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The current article deals with a number of fragmentary bird bowls deriving from several votive layers situated against the S/SE wall foundations of Temples Vc and Vd of the Athenaion on the Acropolis of the Timpone della Motta at Francavilla Marittima. In total seventy-eight fragments dating to the period from the last quarter of the 8th century BC to the end of the 7th century BC can be identified. The fragments, many fitting together, belong to two groups, the so-called bird kotylai and the Sub-Geometric bird bowls. Almost all contexts in this area had previously been disturbed by clandestine digging, which resulted in finds of fragments belonging to the same bowl in as many as six different excavation contexts, some quite far apart. The clandestine excavations of the 1970s also account for the fragmentary state of many of the vessels found on the Acropolis. In this article a chronological sequence of the bird bowls will be presented and related to the stratigraphical setting in which they were found. Also, an evaluation of the possible meaning and function of the bird bowls in relation to cult rituals once practised in Temples Vc and Vd will be offered.

The Athenaion on the Acropolis of the Timpone della Motta

Today a total of five buildings are known to have been erected on the summit of the hill Timpone della Motta. In the 1960s the first three buildings (building I-III) were excavated under supervision of the Dutch archaeologist Maria W. Stoop, who dated the buildings to the late 6th/early 5th centuries BC. The three buildings had wall foundations built of rounded riverbed cobbles and conglomerate blocks. A different interpretation of the three structures was published by the German scholars Dieter Mertens and Helmut Schläger. Mertens and Schläger interpreted the structural remains of building I-III as belonging to two successive building phases, recognising postholes carved out in the conglomerate bedrock as evidence for a building phase prior to the wall foundations. Based on the excavated material Mertens and Schläger dated the posthole buildings to the 7th century BC and the buildings with the wall foundations to the 6th century BC. A fourth building was excavated at the northern part of the Timpone della Motta in the 1980s under the supervision of the Soprintendenza Archeologica della Calabria. Our knowledge of the structure is limited since the results of the excavation are yet to be published. Sadly, a common feature of the four buildings is that only limited stratigraphical information was obtained during excavation, leaving behind a substantial gap in the understanding of the development of the sanctuary. However, in recent years excavations have been conducted at the site by a Dutch excavation team from the University of Groningen under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Marianne Kleibrink. These excavations have revealed remains of a fifth building...
with five chronologically succeeding phases, erected at the same spot on the southern edge of the Acropolis. The buildings are usually referred to as Building/ Temple Va, Vb, Vc, Vd, and Ve. The bird bowls examined in this article relate to Temples Vc and Vd. These two temple buildings are described briefly.4

Temple Vc. This temple was constructed in the last quarter of the 8th century BC replacing an earlier Iron Age timber dwelling (Vb), which showed clear traces of ritual use attested by a hearth with dedicated bronze objects and a standing loom of monumental size.5 Temple Vc measured ca. 22x7.20 m. and was constructed with the use of a native building technique, in which wooden posts were placed in large postholes, carved out in the conglomerate, a technique that had already been used for the previous building Vb. Temple Vc was rectangular and shows obvious similarities with Greek temple plans by the presence of an eastern pronaos and a western adytion. The dating indications for the construction of Temple Vc derive mainly from finds in the lowest stratum in the postholes, among which were fibulae of the a staffa lunga and a drago types and local matt-painted pottery. Inside the temple sherds of the Thapsos class excavated just above the conglomerate bedrock also support this foundation date. However, the majority of the material relating to Temple Vc was found in deposits of votive material located S/SE of Building Vd.

Temple Vd. Just before the middle of the 7th century BC a new building was erected at the site of the former Temple Vc. The postholes in the conglomerate bedrock were dismantled and filled with a stratum of yellowish soil, which was used to level the area and subsequently served as the floor of the new temple. The walls of this temple probably consisted of mud bricks placed on a stone foundation, which was constructed in foundation trenches, carved out in the conglomerate bedrock. Once again the best chronological indications for this temple were obtained from the postholes; from the yellow stratum in and around the postholes a large number of dedicated objects were excavated. The dedications, in particular finds of Protocorinthian pottery, suggest that the temple was erected around 660/650 BC.6 As had already been the case in the previous Temple Vc, the majority of the archaeological material relating to this temple was found in deposits of votive material located S/SE of Building Vd.

The stratigraphy of the S/SE deposits of votive material

The S/SE layers of votive material were found in the excavation pits AC13, AC16/16A, AC17/17A, AC21, AC22/22A and AC23/23A. Due to extensive clandestine digging much of the original stratigraphy was destroyed, only in AC16A-context 26 and 29. Though these contexts had not been disturbed by clandestine digging, a few sherds belonging to the phase of Temple Vd were recorded, indicating that some disturbance of the votive layers occurred when Temple Vc was replaced by Building Vd.

The Greek as well as the native pottery from the S/SE votive deposit consists mainly of drinking cups and pouring jugs. Overall, the Greek pottery in these layers accounts only for less than 5 percent of the finds but since it provides the best dating tool we will focus on it.

The Greek pottery from the votive layer relating to Temple Vc consists mainly of sherds of drinking cups, belonging to the Thapsos and

pseudo-Thapsos groups, dating to the last quarter of the 8th century BC. Dating to the same period are fragments of East Greek Late Geometric oinochoai, globular pyxides of the Thapsos class, sherds of Late Geometric II Corinthian kyathoi and sherds from black glazed kantharoi probably imported from Achaia (NW Peloponnesos) dating to the late 8th/early 7th century BC.7 Also belonging to this context are sherds of early Protocorinthian kotylai and the bird kotyle sherd described in cat. no. 1. The overwhelming majority of jug and cup shapes among the pottery deposited near Temple Vc point towards the dedication pattern that became dominant in the subsequent Temple Vd where miniature water jugs (hydriskai) and cups were dedicated in large numbers together with lesser amounts of aryballoi and pyxides.

The votive material relating to Temple Vd was obtained from two vertically separated layers: the upper votive layer (AC16A-context 9) was 2-3 cm. thick, and the lower votive layer (AC16A-context 18, AC16-context 20 and AC17A-context 16) had a thickness of ca. 10 cm. In the upper votive layer a large number of sherds of local and Greek origin were excavated along with sporadic finds of bronze jewellery, bone and amber beads and a number of terracotta statuettes. The majority of Greek pottery consists of Corinthian imports, dating between ca. 660-610 BC. Likewise a smaller number of sherds of East Greek origin were recorded e.g. sherds belonging to the bird bowls described in cat. nos. 4, 8, 9 and 15.

A fill layer (AC16A-context 13) consisting of ca. 30 cm of strong brown loose soil forms a clear stratigraphical separation between these upper and lower layers of votive material. This soil contained matt-painted and impasto pottery of local manufacture dated exclusively to the 8th century BC. No 7th century BC material was found at all in context 13.

The lower votive layer (AC16A-context 18, AC16-context 20 and AC17A-context 16) again contained extensive groups of pottery vessels - often complete, but also sherds of local and Greek origin. The sherds from the bird bowls described in cat. nos. 4, 8, 9 and 15 were excavated from this lower layer. Frequent finds of bronze jewellery, bone and amber beads, faience objects and a number of terracotta statuettes also occurred in this layer. Once again the majority of the pottery dates between 660 and 610 BC with, as mentioned above, only few sherds of earlier date (ca. 680-660 BC) and sporadic finds of late 8th century Greek pottery, notably of the Thapsos class, along with Late Geometric East Greek pottery, which fit in with phase Vc of the Late Geometric II timber temple.

The general interpretation of these 7th century BC deposit layers is that the objects (many almost complete) in the lower votive layer were not found in any clear pattern, nor did they appear to have been grouped or sorted in any special way. In addition vessels were often found upside down. All this seems to indicate that the objects were not in the position of meaningful primary deposits but had been placed, secondarily, south of Temple Vd, probably after having originally been used inside the temple or near an altar. The chronological and morphological correspondence between the material excavated inside and outside Temple Vd suggests that towards the end of the 7th and beginning of the 6th century BC when the temple was levelled, the accumulation of objects ceased. At that time the lower votive layer must have been sealed off by the thick layer of brown soil that, because of the complete absence of 7th century material in it, must have derived from elsewhere in the sanctuary.

In the upper votive layer quite a different pattern appears: a thin but continuous layer of fragments was excavated here, but no vessels were found intact as in the lower contexts. The fact that fragments found in a wide area (squares AC10-AC23) can be reconstructed into almost complete vessels once again indicates that the upper layer material was not found in its original position. Moreover, a few

---

sherdshave successfully been joined across the upper and lower layers, suggesting that they were deposited not long after one another with the fill of brown soil in between. This observation is further supported by the close correspondence in date between the materials excavated in these two layers. It therefore seems likely that both contexts were the result of the closing of Temple Vd. Subsequently, in the decades just after 600 BC the entire area was covered by a layer of gravel several metres thick.

The bird bowls

The bird bowls are a group of East Greek cups, sometimes also referred to as bird skyphoi, named after their decoration. Basically there are two types: the regular and the Orientalising type. The common feature is the division of the upper part of the bowl into metopal panels, the central one usually carrying a representation of a bird, usually with a crosshatched body. The Orientalising type has a far more elaborate decoration with meander trees and Orientalising filling ornaments. The lower part of the body is in general either dark or carries rays.\(^8\) Of the seventy-eight sherds recently excavated at Francavilla Marittima fifteen different bowls of varying quality could be reconstructed. Thirteen of these bowls are of the regular type, one is probably an imitation of the regular type and another is an extraordinary specimen of the Orientalising type.\(^9\) The individual bowls are described in the catalogue at the end of the article.

The origins and distribution

The place of origin of the bird bowls has been discussed for a long time and the question has still not been answered satisfactorily. At first they were all thought to be of Rhodian origin because they were most numerous on this island and because some of the best pieces were found there. This view has now been entirely abandoned. Locally produced bowls have been identified at Chios, in Sparta, Ephesos, Gela,\(^10\) and now probably also at Francavilla (cat. no. 14). However, it still remains uncertain where the major production centre of the bird bowls was situated, but trace element analysis suggests a place of origin in the North Ionian area, possibly around Clazomenae or Teos and in the case of the Orientalising bowls possibly at Miletus.\(^11\) In Southern Italy and Sicily bird bowls have been found at e.g. Gela, Syracuse, Megara Hyblaea, Siris, Malta and Sybaris,\(^12\) but the high amount of bowls at Francavilla is noteworthy. In fact it seems that no other single votive deposit in Magna Graecia has produced the same amount of similar bowls as Francavilla. The Orientalising type of bird bowl is the most elaborately decorated of the bird bowls and they have not been found in the same quantity as the regular bird bowls. They may not have been as extensively exported as

---

the regular type, at least not as many of them have yet been found and they seem to be centred around Miletus and the eastern Mediterranean. The Orientalising bowl from Francavilla seems to be the only one of its type found in Magna Graecia.

Typology of the bird bowls from the Timpone Della Motta

The sequence of the decorative scheme on the bird bowls has been fairly well established and divided into five stages (Coldstream's bird-kotyle workshop and Sub-Geometric groups I-IV) beginning at the end of the 8th century BC with the bird-kotyle and continuing until ca. 600 BC after which the bird disappears as a motive, but the form of the vessel continues. The development of the decoration generally becomes progressively more mannered. Regarding the dates of the bowls presented here the bird kotyle (cat. no. 1), should, as it belongs to the bird-kotyle workshop, be dated to the period 720-690 BC. The bowls with dark paint and a reserved band on their lower part (cat. nos. 2-6) are traditionally recognized as earlier than those with rays and should be placed before 650 BC but after the earlier type that only has a band usually with dots or stripes below the panels, i.e. between 675 and 650 BC (Coldstream’s group II). The manner of drawing, especially the rendering of the tail of the bird, would suggest a date towards 650 BC. Earlier in this stage the body of the bird is more drop-shaped, later on, before the middle of the century the lower outline of the bird’s body continues as a straight line to form the tip of the tail, which is the case on the bowls from Francavilla.


15. Cook & Dupont, East Greek Pottery; Coldstream, Greek Geometric Pottery.


both relating to Temple Vd. The presence of bird bowls with bands in both the upper and the lower layers suggests, together with other material, that the two layers are chronologically contemporary.

The Orientalising bowl
To the best of our knowledge the Orientalising bird bowl from Francavilla Marittima cat. no. 15 is unique in its form and decoration. It will therefore be treated separately. The form of the body is much more shallow than the regular bird bowls, although in general they also tend to become more shallow during the 7th century BC. The decoration is exquisite with the chain- and double saw ornaments, as well as the finely drawn filling ornaments and the tongues where the handles join the body. The flower tondo with the chain ornament on the interior of the bowl has never before been observed on a bird bowl; the common decoration being completely black, sometimes with a reserved tondo or band or white lines on a black background. The meander tree ornament is also seen on other earlier vessels from the Late and Sub-Geometric periods, especially on the bird-oinochoai and the bird kotylai. The meander tree on the Orientalising bird bowls may be seen as a revival of this earlier type of decoration and it also seems likely that it was inspired by the tapestry-like decoration of the Wild Goat Style that emerged around the middle of the 7th century in the same area.18 This inspiration from the Wild Goat Style pottery is further implied by a fine Orientalising bird bowl from Vroulia19 where the corners of the central field, carrying the bird, are decorated with quarter circles identical to the roundels of the middle Wild Goat Style, which also appears in the central field on the one from Francavilla.20 This would place the bowl from Francavilla somewhere in the period 640-625 BC. An important question raised by the date of the Orientalising bowls is that of the vessel shape. The shape of the Vroulia bowl is that of the earlier type of bird bowls, the bird kotyle, with the characteristic nicked rim, which is believed not to outlive the Early Protocorinthian phase. So either the appearance of the Wild Goat roundel ornament would have occurred before the proper Wild Goat Style or the hemispherical kotyle shape should be allowed to continue into the Wild Goat Style, which seems most likely. In case these two Orientalising bird bowls are contemporaneous there is no reason to doubt their contemporaneity with the bowl from Vroulia now in the British Museum.21

The function of the bird bowls from the Timpone della Motta
As noted earlier the Timpone della Motta has produced one of the highest number of bird bowls from any single context from Magna Graecia. Thus it would be tempting to suppose that these bird-decorated drinking vessels had a special meaning in the cult practised in the sanctuary. However, in order to assess the possible special significance of the bird bowls, one has to take into account the total amount and variation of pottery excavated from the successive Temples Vc and Vd and in the S/SE deposits. When viewed in this overall perspective the bird bowls only account for a small fraction of the total amount of pottery. In comparison, more than 3000 fragments of Protocorinthian kotylai and skyphoi were found in the S/SE deposits, which effectively rules out that the bird bowl itself should have played any significant role in the cult practice. The function of the bird bowls therefore seems to be firmly linked to the general function of the drinking vessels found in the S/SE deposits. The key question is how to interpret the presence of these vast amounts of drinking vessels (bird bowls included) and locally produced hydriskai. The main issue being whether these vessels should be interpreted as actual ex-votos dedicated to

18. Cook & Dupont, East Greek Pottery, 26
the goddess for their own sake or maybe more precisely for the sake of their content or whether the drinking vessels and "hydriskai" should be interpreted as a reflection of a ritual in which the dedicators participate, such as communal dining and drinking. Concerning the pottery associated with Temple Vd, it seems likely that the possibility of ritual dining can be ruled out, since no cooking vessels nor plates, which are normally considered an indication for such activities, have been found.22 Thus it appears that the pottery reflects a drinking ritual. As described above the objects from the S/SE deposits were not found in their original place of deposition, which makes it difficult to determine the combinations in which they were used or dedicated. The find contexts from the interior and partly from the immediate exterior of Temple Vd on the other hand bring some valuable information on the nature of this drinking ritual. Inside Temple Vd isolated assemblages containing a couple of drinking cups and "hydria" together with a few aryballoi and pyxides were often found on the yellow temple floor, indicating that they had been placed there as an intentional set.23 Similar assemblages were occasionally found outside the walls of the building (not to be confused with the S/SE deposits). Among those was the bird bowl cat. no. 7, which was found together with a "hydriskos." The cups and "hydriskai" in these assemblages rather point towards an interpretation as votive sets dedicated to the goddess (or her statue) rather than remains of adorants engaged in ritual drinking.24 In the Greek cultural sphere the "hydrion" is normally associated with water (drinking?) and in fact only very little evidence for wine drinking is present at the Timpone della Motta, since only very few fragments of crateres have been recovered. The vast amounts of drinking vessels and "hydrion" found in the sanctuary throughout the years indicate that the dedication of these sets had a central position in the cult practise. Support for this interpretation derives from a locally produced "pyxion" dated around 700 BC which in all probability came from the S/SE deposits.25 The central scene on the "pyxion" depicts a procession of female adorants approaching an enthroned goddess. The leading adorant is offering the goddess a drinking cup with one hand, while holding a jug in the other. The fact that the dedicated pouring vessels normally function as water containers indicates that the adorants were offering the goddess Athena a drink of water. As we have recently argued,26 the only literary link between Athena and water seems to occur in the legend of Epeios, who received help from Athena because among heroes he was regarded as a kind of underdog with the duty to carry water to the heroes of the house of Atreus.27 According to literary sources, Epeios was the maker of the Trojan horse. Strabo informs us that after the Trojan War Epeios founded the city of Lagaria and dedicated his tools in a famous Athena sanctuary nearby.28 Through time the city of Lagaria has been placed by scholars at a number of different locations among those Metapontion and Amendolara, these places, however, are missing a vital element in favour of such an identification: That of an early Athena sanctuary. In the light of the presence of a well-attested sanctuary at the Motta dedicated to Athena, it seems more probable to attest a possible identification of Lagaria to this place than to any other. The vast amounts of dedicated "hydrion" and drinking vessels, among those also the bird bowls, reflect, as mentioned above, the most central dedication ritual practised in the sanctuary in the 7th century BC. The ritual of offering water to Athena, as depicted on the Ticino "pyxion", is, at the same time, related to both Athena and Epeios. The adorants carrying water to the sanctuary could, as a reflection of the legend of Epeios, have regarded them-

23. Kleibrink, "Early Cults"; Kleibrink, Dalla Lana all’Acqua.
24. For the interpretation of the aryballoi and pyxides, see Kleibrink, Oinotrian and Greeks.
25. Kleibrink, Dalla Lana all’Acqua, 77-78, 91.
27. Stesichoros frag. 200 in PMGF; cf. also Plato, Ion, 533b.
selves as *hydrophoroi* having the duty of carrying water to the heroes, and in the act on doing so, hoping to receive the same favours from Athena as Epeios did.

**Conclusion**

In addition to the bird bowls published here, other sherds were found by Maria W. Stoop during the campaigns 1963-1969 in the area of Building III, belonging to either one or possibly two bird *kotylai*. In total at least sixteen bird bowls have so far been published from the Acropolis at Francavilla Marittima. As mentioned before, this high number does not reflect a special relation of the bird bowl with the sanctuary, but is rather the result of a dedication ritual that was focused on offering sets of *hydriskai* and drinking vessels. The result was that over the years a huge amount of these vessels accumulated at the site. The striking phenomenon in respect to the chronology of the bird bowls is the fact that the only group missing is Coldstream’s I group, which he dated to 690-675 BC. This absence corresponds well with the general chronological sequence of the Greek pottery found both inside Temples Vc/Vd and in the S/SE deposits, where a clear lack of pottery from this period is evident. The bird *kotylai* together with at least three Late Geometric bird *oinochoai* are the earliest imports from the East Greek area, and it seems plausible that they were imported as sets consisting of a *kotyle* and an *oinochoai*, which probably came via Sybaris, where similar bird bowls and bird *oinochoai* have been found. The Orientalising bird bowl is clearly the vessel in this group that draws the most attention, not only because of its artistic expression, but also because of the fact that it is the only one found in Magna Graecia. Perhaps this bowl accompanied one of the few contemporary Wild Goat *oinochoai*, which are also present at Francavilla Marittima.
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**CATALOGUE**

No. 1 (Fig. 1): One rim fragment of a bird *kotyle*, FMAC 16-20/303.

The upper part of the fragment has the characteristic inset rim. The decoration consists of two panels framed on all sides by two lines. The left panel contains a crosshatched lozenge, the right panel has a threefold hourglass ornament, which is also crosshatched.


No. 2 (Fig. 2): Two rim fragments and three body fragments, FMAC 13-15/r136, FMAC 13-4/313, 2812/s.17.

Part of bird with crosshatched body and a panel with crosshatched lozenge preserved. The lower part of the bowl is covered with dark paint except for a reserved band.

This bowl is distinct because it is thick-walled and the drawn lines are quite thickly applied and especially the lozenge in the panel is big and crudely drawn.


29. Stoop, "Note sugli scavi".
31. All drawings are made by Helle Bjaerre Thussing.
No. 3 (Fig. 3): Four body fragments, FMAC 21-3/4, FMAC 16A-22/13, FMAC 16A-9/4, FMAC 13-4/900.

The only preserved decoration consists of the lower part of one bird, one foot of another and a small part of the dark paint with a broad reserved band on the lower part. The distinctive feature here is the fact that only one line is used as division between the upper and lower part of the bowl and between the panels.


No. 4 (Fig. 4): One body fragment, FMAC 16A-18/204.

Preserved are parts of a lozenge, three vertical and three horizontal lines, small part of dark paint on lower part of the fragment and the tail of a bird. A noticeable feature on this fragment is the rendering of the bird's tail. The lines of the body overlap so as to form a y-shape, which is found on this fragment only.


No. 5 (Fig. 5): Four body fragments, FMAC 16A-9/260, FMAC 13-6/2, FMAC 13-4/115, FMAC 16-12/1130.

The feet of a bird standing on one horizontal line are preserved on two of the fragments. Part of the lower half of the bowl with a reserved band is also preserved.


No. 6 (Fig. 6): One body fragment, FMAC 23-1/20.

The preserved decoration is similar to the previous bowl (no. 5), but the hind part of a bird is preserved on this fragment.


No. 7 (Fig. 7): An almost completely preserved bird bowl consisting of nine sherds, eight of which adjoin, FMAC 21-2/5, FMAC 17A-21/102.

It has the typical decoration of the regular type of bird bowl with three metopal panels on either side. The two panels next to the handles have an outlined crosshatched lozenge. The broader central panel comprises a bird with a crosshatched body and a small circle in front. Also in front of the bird is a fringe ornament in the shape of a half circle with a line and behind the bird is a pendant crosshatched triangle. Three vertical lines divide the panels and the handles have one vertical line on either side. The panel zone is separated from the lower part of the bowl by three horizontal lines. The lower part carries five void rays and ends in a low ring foot. The interior of the bowl is covered with dark paint.


No. 8 (Fig. 8): Four rim fragments and one body fragment, all adjoining, FMAC 17A-12/507, FMAC 16-20/313,315, FMAC 17A-cl/1, 18A-cl/101.

The decoration scheme is identical with the previous bowl, except that two lines separate the panels and the upper and lower parts of the bowl. Furthermore, this bowl is smaller, in fact it is the smallest of all the bowls. The decoration is not as well preserved and it seems to be secondarily burnt. The interior has a central reserved tondo with three concentric circles.

Diameter: 9.5 cm. Clay: Munsell 2.5 YR 6/3 light yellowish brown. Paint: Munsell 5 YR 2.5/1 black.

No. 9 (Fig. 9): Three rim fragments and two body fragments, FMAC 16-17/800, FMAC 16-12/1070, FMAC 18A-1/2, FMAC 17A-16/56, FMAC 17A-16/57.

Part of metopal panel with crosshatched lozenge and part of central field with a pendant ornament and a circle preserved on the upper half of the bowl. On the lower half is preserved part of a void ray. These five fragments can all be ascribed to one and the same bowl due to the fact that three lines are used as dividing lines for both panels and the horizontal division between the upper and lower parts of the bowl in combination with the void rays.


No. 10 (Fig. 10): Four rim fragments and one body fragment, FMAC 21-3/3 and FMAC 18A-1/3, FMAC 21-3/2 and FMAC 18-4/53.

The preserved decoration consists of part of metopal panels with crosshatched lozenges, the central field with a bird with crosshatched body and part of a void ray. Only two lines are used here as dividing lines and in front of the bird the fringe ornament takes the shape of a quarter circle bordering the vertical line instead of the usual half circle with a line.


No. 11 (Fig. 11): One body fragment, FMAC 13-7/807.

The only preserved decoration is three horizontal lines and part of a void ray. The fragment belongs to a specific bowl due to the difference in the colour of the paint, which is clearly distinct from that of the other bowls with the same decoration scheme, especially the dusky red colour of the ray.


No. 12 (Fig. 12): One rim fragment and three body fragments, FMAC 23-2/2, FMAC 16A-cl/219, FMAC 22-3/13.

Part of central field with part of feet of a bird is preserved on the upper part of the bowl. The lower
part has an incompletely preserved void ray. Part of a handle is preserved on the rim fragment.


**No. 13** (Fig. 13): Two body fragments, FMAC 18A-cl/102.

Parts of void rays and horizontal lines are preserved. Due to the very different colour of the paint used on the bowl cat. no. 10, these two fragments are ascribed to a separate bowl.


**No. 14** (Fig. 14): Three rim fragments, FMAC 18A-2/2, FMAC 18A-2/1, FMAC 16-2/121. This is probably an imitation of an East Greek bird bowl. It has a slip on the exterior and the interior is covered with dark paint. The form of the decoration is taken directly from the regular bird bowl consisting of a broad dark band on the handle, which is framed on either side by a vertical line. Two dividing lines separate the upper from the lower part of the bowl and the panels. No bird is preserved, but part of the central panel bears a fringe ornament in the shape of a triangle. The side panels have vertical zigzag lines. The top part of one ray is also preserved on one of the fragment. The quality of drawing is not good; the lines are thick and have blurry and unclear edges.


**No. 15** (Figs. 15a-15b): Thirty-one fragments are ascribed to a single bird bowl of the Orientalising type. Due to the fragmentary state of the bowl and the small size of many of the fragments, numbering of the individual sherds was abandoned. The sherds were found in six different contexts; FMAC 13-15, FMAC 16-1, FMAC 16-10, FMAC 16-20, FMAC 16A-9 and FMAC 18A-2, with a distance more than four metres apart. Although the bowl is incomplete and very fragmentary, the whole section is preserved in one place. A general idea of the decoration can therefore be obtained. It had a light slip all over. The interior has a central tondo with two concentric circles. Around this tondo runs an outlined tongue ornament, followed by two lines and a band with a chain ornament, the rest of the interior to the rim is covered with dark paint. On the exterior each side of the handles is divided into five panels, the central one contains the bird. A fragment with a bird has recently been found (October 2004). One of the side panels has an outlined crosshatched lozenge, the other an outlined crosshatched meander tree. This decoration seems to have been repeated on both sides of the central bird panel. Four lines divide the panels. Beneath the panels runs a band with an alternating chain and double saw ornament, which is framed above and below by four horizontal lines. The lower part of the bowl has void rays and again four lines, the foot is dark with another four reserved lines. The bottom of the foot has a central tondo with solid rays radiating to four lines at the edge. Fill ornaments comprise dot crosses, swastikas, stylised quatrefoils, elaborate fringe ornaments and four dots connected with lines as forming a cross. The handles have a floral ornament at the junction with the body.

Fig. 1. Fragment of Late Geometric bird kotyle (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 2. Fragments of a bird bowl, ca. 650 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 3. Fragment of a bird bowl, ca. 650 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 4. Fragment of a bird bowl, ca. 650 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 5. Fragment of a bird bowl, ca. 650 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 6. Fragment of a bird bowl, ca. 650 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 7. Bird bowl, 650-615 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).
Fig. 8. Fragments of a bird bowl, 650-615 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 9. Fragments of a bird bowl, 650-615 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 10. Fragments of a bird bowl, 650-615 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).
AN ORIENTALISING AND RELATED BIRD BOWLS

Fig. 11. Fragment of a bird bowl, 650-615 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 12. Fragments of a bird bowl, 650-615 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 13. Fragments of a bird bowl, 650-615 BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).

Fig. 14. Fragments of an imitation of a bird bowl, second half of 7th century BC (drawing: Helle B. Thusing).
Fig. 15a. Orientalising bird bowl, ca. 640-625 BC (photo: Marianne Kleibrink 2004).

Fig. 15b. Fragment of an Orientalising bird bowl with bird (photo: Jan K. Jacobsen 2004).
Etruscan Women at Tarquinia: Skeletal Evidence for Tomb Use*

by MARSHALL JOSEPH BECKER

Abstract
A seven-year program to study the human skeletal remains recovered from Etruscan tombs excavated at Tarquinia was initiated in 1987 in cooperation with the Soprintendenza Archeologica dell’Etruria Meridionale. Data from the skeletons of 200 individuals recovered during this unique project provide significant direct evidence for the ways in which the people of Tarquinia buried their dead during the sixth to first centuries BCE. Of particular note is the apparently greater numbers of males found in large tombs at Tarquinia. The apparently unequal sex ratio is a result of gendered differences in the use of cremation by the Tarquinians. Adult females at Tarquinia were cremated at a higher rate than males. In addition, female ossilegia (gathered cremated remains) often were placed in perishable containers made of wood, skin or cloth. The decay of these containers further confounds the recovery of evidence for female remains placed within Tarquinian chamber tombs.

Also noted in these tombs are the extremely low numbers of sub-adults and complete absence of children below the age of 5.5 years. These findings regarding burial customs provide insights into household dynamics and social organization in ancient South Etruria.

Introduction
Impressive tomb architecture and wall paintings, gold jewelry, and outstanding examples of imported Greek pottery have long been the focus for research relating to ancient burials in Etruria, and for Etruscan life in general. Elite assemblages of artifacts from the largest of these burial contexts provide the principle database through which Etruscan society was known. This “embarrassment of riches” absorbed so much attention that the tomb contexts in which these objects were found, the villages and cities in which they lived, and other aspects of Etruscan life were largely ignored. For nearly two centuries the skeletons of these Etruscans themselves remained of marginal interest to Etruscologists. The bones within these tombs, trampled by tomb robbers in the past and disregarded by early excavators, are only now being recognized as a valuable source of information about life in these ancient cities.

During the middle decades of the nineteenth century there had been some interest in the data that could be recovered from the human skeletal remains of these Etruscans, but research was based almost entirely on examining the bone collections from the 1860s and 1870s. The past two decades have seen a marked increase in the publication of research on skeletons from Etruscan tombs. During this time several large projects have been initiated to study the human skeletal remains from Etruscan tombs. Archaeologists now have a greater understanding of how Etruscan mortuary customs have been interpreted by earlier scholars; we also have a better understanding of the excavation of Etruscan tombs in the past. For nearly 200 years Etruscan tombs have been ignored as a source of information regarding human life in these cities. The recent emphasis on the human skeletal remains from Etruscan tombs has provided archaeologists with access to information that is much more comprehensive than has been available in the past.
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