104: Basin, Copper Alloy, Etruscan (Bracco 1947, fig. 1).
Fig. 105: Loom Weight, Clay: Metaponto Survey Lo 309-L6 (Foxhall 2012, 551 no. 27, fig. 11.5).
Fig. 106: Inscribed Loom Weight from Metaponto (Foxhall, fig. 11.4).
Fig. 107: Three Loom Weights, Discoid, Clay: Metaponto Survey 531-L1, 531-L2, 532-L1 (Foxhall 2011, No. 39-41).
Fig. 108: Stemless Cup, Attic Red-figure: London, British Museum E 129 (Corbett 1960, pl. 5).

Fig. 109: Hydria, Attic Red-figure: London, British Museum F 90 (Corbett 1960, pl. IV.2).

Fig. 110: Stamnos, Attic Red-figure: Mannheim, Reiss-Museum Cg 60 (CVA Mannheim 1, pl. 29.5).
Fig. 111: Eneolithic Flint Point: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167920 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, Tav. CLXV).

Fig. 112: Razor, Bronze Lunate: Ischia Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167624 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. 132).

Fig. 113: Two Silver Bracelets: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167130, 167131 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. CXLIII).
Fig. 114: Scarab, White Steatite, Silver Pendant: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pitheusae 167133 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. CXLIII).

Fig. 115: Two Bronze Fibulae *a navicella*: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pitheusae 167827 and 167828 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. 139).

Fig. 116: Fibula *a navicella*: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pitheusae 167199 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. CXLVIII).
Fig. 117: Scarab, Faience, set in a silver pendant: Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167334 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. CLII).

Fig. 118: Skyphos, Corinthian Thapsos type with panel: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167390 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. CLIV).

Fig. 119: Kotyle, local manufacture, black glaze: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 168678 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. CLXXXVI).
Fig. 120: Oinochoe: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167934 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. 146).

Fig. 121: Ivory pendant in the form of a double axe: Ischia, Museo archeologico di Pithecusae 167938 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. 146).
Fig. 122: Volute-krater, Attic Red-figure: Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 76127 (Ciancio 1997, 81).

Fig. 123: Panathenaic Prize Amphora: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 9356 (Berti and Guzzo 1993, 154, figs. 123-4).
Fig. 124: Oinochoe, Attic Red-figure in the Form of a Head: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 1896 (Parrini 1993, 288).

Fig. 125: Bronze Candelabrum in the form of a Pankratist: Ferrara, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina 24159 (Statuette), 44746 (Candelabrum) (Hostetter 1986, pl. 45).
Fig. 126: Mirror, Bronze: Florence, Museo Topografico dell’Etruria 83728/c (Delpino 1998-1999, fig. 1).

Fig. 127: Amphora fragments with Relief Decoration, Rhodian: Museo Archeologico di Gela 8602 (Lentini 2005, 302, fig. 1).
Fig. 128: Pithos, Cretan (Orsi 1906, Tav. V.2).
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Fig. 129: Lekythos, Attic Black-figure Sub-Deianeira: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 8679 (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 414 pC14).
Fig. 130: Skyphoi, Attic Black-figure, Hermogeneian type: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 24672, 24673, 24674 (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 250-1, C9-11).

Fig. 131: Neck-amphora, Attic Black-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 21928 (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 437 pD60).
Fig. 132: Neck-amphora, Attic Black-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 21962 (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 420 pD15).

Fig. 133: Neck-amphora, Attic Black-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 21926 (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 420-1 pD16).
Fig. 134: Pelike, Attic Red-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 21193 (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 472 pl3).

Fig. 135: Neck-amphora with Lid, Attic black-figure: Syracuse, Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi 21965 (Panvini and Giudice 2003, 257 D9)
Fig. 136: Polished Stone Axe, Granite from Monte Polizzo (Mühlenbock 2013, fig. 7).

Fig. 137: Two Small Polished Stone Axe Pendants from Monte Polizzo (Mühlenbock 2008, fig. 38).
Fig. 138: Volute-krater, Attic Red-figure: Morgantina, Museo Archeologico di Morgantina 58.23 (Neils 1995, fig. 1).

Fig. 139: Two Vicups: Palermo Museum, No inv. Number; Excavation Nos.: 90/ A.106 O 273; 90/ O 320 (Above, Kustermann Graf 2002, Tav. 47; below, the tomb group, pls. 46-7).
Fig. 140: Two Skyphoi, Attic, Type A: Palermo Museum, No inv. no.; Excavation Nos: 123/O 440 and 123/ O 441 (Kustermann Graf 2002, pl. 66).
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Fig. 141: Tomb 127 assemblage with the krater and lekythos at right (Kustermann Graf pl. 67).
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Fig. 142: Column-Krater, Attic Red-figure: Palermo Museo Archeologico Regionale CAT2835. Krater above left and details below (Kustermann Graf 2002, pl. 86).

Fig. 143: Lekythos, Attic Black-figure from Selinous S/N (Tusa 1982, Tav. 42b).
Fig. 144: Panathenaic Prize Amphora: Tolmeita/ Ptolemais Museum S/N (Maffre and Mohammed 1993, figs. 1, 3).

Fig. 145: Rhyton, Attic Red-figure: Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 21.2286 (Cohen 2006, 285, fig. 87.1).
Fig. 146: Conical Oinochoe, Corinthian (Boardman and Hayes 1966, pl. 3).

Fig. 147: “The Cup of Nestor” Inscription: Lacco Ameno, Museo archeologico di Pitheusae 166788 (Buchner and Ridgway 1993, tav. 73).
Fig. 148: Inscription on foot of black-glaze skyphos: Rhodes Archaeological Museum 11760 (Jacopi 1929-1930, fig. 19).

Fig. 149: Inscription on the foot of a skyphos once in the collection of Colonel William Martin Leake (Vanderpool 1967, pl. 55).
Fig. 150: Aryballos, Corinthian: Corinth, Archaeological Museum C-54-1 (Pappas 2012, fig. 4).

Fig. 151: Aryballos, Attic Black-figure: Athens, National Museum 1055 (Von Bothmer 1985, 196-7, Fig. 103a-c).
Fig. 152: Fragmentary Dinos, Attic Black-figure: Rome, Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia 50599 (Mackay 2010, pl. 53).

Fig. 153: Ring Aryballos, Boiotian: Kilchberg, E. Peters Collection (Osborne and Pappas 2007, fig. 5.7).
Fig. 154: Cup-skyphos, Attic Black-Figure: Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 12894 (CVA Rhodes 2, pl. 20.1).

Fig. 155: Eye-cup, Attic Black-figure: New York, Metropolitan Museum 44.11.1 (Milne 1944).
Fig. 156: Two Plates, Attic Black-figure: Palermo, Museo Archeologico Regionale 314 and 315 (Callipolitis-Feytmans, pl. 80.28-9).
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Fig. 158: Kantharos, Boiotian Black-glaze: Paris, Louvre K 198 (CVA Paris 17, 47, fig. 18, pl. 46.1).

Fig. 159: Kalpis, Bronze: Providence, Rhode Island School of Design (Robinson 1942, figs. 12 and 13).
Fig. 160: Kantharos, Black-glaze, Boiotian. Location unknown (Rolfe 1891, 89).
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