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Summary

Some 17 years ago, Brian Shefton wrote, “the distribution pattern of the Greek imports for the Hallstatt period has crystallized a number of years ago and is unlikely to be greatly modified in the future except on point of detail” (Böhr/Shefton 2000, 28). Indeed, publications describing Greek pottery have reached similar conclusions: Greek vessels were rare in West-Central Europe compared to the Mediterranean coast; where they did appear, it was as apparently prestigious grave goods in elite tombs more than as tableware used in banquets; emphasis in consumption centered on vessels associated with drinking rather than eating, storage, or household functions; and the presence of transport amphorae was extremely limited if not entirely lacking at many sites. Discussions of Greek imports like the one above have tended to occur in a vacuum, however (and I am as guilty of this as anyone; e.g. Walsh 2014), the pottery in particular, has been published by itself, or together with Greek and Etruscan metal vessels, separate from local production. This phenomenon raises the question: what can we gain by considering imports together with the locally produced items recovered from the same contexts? This paper will explore some examples where sufficient publication allows such re-contextualization, emphasizing how consumers made choices according to their needs and interests when constructing assemblages.
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Zusammenfassung

Vor 17 Jahren schrieb Brian Shefton, dass „sich das Verbreitungsmuster griechischer Importe in der Hallstattzeit schon vor einigen Jahren herauskristallisiert habe und größere Veränderungen in der Zukunft außer im Detail unwahrscheinlich seien“ (Böhr/Shefton 2000, 28). Publikationen, die griechische Keramik beschreiben, gelangten zu ähnlichen Schlussfolgerungen: Griechische Vasen seien im westlichen Mitteleuropa rar im Vergleich zur Mittelmeerküste; wo sie auftreten, sei es eher als offensichtlich prestigeträchtige Grabbeigaben in Elitegräbern denn als Tafelgeschirr für Gelage. Der Schwerpunkt der Nutzung liege mehr auf Gefäßen im Zusammenhang mit Trinken als auf solchen zum Essen, für Bevorrung oder Haushaltsfunktionen; und das Vorhandensein von Transportamphoren an Fundplätzen sei extrem begrenzt.
wenn sie nicht überhaupt fehlten. Diskussionen über griechische Importe wie die zitierten fanden jedoch tendenziell im luftleeren Raum statt - wessen ich mich so schuldig gemacht habe wie andere Autoren, z. B. Walsh 2014 -, denn die Keramik wurde vor allem isoliert veröffentlicht oder bestenfalls zusammen mit griechischen und etruskischen Metallgefäßen, getrennt von den einheimischen Waren. Dieses Phänomen wirft die Frage auf, was zu gewinnen sei, wenn die Importe zusammen mit den lokalen gefertigten Objekten aus denselben Fundkontexten untersucht werden. Dieser Aufsatz betrachtet einige Beispiele, bei denen eine hinreichende Publikationsqualität eine solche Rekontextualisierung erlaubt, und betont, dass die einstigen Verbraucher, welche die Fundablagerungen verursachten, ihre Wahl je nach ihren Bedürfnissen und Vorlieben trafen.
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Background

I worked for many years at the Sicilian town of Morgantina, studying how what I eventually determined was a mixed Greek and Sikel population organized their lives - including their acquisition and use of Greek pottery imported from colonies on the coast and from Greece itself (Walsh 2006, 2011-12; 2013; Walsh/Antonaccio 2014). What I learned from this study was that it might be possible to identify the act of choosing some items from an array of available possibilities, and rejecting others from the same array, from the archaeological record. Specifically, I was able to show that different populations at Morgantina desired and chose distinctly different distributions of Athenian fine wares in two consecutive periods (c. 525-460 BC and c. 440/430-400 BC). I attributed these differences to variability in the utility of different shapes for their intended purpose within each group - in other words, local priorities took precedence rather than cosmopolitan ones (or even explicitly foreign ones, like Greek ideas about the correct assemblage of sympotic equipment). The intended purpose thus was not to mimic Athenian practices, but to do something that made sense in Morgantina, to Morgantinoi.

For my book (Walsh 2014) I decided to extend these ideas further, and to really consider why people who were not Greek, were interested in Greek pottery at all. This is a question that I think does not get asked often enough when we encounter ancient material culture outside its home context. We, embedded in a globalized world, often tend to simply assume that it is normal for people to want things that were made by other groups of people, especially things that we ourselves tend to think are nice, for our own reasons - and maybe it was normal, but again: why? Whether the cause of the phenomenon of acquiring imports is general or specific, we still should try to understand what is motivating that choice.

In order to map large-scale distribution patterns, and to work comparatively with a variety of ancient cultural groups and geographic areas, I needed to turn to a bigger region. I catalogued almost 24,000 Greek vases that were archaeologically excavated (or at least had known findspots) in Spain, Portugal, France, Switzerland, and Germany. This dataset and all of the files and maps generated for the book are available for free download, modification, and re-use (including publication) under a Creative Commons license from the Chapman University Digital Commons. In brief, I found that there was tremendous variability in the acquisition and use of Greek

---

1 The datasets are permanently hosted at http://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/art_data/1/ (licensed as CC BY-SA 3.0). They are also the subject of a paper currently under preparation for the Journal of Open Archaeological Data. For information on the datasets' licenses, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/ (available in 38 languages).
pottery in these zones between c. 800 and 300 BC. Well over 90% of the vases were consumed within 50 km of the coast. At no site other than Greek colonies and emporia was a complete sympotic set represented. In some regions, such as Western Provence in France, Greek wine was imported in amphoras, but relatively few drinking vessels (especially few kraters), while just across the Hérault River to the west, in Languedoc, relatively little wine was imported compared to the number of Greek table vessels. As I said, I was able to map the distributions to provide a picture of patterns based on sherd counts, presence-absence, and also on the diversity of assemblages, all of which added to scholarly understanding of different acquisition practices.

It seemed to me that the next step was to move from this “big data” to try to understand why people acquired what they did and rejected what they did. For this aspect of my work, I pulled together what seemed to me to be theoretical approaches from a wide range of sources - archaeological, anthropological, sociological, and even biological - relevant to activities of acquisition, display, and the construction of meaning. In a nutshell, I suggested that these local patterns of import acquisition reflected local status competitions of a kind that has been termed “costly signaling” or “wasteful advertising.” By acquiring, or “consuming” Greek imports, non-Greeks were carefully constructing a public identity, just as an identity was being constructed for them by those who saw their acquisition and use of Greek imports. It was important for my purposes that the Greek imports were both visually distinctive and immediately recognizable as different from local alternatives, that they were necessarily more costly than the local alternatives (and thus a kind of luxury item), and that, generally speaking, relatively few local imitations were produced and acquired, even though the raw material for the pottery, common clay, was obviously abundant. Non-Greeks were choosing to expend greater resources on imports because of the value they had for sending positive signals about them to their surrounding local community. The specific arenas for the display of the items’ acquisition (such as a public market) and use (such as a banquet and/or a funeral) were likewise locally determined, leading to the variety of distribution patterns. I should note that even in the case where resources were not expended (i.e., in the case of receiving a gift), those occasions were likely to be at least somewhat public, and to incur some costs in the form of reciprocal action, such as assistance in creating or maintaining trade. Those costs had to have been worthwhile in the eyes of gift recipients for exchange to have happened on more than a single occasion.

There was a drawback to my approach, however - a drawback that only one reviewer of my book, Mark Lawall, has raised so far (Lawall 2015; although I, too, had acknowledged it: Walsh 2014, 3 n. 1, 103-107). This drawback was that despite the size and scope of my dataset, it still only contained information about imports. It entirely neglected any other type of object, including locally produced pottery, which would contextualize the presence and function of the imports. My choice in this regard was governed by “the possible”; I simply did not have the time or resources to also manually add into the catalogue the local wares that were found alongside the imports, almost always in vastly greater quantities. Moreover, local wares have almost never received the attention that Greek imports did in publications - not in site reports, and certainly not in museum exhibitions on Celtic/Hallstatt/La Tène Cultures. To be fair, it is hard to expect archaeologists to publish a category of evidence potentially comprised of tens or hundreds of thousands of examples from a given site in the same detail as another category of evidence where there are singletons ranging up to perhaps a few hundred examples at the sites of greatest abundance. But the bias must nevertheless be recognized, as must the constraints created by that bias for our interpretation. And again, I have clearly been as guilty of this as anyone, even though my privileging of Greek pottery was specifically intended to direct post-colonialist attention at non-Greek populations.

When I was asked to develop a topic for this paper, then, it seemed like a good idea to try to confront this problem, and to try to use publications of sites or other available data to consider how Greek imports fit into the overall household
(or funerary) assemblages in which they have been discovered. I also wanted to see whether it would be possible to consider these assemblages from the same theoretical perspective regarding identity construction and gain meaningful insights. In the time I had available, I searched for publications that would give me a picture of both locally produced and imported wares from the same archaeological contexts. This was a bigger challenge than I had anticipated. I started by looking to see whether there were available digital datasets that might be of use, but I did not discover any - I even e-mailed colleagues who are directing excavations to see whether they had data that they had already published or otherwise were willing to make available. The response came back in the negative. So I turned to published reports.

In the end, I settled on two sites: Bourges, dépt. Cher, France, and Breisach, distr. Breisgau-Hochschwarzwald, Germany. Again, this was really due only to my ability to gain access to the records during the period prior to the BEFIM conference; no larger conclusions should be drawn from these choices. From Bourges, I had the detailed publication of Greek pottery (all Athenian) and a summary table of counts of local tableware from 22 contexts, a total of 798 sherds, plus another 125 amphora sherds. From Breisach, there was finer detail: 17 contexts from a trench on Kapuzinergasse and 13 contexts from the rescue excavations related to construction of the "Hotel am Münster"; unfortunately, there were only two probable imports, one from each zone (and the one from "Hotel am Münster" was a stray find, unassociated with a specific context). Even so, I would underline the fact that the absence of imports (i.e. the lack of acquisition of imports) is itself a phenomenon that is worthy of note and investigation.

**Bourges**

The Bourges summary table on which this study is based (Milcent 2007, 134 fig. 14) expressed counts of minimum numbers of vessels, not sherd counts, weights, or vessel-equivalents. Of the tableware published from the Bourges contexts, 96% was produced locally. The average context had 35 MNls, though the median of 21 indicates the effect of a few larger deposits on the average. Effectively the same relationship existed between the average number of Athenian sherds per context and the median: 1.6 for the average, with a median of 1. There were 497 MNls from eating vessels (Fig. 1; 64% of tableware) and 287 from drinking vessels (36%). As might be expected, the range of local vessels indicates a variety of functions: two-thirds of all the local MNls came from bowls (Fig. 2), compared to 22% for "goblets," 10% for larger bowls, and a tiny proportion of cups and miniature vessels (1% and 2%, respectively). Of the 35 Athenian MNls, 81% consisted of different kinds of cups (Fig. 3); the remainder was either an unidentifiable large open shape, or simply unknown.

Five contexts had 69% of the Greek pottery, while eleven had no Greek pottery at all. There was no clear correlation between the size of the overall set of pottery per context and its consumption of imports. The very largest set featured 157 local MNls, but no Athenian pottery. The largest number of Athenian vessels (six comprising 17% of all such pottery from Bourges), appeared in a context with 58 local sherds (tied with one other context for the fifth-most local sherds). One context had no local pottery, but one Athenian cup. Although the large majority of Athenian vessels were associated with drinking vessels, there was no clear preference for a certain type of cup - they were very evenly distributed, with seven different types represented by either three or four sherds. There were no pouring or mixing vessels. Amphoras were published separately, as sherd counts, not MNls.

---

2 In the question-and-answer period following my paper at the BEFIM conference, participants were unable to suggest any digital datasets. See discussion of published data from Breisach, below, however.

3 See Walsh 2014, 99-103, for previous discussion of quantification.
*Figure 1: Vessel functions at Bourges (© J. Walsh).*

- Eating
- Drinking

*Figure 2: Local pottery at Bourges (© J. Walsh).*
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seven of the 22 contexts contained amphora sherds; just one of these (F12-125) had 50 of these sherds, compared to 38 local and four Athenian vessels, perhaps indicating that this context was particularly associated with storage of banqueting equipment/ingredients.

It is clear that no context contained sufficient Greek wares to hold a symposium, nor even to have drinks for more than just a few participants exclusively with Greek pottery. This comes, I know, as little surprise - specialists in Hallstatt archaeology already know generally how much Greek pottery has been found in these contexts. By contrast, though, at least 18 of the 22 contexts contained local vessels that were primarily intended for drinking, and bowls could easily be used for consuming liquids, as well - these were plentiful in practically all contexts (494 total sherds, average 22, median 13). In keeping with the results of other papers in these proceedings, there was at best mixed evidence for the consumption of wine, even on very special or unique occasions. The picture we are starting to see, however, is that Greek pottery was, at most, a supplement to equipment that already existed within the Hallstatt and La Tène repertoires. It is hard to imagine that new kinds of behavior - foreign kinds - penetrated any further at Bourges than new kinds of pottery did.

**Breisach**

If anything, the patterns seen at Bourges are emphasized in the two excavated zones of Breisach that were analyzed for this paper (Bender 1993). In this case, all the data comes in the form of sherd counts only. From the Kapuzinergasse site, a compact area of about 25 m², there were a total of 351 sherds. The single sherd that could be attributed to a Greek source was from a “pseudo-Ionian jar.” Of the rest, 257 sherds could be attributed to various eating vessels (essentially bowls, both small and large; Figs. 4-5), while just 36 were attributable to drinking (I counted cups and jars for this category).

The remainder were likely associated with cooking and storage. The local wares were divisible into fine ware (12 % of the total), incised ware and painted ware (together just over 1 %), generic tableware (62 %), coarse ware (21 %), and Urnfield
Figure 4: Vessel function at Breisach-Kapuzinergasse (© J. Walsh).
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Figure 5: Fine ware from Breisach (© J. Walsh).
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 ware (3 %). Unless some cache of cups and jugs went undiscovered by the excavators, the emphasis therefore is decidedly not on drinking in the creation and maintenance of domestic assemblages.

Likewise in the "Hotel am Münster" zone of Breisach, where the excavators found pottery in contexts associated with a double-row of post holes running alongside and parallel to the western ridge of the summit of Breisach's hill. These holes were not interpreted as domestic, but rather likely related to the fortifications. Even so, there
was a domestic character to the finds - not only the household pottery, but also the presence of some 23 loomweights (all but one in a single deposit). There were 231 fragments of pottery, of which one possibly belonged to a Greek cup. The remainder fell into the same ware categories as in Kapuzinergasse: fine ware (8 %), incised and painted wares (13 %), generic tableware (69 %), coarse ware (10 %), and Urnfield ware (>1 %). The only significant difference from the Kapuzinergasse site was the presence of local decorated wares, which comprised mainly cups and "large vessels". Half of these sherds could not be identified for shape. With regard to functional categories, the emphasis on eating persisted: 129 sherds from eating vessels (Fig. 6); 60 from drinking vessels. There did not appear to be any amphoras recovered from either of these zones at Breisach.

Following my presentation of this paper at the BEFIM conference, Dr. Ines Balzer very kindly sent me a copy of her 2009 publication synthesizing many more contexts from Breisach, excavated between 1980 and 1986. This book included sherds from twelve Greek table-vessels (ten Athenian and two "pseudo-Ionian") and nine Massaliote amphoras. The range of table-vessel shapes included kraters (five), an amphora, a cup, a stamnos, and a jar/lekythos (or possibly two). Only one of these pots, an Athenian black-figure column krater, came from an archaeological context in the Kapuzinergasse area (another seems to have been a stray find; three other Greek sherds were also stray finds from other areas), while none were attributed to the "Hotel am Münster" area. The only notable concentration of imported Greek vessels came from area 18, where the drinking cup, table amphora, and two Massaliote amphoras appeared, but all in slightly different contexts, so it cannot be argued that

---

4 It could easily be argued that I should have identified this important book prior to the conference; perhaps I even ought to be embarrassed that I did not. According to the Worldcat catalog maintained by the US Library of Congress, it is owned by just five libraries in the United States, all of which are located approx. 5000 km from my California home (https://www.worldcat.org/title/chronologisch-chorologische-untersuchung-des-sparhallstatt-und-fruhatenezeitlichen-furstensitzes-auf-dem-münsterberg-von-breisach-grabung-1980-1986/oclc/845536529?referer=brief_results, accessed 31/10/2017). I do not make this point to excuse myself from the hard work required for thorough research, but simply to underline the obstacles to accessing significant excavation results and, especially, raw data.
Table 1: Distribution of vases in Cástulo tombs - large outliers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Tomb</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Greek painted</th>
<th>Greek unpainted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baños de la Muela</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baños de la Muela</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baños de la Muela</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baños de la Muela</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estacar de las Robarinas</td>
<td>73/ll</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estacar de las Robarinas</td>
<td>76/l</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Patos</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Patos</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

these formed part of a set. Despite the detailed description of finds by context, it was unfortunately not possible to connect the imported pottery in area 18 with whatever local pottery was also recovered from the same contexts. The vast majority of vessels were locally made, numbering in the hundreds, if not the thousands, and primarily consisting of cup/bowls, large bowls, and jars. The emphasis thus was not on drinking from Greek vessels, but on eating and drinking from local ones.

In short, it appears that although Greek vessels were available in the Westhallstattkreis in this period, they made only the most limited of impact. Of course, I am aware that there were more (even many more) Greek vessels found at sites like Vix and Heuneburg, but those sites have generated far larger total assemblages of pottery, too, and we are only beginning to see the patterns emerge. These two sets of contexts at Bourges and Breisach are admittedly far too small to draw reliable, broad conclusions, but the picture that they paint is one of lifeways in which large-scale conviviality was not especially emphasized, even among sets of locally produced pottery. One possible explanation is that most of these assemblages reflect non-elite people and their activities, by contrast with the tumulus burials and massive hilltop houses found at larger sites.

Cástulo

To illustrate where an approach integrating local and imported wares might get us, I want to turn to a non-Celtic (but also non-Greek) context where I do happen to have access to the necessary data: Cástulo, the capital of the ancient Iberian region of Oretania - the headwaters of the Guadalquivir River in Southern Spain. I have been excavating there since 2014. The focus of my investigation has been an Iberian house of the 4th to 2nd cent. BC (in some areas, we have reached levels of the 8th to 7th cent.). My concept was to provide a domestic contrast to the classical tombs excavated by the Complutense University from the 1960s to the 1980s, which contained many Greek vessels, including almost 100 examples of an Athenian cup shape now referred to as the Cástulo cup (so named by the redoubtable Shefton; Shefton 1982; 1996). Two major questions were

5 Balzer's book is an impressive catalogue of evidence. Like practically all other final publications of archaeological material from Hallstatt sites, however, it treats each category of evidence - metal, stone, pottery, etc. - separately (see, e.g., Bahr/Shefton 2000). The Greek imports are described in individual entries (Liste 3, 214-217) and as a group, describing the shapes and their origins and dates (77-82). At no point, though, is a synthesis presented that would indicate the relative presence, counts, or percentages of imports to locally produced examples, or that would describe or explain a set of pottery from a specific context as a unified assemblage. The fact that many of the context designations have changed over the period of time when material was recovered (in some cases extending much farther back than just the 1980s) further complicates synthesis and analysis. Balzer's summary article of 2010 treats the imported material in similar detail but largely leaves the local material aside.

6 I thank the Loeb Classical Library Foundation and the National Geographic Society for their on-going support of this research.
raised by the material excavated at Cástulo: first, how did the distribution of imported vessels compare to the distribution of locally produced ones? And second, how did the patterns seen in the tombs compare to those that pertain to life in the city, especially in the domestic context where pottery use would have been most frequent?

To answer the first of these questions - how did imports fit into the entire set of vessels used I investigated the relationship of those imports to the other material used in the same contexts. I looked at the first five volumes of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid team’s publications of their tomb excavations, led between 1975 and 1985 by José María Blázquez (Blázquez 1975; 1979; Blázquez/Malla 1981; Blázquez et al. 1983; 1985). These contained 49 tomb contexts with evidence for imported vessels, from five different cemeteries, for a total of 982 vases (both Greek and indigenous). There were 332 Greek imports and 650 indigenous vessels - in other words, a quite substantial percentage of the total number of objects placed in tombs at Cástulo were acquired from abroad.

The distribution of shapes is striking, and it is pervasive, particularly when seen from the perspective of functional types, which again I divide into drinking, eating, household, storage, and transport. No Greek transport vessels (i.e. amphoras) of any kind were placed in the tombs at Cástulo, though all of the other functional types were represented. However, with only a very few exceptions, all the drinking vessels were Greek, and all of the eating, household, and storage vessels were Iberian. At a macro scale, then, it would appear that Greek imports had been fully integrated into the Iberian banquetinig repertoire, but for a very specific purpose. It is worth noting the wide range of depositional practices with regard to the quantity of items deposited. Although the average number of vessels deposited is 20 (seven Greek and 13 indigenous), the median is only 14.5 (4.5 Greek and ten indigenous), indicating the presence of several high outliers (Tab. 1).

Indeed, there were eight tombs with 34 or more vessels. In six of these, the percentage of imports hovered around 50% (45-61%). Three of these had more than 29 Greek imports, and one (Tomb 76/1 in the Estacar de las Robarinas cemetery) had 61 of them (out of 121 total). On the other hand, in one tomb, imports made up only 6% (five of 83 vessels), and in another, there were no Greek vessels at all out of 66 total. In other words, at the micro-scale of individual tombs, there was clear variation in the choice to display the acquisition of imported goods by depositing them with the deceased during funerary ritual. The very richest tombs did tend to emphasize the consumption of Greek drinking vessels relative to local wares (though not by any means to their exclusion). At the same time, at least one, and probably two, very rich tombs in the same cemeteries show resistance to the display of imports. Display of consumption seems to have been the most important thing.

Display of consumption of imports was a point of greater disagreement.

With regard to my on-going excavation, the results have been far from expected. Rather than gaining a clear picture of how Greek vessels were integrated into a set of household equipment, I have instead been confronted by the almost total absence of imports. Fewer than ten sherds have appeared, all tiny and all out of their primary context (they were packed into a later house’s rammed-earth (tapial) walls following their initial discard). My collaborator, Marcelo Castro López, reports that our database now includes over 800,000 sherds recovered over six years of excavation at the site, almost entirely from non-funerary contexts. Of these, roughly 165 are Attic, and only about 60 of these are diagnostic for shape. For the moment, then, it appears that people at Cástulo did not have any real interest in using Greek pottery in banquets, but rather wanted to display it during funerals. Another possible explanation is that Greek pottery used in life was carefully saved and organized to be buried with the deceased user. This problem requires further study.

What I do hope to have shown, however, is that an integrated approach is useful and can point us in new and unexpected directions. In order to take this approach,
however, it will be imperative for scholars at large to have access to large datasets that include the complete range of material, both fancy/imported/demonstrative of links to the wider world, and plain or ugly/locally or regionally made/indicative of local practices and priorities. For those who direct excavations, I encourage you to make all of your raw and processed data not only public but also widely available (sometimes it is so difficult to get publications that even interlibrary loan is not good enough to carry out thorough research), and to consult with organizations such as Open Context (https://opencontext.org/) or the Digital Archaeological Record (https://core.tdar.org/) about best practices in this regard - file formats, publication strategies, preservation/archiving, etc. These aspects of data dissemination are increasingly necessary parts of archaeological research, and they will ensure that your work will have a long life. The services are not free, but if one makes an argument for the permanence of one’s data, a case can be made for including these costs in budget proposals. Indeed, in the US and elsewhere, clear data management plans are now required as part of many grant proposals to fund research.
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