



Kent Academic Repository

Tsirogiannis, Christos, Gill, David W.J. and Chippindale, Christopher (2025)
***A Corrupt Cycladic Corpus of Marble Figures.* Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology & Heritage Studies, 13 (3). pp. 203-233. ISSN 2166-3548.**

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/111624/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.5325/jeasmedarcherstu.13.3.0203>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in **Title of Journal**, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Christos Tsirogiannis<ORCID 0000-0002-2826-9904 >

David W. J. Gill<ORCID 0000-0002-6970-3236>

Christopher Chippindale<ORCID XXX>

<CT>A Corrupt Cycladic Corpus of Marble Figures

<CA>Christos Tsirogiannis

David W. J. Gill

Christopher Chippindale</CA>

<abs>Abstract

The urgent seeking for Cycladic figures since the nineteenth century has caused significant destruction of the archaeological record and serious corruption of the corpus of knowledge. Unsurprisingly, there is little prospect of this corruption ever being understood in detail due to the lack of records. The problem proves impossible, as the loss of knowledge cannot now be undone. First, we examined the contribution to knowledge of collections based in universities (The Ashmolean and the Fitzwilliam), public museums (The J. Paul Getty Museum), and a private collection (Leonard N. Stern); by examining how these Cycladic figures' collections were historically formed, we understood that they can add nothing to our knowledge of the Early Bronze Age in the Aegean. Therefore, we divided the collected corpus into four distinct parts, suggesting sensible and practical guidelines for the future by which we can salvage some trustworthy understanding from a corrupted mess.

</abs>

<ky>Keywords: Cycladic figures, illicit antiquities, forgeries, museums, private collections</ky>

<1>Introduction

The corpus of complete and fragmentary Cycladic figures stands in the region of 1,600 pieces. Yet how can these figures contribute to our understanding of the Early Bronze Age in the southern Aegean? There are concerns that part of this corpus have been corrupted by the incorporation of modern creations¹ that can distort and corrupt the interpretation of these figures. While it may be possible to explore the function of these figures through examples that have been derived from archaeological excavation, the vast majority have arrived at their present residences through their movement through the antiquities market: and such an unscientific route from the ground means that the associated archaeological information has been permanently lost. This current research will explore how the corpus of Cycladic figures has been formed, and will consider which parts should be judged to be reliable, and which should be considered to be potentially corrupt.

The looting of Cycladic cemeteries started as early as the seventeenth century (Apostolides 2006: 204. For the development of the subject: Fitton 1995:106–7). During the nineteenth century Cycladic figures were already available on the international market and started to be acquired for museum and private collections (Wolters 1891: 46–48; Bosanquet 1896–97: 67; Sherratt 2000). However, they were generally ignored, since the academic and public interest was mainly focused on the sculpture of the Classical period (see Jenkins 1992). Modern artists like Brancusi, Moore, and Picasso appreciated the artistic value of these figures and even acquired some of them, while parts of their own work has similarities to Cycladic figures.² These elements ignited the commercial activity around these objects in the 1920s and 1930s and the need to satisfy the increasing demand led to massive catastrophes caused by looters on Cycladic islands (for example, the case of Keros and the involvement of the Greek dealer Nikola Koutoulakis)³ in the period from the 1950s to the 1970s.⁴

On the other hand, from the limited accounts available, we now know that figures created in the “Cycladic” manner since at least the 1930s, whether with the intention or not to

deceive, later found their way into museum and private collections as authentic objects (e.g., Marthari 2001; Craxton and Warren 2004). The most recent relevant account indicates that the forging of Cycladic figures peaked in the 1990s (Tsirogiannis, Gill, and Chippindale 2022). Given that those involved in the peaks of the looting and forging are deceased or elderly now, it is unlikely we will ever know much detail of either process.

Additionally, not much has turned up by way of documentation, as Cycladic objects are being largely absent from such photographic and documentary evidence that has turned up in the several dealers' archives confiscated in Geneva, Basle, the Greek island of Schinoussa and elsewhere.⁵ We suspect that little documentary evidence exists or will become public through the records of the Greek antiquities service and of the Greek police, as well as in the archives of acquiring museums, to tell any kind of full story. Therefore, the greater part of the corpus of Cycladic figures remains in darkness and it can be considered as corrupt.⁶ Efforts to shed a little light by combining knowledge from the seven related research areas of dealing, looting, making Cycladic pastiches whether or not with a forger's intention, identifying individual Cycladic figures as pastiches, learning from collections and groups of looted figures, exploring the looted sites and knowing old collections better from their records, did not illuminate the corpus to a considerable extent. We should briefly summarize what we know so far from each of these related seven areas of research.

Archaeological field work in the Cyclades in recent decades has provided secure material for interpreting Early Cycladic culture. However, the majority of Cycladic marble figures that form the main part of the current corpus are devoid of secure archaeological information and are thus unable to contribute to our understanding of the Bronze Age Cyclades in a meaningful way. The impact of large scale and intensive looting to provide Cycladic material for international museums and collectors has distorted the way that this island culture has been interpreted. Thus, we make a case for prioritizing the archaeologists' corpus of

Cycladic figures over those derived from other routes. This present research returns to our earlier work on intellectual consequences of collecting Cycladic figures while drawing on our views on the nature of the dispersed Keros Haul as well as the creation of modern figures (Gill and Chippindale 1993; Gill 2007; Tsirogiannis, Gill, and Chippindale 2022). It recognizes that some of our predictions about insecure figures have indeed proved to be correct (Gill 2002, 2014).

<A>Dealing: possibilities

From varied sources, we know something of the common routes by which Greek antiquities left that country and travelled, often via Switzerland, to “surface” in markets, collections and museums in acquiring countries, especially the USA.⁷ Switzerland is key, for its famous secrecy as regards sensitive financial matters, for the infamous porosity of its border with Italy, directly relevant for antiquities found in Italy, and indirectly for those found in Greece, and for its odd laws regarding legal ownership, which assist suspect transactions of ancient objects. We suppose Cycladic figures travelled those busy routes in the same ways, since Cycladic figures – whether original or fake – are depicted in the confiscated Becchina archive in Switzerland (Basle).⁸ Perhaps their routes from the islands through the illicit market did not pass through those we *chance* now to know about; it is possible that even hundreds of trafficked Cycladic figures would be a vanishingly small proportion of the overall very large trade in looted antiquities and fakes and we have no reliable information about their context or recent collecting history. We do not even know the specific story or route of the much-discussed Keros Haul after its very first step (see below). The only relevant dealer about which we have a little information is “Nikola” Koutoulakis (Krosney 2006; Getz-Gentle 2008a; Gill 2024a, 73–80). Additionally, the first, recent, first-hand account of a Greek individual who

used to forge “Cycladic” figures in the 1980s and 1990s is now available (Tsirogiannis, Gill, and Chippindale 2022). Overall, we do not expect that any reliable information will surface from the study of antiquities dealers who were systematically involved in the trafficking of Cycladic figures, and, therefore, in that respect, the corpus will continue to include authentic and fake figures as well as pastiches.

<A>The looters: who they were and what they did

The richest looted site we are aware of, and one which Getz-Gentle and others believe can be reliably linked to a large group of Cycladic figures, is on Keros, and the finds from it (or associated with it) are often referred to (inaccurately) as the “Keros Hoard”.⁹ Giorgos Papamichelakis in 2008 talked with some who had memories, direct or hearsay, of what happened when the Keros site was looted around 1963. This new information is slight, but archaeologically useful in that it clarifies the status of the site, since there is a clear report both of broken figurines in massed numbers and of several graves also rich in unbroken figurines. To the question, “Was the Keros site a cemetery or something else?”, the answer can now be that it was both. Papamichelakis and Renfrew’s report is brief, and they are cautious, a correct attitude expressed in their title “Hearsay about the ‘Keros Hoard’” (Papamichelakis and Renfrew 2010). They identify (but do not name) a “merchant ‘A’” who (is said to have) encouraged the Keros shepherds (at this time the island was still inhabited), taught them good looting methods, and organized the boat which took the figures away, always at night, when he came to buy their finds. So “A” was the first link in the chain that went onward to Koutoulakis, the dealer in Paris and Geneva, to Erlenmeyer, the collector in Basel, to Thimme, curator at Karlsruhe Museum at whose 1976 exhibition finds from the Keros Haul “surfaced”. Papamichelakis also heard of seated human figures and of animal figures being found, and of

a huge figure, 1.5 metres long, which “A” broke into four pieces and sold to the Goulandris Collection in Athens.¹⁰

<A>Making Cycladic pastiches (without a forger’s intention)

Papadatos and Venieris (2015) report experimental work in making Cycladic figures, confirming and taking forward what was learnt from Oustinoff’s first experiments of thirty years ago.¹¹ These investigations, although focused on understanding the practices and the level of craftsmanship which ancient Cycladic islanders had, nevertheless underline the several causes to fear that faking Cycladic figures is relatively easy. Marble of the kind used in prehistoric times is to be found easily and everywhere, ubiquitous in the islands. Equally easy to find are other prehistoric working materials such as emery. It takes not so many hours to carve a small figure, and not so many hours more to polish it.¹² Not much practice seems to be needed before one can make a (tolerably) authentic-looking *simulacrum*. The forms are quite simple. And no part of the task requires specialist craft or workshop skills of the kind one imagines are needed to make convincing pastiches of, say, intricate Roman silverwork.

<A>Getz-Gentle and the Cycladic sculptors: what can be learnt from individual figures?

Thirty years ago, a paper presented reasons relating to the fear of faking. Many of the “best” (as they seem to us today) figures surfaced at very late dates in the pattern of Cycladic collecting. One group of figures, all exceptionally large or of rare variants, have strange features held in common – a surface of unusual and peculiar appearance, breaks at head and knees, repairs with the same adhesive; another group, of unbroken and unusually refined

figures, appears so utterly beautiful that one sadly regrets they surely *cannot* be genuine (Gill and Chippindale 1993). These are grounds to suspect certain figures with certain traits, but nothing one could call even weak evidence against them. As long ago as the 1970s, fakes were numerous, and a corresponding fear of fakes prevalent, at a time when the level of looting activity at Cycladic cemetery sites declined; perhaps confidence in what was genuine had begun to fail (this is explored in Gill and Chippindale 1993). Or, cemeteries that escaped looting were beginning to become extinct, and there were simply fewer figures left to loot.

When it comes to the issue of fakes, based on the stone itself, no scientific method yet exists to determine whether any one Cycladic figure (or any kind of sculpture) is ancient or modern (Polikreti 2007). Long ago, Riederer (1977) reported distinct and distinctive differences in calcium salts on the surfaces of genuine and of recent faked Cycladic figures, but neither this observation of more than 40 years ago – if correct – nor other studies of surfaces have given us a routine method of distinguishing genuine from fake (Polikreti 2007). Alongside, there is gossip – perhaps fairly called “Cycladic myth” – about varied ways a fake Cycladic figure is said to be able to be distinguished (Gill and Chippindale 1993:617. An area explored also by Butcher 1992). Instead, we still depend on more subjective reasoning, mostly variants of, “It looks to me to be a fake or possible fake”, “It looks to me to be genuine,” as was done in the inconclusive effort by a panel of experts to decide if the “Getty Kouros” was genuine or fake (Getty Museum 1993; True 1993. See also Spier 1990; Chippindale 1996), after attempts to resolve its standing by analytical science found no decisive answer.¹³ If any corpus contains more than just a few fakes, as the Cycladic appears to, then those justifying comparisons may accidentally and unhappily be judging the standing of one fake on the evidence not of the genuine but of another or other fakes.

Pat Getz-Gentle (formerly Getz-Preziosi) has vast experience of closely studying Cycladic figures, work leading to her 2001 study of *Personal Styles in Early Cycladic Sculpture*, so

individual master artists can be identified and their personalities sketched.¹⁴ Whether such styles exist and can be identified is disputed: we ourselves doubt they do exist, and we see no way they can be identified if they do. What is relevant to our concerns here is that she cancelled her former identification of a “Stafford Master” (or “Sculptor”) as a carver with distinctive personal manner of sculpting since she had come to regard as forgeries four complete figures she had previously ascribed to him, including his “name-piece” (Getz-Gentle 2001:104, and n. 216. The Stafford Sculptor is discussed in Gill 2002). The name-piece for the sculptor had formed part of the collection of Mr and Mrs Frederick Stafford (Getz-Preziosi 1987b:230-31, no. 72). It was “reputedly found on Paros” and had previously been in the collection of Alphonse Kahn. It was exhibited at the Fogg Art Museum in 1954 (Hanfmann 1954:43, pl. 99, no. 127a) at the Isaac Delgado Museum in 1966, and the Safani Gallery in New York in 1983, then loaned to the Fogg Art Museum 1983–1986, (Byrnes 1966, no. 2; Safani 1983, no. 9) when it was acquired by the Emory University Museum of Art and Archaeology.¹⁵ Getz-Preziosi noted that the figure “was carved with great care”, and “even the fact that the original skin of the marble has weathered away does not diminish the effect of the precise incision work or the taut, clean lines” (Getz-Preziosi 1987b:230, no. 72). If Getz-Gentle is correct, and that these figures are indeed modern creations, then it suggests that they were probably made in the late 1940s or early 1950s, or even possibly in the 1930s.

Four other fragments once attributed to the Stafford Master, and now to the Louvre Sculptor, another ancient carver identified by Getz-Preziosi, are linked to Keros or associated with the Keros haul (Getz-Gentle 2001:170, nos 5-8). One was excavated on Keros, but the other three only have a reported association with the haul: one formerly in the Erlenmeyer collection,¹⁶ a second in a private collection (Thimme 1976, no. 224), the third in Tampa Museum of Art on loan from the C.W. Sahlman collection (Getz-Preziosi 1987a:164, no. 5; Getz-Gentle 2001:170, no. 5; Sotirakopolou 2005:238–9, no. 249). But what if the three

associated with the Keros Haul and once linked to the Stafford Master are also modern creations?

About fakes in general, Getz-Gentle remarks in introducing her study: “I have resisted all temptation to reproduce figures of unusual types or unusually large size – forgers’ favorites – that I have not had the opportunity to study ‘in the flesh’.” “Even so,” she goes on, “one can expect a skeptical reaction to some of the more unusual pieces, at least, on the part of some readers, particularly those who find it difficult to accept as incontestably genuine sculptures that do not come from documented excavations or whose pedigrees do not extend back into the last century.”

These kinds of uncertainties, and the lack of any scientific route to validating a figure as genuine, lead us to conclude that it is not possible reliably to identify a fake by close study of its immanent properties, that is, those residing in the object itself, even with all the skill and judgement acquired by the most acute observer and intelligent analyst through long experience – the traditional basis of a connoisseur’s authority and sound judgement.

<A>Sotirakopoulou and the Keros Haul: what can be learnt from a large group of looted figures?

Peggy Sotirakopoulou has studied in great detail the best understood and best documented of the surfacing groups, the “Keros Haul”, which Getz-Preziosi estimated as originally containing 350 pieces (Getz-Preziosi 1983:37; 1987b:134), plus others subsequently surfacing which are said to be from it. After an enormous and painstaking study, and benefitting from other material archaeologically recovered from the site (see below), Sotirakopoulou was still uncertain what belongs to the Haul, and to the Keros site it came from, and what does not, so – sadly – came to a most limited conclusion. Answering the question of her title, *The “Keros*

Hoard”: *Myth or Reality?*, she concludes it is a “reality, in terms of a large group of finds that was forcibly detached from its natural environment at Kavos-Daskalio”. But “it is no longer possible to identify all the objects that it originally comprised, or to verify the provenance of a number of others attributed to it” (Sotirakopoulou 2005:323–35, especially 325). So, examining closely the best – and only – group of “surfacing” figures (or fragmentary figures) for which we may have grounds to hope we might be able to gain a reasonably secure understanding, we gain no answers about its own particular corruption. Notice also that the main new element in Papamichelakis’ reports from the looters – that there were at the site both whole figures in graves and broken figures in another kind of deposit – cannot be verified. Examining individual figures using the Getz-Gentle approach has not clarified the situation, and neither does examining a group which appear and are said to belong together.

<A>Keros Haul and “Special Deposit North”: what can be learnt from a looted site?

“Special Deposit North”, the looted site at Daskalio-Kavos and source of the Keros Haul, has been studied in great and thorough detail in the hope that understanding could be reached that way. Survey and small-scale rescue excavation had not much clarified what the site was and what had happened there, so a full-scale field study was conducted in 1987 and 1988, of surface traces and by excavating quite large areas (Renfrew et al. 2007; Renfrew et al. 2015; Sotirakopoulou et al. 2017; Renfrew 2017). In 14 trenches covering 45 m², the same conditions were found: “The Special deposit seemed disturbed almost everywhere we dug. Nowhere did we encounter an undisturbed stratigraphy of significant depth. . . . we were surprised at the comprehensive nature of the recent disturbance.”¹⁷ In short, the site is wrecked and, although subsequent scientific research offered valuable insights into the use of Special

Deposit North, nothing can be added regarding figures said to have come from there; field research therefore turned to the apparently similar site, “Special Deposit South”, which luckily the looters had not found.¹⁸ Examining single figures is unproductive; so is examining a group; so is examining the looted site the group is said to come from.

<A>Learning from Collections

The Sherratt study of the Ashmolean Cycladic collection: what can be learnt from an early collection?

Susan Sherratt has used yet another approach, exploring what exists in the documentary record which should be most valuable for early museum collections. She has studied with great skill and extreme thoroughness all the Cycladic material in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, amongst it a group of objects which includes 4 figures within it, and a further 33 individual figures, mostly acquired before 1910 (Sherratt 2000). Luckily, the Ashmolean has preserved an archive far fuller than is usual, which Sherratt has explored with great care and insight.¹⁹ Even so, it is incomplete and indeed valuable elements were lost quite recently. Sherratt tells us of her archival work: “several times in the extent documentation I came across references to documents that no longer exist. According to Ann Brown, this was because at some point in the 1980s the then Keeper ordered his secretary to “thin out” the archives. My own suspicion is, though, that in at least one or two cases, documents may have been destroyed because of doubts about legality (Mackenzie’s plans for smuggling Cycladica out of Greece were marked “not for disclosure”) or authenticity (some objects that Dawkins gave to the museum, where the extant documentation refers to correspondence between him and Evans which is now missing).”

Although well published by a major university press, her study is part of an expensive and specialized 2-volume catalogue, which presents itself simply as an analytical description of the collection (Sherratt 2000); therefore its broader significance and the wisdom of its wonderful essay on current issues around Cycladic figurines²⁰ are not well-known. It is these better-documented and older collections – of which this is the most important – which will be, after other approaches (above) have not lifted the darkness, our last and only hope of shining good light onto the corpus. Accordingly, we here present in Table 1 central points about the 37 figures, and in Table 2 the pattern found in the 37; and we report Professor Sherratt's considered views in a little detail.

(Insert Table 1 around here)

(Insert Table 2 around here)

What pattern is visible in the Ashmolean Museum collection (Table 2)? There are 37 figures altogether. As regards the specific concern of the present article, pastiches and their being presented as genuine, three figures are most suspect. Of the Kapros D group figures, Sherratt considers 1.a.1 only “possibly” ancient. Of the puzzling and anomalous 7.31, a head only, Sherratt notes varied worrying aspects, then concludes it is probably prehistoric. Sherratt is more cautious about 7.32, a small figure of unique type, concluding it is “possibly late nineteenth century?” Clearly, all three fall outside any corpus intended to be secure. 7.31 was found or bought in Amorgos in 1891; 7.32, said to be from Amorgos, was purchased in 1898 (For Amorgos in this period: Galanakis 2013). Thus, all these three set aside are early finds but insecure in their status, leaving 34 to be considered as regards find-spot and their subsequent collecting history. Sherratt thinks that the authenticity of two others of the four figures in the Kapros D group may be questioned, but on balance of the evidence reviewed, we keep them in.

Excluding those three, there remain, as regards find-spot: 5 figures with secure knowledge, that is, at least which Cycladic island it comes from, sometimes with more detail as to where on that island and in what context; 26 with insecure knowledge, expressed by Sherratt as “said to be from” a certain island; 3 for which we have no information. The 19 “said to be from Amorgos” make up a large majority of the whole collection. As regards history, 30 have been known since a date before 1914, 4 from a certain date between 1945 and the 1970s, but with grounds to think they were known before 1914, with one of unknown history.

The conclusions to be drawn from Sherratt’s account of this large, famous, well-documented and early collection are dismaying, even desperate. The key conclusions are these. There was then no crisp distinction between “good” legal scholarly archaeology and disreputable illegal wicked looting. For probably the majority of collectors at the turn of the twentieth century, Sherratt concludes, “the question of detailed context and association was of

little or no importance and those more scholarly antiquarians who put a premium on such information (like Dümmler, Wolters, and Evans) were comparatively rare” (Sherratt 2000:30).

A key agent (Sherratt 2000:2) in Athens for the Ashmolean Museum was Arthur Evans, the celebrated excavator of Knossos. The Kapros D group was bought by Evans from Dr Athanasios Rhousopoulos, who was professor of Archaeology and Philology at the University of Athens; he created a vast private collection, commissioned illicit antiquities digging, and sold some of the finds to foreign collectors such as Evans.²¹ The Kapros D group, when first reported by Dümmler in 1886 (Dümmler 1886. See also Karlsruhe 2011:272–5, no. 66) included four marble “idols”; when Wolters published a second report, in 1891, there were still four but one was made of shell, and two of these four are now in the British Museum and in Munich;²² when bought by Evans for the Ashmolean in 1893, the group still had four figures, the four in it today – but which? Sherratt concludes it was not an actual closed group, in the proper sense of a set of objects found together and kept together, but a shifting assemblage (Sherratt 2000:27–29). The group was reported as coming from a grave at Kapros on Amorgos (hence its name), and Amorgos is by far the dominant place reported as the find-spot of the whole Ashmolean collection (Table 2). Noting that “the deliberate obscuring – or more generally – vagueness of provenance and circumstances of finding was a natural result of such covert or semi-covert transactions,” Sherratt notes the “centripetal pull of an island from which, by this time, collectors expected antiquities of this sort to come which dictated an Amorgan provenance”.²³ So we cannot trust the Amorgos provenances; can we trust any of them? When it comes to fakes, Sherratt reminds us that Arthur Evans’s father, the famous pioneering prehistorian Sir John Evans, had as early as 1865 found the forging of antiquities so prevalent that he delivered a lecture on the subject in London (reprinted 1893).²⁴ This is a frighteningly early date – the same year as Lubbock’s *Prehistoric times*, three decades before the 1890s decade when the Ashmolean acquired 16 of its Cycladic figures.

The Cycladic collection in Cambridge: developing a collection during the inter-war years

The character of the Ashmolean collection formed since the end of the nineteenth century can be compared with a second but more modest university collection in Cambridge. There are thirteen Cycladic figures in the various Cambridge collections (The Fitzwilliam Museum; The Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology; Girton College). One of these, a Spedos figure, forms part of the collection of Girton College and was presented by Miss Ethelwyn R. Pearson (1871–1961); it had a possible, though perhaps unlikely, find-spot of Melos. The main impetus for the formation of the Fitzwilliam collection was immediately after the First World War when Winifred Lamb, the newly appointed Honorary Keeper of Greek Antiquities, created a new prehistoric gallery when space was created thanks to the creation of a new wing (Gill 2018a). The need was particularly urgent as Richard M. Dawkins, formerly of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, had withdrawn his loans when he moved to Oxford (See also note 54 above; for Dawkins: Gill 2004b);²⁵ his figures now form part of the Cycladic collection in the Ashmolean Museum. Only three complete figures—a Louros type, a Spedos type, a Dokathismata type—were left in the museum: all three had been said to have been found on Amorgos and were presented by Robert C. Bosanquet, the then Director of the British School at Athens, in 1901.²⁶ The Spedos figure is now attributed to the Fitzwilliam Sculptor (**Fig. 1**).²⁷ (Insert Figure 1 around here) There are three other figures attributed to this individual: one excavated by S. Xanthoudides at Koumasa on Crete, and two with no recorded find-spot (one in Stockholm and the other in the Benaki Museum in Athens). In addition to the three figures from Amorgos, a head of a transitional figure that had been excavated by Bosanquet at Phylakopi on Melos was presented to the Fitzwilliam in 1902 by the

Greek Government as part of the share of the finds (the head is now displayed in the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology inv. D 1984.30: Thimme 1977:452, no. 119). The Fitzwilliam acquired a Spedos figure, said to have been found on Melos, from Alan J.B. Wace, who had just stepped down as Director of the British School at Athens, in 1924; it was presented by the Friends of the Fitzwilliam Museum (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum inv. GR.17.1924: Thimme 1977:461, no. 136). A group of six Louros figures, three in marble and three cut from shell, were purchased from J.P. Orphanides in 1933 (and given by the Friends of the Fitzwilliam Museum). They are said to have been found in a single grave on Paros, and have been attributed to the “Fitzwilliam Louros Master” (Getz-Preziosi 1987a:63. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum inv. GR.8a–f.1933; Thimme 1977:444–5, nos. 88–93). The final figure to be acquired was purchased from T. Zoumboulakis in Athens in 1934, and presented by the Friends of the Fitzwilliam Museum (**Fig. 2**).²⁸ It was said to have been found on Ios. (Insert Figure 2 around here)

The Cambridge figures are predominantly derived from the market, several in Athens. Some of the pieces surfaced prior to the First World War and are likely to be genuine if it is accepted that widespread faking of Cycladic figures did not take place at that point in time. The figure that was reported to have been derived from Ios has characteristics that may suggest that it was a modern creation (See also Tsirogiannis, Gill, and Chippindale 2022:381). Although Bosanquet mentions Cycladic finds such as pottery and obsidian in his letters and papers, no explicit mention of figures has yet to be identified (See Bosanquet 1938. See also Gill 2004a). Figures are also apparently absent from the memoirs of Dawkins and Wace (Gill 2004b; 2004c).

*****The Metropolitan Museum of Art: learning from a civic collection*

New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art acquired its first Cycladic figures in 1934 through a purchase of a ECII figure from the Greek dealer Theodore Zoumboulakis along with a marble bowl and a fragmentary terracotta vessel (**Fig. 3**).²⁹ (Insert Figure 3 around here) This was followed in 1945 by a Plastiras type figure formerly in the Edward Perry Warren collection at Lewes House in Sussex, England; and an ECI figure purchased from Emmanuel Segredakis.³⁰ In 1947 Richter purchased a seated harpist from the estate of Joseph Brummer (New York MMA inv. 47.100.1: Thimme 1977:491, no. 253). Three more figures—one Neolithic, and one a male—from this collection were bequeathed to the MMA in 1971 by Walter C. Baker (here one is illustrated, **Fig. 4**).³¹ (Insert Figure 4 around here) All three had formed part of the Joseph Brummer collection, and two of them had originated with Zoumboulakis. A bronze head of a griffin which was stolen from the Olympia Museum between 1914 and 1936 and was sold in 1936 from Zoumboulakis to Joseph Brummer, was subsequently sold to Walter C. Baker in 1948, and it was later bequeathed to the MMA in 1972; in February 2025 the griffin's head was repatriated to Greece (New York, MMA inv. 1972.118.54, 'Provenance'). A fragment of a Cycladic figure, part of a leg, was acquired as a gift from Ernest Brummer in 1959 (New York, MMA inv. 59.48.35). Two figures were acquired from Christos Bastis in 1964 and 1968: an ECII head and a complete figure attributed to the Bastis Sculptor that had been acquired from Nikolas Koutoulakis (**Fig. 5**).³² (Insert Figure 5 around here) A marble head was purchased from A. Manolas in 1969 in honour of Gisela Richter (New York MMA inv. 69.11.5), and the upper part of a Chalandriani figure was acquired as a gift from Alasdair Bradley Martin in 1971 (New York MMA inv. 1971.258.1: Thimme 1977:484, no. 238).

Alice K. Bache bequeathed two figures in 1977: one a Chalandriani type and the other an ECII with repairs.³³ Three more heads of figures were bequeathed in 2020 by Nanette B. Kelekian (New York MMA inv. 2021.40.11).

Other figures have been placed on loan (excluding the Stern collection; see below). They consist of a figure on loan from Columbia University (New York MMA inv. L.1997.70), a Neolithic figure on loan from the Cindy and David Sofer collection (New York MMA inv. L.2012.13), and a torso, also from the Sofer collection, attributed to the Goulandris Sculptor that formed part of the Keros Haul (New York MMA inv. L.2013.1). A head that was on loan from Richard Hurotowitz had originated with Koutoulakis (New York MMA inv. L.2013.76. Now returned).

The Getty Collection: learning from a recently formed museum collection

The formation of the Fitzwilliam's collection ceased in the 1930s. In contrast, the collection of Cycladic figures in the J. Paul Getty Museum was initiated in 1971 by three purchases from the Royal-Athena Galleries in Manhattan: a head from a Spedos figurine, a head from a Dokathismata figure, and a Plastiras type figure.³⁴ The two fragmentary heads are both assigned to the Keros Haul.³⁵ Further Cycladic figures in 1978, 1979, 1983, 1988, and 1996 were linked to the Keros Haul, reminding us of the long-lived corrupting influence of such looting. The two pieces acquired in 1978 and 1979 can be traced back to Koutoulakis who sold them to Malcolm Wiener of New York.³⁶ A Dokathismata torso fragment acquired in 1983 was also acquired from Koutoulakis (Malibu inv. 83.AA.201: Sotirakopoulou 2005, no. 246). Five fragments were sold by Koutoulakis to Stefan Hornak who donated them to the museum.³⁷ Two further pieces attributed to the Keros Haul were acquired in 1988 from the Paul and Marianne Steiner collection (via the Safani Gallery), and in 1996 from the Fleischman collection (**Fig. 6**).³⁸ (Insert Figure 6 around here)

Outside the Keros Haul material, five other pieces were acquired from the former Steiner collection. They included a Louros type figure that had been acquired from the Leo and

Evelyn Farland collection in New York, and two from anonymous private collections.³⁹ Of the remaining Cycladic figures acquired by the Getty, one precanonical figure was acquired from the collection of Dr Fred and Virginia Bromberg, a Dokathismata type figure was acquired by exchange with Galerie Nefer in Zurich, a Kapsala type attributed to the Kontoleon Sculptor (**Fig. 7**), and a harpist (**Fig 8**) and a late Spedos type figure attributed to the Schuster Sculptor from Robin Symes (**Fig. 9**).⁴⁰ (Insert Figures 7-9 around here)

The Getty's collection of Cycladic figures was either largely derived from the Keros Haul, or from figures that surfaced through the market without any hint of their origin. Such a collection lacks the assurance of authenticity or archaeological security that is found in older and more established bodies of material. Koutoulakis, Frieda Tchacos (of the Galerie Nefer) and Robin Symes have been involved in numerous cases of illicit antiquities, many of which have been repatriated to several countries in recent years.

The Leonard Stern Collection: learning from a recently formed private collection

The display of the Leonard Stern Collection of Cycladica has reignited the issues that were raised by Gill and Chippindale thirty years ago suggesting that the study (and display) of Cycladic figures has not moved along as some might like to suggest. Stern's collection, in part standing behind the title of Harmon Fine Arts, came to prominence in 1990 when eleven pieces, including an Anatolian "Stargazer" figure now in the Cleveland Museum of Art, were placed on display in an exhibition at the Merrin Gallery in New York.⁴¹ At least five of the Stern figures have been associated with the Keros Haul (Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 170, 180, 181, 223, and 242). There are at least 95 figures or fragments of figures in the Stern collection, though only two appear to have a reported find-spot: the third longest (or tallest) Cycladic

figure was said to have been derived from Amorgos, and another attributed to the Goulandris Sculptor was linked to Paros.⁴² A selection of some 38 figures featured in Getz-Gentle's *Personal Styles in Early Cycladic Sculpture* and this provided some further information about the sources consisting either of previous collections or the dealer or auction-house. A Sardinian figure owned by Harmon Fine Arts had been acquired from Robin Symes (Bogdanos and Iyer 2021:15–16).

In 2022 it was decided to place this collection of 161 items into the care of the Hellenic Ancient Culture Institute (HACI) in Delaware, while the main ownership would be placed with the Hellenic Republic. An agreement was reached with the Hellenic authorities so that 15 items from the collection could be displayed for a year at the Museum of Cycladic Art in Athens, and then be placed on long-term loan, along with the rest of the Stern collection, at New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art where they would be displayed for ten years. After this initial period batches of 15 objects would be placed on loan in a museum in Greece. The majority of the Stern collection will continue to be on display at the Metropolitan Museum of Art for twenty five years.⁴³ The agreement itself had to be agreed by Parliament in Athens in September 2022 (Ioannidis 2022; Moynihan 2022; Paphitis 2022).

Concerns about the agreement have been raised in Greece. Despite the Minister's repeated statements in the Greek Parliament that, according to the relevant Directorate, none of the 161 objects from the Stern collection matches any antiquities depicted in the seized photographic archives, one of us has identified a figure in the Becchina archive and published it much before the first 15 objects were sent temporarily in Greece (Migdou 2022). Therefore, although there was a known and published case of an indisputable figure derived from a contested source, the decision to proceed with the agreement appears to legitimize the acquisition of recently-surfaced antiquities that are connected to notorious and convicted traffickers. The arrangement between the Hellenic authorities and HACI appears to overlook

the fact that each one of the pieces has been deprived of its archaeological context and therefore the associated contextual knowledge.

The authenticity of these Cycladic figures is unclear and Christos Doumas has suggested four or five of the ten displayed in Athens at the end of 2022 were modern creations, in part based on the type of marble that was used.⁴⁴ Only one of these suspicious figures is specifically identified: a Late Neolithic figure that Getz-Gentle described as having an “arresting quality” as well as being “highly unusual” (Getz-Gentle 2001:5–6, 173, fig. 2a, pl. 2; Fappas 2022, nos. 1). Perhaps tellingly, Getz-Gentle observed, “the figure appears to belong to a type not previously recognized among the rare Aegean marble images of the Neolithic period”.⁴⁵ Are there other modern creations lurking within the collection? For example, the similarities between one of the figures and the Koutsoupis harpist in the Metropolitan Museum of Art could raise concern especially as they are “said to come from [the] same source”.⁴⁶ Failure to address this issue may allow the corpus of Cycladic figures to be corrupted as the pieces are placed on long-term public display in New York and a definitive catalogue prepared.⁴⁷

<A>Means to illuminate the Cycladic corpus: learning from several approaches

Previous sections of our paper have reviewed several ways in which some reliable information *might* be found in the Cycladic corpus. None of this quite large body of diverse work, by excellent researchers, has brought any substantial knowledge which can bring some order to the corpus. Indeed, by reminding us of early predecessors to recent forgers, by raising the suspicion that even the early Ashmolean finds may include pastiches, by pointing to the clear hint of false provenances again from an early date, they—if anything—prove that the situation is actually worse than we thought it was. There is less than slight prospect of

illumination from memoirs, recollections or documented accounts of the last several decades. We can only dream of a crisp scientific method which will briskly sort fake from genuine in the flash of a non-destructive analytical light. For the moment, and for who knows how long in the future, we are stuck with the corruption. Before we conclude the paper with some constructive ways to work with the corrupt corpus, some other points need to be made.

<A>In praise of pastiches

There is nothing wrong with later and modern pastiches, whether close copies of existing things or new designs in the spirit of a given style. We have both in the Cycladic corpus: close copies in the replicas sold by some Museums like the Goulandris and in the fakes mentioned by a Forger (Tsirogiannis, Gill, and Chippindale 2022) as modelled on those pastiche replicas; and a new element of design in the Koutsoupis harpist (whether or not this is the one now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York).⁴⁸ Pastiches have a long and honourable history, including in Classical times the Roman copies by which we know several major Greek sculptures whose (bronze) original is lost,⁴⁹ and in early modern times the training of new artists by their making pastiches of existing masterpieces. The recent revival of interest in Classical cast collections underlines the value of these close pastiches of great sculptures in making them available, at full scale and in near-identical form, in places far from the originals and where a diverse set of masterpieces can be gathered up to stand close together in a way the scattered originals never do.⁵⁰

A useful capacity of pastiches is that they can be made even “fuller”; more extreme, that is, and therefore more compelling, than are many or even all the originals. One can today make a pastiche Henry Moore which is more “Mooreish” in its traits than the sculptor’s actual works, its exact form depending on what that Moore aesthetic is thought to be, and just what

characteristics make a sculpture more Mooreish: to the contemporary eye, a pastiche so designed can be “better” than a genuine Moore in that it elicits the “fitting” response more strongly. Encouraged by Getz-Gentle’s confidence that many of those “very best” Cycladic are fake, and by the high proportion of these which surfaced with no or slight history or archaeology, and by the common instinctive (as it seems) inclination to be excited by a “really good” figure, we think it likely that this move towards the extreme has happened with Cycladic. The result of this would be that we may now have within the corpus a group of “over-Cycladic” or “hyper-Cycladic” pastiche figures, especially in the variants noticed above, such as those near-life-size, some musicians, double and treble figures, and some in the very best physical condition.

The makers of the series of ivory objects and the marble Fitzwilliam Goddess in the early twentieth century (Butcher & Gill 1993) were consciously trying to produce unique objects, objects going beyond what had been seen before – because there were the most sought after in that era. Today, when the variants and typologies of both Cretan and Cycladic types are much better known, a safer strategy may be to make figures which closely match established styles and types. It would seem that contemporary forgers are becoming too clever to invent fancy variations – like the “Henry James” look of the Boston Goddess or the “flapper” look of the Toronto figure.⁵¹

Believing the place for original Cycladic figures is in the security of publicly owned museums, the present authors have no desire themselves to possess one. But one of us certainly would enjoy having a pastiche in their house. He would prefer one which is in some way “hyper-Cycladic” or with some kind of a twist: he fancies, say, a musician just a little oversize playing not a harp but, say, a *buccina*, the curved brass horn of the Roman army, as a tease because the horn is ancient to us yet wildly later than the Cycladic era. Trouble with later pastiches only begins when they are honestly mistaken or dishonestly presented as being

ancient, as may well have happened with the Metropolitan's harpist, and has happened with whatever proportion of the collected corpus is fake.

<A>The future of the Cycladic corpus: recognizing the need for subdivision

Now that we have *some* knowledge of the issues – especially looting, pastiches made as fakes, identifying individual pastiches, understanding collections of looted figures, exploring the looted sites, knowing old collections better from their records – we can find as good a way forward as exists in unhappy circumstances.

We cannot rely on the surfacing figures, with or without accounts of their archaeology and history, which may or may not be true. They are a mixture of pastiches and genuine figures, proportions of each unknown, and the statements about archaeology and history vary in their certainty, again in unknown proportions. We can divide the corpus in light of what we know for each figure of its *archaeology* and its *history*, using the definitions established in a 1993 paper.⁵² There we posed the notion of an object having a three-step existence: first is its ancient life, as a cultural object in its own time, until it enters the earth (or water) and is forgotten. It then has a period of limbo, in the earth (or water) and lost from the human world, when it has no cultural life. Then, once re-discovered, it enters a new life, not in a resumption of its former social meaning, but as an antiquity in a modern world, where its age is its defining virtue, and – very often – its former social purpose is not resumed and – quite often – that purpose is unknown.⁵³

The meaning and use of Cycladic figures, for example, is unknown: we just have speculations⁵⁴ prompted by what we see in them and what we know of their context. *Archaeology* is the life-history of the object in ancient times up to its going into the ground and out of active cultural life, as evidenced in its archaeological context as surviving and in which

it is discovered; ideally, our knowledge of this can be a full record of that context; at a minimum it is simply some kind of known find-spot, which in the case of Cycladic figures is commonly as imprecise as just a named island. *History* is the record of what has happened to it coming to light in recent times, and its subsequent modern story as an object once more having an active cultural life – but one which surely has nothing in common with its ancient life. Ideally, and in some actual cases, this history is a continuous and documented record of its finding and its movements since its rediscovery. With these considerations in mind, we can divide the collected Cycladic corpus into several defined parts.

Corpus 1: an archaeologists' corpus

Archaeology is the study of the past from the surviving material evidence, and archaeologists are the people who do this work. Their primary ambition is to discover reliable knowledge of the past, whether that resides in grubby and dismal little objects, or beguiling and attractive ones like the Cycladic figures. Therefore, the corpus they work with must be of those figures for which there is reliable history, that is: reliable knowledge of when they were found and what happened subsequently, as this also provides confidence that they are genuine. Reliable history goes with reliable archaeology, knowledge of where they were found and – one hopes – at least some report of what context, such as its being found in a grave. This ancillary information conveys further knowledge beyond what is immanent in the object itself.

Sotirakopoulou's study of the Keros Haul reports that at the time of her writing, just under twenty years ago, there were a total of about 1405 extant Cycladic figures from all sources.⁵⁵ She suggested only about 41.5% (some 583) have reliable archaeology and history.⁵⁶ Our larger sample in excess of 1600 figures suggests that some 45% of the corpus has a secure history. Sotirakopoulou's count may include the fragments archaeologically recovered from

the looted Keros site in 1963 and 1967 (the site now called “Special Deposit North”). To these can now be added the 34 (some tiny fragments) excavated there in 1987 and 1988 (Renfrew et al. 2007: 265–86; Renfrew et al. 2008); the more than 500 fragments recovered from later excavations at the new neighbouring and un-looted site, “Special Deposit South” (Renfrew et al. 2009:28, 108; Renfrew et al. 2013, 2015, 2018; Renfrew and Boyd 2017); also, other figurines as new excavations find them, such as the 10 from the near-by site on the now-separate islet of Dhaskalio (Renfrew et al. 2009:42; Renfrew et al. 2013, 2015, 2018; Marthari, Renfrew, and Boyd 2017). However, if you exclude the fragmentary finds from “Special Deposits North and South” at Kavos, the secure part of the corpus is closer to 14%.

Secure material can include material from unscientific investigations, such as those found by J. Theodore Bent on Antiparos that now form part of the Cycladic collection in the British Museum.⁵⁷ One academic response to our earlier work on the insecure corpus has been to collect and identify figures derived from excavations. Scientific work in various cemeteries in the Cyclades has yielded further figures from Aplomata, Phiondas, Aghioi Anargyroi, and Avdeli, on Naxos; Epano and Kato Kouphonisi; and Syros.⁵⁸ Further studies have identified figures that have been found on the Greek mainland, the north and eastern Aegean, and on Crete (Marthari, Renfrew, and Boyd 2019a; Stampolidis and Sotirakopoulou 2017). Such secure excavated figures (and fragmentary figures) will provide the benchmark for defining the corpus.

Together these make the **archaeologists’ corpus**, that is, the set of Cycladic figures we can rely on as sources of reliable information about prehistoric times. We have good confidence they are genuine, and that the information we have about their find-spot and context is dependable, whether it is full or slight. The key qualifying condition is that we are seeking *security*. At the present, then, these total about a thousand figures and fragments, in two sets of roughly equal size with different contexts in their deposits. About half come from varied

islands; some of these are complete, and some come from graves. The other half, nearly all fragments, come from the two Special Deposits on Keros.

On close examination of the archaeology and history of figures in this should-be-secure group, some may have to leave. That happened to most of the Ashmolean's 37 figures when Sherratt closely studied their history and reported on their archaeology: she concluded accounts of only 6 were secure. On further examination in this way of other collections, the non-Keros half of the archaeologists' corpus may be drastically reduced. There is no merit in separating a group to be relied on if it is immediately allowed to accept any figures whose archaeology and history is not really secure! Since the corpus is corrupt, we think a tough criterion of security is right, and in consequence this archaeologists' corpus is on the small side: it will shrink as further accounts of history and archaeology for presently known figures are found not good enough (as for the Ashmolean's, above). It will grow with new and reliable discoveries.

Corpus 2: a connoisseurs' corpus

Guided by the *Oxford English Dictionary*, we define connoisseurship as critical acquaintance with works of art or matters of taste, in this case specifically with the Cycladic figures as works of art, valuing them primarily for their aesthetic merit.⁵⁹ If a Cycladic figure also is informative about prehistory, that is valued but secondary: the primary concern resides in the object as it is understood and experienced in the world today. Insofar as a figure may be a pastiche, any evidence it is genuine is valuable, such as the kind of reassurance which a known history may provide.

Alongside the archaeologists' corpus, hoped to be secure, is a second group of 32.5% of the whole (about 457), those which, as Sotirakopoulou says, have "a fairly certain or alleged provenance from one of the Cycladic islands, even though the exact conditions of discovery of

those pieces are unknown”.⁶⁰ So ancillary information is missing, but there can be some measure of confidence they are genuine: one can say “These should be OK.” This group makes the **connoisseurs’ corpus**. Its separate definition from the archaeologists’ corpus follows the different balance between present and past in the two kinds of interested parties, one concerned more with the object in the past, one with the object in the present.

Given the reality of how collectors and dealers have behaved over the decades, it is evident the connoisseurs’ tradition does involve placing esteem, and the connoisseur’s high capacity to appreciate the finest things, above other considerations. One consideration evidently not prime is to be guided by what national laws do and do not permit: there is a persistent arrogance of desire, and a consequent right to possess. To take one aspect only, if the Greek government permits no Cycladic figures to be legally exported, then all recently exported Cycladic figures in that corpus are illicit and must have travelled through improper and murky channels, so there is an increased risk of any one of them being a pastiche.⁶¹

Corpus 3: unresolved corpus

Sotirakopoulou reports about 25% of the 1405 are of “unknown provenance” that is, have no archaeology or no history or neither archaeology nor history, totaling about 351.⁶² These make a group even more risky, that is, a further set of Cycladic figures we enjoy and revere as objects in our time, in the world today; but bring a greater risk they are not ancient, and on which we certainly cannot rely as sources of trustworthy information about the ancient past: this is an insecure group and, therefore, we call this the **unresolved corpus**.

These figurines certainly do not qualify for the archaeologists’ corpus. Whether they can be moved or “promoted” into the connoisseurs’ corpus depends again on a balance of interests, on esteem for the figure as an admirable object in the present world, against the risk

it is pastiche, against the possibility it was looted and the consequences that event had. Insofar as the connoisseurs' world is also the world of market and of cash value, those values also fundamentally shape this corpus and decide the point of balance. Also, in this corpus are placed those figures for which there is some reported archaeology and/or history but about which there are reasonable grounds to fear they are pastiches (see above, the Ashmolean figures).

Corpus 4: an outcast corpus

Nearly all Cycladic figures have been found in Greece, mostly in the Cyclades, and a very few in Türkiye.⁶³ So, nearly every Cycladic figure found outside Greece must either: have been legally exported with consent, but we are not aware of any State permission having ever been granted for a Cycladic figure to leave Greece permanently; or left Greece before the law banning such export was passed in 1834 (revised in 1932, in 2002 and parts of the later in 2008) – surely vanishingly few, as this date, so long ago, falls before the era when Cycladic figures began to be valued alongside Classical objects; or left Greece illegally.

The Act as amended in 1899 ruled that all finds be notified regardless of the circumstances of discovery; and private ownership of or dealing in antiquities was only allowed for objects of no rarity or of foreign origins. By this date, Cycladic figures had already been described as “Archaic figures of Aphrodite” and in a very few years Dawkins was paying high prices for them. They had become objects of cash and cultural value. Even so, Mackenzie's actions show that it was not difficult to smuggle them out of Greece after 1899 (Sherratt (pers. comm.)). See also Momigliano 1999:27–8).

We can understand this 1899 benchmark by considering the Cycladic figures acquired by the British Museum and the Louvre. For the British Museum, there are reported to be “some 25 female Cycladic figurines, representing all the main types” (British Museum 2011. See also

Fitton 1989), one male figurine and parts of 7 more figurines (mainly heads), totaling 33. Most of these were acquired prior to 1899. Of these, 26 entered the British Museum collection between 1842 and 1890, 4 between 1904 and 1932, and 3 between 1969 and 2011.⁶⁴ The earliest was acquired from Thomas Burgon in 1842 (reportedly from Syros, London BM inv. 1842.7-28.616: Fitton 1989:41, fig. 42), five were purchased from William Webster in 1854 (London BM inv. 1854.12-18.22-26: Fitton 1989:40, 50, figs. 40, 59-61), three from Viscount Strangford in 1863 (London BM inv. 1863.02-13.1-3: Fitton 1989:46, 49, 53, figs. 51-2, 57-8, 67), two purchased from Rollin & Feuarden in 1875 (London BM inv. 1875.03-13.1-2: Fitton 1989:41, 51, figs. 41, 62), three from the Reverend Greville J. Chester (in 1882, 1889, and 1890),⁶⁵ and the remainder from J.T. Bent in 1884 and 1886.⁶⁶ A figure once owned by Thomas A.B. Spratt was acquired in 1904, and further figures were acquired from C.A. Lembressis in 1912, by exchange with the Greek Government, and from Sir Arthur Evans in 1932 (London BM inv. 1904.06-05.4, 1912.04-17.1, 1912.06-26.352, 1932.10-18.1: Fitton 1989:47, 67, fig. 53, 54, 84). Two of the figures, acquired in 1969 and 1971, were purchased from Robin Symes, and a further figure of a hunter/warrior was purchased in 2011.⁶⁷ The Louvre only acquired five figures prior to 1899: a head reported to be from Keros from Olivier Rayet in 1873, two figures from Paros from Gustave Hinstin in 1876, and two heads reported to be from Amorgos from Jules Delamarre in 1896.⁶⁸ Over twenty figures were given to the museum by Maryse Cordesse in 1996: at least three are associated with the Keros Haul.⁶⁹

If the events in the early 1970s—such as the UNESCO Convention—are seen as “changing the rules” of what is right and what is not, then that era should now be emerging as a standard *de facto* date for the art market in antiquities to separate what is respectable from what is not: so an ancient object which was demonstrably outside its likely or certain country of origin by then is welcomed on the open market – whether or not it left its country of origin lawfully. If it emerged later than this period, then the open market is not comfortable with it.

(Less open parts of the market may accommodate it, comfortably or not.) This change of attitude is evident, for instance, in the antiquities sales of the great auction-houses in London and New York; as late as the early 1990s these usually gave either slight account or none at all of the history of objects they sold; now every object has, one notices, some account which begins in or before that era. The Sevso Treasure, the dazzling set of 14 Late Roman silver decorated vessels which surfaced in 1980, after the cut-off date, has been valued at many millions, but was impossible to sell on the open market.⁷⁰ It is the prototype and a leading first member in an emerging corpus of antiquities, which we can call the **outcast corpus**. It is here that Cycladic figures without a respectable history before 1970 or so will surely come to be marooned.⁷¹ Certainly, everything in this corpus falls outside the archaeologists' corpus. How many fall outside the connoisseurs' corpus depends, again, on the balance between esteem and other considerations.

<A>Which Cycladic figures belong in which of the four corpora? Consequences of the four corpora

The criteria we state above are reasonable and we propose them as a good way forward.

To summarize:

Corpus 1: **archaeologists'** Known archaeology and history, with higher confidence they are genuine.

Corpus 2: **connoisseurs'** Less-known archaeology and history, with medium confidence they are genuine.

Corpus 3: **unresolved** Unknown archaeology and history, so with lower confidence they are genuine.

Corpus 4: **outcast** Lacking history before some cut-off date, at risk of being refused by archaeologists and by the open market.

We recognize that the record of archaeology and of history is slight or weak for many figures, so deciding what “known”, “little-known” and “unknown” mean in respect of any one figure is not easy or fully reliable. Documentary records can themselves be pastiches; and we can expect the number of cases to increase where documentation is falsified to create or “improve” archaeology or history (see also below).

We can anticipate the four corpora will take different directions in future decades, consistent with their defining differences. We think it is likely that some, perhaps many, figures may leave the archaeologists’ corpus and go to the connoisseurs’. At the same time, the archaeologists’ will be increased by whatever figures are newly discovered by licensed archaeologists in excavations monitored by the Greek state. The outcast corpus should increase, but the reduction in cash value if a figure sits in the outcast rather than the connoisseurs’ corpus is great: this must create pressure and temptation to consolidate guesses, half-memories and presumptions into stated facts, alongside simple falsities. One can imagine some conversations and outcomes might go rather like this:

“This was my grandmother’s: I don’t know anything about it; I guess it is Art Deco. French, maybe? She used to go to Paris at Easter time.”

“No, it’s not twentieth century or modern at all. It’s ancient – prehistoric. It comes from the Cyclades, the archipelago between mainland Greece and Crete. Did your grandmother ever go to Greece – on holiday maybe?”

“Well, she had a friend who had a villa on a Greek island. She went there in summer maybe a couple of times. I remember she said there wasn’t really anything to do except go to the beach – it was just by the villa – and it was far too hot to enjoy that. She liked antiques and

she always liked to bring back something special to remind her of anywhere she went for a holiday.”

“Do you know any more?”

“I think what one did was go to Athens, and then one had to go on a ferry-boat which went to other islands first and took forever: she used to talk about its being all rather a long and tiresome performance to get there. And I think I may vaguely remember the name. It begins with an I or a Y and it is very short, just two or three letters, all vowels – is that possible? might that be right?”

“Ios? – one of the Cycladic islands is called Ios, and there are holiday houses there, by the beaches.”

“That must be the one.”

“When might that be?”

“Well I wouldn’t know exactly. But it must have been when she had a bit of money and could afford holidays in Greece, and it must be before she met Gerald, her second husband, and moved to the USA. That was in 1957.”

“So, it would have been early or mid-1950s?”

“I suppose it would have to be.”

“Can you be sure it was before about 1970?”

“Yes, years and years before. After she emigrated to Arizona, she only ever came back to visit relatives like me in England.”

Then, subsequently, a summary story when the figure goes to auction, presented as giving a reliable history so the buyer can be confident this Cycladic treasure is “good”:
 “Acquired on Ios, early 1950s. Descent in family to the present.”

Conclusion

As long as there has been both connoisseurship and archaeological research, the two interests – which we could also call the archaeological and the aesthetic – have run together, often intimately mixed up: they were entwined in relation to the early Ashmolean acquisitions of Cycladica. But they are to an extent opposed, as is so evident in the recent Cycladic story. It was esteem by collectors and by art museums for the aesthetic merits of Cycladic figures which prompted looting and the deliberate making of pastiches, later presented as authentic. We must now recognize that a single shared corpus can no longer serve both archaeology and aesthetic interests.⁷² We need to have two, as defined above, by the *archaeological interest* and by the *aesthetic interest*. And this split also creates the third, the figures whose place in one or other corpus is unresolved, and the fourth, refused by both.

Inevitably, if this division or one like it becomes established, then the difference in value, corpus by corpus, will create an impulse to promote objects from a poorer and cheaper corpus to one better and more valuable by “improving” its history with some false story. We must be on the lookout for such promotions, and critically scrutinize them in order to keep the archaeological corpus always uncorrupted. We believe that nevertheless it is worth splitting the existing single corpus into the four suggested corpora, because we are well overdue in the need for one uncorrupted corpus (the archaeological one) on which research in this field can securely develop.

So many unusual, remarkable and alluring figures fall outside the archaeologists’ corpus as so decided, that it will now be radically depleted in relation to the one researchers have become used to. Until now, we archaeologists have enjoyed quite a number of unusual classes, the three kinds of musicians (harpists, flautists, pan-pipers), the larger figures that approach nearly human life-size, the double and triple figures, the hybrid figures (those combining characteristics of both schematic and naturalistic) – enough of each to make distinct

recognized groups, with as many as 33 examples in the case of the hybrid figures (Sotirakopoulou 2005:63) (CONSIDER INSERTING TABLE HERE). Now we will have – alas! – just a handful of anomalous isolated figures. For example, not one of the “vertical compositions”, the six examples where the figure consists of one human standing on the shoulders of another, is secure, so this class disappears completely from the archaeologists’ corpus. Instead of a group of harpists, we will have just a single, unique example. Again, so be it, so must it be.

An analogy with another corpus of ancient objects, perhaps seeming to be extreme, is in our view extremely relevant. Prehistory always depends on the vagaries of taphonomy, on what survives and is recovered, on what perishes or is never found. We have many thousand ancient skeletons from Europe, but very few remains where soft tissues are preserved, the few score bog bodies from northern peat swamps, and the singular and unique dry mummy “Ötzi”, the Iceman from the high Italian Alps. For the rest of the millions of ancient Europeans – nothing. If it were not for some unusual cultural habit in the north European Iron Age, if it were not for a singular one-off course of events in an Alp-top snow-field, there would be no bog bodies, no “Ötzi”. We have many hundred Cycladic figures in consequence of a series of cultural chances – that figures were made, they were made of stone, that they were buried in graves or, broken, in “special deposits”, that those kinds of deposit are easy to find in the particular conditions of the Cycladic landscape, that archaeological and market interest has prompted their recovery. Suppose figures had not been made? Suppose they had been made of wood? Suppose, if made of marble, they had been cast onto the household fire when their active cultural life ended? Or broken into tiniest pieces and cast out onto the far-offshore sea-bed? Supposed they were feared in medieval times as evil instruments, pictures of devils which were hunted down and burnt with such fervour that the prehistoric cemeteries were emptied of them. That we have Cycladic figures at all and in such numbers is a matter of chance. If the record

of the majority of them is corrupted, then we must let those go. There are plenty of other sources for knowing the ancient Cyclades, the ones well used and others like the shell and stone “pestles” or “spools”, and the clay sealings (Renfrew 2011:XLI–XLIII).

Museums with antiquities collections have a hybrid role, in that they commonly combine the personalities of the archaeologist and the connoisseur: they collect ancient objects because they are ancient, but strongly prefer those of high aesthetic value; they collect fine objects and privilege those which also have the virtue of antiquity. Unsurprisingly, museums share the attitudes of the archaeologist and of the connoisseur, in different proportions, and proportions which vary over time.⁷³

In a corresponding way, and for the same reasons, different habits are evident in how damaged ancient objects are treated. The archaeologists’ preference now is for “conservation”, preferring to hold the object stable in whatever state time and chance has left it, and reluctant much to amend that. The connoisseur’s tradition is instead that of “restoration”, of returning an object to its original state, especially when this is splendid. That connoisseur’s approach is visible in several sets of photographs that have come to light of looted Greek painted pots which illicit dealers handled: these show the same pot in successive states of restoration and at successive stages of its journey from the earth to the connoisseur or museum. The pot starts grubby and with surface damage, even with earth still in the crevices, and ends up as a vase perfect in every little painted line, in improbable serenity as if made yesterday.⁷⁴ To these archaeologists, they look over-restored, falsely re-perfected, and – we would fear – in that mending, re-surfacing and re-painting some original material will have been removed, lost or covered over, and with that potential sources of information slip away.⁷⁵ That this perfecting was routine underlines how the commercial market in antiquities resolutely prefers the connoisseur’s values. Attitudes shift. Colin Renfrew as an established researcher wrote his celebration of the Goulandris collection, *The Cycladic Spirit*, about the time two of us were

beginning to grasp the malign consequences of esteem for Cycladic figures.⁷⁶ We were uneasy about his book then, because the Goulandris collection is largely of unprovenanced and looted objects (and, by its viewpoint, was a fine venture in thereby saving them from being lost to the Greek nation by disappearing to the market overseas). With good frankness, Renfrew later stated that his book (and other archaeologists' writing in the same spirit) was a misjudgement.

Outside the Cycladic, we can envisage that other corpora of ancient objects, where secure and insecure items co-exist, or where pastiches are thought to be numerous or endemic, will also need so to divide. This simple change fairly reflects that the attitudes we have to the objects today depend on different values and different ambitions; therefore, different criteria reasonably should apply by which an object is or is not accepted into any given corpus.

As archaeologists ourselves, we tend to see responsible archaeological recovery and long-term preservation in public ownership as “good” (whilst acknowledging grave drawbacks, in both theory and practice), the pursuit of figures primarily for their aesthetic value as “bad” because it privileges the present over the past, and because it encourages destruction and falsities. We also note how these different value systems uneasily co-exist today, each with their own philosophies, each leading to certain actions considered reasonable and right by one interest, irrational and wrong by the other. We recognize that connoisseurship is historically and philosophically founded upon good morality and ideals. We do not refuse this opportunity to state again that the material consequences of esteem for Cycladic figures involve much greed, deception, destruction, and simple pursuit of money. And they are so very lovely, and they should be so respected and so precious by values not to be expressed in millions of dollars.

<aubio><smcaps>christos tsirogiannis</smcaps> is a forensic archaeologist based in Cambridge (UK), where he obtained his PhD on the international trafficking networks on

antiquities. He held a post-doc position at the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research (University of Glasgow, 2014–2016) and was a Research Fellow at the Aarhus Institute of Advanced Studies (Aarhus University, 2019–2022). He is now the head of Working Group Illicit Antiquities Trafficking of the UNESCO Chair on Threats to Cultural Heritage and Cultural Heritage-related Activities (Ionian University, 2022–present) and Provenance Research Fellow at the Allard Pierson Museum, University of Amsterdam. (Aarhus Institute of Advanced Studies, University of Aarhus, Høegh-Guldbergs Gade 6B, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark; christos.tsirogiannis@cantab.net)

[**<smcaps>david w. j. gill</smcaps>**](#) is Honorary Professor and Research Fellow in the Centre for Heritage, University of Kent, and Honorary Research Fellow in the School of History, University of East Anglia. He is a former Rome Scholar at the British School at Rome and Sir James Knott Fellow at Newcastle University. He was the curator responsible for Greek and Roman Antiquities at the Fitzwilliam Museum, University of Cambridge, before moving to Swansea University where he was Reader in Mediterranean Archaeology. He was appointed Professor of Archaeological Heritage at the University of Suffolk. He is a recipient of the Outstanding Public Service Award from the Archaeological Institute of America. (Centre for Heritage, Kent Law School, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NZ, UK; d.gill@kent.ac.uk)

[**<smcaps>christopher chippindale</smcaps>**](#) is former Senior Assistant Curator at the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Reader in Archaeology, and Research Fellow in Archaeology at Girton College, Cambridge. He was editor of *Antiquity* (1987–1997). (McDonald Institute of Archaeology, Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3DZ, UK; cc43@cam.ac.uk)[**</aubio>**](#)

References

- Apostolides, A. 2006. *Arhaiokapilia kai Emporio arxhaiotiton*. Athens: Agra Publishing.
- Arrington, N. T. 2017. Connoisseurship, Vases, and Greek Art and Archaeology. In *The Berlin Painter and His World: Athenian Vase-Painting in the Early Fifth Century B.C.*, ed. J. M. Padgett, 20–39. New Haven: Princeton University Art Museum.
- Baker, M. 2007. *V&A Masterpieces: The History of the Cast Courts*. Rev. ed. London: Victoria & Albert Museum.
- Beard, M. 1993. Casts and Cast-Offs: The Origins of the Museum of Classical Archaeology. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 39:1–29.
- Bennett, M. 2013. *Praxiteles: The Cleveland Apollo*. Cleveland Masterwork Series 2. Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art.
- Bent, J. T. 1884. Researches Among the Cyclades. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 5:42–58.
- Bland, R. 2008. What's Yours is Mine. *London Review of Books* 30:39.
- Bogdanos, M., and A. Iyer. 2021. Statement of Facts in the Matter of a Grand Jury Investigation into a Private New York Antiquities Collector. New York: Manhattan DA. <<https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/21138685-2021-12-06-steinhardt-statement-of-facts-w-attachments-filed2?responsive=1&title=1>>.
- Bosanquet, E. S. (ed.) 1938. *Robert Carr Bosanquet: Letters and Light Verse*. Gloucester: John Bellows Ltd.
- British Museum. 2011. The British Museum Collection Reaches Record Audiences Worldwide (available at https://www.britishmuseum.org/about_us/news_and_press/press_releases/2011/bm_reaches_record_audiences.aspx, last accessed 11 April 2016).

- Butcher, K. 1992. The Land of Parallél: An Archaeological Obsession. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 11(1): 311–14.
- Butcher, K., and D. W. J. Gill. 1993. The Director, the Dealer, the Goddess, and Her Champions: The Acquisition of the Fitzwilliam Goddess. *American Journal of Archaeology* 97: 383–401.
- Byrnes, J. B. 1966. *Odyssey of an Art Collector: Unity in Diversity—5000 Years of Art*. New Orleans: Isaac Delgado Museum.
- Chippindale, C. 1996. Review of *The Getty Kouros Colloquium* (1993). *American Journal of Archaeology* 100: 185.
- Comstock, M. B., and C. C. Vermeule. 1976. *Sculpture in Stone: The Greek, Roman and Etruscan Collections of the Museum of Fine Arts Boston*. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts.
- Cuno, J. 2008. *Who Owns Antiquity? Museums and the Battle Over Our Ancient Heritage*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Devlin, L. 2022. Antiquity Market Trends in Cycladic Figurines, 2000–19: Studies in Price, Prevalence, and Provenance. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 29 (3): 311–44.
- Doumas, C. G. 2000. *Early Cycladic Culture: The N.P. Goulandris Collection*. Athens: N.P. Goulandris Foundation - Museum of Cycladic Art.
- . 2010. Cycladic. IV. Stone Figurines. In *Grove Art Online*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (available at <https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/gao/9781884446054.article.T020787>, last accessed 24/1/2023)
- Doumas, C. G., and V. Lambrinoudakis. 2017. The Cemetery at Aplomata on Naxos. In *Early Cycladic Sculpture in Context*, edited by M. Marthari, C. Renfrew, and M. J. Boyd: 184–218. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

- Dümmler, F. 1886. Mitteilungen von der griechischen Inseln. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 11: 15–46.
- Elia, R. J. 1996. A Seductive and Troubling Work. In *Archaeological Ethics*, edited by K. D. Vitelli: 54–62. Walnut Creek: Altamira.
- Evans, Sir J. 1865. The Forgery of Antiquities, Lecture Delivered at the Royal Institution, 24 February. Published as: “On the Forgery of Antiquities”. *Notices of the Proceedings of the Royal Institution of Great Britain* 4 (1862-6): 356-65. Reprinted as: “On the Forgery of Antiquities.” *Longman's Magazine* 23 (1893-1894): 142–5.
- . 1866. Countermarked Gaulish Coin Found in Switzerland. *Numismatic Chronicle* new series 6: 252–3.
- Fappas, I. D. 2022. *Homecoming*. Athens: Museum of Cycladic Art.
- Fellmann, B. 1981. Frühe Idole in den Münchner Antikensammlungen. *Münchner Jahrbuch der Bildenden Kunst* 32: 7–24.
- Fitton, J. L. 1989. *Cycladic Art*. London: British Museum Press.
- . 1995. *The Discovery of the Greek Bronze Age*. London: British Museum Press.
- Freeman, A. L. 2009. Swiss Gallery Surrenders EU2 Million in Antiquities to Italy. *Bloomberg*. 19 May (available at <https://www.bloomberg.com/politics?pid=newsarchive&sid=a1km7Oa1Z2SU&refer=home>, last accessed 8/11/2015).
- Galanakis, Y. 2013. Early Prehistoric Research on Amorgos and the Beginnings of Cycladic Archaeology. *American Journal of Archaeology* 117 (2): 181–205.
- Georgiou, H. 1977. Cycladic Figurines in the J. Paul Getty Museum. *J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 5: 67–74.
- Gerstenblith, P. 2019. Provenances: Real, Fake, and Questionable. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 26: 285–304.

- Getty Museum, The J. Paul. 1993. *The Getty Kouros Colloquium, Athens, 25–27 May 1992*. Athens: Nicholas P. Goulandris Foundation / Museum of Cycladic Art & Malibu (CA): The J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Getz-Gentle, P. 2001. *Personal Styles in Early Cycladic Sculpture*. Madison (WI): University of Wisconsin Press.
- . 2008a. The Keros Hoard Revisited. *American Journal of Archaeology* 112: 299–30.
- . 2008b. Keros Hoard Objects in Detail. *American Journal of Archaeology* 112 (supplementary online material): 1–7. (Available online, http://www.ajaonline.org/sites/default/files/AJA1122_Getz-Gentle_ADD.pdf last accessed 3/2/2023).
- Getz-Preziosi, P. 1966. Cycladic Objects in the Fogg and Farland Collections. *American Journal of Archaeology* 70: 105–11.
- . 1977. Cycladic Sculptors and Their Methods. In *Art and Culture of the Cyclades: Handbook of an Ancient Civilization*, edited by J. Thimme: 71–91. Karlsruhe: C.F. Müller.
- . 1981. Risk and Repair in Early Cycladic Sculpture. *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 16: 5–32.
- . 1983. The ‘Keros Hoard’: Introduction to an Early Cycladic Enigma. In *Antidoron: Festschrift für Jürgen Thimme zum 65. Geburtstag am 26. September 1982*, edited by D. Metzler, B. Otto & Ch. Müller-Wirth: 37–44. Karlsruhe: CF Müller.
- . 1984. Nine Fragments of Early Cycladic Sculpture in Southern California. *J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 12: 5–20.
- . 1985. *Early Cycladic Sculpture: An Introduction*. Malibu: The J. Paul Getty Museum.
- . 1987a. *Sculptors of the Cyclades: Individual and Tradition in the Third Millennium BC*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- . 1987b. *Early Cycladic Art in North American Collections*. Richmond: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts.
- Gill, D. W. J. 2002. Review of *Personal Styles in Early Cycladic Sculpture*, by P. Getz-Gentle. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (available at <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2002/2002-09-24.html>, last accessed 5/6/2021).
- . 2004a. Bosanquet, R. C. (1871–1935). In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 6: 695-6. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2004b. Dawkins, R. MacGillivray (1871–1955). In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 15: 538-40. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2004c. Wace, A. J. B. (1879–1957). In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 56: 632-5. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2007. Review of *The "Keros Hoard": Myth or Reality? Searching for the Lost Pieces of a Puzzle*, by P. Sotirakopoulou. *American Journal of Archaeology* 111: 163-5.
- . 2009. Review of *Who Owns Antiquity? Museums and the Battle Over Our Ancient Heritage*, by J. Cuno. *American Journal of Archaeology* 113 (available at <https://www.ajaonline.org/book-review/591>, last accessed 12/3/2025).
- . 2011. *Sifting the Soil of Greece: The Early Years of the British School at Athens (1886-1919)*. Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies suppl. vol. 111. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- . 2012. The Material and Intellectual Consequences of Acquiring the Sarpedon Krater. In *All the King's Horses: Essays on the Impact of Looting and the Illicit Antiquities Trade on Our Knowledge of the Past*, edited by P. K. Lazrus and A. W. Barker: 25–42. Washington DC: Society for American Archaeology.

- . 2014. Review of P. Getz-Gentle, *Personal Styles in Early Cycladic Sculpture*. Wisconsin Studies in Classics. Rev. ed. (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2013). *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (available at <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2014/2014-07-12.html>, last accessed 5/6/2021).
- . 2016. Thinking About Collecting Histories: A Response to Marlowe. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 23: 237-44.
- . 2017. The Destruction of the Archaeological Record Matters: Further Reflections on Marble Figures from the Cyclades. Lecture, Cambridge Aegean Archaeology Group, 9 February 2017. <https://www.academia.edu/30857624/The_destruction_of_the_archaeological_record_matters_further_reflections_on_marble_figures_from_the_Cyclades>.
- . 2018a. *Winifred Lamb: Aegean Prehistorian and Museum Curator*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- . 2018b. Returning Archaeological Objects to Italy. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 25: 283–321.
- . 2024a. *Artwashing the Past: Context Matters*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- . 2024b. Context Matters: Roman Fresco Fragments at the J. Paul Getty Museum. *Journal of Art Crime* 32: 71–7.
- Gill, D. W. J., and C. Chippindale. 1993. Material and Intellectual Consequences of Esteem for Cycladic Figures. *American Journal of Archaeology* 97(4): 601–59.
- Godart, L., S. De Caro, and M. Gavrili, eds. 2008. *Repatriated Masterpieces: Nostoi. New Acropolis Museum, 24-9 to 31-12-2008*. Translated from the Greek by D. Hardy. Athens: Ministry of Culture, General Directorate of Antiquities and Cultural Heritage.
- Hanfmann, G.M.A. 1954. *Ancient Art in American Private Collections*. Cambridge: Fogg Art Museum, 1954.
- Hemingway, S. 2012. Art of the Aegean Bronze Age. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 69.

- Hopkins, J. N., S. K. Costello, and P. R. Davis, eds. 2021. *Object Biographies: Collaborative Approaches to Ancient Mediterranean Art*. Houston: The Menil Foundation.
- Hopkins, J. N., and S. McGill. 2023. *Forgery Beyond Deceit: Fabrication, Value, and the Desire for Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ioannidis, S. 2022. Debate: Cycladic Idol Deal Signals New Chapter in Heritage Management. ekathimerini.com September 13, 2022. <<https://www.ekathimerini.com/culture/1192954/debate-cycladic-idol-deal-signals-new-chapter-in-heritage-management/>>.
- Jenkins, I. 1992. *Archaeologists & Aesthetes in the Sculpture Galleries of the British Museum 1800-1939*. London: British Museum Press.
- Karlsruhe 2011. *Kykladen: Lebenswelten einer frühgriechischen Kultur*. Karlsruhe: Badisches Landesmuseum.
- Kleftogianni, Ioanna. 2022. ‘Vomva’ Christou Douma stin Popaganda: ‘Toulahiston 4-5 eidolia apo ti sillogi Stern pou ektithetai stin Athina einai pithanotata kivdila». popaganda.gr 18 December 2022. <<https://m.popaganda.gr/people/interview/christos-ntoymas-toylachiston-4-5-eidolia-apo-ti-syllogi-stern-einai-pithanotata-kivdila/>>.
- Krosney, H. 2006. *The Lost Gospel: The Quest for the Gospel of Judas Iscariot*. Washington (DC): National Geographic.
- Kurtz, D. C. 1985. Beazley and the Connoisseurship of Greek Vases. In *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, vol. 2: 237-50. Malibu: J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Lapatin, K. D. S. 2000. Proof? The Case of the Getty Kouros. *Source* 22, 1: 43-53.
- . 2002. *Mysteries of the Snake Goddess: Art, Desire, and the Forging of History*. Boston (MA): Houghton Mifflin.
- Legaki, I. 2017. Sculptures from Phiondas, Naxos, in *Early Cycladic Sculpture in Context*, edited by M. Marthari, C. Renfrew, and M. J. Boyd: 219–54. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

- Lenain, T. 2011. *Art Forgery: The History of a Modern Obsession*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Majewski, K. 1935. *Figuralna plastyka Cycladska: Geneza i rozwój Form*. *Archivum Towarzystwa we Lwow* 6. Lwów: Nakładem Towarzystwa naukowego.
- Maniatis, Y., N. Herz, and Y. Basiakos, eds. 1995. *The Study of Marble and Other Stones Used in Antiquity*. London: Archetype.
- Marlowe, E. 2013. *Shaky Ground: Context, Connoisseurship and the History of Roman Art*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- . 2016. What We Talk About When We Talk About Provenance: A Response to Chippindale and Gill. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 23: 217–36.
- Marthari, M., C. Renfrew and M. J. Boyd, eds. 2017. *Early Cycladic Sculpture in Context*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . eds. 2019a. *Beyond the Cyclades: Early Cycladic Sculpture in Context from Mainland Greece, the North, and East Aegean*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . 2019b. Early Cycladic Sculpture Beyond the Cyclades: The Aegean Context. In *Beyond the Cyclades: Early Cycladic Sculpture in Context from Mainland Greece*, edited by M. Marthari, C. Renfrew, and M. J. Boyd: 280–96. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Merrin Gallery. 1990. *Masterpieces of Cycladic Art from Private Collections, Museums and the Merrin Gallery*. New York: Merrin Gallery.
- Mertens, J. R. 2002. Cycladic Art in the Metropolitan Museum, Antecedents and Acquisitions. In *Silent Witnesses: Early Cycladic Art of the Third Millennium BC*, edited by C. G. Doumas: 14–19. New York: Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation (USA).
- Migdou, E. 2022. Syllogi Stern kai Arhaiokapilia. *Athens Voice*, September 30, 2022. <<https://www.athensvoice.gr/politismos/773005/sullogi-stern-kai-arhaiokapilia/>>.

- Momigliano, N. 1999. *Duncan Mackenzie: a Cautious Canny Highlander & the Palace of Minos at Knossos*. Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies suppl. vol. 72. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Moynihan, C. 2022. Leonard Stern's Cycladic Art Will Be Shown at the Met but Owned by Greece. *New York Times* October 11, 2022.
- Muscarella, O. W. 2000. *The Lie Became Great: The Forgery of Ancient Near Eastern Cultures*. Studies in the Art and Archaeology of Antiquity 1. Groningen: Styx.
- Oğuzhanoglu, U. 2014. New Contributions to the Western Anatolian Early Bronze Age from Laodikeia. In *10. Yilinda Laodikeia (2003-2013 Yılları)*, Laodikeia Çalışmaları 3, edited by C. Şimşek. Istanbul: Ege Yayınları.
- Oustinoff, E. 1984. The Manufacture of Cycladic Figurines: A Practical Approach. In *Cycladica. Studies in Memory of N.P. Goulandris: Proceedings of the Seventh British Museum Classical Colloquium, June 1983*, edited by J. L. Fitton: 38–47. London: British Museum Press.
- . 1987. The Early Cycladic Sculptor: Materials and Methods. In *Early Cycladic Art in North American Collections*, edited by P. Getz-Preziosi: 90–102. Richmond (VA): Richmond, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts.
- Papadatos, Y., and E. Venieris. 2015. An Experimental Approach to the Manufacture of Cycladic Figurines: Preliminary Observations. In *Early Cycladic Sculpture in Context: Papers Presented at a Symposium Held at the Archaeological Society at Athens 27–29 May 2014*, edited by M. Marthari, C. Renfrew & M. J. Boyd: 483–90. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Papamichelakis, G., and A. C. Renfrew. 2010. Hearsay About the “Keros Hoard. *American Journal of Archaeology* 114(1): 181–5.
- Paphitis, N. 2022. Greece Ratifies Deal to Recoup 161 Ancient Treasures From US. Associated Press September 8, 2022.

- Pasquier, A. 1997. Des statuettes et des vases en marbre des îles pour le Louvre. Donation d'un ensemble d'oeuvres cycladiques (3200–2000 avant J.-C.). *La revue du Louvre et des musées de France* 2: 16–17.
- Perrot, G., and C. Chipiez. 1894. *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité* Tome VI: *La Grèce primitive, l'art mycénien*. Paris: Hachette.
- Polikreti, K. 2007. Detection of Ancient Marble Forgery: Techniques and Limitations. *Archaeometry* 49(4): 603–19.
- Reif, R. 1990. Stark Cycladic Figures Haunt Contemporary Collectors. *New York Times* March 25, 1990: 38.
- Renfrew, C. 1991. *The Cycladic Spirit: Masterpieces from the Nicholas P. Goulandris Collection*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- . 2003. *Figuring It Out. What Are We? Where Do We Come From? The Parallel Visions of Artists and Archaeologists*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- . 2008. Trenches Excavated in the Disturbed Area of the Special Deposit. In *Keros* volume 1: *Keros, Dhaskalio Kavos: The Investigations of 1987–88*, edited by A. Colin Renfrew, Christos Doumas, Lila Managou & Giorgos Gavalas: 79–114. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- . 2011. *The Emergence of Civilisation: The Cyclades and the Aegean in the Third Millennium BC*. New edition. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- . 2014. Shame Still Hangs Over the Sevso Hoard. *The Art Newspaper* 257 (May).
- . 2015. A Note on Earlier Work at the Special Deposit North. In Renfrew et al.: 399–404.
- . 2017. The Figurine Fragments Recovered from the Special Deposit North at Kavos in 1987, in *Early Cycladic Ssculpture in Context*, edited by M. Marthari, C. Renfrew, and M. J. Boyd: 369–72. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

- . 2018. The Sculptures from the Special Deposit South: The Finds. In *The Marble Finds from Kavos and the Archaeology of Ritual*, edited by C. Renfrew, O. Philaniotou, N. Brodie, G. Gavalas, and M. J. Boyd. *The Sanctuary on Keros and the Origins of Aegean Ritual Practice: The Excavations of 2006–2008*, vol. III. Cambridge: McDonald Institute.
- Renfrew, C., C. G. Doumas, L. Marangou, and G. Gavalas. 2008. *Keros, Dhaskalio Kavos: The Investigations of 1987–88*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute of Archaeology.
- Renfrew, C., O. Philaniotou, N. Brodie, G. Gavalas, E. Margaritis, C. French, and P. Sotirakopoulou. 2007. Keros: Dhaskalio and Kavos, Early Cycladic Stronghold and Ritual Centre: Preliminary Report of 2006 and 2007 Seasons. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 102: 103–36.
- Renfrew, C., O. Philaniotou, N. Brodie, and G. Gavalas. 2009. The Early Cycladic Settlement at Dhaskalio, Keros: Preliminary Report of 2008 Excavation Season. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 104: 27–47.
- Renfrew, C., O. Philaniotou, N.J. Brodie, G. Gavalas, and M. J. Boyd. 2013. *The Settlement at Dhaskalio. The Sanctuary at Keros and the Origins of Aegean Ritual Practice: The Excavations of 2006–2008*. Volume I. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Renfrew, C., O. Philaniotou, N.J. Brodie, G. Gavalas, and M. J. Boyd. 2015. *The Sanctuary at Keros and the Origins of Aegean Ritual Practice: Excavations at Dhaskalio and Dhaskalio Kavos, Keros 2006–2008*. Volume II. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Renfrew, C., O. Philaniotou, N.J. Brodie, G. Gavalas, and M. J. Boyd. 2018. *The Sanctuary at Keros and the Origins of Aegean Ritual Practice*. Volume III. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

- Renfrew, C., and M. J. Boyd. 2017. Selected Sculptural Fragments from the Special Deposit South at Kavos on Keros. In Marthari et al.: 379–94.
- Riederer, J. 1977. Forgeries of Cycladic Marble Objects. In *Art and Culture of the Cyclades: Handbook of an Ancient Civilisation*, edited by J. Thimme: 92–4. Karlsruhe: C.F. Müller.
- Safari Gallery. 1983. *The Art of the Cyclades: An Exhibition of Sculpture and Artifacts of the Early Cycladic Period*. New York: Safari Gallery.
- Sherratt, S. 2000. *Catalogue of Cycladic Antiquities in the Ashmolean Museum: The Captive Spirit*. Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Sotirakopoulou, P. 2005. *The “Keros Hoard”: Myth or Reality? Searching for the Lost Pieces of a Puzzle*. Athens: N.P. Goulandris Foundation - Museum of Cycladic Art.
- . 2008. The Keros Hoard: Some Further Discussion. *American Journal of Archaeology* 112: 279–94.
- Sotirakopoulou, P., C. Renfrew, and M. J. Boyd. 2017. Selected Sculptural Fragments from the Special Deposit North at Kavos on Keros. In Marthari et al. 2: 345–68.
- Spier, J. 1990. Blinded with Science: The Abuse of Science in the Detection of False Antiquities. *Burlington Magazine* 132: 623–31.
- Stampolidis, N., and P. Sotirakopoulou. 2007. *Aegean Waves: Artworks of the Early Cycladic Culture in the Museum of Cycladic Art at Athens*. Milan: Skira.
- . Eds. 2017. *Cycladica in Crete: Cycladic and Cycladicizing Figurines Within Their Archaeological Context*. Athens and Rethymno: University of Crete and the Museum of Cycladic Art.
- Tambakopoulos, D., and Y. Maniatis. 2017. The Marble of the Cyclades and its Use in the Early Bronze Age, in M. Marthari, C. Renfrew, and M. J. Boyd (eds.), *Early Cycladic Sculpture in Context*: 468–82. Oxford: Oxbow.

- Thimme, J., ed. 1976. *Kunst und Kultur der Kykladeninseln im 3. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Karlsruhe: C.F. Müller.
- . ed. 1977. *Art and Culture of the Cyclades: Handbook of an Ancient Civilisation.* Karlsruhe: C.F. Müller.
- True, M. 1993. The Getty Kouros: Background on the Problem. In *The Getty Kouros Colloquium: Athens, 25-27 May 1992*: 11–15. Athens: Nicholas P. Goulandris Foundation / Museum of Cycladic Art.
- Tsirogiannis, C. 2013. *Unravelling the Hidden Market of Illicit Antiquities: the Robin Symes–Christos Michaelides Network and Its International Implications.* University of Cambridge, unpublished PhD thesis.
- . 2021. The Antiquities Market We Deserve: ‘Royal-Athena Galleries’ (1942–2020). In *Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia*, edited by M. Biffis and S. Hardy. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Tsirogiannis C., D. W. J. Gill, and C. Chippindale. 2022. The Forger’s Tale: An Insider’s Account of Corrupting the Corpus of Cycladic Figures. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 29 (3): 369–85.
- Watson, P., and C. Todeschini. 2006. *The Medici Conspiracy: The Illicit Journey of Looted Antiquities from Italy’s Tomb Raiders to the World’s Great Museums.* New York: Public Affairs.
- . 2007 (revised edition). *The Medici Conspiracy: The Illicit Journey of Looted Antiquities from Italy’s Tomb Raiders to the World’s Great Museums.* New York: Public Affairs.
- Zervos, C. 1957. *L’art des Cyclades du début à la fin de l’âge du bronze, 2500–1100 avant notre ère.* Paris: Editions Cahiers d’Art.
- Zimmerman, J.-L. 1994. *Poèmes de marbre: Sculptures cycladiques du Musée Barbier-Mueller.* Marseilles: Musée d’Archéologie Méditerranéenne.

<unn>Acknowledgments: Christos Tsirogiannis acknowledges support from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 754513 and The Aarhus University Research Foundation. We would like to thank many friends, colleagues and strangers for information, intelligence and advice, in particular the second anonymous reviewer, the second time we submitted this manuscript for publication, for the very helpful comments s/he provided. We thank Dr. Helen Van Noorden for proofreading the English. We are grateful to Dr. Susan Sherratt for her assistance in further exploring the insights that can be gained from her remarkable study of the collection of Cycladic figures in the Ashmolean. Jenny Doole kindly prepared the drawing of the figure in the Fitzwilliam Museum.</unn>

Endnotes

¹ For a summary of the extensive bibliography on art forgery see Lenain 2011. See also Hopkins and McGill 2023, for example, the discussion of various contradictory terms by Lapatin in the prologue.

² Apostolides 2006: 195. For modern responses: Karlsruhe 2011:326–33, nos. 131–41. See also Renfrew 2003 for the artistic context of Cycladic figures.

³ For example, Getz-Gentle 2008a, 2008b; Papamichelakis and Renfrew 2010; Renfrew in Pournara 2011: 1; Gill 2024a:73.

⁴ Around the 1950s, the young, wealthy collector George Ortiz was unable to pay \$45,000 to Koutoulakis for a Cycladic figure. See Ortiz in Apostolides 2006:85.

⁵ These archives are contemporary records of what was passing through dealers’ hands, including items distinctive enough to be identified with objects later sold and “surfacing”. See first: Watson and Todeschini 2007; then, for example, Tsirogiannis 2013, 2021. For a figure from the Becchina archive see below p. **.

⁶ The quantification of excavated figures still suggests that the main part of the corpus consists of items without any form of reliable find-spot: see Marthari et al. 2019b.

⁷ For a consideration of Cycladic figures on the market from 2000 to 2019: Devlin 2022, which does not engage with the network of dealers and galleries. For an earlier analysis for the period 2000 to 2016 with specific examples: Gill 2017.

⁸ Cretan antiquities also appear in the Becchina archive, suggesting a common route from Greece: see Gill 2024a, 33. For an indication of the range of material returned to their countries of origin after being identified from the Becchina archive: Gill 2024b.

⁹ There are changing, and similar names, for the three sites of the relevant period on Keros, so they are easily confused. Keros is a small Cycladic island, between Naxos and Amorgos, today uninhabited. When a group of looted objects surfaced which was known to come from Keros, it was called the “Keros Hoard”. Since it was not a hoard, in the proper sense of a group of precious objects deposited together in former times, but the collected material from looting, the term “Keros Haul” is better; see Gill 2007, with a response from Sotirakopoulou 2008. The place on Keros where the Haul had been dug from was identified as being at Kavos, on the west side of the island; so the site was called “Dhaskalio Kavos”, Dhaskalio being the name of an islet immediately offshore. As the site was of an unusual kind, rather than a cemetery, archaeologists called it a “Special Deposit”. When a second, similar and unlooted deposit was found close by, that first, looted “Special Deposit” was re-named «Special Deposit North» and the new, unlooted one became “Special”. On the offshore islet is a separate third site, a settlement, called simply “Dhaskalio”. The assignment of fragments to the Keros Haul does not necessarily guarantee their authenticity.

¹⁰ This might or might not be the large figure in the Goulandris Collection reported to have been acquired in the 1980s: Athens MCA 724 [1.40 m]: Doumas 2000:154–5, no. 222; Stampolidis and Sotirakopoulou 2007: 120–1, no. 25. The figure is reported to have been “sawn by the illicit excavators in order to facilitate its transport” (Doumas 2000:154, no. 222). But that would have been perhaps 20 years later. Or was it the large figure acquired by Thimme for the Karlsruhe Museum and now repatriated to Greece (see Thimme 1976: no. 151 [88.8 cm])? Or was that story confused or mis-remembered or with key details wrong? Or was it simply not true? These questions come naturally to mind, because of the corrupted nature of the corpus, due to the lack of documented knowledge.

¹¹ Oustinoff 1984, 1987. See also Getz-Preziosi 1977, 1981. For a summary of modern forgeries: Doumas

2010.

¹² The craftsmanship of larger figures is expected to take much longer, compared to the usual smaller ones. For a study of marble sources for a selection of Cycladic figures, some from Keros: Tambakopoulos and Maniatis 2017. For an overview of marble sources: Maniatis et al. 1995.

¹³ Lapatin 2000. However, the Getty Museum now accepts that the Kouros is a forgery and in 2018 removed it from exhibition. The online catalogue entry states “about 530 B.C. or modern forgery” (see <https://www.getty.edu/art/collection/object/103VNP>, accessed on 24/1/2023).

¹⁴ Getz-Gentle 2001; also Gill 2002 and 2014 commenting on this publication. Getz-Gentle (2001:xvii) noted, “In my files I have photographs of more than two hundred purportedly Cycladic works that I regard as obviously or probably false. I have examined most of them. A high proportion of the figures I have seen in the last few years I consider spurious”.

¹⁵ Michael C. Carlos Museum inv. 1986.9.1. Getz-Preziosi 1985, 41, fig. 20; Getz-Preziosi 1987b:230–1, no. 72. The figure does not appear in the museum’s online catalogue.

¹⁶ Thimme 1976:483, no. 223; Getz-Preziosi 1987a:164, no. 7; Getz-Gentle 2001:170, no. 7; Sotirakopolou 2005:167, no. 135.

¹⁷ Renfrew 2007:83 and concluding remarks on page 105.

¹⁸ Renfrew and Boyd 2017; Renfrew 2018. Renfrew and Boyd 2017:393 state: “The circumstance that so many of such finds are unprovenanced, and therefore not of secure authenticity, complicates the problems of interpretation”.

¹⁹ Sherratt’s account of just one set of objects, the puzzling “Kapro D’ group comprising 4 Cycladic figures, 8 other items, and 19 beads, takes up 23 large-format pages with 76 footnotes, many long and detailed.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 2000, part III, chapter 7 “Marble figurines”, especially the essay before the catalogue entries, on pages 126–39.

²¹ Sherratt 2000:6 and 25–6. Susan Sherratt (pers. com.) comments: “But see Galanakis 2013 for a more complex discussion of this. It also seems a possibility that some (or perhaps even all?) could have been acquired directly from Palaiologos.”

²² British Museum: BM 1890.9–21.5; see for example, Getz-Preziosi 1987a:16, fig. 8:b; Thimme 1976 no. 71; Perrot & Chipiez 1894, fig. 333. Munich: Munich Staatliche Antikensammlungen 10.112; see for example, Getz-Preziosi 1987a:50c; Thimme 1976 no. 105; Fellmann 1981, no. 1, fig. 1; Majewski 1935, pl. 24; Zervos 1957, fig. 48.

²³ Sherratt 2000:6–7. See also Sherratt 2000:366–368 for four bronze objects bought in Athens in 1883 by Arthur Evans for his father John Evans, and labelled as coming from Amorgos. Two of these are of well-known types with well-known distributions and cannot be of Cycladic origin. For forgeries around the time of Evans, see Lapatin 2002.

²⁴ Evans 1865. And another article on forgeries the next year (Evans 1866).

²⁵ See also note *** above; For Dawkins: Gill 2004b.

²⁶ For Bosanquet: Gill 2004a. For the British School at Athens at this time: Gill 2011. The figure of Louros type: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum inv. GR.33b.1901. The figure of Dokathismata type; Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum inv. GR.33a.1901.

²⁷ Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum inv. GR.33.1901: Thimme 1977:466, no. 161; Getz-Gentle 2001:158, no. 4.

²⁸ Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum GR.4.1934: Thimme 1977:492, no. 249. Zoumboulakis was the source, around the same time, for a figure acquired by the British Museum (inv. 1932.10–18.1: Fitton 1989:47, fig. 53, 67, fig. 84), a figure in Boston's Museum of Fine Arts (inv. 35.60: Comstock and Verneule 1976:3, no. 4), and two figures acquired by New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art: inv. 34.11.3 (Thimme 1977, no. 135) and 1971.118.103 (Thimme 1977, no. 246; Getz-Preziosi 1987b, no. 64; Hemingway 2012:19 fig. 28).

²⁹ New York, MMA inv. 34.11.3: Thimme 1977:456, no. 125. For the marble bowl and the clay pot: inv. 34.11.4–5.

³⁰ New York, MMA inv. 45.11.18: Thimme 1977:436, no. 65; Mertens 2002:14, fig. a. New York MMA inv. 45.11.4: Thimme 1977:423–4, no. 21.

³¹ New York NNA inv. 1972.118.102, 103. 104: Thimme 1977:419, no. 1; 456–7, no. 126; 487, no. 246.

³² New York MMA inv. 64.246: Thimme 1977:474, no. 202; Mertens 2002:16, fig. e. New York MMA inv. 68.148: Thimme 1977:468, no. 166; Mertens 2002:16, fig. f.

³³ New York MMA inv. 1977.187.10a–b, 11: Getz-Preziosi 1981, 7–10, 16–17, 19–21, 25–6, 29–30,

figs. 2, 39–42, 45–9, nos. 16 and 21; Getz-Preziosi 1987b:224–5, no. 67.

³⁴ Malibu inv. 71.AA.125, 126, 128. For the two pieces linked to the Keros Haul: Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 151 and 243. For the development of the collection: Georgiou 1977; Getz-Preziosi 1984; Getz-Preziosi 1985.

³⁵ For the relation between the Keros haul and these earlier acquisitions: Getz-Preziosi 1984:5–6.

³⁶ Malibu inv. 78.AA.407, 79.AA.11: Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 184 and 252. The Louvre also acquired two figures, one of the Pelos group and one of Plastiras type, from Koutoulakis in 1949 and 1950: Paris, Louvre inv. Ma 3505, Ma 3520. A marble figure and three heads in New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art were derived from Koutoulakis: New York MMA inv. 68.148 (attributed to the Bastis Sculptor); L.2013.76 (loan from Richard Hurowitz); 2021.40.12, 2021.40.16 (bequest of Nanette B. Kelekian).

³⁷ Malibu inv. 83.AA.316.1–2, 83.AA.317.1–2, 83.AA.318: Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 174, 211, 232, 240 and 241.

³⁸ Malibu inv. 88.AA.82, 96.AA.27: Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 176 and 199.

³⁹ Malibu inv. 88.AA.77, 88.AA.78, 88.AA.79, 88.AA.80, 88.AA.81. For the Farland collection: Getz-Preziosi 1966. For two further figures in the Marianne Steiner collection: Getz-Gentle 2006:23, no. 2, 33, no. 24 (formerly in the R. Colin collection).

⁴⁰ Malibu inv. 72.AA.156, 85.AA.103, 88.AA.48, 90.AA.114. The harpist had formed part of the Maurice Tempelman collection.

⁴¹ Merrin Gallery 1990. For a review of the exhibition including a mention of the Stern collection: Reif. 1990. The 'Stargazer' figure (no. 7): Cleveland Museum of Art inv. 1993.165. The figure belonging to Christos Bastis (no. 23) was later acquired by Stern.

⁴² Amorgos: Getz-Preziosi 1985:24–5, fig. 4, 50, fig. 34 (detail); Getz-Preziosi 1987a, pl. x (and commentary on p. 248). The figure had been in a Belgian private collection. It measures 1.32 m in length. Getz-Preziosi notes, 'Breaks at the neck and legs may have been made intentionally in order to fit the figure into a grave that otherwise would have been too short for it'. For the statue linked to Paros: Getz-Preziosi 2001:163, no. 26 ('but very likely incorrect').

⁴³ For the fifteen items exhibited at the Museum of Cycladic Art: Fappas 2022. The catalogue uses the loan inventory numbers for New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art.

⁴⁴ Kleftogianni 2022. The figures displayed in Athens were: Fappas 2022, nos. 1 (168; L.2022.38.49), 2

(185; L.2022.38.62), 3 (159; L.2022.38.42), 6 (210; L.2022.38.83), 7 (121; L.2022.38.14), 10 (149; L.2022.38.32), 11 (138; L.2022.38.22), 12 (163; L.2022.38.44), 13 (166; L.2022.38.47), and 14 (308; L.2022.38.108).

⁴⁵ Getz-Gentle 2001:6. The exhibition catalogue echoes Getz-Gentle: Fappas 2022, no. 1, “It belongs to a type that has not yet been identified among Aegean marble figures of the Neolithic period”.

⁴⁶ Getz-Gentle 2001:26–8, 174, pls. 20, 1–2, 22; Fappas 2022, no. 7. For a discussion of the harpist: Tsirogiannis, Gill, and Chippindale 2022:378–80.

⁴⁷ For the development of the Cycladic collection at the Metropolitan Museum of Art: Mertens 2002.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* A precanonical figure in the Stern Collection (121) was reported to have been found with the Metropolitan Museum’s harpist: Getz-Gentle 2001, pl. 20. Does that raise issues about its authenticity?

⁴⁹ For the complexity of the issue surrounding such copies see the discussion of the newly surfaced Sauroktonos in the Cleveland Museum of Art: Bennett 2013; see also Gill, 2020:43–50. For the Roman copy of Polykleitos’ Doryphoros in the Minneapolis Institute of Art: Gill 2024a:67–70.

⁵⁰ See Beard 1993 for the nineteenth-century interest in casts, and Baker 2007 for the twenty-first-century revival exemplified in the rejuvenation of the Victoria & Albert Museum’s cast court, London.

⁵¹ Muscarella (2000) is acute, and we are sure is correct, in seeing how observant and clever forgers tend to be – often more observant than are archaeologists, collectors or museum collectors. Why? Because actually *making* something requires closer observation than is just *looking* at it once it is made.

⁵² Gill and Chippindale 1993. For an expansion on the definition of history: Gill 2016. For a discussion of the terminology: Gerstenblith 2019.

⁵³ For the biography of ancient objects, mapping their journey through different galleries and collections: Gill 2012. The topic is explored in Hopkins et al. 2021. For a consideration of the “history” of an object: Gill 2016, in response to Marlowe 2016.

⁵⁴ Zimmerman 1994:174–5 usefully synthesizes those offered up to a generation ago.

⁵⁵ We are relying here on Sotirakopoulou’s counts for a broad overall arithmetic of Cycladic, rather than the detail of the Keros haul, item by item, which occupies most of her monograph. See Gill (2007) for those other issues, also Sotirakopoulou (2008) and Renfrew (2008b) for further discussion of the Haul. As items from the

Haul belong in our uncertain and insecure categories, they do not affect our overall picture.

⁵⁶ Sotirakopoulou 2005:63 (“an attested provenance and certified discovery conditions”). The numbers have been revised by Marthari et al. 2019b. We estimate that only 14 per cent of the figures have a reliable find-spot (though we exclude material from the Keros Haul), and only six per cent of figures can be traced back to the period before the Second World War. Sotirakopoulou does not define “an attested provenance”. Are links with named collections confirmed by authenticated documentation? Does an association with a dealer who is known to have handled looted antiquities count as “an attested provenance”? We take “certified discovery” to mean found in a scientific excavation and not associated with a particular place by word of mouth or speculation.

⁵⁷ Bent 1884. The figures are London BM inv. 1884.12-13-18: Fitton 1989:25, 28, 40, figs. 18, 22 and 39. See also the lead figure from Antiparos: London BM inv. 1884.12-13.20: Fitton 1989:58, fig. 76.

⁵⁸ Figures from these excavations are explored in Marthari, Renfrew, and Boyd 2017, for example, Doumas and Lambrinoudakis 2017; Lekaki 2017.

⁵⁹ See Renfrew 2003. For related views on connoisseurship in the field of classical archaeology: Kurtz 1985; Arrington 2017.

⁶⁰ Sotirakopoulou 2005:63. We estimate that 24% of the figures are “said to be” or “allegedly” from a named find-spot. If we exclude pieces excavated from Kavos Dhaskalio, then the figure is 37.8%.

⁶¹ The same risk applies to Cycladic figures in the Goulandris collection, which was permitted, even encouraged, to buy from looters, as in that way the figures stayed in Greece rather than being exported and lost to the nation. It may be that the Goulandris, being closer to the Cyclades and if in closer contact with the actual looters, had a lower risk of buying pastiches. The case of the Stern collection of Cycladica on loan to New York’s Metropolitan Museum of Art sidesteps the key issues of illegal export and ownership.

⁶² Sotirakopoulou 2005:63. Our estimate currently stands at 28% of figures have no recorded find-spot. If the fragmentary figures from Special Deposits North and South at Kavos are excluded, the figure is closer to 44%. We calculate 461 figures in the corpus do not have any recorded find-spot.

⁶³ This must depend on whether Cycladic and Anatolian figure types really are distinct and different, so it can be said “this is a Cycladic figure found in Anatolia” rather than “this is an Anatolian figure rather resembling the Cycladic form”. Sherratt (pers. comm.) has in mind as possible Cycladic figures in Anatolia, for example,

from Miletus and one exported from as far inland as Laodicea. See Oğuzhanoğlu 2014. The examples are explored in Marthari, Renfrew, and Boyd 2019a.

⁶⁴ Details can be found at http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/search.aspx?searchText=Cyclades

⁶⁵ London BM inv. 1882.10-14.3, 1889.05-21.2, 1890.09-21.5: Fitton 1989:25–26, 43, figs. 19, 20, 45–6.

⁶⁶ London BM inv. 1884.12-13.6–11, 1886.03-10.1: Fitton 1989:19, 28, 38, 42, 48, 65, figs. 8, 22, 37, 43–4, 55–6, 82. For the figures from Antiparos, see above n.*** [n. 111].

⁶⁷ London BM inv. 1969.10-01.2, 1971.05-21.1, 2011.50-07.1: Fitton 1989:45, 56, figs. 49–50, 72. The figure acquired in 1969 appeared to be acquired with a grave group.

⁶⁸ Paris, Louvre, inv. Ma 2707, 2708, 2709, 3094, 3095: Zervos 1957, figs. 163, 164; Thimme 1977, nos. 184, 200; Karlsruhe 2011:333, no. 142.

⁶⁹ The figures were accessioned in 1997. See Pasquier 1997. Some of the figures are displayed in Louvre Abu Dhabi. For the Keros Haul: Sotirakopoulou 2005, nos. 177, 196, 222.

⁷⁰ See Renfrew (2014) for the purchase of seven items of the Sevso Treasure for 15 million euros by the Hungarian government. This was not an open sale, as the Hungary believed, with good evidence, the Treasure had been looted from its territory; so, as Renfrew plainly says, “the government of Hungary has had to pay €15m to repatriate what was presumably its own property in the first place”.

⁷¹ Hence the complex arrangement for the loan of the Stern Collection to New York’s Metropolitan Museum of Art.

⁷² Gill and Chippindale 1993; For the importance of differentiating objects of value to archaeologists and connoisseurs, see Marlowe 2013.

⁷³ For some of the recent debate: Cuno 2008. See Bland 2008; Gill 2009, 2024a. The implications of acquiring antiquities that lack secure histories is explored in Gill 2018b.

⁷⁴ Others in the market in the same perfect form, one fears, are improbably serene because they *were* made yesterday – pastiches newly made as fakes.

⁷⁵ Tsirogiannis 2013:126. An example: regular and professional images of a Caeretan hydria attributed

to the Bousiris Painter, depicting two men attacking a panther and a lioness who are attacking a mule, were discovered in the confiscated archives of Medici and Symes-Michaelides. These images present the hydria undergoing various stages of restoration, which included: filling big gaps on the body of the vase from fragments not found by the looters, painting these gaps so as to match the rest of the decoration, and the complete restoration of the hydria's vertical handle. The hydria was subsequently acquired by the collectors Shelby White and Leon Levy and was repatriated to Italy in 2007. The following year it appeared in the "Nostoi" exhibition at the New Acropolis Museum (Godart, De Caro, and Gavrili 2008:108–9, no. 36). Its label reads: "Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Shelby White Collection. From an illicit excavation in central Italy".

⁷⁶ Renfrew 1991. See Elia 1996. The sub-title of the Ashmolean catalogue, *The Captive Spirit*, is no doubt a play on Renfrew's title: Sherratt 2000.