

## CHAPTER 19 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

---

### Chronological Summary and Review

As a summary, the following objects and their limited contexts are some of the chief closely datable evidence for Minoan chronology relative to that of Egypt. It must always be borne in mind that the Minoan ceramic dating, by its very nature, cannot provide exact dates of transformation from one style to another. There always will be some overlap as ceramic style develops from one to the next period, not only from one generation of potters and painters to the next, but also from centre to periphery of production and fashion.

### Pre-Palatial

#### *Early MM IA*

– Archanes, Burial Building 7, late Dynasty XI scarab {52}.

#### *MM IA*

– Lebena, Tomb I upper stratum, early Dynasty XII scarab {366}.

– Lebena, Tomb II upper stratum, late Dynasty XI scarab {367}.

– Lebena, Tomb IIA upper stratum, early Dynasty XII scarab {368}.

#### *MM IA (mainly, with a little MM IB – perhaps early MM IB?)*

– Archanes, Burial Building 6, late Dynasty XI scarab {50}.

– Marathokephalo tholos tomb, late Dynasty XI–early XII ovoid {392}.

– Gournes, house tomb, early/mid-Dynasty XII scarab {72}.

This collection of material in context clearly indicates that MM IA on Crete was contemporary with the late Dynasty XI–early Dynasty XII in Egypt. The cultural/architectural development to MM IB and the Proto-Palatial period seems to have occurred near or at the middle of Dynasty XII, with a cross-

over indicator being the single early Dynasty XII scarab {483} in an MM IB occupation level at Poros. This scarab *might be* the last quite tightly but still generally contemporary cross-cultural overlap *in its context*, or instead in the earliest ‘slightly later’ context: Had MM IB and the Proto-Palatial period already begun before the *cultural* transition from early Dynasty XII? It is perhaps better to see this one scarab as slightly earlier than its context.

When MM IA began is not readily discernible from the Egyptian evidence, although it may perhaps be somewhat shorter than previously considered. A late Dynasty XI scarab {52} was recovered in an *early* MM IA tomb context at Archanes. Other relevant cross-cultural evidence, not discussed in the present study, would need to be considered in the light of this one context in a thorough investigation before such a close correlation were to be accepted. We might note, however, Pini’s suggestion that the imported scarabs first arrived in early MM IA and the Minoan versions produced somewhat later in the period.

### Proto-Palatial

#### *MM IB*

– Qubbet al-Hawa, Minoan vessel in late Dynasty XII–early Dynasty XIII tomb context.<sup>1210</sup>

#### *MM IB–IIA*

– Harageh, Minoan and ‘minoanising’ Egyptian vessels in mid-Dynasty XII–early Dynasty XIII tomb and cemetery debris contexts.<sup>1211</sup>

#### *MM IB–IIIA*

– Kahun, Early and Classical Kamares sherds in mid-Dynasty XII–XIII town dump, not earlier than the reign of Senwosret II (mid-Dynasty XII) when the town was founded.<sup>1212</sup>

#### *MM IIA (late?)*

– Knossos, deposit, Royal Road, South side, late Dynasty XII–XIII scarab {197}.

---

<sup>1210</sup> KEMP and MERRILLEES 1980:175–219; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:103; Janine Bourriau (personal communication, 01 February 2002) provides a date of late Dynasty XII–early XIII for the pottery.

<sup>1211</sup> KEMP and MERRILLEES 1980:6–57; MACGILLIVRAY

---

1998:103, 104–105, the latter quoting a 1990 paper by Dorothea Arnold.

<sup>1212</sup> KEMP and MERRILLEES 1980:57–104; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:104.

*MM IIB/IIIA*

– Tell el-Dab<sup>a</sup>, Classical Kamares sherds in stratified early and mid-Dynasty XIII contexts.<sup>1213</sup>

A considerable number of overlaps of imported material in context can be cited for the Proto-Palatial period, and with them the reason for my hesitation in assigning the early Dynasty XII Poros {483} scarab to a *contemporary* MM IB context. Virtually all relevant objects are Minoan and their contexts Egyptian, with the exception of the Knossos scarab {197}. The Minoan material cannot be ‘pushed’ father back than MM IB in stylistic date and the contexts no earlier than ‘mid-Dynasty XII’ and the reign of Senwosret II. The Knossos scarab is late Dynasty XII at the earliest, and its context published as MM IIA, then MM IIB, then MM IIA again. Full publication of its context would be necessary to be certain, but even without this data it acts as a good cross-check for the Minoan material in Egyptian contexts. No particularly good correspondence emerges, and the Minoan material in Egypt was not studied here, but the accumulated evidence provides a good *general* series of correspondences that can be provided with better foci for period development by bringing in the evidence of Egyptian/Levantine correspondences as well as the Aegean/Levantine evidence, especially at Byblos. This is, however, a separate investigation.

**Neo-Palatial**

There appear to be no direct correlations between Egyptian and *Minoan* material in cross-cultural context for this period, either on Crete or in Egypt. The nearest claim on Crete is the not terribly well-dated MB IIB–C or late Dynasty XIII–XV *anra* scarab {215} from a late (or perhaps end) LM IB context at Knossos. Thus, the scarab and its context would be generally contemporary *only* if the scarab could be dated to late MB IIC, an impossibly precise attribution to assign. The generally MB IIB–C or Dynasty XV scarab from the ‘palace’ at Archanes {48}, presumably also an LM IB destruction context, is a parallel situation, but neither scarab nor context is sufficiently published for direct comparison. A Late *Hel-*

*ladic* IB tall alabastron was recovered in Tomb 137 at Sidmant, but the tomb itself is not datable to anything other than early–mid-Dynasty XVIII, not later than the reign of Thutmose III. A late Late *Helladic* IIA squat alabastron and handled cup were recovered in Tomb NE.1 at Saqqara, associated with remarkably few Egyptian objects, but these include a coffin type that went out of use during the reign of Thutmose III and a little pottery whose production (although not necessarily *use*) ceased before his reign began.<sup>1214</sup> The relationship between the LM IB and LH IIA date ranges requires further study as they do not appear to be as precisely equivalent as is often assumed,<sup>1215</sup> nor should they be considered so. Other Aegean vessels found in Egypt have even less ‘precise’ contexts, or none at all beyond an Egyptian provenance.

**Final Palatial***LM II–IIIA1*

- Katsamba, no find context, *Gravidenflasche*, not earlier than late in the reign of Thutmose III (mid-Dynasty XVIII), converted to rhyton {119}.
- Knossos, LM II–IIIA1 Room of the Stone Vases, amphora or amphoriskos not earlier than the reign of Amenhotep II (mid-Dynasty XVIII), converted to rhyton(?) {144}.
- Kommos, LM IIIA1 fill below LH IIIA2 floor in House X, ‘pilgrim flask’ within the reigns of Amenhotep II–III (mid/late Dynasty XVIII) {335}.

*‘Early’ LM IIIA1*

- Knossos, Sellopoulo tomb, Amenhotep III (late Dynasty XVIII) scarab {262}, and also containing a ‘developed’ Late Helladic IIIA1 high-spouted jar.

*LM IIIA1–2*

- Kalyvia, tomb, late Dynasty XVIII (within reigns of Amenhotep III–Akhenaten) glass flask {89} and (within reigns of Amenhotep III–Horemhab) glass krateriskos {92}.

*Beginning of LM IIIA2*

- Aghia Triadha, deposit with various earlier artefacts and including late Dynasty XVIII (reign of

<sup>1213</sup> WALBERG 1991; 1992a; MACGILLIVRAY 1995; 1998:105; WALBERG 1998.

<sup>1214</sup> See MERRILLEES in KEMP and MERRILLEES 1980:228–231, 253, with further references. My thanks to Aidan Dodson for dating the coffin type, and Janine Bourriau the pottery, for me in January 1997.

<sup>1215</sup> E.g., FRENCH 1997:150 (“LM Ib extends just long enough to receive a couple of LH IIB pots”). I.e., LH IIA ended before LM IB, or LH IIB had begun before LM IB ended. This lack of absolute synchronism also is noted in the Sellopoulou tomb (Knossos NN), combining LM IIIA1 early and LH IIIA1 ‘developed’ ceramics.

Amenhotep III) ovoid of Queen Ty {18} possibly but not necessarily slightly earlier than its context.

– Archanes, Tholos A, late Dynasty XVIII (after reign of Amenhotep III) cornflower bead {58}.

Again, a good general series of correspondences are found for this period. These suggest that LM II certainly had arrived by late in the reign of Thutmose III, and LM IIIA1 likely even later or sometime during the 26-year reign of Amenhotep II. The correspondence between LM IIIA1 and the 38-year reign of Amenhotep III is reasonably clear, but LM IIIA2 must have begun before the accession of his son Amenhotep IV<sup>1216</sup> and so sometime late in the reign of Amenhotep III. It would have extended through until at least 1300 or slightly later, depending on the date of Zapher Papoura tomb 99 (discussed below) and if we accept a near-direct correspondence of Late Minoan and Late Helladic IIIA2. Again, as with the Neo-Palatial period, the relationship between the Late Minoan and Late Helladic ceramic periods is a crucial factor for determining Late Minoan and Egyptian dating correspondence. It is likely that LM IIIA2 both began later than LH IIIA2 and continued beyond its end. Nonetheless, for the Final Palatial period, we are also dependent on other factors, including the question of how long each ceramic phase would have survived, and how long each might have continued in different areas of the island after the next had been introduced. The general ceramic phase correlations are understood, but the specific question of when one becomes the next is flexible.

### End Palatial

#### *Very early LM IIIB*

– Zapher Papoura, chamber tomb, early Dynasty XIX scarab {265}.

#### *LM IIIB*

– Poros, house floor, Dynasty XIX scarab {482}.

The point at which Final Palatial becomes End Palatial is somewhat blurred, sometime in early LM IIIA2. Again, no direct correspondence emerges for Minoan chronology. Little direct evidence for Minoan-Egyptian relative chronology can be cited for the LM IIIB period either, but clearly it does cor-

respond in general to Dynasty XIX in Egypt. LM IIIA2 must have continued for a short while after Dynasty XIX began, for the evidence of the relative dating of the Zapher Papoura tomb and its scarab is the best barometer of the relationship. Uluburun has produced no Minoan ceramics, only Late *Helladic* IIIA2 pottery, so we are dependent on the Minoan-Mycenaean cultural relationship for any more detailed correspondence with the multicultural material on this wreck.

### Post-Palatial

No direct correlations between Egyptian and Minoan material in cross-cultural context are known for this period.

### ‘False’ and Misleading Evidence

‘False’ or misleading correlation contexts can be identified when the evidence from elsewhere is in direct opposition to the correlation found in the given context. Although precision in dating parameters is not exact (see above), some contexts simply cannot be contemporary with the foreign material found in them. A large number of these objects are the Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom vessels recovered in Proto-Palatial and later contexts. Some Minoan examples are given below, with more detailed discussion in their individual catalogue entries.

– Aghios Onouphrios, ‘tomb deposit’ collection, dated EM I–LM I, with a 12<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> c. BC Levantine scarab {38} and Dynasty XIX–XX scarab {39}; *perhaps* also two more scarabs {43–44} dated respectively to the post-TIP and Dynasty XIX–XX, not originally published with the collection. Three other scarabs also need not necessarily be from the same context(s) as the Minoan finds, although they are within the dating parameters of the Minoan material;

– Aspri Petra, ‘tomb deposit’ collection, dated EM I–IIA, with a Minoan MM IA scarab {66};

– Kalyvia cemetery, dated LM IIIA, with two imported Dynasty XII–early XVII alabastra {90–91}, but also with two generally contemporary (within reigns of Amenhotep III–Akhenaten/Horemhab) glass vessels {89; 92};

– Katsamba, tomb B, dated LM IIIA1, with a mid-Dynasty XVIII amphora inscribed with the cartouche of Thutmose III {114} (a generation or possi-

<sup>1216</sup> I use ‘Amenhotep IV’ here, as he did not change his name to Akhenaten until about the same time that he moved his capital from Thebes to Akhetaten (Amarna) in his Year 6 after the death of his father.

bly two earlier than the date of the tomb); and a Dynasty II–IV spheroid jar {115};

– Knossos, Isopata ‘Royal Tomb,’ dated LM II–IIIA1, with stone vessels dated to the Old, Middle/SIP and New Kingdoms {241–243; 247–255}, mostly ‘heirloom’ vessels although, due to their context date, the New Kingdom vessels can be no later than the reign of Amenhotep III *if* they are considered generally contemporary with their deposition;

– Knossos, Gypsades tomb, dated LM IIIA1, with MM (IB?–)II Minoan scaraboids {275–276} in reuse;

– Malia, *Quartier Nu*, MM III–LM IA sondage level above MM II building, with early Dynasty XII scarab {382};

– Palaikastro, LM IB ‘hoard’ in town excavations, with a Dynasty I–V ‘heart-shaped jar’ {428} and an EM III–MM I ‘shouldered jar’ {429};

– Poros, MM IB occupation level, with slightly earlier early Dynasty XII scarab {483}, although it is possible that context and artefact are generally contemporary; and

– Abydos, MM IIA Minoan vessel in tomb context tentatively dated to early Dynasty XVII.<sup>1217</sup>

The above are listed merely to draw attention to the fact of their lack of synchronisation with evidence elsewhere. The above list does not include the majority of the imported Egyptian early stone vessels, unless other relevant imported artefacts also were recovered with them. They are too numerous and are a phenomenon of the period in which the majority are found, and are discussed elsewhere in the present study as group types. WARREN (1969:*passim*) has also drawn attention to Minoan stone vessels found in ‘survival’ contexts, some of which are egyptianising derivations and also discussed elsewhere in the present study.

The Thutmose III amphora {114} cannot be contemporary with its associated LM IIIA1 tomb material, in light of the scarab of Amenhotep III {262} with LM IIIA1 early ceramics in the undisturbed Selopoulo tomb; a minimum of some 34 years separates their two reigns. Likewise, the early Dynasty XII scarab {382} from *Quartier Nu* is old at the time of its deposition (MM III–LM I); the late Middle Kingdom scarab {197} from an MM IIA Knossos context leaves no room for doubt.

Examination of the material from ‘deposit groups’ purchased or presented as a single ‘deposit’ but not

recovered in controlled excavation clearly indicate that some pieces clearly are problematic for this interpretation of their ‘deposit’ origin. At least two of the scarabs from Aghios Onouphrios {38–39}, Levantine and Egyptian in origin, should not be associated with their purportedly discrete ‘deposit group’ of Minoan material, although others {40–42}, Egyptian and Minoan in origin, do fit within the chronological parameters of the Minoan material as a whole and potentially could have been recovered with it. The Minoan scarab {66} stated to be from Aspripetra, should be entirely disassociated with the material ‘found’ with it. The collection of objects from Pyrgos (Khanli Kastelli) is more wide-ranging in date than the limited LM I period assigned it by Evans, and thus its ‘miniature amphora’ {506} need not necessarily be a ‘survival’ piece in a much later context although this remains possible. On the other hand, the collection of material purchased together by Evans at Arvi, including bead {65}, plausibly can be seen as a single tomb group, although we can never be absolutely certain of its unity over a century after its acquisition.

Additionally, a number of post-Minoan contexts include amongst their contents Egyptian imports of Bronze-Age date. Whilst these may have been imported during the Bronze Age then later found and re-deposited in later ancient times, or whether they were imported and deposited in Iron Age or later times, it is worth noting this material as a group. Some, like the cornflower beads, may in fact be of Iron Age date. These are:

– Khamaizi Phatsi, probably Subminoan-Geometric tomb with probably late Dynasty XVIII (not earlier than reign of Akhenaten) or later cornflower bead {124}, but the tomb context is uncertain, the bead type was used into Dynasty XXV and this piece may have no context whatsoever;

– Knossos, Proto-Geometric deposition context with Dynasty XII–early XVIII alabastron(?) {198};

– Knossos, Stratigraphical Museum excavations, Classical-later Hellenistic pit with OK closed vessel fragment {234}; and modern pit with battered Dynasty I–IV spheroid jar fragment {235};

– Knossos, Classical-Roman pit in Sanctuary of Demeter with probably late Dynasty XVIII (not earlier than reign of Akhenaten) or later cornflower bead {239} and MM IB–II amulet/pendant in squatting ape form {240};

<sup>1217</sup> See above, n. 66. Note that this is not a closed context.

– Knossos, Late Protogeometric-Early Orientalising tomb with Dynasty XIX–XX or later scarab {260}; and

– Kommos, Archaic well with part of a Minoan MM (II?) figurine of an ape {344}; and unspecified Iron Age contexts with LM III material and two Dynasty XVIII clay vessel fragments {358–359}. These generally are from ‘fill’ contexts of re-deposited material.

Other objects, especially scarabs, merely have been misdated to the Bronze Age in previous literature. These are not listed above, but are shown on Distribution Map 39.

The following is an overview of actual Egyptian material contact and influence on Crete:

### Pre-Palatial

*EM II(A?)*: The contexts of the earliest clear imports and ‘egyptianising’ objects are dated to EM IIA.<sup>1218</sup> Early finds are quite varied in type: an obsidian rim fragment {139} in an early EM IIA habitation context and a worked hippopotamus canine {138} in another at Knossos, a faience bowl {404} and beads {405} in one tomb and an ape image on a Minoan seal form {402} and possibly the two ‘miniature amphorae’ {400–401} in another at Mochlos, and a third {60} in an Archanes tomb.<sup>1219</sup> The ‘miniature amphora’ form may have been ‘egyptianising’ although equally may well have been an indigenous Minoan development but, even so, the variety of material is surprising for this early period. The back-to-back image of two squatting apes on the Mochlos seal pre-dates the use of ‘stamp-seals’, and the ape image on such ‘seals’, in Egypt. Moreover, the back-to-back image is not known there. Nonetheless, the animal was not indigenous to Crete and almost certainly derived from Egyptian representations of the *hamadryas* baboon. Likewise, the obsidian and hippopotamus ivory, and almost certainly the faience, are actual imports to the island, all ‘luxury’ goods even in their home cultures.

<sup>1218</sup> On the problematic published context dating of scarab {367} as EM I, see catalogue discussion. The material from Knossos A {132–134} *might* be EM I, but their contexts are too insecure for certainty. Nonetheless, it must be noted that the Egyptian dating (as known) of these three vessels at Knossos does not contradict the early dating of their potentially early ‘contexts.’

<sup>1219</sup> Some contexts are not securely EM IIA but may also extend into EM IIB; see catalogue discussions.

<sup>1220</sup> The former might be as late as MM IB, the latter as late as MM III in their known contexts. Another cylinder jar

Notably, all these sites are found along the north-eastern coast. Other imports and perhaps also ‘egyptianising’ material also are found in this region, and have been assigned dating parameters spanning EM II and/or III, although the former seems to me more likely. These include a faience ‘cylinder jar’ {396} from Maronia, the ostrich eggshell fragments {425} at Palaikastro, as well as the deep open bowl {135} and cylinder jar fragments possibly as early as EM II(B?)<sup>1220</sup> and the siltstone bowl {140} in an EM III level at Knossos. Some of the stone vessels in the unstratified deposits at the north-west corner of Knossos palace {165–171} *might* also be this early.<sup>1221</sup> These too would be considered ‘luxury’ materials and/or objects, similar to the EM II(A?) imports already mentioned.

*EM (II?–)III*: The focus shifts at some point after EM II, from the north-eastern coastal region to the Mesara Plain, where numerous tholoi already were in use. The possibly relevant Mesara material generally seems to fall into two groups, a limited earlier (EM II?–III) and an expanded later (EM III–MM I) collection, as the evidence allows; the material is discussed in these two groups. Possibly some material in the Mesara tholoi may be dated to the earlier (EM II and/or III) period, but this cannot be demonstrated on the evidence available, apart from what appear to be an ‘earlier’ collection of ‘miniature amphorae’ at Platanos, if they are accepted as derivative forms. However, the later dating range, EM III–MM I(A) expands the repertoire of material further.

The only early, and possibly the first, physical evidence of actual importation to the Mesara region is the stone pyxis {23} at Aghia Triadha that *may* have arrived at this time. Other material, said to be ‘egyptianising,’ to my mind is not demonstrably so.<sup>1222</sup> Thus little if anything in the Mesara can actually be assigned to this period, and even the imported stone pyxis at Aghia Triadha may have arrived later, in ‘EM III–MM IA’ or even ‘MM IA.’

{311} has no known context, and could well have been an LM import.

<sup>1221</sup> Most can be dated not later than the Early Dynastic period and therefore pose no chronological problem, but apparently {165} and certainly {170} could not have been deposited this early.

<sup>1222</sup> Questionable as ‘egyptianising’ are the early ape(?) images at Aghia Triadha {29}, Archanes {57}, Marathokephalo {395}, and Platanos {474–475}, that *may* ultimately have a source in Egyptian representations. All are pendants rather than seals and they are far

*EM III–MM IA*: The ‘cylinder jar,’ in its different manifestations, was prevalent during this period in the Mesara, especially at Aghia Triadha where a considerable number {26–27; 31–33; 36} are found, as well as at Marathokephalo {395}, Platanos {460} and Porti {492}. Nonetheless, there is no specific reason to assign even this fairly wide date range to these vessels, as all archaeological contexts in which these have been recovered are more wide ranging and a more specifically MM IA date can be argued for their appearance. The small number of vessels suggests they probably were produced within a short period of time, and MM IA is preferred since the majority of other ‘egyptianising’ types are limited to not earlier than this period, as described below.

I am not convinced of the ultimately Egyptian origin of the ‘miniature amphora’ vessel form in general, and only two, {399} from Mochlos and {461} from Platanos, seem even potentially derived from the Egyptian form due to their ‘concave collar’ neck. These two vessels are otherwise dissimilar.<sup>1223</sup>

*MM IA*: It is now possible to isolate the importation and deposition of scarabs on Crete to not earlier than early MM IA and those of indigenous origin to later within this same period, almost entirely limited to the Mesara region, thanks to the recent work of specialists in both Egyptian and Aegean studies. Scarab

distribution on the island exemplifies the spread of ‘egyptianising’ influence, or at least a particular type of ‘egyptianising’ objects by this time: Archanes {50; 52}; Gournes {71–72} and Trapeza {510} in the north-east,<sup>1224</sup> and Lebena {366–368}; Moni Odigitrias {419–420} and Platanos {476–477; 478?} in the Mesara, as well as those of more dubious circumstances at Aghios Onouphrios {41}; ‘Andiskari’ {522}, Aspripetra {66}; Kaloi Limenes {83}; Moni Odigitrias {421–423}; Moires {413}, and Crete {547}. Whilst locally made products are limited almost entirely to the Mesara and mostly around the Aghia Pharango valley area on its western side, imports do range slightly further, and likely were transported there from the Mesara. Ovoids too can be dated to not earlier than this period, with examples at Aghia Triadha {28}; Marathokephalo {392} and Kaloi Limenes {81–82}. The Minoan seal with spiral decoration {56} from Archanes also may be placed in this period. Other zoomorphic images, on the other hand, are far more likely to have been of Minoan origin.<sup>1225</sup> An overlap of MM IA with later Dynasty XI and early Dynasty XII is clear.

The remarkably homogenous group of seals, and some variants, in the form of a squatting ape likely are similar in date, MM IA, and appear to be later products than the EM (II?–)III pendants. The apes now are depicted in detail, rather than the heads only

---

removed, both physically and geographically, from the only known earlier ape image, the seal face {402} from EM II(A?) Mochlos. They likely are EM III rather than earlier, although this is conjectural. Three of the five pendants show back-to-back figures, one from Platanos {475} with the squared muzzle reminiscent of the *hamadryas*, and others are in the squatting position with hands raised in front of their face, but interpretation of whether they all are derivative is problematic. They fit a tradition of such anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figures in the tholoi and other tombs that continues at least into MM IA–B when another questionable ape figure {55} is interred. It may be that these odd ‘ape’-like pendants are the indigenous images already in place that inspired the squatting ape figure to be adopted.

Little is found assignable to this date range beyond the Mesara region, but for the one example from Archanes already mentioned, and the ape(?) pendant or seal in the cave at Trapeza {511} that physically appears to bridge the earlier Mochlos seal design and the Mesara pendants in presentation.

<sup>1223</sup> The large collection of unlikely ‘egyptianising’ ‘miniature amphorae’ in tholos A at Platanos appears to fall into the two date ranges, the earlier (EM [II?–]III) {462–463; 466–467; 470–472} and the later (EM III–MM I) collection {460–461; 464–465; 473} on the basis of their technology. Others were found in tholoi at Aghia Triadha {24–25}, and

---

Marathokephalo {394}, and those without known context at Aghia Triadha {34}, Pyrgos {381} and Crete {536}, all of which appear to fall within the later collection on the same criteria, and the earlier collection from Mochlos {399; 403; 408?; 410?; 411?}. This division is somewhat arbitrary and unsure, essentially based on an undercut interior section, and I am unconvinced in any case that most are derived from Egyptian models. Those from Kamilari {100}, Pseira {498} and Crete {534} are unpublished and their profiles unknown to me.

<sup>1224</sup> Note that {382} and {483} also are early Middle Kingdom in date, generally contemporary with the other imported scarabs listed, but are found in a slightly later (MM IB) stratified occupation context at Poros and even later (MM III–LM IA) occupation context at Malia. They also are the only early Middle Kingdom scarabs from occupation contexts, and highlight the problem of chronological concordance, indicated here by the later contexts as dated by the later material found with them. It is possible that MM IB should begin about mid-Dynasty XII, perhaps late within early Dynasty XII.

<sup>1225</sup> The seals in duck or goose form {80; 570; 571} from Kaloi Limenes and Crete and the rough stone beetle figurines {443?; 499} at Gerontomouri and Pseira all likely are indigenous rather than ‘egyptianising’ in origin, as should be the limestone bowl in scarab form {468} from Platanos. The fly seal from Archanes {51} is of indigenous origin.

on the pendants, and for this reason it is likely that the large bone pendant(?) {459} in the form of back-to-back apes from Platanos most likely also is MM IA. These zoomorphic seals are found at Aghia Triadha {30}, Archanes {54}, Platanos {469} and without context on Crete {563; 565; 567–569}.<sup>1226</sup> The unique seated ape-shaped seal from Trapeza {509} can only be a late and *tour de force* example of the type, as, perhaps, the pendant(?) {511} also found there.

Identification of faience beads is, at best, problematic, but those from Gournes {75} are likely to be Minoan rather than imported from Egypt. Faience beads are recovered in several Mesara tholoi, but their quantity argues more for indigenous production than multiple importation.

These last few paragraphs have done little more than recite a ‘roll call’ of Egyptian and ‘egyptianising’ material. Despite the rather boring repetition of numbers and object types, this was done with a purpose in mind – to highlight the sense of ‘grouping’ that such objects appear to have on Crete itself. Material from the earliest period, EM II(A?), is virtually limited only to actual imports of luxury objects and materials, albeit in extremely small quantity, along the north-eastern coastal region at Mochlos and Knossos. Bridging into the EM III period, we again are virtually limited to imported luxury goods along the north-eastern coast, now at Palaikastro and Maronia in addition to Knossos. The Mesara can boast only a single imported stone vessel at Aghia Triadha that may be assigned to this general date range or later. The Mesara does not come into its own, in terms of imports, until the scarabs appear in MM IA, and even these also are found farther north – not along the coast where imports previously have been recovered but more inland at Archanes, Gournes and Trapeza. A change in emphasis clearly seems to be indicated.

Early (Pre-Palatial) egyptianising influence seems limited only to the cylinder jar form and the image of the squatting ape figure, together with the scarabs and likely also chronologically limited to the MM IA period. The seal design at EM II(A?) Mochlos appears to be a ‘one-off,’ perhaps made by an artisan who had seen or been told of anthropomorphic figures with tails. The pendants found in the Mesara tholoi are very

far removed from the actual ape image, and their identification as apes is based only by their drooping head form – it is entirely possible that they actually do not depict apes but instead other figures that we have not correctly identified. The Trapeza pendant or seal is merely a more three-dimensional presentation of this amorphous figure. I am not entirely convinced of their identification as apes, but have included them in the catalogue as possible precursors, possibly indigenous, to adoption of the ape image in the Mesara. If these pendants do not represent apes, then the earliest instance (other than the early Mochlos seal design) of the unmistakable ape figure, with attendant detail although most often tailless, are the MM IA seals mostly from the Mesara that appear at about the same time as the first imported scarabs. Surely this is not coincidence, and we should consider that both these zoomorphic figures were adopted on Crete at this time.

As for the cylinder jars, a very few imports have been found, and only at Knossos, none of them with a good early context but *possibly* at this early date. It is these, or others elsewhere not yet recovered, that may have been the initial source of the adopted form in the Mesara perhaps sometime in EM III as the earliest ‘egyptianising’ type on Crete in any quantity – if not in MM IA together with the ape and scarab forms. No imported models for these vessels have been found in the Mesara, however, but both different indigenous types (concave and convex-sided) are interred in tombs even to the farther reaches of the plain’s catchment area. Interestingly, they are smaller in scale than the Knossian imports, probably due in part to the small scale of all early Minoan vessel forms, but this difference in scale also is a feature of later Minoan vessels having foreign derivation. That they were in use and probably manufacture in MM IA can be argued on the basis of the cylinder jar {406} from Mochlos, whose context is no earlier, unless this jar is an heirloom at its interment. The evidence as known does not dispute the possibility of an EM III introduction, but I lean towards the probability that the jars as a group should all be considered MM IA in date.<sup>1227</sup> The Mochlos jars, as a type, stand outside the two Mesara types, suggesting a third indigenous variety having a more limited distribution and derived, perhaps, from a more extreme Egyptian model.<sup>1228</sup>

<sup>1226</sup> Perhaps also {55}, from the same context as {54}, but quite different in presentation. The ape-shaped seal from Malia {386} probably is later, due to its stone material and different presentation of the figure.

<sup>1227</sup> The context of another cylinder jar {98}, at Kamilari, is not earlier than MM IB, adding to this probable late Pre-

Palatial date range for the type that must have spilled over into the early Proto-Palatial in the region.

<sup>1228</sup> The Maronia faience vessel {396}, although imported to this area, is a highly unlikely model for the Mochlos jars as its profile is entirely different.

Scarabs also appear in quantity during this same period, suggesting a direct contact or at least interest in Egyptian goods. Scarabs are the only type in pre-Palatial Crete for which both imports and Minoan versions are found in the same region and indeed the same (albeit lengthy multiple-use) context, and it is likely that the Mesara was first involved in Aegypto-Cretan relations sometime during MM IA and, in Egyptian terms, the early Middle Kingdom. Scarabs on Crete are later than the earliest known scarab types in Egypt, suggesting that the idea of the scarab was a concept transferred to and employed on Crete *after* its initial appearance in Egypt sometime in the late First Intermediate Period. The evidence pinpoints the early Middle Kingdom, perhaps early in late Dynasty XI. The form of the indigenous Minoan scarab seal can safely be assumed as directly related to the Egyptian model, at least at this time. Minoan scarab seals bear no trace of a ‘horn,’ and therefore were not depictions of the indigenous *copris hispanus* beetle but rather the Egyptian scarab type, *scarabaeus sacer*. This is emphasised by the characteristically Minoan and not Egyptian face designs. The *copris* beetle already had some religious function in the north-east that apparently was little known in the Mesara; its only manifestation there seems to be the unique Platanos bowl {468}.

Actual but sporadic Egyptian imports are known in context along the northern coast of Crete, by early EM IIA and mostly in EM IIA, in Egyptian terms from sometime late in Dynasty II at the end of the Early Dynastic period. This mirrors the first great period of Egyptian relations with the Levantine coast at Byblos, when Egypt was trading there for Cyprus wood from the time of Khasekhemwy, the last Dynasty II king.<sup>1229</sup> It seems therefore that a continuation of this connection may have been initiated either by the Byblites or the Egyptians, or by the Minoans themselves (presumably from Knossos), in order to effect the importation of the small luxury goods and materials to the north coast of Crete at the end of the Early Dynastic and at least through the earlier part of the Old Kingdom. Even at this early date, some goods such as the obsidian bowl {139} can only be heirloom pieces possibly removed from old tombs, whilst others *may* have been relatively contemporary although they are not demonstrably so in their find context.

Actual ‘egyptianisation’ of goods and images on Crete appears to occur in a different region and at a later date, MM IA in the Mesara. This is a period that, by its cross-chronological links with scarab seals, effectively dates to the period not earlier than when Egyptian contact via Byblos was renewed by the first king of the unified Egypt at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, as recorded in the biographical inscription of the Great Steward Henenu during the reign of Mentuhotep II (Nebhepetre).<sup>1230</sup> The early Middle Kingdom also saw a renewal in the use of cedarwood, imported from Syria, for wooden boxes and coffins, some dating to late Dynasty XI although the majority of objects are of Dynasty XII date. Additionally, the most documented period of this relationship in fact is Dynasty XII, when numerous Egyptian imports are found in contemporary Byblite contexts and Byblite princes adopted the Egyptian titles *r-p<sup>c</sup>(t)* (usually translated as ‘hereditary prince’) and *h3ty-<sup>c</sup>* (usually translated as ‘nomarch’), rather than late Dynasty XI when contact was in the process of being renewed. The scarabs and other objects of the ‘Montet Jar,’ found at Byblos, date to early Dynasty XII, and not earlier as previously thought. It seems reasonable to link the renewal of contact (whether direct or indirect via Byblos) between (south-central) Crete and Egypt to the period of renewed contact with Byblos. The imported scarabs and their ‘egyptianised’ cousins definitely support some form of renewed contact in the early Middle Kingdom, perhaps the bulk of these imports arrived early in Dynasty XII, and were used as models for indigenous scarab production still within MM IA in the Mesara. The point at which the Aghia Triadha pyxis {23} was imported and the cylinder jar form and squatting ape figure were ‘minoanised’ obviously is more tenuous, but it can reasonably be suggested to occur at generally the same time (i.e., in MM IA), rather than each being individually absorbed on (south-central) Crete at different times. I would suggest, then, that early Dynasty XII=MM IA would be the high point of Aegypto-Minoan interaction in the Pre-Palatial period, after some minor contact in later Dynasty XI=earlier MM IA and a very long hiatus that encompassed the Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period/much of EM II(including B)–III. The minor evidence of earlier contact, in the small and valuable pieces along the

<sup>1229</sup> WILKINSON 1999:160.

<sup>1230</sup> As noted by WARD 1971:61–62, from HAYES 1949:46 line 16, 49 n. k.



north-eastern coast, probably also was the result of some Aegyptio-Byblite relationship late in the Early Dynastic period; the earliest inscriptional evidence of an Egyptian king at Byblos names Khasekhemwy, last king of Dynasty II, followed by a possible hiatus in Dynasty III although inscriptional evidence survives of many Dynasty IV–VI kings.

### Proto-Palatial

*MM IB:* Recent rediscovery of ‘missing’ or ‘lost’ material from the ‘Room of the Stone Vats’ at Knossos and dating of its context to early MM IB has underlined this site’s continued or, possibly, renewed prominence at the beginning of the Proto-Palatial period, and its sustained ability to attract and employ luxurious imported goods and materials. Fragments of two(?) ostrich eggshells {153–154} and others shaped into inlays {155} are imports recovered in this one deposit.<sup>1231</sup> At nearby MM IB Poros we find an imported scarab {483} of early Middle Kingdom date like those from the Mesara tholoi, and an entirely new form of Minoan scaraboid {484} that seems transitional to the Proto-Palatial Style I steatite scaraboids. The imported scarab may in fact have first arrived to the Mesara and later traveled north to Poros. It may either be an heirloom in its occupation context, or at least is found in a context later than, and different to, others of its type and date. The latest and last of the Minoan cylinder jars {98} to be found in a tholos tomb is recovered at Kamilari, not interred before MM IB and likely produced either in MM IA or B.<sup>1232</sup>

*MM IB/II:* The major distinction between scarabs imported during the Pre-Palatial and Proto-Palatial

periods is the comparative dearth of imported late Middle Kingdom and, far more strikingly, ‘egyptianising’ Minoan scarabs on Crete, not even necessarily in Proto-Palatial contexts. Late Dynasty XII–mid-XIII scarabs are far more than abundant in Egypt than earlier, but far fewer are found on Crete than those of early Middle Kingdom date. Other than the early Middle Kingdom scarab in MM IB context at Poros {483} already mentioned, these are limited to those at Knossos {197}, Psychro {502} and probably Kastelli {103} in context, and others without context at Aghios Onouphrios(?) {40?; 42}, Nipodhitos {418}, the Mesara region {520} and possibly Crete {542}. Most indigenous Minoan examples of this period are a surprisingly large typologically related (Style I) group that first appears perhaps as early as MM IB, and clearly are scaraboids rather than scarabs. The type apparently lingers into MM IIIB–LM IA, perhaps not in production but at least in use, and seems to owe nothing to the imported scarabs. All of local coloured steatite, they are found at Poros {485; 487}, Malia {384} and on Crete {548–549; 551}, centred in the north-east and not in the Mesara where scarabs were imported and produced in the Pre-Palatial period. The few scaraboids that do not fit within this group are hard stone pieces at Koumasa {364}, Pezoules Kephales {444} and the early Poros piece {484}, but some late examples of this type still are found in early Neo-Palatial contexts. Additionally, two Proto-Palatial scaraboids in carnelian {275–276} were recovered in a much later Final Palatial tomb, and relate to the Style I group.

Additionally, Minoan artisans carved Minoan face designs onto what can only have been the previously

<sup>1231</sup> Although the ‘Egyptian blue’ beads {152} and likely the faience beads {150–151} found with them are of Aegean origin, as also perhaps the flint chip {156}. The last is included due to its stated similarity of material to the flint knife blade {137} from a largely Proto-Palatial context box.

<sup>1232</sup> The last of the probably pseudo-‘egyptianising’ ‘miniature amphorae’ to be recovered in tombs and cemetery sites are interred at this time, and their descendants are found in MM II occupation and cultic contexts. The former come from Kamilari {100} and Palaikastro {432}; and the latter at Kommos {325}, Malia {376; 385} and Phaestos {454}. We may also note the cat’s head mould {441} from MM IB Perivolakia, that seems to be the earliest clearly datable representation of a feline on Crete, and the figurine or appliqué {383} from MM IB (or II?) Malia that appears to be the earliest seated cat image, a presumably related introduction of indigenous East Cretan origin. Both large

moulded heads and smaller moulded appliqué figures continue in use during the Proto-Palatial period (and beyond), the former at Mavrikiano {397} and as an appliqué on a pyxis foot elsewhere {574}, the latter at Malia {377; 379–381} and presumably transported to Monastiraki {414}. Both images also appear as seal face designs by MM IB or MM II, the latter at Goulas {70}, Prinias {496} and Central Crete {525}, even in ‘arrested movement’ {575} before the end of the period. (For seals having a cat’s head on the face, see Yule 1981:131 Motif 9:A. The earliest appears to be MM IB in date.) I remain unconvinced of an Egyptian origin for this image on Crete, especially as possible prototypes for both the large head and seated figure are not easily accessible in Middle Kingdom Egypt. The living animal itself must have been the model for the large heads (and their moulds), so it *may* have been transported from Egypt, the Near East or even the Greek Mainland at this time, if not already resident on the island.

blank surface of certain imported scarabs {42; 388?; 502} of hard stone. These subsequently carved scarabs must have come from pieces of composite jewellery that had been dismantled – presumably necklaces of scarabs strung end-to-end – and are evidence that the Minoans were not merely absorbing the imported material but also employing it for their own purposes by this time. Another possible example {542?} may have had a partly finished face in anticipation of inscribing it according to what its purchaser, not necessarily a Minoan, desired, a practice well-known in Egypt and the Levant. Other pieces, chiefly beads in hard stone, may also have been dismantled and reused in Minoan jewellery arrangements, but this cannot be demonstrated.

Thin-walled open stone vessel forms, probably robbed from earlier tombs in Egypt, almost certainly were imported to Crete, and specifically to Knossos, at this time, despite the little available contextual evidence. The ‘shallow carinated bowl’ {175; 291–294} and ‘deep open bowl’ {167?; 168–169; 289–290} forms in mottled hard stones likely were imported for their own sake, and the former at least seems to have been intended for a cultic function. The material and profile of the ‘shallow carinated bowl’ were directly followed at least twice {172; 213}, and a comparable profile for the pedestal bowl {164} of cultic use at Knossos and elsewhere provides a comparable date range for importation and use of the ‘shallow carinated bowl’ (and probably also the ‘deep open bowl’) as MM IB–II, the Proto-Palatial period. It is another aspect of the pre-eminence of Knossos as *the* receiver of fine luxury goods from Egypt during this period. The ‘distribution’ of both types at this time, limited to this one site, can hardly be coincidence.

Other vessels in the ‘north-west of palace’ deposit(s),<sup>1233</sup> such as the unique and likewise thin-walled ‘moustache cup’ {170} may also be considered here. As no other related material is available with which to judge their context date(s), these deposits are problematic. Nonetheless, they also yielded substantial fragments of at least two and possibly three ‘spheroid jars’ {165–166; 167?} and a fourth of even larger dimensions {171}. *If* the context of {171} is part of the fill prior to construction of the MM III (i.e., second palace) wall and the others excavated by Evans are taken to be the same, this would suggest that ‘spheroid jars’ initially are imported to Knossos

before the end of the Proto-Palatial period. Nonetheless, it is noticeable that these thick-walled vessels are recovered in the north and north-west deposits, and the thin-walled vessels in the north-west and west deposits: the vessel walls appear to become thinner as the deposit location moves west, although their specific contexts are, of course, unknown. Whether this has any significance is debatable, and now impossible to answer. *If* these ‘spheroid jars’ were imported by this time, then the ‘imitation’ of this vessel type {273} dated to MM IIB by Warren would well indicate that such adaptation and blending of foreign and indigenous forms already had begun before the beginning of the Neo-Palatial period almost solely associated with this Minoan practice. The one Minoan vessel is not a direct copy or ‘imitation’ of the ‘spheroid jar’ form but rather an adaptation, deliberately provided with features not found or quite uncommon in the original Egyptian type, including its smaller scale. Its Minoan touches must have reflected differing perceived requirements for, or actual use(s) of, the original vessels in Egypt and on Crete of both the imported and ‘minoanised’ vessels. {273} is found in a tomb whilst the others all are not, despite being tomb furniture in Egypt.

The last of the three-dimensional ape-shaped seals appears at this time, now of coloured steatite at Malia {386} like the Proto-Palatial Style I scaraboids, together with an amulet or pendant of rock crystal at Knossos {240}, a small clay figurine from Kommos {344} and an unlikely protome in this form on a vessel handle {371}, also from Malia. These figures all are individual, as clearly an agreed image now is lacking. However, the crouching figure is transferred instead to two-dimensional form on seal impressions, but not until MM IIB, at Phaestos {447; 450} and, just possibly, Knossos {160} although the odd and far more ‘minoanised’ representation with long flowing hair on Malia seal {387} may be slightly earlier. It is this two-dimensional figure that continues on in the Neo-Palatial period, whilst those in the round are limited to imports. The amethyst figurine without context {562} also likely was imported at this time also (or later) although not from Egypt, and is the earliest of these imported figures. The Knossian seal impression {160}, if indeed of Proto-Palatial date, is the earliest representation of apes in a landscape setting that is found on the Neo-Palatial series of fresco paintings, although it is far more likely to be

<sup>1233</sup> See Knossos Q–R.

Neo-Palatial in date and in fact appears on a Final Palatial nodule type. A flat rectangular Minoan seal {564} without context on Crete but dated stylistically to MM II–III, depicts the earliest example both of the standing ape figure and of a confronted pair of apes.<sup>1234</sup> The ape's general appearance in both the two- and three-dimensional Proto-Palatial examples has become a thinner and more elongated body profile, resembling more a *Cercopithecus* monkey than the *Cynocephalus* baboon of the Pre-Palatial period. Nonetheless, the baboon's humped back still is retained on the Proto-Palatial figures. Its presentation evolves quite slowly on Crete.

The quite individual seal face design from Tsoutsouros {514} depicting what appears to be a crocodile is an anomaly at this time, but its identification and an ultimate Egyptian origin for the motif both seem reasonably secure.

*MM IIA*: The importance of this small window called MM IIA derives from the recovery of two objects in stratified contexts of this narrow ceramic date, both from the Royal Road excavations at Knossos. The first is the 'ball bead' {202}, recovered at the MM IIA level. Whilst it has no cultural impact in that no Minoan examples of the type are known, it is yet another unique import at Knossos. The other, and more important, is an imported scarab {197} having two distinctions. It can itself be dated to within late Dynasty XII–XIII, and thus within its MM IIA context provides a good reverse overlap to the Classical Kamares (MM IIB–IIIA) vessels recovered in early/mid-Dynasty XIII contexts at Tell el-Dab'a in Egypt.<sup>1235</sup> Secondly, it is the earliest imported scarab, and in the earliest context for a scarab, recovered at Knossos itself. It seems, in fact, it was recovered at the top of the MM IIA floor deposit, suggesting it may be quite late in that period – an explanation that fits well chronologically with other evidence, including the Tell el-Dab'a Kamares vessel context dates.

*MM IIB*: First appearing on Crete quite late in the Proto-Palatial period, apparently at MM IIB Knossos {159} and Phaestos {448–449} only, is the already 'minoanised' standing Egyptian hippopotamus deity

as a two-dimensional figure on seal impressions. The figure recognisably is no longer an Egyptian one from its earliest known appearance, and already is associated with its Minoan attribute, the *Schnabelkanne* that is a constant from now on. This clearly is to be viewed as a Minoan cultic image from its earliest (known) appearance here, and presumably the character and presentation of the Egyptian figure – at least as the Minoans understood it – fulfilled an ideology already existing on the island even though it cannot be linked to an earlier Minoan figure of similar type.<sup>1236</sup> The seal impressions are recovered in the same sealing deposits as the crouching ape figures mentioned above and also first appear in this same MM IIB horizon. The association may have had some inherent meaning to the Minoans, or may be entirely coincidental, but adds more weight to the near-certainty that the crouching ape is a recognisably cultic image by this time. Nonetheless, it appears that the standing hippopotamus deity's apotropaic function in Egypt was not entirely adopted on Crete, where it seems to have played some intercessory role without apparent protective force. The two-dimensional medium, restricted to seal face designs, also allows for the addition of attributes or filler images of unknown but probable significance, usually a leaf- or branch-like design, for both these adopted images. This suggests at least some related rôle(s) for both, although the two figures are unrelated in their original Egyptian iconography until the New Kingdom.

This is a period best described as 'transitional,' at least in terms of the topic under discussion, but it follows other aspects in the development of Minoan society. The imports no longer are simply imported or versions made locally as apparent luxury items, but are adopted and adapted into Minoan society and, in particular, into Minoan iconography. Minoan Pre-Palatial forms of both seals and stone vessels that continue into the Proto-Palatial period from the Pre-Palatial are obsolete before its end, and the 'egyptianising' scarabs, ape seal forms and cylinder jars all follow this trend. Few are made or recovered even in MM IB. Some continue in a new presentation or a new

<sup>1234</sup> Other than the EM II(A?) Mochlos seal {402}.

<sup>1235</sup> Thus, the combination provides a contextual cross-check of the two chronologies, as MM IIA should overlap with early Dynasty XIII and MM IIB–IIIA with early–mid-Dynasty XIII. On the Dab'a sherds, see MACGILLIVRAY 1995; WALBERG 1991; 1992a; 1998.

<sup>1236</sup> The crouching woman figures, as an appliqué on a bridge-

spouted jar {378} and as a figurine and vessel(?) protome {451–452} at Phaestos. None are found in the palace area but rather in town buildings. All differ considerably from each other, but clearly are variations on a theme that is not inherently Minoan and must originate from elsewhere. Their ultimate origin is obscure, but cannot be Egyptian.

image in the Proto-Palatial period, indicating that the Minoans themselves now seem to consider the types Minoan and now subject them to internal stylistic or iconographic development not evident before. Their emphases have become cultic and iconographic, rather than reproduction of a limited number of specific object forms.

Pre-Palatial characteristics decline and those continuing into the Neo-Palatial period are in their initial stages of iconographical development, following in fact the general development of Minoan material typologies.

### Neo-Palatial

This period is the heyday of Egyptian object importation, for the majority of material imported from Egypt (and Syro-Palestine) has been recovered from contexts of this date. The geographical dissemination and variety of imported objects is not surpassed either before or after Neo-Palatial. Notably, some are of demonstrably earlier date of manufacture, and must have been imported as antiques, an unsurprising feature in a period contemporary with the majority of the Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom. Nonetheless, only a very few influenced the work of Minoan artisans. Virtually all objects in MM III–LM IA contexts are recovered at Knossos, but are found all over the island in the last, LM IB, ceramic period.<sup>1237</sup>

*MM IIIA*: A very small group of disparate relevant objects are associated with the MM IIIA, all of which are limited to contexts at Knossos. Only one object is imported, the ostrich eggshell fragment {277} from MM IIIA domestic debris overlying the MM II–IIIA tomb on Gypsades hill, and the others seem to be evidence for expanded appropriation of ‘egyptianising’ influence especially in the religious sphere. Evans’s famous clay ‘ostrich eggshell’ rhyton {236}, possibly this early in date, is a direct ‘imitation’ of the ostrich eggshell in that it appears to be an already known vessel type painted to look like the more exotic shell,

implying that the egg was available as the model although perhaps not itself necessarily in use as a rhyton. And the beginnings of Minoan hybridisation of their own and imported vessel forms is demonstrated by the ‘spheroid jar’ {173} (dating possibly even as early as MM IIB?) from the lower layer of a Gypsades tomb. This also is the beginning of large and sturdy container vessels being imported at least to Knossos, and later elsewhere on the island, in comparable popularity, although some imports have been recovered in what could be earlier contexts.<sup>1238</sup>

The ‘tamed pet’ monkeys of the ‘Saffron Gatherer’ fresco {161}, now have lost all *cynocephalous* characteristics and their large scale and painted details clearly imply actual importation of the animal itself by this time, so that the fresco artists could work from ‘life’ and include detailed characteristics and mannerisms. From this point on and whatever the medium used, Minoan ape figures are none other than the *cercopithecus* monkey – unlike the Proto-Palatial images that still possessed humpbacks.<sup>1239</sup> This is one argument for an early date for the seal that was stamped on the LM II–III nodule recovered in the ‘Hieroglyphic Deposit’ at Knossos {160}, as both figures there have rather ‘humped’ shoulders.

*MM IIIB*: The other large Egyptian container form popular later in the Neo-Palatial period, the alabastron, also is imported by this time to Knossos, as shown by one fragment {237} found in an MM IIIB habitation context near ‘Hogarth’s Houses’ on Gypsades hill. Recovery of a Minoan rhyton fragment in banded travertine from this and/or a similar context at this same location (and possibly a second fragment elsewhere) also carries the explicit implication that this raw stone also is being imported from Egypt at least to Knossos by this period.<sup>1240</sup>

*MM III*: Only one other relevant context is limited to within MM III, a Knossos tomb at Ailias containing a scarab {270}, a silver pendant depicting an enigmatic human figure {271}, and a carnelian amulet in the shape of a fly {272}. This is an unusual combi-

<sup>1237</sup> PHILLIPS 2001 discusses in particular the relevant stone vessels from contexts limited to this period, but the same may be said for other objects at this time.

<sup>1238</sup> I.e., the spheroid jar fragments from the ‘north-west of palace’ fill; see discussion above, MM IB/II. Two Minoan vessel bases having a ‘brilliant vermilion glaze,’ {181; 288} only the second of which might be an amphora, also are dated to MM IIIA. Both are unaffected by any Egyptian influence.

<sup>1239</sup> It should be noted at the outset that Minoan fresco dating

still remains controversial, and those quoted seem to me to be most likely. Dating for individual frescoes is discussed in their catalogue entry.

<sup>1240</sup> PHILLIPS 2001:82–83. The only other catalogue items datable to MM III(B?) are the two roundels published as having seal impressions depicting the ‘genius’ figure {370; 390}. Interpretation of these two impressions is heavily disputed, and they are not considered here; see catalogue entries for details.

nation of artefacts, the more so because all three pieces are unique at Knossos and indeed on the entire island, and the pendant and amulet likely are imported, although the former not necessarily from Egypt. Clearly they inspired no local versions. The scarab seems to be the latest and last version of the ‘egyptianising’ Proto-Palatial type, in hard stone and employing only straight engraved lines strongly related to Yule’s ‘tectonic ornament’ in its production.

A number of other objects also must have been imported or produced during the MM III period, but their context dates do not allow us to isolate their manufacture at this early date; many are recovered in LM IB destruction contexts and are discussed below in that section. The most pressing to mention here is the ‘genius’ shown on a Minoan cushion seal {87} found in an LM IIIA2 tomb at Kalyvia. The figure itself is physically similar to those on the MM IIB seal impressions at Knossos and Phaestos {159; 448–449} but unlike them holds a dead agrimi that heralds a new Neo-Palatial iconography found on seals and seal impressions in LM IB contexts. I prefer an early date for its manufacture, as the Kalyvia tombs seem to be the cemetery for the local élite and the seal itself may have been found and embellished in LM IIIA.<sup>1241</sup>

*MM III(B)–LM IA:* Few objects can be isolated within wide-ranging contexts of the Neo-Palatial period but excluding LM IB. This partly is due to the overabundance of LM IB destruction horizon contexts that mark the end of the period, but earlier stratified and otherwise isolated contexts are known at numerous sites throughout the island. Thus, the virtual limitation of Egyptian imports and their derivations only to the site of Knossos and its immediate satellites before LM IB should not be viewed as an accident of survival but rather as a real indication of the evidence for this restricted distribution. Those contexts of limited single-period date already have been discussed separately above, but those spanning the rest of the Neo-Palatial period *except* LM IB also reflect the same situation, both for the imports and, underlining this conclusion, their derivations on the island.<sup>1242</sup>

An unembellished Minoan bowl partly derived from the ‘spheroid jar’ imports {214} was found in the KSM site at Knossos, and another with vertical ribbing and horizontal handle at nearby Poros {486}. Both, with others already mentioned above, indicate the variety of shape and possibly functional derivations already being achieved by Minoan artisans by this time. The ‘votive deposit’ vessel from Katsamba {118} is the earliest of the ‘high shouldered jar’ form probably imported as a variation of the ‘spheroid jar’ type, the next are not found (in context) before the Final Palatial period, and then only in tombs. The only other import in a context assigned this date range is the lid fragment {221}, also from the KSM site.

The unusual ‘white paste’ scaraboid from Geron-tomouri {69} probably was interred in MM III (or LM IA?) with the latest material in the cave. It is not Cretan, nor is it Egyptian or Levantine. It is, in fact, difficult to assign an origin for it, and the latest point within the cave’s date range as suggested here is based solely on the seal’s similarity to the collection excavated in the even later (LH IIA–III) tholos at Aidonia. It is a puzzle.

*LM IA:* Egyptian stone vessels continue to be imported in increasing number to Knossos {204} in LM IA, now also deliberately reduced to scrap {194}, and converted into entirely different, recognisably Minoan vessel types. Some converted vessels subsequently also are exported to Mainland Greece, presumably from Knossos where they must have first arrived. Such vessels specifically went to Mycenae where they are recovered in high status ‘royal’ graves {590} and, apparently, also to Akrotiri on the island of Thera {585} where the vessel is re-employed as a paint-pot. These are part of a larger and presumably well-organised export of stone vessels from Knossos, for other Egyptian stone vessels, Minoan vessels in Egyptian banded travertine stone and Minoan variations on an imported Egyptian typology also are recovered in these same and similar contexts, including a Minoan ‘spheroid jar’ {274} in a Knossos tomb, the famous ‘duck’ bowl {591} at Mycenae, and possibly the Type A alabastron con-

<sup>1241</sup> The four amphorae {94–97} with basal ridge from the Kamilari tholos, the fifth {93} and another from a Poros tomb {489}, perhaps dated slightly later at MM III–LM IA, all still antedate the popular use of this feature on Egyptian amphorae.

<sup>1242</sup> The two clay amphorae of this date found in tomb con-

texts at Kamilari {93} and at Poros {489} still are earlier than the common appearance of the comparable form in Egypt. Only Tell el-Dab<sup>a</sup> has produced Second Intermediate Period examples, and early Dynasty XVIII examples are few.

verted to a Minoan rhyton from the ‘Unexplored Mansion’ at Knossos {210}, as well as Minoan vessels in banded travertine in all three sites.<sup>1243</sup>

Few other ‘egyptianising’ features can be associated specifically with the LM IA period, but the ‘House of Frescoes’ rocky landscape fresco with apes {180} appears to have been painted sometime early in LM IA.<sup>1244</sup> The painted details of these monkeys differ from those elsewhere and some details are not found in nature, so it may be surmised that either the various artists involved either had more than one species as models or that they embellished the ‘real’ details with fanciful additions from their imagination, or both.<sup>1245</sup>

The only other ‘egyptianising’ piece is, by this time, wholly Minoan in its presentation and ideology, and it is unlikely that any foreign association still was ascribed to it. The famous steatite rhyton in the form of a triton shell from Malia, an entirely Minoan phenomenon, with relief decoration of two ‘genii’ in the ritual act of pouring and receiving a liquid (presumably water) from a *Schnabelkanne* {372} is the most detailed image of the figure known to us, and one of only two images not found on a seal or seal impression on Crete. Actual ‘minoanisation’ of the figure, following its initial transformation into a Minoan demi-deity with the MM II(B?) seal impressions of Knossos {159} and Phaestos {448–449} (if not earlier) by way of its attributes, is a slow process: the figure only gradually is transforming into the ‘wasp-waisted’ being of the canonical ‘Minoan genius’ of later periods (that really ought to be called ‘Mycenaean genius’). Thus the comparatively wide girth seen on the two figures on this triton is indicative of its comparatively still early date. This wide girth remains an attribute associated with the ‘genius’ and with no other being in the Neo-Palatial period.<sup>1246</sup>

*LM I*: Imports found in contexts spanning both halves of the LM I period, including LM IB but excluding an LM IB destruction level, are greater in number and now reflect a slightly more expanded distribution. The date range of some extend back into MM III(B?), and quantities are skewed by the disproportionate number published from the KSM. However, this still does nothing to argue against the conclusion that most relevant material did not travel beyond the vicinity of Knossos before LM IB. This cannot be demonstrated with complete certainty, but nonetheless it is a strong probability.

At Knossos itself were recovered fragments of an imported lid {227}, bowl(?) {222}, closed vessel {220} and several alabastra {218; 223–225} from the KSM site in general LM I contexts spilling over into LM II, whilst another lid {490} was recovered in a Poros tomb. The only other import is an ape-shaped vessel {19} possibly but not certainly from the LM I deposit level of the so-called ‘Tomba del Oro’ at Aghia Triadha. Much of the possible material therefore is only questionably limited to an LM I date range.

Minoan material is easier to consider, as it is dated stylistically even if without context. Thus seals from Phaestos {456} and Prassa {495} depicting the squatting monkey figure either worshipping(?) or confronted and protective, the LM II–III Knossian nodule depicting a ‘genius’ {141} and another seal without provenance showing two confronted protective ‘genii’ figures {524} may be mentioned here, as they date to LM I. Their cultic roles are obvious and typical of the period in all cases.<sup>1247</sup> The seal stamped on an LM II–III nodule {142} showing the seated ape might be of earlier, LM I, date, as its short tail clearly has the tuft indicative of the baboon, or might be a late example of the baboon image. Other LM II–III nodules stamped

<sup>1243</sup> See PHILLIPS 2001 for more detailed discussion of MM III–LM IA stone vessels.

<sup>1244</sup> Thus, it is later than the MM IIIA ‘Saffron Gatherer’ {161} but likely earlier than the far more simplified fresco figures from Akrotiri on Thera dated to sometime in LM IA (Sp. MARINATOS 1968–1976:II:53–54, fig. 43, pl. B:1; N. MARINATOS 1984:61–62, fig. 40; 1987a; 1987b; DOUMAS 1992:120–123 fig. 85–89). A painted fresco monkey head also is known from Phylakopi on the island of Melos (MORGAN 1990:256 fig. 7), strongly suggesting the artists on these three islands either knew of each others’ work or at least had seen it *in situ*, or all were able to work from life models (i.e., monkeys had been imported to all three islands). This gives some credence for the presence of the Egyptian cylinder jar with abortive rhyton hole on the base {585} in a non-palatial, non-‘royal’ context at Akrotiri.

<sup>1245</sup> The context of the cat, perhaps seated atop the famous ‘Snake Goddess’ {157}, is dated to the early or mature phase of LM IA, although the figure likely is a bit earlier in date.

<sup>1246</sup> The only other wide-waisted figure is the one male figure shaking the sistrum in the ‘Harvester Vase’ procession; see KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:266 fig. top.

<sup>1247</sup> The pair of elongated ‘amphorae’ in cultic context at Phaestos {445–446} and the single example from Knossos {173} clearly indicate a change in their function sometime in the LM I period, if not earlier. Examples of the cat’s head as rhyton {431} and vessel appliqué {517–518}, at Palaikastro and Vathypetro respectively, and as painted stalking figures at Aghia Triadha {9} and perhaps also Knossos {162} emphasise the cultic role this animal continued to play in LM I.

with potentially LM I seals depict ‘genii’ figures, including {309; 309A; 309C; 309F},

*LM IB*: The material discussed here includes those in the LM IB destruction levels at various sites throughout the island, as well as in non-destruction contexts not earlier than LM IB in date. Thus, it reflects the situation for the relevant material at the tail end of the Neo-Palatial period, but cannot distinguish objects that had been imported or identifiably produced in LM IA or earlier and still in use during LM IB or the destruction that marks its conclusion. Whilst it seems very likely that the earlier Neo-Palatial contexts of the Phaestos and Malia palaces are unlikely to produce further quantities of imported goods, the ‘first’ palace at Kato Zakro may yet do so in the MM III–LM IA levels, when it is excavated beyond the initial trial trenches so far made. Thus, the evidence highlighting Knossos earlier in Neo-Palatial I may be skewed, but this is beyond consideration in the present study.

Imported alabastra are now recovered, not only at Knossos {195; 201; 218}, but also in the Archanes palace {47} nearby, the Aghia Triadha ‘villa’ to the south {4} and in quantity at the Kato Zakro palace {106; 109?; 110?}. Clay ‘tall alabastra’ are found throughout the island, but those clearly painted to imitate the banded stone are again at the Aghia Triadha ‘villa’ {8}, an ordinary house at Gournia {76} and Phaestos {453}, and the apparent tip over the ‘South House’ at Knossos {176A}.

All the faience {182–192} and ‘Egyptian blue’ {193} vessels found *in context* are limited to Knossos, whilst the extremely few scarabs known are recovered at Knossos {215} and nearby Archanes {48}. Ostrich eggshells also are limited to the palace of Kato Zakro {108} (perhaps made into a rhyton, or even two) and in the cultic or domestic fill of the ‘North House’ at Knossos {216}; a tridacna shell fragment {217} was recovered in similar fill near the latter context. Two stone bowls partly derivative of ‘spheroid jars’ {228–229} also were recovered here, one also near the cultic area of the ‘North House.’

Cultic contexts seem to be the main source of foreign material. The Kato Zakro ‘Treasury’ contained an entire collection of exotica, including two spher-

oid jars {104–105} cleverly converted to a rhyton and bridge-spouted jar, at least one (and perhaps three?) alabastra {106; 109?; 110?}, two converted to rhyta. The Myrtos Pyrgos ‘villa,’ a far cry from any palace and from Knossos in particular, produced two stone vessel fragments, one converted perhaps into an amulet {416} and the other of a spheroid jar perhaps also potent simply for its exotic origin {415}; both were found in destruction fill from a shrine above. The Palaikastro ‘hoard,’ with an imported ‘heart-shaped jar’ {428} and an antique Minoan shoulder jar {429} also is suggestive. This contrasts with the situation in the Mesara.

Despite both the Aghia Triadha ‘villa’ and Phaestos palace being destroyed at the end of this period, with attendant destruction fill throughout, virtually no relevant imported objects have been recovered at either site. Only one alabastron {4} was found, in the ‘villa,’ although particularly close clay ‘tall alabastra’ are recorded at both sites {8; 453}. There were, however, a surprisingly large number of stone vessels derived from the Egyptian spheroid jar, with much variety of extraneous decoration added {5–7; 16–17}. This is in contrast to the number of clay transport vessel sherds recovered at Kommos, either in LM IB contexts {332} or contemporary Egyptian vessels in later fill deposits together with largely LM IB Minoan sherds {324?; 342–343}, suggesting that, in the south at least, the vast majority of goods that must have been transported do not survive in the archaeological record.<sup>1248</sup>

The only other relevant objects are two nodules and a nodule from the Aghia Triadha, depicting two confronted monkeys {10}, a squatting monkey {11} and a ‘genius’ figure {12} typical of the Neo-Palatial period. The only relevant object from western Crete is the elongated nodule from Khania {127}; two of its 12 seal impressions depict a ‘genius’ and two squatting monkeys. They are, by this time, fully aegeanised representations of the adopted figures and irrelevant for cross-cultural purposes.<sup>1249</sup>

The spheroid flat-collared bowl continues to be elaborated and enhanced with Minoan features and decoration, especially those found at Aghia Triadha. The high-shouldered bowl probably also partly influenced

<sup>1248</sup> This appears to be the case for all imported goods for the entire Late Bronze Period: see the quantification list in CLINE 1994:276–277 Table 70: Ayia Triadha (6 objects listed), Phaestos (1 object listed).

<sup>1249</sup> The elongated ‘amphorae’ in destruction contexts at Aghia Triadha, both as pairs {13–14; 21–22(?)} and as sin-

gle vessels {15; 20} (as recovered) again are recovered in or near cultic contexts, and continue the same function as (possibly) earlier. It is possible that the associated pair should instead be {20–21}. No examples of the cat are limited in context or style to the LM IB period.

a number of Minoan handled bowl profiles. The Minoan tall clay alabastron first appears in LM IB, although the Egyptian stone alabastron is known even in MM IIIB contexts, so the perceived need to emulate it in clay did not appear until over a century after its arrival on the island. This may be because the stone vessels did not disperse beyond the upper levels of Knossian society, and certainly Knossos itself, until this time. Despite its late introduction, the clay vessel soon became a popular and quite elaborately decorated form; its profile followed quite closely the original Egyptian shapes.

The amphora-on-stand form originally seems to have been a storage vessel type at Kamilari and elsewhere, for much the same purpose as Egyptian usage but pre-dating its appearance there, and possibly was inspired by the common Egyptian use of low clay potstands to support clay storage vessels that in Egypt almost inevitably have a rounded bottom. However, the vessel, with its characteristic raised ridge at the lower body/base junction, soon was modified – and ‘refined’ – to serve an entirely different and rather obscure cultic function completely removed from its original storage use and popular contemporary storage function in Egypt. The rise in level of the lower body/base ridge from near the base to higher up the lower body by sometime in LM I(A?) suggests the vessel is on a tall potstand, of a type similar to those found both in Egypt and on Crete.<sup>1250</sup>

Modification by re-carving and adding separately-made features to create Minoan vessel types from imported vessels seems a practice first appearing sometime in LM IA. It is a phenomenon limited almost entirely to Neo-Palatial Crete and, until LM IB, to Neo-Palatial Knossos. The conversion of imported ostrich eggshells into rhyta also may be postulated in this period, although not earlier.<sup>1251</sup> The rôle of these converted vessels seems to have been restricted to cultic uses, although some were imported to the Mainland where they often were interred in wealthy or royal graves.<sup>1252</sup>

Notably, the majority of these imported vessel types are either limited to tomb contexts in Egypt, or the majority of examples are tomb finds. On Crete at

this time, they are found in palatial, habitation and cultic contexts, being employed during the lifetime of the owner.<sup>1253</sup>

Egyptian scarabs apparently no longer were altered by adding Minoan designs to the blank face, and in fact Minoan scarab production declined substantially. No local scarabs or scaraboids were produced after, or perhaps even during, MM III. All those known are of hard stones, although the imported scarabs are of softer materials. The two types bear no resemblance to each other. The seemingly abrupt cessation of Minoan scaraboid forms is directly related to the increased popularity of simple flattened seal types engraved on one face only, such as amygdaloid, lentoid and conoid forms, and the concurrent general decline in representational and elaborate shapes (of which the Minoan scaraboid was one). Nonetheless, imported scarabs are known in this period, if very few in number *in context*. Yet the Neo-Palatial period clearly is one of decline in their popularity.

The two-dimensional ape image continued in abundant quantity, but now was provided with a number of different and wholly indigenous ‘supporting’ figures, attributes and settings, and even new poses. Its role clearly is cultic in nature but remains ill-defined, due in part to the variety of sometimes conflicting iconography and the varieties of interpretation of the evidence. The ape appears as a protective or guardian figure as well as both as worshipper and object of worship; its role seems best described as an intermediary between humans and deities. Its identification is blurred by combinations of features of different species and sub-species, but its presentation (especially on the frescoes in idyllic surroundings) could only stem from direct observation of a living model, by this time (if not earlier) imported to the island.

The profile of the Egyptian standing hippopotamus deity was transformed into that of the Minoan ‘genius,’ apparently during MM III.<sup>1254</sup> Its features were altered so that the dorsal appendage has become a separately defined form draped over its back and contoured to its body, with the head leonine in appearance and the waist thin and defined.

<sup>1250</sup> See BETANCOURT *et al.* 1983.

<sup>1251</sup> Since use of the rhyton in non-zoomorphic form is unknown on Crete until MM II (with a single exception; see KOEHL 2000:94), the possibility that those found at EM III Palaikastro {425} and MM IA Knossos {153} were converted into rhyta is untenable.

<sup>1252</sup> At LM IA Akrotiri, ultimately in apparent use as a paint-pot {585}.

<sup>1253</sup> Neo-Palatial tombs are quite rare. Interment of the imports was unlikely at this time.

<sup>1254</sup> Its attributes had already undergone a complete change by MM II.



Its function also was expanded beyond holding the *Schnabelkanne* to include new roles chiefly to do with libation, with additional ‘supporting’ figures and a variety of other attributes and settings. Its Egyptian origin had been entirely forgotten. The ‘genius’ also made its appearance in the Mycenaean world, but there also acquired further distinctive features it did not possess on Crete (nor in Egypt), such as the ‘forehead curl.’

### Final Palatial

Following the destruction of most of the palaces at the end of LM IB, it seems that a strong Mycenaean influence pervaded much of, if not all, the island, and perhaps even some Mycenaean ‘invaders’ in its wake. The only Neo-Palatial palace that continued to be occupied and still function as a palace was Knossos, with its associated cemeteries, although a considerable number of other, lesser sites such as Kommos and Aghia Triadha also are known to have been inhabited and even flourishing, as did certain nearby cemeteries such as Kalyvia. A distinct shift in social organisation, burial customs, iconography and material goods can be recognised, with a strong Mycenaean veneer overlying the Minoan tradition underneath.

Unlike earlier sections, separate discussion of the material in context date groups of this and the following periods is difficult, and all are included together within their ‘period’ groupings.

Other than two alabastra recovered in the Kalyvia cemetery {90–91}, imported stone vessels of this period are limited solely to the Knossos region. The classic evidence to be cited is the large collection interred in the Isopata ‘Royal Tomb,’ including alabastra {249–252; 254} in a variety of forms, and a variety of other closed vessels {248; 253; 255} as well as two deep open bowls {242–243}, a spheroid jar {241} and a high shouldered jar {247}. Some have been altered to resemble Minoan forms, but whether in the Neo-Palatial or early Final Palatial period is difficult to judge, as some must be Final Palatial conversions. Other vessels in a variety of closed forms also were interred in tombs elsewhere in the Knossos region nearby {281}, at Archanes {49; 61} and Katsamba {114; 116}, and more fragmentary pieces in occupation sites near the ‘Royal Road’ {200; 219; 222?; 233?}.

Imported vessels {119; 144} are still converted to Minoan forms, at least at Knossos, and these contin-

ue to be buried in wealthy Mainland {593; 595?} and now also Knossian {241} tombs, and employed in cultic function at Knossos {144–145; 148}. One {219}, deliberately sawn for reuse, was recovered in an LM II context near the Royal Road. It is clear, from the conversion of amphora {144} that the cultic function of the entire stone vessel group with which it was found continues to be emphasised into Final Palatial Knossos. Use of a far more restricted repertoire of rhyton forms continues throughout the entire island at this time, and the type declines in use throughout the period.<sup>1255</sup> Likely, however, the converted *Gravidenflasche* {119} from Katsamba also would have been employed. The derivative clay ‘tall alabastra’ and stone spheroid flat-collared bowls continue to be made and used, but they are the only vessel forms under discussion to survive the end of the Neo-Palatial period, and the glass vessel from Zapher Papoura {264} heralds the decline of the alabastron form. Nonetheless, the large ‘Egyptian blue’ vessel at Knossos {238}, ivory swan *regardant* pyxis in a Zapher Papoura tomb {263} and its smaller, more fragmentary cousin handle terminus at Archanes {59} indicate, as much as anything, that a variety of other luxury goods continue to be imported onto the island at least to Knossos.

The site of Knossos and its satellites receive, employ, or at least end up with the major bulk of imported goods in this period, with only a comparative handful of objects farther east, west or south. Amongst these, however, is the glass vessel in House ‘X’ at Kommos {334} and possibly those in the Kalyvia cemetery {89; 92}. Also at Kalyvia are the two antique alabastra {90–91}, whilst Aghia Triadha (which seems to have overtaken Phaestos as pre-eminent site in the Mesara) also acquired a scarab of Queen Ty {18}, and Kommos has produced a surprising number of clay vessel sherds. Sites not far distant from Kommos, specifically those in the western Mesara, were able to acquire such rare and valuable materials and objects in some measure.

The dramatic increase in the number of clay storage and amphora fragments in contexts of this period at Kommos, in contrast to the few of Neo-Palatial date, also is indicative of the rise in the *importance* of this site and those inland of it, despite Knossian hegemony. No such sherds have been reported from Knossos, but fragments are found at Kommos scattered throughout both in the housing area on the hillside and hilltop {321; 323; 328; 340}

<sup>1255</sup> KOEHL 2000:95.

as well as in the area of the Civil Buildings {345–346}, together with some pilgrim flasks {323?; 329; 335}, albeit all in secondary and usually fill contexts.<sup>1256</sup> These vessels of largely transport and storage function have nothing to do with the indigenous clay amphorae having a basal ridge, production and cultic use of which already had ceased with the end of the Neo-Palatial period. The only stone parallels are recovered at Knossos {144; 287} and nearby Katsamba {114}, at least two in Final Palatial contexts.

Scarabs and scaraboids are known on Crete, but only a few imported pieces are found in context, whilst indigenous production had ceased long before. The one LM II–III nodule with an apparent Egyptian or Canaanite scarab seal impression without context at Knossos {317} may also be mentioned here, although its date range encompasses the entire Neo-Palatial period. It offers evidence that such imported seals were employed *as seals* on Crete at this time, if only at the palace. They were not used just for amuletic or possibly decorative purposes.

Together with the scarabs, and perhaps considered in the same light by this time, are a number of other small jewellery items and components. The vast majority are recovered in tomb contexts and mostly in the Knossos region, including scarabs {262} at Sellopoulo and possibly {1?} at Aghia Pelagia, the latter with some beads {2?}. Beads {244; 257} and amulets {245–246; 256} at Isopata, the cornflower beads at Archanes {58} and possibly Episkopi {67?}, and antique indigenous scaraboids {275–276} also are found at Gypsades, interred in tombs and having the same functional reuse as necklace components. The Queen Ty ovoid at Aghia Triadha {18} and the scarab with the name of her husband Amenhotep III at Khania {125?} seem to be the only items of imported ‘jewellery’ *not* recovered in a tomb, and both sites – like Episkopi – are well distant from Knossos.<sup>1257</sup> The duck-shaped weight or amulet from Nea Halikarnasos {417} appears to have been a ‘one-off’ tomb interment, paralleled only by two similar objects on the Mainland, as possibly also may have been the Kalo Chorio oval plaque {79}.<sup>1258</sup> Noticeably,

virtually all those objects of problematic date or found in contexts extending into the End Palatial period are found at sites beyond the Knossos area: Episkopi, Kalyvia, Khania, Kalo Chorio(?), although not, apparently, the Queen Ty scarab {18} at Aghia Triadha and some of the Kommos sherds. Were any Cretan sites, other than Knossos and Kommos, actually receiving foreign goods in this period? Were these ‘LM IIIA’ finds all heirloom arrivals of earlier date, arriving and being interred in the End Palatial period (later LM IIIA2, presumably after the death of Akhenaten)? Presumably, some at least must have done so, if only due to the large number of clay amphorae and their contents represented by the fragments found at Kommos in debris contexts deposited as late as LM IIIB. All these imports inspired no Minoan variations or adoptions, and those adopted earlier either no longer survived, or were by now no longer considered foreign – with one possible exception, a new addition to the zoomorphic repertoire unaccompanied by an imported Egyptian model.

The ‘aegeanised’ Egyptian crocodile image makes its first appearance<sup>1259</sup> at this time with little or no artistic inspiration from Egypt. Its only certain Final Palatial context is the ‘Mycenaean burial enclosure’ at Archanes {52}, although some continue into the End Palatial period and others described below also may be this early. The design and image may have been a Minoan phenomenon, but more likely is a Mycenaean one. Wherever the design originated, its presence on Crete likely owes more to Mycenaean cultural and cultic veneer than to Minoan preference for the image. Other images, initially Minoan and continuing into the Final Palatial period, also cannot be separated from their reception in the Mycenaean world.

The ape image, so popular earlier, barely makes an appearance in Final Palatial, with only a single image on the gold ring from Kalyvia {84}, the two LM II–III nodules stamped with a seal probably of Neo-Palatial date depicting the seated ape figure {142; 160}, and a very few late, mostly imported Egyptian, examples known from the Mainland. All appear to be

<sup>1256</sup> Others {325; 346}, although deposited in this period, are associated with Neo-Palatial material and probably arrived at that time.

<sup>1257</sup> The amethyst and carnelian beads from Aghia Pelagia {3}, Arvi {65} and possibly Pyrgos (Kanli Kastelli) {505} would also be included here, but they are without context and their place of origin is unknown. Ultimately, however, the raw stone at least likely was imported from Egypt, if

not the finished beads. Those from the Isopata ‘Royal Tomb’ {244; 257}, of lapis lazuli, may be indigenous and heirloom but, even so, their material is imported from elsewhere than Egypt.

<sup>1258</sup> *If* recovered in the tomb. If not, it could equally well be of practically any date, including the Iron Age.

<sup>1259</sup> Except for the Proto-Palatial seal {514} from Tsoutsouros.

little changed from the thin elongated figure seen in LM IB, and it may be that they are the last true remnants of the type. The Kalyvia ring until recently was thought to be a worn LM IB product in later, LM IIIA1, deposition. The cultic significance of the figure seems not to have survived the destruction of the palaces, even at Knossos, suggesting the new 'tradition' there no longer required it or need to maintain its cultic association. It is for this reason, if no other but their three-dimensionality, that the two pendants from the Isopata 'Royal Tomb' {245; 256} surely must have been imported. They are the only 3D images on Crete after the Pre-Palatial period

The Minoan 'genius,' on the other hand, remains popular and continues to be engraved on seal designs. The quantity of images on Crete now is far greater than before, perhaps another indication of the current 'mycenaeanising' cultural veneer, even though the image initially was a Minoan adaptation subsequently adopted on the Mainland. Its appearance on Crete has developed beyond the Neo-Palatial image, and it is now depicted as an almost insect-like creature with a tiny 'wasp-waist,' the dorsal appendage limited to the lower body and seemingly the insect's abdomen, and having a spiked back and thin stick-like legs. Its rôle and interaction with other, purely Minoan, attributes and figures continue to develop {309D; 309F?}, now with an additional triumphant rôle carrying or otherwise interacting with a variety of large and often apparently dead animals {64; 87?; 129; 174; 207; 266; 309C?; 318; 554; 557–558} and acting as guardians of presumably sacred objects and columns {88; 303; 309A; 440; 503; 523; 555}, occasionally in the singular {206?; 208; 309B}. Its popularity in the Mycenaean world beyond the island is attested by similar images and rôles in a greater variety of media, including fresco and glass in addition to seal face designs. Perhaps this figure too would have died, like the ape image, if the Mycenaean had not adopted it, but on Crete it still remains a particularly Minoan image without the 'forehead curl' Gill notes as a Mycenaean feature. The only example not found on a seal is the ivory mirror handle at Pankalochori {440}, where the 'forehead curl' also is absent.

Basically, then, only those few object and image types already or also adopted and adapted by the

Mycenaean continue to be found on the island before the end of Final Palatial early in LM IIIA2. Noteably, also, they are limited almost entirely to the site of Knossos and its immediate environs. Nonetheless, some are found elsewhere, such as the rich necropolis of Kalyvia and a few other sites and cemeteries. Unlike in Neo-Palatial, find contexts are limited almost exclusively to tombs, with the exception of the clay imports at Kommos, some images of the 'genius' on seals and sealings, and the ubiquitous clay alabastra.<sup>1260</sup>

### End Palatial

The most indicative group of objects is this period appears to be the scattered sherds of storage vessels and amphorae found at Kommos, evidence that the commodity or commodities they represent *may* still have been imported to the site from abroad. Whilst we may exclude those from contexts incorporating mostly material of earlier date {324?; 342–343}, we may still note the large number found in contexts, albeit fill contexts, of End Palatial date both in the area of the Civic Buildings {348; 350–351; 355–357} and in the housing uphill {322; 327}. Nonetheless, little other relevant material is recovered either here or at other sites nearby, and imports found in the Knossos region otherwise still dominate this period.

Importation of stone vessels had ceased entirely by the End Palatial period, as did the production of the indigenous clay 'tall alabastra' and stone spheroid flat-collared bowls. So too did Minoan stone vessel production as a whole. A few vessels, presumably heirloom rather than new imports or Minoan versions of them, are recovered in End Palatial contexts. The Kalyvia tombs, more likely Final than End Palatial, revealed a variety of heirloom stone vessels including two Middle Kingdom and/or Second Intermediate Period alabastra {90–91} and a Minoan 'spheroid jar' {85}. The 'spheroid bowl or jar' from Angeliana {45}, whether a Minoan or Egyptian vessel, likely also is an heirloom at its LM IIIA?–B interment like the Minoan example from an LM IIIB Gournes tomb {74} and the imported high shouldered jar from Katsamba {117}. Habitation contexts, however, have produced only individual fragments of imported 'spheroid jars' in late debris contexts, at Knossos {230}, and 'minoanised' examples at Mycenae {587} and Pylos

<sup>1260</sup> The 'hunting' or (more accurately) 'bird-flushing' cat also continues as a single theme on the island, with the seal designs perhaps of this period or the next from Archanes {63}; Knossos {319} and Crete {530; 572}. On the other hand, the larger cat's head models (etc.), so common earli-

er, also did not survive the end of the Neo-Palatial period. The clay pseudo-amphora-on-stand form is no longer made nor employed on Crete, although it is only at this time that it truly begins to become popular for stone and clay amphorae in Egypt itself.

{596}. The context dates of the last two, LH IIIB1 or later and LH IIIB2 respectively, clearly are merely *termini ante quem* for vessels probably imported much earlier from Knossos, likely during the Final Palatial or more probably Neo-Palatial period when these ‘spheroid jars’ were worked on Crete.

However, glass vessels now are produced in greater quantity in Egypt, and are now found in relative quantity beyond its borders. Imported flasks are interred in Minoan tombs, perhaps in place of the travertine forms now that they themselves are more available commodities and the alabastra are becoming less popular. Certainly the imported glass Karteros flask {101} was interred in this period, although the Kommos vessel {334} and that from Zapher Papoura {264} (whatever its form) certainly, and at least one or possibly both of the Kalyvia vessels {89; 92}, instead are of Final Palatial deposition.

Otherwise, imports are limited to small portable items, notably steatite scarabs and component pieces of jewellery, mostly in various stones. The most important phenomenon of the period was the continued dismantling of imported jewellery for re-use of the component parts, as clearly evidenced by the find circumstances of the cornflower beads and some scarabs.<sup>1261</sup> Scarabs, not always component parts of Egyptian jewellery, also were incorporated into Minoan necklace arrangements and were worn by the deceased at interment. The practice began before the End Palatial period but, apart from some contexts encompassing LM IIIA and therefore possibly of later Final Palatial date, there is no specific evidence for this practice before late Final Palatial beyond presumption of a similar history for the single fly amulet or bead from MM III Ailias {272}. The disparate collection of component elements also suggests that these beads may be the remnants of wealth, acquired individually rather than a commissioned piece made to be worn together.

Contexts after the Final Palatial period having imported objects are no longer confined to the Knossos area. Similar reuse of foreign component jewellery continues at Zapher Papoura {265} and perhaps Aghia Pelagia {1?; 2?; 3?} (without context) nearby, and their sparse but wide dissemination throughout the island, including the cornflower

beads at Episkopi {67?}, Gournes {73} and other sites geographically distant from Knossos, suggests a decentralisation from Knossos of the Mycenaean veneer. Nonetheless, the Zapher Papoura scarab {265} clearly indicates, both by its early Dynasty XIX date and its generally contemporary very early LM IIIB interment, that material was still being imported to Knossos in the End Palatial period. The Mycenaean also re-used component pieces in their own arrangements, to judge from similar but more numerous finds of cornflower beads at Perati and Ialysos in even later (late LH IIIB–C) contexts; perhaps they inherited the idea from Minoan artisans.

Individual scarabs are recovered in context in an LM IIIB house at Poros {482}<sup>1262</sup> and a pit at Khania not later than LM IIIB {125},<sup>1263</sup> but the majority actually have no provenance beyond a certain locality, and sometimes only the island itself. Those found without context at Knossos {315; 320}, Aghios Onouphrios {39; 44?}, and with no further provenance than the island {544} could not have been imported earlier than the End Palatial period. Cornflower beads with a similar lack of provenance are in Post-Minoan contexts at Knossos {239} and Psychro {511}, and perhaps none at all at Khamaizi Phatsi {124}, and all three could in fact be Iron Age products.

The image of the Minoan ‘genius’ deteriorated considerably in the End Palatial period on Crete, to the point where it is virtually unrecognisable as such. Its *raison d’être* seems to have been lost on the island, and the figure has been reduced to its simplest form. The degraded image is found only as a pair flanking a central column on several seals, of which only one {130} is found in context at Khania, in a habitation deposit dated to LM IIIA2(–B early). This one piece in its dated context indicates the rapidity of deterioration from the carefully depicted ‘genii’ of the Final Palatial period. All other seals are without context at Knossos {309E}, Palaikastro {433?; 435}, Tylissos {516} and without provenance on the island {556; 559–560}. On the Mainland and elsewhere, however, the clear and detailed image continued unabated, suggesting that the Minoans had finally rejected the Mycenaean veneer, although the Mycenaean had not. Surprisingly, the cylinder seal from Palaikastro

<sup>1261</sup> See Chapter 8; also Chapter 7, Appendix.

<sup>1262</sup> The scarab is ‘generally contemporary’ with its LM IIIB context, one of the few End Palatial correlations of import and context. This is a rather loose designation for the particular circumstance here, as the excavation is as

yet unpublished and the dating of both scarab and context as yet covers perhaps a century in time. The Zapher Papoura scarab {265} is better.

<sup>1263</sup> Inscribed with the name of Amenhotep III, and therefore at least a Final Palatial import at the earliest.

{435} also displays a single rather rudimentary and almost unrecognisable image of the squatting ape figure between the two confronted but even less recognisable ‘genii,’ also its last hurrah on Crete. Those images on Crete of ultimately Egyptian origin that do continue on, do so beyond the Knossian, and even Minoan, sphere.

The crocodile image, on the other hand, appears in equally high quality both on the Mainland and Crete, although in equally limited quantity in both regions. It is not found after LM IIIB and perhaps even after LM IIIA2 on Crete;<sup>1264</sup> context dates are not precise enough to be sure of its final example. The two combs and an amulet displaying these images, recovered on Crete at Karteros {102}, Milatos {398} and Palaikastro {427}, may have been imported from the Mainland, but equally may be indigenous Minoan work. Notably, Knossos has revealed no crocodile image at this period, and only one {102} is found at any site nearby. Knossos, in fact, so far has produced no ‘egyptianising’ image at all in the End Palatial period.<sup>1265</sup>

### Post-Palatial

By this time Crete seems to have become more or less a complete ‘backwater’ in terms of imported luxury goods and exotica in general, while the Mainland continued to import a surprising variety of objects throughout the LH IIIB period and even into LH IIIC.<sup>1266</sup> Even the quantities of the small portable items found on the island are small in comparison to those found elsewhere and may be contrasted with the multiple discoveries of comparable objects at the Mycenaean sites of Perati and Ialysos. Nonetheless, such imported objects as are found on Crete are limited only to scarabs recovered without context. Nothing is found in context. Two are surface finds from Knossos {315; 320}, a third is incorrectly associated with the Aghios Onouphrios ‘deposit’ {38}, a fourth reportedly is from Tsoutsouros {512} and the last is entirely without provenance {537}. All therefore need not necessarily have been imported contempo-

rary with their date of manufacture.<sup>1267</sup> Crete may have been entirely removed from the extended international scene in the Post-Palatial period.

### Commentary

In any culture known archaeologically only through its material remains, inference for any external influence can only be made through the artefacts found. If they clearly are of local manufacture and yet can be shown to exhibit features not locally developed but strongly reminiscent of, or paralleled by, those of a foreign culture, then they can be said to be ‘imitative’ or, more correctly, derived from one or more elements, of that culture. The onus, however, should rest on evidence rather than assumption of this foreign influence and if there is sufficient evidence for, or reasonable assumption of, a local development without outside influence, then presumption of local development should take precedence over the suggestion of possible foreign inspiration. One can assume the former, but must demonstrate the latter.

On Crete, objects and – more particularly – iconographical images could have been imported through two different and not necessarily exclusive means: importation of objects themselves<sup>1268</sup> or verbal descriptions of the object or image seen abroad without actual importation of the artefact itself; that is, a visual or a verbal model. Therefore, certain types of Egyptian ‘objects’ should be excluded from serious consideration as direct source material, such as relatively contemporary tomb illustrations and objects or images limited to the non-public areas of temples including large-scale cultic images. General access to both sources was severely limited, and the possibility of even indirect verbal transmission seems unlikely.

There remains the minor possibility of similar palatial or domestic material, based on WACHSMANN’S (1987) discussion of ‘copy-books’ and ‘pattern books’ as transmitters of specific details and compositions.<sup>1269</sup> Minoan art displays little evidence of such direct means, however, especially in two-dimensional work such as fresco painting.<sup>1270</sup> It is difficult to

<sup>1264</sup> It does not extend beyond LH IIIB or perhaps even LH IIIA2 on the Mainland either.

<sup>1265</sup> The two parturient rhyta {78; 123} from Gournia and Kephala Khondrou are unlikely descendants of the short-lived Egyptian *Gravidenflasche* type.

<sup>1266</sup> See comments by R.B. BROWN 1975:159. LH IIIB and LH IIIC are relatively equivalent in date to LM IIIB and LM IIIA2 respectively, within a decade or two; see WARREN and HANKEY 1989:169.

<sup>1267</sup> As with the End Palatial parturient rhyta, the femiform vase from Aghia Triadha {35} almost certainly has little if anything to do with the earlier *Gravidenflaschen*, an Egyptian phenomenon now over a century out of date.

<sup>1268</sup> Including objects having visual representations, and (in the case of zoomorphic images) the live animal itself.

<sup>1269</sup> WACHSMANN 1987:140 (‘copybook’), 144 (‘pattern books’).

<sup>1270</sup> See W.S. SMITH 1965; M.C. SHAW 1967; 1970.

assume such direct transmission, even within Egypt itself, as the specific details and compositions are not, in fact, direct copies. Rather, they are similar but quite different presentations of the same ideas and themes, more the result of individual artists' realisation within the boundaries of convention than of slavish copying. It is a mistake to consider the Egyptian artist as a slavish copyist relying on direct transmission, despite a definite adherence to traditional and well-established conventional patterns. There is, in fact, little evidence for copying of entire scenes or even details within scenes (except some clearly archaising examples of much later date) to suggest such 'copybooks' existed, and no 'copybooks' have survived.<sup>1271</sup> Wachsmann's argument for the existence of these 'copybooks' is limited to certain tombs at Thebes, the products of multiple generations of the same artist-families. Contemporary Memphite tomb decoration is quite different in style, colour and presentation.<sup>1272</sup> Although there is an impression of similarity to Egyptian composition and detail, the Minoan work is even farther removed and entirely un-Egyptian in concept and effect. The most likely possibility remains verbal transmission of ideas, especially for this type of large-scale artwork.<sup>1273</sup>

In consideration of the object types actually found on Crete, the probability of imported small scale figurines and other Egyptian objects bearing relevant images having any influence also can be considered minimal since extremely few such objects have been found on the island, and – more pointedly – these few objects found have produced no local 'imitations' or derivations.<sup>1274</sup> Also, imported Egyptian figurines or other objects of the type(s) thought to have been 'imitated' by Minoan artisans, such as figurines and seals in the form of cats, should have been recovered during excavation but *never* have been found on Crete after a century of excavation. The images assumed to have been copied or derived from foreign originals, such as the seated and 'bird-flushing' cat and the crocodile, have no imported exem-

plars on the island. Others, such as the duck *regardant* and ovoid seal forms and the *Gravidenflasche*-type figure, appear both in Egypt (and as imports on the island, when found there) demonstrably later than the indigenous Minoan 'versions' of the image.

The thesis that such imported figurines or other objects as the cat and crocodile *should* have been found is strengthened by the preservation of indigenous small Minoan objects in such materials as faience that have been recovered from excavations throughout Crete. Had imported objects in similar materials arrived on the island, some at least also should have been recovered, but none have been found. Nonetheless, a number of materials found in abundance and good condition in Egypt did not survive on Crete, including wood, fabrics and other organic materials. Wooden examples of some iconographical images are known in Egypt, and it is conceivable that they were brought to Crete. However, if so, it would seem odd that *only* examples in perishable material(s) would have been brought to the island; one still would have expected some imported images in surviving materials also to have been recovered there.

A number of other object and image types are well known in Egypt, that one would expect to survive on Crete but have never been reported. The kohl pot,<sup>1275</sup> for example, would not have been required if its usual contents were not imported; we might assume that this cosmetic eye paint already was readily available on Crete. A number of other vessel types could also be cited, but the limited variety found on Crete (and even more limited variety of those found in quantities of more than one or two) is striking. The number of scarabs that have been found on Crete, while always small, also underlines the importance of the absence of other forms of Egyptian seals such as the fish, hedgehog, *wꜥꜥt*-eye, baboon, cat and a host of other figures regularly employed as seal shapes alternative to the scarab beetle. Only two ovoids {18; 28} and two possible *regardant* duck shapes {417; 436} are recorded from the island. The Egyptian amulet, an object type ubiq-

<sup>1271</sup> There are, however, numerous *ostraka* used as trials, sketches and as a means of recording interesting images. One famous example is the 'Queen of Punt' on the Deir el-Bahari scene, sketched on an *ostrakon* of the Ramesside period; see PECK and ROSS 1978:115 #45–46. These are not 'copybooks' but rather one-off images used essentially as a sketching medium or as a temporary measure of transferring an idea.

<sup>1272</sup> See MARTIN 2001. This is particularly noticeable in the use of colour, quite distinct from the Theban style, a topic much discussed at the conference itself.

<sup>1273</sup> Although not found on Crete, the most obvious example of

verbal transmission is the so-called 'monkey-in-a-shrine' fresco from Akrotiri (MARINATOS 1968–1976:II:53 fig. 43), where the shrine columns are each surmounted by double flowering papyrus leaves – a visually literal translation of what could only have been a verbal description of the Egyptian papyriform column type known in domestic, palatial, cultic and even funerary architecture throughout the Dynastic period from at least Dynasty III; see PHILLIPS 2005a:45.

<sup>1274</sup> See Chapter 11.

<sup>1275</sup> See Chapter 4 for discussion.

uitous in ancient Egypt itself with a multitude of forms and representations, likewise is unknown on Crete with the possible exception of the two apes and a frog from Isopata {245–246; 256}, the fly from Ailias {272}, the amethyst Levantine(?) ape {562} and also (if they are considered amuletic) the cornflower beads {58; 67; 73; 124; 239; 500}.<sup>1276</sup> It is an extremely limited and negligible selection, especially when the enormous variety of such objects in Egypt itself is considered.<sup>1277</sup> One can only assume, after more than a century of excavation, that the actual situation is not fortuitous. The Minoans knew what they wanted and, more importantly, what they did not.

The question of other, unpreserved but probably imported materials must also be considered, although previously discussed in the present study only peripherally. The design qualities of alabastra and other hard stone closed vessel types, for example, suggest they were imported as containers for the ‘real’ imports. Perfumed unguents almost certainly were imported in the alabastra, as travertine is the most satisfactory impermeable material regularly employed for that purpose in the Bronze Age. Even following the introduction of glass, an expensive material apparently restricted to royal workshops until at least Dynasty XIX, travertine continued to be used for the same purpose.<sup>1278</sup> The large spheroid flat-collared jars too may have been brought as containers for some as-yet-unknown import, but the internal cavity often is so small in comparison to the size and weight of the

bowls that this is unlikely. Open stone vessel shapes were unlikely to have been transport containers and the shallow carinated bowls in particular could only have been imported for their own merits.

Other non-surviving materials that may have been transported include ‘luxury’ goods such as fabrics (especially fine linens) and possibly papyrus. The Minoans were quite capable of weaving their own fine fabrics, to judge from the intricately ‘woven’ multi-coloured patterns on the clothing worn by those in the fresco paintings.<sup>1279</sup> Nonetheless, they may have appreciated Egyptian linen both as an imported exotic and for its own qualities.<sup>1280</sup> If Warren’s assessment of the Aegean papyrus as an exclusively garden rather than wild plant is correct,<sup>1281</sup> then it is unlikely that the indigenous plant population could have sustained a papyrus-manufacturing industry to any useful degree; imported ready-made papyri would have been a logical choice if feasible or considered necessary as a supplement to any indigenous harvest and manufacture.<sup>1282</sup> Additionally, a demand for exotica might have included such items as ostrich feathers in addition to the imported ostrich eggs found on the island. The ivory tusks found at Kato Zakro, not necessarily imported from or through Egypt,<sup>1283</sup> are further evidence of trade in exotica although these undoubtedly were intended as raw material for Minoan ivory products. We might also presume importation of some raw gold to be worked by local artisans,<sup>1284</sup> in addition to the amethyst and car-

<sup>1276</sup> BRANIGAN 1970c has shown that Minoan foot amulets have no relation to Egyptian leg amulets. One might also include the Bes figurine said to be from Trapeza {508}, but this is highly questionable.

<sup>1277</sup> See ANDREWS 1994 for the range of Egyptian amulet types. Not all are dated to the New Kingdom or earlier but, even so, the variety is extensive.

<sup>1278</sup> The glass vessels from Kalyvia {89; 92} and Zapher Papoura {264} therefore were highly valuable imports when they were interred, and the Karteros flask {101}, although slightly later, should also be viewed in the same perspective.

<sup>1279</sup> E.g., EVANS *PM* II.2:fig. 456–459, 485, pls. XII, XXV, XXVII; HOOD 1978:figs. 35, 45.

<sup>1280</sup> I would disagree with B.R. Jones, who has attempted with some success to replicate the women’s clothes depicted in the Theran and other frescoes and suggests that linen probably was the material used for Minoan cloth; see JONES 2000:37. Minoan clothing, as depicted worn by both men and women in brightly coloured and intricately patterned designs, is hardly likely to be made in a fabric strongly resistant to accepting and retaining natural dyes (see BARBER 1991:49 n. 6, 211; VOGELANG-EASTWOOD 1992:36; 2000:278), although linen *was* dyed in antiquity. It seems far more likely that wool would have been

employed for the cloth, although the laces would have been made of the stronger linen (flax) thread.

<sup>1281</sup> WARREN 1976b; see also BETTS 1978; MORGAN 1988:21–24, 147.

<sup>1282</sup> WEINGARTEN 1986:281–283 notes that sealings from the Knossos Temple Repositories presumably sealed documents, not objects. MÜLLER (1999:349–359, figs. 8–15) has done much to elucidate the attachment of sealings to tied objects, but the objects themselves are unclear. Compare these attachments to those of ancient Egypt, where the documents and other objects sealed also survive; see PARIS 1982:316–318.

<sup>1283</sup> See KRZYSZKOWSKA 1988:227–230. The base of another raw tusk was reported by Mosso at Phaestos over a century ago in an apparently Late Neolithic/Early Minoan context (see *PM* II.2:742), but this identification cannot now be confirmed as the object cannot be located; Olga Krzyszkowska considers it a ‘non-starter’ (personal communication, 09 January 2000).

<sup>1284</sup> As Crete itself is extremely poor in mineral and metal resources, Minoan objects made of gold and other metals must have been manufactured from imported raw material. There is, for example, no known source of gold on the island, whilst Egypt mined the metal extensively.

nelian<sup>1285</sup> and other stones. These other stones may have come from Egypt, but other possible sources of supply also are known for them. Other non-Egyptian stones also were imported onto Crete as raw material.<sup>1286</sup> The limited amount of land available for agriculture, especially of grains, also suggests that basic foodstuffs may also have been brought from some distance and even possibly from abroad, especially at Kato Zakro where there is no suitable land in any quantity for miles. One source for foodstuffs may have been Egypt, although other lands are closer.

After detailed study of many objects and iconographical types from Minoan Crete long suggested or accepted as ‘egyptianising,’ it has become apparent to me that in fact many iconographical images have little if anything to do with a perceived Egyptian source, but instead were locally derived rather than being adopted or adapted from across the southern Mediterranean. These include the images of the *Gravidenflasche*-type figure and the cat, duck *regardant* and ovoid seal forms,<sup>1287</sup> and the footed amphora with raised ridge at the lower body/base junction.<sup>1288</sup> All have visual similarities to the Egyptian ‘models’ but are ‘wrong’ either chronologically or in specific details. Such inconsistencies indicate a lack of dependence on their supposed Egyptian ‘original’ sources.

The appearance of the *Gravidenflasche*-type image on Crete in MM (IB?–)II is earlier than in Egypt, as is the even earlier and sporadic appearance of the duck *regardant* seals. Pre-Palatial ovoids also are much earlier than their counterparts in Egypt, and the clay amphora, too, predates the comparable Egyptian type. The seated cat, despite its strong resemblance to similar – and contemporary – Egyptian representations, does not conform to them in its details, and indigenous fauna more likely are the source of inspiration. Nonetheless, it is distinctly possible that cats, like apes, were transported and introduced onto the island from Egypt although, apparently, at different times.

Importation of a form or image through non-material (i.e., visual or verbal) means is extremely

difficult to prove archaeologically. One can, on the other hand, reasonably show that such transference was possible. The idea of the crocodile image certainly must have originated in Egypt, for example, since it is virtually the only area the reptile inhabited. However, its appearance as an LM (and LH) III image is temporally far removed from its late Old Kingdom-Dynasty XIII *floruit* in Egypt.<sup>1289</sup> Physically, too, its depiction on Crete is quite removed from Egyptian iconography, with an entirely different pose, material, attitude and presentation. Surely a non-material transference of the image, by word of mouth or other intangible method, is the most reasonable source of its appearance on Crete, as the living reptile itself could hardly have been transported from Egypt to the island by the only means possible, on board ship. The ‘bird-flushing’ cat, on the other hand, *may* have been in part a reflection of some Egyptian source or sources but nonetheless essentially is an indigenous development. Individual elements are similar to Egyptian scenes (in tombs where they were unlikely to have been seen by any traveling Minoan artisans), but although the idea of the genre may or may not have been ‘imported,’ these elements and their details are used in a manner alien to Egyptian representations, and Minoan depictions of the cat itself could only have been based on observed living models as specific Egyptian model *images* do not exist in sufficient detail.

Objects previously considered to have been of Egyptian origin and imported onto Crete include certain round and barrel beads of various imported materials that more likely are of local manufacture, and human figurine types now generally – and correctly – accepted as indigenous products. While both beads and figures earlier had been considered as imported objects, there is no evidence for assuming their importation nor, more specifically, for rejecting a local origin for them.

Therefore, despite the very restricted selection of the entire Egyptian repertoire of artefacts and iconographical images available for export that *were* in fact imported onto Crete, an even more restricted

<sup>1285</sup> Discussed in Chapter 9.

<sup>1286</sup> See PHILLIPS 2000b:83–84. Other, potentially importable stones from Egypt would include turquoise, anhydrite and red granite, but these are not found in Minoan stoneworking, either for jewellery or vessel manufacture.

<sup>1287</sup> Also the sphinx image, having a Near Eastern source rather than Egyptian and so not discussed in the present work. See RHYNE 1970:*passim*.

<sup>1288</sup> A probable visual Egyptian influence of storage vessel and separate potstand must be acknowledged for the last, as the low potstand is unknown on Crete but is common in Egypt.

<sup>1289</sup> Nonetheless, the crocodile image continued throughout the dynastic period in Egypt, although not as popular as before.



selection of transported material actually had any 'impact' on the culture of Minoan Crete. As would be expected, not all material imported onto the island actually had any influence here. In fact, the majority of (surviving) types indicate, by their accumulated presence, the limited rise and fall of Minoan interest in Egyptian goods and iconography.

The vast majority of imported Egyptian object types found on Crete had no cultural or artistic effect on the island, or at least there is no trace in the archaeological record of indigenous objects influenced by them. Among these are the faience, blue frit and glass vessels, cornflower beads, scarabs (from the Proto-Palatial period on), and most stone vessel types including the deep open bowls, 'heart-shaped' jars, Type A ('flask') alabastra and flat handless lids, and also those object types found in smaller quantity and even as single exemplars on the island.

The evidence, in overview, certainly is not uniform but rather quite varied and often contradictory. It strongly implies multiple levels of influence, and more specifically of individual consideration, development, absorption and adaptation of each object or iconographical type in isolation from others that happened to be considered, developed, absorbed or adapted. The Minoans took only what they themselves chose, deemed necessary or wanted on an individual basis, and altered the foreign original to fit their own existing requirements as necessary.

A large proportion of object types that did effect some cultural or artistic impression on the island, did so only through a definite Minoan filter. The stone alabastron was adapted to a vessel made only in clay. The tall clay alabastron form was highly decorated and always lidless in contrast to the simple visual image of the original lidded stone vessel, yet the early baggy flat-bottomed profile with widely flaring rim was retained, even when it was long outdated in Egypt and contemporary everted rim alabastra were imported elsewhere. The amphora, on the other hand, already had been produced as a combined vessel-and-stand form, elongated and slimmed, trimmed, only crudely decorated or left unpainted, (apparently) given a covering lid, and made and used in pairs by the time the Egyptians first produced the form as a storage-vessel type in

any quantity. One of the pair was made hollow {14; 446} and the other not {13; 445}, and together were employed for an unknown cultic purpose certainly quite different from its original Minoan storage function. Spheroid flat-collared 'jars' and cylinder jars with everted rim and base, when adapted to visually similar vessel forms on Crete, were reduced in scale. The former often were given additional surface decoration. The Mycenae duck-bowl {591} can only be a Minoan product, due to its material. Nonetheless, it has been given a flattened spout at the tail end, not found in Egyptian examples where the tail is employed as a handle on dishes and bowls. Scarabs initially were simplified in back and side detail, and Egyptian face designs from the beginning rejected entirely in favour of indigenous images on both scarabs and ovoids (the latter of entirely non-Egyptian origin). Then the scarabs were simplified even farther, being 'reduced' to scaraboids of entirely Minoan character. The popularity of the scarab seal throughout Dynasty XVIII–XIX Egypt is not paralleled on LM Crete, where the scarab-type seal had died out entirely.<sup>1290</sup>

A similar dearth of cultural and artistic influence of adopted Egyptian iconography on the island is noticeable. Only two images can be traced with certainty to Egypt, but their origins were soon forgotten. Nonetheless, the Minoans treated their newly adopted forms entirely differently. The Egyptian standing hippopotamus deity quickly acquired a Minoan attribute (the *Schnabelkanne*) and soon was transformed into an almost unrecognisable form and a variety of functions unrelated to the Egyptian source figure, and continued in an internal development. The squatting ape figure, on the other hand, remained essentially unchanged in its individual appearance and pose for some centuries before it seems to have been transformed from the *Cynocephalus* to generally *Cercopithecus* type, become a two-dimensional image, and then added Minoan embellishments or attributes in the form of filler foliage on the Phaestos sealings in MM IIB. Finally – and belatedly – its role, pose and attributes were expanded, probably in MM III, shortly before or at about the same time as the 'genius.' The virtual disappearance of the ape image at the end of the Neo-Palatial period is in direct contrast to its popularity in Egypt in the latter half of Dynasty XVIII. The 'genius,' on the

<sup>1290</sup> Although imports continued to arrive on the island, as evidenced by their date of manufacture and, occasionally, their context.

other hand, survived into Final Palatial and later, not because of any particular popularity of the standing hippopotamus deity in Egypt but clearly due to adoption of the developed 'genius' figure from the Minoan into the Mycenaean repertoire even though the image essentially died out on Crete itself shortly thereafter.

This observation also is exemplified by the use to which the Minoan artisans put certain imported objects in certain periods. Minoan sealmakers in the Proto-Palatial period carved designs on blank-faced imported scarabs. Final Palatial and End Palatial Minoan artisans re-used imported beads and scarabs in creating new pieces of jewellery.<sup>1291</sup> The converted stone vessels were reworked quite skillfully into both Minoan and not-quite-Minoan vessel forms during Neo-Palatial (and into the Final Palatial) as, presumably, were ostrich eggshells converted to rhyta.

The urge to employ imported objects as models for indigenous forms doubtless developed as a result of inadequate supply or (more likely) a demand for a less expensive product. Some types, such as the alabastron, even employed a less expensive material. Adoption of certain images, on the other hand, must have been due to that particular image conveying an interpretation of an already-existing cultic idea. That the 'genius' quickly developed a Minoan persona and attribute suggests that the original Egyptian image was inadequate for Minoan needs although it captured or visualised some recognisable and important aspect(s) well enough for adoption. Noticeably, the Egyptian image itself has not been found on the island.<sup>1292</sup> No faience amulets are known, nor any figurines – both objects manufactured by the thousands especially during the New Kingdom. By this time, the relationship of the standing hippopotamus deity and the 'genius' was long lost to the Minoans (and the Mycenaean).

The squatting ape figure, on the other hand, is known on several (possible) imported objects of date later than its introduction to the island, including figurines, amulets and even a small zoomorphic pot. The image itself was retained virtually unchanged (although expanded upon centuries after its arrival), and the Egyptian image must have been recognised by any Minoan who saw it. Despite a

number of known imports of this image recovered at Mycenae and elsewhere on the Mainland, including the large zoomorphic jar and figurines inscribed in the cartouche of Amenhotep II, the Mycenaean did not adopt the ape as a cultic figure, for reasons we shall never know.

The vast majority of imported and derivative objects were found at Knossos and its immediate vicinity. This clearly cannot be coincidental. The other sites with large quantities of these objects also are palatial or at least feature a large 'villa,' admittedly not a 'palace' but the next 'step' below. Imports, with few exceptions, remain limited in distribution to these elite sites or others immediately adjacent to them, strongly suggesting a limited market for, or accessibility to, the goods imported onto the island – an 'elite' associated with political, economic or cultic power. The adopted types, in their earliest manifestations, also are limited in distribution to these same sites. The earliest 'genius' images, for example, are found only at Knossos {159} and Phaestos {448–449}, and there are in fact few at all found beyond these sites and their immediately adjacent satellites until well into the Neo-Palatial period and later. The ape image, in its later manifestation in the Proto-Palatial period, also is limited to the palace areas. This cannot be explained as the result of extant examples being known only on sealings, the vast majority of which were found at the palaces. Sealings are impressions of seals on which the design was carved, and seals are found in quantity throughout the island beyond the limitations of the palatial setting. None, however, depict the ape or 'proto-genius' although, had the image been known beyond the palaces, one would have expected at least one representation elsewhere through sheer volume of quantity.<sup>1293</sup> Imported stone vessel types all are restricted to palatial sites,<sup>1294</sup> and the majority of Minoan adaptations do not venture beyond the boundaries of immediate palatial influence. Even Pre-Palatial contexts are located adjacent to future important sites.

One immediately noticeable thread is the strong cultic association of the majority of both imports and adaptations. From funerary burial goods through religious imagery to shrine furniture, the imported and adapted Minoan material seldom is

<sup>1291</sup> Also perhaps at other periods.

<sup>1292</sup> The sole exception is scarab {477}, but this image is incidental to its main feature, that of a scarab.

<sup>1293</sup> The presence of the cat image (including representations of the cat-head) throughout the island, in contrast, sug-

gests the opposite, both common knowledge of and an indigenous origin for the image.

<sup>1294</sup> With the exception of the Pre-Palatial types, centred in the Mesara. This also is true of the Pre-Palatial ape images. KOEHL 2000:95.

associated with purely domestic circumstances. Whatever and wherever these goods were imported and adapted, religion clearly played an important, albeit varied, role. Even the clay alabastron, the object type most commonly found in domestic circumstances, is so highly and elaborately decorated – often with religious imagery – that some cultic significance must be attached to it.

The quantities of surviving imported goods remains very little throughout the entire Bronze

Age, even in their greatest cumulative quantity in Neo-Palatial and at the site of Knossos. The limited distribution of both imports and their derivative Minoan material is strongly suggestive of both limited availability to, and knowledge of, the presence of imports on the island. The bulk of the population probably would never have encountered these objects, which must have been available only to a limited élite – supported by one or all of political, economic or cultic power.

