


Μουσείο Μπενάκη

Τόμ. 2 (2002)



«ΥΓΙΕΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΡΙ(Ε)...». Υστερορωμαϊκός ορειχάλκινος κάδος με σκηνή κυνηγίου

Anastasia Drandaki

doi: [10.12681/benaki.18187](https://doi.org/10.12681/benaki.18187)

Copyright © 2018, Anastasia Drandaki



Άδεια χρήσης [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

Drandaki, A. (2018). «ΥΓΙΕΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΡΙ(Ε)...». Υστερορωμαϊκός ορειχάλκινος κάδος με σκηνή κυνηγίου. *Μουσείο Μπενάκη*, 2, 37–53. <https://doi.org/10.12681/benaki.18187>

“ΥΤΙΕΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΠΙ(Ε)” A Late Roman brass bucket with a hunting scene

AMONG THE MOST interesting acquisitions by the Benaki Museum in the last decade is an inscribed copper-alloy bucket, inv. no. 32553 (lat. *situla*), which was on display in the impressive exhibition, *Everyday Life in Byzantium* at the White Tower, Thessaloniki (fig. 1).¹ It was raised by hammering from a single sheet of metal and is covered all over with a green, in some places brown, patina. The sides are vertical and the base flat, which gives the object a cylindrical appearance.² The height (without the handle) is 10.7 cm, and the diameter varies from 17 to 17.8 cm.

The semi-ellipsoid “lugs” (h. 1.4 cm) are fixed on either side of the rim of the bucket and have holes in the middle for the handle which is made from a strong polygonal curved rod. The two ends of the rod are bent back to form closed hooks, thus fastening the handle to the bucket.

The exterior of the bucket (fig. 2) has three bands of decoration, divided by single rows of punched circles. The upper and lower bands are almost equal in height (1.5 cm and 1.3 cm), while the central band with a hunting scene measures 6.4 cm. When adding the ornamentation the craftsman used as a “guide” six pairs of incised lines running round the sides at regular intervals; the precision of the lines indicates that they were incised while the vessel was lathe-turned.³ Starting from the top, the first two pairs of lines coincide with the borders of the top band, thus defining the size of the letters of the inscription (fig. 3). The two following pairs enclose the bodies of the hunters from shoulder to hip, the fifth is at the level of their calf and the sixth

pair at the bottom of the lower band defines the lowest point of the decorative surface. In spite of their use in organising the decoration, these lines do not appear to have restricted the craftsman’s freedom of execution, as he has managed to avoid stereotyped, geometrical forms. The technique used in the ornamentation is largely responsible for this, as the shapes, letters and decorative motifs have been executed with successive annular punches and not with an engraving tool.

The upper band contains a Greek inscription in capital letters ΥΤΙΕΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΠΙ(Ε) ΕΝ ΠΟΛΛΟΙΣ ΕΤΕΡΟΙΣ ΚΕ ΚΑΛΟΙΣ ΕΥΤΥΧΩΣ (Use this in good health, master, for many good years happily); the start of the inscription is indicated by the stylised figure of a bird. The lower band has a zig-zag pattern and the triangular spaces thus created contain dotted patterns in the form of triangles.

The broad central band shows a hunting scene with five figures in groups of two and three, chasing a lioness and a leopard respectively. The hunters are naked except for cloaks covering their front shoulder and calf-length boots. Four carry large bossed ellipsoid shields. Three are armed with spears and the other two hold large stones. A hunting dog can also be seen, while stylised trees and plants provide a suggestion of background scenery.

The principal figure of the representation appears to be the hunter shown below the start of the inscription with the hound at his feet. He has an additional weapon, a sheathed sword at his thigh, while the cloak flowing freely behind him adds to his significance.



Fig. 1. The Benaki Museum bucket (no. 9) (photo: M. Skiadaresis).



Fig. 2. The decorative scheme of the Benaki bucket (drawing: K. Mavraganis).

Fig. 3. Detail of the decoration of the Benaki bucket.

The treatment of the figures is stylised, and provides little in the way of detail, but the basic lines of the anatomy are accurate, with special emphasis given to the muscles, so that the voluminous bodies exude strength and power. The two animals are shown standing on their hind legs, poised for attack, a stance which is repeated in all similar hunting scenes.⁴

The Benaki Museum bucket may be considered as a new addition to a group of eight similar objects which have been identified and studied as a unity, while a tenth one appeared recently in the market.⁵ Their provenance –where available– is strikingly varied, ranging from Mesopotamia and Palestine to East Anglia and Spain. Unfortunately the Benaki vessel comes with no indication of provenance. The list of *situlae* of the group is as follows:⁶

1. Provenance: Kale e-Zerzevan, Mesopotamia, now in Istanbul. Height: 23 cm. Decoration: Series of crosses under an arcade. Tin(?) plated. Inscription: ΥΠΕΡ

EYXHC KAI CΩTHPIAC ANTIΠATPOY KAI ΠANTOC TOY OIKOY AYTOY KYPIOC ΦYΛAZI CAI (In fulfilment of a vow and for the salvation of Antipatros and all his household, Lord protect you);⁷

2. Provenance: Caesarea, Palestine(?), now in Rome (known as the Secchia Doria). Height: 23.5 cm. Decoration: Scenes from the life of Achilles (fig. 6). Uninscribed;⁸

3. Provenance: Bueña, now in Madrid. Height: 15.5 cm. Tin(?) plated. Decoration: Hunting frieze. Uninscribed, with two Greek letters on the base;⁹

4. Unprovenanced, now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. Height: 13.5 cm. Decoration: hunting frieze (fig. 4b). Uninscribed;¹⁰

5. Provenance: Bromeswell, Suffolk, now in the British Museum, London. Height: 13.5 cm. Decoration: hunting frieze (fig. 4a). Inscription: ΥΓΙΑΙΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΡΙ(Ε) ΚΟΜΗC ΕΝ ΠΟΛΛΟΙC CΕ ΧΡΟΝΟΙC ΚΑ[Ι ΚΑΛΟΙC] (Use this in good health, Master Count, for many happy years);¹¹

6. Provenance: Chessel Down, Isle of Wight, female grave 45. Now in the British Museum, London. Height: 9.9 cm. Decoration: animal frieze (figs 5c, 7). Uninscribed;¹²

7. Unprovenanced, now in the British Museum, London. Height: 12.7 cm. Decoration: animal frieze (fig. 5a). Inscription: ΥΓΙΑΙΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΡΙ(Ε) ΕΝ ΠΟΛΛΟΙC CΕ ΧΡΟΝΟΙC ΜΕΤΑ ΤΗC ΚΥΡΑC ΚΕ [ΤΩΝ Π]ΙΕΔΙ(ΩΝ) (Use this, master, in good health for many happy years together with your wife and children);¹³

8. Unprovenanced, now in the Römisch-Germanisches Museum, Cologne. Height: 10 cm. Decoration: animal frieze (fig. 5b). Inscription: ΥΓΙΑΙΝΟΥCΑ Χ[Ρ]Ω ΚΥΡΑ ΘΕΟΔ[Ω]ΡΑC ΧΑΡΙC (Use this in good health, Lady Theodora, [with] grace);¹⁴

9. Unprovenanced, now in the Benaki Museum,




Fig. 4. The decorative scheme of two hunting buckets: a. the Bromeswell bucket (no. 5), b. the Ashmolean bucket (no. 4) (after: Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, fig. 4 a-b).




Fig. 5. The decorative scheme of three animal frieze buckets: a. the British Museum bucket MLA 1988, 10-1, 1 (no. 7), b. the Römisch-Germanisches Museum bucket (no. 8), c. the Chessell Down bucket, British Museum MLA 1869, 7-21, 136 (no. 6) (after: Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, fig. 5 a-b).



Fig. 6. The Doria bucket with scenes from the life of Achilles (no. 2) (after: *Age of Spirituality*, no. 196).



Fig. 7. The Chessell Down bucket, British Museum MLA 1869, 7-21, 136 (no. 6) (courtesy of the British Museum).

Athens. Height: 10.7 cm. Decoration: hunting frieze (figs 1-3, 10, 11). Inscription: ΥΓΙΕΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΡΗ(Ε) ΕΝ ΠΟΛΛΟΙΣ ΧΡΟΝΟΙΣ ΚΑΛΟΙΣ ΕΥΤΥΧΩΣ (Use this in good health, master, for many good years happily);¹⁵

10. Unprovenanced, now at Amherst College, Massachusetts. Height: 14.7 cm. Decoration: hunting scene. The mythological names of the four hunters are inscribed in Greek: ΘΗΡΕΙΑΣ, ΑΚΤΕΩΝ, ΠΕΡΔΙΚΑΣ, ΥΠΟΛΑΥΤΟΣ;¹⁶

In their basic article on this group of objects Mundell-Mango et al. discuss in detail their common characteristics. The distinctive features of this group of buckets are, in brief, their uniform shape, the use of identical techniques in their manufacture and ornamentation, and common epigraphic elements not only in the letter forms but also in the content of the inscriptions. They all have a flat base and an identical handle. Buckets nos 1, 2 and 3 have slightly tapering sides (fig. 6) while nos 1 and 3 have additional silver or probably tin plated decoration, reminiscent of earlier Roman examples

such as the impressive bucket with Bacchic decoration in the J. Paul Getty Museum,¹⁷ which also has tapering sides but is significantly taller (height: 33.5 cm), while its overall appearance is more slender by comparison with the group of buckets under examination. As for their dimensions, nos 1 and 2 are the largest, with a height around 23 cm, while no. 3, which has similar tapering sides, is smaller (height: 15.5 cm); the remaining examples have a cylindrical form and range from 9.9 to 14.7 cm in height.

Both the decoration and inscription of bucket no. 1 show that it was intended for a religious environment.¹⁸ *Situla* no. 2, known as the *Secchia Doria*, has mythological iconography from the Achilles cycle; the remaining eight buckets bear ornamentation related to hunting, in the form either of a full-scale scene or of a row of running animals, presumably a scaled-down version of the scene. In most cases the running animals frieze has been chosen for smaller vessels, such as examples 6, 7 and 8. However, for the central band of the equally small bucket in the Benaki Museum (no. 9) the



Fig. 8. Detail of the decoration of a cross. Munich, private collection (after: L. Wamser, G. Zahlhaas [eds], *Rom und Byzanz* [Munich 1998] no. 64).




Fig. 9. The hunting mosaic in the Triclinos building, Apamea (after: J. Balty, *La grande mosaïque de chasse du Triclinos* [Fouilles d' Apamée, Brussels 1969] fig. IX).



craftsman selected a full scale hunting scene. It should also be observed that three of the vessels, which clearly relate to women, –no. 6, which was found in a female grave and nos 7 and 8 which bear inscriptions referring to women– are all decorated with an animal frieze.

When inscribed, the buckets bear Greek inscriptions. Nos 5, 7, 8, 9 contain a stereotyped, occasionally personalised expression (as in nos 5 and 8), wishing the owner of the vessel a long life in good health and happiness. The content of the inscriptions combined with the decoration suggest a private domestic use for all the buckets nos 2-10, with the exception of no. 1, which as previously mentioned has a distinctive ecclesiastical purpose.

Apart from a few minor details, the manufacture and

ornamentation of all these buckets was executed in the same manner. They are hammered from a single sheet of metal, and have a flat bottom and straight sides, either vertical (figs 1, 7) or tapering. In most cases the background and even the bodies of some of the animals are punctuated with rosettes (fig. 6), a feature which is absent from the Benaki Museum example. Ring-punching is the dominant decorative technique in all ten buckets. This technique creates a strong impressionistic effect reminiscent of the style of a group of glass bowls, attributed to mid-4th century workshops in Cologne, where equally impressionistic figures are rendered with shaded contour lines.¹⁹

The similarities of the buckets apparent from visual




Figs 10-11. Details of the decoration of the Benaki bucket.

observation can be supplemented by the published results of technical analyses. The Benaki example was recently examined by the conservator Despina Kotzamani –see her following article–, and metal analyses showed that the techniques involved in its production and decoration exactly matched those of the previously analysed buckets in the group.²⁰ It is clear therefore that we are dealing with a group of objects with a common manufacture, provenance, dating, purpose and usage.

The technique of decoration by annular punching is found in other 5th and 6th century metal objects from workshops in Asia Minor and Syria, for example an impressive liturgical cross in a private collection in Munich (fig. 8).²¹ On the other hand, although dot and

ring punching is used for decorative details on earlier examples –e.g. the Getty situla– it is not the dominant technique characterising their style, as it is with the late antique buckets examined here.

An abbreviated depiction of a hunting scene with a row of running animals very similar to the decoration of buckets nos 6-8 is encountered on the floor mosaics of the Synagogue at Gerasa, with a terminus ante quem of AD 530/1.²² The rendering of the animals and the plants present close affinities with the decoration of the buckets. The modelling of the bodies, the depiction of many figures from the rear, and the striking poses with exaggerated but not distorted musculature (figs 10, 11) are all found in contemporary mosaic pavements, in



Figs 12-13. Details of the Great Palace mosaics, Constantinople (after: W. Jobst et al., [eds], *Istanbul, the Great Palace Mosaic* [Istanbul 1997] figs 21, 24).

which hunting scenes played a prominent role.²³ Beside the Antiochian mosaic parallels presented by Mundell-Mango et al.,²⁴ the closest resemblances occur in two mosaics which may be considered the masterpieces of the late 5th and first half of the 6th century. These are a realistic hunting scene in the Triclinos building in Apamea, Syria (fig. 9) which has a disputed terminus ante quem of AD 539 but can be dated on stylistic grounds to the second half of the 5th or early 6th century,²⁵ and the pavement in the Great Palace, Constantinople (figs 12, 13), the crowning glory of the art of the mosaic of the era, whose dating troubled academics for years²⁶—it has been given dates from the early 5th right up to the late 7th century— but which can now be firmly attrib-

uted to the first half of the 6th century on grounds not only of style but also of archaeological evidence.²⁷ In spite of the different media involved—a metal vessel and a mosaic pavement—they display close affinities, mainly in the shaping of the human body, but also in the repetition of certain iconographic forms and the treatment of the natural environment and animals, all of which indicate that these works originate in and are faithful to common aesthetic trends of the period.

The unvaried repetition of standard forms in the depiction both of humans and of animals is found in a variety of objects, and even in first-rate works of art such as the Palace mosaic. This is an indication of how artists and public alike were interested not so much in the inspirational discovery of new iconographic types as in the formation of new compositions through the recycling of well-known, recognisable motifs and standard patterns, an observation also made about other thematic cycles of the period.²⁸

Epigraphic elements in the inscription, such as the inclined X and the divided Ω are found on inscribed vessels dated to the 6th century,²⁹ including several examples from the Hama Treasure.³⁰ The form of dedicatory inscription that appears on four buckets (nos 5, 7-9) is repeated on various utilitarian objects in late antiquity, some of which also have functions related to water, such as the tin(?) plated, copper alloy jug at Trier and the well-known Göttingen *patera*.³¹ However the same inscription appears on all kinds of objects, among them a gold toothpick in the Louvre with the inscription $\Upsilon\gamma\iota\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\sigma\alpha\ \chi\rho\tilde{\omega}\ \kappa\rho\tilde{\alpha}\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\alpha\upsilon\sigma\eta\varsigma$ (Use this, lady, for many years of enjoyment).³² A simpler version with the same content is the type $EYTYX\Omega C\ X\Omega$, and $EY\ X\Omega$ or $UTERE\ FELIX$ (Use well),³³ as in a pair of 6th century compasses in the Benaki Museum with the silver inlaid inscription $EYTYX\Omega C\ X\Omega\ \Pi\Lambda\Lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$.³⁴

As for the main theme of the decoration, hunting was from the time of Hadrian onwards a standard aristocratic pastime³⁵ and as such was depicted in real-life hunting scenes in the 3rd and 4th centuries,³⁶ while occasionally realistic and mythological hunts could be mixed, as in the mosaics of the Constantinian Villa in Antioch.³⁷ Realistic scenes from hunting spectacles in the hippodrome (the *venatio*) were also widely popular.³⁸ However there is a third category of hunting scenes, the



Fig. 14. The *Megalopsychia* hunt mosaic, from Daphne, Hatay Archaeological Museum, Antakya (after: Chr. Kondoleon [ed.], *Antioch, The Lost Ancient City* [Princeton 2000] 8 fig. 6).

representation of the ‘heroic hunt’, in which the realistic element diminishes.³⁹ Here the action takes place at the level of symbolism and myth and the hunting theme is no longer the prerogative of a particular class who could indulge in this form of sport, but becomes the common possession of all. The representations on the *situlae* belong to this category of mythical hunts, as suggested by the depiction of the hunters naked.⁴⁰ Nevertheless the hunting scenes on these *situlae* display no clear identification with a particular myth (e.g. that of Meleager) but rather an abstract depiction of a heroic hunt which endows the owner of the bucket with the emblematic characteristics of the hero.⁴¹ The allegorical transmission of heroic characteristics to the owner of

the vessel—or the house—is clearly manifested in examples like the *Megalopsychia* hunt mosaic from Daphne, Syria (fig. 14); there, the presence of the personification of Magnanimity at the centre leaves little doubt of the purpose and meaning of the hunting scene that surrounds it. Similar connotations can be discerned in the Amherst College bucket (no. 10), where the depicted hunters are accompanied by mythological names, as in the *Megalopsychia* hunt mosaic.⁴² Against the background of this reading of the hunting theme, the animal frieze may have been considered more suitable for female owners (buckets nos 6-8), since the allusion to heroic deeds is much less pronounced and the decorative character prevails; however full scale hunting scenes




Fig. 15. The baths of Ardabur from the border of the *Megalopsychia* mosaic, Hatay Archaeological Museum, Antakya (after: Chr. Kondoleon [ed.], *Antioch, The Lost Ancient City* [Princeton 2000] 148 fig. 2).

could also have merely decorative purpose, as they depicted a subject which was in vogue at the time.⁴³

In view of the fact that the hunt can be perceived not only as a scene where man's bravery is put to the test but also as an allegory of his battle with hostile forces⁴⁴ an apotropaic nuance cannot be excluded, particularly in the conjunction of the stereotyped inscriptions with the representations of the hunt.⁴⁵ This interpretation finds support in a mosaic from a house in Carthage which shows a hunting scene surrounded by an inscription: "(In)bide vive e(t) bide (ut) possas plurima bid(ere)" (O Envy, live and see, so that you may see more):⁴⁶ the reference to *Invidus* (Envy) and the siting of the mosaic and the inscription at the entrance to the house underline their apotropaic character. The same connotation of man's brave fight against hostile powers can be found in the depiction of the hunt in late Roman sarcophagi, a reference to his ultimate and greatest battle, against death.⁴⁷

As for their use, the shape and various pieces of evidence available to us suggest that vessels of this type were

intended for water and were probably used in baths, as part of the *instrumenta balnei*, the bathing kit.⁴⁸ The connection with water is strengthened by the etymology of the Latin word for this type of bucket, *situla*, whose derivation is the verb *sitire* = to be thirsty.⁴⁹ This is also suggested by their inclusion in bathing scenes,⁵⁰ for example in the mosaic with the bath of Ardabur (fig. 15) on the border of the *Megalopsychia* mosaic from Daphne (4th century)⁵¹ and in the 6th century floor mosaic of a private bath at Sidi Ghrib in Tunisia, showing a lady at her toilette.⁵² A bucket with slightly tapering sides is also depicted in the scene of the visit to the bath on the lid of the Projecta casket (4th century)⁵³ and another, which could be intended for washing the hands, is depicted in the mosaic panel of *Opora, Agros* and *Oinos*, in the House of the Boat of Psyche, Daphne (3rd century AD).⁵⁴ The same use in baths has been suggested for more sumptuous silver buckets, like the Hippolytus *situlae*, from the Sevso Treasure.⁵⁵ Moreover, as has been noted by Mundell-Mango et al., according to the Chronicle of Michael



Fig. 16. Attic grave relief with Epigonos and Elate in the dress of Isis, Athens N.M. 1308 (after: E. J. Walters, *Attic Grave Reliefs that represent Women in the Dress of Isis* [*Hesperia* Suppl. XXII, Princeton 1998] pl. 24d).

the Syrian (1126-1199), Constans was killed in 668 by a blow from a silver *situla* in a bath in Sicily.⁵⁶

The connection of vessels of this shape with water is also demonstrated by their earlier history. Objects with comparable dimensions and a similar handle, sometimes with vertical sides⁵⁷ but more often ovoid or semi-spherical with a foot,⁵⁸ were associated with mystery cults, in particular those of Isis and Dionysos, where they were used for ritual ablutions.⁵⁹ Typical

examples are a silver *situla* from the Iseum in Pompeii⁶⁰ and tombstones with the devotees of Isis holding a *sistrum* and a *situla*, her distinctive cult objects (fig. 16). These vessels were also used for holy water (*hagiasma*) in a Christian context,⁶¹ as indicated by similar metal objects and also the few precious ivory *situlae* which have been preserved in the west from medieval times.⁶² A comparable liturgical use in church may also be assumed for the Constantinopolitan *situla* (no. 1) of our late antique group.

A final question concerns the provenance and the wide distribution of the buckets. Greek inscriptions and elements of the ornamentation suggest a common place of manufacture in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 6th century and the authors of the article (Mundell-Mango et al.) have persuasively argued that Syria, and more specifically Antioch, is the most probable candidate. As regards the distribution, they argue that an explanation possibly lies with the army: a 2nd century text includes a bucket among the standard items of military equipment, a situation which may well have continued until the 6th century.⁶³ All this suggests that the buckets may be attributable to *fabricae*, the state factories which equipped the army,⁶⁴ such as we know existed in Antioch.⁶⁵

However we also need to take into account the testimony of those inscriptions which refer to women or couples (nos 7 and 8). Without of course rejecting the idea that vessels of this type were manufactured for use by military officials as well, we should perhaps look more closely at some form of wider mercantile activity which would have permitted the export of these buckets to western Europe, like other 6th and 7th century metal objects from Eastern Mediterranean workshops (e.g. the so-called ‘Coptic’ bronzes).⁶⁶ In spite of the earlier barbarian invasions, during the 6th century maritime trading routes remained open,⁶⁷ as is confirmed by a host of findings of Eastern origin in barbarian graves in the Rhine valley, Gaul, Spain, and Britain.⁶⁸ An indication of the level of trading activity is that written sources inform us that at the beginning of the 7th century the church at Alexandria had at its disposal ships which, among their other activities, transported metalware to Britain, Sicily and the Adriatic.⁶⁹ This information is confirmed by metal findings in shipwrecks with cargos originating from the East.⁷⁰




Fig. 17. Ecclesiastical bucket for holy water, Munich, private collection (after: L. Wamser, G. Zahlhaas [eds.], *Rom und Byzanz* [Munich 1998] no. 41).

Fig. 18. Islamic bucket with a dedicatory inscription, workshop of Egypt 10th c. (after: *Masterpieces of Islamic Art in the Hermitage Museum* [Kuwait 1990] no.14).

Fig. 19. Islamic bucket with running animals and a dedicatory inscription, from Khurasan, 11th c. (after: R. Ward, *Islamic Metalwork* [London 1993] fig. 42).



Furthermore, we know that by the late 6th century, perhaps earlier, the army received cash allowances,⁷¹ and it is therefore highly possible that military officials were themselves the vehicles for this trading activity, buying fashionable items of the day such as brass buckets with hunting scenes.

If the buckets under discussion were, as suggested, used in baths then they would represent a necessary personal item reflecting the financial means and social status of their owner in the socially significant ritual of visiting the Baths.⁷² Cheaper than the sumptuous glass

examples, like the one in St Mark's Treasury, Venice,⁷³ and far more affordable than the heavy silver *situlae* from the Sevso Treasure⁷⁴ or the lighter yet elaborate silver bucket in Vienna (AD 613-629/30),⁷⁵ this group of brass buckets, all with their well executed, fashionable decoration, and made of a semi-precious metal alloy that occasionally through tin-plating imitates more precious examples, appears to be well suited to a 'middle class' clientele – a clientele which is present if not easily identifiable in the content of the dedicatory inscriptions of the buckets. Furthermore, it is possible that these buckets formed a functional unit with closely related jugs, such as the Trier example whose inscription, decoration and technique are identical with those of the *situlae* under examination.⁷⁶

We do not have analogous groups of buckets from later centuries, but if the association with baths is well founded the lack of such objects should not surprise us in view of the change in attitude to baths and all that they stood for in the late Roman empire.⁷⁷ Comparable

vessels continued however to be in use throughout the Middle Byzantine period in an ecclesiastical context: an 11th-12th century bucket for example, now in a private collection in Germany, has a dedicatory inscription which testifies to its use in church (fig. 17).⁷⁸

But there are even closer affiliations – in form, in ornamentation and in usage for ablutions –⁷⁹ in the Islamic world, which also inherited and exploited the legacy of late antiquity.⁸⁰ An almost identically shaped bucket, made by the same technique, dates from the 10th century and is attributed to a workshop in Egypt (fig. 18),⁸¹ while an 11th century cast example from Khurasan (fig. 19) is decorated with the well-known motif of running animals, now placed within spreading vegetation.⁸² Both have below the rim the familiar inscriptions wishing *good luck, happiness, joy and peace*⁸³ to their owner.

Anastasia Drandaki

Curator of the Byzantine Collection

e-mail: anastasia@benaki.gr

ABBREVIATIONS

Age of Spirituality: Age of Spirituality. Late Antique and Early Christian Art, third to seventh Century (exhibition catalogue, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, ed. K. Weitzmann, New York 1979).

Anderson 1985: J. K. Anderson, *Hunting in the Ancient World* (Berkeley 1985).

Dunbabin 1978: K. Dunbabin, *The Mosaics of Roman North Africa* (Oxford 1978).

Dunbabin 1999: K. Dunbabin, *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman world* (Cambridge 1999).

Levi 1947: D. Levi, *Antioch mosaic pavements I-II* (Princeton 1947).

Mundell-Mango et al. 1989: M. Mundell-Mango, C. Mango, A. Care Evans, M. Hughes, A 6th-century Mediterranean bucket from Bromeswell Parish, Suffolk, *Antiquity* 63 (1989) 295-311.

Mundell-Mango 1995: M. Mundell-Mango, Artemis at Daphne, in: S. Efthymiades et al. (eds), *Bosphorus. Essays in honour of Cyril Mango* (=BFXXI [1995] 263-82).

NOTES

1. D. Papanikola-Bakirtzi (ed.), *Everyday Life in Byzantium* (Athens 2002) 137 no. 148, with earlier bibliography; A. Drandaki «Υγιένων χρῶ...». Ενεπίγραφος χάλκινος κάδος με σκηνή κυνηγιού στο Μουσείο Μπενάκη, in: *22ο Συμπόσιο της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας, Πρόγραμμα και Περιλήψεις εισηγήσεων και ανακοινώσεων* (Athens 2002) 32-33. This *situla* first appeared in an auction catalogue in Zürich, *Excavations - Semitic Inscriptions: 11th Cent. B.C. - 7th Cent. A.D. - Jewish, Early Christian and Byzantine Antiquities, 20 Nov. 1989*, lot 416. It is mentioned by M. Mundell-Mango in: D. Buckton (ed.), *Byzantium, Treasures of Byzantine Art and Culture from British Collections* (London 1994) 85, and by R. Scholl, Eine beschriftete Bronzekanne aus dem 6. Jh. n. Chr., *ZPE* 103 (1994) 235, 237; see also Mundell-Mango 1995, *passim*.
2. On the manufacture of the bucket and its present condition and conservation, see the article of Despina Kotzamani in this volume.
3. C. E. Snow, From Ingot to Object: Fabrication Techniques Used in the Manufacture of the Hama Silver, in: S. Boyd, M. Mundell-Mango (eds), *Ecclesiastical Silver Plate in Sixth-Century Byzantium* (Washington 1992) 200; see also the article of D. Kotzamani in the present volume.
4. Cf. the representations of feline animals in mosaics; e.g. Levi 1947, II, pls LVI, LVII, LXXVII, LXXXVI, CLXX, CLXXII; Dunbabin 1999, figs 135, 137, 142, 147, 160.
5. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, with full bibliography on the vessels of this type. Another two buckets are mentioned by M. Mundell-Mango in: *Byzantium* (n. 1), one of which is the present vessel, now in the Benaki Museum. The tenth appeared in an auction catalogue and is now at Amherst College, Massachusetts, Mundell-Mango 1995, *passim*.
6. For the convenience of the reader this list follows the same order as the basic article on these buckets (Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 298).
7. F. W. Deichmann, U. Peschlow, *Zwei spätantike Ruinenstätten in Nordmesopotamien* (Munich 1977) 39-40; Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 301.
8. A. Carandini, La Secchia Doria: una "Storia di Achille" tardo-antica, *Studi Miscellanei* 9 (1963-64) 1-45; *Age of Spirituality*, no. 196; Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 298.
9. J. Arce, La Sítula tardorromana de Bueña (Teruel), *Estudios sobre la época tardorromana. Museo Arqueológico Nacional. Catálogos y monografías. Estudios de iconografía* I (Madrid 1982) 113-62; the Greek letters Γ and Ο on the base of this bucket are probably indications of weight as suggested by Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 305, and not workshop marks as Arce interpreted them (Arce 1982, 126, 130).
10. *Byzantium* (n. 1) with earlier bibliography.
11. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, *passim*; for the reading of the inscription see Scholl (n. 1) 234.
12. C. J. Arnold, *The Anglo-Saxon cemeteries of the Isle of Wight* (London 1982) 27; R. Bruce-Mitford, *The Sutton Hoo ship-burial* III (London 1983) 748-50, 756; Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 298, 305-08.
13. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 298, and *passim*.
14. *Ibid.*
15. See above n. 1.
16. Mundell-Mango 1995, *passim*.
17. J. J. Herrmann Jr., A Bacchic bucket of Rhenish Origin in the J. Paul Getty Museum, in: C. C. Mattusch et al. (eds), *From the Parts to the Whole. Acta of the 13th International Bronze Congress, held at Cambridge Massachusetts, May 28-June 1, 1996* II (Portsmouth-Rhode Island 2002) 205-12. The Getty bucket, dated AD 210-230, is unprovenanced.
18. Two more examples of metal buckets with Christian iconography could be intended for use in a similar environment: one is decorated with christograms and the other with Christian figures and symbols, *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* III (1991) s.v. *situla* (M. Mundell-Mango).
19. *Age of Spirituality*, nos 74, 378; D. B. Harden (ed.), *Glass of the Caesars* (Milan 1987) 226-30, nos 126-28.
20. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 308-09.
21. L. Wamser, G. Zahlhaas (eds), *Rom und Byzanz. Archäologisches Kostbarkeiten aus Bayern* (Munich 1998) 72-76 no. 64 (A. Effenberger).
22. M. Piccirillo, *The Mosaics of Jordan* (Amman 1993) 290, figs 547, 548, 551.
23. Dunbabin 1978, 46-64.
24. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 299.
25. J. Balty, *La grande mosaïque de chasse du Triclinos (= Fouilles d' Apamée de Syrie, Miscellanea 2, Brussels 1969)* 26-35, where the mosaic is dated to the end of the 4th century; Balty convincingly proposes a new date in *Mosaïques antiques du proche-orient* (Paris 1995) 23, 78-9, followed by K. Dunbabin (Dunbabin 1999, 183-84).
26. J. Trilling, The Soul of the Empire: Style and Meaning in the Mosaic Pavement of the Byzantine Imperial Palace in Constantinople, *DOP* 43 (1989) 27-72, esp. 29-36, where there is a retrospective analysis of the earlier opinions.
27. W. Jobst, H. Veters (eds), *Mosaikforschung im Kaiserpalast von Konstantinopel* (Vienna 1992) 26-60; Dunbabin 1999, 232-35.
28. The same observation has been made about objects with mythological subjects, e.g. the Secchia Doria *situla* (*Age of Spirituality*, no. 196, where comparable examples are mentioned). On the general question on the use of model books by artists, and more specifically by mosaic workers, see P. Bruneau, Les mosaïstes antiques avaient-ils des cahiers

des modèles?, *RA* (1984) 241-72; for a general discussion on model-books, Dunbabin 1999, 300-03.

29. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 297; Scholl (n. 1) *passim*.

30. M. Mundell-Mango, *Silver from Early Byzantium. The Kaper Koraon and Related Treasures* (Baltimore 1986) 74-77, 96-97, 108-11; I. Ševčenko, The Sion Treasure: The Evidence of the Inscriptions, in: *Ecclesiastical Silver Plate* (n. 3) 39-56.

31. For the *patera*: W.-F. Volbach, Zu der Bronzenpfanne von Göttingen, *Germania* 17 (1933) 42-47; P. Périn, A propos des vases de bronze ‘coptes’ du VIIe siècle en Europe de l’Ouest: le pichet de Bardouville (Seine-Maritime), *CahArch* 40 (1992) 37-38; on the inscription of the *patera* R. Egger, Die Inschrift der Bronzepfanne von Göttingen, *Germania* (*ibid.*) 114-18, and more recently S. Colussa, Sul significato dell’iscrizione del bacile a padella di Reggio Emilia, *Pagine di Archeologia-Studi e Materiali* 1 (2000) 7-27, with a general discussion on the meaning and form of this type of inscription. For the jug which is decorated with a hunting scene and an animal frieze, closely related to our group of buckets: Scholl (n. 1); SEG XLIV (1994) 465.

32. J. Durand et al. (eds), *Byzance, l’art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises* (Paris 1992) 137 no. 93.

33. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 304.

34. A. Delivorrias, D. Fotopoulos, *Greece at the Benaki Museum* (Athens 1997) no. 350. For further examples and a general discussion on these inscriptions, see Colussa (n. 31) *passim*.

35. J. Aymard, *Essai sur les chasses romaines* (Paris 1951) chapters 23-24; Anderson 1985, 101-21; M. R. Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy. Social and Religious change in the Western Roman Empire* (Cambridge, Mass. 2002) 44-45.

36. Dunbabin 1978, 60.

37. Dunbabin 1999, 164 fig. 170; Levi 1947, I, 236-44; II, pls LVI-LVII.

38. *Age of Spirituality*, no. 84; Dunbabin 1978, 65-87.

39. For this development in North African mosaics, Dunbabin 1978, 60.

40. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 299.

41. Anderson 1985, 135.

42. *Byzantium* (n. 1). The *Megalopsychia* hunt is believed to depict the *venatio*: the hunters are clothed and the mythological names given to them may well refer to mythological stage names given to contemporary heroes of the amphitheatre (Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 299). The fact that the hunters on the Amherst College bucket have the same names suggests an imitation of such mosaic scenes and at the same time emphasises the heroic character of the theme, which may reflect a foundation myth of Antioch (Mundell-Mango 1995, 274-79).

43. The 3rd century sophist Philostratos describes a hunting scene painted to give pleasure only, without any allusions to bravery or victory (Anderson 1985, 135). The popularity of hunting scenes is manifested not only in mosaic floors and objects of daily use but also in textiles of the period. See for example H. Maguire, The Good Life, in: P. Brown et al. (eds), *Late Antiquity, A Guide to the Postclassical World* (Cambridge, Mass.-London 1999) 242 figs 19, 21.

44. Dunbabin 1978, 63.

45. It is interesting to note the interpretation of the depiction of armed hunters confronting wild beasts given by H. Maguire in connection with the 6th century mosaic pavements of churches in Jordan. The inclusion of this subject in the decorative programme of the ecclesiastical pavements is associated with homilies of Gregory of Nysa and of John Chrysostom, which elaborate on the domination of mankind over beasts, in accordance with God’s plan for the world, H. Maguire, *Earth and Ocean, The Territorial World in Early Byzantine Art* (Pennsylvania State University 1987) 69-72. On a more general level, the symbolic identification of wild beasts with the passions, which must be subdued by the noble man, is a common topos in the Greco-Roman literary tradition, Trilling (n. 26) 64-66 n. 166.

46. Dunbabin 1978, 63, 162-63.

47. Anderson 1985, 126-29. For the earlier Greek tradition associating hunting with funerary iconography, see J. M. Barringer, *Hunting in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore 2001) 174-202.

48. R. Nenova-Merdjanova, Roman bronze vessels as part of *instrumentum balnei*, in: J. De Laine, D. E. Johnston (eds), *Roman Baths and Bathing. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Roman Baths held at Bath, England, 30 March-4 April 1992* (= *JRA Suppl.* 37, 1999) 131-34; R. Nenova-Merdjanova, Bronze vessels and the toilette in Roman times, in: *From the parts to the Whole* (n. 17) 200-04.

49. J. Pollini, *The Cobannus Hoard. Gallo-Roman bronzes and the Process of Romanization* (Leiden 2002) 35-38; P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1976) 1775 *s.v.* *situla, situlus*.

50. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 304; Mundell-Mango 1995, 279-82.

51. G. Downey, *Ancient Antioch* (Princeton 1963) fig. 58; Mundell-Mango 1995, 269-74; Chr. Kondoleon (ed.), *Antioch, The Lost Ancient City* (Princeton 2000) 148.

52. Maguire (n. 43) 241 fig. 17.

53. J. K. Shelton, *The Esquiline Treasure* (London 1981) 26-28 pls 6-8.

54. *Antioch, The Lost Ancient City* (n. 51) 71-74 fig. 7.

55. M. Mundell-Mango, A. Bennett, *The Sevso Treasure I* (= *JRA Suppl.* 12, 1994) 319-63.

56. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 304; J.-B. Chabot (ed.),

Chronique de Michel le Syrien II (Paris 1899-1924) 450.

57. E. J. Walters, *Attic Grave Reliefs that represent Women in the Dress of Isis* (*Hesperia* Suppl. XXII, Princeton 1998) pl. 38c.

58. Walters (*ibid.*) 21-25, and *passim*.

59. Walters (n. 57); for the significance of water ablutions in the cult of Isis, R. E. Witt, *Isis in the Greco Roman World* (London 1971) 89, 91.

60. F. Baratte, Les trésors dans le monde romain: Une expression particulière de la piété, in: *Ecclesiastical Silver Plate* (n. 3) 114 figs 7-8.

61. It is noteworthy that holy water was still carried in similar buckets by Greek Orthodox priests until recent times.

62. E.g. the Basilewski *situla* in the Victoria and Albert Museum, P. Williamson, *The Medieval Treasury. The Art of the Middle Ages in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London 1986) 77 pl. 3.

63. Mundell-Mango et al. 1989, 304-05.

64. M. Feugère, *Les armes des Romains* (Paris 1993) 235-48.

65. S. James, The *Fabricae*: state arms factories of the Later Roman Empire, in: J. C. N. Coulston (ed.), *Military Equipment and the ID of Roman Soldiers* (= *BAR Int. Series* 394, Oxford 1988) 257-331; M. C. Bishop, J. C. N. Coulston, *Roman Military Equipment from the Punic Wars to the Fall of Rome* (Rome 1993) 186 fig. 135. The attribution of the buckets to Antioch is strengthened by the analyses of the Amherst *situla* (no. 10), Mundell-Mango 1995.

66. On the distribution of metalware, especially copper alloy objects, during Late Antiquity see the basic article by M. Mundell-Mango, Beyond the Amphora: Non-Ceramic Evidence for Late Antique Industry and Trade, in: S. Kingsley, M. Decker (eds), *Economy and Exchange in the East Mediterranean during Late Antiquity. Proceedings of a Conference at Somerville College, Oxford, 29th May 1999* (Oxford 2001) 87-106.

67. On the transmarine commercial activity of the 5th-6th century, A. Cameron et al. (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, XIV: *Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors, A.D. 425-600* (Cambridge 2000) 369-77 (B. Ward-Perkins); see also the entry "transport", in: *Late Antiquity* (n. 43) 730-31.

68. Mundell-Mango (n. 66) 89-91.

69. The main source is the Life of St John the Almsgiver, patriarch of Alexandria between 610-620, A. J. Festugière (ed.), *Léontios de Néapolis, Vie de Syméon le fou et vie de Jean de Chypre* (Paris 1974); for an analyses of passages in the Life offering information on the metalware trade, see Mundell-Mango (n.

66) 96-99, where other written sources are also used.

70. Mundell-Mango (n. 66) 99-101; Y. Solier et al., Les Epaves de Gruissan, *Arcaeonautica* 3 (1981) 26-52, 176-221; A. J. Parker, *Ancient Shipwrecks of the Mediterranean and the Roman Provinces* (= *BAR Int. Series* 580, Oxford 1992) 205, 270-71, 319; of special interest among these shipwrecks is the Favaritx wreck, located near Minorca (Balearic Isles), dated c. 450-600, with a cargo of bronze objects of eastern origin, which has been interpreted as a ship carrying a metal-worker with supplies for the area (*ibid.*, 176).

71. James (n. 65) 286.

72. J. DeLaine, Bathing and Society, in: DeLaine, Johnston (n. 48) 7-16 and *passim*; F. Yegül, Baths and Bathing in Roman Antioch, in: *Antioch, The Lost Ancient City* (n. 51) 146-51.

73. *Glass of the Caesars* (n. 19) 220-21 no. 122. The San Marco glass *situla*, which has been dated to the 4th or early 5th century, measures 20.3 cm in height and has slightly flaring walls like nos 1-3 in our list of brass buckets.

74. See above n. 55.

75. *Age of Spirituality*, no. 118.

76. The inscription on the Trier jug reads: ΥΓΙΑΙΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΡΠΙ(Ε) ΚΟΜΗC ΕΝ ΠΟΛΛΟΙC CΕ ΧΡΟΝΟΙC ΚΑΙ ΚΑΛΟΙC ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΠΙΕΔΙΩΝ, Scholl (n. 1) 231 pl. XIX a-b. See also the silver Hippolytus jug and the two matching Hippolytus buckets from the Sevso treasure, Mundell-Mango (n. 55) 319-401.

77. F. Yegül, *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity* (New York 1992) 314-49; C. Mango, Daily Life in Byzantium, *JÖB* 31,1 (1981) 337-41.

78. *Rom und Byzanz* (n. 21) no. 41 (V. Elbern).

79. For the use of Islamic buckets of this type in baths, see R. Ettinghausen, The Bobrinski "Kettle", Patron and Style of an Islamic Bronze, *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 24 (1943) 199-203; R. Ettinghausen, O. Grabar, M. Jenkins-Madina, *Islamic Art and Architecture 650-1250* (New Haven-London 2001) 167-68 figs 257-58; for baths, their role and function in the Islamic world, *The Encyclopedia of Islam* III (1986) 139-46 s.v. Hammam (J. Sourdel-Thomine, A. Louis).

80. For a general introduction to the relations of Islam with the heritage of Late Antiquity, H. Kennedy, Islam, in: *Late Antiquity* (n. 43).

81. *Masterpieces of Islamic Art in the Hermitage Museum* (Kuwait 1990) no.14.

82. R. Ward, *Islamic Metalwork* (London 1993) fig. 42.

83. J. W. Allan, *Nishapur: Metalwork of the Early Islamic Period* (New York 1982) 42-43, 82-85 n. 100.

ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΙΑ ΔΡΑΝΔΑΚΗ

«ΥΠΙΕΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΡΙ(Ε)...». Υστερορωμαϊκός ορειχάλκινος κάδος με σκηνή κυνηγιού

Στις συλλογές του Μουσείου Μπενάκη συγκαταλέγεται ένας ενεπίγραφος κάδος (*situla*) από κράμα χαλκού, διακοσμημένος με σκηνή κυνηγιού, ο οποίος πρόσφατα παρουσιάστηκε στην εντυπωσιακή έκθεση του Λευκού Πύργου, *Καθημερινή ζωή στο Βυζάντιο*. Το σκεύος είναι σφυρηλατημένο σε ενιαίο φύλλο μετάλλου, το οποίο οι μεταλλουργικές αναλύσεις απέδειξαν ότι είναι ορείχαλκος. Τα τοιχώματα είναι κάθετα και η βάση επίπεδη, διαμορφώνοντας ένα σκεύος σχεδόν απόλυτα κυλινδρικό. Το σώμα έχει ύψος 10,7 εκ., ενώ η διάμετρος του κυμαίνεται μεταξύ 17-17,8 εκ. Δύο ημιελλειψοειδή “αυτιά” υψώνονται αντικρυστά στο χείλος του σκεύους και από τις τρύπες στο μέσον τους περνά μια γερή, καμπυλωμένη ράβδος πολυγωνικής διατομής, η οποία συνιστά τη λαβή του κάδου. Τα αναδιπλωμένα άκρα της ράβδου σχηματίζουν κλειστούς γάντζους που τη στερεώνουν στο σκεύος.

Η εξωτερική επιφάνεια χωρίζεται σε τρεις διακοσμητικές ζώνες, τις οποίες ορίζουν μονές σειρές από χτυπητούς κύκλους. Η πάνω και κάτω ζώνη είναι περίπου ισοϋψείς (1,3 και 1,5 εκ. αντίστοιχα) ενώ η πλατιά μεσαία ζώνη (ύψος 6,4 εκ.) φέρει τον κυρίως διάκοσμο του κάδου, τη σκηνή του κυνηγιού. Για την οργάνωση της διακόσμησης ο κατασκευαστής χρησιμοποίησε ως οδηγό έξι ζεύγη εγχάρακτων γραμμών που περιτρέχουν σε κανονικές αποστάσεις τα τοιχώματα. Το σύνολο του διακόσμου είναι στικτό, εκτελεσμένο με διαδοχικά κτυπήματα από καλέμι με κυκλική απόληξη. Την πάνω ζώνη περιτρέχει η μεγαλογράμματη ελληνική επιγραφή: ΥΠΙΕΝΩΝ ΧΡΩ ΚΥΡΙ(Ε) ΕΝ ΠΟΛΛΟΙΣ ΣΕ ΧΡΟΝΟΙΣ ΚΕ ΚΑΛΟΙΣ ΕΥΤΥΧΩΣ. Στην κεντρική ζώνη αναπτύσσεται η σκηνή του κυνηγιού, στην οποία πρωταγωνιστούν πέντε κυνηγοί. Ανά τρεις και δύο κυνηγούν αντίστοιχα λέαινα και λεοπάρδαλη. Στο κυνήγι συμμετέχει ένα κυνηγετικό σκυλί, ενώ συνοπτικά αποδοσμένα δέντρα και φυτά δηλώνουν το φυσικό τοπίο στο οποίο εκτυλίσσε-

ται η σκηνή. Η κατώτερη ζώνη χωρίζεται με γραμμή ζικ-ζακ σε τριγωνικά διάχωρα, τα οποία περικλείουν με τη σειρά τους μικρότερα διακοσμητικά τρίγωνα.

Ο κάδος του Μουσείου Μπενάκη έρχεται να προστεθεί σε μια ομάδα ανάλογων αντικειμένων που έχουν εντοπιστεί και μελετηθεί ως ενιαίο σύνολο. Οι κάδοι αυτής της ομάδας παρουσιάζουν εντυπωσιακή διασπορά ως προς τον τόπο εύρεσης, χρονολογούνται στον 6ο αιώνα και αποδίδονται σε εργαστήρια της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου, πιθανότατα της Αντιόχειας. Με την εξαίρεση του πρώτου κάδου, ο οποίος φέρει διάκοσμο με σταυρούς και αφιερωτική επιγραφή που τεκμηριώνει τη χρήση του σε εκκλησία, οι υπόλοιποι εννέα διακοσμούνται με σκηνές κυνηγιού και μυθολογικό θέμα από τον κύκλο του Αχιλλέα. Η διακόσμηση σε συνδυασμό με τις ευχετικές επιγραφές που διαβάζονται σε τέσσερις κάδους, υποδεικνύουν σαφώς ότι τα αντικείμενα αυτά αποτελούσαν προσωπικά σκεύη καθημερινής χρήσης. Αποτελούν φτηνότερα αντίγραφα πολυτελών κάδων από γυαλί ή ασημί και –όπως μαρτυρούν οι επιγραφές– απευθύνονταν σε ανδρικό και γυναικείο κοινό. Πιθανώς πρόκειται για σκεύη λουτρού, όπως υποδηλώνουν οι απεικονίσεις τους σε σχετικές σκηνές. Ανάλογα μεταγενέστερα σκεύη με διαφορετικές επιγραφές εντοπίζονται σε εκκλησιαστικό περιβάλλον, όπου προορίζονται για αγίασμα.

Ακόμη πιο συγγενικές όμως είναι οι επιβιώσεις του σχήματος, της διακόσμησης και της χρήσης των κάδων που εξετάζουμε στον χώρο του Ισλάμ, που κληρονόμησε και αξιοποίησε εξίσου την παρακαταθήκη της Ύστερης Αρχαιότητας. Όμοιοι κάδοι με προορισμό τη χρήση στο λουτρό κατασκευάζονταν τον 10ο-11ο αι. σε εργαστήρια της Αιγύπτου και του Χορασάν. Συχνά διακοσμούνται με ζώα που τρέχουν, και κάτω από το χείλος φέρουν γνώριμες επιγραφές που εύχονται *καλή τύχη, ευτυχία, χαρά και ειρήνη* στον κάτοχό τους.