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The Phoenicians first settled the Maltese islands sometime in the early to late seventh century B.C., and their material culture left a lasting influence on the island for nearly a millennium. Beginning in the early 1600s, Phoenician material culture began to be recognized as such. Following wider trends in the Enlightenment era in Europe, Maltese nobility and clergy began collecting antiquities. Much of this material culture is now known through museum and private collections that have recently been published. Despite a very early implementation of cultural heritage laws that forbid removing antiquities from the nation, a private collection of this material with links to a noble family and at least one sister collection in Malta made its way to the Milwaukee Public Museum (MPM). This thesis presents a preliminary analysis of a collection of predominantly Punico-Roman materials, especially funerary ceramics, which were exported to the MPM in the late 1960s. The research is split into two phases, beginning with biographical research on the collection’s donors to provide provenance for the museum’s documentation. The second phase updates the outmoded terminology since the collection first arrived at the museum and provides a preliminary attribution of context for the material.
I dedicate this thesis to my mother.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

Collecting ancient artifacts is a longstanding tradition throughout the world. Whether it be for financial gain, curiosity, or by accident, archaeological sites and artifacts are often collected and will continue to be for the foreseeable future. When these objects are discovered and preserved, they often find themselves in the hands of wealthy collectors and are eventually donated to a museum or comparable institution. Unfortunately, the removal of artifacts from their contexts, which are key in any archaeological investigation, often limits their utility in research. However, much can be gleaned from artifacts that are already in museum collections, and they ought not to be left to collect dust in storage rooms or display cases. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee’s (UWM) Masters of Science program has a history of “rehabilitating” orphaned collections at the MPM through its students’ research (see Cannizzo 2007; Caywood 2011; Cullen 2008, for theses dealing with other collections of ancient materials originating in the Mediterranean region). With the proper documentation and research, provenance can often be reconstructed for collections that have been orphaned from their original contexts. Such a collection is housed in the Milwaukee Public Museum (MPM). Though it is not formally named by the MPM, here it is referred to as the Leopardi Collection after its former owner, Mr. Eduardo Romeo Leopardi of Malta. It has remained unstudied for the nearly 50 years that it has been at the museum. Considering the rarity of the types of artifacts that comprise the collection, primarily Phoenician, Punic, and Roman artifacts that are rarely found outside Malta, the collection merits study. This thesis represents a first attempt to provide a context for and preliminary analysis of this material.
Aim and Scope of Project

This collection may be considered “orphaned” in the sense that it has very limited research or educational potential due to the absence of context information (Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections 2006:1). Despite the fact that the Maltese artifacts are without their context, we are still able to glean a great deal of information from the collection. Though research on decontextualized artifacts is inherently less productive than artifacts from systematically excavated contexts, by neglecting such collections the scientific community is also neglecting a great deal of data (Akin 1996:105). Much of our knowledge on Phoenicio-Punic and Roman antiquities comes from research on decontextualized Maltese Phoenicio-Punic collections and has been quite fruitful in the past (see Sagona 2002, 2003, 2006, and Vella 2005). My research incorporates these previous findings in order to leverage the research value of the MPM collection and contribute data on funerary assemblages in Phoenicio-Punic Malta. This thesis also contributes to the exposure of such material to American audiences through the medium of the Milwaukee Public Museum by increasing the collection’s value for future research and exhibition.

The primary aim of this thesis was to describe and analyze the decontextualized Leopardi collection, consisting of 167 catalog numbers representing some 199 objects that were acquired by multiple donors from a single source between 1968 and 1974, all of which originate from the same Maltese source (Table 3.2). The collection was studied as a whole with a moderate emphasis on the ceramic vessels, for which much more research is available. Ceramic vessels constitute the greatest part of the grave gifts in Phoenician, Punic, and Roman funerary rites (Said Zammit 1997; Sagona 2002) and are key elements in the interpretation of past lifeways, beliefs, and economic practices (Sinopoli 1991:83).
The choice of this collection was not accidental. First, the collection has remained largely unstudied since its accessioning by the museum in the 1960s and 70s (though some of its materials were incorporated in other UWM Master’s thesis projects, e.g. Cannizzo [2007] and Mortensen [2014]). Second, the material belongs to a culture that has been largely neglected by Western scholarship, at least until Sabatino Moscati’s revival of Phoenician and Punic studies in the 1970s, and the Phoenicians have generally been treated as a foil to Greek exceptionalism (Vella 2014). Since at least the mid-nineteenth century, Greek art “represented the ideal of a perfect and absolute beauty,” in no small part due to the seminal work of Johann Winckelmann entitled *The History of Ancient Art among the Greeks* (the English translation was published in 1850), which has influenced scholars into the present day (Schnapp 1997:262). This thesis contributes to the slowly growing interest in the Phoenician world outside of the Levant by adding to the available data on such materials in the archaeological literature and increasing the educational and research value of the MPM collection. Furthermore, the MPM’s Leopardi collection is even more interesting to scholars as it is likely the largest collection of materials of this kind in the United States, and possibly the largest outside of Malta itself. With these elements of the collection considered, it is clear that the study of this material, beginning with the analysis provided by this thesis, has the potential to contribute a great deal to our knowledge of Malta’s Phoenician, Punic, and Roman periods, as well as the similarities and differences compared to the rest of the Phoenician west.

**Primary Research Components**

This thesis project was organized based on previous theses on “orphaned” museum collections at the MPM (e.g., Caywood 2011; Cullen 2008). Research on collections with no context can use various strategies to better contextualize the objects within them: the first
generally focuses on the material, while the second focuses on the “object biography” of the collection since its deposition (Kopytoff 1986). A third research component may discuss ethical issues with the collection discovered during the review of museum documentation of the acquisition of the collection (Cullen 2008). This research narrative therefore will begin by putting Phoenician Malta into its temporal, spatial, and cultural context in the ancient Mediterranean. Beginning with the earliest human habitation on the island, I sketch the developments of Maltese prehistory up until its settlement by the Phoenicians in the early first millennium B.C. Particular attention is paid to the initial settlement period, and the major transition periods that have characterized scholars’ ideas of the difference between the Phoenician, Punic, and Roman phases of the archipelago. This thesis focuses on the mortuary assemblages known in Malta in the relevant periods and seeks to type the objects using the most recent scholarship on Maltese funerary assemblages (especially Sagona 2002). The research questions addressed include: What kind of technical and stylistic similarities can we find between objects in the collection and what can this tell us about their place of manufacture? Do objects with similar stylistic and technical features conform to existing knowledge of burial assemblages in Phoenician and Punic Malta? Can we find technical, stylistic, or chronological associations between the various objects within the collection?

The second component of the research consists of the analysis of the provenance of the collection. By making use of the distinction between “provenience” and “provenance,” the former connoting an original context of an object or assemblage while the later connotes its original context, as well as its history of ownership (Chippendale and McGill 2000:467), I attempt to reconstruct the collection’s provenance, despite its provenience having been lost. Using the MPM documentation concerning the acquisition of the collection, I have tried to
determine the context in which it was collected and how it came into the hands of Eduardo Romeo Leopardi before it was sold to the Milwaukee Public Museum between 1968 and 1974. Associated research questions include: What sort of collector was Leopardi? Can we trace the collection further back in time? Are there any connections between this collection and other private or museum collection in Malta? Does this research contribute to the perpetuation of the illicit trade in looted artifacts by legitimizing the study of such material (Cullen 2008:7)? What other museums have artifacts from Malta?

The third component of the research involves an analysis of the ethical issues associated with the collection’s purchase in the 1960s. Archaeological ethics have been an increasingly important part of the museum field in recent years (Green 1984; Greenfield 1996; Messenger 1999; Tubb 1995; Vitelli 1996), and are an important part of discussing such a collection. Malta’s antiquities laws were well developed in the early 20th century and expressly forbade the exportation of cultural heritage from Malta without governmental approval (Stubbs and Makas 2011:355). Contemporary museum best practices will be discussed in this connection, as well as ongoing work with Heritage Malta in order to pursue an ethical outcome. It is hoped that this aspect of the research will contribute to a productive dialogue between Heritage Malta and the MPM and help resolve a possible ethical dilemma.

**Geography and Geology**

The official name of the country is the Republic of Malta and it became a sovereign nation in 1964, having been a British protectorate since its annexation from the French in 1814. Upon independence in 1964, the fledgling nation joined the United Nations, becoming a member of the European Union in 2004 and the Eurozone in 2008. Its official languages are Maltese and
English. The population of Malta is 416,055 according to the 2011 census, making it the most densely populated nation in the European Union.

The Maltese archipelago is located approximately 90 kilometers south of the island of Sicily, 290km to the east of Tunisia, and 354km north of Tripoli in Libya. The archipelago consists of two inhabited islands, Malta and Gozo, and two much smaller islands that are currently uninhabited, Comino and Filfla, with a total landmass of 316 square kilometers (Fig. 1.1).

Figure 1.1 Map of Maltese islands (dark green) within the European Union (light green)(after NuclearVacuum 2009).

The geology of Malta consists of sedimentary rock that formed under the sea between ten and 25 million years ago and consists of a lower hard coralline limestone followed by a soft globigerina limestone above it, followed by a layer of blue clay, a greensand formation, and an upper layer of coralline limestone (Pedley et al. 1976; Fig 1.2). The clay is of the most interest to research on Maltese ceramics as it is the only source on Malta. The Maltese clay formations
contain between 2-30 percent calcium carbonate, with a tendency to increase in calcium carbonate as one nears the globigerina formation (Alexander 1988). The variation in calcium carbonate along with other more minor variations in other mineral contents make the clay range from gray to brown and yellow when it is dried (Alexander 1988; Molitor 1988).

Figure 1.2 Geology of Malta (adapted from the Geological Map of the Maltese Islands (1:25,000) published by the Oil Exploration Directorate, Office of the Prime Minister, Valletta, Malta, 1993, courtesy of Fred Pirone).

The island of Malta enjoys mild winters with very hot summers and a mean annual rainfall of about 450mm (17.7 inches) while the landscape is characterized by a mix of fertile valleys and ridges to the north and west that consist of karst land that is not suitable for pastoral or agricultural use (Said-Zammit 1997:1). Malta’s geographical placement has made it a valuable stop over on long sea voyages, and its proximity to Sicily fostered interaction between the islands dating back to the Neolithic period (Fig 1.3). The island was the site of multiple distinct archaeological facies that may or may not have been caused by multiple waves of settlement (Bonanno 2008). In any case, the best documented settlement of the island is the Phoenician settlement in the mid-eighth to mid-seventh century B.C. This resulted in a major cultural shift,
completely overlaying all evidence of previous cultures, and forming the basis for the material culture that has survived in the tombs that eventually made it into the MPM Leopardi Collection.

Figure 1.3 The Maltese archipelago in relation to Sicily and other central Mediterranean islands (after Tanasi and Vella 2014:58 Fig. 4.1).

Now that modern day Malta and its geography and spatial relationships with the western Mediterranean have been introduced, the next section will focus on a contextualization of the material culture, beginning with a brief overview of Maltese prehistory. The rest of the chapter focuses on scholarship regarding the various phases of Phoenician, Punic, and Roman occupation of the archipelago, followed by a short analysis of known mortuary practices in Malta and the wider Mediterranean, as well as a brief introduction to previous scholarship on Maltese material culture in the periods of interest.
In order to understand the origins of the Leopardi Collection, it is necessary to try and contextualize the objects involved as much as possible. We will begin with a brief overview of Maltese prehistory and its links with the wider Mediterranean. We will then focus on the various chronological periods represented by the material culture found in the collection, incorporating ancient texts where possible, before discussing more recent scholarship that better reflects the localized cultural developments of the Maltese archipelago during the period in question.

**Maltese Prehistory**

There is no evidence of human habitation on the island until the Neolithic period, when the archipelago was settled by the Ghar Dalam culture, which exhibits similarities to the contemporary Stentinello culture in Sicily, circa 5500 B.C., when the islands were much larger due to a lower sea level and had a much lushier environment (Bonanno 2008:28; Zohar 2012:245) (Table 1.1). The archipelago probably could not have maintained any prolonged human habitation until the adoption of agriculture, as the islands would have been too small to support a foraging population (Stoddart 1999:139). Once agriculture on the island intensified, a new cultural facies developed called the Red Skorba phase, which exhibited similar stylistic features to the contemporary Diana culture in Sicily (Bonanno 2008:28). The Neolithic cultures that first settled the island would leave the greatest physical and psychological mark on the later inhabitants of the island in the form of megalithic temples (Vella and Gilkes 2001). The island generally maintained close contacts with the wider Mediterranean, especially Sicily, until the Ġgantija and Tarxien phases, but was reincorporated into robust trading relations with Sicily during the Tarxien Cemetery phase (Stoddart 1999:140-41). During the Middle Bronze Age in Malta, there is evidence of contact with Mycenaean traders (or at least Mycenaean material culture), probably via Sicily (Tanasi 2005, 2010).
Table 1.1 Maltese prehistoric chronology (after Evans 1971).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maltese Prehistoric Chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic (5,000-4,100 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Period (4,100–2,500 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age (2,500–700 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bronze Age trade networks that united the eastern and western Mediterranean during this period began to fall apart during a long period of upheaval in the Aegean, culminating in the collapse of the Mycenaean palaces in the Aegean Late Bronze Age, the catalysts for which are still under debate (Drews 1995; Robbins 2001). External contacts were not reestablished on an extensive level until some centuries later. There is no reason to believe that the lucrative trade to the west was entirely discontinued, or that the memory of these contacts was lost, and it would pick up again in the tenth century (Sagona 2015:172). These contacts culminated in a Phoenician colony that would eventually subsume the local cultures of the island, most likely in the mid-eighth to mid-seventh centuries (Vella 2005).

**Phoenician Settlement**

This more or less continuous contact with the wider Mediterranean meant that Phoenician travelers established contact with the archipelago in the Maltese Middle Bronze Age sometime in the early first millennium B.C. Phoenicians had been expanding their trading networks and
establishing colonies further westward from their homeland in the Levant since the ninth century B.C. based on radio-carbon dates at Huelva on the Atlantic coast of the Iberian peninsula, probably due to economic and political constraints in the Levant (Vella et al. 2011:267).

Eventually Greek expansion would follow the Phoenician one, and nearly the entirety of the Mediterranean would be colonized (Fig. 1.4). Diodorus Siculus, writing many centuries after the fact, in the first century B.C., attributes this expansion to the Phoenician trade in silver.

Discussing the extensive silver mines in Iberia, he writes:

“Now the natives were ignorant of the use of the silver, and the Phoenicians, as they pursued their commercial enterprises and learned of what had taken place, purchased the silver in exchange for other ware of little if any worth. And this was the reason why the Phoenicians, as they transported this silver to Greece and Asia and to all other people, acquired great wealth. […] And the result was that the Phoenicians, as in the course of many years they prospered greatly, thanks to commerce of this kind, sent forth many colonies, some to Sicily and its neighboring islands, and others to Libya, Sardinia, and Iberia” (Bibliotheca Historica V.35.4)

Figure 1.4 Phoenician, Greek, and local settlements in the ancient Mediterranean (after Anastasi 2015: Fig. 8).

Tin was also an important resource that led to Phoenician expansion towards the west, leading to the development of an extensive Phoenician trade network with autonomous entrepôts that often developed into city-states with evidence for a high degree of local contact and influence in the central and western Mediterranean (Aubet 2001; Moscati 1976). Major early
settlements include Utica (Lopez Castro et al. 2016), Carthage (Lancel 1995), Malaga, Ibiza, Motya (Nigro 2010), and others. As noted by the late Sabatino Moscati, Phoenician involvement in western Mediterranean history generally took a backseat in major narratives about colonial expansion in favor of the Greeks and Romans (1976:10). Now, however, renewed interest has begun to shed light on their involvement in this part of the world, and Malta is one of the many examples in which an increasing amount has been published on the matter of Phoenician colonization, especially considering that appears never to have been a Greek colony on Malta, as certain antiquarians had thought or hoped (see Bonanno 1983 for the history of this topic).

While the Maltese archipelago would have had little to trade with outsiders, the islands sport some excellent natural harbors that the Phoenicians could have exploited on their long voyages westwards and perhaps on their voyages back east (Bonanno 2005:29). These Phoenician traders eventually established permanent settlements on Malta. A Greek historian from Sicily, Diodorus Siculus, wrote in the first century B.C. that Phoenician mariners used Malta as a port of refuge during their long trading voyages from the Levant to the West. Diodorus Siculus describes this process as follows:

“This island is a colony planted by the Phoenicians, who, as they extended their trade in the western ocean, found in it a place of safe retreat, since it was well supplied with harbors and lay out in the open sea; and this is the reason why the inhabitants of this island, since they received assistance in many respects through the sea-merchants, shot up quickly in their manner of living and increased renown” (Bibliotheca Historica V.12.3)

Although the exact date of this settlement process is not known, based on the archaeological evidence it could not have occurred before the middle of the eighth century B.C. (Bonanno 2005:23). The exact date of Phoenician began settlement on the Maltese islands is somewhat disputed. Though samples have been taken for radiocarbon dating, results have not been published for this particular period of Malta’s history (Sagona 2015:174). Traditionally, the dates of Phoenician colonization were thought to lie in the mid-eighth century B.C. based on the
discovery of imported early Greek ceramic types with known dates. The earliest sealed funerary archaeological context of the Phoenician period, the Ghajn Qajjet tomb, has been dated to the latter half of the eighth century based on two Greek imported vessels, a proto-Corinthian kylix and a Rhodian “bird bowl” of the mid-eighth and late eighth centuries B.C., respectively, alongside the characteristic Phoenician Red Slip Ware (Baldacchino and Dunbabin 1953). This context predates the traditional date for the end of the Maltese Bronze Age, which is ca. 750 B.C. (Fig. 1.5); leading Claudia Sagona to divide this period into one of Phoenician influence and one of established contact (Sagona 2002:24, 2015:174). These dates, however, have been pushed forward by a century or so, as the dating for these ceramics has changed (Semararo 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Date range</th>
<th>Broad Cultural Developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II B 1</td>
<td>1450-1350 BC</td>
<td>Archaic Phase I: period of trading contact and sporadic settlement ‘Orientalizing’ period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B 2</td>
<td>1350-900 BC</td>
<td>Established Phase I: fully fledged Phoenician colonisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B 3</td>
<td>900-750 BC</td>
<td>Late Phase to Early II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/II C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Period of introversion: minimal foreign influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>500-410 BC</td>
<td>‘Classic’ Punic: Early Phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>410-300 BC</td>
<td>‘Classic’ Punic: Late Phase III to Early IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>300-100 BC</td>
<td>Incipient ‘Romanization’: covers the Roman conquest of Malta in 218 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>100 BC-c.50 AD</td>
<td>‘Romanization’ of the local repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>c.50 AD onward</td>
<td>Romano-Punic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.5 Comparison of Sagona and Trump’s chronological schemes (after Vella 2005:437, Fig. 1).

Claudia Sagona is a strong proponent of the idea that there is noticeable hybridization between the Late Borġ in-Nadur culture and the colonizing Phoenicians (2015:173). However, this evidence has been debated (Vella 2005). The Borġ in-Nadur culture seems to have been subsumed within Phoenician material culture soon after their arrival, but very little is known
about the settlement patterns and material culture of this period of Malta’s prehistory (Tanasi and Vella 2010).

**Phoenician, Punic, and Roman Malta**

Malta is typically associated with two periods of “great splendor,” the Neolithic period from the fifth through the third millennium B.C., and the Knights of St. John from the 16th to the 18th centuries A.D. (Vella and Gilkes 2001; Zohar 2012:244). This thesis covers some of the time in between these periods, from the tenth century B.C. to the third century A.D., though some of the objects in the collection, as we shall see, fall outside the chronological scope of this project. In order to understand the developments of this long chronological period it is important to define what we mean by the various cultural designations that characterize the literature regarding Malta. This consists of defining some of the ethnic designations used, as well as putting them within the context of broader scholarship of these terms as they apply to Malta in particular. We will begin with the terms Phoenician, Punic, and Roman, and then discuss the use of this terminology versus a more localized orthography that recognizes “local realities which tend to be obscured by the effort to generalize colonizing traits and cultural outcomes” (Vella et al. 2011:268) in the context of the various “Melitan” phases that have been outlined in recent scholarship on Malta by Claudia Sagona (2008:489). It is important to note that not all scholars use Sagona’s chronology much less the new terms she adopts for it. For example, while Sagona has identified ceramics belonging to a 250 year intermediate phase of Phoenician influence on local populations (Fig. 1.5), most scholars of Maltese prehistory do not agree that there was Phoenician influence on the Late Borg in-Nadur phase (Vella 2005). In addition, most scholars agree that there is no evidence of ceramics from one of the principal Phoenician city-states at Tyre in the Western Mediterranean prior to Bikai’s Types 2 and 3 (painted Bichrome Ware and
burnished Red Slip Ware, respectively), dating from 750 to 700 B.C. (Ciasca 1995a:140). One of the major issues with Phoenician and Punic archaeology in general is the almost complete lack of textual sources (Moscati 1976:11).

Further confounding the chronology of Maltese archaeology for the cultural phases in question are a variety of post-depositional processes that affect the state of the evidence within the archipelago. The relatively small islands of Malta and Gozo have a notable shortage of arable soils so farmers have brought soils from other parts of the island to make terraced fields, which can negatively affect the reliability of survey work (Anastasi 2011:165). In addition these is a long tradition of “gathering and collecting ancient pottery from the countryside to be crushed and pounded with lime for the waterproofing of roofs” (Anastasi 2011:165), which has contributed to the destruction of archaeological deposits, including, one might imagine, ancient vessels from rock-cut tombs.

**The Phoenicians**

Diodorus Siculus, Livy, and the Geographer Claudius Ptolomaeus (a.k.a. Ptolemy) are the major ancient historians from whose writings we derive the majority of our information about Malta. Ptolemy states that there were three main settlements on the archipelago: one on Gozo, the other two on the island of Malta. The evidence for the settlements mentioned has been found at the sites of the Grand Harbor area in Malta, with Rabat as the main inland settlement, and the Gozoan settlement located in the area of Victoria on the nearby island of Gozo (Said-Zammit 1997:1). The latter two are the only settlements that have yielded evidence for defensive structures (Said-Zammit 1997:18).

With the arrival of Phoenician settlers, we find the introduction of a great deal of material culture that suggests the quick adoption of new forms of dining and drinking practices (Sagona
The existence of handmade wares in Phoenician forms indicates that initial contact (occurring, according to Sagona, in the tenth century B.C.) did not include a great deal of actual settlement, as no potters brought the wheel to Malta. It is only in the early Melitan Established Phase I (750-620 B.C.) that wheel-made pottery seems to become standard (Sagona 2015:209). One of the major novelties in drinking practices reflected in the ceramic repertoire of the islands is the introduction of vessels specifically for the consumption of wine and there is pollen evidence that viticulture began in this period (Sagona 2015:211). Pear shaped flasks have been found to be useful chronological markers for Phoenicia (Núñez Calvo 2008:25), and they are now hypothesized to have been used in the mixing of herbs with wine (Sagona 2015:211). Phoenician settlement also resulted in an increase in cereal production as well as the introduction of walnut and olive trees (Sagona 2015:213).

The Punic Period

It is uncertain when exactly Malta and Gozo fell under the sphere of influence of the ascending city-state of Carthage (Said-Zammit 1997:2). Carthage itself was an older Phoenician colony, probably founded in the eleventh or ninth centuries B.C. (Lancel 1995). Some have hypothesized that major changes in the east, most notably the fall of Tyre in 573 B.C. to the Assyrian King Nebuchadnezzar, which led to the abandonment of some Phoenician sites, played a role in the ascendency of Carthage and the expansion of its sphere of influence over the western Mediterranean (Bonanno 1997:59; Ciasca 1995b:710; Sagona 2015:218). The growing power of the Greek colonies in the West, especially that of Syracuse, might have been perceived as a threat (and indeed the city-state of Syracuse and the Sicelo-Phoenician dependencies of Carthage warred with each other for centuries until the ascendency of Rome and the First Punic War), possibly causing smaller Phoenician settlements to seek shelter from a larger power
Despite being under Carthage’s sphere of influence, some Maltese scholars have suggested that commercial ties were stronger with Greek Sicily, Greek Italy, and Punic Tripolitania than they were with Carthage (Bonanno 1997:59), as there is scant evidence for Carthaginian types of ceramics in Maltese ceramic assemblages (Ciasca 1995b:699). Regardless, according to Claudia Sagona, the Punic periods evidence a decrease in imports and an increase in poor quality pottery as Malta was forced to rely on its own resources (2015:218). Sagona further characterizes the transition between the Phoenician and Punic periods as an increase in the construction of rural complexes for the commercial production of olive oil, an increase in local pottery production, and an increase in population and a continuation of maritime commerce (Sagona 2015:219), setting the stage for later prosperity under the Roman Empire.

Despite the long period of cultural stability, there is very little archaeological or historical evidence of Phoenician or Punic habitation sites on Malta, very few architectural remains are documented and the limited number of systematic excavations that have been carried out in residential quarters have not revealed much evidence of Phoenician or Punic influence (Bonanno 2005; Sagona 2015). Tombs, therefore, provide the most substantial information for Phoenician occupation of the island. The relative numbers and clusters of tombs have provided archaeologists with a rough plan of settlement and population growth on Malta and Gozo (Bonanno 2005:86). The relatively standard typologies of the rock-cut tombs and their accompanying ceramic repertoires have also been shown to change diachronically (Sagona 2002) and can be used to date depositions and, by proxy, habitation sites. The 642 burials that were considered in a recent study on Malta suggest that there were at least 19 rural settlements and one major nucleated settlement in the archipelago, near or within the current city of Rabat Mdina (van Dommelen et al. 2008:152; Fig. 1.6).
It is during this period that ceramics cease to be imported on a large scale and ceramic production in Malta itself becomes well established. Punic Crisp Ware and its Thick-Slipped Ware variant become predominant, phasing out the earlier Red-Slipped Wares of Phase I (Sagona 2015:244). Decoration, if present at all, consists of red painted bands (Sagona 2015:244). The pottery repertoire loses the “thistle headed beakers, piriform jugs with trefoil lips, tripod bowls, and small pear shaped oil flasks” (Sagona 2015:244), which are conspicuously missing from the Leopardi Collection. Otherwise, from the rare evidence of personal ornament available, Punic material culture follows similar trajectories to the rest of the Mediterranean (Sagona 2015:247).

The Roman Period

Livy detailed the conquest of the island by the Romans in 218 B.C. during the Second Punic War. In the course of a search for a Carthaginian fleet, a Roman fleet from Lilybaeum (a Punico-Sicilian city-state and dependency of Carthage) commanded by Titus Sempronius...
Longus made contact and the islands were annexed to the province of Sicily (urbe condita XXI.5.51). Despite the island’s subjection to Roman rule “Phoenician cultural traditions died hard” (Saïd-Zammit 1997:2). When St. Paul supposedly landed on the island of Malta hundreds of years later in the first century A.D., the inhabitants were described as “barbaroi” and so were probably not speaking the “civilized” languages of Latin or Greek (Bonanno 1997:64; Buhagiar 1994:80). While the local cultural identity may not have been subsumed by Roman identity or even the Latin language, it was surely incorporated into the wider Roman Empire, but no longer being a site for “military activities which attract documentary accounts” we have fewer extant documentary sources detailing Malta (Stoddart 1999:143). Nevertheless, there are some, and they relate Malta’s continued prosperity under Roman rule. Diodorus Siculus, writing in the first century B.C., describes Malta as a prosperous center for trade that

“possesses many harbors which offer exceptional advantage, and its inhabitants are blest in their possessions; for it has artisans skilled in every manner of craft, the most important being those who weave linen, which is remarkably sheer and soft, and the dwellings on the island are worthy of note, being ambitiously constructed with cornices and finishes in stucco with unusual workmanship.” [Bibliotheca Historica 5.12.2]

The islands even developed their own mint during this period (Sagona 2015:222).

However, the most remarkable remnant of the Roman period is the Roman town-house of Rabat. There were probably up to 25 residential and/or industrial villas on the islands that apparently specialized in the commercial production of olive oil (Fig 1.7). This would have been especially useful to the islands as the discarded olive pits are an excellent fuel source that helped to offset the lack of any significant sources of timber (Sagona 2015:230-31). The Roman period, as it applies to the material of this thesis, came to an end with the arrival of Christianity on the island beginning in the mid-third century A.D. (Buhagiar 1994:80).
Ethnicity and Identity in the Central Mediterranean

It is at this juncture that it is necessary to bring up a pressing matter in contemporary Mediterranean archaeology. While it is not the subject of this thesis, it is important to briefly survey some of the issues stemming from the terminology that is often used to describe peoples, material cultures, and chronological periods simultaneously. Much of the old terminology regarding ethnic identity has been challenged in recent decades. It has been shown that archaeology has traditionally operated under the assumption, at least in the cultural historical approach, that “homogenous cultural entities correlate with particular peoples, ethnic groups, tribes, and/or races” (Jones 1997:24). The question of what “Phoenicians” in the West should be called has been asked for decades (Ciasca 1995a:147, 1995b:700; Niemeyer 2000; Prag 2014). What do we mean when we talk about the Phoenicians, the Punic, the Romans, or even the Greeks? If ethnicity can be defined as “culturally ascribed identity groups […] based on the
expression of a real or assumed shared culture and common descent” (Jones 1997:85), to what extent are these useful labels when discussing the peoples of the Mediterranean, and those of Malta especially? While they are all convenient ethnic labels that may make sense in the modern world, they all imply assumptions about what categorizes an ethnicity that does not correspond well with ancient ideas of identity. We must be wary of trying to ascribe broad ethnic terms such as these that obfuscate differences, whether perceivable in material culture or not (see Skibo and Feinman 1999). For example, “Phoenician” is an ethnic label that contains very little actual information that would have been deemed important by the people being studied, just as the term “Greek” does not convey the many different “types” of Greeks there were around the Mediterranean at this time (Prag 2014:11). Greek authors used the non-distinctive term Phoinikes (later transliterated into poenus in Latin) to designate anyone who came from the region or spoke a similar language to the Phoenicians of the Levant, who would have referred to themselves as Canaanites. Greek authors were just as likely to refer to Phoenicians as citizens of a particular city state (e.g., Tyrians, Sidonians, or Carthaginians) as they were to use the more general term (Prag 2014:13). This language was appropriated by early scholars of the classical world, and many of our ideas about the Phoenicians are still influenced by the nineteenth century belief that objects were ethnically diagnostic and reflect the “invention of a ‘Phoenician’ art style” (Jones 1997:41; Vella 2014:30). For example, by the late nineteenth century, some claimed to be able to “pronounce with confidence that Phoenician art could be distinguished at a glance ‘without regard to its provenance’” (Vella 2014:32). Phoenicians were treated as a homogenous group and few scholars sought to problematize this until the revival of Phoenician studies by the late Sabatino Moscati in the 1970s (Vella 2014:29).
Of course, the concept of the modern nation state was not in use in the ancient Mediterranean. So what did the people of Malta think of themselves? According to Niemeyer, “the Levantine communities were apparently defined primarily as the populations of their respective city states, and had already developed their corporate identity by the second millennium” (2000:93). The fact of the matter is that they certainly did not refer to themselves as Phoenicians, Punics, or Romans. It is now agreed that material culture traditionally considered Roman is not evidence for an ethnic identity in line with that of the city-state (Jones 1997:133), and the increased presence of Roman material culture is not likely to have instilled a sense of romanitas in the people of the island of Malta. So despite the ethnic terminology used to convey chronological ranges, these should not be thought to reflect local perceptions of identity. We must be wary of mapping modern notions of ethnicity onto ancient practices. The word Punic is no less problematic. ‘Punic’ denotes a cultural identity that is often applied to “a large group of societies in the central and western Mediterranean between the middle of the sixth and the end of the second century B.C.” (Gómez Bellard 2014:70). No one ever referred to themselves as ‘Punics,’ either, and a more neutral term might be “Western Phoenician” (Prag 2014:11-12). In fact, there is very little evidence that western Phoenicians even thought of themselves as separate from eastern Phoenicians, despite the archaeological distinction in their cultural material (Prag 2014:12). In the western “Phoenician” and “Punic” world, regional differences abound. For example, the Iberian Peninsula and Malta did not subscribe to the bichrome ceramic tradition that is typical of Carthage and Motya (Ciasca 1995a:146). Can we see in the different material culture a difference in identity? Regardless, the most relevant way of looking at these peoples is by the “dominant form of ethnic distinction and political identity” of the period, which took the form of civic ethnic groups (Prag 2014:16).
In the context of Malta, then, what can we say about the identity of the local inhabitants, and what should we call them? Some scholars have begun to challenge this terminology, which has served to “[compartmentalize] Maltese history into ‘Phoenician,’ ‘Punic,’ and ‘Roman’” which “masks a persistent and evolving culture” (Sagona 2015:218). When the Maltese archipelago first enters the literate world, we learn that Greek and Latin sources name the two main islands Melite and Gaulos/Gaudos, and Melita and Gaulos/Gaulus, respectively. These names are suspected to derive from the Punic mlth and gwl (Sagona 2015:174). Claudia Sagona appropriates the term Melita to coin the ‘Melitan culture,’ in order to capture the idea that “the archipelago developed culturally along its own path,” despite many outside influences. She uses the term to distinguish the archipelago’s cultural continuity from ideologically laden terms such as “Phoenician,” “Punic,” and “Roman” (Sagona 2002, 2015:175). These are further divided into chronological phases. However, it is important to note that the usage of these terms has a long history, and we may be best served if we stick with these chronological designations, as they are of value to the scientific community as standard chronological markers (Vella 2005:438).

**Mortuary Practices in Malta**

There is very little evidence of burial practices in the cultural group preceding the Phoenicians. In fact, until the Phoenician period, there is very little evidence for mortuary practices of the Bronze Age in general (Tanasi and Vella 2011). Much like the North African coast, where Phoenicians also established many settlements, Phoenician mortuary practices totally subsumed local rites with little if any noticeable change (Ben Younès and Krandel-Ben Younès 2014:164). Funerary rites are rarely the site of innovation, as funerary gestures are often “tied to a set of accumulated traditions that become a kind of inherent mentality, in contrast to elements of daily life, which are more sensitive to changes in taste” (Ben Younès and Krandel-
Ben Younès 2014:149). Through time and space, the topography of funerary areas in the Phoenician and Punic exhibits many similarities. One necropolis is usually in place for both small and large settlements that are often “separated in a symbolic way” by a river or small valley and small farms would often have their own little cemeteries (Gómez Bellard 2014:71). The various types of graves are divided between adults and children. Tombs for adults include *hypogea*, *fossae*, *pozzi*, and built tombs, though built tombs are usually termed Phoenician and were only found in Carthage (Gómez Bellard 2014:71). Tombs for children include hypogea, or small underground family unit cemeteries, with other adults on rare occasions, while *enchythrismos* burials, or inhuming an individual within a ceramic vessel, are the most common type (Gómez Bellard 2014:72; Fig. 1.8). Inhumation was the dominant funerary ritual for adults throughout the period in question; the deceased were laid out on their backs, with all of their burial goods placed on or around them (Gómez Bellard 2014:72; Said-Zammit 1997:5).

In Sicily, Sardinia, Spain and Algeria, Phoenicians in the west practiced mainly cremation (Gómez Bellard 2014:72), and some scholars use the near complete abandonment of this practice in Carthage as the marker for the transition to the Punic phase in North Africa. In

![Figure 1.8 Display of an *enchythrismos* burial with infant remains from excavations at the St. Paul’s Catacombs. Note the cup and lamp that were placed in the amphora with the infant (photo by the author).](image-url)
the second half of the fourth and the beginning of the third centuries B.C. we see the reintroduction of cremation in the wider Punic world, but it never totally replaces inhumation (Gómez Bellard 2014:72). In Malta from the mid-eighth century to the mid-sixth centuries B.C. the rite of cremation became more common than inhumation though between 550 B.C. and 300 B.C. this trend was reversed, perhaps due to Hellenistic influence on the island (Said-Zammit 1997:5, 22). Both cremation and inhumation took place side by side throughout the entire Phoenician and Punic periods (Said-Zammit 1997:6). Cremation consisted of a burnt body whose ashes were deposited in a cinerary urn that was then buried in a rock-cut chamber tomb or in a separate grave-pit, sometimes including personal ornaments (Said-Zammit 1997:22). In Malta, the primary form of inhumation burials consists of rock-cut tombs (Fig. 1.9), which characterized tombs from the initial settlement to the adoption of hypogea and catacombs when Christianity took hold of the island (Bonanno 1997:64, 2005, Said-Zammit 1997).

Figure 1.9 Reconstruction of a burial in a rock-cut tomb (after Bonanno 2005:93).
A diverse set of grave goods formed an important part of the funerary ritual in the ancient Mediterranean. A wide variety of objects included in the ritual are attested archaeologically and can be organized into broad categories (Table 1.2). As the material remains of mortuary practice make up the bulk of the diagnostic material available for this period of Malta’s history, burials also serve as a way to chart cultural change (Sagona 2003:3). The classes of vessels in Malta reflect wider trends in Phoenicio-Punic mortuary practices. The ceramics most often reflect sets of vessels for the consumption of wine, which was a phenomenon that spanned most of the Mediterranean in antiquity. The centrality of wine in the grave good assemblage has been interpreted as “the blending of vegetal and animal force” symbolizing “the nature of exchange between people and their environment” (Ben Younès and Krandel-Ben Younès 2014:155-56). It is important to note that while imported Greek types of ceramics are often found in both Phoenician and Punic graves, this should not be considered as an alteration of the typical funerary assemblage as they always consist of objects that serve functions of the ritual such as wine-drinking cups or unguentaria for perfumes (Gómez Bellard 2014:73; Fig. 1.10).

Table 2.2 Principal types of grave goods used in Punic funerary ritual (adapted from Gómez Bellard 2014:73).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Types of Grave Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed-form vessels for holding liquids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-form vessels for holding or serving solid foodstuffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-form drinking vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pots (rare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unguentaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamps for illumination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry and amulets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal goods, normally for personal care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coins in later periods, often worn as decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic objects: terracottas, ostrich eggs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another essential class of object in Phoenician ritual is the lamp. Lamps are found in nearly all tomb contexts throughout the Phoenician Mediterranean and can be traced back to their use in the Levant, such as at the city-state of Tyre in the Iron Age (Bikai 1978; Núñez Calvo 2011) which shared mortuary practices with North Africa (Ben Younès and Krandel-Ben Younès 2014:154). Lamps have not been a popular subject of research despite their near ubiquity in Mediterranean funerary contexts and the “role of lighting in funerary ritual and eschatological beliefs” (Şöföroğlu and Summerer 2016:259, also see Elrasheedy and Schindler 2015). When studying a Hellenistic burial in Cyprus (an island with a long history of Phoenician settlement and similar burial practices) Şöföroğlu and Summerer found that “clay lamps together with unguentaria represent the most frequent and numerous grave goods” (2016:263). Lamps have many uses in funerary ritual, and could have been used for utilitarian purposes as luxury goods, symbols of femininity, light in the house of the dead, evidence for a vigil over the dead body, a parting gift, or votive dedications/magic (Şöföroğlu and Summerer 2016:263-65). The importance of lamps in Maltese funerary ritual is evident in the quantities in which they are
recovered from funerary contexts, and lamps form an important class of materials in the MPM Leopardi Collection.

The class of materials that is conspicuously almost completely absent from the Leopardi collection is personal ornaments, including jewelry and amulets. This is unsurprising considering that of the 668 tombs known on Malta from these periods in 1997 only 92 were found to contain personal ornaments or other “lavish” grave gifts (Said-Zammit 1997:19). Such burial goods included Aegyptica, a term denoting the broad category of materials from or influenced by ancient Egypt and the belief systems dominant there and found throughout the Phoenician and Greek Mediterranean (Hölbl 2010:93). The Aegyptica in the Leopardi Collection consist entirely of amulets though evidence also exists in the form of stelae, ushabti, statuettes, and beads (Evans 1971:236; Hölbl 1989). Certain amulets were specialized for various functions, and some were exclusively meant to be buried with the deceased. Such amulets are frequent all over the Mediterranean and are especially important in Carthage and other Phoenician colonies (van Sister 2012:19). A fantastic example of Aegyptica from Malta is a bronze amulet-container in which was found a papyrus with an image of Isis and Phoenician script dating to the first half of the fifth century B.C. (Hölbl 1989:116-18). It contained a message for the deceased enlisting the aid of Isis to make sure that the deceased triumphed over a mythical enemy barring the way to the underworld. The total absence of jewelry in the MPM collection may be explained by its relative rarity. It can also be explained by the activity of collecting itself, as jewelry may have been missed during clearing of tombs, kept by peasants finding the material, or sold by E.R. Leopardi before the collection arrived in Milwaukee. Without an inventory of the collection before it arrived at the museum, it is impossible to tell.
The majority of the tombs found on the archipelago were given only coarse ceramics as grave gifts (34 percent), while 12 percent of the population was provided with personal ornaments and only two percent were provided with fine pottery (Said-Zammit 1997:22). It is very difficult to know the exact number of grave goods that were placed with the deceased as the goods of the previous interment would usually be moved to one side of the tomb to make room for the new burial. Re-use could even occur centuries later, and happened at least sporadically into the Byzantine period (Ciasca 1995b:703), which further confounds the attempt to establish a reliable chronology for Maltese ceramic assemblages of the period. This practice suggests an emphasis on communal identity, and Sagona has suggested that locals may have re-used tombs especially after the third century to reaffirm their “Punic” identity (2002:238). Regardless, the re-use of tombs may serve as evidence for a strong insular form of identity that continues into the Christian period. Recent excavations in St. Paul’s Catacombs revealed evidence for the re-use of tombs in the Christian period as well (Cardona 2017; Cardona and Gustafsson 2013:69), though it is important to note that this is not an uncommon practice in Late Antique catacombs elsewhere and may have a reason.

**Antiquarian Interest in Maltese Archaeology**

Much of what we know about the ancient world, however incompletely, is due to the documentation of many old discoveries by antiquarians or their contemporaries, without which we would know much less about early discoveries (Renfrew 2000:17), and this is no different in Malta (Vella 2014:26). Interest in the materiality of antiquity begins to develop in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and begins to form itself into a discipline with the systematic description of Rome, a city replete with antiquities and smaller in the Renaissance than it was in the Classical period (Schnapp 1997:122-23). The humanist impulse to collect and classify led to the
creation of cabinets of curiosities, meant to serve as a microcosm of the world, in which antiquities played an important part (Schnapp 1997:167). It was antiquarian interest in the first place that led to museums collecting much of the material available for study today (Chase et al. 1996:20). The interest in such antiquities, however, generally focused on Greco-Roman material culture, eschewing the many areas of the Mediterranean that had Phoenician and Punic remains (Culican 1976:1). Unfortunately in the case of Malta, the majority of our knowledge about the Phoenician, Punic, and Roman periods in Maltese history comes from objects that were discovered before the development of modern archaeology and thus lack the critical context that is so important to archaeological inquiry (Chase et al. 1996; Renfrew 2000). Antiquarian interest spread throughout Europe, including the Mediterranean island of Sicily with its Classical ruins and Malta with its “visible ruins of gigantic proportions, as well as the cult and devotion towards St. Paul, who allegedly landed there in 20 A.D.” (Vella et al: 2011:353). Scholars from all over the European continent were encouraged to make their “grand tour” and publish it upon their return, such as Dominique Vivant Denon *Voyage en Sicile*, published in 1788 (Fig. 1.11).

The majority of artifacts from the periods under discussion come from museum and private collections where information on archaeological context is scarce if present at all. It is interesting to note, however, that contrary to the rest of Europe, Phoenician and Punic antiquities actually played a relatively central role in the development of antiquarianism in Malta. According to William Culican, the “Phoenicians have always mattered in Malta,” and Giovanni Abela first recognized Phoenician material culture on the island in the mid-seventeenth century, approximately a hundred before any European antiquarians noted Phoenician presence in the western Mediterranean (1976:1). The megalithic temples that Malta is so famous for, once the myth that Malta was inhabited by a race of ante-diluvian giants was dispelled, were actually
interpreted as Phoenician temple sites until the beginning of the twentieth century (Culican 1974:3-4). Malta’s Phoenician past would also take political dimensions in the early twentieth century, shortly after the island became a British protectorate. In 1921, the British scholar Lord Strickland delivered a lecture entitled “Malta and the Phoenicians” with the explicit aim of proving that the Phoenicians were not a Semitic or African race, but a Caucasian and/or Aryan race that belonged to Europe (Culican 1976:5; Vella and Gilkes 2001:363-65).

![Figure 1.11 Dominique Vivant Denon’s itinerary in Sicily and Malta (after Vella et al. 2011:255, Fig. 9.1).](image)

**Recent Scholarship on Ceramic Typologies in Malta**

Recent scholarship on Phoenician and Punic museum collections in Malta has provided a new typology of the relatively standard Melitan ceramic repertoire that has been linked to a provisional chronological development of style and form. Through her comprehensive study of
both provenienced and unprovenienced funerary assemblages, Claudia Sagona was able to identify through macroscopic analysis a variety of wares that can be attributed to various chronological phases (2002; Table 1.3).

According to Sagona’s scheme, and due to the longevity and standardization of Malta’s mortuary practices and materials, it is possible to reconstruct a great deal of information from unprovenienced tombs. If a private or formerly private collection is relatively complete and has not been added to, a great deal of data can be discerned from it. This was the case with the private Monsignor Vassallo Collection, in which the pottery reflected perfectly two burials of two different time periods (Sagona 2003:35). Claudia Sagona’s characterization of vessel forms is quite complete, and whether these are chronologically accurate or not, can help establish a standard language that scholars of Maltese archaeology can use to describe pottery. This scheme has begun to be used increasingly (e.g., Anastasi 2011, 2015; Bonanno 2005). Nevertheless, it is important to note that the ceramic typology developed by Claudia Sagona is not ideal. The seriation of the typology was developed through analysis of ceramics from museum and private collections and old archaeological contexts. As a result, her chronological framework is disputed by some scholars (Vella 2005). However, it is currently the only fully developed classification of Phoenicio-Punic ceramics from Malta, and so for the purposes of this research, Sagona’s scheme has been used to classify the ceramics from the Leopardi Collection. Despite the provisional nature of Sagona’s classification of this material, the classification of the ceramics within the MPM collection in terms of Sagona’s work is an improvement over the MPM’s current classification documentation and should make it easier to modify the findings of this thesis for future research purposes should there be updates to the chronology of Phoenicio-Punic ceramics from Malta.
Table 1.3 Ware types and associated phases (after Sagona 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Associated Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chalky, Reddish Yellow Ware</td>
<td>Late Borg in-Nadur to Archaic Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddish Yellow Gritty Ware</td>
<td>Established Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Grey Gritty Ware</td>
<td>Late Phase I to Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick-slipped Crisp Ware</td>
<td>Phase III to Early-Phase IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisp Ware</td>
<td>from Phase II onward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biscuit Ware</td>
<td>Phases III to IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Brown Ware</td>
<td>Phase III to Phase IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Orange Ware</td>
<td>Early Phase IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported Grey-Brown Ware</td>
<td>Appears in Phase IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported Pink-Buff Ware</td>
<td>Phase IV onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported (?) Red Bricky Ware</td>
<td>Appears in Phase IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic and Related Wares</td>
<td>Appear in late Phase I/early Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported Red Wares and Roman Fine Wares</td>
<td>Appears in Phase VI onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Red (Romano Punic) Ware</td>
<td>Phase VI onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ware types discussed in Sagona are less widely accepted, and different classifications of fabrics based on archaeometric analyses (e.g., Bruno and Capelli 2000; Schmidt and Bechtold 2013) seem to be taking hold (see Anastasi 2015) that do not correspond to Sagona’s ware types. Neutron activation analysis has also been used in an effort to determine different fabric types (Mommsen et al. 2006). The analysis of different fabrics in terms of their composition, coupled with the relatively sparse clay deposits on the islands, has also allowed for the provisional mapping of different pottery production zones in the archipelago (Fig. 1.12). Considering the ongoing research and for consistency’s sake, however, the Leopardi collection was characterized according to Sagona’s scheme.
Figure 1.12 Map of Maltese islands with possible production zones (after Anastasi 2015:147, Fig. 28).
Chapter 2: The Leopardi Collection at the MPM

The MPM’s documentation of the transactions that lead to the museum acquiring the collection is fairly extensive, consisting mainly of correspondence between the director of the MPM at the time, some of his staff, a U.S. official at the Embassy of Malta, and both Mr. Eduardo Romeo Leopardi (1905-1968) and his wife Mrs. Françoise Leopardi (1909-?). After consulting the documentation for the collection, I was able to develop a fairly clear picture of the provenance of the collection, beginning with its first being identified, through its ad hoc cataloguing process, to the final donation to the MPM in 1974 (Table 2.1). This chapter will commence with short biographies of the principal individuals involved. A summary and analysis of the transaction will follow and end with discussion of the formation of the collection before its sale to the MPM.

Table 2.1 The MPM Leopardi Collection donor and accession information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Associated Name</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date Catalogued</th>
<th>Number of Objects Accessioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20643</td>
<td>Mrs. Malcolm K. Whyte</td>
<td>28-Feb-67</td>
<td>10-Mar-67</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20651</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. James</td>
<td>17-Mar-67</td>
<td>17-Mar-67</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20652</td>
<td>Edith Fairchild Frank</td>
<td>17-Mar-67</td>
<td>17-Mar-67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21009</td>
<td>Ms. Alice Marie Werra</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>24-Oct-67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21010</td>
<td>YWCA Women's Club</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>24-Oct-67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21011</td>
<td>Roch</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>24-Oct-67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21012</td>
<td>Shorewood Women's Club</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>24-Oct-67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21013</td>
<td>Leopardi</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>24-Oct-67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21014</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. LeRoy I. Segall</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>24-Oct-67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21093</td>
<td>John F. Luedtke</td>
<td>6-Dec-68</td>
<td>10-Sep-68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21500</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. E.R. Leopardi</td>
<td>10-Sep-68</td>
<td>10-Sep-68</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21501</td>
<td>Guido De Piro D'Amico and Mrs. E.R. Leopardi 10-Sep-68 10-Sep-68 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21513</td>
<td>Guido De Piro D'Amico and Mrs. E.R. Leopardi</td>
<td>19-Sep-68</td>
<td>19-Sep-68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23648</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. John Pick</td>
<td>26-Aug-74</td>
<td>9-Sep-74</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 199
One of the principal actors in the acquisition of the Leopardi Collection is Dr. Stephan F. Borhegyi (1921-1969; Fig. 2.1). Stephan “Steve” Borhegyi, Director of the Milwaukee Public Museum at the time, first contacted Eduardo Romeo Leopardi expressing interest in acquiring the collection on November 29, 1965 (Appendix A: Letter A.1). Quite a bit is known about Stephan Borhegyi, who received his doctorate from Peter Pazmany University in Hungary after serving on the Eastern front as a Lieutenant in the Royal Mounted Artillery during the Second World War. After the death of his grandfather, he inherited the title of Baron. He came to the United States on a fellowship where he took to the archaeology of Mesoamerica and the operations of museums. He became the Director of the Milwaukee Public Museum in 1958, and was killed in a car accident in 1969 (Wendorf 1970: 194-95).

Figure 2.1 An iconic image of Dr. Stephan F. Borhegyi.
E.R. Leopardi was born in 1903 to Alfonso Aloysius and Egizia Borg (Paul Leopardi Genealogy 1998). He joined the civil service in 1928, and was promoted to Assistant Librarian at the Royal Library of Malta (now the Bibliotecha, or National Library of Malta), and held various positions in local societies, including the local secretary of the UNESCO National Commission, and retired with in 1960 with a pension (Pullicino 1967:290). He was also a founding member of the Malta Historical Society in 1950, the same year he married Françoise de Piro (Ganado 1998; Pullicino 1967:290). He was apparently a passionate researcher (Cardona 2016 personal communication; Schiavone 1997:366), and a regular contributor to Maltese newspapers and journals beginning in 1949 and published over a dozen contributions in Melita Historica and Scientia between 1956 and 1966. In 1962 he was made Donat First Class of the Sovereign Order of Malta, and became full Knight of the Order before his death in 1967 (Pullicino 1967:290).

Later letters come from Françoise Leopardi, who reveals that her maiden name was De Piro (Appendix A: Letter 27b). Her full name was Françoise de Piro D’Amico Inguanez (Pullicino 1967:290), and she was part of a long line of a noble family originating in the mid-eighteenth century that still exists today in Malta whose genealogy is well-recorded and kept up to date (Libro d’Oro di Melita; Caruana Galizia 2014). She had authored at least two children’s books in English under her maiden name, Françoise de Piro D’Amico, including The Golden Eagle and Other Tales (1949) and Once Upon a Time (1964). Though it is hardly mentioned in the correspondence, Françoise de Piro was an instrumental link to the collection and its history, as it was through her that E.R. Leopardi and subsequently the MPM had access to it.

Dr. John and Mrs. “Cissie” Pick are first mentioned in the correspondence as having informed Borhegyi of the collection in Malta in a letter written on November 29, 1965 (Appendix A: Letter A.1). Dr. Pick was a Professor of English at Marquette University. He
published predominantly on poetry, and was the Chairman of the Marquette University Committee on Fine Arts for at least the year of 1962, when he helped found that committee (Haggerty Museum of Art 2017). His position in this organization most likely brought him into contact with Borhegyi, and if not, they must have at least known of each other. He was definitely in contact with MPM curator John Luedtke as of 1962-1963 in connection with a lecture series entitled “The Development of Art in Greece and Rome.” He seems to have collected numerous antiquities which he subsequently sold to the MPM. In 1970 he sold two Greco-Sicilian coins minted in Syracuse and Taormina that sold for 1,000 USD and 900 USD respectively (calculated to ca. 12,000 USD using the CPI Inflation Calculator). Four years later he sold five artefacts, presumably collected in Malta, for a total of 965 USD, and in the same year he propositioned John Luedtke to buy a Beecher portrait and Spanish Colonial Altar piece for 5000 USD (or ca. 26,000 USD when calculating for inflation). John Pick was married to Mrs. “Cissie” Pick in 1956 in Malta, and the two of them survived the worst maritime disaster in U.S. waters since 1915 with the sinking of the SS Andrea Doria on July 26 (Fig. 2.2).

Figure 2.2 The SS Andrea Doria at dawn after its collision with the MS Stockholm (Grillo 2007).
Similarly to E.R. Leopardi, the story becomes much clearer when we learn the name of John Pick’s wife, “Cissie.” Her full name was “Marchesa Cecilia ‘Cissy’ Piro dei Baroni della Budaq [sic]” (Scott 2014). With this information, her previous name and titles could be consulted in the Libro d’Oro di Melita, where she is described as Dona Cecilia de Piro, Hereditary Nobile of Hungary, inheriting her later titles. She was first married to Marchese and Count Nazzareno Charles Zimmerman Barbaro, 5th Count von Zimmermann, Patrizio of Venice, Marchese of St. George, (1906-?), before remarrying Dr. Pick (Libro d’Oro di Melita). It is an interesting side note that both Borhegyi and Cissie Pick were nobles with titles from Hungary. In any case, this firmly establishes her as Françoise Leopardi’s cousin and provides a firm familial link between the Leopardis and the Picks.

Additional actors mentioned in the letters include (in order of mention) Mr. John J. Conroy, erroneously saluted in the letters as John G. Conroy (Appendix A: Letters A.1-A.5) until he signs his name John J. Conroy (Appendix A: Letter A.6), Mr. John Luedtke, Mr. Frank, Dr. Bauernfield, Irene Reinold, Mr. Robert Gorski, Mrs. Malcolm K. Whyte, and Dr. Ritzenthaler. John J. Conroy served in the U.S. Embassy to Malta at Sliema for an unknown period of time. In 1966, he held the title of American Chargé d’Affaires ad interim to the Maltese Secretary for the Ministry of Commonwealth and Foreign Affairs, and organized a treaty entitled “Maritime Matters: Deployment of USS Shenandoah to Malta” (United States Treaties and Other International Agreements 1967). Apart from being asked to help in the shipment of the collection to the United States, he was otherwise uninvolved. Mr. John Luedtke was the MPM Acting Curator of Oriental, Classical, and Decorative Arts at the time (Appendix A: Letter A.28). It is not possible to associate Mr. Frank with a particular individual, but he may have been the husband of Edith Fairchild Frank, who was an avid patron of the museum and acquired or helped
acquire many Egyptian antiquities for the museum, including the Aegyptica of the Leopardi Collection. Dr. A.W. Bauernfeind was another Assistant to the MPM Director (Appendix A: Letter A.10b). Irene Reinold was the MPM Secretary to the Director and sent one letter (Appendix A: Letter A.12). Mr. Robert Gorski was an Administrative Assistant and is both Cc’d on and sent multiple letters on behalf of Borhegyi and the MPM. Mrs. Malcolm K. Whyte was another wealthy patron of the museum, and her donations were responsible for several MPM accessions, including one for the Leopardi Collection. It is unclear why Dr. Ritzenthaler (1911-1980) was Cc’d on the penultimate letter to Françoise Leopardi of October 8, 1968, but he was an acting Curator of Anthropology at the time (Milwaukee Public Museum Lacendon Collection Donor Biographies 2017).

The documentation concerning the acquisition of the Leopardi Collection begins on November 29, 1965 (Appendix A: Letter A.1) and ends on October 17, 1968 (Appendix A: Letter A.31). It begins with the mention of Cissie and John Pick bringing to the museum’s attention the Leopardis’ willingness to part with their archaeological collection, for the possible price of 1,000 GBP, and the museum’s interest in acquiring it, and how shipping permits might be obtained (Appendix A: Letter A.1). This letter Ccs “Mr. John G. Conroy of the U.S. Embassy [sic]” in the hopes that shipment might be expedited through a U.S. naval vessel. At first it was presumed that Mr. and Mrs. Pick of Milwaukee had visited Malta while on vacation and met had with the Leopardis there. They presumably viewed the collection and upon their return from their vacation informed Borhegyi of the possibility that Mr. Leopardi might part with it (Appendix A: Letter A.1). However, it is now not so clear that the Picks had visited Malta prior to Leopardi’s shipment of materials to the MPM. It is more likely that the materials were acquired during a visit to the Leopardis in the summer of 1966 (Appendix A: Letter A.14) after the collection had
already been shipped to the museum as of June 4 (Appendix A: Letter A.11). This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that the materials donated by the Picks to the MPM are of a very different nature, and different quality, than those in the Leopardi collection. It may be no coincidence that the Picks had acquired Renaissance and/or early modern figurines in marble, considering that one of the Haggerty Museum’s major collections (the museum was born out of Marquette University’s Committee of Fine Arts according to the museum’s website) consists of Italian Renaissance ‘Petite Masters’ (Haggerty Museum History). In any case, E.R. Leopardi responds with a letter dated to December 18, 1965 informing Borhgyi that John G. Conroy came to see the collection, thought it impressive, and would be glad to help once the necessary export permits had been obtained (Appendix A: Letter A.2). He goes on to explain that the collection is “mostly Punic and Roman,” consisting of “burial urns, lamps, pottery utensils, vases, amphorae, glass ampullae and unguentariae [sic], a Graeco-Sicilian vase, stone cat, etc.” as well as some “small statuettes of primitive African Art” and that he will be sending along a booklet on Maltese archaeology that should help in its classification. It was also at this juncture that Leopardi suggested that payment be sent after the museum had received the collection (Appendix A: Letter A.2). The booklet mentioned is never mentioned by title, and only one booklet on Maltese archaeology (mentioned in Appendix A: Letter A.14) is known to still be in the MPM archives.

On December 22, 1965, Borhegyi responds that he is “glad to know that [Leopardi] will be able to obtain an export permit” and agrees to the idea of paying for the collection after it is received (Appendix A: Letter A.3). On January 28, 1966, Borhegyi sends a letter directly to John Conroy, Cc’ing Mr. and Mrs. E.R. Leopardi (as well as the Picks, who have been Cc’d thus far), asking for a progress report on the export permits, stating that “I would sincerely appreciate whatever you can do to assists the Leopardis and the Museum in getting this important collection to us as
soon as possible” (Appendix A: Letter A.4). A letter dated February 3 1966, from E.R. Leopardi assures Borhegyi that “we look upon the collection as already yours” and that “it is not easy to get the permit” (Appendix A: Letter A.5). He writes that in case that they cannot obtain the permits, they will “ship the collection on a mercantile vessel, when the occasion offers” and that “it might be easier, at this side, if the case is addressed to a private address” adding that the “local authorities might be ‘imaginative’ seeing the addressee a Museum! Intelligenti pauca! [sic]” (Appendix A: Letter A.5). John Conroy was Cc’d in all previous letters, but this is the last time he is included. The next letter in the chronological sequence is from John Conroy to Borhegyi, in which he affirms that while the collection was indeed impressive and that he would explore the options of aiding in its shipment, “the determining factor, of course, is whether the Government of Malta will allow artifacts such as these to be sold outside of Malta” (Appendix A: Letter A.6). On March 2, Borhegyi replies to E.R. Leopardi’s previous letter and expresses his appreciation for the difficulties in obtaining the necessary permits and indicates that the museum will “try to wait with patience the arrival of your beautiful material” (Appendix A: Letter A.7). That same day he sends a letter to John Conroy in which he expresses the museum’s appreciation for Conroy’s “efforts to help the Leopardis find a way to send their beautiful collection” and he hopes that “you [Conroy] will continue your intercession on our behalf” (Appendix A: Letter A.8). A letter to Borhegyi from E.R. Leopardi dated to April 25, 1966 informs the director that “the promised collection will soon be dispatched” through the American Express and that “you [Borhegyi] will understand that under the circumstance we could not use the kind offer of the American Embassy” (Appendix A: Letter A.9). This is the last reference to Mr. Conroy, and suggests that there may have been other letters involving the embassy that are not extant, or that, refusing to be part of an illicit deal, he was purposefully shut out of the conversation. The next
letter, dated to May 20, 1966, mentions another letter of May 13, concerning insurance issues, confirming that there was one if not more letters concerning the transaction missing from the MPM documentation (Appendix A: Letter A.10b). Finally, in a letter dated June 4, 1966 and addressed to Borhegyi, Leopardi confirms that “the Punic and Roman pottery promised is, as I write, on the high seas. It is packed in three cases along with a catalogue from which you will find it easy to classify your exhibits” (Appendix A: Letter A.11). He also mentions the ethnographic materials that were brought home by his wife’s father from the German Resident’s house in Cameroon during the First World War. He advises caution during the unpacking, as there are many small and fragile pieces to the collection, including “old Roman glass specimens, whole and in fragments, also a bead and small toy” and “burial urns – just as found with the ashes in them” and “a bone which I had placed in the case after finding it in the road, it had fallen out of a van carrying bones cleared from a cemetery” as well as “a sarcophagus lid which had crumbled” and fossils, teeth of primitive creatures and small pieces of flooring from Roman houses” (Appendix A: Letter A.11). Lastly, he mentions that the cases are addressed to W. Farrugia – Milwaukee, and that after arrival they will be redirected to the MPM (Appendix A: Letter A.11). Some research was undertaken to the person referred to but there was no tangible evidence from which to formulate a hypothesis. The crates arrived sometime between the two letters from the MPM to Leopardi, the first dated to June 9, asking for the cases to be cleared directly to Milwaukee, and the second dated to September 14, 1966 from Borhegyi informing Leopardi that the cases were received with only some breakage (Appendix A: Letters A.12 and A.13, respectively).

One of the most important and revealing letters of the series is Appendix A: Letter A.14. Addressed to Borhegyi and dated to September 23, 1966, Leopardi writes that “my wife and I are
happy to know that this collection has found safe moorings in a country where ancient cultures are appreciated,” adding that he is sending “another publication compiled by Dr. D.H. Trump, formerly Curator of Archaeology in our Museum” but that “at the present moment there are no publications in Malta which describe fully the various classes of pottery etc.” (and indeed there were none until 2002), and that “the booklet contains useful data on the prehistory of Malta” (Appendix A: Letter A.14). The association of this “booklet” by Trump with his work *Malta: an Archaeological Guide* (1959), which is a guidebook to the National Museum of Valletta, Malta that had just recently been established at the Auberge de Provence in 1958 is confirmed in Appendix A: Letter A.15, in which Borhegyi thanks Leopardi for it. This booklet is still in the MPM’s archives in a photo-copied form. More importantly, in the third paragraph of the letter, Leopardi’s knowledge of the cultural heritage laws and Borhegyi’s complicity become apparent when Leopardi writes: “on account of restrictions regarding the exportation of ‘antiques’ I would ask you to be kind enough not to divulge my name in connection with the collection – I feel sure you will understand my meaning in asking this favor” (Appendix A: Letter A.14). While several of the actors had skirted the issue in the course of that month’s correspondence, namely, Borhegyi, Conroy and E.R. Leopardi, this letter makes it quite clear that the latter knew the illegality of the shipment and expressly asked for his name not to be associated with the collection as a result. He ends the letter leaving the method of payment up to the museum, though he indicates that he would prefer that it be sent by check addressed in his name. In a letter dated to November 1, 1966, Borhegyi informs Leopardi that Luedtke analyzed the collection and counted 177 pieces, showing it to Dr. Pick, and that they felt that a fair price for the collection, “including your packing and shipping costs, the African pieces and the books you sent and your many efforts in our behalf [sic], would be $3,000” (Appendix A: Letter A.16), comparing it to
the 1,000 GBP asking price, which converts to 2,800 USD in 1966 (Dollar Exchange Rate From 1940-Today). An internal document which was seemingly compiled by Luedtke reveals that the collection was valued at 3,864.85 USD, compared with the asking price of 1,000 GBP, converted in the document to 2,700 USD, with the notation “to be paid $3,000.00.”

It is at this point in time that Borhegyi seems to begin to actively seek out potential donors. We have evidence of this in the form of three letters addressed to Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Stacy and Mrs. Douglas van Dyke (Appendix A: Letters A.32-34). Though there are no records of these names in the accession files related to the Leopardi Collection, this explains why much of the collection was bought piecemeal. Whether the donors associated with the collection were aware of what their donations were purchasing is not clear, but it was clearly being bought with funds drawn from various sources. After the collection was received by the MPM, it was accessioned and catalogued in a similar piecemeal manner. As a result, the collection has a total of 14 different accession numbers associated with it (Table 2.1). The MPM purchased the collection in lots, sometimes accepting donations for single objects, such as in the cases of accession numbers 21009-21014, each of which has only one object associated with it. The accession numbers that are associated with the most objects are 21500 and 21501. These are the accession numbers that were used once Françoise Leopardi donated the rest of the collection to the museum. The former was accessioned in the name of Guido de Piro D’Amico while the latter was catalogued in the name of Eduardo Romeo Leopardi.

The next letter, dated to February 28, 1967, mentions “a generous friend of the Museum and the Picks” had made the first installment of 500 USD possible, Cc’ing Mrs. Malcolm K. Whyte (Accession number 20643). Appendix A: Letters A.19 through A.23, dating from April 11, 1967 to November 9, 1967, detail payments from the MPM and replies from Leopardi. These
letters are interrupted include one addressed to Mrs. Leopardi from Robert Gorski, dated to February 1, 1968, extending the museum’s condolences on the loss of her husband (Appendix A: Letter A.24). In response, Françoise Leopardi expresses her gratitude for the sympathy, and informs the museum that further checks should be made in her name (Appendix A: Letter A.25). The following letter, dated to July 31, 1968, again from Robert Gorski, provides Françoise Leopardi with a list of objects which the museum would like to pay for, requesting an invoice, and suggesting that perhaps Françoise Leopardi might “be interested in donating one of the unpaid specimens to the Museum in the name of your late husband, thereby forever giving him a credit toward the accumulation of these various fine specimens,” concluding that Luedtke and Borhegyi send their best regards (Appendix A: Letter A.26). It is in Françoise Leopardi’s reply dated to August 31, 1968 that we learn that the collection “belonged to the family of my late father: Guido De Piro D’Amico M.D.” (followed by a series of acronyms, interpreted as various titles), and that she wishes to donate the rest of the collection, valued at 1,000 USD, to the museum in the names of both her late father and husband, if at all possible (Appendix A: Letter 27a-c). Responding to Françoise’s letter on September 12, 1968, Luedtke expresses the museum’s gratitude for the donation, and writes that “in the future, Museum visitors will read both of the names any time they are viewing our exhibits of Maltese archaeological material” (Appendix A: Letter A.28). Borhegyi follows up with a letter on October 8, 1968, in which he thanks Mrs. Leopardi again for her help and the gift of objects worth 1,000 USD, and informs her that the entire collection has been called “the Leopardi Collection” (Appendix A: Letter A.29). The last two letters of 13 October and 17 October from Françoise Leopardi and Borhegyi respectively exchange niceties on the closing of the transactions between her and the museum.
(Appendix A: Letters A.30 and A.31), concluding the documentation directly relevant to the acquisition of the collection.

The connection of Françoise Leopardi with the de Piro family, as well as the subsequent discovery of Cecilia Pick’s association with the family, allows us to reconstruct a family tree based on sources in the Libro d’Oro di Melita (Fig. 2.3). The documentation seems to be somewhat ambiguous on the matter, as the Picks are referred to as the Leopardis’ relatives on two occasions (Appendix A: Letters A.13 and A.14), while Françoise Leopardi is referred to as Cecilia Pick’s sister in Letter A.32, which is not the case, as Françoise only had one sister named Maria (Libro d’Oro di Melita). Once Cecilia Pick’s real name was discovered, however, the picture became much clearer. Cecilia de Piro’s father was Ignonino de Piro D’Amico Inguanez, one of Guido de Piro’s older brothers, and so the two were cousins.

![Figure 2.3 Françoise Leopardi’s family tree.](image)

A few questions remain. How did the Leopardi Collection come to be known to the Picks in the first place, and why did they seek to sell it? The first letter of the documentation may provide some clues. While Borhegyi refers to the Picks in tandem nearly throughout the entire process, in the first letter he mentions Cissie Pick specifically in regards to the collection. It is she, not John Pick, who not only knows the asking price of the collection, but is also ready with a
suggested shipping company, Saltfish Packers (Appendix A: Letter A.1). This suggests that she was approached by one of the Leopardis, most likely Françoise Leopardi herself, about putting the collection up for sale.

As to why the collection was put up for sale in the first place, there are only hypotheses that must remain to be tested. One possibility is that E.R. Leopardi, having retired in 1960, was looking for a way to supplement the income from his pension. Perhaps he had run into some health problems, or was otherwise financially embarrassed and needed some money. But then why would the Leopardis risk selling the collection abroad? Again, it is only possible to hypothesize the answer. One possibility is that the collection would fetch a higher price abroad than it would in Malta. As will be seen in the next chapter, the collection is quite large and comprehensive in terms of the Punic and Roman forms identified by Sagona, but is otherwise relatively unremarkable. There are no precious metals associated with the collection, and the objects themselves are not rare in Maltese private collections (see Sagona 2003 and 2006), nor would they have been highly valued by the National Museum had Leopardi attempted to sell them there. In fact, considering that Phoenician, Punic, and local Roman antiquities were relatively undervalued, perhaps especially in the socio-historical framework of a recently independent Malta, the collection may have been considered of very little value. On the other hand, considering the rarity of such collections of materials in the English speaking world, such a collection might have been valued highly by institutions outside of Malta. Borhegyi, for example, was trained in Classical Archaeology and Near Eastern Studies, and may have been aware of the rarity and value of such a collection. He was very much a dedicated museum director and sought to make the Milwaukee Public Museum a major national institution (Wendorf 1970), and a rare collection such as the Leopardi Collection would have suited these
goals. The museum had also just recently completed an exhibition on Classical Greece and the Rise of Civilizations (Joslyn 1965), and perhaps the addition of Punic and Roman antiquities fit into future plans for an exhibit on the Phoenicians (though considering the relative paucity of appreciation for Phoenician and Punic history as discussed above this seems unlikely). Nevertheless, the collection was surely brought to the attention of the Milwaukee Public Museum by Cissy Pick. In all likelihood, having been born in Malta to a noble family, she would have been exposed to this sort of material at one point in her life, and would have been relatively familiar with it. In fact, there is a great deal of evidence that her being a de Piro would have exposed her to antiquities. Knowing that Françoise Leopardi inherited these materials from her father, Guido de Piro D’Amico, it is possible to begin to reconstruct the provenance of the collection.

By the nineteenth century in Malta, as well as the rest of Europe, antiquarian pursuits had become a gentlemanly pastime (Nordbladh 2012:82). Giovanni Pio de Piro obtained the title of Baron of the fief of Budach in 1716 and secured the title of Marquis of Castile from the Kingdom of Spain in 1742, establishing the nobility of the de Piro family (Caruana Galizia 2014:422). Before his death in 1752, Giovanni Pio de Piro amassed a great deal of wealth and owned or had owned at least 40 properties across the Maltese islands (Caruana Galizia 2014:423). Considering the Maltese tradition of peasants bringing antiquities to their landlords as gifts (Cardona 2016 personal communication), the family would have had ample opportunity to amass a large collection of antiquities through its long lifespan. Malta’s antiquarian collections can be traced as far back as the seventeenth century and Maltese royalty was known for their interest in collecting antiquities (Trump 1959:1; Vella 2014). Considering that the Maltese nobility have a long history of collecting antiquities, it is not unreasonable to try and trace the
collection further back in time. We know from MPM Letter A.27a-c that the collection originally belonged not only to Françoise Leopardi, but to her family as well. Thus, not all of the family collection was given to the Leopardis upon the death of Guido de Piro D’Amico. In fact, there is a well-known and documented collection in Malta, from one of Guido De Piro’s brothers. Rev. Mgr. Giuseppe de Piro (1877-1933) was one of Guido de Piro’s older brothers and was best known as the founder of the Missionary Society of St. Paul. Upon Giuseppe de Piro’s death in 1933, a collection of Phoenician-Roman ceramics passed to the Missionary Society, a collection that he had inherited from his father which is now in St. Agatha’s Museum in Rabat, Malta (Sagona 2003:40; Schiavone 1997:223). The de Piro collection in St. Agatha’s Museum in Rabat has been previously studied (Hübner 2005; Gonzalez 1996; Sagona 2003), has been demonstrated to contain typical vessels for the periods in question in this thesis, and is quite similar to that of the Leopardi collection. The fact that both brothers had inherited similar materials from their family proves that the MPM material was not personally collected by E.R. Leopardi, nor was it collected exclusively by his father-in-law. It was much more likely amassed by an ancestor of Françoise Leopardi, such as her grandfather, Don Alessandro de Piro (1848-1898). Alessandro de Piro’s life was fully embedded in the nineteenth century, before the establishment of a central Museum Department in 1903 was tasked with protecting antiquities, or the more formal Antiquities Protection Act of 1925 was passed (Stubbs and Makas 2011:355). Prior to these cultural heritage protection acts, tomb-robbing (and/or collecting), was extensive (Bonanno 2005:60). Alessandro de Piro clearly passed on his collection to two of his sons, Guido and Giuseppe de Piro. This collection might even be able to be traced further back in time through inheritance. This line of thought is even more promising considering Anthony Bonanno’s observations that there is a noticeable lack of folklore on Malta regarding tombaroli.
(semi-professional looters) in the twentieth century (2005:60). This further reduces the likelihood that the collection was assembled ad hoc from various purchases in later periods. In addition, Guido and Giuseppe de Piro were only two of Don Alessandro de Piro’s nine children (Libro d’Oro di Melita). If the collection was split up evenly, that means that there is a great deal more of it still in private hands in Malta (unless it has been donated or sold to other institutions or individuals, public or private). Indeed, we might trace some of it to Cecilia Pick herself, as she was the daughter of one of Alessandro de Piro’s sons, Ignonino de Piro D’Amico Inguanez. If she did inherit some of these antiquities, and did not rid herself of them before she moved to Milwaukee with John Pick (either by giving it away, selling it, or leaving it with her son, Edward Gerald Patrick St. George), they are in fact easily locatable. They are on the ocean floor not far off the coast of Nantucket. On July 28, 1956 Cissie Pick was interviewed on the docks of New York where she was brought from the recently sunk SS Andrea Doria (Fig. 2.4). She reported that she “lost everything, beautiful family silver, beautiful jewelry, I don't even have a hand bag! I have my husband- that's all!” as well as “all of her possessions, including irreplaceable family antiques” (Milwaukee Sentinel 1956, emphasis added).

During the course of the investigation into E.R. Leopardi’s background and transactions with the museum, a close inspection of the letters showed that there may have been some illicit activity on the part of either or both Dr. Borhegyi and Mr. Leopardi. Based on the 1925 Antiquities Protection Act, it would have been illegal to ship antiquities outside of Malta without the necessary permits, and since these are lacking in the MPM’s archives, there is little room for doubt that such permits were never acquired.
Figure 2.4 The Marchesa Cecilia “Cissie” de Piro Baron della Budaq Pick being interviewed on the docks of New York on January 28, 1956, immediately following the tragedy of the SS Andrea Doria (MJS 1956).

**Ethical Considerations**

Considering the nature of the collection at the MPM as the result of antiquarian collecting and possible illegal export, the research into this collection has ethical implications. When the Leopardi collection was acquired in the late 1960s, the museum world was not a wholly professionalized industry. It had yet to formulate profession-wide standards or ethical practices, which it has since done to a great extent, especially since the passage of the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (UNESCO 1970). While the conditions and motivations under which the Leopardi collection was collected are no surprise and did not infringe upon ethical standards of the time, the manner in which the material was acquired by the MPM certainly seems to have been in violation of Maltese cultural heritage law. That being said, it was not until the early to mid-1970s that museums began to stop collecting, buying, or accepting donations devoid of context like the Leopardi Collection (Chase et al. 1996:21). Ultimately, however, there was no
such law in effect in the United States when Borhegyi bought the collection from the Leopardis, so technically there was no wrong-doing on the side of the MPM at the time.

In letters dating to the early period of the transaction, both parties involved mention the need for export permits that would be required to ship antiquities from Malta to Milwaukee, and E.R. Leopardi expresses the difficulties he has faced in obtaining such a permit (Appendix A: Letter A.4). However, the later letter in which Leopardi explains that he has shipped the materials refers to a private shipping company and he does not mention any permits. More worryingly, he asks to make the shipment to a private address in order to avoid “imaginative” local authorities (Appendix A: Letter A.5). The export of Maltese antiquities had been strictly forbidden since 1903 by the establishment of a central Museum Department in that year and then the more formal Antiquities Protection Act of 1925 was passed (Stubbs and Makas 2011:355). There is little reason to believe that E.R. Leopardi, a civil servant for 32 years, was unaware of these restrictions, and he makes it quite clear that he is aware of the illegality of his action when he requests that his name not be associated with the collection after it arrives in Milwaukee (Appendix A: Letter A.14). Therefore, it is quite clear that the collection was illegally exported in the strict sense of the term.

Under these complex circumstances, it is important to state the reasons for the study of this material and its outcomes. The goal of this research is not to add monetary value to the collection or legitimize the fact that the objects may have been exported illegally by trying to create “provenance through publication” (Renfrew 2000:35). Rather, the idea is to make the collection more accessible to the American and Maltese public. To keep the collection unreported and out of the public gaze is akin to sanctioning looting by removing the material
from its original context and keeping it secret, something even archaeologists can be guilty of (Cullen 2008; Fagan 1996).

After having consulted the documentation, suspecting that the collection was illegally exported from Malta, I immediately brought this to the attention of Dawn Scher Thomae, Curator of Anthropology at the Milwaukee Public Museum, and informed her of my findings. I had been previously in touch with David Cardona, Principal Curator of Phoenician, Roman and Medieval Sites at Heritage Malta, the country’s national heritage organization, to discuss the Maltese materials, and I was told to share all of the MPM’s documentation. Working through the MPM’s archival materials, it became apparent that the possible illegal exportation of the objects would best be dealt with in an ethical manner by notifying Malta’s Ministry of the Interior in order to determine what further action might be advisable. The MPM, represented by Dawn Scher Thomae, has indicated a willingness to comply with any and all subsequent repatriation or documentation requests by Heritage Malta and/or the Maltese government. At the time of this writing, however, contact with the Ministry of the Interior had not yet been made. Nevertheless, during a trip to Malta in the summer of 2016 to examine the National Museum at Valletta’s collections, an agreement was between the author and Heritage Malta signed that this thesis would be shared with the organization in order to make the collection partially accessible to the Maltese public, along with the photos and data acquired during research. The possibility of publishing this work in a monograph in Malta may also arise, which would make the collection more accessible to Maltese scholars and the public alike.

**Rarity of the Collection**

The Leopardi Collection at the MPM is a rare sort of collection. One of the objectives of this research was to evaluate its rarity by surveying some of the other major museums in the
United States and UK for comparanda. A total of 11 museums were contacted in order to assess whether materials such as those found in the collection at the MPM could be found elsewhere in the U.S. and U.K. (Table 2.2). The American Museum of Natural History’s online collections include no Maltese materials; however, the term “Phoenician” returned nine hits (American Museum of Natural History 2017). The Ashmolean Museum was contacted via email, and was asked if their collections included objects with provenience from Malta between a date range of circa 800 B.C. to 300 A.D. The curator replied that the Ashmolean had circa 100 such objects in its collection. The British Museum has much of its collections online, and the online database returned over 1,000 hits (British Museum 2017). When the search was refined to include “Phoenician” or “Punic” or “Roman” and “Malta,” the search produced 63 hits. The Cleveland Museum of Art was contacted via email but did not reply. Jamie Kelly, the Head of Collections at the Gantz Family Collections Center at the Field Museum, was contacted and reported that there were no objects in the collection that corresponded to Malta or the time period in question. Harvard’s Peabody Museum also has much of its collection inventory online (Harvard Peabody Museum 2017). When searching “Malta,” the database returns 47 hits. Thirty-seven of these objects are labelled as Neolithic potsherds from the Tarxien and Bahrija phases. This is not surprising, as this is the period in Malta that has received the most attention (see Vella and Gilkes 2001). The ten other Peabody artefacts consisted of earthen vessels, stamps, and lamps, as well as two coins, none of which were attributable to the phases in question in this thesis. When the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology’s online catalogue was searched, only one hit resulted (Kelsey Museum of Archaeology 2017). It was a coin from Malta that dated between the second and first century B.C. When the search was expanded to include Phoenician and Punic objects, without the stipulation that they be from
Malta, the search resulted in 125 hits. Durham University’s Museum collections were searched online as well (Durham Museum of Archaeology 2017). There are no hits when searching for “Malta” or “Punic,” but when the term “Phoenician” is searched, there are 13 hits, consisting of one ceramic vessel, three scaraboids, four coins, and five glass vessels.

Table 2.2 Museums surveyed for collection comparanda and number of hits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>New York, USA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashmolean Museum</td>
<td>Oxford, UK</td>
<td>~100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Museum of Art</td>
<td>Cleveland, USA</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Museum</td>
<td>Chicago, USA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Peabody Museum</td>
<td>Cambridge, USA</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey Museum of Archaeology</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, USA</td>
<td>~125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Archaeology</td>
<td>Durham, UK</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Classical Archaeology</td>
<td>Cambridge, UK</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Museum of Art</td>
<td>New York, USA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>New Haven, USA</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Institute</td>
<td>Washington D.C., USA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology</td>
<td>Philadelphia, USA</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The online collection of the Museum of Classical Archaeology in Cambridge, UK (Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge 2017) returned no hits related to Phoenician, Punic, or Roman Malta. New York’s Metropolitan Museum of Art’s online catalog also does not list any Maltese material (Metropolitan Museum of Art 2017). The Yale Peabody Museum of Natural History in New Haven, Connecticut was contacted via email, but has yet to respond. A search of the Peabody Museum’s online collections database returned 142 hits when using the search term “Malta,” but all were natural history collections, with only two hits in the
Anthropology department, neither of which were ancient. Searching “Phoenician” yielded 21 hits, but all consisted of glass beads, while the search term “Punic” yielded seven glass beads, and the search term “Roman” yielded 1,502 hits that were primarily Egyptian or Near Eastern, with none apparently conforming to materials within the Leopardi Collection (Yale Peabody Museum of Natural History 2017). The Smithsonian Institution collections were searched online. Only four objects from Malta were found and none of them were ancient. Seeing that 97 percent of the Smithsonian’s collections are catalogued online, it is highly unlikely that there is material of this sort at the Smithsonian. Finally, the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology provided 15 listings of Maltese artifacts when the database was searched (this consisted of a general search: “Malta”) (2017).

The result of this inquiry shows that the MPM’s Leopardi collection is nearly twice as large as the next largest U.S. or U.K. institutional collection that contains Phoenician, Punic, and Roman artifacts from Malta (the Ashmolean Museum). It is most likely the largest collection of its kind in the United States and United Kingdom. In fact, considering the relative paucity of hits when searching for Phoenician and Punic materials in many American and British museums, it may be one of the largest collections of Phoenician and Punic material culture in this country. This assertion would have to be tested by further more exhaustive inquiries into museum collections around the United States using professional listserves.

In addition to the rarity of this sort of collection outside of Malta, some of the objects that comprise the objects are themselves rare in the repertoire of funerary assemblages in Malta. Greek imports to Malta began in the late eighth century at the earliest, but are more likely to have begun to arrive in the early seventh century during Sagona’s Established Phase I and early Phase II (Ciasca 1995b:700; Sagona 2002:39, Semeraro 2002:490). In Semeraro’s analysis of
Archaic Greek imports in Malta between the eighth and fifth centuries B.C., she writes that there are only 16 examples of Archaic Greek imports known in the museums of Malta (2002:490). The Leopardi Collection has four such objects, one of which consists of a nearly complete, albeit badly damaged by restoration efforts, column krater (N14652). This form is only known from sherds from archaeological contexts at Tas-Silġ, and only two of these are Attic Black Figure vessels, like the example in the Leopardi Collection (Semeraro 2002:511).
Chapter 3: Methods and Analysis

Research on museum collections without good provenance or provenience faces many methodological limitations. Constraints include the relative difficulties of drawing conclusions about material that ultimately has no context, as well as the relative limits of working with museum catalogued collections whose documentation is often incomplete. Nevertheless, such material is an important resource for the academic community and provides the possibility of studying rare artifacts or those very rarely found in the field in a cost-effective manner (Saville 1999:191). Much of our knowledge of Phoenician and Punic ceramics comes from private collections that have been compared with the relatively rarer archaeological discoveries (Sagona 2002, 2003, 2006). Every effort ought to be made to understand and study these collections, especially when archaeological data are available for comparison. Beyond the academic scope, these collections ought to be studied for the museums’ sake, as rarely can museums afford to hire the requisite number of experts to understand (even to a small degree) the entirety of their collections. Research projects such as this one can provide curators with a great deal of information on how to interpret the objects in possible exhibits as well as set the groundwork for more in-depth research on the collection in question.

It was decided that the collection should be examined as a whole so as to best understand the collecting activity that produced it. This allows a researcher to draw associations between all the materials in a collection, rather than limiting the analysis to one class of materials (e.g., metals, Aegyptica, ceramics, etc.). The collection consists of 167 catalog numbers comprising 199 objects or lots of objects of various materials, almost all of which were likely found in funerary contexts. Although some of the smaller ceramic sherds may represent domestic contexts. Most of the ceramics are completely intact, which is rare for archaeological artifacts.
found in settlement contexts. This, and the fact that many show signs of calcareous accretions which are often found on archaeologically discovered materials in tombs (having been entombed in rock-cut structures for nearly three millennia), indicates their likely origin.

**Donor Biography and Provenance**

The research conducted on the Leopardi collection involved two different aspects of the collection. The first part was focused on gathering and recording all of the MPM’s documentation on the collection and its acquisition in order to gain a detailed understanding of the arrival of the material in the museum and a sense of the time frame involved. These documents provide clues about donor biographies and help to produce a clearer picture of the history of the Leopardi Collection. Once the MPM donor histories were complete, online genealogical databases were consulted in order to attempt to build a biography of the collection and gain a clearer sense of its life-history.

**Descriptive Analysis**

The second part of the research project involved the physical objects themselves. Analysis of the collection focused on the ceramic objects, as more diagnostic data can be drawn from this category of well-studied and ubiquitous material. A detailed catalogue was created to lay the groundwork for a comparative analysis based on typological information available for the ceramics. The catalogue includes a macroscopic analysis of the clay fabric, relevant measurements in centimeters of the vessels, photographs of each piece, and technical drawings of the ceramic vessels for comparative purposes. As the terminology used by the MPM when the objects were first catalogued was thought to be misleading, objects were re-named based on a scheme devised by the author. An Excel database was created for these data and for the purposes of comparative analysis. These data may later be used by the MPM to update the MPM’s KE.
EMu database and/or serve as a resource for future researchers. The Excel database is based on an inventory created by querying KE EMu. The fields for each object include catalogue number, accession number, object display name (the MPM’s original classification of object), object class (the author’s classification), location within the museum, measurements (centimeters), Munsell color, material, description, and fields to determine whether the object was photographed and/or catalogued as well as a field for additional notes.

Considering that the pottery in the collection had not been assigned more recent types than those available in the 1960s, this project produced classifications of types of Phoenician pottery according to the existing archaeological literature. Each ceramic vessel and sherd was compared to other finds from archaeological and museum contexts based on morphological, compositional, and decorative criteria. Where possible, the ceramics were compared to data from excavation reports of undisturbed tombs in Malta, ceramics from excavations in other Phoenician colonies (e.g., Núñez Calvo 2011) and finally studies of unprovenienced items such as Claudia Sagona’s recent surveys of private and ecclesiastical collections in order to establish the types of ceramics present in the collection (Sagona 2002, 2003, 2006). In the case of obvious imports, literature from other parts of the Mediterranean was consulted to identify imports from Greek, Roman, and other Phoenician and Punic contexts. Once types were identified and chronological ranges applied, they were grouped chronologically.

The goal of both of these aspects of the research project was to provide the MPM’s Leopardi collection with improved and expanded context, including the objects’ provenience and potential production history, as well as tracing their life cycle from a Phoenician workshop to the MPM. If the collection shows signs of resembling a funerary assemblage, then it is more likely that the material was acquired directly from primary contexts, as opposed to having been
collected in an ad hoc fashion on the antiquities market. If, on the other hand, the materials in the collection do not conform to any sort of known tomb assemblage, then it is more likely that the materials were acquired in an ad hoc fashion. The collection may also have been split through inheritance, as we know happened between Alessandro de Piro and Giuseppe de Piro upon the death of their father. While this study will not be able to contribute to the chronological framework of Maltese ceramics, it is important that the collection be studied and made accessible to understand how it fits within the context of the existing ceramic repertoire of the Maltese islands of the period.

**Analysis**

The following section discusses the Leopardi collection in detail and includes a qualitative and quantitative analysis of forms and morphological features. The artifacts are divided by types that are identified by Claudia Sagona in her works on the Melitan pottery. Each artifact is identified by its MPM catalogue number (e.g. N15302). Nearly all of the artifacts from the collection are designated with the MPM prefix N, which stands for Nunnemacher, with a sequential numbering system, followed by a forward slash and the accession number. Each of the ceramic forms is accompanied by a photograph and digitized technical drawing of the artifact, while artifacts in other categories are accompanied by a photograph only. Each piece was catalogued separately for the purposes of this analysis, including a description of the morphological traits of the artifact and metric dimensions (Appendices B-K). The goal of this process was to identify the types of artifacts according to recent research.

Once the ceramic forms represented in the Leopardi collection were properly identified according to the new scholarship, it was possible to assess how the objects relate to one another chronologically, as well as piece together the relationships between the ceramics themselves to
reconstruct context. For example, a group of ceramics with a similar chronology could be tentatively linked. By consulting the standard sets of mortuary assemblages known from systematically excavated contexts, hypotheses about the relationships of the various types of artifacts could be generated.

The MPM collection itself consists of 167 catalogue numbers comprising 199 objects made of ceramic, glass, and metal, as well as Egyptian amulets and skeletal remains (both human and faunal, Table 3.1). The collection has been divided into various classes of material to facilitate the presentation of the research. These broad classes include Aegyptica, ceramic open form vessels, closed form vessels, ceramic lamps, coins, human/faunal remains, metallic objects, and terracottas. Each of the broad ceramic classes is defined and then further broken down into types that are used in Claudia Sagona’s taxonomy of vessel forms. Each class is presented in order of prevalence while each form is presented within the broader class in alphabetical order.

Table 3.1 Number of objects by class and proportion of collection in order of prevalence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Class</th>
<th>Object Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Open Forms</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Closed Forms</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamps</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Objects</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Elements</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Objects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracottas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegyptica</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human/Faunal Remains</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Objects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ceramics

The collection is dominated by ceramic vessels and sherds of open form with 51 objects (27.7 percent) followed by ceramic vessels or sherds of closed form with 37 objects (18.7 percent). Ceramic vessels are the best studied object category and therefore the most diagnostic class of materials within the collection, considering the lack of context. The majority of the objects in this category were designated based on the inventory included by the donor, who used the names of Greek ceramic forms, despite the fact that many of the vessels are Phoenician or pan-Mediterranean forms. The old practice of using Greek ceramic types for Phoenician or Punic wares (e.g., Caruana 1889) can confound the important differences that exist between the ceramic repertoires of Malta and those of the rest of the Mediterranean, and could lead to improper use of materials in museum exhibits. For this reason, the updated chronology and typology provided in this thesis for the materials in the Leopardi Collection will make it much more useful for the MPM and future researchers.

The ceramics were sorted into object classes based on Sagona’s division of forms (2002) and analyzed accordingly. They are presented here in alphabetical order following Sagona’s divisions. Due to certain limitations of Sagona’s typology, such as its focus on fine wares and the sheer variety of the objects in the collection, some objects could not be typed, but are still discussed in the appendices (Appendices D, E, and F).

Some initial interpretations were possible based on the objects’ outlier fabric and with the help of Mr. David Cardona, who confirmed that vessels N14627, N14628, and N16194 are most likely of medieval date and N14626 is unlikely to be associated with the Late Bronze Age Borg in-Nadur culture, contra the MPM catalog (David Cardona personal communication 2016, Fig. 3.1). These objects are nevertheless considered briefly in their relevant categories.
Figure 3.1 Ceramic objects in the Leopardi Collection most likely not affiliated with Phoenician, Punic, or Roman phases. **N16194** (a) is classified as an amphora. **N14627** (b) is classified as a jug. **N14628** (c) is classified as a lamp warmer. **N14626** (d) is classified as a terracotta due to its molding and shape resembling that of a boat.

**Open Form Vessels**

Open form vessels are defined in this thesis as vessels that do not have restricted orifices. These forms include beakers, bowls/lids, plates/lids, skyphoi, spinning wheels, and kylikes. This is the most prevalent class of objects within the collection, and all of these forms fall within Sagona’s taxonomy of forms, which can all be expected to be found in mortuary contexts in Malta in the periods in question. There are no anomalous forms in the broad class of open form vessels. The data collected for this class of objects can be found in Appendix D.

**Beakers**

The Leopardi Collection includes one vessel that can be classified as a beaker (**N15302**). The object is anomalous in the collection and was not like anything found in Sagona’s Melitan repertoire. It could therefore not be dated or typed. The beaker’s very fine clay and light red coloring is similar to later African Red Slip Wares, hinting at late Roman manufacture in North
Africa, but there are no known late Roman beakers of this shape (see Hayes 1972). The outer walls of the beaker show evidence for differential firing, suggesting that it had been stacked with similar objects during firing. The inner walls show evidence of exfoliation, especially the lower third of the vessel, indicating that the vessel may have contained liquid for some time. There is some additional exfoliation on the exterior.

**Bowls/Lids**

Bowls/lids were the most common type of open form vessels with 14 examples. This class of bowls was also frequently used as lids for cinerary urns. Many bowls that could have seen functional use or been included in the grave assemblage as separate objects also functioned as lids for cinerary urns. In some cases, associations could be made between vessels based on catalogue information, but this does not preclude their use as lids. For simplicity’s sake, all bowls that do not have an explicit association with an urn will be called bowls. Some of the bowls were shipped to the MPM still in association with what were presumably their original urns. N16083a is an example of an associated lid, though it is unusual in that it is relatively well crafted compared to many of the other lids. It is very similar to Sagona Form V: 2, which are carinated bowls with “a straight or slightly flaring rim above the high angular shoulder” (Sagona 2002:182). Other vessels, such as N16155 and N16121, were presumably used as lids due to their asymmetry and simplicity. It is important to note that these three objects are very different (Fig. 3.2), and that there is no one form for a lid for a cinerary urn.

The remaining bowls have a wide range of forms. The most common is the miniature bowl (N16123, N16124, N14651, N15305, and N16085), presumably used for offerings during a funerary ritual or as impromptu lamps based on the exfoliation of the interior of some of the bowls (especially N16124). The rim of N16124 seems to have been cut flat as the rim is not
rounded, and it may be the lower portion of a different vessel type. Strangely, the miniature bowl is not covered at all in Sagona’s typology of funerary ceramics.

Figure 3.2 Possible lids of both bowls and plate forms: bowl form N16083a (a), plate form N16195 (b), bowl form N16092 (c), plate form N16117 (d), bowl form N16138 (e).

One of the more common wares used to produce bowls is the Local Red Ware (Fig. 3.3), represented by objects N16126, N16135, N14651, N15303, N16085 and N16093. This ware became popular in Phase VI (ca. A.D. 50 onwards), and was most likely influenced by the influx of Roman Arretine Ware and the incipient African Red Slip Wares.

Cooking Vessels

Two vessels can be considered cooking vessels in the Leopardi Collection: N16108 and N16158. N16108 is a late Punic vessel form that correlates to Sagona’s Cooking Vessel Form IV: 1. Such vessels are also found containing the cremated remains of premature infants, as in
the case of an undisturbed tomb in Rabat, discovered in 1912 (Sagona 2002:962). **N16158** is an unknown cooking vessel form.

![Figure 3.3 Examples of local Red Ware bowls from the Leopardi Collection N15303 (a), N16085 (b), and N16093 (c).](image)

**Kylikes**

Kylikes, like skyphoi, are a specific form of cup exclusively associated with wine drinking, unlike skyphoi, which have other uses. There are three examples of Punico-Phoenician kylikes in the collection: **N14632**, **N14640**, and **N22029** (Fig. 3.4). Imported Greek kylikes are quite rare and would probably have been considered luxury items (Semeraro 2002). The kylikes in the Leopardi Collection are all local Thick-Slipped Crisp Ware. **N14640** and **N22029** are the earlier examples of the kylikes produced on the island, before the form lost its offset flaring rim (Sagona 2002:198), and are both examples of Sagona Form II: 1. Unfortunately, neither has any decoration preserved. **N14632** is a later form, and a very well preserved example of Sagona Form III-IV: 1, as some of its painted red band decoration is very bright.
Figure 3.4 Kylix forms within the Leopardi Collection, **N143629** (a) and **N14640** and **N22029** (b and c respectively).

**Plates/Lids**

Plates and lids account for nine examples and are the second most frequent category of objects within the open form category. They are generally defined as “broad rimmed with a wide floor” that deepens through time until forms manifest a deep well at the center of the plate much like Greek fish plates (Sagona 2002:204). This typical class of plates was also classified as a lid form because, like many bowls forms, they could have also seen functional use or have been included in the grave assemblage as separate objects, or as lids for cinerary urns. In some cases, associations could be made between vessels based on catalogue information, but this does not preclude their use as lids. For simplicity’s sake, all plates that are not explicitly associated with an urn will simply be called plates. The frequency of plates in the Maltese ceramic funerary repertoire must also factor in their frequent use as lids for cinerary urns. Some of the lids were catalogued by the MPM as associated with what were presumably their original urns. In the case
of associated lids, they were compared with their corresponding urns and were deemed to be plausible associations, and so there is little reason to doubt the authenticity of these associations. Such possible lids include the N16117 and N16130a, the latter having been associated with the urn N16130b (Urn Form IV: 1a) and the former being interpreted as a lid based on its near identical characteristics to N16130a.

Skyphos

Skyphoi are generally imports from the Aegean in Malta, but local types were made as well (Sagona 2002:193). The skyphos in the Leopardi Collection (N14641) is clearly a cup of Greek manufacture (Fig. 3.5a). Its slip, clay fabric, and accretions are similar to that of an aryballos (N14642), which is further evidence that the objects were associated with one another during their deposition. This would be an atypical situation as generally burials include only one imported vessel in Malta, a practice that is supported by Jean-Paul Morel’s observations in Carthage (Morel 1995:424; Semeraro 2002:509). These objects could also have been placed at different times in the same tomb or possibly two separate tombs with similar environments resulting in similar accretions on the vessels.

![Figure 3.5 Black Slip forms: Skyphos N14641 (a), Aryballos N14642 (b), and N14643 Padlock lamp (c).](image-url)

**Spinning Wheel**

Object N16109 could be considered a spinning wheel for the production of yarn (Barber 1991:71; Fig. 3.6). Its fabric composition is consistent with Sagona’s Crisp Ware. There are no known examples found in tomb contexts in Malta.

![Spinning wheel N16109](image)

**Closed Form Vessels**

Closed form vessels are defined within this thesis as vessels that have restricted orifices, whether with respect to the rim or the neck. These forms include amphorae, aryballoi, ewers, flasks, juglets, jugs, kraters, lamp warmers, unguentaria, and urns. This is the second most prevalent class of objects within the collection, and all but one of these forms fall within Sagona’s taxonomy of forms, which can be expected to be found in mortuary contexts in Malta in the periods in question. The one anomalous form within the broad class of closed form vessels that has no equivalent in Sagona’s taxonomy is the lamp warmer (N14628).

**Amphorae**

Amphorae defined as “vessels used primarily in the commercial sector for the transportation of food and beverages” are a relatively common find in rock-cut tombs in Malta
There are three complete amphorae in the collection (N16077, N16188 and N16194) and four fragments of amphora vessels (N16163a, N16165, N16168, and N16169). Objects N16163a, N16168 and N16169 were all too fragmentary to type, but their fabrics suggest possible imports. Object N16165 is a fragment of a large vessel with a double strap handle, and an atypical fabric for the collection. It can be reasonably attributed to an outside source and was probably not found within a tomb considering its state of preservation, though this cannot be confirmed. Object N16188 is another transport amphora with a red inner fabric similar to that of other items from the collection, most notably N16130b, but due to the amount of accretions on N16188, it was difficult to assess the fabric further. Considering that the form is not known in Sagona’s works, it is most likely an import. It may be a Carthaginian import, or, as the MPM catalog entry indicates, an Egyptian amphora, and was most likely found in a tomb considering the accretions and state of preservation. N16194 was classified by the MPM as a “lagena” due to its flask-like shape, the object is nevertheless too large to have served the function of a flask, and was most likely a storage vessel. It is an asymmetrical handmade vessel with two small vertical loop handles. Its fabric and technique of manufacture are atypical for the collection though very similar to that of N14627. Both N16194 and N14627 are considered to lie outside the chronological scope of this work, as they most likely date to the medieval period.

Aryballos

There is a single black-slip aryballos in the collection (N14642); it is part of the group of four vessels that were clearly imported from Greek workshops (whether from Athens, southern Italy, or Sicily). An aryballos is a small vessel with short neck, single handle, a flaring lip, and a small orifice for containing oils. The aryballos’s slip is unevenly applied, similar to the treatment observed on the skyphos (N14641) and the vessel shows evidence of similar accretions. Could
these pieces have originated from the same tomb? According to the list of extant archaic Greek pottery studied by Semeraro (2002:511), this may be only the second example of a black slip aryballos recovered in Malta from a mortuary context. This aryballos has undergone extensive restoration in order to make it look more complete. This raises the question of whether an MPM curator sought to make the object look more pleasing for display, or whether one of the previous owners touched it up for aesthetic reasons or possibly to increase its monetary value when selling it to the MPM (see Akin [1996] for further details on motivations of collectors). A handle was added with some sort of claylike substance and painted black. The bottom of the base is also missing and has been replaced by a plywood bottom, which hints that it was modified prior to its arrival at the MPM, as it is unlikely that this method of restoration would have been used by MPM staff.

_Ewer_

The Leopardi collection contains one mold made ewer (N16131, Fig. 3.7), designed to hold and pour water. The vessel is in the shape of a ram, with a different level of detail on either side of the vessel, probably due to one side of the mold being older. The dark brown, very gritty fabric with limestone inclusions as well as infrequent yellow grit suggests Sagona’s Soft Brown Ware (2002:81). Considering the significance of the ram as a sacrificial animal in the Mediterranean, it is not out of the question to infer that this vessel was used for ritual uses, funerary or otherwise. However, it seems to be a rare piece, as no mention of such a piece was found during research on such vessels in Malta.
Flasks

Sagona defines flasks as “closed vessels used for storage and pouring of liquids” (2002:142). Again, the majority of this class can be attributed to Phase IV. There are four objects in the collection that may be considered flasks according to Sagona’s scheme (Fig. 3.8). Object N14633 (Fig. 3.8a) has a fabric conforming to Crisp Ware and Sagona Form IV: 1e. Object N16100 (Fig. 3.8b) conforms to Sagona’s type IV: 1b. Object N16132 (Fig. 3.8c), with its trefoil mouth, conforms best to Sagona Form VI: 1a. Object N16134 (Fig. 3.8d) conforms to Sagona’s Crisp Ware and Form IV: 1a.
**Juglets**

There are four juglets in the collection (Fig. 3.9). Sagona defines juglets as “small pouring vessels with one handle” (2002:136). There are four objects that can be considered juglets in the MPM collection. N16119 (Fig. 3.9b) is a trefoil mouthed vessel with a swelling neck. This is an example of Sagona’s oldest type as it best fits Sagona Form III: 1. Both N16118 (Fig. 3.9a) and N16140 (Fig. 3.9c) conform to Sagona Form V: 1b and have a fabric that compares favorably to Crisp Ware. N16084 (Fig. 3.9d) is Sagona Form IV-V: 1b.

**Jugs**

There are four jugs in the collection. Sagona defines jugs as being “one-handled pouring vessels” (2002:116). N16082 is a large vessel and completely covered in a thick white slip, conforming to Sagona’s Form II: 1b. N16088 conforms to Sagona Form I: 1. See Appendix D for images.

![Juglets](image_url)
Krater

A krater is a wine-drinking vessel that was used to mix wine. Initially there was thought to be one Black Figure krater in the collection (N14652; Fig. 3.10) until it was discovered to be a reproduction based on its strange form and the stylistic qualities of the paintings (Davide Tanasi 2017: personal communication). There is a second object (N14639) that was labelled as a “calyx,” perhaps as in calyx krater, but this object could not be located. Object N14652 is a “column krater” with two large loop handles extending from a globular body and attached to the flat rim with a stemmed foot. The rim and lip bear signs of intense and clumsy restoration efforts, which obfuscate the actual clay. The clumsy restoration may be part of the reproduction, or to mask elements that would betray that the whole piece is a fake. Below the rim, the lip and neck are black, as are the handles. These bear signs of having been painted in modern times, however. Where the neck meets the body, the motif switches to black lines on a red background. Below is a thin black band, followed by a thicker black band, and then another thick black band separates the main field depicting a celebratory scene with three large palmettes flowing out from beneath the handles on either side. The scene on one side depicts four dancers, two male and two female, with arms interlocked and holding garlands. The reverse side has three figures facing to the right, two female and one male, dancing and holding long garlands. It is one of the four explicitly Greek vessels in the collection (the others being N14641, N14642, and N14643) but it is unclear whether Leopardi knew it was a reproduction when he sold it to the MPM.

One of the strange aspects of the vessel is that it seems to be damaged and was repaired using unusual techniques. In various locations there is evidence that sherds were drilled into and tied together with iron wire, which is an old practice of mending broken vessels. Within the
vessel, the interior surfaces have been covered with a thick coat of brown plaster that presumably helped keep the vessel together, but also masks the interior black “slip” of the krater.

Figure 3.10 Krater N14652 with details (note: detail images are not to scale).

There are very few examples of forgeries of antiquities in Malta. There is one account of a French engineer, architect, and scholar, George de Vasse Grognet, who was known to have tampered with original artefacts in order to support his theories (Culican 1976:5-7). Perhaps this was sold to one of Francoise de Piro’s ancestors and was thought to be genuine. It is somewhat surprising that neither the curators nor the Leopardis were able to recognize a reproduction. For E.R. Leopardi, surely, there was an incentive not to divulge this information to the MPM, in order to maximize its worth, and it was indeed one of the highest valued pieces, at 150 USD.

*Lamp Warmer*

There is one object that can be classified as a “lamp warmer” in the collection (N14628). This object is also an anomaly, and probably does not fall within the chronological scope of the
majority of the material. The fabric is quite friable and contains much larger and very different proportions of grit inclusions from the rest of the collection. No examples of this form were encountered during research on Phoenician, Punic, or Roman ceramic forms and thus it is most likely not part of the ceramic repertoire of these periods. This object was catalogued with N14626 and N14627, which may have been lumped together due to their similarity of fabric, though there is little suggestion that these forms were actually contemporaneous.

Unguentaria

Unguentaria are an important class of objects in the collection, are often found in funerary contexts and are generally defined as “smaller capacity vessels culminating in the stiletto, narrow style of the Roman-Punic era” (Sagona 2002:154). There are two main classes of unguentaria in the collection: local, and imported. Unguentaria begin to appear in Phase III and become standard by Phase V, and when found in burial contexts are usually found near the foot or the knee of the inhumed individual or next to the cremation urn (Sagona 2002:155). The stylistic and technical make up of most of the unguentaria in the collection implies that they are imported objects. Three unguentaria match local forms, with N14629 matching Sagona Form V: 1, and N14630 and N16122 matching Sagona Form V: 2c, with fabrics that conform to Crisp Ware. These vessels bear horizontal painted decorations consisting of small red bands along the neck and shoulder. A fourth vessel, N16129, has a local fabric (Crisp Ware), but is less refined and has a strange lopsided globular body with a flat rounded base and no decoration. Its morphology implies its function as an unguentarium, but it does not match any of Sagona’s reported vessel shapes. The rest of the unguentaria are imported or unknown forms. N16087 and N16105 conform to Sagona Form IV: 1a, while N16094 matches Sagona Form IV: 3 and N16081 and N16126 match Sagona Form V: 2b (Sagona 2002:160). These five unguentaria have
similar fabrics and stylistic features that are believed to originate in the Aegean, but without a known location of manufacture (Sagona 2002:154). The remaining vessel in this group also could not be typed. Despite N16120 having a similar fabric, morphology, and decorative style as the other unguentaria, it does not conform to any type provided by Sagona. What distinguishes the vessel is a particularly bulbous body with a low ring foot. Despite this difference, its other characteristics are consistent with a function as an unguentarium; it may have been imported from a similar location as the other vessels above. A selection of these objects (N16081 and N14629) were analyzed by Mortenson and were found to contain similar contents, namely traces of cinnamon, myrrh, and olive oil, as some of the glass vessels in the same collection (Mortenson 2014:69, 80).

Urns

Claudia Sagona defines urns as “two handled, closed vessels” that were often used as containers for cremation burials and not generally used in commercial contexts (Sagona 2002:93). Urns are an important part of the Maltese and wider Phoenicio-Punic funerary repertoire as they often served as containers for the ashes of the deceased or animal sacrifices. The use of urns as specific forms for the disposal of the dead dates back to the Iron Age in the Levant (Bikai 1978; Núñez Calvo 2011). It is important to note that not all urns functioned as cinerary urns, and some of them most likely had a double function. There are 14 urns in the collection. As most of the urns were located in the Lower Film Storage in the MPM at the time of this study, access to them was restricted relative to the rest of the materials, and therefore analysis was necessarily more cursory. The majority of the urns date to Phase IV (Fig. 3.11), with two urns belonging to the intermediate III-IV phase, and two anomalous urns that could not be assigned to a phase. Of particular interest are the Forms III-IV: 4a and IV-V: 1e. N16130b conforms to Sagona Form III-
IV: 1a and is associated with a plate/lid (N16130a). This type of urn is known as one of the few local Maltese ceramic productions that is found outside of Malta (Fig. 3.12), and could therefore be considered a transport amphora. In this case the vessel’s function as a cinerary urn has taken precedence over its form in the determination of vessel class.

![Figure 3.11 Examples of Phase IV urn forms from the Leopardi Collection: N14623 (a), N14627 (b), N16137 (c).](image)

N16127 is an example of Sagona Form IV: 1b. N14623, N16128, N16137 and N16090 are obvious examples of Sagona Form IV: 1e. The urn N14123 is of particular note as it still contains much of its original contents, albeit disturbed (Appendix L). N16191 is another form that looks like a transport amphora, of a type that is described as having contained cremated remains and so has been classified as an urn. This urn conforms to Sagona Form III-IV: 3, with Biscuit Ware fabric. N16195b conforms to Sagona Form III-IV: 1. N16133b is an urn that does not seem to be featured in Sagona’s typology of urns, and its two strap handles that stem from the widest part of the body and connect to the place where the neck meets the rim make it very distinctive. The second anomalous funerary urn, N22030, is in fact a jug, but was listed in the MPM documentation as a funerary urn. It is not out of the question that this object was used as a cinerary urn, and it may be an example of an ad hoc use of a vessel for funerary ritual.
Unattributed Sherds

There are seven objects that are too small to extrapolate their form (Fig. 3.13). Their small size in some cases also makes it difficult to examine and describe their fabric. Due to curatorial restrictions at the MPM, it was not possible to wash or break the sherds to examine their fabric more closely. Only one sherd (N16164d) could be tentatively classified as belonging to the class of ceramics known as Campana C, originating in Sicily and first identified by Nino Lamboglia (1952). Its characteristic grey-brown dark slip and coarse grey fabric hint at the common plate forms of this class of ceramics. The rest of the sherds, including the rim sherd N16166 and the base sherd N16167, seem to be coarse wares of some sort, but otherwise could not be characterized further.
Lamps

There are 30 lamps in the collection, all of which are ceramic. Seventeen of these lamps are double-nozzled open face lamps, commonly referred to as *bilychnes* lamps (from the Greek *lychnos* for lamp) in the literature (Sagona 2003:28). The rest are characteristic of a local Maltese style of Late Roman date, or Greek, Roman, or Byzantine imports. The MPM’s collection of ancient lamps was studied by Anna Cannizzo for her Master’s thesis in 2007. She found that the majority of the double bilychnes lamps could be attributed to a Phoenician or Punic origin, but could not be accurately dated due to the length of time that these lamps were manufactured and used (Cannizzo 2007:72). Though the lamps are undated, a closer analysis based on the same criteria used for the ceramic vessels allows some to be attributed to certain periods, wares, or locations of manufacture, and thus links them to other vessels within the collection. The presentation of this material will follow a rough chronological order, beginning with bilychnes lamps that are known from a very early date, followed by Hellenistic, Roman, and Romano-Maltese lamps, and finally a lamp of Byzantine date.
Bilychnes Lamps

There are 21 examples of bilychnes lamps in the collection, which is unsurprising considering this type’s longevity and popularity in Phoenician Punic contexts. They were first used in the Levant beginning in the second millennium B.C., having evolved from simple bowls that held wicks (Bailey 1972:17). Due to the longevity of their form, they are difficult to type and date, though Claudia Sagona posits a progression of their types. They can also be distinguished by ware type, if not by absolute chronology. These lamps are particularly common in tombs, and were a standard part of the funerary kit of a cremated individual: lamps can often be found in situ on top of the lid of a cinerary urn. It is hypothesized that the tops of the urns were left above ground and lamps would be set upon them and burned into the night (Núñez Calvo 2011). A sort of urnfield is thus created, as documented at the excavation at Tyre (Núñez Calvo 2011).

Hellenistic Lamps

There are two examples of so-called “Hellenistic” type lamps (N14643 and N16152). The first is a black slip padlock lamp (N14643), mentioned above, which was a very common type that originated in Athens in the sixth century B.C. It was so popular and ubiquitous that Italian workshops, including workshops in Sicily, began to produce high quality copies in great quantity into the third or second centuries B.C. Considering the proximity and historical trade relations between the two islands, these lamps were almost certainly imported from or via Sicily. The lamp N16152 is a mold made lamp. This manufacturing technique began to develop in the fourth century B.C. (Sagona’s Phase IV), providing a terminus post quem for this object.
Roman Lamps

There are two explicitly Roman, *terra sigillata*, or *Bildlampe* in the collection (N16112 and N16113). N16112 is clearly African Red Slip ware, while N16113 is more generally called a *Bildlampe*, a class of lamps that developed alongside the Hellenistic examples and are characterized by an image on the lamp’s discus (Freer 2015:67).

N16113 has the well-known stamp bearing the name FLORENT on the bottom, which suggests it was manufactured near the modern day city of Florence (Cannizzo 2007). Unfortunately, these relief stamps had a wide distribution among the various provinces of the empire and could span centuries as they were often copied. In fact, this example may be a copy itself, as despite its seemingly excellent preservation, the relief image on the discus is very faded (Freer 2015:260; Fig. 3.15). Thus, while the lamp may have originated in Rome, it could be from a North African context as well, as the fabric and treatment of the lamp are very similar to those of African Red Slip Wares.
Romano-Maltese Lamps

There are five examples of what are known as “Romano-Maltese lamps” (N16091, N16115, N16139, N16144, N16157). These lamps are characterized by having “a pointed nozzle with back swept flukes, almost barbs” which have been hypothesized to have been developed based on examples from Sicily (Bailey 1975:292). This is another form of lamp that has a long period of use. Sagona includes it in her late Phase IV and early Phase V groups of ceramic forms, though other sources would not date it back so far in time. Similar examples of this lamp have been excavated in the St. Paul’s Catacombs and the form is typically dated to the third to fifth centuries A.D. (Cardona and Gustafsson 2013). It is interesting to note that no such lamp has ever been found on top of a cinerary urn, indicating that it may have been differentiated from double-nozzled lamps, at least in regards to the funerary ritual (Sagona 2002:234).

Byzantine Lamps

There is one lamp that can firmly be placed in the very late Roman or early Byzantine period, making it a chronological outlier compared to the majority of the rest of the collection.
The lamp is mold made with a circular rosette stamp on the bottom (Fig. 3.16), while on the top it has what seems to be a rosary-like raised-dotted pattern around the fill hole. Antonia Ciasca has noted that there was some continued re-use of rock-cut tombs into the Byzantine period (1997b:703), and this object, considering its state of preservation, could be an example of such re-use. It is also possible, however, that the lamp originates from a later burial in the Christian catacombs of the island.

Terracotta Figurines

There are eight terracottas in the collection. One clay cat figurine (N14660) could be considered a terracotta but it has been included in the Aegyptica category as it was accessioned with the rest of the Aegyptica. The eight terracottas include four Punico-Roman objects, including the head of a female statuette with a Roman hairdo (N14644), the upper portion of a female statuette wearing a kalathos and painted with reddish brown stripes (N14645), the upper portion of a statuette of a male lyre player (N14646), a fragment of a statuette consisting of a foot on a pedestal (N14647), and a complete figurine of a martyred saint (N15301). One terracotta is of debatable antiquity (N14626), and has been described as a model of a boat. Two others are of Islamic date (N14624 and N14625), probably from the thirteenth century A.D., and were not subjected to close study as they are too far outside the chronological scope of the analysis.
The Punico-Roman terracottas were more closely analyzed. \textbf{N14644} (Fig. 3.17a) seems to be a mold-made face with appliques for further decoration, including an earring or “flower” on the right side of the head (the left ear is missing). It has a particular Roman hairdo and is made with a different clay fabric than the rest of the terracottas, and is therefore an outlier in this grouping. \textbf{N14645} (Fig. 3.17b) is relatively poorly preserved, only showing schematic facial features and a few stripes of paint. The composition of its fabric is unlike any other in the collection, but it does contain the nearly ubiquitous black sand found in many vessels, hinting that it is a local Maltese product. Otherwise, it is not possible to make any associations with other objects in the collection. However, Phoenician terracottas in the central-western Mediterranean sphere are known to be influenced heavily by Greek motifs, and many female figures of deities or gift bearers found in Motya (a Phoenician colony in Western Sicily) adopt the iconography of the Greek goddess Demeter, notably the \textit{kalathos} headdress (Bisi 1988:332). Thus, \textbf{N14645} is likely a local manifestation of this popular motif.

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Terracottas: \textbf{N14644} (a), \textbf{N14645} (b), and \textbf{N15301} (c).}
\end{figure}

\textbf{N14646} and \textbf{N14647} are both made of a similar clay fabric, exhibiting similar clay colors and inclusions, as well as manufacture (Fig. 3.18). Considering the inclusions of rounded and
shiny black grit as well as angular red and grey grit, these examples may be locally made in Malta. Otherwise the subjects of the terracottas are out of proportion to be associated with one another. Due to poor preservation, the lyre player (N14646 Fig. 3.18a) could not be associated with any particular mythological figure, while the fragmentary nature of the foot on the four-footed pedestal also prevented specific identification (N14647 Fig. 3.18b).

![Figure 3.18 Fragments of terracottas N14646 (a) and N14647 (b).](image)

**Aegyptica**

There are seven (3.5 percent) Egyptian or Egyptianizing objects in the collection. During the Third Intermediate Period in Egyptian chronology (ca. 1069 – ca. 664 B.C.), coinciding with the most active period of Phoenician colonizations there was an explosion of popularity in Egyptian amulets, which began to portray more and more deities (Patch 2004). The early period of the Phoenician settlement of Malta is known for its use of Egyptian religious symbols in mortuary practices and the early rock-cut tombs have frequently yielded Egyptian amulets or copies of them (Bonanno 2005:63). Egyptian magic had an important effect on Phoenician religious practices across the Mediterranean and was widely adopted by Phoenicians in both the eastern and western spheres of the Mediterranean (Acquaro 1988:394). Three of the amulets, two
in faience and one in glass, were identified and photographed (N14655, N14656, and 14657; Fig. 3.19).

![Egyptian amulets](image)

**Figure 3.19** Egyptian amulets, probably of Phoenician manufacture: N14656 (a), N14655 (b), N14657 (c).

**N14656** (Fig. 3.19a) is a Phylactic amulet representing the head of Bes. The representation bears a detailed incised face with a large beard or lion’s mane, with prominent ears and plumes and a pillar at the rear bearing a suspension hole. The stylistic features of this amulet suggest a date of the Third Intermediate Period or later (Kniskern forthcoming). **N14655** (Fig. 3.19b) is a Phylactic amulet of a Pataikos, made with an open mold with a bulbous head and prominent ears. The open mold manufacture suggests an earlier date for the amulet, but the detailed pectorals suggest a later date (Kniskern forthcoming). **N14657** (Fig. 3.19c) is a rather unusual Theophoric amulet of Shu. The Shu is represented with bent legs, kneeling on the right knee with its arms raised in the typical sign of the *ka*, though it is unclear whether the Shu is holding the sun disk between his arms or if it is meant to represent the three plumes that he is sometimes depicted as wearing. The stylistic features point to its manufacture in the Late Period (ca. 711 – 332 B.C.) (Kniskern forthcoming). It is worthy of note that these elements were simply dated to the Ptolemaic Period by the curator when they were catalogued. The other four
cataloged objects could not be located and therefore were not catalogued or photographed for this study. Two of the missing objects are made of bronze and are listed as Osirises (N14653 and N14654), while a third is a large ceramic figurine of a cat, estimated by the curator to date to ca. 800 B.C. (N14660; see Appendix B). The last object (N22031) was donated by Mr. and Mrs. Pick in 1974, having been acquired in Malta during their trip, and it is listed as being a mummy-like faience statue with inscriptions from the Book of the Dead assigned to a Ptolemaic date, ca. A.D. 130. These four objects are still listed in KE EMu as being located in the “MPM building,” with no further information provided. Egyptian amulets and scarabs were very common in Maltese burials, and so these objects are very likely grave goods.

Architectural Elements

The Leopardi collection includes a total of 18 architectural elements (9 percent) that are best discussed by material type. Stone is an obvious material for architectural elements, but ceramics are also perfectly adapted to be used as building materials as well as vessels, and the use of ceramics was ubiquitous in ancient building techniques. Eleven architectural elements are made from stone while seven are made from ceramics. These objects consist of diamond shaped tiles for flooring (e.g., N14649a-i)(Fig. 3.20), fragments of mosaic (N14635), fragments of marble (e.g., N16162c), and an architectural element that seems to be a cornice (N16160a). As these objects are relatively undiagnostic, they are not described here in greater detail (see Appendix C for additional information).

Coins

The collection contains three bronze coins. All three of these coins are labeled as Roman in KE EMu, and two of them are suspected to be ases (NM17445 and NM17446), or Roman bronze coins. Some of the MPM documentation suggests that these coins are not dateable, while
the third was hypothesized to be of Late Roman date (N17447). The curator who first catalogued the material, however, described NM17445 and NM17446 as Roman copper-bronze ases minted under the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Probus, who reigned from 276-282 A.D. NM17447 is a better preserved example and was attributed to the reign of Emperor Lucinius I (308-324 A.D.) and was made at the Aquileia mint in Italy (see Appendix G).

Figure 3.20 Representative selection of a lot of ceramic diamond shaped tiles: catalogue number N14649g (a), N14649b (b), and N14649i (c).

Glass

There are 20 catalogue numbers for glass objects or fragments. These numbers range from lots of small sherds of glass to full vessels. The unguentaria are of two principal types: the older Phoenician glass and the later Roman glass with some seemingly modern glass mixed in. The complete vessels are most commonly unguentaria. Most of the sherds of glass also seem to be attributable to forms of unguentaria, although some are certainly from goblets. The earlier Phoenician unguentaria were made with the noyau de sable technique and often show zigzag, wave, and feather decorations (like N16159). These earlier glass products were most likely manufactured in Syria-Palestine or Rhodian workshops, and can be found throughout the Mediterranean by the sixth century B.C. (Barthelemy 1995:514). The majority of the rest of the objects (N14659, N15299, N15388, N16079, N16086, N16095, N16096, N16098, N16141,
and the majority of the N16170 lot of glass sherds and N16101a-e) are made of blown glass, with the possible exception of N16143, which is typical of the Roman period.

The discovery of the glassblowing technique as a commercial enterprise seems to begin in the major Phoenician city of Sidon and quickly spreads to Italy, especially Campania, sometime in the late first century B.C. (Stern 2001:37). Many of the blown-glass forms present in this collection were found in the Zurrieq tomb, discovered in 1956 with ceramic vessels with forms predominantly from Phases III-IV and VI (see Sagona 2002:583, Fig. 263 numbers 22-30, 36), suggesting that these were predominantly used in the “Romanizing” period of the Punic period in Malta. These forms would principally be used for the transport and application of scented oils, cosmetics, and medicines (Stern 2001:39), though the fragments of the bowl of a goblet bowl and stem (N16101a-e and N16143, respectively) show clearly that glass tableware was not unknown in Malta.

A previous thesis project undertaken by Jenna Mortenson performed inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) and Fourier transform-infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR) on a selection of these glass unguentaria (N15299 and N16141, 2014). N16141 was found to contain residues that suggested that it once held elements of cinnamon, myrrh, and olive oil (Mortenson 2014:69). N15299, which had similar traces as the ceramic unguentaria N14629 and N16126, was found to contain residues that suggested strong elements of pine and spikenard oil (Mortenson 2014:70).

**Metal objects**

There are four metallic objects (2 percent) of bronze, lead, and iron in the collection. These were sorted into material types for analysis. Two objects are bronze statuettes of Egyptian deities that were included in the Aegyptica section and are not discussed here. The metal objects
in the collection are highly degraded and fragmented. One well preserved bronze object is in the shape of a handle.

**Bronze**

Catalog number **N16174** references a lot of bronze fragments including some that seem to have been burned and are very likely the remains of an offering that was placed with the deceased during the cremation and burial ritual. There are some fragments that are thin and cylindrical, looking not unlike a portion of a fibula, while about half of the fragments are very thin and exhibit sharp, 90 degree angles. Two of these fragments show clear signs of having once been punctured by iron nails, as evidenced by brown rust in the form of a nail head encrusted in holes in the objects. This suggests that at least some of the bronze fragments once lined something that would have required nails to fasten the bronze to, perhaps a wooden box or plaque of some sort. On my visit to Malta, similar thin bronze objects were displayed in the St. Paul’s Catacombs and Museum in Rabat along with thin bronze and iron nails; these have also been found in situ in later Christian burials and are interpreted as fastenings for wooden coffins (Cardona 2017).

The bronze handle (**N16173**, Fig. 3.21) consists of two parts: a handle and a clinch in which the handle fits so that it may pivot. This object is difficult to interpret without any context, but it may be a handle for a coffin like the fastenings discussed above. Considering its relatively good state of preservation, it may also be a more modern item as well.

**Iron**

There is only one iron item in the collection (**N16172**) and it is quite modern. The MPM catalogued the item as an iron chisel and this is most likely correct. Considering its shape and
state of preservation, there is very little doubt that it does not pertain to the Phoenician, Punic, or Roman periods of Malta.

Figure 3.21 Bronze handle N16173.

Lead

There is one lead object that has an associated catalogue number (N16175, Fig. 3.22), though there were fragments of lead found within the matrix of the contents of the cinerary urn N14623 (Appendix L). This may be the “sarcophagus lid that has crumbled that E.R. Leopardi mentioned in one of his letters (Letter A.11). The lead object consists of fragments of varying sizes of what used to be a casket. Lead caskets are known to be containers for cremated remains in the Roman period across the Mediterranean (see White [1997] for an example from Tyre).

Figure 3.22 Fragments of lead box or “sarcophagus cover” N16175.

This concludes the analysis of the Leopardi Collection. The diagnostic objects relevant to Sagona’s Phases of Phoenicio-Punic archaeology of Malta were covered in depth, while the less
diagnostic material that may still be relevant was covered in lesser detail. Some objects in the collection fell wholly outside of the scope of the thesis or could not be made to fit within the scope. These objects are nevertheless included in the Appendices. The next chapter will summarize the conclusions that can be drawn from the analysis, and offer suggestions for future research on the Leopardi Collection.
Chapter 4: Conclusion

One goal of this thesis was to demonstrate the potential of the MPM’s Leopardi Collection. Through preliminary description and classification of the objects, the thesis has set the stage for further research on the collection and its situation within the literature of the material culture of Malta, especially in its mortuary context, during the Phoenician, Punic, and Roman periods. The thesis will be provided to both the Milwaukee Public Museum, and to Heritage Malta at the National Museum of Archaeology in Valletta, Malta, increasing the collection’s potential for educational and research purposes. Though it is not the first such study, it should be a valuable contribution to data on the wider literature on the Phoenician, Punic, and Roman archaeology of Malta. Having established the collection’s provenance on firmer grounds by linking it to the de Piro family and its sister collection in the Museum of St. Agatha in Rabat, this thesis has also contributed to the value of the collection as a subject of research, as well as contributed somewhat to the study of the activities of collectors (Akin 1996).

In addition, in the process of performing research on the collection, this thesis has revealed a potential ethical dilemma and as a result has brought two major cultural institutions into contact, one in Malta and one in Milwaukee. While communication is still ongoing, there is great potential for a resolution to this potential conflict, which may result, one might hope, in further cooperation in the future.

Directions for Future Research

As has been mentioned above, many of the archaeological scientific techniques that have been developed over the past few decades have not yet been applied to the Maltese chronological phases under review in this thesis. First and foremost, no absolute dating techniques have been
applied, despite samples having been collected in the past. Due to the abundance of carbonized material and the relatively undisturbed nature of some of the cinerary urns in the collection, it may still be possible to get absolute chronological dates in association with a particular type of vessel. While the context for the collection has been lost, the association of dates with certain vessel types might help to confirm or debunk dating ranges that have been applied to them, and could be helpful in the refinement of currently existing typologies.

Another avenue of research would be to examine more closely the skeletal remains in the cinerary urn (Appendix L). To date, there have been no discrete examinations of faunal materials in cinerary urns in Malta as there have been in other locations, such as the Tophet in Carthage and Motya (Lancel 1995; Nigro 2010). The assumption is that the Maltese funerary practices reflect very closely those found elsewhere in the Phoenician and Punic worlds; and while this is a fair assumption to make, it remains an assumption. The analysis of the sort of animals that were sacrificed with the deceased, and the determination of whether there is any human skeletal material in some of these cinerary urns, could be a very productive avenue of research. Indeed, the analysis of the skeletal remains of Carthage’s Tophet have sparked (and were the result of) a debate about Carthaginian funerary practices, and it is not an unreasonable hypothesis that funerary practices differed across the Phoenician and Punic worlds. Blood residue analysis could be used in an attempt to identify at the species level the fauna sacrificed as part of the funerary ritual, and while the results would not be representative of all Melitan periods, it would provide a base from which further faunal analyses could spring.

The ceramic typologies themselves might be further refined by non-destructive chemical composition analyses such as pXRF. To date, there have been no attempts to chemically characterize fabrics of Melitan ceramics despite their noticeable heterogeneity. Such an analysis
could confirm or debunk the associations made between vessels in this thesis and works by other scholars. As has been mentioned before, associations have often been difficult to make due to the often mixed nature of the contexts in which these vessels are found archaeologically, and the relatively limited information about their context when museums inherit private collections. The vessel’s fabric is not the only part of the vessel that might be analyzed. As mentioned previously, the underground context in which Melitan funerary materials are often found has left most of them with thick calcareous concretions. As Sagona has noted, some of these are quite distinct from one another, and an analysis of the chemical composition of the concretions themselves may provide clues to a decontextualized artifact’s original location of deposition (2003:29-30).

Another potential productive avenue would be organic residue analysis, provided that there has not been overly extensive restoration work on the vessels. This avenue of research has already been successfully pursued by another UWM thesis project (Mortenson 2014) on some of the vessels in the collection. This strategy has also been successfully carried out by Heritage Malta (Cardona personal communication).
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APPENDIX A: MPM DOCUMENTATION

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC MUSEUM
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233, U.S.A.
November 29, 1965

Mr. & Mrs. E. R. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Malta, Malta, Europe

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Leopardi:

Cissie and John Pick were kind enough to call to our attention the possibility that you might be willing to part with your archaeological collection which, I understand, consists of various Roman, Greek, Hellenistic, and Maltese specimens. Cissie mentioned the price of your collection would be about 1,000 English pounds.

We are very much interested in obtaining this collection for our Museum and are anxious to commence negotiations with you about shipping it to our Museum, via Saltfish Packers, a company highly recommended by Cissie.

We understand there might be a possibility that the shipment can be mailed from Malta to the United States through the kind help and cooperation of Mr. John G. Conroy of the U.S. Embassy. For this reason I am taking the liberty of mailing a copy of this letter to Mr. Conroy who might want to suggest ways and means to expedite shipment of the collection. Since our Museum (the 4th largest natural history museum in the U.S.) is municipally owned and governed educational institution, there might even be a possibility that the collection can be shipped from Malta to the USA by any returning navy vessel.

We are anxious, therefore, to hear from you at your earliest convenience to learn more about your collection (its size and the type of archaeological pieces) and in what manner you suggest obtaining shipping permits.

With best regards.

Cordially yours,

Stephen F. Bergey, Director

CC: Mr. John G. Conroy
Dr. & Mrs. John Pick
Mr. John Luedtke
December 18, 1965

Dr. Stephan F. Borhegyi, Director
Milwaukee Public Museum
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233
U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Borhegyi:

I have delayed answering your letter of November 29, as I wished to contact Mr. John C. Conroy of the U. S. Embassy before writing.

He has very kindly been here to see the collection, which impressed him favorably, and has been most helpful as regards your suggestion of shipping the cases on a navy vessel returning to the States. He said this would be possible once we obtain the necessary export permit.

I shall let you know further as soon as we obtain the necessary documents. In the meanwhile I am sending you a booklet, by surface mail, in which many of the pieces of the collection are described. The collection is mostly Punic and Roman. There are burial urns, lamps, pottery utensils, vases, amphorae, glass ampullae and unguentariae, a Creaco-Sicilian vase, stone cat, etc. You will find some small statuettes of primitive African Art, and when packing I shall label these. With the booklet I am sending by surface mail you will find a fuller description.

As regards payment my wife and I feel that you might prefer to pay after receiving and seeing the collection, which will suit us.

I trust all will go well this side and I shall soon be able to let you know further.

Yours sincerely,

(SIGNED) E. R. LEOPARDI

Copy to: Mr. J. G. Conroy

CC: Dr. & Mrs. John Pick
    Mr. Luedtke

Letter A.2
Mr. & Mrs. E. R. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Mdina, Malta, Europe

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Leopardi:

We are indeed glad to know that you will be able to obtain an export permit for your wonderful collection, which we will look forward to receiving some time next year. I think your idea to discuss payment for this collection after we receive it, is an excellent one. We can reach a better decision for all concerned.

I will also await the booklet you sent by surface mail that will describe the collection in more detail.

Warmest greetings for a happy holiday season.

Cordially,

Stephan F. Barhagyi, Director

CC: Mr. John G. Controv
    Dr. & Mrs. John Pick
    Mr. John Luedtke
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC MUSEUM
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233 U.S.A.

January 28, 1966

Mr. John C. Conroy
American Embassy
Malta, Europe

Dear Mr. Conroy:

Do you know how things are progressing with the export permit that Mr. and Mrs. Leopardi were seeking to permit them to send their collection of Punic and Roman materials to our Museum? We have not heard from them since my letter of December 22, 1965, a copy of which I sent to you.

I would sincerely appreciate whatever you can do to assist the Leopardis and the Museum in getting this important collection to us as soon as possible.

Cordially,

Stephan F. Bogue, Director

SFB:R

CC: Mr. & Mrs. E. R. Leopardi
    Mr. & Mrs. John Pick
    Mr. John Luedtke
3rd February 1966

Dr. Stephan F. Borhegyi
Director, Milwaukee Public Museum
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233 U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Borhegyi:

My wife and I hasten to assure you that as soon as possible you will receive the collection - it is not easy to get the permit - with the consequent shipping through the Embassy. Mr. Conroy has been most helpful in every way, but we would never impose on his kindness, as you will understand. Failing this we shall ship the collection on a mercantile vessel, when the occasion offers.

It might be easier, at this side, if the case is addressed to a private address - for instance your name and home address - you will understand that the local authorities might be "imaginative" seeing the addressee a Museum!  \(\text{Intelligenti pauc\(a\)}\)

In the meantime we ask you to wait patiently - remembering Aesop's "all things come to he who waits."

Allow us to assure you that we look upon the collection as already yours, for our word is a bond.

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

E. R. LEOPARDI

1 Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

CC: Mr. J. G. Conroy

Letter A.5
Dr. Stephan F. Borhegyi, Director
Milwaukee Public Museum
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53223

Dear Dr. Borhegyi:

I have received your letter of January 28 regarding the Leopardi collection. Mr. Leopardi wanted to answer your letter himself, and I have just received a copy of his reply to you.

As he told you in his letter of December 15, I saw the collection and was very much impressed with it. I told him that we would be glad to help in any way possible regarding the shipment of the items to Milwaukee, including our exploring whether it would be possible to ship them on a Navy vessel returning to the States. The determining factor, of course, is whether the Government of Malta will allow artifacts such as these to be sold outside of Malta. In this regard I told Mr. Leopardi that as soon as he had obtained an export certificate we would stand ready to do whatever we could to help.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. CONROY
Counselor of Embassy
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC MUSEUM
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233, U.S.A.

March 7, 1966

Mr. E. R. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

Dear Mr. Leopardi:

When I returned to the office this week, I found awaiting me your letter of February 5.

We do appreciate the difficulties you are encountering to obtain the necessary permits and make arrangements for the shipment of your collection on a Navy vessel returning to the States. We sincerely hope you soon will be successful in completing all that is necessary and that the collection will be on its way to us shortly. We shall try to wait with patience the arrival of your beautiful material, and are grateful to you for your efforts in our behalf.

Cordially,

R

Stephen F. Burkhart, Director

CC: Mrs. Pick
Mr. Frank
Mr. Ludtke

Letter A.7
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC MUSEUM
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233, U.S.A.

March 2, 1966

Mr. John J. Conroy
Counselor of Embassy of the U. S.
Valletta, Malta

Dear Mr. Conroy:

This week when I returned to the office, I found awaiting me your letter of February 6.

We greatly appreciate your efforts to help the Leonards find a way to send their beautiful collection to us. We are hopeful that he will be able to obtain the necessary export certificate and permission from the Government of Malta to send the material to us. It would be of great value to our Museum and the many visitors who come here from all over the world. I hope you will continue your intercession on our behalf.

Cordially,

[Signature]

Stephen F. Borhagy, Director

CC: Mrs. Pick
     Mr. Frank
     Mr. Luedtke

Letter A.8
E. R. Leopardi,
1 Archbishop Square,
Notabile, MALTA

25th April, 1966

Dr. Stephan F. Gorbevly,
Director, Milwaukee Public Museum,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233,
U. S. A.

Dear Dr. Gorbevly,

It is with pleasure that I inform you that the promised collection will soon be dispatched - preliminaries are ready and packing will start this week. It has been a hard and weary process - there were times when I thought we would never succeed in getting it out of the island.

The local agents of the American Express are undertaking the dispatch which will reach the States by sea - you will understand that under the circumstances we could not take the kind offer of the American Embassy.

It would facilitate matters if you would take out the insurance policy covering the shipment at your end. On receiving confirmation from you I shall send you full details as regards number of cases, etc., to be insured.

With best regards.

Yours sincerely,

E. R. Leopardi
E.R. Leopardi,
1, Archbishop Square,
Notable, M A L T A.

20th May, 1966

Dr. A. W. Bauernfeind,
Assistant to the Director,
Milwaukee Museum,
800 W. Wells St.,
Milwaukee, Wis. 53233
U. S. A.

Dear Dr. Bauernfeind,

In answer to your letter of the 13th, my wife
and I wish to say that we fully understand the difficulty
you have had regarding insurance.
For this reason we have done everything humanly
possible as regards packing - and trust all will
reach you safely.
Within a few days we are hoping to write that
the cases are on their way to the States.
With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

E.R. Leopardi
E.R. Leopardi,
1, Archbishop Square,
Notabile, MALTA.

4th June 1966

Dr. Stephan T. Borhegyi,
Director, Milwaukee Public Museum,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53253,
U. S. A.

Dear Dr. Borhegyi,

The Punic and Roman pottery promised is, as I write, on the
high seas. It is packed in three cases along with a catalogue
from which you will find it easy to classify your exhibits. Also
in one of the cases are four old wooden idols, and examples of
primitive African art in black earthenware statuettes, and two
ceremonial pipes smoked at "pow-wow" — these were brought home
by my wife’s father from the German Resident’s house in the
Cameroons in the 1914-18 War. We feel sure these will find safe
keeping with you and you will appreciate having them at your
museum.

I would ask you to be especially careful when the cases are
being unpacked and to look through every piece of paper. There
are old Roman glass specimens, whole and in fragments, also a
scull and skull box. There are burial urns — just as found with
the ashes in them. Incidentally I forgot to remove a bone which
I had placed in the case after finding it in the road; it had
fallen out of a van carrying bones cleared from a cemetery.
I am sure you will distinguish it.

There is a one-cuadras lid which has crumbled. You will
find some fossils, teeth of primitive creatures and small pieces
of mosaic flooring from Roman houses.

The cases are addressed as follows: W. PARADIGMA — MILWAUKEE.
The American Express Company of New York have been informed of
this arrangement and after arrival the cases will be redirected to you, I hope. Kindly contact the American Express Company
of New York.

You will be feeling as anxious as we are regarding these
cases — but we have taken every care as regards expert packing
and spared no cost.

I now look forward to hearing that you have received the cases
and all has arrived safely.

With kind regards,

[Signature]

Letter A.11
Mr. E. R. Leopardi  
1, Archbishop Square  
Notabile, Malta  

Dear Mr. Leopardi:

Your letter of June 4 arrived here during Dr. Boromeyi's absence from the office. He is expected to return next week, and I know he will be delighted to learn that the collection of Punic and Roman pottery is on the high seas. Your letter will be brought to his attention when he returns.

In the meantime, will you please advise us on what ship the collection of three cases has been sent to us? It will help us at this end to have this information.

Also, Mr. Luedtke our curator of fine arts, asked if you would be able to send a note to the American Express Company of New York and ask that the cases be cleared directly through Milwaukee. This would save considerable time and money for us. If it must be cleared in New York and in Milwaukee, it will necessitate two fees for clearance.

Thank you for helping us. We, too, will be relieved when the shipment has reached us safely.

Sincerely,

Irene Reinhold, Secretary to the Director

P.S. We doubt if the American Express Company would send the shipment directly to Milwaukee if we request it from this end since you are the shipper.
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC MUSEUM
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233 U.S.A.

September 14, 1966

Mr. & Mrs. E. R. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Leopardi:

When I returned from my vacation trip to Mexico I was delighted to learn that the long-awaited three cases from Malta had arrived. Mr. Luedtke, our Curator of Classical Archaeology, has unpacked the three cases and reports to me that they arrived in relatively good condition. There was some breakage, unfortunately, but it can be repaired later on.

According to Mr. Luedtke’s count, there are 167 Greek, Roman and Maltese archaeological specimens in the collection, and 10 African ethnological pieces, making a total of 177 specimens.

We are at the present moment evaluating the collection for which you have asked tentatively the price of 1,000 English pounds. As soon as we arrive at an appropriate evaluation and find a donor for the specimens, we will be in contact with you and will transmit the appropriate amount. Would you please let me know to whom and in what way the check should be made out?

We are, of course, extremely happy to have this fine collection in our Museum where it will be used by students and the general public alike. When you come to visit your relatives the Pick’s, we hope that you will plan to spend enough time to see our museum and enjoy seeing again your collection.

Thankfully yours,

Sincerely,

Stephen F. Borhegyi, Director
P.S.

Mr. Luedtke is particularly grateful to you for sending along the publication on Maltese archaeology. It is very handy and if you can supply us with any additional books on the subject, we would be most grateful.

CC: Mr. & Mrs. John Pick
Mr. Luedtke
September 23, 1966

Dear Professor Barbieri,

I was glad to receive your letter of the 14th, with the news that the cases have been unpacked, and you are pleased with the contents. My wife and I are happy to know that this collection has found safe asylum in a country where ancient cultures are appreciated.

I was pleased Mr. Luedtke found the publication I sent useful. I am now sending, under separate cover, another publication compiled by Dr. D.H. Emmert, formerly Curator of Archaeology in our Museum. As the present moment there are no publications in Malta which describe fully the various aspects of prehistory, etc., but from this booklet contains useful data on the prehistory of Malta. I shall keep in mind your request and should other publications appear I shall send them to you.

On account of restrictions regarding the exportation of "artefacts" I would ask you to be kind enough not to divulge my name in connection with the collection — I feel sure you will understand my reasoning in asking this favour.

As regards your query about how and to whom we would like the payment, I would suggest a cheque through a bank made payable to me: Edward Romeo Leopardi — i.e., if this is considered best to you, otherwise my wife and I leave this matter entirely in your hands.

We had the pleasure of seeing our relatives, the Hicks, this summer in Malta — my wife and I have very fond memories for them both.

With best regards from my wife and myself.

Yours sincerely,

E.R. Leopardi
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC MUSEUM  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53223 U.S.A.  

September 29, 1966  

Mr. & Mrs. E. R. Leopardi  
1 Archbishop Square  
Notabile, Malta  

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Leopardi:  

Our sincerest thanks for sending us the booklet: National Museum of Malta, Archaeological Section, by D. H. Trump.  

This is an excellent booklet and will be very handy for the correct classification of your wonderful collection. We are most grateful for your kindness in sending it to us.  

Cordially,  

Stephen F. Berhegyi, Director  

CC: Mr. & Mrs. John Pick  
Mr. John Ineitke  

Letter A.15
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC MUSEUM
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233, U.S.A.

November 1, 1966

Mr. R. R. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Leopardi:

Please forgive me for the long delay in not writing to you, but our November 8 opening of our second floor exhibits took all my attention until this time.

Mr. Luedtke, meanwhile, analyzed your collection of 177 pieces and also showed it to Dr. Pick. We feel that a fair price for your entire collection, including your packing and shipping costs, the African pieces and books you sent and your many other efforts in our behalf, would be $3,000. Your actual request was 1,000 English pounds.

If you would agree to the above, we hope that early in 1967 we will be able to send you all or at least part of the money by using some of our 1967 specimen purchase funds and, hopefully, if we can locate a donor, there will be some private funds.

We will remit by check made payable to Edward Renee Leopardi. Would you prefer to have the check sent to a Maltese or London bank? If so, to which one?

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain with best personal regards.

Cordially,

Stephan F. Borhegyi, Director

SFS:R

CC: Mr. Luedtke
    Mr. Pick
    Mr. Gorski

Letter A.16
February 28, 1967

Mr. E. R. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

Dear Mr. Leopardi:

It gives me great pleasure to be able to send you the enclosed check in the amount of $500.00, the first payment for your $3,000 collection of beautiful specimens from Malta.

Fortunately, a generous friend of the Museum and the Picks have made this first payment possible. We sincerely hope to be able to send the balance to you as soon as possible, and deeply appreciate your willingness to wait for the money.

Cordially,

R
Enc.

Stephan F. Borhegyi, Director

CC: Mrs. Malcolm K. Whyte
Mr. & Mrs. Pick

Mr. Luedtke
Mr. Gorski

Letter A.17
April 11, 1967

Mr. E. R. Leopardi  
1 Archbishop Square  
Notabile, Malta

Dear Mr. Leopardi:

I am delighted to be able to enclose a second payment on your $3,000 collection of wonderful specimens from Malta. Enclosed is a check in the amount of $400.00, drawn on Barclays Bank D.C.O, Valetta, Malta. I hope this reaches you in good order.

We will make every effort to send the balance to you at an early date and thank you for accepting payment on the "installment" plan.

Cordially,

Stephan F. Borhegyi, Director

SFB:R
Enc. - 1 check

CC: Mr. Gorski /  
Mr. Luedtke
Dr. Stephen J. Borhegyi,
Inspector, Milwaukee Public Museum,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53233,
U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Borhegyi,

I hasten to thank you for your letter of February 28, and enclosed cheque for the amount of 500 Dollars.

It gives my wife and I much pleasure to know you are pleased with the collection.

Once again I assure you of our willingness to wait for further payment until such is convenient to you.

With kind regards from us both.

Yours sincerely,

E.R. Leopardi
April 11, 1967

Mr. E. R. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

Dear Mr. Leopardi:

I am delighted to be able to enclose a second payment on your $5,000 collection of wonderful specimens from Malta. Enclosed is a check in the amount of $400.00, drawn on Barclays Bank D.C.O., Valetta, Malta. I hope this reaches you in good order.

We will make every effort to send the balance to you at an early date and thank you for accepting payment on the "installment" plan.

Cordially,

Stephan F. Borhegy, Director

SFB:R
Enc. - 1 check

CC: Mr. Gorski
    Mr. Luedtke
E.R. Leopardi,
1, Archibishop Square,
Notabile, BATA.

April 27, 1967

Dr. Stephan P. Borbegyi,
Director, Milwaukee Public Museum,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53233,
U. S. A.

Dear Dr. Borbegyi,

My wife and I thank you for your letter of April 11, and enclosed cheque for $ 400.00.

The letter and enclosure reached us today, for we have had a strike of Post Office employees and consequent entire hold up of postal delivery!

With renewed thanks and kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

E.R. Leopardi
To: E.R. Leopardi
1, Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

Paid from History Dept. Fund ($00.81)

1 pottery bowl - Punic-Roman period - Malta
    (Miss Alice Marie Werra) $4.00
1 pottery patina - Punic Period - Malta
    (Y.W.C.A. Women's Club) $5.00
1 terra cotta figurine - Malta 3-5 cent. A.D.
    (Mrs. John Koch) $10.00
1 pottery beaker - Roman period - Malta
    (Shorewood Women's Club) $20.00
1 pottery lagena - Punic period - Malta
    (Weissel Foundation) $36.00

Paid from Segall Fund ($00.87)

1 glass ampulla - Roman period - Malta
    (Mr. & Mrs. LeRoy Segal) $25.00

Total: $100.00

20 October 1967

[Handwritten notes: Must Fd. 10-24-67 Ok#2355]
November 9, 1967

Mr. L. R. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

Dear Mr. Leopardi:

We are enclosing two checks, Milwaukee Public Museum Trust Fund Check No. 2355 dated October 21, 1967 in the amount of $100.00, and a City of Milwaukee Check No. 311551 dated October 27, 1967 in the amount of $200.00, to apply as the third payment on the $3,000.00 collection of specimens from Malta.

Although we have not had these checks drawn on Barclays Bank P.C.C., Valletta, Malta, we know that the First Wisconsin National Bank has a branch office in your area, and we believe you will have no difficulty with the City of Milwaukee check drawn on the Marine National Exchange Bank.

The balance of payment is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Bill</th>
<th>$3,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less first payment</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less second payment</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less third payment</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New balance as of 11/9/67 | $1,760.00

Cordially yours,

Stephen Burhagyi
Director

SH:RG/bn

enclosures:

cc: Mrs. Whyte, Messrs. Pick, Luette, Gorski

Letter A.24
February 1, 1960

Mrs. I. E. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Valletta, Malta

Dear Mrs. Leopardi:

In conjunction with Dr. Stephen F. Barbeggi, we wish to also extend our condolences to you.

Inasmuch as we may be sending another payment this year, please let us know if the check should now be made out in your name or otherwise.

Cordially yours,

KILMANI SC PUBLIC MISSION

Robert Gorski
Administrative Assistant

RG/st

cc: Dr. Barbeggi
Mr. Pick
Mr. Laedlike
File
6th February 1968

Dear [Name],

I am deeply grateful for your kind expression of sympathy and thank you for your letter of 12th February.

As regards further payment, kindly make the cheque in my name. With renewed thanks and my expression of sincere regard.

Yours,

[Signature]

Fraîche Leopardi

Letter A.26
July 31, 1968

Mrs. E. E. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

Dear Mrs. Leopardi:

Mr. Luedtke from our History Division has made a selection of the following items for which we propose to pay to you the sum of $760.00 which will be another partial payment against the balance we owe to your family, refer Dr. Borbegyi’s letter of November 9, 1967.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Pottery amphora, Malta, 6th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Pottery lagena, Malta, 15th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>Pottery stamnos, Malta, 5th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Pottery lagena, Malta, 7th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>Pottery oinochoe, Malta, 7th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-5</td>
<td>Pottery olpe, Malta, 250 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-3</td>
<td>Pottery bowl, Malta, 7th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>Pottery dishos, Malta, 3rd century</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-6</td>
<td>Pottery dishos, Malta, 5th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $760.00

If you would be so kind as to give us your invoice or bill for the above items, we would expect to be able to send you a check in that amount before the end of the year.

The director and the staff of the Museum would like you to know that we are very appreciative of your help, time, and patience, as well as that provided by your late husband in helping us to obtain this fine collection of Punic and Roman pottery. Just as a possible suggestion, perhaps you may be interested in donating one of the unpaid specimens to the Museum in the name of your late husband, thereby giving him a credit toward the accumulation of these various fine specimens.

Again, thank you for all of your consideration and help. The director and Mr. Luedtke send their best regards.

Cordially yours,

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC MUSEUM

Robert Gorasi
Administrative Assistant

RG/kr

cc: Dr. Borbegyi
Mr. Luedtke

Letter A.27
Dear Dr. Groote,

I must start with asking you to excuse my not having answered your letter earlier. I thank you for it, and your kind suggestion to make a small donation in memory of my late husband. If it is possible for you to...
pay me $960.00 at sometime
later, according to my calculation
$1000 remain. May I donate all
the remaining specimens making
the amount of $1000? The collection
belonged to the family of my
late father, Lucio de Fers d'Amica
M.D. (Louain) M.R.C.S. L.R.C.P., dip. T.M.
and therefore it might be possible
to make this donation in memory
of both. But I leave that for you
to decide.
Do there any need of an invoice?
I am not very good at making

Letter A.28b
one, and in any case it would be a repetition of the excellent one you wrote down in your letter of July 31, 1968.

I would like to express my best regards to the Director and his friends and to you my cordial thanks.

Yours sincerely,

Francois Leopoldi.
September 12, 1968

Mrs. I. E. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notable, Malta

Dear Mrs. Leopardi:

We were very happy to receive your letter saying that you would like to donate the balance of the collection in the name of your husband and your father. We have catalogued both the remainder of the collection and the miscellaneous small items that your husband had suggested need not be priced. For this reason, the total valuations of each group come to more than $1,000.00.

In the future, Museum visitors will read both of the names any time they are viewing our exhibits of Maltese archaeological material.

Sincerely,

John W. Luedtke
Acting Curator
Oriental, Classical & Decorative Arts

JWL/kk

cc: Dr. Borhegyi

Letter A.29
October 8, 1966

Mrs. E. R. Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notable, Malta

Dear Mrs. Leopardi:

My very best personal thank you for your generous gift of over $1,000.00 in value of specimens donated in the name of your late husband and your father.

You can be forever assured that we have a very special appreciation for these fine specimens which you have donated, and needless to say, they will be greatly enjoyed by the many visitors to our fine museum, now and in the future years.

We are enclosing a City of Milwaukee check #103265 in the amount of $750.00 which will complete all transactions relative to the entire collection which we have appropriately called the Leopardi Collection.

Cordially yours,

Stephan F. Borhengel
Director

STB: RG/kr

Enclosures: Check
Tax forms

cc: Dr. Ritzenthaler
    Mr. Luedtke
    Mr. Gorski

Letter A.30
Dear Dr. Bader,

I have received your kind letter and that of the Museum Board of Trustees and the Milwaukee Public Museum. Very thanks are due to you for the pleasure I feel in having been able to do something in memory of my late husband and that of my father.

Enclosed are the signed papers of donation.

I have enclosed your check no. 100. 265 for $760.00 which has closed all transactions relative to the entire collection.

With expression of esteem to you and the members of the Board of Trustees and Milwaukee Museum.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Letter A.31
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC MUSEUM
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233 U.S.A.

October 17, 1968

Mrs. Francoise Leopardi
1 Archbishop Square
Notabile, Malta

Dear Mrs. Leopardi:

Our warmest thanks for your kind letter of October 15, and for the return of the signed donation tax forms.

We are delighted to have this wonderful collection in our Museum and are most grateful to you and Mr. Leopardi for making this acquisition possible.

We will keep you posted on future exhibits that will feature your Maltese collection which was donated to us in memory of your late husband and father.

With warmest best wishes and thanks.

Cordially,

Stephan F. Borhegyi, Director

CC: Dr. Pick
Dr. Lamers
Mr. Gorski
S. Marine
December 5, 1966

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Stacy
1610 N. Prospect Ave.
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Dear Stanley:

The Milwaukee Public Museum was fortunate recently to obtain an unusually fine Ancient Greek, Roman and Phoenician collection from Malta. The collection comprises 177 pieces and was obtained through the good help of John and Cissie Pick from Cissie's sitter and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. E. R. Leopardi of Malta.

This collection is an accumulation of the Leopardi's collections in Malta and represents almost every type of pottery from about 1,000 B.C. on to 500 A.D.

Knowing your passionate interest in Greece and the Islands, we invite you to the Museum to see this collection. Since this is one of the collections which is "looking for a sponsor," we would love to entertain you for luncheon whenever it is most convenient for you within the next two weeks. I am sure you will find it worthwhile to see this collection and also your museum's latest exhibits. Hoping to hear from you in the near future, I am

Cordially,

Stephan F. Borhegyi, Director

SFB:R

CC: Dr. Pick
    Mrs. Whyte
    Mr. Luedtke
December 5, 1966

Mrs. Douglass Van Dyke
8315 North River Road
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53217

Dear Kay:

I am sorry that I have not heard from you since my letter of November 4 telling you of the unusually fine collection of material from Ancient Greece, Rome and Phoenicia that was sent to us from Malta. I realize that this is a busy time of the year for everyone, but I do not like to have this collection of 177 fine pieces of important pottery escape from the Museum.

Since it is drawing closer to the time when Santa Claus pays his annual visit to all good children - and the Museum is one of his best children, I sincerely hope that the clatter of his reindeer's hooves will not drown out our plea for this collection.

I sincerely hope you will be able to call me and perhaps come in to see these beautiful pieces.

Warmest wishes for a happy holiday season.

Cordially,

Stephan F. Berhegyi, Director

CC: Dr. Pick
Mrs. Whyte
Mr. Luedtke

[Handwritten note:]
Masonic - I also wrote a "help
note to Berhegyi - so let's
keep our fingers crossed.

Steve
November 4, 1966

Mrs. Douglass Van Dyke
8315 North River Road
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53217

Dear Kay:

The Milwaukee Public Museum was fortunate recently to obtain an unusually fine Ancient Greek, Roman and Phoenician collection from Malta. The collection comprises 177 pieces and was obtained through the good help of John and Cissie Pick from Cissie's sister and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. E. R. Leopardi of Malta.

This collection is an accumulation of the Leopardi's collections in Malta and represents almost every type of pottery form from about 1,000 B.C. on to 500 A.D.

Knowing your passionate interest in Greece and the Islands, we invite you to the Museum to see this collection. Since this is one of the collections "which is looking for a sponsor," we would love to entertain you for luncheon whenever it is most convenient for you within the next two weeks. I am sure you will find it worthwhile to see this collection and also our Museum's latest exhibits. Hoping to hear from you in the near future, I am

Cordially,

Stephan F. Borhegyi, Director

SPB:R

CC: Dr. Pick
    Mr. Luedtke  

Letter A.35
APPENDIX B: AEGYPTICA

Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N14653/20652 Bronze Osiris Aegyptica

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 10.8 W.: 2.6 Length: 0.9

Description: Bronze Osiris

Additional Notes: Not Found, MPM Documentation

Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N14654/20652 Bronze Osiris Aegyptica

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 9.3 W.: 1.9 Length: 1.9

Description: Bronze Osiris, part of crown missing.

Additional Notes: Not Found, MPM Documentation

Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N14655/20652 Faience Bes Aegyptica

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.5 W.: 1.8 Length: 1.5

Weight: 6.6g

Description: This pataikos was made with an open mold, suggesting an earlier date, but the detailed pectorlas suggests a later date. The head is bulbous and the ears are prominent. The amulet is in poor condition. Most of the legs are missing and the arms are broken.

Fabric: Glazed
Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N14656/20652 Glass Bes Aegyptica

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.6 W.: 1.0 Length: 0.4

Weight: 0.8g

Description: The amulet is only the head of Bes. A large beard or lion’s mane is visible. The face is well-detailed with heavy brows. The ears and the tall plumes are prominent. The back of the amulet has a pillar for the suspension hole. Condition: Intact with little signs of wear beyond buildup in the incised details.

Category: Phylactic

Date: Third Intermediate Period or Later (c. 1069 – c. 664 BC)

Fabric: Glass?

Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N14657/20652 Faience Shu Aegyptica

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.0 W.: 1.0 Length: 0.6 Weight: 1.3g

Description: Not the most common way to depict Shu because the bending of the legs to kneel on the right knee is not very clear - rather unusual (as the bending of the knee is a big part of the portrayal of Shu). The arms are raised in the typical sign of the ka, Shu usually has the sun disk between his arms. This one is unclear if it is the sun disk (because of the rectangular form) or the three plumes that he is sometimes depicted as wearing. Most likely it is a stylized sun disk. The face is depicted but not detailed.

Category: Theophoric

Date: Late Period (711 – 332 BC)

Fabric: Glazed
Catalogue/Accession Number: N14660/20652
Object Name (MPM): Figurine of cat
Object Class: Aegyptica

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 27.9 W.: 14.9 Length: 8.7

Description: Cat, pottery, wearing collar, 800 BC

Fabric: N/A

Additional Notes: Not Found, MPM Documentation

Catalogue/Accession Number: N22031/23648
Object Name (MPM): Faience Statue
Object Class: Aegyptica

Measurements (cm.):
H.: W.: Length:

Description: "Faience statue, Egyptian tomb piece, mummy-like figure with inscriptions from book of the dead, Ptolemaic, ca. 130 A.D., Malta" - MPM Documentation

Fabric: N/A

Additional Notes: Not Found
APPENDIX C: ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14635/20643</td>
<td>Mosaic fragment</td>
<td>Architectural Element</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

H.: 8.0  W.: 7.4  Length: 3.2

**Description:** Fragment of mosaic with tesserae embedded in mortar. 3 colors of tesserae: Beige/Brown, White, and Black. 1 white tessera is cut into a triangle to fit into place. There seem to be multiple layers of different mortar but closer examination is required, i.e. the inclusin in the lower half of the mortar seem to be different than those in the upper portion of the mortar. There may have also been a fourth type of stone, which is a light grey, but it also could be some form of repair to stabilize the tesserae fragments (more evidence of conservation?). Brown tesserae are chipping, probably ab antiquo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14636/20643</td>
<td>Lot of stones from mosaic</td>
<td>Architectural Element</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):** N/A

**Description:** These were not found. However, there are some stones that could be tesserae that are partially buried in the sand in the "Africa Before Islam" case (MPM - 3 Africa - North Africa 3E009). It was thought unwise to disturb these as they were loose and seemed to be unmarked.

**Additional Notes:** Not Found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14648a-i/20651</td>
<td>Tiles</td>
<td>Architectural Element</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):** N/A

**Description:** Diamond shaped tiles

**Additional Notes:** Not found
Catalogue/Accession Number: N14649a/20643
Object Name (MPM): Ceramic tile
Object Class: Architectural Elements

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.0 W.: 6.2 Length: 9.2

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Cement: white Fabric: 2.5Y 7/4 pale yellow.

Description: Diamond shaped tile with some cement still attached. Accretions on top of the tile suggest former plaster.

Fabric: Fabric is greenish and somewhat porous with miniscule black and very small red grit > 1 mm². Cement contains grey grit as well.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14649b/20643
Object Name (MPM): Ceramic tile
Object Class: Architectural Elements

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.0 W.: 5.9 Length: 9.2

Restoration Work: No


Description: Diamond shaped tile. The top of the tile is more orangeish. Again, accretions on the top of the tile seem like the work of plaster.

Fabric: Finer clay with similar inclusions to 14649a. The cement or mortar contains red and orange grit inclusions. Reddish purple color with miniscule black grit, micaceous inclusions and small red grit.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N14649g/20643
Object Name (MPM): Ceramic tile
Object Class: Architectural Elements

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.6  W.: 5.6  Length: 9.2

Restoration Work: No


Description: Diamond shaped tile with evidence for mortar on all sides.

Fabric: Yellowish exposed ceramic with deep reddish brown fabric below exterior and interior is a deep brown. Red, black, and yellowish grit. Mortar contains frequent black pebbles that look like volcanic rock. Some red inclusions as well roughly 1-2mm in diameter. Rough fabric on upper portion of tiles.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14649h/20643
Object Name (MPM): Ceramic tile
Object Class: Architectural Elements

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.1  W.: 6.1  Length: 9.1

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 7.5 YR 4/1 dark grey

Description: Darker diamond shaped tile that looks like stone. Mortar still attached to some of it.

Fabric: Inclusions are difficult to identify because of the lack of color and no clean breakages. Some hint of black and red grit.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N14649i/20643
Object Name (MPM): Ceramic tile
Object Class: Architectural Elements

Measurements (cm.):
H.: W.: Length:

Munsell color: 10YR 6/3 pale brown

Description: Lighter colored diamond shaped tile.

Fabric: Large dark inclusions in lower left part of the tile. Exfoliated area exposes streaks of red ceramic like material along with black and red grit inclusions. Mortar seems a little finer than the other examples.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14650/20651
Object Name (MPM): Tiles
Object Class: Architectural Elements

Measurements (cm.): N/A

Additional Notes: Not Found. Diamond shaped tiles
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16160a/21500
Object Name (MPM): Architectural element
Object Class: Architectural Element
Measurements (cm.): H.: 7.9 W.: 8.7 Length: 6.3
Restoration Work: No
Description: Reddish stone in a pyramidal shape. Granite? Clearly worked though it is broken. It could have been part of a cornice.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16160b/21500
Object Name (MPM): Architectural element
Object Class: Architectural Element
Measurements (cm.): H.: 6.9 Dia. 5.3
Restoration Work: No
Description: Whitish pink limestone, spherical shape. It looks almost ceramic, frequent fine vacuoles. CBM? It is a worked with two sets of raised grooves that is cut in the middle with one single groove. Former barrel of column? No signs of mortar.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16160c/21500
Object Name (MPM): Architectural element
Object Class: Architectural Element
Measurements (cm.): H.: 5.1 W.: 2.5 Length: 3.4
Restoration Work: No
Description: Green marble or granite with black streaks. Clearly worked as two sides are flat, the rest is irregular. No signs of mortar.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16161a/21500  
Object Name (MPM): Architectural element  
Object Class: Architectural Element  

Measurements (cm.):  
H.: 8.4 W.: 6.4 Length: 1.8  

Restoration Work: No  

Description: Diamond shape evidence of being set in ground on underside. Looks cut on sides, broken on bottom. Single red line running through it. It looks painted but is apparent around the whole object. Evidence of mortar.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16161b/21500  
Object Name (MPM): Architectural element  
Object Class: Architectural Element  

Measurements (cm.):  
H.: 6.7 W.: 4.3 Length: 0.8  

Restoration Work: No  

Description: Diamond shaped. Clearly cut on one edge, but the rest looks damaged. Unsure of type of stone. Greenish color. Possible evidence of mortar on flat edge.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16161c/21500  
Object Name (MPM): Architectural element  
Object Class: Architectural Element  

Measurements (cm.):  
H.: 12.8 W.: 9.6 Length: 4.7  

Restoration Work: No  

Description: Basalt rock, some evidence of working but not fine. Evidence of mortar on bottom of the object. Stone for the floor or a wall?
Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N16162a/21500 Marble Fragment Architectural Element

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 6.4 W.: 4.0 Length: 1.3

Description: Black stone, worked and fragmented, two sides flat with possible third. Nothing remarkable.

Additional Notes: Not sure if this is marble.

Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N16162b/21500 Marble Fragment Architectural Element

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 6.5 W.: 6.5 Length: 1.7

Description: White stone, worked and fragmented, two sides flat, otherwise broken. Nothing remarkable.

Additional Notes: Not sure if this is marble.

Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N16162c/21500 Marble Fragment Architectural Element

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 14.6 W.: 7.8 Length: 1.8

Description: Red marble with purple veins. 1 side clearly roughened to be set into wall while the other side is smoothed. Fragment, two sides flat.

Additional Notes: Could be from anywhere. Tomb (loculus) dressing, wall, floor, eventually broken apart and re-used which is so often the case.
APPENDIX D: CERAMICS - OPEN FORMS

BEAKERS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N15302/21012
Object Name (MPM): Beaker
Object Class: Beaker

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 12.5 W.: 8.8 (W. with handles: 13.8) Dia. Rim: 8.7 Dia. Base: 6.1 Th. Wall: 0.3 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3 Depth: 12.2

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 2.5YR 4/1 (dark reddish grey) darkest part of the slip. The rest of the vessel varies between 2.5YR 6/6 (light red) to 5/6 (red)

Description: Some white accretions. Large darkened splotches of clay from firing. Inside lower third of vessel is more exfoliated than the rest. Probably contained something for some period of type. Possible evidence of slip, but unclear. Infrequent voids.


Sagona Type: None.

Additional Notes:
This is not a form that is well known in Malta.

N15302/21012
## BOWLS/LIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14651/20651</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.**: 4.5
- **W.**: 9.9
- **Dia. Base**: 5.6
- **Th. Wall**: 0.5
- **Th. Rim/Lip**: 0.5

**Restoration Work**: Yes

**Munsell color**: 2.5YR 5/6 red.

**Description**: Wheel made assymetrical footed bowl with inward curving rim. Striations visible on the exterior of cup/bowl. Presence of dirt on upper inner walls. Evidence of white accretions on bottom, foot, exteriors and inner wall. Exfoliations of lower interior walls as well. Looks like it was covered with a thin slip that is coming off in places. Cracks along two sides of wall have been refurbished using what seems to be a similar material as we have seen elsewhere. Neither of the two cracks run entirely down the vessel, however, is this a post-deposital process or two cracks from firing which made the vessel only suitable for a "non-functioning" item such as a grave good.

**Fabric**: Very fine fabric with few voids. Some of the voids hint at organic inclusions. Five bubbly orange accretions on the exterior of the vessel.

**Sagona Type**: Local Red Ware (?). Form most similar to IV: 3b, but lacking central nipple below base and rim is overly inverted.

**Additional Notes**: Accretions similar to those on black slip vessels? Classic Hellenistic Black-slip Form.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N15303/21010

Object Name (MPM): Patina

Object Class: Bowl

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 4.5 Dia. Rim: 16.0 Dia. Base: 4.3 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.6 Depth: 4.0

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: 10R 4/6 red

Description: Wheel made footed bowl with dark red slip. Reminiscent of Arretine ware but not as fine. Some accretions on the interior of the vessel. Slip exfoliated in the inner portion of the vessel except in central depression. Clear effort to restore some issue on the interior of the vessel. Evidence for restoration (two parts put together on the outside as well) Short relatively flat base. Seems unslipped/poorly slipped. Certain parts of exterior are also missing slip.

Fabric: Light orangish tan fabric with many miniscule black, red, grey, white, and brown grit inclusions. Shiny black grit is the most frequent inclusion. Very few voids visible through the slip.

Sagona Type: Local Red Ware
Catalogue/Accession Number: N15304/21009
Object Name (MPM): Bowl
Object Class: Bowl, Miniature

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 4.4 W.: 7.2 Dia. Rim: 6.9 Dia. Base: 4.0 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.2 Depth: 3.0

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow

Description: Wheel made miniature footed bowl with no slip. Accretions white, especially towards the bottom.

Fabric: Orange/dark orange fine clay with frequent small voids. Abundant calcite inclusions. Frequent black and red grit. One really large fragment of calcite 2.5mm2. Brown and red accretions also. No evidence of slip. Very rare miniscule micaceous shines.

Sagona Type: N/A
Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N16083a/21500 Bowl Bowl, Lid

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 4.3 Dia. Rim: 12.8 Dia. Base: 4.2 Th. Rim/Lip: 1.0 Depth: 3.1

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Inner Slip: 2.5Y 8/3 – 7/3 pale yellow

Description: Wheel thrown footed bowl. Everted rim. Seemingly thick brown slip. Perhaps due to accretions. Associated with cinerary urn N16083b. The interior of the vessel has dark brown splotches on the pale cream fabric. Part of the slip? Exterior of the vessel has been exfoliated enough in parts to see the fabric underneath.

Fabric: Underneath the slip, very frequent very fine black and infrequent red, brown, and grey grit. Infrequent voids. Some limestone/calcite. Some larger voids show grey grit.

Sagona Type: Bowl form V: 2.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16085/21500
Object Name (MPM): Palnia
Object Class: Bowl, Miniature

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.1 – 3.6 Dia. Rim: 9.2 Dia. Base: 4.1 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.4 Depth: 2.2

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 2.5Yr 5/8 red


Fabric: Dark orange, fairly fine clay. Very frequent grit inclusions, including black, red, and brown/grey grit.. Fairly frequent voids on exterior, fewer on interior. Slightly more exfoliated on interior. Some micaceous shine.

Sagona Type: Bowl form VI: 5d. Local Red Ware.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16092/21500
Object Name (MPM): Phiala
Object Class: Bowl

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 4.0 – 4.9 Dia. Rim: 17.0 Dia. Base: 4.3 Depth: 3.7

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 2.5YR 6/4 light reddish brow – 7.5YR 7/4 pink.

Description: Wheel made but very lopsided. Some striations in the interior, unclear whether decorative or not. Various colors from pinkish orange to yellowish to darker orangish brown color. Varies from one side to the other and it changes shade relatively gradually. Seems like some liquid or other evaporated in the middle. Exterior color is more uniform. Orangish-yellowish. Hole in the base.


Sagona Type:

Additional Notes: Hole in base may have made it a candidate for funerary use. Similar fabric to N16084.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16093/21500
Object Name (MPM): Pahria
Object Class: Bowl

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 4.4  W.: 13.2  Dia. Rim: 13.2  Dia. Base: 5.5  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.5  Depth: 3.3

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: 5YR 6/8 reddish yellow

Description: Wheel made footed bowl form with everted rim. 1/3 of vessel is restored. Fairly exfoliated all over the vessel. Exterior of vessel especially has thin layer of accretions.

Fabric: One large 3mm2 void on the interior bottom. Infrequent smaller voids. Inclusions of read and black grit <1mm2 frequent. Some large 2mm2 black grit inclusions visible in interior. Otherwise a very refined clay. Some evidence of bubbles in the interior from firing(?), perhaps due to use wear. Also miniscule inclusions of calcite or white stone only visible at x20 magnification.

Sagona Type: Bowl form V: 2a. Local Red Ware.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16121/21501
Object Name (MPM): Patera
Object Class: Bowl

Measurements (cm.):
- H.: 3.9
- W.: 14.6
- Dia. Rim: 13.7-14.3
- Dia. Base: 4.5
- Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Inner Fabric: 5YR 6/8 reddish yellow
Slip: 10R 4/6 red

Description: Slow wheel thrown. Copious accretions on the bottom and some inside.

Fabric: Copious amount of shiny black grit with less frequent red grit and some micaceous inclusions. Black grit inclusions are more apparent on the light orange color underneath the darker pinkish red. The reddish slip covers up the grit, especially on the exterior of the vessel. Frequent small voids. Evidence of spalling on the interior of the vessel.

Sagona Type: Similar to forms I: 4b and II: 2.

Additional Notes: Similar fabric to N16084.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16123/21501
Object Name (MPM): Bowl
Object Class: Bowl, Miniature

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 4.0  W.: 7.6  Dia. Rim: 7.6  Dia. Base: 4.3  Th. Wall: 0.3  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3  Depth: 3.4

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 5/6 yellowish red  Slip: 5YR 4/6 yellowish red

Description: Wheel thrown miniature bowl. Very exfoliated. Half of the vessel is restored with brown/tan clay. Interior of the bowl is exfoliated and flaky (perhaps due to containing liquids for an extended period. Exterior of bowl has a red slip, dark, reddish/orange. Peeling and flaking. Rim of base is particularly exfoliated.

Fabric: Fine orangeish clay with red, black, white and brown grit. Also micaceous particles. Infrequent 1mm voids on exterior of vessel that show through red slip.

Sagona Type: N/A. Local Red Ware
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16124/21501
Object Name (MPM): Bowl
Object Class: Bowl, Miniature

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.1 W.: 4.7 Dia. Rim: 4.7 Dia. Base: 2.6 Th. Wall: 0.2 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.2 Depth: 2.8

Restoration Work: Yes


Description: Miniature wheel thrown bowl with clear restoration work. Missing rim of the vessel was extrapolated from preserved portion of the rim. The surviving portion of the rim seems to have been cut flat. The inside is clearly exfoliated.

Fabric: Light to medium brown fabric with frequent miniscule inclusions of black grit and micaceous materials. Clay is faintly shiny. Infrequent voids and calcite inclusions. Inner exfoliated fabric is much darker brown but reveals some black grit and micaceous shine. Some straigation marks from tool(?).

Sagona Type: N/A. Soft Orange Ware (?).

Additional Notes: Similar fabric to N16126.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16135/21501
Object Name (MPM): Patina
Object Class: Bowl

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 5.3 Dia. Rim: 10.8 Dia. Base: 4.4 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.5 Depth: 4.5
Restoration Work: Yes
Munsell color: Fabric: 5Yr 7/6 reddish yellow. Slip: 10R 4/6 red

Description: Slow wheel thrown red slipped bowl form. Flat lip with three grooves about 1mm wide spaced about 1mm apart. Outer slip is a deep red where the vessel is cleanest. Inner portion of the vessel seems to have a slightly lighter and more eroded surface, indicating some use. Only two thirds of the vessel is original. The rest is restored with a brown and tan clay-like substance found on other vessels. Inner part of bowl shows wear in the form of scratches/use.

Fabric: Inner part of vessel where slip is eroded shows light orange paste, very fine clay, with frequent miniscule black grit. Some brown grit. Black grit shines under direct light, also some micaceous shine. Semi-frequent voids popping out of slip on exterior of vessel, other inclusions of black grit.

Sagona Type: Local Red Ware
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16155/21501  Object Name (MPM): Dish  Object Class: Bowl

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.8-4.8  Dia. Rim: 16.0  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.5  Depth: 4.0

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 5YR 7/6 reddish yellow

Description: Wheel thrown bowl with no base. Used as lid? Very eroded interior wall, with slightly less eroded exterior walls. Cracking exterior walls. Shows evidence of multiple rings of red paint. At least three are apparent to the eye. One along the base, one about half way down the vessel before the change in egree, and =1.5cm below the change of the slope. Possible stripe above the change in slope. A lot of wear and tear on the inside and the outside of the vessel. Some restorative work reattaching four shard from a rim. Thick brown accretions on one side of the vessel. The other side is scratched as if there was an effort to remove it.

Fabric: Clay currently friable. Red and yellowish grit inclusions but mostly calcite. More than other vessels.

Sagona Type: Most similar to Form II: 2 or III: 1.

Additional Notes: Very similar fabric to N16187.
Catalogue/Accession Number:     Object Name (MPM):     Object Class:
N16187/21513                   Diskos                  Bowl

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 4.2 Dia. Rim: 15.3 Dia. Base: .6 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.6 Depth: 3.3

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 6/6 light red Slip: 7.5YR 8/3 pink

Description: Slightly asymmetrical wheel thrown bowl with red painted swirl decorations on both the exterior and interior. Creamy pinkish slip, peeling. Semi-flat base with no foot. Decoration begins on the rim of the vessel and swirls along the sides until it reaches the base, probably applied on the wheel.

Fabric: Fairly frequent voids on the surface with white inclusions, some red grit. Frequent miniscule black grit.

Sagona Type: Bowl Form II: 2.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16189/21513  
Object Name (MPM): Diskos  
Object Class: Bowl  

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.9  Dia. Rim: 17.5  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3  

Restoration Work: Yes  
Munsell color: 2.5YR 4/6 red  

Description: Wheel thrown asymmetrical shallow bowl with an unfeatured, thin rim and no base. Red inside lighter colors on the exterior due to wear/accretions. Some evidence of red stripes painted onto the vessel but inconclusive. Part of rim is repaired with plastic material (distinct from other restoration work).

Fabric: Fine clay with dark gritty inclusions and infrequent voids. Generally larger (basalt?) grit than seen elsewhere. Sometimes it bulges out of the vessel. Some micaceous shine from inclusions. Without breakages, it is difficult to analyze the inclusions. Red interior with lighter color on the exterior due to wear/accretions.

Sagona Type: Bowl Form II: 2 or III: 1, difficult to tell without decorations.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16190/21513
Object Name (MPM): Bowl
Object Class: Bowl, Miniature

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 5.7 Dia. Rim: 10.5 Dia. Base: 5.7 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3 Depth: 5.4

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 7/6 reddish yellow Slip: 7.5YR 8/4 pink.

Description: Wheel made thin walled miniature bowl with flat base. Interior of vessel has most visible inclusions on lower portion. Exterior of vessel has most visible inclusions on upper port of vessel.

Fabric: Light orange very fine clay paste with very frequent inclusions of very fine black and red grit. Frequent voids, some still containing calcite. Cream wash slip. Interior of vessel has brown substance adhering to the walls. Voids semi-frequent, very light weight, very similar type of fabric to others with abundance of black grit.

Sagona Type: No similar form in Sagona 2002. Crisp Ware.
COOKING VESSEL

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16108/21500
Object Name (MPM): Caccabus
Object Class: Cooking Vessel

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 18 Dia. Rim: 20.5 Dia. Base: 10.5 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.9

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected.

Description:
Fabric: Thick white slip apparent underneath lip. Fine clay with few inclusions.

Sagona Type: Most similar to Cooking Pot Form VI: 1, however, examples do not usually have a ridge on the rim to accommodate a lid.

Additional Notes: Cooking pots are very rare in tomb contexts.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16158/21501
Object Name (MPM): Chytros
Object Class: Cooking Vessel

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 10.5 Dia. Rim: 31.5 Dia. Base: 9.0 Th. Rim/Lip: 1.4

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected.

Description: Not examined.

Fabric: Not collected.

Sagona Type:

Additional Notes: Asymmetrical
KYLIKES

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14632/20643
Object Name (MPM): Kylix
Object Class: Kylix

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 4.3  Dia. Rim: 15.6  Dia. Base: 7.0  Th. Wall: 0.8  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.5  Handle: 1.1 x 1.2  Depth: 3.7

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected

Description: Wheel made footed kylix with very broad, shallow bowl and thick horizontal loop handles. Very well preserved. Accretions range from white to a sulfur color. Decoration consists of thin (c. 1mm) red bands on the interior and exterior of the vessel’s bowl. Four thin red paint bands on inner wall, then below 15mm blank, then evidence of 7 red lines, then 15mm below evidence of another red line further down bowl 15mm down. Exterior decoration consists of three red bands, alternating circa 1mm the red band. Red band where foot becomes bowl. One red band lining inner part of foot and at least one red band or "eye".

Fabric: Frequent miniscule red grit and micaceous inclusions. Other orangish brown sand/stains apparent. Even the creamy slip has frequent miniscule voids, as does the clay paste. Some darker grit. Clay is fairly well refined with frequent miniscule inclusions. Notable lack of black inclusions.

Sagona Type: Kylix Form III-IV: 1 or IV: 2. Thick Crisp Ware.

Additional Notes: Similar example in St. Agatha’s Museum.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N14640/20651
Object Name (MPM): Kylix
Object Class: Kylix

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.2 Dia. Rim: 11.5 Dia. Base: 4.0 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3 Handle: 0.7 Depth: 2.7

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Interior Fabric 2.5YR 6/8 light red Slip: 7.5YR 8/3 pink

Description: Kylix with offser flaring rim. Two asymmetrical loop handles, the lower handle is a restoration.

Fabric: Very friable creamy light orange slip. Clay is darker where it is exfoliated. Parts of vessel are more porous than others, perhaps where creamy orange slip has been removed. Small voids on vessel with larger voids on base. very frequent grit, some 1-2.5mm2, on the body and lower part of the vessel. Very frequent small black and red grit inclusions and calcite.

Sagona Type: Kylix Form II: 1. Thick Crisp Ware.

Additional Notes: Small tag with the number “42” written on it attached to handle.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N22029/23648
Object Name (MPM): Kylix
Object Class: Kylix

Measurements (cm.):

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Not collected.

Description: Kylix with offset flaring rim over shallow bowl and flat foot and depression. Two horizontal loop handles with a slight upswing. Evidence of red paint decoration on both the interior and exterior of the vessel.

Fabric: Friable creamy light orange slip, better preserved than N14640. Parts of vessel are more porous than others, perhaps where creamy orange slip has been removed. Small voids on vessel with larger voids on base. Very frequent grit, some 1-2.5mm², on the body and lower part of the vessel. Very frequent small black and red grit inclusions and calcite.

Sagona Type: Kylix Form II: 1. Thick Crisp Ware.
PLATES/LIDS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14631/20643
Object Name (MPM): Phiala
Object Class: Plate

Measurements (cm.):

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color:
Fabric: 5YR 6/4 light reddish brown
Slip: 7.5YR 7/2 pinkish grey
Paint: 5R 4/4 weak red

Description: Wheel made footed plate with broad everted rim. Classic “phiala” or “fish-plate” shape. Concentric red painted rings on slip. Some accretions apparent. Black, red, brown, and grey grit inclusions. Red gritty inclusions less common. One red grit particle is 2.6mm long. Inclusions only apparent in areas that is eroded. Exfoliated chunks in the inner

Fabric: Creamy pinkish outer color. Light reddish brown also color of outer fabric that is not white or slipped

Sagona Type: Plate Form III: 2, III-IV: 2a, or IV: 1. Thick-Slipped Crisp Ware.

Additional Notes: Plate with red concentric circles painted, exfoliated in places.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16111/21500
Object Name (MPM): Phiala
Object Class: Plate

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.7 Dia. Rim: 16.9 Dia. Base: 4.7 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.7

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Exfoliated fabric: 5YR 7/6 reddish yellow Outer Fabric: 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow

Description: Wheel made footed plate dish. Heavy accretions. Clear evidence of white slip below accretions. Interior and exterior walls of dish are mostly covered in pinkish-brown-white accretions(?). Evidence of breakage in three areas with evidence of some glue on two of these areas. Part of the eroding exterior wall looks like it is actually a thick slip that is flaking off. Differentially fired clay?

Fabric: Gritty friable fabric with no predominant colors or size of grit. Inner fabric seems to have fewer but larger pieces of calcite while the exterior fabric has much more frequent but smaller bits of calcite. Few very small voids.

Sagona Type:

Additional Notes: Asymmetrical
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16117/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lid
Object Class: Plate, Lid

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.4-1.5 W.: 9.3-9.5 Dia. Rim: Dia. Base: 5.0 Th.
Rim/Lip: 0.6-0.7

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: 5YR 7/4 pink

Description: Wheel thrown miniature plate with small central depression in base. Base is not smoothed. Exact form of other associated plates in the collection (e.g. N16130a). Heavy accretions on the bottom of the vessel. Similar accretions to those found on N16094 (unguentarium).

Fabric: Fine clay fabric of pinkish-orange color. Frequent very fine red grit. Fewer very fine black grit. Some micaceous particles. Crushed shell? This clay seems to be particularly fine clay compared to other vessels. Very few voids.

Sagona Type: N/A

Additional Notes: The accretions at the bottom suggest that the vessel was placed or fell on the ground and left there.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16130a/21501
Object Name (MPM): Dish
Object Class: Plate, Lid

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.7 Dia. Rim: 9.2 Dia. Base: 4.0

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: From 10YR 6/1 grey to 10YR 8/3 very pale brown.

Description: Small plate form, served as the lid for N16130b. Few accretions.


Sagona Type: N/A
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16133a/21501
Object Name (MPM): Dish
Object Class: Plate

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.9 Dia. Rim: 15.2 Dia. Base: 5.6 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.6

Restoration Work: No


Description: Slightly asymmetrical wheel thrown dish with two holes bored through it. The holes are symmetrical but not placed centrally, i.e., not aligned with the center of gravity. The holes on the upper part of the vessel are smooth whereas the edges on the lower (underneath) portion are exfoliated (perhaps due to boring direction or use wear from string).

Fabric: Orangish clay, unslipped with a few voids. Also shows signs of ballooning in at least two places, up to four. S-shaped cracked on the foot/base. More noticable voids on the exterior of the vessel. Inclusions not visible.

Sagona Type: Unknown.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16138/21501
Object Name (MPM): Phiale
Object Class: Plate, Lid

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.4 - 3.8  
Length: Dia. Rim: 15-16  
Dia. Base: 5.7  
Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Inner fabric: from 10YR 7/3 very pale brown

Description: Wheel made asymmetrical bowl with everted rim and incorporated foot. Two different colors of accretions. One side of the vessel droops downward. Small straiaition 1.8mm thick on the inner part of the vessel with a 6.8cm diameter. There is a cut or abrasion at the base of the vessel, probably caused during separation of the vessel from the wheel.

Fabric: Cream colored fabric with some voids and red and black grit.

Sagona Type: Most similar to Bowl Form: IV: 1.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16195a/21513
Object Name (MPM): Stamnos lid
Object Class: Plate, Lid

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.5-2.8 Dia. Rim: 14.8 Dia. Base: 5.0 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.6 Depth: 1.8

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected.

Description: Wheel thrown plate form with flat, broad, reentrant rim and shallow inner depression. There may have been decoration on the vessel as evidenced by the lighter swirls within the bowl of the dish. If it was red paint and left in the sun for a long time it might have baked off leaving differential markings. Discoloration on top of rim, possibly due to weathering.

Fabric: Outer clay is a creamy color with some white accretions. Breakage on the end of the vessel exposes a range of dark to light brown and grey color of the clay. Very frequent miniscule (< 1mm) white inclusions. Infrequent red grit.

Sagona Type: Probably Plate Form I: 3a due to form and fabric.
SKYPHOS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14641/20651

Object Name (MPM): Skyphos

Object Class: Skyphos, Black Slip

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 8.0 W.: 13.8 Dia. Rim: 8.9 Dia. Base: 4.7 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3 Handle: 0/7x0.9 Depth: 7.7

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Not collected.

Description: Black slipped curvaceous body with slightly everted flaring lip and two horizontal loop handles. Ring foot. There is a small eye at the bottom of the vessel. Inner portion of the lip and edges of foot are eroded. The foot and one of the loop handles has been restored with a brown clay-like substance that has been painted black. About one third of the foot seems to have been reconstructed like this. The loop handle was broken into multiple pieces, reattached, and gaps were filled in.

Fabric: The fabric is very fine with lots of fine mica. Underneath the slip, the clay is a burnished orange but also brown and grey in some places. Underneath the burnished orange color there is a grey-brown clay paste. The vessel has some orange accretions very similar to the color of the orange clay. Some cracks in the slip may also point to issues with firing. Slip is thickly applied on wheel on the first third of the vessel, then become less thick and may be the reason for the loss. Also fragments of tiny white inclusions in the exposed grey portion of the clay.
SPINNING BOWL

Catalogue/Accession Number:  N16109/21500
Object Name (MPM):  Weight
Object Class:  Spinning bowl

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 5.2  W.: 20  Dia. Rim: 20  Dia. Base: 11.8  Th. Wall: 0.6  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.6  Handle: 1.2x1.8

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 10YR 7/4 very pale brown - 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow

Description: Wheel thrown asymmetrical (slow wheel?) "plate" form with central loop handle and two symmetrical holes bored from the interior towards the exterior in the base of the vessel flanking the handle. Originally thought to be used with scales, most likely a spinning bowl.

Fabric: Fabric ranges in coloration from very pale brown to reddish yellow with semi-frequent voids. Clear calcite inclusions. Hard to see other inclusions as there are no breaks in the fabric. Some evidence of grit.

Sagona Type: Crisp Ware.
STRAINER

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16089/21500
Object Name (MPM): Strainer
Object Class: Strainer

Measurements (cm.): Not collected.

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected.

Description: Large strainer, shaped like a cooking vessel but with many small holes pierced into the bottom. Pierced from the exterior towards the interior.


Sagona Type: Crisp Ware.

Additional Notes:
UNNATRIBUTED SHERDS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16163b/21500
Object Name (MPM): Sherd
Object Class: Unknown Sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 5.4 W.: 4.3 Th. Wall: 0.6-0.9 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.4

Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 6/4 light reddish brown

Description: Rim sherd. The preserved rim is too small to determine rim Dia. and it is difficult to ascertain the orientation as well. Probable import.

Fabric: Orangeish brown clay, unslipped, with thick white accretions on a portion of the sherd. Extremely fine clay. Grit only visible at x10 magnification. Some oblong voids parallel with walls of sherd and some micaceous shine.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16164b/21500
Object Name (MPM): Sherd
Object Class: Unknown Sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.4 W.: 2.8 Length: 0.4

Munsell color: 10R 7/3 very pale brown

Description: Body sherd.

Fabric: Very fine clay with fine inclusions and voids, almost invisible to the naked eye. Reddish brown interior fabric with lighter more yellow exterior fabric and orange accretions.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16164c/21500
Object Name (MPM): Sherd
Object Class: Unknown Sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.1 W.: 1.8 Length: 0.2

Munsell color: 7.5YR 7/4 pink

Description: Brown body sherd with exfoliated interior and exterior walls.

Fabric: No relevant data collected.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16164d/21500
Object Name (MPM): Sherd
Object Class: Unknown Sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.9 W.: 2.2 Length: 1.8

Munsell color: 10YR 8/2 very pale brown

Description: Body sherd. Probably a flat vessel. Dark brown/black slip on "top" of the sherd.

Fabric: Greyish brown slip similar to Hellentistic plate forms and the creamy/grey fabrics of Sicily. Breakages are too dirty to get a good view of the clay, though it seems like a fine clay.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16164e/21500
Object Name (MPM): Sherd
Object Class: Unknown Sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.3 W.: 3.4 Length: 0.5

Munsell color: Exterior fabric: 5YR 6/4 light reddish brown
Interior fabric: 5YR 5/3 reddish brown

Description: Body sherd. Too small to determine form.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16166/21500  
Object Name (MPM): Rim Sherd  
Object Class: Unknown Sherd

Measurements (cm.):  
H.: 2.5  W.: 6.8

Munsell color: Exterior fabric: 2.5Y 8/2 pale yellow  
Interior fabric: 7.5YR 7/4 pink  
Slip: 2.5Y 8/2 pale yellow

Description: Rim sherd. Coarse ware.  

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16167/21500  
Object Name (MPM): Rim Sherd  
Object Class: Unknown Sherd

Measurements (cm.):  
H.: 2.0  W.: 6.4  Length: 1.3 (thickness of base)

Munsell color: Fabric: 10YR 7/3 very pale brown  
Slip: 2.5Y 7/4 pale yellow

Description: Base sherd. White slipped. Coarse ware.  
APPENDIX E: CERAMICS - CLOSED FORMS

AMPHORAE

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16087/21500
Object Name (MPM): Guttos
Object Class: Amphora, Stopper

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 11.6   W.: 7.2   Th. Wall: 0.5

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 10YR 7/2 light grey.

Description: Globular body, wheel thrown, seems to have been attached to mortar on the top. Wheel lines visible in the interior.

Fabric: Very fine grey clay with few minuscule gritty inclusions. Crisp Ware (?)

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16163a/21500
Object Name (MPM): Sherd
Object Class: Amphora sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 5.0   W.: 4.8   Length: 0.6-1.3

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Outer fabric: 7.5YR 6/6 Inner Fabric: 7.5YR 5/2 brown

Description: Body sherd. Shoulder or neck of amphora or large jar.

Fabric: Fine clay. Small voids on exterior wall, some on breakage with larger voids of a diameter of 2.5-3mm. Orangeish brown exterior with a dark brown or grey interior. Some red and white gritty inclusions visible. White-yellowish encrustations present very similar to N16163B. Straitions from wheel throwing visible on the interior.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16165/21500
Object Name (MPM): Handle
Object Class: Amphora sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 14.8 W.: 4.9 Length: 2.7

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Interior of vessel: 5YR 6/6 Exterior of vessel: 10YR 8/2 very pale brown Fabric: 7.5Yr 6/4 light brown

Description: Thick amphora for storage/transport. Double strap handle, pointed at top. Seems to have been washed or covered with white material. Might be accretions inside of vessel is an orangeish brown. Some breakage is still dirty while some are clean, which means it was broken shortly before collection or recently after.

Fabric: The fabric is very gritty mixture of very fine grit. There is no "black sand" or red angular gritty inclusions so typical in much of the collection.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16168/21500
Object Name (MPM): Sherd
Object Class: Amphora sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 7.8 W.: 10.0 Length: 0.6-0.8

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow - 7.5YR 6/2 light brown Exterior of sherd: White

Description: Amphora body sherd. Covered in dirt and accretions. Outside and in there are a few clean breaks (meaning that they happened since it was recovered, especially considering that other breaks had accretions on them). From the neck or body of an amphora.

Fabric: Brownish red inner fabric that darkens as it approaches the interior of the vessel. Many miniscule voids apparent at x10 magnification with a few much larger. Organic inclusions? Circular and linear. No visible grit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16169/21500</td>
<td>Handle</td>
<td>Amphora sherd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):** Not collected.

**Munsell color:** 10YR 7/4 pale yellow

**Description:** Handle of creamy clay.

**Fabric:** Red grit inclusions larger than other grit. Very small grit otherwise. Smooth. Breakages have very few and very fine inclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16188/21513</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- H.: 75cm
- W.: 17.3cm
- **Dia. Rim:** 15cm
- **Th. Rim/Lip:** 1.6cm
- **Handle:** 1.4cm x 2.4cm

**Restoration Work:** No

**Munsell color:**

**Description:** "Egyptian style" amphora. No visible decorations. Everted rim. Two vertical ear shaped loop handles. Possibly creamy slip, though it may be attributed to accretions. The bottom of the vessel has all sorts of white greyish accretions that are very similar to other vessels in the collections. It seems to made from a single piece as it is hollow all the way through the point. "small neck, expanded lip, two small strong lateral vertical ear shaped handles. Punic 5th to 4th century BC"

**Fabric:** Where visible, the outer layer of clay has a yellowish-creamy finish. Underneath is a pink clay which is most visible on the inner portion of the vessel and point at the bottom. Inclusions show red and grey girt under x10 magnification, as well as some limestone inclusions. Very similar to other pinkish gritty clays in the collection.

**Sagona Type:** Import.

**Additional Notes:** MPM Documentation.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16194/21513
Object Name (MPM): Lagena
Object Class: Amphora

Measurements (cm.): Not collected.
Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: Not collected.
Description: Handmade unslipped amphora/storage vessel with small hand molded and twisted vertical loop handles. Strange patterned accretions on the vessel.
Fabric: Unique in the collection.
Sagona Type: N/A
Additional Notes: Possibly medieval.
ARYBALLOS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14642/20651
Object Name (MPM): Aryballos
Object Class: Aryballos

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 7.9  W.: 8.9  Dia. Rim: 3.6  Dia. Base: 7.3  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.5  Depth: 7.8mm

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Not collected.

Description: Aryballos. Black slip throughout though unevenly fired. On portion of the body opposite the handle, there are brownish red patches where the slip seems to have not fully oxidized. Similar orangeish accretions along the lower portion of the vessel to those of the skyphos N14641. Evident also on the ridge of the body, as well as undeneath the lip and on the neck and inside of the neck. The original handle is missing and the handle visible is completely reconstructed from clay-like material and painted black with straitions made into the handle to provide texture. The bottom is completely missing and has been replaced with plywood or a similar material and painted black. Evidence on the base of decaying adhesive material. The vessel contains some dirt.

Fabric: Exposed clay underneath is dull reddish brown, similar to skyphos. Some miniscule calcareous inclusions and some mica, but no brown body paste as seen before.

Sagona Type: Attic Import
EWER

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16131/21501
Object Name (MPM): Ewer
Object Class: Ewer

Measurements (cm.): H.: 20 W.: 8 Length: 25

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected.

Description: Mold made ewer in the form of a ram. No evidence of a seam, smoothed out. One side of the vessel is much better defined than the other, perhaps due to manufacturing defects or exfoliation. One side show inner paste a dark grey color while outer paste is lighter brown. Parst still show evidence of a thick slip, red-brown. Though described as a lamb in the documentation, dearly there are two horns. Circular eyes, two deep grooves, horizontal. The mouth forms a spout and is circular. Ram seems to be standing on a pedestal of some sort as the legs are depicted only so far, and below is a groove and then a blank field. The fill hole on the top of the object is asymmetrical. On the rump of the ram, just below the textured loop/strap handle is marked an X. This was clearly made before firing, as intersecting hatch mark raises one side on the cors and is fired hard. Could this be a maker’s mark? The lamp warmer has a cross shaped t symbol. Or could it be a mark to mean it is sub par (poor definition in one side of mold?), but then why would it be fired at all? There seems to be a trend that sub-par items and wasters were often used in burial contexts. The handle is textured, ribbed vertically.


Sagona Type: N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14633/20643</td>
<td>Olpe</td>
<td>Flask</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.**: 12.9 (with restored rim) **W.**: 9.0 **Dia. Base**: 4.3 **Handle**: 0.7x0.8

**Restoration Work**: Yes

**Munsell color**: 2.5YR 6/8 light red

**Description**: Globular vessel with cylindrical neck ridged/grooved flat strap handle. Straits visible on globular body, wheel made. Short foot, strap handle somewhat askew. Upper portion of the vessel has been restored with clay, different than some of the other restorants. The MPM documentation describes it as missing its lip missing.

**Fabric**: Very gritty, mostly black sand. Bright orange color, perhaps once coated by a slip which is a creamy yellow color poured on the top part of the handle. Semi-frequent voids, usually calcite of some sort within. Red and other colored gritty inclusions. This is a similar fabric to many other vessels in the collection.

**Sagona Type**: Flask Form IV: 1e. Crisp Ware?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14638/20651</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>Flask</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.**: 6.9 **W.**: 5.2 **Dia. Rim**: 2.2 **Dia. Base**: 3.1 **Th. Rim/Lip**: 0.4 **Handle**: 0.7 **Depth**: 6.2

**Restoration Work**: Yes

**Munsell color**: Exfoliation: 2.5YR 6/6 light red Slip: 2.5Y 8/2 pale yellow

**Description**: Partially restored juglet. Front is missing. Probably a trefoil but impossible to tell. Reconstructed 1/2 of vessel covered with slip ranging in color from tan to cream to pink. This slip, almost chalky, is very soft. Other half is exfoliated, almost as i

**Fabric**: Dark red grit ~1mm². Evidence of limestone inclusions. Fairly frequent small <1mm voids speck the slipped surface. Some red grit inclusions as well. When x20 can see black drit. Fine clay.

**Sagona Type**: Unknown.
Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N16100/21500 Olpe Flask

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 14.2 W.: 11.4 Dia. Rim: 3.4 Dia. Base: 5.4 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.6 Handle: 0.9x1.1 Depth: 13.3

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected.

Description: Slightly asymmetrical wheel thrown flask with attached strap handle.

Fabric: Frequent miniscule voids with frequent red and black grit. Some micaceous shine in the fabric.

Sagona Type: V: 1b (?)

Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N16132/21501 Olpe Flask

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 16.7 W.: 11.5 Dia. Rim: 4.2 Dia. Base: 6.1 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.8 Handle: 0.8x1.1

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow – 10YR 8/2 very pale brown.

Description: Juglet with everted flat rim. Vertical strap handle with double grooves wide. Lots of thick white accretions especially around handle of jug. Thick slip. Hole poked into lower body ab anqituo as accretions cover it. Faint groove at 2.5cm from rim that lines up with the handle. String cut from wheel. There is also a line of graphite. There is pencil writing on the bottom of vessel (N22039)(?).

Fabric: Pretty typical bright orangeish with frequent black sand inclusions and small limestone inclusions rare voids, some look like spalling.

Sagona Type: VI: 1a (?) Crisp Ware
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16134/21501
Object Name (MPM): Oinochoe
Object Class: Flask

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 13.3  W.: 5.9  Dia. Base: 4.1  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3  Handle: 1.1

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow – 10YR 8/2 very pale brown.

Description: Pinched trefoil juglet with superceding vertical loop handle. Slightly asymmetrical. Encrustations all over one side of vessel in particular, this can be found elsewhere. Brownish, light general color of fabric. One part looks both exfoliated and subjected to different firing conditions and is darker reddish brown.

Fabric: Exterior with no exfoliation shows relatively rough exterior with frequent voids and miniscule to ~1mm inclusions. Mostly calcite visible but also some micaceous shine. No indications of red or black grit.

Sagona Type: Flask Form IV: 1a (?)
JUGLETS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16084/21500

Object Name (MPM): Olpe

Object Class: Juglet

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 13.5  W.: 6.2  Dia. Base: 4.1  Th. Wall: 0.5  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.4  Depth: 13.1

Restoration Work: No


Description: Open form w/missing handle and back of rim. Lip seam degraded to the point that it is difficult to tell whether it is original rim or not.

Fabric: Orange fire clay with many inclusions. Fine brown slip?, accretions? Though it might be a slip of some sort as it can be found inside and outside the vessel, especially on the base. Seems to cover fairly evenly on the inside.

Sagona Type: Sagona Form IV-V: 1b

Additional Notes: Very similar fabric to N14633, N14646, N16090. These forms are known primarily from museum contexts.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16118/21501  
Object Name (MPM): Oinochoe  
Object Class: Juglet

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 13.4  W.: 6.4  Dia. Base: 4.4  Th. Wall: 0.4  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.6
Depth: 12.5

Restoration Work: No


Description: Asymmetrical juglet with flanged lip and upwards swelling neck. Repaired where broken around the neck. Handle missing. Dimensions and form are nearly identical to that of N16140. The paste seems to more orange and there are fewer encrustations, but otherwise identical. Creamy slip on top. Breakages are darker brown.

Fabric: Breakage is darker brown and also exhibits few gritty inclusions (rim). Breakage on handle is more demonstrative. The fabric below the cream slip shows abundant calcite and small voids with fewer red inclusions. Very few black sand inclusions if any.

Sagona Type: Juglet from V: 1b (?) Crisp Ware.

Additional Notes: Similar vessel in St. Agatha’s Museum.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16119/21501  
Object Name (MPM): Oinochoe  
Object Class: Juglet

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 9.2  W.: 5.0  Dia. Base: 3.5  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3  Depth: 8.8

Restoration Work: Yes


Description: Asymmetrical trefoil mouthed juglet with swelling neck. Partially restored at the top, one side of the trifoil decoration. Wheel made. All one piece, minus handle.

Fabric: Creamy fabric on the outside with very frequent black sand inclusions. Miniscule underneath the paste is a pinkish orange color. Frequent brown and red grit but black prevails. Seem to be more slipped towards the bottom as the inclusions are harder to see.

Sagona Type: Juglet Form II: 1.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16140/21501
Object Name (MPM): Oinochoe
Object Class: Juglet

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 13.2  W.: 6.3  Dia. Base: 4.2  Th. Wall: 0.3  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.4

Restoration Work: No


Description: Narrow necked trefoil juglet, broken where handle attaches to the neck. Nub of fired clay on the body shows where handle might have been attached. Nub of fired clay on the body shows where handle might have been attached. The clear break on the rim but the encrustations on the handle is a little strange, when the cover multiple points of breakage. Seems to have white encrustations, all over the body but less on the neck (Breakage on foot is also encrusted) Greenish color of the body except on one part at shoulder which is brownish.

Fabric: Paste is brown color with some very small voids. Very few visible grit inclusions Some calcite on outer surface are somewhat frequent voids on neck less visible on body, occasional evidence of gritty inclusions?

Sagona Type: Juglet Form V: 1b. Crisp Ware.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14627/20643</td>
<td>Ampulla</td>
<td>Jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements (cm.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.: 22 W.: 15 Dia. Rim: 3.5 Dia. Base: 13.5 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration Work: No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munsell color: Not collected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: Large asymmetrical handmade jug with flat base. No evidence of slip.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric: Large white inclusions and relatively frequent voids. Coarse clay with some white accretions. No slip. Rear of the vessel is much exfoliated and shows very gritty clay underneath with very frequent white, grey, and red grit, with what looks like shell as well. Very similar to the fabric of N14628.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagona Type: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Notes: Handmade. Possibly medieval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14639/20651</td>
<td>Calyx</td>
<td>(Krater?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements (cm.): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration Work: ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munsell color: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: “Black on red, hemispherical bowl w/2 horizontal loop handles.” Lower Film Storage (?).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Notes: Not found. MPM documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16082/21500
Object Name (MPM): Oinochoe
Object Class: Jug

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 33.5  W.: 22.5  Dia. Rim: roughly 13  Dia. Base: 13.2  Th. Rim/Lip: 1.2  Handle: 2.8 x 3.0

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: White

Description: Large white jug with trefoil rim.

Fabric: Covered with thick white accretions and slip. No evidence of inclusions.

Sagona Type:

---

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16088/21500
Object Name (MPM): Oinochoe
Object Class: Jug

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 15.2  W.: 11.0  Dia. Base: 5.6  Th. Wall: 0.4  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.4  Handle: 2.0x1.0  Depth: 14.2

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 2.5Y 8/3 pale yellow

Description: Globular pouring vessel, trefoil rim, with vertical strap handle over arching. Organic material inside, part of packing material sent from Malta. One chip on upper lip shows a reddish interior. Original color of vessel a pale yellow. Probably slipped based on the slightly different color.

Fabric: Very fine paste with evidence for calcite inclusions. Some large angular red grit inclusions. Where paste is visible, "black sand" is frequent. It is so fine that it is nearly indistinguishable from tiny voids to the naked eye. Extremely fine grit interspersed with larger red grit particles.

Sagona Type:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16192/21513</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>Jug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.:** 23
- **W.:** 13
- **Dia. Base:** 7
- **Dia. Rim:** ~7
- **Th. Rim/Lip:** 0.7
- **Handle:** 1.8x1.9
- **Depth:** 14.2

**Restoration Work:** No

**Munsell color:** Not collected.

**Sagona Type:** N/A

**Additional Notes:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16193/21513</td>
<td>Olpe</td>
<td>Jug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.:** 11.1 (14.0 w/handle)
- **W.:** Dia.
- **Dia. Rim:** ~4.8x4.3
- **Dia. Base:** 4.1
- **Th. Rim/Lip:** 0.4
- **Handle:** 0.8x1.4
- **Depth:** 10.5

**Restoration Work:** No

**Munsell color:** Not collected

**Description:** Pink-creamy white clay. Partly orange. Upswung handle. Neck pushed in where handle was attached.

**Fabric:** Common sort of fabric with fine clay and many extremely fine inclusions, especially black grit at x10 magnification. Not uniformly spread. White accretions inside.

**Sagona Type:** Jug form IV-V: 1b.

**Additional Notes:** There is no provenance info on this type but common in collections (Sagona 2002:131).
Catalogue/Accession Number: N22030/23648
Object Name (MPM): Funerary Urn
Object Class: Jug

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 12.2 (14.2 w/handle) W.: Dia. Rim: Dia. Base: 5.9 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.6 Handle: 1.1 x 1.9
Depth: 11.7

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Fabric: 10YR 8/3 pale yellow Slip: 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow – 2.5YR 6/6 light red

Description: Overarching vertical strap handle and everted rim. Green yellowish accretions on one side. Strange that this jug was labeled as a funerary urn by the MPM, as it does not conform to any known vessels used as funerary urns. Restored with hardened plaster like substance. Probably 4-5 separate sherds. Contains some dirt, three fragments of bone, a dustbunny, and something red. It looks like dried out rubber. [Removed contents and placed in baggy]

Fabric: No clear break to examine. Infrequent miniscule red grit. Infrequent small voids. Hard to detect but probably some calcite inclusions as well, otherwise very pure.

Sagona Type:

Additional Notes: From the Mr. and Mrs. Pick accession.
KRATER
Catalogue/Accession Number: Object Name (MPM): Object Class:
N14652/20651 Column Krater Krater

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 32.5 W.: 22.5 Dia. Rim: 15.5 Dia. Base: 13.5 Th. Rim/Lip: 1.8 Handle: 1.4

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: N/A

Description: Reproduction of a Black Figure Column Krater. Extensive restoration work.

Fabric: Fabric is not visible enough underneath the decoration and restoration work to be characterized.

Sagona Type: N/A. Import.

Additional Notes: Restoration work is extensive and in some cases masks the original vessel.
LAMP WARMER

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14628/20643
Object Name (MPM): Lamp warmer
Object Class: Lamp Warmer

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 10.7  Th. Wall: 1.3  Handle: 1.8  Depth: 10.2

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Not collected

Description: Handmade lamp warmer with thin flaring orifices at the front and top. Possible attempt to repair a crack near the handle. Exfoliation of the fabric on both the interior and exterior of the vessel. Off centered horizontal loop handle. “X” mark near the handle.

Fabric: Coarse fabric with a great deal of grit and possibly shell temper. The grit is primarily grey with some limestone. No black or red grit typical of many of the other vessels. Whitish paint or wax-like substance within, perhaps due to use as a candle or lamp holder.

Sagona Type: N/A

Additional Notes: There is no such form in the Phoenician or Punic repertoire of ceramic forms. Most likely of much later date, possibly medieval.
UNGUENTARIA

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14629/20643

Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium

Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 13.0 W.: 3.6 Dia. Rim: 2.0 Dia. Base: 1.7 Th. Rim/Lip: 1.3 Handle: Depth: 10.2

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: not collected

Description: Vessel can stand on its own. Dipped slipped neck and rim. Darker brown/reddish. Rest of body unslipped and shaped with tool? Not smoothed surface but striations. Seems to be ancient wear on the body (accretions are on the top over the wear) smears of slip around body. Two large voids on opposing ends of body. Contact during drying or firing?

Fabric: Clay is fine with few if any inclusions Some extremely fine maca. Perhaps some extremely fine black grit.

Sagona Type: Unguentarium Form V: 1 (Sagona 2002:161).

Additional Notes: Mortensen's Thesis, was found to contain strong elements of pine and spikenard oil (Mortensen 2014:70). Found to contain the same substance as N16126 and 15299 (Mortensen 2014:80).
Catalogue/Accession Number: N14630/20643
Object Name (MPM): Guttus
Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 9.0  W.: 5.2  Dia. Rim: 2.5  Dia. Base: 2.1  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.9  Depth: 8.6

Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: Fabric 5YR 6/4 light reddish brown Paint: 10R 4/4 weak red to 10R 5/6 red

Description: Miniture globular vessel linear-band decoration, radial. Decoration: The vessel is decorated similarly to N16122 though a bit more sloppily. Follows the same formula of slipped rim and six bands (5-6 as at one point they run together) on the neck and shoulder. 9mm below rim is 1mm band, 2mm band, 1mm band, 1mm blank, 5-6mm band, 1mm band = 1mm band that closes when they meet.

Fabric: Dark orange fabric (slipped?) probably not. Frequent voids with calcite poking out all over. Very infrequent visible inclusions of ret grit. All >1mm One spot where there seems to be Ferras residue seeping from inside of vessel. Very weird. Circular crack surrounded by stain but no hole in the vessel. Clay darker orange then N16122.

Sagona Type: Unguentarium Form V: 2c

Additional Notes: Local Form
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16078/21500
Object Name (MPM): Guttos
Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 21.9  W.: 6.2  Dia. Rim: 3.6  Dia. Base: 3.4  Th. Wall: 0.2  Th. Rim/Lip: 0.6  Depth: 14.7

Restoration Work: No


Description: Tall unguentarium with collared rim. Brown-white accretions. Decoration consists of brown-black slip at the top, dripping down one side. At four different perpendicular to one another at the point of the largest W. of the body are strange protrusions, smudges, and cracks in the clay itself that suggest that the stacking/storage before or during firing was body to body, leaving these impressions.

Fabric: Voids are very frequent, probably due to high calcite content in the fabric. Many break through the slip at the top. Voids range from tiny to larger. Some seem to have exploded off, chipping away a larger part of the surface.

Sagona Type: Unguentarium Form IV: 1a

Additional Notes: Imported form.
Catalogue/Accession Number:       Object Name (MPM):       Object Class:
N16081/21500                       Unguentarium                      Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 9.7   W.: 5.3   Dia. Rim: 2.6   Dia. Base: 2.8   Th. Rim/Lip: 2.5   Depth: 9.5

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow

Description: Small unguentarium with slip on the nozzle/around the spout and a decorative drizzle element, which is a darker color orange than the light orange of the fabric itself. Slip reaches farther down on the outside of the vessel (6-10mm), past the middle (3-4mm)


Sagona Type: Unguentarium Form V: 2b

Additional Notes: Found to contain substance containing cinnamon, myrrh, and olive oil (Mortensen 2014:69).
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16094/21500
Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium
Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 13.6 W.: 5.5 Dia. Rim: 3.6 Dia. Base: 2.8 Depth: 20.7

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric 5Y 6/3 pale olive

Description: Heavy accretions on one side, though there is evidence of accretions on other side. There are encrustations on the other side. Powdery white substance underneath accretions? Unclear whether this was part of slip, but doubtful.

Fabric: Pale green color. Lines of manufacture around the body. Inside seems to be reddish in color. Underneath is white.

Sagona Type: Unguentarium Form IV: 3.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16105/21500  
Object Name (MPM): Guttus  
Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5YR 5/6 red

**Description**: Slightly leaning long tall with body upper 1/2 of vessel something seems different about the fabric of the rim. Important note: Rim of the vessel is suspicious. The inclusions seem to differ, the colors seem to differ, and the clay on top seems to have reacted differently to the firing. In addition, on the interior of the vessel the clay of the rim seems to be distinguished from that of the interior of the body. The clay probably fell in when it was altered.


**Sagona Type**: Unguentarium Form IV: 1a (restoration makes it difficult to tell).
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16120/21501
Object Name (MPM): Guttus
Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 15.2 W.: 9.4 Dia. Rim: 5.2 Dia. Base: 4.7 Th. Wall: 0.4 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.4 Depth: 13.1

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: not collected

Description: Unguentarium and Guttus definitions need to be made. Could be considered either. Decoration consists of the rim being dipped in brown/black slip. Wheel thrown. Globular vessel on foot. Slup goes farther down on the inside of the vessel than on the outside. Some damage but superficial. Special foot type. Relatively few accretions. Slip has a shine to it like N16078, Hellenistic.

Fabric: Shiny micaceous inclusions frequent. Very few chip in surface. Very fine clay, extremely fine grit that can only be seen at x10 magnification. Some calcite seems to have caused some coids and some spalling. The straiations seen on the side are probably the cause of grit temper being pulled out of the atric on the wheel. Some black grit.

Sagona Type: Unknown

Additional Notes: Despite having a similar shape and decoration and clay fabric to the other imported unguentaria, Sagona makes no mention of a footed example.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16122/21501
Object Name (MPM): Guttus
Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 7.9cm W.: 4.8cm Dia. Rim: 2.4cm Dia. Base: 2.2cm Th. Rim/Lip: 2.7cm Depth: 7.5cm

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 7/6 reddish yellow Paint: 5YR 6/8 reddish yellow

Description: Minature juglet with minor decorations in the form of orangish slip. Some wear and tear on the vessel. Some dirt on the insides probably not encrustations. Slightly lopsided Evidenc of firing differential on side of body. Evidence of flaking of clay (during firing?) on lower part of vessel. Outer portion of rim seems to have orangish slip. Body: (neck/shoulder) decoration consists of five bands, though there could have been a sixth. 13. 8mm below rim is 1st band 1mm, below 1mm blank below 6mm thick band (looks like 4mm from the side) then 1mm blank, below 1mm slip band, below 1mm, blank, repeated pattern.

Fabric: Same as N14630.

Sagona Type: Unguentarium Form V: 2c.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16126/21501  
Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium  
Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 9.9cm (with restoration)  
W.: 5.3cm  
Dia. Base: 2.6cm

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: 7.5YR 4/3 brown

Description: Restored at the top. Hard to tell why it's done this way. Fabric is same color and restored in same way as N16124. Both have very fine walls. Very flat base just the other. Some voids and lines. Almost evidence of band decoration but most likely they are simple striations and difference in clay color. These two pieces are very unique so far. There seems to be large bits of grit embedded on the other part of the vessel with no explanation.

Fabric: Somewhat frequent calcitration. Many tiny micaceous inclusions. White shiny and coppery shiny. Tiny and very frequent so that vessel shines when looked at closely in the light. Some voids/striations from rough turning wheel?

Sagona Type: Unguentarium Form V: 2b

Additional Notes: Asymmetrical. Was found to contain strong elements of pine and spikenard oil (Mortensen 2014:70). Contained the same or similar substances as N14629 and N15299 (Mortensen 2014:80).
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16129/21501
Object Name (MPM): Guttus
Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 8.4 W.: 7.3 Dia. Rim: 3.4 Dia. Base: 3.8 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.5 Depth: 8.2

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: 7.5 YR 7/4 pink

Description: Flat rounded base with lopsided globular body. Rounded asymmetrical rim. Some evidence of repair around rim.


Sagona Type: Unknown.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16136/21501
Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium
Object Class: Unguentarium

Measurements (cm.): Not collected.

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected

Description: Undecorated unguentarium.


Sagona Type: Unknown

Additional Notes: Found to contain common with cinnamon, myrrh, and olive oil (Mortensen 2014:69)
URNS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14623/20643
Object Name (MPM): Stamnos
Object Class: Urn

Measurements (cm.): Not collected.

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected

Description: Cinerary Urn with slight compound curve and loop handles connected high on the body to the shoulder.

Fabric:

Sagona Type: IV: 1e. Crisp Ware.

Additional Notes: Object photographed with lid in place. Lid Diameter: 17.5cm.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N15300/21013
Object Name (MPM): Lagena
Object Class: Urn

Measurements (cm.): Not Collected.

Restoration Work: ?

Munsell color: Not Collected.

Description: "redware lagena, cylindrical neck, squat, round strap handles on shoulders, one handle missing

Fabric:

Sagona Type:

Additional Notes: Not found. MPM documentation.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16077/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lagena
Object Class: Amphora

Measurements (cm.):
Handle: 1.7 x 2.4

Restoration Work: Yes
Munsell color: Not Collected
Description:
Fabric:
Sagona Type: Urn Form III-IV: 3.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16083b/21500
Object Name (MPM): Stamnos
Object Class: Urn

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 25.5 W.: 20 Dia. Rim: 12.3 Dia. Base: 13 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.8 Handle: 2.4 x 1.9 Depth: 24

Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: Not collected
Description: Globular cinerary urn with two large loop handles that connect mid-way on the body and to the ridge around below the neck of the vessel.
Fabric: Darker color with some larger dark grit, mostly angular 2mmx1mm. Some large voids 5mm². Breakage exposes inner fabric of red and dark brown color.
Sagona Type: III-IV: 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16090/21500</td>
<td>Stamnos</td>
<td>Urn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.:** 25.5 **W.:** 22 **Dia. Rim:** 13.7 **Dia. Base:** 15  
- **Th. Rim/Lip:** 0.9 **Handle:** 3.1 x 1.5 **Depth:** 23

**Restoration Work:** No

**Munsell color:** Not collected

**Description:** Compound curve cinerary urn with small rim and two large loop handles that connect from the middle of the body to the shoulder of the vessel. Flat base. The base is pure white from what may be accretions or possibly mortar. Sagona mentions the practice of cementing some vessel in place.

**Fabric:** Frequent large grit with dark brown and yellow angular inclusions, up to 3mm².

**Sagona Type:** IV: 1e. Crisp Ware.

**Additional Notes:** Some strange green accretions on the body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16127/21501</td>
<td>Stamnos</td>
<td>Urn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.:** 25.5 **W.:** 21 **Dia. Rim:** 12.5 **Dia. Base:** 15  
- **Th. Rim/Lip:** 0.4 **Handle:** 2.7 x 1.4 **Depth:** 24

**Restoration Work:** No

**Munsell color:** Not collected

**Description:** Very lopsided cinerary urn with a broad, well formed flat foot, and compound curve shape (concave-convex). Collared rim sitting around the neck of the vessel and loop handles sitting higher on the body attached to the shoulders delineated by incision.

**Fabric:** No breakages reveal the inner fabric.

**Sagona Type:** IV: 1b

**Additional Notes:**
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16128/21501  
Object Name (MPM): Stamnos  
Object Class: Urn

Measurements (cm.):
Rim/Lip:  1.8  Handle: 1.5x2.5

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Not collected

Description: "stamnos, wide mouth, shoulder high ring, loop ear handles Punic 7th to 4th century B.C."

Sagona Type: IV: 1e

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16130b/21501  
Object Name (MPM): Jar  
Object Class: Urn

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 26cm  W.: 12.3  Dia.  Rim: 9  Dia.  Base: 9  Th.  Wall: 0.9  Th.  
Rim/Lip:  1.3  Depth: 25

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5YR 7/4 light reddish brown  Accretions: White to 7.5YR 6/3 light brown  Paint: 5R 3/6 dark red.

Description: Jug with two double loop strap handles, vertical that attach circa 42 mm from the top of the rim. Vessel is symmetrical except for base. The vessels is noted to be white slipped, and it shows evidence of this from the friability of parts of the vessel that expose a pinkish orange fabric. Evidence of red paint on the white slip on one handle of horizontal stripes. Accretions thick and smooth, almost chalky, covering most of the vessel. The interior of the vessel shows evidence of such accretions one side, probably because water level did not rise above a certain degree for long, as one third of the interior of the vessel is a dark reddish orange, showing no signs or other alterations of the clay.

Fabric: The little pinkish orange fabric that is exposed seems to resemble that of the other in its color and frequency of inclusions. Red grit with a smattering of other grit and few voids.

Sagona Type: IV: 1a.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16133b/21501
Object Name (MPM): Stamnos Urn

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 25.5cm W.: 17.5cm Dia. Rim: 10.5cm Dia. Base: 12.5cm Th. Wall: Th. Rim/Lip: 1.0cm Handle: 13.4 x 2.6cm

Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: not collected

Description: Broad and everted rim with short neck and two strap handles attached to neck just below the rim.


Sagona Type: V: 1a.

Additional Notes: Fairly uncommon. (Sagona 2002:110).

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16137/21501
Object Name (MPM): Stamnos Urn

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 24cm W.: 18.5cm Dia. Rim: 12.5cm Dia. Base: 13.5cm Th. Rim/Lip: 1.0cm

Restoration Work: Yes
Munsell color: not collected

Description: Fragmented bulbous cinerary urn with slightly everted rim that has been reconstructed. Two loop handle (missing) attached at the widest part of the body and shoulder delineated by an incision.


Sagona Type: IV: 1e (?)
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16191/21513
Object Name (MPM): Lagena
Object Class: Urn

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 25.5cm W.: 16.5cm Dia. Rim: 9.0cm Dia. Base: 11.5cm
Th. Rim/Lip: 1.2cm Handle: 1.6cm x 2.0cm

Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: not collected

Description: Two loop handles joining the shoulder to the upper neck at ridge. Thick rounded rim.

Fabric: Crisp Ware.

Sagona Type: Urn III-IV: 3.

Additional Notes: Typically decorated with red bands and never used as cinerary urns (Sagona 2002:102). One of the forms found outside of Malta (Anastasi 2015).

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16195b/21513
Object Name (MPM): Stamnos
Object Class: Urn

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 31.5cm W.: 27cm Dia. Rim: 17cm Dia. Base: 17.5cm Th. Rim/Lip: 1.5cm Handle: 1.9cm x 3.6cm
Depth: 30cm

Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: not collected

Description: Cinerary urn containing bone fragments and a concave convex shape with two strap handles connecting from the body to the widest part of the vessel at the shoulder. Well defined rim. White accretions and exfoliation on one side of the vessel.

Fabric: Pinkish yellow color and very refined clay with predominantly red grit. Some micaceous shine under magnification. Infrequent voids.

Sagona Type: III-IV: 1.
APPENDIX F: CERAMICS – LAMPS

BILYCHNES LAMPS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16080/21500
Object Name (MPM): Bilychnes Lamp
Object Class: Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.9 W.: 6.5 Length: 7

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 7.5YR 7/4 pink

Sagona Type:

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16097/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.3 W.: 9.6 Length: 9.3

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5YR 6/8 red

Sagona Type:

Additional Notes:
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16099/21500

Object Name (MPM): Lamp

Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.1 W.: 8 Length: 8.5

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 7.5YR 6/6 reddish yellow

Sagona Type:

Additional Notes:

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16102/21500

Object Name (MPM): Lamp

Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.1 W.: 8 Length: 8.5

Restoration Work:

Munsell color: Fabric: 7.5YR 6/6 reddish yellow

Description: Fairly thick slip preserved within the folds. Flat base.

Fabric: Evidence of former slip. Very brown (reddish brown). Familiar orangeish clay though this one is somewhat darker than usual. Frequent mica inclusion that seem different in that they are quite large. Very dark mica that appears black until it catches the li

Sagona Type:

Additional Notes:
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16103/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.): Not collected

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5YR 6/8 red

Description: This is a large and heavy example of its type. The wall is some 14mm thick in some places. Flat base. Evidence of wheel use.

Fabric: The clay is a light orange (red). Clearly had been slipped with a cream color. Familiar clay made up with well refined clay but frequent inclusions of brown-red sand and some limestone. Some voids.

Sagona Type: Form III: 1a. Thick-slipped Crisp Ware.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16104/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.0 W.: 7.5 Length: 8.0

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5YR 7/4 pale red

Sagona Type: Form II: 1
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16106/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp
Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2 W.: 7.9 Length: 7.3
Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: Fabric: 7.5YR 7/4 pink
Sagona Type:

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16107/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp
Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.4 W.: 8 Length: 7.7
Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 7/6 reddish yellow
Sagona Type: Form V: 1a.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16114/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: ‘Cocked-hat’ lamp
Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.7 W.: 5.7 Length: 6
Restoration Work: Yes
Munsell color: Not collected
Description: "Flat base"
Sagona Type: Unknown Type.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16116/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.): H.: 1.9 W.: 7.5 Length: 7.8
Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5Y 7/3 pale yellow,
Sagona Type: Lamp Form V: 1a.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16125/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.): H.: 1.9 W.: 9 Length: 9
Restoration Work: No
Sagona Type: Lamp Form IV: 1b.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16145/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.): H.: 2 W.: 8.5 Length: 8
Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 7/6 reddish yellow.
Sagona Type: Form II: 1
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16146/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.9 W.: 7.7 Length: 8.5

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 10YR 7/4 very pale brown.

Description:
Fabric:
Sagona Type: Lamp Form I: 1a.

Additional Notes:

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16147/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.3 W.: 8.2 Length: 7.7

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 7.5YR 7/4 pink.

Description:
Fabric:
Sagona Type:

Additional Notes:
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16148/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.2 W.: 8.5 Length: 8.3
Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 7/4 pink.
Sagona Type: Lamp Form II: 1.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16149/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.9 W.: 9.5 Length: 9
Restoration Work: No
Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 7/4 pink.
Sagona Type:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16150/21501</td>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>Bilychnes Lamp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**
- **H.:** 3.2
- **W.:** 9
- **Length:** 9.3

**Restoration Work:** Yes

**Munsell color:** Fabric: 5YR 8/4 pink.

**Sagona Type:** Form II: 1

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16151/21501</td>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>Bilychnes Lamp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**
- **H.:** 2.1
- **W.:** 6.3
- **Length:** 6.5
- **Dia. Base:**

**Restoration Work:**

**Munsell color:** Fabric: 2.5YR 6/6 red.

**Description:** Somewhat abnormal in that this object has a base.

**Fabric:**

**Sagona Type:**

**Additional Notes:**
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16153/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.1 W.: 6 Length: 7

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 7.5YR 6/3 light brown

Description: Open spouted baggy lamp with dark accretions.

Fabric: Fabric not able to be observed.

Sagona Type: Form V: 1b.

Additional Notes:

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16154/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.3 W.: 6.5 Length: 7

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow

Sagona Type:
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16156/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Bilychnes Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 4.1 W.: 10 Length: 10.5

Restoration Work:
Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5YR 6/6 red
Sagona Type: Form IV-V: 1a.
HELLENISTIC LAMPS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14643/20651
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Padlock lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.2 W.: 5.9 Length: 9.8 (7.8 w/out handle)
Dia. Rim: 3.6 Dia. Base: 5.5

Th. Wall: 0.6 Th. Rim/Lip: N/A Handle: 0.6x1.4 Depth: N/A Weight: N/A

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5YR weak red. Slip: Black.

Description: Padlock lamp. Relatively unremarkable. Dusty. Differential firing in some places. Probably slipeed on the wheel as base is unslipped.

Fabric: Same brownish orange accretions as on the other black slip vessels. Clay is brown, no visible inclusions other than frequent miniscule mica.

Sagona Type: N/A

Additional Notes: Black slip, Import
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16152/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Hellenistic Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.2 W.: 6.1 Length: 9.1

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 10YR 7/4 very pale brown

Description: flat loop handle "This mark is in relief form on the base of a Roman lamp with Hellenistic features. This may be a rosette, which is a popular image on lamps, however, no parallel was found of this exact type" (Cannizzo 2007:128) "Lamps of this type generally have a red slip; however, this example had a dark grey surface treatment, which raises the question of whether it is actually Hellenistic. The radial decoration on the convex shoulder area with the addition of a side lug also raises the question of whether or not it is a Hellenistic specimen. Most Hellenistic versions with this type of patterning do not have this handle. There is a possible rosette maker's mark on the underside for which there is no known parallel for this type of maker's mark. However, rosette patterning is commonly depicted in Roman lamp iconography. The handle is very indicative of Early Roman manufacture. The nozzle is not present, so it is not possible to confirm the attribution or indicate whether or not it was used" Cannizzo 2007:80.

Fabric:
Sagona Type: N/A

Additional Notes: Import
ROMAN LAMP

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16112/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Roman Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.3 W.: 8 Length: 10.5

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 10R 5/6 red

Description: "A? This mark is found impressed on the base of a North African Red Slip Lamp. May be the Greek letter alpha. Alpha is commonly found on lamps of all types and is not attributed to a single manufacturer or time period" (Cannizzo 2007:128) "This lamp has an

Fabric:

Sagona Type: N/A

Additional Notes:

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16113/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Roman Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.7 (4.2 w/handle) Dia. Base: 4.7 Handle: 0.8-0.9 x 0.8-1.6

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 7.5YR 7/3 pink

Description: Discus has offset hole. Features figure, bare chested(?) with laurle holding palm branch(?) posing with and/or leaning on stick(?) in right hand. Figure facing object right. Bottom of the vessel is stamped with FLORENT. Shoddy manufacture, molded in two

Fabric: Classic red color. Seems to turn brown/tan underneath. Lots of accretions around the nozzle. Brown. Due to use?

Sagona Type: N/A
ROMANO-MALTESE LAMPS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16091/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Romano-Maltese lamp

Measurements (cm.):

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: Fabric: 7.5YR 7/3 pink

Description: Pope's hat nozzle and a molded body. Evidence of soot on nozzle. The nozzle is clearly punched while the clay is still soft. No discus. Constriction on either side of nozzle. Still dirty inside. Half of the lamp is restored but it is difficult to tell from the rest of the lamp. "Open body and typical, closed nozzle; no signs of burning" Cannizzo 2007: 82.

Fabric: There are no clean breaks to see the inner fabric. Quite clear that it is unlike the fabrics of other vessels. Some oblong voids suggest possible organic temper with some evidence of calcite. The clay is very fine with fine grit inclusions only visible at x10 magnification.

Sagona Type: IV-V: 2 (?)

Additional Notes:
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16157/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Romano-Maltese lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.5 W.: 6.9 Length: 9.1 Dia. Base: 3.6

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5Y 7/3 pale yellow.

Description: Wheel thrown Romano-Maltese lamp. Pointed flaring nozzle. Evidence of burning. Greenish colored clay. Very few accretions. On one side there is a slight half moon protrusion, probably produced during smoothing. The nozzle was clearly hole-punched. Bailey 1975:292 Plates 118 and 119


Sagona Type: Unknown.

Additional Notes: Definteily a fabric without parallel in the collection.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16115/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Romano-Maltese lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.7 W.: 6.5 Length: 7.2

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5YR 6/6 red.

Description: Missing nozzle and exfoliated discus and fill hole. Flat base with undecorated discus and small vertically protruding handle. Reddish color.

Fabric: Red colored fabric with very few inclusions visible.

Sagona Type: May be a later variant of IV-V: 2. Local Red Ware (?).

Additional Notes: Conforms to Sagona’s Lamp Form IV-V: 2 with the single fill hole and four air-holes but the fabric does not conform, nor does the small vertically protruding handle.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16139/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Romano-Maltese lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.8  W.: 5.6  Length: 7.7  Dia. Base: 2.8  Th. Wall: 1.7  Depth: 2.3

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 2.5YR 6/6 red.

Description: Plain Romano-Maltese lamp. Brownish yellow color. Brown and white accretions and restoration work apparent. Restorations made with white plaster/cement. Fault line running horizontally, unevenly splitting the lamp in half. Inside the lamp has large clumps of plaster. Lamp nozzle looks like a pope's hat. Some yellow rock seems fused to the top. Evidence of burning on the nozzle. Large fill hole in closed body with no drain holes and a slight sunken rim/discus area, Cannizzo 2007 82.

Fabric: May be slipped. Even with x20 magnification, no inclusions are apparent.

Sagona Type: IV-V: 2 (??).
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16144/21501
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Romano-Maltese lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 3.1 W.: 7.2 Length: 9.2

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 2.5YR 6/6 red.

Description: "Large fill hole in closed body with two drainage holes and slight sunken rim/discus area" (Cannizzo 2007:92).

Fabric: N/A

Sagona Type: Form IV: 2.

Additional Notes: Not found.
BYZANTINE LAMP

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16110/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lamp
Object Class: Byzantine Lamp

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.6cm W.: 4.3cm Length: 7.6cm

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Fabric: 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow.

Description: Byzantine or Late Roman mold-made lamp. Stamped on bottom. Crescent moon or rosary motif around the fill hole. Handle is broken. Evidence of burning near spout. Visible lines where the two halves of the lamp were connected. "This mark is fund in relief fo

Fabric: Pinkish clay with cream slip. Frequent calcite inclusions, <1mm in diameter. Very frequent tiny voids n the exterior both through and within the slip. Edges of lamp. Very tiny grit temper visible under magnification. Frequent micaceous shine. Mix of dark

Sagona Type: N/A

Additional Notes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM17445/21500</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurements (cm.):</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>Copper-Bronze As, Rome- Probus (c. 276-282 AD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Not Found, MPM Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM17446/21500</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurements (cm.):</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>Copper-Bronze As, Rome-Probus (c. 276-282 AD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Not Found, MPM Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM17447/21500</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurements (cm.):</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>Bronze, Apollis, Italy-Ucinius I, Aquilcia Mint (c. 308-324 AD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Not Found, MPM Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H: GLASS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14658/20652
Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium
Object Class: Glass vessel

Measurements (cm.): N/A

Restoration Work: ?

Description: Unguentarium, round conical base with curved tubular neck and flaring lip, Ptolomaic

Additional Notes: Not Found. MPM Documentation

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14659/20652
Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium
Object Class: Glass vessel

Measurements (cm.): N/A

Restoration Work: ?

Description: Ampulla, round bottomed tubular vessel with flaring lip, Ptolomaic

Additional Notes: Not Found. MPM Documentation.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N15299/21014
Object Name (MPM): Ampulla
Object Class: Glass Vessel

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 15.7 W.: 9.2 Dia. Rim: 4.0

Restoration Work: No

Description: Cotton plugged into the mouth, perhaps to keep contents within. Can hear some dirt/sand inside. Has some lines around lower neck and shoulder. Symmetrical around the lip. Lip has some glass rot on it. Flat base. Accretions on side of vessel that hint that it was found in a tomb.

Additional Notes: This vessel was found to contain strong elements of pine and spikenard oil (Mortensen 2014 p. 70). Found to contain the same substance as N16126 and N15299 and N14629 (Mortensen 2014:80).

Catalogue/Accession Number: N15388/21093
Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium
Object Class: Glass vessel

Measurements (cm.): N/A

Restoration Work: No

Description:

Additional Notes: Found to contain common with cinnamon, myrrh, and olive oil (Mortensen 2014 p. 69).
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16079/21500
Object Name (MPM): Ampulla
Object Class: Glass vessel

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 6.2 W.: 4.6 Length: <0.1
Dia. Rim: <0.1 Th. Wall: <0.1 Th. Rim/Lip: <0.1

Restoration Work:
Description: Brownish color caused by dirt. Missing large portion of body. Outward flaring rim. Glass wall is less than 1mm thick.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16086/21500
Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium
Object Class: Glass vessel

Measurements (cm.): N/A
Restoration Work: No
Description: Large glass ampulla
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16095/21500
Object Name (MPM): Bottle
Object Class: Glass vessel

Measurements (cm.): N/A
Restoration Work: No
Description: Glass bottle

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16096/21500
Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium
Object Class: Glass vessel

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 9.2 W.: 3.0 Length: 0.1 Dia. Rim: 0.1cm Th. Wall: 0.1 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.1
Restoration Work: No
Description: Glass bottle or unguentarium which is dirty inside with patina, but difficult to see. Seems cneints. Long tube with small body, not symmetrical.
Additional Notes: Found to contain common with cinnamon, myrrh, and olive oil (Mortensen 2014 p. 69).
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16098/21500  
Object Name (MPM): Unguentarium  
Object Class: Glass vessel

Measurements (cm.): N/A

Restoration Work:

Description:  

Additional Notes: Not found. Found to contain common with cinnamon, myrrh, and olive oil (Mortensen 2014 p. 69).

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16101a-e/21500  
Object Name (MPM): Glass fragments  
Object Class: Glass sherds

Measurements (cm.): N/A

Restoration Work: Yes

Description: Unclear why these sherds are associated apart from the fact that they have a similar patina. Partially reconstructed fragments of a stemmed goblet, including the bowl of the goblet that is decorated with little bubbles, gutae, or droplets along the outer

Additional Notes: Distinctive shape
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16141/21501</td>
<td>Unguentarium</td>
<td>Glass vessel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

H.: 14.5 W.: Dia. Rim: 3.3 Dia. Base: 7.8

**Restoration Work:** No

**Description:** Glass unguentarium with a flaring and asymmetrical lip.

**Additional Notes:** Found to contain common with cinnamon, myrrh, and olive oil. (Mortensen 2014:69)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16142/21501</td>
<td>Ampulla</td>
<td>Glass vessel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

H.: 9.5 W.: 7.0 Th. Wall: 0.2 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.2

**Restoration Work:** Yes

**Munsell color:** N/A

**Description:** Glass ampulla with flat base. Restored but still missing some of the body and rim. Globular body. Lots of chipping of the glass patina, much of which is pooled inside the vessel.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16143/21501
Object Name (MPM): Glass vessel fragments
Object Class: Glass sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.9 W.: 5.5 Length: Dia. Base: 5.5 Th. Wall: 0.3

Restoration Work: No

Description: Covered in black patina, this base is yellow/golden underneath the patina. Base of a stemmed goblet with little of the wall remaining.

Additional Notes:

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16159/21501
Object Name (MPM): Glass fragments
Object Class: Glass sherd

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 5.6 Dia. Rim: 3.1 Th. Rim/Lip: 0.3

Restoration Work:

Description: Beautiful sherd of glass with rim preserved as well as neck, down to part of the shoulder. Handle is folded ad molded while still hot. Seems to be colored glass with black, purple, and white streaks. Unfortunately most of the object is covered in dirt and patina.

Additional Notes:
Catalogue/Accession Number: N16170/21500
Object Name (MPM): Lot of glass sherds
Object Class: Lot of glass sherds.

Measurements (cm.):
No Measurements were taken for the glass fragments.

Restoration Work: Some

Description: There are various lots of glass sherds contained in 6 boxes. Box 1 has 5 glass fragments in deep blue, light green, grey colors, one being a rounded loop handle. None seem to demonstrate particular antiquity. Only deep blue sherd shows much patina. Seems awfully thick for ancient glass. Box 2 has 8 sherds of glass with patina, 3 of which are rims and 5 of which are walls. Box 3 has 11 fragments, one being almost a complete vessel, though in poor state of conservation. One is a base, with the rest of the fragments being walls. Some of which seem to belong to the same vessel. Box 4 contains 10 fragments, 2 of which are a base, and one of which is a shoulder. They are very fine with patina, hinting that they are indeed ancient. Box 5 contains 13 fragments, partially restored with one being a base and two or three being seemingly shoulders, very thing, patina. Therefore probably ancient. Box 6 contains two partially restored vessels, both being small ampullae.
(From upper right) Boxes 2, 4, 5, and 6.
# APPENDIX I: TERRACOTTAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14624/20643</td>
<td>Figurine of horse</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.:** 24.2
- **W.:** 6.2
- **Length:** 21.1

**Description:** Horse with runny green glaze. 13th century

**Additional Notes:** Not studied, MPM Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14625/20643</td>
<td>Figurine of leopard</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.:** 28.5
- **W.:** 7.4
- **Length:** 24.8

**Description:** Leopard with runny green glaze. 13th century

**Additional Notes:** Not studied, MPM Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14626/20643</td>
<td>Boat model</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):**

- **H.:** 12
- **W.:** 31
- **Min. Length:** 28
- **Max Length:** 34
- **Th. Wall:** 0.6
- **Th. Rim/Lip:** 0.6

**Restoration Work:** Yes

**Description:** Handmade model of a boat (?). Made out of several pieces that were molded together. It was broken into several pieces but later restored. Molding technique on the bottom looks similar to that of N14627 and possibly N16194.

**Fabric:** Frequent calcareous and dark grey angular inclusions.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N14644/20651
Object Name (MPM): Figurine of head
Object Class: Terracotta

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 7.9 W.: 5.9 Length: 4.9

Restoration Work: Yes

Munsell color: 5YR 6/4 light reddish brown

Description: Female figurine with head turning to object right. Nose is somewhat damaged. On the left side the whole ear is missing. Particular roman headdress and hairstyle. Left side there is a protrusion, added decoration (flower?). The rear of the terracotta is much rougher than the front. The right side of the head seems to have an earring. The terracotta seems hollow inside, the hole is visible from the neck. The "crown" of the headdress seems to be somewhat repaired as there is a pink pigment on it. In terms of manufacture the headdress was surely added later as it has broken off relatively whole, destroying the bits of clay that were used to meld the headdress to the heard. Similar to the "flower," which seems relatively carelessly placed on the side of the head.

Fabric: Fine clay with some black and red grit and mica < 1mm with very infrequent calcite. (Local)
Catalogue/Accession Number: N14645/20651
Object Name (MPM): Bust
Object Class: Terracotta

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 8.7 W.: 6.2 Length: 4.3

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: Core: 2.5Y 5/1 grey Outer Fabric: 7.5YR 7/3 pink Paint: 10R 5/6 red - 10R 5/4 pale red.

Description: Female figureine with a veil or long hair. Not well preserved. Schematic facial features remain. Painted with a brown slip. Broad stripes run horizontally down the back of the head/veil. Kalathos headdress. Could have small triangles or dangles on the back.

Fabric: The clay is dense. The inner clay is a dark grey while the outer is a creamy orange with darker paint or slip over it. Inclusions consist of black sand with occasional other grit < 1mm, with some calcareous inclusions as well.

Additional Notes: Dimensions from the MPM Documentation.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N14646/20651
Object Name (MPM): Bust of male lyre player
Object Class: Terracotta

Measurements (cm.): H.: 5.6 W.: 6.2 Length: 3.7

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 5YR 7/6 reddish yellow.

Description: Male figure holding harp on left side toward face. Seemingly bald head with large nose and schematic mouth and eyes. Hollow. Whitish-grey accretions.

Fabric: Reddish yellow clay. Frequent black grit inclusions <1mm. Infrequent red and brown colored grit, angular. The black sand shines when it is magnified and it is smoothed and round in some cases. Infrequent voids.

Additional Notes: Dimensions from the MPM Documentation.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14647/20651
Object Name (MPM): Figurine of foot on rest
Object Class: Terracotta

Measurements (cm.): H.: 4.3 W.: 3.1 Length: 5.9

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color: 2.5YR 6/6 light red

Description: Foot on a pedestal with long toes and toenails

Fabric: It is made from a fine light orangeish clay with some voids. Inclusions are predominantly red grit with some fine black grit. Suggesting local manufacture. There is a thin layer of brown accretions on the piece.

Additional Notes: Dimensions from the MPM Documentation.
Catalogue/Accession Number: N15301/21011

Object Name (MPM): Figure of standing Christian

Object Class: Terracotta

Measurements (cm.):

H.: 13.5  W.: 4.7  Length: 3.6 (4.2 at base)

Restoration Work: No

Munsell color:

Description: Molded terracotta of a saint. There is a small base pinched at the front and rear. The saint is nude except for a cloth draped around the front midrif of the figure. Knees are bent and left foot looks as if it was flattened during production and is darker.

Fabric: The clay is extremely fine with almost no visible inclusions. There are a few inclusions of black grit. It is very atypical for the collection.
APPENDIX J: METAL OBJECTS

BRONZE

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16173/21500
Object Name (MPM): Bronze handle
Object Class: Metallic Objects

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 11.4 W.: 5.7 Length: 0.6-1.5

Description: This is in two pieces. One large handle that is somewhat ovoid in cross section, that is thickest opposite the swivel and tapers off as it approaches the swivel-bit. It is very heavy and accommodates a hand. Must have been attached to something, perhaps a coffin or a lockbox. It is remarkably well preserved and is therefore probably not as old as some of the Phoenician burials. Lower half of the object shows a great deal of accretions similar to those found on pottery. It may this have sat still for sometime underground.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16174/21500
Object Name (MPM): Bronze fragments
Object Class: Metallic Objects

Measurements (cm.): N/A

Description: Lot of 22 bronze fragments. Impossible to know the context, but there seem to be some preliminary distinguishing factors. Some of the bronze fragments show signs of burning, which could be part of the funerary ritual. Others show no signs of burning. Thes
IRON

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16172/21500
Object Name (MPM): Iron chisel
Object Class: Metallic Objects

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 12.3  W.: 1.6  Length: 1.6

Description: This is a clearly modern chisel based on its shape and state of preservation.

LEAD

Catalogue/Accession Number: N16175/21513
Object Name (MPM): Lead casket
Object Class: Metallic Objects

Measurements (cm.): N/A

Description: Remains of a lead casket. Often contained cremated remains.
APPENDIX K: MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTS

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14634a/20643
Object Name (MPM): Loom weight
Object Class: Stone

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 1.6 W.: 5.0

Description: Interpreted as a loom weight, each stone has similar size and weight. Each is burnished or worn to a degree on the exterior, but not where it has been drilled through the center. It could alternatively be interpreted as a fishing net stone.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14634b/20643
Object Name (MPM): Loom weight
Object Class: Stone

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.5 W.: 5.0

Description: Interpreted as a loom weight, each stone has similar size and weight. Each is burnished or worn to a degree on the exterior, but not where it has been drilled through the center. It could alternatively be interpreted as a fishing net stone.

Catalogue/Accession Number: N14634c/20643
Object Name (MPM): Loom weight
Object Class: Stone

Measurements (cm.):
H.: 2.2 W.: 4.8

Description: Interpreted as a loom weight, each stone has similar size and weight. Each is burnished or worn to a degree on the exterior, but not where it has been drilled through the center. It could alternatively be interpreted as a fishing net stone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N22027/23648</td>
<td>Figurine of Terpsichore</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):** N/A

**Description:** "Marble statue, Italian Renaissance, carved white of Terpsichore. Holding lyre left, pick in right hand. Flowing draped robes, head uncovered, ca. 16th to 17th century, Malta."

**Additional Notes:** Not Found, MPM Documentation,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number:</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM):</th>
<th>Object Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N22028/23648</td>
<td>Figurine of Erato</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurements (cm.):** N/A

**Description:** "Marble statue, Italian Renaissance, carved white of Erato. Roman vestal Virgin, draped scarf on head, flowing robe and skirt, bare feet, ca. 16th to 17th century, Malta"

**Additional Notes:** Not Found, MPM Documentation,
APPENDIX L: HUMAN/FAUNAL REMAINS

Only a human fibula and tibia were mentioned in the accession records (N16171a and 16171b respectively, 1%) and are not directly related to the rest of the material (see Appendix A). One ceramic vessel was found to contain additional faunal and/or human remains (N14623). As these remains were left the inside vessel, they were not accessioned or catalogued. Nikita Werner, an intern at the MPM in 2016, was tasked with examining the faunal remains and separating them from the rest of the matrix. The matrix consisted of very fine sand, ashes, and shells, as well as some sherds of artefacts. Cremated faunal skeletal remains were bagged by size or bone type if they could be identified. Some remains seemed to exhibit cut marks (Dawn Scher Thomae 2016: personal communication).

The faunal remains examined from the contents of N14623 remain mostly unsorted. The sorting that has been done so far has identified mammal remains by element and part, such as part of a zygomatic arch, scapula, and various long bone fragments. The remains include various bagged long bone shaft fragments, cranial fragments, various other elements and UNID. The overall size of the remains suggests medium to large size mammals such as Maltese sheep, goat, or swine. A box of medium to large mammal epiphysis of long bones was also included, but due to the fragility of the specimens, it was not possible to perform sufficient analysis of their relation to the long bone fragments previously identified. Other specimens remained unsorted in UNID bags which were not analyzed due to time constraints. Many of the bones include modifications such as cut marks, burn marks, and crushing possibly related to marrow extraction. Age of the specimens is varied. The fragments analyzed were too heavily fractured to draw conclusions based on epiphysis fusions, but many showed signs of disfigurement by arthritis growths (Coley Barnett 2017: personal communication).
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Fragments of lead and small ceramic sherds were also found. When examining the fragments of pottery, it was evident that there was a rim sherd of Crisp Ware that, based on its shape and size, could be identified as the lip of a miniature trefoil flask or juglet.

In addition, there are two shells that were accessioned with the collection (17432 and 17433) that were not given the Nunnemacher prefix. It is presumed that these were given to a different department. As they were not described in the catalog, it is impossible to designate a species. However, if these shells were to match other shells found in Phoenician and Punic tombs, they could be significant. If they had been murex shells, for example, they could have been grave goods for individuals associated with dyeing industry that the Phoenicians were so renowned for.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17432/21500</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Faunal Remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements (cm.): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Notes:</td>
<td>Not Found, Not Studied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17433/21500</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Faunal Remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements (cm.): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Notes:</td>
<td>Not Found, Not Studied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16171a/21500</td>
<td>Fibula</td>
<td>Skeletal Remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements (cm.): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Seemingly normal adult fibula. Shows rodent gnaw marks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue/Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Name (MPM)</th>
<th>Object Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N16171b/21500</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>Skeletal Remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements (cm.): N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Seemingly normal adult tibia. Some evidence of arthritis toward the knee bone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>