

FORUM RESPONSE

The Keros Hoard Revisited

PAT GETZ-GENTLE

Abstract

I am adamant that the objects formerly in the Erlenmeyer Collection are neither more characteristic of the Keros Hoard nor more valid members of it than the other objects I have associated with this extremely large body of material, now firmly identified as coming from Kavos on Keros. My persistence, as explained in the present Forum Response, is both grounded in a somewhat “privileged” knowledge of the ways of the principal dealer involved and informed by a long familiarity with many of the pieces associated with the hoard. After providing the necessary background, I offer criteria that I consider sufficient to associate objects with the hoard, and along the way I add more fragments to the catalogue provided by Sotirakopoulou in *The “Keros Hoard”: Myth or Reality?**

INTRODUCTION

I come to the issues regarding the Keros Hoard from a vantage point quite different from that of Sotirakopoulou and Renfrew, having of necessity straddled a great and unfortunate divide for some 40 years.¹ It is the nature of my work on Early Cycladic sculpture that I have had to find material wherever it happened to be and under whatever circumstances it happened to have been found. I have always believed that ignoring works not recovered in sanctioned excavations—the majority of Early Cycladic figures worldwide, even in Greece—is counterproductive for the understanding of Cycladic art and culture. The objects themselves are blameless and not to be disparaged because there are also forgeries abroad in our imperfect world.

To the questions raised by Renfrew,² Sotirakopoulou has provided some cogent answers, based in part on correspondence that I had long ago forgotten. In the process, she has confirmed his suspicion that the

recipient of the hoard was indeed Nicolas Koutoulakis (1910–1996). My hope here is to persuade my colleagues that the Keros Hoard, as we know it, represents a portion of a single entity, together with objects that were recovered by archaeologists at the site of Kavos on Keros and obtained by others either by chance or by looting both before and after the hoard left the island.

PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE KEROS HOARD

My own interest in Keros and the Keros Hoard dates back to 1968, when I was gathering material for my doctoral dissertation.³ I was introduced to Koutoulakis and shown a portion of the huge assemblage that was later to be called the Keros Hoard. By 1968, the mass of material shown to me by this dealer consisted of incomplete marble figures and smaller fragments of such works. With a few exceptions, the complete pieces, the largest ones, and those with superior aesthetic appeal had already been sold. The identity of only some of these is known; that of some others can be deduced. When a fragment long held in a private collection appears on the market, which happens now and then (e.g., fig. 1), it is still sometimes possible to associate it with the hoard, as discussed below. Only rarely is it possible to make such a connection in the case of whole works. That is because complete and nearly complete Cycladic figures are much more commonly found in grave contexts than are fragments, while the opposite was evidently true at Kavos.

Visiting Koutoulakis, I was like a child let loose in a candy shop, and he appreciated my enthusiasm. Al-

Editors' note: This article mentions some antiquities that have not yet been presented in a scholarly forum. However, the discussion explores the problems of studying artifacts from the market and highlights the difficulty of attributing artifacts to the Keros Hoard because of the looting of the site. If the items shown here as figs. 1 and 2 had been recovered in a legal and recorded excavation, their provenance would be secure and the question of their attribution to the Keros Hoard would be moot. This irretrievable loss of critical information is one of the reasons why archaeologists decry the looting of archaeological sites.

*I am very grateful for the invitation—suggested by Renfrew and endorsed by Sotirakopoulou—to participate in the present Forum and to write openly for the first time about matters of mutual interest.

¹In referring to particular pieces here, I cite the catalogue in Sotirakopoulou (2005, 176–243, nos. 150–254) wherever possible, since she provides excellent publication records for each piece inventoried.

²Renfrew 2006, 30–4.

³This is the correct date; cf. Getz-Gentle 2001, 141 n. 135.



Fig. 1. Head of a figure from the Keros Hoard, preserved lgth. 9 cm, losses all ancient. Ghosts of painted curls can be seen on the side and back (courtesy London antiquities gallery).

though wily in his business dealings, Koutoulakis provided me with information that I believe to be true, including the Kerian identity of the hoard. As illustrated by Sotirakopoulou, this provenance has now been confirmed by the discovery of two joins between, in each case, a fragment from the Erlenmeyer Collection and a fragment found on Keros during sanctioned exploration.

Koutoulakis did not like to disclose provenance information. When pressed, he would give buyers Naxos or Herakleia or “one of the small islands” between Naxos and Amorgos as the source of objects from the hoard. Occasionally, he mentioned that they came from a large group of material found in one place. This practice was to bedevil me in my quest for pieces that belonged to the hoard, but when I asked him about specific works he could remember, the answer was often that they came from Keros. When I posed the same question at different times, he contradicted himself once or twice, mentioning Naxos on one occasion, Keros on another.⁴

Koutoulakis let me take snapshots of hoard objects on my first visit to his gallery in Paris, and subsequently he had proper photographs taken for me of many of the pieces I had seen. As noted by Sotirakopoulou, I have discussed and illustrated some of this material over the years in various publications.⁵ Pieces from the hoard continue to surface in collections and on

the market. Nevertheless, the disturbing fact remains that an unknown number of figures are no longer traceable.

I also met Marie-Louise Erlenmeyer (now deceased) in 1968 and was able then, and on several later occasions, to examine the part of the hoard that she and her late husband had acquired from Koutoulakis.⁶ Although this material included several interesting works, for the most part it was composed of the sort of bits and pieces, of scholarly interest only, that Koutoulakis was happy to dispose of. There were few heads and no fragments of unusually large works. And so, just as it is wrong to consider the objects still with Koutoulakis in the late 1960s as fully representative of the hoard as a whole, one should likewise not think of the Erlenmeyer objects as a completely characteristic sampling.

It is of paramount importance for the following discussion that the role played by Koutoulakis be understood. Brought to Paris from Crete at a young age and schooled by his uncle, Manolis Segredakis (1891–1948), from whom he inherited the Paris gallery, Koutoulakis was, from the 1950s through the early 1980s, the primary source of Cycladic antiquities acquired by museums and private collectors in Europe, Japan, and the United States, even if they were not bought directly from him.⁷ It was Koutoulakis who obtained the material from Greece; it was from him that most

⁴E.g., Sotirakopoulou 2005, no. 176.

⁵Most recently in Getz-Gentle 2006, nos. 31–3, 35, 36, 41; not certainly from the hoard: nos. 20, 29, 34. I now have good

reason to believe that the last three did belong to the hoard.

⁶Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 1–149.

⁷Apostolides 2006, 88.

of the well-known dealers bought Cycladic objects—people such as the late Herbert Cahn in Basel, John (K.J.) Hewett in London, and C. Dikran Kelekian, J.J. Klejman, and Matthias Komor in New York, to name just a few. A thriving market in Cycladic marble objects began in the 1950s, and it is my belief that a great many of the pieces purchased then and subsequently belonged originally to the hoard. It is no longer possible in all cases to identify them, since the acquisition history of a piece can be complicated if it passed through a series of dealers and/or auction houses or both before landing in a collection.

My inconsistency regarding the identification of a piece as, for example, “find-place unknown,” or “from,” “said to be from,” “probably from,” “possibly from,” or “conceivably from” Keros or the Keros Hoard has been clearly documented by Sotirakopoulou in the publication history she provides in her catalogue entries. I have been criticized for this by both her and Renfrew and by others as well. My inconsistency may reflect a lack of rigor on occasion and an ambivalence over time regarding the choice of words, but the more radical inconsistencies are due to the fact that it took me a long time to understand the magnitude of the role Koutoulakis played in the antiquities trade and to work out the relationships he had with other dealers who may or may not have passed on his find-place information to their clients. In some cases, I have been ambivalent because I did not and may still not know the identity of the dealer or dealers involved or whether a piece had a known French connection. The more I consider the inconsistencies in find-place information I have offered over the years, which have tended to change in the direction of increasing confidence in Keros as the source, the more I believe I have been too conservative in places—even in my most recent publications.⁸

As for dating the removal of the hoard from Kavos, unlike Renfrew I consider it significant that, according to a reliable and knowledgeable source very close to Koutoulakis, the objects arrived in Paris individually wrapped in pre-World War II newspapers. There is one piece I am now firmly convinced is from the hoard: it was acquired by the late French collector Georges Halphen before the war.⁹ When I asked the elderly col-

lector from whom he had bought it, he was unable to remember. I wonder now if he had dealt with Segredakis (rather than Koutoulakis) some 50 years before.

The early arrival in Paris of this handsome fragment suggests that Koutoulakis knew about the Keros material before the war, even if he did not receive the majority of it until sometime afterward, possibly not until after the end of the Greek Civil War in 1949. Even then, the remaining bulk of the material is not likely to have left Greece all at once. I was told the objects arrived in suitcases. A great many very heavy suitcases would have been required to transport all of them, and more than a small number of suitcases at a time might well have aroused suspicion.¹⁰ It is quite possible, too, that Koutoulakis encouraged his Cycladic contacts to search for more objects in the mid 1950s and into the early 1960s.¹¹

Among the pieces (not sold to the Erlenmeyers) that I now believe come from the hoard, I have information for two that were acquired by their respective collectors “before 1954” and sometime before the death in 1951 of Kelekian, from whom the collector had bought the piece.¹² The rest of the hoard pieces, for which I have information, entered collections beginning in 1955.¹³

It is perhaps not coincidental that about this time, during the economically bleak period following the Greek Civil War, forgeries of Cycladic figures also began—and continued—to appear in the inventories of dealers and collectors who bought genuine works of high quality from Koutoulakis. It is no secret among the dealers who knew him that he offered his clients some of the most extraordinary genuine works, as well as some of the most egregious fakes. The fakes that have been tested appear to be made of Cycladic marble, although not from a source used by Early Bronze Age sculptors, as far as we know. Many of these counterfeits were based on replicas of objects in the Louvre, one of which happened to be the colossal head found on Keros that entered the museum in 1873.¹⁴

Hewett was one of the dealers in question. He sold Keros Hoard fragments acquired from Koutoulakis to the Robert and Lisa Sainsbury Collection,¹⁵ as well as at least three to David Sylvester. The latter surfaced

⁸ Getz-Gentle 2001, 2006; supra n. 5.

⁹ Getz-Gentle 2001, 157, Copenhagen Sculptor [8]; 141 n. 135.

¹⁰ In the past, customs authorities in Greece could be lax in searching for antiquities leaving the country. An unusually blatant example of this was related to me by Marie-Louise Erlenmeyer and concerns the fragment of an extremely large male figure, now in the Museum of Cycladic Art (inv. no. 969), that she and her husband bought on Amorgos in the early

1950s. Hans Erlenmeyer was a man of imposing stature who simply carried the piece onto their flight out of Greece, concealed under a trench coat folded over his arm.

¹¹ See Apostolides 2006, 84–5.

¹² Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 171, 231.

¹³ E.g., Sotirakopoulou 2005, no. 191; infra n. 30.

¹⁴ Thimme 1977, no. 200; see also Getz-Gentle 2001, pl. 98 (without restoration).

¹⁵ E.g., Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 194, 236, 238.

at auction following the collector's death.¹⁶ They had been acquired from Hewett in the early 1970s. Hewett also sold the Sainsburys a very large head with a dubious history.¹⁷ It is, in my opinion, a replica-based forgery of the Louvre head. I have every reason to believe that it, too, came from Koutoulakis and was one of a number of similar counterfeits, one of which was said to come from Herakleia—the same provenance Koutoulakis occasionally gave for hoard objects.¹⁸

Cahn was another dealer with both genuine and bogus offerings. An exhibition in New York in 1965 that he organized contained a very high percentage of fakes and highly suspect works:¹⁹ of the 16 Early Cycladic (EC) II/"EC II" pieces illustrated in the catalogue, only numbers 15, 16, 23, and 24 are certainly genuine. I have reason to believe the source of all of them was Koutoulakis. It is noteworthy that two of the genuine works (nos. 15, 23) are attributable to the Goulandris Sculptor, while one of the certain forgeries (no. 10) is an outsized work of 87.5 cm, the upper half of which must have been based on a much smaller work of this carver (perhaps no. 15 in the same exhibition)²⁰ or a fragment consisting only of the upper half—a fragment from the hoard? Many of the works attributable to the Goulandris Sculptor, including complete and very nearly complete works, can be traced back to Koutoulakis.²¹ Some, if not all, of the latter are or are almost certainly from the hoard.²²

To my knowledge, however, Koutoulakis never tried to insinuate fakes into the hoard. Their doctored surfaces bore little resemblance to the naturally aged

surfaces of the Keros finds, so that, mixed in with the hoard objects, they would have been much too conspicuous to be accepted by anyone.

I am also not aware that Koutoulakis (or his Greek sources) disturbed the purity of the hoard by adding to it fragments from other places. The typology and relative chronology of Early Cycladic sculpture was not yet established at the time, making it highly unlikely that Koutoulakis or his sources would have had the knowledge to keep earlier material out.²³ And, as already noted, fragments occur rather rarely in graves compared with complete or nearly complete images. Since cemeteries would have been the looters' only other source of material, it is unlikely that they recovered a significant number of fragments that could have been added to the hoard. My guess is that it would not have been beyond Koutoulakis or his suppliers to add the odd fragment to a box of hoard material, but I very much doubt that anyone made a habit of doing so. Looting at Kavos did not end with the removal of the hoard.²⁴ Thus, some fragments later brought to Koutoulakis might have been found there as well.

Renfrew is reluctant to accept the presence in the hoard of pieces of unusual or exceptional size. He wonders if perhaps they and the "colossal" head in the Louvre might have come from a different site on Keros. While a detailed survey of the island is certainly in order, there is at present no evidence that such a site existed. I believe it would not be right to subtract from the hoard the fragments of larger-than-usual works that have been associated with it in previous

¹⁶ Sotheby's London, 26 February 2002, lots 5, 26, 27. Lot 5 I recognized from a 1968 hoard photograph; the others are clearly from the hoard as well.

¹⁷ Thimme 1977, no. 198.

¹⁸ Thimme 1977, no. 199. For a discussion of comparable replica-based forgeries of a complete figure in the Louvre, see Getz-Gentle 2001, 104–8. The sculptor of the eponymous Louvre figure is well represented both in the hoard and in the sanctioned finds. To the list of his work (Getz-Gentle 2001, 169–70) can now be added another torso fragment that was found at Kavos by Renfrew in 1963 (Renfrew 2006, fig. 3 [middle]).

¹⁹ See *Early Art* 1965.

²⁰ Getz-Gentle 2001, Goulandris Sculptor [13].

²¹ E.g., Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 185 (composed of three hoard fragments), 188.

²² The smallest complete figure attributable to the Goulandris Sculptor (Getz-Gentle 2001, Goulandris Sculptor [1]) entered the Sainsbury Collection in 1955. I suspect—and this could be checked—that it, too, came from Hewett, and ultimately Koutoulakis. Note that nos. 194 and 236 (supra n. 15) are also attributed to the Goulandris Sculptor, having entered the Sainsbury Collection in 1961 and 1970, respectively.

²³ Koutoulakis, during his heyday, sold many EC I and EC I/II works that clearly did not come from Keros. Had he felt

inclined to do so, he had plenty of pieces he could have added to the hoard.

²⁴ It is clear, e.g., that some—perhaps many—of the treasures and lesser pieces and fragments of figures in the core collection of the Museum of Cycladic Art were found at Kavos. The problem is that we do not know which ones they are. See Doumas (2000, nos. 187, 196), where two heads and a number of marble vessel fragments are tentatively identified with Keros. Find-place information is also not given for any of the fragmentary objects in the Paul and Alexandra Kanellopoulos Museum, yet a substantial number of them look as if they could also be from Kavos (e.g., Brouscari 1981; Getz-Gentle 2001, pls. 47b, 48b, Goulandris Sculptor [12]). A number of figures and fragments have also been confiscated from looters. Again, we do not know where the majority of those were found, although in the case of two heads and three fragmentary images in the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki (*ArchDelt* 24 B [1969] pl. 299; Getz-Gentle 2001, Goulandris Sculptor [11]), I have reason to believe they came from Kavos. The same people apprehended with the pieces that went to Thessaloniki were also involved in finding the head (not from the hoard) that joins a torso definitely from the hoard (Sotirakopoulou 2005, no. 199), indicating that the head was the result of clandestine activity at Kavos not long before 1974, when it was bought.

publications,²⁵ as well as one I would add now that is well known through publication.²⁶ To be sure, the association in those cases is largely based on information provided by Koutoulakis, from whom, ultimately, all of them were acquired. The objects in question had been sold to other dealers or collectors several years before I met him. However, among the hoard fragments that I studied and photographed in 1968, there was one head, preserved with a short section of the neck, that originally belonged to a figure measuring 1 m or more in height (fig. 2). As a looted object, some might be unwilling to accept this head as evidence that images or fragments of images larger by far than any ever recovered from a grave by an archaeologist have actually been found at Kavos.²⁷ But the recovery of a lower torso/upper thigh fragment in the excavation of the “special deposit south” during the 2007 season does support this. It is difficult to estimate the original length of the figure from my brief look at it, but I venture a rough guess of 80–100 cm.²⁸ While this fragment is the sole piece of unusually large size found in the course of sanctioned exploration of an undisturbed area of Kavos, it seems likely to me that

other such works, some said to be from Amorgos, were actually found on Keros.²⁹

Before turning to the second part of the inventory of objects ascribed to the hoard as presented by Sotirakopoulou, it is important to stress that there was and is no special cachet or advantage for either dealer or collector to state that a piece belonged to the Keros Hoard or that it is said to have been found on Keros. Quite the contrary: normally, Koutoulakis was loath to reveal the location of his “goldmine,” while current dealers and collectors are made nervous by evidence that Keros was indeed the source of the hoard. Rather, the case for as much transparency as possible, based on information gleaned or given, has been largely my own.

CRITERIA FOR ASSOCIATING AN OBJECT WITH THE KEROS HOARD

I believe that certain criteria can be used to confirm the identification with the hoard of the majority of the works in part 2 of the catalogue published by Sotirakopoulou.³⁰ To me, the most persuasive yardstick for ascribing a piece to the hoard is that I saw it with my

²⁵ E.g., Getz-Gentle 2001, pl. 62a; 2006, no. 32; Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 170, 176–78, 193, 198.

²⁶ It occurs to me now for the first time that the very large head (Thimme 1977, no. 202) given by Christos Bastis to the Metropolitan Museum in 1964 must also be from the hoard. According to George Ortiz, Bastis bought antiquities almost exclusively from Koutoulakis (Apostolides 2006, 281). I would qualify that statement by adding that, as far as his Cycladic objects were concerned, this was true until roughly the mid 1980s. It is not clear when Bastis bought the head, but presumably it was sometime in the decade before he made the donation. That, too, points to the hoard, as does its very close similarity to Getz-Gentle 2006, no. 32; see also Thimme 1977, no. 201 (illustrated next to no. 202).

²⁷ The largest complete figure found by an archaeologist in a grave (Tomb 10 at Spedos, on the island of Naxos) measures 58.2 cm in height (Zervos 1957, fig. 113); no fragments of comparable or larger figures have been found in this context. While it is plausible that somewhat larger examples have been found in graves by looters, it seems unlikely that “colossal” ones—those measuring 1 m or more—have. The second-largest complete figure (140 cm) is said to have been found in a cave—quite credibly, according to two different sources—on Keros, not far from Kavos (Doumas 2000, no. 222; Getz-Gentle 2001, pl. 64c).

²⁸ I am grateful to Renfrew for permission to mention this fragment.

²⁹ E.g., the very large head with carved ears and mouth in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens (inv. no. 3909), which in the museum’s inventory comes, curiously, between the musician figures from Keros (inv. nos. 3908, 3910) acquired in 1884; the full figure (inv. no. 3978), first published in 1891, which, at 148.3 cm, is the largest complete figure known and was allegedly broken into several pieces

to make it fit in a grave; the very large head in Copenhagen, acquired in Athens in 1896 (Getz-Gentle 2001, Goulandris Sculptor [36]); and the fragmentary male figure acquired on Amorgos by the Erlenmeyers—supra n. 10. Keros, until 1952, was under the authority of the monastery of Panagia Chozoviotissa on Amorgos. Had it been known that Keros was the find-place of these outstanding objects, however ugly and barbaric the three very early finds may have been perceived at the time, not only might the church have claimed them but, by giving Amorgos as a source, the diggers would have put others off their trail. I am beginning to believe, further, that the story of the procrustean measures taken to fit the figure in a grave is fictitious. The idea that it could have been subjected to ritual breakage is unlikely to have occurred to anyone at the time, and the story made a credible explanation for why the huge figure was found in pieces. As for the fragmentary male image actually purchased on Amorgos, its finders are also not likely to have revealed the true source in order to keep it safe for further digging. Regarding no. 3909, I have suggested (Getz-Gentle 2001, 142 n. 148) the possibility that it could be somewhat earlier than the other objects found on Keros. Arguing against this is the fact that it is one of very few images that have long, vertical, parallel painted strokes on the face (Renfrew 1991, fig. 113, pls. 71, 72). The two other examples with long strokes known to me—the head cited here, in Copenhagen, and Getz-Gentle 2001, Goulandris Sculptor [32] (where I failed to mention the facial markings)—are both attributable to the same carver of Late Spedos variety figures, and both, I now believe, were found on Keros; the latter must belong to the hoard; see also *Early Art* 1965, no. 23; supra n. 20.

³⁰ The specific reasons for associating each individual piece with the hoard are given in an addendum available on the AJA Web site (<http://www.ajaonline.org>), under “Supplemental Data.”



Fig. 2. Head and part of the neck of a very large figure from the Keros Hoard, preserved lgth. 21 cm, major damage ancient. Ghosts of painted curls can be seen on the back. Haifa, Hecht Museum, inv. no. H-746 (courtesy the Hecht Museum, University of Haifa, Israel).

own eyes on one of my visits to Koutoulakis, either in Paris or Geneva, stored in boxes containing comparable material, all identified by him as being from the hoard. Some of these pieces were exhibited anonymously in Karlsruhe in 1976; some have turned up in collections or on the market, and I have been able to confirm their identity from my photograph archive.³¹ For pieces not examined personally when they were still with Koutoulakis, I have relied on information supplied by collectors or dealers—in many cases Koutoulakis himself—that they were acquired from him and belonged to the huge group of objects found together (or some such description of the hoard).

For other pieces (including probably some that, for lack of photographs, I no longer recall being shown by Koutoulakis), I have relied on information supplied by dealers, auction catalogues, collectors, or museums that they, too, were bought in Paris or Geneva several decades ago and thus, virtually certainly, came originally from Koutoulakis. The same can be said of pieces sold by certain dealers known to have acquired

their objects from Koutoulakis. Nearly all the pieces in question are fragmentary; some are from unusually large images. All belong exclusively to the EC II types and varieties found in both the hoard and the sanctioned excavations and in some cases can be attributed to the hands of sculptors represented in both sets of material.

A few of these works show vivid traces of surviving paint;³² many—particularly heads—show evidence of paint ghosts,³³ often in the form of a solid-painted mass that begins on the forehead, continues onto the sides and in a large area on the back, with curls depending from the sideburns and back, as illustrated in figures 1 and 2.³⁴ The presence of paint, and especially paint ghosts, on many of the pieces from the hoard indicates a similarity in the conditions under which they were preserved, and thus suggests that they could come from the same site. The fact of their presence cannot be used as a sole criterion for identification of a piece with the hoard, but together with other factors, it can be considered supportive of such an association.

³¹ Among fragments not attributed to any of the individual sculptors discussed in Getz-Gentle 2001 (e.g., Münzen und Medaillen, Auction 56, 19 February 1980, lot 4; Sotheby's London, 13–14 July 1987, lot 405; *Masterpieces* 1990, no. 25; Christie's New York, 10 June 1994, lot 107; Christie's New York, 10 December 2004, lot 447; supra n. 30).

³² E.g., Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 70, 176, 177; supra n. 21.

³³ On the phenomenon of the paint ghost, see Preziosi and Weinberg 1970 (where the fragments in pls. 4[5.6], 5[2.3], 6[1.2, 3.4, 5.6] [Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 169, 209, 161, 192, 215, respectively] are from the hoard) and, most recently, Getz-Gentle 2001, 145 n. 185. For additional illustrated examples, see Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 170, 200, 207, 209.

³⁴ See also, e.g., Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 202, 211.

Finally, there is the “bad marriage,” in which fragments from different figures have been joined. This could occur in some numbers only in a situation where a great many fragments present enticing possibilities. Even though the resulting joins are imperfect and incorrect, they were good enough for an expert restorer to camouflage. A number of these faulty joins involve the fragment of a work attributable to the Goulandris Sculptor attached to the fragment of a figure from a different hand.

FINDING JOINS

I am not aware (and doubt) that any systematic attempt to find joins was ever made when the entire hoard, including the Erlenmeyer portion, was still with Koutoulakis. It is not even certain that the Keros material sent to him was ever all in one place at the same time. If, in fact, he received the hoard in different shipments over a period of time, he may have sold objects from one lot before he received the next one. Nevertheless, now and then, happy marriages composed of hoard fragments have also occurred. These, too, usually involve the Goulandris Sculptor, who was by far the most prolific of all Early Cycladic carvers and the one that is best represented in the hoard.³⁵ I myself had the pleasure of finding the head of an otherwise nearly complete figure of his while rummaging around in one of the boxes of hoard fragments in 1983.³⁶

The possibility of finding further joins (except perhaps from photographs, in the relatively few cases where the fractures are distinctive) is now limited by the widespread dispersal of the hoard fragments, as well as by bad marriages and the preference of some collectors for having the missing portions of their figures restored, effectively obscuring their break surfaces.³⁷ Nevertheless, I am convinced that, under ideal circumstances, additional joins between hoard fragments and with fragments found by archaeologists at Kavos are possible.³⁸ One can only hope that new technologies will be developed or existing technologies adapted that will make this possible and will obviate the need for the objects in question to be brought together.

151 CANNER STREET
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT 06511
CYCLAMEN@SBCGLOBAL.NET

Works Cited

- Apostolides, A. 2006. *Αρχαιοκαπηλία και Εμπόριο Αρχαιοτήτων: Μουσεία, Έμποροι Τέχνης, Οίκοι Δημοπρασιών, Ιδιωτικές Συλλογές*. Athens: Agra Publications.
- Brouscari, M. 1981. “Collection P. Canellopoulos: Antiquités cycladiques.” *BCH* 105:499–535.
- Doumas, C.G. 2000. *Early Cycladic Culture: The N.P. Goulandris Collection*. Athens: The Nicholas P. Goulandris Foundation–Museum of Cycladic Art.
- . 1965. *Early Art in Greece: The Cycladic, Minoan, Mycenaean and Geometric Periods, 3000–700 B.C.* 1965. Exhibition catalogue. New York: André Emmerich Gallery.
- Getz-Gentle, P. 2001. *Personal Styles in Early Cycladic Sculpture*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- . 2006. *Ancient Art of the Cyclades*. Katonah, N.Y.: Katonah Museum of Art.
- Getz-Preziosi, P. 1987. *Early Cycladic Art in North American Collections*. Exhibition catalogue. Richmond: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts.
- . 1990. *Masterpieces of Cycladic Art from Private Collections, Museums and the Merrin Gallery*. 1990. Exhibition catalogue. New York: Merrin Gallery.
- Preziosi, P.G., and S.S. Weinberg. 1970. “Evidence for Painted Details in Early Cycladic Sculpture.” *AntK* 13:4–12.
- Renfrew, C. 1991. *The Cycladic Spirit: Masterpieces from the Nicholas P. Goulandris Collection*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, in association with the Nicholas P. Goulandris Foundation–Museum of Cycladic Art.
- . 2006. “Dhaskalio Kavos (Keros): Reflections and a Question.” In *ΓΕΝΕΘΛΙΟΝ: Αναμνηστικός τόμος για την συμπλήρωση είκοσι χρόνων λειτουργίας του Μουσείου Κυκλαδικής Τέχνης*, edited by N.C. Stampolides, 25–34. Athens: The Nicholas P. Goulandris Foundation–Museum of Cycladic Art.
- Sotirakopoulou, P. 2005. *The “Keros Hoard”: Myth or Reality? Searching for the Lost Pieces of a Puzzle*. Athens, Los Angeles, and New York: The Nicholas P. Goulandris Foundation–Museum of Cycladic Art, The J. Paul Getty Museum, and the Cycladic Art Foundation.
- Thimme, J., ed. 1977. *Art and Culture of the Cyclades in the Third Millennium B.C.* Translated and edited by P. Getz-Preziosi. Exhibition catalogue. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zervos, C. 1957. *L’art des Cyclades du début à la fin de l’Age du Bronze, 2500–1100 avant notre ère*. *CahArt* 18. Paris: Cahiers d’Art.

³⁵ On the Goulandris Sculptor, see Getz-Gentle 2001, 84–93, 161–66. See also n. 179 for earlier bibliography.

³⁶ Getz-Preziosi 1987, no. 75; Sotirakopoulou 2005, no. 87.

³⁷ E.g., Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 171, 186, 195. There is now a noninvasive method, developed at the University of Bologna, using high-energy X-ray computer tomography that can discriminate very clearly between restoration and original

carving that might also be applied to find joins. It is, however, not in widespread use and is not portable.

³⁸ It ought to be feasible, using a computer model, to identify nonadjacent fragments belonging to the same work—fragments that may or may not come from different sets of material.