

AGHIA PELAGIA

The site of Aghia Pelagia lies about 18 kilometres west of Herakleion, on a coastal peninsula having low cliffs. There actually are two sites sharing the same name, both noticed by A.J. Evans in 1906.¹

Immediately on the coast he identified the remains of walls having well-squared blocks as house foundations, and reported sherds “to the earliest Minoan times”. This he considered the best existing remains of a Minoan port. On the northern side of the bay, A. Taramelli found some Graeco-Roman sherds and walls,² and here St. Alexiou and A. Kanta excavated a small area in 1971–1972. They found LM occupation underlying later levels.³ The MM III–LM IIIA and IIIC remains were limited to sporadic sherds but LM IIIB housing identified the period of greatest Minoan occupation, apparently destroyed by burning. A. Karetso later continued excavation in this area.⁴

In the hills southwest of his house foundations, Evans also reported the remains of an extensive cemetery of chamber tombs in the area of Kladisos immediately to the north.⁵ Although the cemetery itself has yet to be excavated, he dated the majority of the tombs to LM IIIB, and some earlier. He also acquired several clay vessels and pieces of jewellery found in “a tholos tomb” (actually a chamber tomb).⁶ Evans’ tomb pottery from this site as a whole is dated from LM IIIA (early) to IIIB, but all his acquisitions could not have been from a single tomb.⁷ It is not inconceivable that all the following came from the later, Post-Minoan occupation.

1. Scaraboid, AM AE 1238

‘Egyptian blue,’ L: 11.4; W: 7.8; H: 5.5; SH: 1.3 mm, very worn, chiefly on back near string-holes, with complete loss of surface coating.

Scaraboid with no preserved indication of markings on back. Legs indicated by horizontal line on sides and at back. Engraved lines filled with white substance. String-hole through length. *Face*: Indeterminate design, possibly a hiero-

glyphic inscription, the remaining design filled with the same white substance as the scarab details.

Egyptian, New Kingdom or East Mediterranean area, Iron Age, or later.⁸

Context: None.

Chronology: Egyptian, New Kingdom or later, or East Mediterranean area, Iron Age, without recorded context.

References: PHILLIPS 1991:II:366 #1, III:982 fig. 1; 1992b:499.

Comments: The use of ‘Egyptian blue’ for scarabs seems not to have begun before Dynasty XVIII, when mould-cast scarabs with a composition-core made their appearance, and is particularly characteristic of scarabs and small objects in Egyptian style in the 8–7th century East Mediterranean but not commonly found in Egypt.⁹ The scaraboid, together with the beads {2} below and several other seals and beads from this site, were presented to the AM by Evans.

The indeterminate possible face inscription does not correspond to any royal names, but *may* include the seated deity figure holding an *ankh* sign, e.g., C 2 (Ra), C 12 (Amun), or C 17 (Montu), in the combination of surviving long lines in the lower corner.

Not included in LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990 or CLINE 1994.

2. Beads, AM AE 1238

‘Egyptian blue,’ quantity: 7. (A) L: 8.8; D: 10.4; SH: 1.8 mm; (B) L: 8.2; D: 9.5; SH: 1.3 mm; (C) L: 8.0; D: 9.3; SH: 1.6 mm; (D) L: 8.6; D: 9.6; SH: 1.8 mm; (E) L: 7.8; D: 9.2; SH: 1.9 mm; (F) L: 7.6; D: 9.6; SH: 1.4 mm; (G) L: 8.4; D: 9.2; SH: 1.9 mm. Complete loss of surface coating and some differential wear and chipping, bead (A) recently broken and repaired.

Globular, with string-hole through length.

Egyptian, New Kingdom or East Mediterranean area, Iron Age, or later.

Context: None.

Chronology: Egyptian, New Kingdom or later, or East Mediterranean area, Iron Age beads, without recorded context.

Reference: PHILLIPS 1991:II:366 #2, III:982 fig. 2.

Comments: Although ‘Egyptian blue’ beads are known as early as Dynasty IV,¹⁰ their presence together with the scaraboid here suggests probable contemporaneity. Although not too much could be made of their material composition(s) without analyses, the visual similarity and identical condition of the beads and scaraboid {1} above suggest they could have been manufactured at a similar date.

The AM has catalogued and displayed the scaraboid and beads as a unit. The beads are visually uniform in colour but lighter than the scaraboid. They may have been restrung together with it by a Minoan artisan from two different imported

¹ EVANS *PM* I:299.

² TARAMELLI 1899:318. Presumably Taramelli and Evans refer to the same specific site location, although Evans does not specify its relationship to the bay.

³ ALEXIOU 1972a. This later occupation also had been noted by EVANS *PM* I:299 n. 2.

⁴ See CATLING 1986:86.

⁵ EVANS *PM* I:299. See also CATLING 1973:30.

⁶ See KANTA 1980:18.

⁷ A Proto-Geometric stirrup-vase identified as from Aghia Pelagia by BOARDMAN 1961:97 #433 would suggest the cemetery continued into the 10th c. BC. KANTA 1980:18 n. 1

notes that Boardman mistakenly placed the site in West Crete, but nonetheless this vessel may have come from this site as it was a gift of Evans. Despite Boardman (and PINI 1968:76), this vessel may have come from the occupation site. Evans is quite clear in his dating of LM IIIB and earlier for the cemetery, and could not have mistaken a PG vessel for one LM IIIB or earlier.

⁸ James Weinstein (letter of 06 April 1988) presumes this scaraboid to be Aegean in origin. If so, it is the only known Aegean scarab in ‘Egyptian blue.’

⁹ TUFNELL 1984:I:42; JAMES 1962:467–468.

¹⁰ LUCAS and HARRIS 1962:343.

pieces, if the modern stringing is based on any circumstantial evidence uncovered during their excavation although, given the recorded circumstances, this is unlikely. Such restrung combinations from several different dismantled jewellery pieces, including scarabs, is evidenced elsewhere.¹¹ Not included in LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990 or CLINE 1994.

3. Bead, AM AE 1200

Pale cloudy amethyst, H: 12.5; Dia: 13.3–13.6, SH: 2.2 mm, intact but worn.

Globular. String-hole through length.

Probably Minoan, LM IIIA–B.

Context: None. Likely LM IIIA–B, but possibly later.

Chronology: Probably LM IIIA–B bead, without context but probably in generally contemporary LM IIIA–B tomb context.

Comparanda: {65}; {505 (G)}.

Reference: PHILLIPS 1991:II:367 #3, III:982 fig. 3.

Comments: This is one bead in a re-strung arrangement of nine from Aghia Pelagia. The others consist of five carnelian, one rock crystal, one faience (or a blue stone) and one possibly agate bead. Only the amethyst bead might be considered Egyptian but, like those from Arvi {65} and Pyrgos (Khanli Kastelli) {505 (G)}, its origin is questionable. The AM catalogue entry has a question mark after the site name; Evans must have been unsure of its provenance here.

Not included in LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990 or CLINE 1994.

AGHIA TRIADHA

The site of Aghia Triadha is about 2.5 kilometres from Phaestos, in the middle of the western end of the Mesara plain. It lies on the western of three hills, with Phaestos on the eastern hill. Unlike Phaestos, however, the site is on the northern slope, not the flatter ground near the hilltop. The excavators of Phaestos first identified this site when they had surveyed the area surrounding the palace. Excavation began in 1902 under the direct supervision of F. Halbherr, but he soon was taken up with Phaestos and other pursuits and often left supervision to others. This lack of co-ordinated directorial planning, together with the practice (accepted at the time) of ‘pitting’ to gain an overall impression and ascertain a site’s potential, led to even less stratigraphic and recording control of the material found, as the pits were backfilled and later re-‘excavated’.

Later seasons, in 1903–1905 and 1910–1914, were

mainly the work of R. Paribeni, then a young student, and the draughtsman E. Stephani, whose work is a main source of present-day interpretation and conclusions regarding the site and its architectural history. They excavated both the villa (‘Villa Reale’) and much of the town, including a small portion of MM housing, the LM I villa and parts of the town to its north, the LM III stoa, the overlying town buildings, and the massive LM III ‘megaron’ overlying part of the villa. A few walls of later structures also were recognised.¹²

Final publication of the site is not yet completed. Halbherr was unable to put together a co-ordinated final report. L. Banti sank some trenches in 1939 but it was not until after the war that she was able to pull together the original excavation material and her own to publish an account. A second, posthumous, volume containing work by HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI (1977) helped to clarify other matters. In the meantime, Pre-Palatial housing was accidentally discovered in 1970 north-east of Tomb A, and excavated in 1973 and 1977.¹³ Shortly afterwards, in 1976–1977, an LM I pottery kiln was excavated east of the settlement.¹⁴

Recently, V. La Rosa began to excavate other parts of the site to clarify some of the numerous problems in the early excavation records. The earlier town, consisting of housing constructed throughout MM IB–LM I, was destroyed by fire together with the villa in LM IB. The stoa was built in LM IIIA2, together with the later town in an apparently unified plan following the deliberate destruction and leveling of the earlier houses. Although the overall plan suggests a strong unified power in LM IIIA2, the town declined throughout LM IIIB and there is little evidence for LM IIIC use.¹⁵

Immediately to the north-east, Paribeni also excavated a number of tombs, including two tholoi (A and B) and the LM IIIA2 (early) ‘Tomb of the Painted Sarcophagus’.¹⁶ Both tholoi date to mostly to EM I–MM I and thereafter gradually go out of use. Nonetheless, their use extends over a long period, although Tholos B appears to begin and end slightly later.

¹¹ PHILLIPS 1992b.

¹² HALBHERR 1903; PARIBENI and PIGORNI 1903:320–340; HALBHERR 1905; BANTI 1941–1943; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977.

¹³ LAVIOSA 1969–1970; 1972–1973.

¹⁴ LEVI 1976:318–319; LEVI and LAVIOSA 1979.

¹⁵ LA ROSA 1977; 1979. See also WARREN 1982:275; WATROUS 1984:123–134.

¹⁶ HALBHERR 1905:248–253; STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931: 147–216; PERNIER and BANTI 1947:28–38; LA ROSA 1984:117. Construction of the tomb containing the famous sarcophagus recently has been ascertained to have been in an early phase of LM IIIA2; see BLACKMAN 1998:111.

A. The ‘Villa Reale’

The Villa Reale itself lies uphill of the tholoi and also the town area, from which it is separated by a wide road called the ‘Rampa del Mare’. Halbherr and various designated supervisors in 1902–1905 and 1910–1914 excavated here, with some further work by Banti in 1939. There are basically two phases of occupation, the LM I villa destroyed by fire, and an LM III re-building and habitation that continued into LM IIIC. The first building was constructed at the end of MM IIIB or beginning of LM IA, and destroyed at the end of LM IB.¹⁷ It has no central court but rather is L-shaped in plan, with storerooms along the ‘wing’ at the south-west (usually considered a ‘service quarters’) and more formal rooms at the east end together with further storage rooms along this west-east line. Those at the north-west corner chiefly are open ‘pier-and-door’ partitioned spaces taking advantage of the magnificent view. There is a small court south-east of the building. It sometimes is called a ‘palace’ but more properly is a ‘villa,’ since it does not possess a central court common to true Minoan palaces. It often is called the ‘Villa Reale,’ or the ‘Royal Villa’.

A.1. North-west Quarter

One of the first areas to be excavated as a whole rather than by test pitting was the north-west quarter immediately west of the later ‘megaron’ building, under Halbherr in 1902.¹⁸ This area chiefly consists of open spaces and rooms, with much ‘pier-and-door’ partitioning and excellent architecture and construction that faced the sea. It has been interpreted as private quarters, and as a mixture of private and public quarters, and certainly is designed with aesthetics in mind. The rooms may have been a combination of bedrooms and dining area(s). Certain rooms are identified as a ‘court’ (4), ‘bedroom’ or ‘shrine’ (14), and ‘magazine’ (15), and date to the LM I period. These rooms, together with the rest of the villa, were destroyed by fire in LM IB.

Unfortunately, few finds can be assigned specifically to a single room from this season. The following were found in the 1902 season in this area, generally designated as Rooms 4, 11, 14, 15 and 51 and their immediate vicinity.

4. Alabastron (Type C), HM A 343

‘Grey-banded’ travertine(?), H: 20.1; Dia. (rim): 11.2; (max):

16.5 cm, restored from numerous joining fragments with entire profile preserved.

Baggy, flat-bottomed alabastron with slightly convex profile and wide flaring rim shaved at top.

Egyptian, SIP (–very early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period (–very early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, in somewhat later LM IB destruction context.

Comparanda: (material) {106}; {109}; {110}; {179?}; {269}.

References: HALBHERR 1903:62–63 #3, fig. 48; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:9 #9; KANTOR 1947:38; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I, P606; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:64 #3, fig. 34; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:193 #23, pl. 65:23; PHILLIPS 1991:II:380 #17, III:985 fig. 17; CLINE 1994:165 #259; LILYQUIST 1996:139, 158, pl. 2.2; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:202 #198.

Comments: The ‘grey-banded’ colouration may be the result of having been subjected to fire.

5. Jar (‘spheroid jar’), HM A 351

White limestone with dark blue/grey patches, H: 6.3; Dia. (rim): 8.8; (max): 12.2; (base): 5.4 cm, pitted and cracked, numerous chips on body and rim, partly burnt.

Spheroid jar with high shoulder, very low rim with flat raised base. Two concave horizontal flutes on shoulder and fluted rim. Two solid horizontal roll handles at mid-body.

Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB destruction context.

Comparanda: {16}; {74}.

References: WARREN 1969:74 Type 30:A, D219; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:66 #6; PHILLIPS 1991:II:380 #18, III:986 fig. 18; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:213 #212.β.

Comments: Karetsou *et al.* provide no limited context for this vessel within the villa.

6. Jar (‘spheroid jar’), HM A 352

Gabbro, H: 8.7; Dia. (rim): 9.1; (max): 11.3; (base): 5.2 cm, restored from numerous fragments with much of rim and part of upper shoulder missing, partly burnt.

Spheroid jar with high shoulder, thickened flat rim and high flat raised base. Two solid horizontal roll handles on shoulder. Interior horizontal grooves at upper shoulder level.

Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB destruction context.

References: HALBHERR 1903:62 #5, fig. 50; WARREN 1969:74 Type 30:A, P395, D220; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:66 #5; PHILLIPS 1991:II:380 #19, III:986 fig. 19; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:213 #212.γ.

Comments: Karetsou *et al.* provide no limited context for this vessel within the villa.

7. Jar (‘spheroid jar’), HM 1091

White limestone with blue/grey patches, H: 12.5; Dia. (rim, rest.): 12.3; (max): 15.8; (base): 7.5, restored from four joining

¹⁷ MILITELLO 2000:78.

¹⁸ HALBHERR 1903; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:63–120. See also WATROUS 1984:125.

fragments with much of upper body missing and much encrustation on exterior surface.

Spheroid jar with high shoulder, flat thickened rim and high flat raised base. Two concave grooves around upper circumference of upper rim. Two pairs of drill holes at shoulder level, with room for a third pair at restored area.

Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB destruction context.

Comparison: (rim grooves) {587}.

References: HALBHERR 1903:62 #4, fig. 49; WARREN 1969:74 Type 30:A, P397, D221; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:34 #4, fig. 35; PHILLIPS 1991:II:380–381 #20, III:987 fig. 20.

Comments: Karetsou *et al.* provide no limited context for this vessel within the villa.

The two or, most likely, three pair of drill holes indicate that this vessel would have had three handles. No corresponding holes are found at the rim area, suggesting the handles probably were not vertical.

A.1.1. Room 14

Room 14 within the north-west quarter, excavated by HALBHERR in 1903, is a small long (about 2.5 m.) room which is joined to its adjacent Rooms 13 and 52 and stairway to the north by ‘pier-and-door’ partitioning to the west and thin partition walls north and south. Some scholars have identified it as a bedroom, with 52 as a possible bathroom and 13 an improbable latrine as the area has no drainage system. The three together form a common Minoan grouping generally clustering around a so-called ‘Women’s Hall’.¹⁹ Most identify the room as a ‘shrine,’ due to the nature of the frescoes decorating its walls. Objects specifically ascribed to Room 14 include four clay alabaster, a pyxis and numerous LM I floral and marine style sherds, a marble chalice, bronze female votary figurine, pedestalled lamp, five lids and other vase fragments, and an ivory pyxis.

The walls of these rooms were decorated with lively landscape frescoes, a number of which were recovered but unfortunately badly burnt by the fire that destroyed the villa.²⁰ Although records are scanty and exact find spots problematic, it seems that all were on the two partition walls, i.e. the north and south walls of the room, although this is uncertain. It is now gen-

erally accepted that all walls, including the intervening east (or back) wall, were covered in a continuous frieze, an opinion supported by the quantity and scale of the remaining fragments and their reconstructed scene(s), and by frescoes found at other sites.

Fragments include the ‘Woman at Shrine,’ ‘Woman picking Crocuses,’ ‘Cat stalking Bird’ and the ‘Leaping Deer,’ in addition to smaller fragments of similar subject matter. Cameron has proposed a conjectural restoration of the entire composition, but this must be reduced in length by 1.5 m. at either end to accommodate the available space.²¹ This arrangement has the ‘Woman at Shrine’ at the end wall (below a wooden altar conjectured by burn-mark patterning on the preserved fresco), with the ‘Woman picking Crocuses’ along the north wall (left side) and the ‘Cat stalking Bird’ and ‘Leaping Deer’ on the south wall (right side) of the composition, each with their related additional fragments and figures.²²

8. Alabastron (Type C form), HM Π 2997

Clay, H (pres.): 20.5; (rest.): 21.0–21.4; Dia. (rim, rest.): 10.7; (max): 18.2; (base):14.3–14.5 cm, restored from numerous fragments with several lower and upper body fragments and virtually all rim missing.

Baggy, flat-bottomed alabastron with outturned rim, painted with dark wavy horizontal lines on body and solid painted rim. Slightly raised base and concave underfoot with rough surface underfoot.

Minoan, LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM IB vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB villa shrine destruction context.

Comparanda: {76}; {176A}; {453}.

References: PENDLEBURY 1939:202, pl. XXXIII:1; SCHIERING 1960:22, fig. 12:left; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:95 #7, fig. 61; PHILLIPS 1991:II:382 #21, III:988 fig. 21; LILYQUIST 1996:146, pl. 6.6.second from right; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:204 #201.

Comments: A fairly obvious direct imitation of the Egyptian Type C alabastron of Second Intermediate Period type normally made of travertine, both in its shape and the painted decoration that clearly imitates the veining of the stone.

9. Fresco fragments, HM T 4 (not handled)

Plaster and paint, H (main fragment group): 39.5 cm, badly burnt, several joins restored.

‘Nature’ scene of animals in a landscape, including a cat stalk-

¹⁹ HALBHERR 1903:55; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:91–95. See also WATROUS 1984:125; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:203; EVELY and JONES 1999:124–127.

²⁰ The published frescoes are gathered together in SMITH 1965:77–79, figs. 106–110; see now also MILLITELLO 2000.

²¹ EVELY and JONES 1999:124; they note the length of the room is 2.30 m., but Cameron’s composition results in a

room 3.80 m. long. A 1 m. reduction in length is not a problem for the north wall, but the three cats and two deer would be hard to fit into a smaller space than Cameron has provided. See also MILITELLO 2000.

²² Fragmentary scenes dating to LM IIIA and depicting similar figures and theme were found in a dump nearby; see IMMERWAHR 1990:101–102, 181 A.T. Nos. 3–5.

ing a bird of unidentifiable species. The cat has a long sinewy body, long tail raised in the air, a rounded face and pointed ears, dark pupil and solid-coloured fur. It is separated from the bird by several tendrils of ivy, and steps on a rocky landscape with flat ground plane below. A separate fragment of a leaping deer amidst similar foliage and ground plane likely is part of the same scene. Recently identified fragments of two more cats and another leaping deer also have been incorporated into conjectural restorations of the scene.

Minoan, end of LM IA/beginning of LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: End of LM IA/beginning of LM IB wall fresco, in slightly later LM IB villa shrine destruction context.

Comparison: {162}.

References: HALBHERR 1903:58, pl. 8; SMITH 1965:77–79, fig. 110; BUCHHOLZ and KARAGEORGHIS 1973:80 #1043, 331 #1043; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:91–92, fig. 58; SAKELLARAKIS 1978:121 Fig.:lower, 122; MORGAN 1988:43–44, 147, pl. 182; IMMERWAHR 1990:49–50, 54, 161, 165, 180 A.T. No. I.c, pls. 17; PHILLIPS 1991:II:382–383 #22, III:989 fig. 22; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:364, 393 #277; MILITELLO 1998:107–115, figs. 29–30, pls. 5–6, 8, G–H; EVELY and JONES 1999:241–243 #86; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:297–298 #292; MILITELLO 2000:79–80, figs. 1–3; MORGAN 2005a:27 fig. 1.9, pls. 2.3, 30.1.b.

Comments: Stephani's original reconstruction had an arrangement allowing for two cats, the bird and a single deer in an elongated composition, but both Cameron and Militello have reconstructed it to cover the wall to the ceiling. From its position when found, reportedly still partly in position against the north mud-brick partition together with the 'Sitting Lady' or 'Woman with Crocuses' fresco, this fresco was thought to have decorated the north wall at its eastern corner, part of a larger composition involving the other fragmentary scenes. This positioning is at odds with Cameron's restoration of the composition,²³ and the true arrangement probably will not be agreed upon, although Militello's more recent reconstruction now allows for the space available, at 2.3 by 1.5 m.²⁴ The partitions themselves were part of the room's modification, suggesting that the frescoes are later rather than earlier decoration, and the dating quoted above follows that of Militello.

The apparently monochrome coat of the cat suggests it is a *Felis chaus*, a species inhabiting the type of landscape depicted in the fresco, and stands in contrast to other coloured depictions of the cat.

A.1.2. 'Court' II Area

'Court' II is a large open area excavated in 1902, at least half of which is lost by erosion down the scarp.²⁵

The remaining portion consists chiefly of an open portico, with three pillar bases and the hole of a fourth near the south-east corner. A pier-and-door partition

to the south divides it from Room 3, the western hall of the 'main suite,' while to the east a wall distinguishes it from Room 13, the improbable 'latrine' better described as an outer hall to the 'Woman's Hall' cited above and called the '*stanza dei sigilli*' from the more than 450 sealings recovered here (together with many fresco fragments, stone and clay vases, part of a bronze figure and an alabaster boat model), probably fallen from the upper storey.²⁶ Like the others, it is slab-paved, at least around the perimeter.

Halbherr found 179 nodules and at least 15 Linear 'A' tablets in the Court II area, mostly recovered in sieving the fill. Also recovered were many clay sherds, several vases, four fragmentary pithoi, three rock crystal discs, fresco fragments and several stone vessels, including a limestone rhyton, a conical rhyton, chalice, marble alabstron and the 'Boxer Rhyton,' either from the paving or in the fill above it. It is assumed that the nodules and tablets all came from the upper storey, almost certainly an archives of some sort.²⁷

The 1903 excavations included Room 54, east of the portico and separated from Room 14 to its south only by a staircase. It is a light well, called the 'Room of the Graffiti' from the inscriptions on its walls. Immediately north of this room is Room 55, with a small built-in gypsum chest off the short passage between the two rooms.²⁸ Another 250–300 further clay nodules were found in this chest, which is assumed to have held documents of some kind. Apart from those published by HALBHERR in 1903, which must have come from the portico, the nodule groups cannot be separated in the excavation records.²⁹

10. Nodule with seal impression, HM Σ-T 577

Clay, nodule: L: 19.8; W: 16.3; H: 14.9; seal impression: H: 13.0; W: 14.0 mm, virtually entire impression preserved in one example.

Pyramidal recumbant flat-based nodule ('*Päckchenplombe*') with twisted string and rectangular knob impression on back, and impression from a lentoid (hard stone?) seal showing two apes with bulbous eyes and jaws facing centre and each other, standing on hind legs with forepaws held just above an incurved altar placed between them. Tails curving upright behind.

Minoan, LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM IB object, in generally contemporary LM IB villa archival destruction context.

Comparison: {447}.

²³ See EVELY and JONES 1999:241 for discussion of this point.

²⁴ Cameron's full composition has been entirely revised, as well as those of the other two walls.

²⁵ PARIBENI and PIGORNI 1903:330; HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:82–85; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:203.

²⁶ See DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:203.

²⁷ See WATROUS 1984:125–126, 128.

²⁸ HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:98–103, figs. 67–68; see also WATROUS 1984:126, 128.

²⁹ See POPE 1960:200–201; WATROUS 1984:126, 128; *CMS* II.6.

References: LEVI 1925–1926:99 #49, fig. 70; EVANS *PM* IV.2:611, fig. 599:c; HOOD 1978:223 fig. 224:B; YOUNGER 1983:122; MARINATOS 1987a:129, fig. 7:1; PHILLIPS 1991:II:384 #23, III:990 fig. 23; HALLAGER 1996:II:220; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:365, 401 #448; *CMS* II.6 #74, 429 #HMs 577; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:176 #161.

Comments: Identified by KARETSOU *et al.* (2000) as from the Room 11 nodule group.

The impression is very faint and, quite unusually, is in sunk relief, indicating that the seal from which it was made had the figures in raised relief. The apes originally were identified by Levi as lions and still were cited as such by Hood. Younger placed this amongst the products of the “bulbous-nose master” within the “line-jawed lions” stylistic group, which he dates to within LM I; they are, however, now considered apes rather than lions. The slight hunchback and rounded muzzle suggest the *Cynocephalus* baboon but the thin profile of the bodies suggests the *Cercopithecus* monkey; this combination also is found in another seal impression from Phaestos of MM II date.

No seal impression code was assigned by HALLAGER (1996).

11. Nodule with seal impression, HMs 478/1-20 (HT Wa 1927–1946) (not handled)

Clay, H: 11.5–2.0 mm, seal impression fully preserved in 20 examples.

Single-hole dome/pendant hanging nodule (*Schnurendplombe*) with 20 seal impressions from the same lentoid seal, showing a squatting ape facing right, with both arms raised in front of face and tail curling upright and away behind. Elongated pointed snout. Legs proportionately short. Vertical line down body, and back half striated diagonally. Two lines along upper leg. Possible indication of two pendant breasts. Four floating filler designs of three-, four and five-leafed plants behind and in front of ape figure.

Minoan, LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM IB object, in generally contemporary LM IB villa archival destruction context.

Comparanda: {561}; (breasts?) {19}.

References: HALBHERR 1903:39 #27, fig. 32;³⁰ LEVI 1925–1926:119 #106, fig. 122, pl. XIV:106; EVANS *PM* I:683 n. 2; II.2:764, fig. 492:b; MATZ 1928:116 n. 5; McDERMOTT 1938:324 #604; POPE 1960:207; MARINATOS 1987a:fig. 6; PHILLIPS 1991:II:38384–385 #24, III:990 fig. 24; HALLAGER 1996:I:192 fig. 71.HT 106, II:279; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:365, 401 #445; *CMS* II.6 #73, 424 #HMs 478.

Comments: This is an unusually elaborated figure. The possible pendant breasts may indicate that this *Cercopithecus* is female, and so is similar to the calcite pot {19}, also found at Aghia Triadha.

12. Nodulus with seal impression, HM Σ-T 1347 (HT We 1021) (not handled)

Clay, nodulus: L: 30.3; W: 13.8; H: 18.4; seal impression: H: 27; W: 13 mm, entire seal impression preserved in one example.

Dome nodulus with disc-type Linear A inscriptions on two faces, including the fraction $3/4$ ³¹ and, on third face, impres-

sion from a ring, showing a standing Minoan ‘genius’ facing right, one elbow drawn back and the other arm wrapped around a comparatively small lion (skin?) held to its breast. ‘Genius’ has tactile dorsal appendage from ears to knees with undulating edges, leonine legs and face, and thin waist.

Minoan, LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM IB object, in generally contemporary LM IB villa archival destruction context.

References: LEVI 1925–1926:119–120 #107, fig. 123, pl. VIII:107; GILL 1964:20 #40, pl. 6:I; KAISER 1976:pl. 7:6; POPE 1960:202, 210, fig. 3:1347; PHILLIPS 1991:II:385 #25, III:990 fig. 25; REHAK 1995:219; HALLAGER 1996:II:195; *CMS* II.6 #98, 402 #HMpin 1347; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:158 #135.

Comments: Identified by KARETSOU *et al.* (2000) as from the Room 11 nodule group.

A.1.3. Magazine 15

The ‘magazine’ Room 15, excavated in 1903 at the eastern end of the north-west quarter, is a large rectangular (5.33 by 3.74 m.) room with two square pillar bases identified by Watrous as a pantry and Driessen and MacDonald as “originally a fine pillar hall,”³² and separated from the rest by a landing for the stairs immediately to the south. The floor is of slab-limestone, as are the pillar bases. A door in the north-west corner leading to the stair-landing is the only entrance. The room apparently was ‘packed’ with pottery, the majority of which is suggested to have come from an upper storey. Vessels include pedestal lamps, bridge-spouted jars, lids, jars, jugs and juglets, oval-mouth and other amphorae, and conical cups. Many are decorated utilitarian vessels. Two bronze vessels, one inside the other, and some small objects of bronze also are reported, as well as carbonised wood fragments. Many sherds were found on the floor. Apparently all but one LM IB fragmentary jug are of LM IA date.

13. Amphora, HM 2976

Rough clay, H (rest.): 40.4; Dia. (rim, rest.): 9.9; (max): 14.8; (base): 10.9 cm, restored from numerous fragments, with majority of rim missing.

Amphora with high pedestal base, tall tapering body and elongated neck with flaring everted rim. Two horizontal coil loop handles on shoulder, thick raised ridge at neck/shoulder and body/base junctions, horizontal groove at top of base. Hollow stem and base. Undecorated.

Separate small flat lid with handle (not found in HM).

Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB villa storage destruction context.

³⁰ Identified as a monster or animal.

³¹ See POPE 1960:210.

³² HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:110–118; WATROUS 1984:126; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:202.

Comparison: {445}.

References: HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:117–118 #13; LA ROSA 1984:169 fig. 241:top left; PHILLIPS 1991:II:386 #26, III:991 fig. 26; CUCUZZA 2000:101 #6.

Comments: Marked in pencil on side ‘21 III 1945’. Found together with {14} below. Stefani illustrates the lid in a 1912 notebook, reproduced by La Rosa (1984). Cucuzza notes that other lids with central handle were recovered with {14} and one from Phaestos {446}.

14. ‘Amphora,’ HM Π 2977

Rough clay, H: 40.5; Dia. (rim): 9.8; (max): 15.5; (base): 10.5 cm, part of rim and base missing and restored.

‘Amphora’ with high pedestal base, tall tapering body and elongated neck with flaring everted rim. Two horizontal coil loop handles on shoulder, thick raised ridge at neck/shoulder and body/base junctions, horizontal groove at top of base. Hollow profile throughout. Undecorated.

Separate small flat lid with handle (not found in HM).

Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB villa storage destruction context.

Comparanda: {15}; {173}; {446}.

References: HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:117–118 #13, fig. 83; PHILLIPS 1991:II:386 #27, III:992 fig. 27; CUCUZZA 2000:101 #7; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:231 #227.β.

Comments: Useless as a storage vessel due to its hollow profile. Its connection to amphora {13} above is confirmed both by their mutual context and exterior similarity. Their combined function is difficult to understand, especially as the diameter of the basal ‘hole’ of this ‘amphora’ is far too large to accept it as a rhyton. Cucuzza notes that a lid with central handle was recovered with this amphora, and others with {13} and one from Phaestos {446}.

A.2. Room 69

North of the north-west quarter, the excavators uncovered a massive LM III megaron structure which obscured their excavation of the villa area below. One of these rooms was Magazine 69, entered from the ‘Magazine’ 68 to the north, Corridor 71 to the east and a door south to Room 70. Some 2.1 by 3.1 m. in size, it boasted a slab-paved gesso floor and held two small clay pithoi and three amphorae of different types, two steatite lamps and a large stone pithos, bronze dagger and fragments of gold foil.³³

15. ‘Amphora,’ HM Π 5894

Rough clay, H (pres.): 29.6; (rest.): 38.9; Dia. (max): 13.5; (base): 9.7 cm, all rim, majority of neck and base, and both handles (except stubs) missing, remainder preserved in three joining fragments.

‘Amphora’ with high pedestal base, tall tapering body, two horizontal coil loop handles on shoulder. Thick raised ridge at

body/base junction, deep horizontal groove at top of base and (restored) horizontal ridge at (mid-)neck. Hollow profile throughout. Ring of vertical red-painted lines around bottom of stem and one horizontal band immediately below basal ridge.

Minoan, LM I, possibly LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB villa storage? destruction context.

Comparanda: As above, {14}.

References: HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:117, 167 #4; PHILLIPS 1991:II:387 #28, III:993 fig. 28; CUCUZZA 2000:101 #8; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:230 #227.α.

Comments: As ‘amphora’ {14} above, this vessel is useless as a storage vessel due to its hollow profile. No companion vessel is recorded.

A.3. Villa, No Find Context

Also from the villa excavations but without specific context known to me are the following.

16. Jar (‘spheroid jar’), HM Λ350

Gabbro, H: 8.4–8.6; Dia. (rim): 10.5; (max): 14.2; (base): 6.4 cm, restored from numerous fragments with some rim and body fragments missing.

Spheroid jar with high shoulder, high flat thickened rim and high flat raised base. Concave thick and thin horizontal flutes on shoulder, with two solid horizontal roll handles below. Radiating grooves atop flat rim, and vertical ribbing on roll handles.

Minoan, LM I.

Context: Probably LM IB, possibly later.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB villa destruction context, or somewhat earlier vessel as part of later fill or use.

Comparanda: {5}; {74}.

References: WARREN 1969:74 Type 30:A, P394, D218; PHILLIPS 1991:II:388 #29, III:994 fig. 29; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:212–213 #212.α.

17. Jar (‘spheroid jar’), HM Λ 353

Basalt?, grey/brown stone with find grains having tiny chrysochlorite particles,³⁴ H: 7.9–8.3; Dia. (rim): 9.0; (max): 11.2; (base): 5.2 cm, intact.

Spheroid jar with high shoulder, thickened flat rim and high flat raised base. Two concave horizontal flutes on shoulder, with thin horizontal groove below. Two solid horizontal roll handles on shoulder with vertical ribbing. Radiating grooves atop flat rim.

Minoan, LM I.

Context: Probably LM IB, possibly later.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB villa destruction context, or in somewhat later fill or use.

References: WARREN 1969:74 Type 30:A, P396; PHILLIPS 1991:II:388 #30, III:995 fig. 30; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:214 #212.δ.

³³ HALBHERR, STEFANI and BANTI 1977:166–167; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:204.

³⁴ WARREN 1969:74.

B. ‘Tomba degli ori’ (‘Shrine’) near Tholoi

On the hill slope west of the town ‘Stoa’ and about 27 m. south of the Tholos B annexe, on the other side of the ‘Tomb of the Painted Sarcophagus,’ Paribeni found in 1903 some rooms built into the hillside that he thought was a tomb, and called ‘Tomb 5’ or the ‘Tombi degli Ori’ from the large quantity of gold finds recovered there. The rooms later were interpreted as a shrine area.³⁵ V. La Rosa re-cleared Paribeni’s rooms and excavated the immediate area in the late 1980s, uncovering an extensive building programme that includes the structure originally exposed. This has transformed interpretation of the earlier excavation and its material, but it seems better to describe this material as initially reported, before incorporating it within the interpretations stemming from the recent excavations, as most references to the objects and their context(s) were able only to use the early reports.

B.1. Paribeni Excavations

Only the north-south walls of the rooms and the southern end-wall survived; the northern wall is lost. Four rooms over a 15.4 m. length were excavated in 1903, of which the most western contained two squared pillars in its 4.75 m. length. The two middle rooms were long and thin, considered a U-shaped staircase or possibly storerooms,³⁶ and the easternmost (‘Room A,’ suggested by Soles to be an entrance portico) was almost as wide as the ‘Pillar Crypt’. Nothing was found in the two ‘staircase’ rooms in between.

The lower fill above the floor was devoid of finds. The objects found all came from the upper fill of the

Pillar Crypt and ‘Room A’ in an unstratified mixed context. These must have fallen from an upper storey, presumably above the ‘Pillar Crypt,’ spilling into the ‘Crypt’ and ‘Room A’ but not the other two rooms when the upper floor collapsed. ‘Room A’ contained a clay zoomorphic bird vase, gold-plated earring, bronze mirror and worn stone bowl in the fill 0.3–0.5 m. above the floor, while at a higher level, 1.15 m. above the floor, were an imported Hittite serpentine sphinx and part of a bronze bull figurine, two daggers and a hair ring, part of a clay ‘goddess’ figure and two pillar figurines. The last are part of the ‘girl-on-a-swing’ figurine mentioned below, and indicate cross-joining with the ‘Pillar Crypt’ material. Fragmentary skeletal material was recovered above the 1.15 m. level from the floor, separate from and above the artefacts

The ‘Pillar Crypt’ was sterile for the lowest half metre. Above and scattered throughout the next (and top) 1.5 m. of fill were at least five skeletons concentrated in the southeast corner together with the other finds, but mostly at 0.6–0.7 m. above the floor. An unpainted conical cup was found with one skull. The other finds include animal bones, a gold heart-shaped amulet and two earrings, seven clay ‘goddess’ figures, a breccia hammer and faience conch shell fragments,³⁷ fragments of a pedestal jar and urn, the ‘girl-on-a-swing’ figurine and fragments of a zoomorphic pot in the form of an ape. The next 20 cm., still part of this deposit, were five zoomorphic gold pendants and a ring, another ‘goddess’ figurine, a macehead, four bronze daggers, the ‘Queen Ty’ ovoid, handleless clay cups and the head of the ape-shaped pot.

Thus, the deposition would be as follows:

Fill height	Pillar Crypt/Room 1 (west)	2	3	Room A/Room 4 (east)
2.0 1.15	Some of below			Skeletal material
1.15	Some of below			Hittite sphinx, bronze bull figurine, 2 daggers, gold hair ring, 2 pillars (for ‘girl-on-a-swing’ figurine), part of clay goddess
0.9–1.14	Some of below			

³⁵ PARIBENI and FIGORNI 1903:348–351; PARIBENI 1904:719–756; BANTI 1941–1943:23–26. See also LONG 1959:61–63; SOLES 1973:259–269; GESELL 1985:75 #16; SOLES 1992:120–125.

³⁶ Most scholars accepted a stairway, but SOLES (1973:261 and 1992:121 n 8) noted the presence of the inner western wall face not seen on the early published plan and suggested they may have been storerooms instead. However, both were devoid of finds. See now also B.2 and La Rosa’s interpretations below.

³⁷ This is both Minoan and, as noted by LA ROSA 2000:89, of faience, although his comparanda from Kalyvia are imported glass vessels {89; 92} rather than faience shells. PARABENI 1904:745 #8 had called the shell vessel “pasta vitrea.” Other faience vases in shell form were recovered in LM I contexts at Myrtos Pyrgos and Kato Zakro; see, e.g., KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:97 #69–70.

Fill height	Pillar Crypt/Room 1 (west)	2	3	Room A/Room 4 (east)
0.9	5 zoomorphic gold pendants & ring, goddess figurine, stone macehead, 4 bronze daggers, Queen Ty ovoid, head of ape pot, handleless clay cups			
0.7				
0.7	Most of 5 skeletons in SE corner, with unpainted conical cup near skull; Concentration of animal bones, gold heart amulet & 2 earrings, 7 clay goddess & 'girl-on-a-swing' figurines, fragments of pedestal jar & urn, breccia hammer, faience conch shell, ape pot body fragments			
0.6				
0.5–0.6	Some of above			
0.5 0.3	sterile			Clay bird vase, gold-plated earring, bronze mirror, worn stone bowl
0.3 0.0 floor	sterile			

The pottery was dated to EM II and MM III/LM I, but little was diagnostic and later features dated deposition as a whole to LM IIIA.³⁸ The clay bird jar and fragments of a 'dark bucchero' vase were dated to EM IIA, the daggers to EM II and the diadems and a gold-plated pendant possibly also EM II, a tall cylindrical jar and pedestaled vase to MM III, the 'girl-on-a-swing,' and another female figurine with barbotine decoration to the end of LM I(B), the Hittite sphinx and breccia hammer and the remaining jewellery (including pendants in the form of a bull's head and a lion) to MM III/LM I, and the female figurines ('goddesses') with hollow cylindrical base and the ovoid seal to LM IIIA. Soles noted that the architecture is too advanced for an EM construction date for the structure, and implied instead a Neo-Palatial date with the EM II finds being intrusive. See also La Rosa's interpretation below.

18. Ovoid, HM Σ-K 340

Glazed 'white piece,'³⁹ L: 14.5; W: 14.8; H: 5.4; SH: 1.8 mm, intact but chipped on back to reveal core.

Ovoid. Circular shape, gable-shaped in section. String-hole through length. *Face*: Egyptian hieroglyphs, *hmt-nsw Ty*, 'The king's wife, Ty,' the name and title of Queen Ty, wife of Amenhotep III. Line border. Deeply cut, with feathering on the 'Ty' signs.

Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII, reign of Amenhotep III.

Context: Deposition beginning of LM IIIA2.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XVIII (reign of Amonhotep III) ovoid, in nearly contemporary or slightly later debris deposition at beginning of LM IIIA2.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1890:pl. X:75:right; 1917:pl. XXXV:153:right, 159, 163, LXXI:Z.92; SLIWA 1989:35 #4, pl.I:4.

References: PARIBENI 1904:733–735 #16, fig. 33; PORTER and MOSS 1927–1951:VII:405; PENDLEBURY 1930b:9 #10, pl. I:10; BANTI 1941–1943:24; KANTOR 1947:38; NILSSON 1950:300; LONG 1959:62; SMITH 1965:90; POPHAM 1970:227; SOLES 1973:267; HANKEY and WARREN 1974:144; BETANCOURT and WEINSTEIN 1976:339; POMERANCE 1978:27; HELCK 1979:95; KANTA 1980:316; GESELL 1985:75; *CMS* II.3:#116; CLINE 1987:12, 25 fig. 12; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:148; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:191–192 #19, pl. 57:19; PHILLIPS 1991:II:377 #15, III:983 fig. 15; CLINE 1991:38; 1994:149 #142; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:443; LA ROSA 2000;⁴⁰ KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:326 #340; PHILLIPS 2005b:457, 459 n. 20.

Comments: The reign of Amenhotep III generally is equated with LM IIIA1.⁴¹ It is highly unlikely that Ty's name would be used on a scarab seal after the reign of her husband or (at most) that of her son, as she was a commoner. Thus an LM IIIA2 (early) date could be contemporary.

19. Pot, HM Λ 110

Creamy white to pale orange translucent calcite, H: 9.2; Dia. (rim): 2.5; (base): 3.9 × 4.2 cm, restored from four joining fragments with lower left of face and majority of left leg and base missing, battered. Lid lost.

Zoomorphic pot in the form of a female ape seated on a short shield-shaped base, with pendant flat breasts and hands on abdomen. Head, ears, eyes and body carved, pupils drilled. Long hair down back, fingers, hands and eye incised. No articulated rim. Large 'cup-hole' at the top of the head. Tail (if originally indicated) probably would have curled to the right and rest on the base, but the relevant area is lost.

Probably Levantine, LB I–II, just possibly Egyptian, Middle Kingdom–Dynasty XVIII.

Context: Mixed EM II, MM III–LM I, beginning of LM IIIA2.

³⁸ Previously dated variously to LM I–II (PENDLEBURY 1930b:8–9) and MM III–LM IA (PLATON 1954:455). The dating of this area has been a matter of controversy for many years but now is generally accepted as LM IIIA, despite the earlier material. See now also B.2 and La Rosa's interpretations below.

³⁹ Ingo Pini (personal communication, 09 February 1989). Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 15 August 2000) considers ivory "doubtful."

⁴⁰ He calls this a "circular stamp seal."

⁴¹ See {262}.

Chronology: LBA I–II (or Middle Kingdom–Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, in generally contemporary to later MM III–LM I or beginning of LM IIIA2 debris.

Comparanda: HAYES 1953–1959:I:fig. 157:lower left; TERRACE 1966:60 Type A:II, pl. XX; VALLOGGIA 1980:pls. XVII–XVIII; SPARKS 1998:II:119, 238 fig. 36.11, 242–242, III:154 #1168, 1170.

References: PARIBENI 1904:727–728, fig. 25;⁴² WARREN 1969:104 Type 42:C, P587; SOLES 1973:264; SAKELLARAKIS 1976:178–179; GESELL 1985:75; PHILLIPS 1991:II:377–378 #16, III:984 fig. 16; CLINE 1991:38; 1994:217 #743, pl. 6.21; LA ROSA 2000:89;⁴³ KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:253 #251.

Comments: It represents a *Cercopithecus*. Warren does not include this piece as an import; however, its resemblance to Egyptian vessels and lack of parallels on Crete suggest it *may* have been either ‘egyptianising’ Levantine or Egyptian. Even if not, the inspiration ultimately must have come from Egypt. The calcite material in which it was made suggests it is probably not Egyptian, but made in an ‘egyptianising’ style possibly in the Levant or even on Crete itself; comparative Levantine kohl pots are known. It probably is an unfinished kohl pot with an extremely shallow (possibly unfinished) ‘cup-hole’. The flat diagonal rim appears ‘shaved’ to accommodate a (lost) lid, as were several vessels of Dynasty VI⁴⁴ and XII–XIII date; the Levantine parallels are not ‘shaved’. This piece is of comparative scale to the Levantine pots, whilst the AM parallel (a seated figure vessel, hollow throughout) and MMA kohl pot illustrated by Hayes also are of similar pose and scale. The wide-ranging dates of material found within this context is no help, but this figure has little resemblance and no connection to the corpus of much larger Egyptian vessels dated to Dynasty VI.⁴⁵ The date ranges cited reflect those of other known vessels similar to this form both in the Levant and in Egypt.

20. Amphora or ‘amphora.’ HM — (not located)

Clay, with many inclusions, no dimensions given, base damaged and both handles missing, otherwise intact.

Amphora or ‘amphora’ with cylindrical neck and wide flat rim, tall tapering body, two horizontal coil loop handles on shoulder, high pedestal base. Ring of vertical red-painted lines around base. Presumably thick raised ridge at body/base junction, deep horizontal groove at top of base.

Minoan, LM I, probably LM IB.

Context: Unstated, but probably LM IB.

Chronology: LM I(B?) vessel, in unstated but probably LM IB context.

Comparanda: {13}; {445}.

References: PARIBENI 1904:744, #5; CUCUZZA 2000:101 #9; LA ROSA 2000:88.

Comments: Paribeni compares this vessel with another that he had excavated earlier at Phaestos {445}, suggesting that the Aghia Triadha vessel also is not hollow throughout, so it may have been a pseudo-amphora instead. Its context date is presumed by analogy with the two recovered by La Rosa {21; 22} below. I was unable to ascertain whether its profile is hollow throughout.

B.2. La Rosa Excavations

La Rosa’s excavation has extended and cleared around this area, and has confirmed that the ‘Tomba degli Ori’ is not an early ‘house tomb’ as previously thought, but was both constructed and destroyed in LM IB.⁴⁶ Following the room sequence from west to east, the ‘Pillar Crypt’ (now Room 1) is still accepted as such, Room 2 remains a longitudinal space and possibly a staircase, Room 3 extended and widened farther downhill to become a square space of which a little of the northern wall was exposed; all three were linked by a small east-west corridor that Paribeni did not find. Room 4 (‘Room A’ at Paribeni’s eastern end) was discovered to be a long rectangular room aligned east-west, and a fifth room to the building was exposed, downhill of Room 4 and east of square Room 3, of which only the southern and western walls were found. A stone staircase was exposed immediately south of Room 4, that linked the building to a second and contemporary structure of religious function exposed in 1989, the ‘Complesso della mazza di Brecchia’. Both structures bordered a paved court. Earlier material, including the bones, was mixed together with the building’s destruction layer. Further material also was dumped after the building had gone out of use, at the beginning of LM IIIA2 according to La Rosa. He also identified several earlier LM I walls below and immediately north of the ‘Complesso,’ and an MM III wall and MM IIB structure below it. A scrap wall of LM IIIA2 also was exposed.⁴⁷

Material from Paribeni’s structure was restudied by LA ROSA (2000), and assigned the following dates. Their deposition is confusing but, other than the small amount of EM material, he attributes⁴⁸ a num-

⁴² Head only, identified as a pommel. The rest of the body was recognised and attached later.

⁴³ He seems not to have realised that the head fragment recovered high up in the fill with the Queen Ty ovoid later was found to join the body fragments from the deposit group of material in the level below.

⁴⁴ See METROPOLITAN MUSEUM 1999:446–446 #178.

⁴⁵ See FISCHER 1993; add SCHOSKE 1990:92–93 #49–50 to his corpus. Fischer’s #15 was recovered at Mycenae (NMA 6250/2657), citing only the latter number, and is on display. The

most complete but very much restored publication of this vessel is LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:pl. 74.434 and, for a description, CLINE 1991:38. The Valloggia comparison is tenuous.

⁴⁶ See LA ROSA 2000:86–90 for his reinterpretation of the structure’s history, from which this section of the main text is extracted.

⁴⁷ See LA ROSA 1992–1993:pl. I for a detailed phase plan of the excavation.

⁴⁸ If I have interpreted his 2000 text accurately.

ber of bronze weapons (spearhead [earlier called a dagger], three daggers and a knife), grey granite macehead, numerous conical cups, a perforated vessel, two amphorae, a barbotine vessel with clay figures, other clay figures including those with bell-shaped skirts and the ‘girl on a swing,’ gold pendant with animals in relief and a pair of repoussé lions, and perhaps also the Hittite sphinx, to the LM I phase building, and suggests the material came from its upper storey.

Material he attributes to the later, post-destruction material deposited at the beginning of LM IIIA2 are the Queen Ty ovoid, a Babylonian cylinder seal, mirror, the faience shell vessel, and the head of the zoomorphic ape pot, as well as an LM IIIA deposition of the LM I figurines, and possibly also the Hittite sphinx. Other objects were not specifically discussed. The following were recovered in La Rosa’s excavations.

21. Amphora, ATR 89 1643 (not seen)

Clay, H: 47.4 cm; restored from fragments, virtually complete except majority of one handle.

Amphora with high pedestal base, tall tapering body and flaring everted rim. Two horizontal coil loop handles on shoulder. Thick raised ridge at body/base junction, deep horizontal groove at top of base and small raised horizontal ridge at shoulder/neck join. Apparently undecorated.

Minoan, LM I, probably LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I(B?) vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB destruction layer.

Comparanda: {13}; {445}.

References: LA ROSA 1991–1993:fig. 16;β; 1993–1994:125, 127 fig 4; CUCUZZA 2000:101 #10, 104; LA ROSA 2000a:35, 36 fig. 3.

Comments: Recovered on the LM IB pavement (level 6) in the recently (1989) exposed Room 5 of the ‘Tomba degli Ori,’ together with {22} below. Not hollow throughout.

22. Amphora or ‘amphora,’ ATR 89 1644 (not seen)

Clay, H: c. 30 cm, condition and preservation not given.

Amphora or ‘amphora’ with high pedestal base, tall tapering body, two horizontal coil loop handles on shoulder. Thick raised ridge at body/base junction. Apparently undecorated.

Minoan, LM I, probably LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I(B?) vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB destruction layer.

Comparanda: {13}; {445}; (hollow profile) {14}; {15}; {446}.

References: CUCUZZA 2000:101 #11, 104; LA ROSA 2000:88.

Comments: This vessel is unpublished, but the description here is based on its stated similarity to {21}, with which it was

found on the LM IB pavement (level 6) in the recently (1989) exposed Room 5 of the ‘Tomba degli Ori.’ Cucuzza notes at one point (p. 101) that this vessel is hollow throughout, but elsewhere (p. 104) that it is not. If the former, then this vessel, as ‘amphora’ {14} above, would be useless as a storage vessel due to its hollow profile throughout and would fit the pattern of {13; 14} above and {445; 446} at Phaestos in pairing a ‘useful’ and ‘useless’ (hollow) amphora. Nonetheless, the two found in Room 5 clearly are not a pair, due to their substantial difference in height.

C. Tholos Tomb A

Tholos A, the larger of the two with a diameter of about nine metres, was discovered and excavated by Halbherr in 1903/1904.⁴⁹ Built into sloping rocky ground north and downhill of the excavated town area, about half of the tholos chamber is preserved to a maximum height of 1.55 m. with a rock floor. The architecture was well planned, with carefully chosen facing stones. The eastern entrance was a complex of small annexes, basically arranged three either side of a central corridor, and another at the front end. They apparently are later additions to the tholos.

Halbherr estimated that the annexes contained some 50 more burials. Most were devoid of finds, but others were filled with material. Most of the conical cups were concentrated in large groups only within Room L, nearest the entrance to the south but, unlike similar concentrations elsewhere, were not found upside-down.⁵⁰ The annexe contents date mainly to EM II–MM I, but Walberg reports later material (her phases 2 and possibly 3 into MM II at least, possibly MM IIIA) in some quantity.⁵¹ Some 50 stone vessels and as many clay vases were recorded from the latest antechambers. Additionally, more than a hundred seal stones, a sizable collection of gold jewellery including ‘heart-shaped’ pendants and a fragmentary diadem, two large flat perforated stones, some small figurines with featureless bodies and rounded heads and bases, and zoomorphic and anthropomorphic clay vessels were found.

C.1. Tholos chamber

The tholos itself contained an estimated 200 individuals, according to Halbherr. The skulls had been swept aside in groups of three to six in order to accommodate later interments. A dozen skulls were found on the floor itself. Specifically from the tomb

⁴⁹ STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:147–216.

⁵⁰ STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:160 fig.40. See also BRANIGAN 1970a:100, pl. 12.

⁵¹ WALBERG 1983:92; for correlation of her phases with ‘Evans’ system,’ see p. 2.

chamber were some 50 dagger blades, recorded according to their position. Three-quarters of them pointed to the west, suggesting a general body position with head facing east. One burial was found articulated in a contracted position. Some bronzes, stone vessels and a few animal bones and shells of edible marine molluscs were found in the chamber, together with much pottery dating to EM II–MM IA, and a pithoid jar fragment and jug dated by Walberg to her ‘phase 3’ (Classical Kamares MM IIA–IIIA),⁵² indicating some later reuse of the chamber.

The following are recorded from the burial chamber itself.

23. Pyxis, HM A 666

Anorthosite gneiss(?), chiefly white with black veins, H: 4.4; Dia. (rim): 5.7; (max): 6.4; (base): 6.1 cm; rim chipped, restored from four joining fragments, but lid lacking.

Low cylindrical pyxis with flat base, vertical body and ledge rim with upright above to support missing lid.

Egyptian, Dynasty VI or earlier.

Context: EM II–MM IA, MM IIA–IIIA?

Chronology: Dynasty VI or earlier vessel, deposited in tomb context not earlier than late EM IIB, but more likely EM III–MM IA.

Comparanda: CM 18419; see also EL-KHOULI 1978:pl. 37:804–806, 40:976–977, 43:1062, 45:1118–1119.⁵³

References: STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:fig. 4 plan, 182 #82, fig. 46; WARREN 1965:33–34 #29, pl. Δ:4; 1969:111–112 Type 43:G4, P604, D327; 1980:493, 494; CADOGAN 1983:512; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:125, pl. I.c; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:193 #22, pl. 72:22; PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 16, 323; 1991:II:370–371 #4, III:982 fig. 4; LILYQUIST 1995:13 n. 85; 1996:159; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:28 #5.

Comments: Recovered near the middle of the tholos (plan, 5:00).⁵⁴ Originally thought to be of marble and later identified as Egyptian and of “Khephren diorite” (i.e., anorthosite gneiss) by Warren, who noted no Minoan parallels for it.

Lilyquist, however, has noted that the stone is not typical of this diorite type, and may be an indigenous Aegean product. She dates the unusual Egyptian vessel in Cairo (CM 18419) with which Warren compares it as not earlier than the Second Intermediate Period, and therefore later than the context date of the Aghia Triadha vessel (or barely overlapping its latest use, taking into consideration Walberg’s two ‘phase 3’ clay vessels). The Cairo vessel is of red limestone breccia, a stone frequently used for vessels in Predynastic through Dynasty IV period and less common afterwards.⁵⁵ Therefore, the breccia vessel is more likely to date from the Old Kingdom on the basis of the material, although its incised decoration (*ankh*

sign on wall, cross on base) may have been added at a later date, possibly during the New Kingdom when stone vessel reuse and added incised inscription is attested in Egypt itself.⁵⁶

24. Jar (‘miniature amphora’), HM A 654

Grey and white mottled dolomitic marble, H: 6.0; Dia. (rim): 3.9; (max): 4.0; (base): 2.7 cm, chip on base, otherwise intact. ‘Miniature amphora’ with high shoulder, flaring rim and flat base. Interior drilled, with a vertical profile and thick section. Minoan, EM III–MM I.

Context: EM II–MM IA, MM IIA–IIIA?

Chronology: EM III–MM I vessel, most likely contemporary deposition in EM III–MM IA tomb context, but possibly ‘heirloom’ and part of later MM IIA–IIIA? use.

References: PARIBENI and PIGORNI 1903:fig. 7:upper right, second from right; STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:fig. 4 plan, 186 #106, fig. 50:e; WARREN 1969:203; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:371 #5, III:982 fig. 5; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:38–39 #19.β; BEVAN 2001:II:378 fig. 5.30.lower, second from right; PHILLIPS 2005a:43.

Comments: Recovered to the right of the tholos entrance, near the wall (plan, 5:00). Not earlier than EM III on the basis of interior drilling.⁵⁷

25. Jar (‘miniature amphora’), HM A 655

Grey and white mottled dolomitic marble, H: 5.8; Dia. (rim): 3.9; (max): 3.8; (base): 2.0 cm, intact.

‘Miniature amphora’ with thickened rim, high shoulder and flat base. Thin section with interior undercut below shoulder. Minoan, EM III–MM I.

Context: EM II–MM IA, MM IIA–IIIA?

Chronology: EM III–MM I vessel, most likely contemporary deposition in EM III–MM IA tomb context, but possibly ‘heirloom’ and part of later MM IIA–IIIA? use.

Comparanda: {325}; {473}.

References: PARIBENI and PIGORNI 1903:fig. 7:upper right; STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:fig. 4 plan, 184 #105, fig. 50:f; WARREN 1969 72 Type 28, P358, D198; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:371 #6, III:982 fig. 6; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:38 #19.α; BEVAN 2001:II:378 fig. 5.30.lower right; 380 fig. 5.32.e; PHILLIPS 2005a:43.

Comments: Recovered to the right of the tholos entrance, against the wall (plan, 5:00).

26. Jar (‘cylinder jar’), Type A, HM A 660

Brown translucent calcite with opaque white patches, H: 4.35; Dia.: (rim): 4.6; (base): 3.0 cm, intact.

Medium ‘cylindrical’ jar with everted rim and slightly everted base, both rounded at edges, slightly convex tapering body.

Minoan, EM III–MM I.

Context: EM II–MM IA, MM IIA–IIIA?

⁵² WALBERG 1983:92; for correlation of her phases with ‘Evans’ system, see p. 2.

⁵³ All El-Khouli comparanda are dated within Dynasty I–II and made of travertine. They are generally similar but not direct parallels.

⁵⁴ STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1930 repeat fig. numbers in their separate discussions; references here are to Stefani’s plans between pp. 154–155. Object locations within the tholos are

indicated by clock timings, with the tholos entrance at 6 o’clock.

⁵⁵ Cairo vessel material identified by LILYQUIST 1996:159. B.G. ASTON 1994:54 notes one Middle Kingdom and a few New Kingdom examples, but mentions no Second Intermediate Period vessels in this material.

⁵⁶ See PHILLIPS 1992a:169–173.

⁵⁷ WARREN 1969:161.

Chronology: EM III–MM I vessel, most likely contemporary deposition in EM III–MM IA tomb context, but possibly ‘heirloom’ and part of later MM IIA–IIIA? use.

Comparanda: {27}, {98}, {393}, {460}, {480}.

References: STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:fig. 4 plan, 184 #98, fig. 50:c; WARREN 1969:76 Type 30:D, P419, D229; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:371 #7, III:982 fig. 7; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:44 #25.η;⁵⁸ BEVAN 2001:II:378 fig. 5.30.lower left; PHILLIPS 2005a:43.

Comments: Recovered to the right of the tholos entrance, near the wall (plan, 5:00). Inscribed ‘29’ on the base. Egyptian ‘cylinder jar’ forms contemporary with EM II–MM I are tapering but tend to either be straight or slightly concave in profile. Convex forms almost exclusively are Predynastic and date not later than Dynasty I, and in any case do not have a defined base.⁵⁹ Thus this vessel is somewhat removed from the Egyptian type, and so is difficult to correlate with it; the footed base would at least place its model within the Dynastic period.

27. Jar (‘cylinder jar’), Type B, HM Λ 663

Grey and white mottled dolomitic marble, H: 5.32; Dia. (rim): 3.4; (base): 3.6 cm, intact.

Medium-tall ‘cylindrical’ jar with everted rim and base with rounded edges, slightly convex and slightly tapering body.

Minoan, EM III–MM I.

Context: EM II–MM IA, MM IIA–IIIA?.

Chronology: EM III–MM I vessel, most likely contemporary deposition in EM III–MM IA tomb context, but possibly ‘heirloom’ and part of later MM IIA–IIIA? use.

Comparanda: {26}, {98}, {393}, {460}, {480}.

References: STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:fig. 4 plan, 184 #99, fig. 50:d; WARREN 1969:76 Type 30:D, P420; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:371 #8, III:983 fig. 8; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:45 #25.Θ; BEVAN 2001:II:378 fig. 5.30.lower, second from left, 380 fig. 5.32.b; PHILLIPS 2005a:43.

Comments: Recovered to the right of the tholos entrance, near the wall (plan, 4:00). See comments on form to {26}.

28. Ovoid, HM Σ–K 1020

Bone or ivory,⁶⁰ L: 15.6; W: 13.3; H: 5.3; SH: 2.1 mm, chipped at edges.

Ovoid. Ovoid-shaped, gable-shaped section, slightly higher towards one end. String-hole through length. *Face:* Three lotus blossoms flanked by two incurving spirals, all originating from a raised base, probably a pedestal vase. Two hanging filler designs, filled by horizontal ladder lines. Horizontal format. Line border.

Egyptian, early Dynasty XII, just possibly late Dynasty XI.

Context: EM II–MM IA, MM IIA–IIIA?.

Chronology: Early Dynasty XII, just possibly late Dynasty

XI ovoid, most likely in generally contemporary MM IA tomb context, but possibly ‘heirloom’ and part of later MM IIA–IIIA? use.

Comparanda: (face design) WARD 1978:pl. VII:191–194.

References: PENDLEBURY 1930b:9 #7, pl. I:7; STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:fig. 5 plan, 214–215 #258:a, fig. 116; *CMS* II.1:#95; YULE 1983:366 n. 22; PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 15, 325 n. 36; 1991:II:372 #9, III:983 fig. 9; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:309 #306.

Comments: Recovered to the left of the tholos entrance, near the wall (plan, 8:00). Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) dated this to Dynasty XII–XIII.

29. Pendant, HM O–E 130

Bone?⁶¹ or ivory, H: 22.9; W: 17.2; Th.: 10.9; SH: 2.0 mm, arms missing from elbows.

Pendant, possibly in the form of an ape, squatting with front paws probably raised in front of face and legs drawn up in front, separated by sawing. Large thick mane of hair on head. Drilled eyes and long curled snout. String-hole drilled from either side diagonally through back of shoulder, meeting at interior. Tailless.

Minoan, EM III–MM I.

Context: EM II–MM IA, MM IIA–IIIA?.

Chronology: EM III–MM IA pendant, most likely contemporary deposition in EM III–MM IA tomb context, but possibly ‘heirloom’ and part of later MM IIA–IIIA? use.

References: HALBHERR 1905:251, pl. XI:27:bottom row, third from right (shown on its side); PENDLEBURY 1930b:9 #8;⁶² STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:fig. 4 plan, 196 #177, fig. 58:u; McDERMOTT 1938:206 #262;⁶³ ZERVOS 1956:pl. 203:centre left;⁶⁴ LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:192 #20;⁶⁵ PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 17; 1991:II:373 #11, III:983 fig. 11; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:365, 400 #441;⁶⁶ KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:184 #172.

Comments: Recovered near the tholos centre (plan, 1:00). This example most closely resembles the *hamadryas* baboon with its extensive ‘mane’. Stefani and Banti suggested it is a Minoan object, since the form resembles more clearly very early Egyptian figures rather than contemporary examples despite the elongated snout, although Pendlebury had accepted it as Egyptian. Despite McDermott, the head is not “missing,” but extremely low with thick mane at the neck and upturned snout. Although it has no specific parallel elsewhere on Crete, it is far removed from Egyptian ape figurines, and must be a Minoan product.

C.2. Annexe Room F

Annexe room F is a blocked chamber immediately north (right) of the tholos entrance. A small (1.7 by

⁵⁸ Photographs are reversed in publication: that marked ‘25ε’ is this vessel, whilst ‘25ν’ actually is 25.ε from Platanos {460}.

⁵⁹ See B.G. ASTON 1994:99–105.

⁶⁰ Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 15 August 2000).

⁶¹ Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 15 August 2000).

⁶² Misidentified as ‘lapis lazuli’ in publication, but corrected

to ‘ivory’ in a hand-written emendation to his personal copy now in the Villa Ariadne library at Knossos.

⁶³ He notes the material as ‘faience.’

⁶⁴ The provenance is misidentified as Koumassa. The pendant shown upper right of this photograph also is from Tholos A at Aghia Triadha, as it also is illustrated by HALBHERR 1905:pl. XI:27.

⁶⁵ The material is misidentified as ‘lapis lazuli.’

⁶⁶ He identifies this incorrectly as a seal.

0.85 m.) rectangular space, it leads into room G behind. Halbherr recovered 14 skulls from this room, together with a stone vessel and four seals.⁶⁷ All seals are dated within EM III–MM IA(–B?), and no mention is made of any later material here although other annexe rooms held MM II pottery.

30. Seal, HM Σ–K 447 (not handled)

‘Similar to white piece,’⁶⁸ L: 11; W: 7; H: 18 mm, intact.

Theriomorphic seal in the form of an ape with large ears, seated on short base and forepaws resting on base between hind paws. Pointed nose/mouth, slight ridge on top of head between ears, eyes drilled through head, tail indicated by diagonal line above base on left side. Horizontal string-hole drilled through sides at upper arm level. *Face*: Five lines cross-hatched, nearly horizontal and vertical.

Minoan, MM IA.

Context: EM II–MM IA, MM II?.

Chronology: MM IA seal, most likely contemporary deposition in MM IA, but possibly ‘heirloom’ and part of later MM II? use.

Comparison: {54}; {469}.

References: MATZ 1928:6–7 #A:4; STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:216 #265, fig. 120:b; MCDERMOTT 1938:209 #278; CMS II.1:#20; YULE 1981:94 Class 33:d; KRZYSZKOWSKA 1989:122; PHILLIPS 1990:325 n. 29; 1991:II:372–373 #10, III:983 fig. 10; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:172 #153.

Comments: The thick neck suggests a derivation from the *Cynocephalus*, although the long pointed head is more reminiscent of the *Cercopithecus*. The ears are overly large for an ape, and indeed it looks more like a mouse than anything else. Pini’s grouping of seals made in ‘white piece’ material⁶⁹ limits the date of this seal to MM IA, and it must have been amongst the latest depositions of its initial period of use, or was deposited as part of the later reuse of the Annexe.

D. Tholos Tomb B

Tholos B, some 30 m. south-west of Tholos A, was excavated in 1903 by Paribeni. It is far smaller in size and likewise only half-preserved in plan, but its maximum preserved height of 2.3 m. is almost 1 m. higher than the larger tholos.⁷⁰ Originally called ‘Tomb 1,’ its entrance also faced east. It too is dated EM II–MM II, apparently going out of use gradually from MM I. Within the tholos were found a number of clay and stone vessels, seal stones, bronze and stone tools including stone axes and mace heads and bronze awls, and a number of disarticulated bones. The

presence of some LM IIIA1 vessels within the tholos itself indicates later reuse at that time.⁷¹

An irregular wall projects from the south wall of the tholos and then turns eastwards at right angles, then northwards to form a large space enclosed on three sides, delineating an ‘annexe’. It probably was unroofed as an antechamber, but left open as a large court in front of the entrance. It is dated no later than the end of the Proto-Palatial period; found within it were stone bowls, jars and cups, a kernos, ‘ivory’ seal, bronze razors and daggers, and several clay vessels of which a number were highly decorated in the Kamares style and the remainder of earlier date. The following are from this annexe area.

31. Jar (‘cylinder jar’), Type B, HM A 381

Red/brown limestone, H: 3.45; Dia. (rim): 2.75; (base): 2.0 cm, restored from numerous broken fragments, entire profile with one body and rim fragment missing.

Tall cylindrical jar with projecting everted rim and base, slightly tapering nearly straight-sided body.

Minoan, EM III–MM I.

Context: EM II–MM II.

Chronology: EM III–MM I vessel, most likely contemporary deposition in EM III–MM II tomb context.

References: PARIBENI 1904:700 #18, fig. 10:3; WARREN 1969:76 Type 30:D, P417; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:374–375 #12, III:983 fig. 12; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:45 #25.1.

Comments: The general profile and especially the exaggerated basal eversion seem to best fit models within the later Old Kingdom–First Intermediate Period,⁷² which is basically contemporary with its context.

32. Jar (‘cylinder jar’), Type B, HM A 382

Grey and white mottled dolomitic marble, H: 3.5; Dia. (rim): 3.2; (base): 2.5 mm, chipped on rim and base, otherwise intact. Tall cylindrical jar with projecting everted rim and base with rounded edges, slightly tapering nearly straight-sided body.

Minoan, EM III–MM I.

Context: EM II–MM II.

Chronology: EM III–MM I vessel, most likely contemporary deposition in EM III–MM II tomb context.

References: PARIBENI 1904:700 #17; WARREN 1969:67 Type 30:D, P418; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:375 #13, III:983 fig. 13; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:45 #25.κ.

Comments: See comments to {31}.

33. Jar (‘cylinder jar’), Type B, HM A 340

White limestone with patches of serpentine, H: 4.0; Dia.

⁶⁷ STEFANI and BANTI 1930–1931:151. The other seals are HM 453, 485 and 490. Stefani described HM 447 as a pendant. Banti (pp. 188–189) lists no stone vessel from Room F.

⁶⁸ Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 15 August 2000).

⁶⁹ PINI 1992:203.

⁷⁰ PARIBENI 1904:678–691.

⁷¹ KANTA 1980:104; LA ROSA 2000:91. MYERS, MYERS and

CADOGAN 1994:76 quote an LM IIIA2–B date for its reuse, but see also LA ROSA 2000:93 n. 6. Significantly, it is located near the early LM IIIA2 chamber tomb containing the famous painted sarcophagus (LONG 1974), but La Rosa emphasises use of the two buildings is not strictly contemporary. See now also BLACKMAN 1998:111.

⁷² B.G. ASTON 1994:99–100, 104 #34–35.

(rim, rest.): 3.3; (base): 2.1 cm, chipped at base with most of rim and upper body restored but entire profile preserved.

Tall 'cylindrical' jar with projecting everted rim and base with rounded edges, with strongly tapering nearly straight-sided body profile.

Minoan, EM III–MM I.

Context: EM II–MM II.

Chronology: EM III–MM I vessel, most likely contemporary deposition in EM III–MM II tomb context.

References: PARIBENI 1904:700 #16; WARREN 1969:76 Type 30:D, P416; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:375 #14, III:983 fig. 14; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:44 #25.ζ.

Comments: See comments to {31}. The excessively tapering body and splayed foot suggests some influence for this vessel of WARREN's (1969) Type 29 ('miniature goblet'), also found in Tholos A and other tholoi in the Mesara.

E. No Find Context

The following have no specific published provenance on the Aghia Triadha site.

34. Jar ('miniature amphora'), HM A 362 (not seen)

Dark grey marble with irregular white diagonal banding, H: 6.5; Dia.: (base) 3, (max.) 5.4 cm, majority of rim lost, chipped on body and base.

'Miniature amphora,' with small lip rim, rounded shoulder and slightly curved base. Shallow cylindrical interior.

Minoan, EM III–MM I.

Context: None known.

Chronology: Without context, but deposition EM III or later.

References: WARREN 1969:201; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:389 #32; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:39 #19.γ.

Comments: Its catalogue number suggests it was found during the early seasons, while its date suggests it probably came from one of the early tombs, probably either Tholos A or B, neither utilised before EM II.

35. Femiform parturient vase, HM Π 3243 (not handled)

Clay, buff, H: c. 27 cm, restored from numerous joining fragments with some body fragments missing. Paint (if any) quite worn.

Anthropomorphic parturient vase in the form of a crouching nude pregnant woman, with wheel-made body and added plastic limbs and features. Coil legs flexed having tiny feet, right arm bent on knee with hand over right breast, left arm raised to hold hydria balanced on head. Short 'flapper' hairstyle and prominent nose, fingers, toes and vulva incised, pubic hair indicated by added clay area and mouth and eyes by slight horizontal grooving. Hydria with small globular body, tall wide neck and everted upright rim, two horizontal coil loop handles at mid-body and one vertical strap handle at back from shoulder to neck. If painted, it is an all-over wash. Minoan, LM IIIC or Sub-Minoan.

Context: None known.

Chronology: Without context, but deposition LM IIIC or later.

Comparanda: ALON and AMIRAN 1976:117–120, pl. XXXIII, XXXVI:right; {78}; {123}.

References: PHILLIPS 1991:II:389–390 #33, III:996 fig. 33; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:263–264 #264.

Comments: A clay vessel of similar pose, including a jar atop the head, was found in a Chalcolithic temple-room at Gilat in Israel. The general pose would suggest the *Gravidenflasche* vessel type, although it has no true relationship to the Egyptian vessel. The hydria form atop her head is entirely un-Minoan but is surprisingly similar to an Egyptian amphora form dated from the reign of Thutmose III to Dynasty XX⁷³ but with the addition of the third, vertical handle. Its nearest equivalent in the Mycenaean repertoire would be a hydria, complete with third handle, but the proportions are quite incorrect for this vessel type.⁷⁴

36. Jar ('cylinder jar'), Type B, HM 3270

Grey and white dolomitic limestone, H: 4.0–4.1; Dia. (rim): 3.6; (base): 2.5–2.7, chipped on rim, otherwise intact.

Tall cylindrical jar with projecting everted rim and base, slightly concave tapering profile and uneven height. Slightly projecting drill-core remains on interior base.

Minoan, EM III–MM IA.

Context: None.

Chronology: Without context, but deposition EM III or later.

Comparanda: {406}, {407}.

Reference: PHILLIPS 1991:II:390 #34, III:996 fig. 34.

Comments: This was presented to the HM in 1970 by a Tymbaki family, and is said to be a stray find from Aghia Triadha. Presumably it is from a tomb context originally, although no further provenance is known. The material identifies it as a Minoan product. The form best corresponds to late Old Kingdom through First Intermediate Period forms in Egypt⁷⁵ and must have been influenced by vessels of that period, although it is not as exaggerated as similar vessels from Mochlos {406; 407}. The use of a tubular drill dates this vessel no earlier than EM III,⁷⁶ as does the date range of the Egyptian vessel forms.

37. Miniature bowl, HM 391 (not seen)

Porphyritic rock having black matrix and white crystals with fine green veins (Andesite porphyry Type B–C?), H: 1.7 cm, intact.

Wide but shallow bowl with high shoulder and slightly raised collar, not undercut. High flat narrow raised base. Deeply undercut interior.

Probably Egyptian, Dynasties I–II, and converted into Minoan, LM I, but possibly Egyptian, late Middle Kingdom.

Context: None known.

Chronology: Without known context, but deposition probably LM I or later.

Comparison: B.G. ASTON 1994:60, pl. 13.a.

References: HALBHERR 1903:64 #9; WARREN 1969:111 Type 43:D5, P598; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:192–193 #21, pl. 65:21; PHILLIPS 1991:II:3888–389 #31, III:996 fig. 31; CLINE 1994:191 #507.

⁷³ See B.G. ASTON 1994:152 #175.

⁷⁴ See hydriae in MOUNTJOY 1993:88 fig. 217 (LH IIIB), 94 fig. 240 (early LH IIIC), 112 fig. 313 (late LH IIIC).

⁷⁵ B.G. ASTON 1994:99–100, 104 #35.

⁷⁶ WARREN 1969:161.

Comments: Warren says it is from Aghia Triadha, but the HM records its find spot as “Phaistos”. This latter site is quoted by Cline, whilst Lambrou-Phillipson merely notes the findspot is unrecorded. Nonetheless, Halbherr published it together with Aghia Triadha material, so I have included it with material from this site.

Warren identifies this bowl as possibly Egyptian due its material and shape, but concedes it may be Minoan. If Minoan, he dates its manufacture to MM I–II due to its miniature size. He prefers an Egyptian origin, as the material is unknown on Crete and the undercutting probably was not possible technologically to MM I–II Crete, but cannot provide Egyptian parallels. However, at least one does exist, a small Dynasty XII–XIII steatite jar of similar profile but slightly taller at 2.6 cm, recovered in Abydos tomb E3, dated to a period when all four of Aston’s andesite porphyry types were not employed for stone vessels in Egypt. Thus, it is possible that this vessel was made from a fragment of an Early Dynastic–Old Kingdom spheroid jar of substantial thickness⁷⁷ and, if so, probably was converted in LM I.

AGHIOS ONOUPHRIOS

A. ‘Deposit’

A small deposit of artefacts together with a heap of human bones was reported to be uncovered on a hill near the town of Aghios Onouphrios, about 0.5 kilometres north of Phaestos hill in the Mesara plain, near the end of the 19th century.⁷⁸ It was presented to the HM by 1893 and shortly afterwards published by A. Evans.⁷⁹

The deposit is considered to have originated from a tholos tomb, now lost or destroyed as none have yet been identified near the town. It is important especially for its pottery, being the ‘type-site’ for the decorative ceramic style known as ‘Aghios Onouphrios Ware’ characteristic of the EM I–IIA periods.⁸⁰ Other material however is later: the deposit ranges in date from EM I to LM I. Excavated Mesara tholoi also contained ceramics having a wide range of deposition. Although probably largely a single deposit group, it is clear that some objects should not have been found together with the majority of the group.

The Egyptian and ‘egyptianising’ material consists solely of scarab seals, but other foreign material was also found. Cycladic figurines and stone vessels⁸¹ and a possibly Italian dagger⁸² also belong to this deposit. Other finds included a small limestone vase with lid, clay and steatite shells, and seals, beads and

pendants of various design in steatite, rock crystal, variegated limestone and gold.

The wide date range of this deposit is no help for chronological purposes, but the earliest possible date for each of these scarabs strongly suggests that some could not have been associated even with the latest ceramic material of the ‘deposit’.

38. Scarab, HM Σ–K 46

Unidentified glazed material, L: 15.5; W: 12.1; H: 7.4; SH: 1.4 mm, intact but glaze worn.

Scarab with rayed head, single line between pronotum and elytra, and triple line between elytra. Legs indicated by horizontal grooves in addition to two horizontal grooves around body. String-hole through length. *Face:* Antithetical design consisting of C-scrolls either end, joined by a large X-shaped cross in centre flanked by a spiral either side. Rope border. ‘Levantine,’ end of LB/beginning of IA I (12th–10th c. BC).

Context: None, with EM I–LM I collection of objects.

Chronology: End of LB/beginning of Iron Age I (12th–10th c. BC) scarab, without context.

Comparanda: (back) PETRIE 1925b:pl. XXIX:85; TUBB 1988:71 fig. 51 upper middle two; KEEL 1995b:51 §101, figs. 60–62; (face design) MATOUK 1972–1977:II:407 #2155–2156.

References: EVANS 1895:105, 106 fig. 78; FIMMEN 1924:200 fig. 192:right; MATZ 1928:22–23 #266, pl. X:10; PENDLEBURY 1930b:7 #3, pl. I:3; ZERVOS 1956: fig. 215:center; KENNA 1960:28 n. 5, 31; CMS II.1:#119; YULE 1983:366 n. 22; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:197 #31, pl. 43:31; PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 15, 325 n. 36; 1991:II:392 #35, III:996 fig. 35; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:329 #346; BROWN and BENNETT 2001:19:pl; PHILLIPS 2005b:459 n. 22.

Comments: The face design, especially the rope border, normally is indicative of late Dynasty XII–early XIII in Egypt, and parallels to the back type apparently date chiefly to Dynasty XXV. However, the head type is Ramesside, although it could even be later than this (TIP in Egyptian terms). Two scarabs with similar heads and Dynasty XIX date, were found in Tomb 526 at Mycenae (LH III),⁸³ and two others on the Cape Gelidonya shipwreck (late 13th c.);⁸⁴ none have a rope border.

The best parallels for the combination of head/back/side on this scarab are Near Eastern, from Jordan, and Nir Lalkin suggests it is a local Levantine product rather than Egyptian, of the date range cited. Thus it cannot be associated with the Minoan material in the ‘deposit,’ all of which is of earlier date by several centuries to over a millennium, and it would not have arrived on Crete before late LM IIIB at the earliest.

39. Scarab, HM Σ–K 47

Ivory, L: 12.5; W: 9.8; H: 7.2; SH: 2.1 mm, intact.

Scarab with lunate head and rayed clypeus, single line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Framing line at

⁷⁷ See Chapter 4, Appendix A.7 and Appendix B.

⁷⁸ EVANS 1895:105. See also TARAMELLI 1901:418–421.

⁷⁹ EVANS 1895:105–136.

⁸⁰ See BETANCOURT 1985:29–31.

⁸¹ SAKELLARAKIS in THIMME 1977:146–147, 151.

⁸² BRANIGAN 1970b:184.

⁸³ PENDLEBURY 1930:56 #95–96; WACE 1932:pl. IX:1–2. Both incorrectly dated the scarabs to Dynasty XVIII.

⁸⁴ SCHULMAN 1967:144 fig.150:SC 2, SC 5. Schulman dated both scarabs to “the early New Kingdom, more specifically to Dynasty 18,” but BRANDL 2003 has redated them to the reign of Ramesses II.

outer edge of pronotum and elytra. Humeral callosities indicated. Legs indicated by deep undercutting. String-hole through length. *Face*: Egyptian hieroglyphs in vertical format: *Imn-R^c nb niwt*: ‘Amon-Re, Lord of Thebes’.⁸⁵ Line border.

Egyptian, Dynasty XIX–XX.

Context: None, with EM I–LM I collection of objects.

Chronology: Dynasty XIX–XX scarab, without context.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1891:pl. XXIII:737, XXVI:23; 1925: pl. XVIII:1378.

References: EVANS 1895:105; PENDLEBURY 1930b:7 #4, pl. I:4; CMS II.1:#120; YULE 1983:366 n. 22; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:197–198 #33, pl. 45:33; PHILLIPS 1991:II:392–393 #36, III:996 fig. 36; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:325 #339; BROWN and BENNETT 2001:19:pl; PHILLIPS 2005b:459 n. 22.

Comments: Parallels all date to the New Kingdom.

Not included in CLINE 1994. Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) correctly date this to “possibly Dynasty XIX–XX,” clearly centuries later than the latest material associated with it in the deposit. I concur, due to the rather crude and rather hurried cutting of both face design and scarab features, and the deep cutting of the former. Thus this scarab (like {38} above) cannot have been recovered with the Minoan material of this ‘deposit,’ and it would not have arrived on the island before LM IIIB.

40. Scarab, HM Σ–K 48

Sardonyx, L: 10.7; W: 9.0; H: 6.6; SH: 2.3 mm, intact.

Scarab with lunate head, single line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra, the former extending to the sides and the latter bifurcating at rear. Short framing line outer sides of elytra. Legs indicated by shallow undercutting. String-hole through length. *Face*: Single stylised lotus (similar to M 16) in a *nb*-basket (V 30) along length, with filler motifs either side. Vertical format. Line border.

Probably Egyptian, probably either Middle Kingdom or late Middle Kingdom but not later than early Dynasty XVIII.

Context: None, with EM I–LM I collection of objects.

Chronology: Probably early Middle Kingdom or late Middle Kingdom–early Dynasty XVIII scarab, without context but possibly from tomb(?) deposition.

Comparanda: TUFNELL 1984:112 fig. 23:23; {541}.

References: EVANS 1895:105; PENDLEBURY 1930b:7 #5, pl. I:5; CMS II.1:#121; YULE 1983:366 n. 22; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:197 #32, pl. 43:32; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 22, 326 n. 37; 1991:II:393–394 #37, III:996 fig. 37; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:311 #311; PHILLIPS 2005b:459 n. 22.

Comments: Yule is unsure of its original provenance, while Pendlebury identified it as Dynasty XII Egyptian; Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) date it to Dynasty XI–early XII. Hard stone scarabs of this date and earlier are relatively crude, often with summary incised lines on the back and sides, in sharp contrast to contemporary scarabs in softer materials. Quirke and Fitton would date it to the “late Middle Kingdom (?),” noting that semi-precious stones like sardonyx are most

common in the late Middle Kingdom and not very common later. The participants of the ‘Scarabs’ workshop in Vienna suggested either an early Middle Kingdom or late Middle Kingdom date.⁸⁶ The design suggests it more likely is later than earlier. Its height is excessive for a Minoan scarab and is extremely uncommon in Egypt. Its shape and cut are unusual, but it appears the extended line dividing pronotum and elytra is common in the Second Intermediate Period–early Dynasty XVIII. The filler motifs are quite unusual and do not fit the *nb*-*ty* formula or single stem flower design,⁸⁷ and it may be this is an ‘egyptianising’ scarab imported from elsewhere with a misunderstood or debased version of either design type. No good parallel is forthcoming; the nearest in shape is from the early Dynasty XVIII tomb of Maket, but one without provenance on Crete also is similar in shape and hard stone material, and has a debased *nb*-*ty* face design. The date and circumstances of its discovery do not suggest a forgery or fake.

Not included in CLINE 1994.

41. Scarab, HM Σ–K 44

Glazed ‘white piece’ material, L: 13.5; W: 10.1; H: 6.9; SH: 1.8 mm, part of face design and side broken off, glaze partly flaked off, cracked along front and sides.

Scarab with open head and rayed clypeus, double line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Elytra cross-hatched separately. Legs indicated by three horizontal lines notched with opposite diagonal lines in between. String-hole through length. *Face*: Six groups of triple concentric circles in two rows, separated by straight dividing lines. Line border. Circles increase in depth from exterior to interior.

Minoan, MM IA.

Context: None, with EM I–LM I collection of objects.

Chronology: MM IA scarab, without context but possibly from generally contemporary or slightly later MM IA or later tomb(?) deposition.

Comparanda: {66}.

References: EVANS 1895:105, fig. 77; MATZ 1928:22–23 #265, pl. X:7; PENDLEBURY 1930b:7 #2, pl. I:2; KENNA 1960:28 n. 5, 73 n. 5; CMS II.1:#117; YULE 1981:78 Class 29:a; 1983:363, 363 n. 12, 366 n. 22, fig. 22, 26; PINI 1989:102 #2; 1990:116 #7; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:196–197 #30, pl. 43:30; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 22, 325 n. 36; 1991:II:394–395 #38, III:996 fig. 38; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; PINI 2000:108–109 #2, fig. 1.2; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:312 #312; SBONIAS 2000:290 fig. 5; CMS II.1 No. 117; BROWN and BENNETT 2001:19:pl.; PHILLIPS 2004:162 fig. 1.a.2; 2005b:459 n. 22.

Comments: Yule includes the face design as a peripheral example of the ‘Border/Leaf Complex,’ whose “resemblance to Cretan parallels clearly outweighs that to oriental ones”.⁸⁸ Two features found on this scaraboid and the other example having a cross-hatched back {6}, namely the separate pronotum and the dividing line between elytra, are not found on either Egyptian or Canaanite scarabs with cross-hatched back, so both must be Minoan products. All other Minoan ‘white piece’ seals are dated to MM IA, so then should these. Moreover, as the cross-hatched back does not appear in Egypt until some-

⁸⁵ The alternative quoted by Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000), *Imn-R^c nb(i)*: ‘Amon-Re, (my) Lord,’ is incorrect due to the inclusion of the bread loaf *t* (X 1) and stroke (Z 2) before the *nb* (V 30) sign.

⁸⁶ By all participants, 12 January 2002.

⁸⁷ Compare with TUFNELL 1984:II:pl. I:1034–1044.

⁸⁸ YULE 1983:363.

time in Dynasty XII⁸⁹ (= MM IB on Crete) and Canaanite scarabs are not earlier than late MB IIA (= sometime early Dynasty XIII), it seems that the cross-hatching on this and {66} must be an entirely indigenous Minoan feature of very limited popularity, earlier in date than the cross-hatched backs of both Egyptian and Canaanite scarabs and entirely divorced from them. Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) incorrectly consider this Egyptian, of Dynasty XIII date.

42. Scarab, HM Σ-K 45

Amethyst, L: 16.3; W: 11.1; H: 8.6; SH: 1.8 mm, half of face design and part of scarab head broken off, worn surface on back and sides.

Scarab with unmarked head, grooved clypeus and pronotum, single line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Legs indicated by light diagonal lines. String-hole through length. *Face*: Four joined circles in a bowed line along length. Egyptian, Dynasty XII, just possibly Dynasty XIII, face design Minoan, MM IB–III.

Context: None, with EM I–LM I collection of objects.

Chronology: Dynasty XII(–XIII?) scarab, without context but possibly from generally contemporary or slightly later MM (IB?–)II–III or later tomb(?) deposition.

Comparanda: WARD and DEVER 1994:*passim* (Head type X2, side type e5, back type LN); CMS II.5:#25, #45; IV:#30D; KENNA 1960:103 #109–110; {384}; {502}; (reuse) {502}.

References: EVANS 1895:105; 1901:137; PENDLEBURY 1930b:7 #1, pl. I:1; CMS II.1:#118; YULE 1981:144 Motif 23; 1983:363, 364 fig. 29, 366 n. 22; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:196 #29, pl. 42:29; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 22, 326 n. 37; 1991:II:395 #39, III:996 fig. 39; 1992b:497, 503 fig. 1; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:311 #310; BROWN and BENNETT 2001:19:pl., 31, 35, 404 #25, 405:fig. 25; PHILLIPS 2004:166 fig. 6.top; 2005b:459 n. 22.

Comments: Seen by Evans in the (then) Candia Museum on 20–21 March 1894. Yule identifies this as a Minoan scarab, employing ‘tubular drill ornament,’ a typically Minoan technique appearing as early as EM III but most common in MM IB–III. The plainness of the motif here finds its closest parallels amongst Minoan seals. However, the scarab itself is excessively tall, and its comparatively quite worn back and sides both indicate it should be considered an Egyptian import that probably was ‘blank’ (unengraved) on the face; the Minoan design was a later addition. It probably originally was part of a composite piece of Egyptian jewellery dismantled and reused by the Minoans. Hard stone seals are virtually unknown in MM IB but are common in MM II and III, suggesting a date within these periods for conversion of this scarab. The scarab itself may be older than its face design.

B. Extraneous

Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) state the following are from Aghios Onouphrios,⁹⁰ but PENDLE-

BURY (1930) lists them as ‘unprovenanced,’ as does the HM Inventory Book. They were not included in Evans’ publication of the ‘deposit,’ and their museum numbering is slightly out of sequence with the others above (HM 44–48, leaving a gap of HM 49–50), suggesting both may or may not have been accessioned in the museum at the same time as the others. It is possible that Evans in fact did not include them with the ‘deposit’ because he recognised that their date of manufacture lay outside the dating parameters of the Minoan material included in the ‘deposit,’⁹¹ although it is equally possible that they are separate purchases or the accessions registrar may have been in error. At the time, the other five scarabs (above) were considered to lie within the ‘deposit’s’ dating parameters. I have placed the following, with some hesitation, together with those published by Evans, as it is possible they were from Aghios Onouphrios, although not necessarily from the ‘deposit’. If the following are indeed part of the ‘deposit,’ they give added emphasis to the improbability that it was from a single collection.

43. Scarab, HM Σ-K 51

Faience,⁹² L: 14.8; W: 11.5; H: 7.4; SH: 2.1 mm, chipped on edge of face.

Scarab with open head, no distinction between pronotum and elytra, nor between elytra. Legs indicated by deep undercutting. String-hole through length. Moulded. *Face*: Horus hawk (G 5) in centre, flanked either side by an upraised uraeus cobra (I 12), in horizontal format. All figures face right.

Egyptian, (TIP?–)Dynasty XXVI.

Context: None.

Chronology: (TIP?–)Dynasty XXVI scarab, without context.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1890:36, pl. XXIII:113; 1925b:pl. XVIII:1412; IAKOVIDES 1969:III:pl. 85δ: 39; THOMAS 1981:I:77–78 #641, II:pl. 33:641; {265}; {545}; (‘cryptographic writing’) DRIOTON 1957:13–14.

References: PENDLEBURY 1930b:40 #67, pl. I:67; CMS II.1:#498; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:274 #245, pl. 51:245; PHILLIPS 1991:II:811–812 #420, III:1151 fig. 420; CLINE 1994:252 #1074; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:330 #348; PHILLIPS 2005b:459 n. 22.

Comments: The workmanship either is particularly crude or badly worn. It is moulded. Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) correctly provide a “possibly 750–600 BC” date for this scarab, and note it could range from anytime in the TIP to Dynasty XXVI. They note that unpublished scarab Philadelphia University Museum 34-21-4-15 is an exact parallel, but others also can be quoted. Quirke and Fitton provide only a

⁸⁹ WARD 1978:29 Table V:Back Type XXX, dated to early Dynasty XII; this date still is accepted.

⁹⁰ Evangelis Kyriakides (personal communication, 06 February 2002) confirmed their inclusion in the HM Accessions Book as from ‘Aghios Onouphrios.’

⁹¹ Note that PENDLEBURY 1930b does not mention their possible origin at Aghios Onouphrios, possibly for the same reason.

⁹² PENDLEBURY 1930b:40. Identified as a ‘blue-green stone’ in the CMS but probably is not.

“NK” date. The face design is found at least as early as the New Kingdom, as published by Petrie at Gurob, but the scarab type itself is much later. A similar scarab also was recovered at LM III C Perati. This piece is included in the present catalogue due to its previous publication as a NK scarab. Previously seen as an apparent cryptographic writing of *Imn*, ‘Amon,’ the god Amon.⁹³

44. Scarab, HM Σ-K 52

Glazed material, probably ‘white steatite,’⁹⁴ L: 11.9; W: 8.6; H: 5.9; SH: 1.7 mm, intact but damaged at edge of face and on edge of one reed-leaf sign, with traces of turquoise coloured glaze on face.

Scarab with lunate head, single line between pronotum and elytra, double line between elytra. Legs indicated by horizontal groove around side. String-hole through length. *Face*: Egyptian hieroglyphic inscription in horizontal format: *Imn-Rē*, ‘Amon-Re,’ the god Amon-Re. The reed-leaf *i* (M 17) appears to be duplicated either end, although that on the left is more likely a badly-executed *nb*-basket (V 30, ‘Lord’) instead. Line border.

Egyptian, Dynasty XIX–XX.

Context: None.

Chronology: Dynasty XIX–XX scarab, without context.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1890:36, pl. XXIII:81; BRUNTON and ENGELBACH 1927:pl. XXVIII.between 3 and 4;⁹⁵ ROWE 1936:pl. XIX:750, 764, 765, XXVII:S.32.

References: PENDLEBURY 1930b:40 #68, pl. I:68; *CMS* II.1:#499; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:274 #244, pl. 50.244; PHILLIPS 1991:II:812 #421, III:1151 fig. 421; CLINE 1994:252 #1076; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:325 #338; PHILLIPS 2005b:459 n. 22.

Comments: Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) provide a wide-ranging Dynasty XVIII–XX date, but see it as later rather than earlier within this range and even possibly into Dynasty XXI. This is a common later New Kingdom face design, and Quirke and Fitton suggest only a “NK” date for the scarab. The Ramesside (rather than Dynasty XVIII) dating is seen in both the deep and rather crude cutting of both the design and scarab features.

ANGELIANA

The small village of Angeliana is located about four kilometres south of the north coast of Crete and 18 kilometres east of Rethymnon, on a minor road three kilometres north-west of Perama Mylopotamou village. Some three kilometres north-east of Angeliana

on the lower slope of Tsoukni hill in the Plagati area, N. Kalamaliki and others excavated a partly plundered LM IIIA–B rock-cut chamber tomb in 1983 on an open plot of land on its south side belonging to N. Papadakis.⁹⁶ It appears to have been part of a Minoan cemetery, and was designated Tomb 1. The dromos had collapsed down the hillslope, but was both narrow and inclined. The chamber too had collapsed.

Six larnakes were found, two in very fragmentary condition near the dromos entrance and the other four in the oval chamber. Three larnakes (A–Γ), were empty of grave goods, two (ΣΤ and Δ) each contained a single bronze ring, and the last (E) had three rings and a pair of tweezers. Bones were recovered both in the larnakes, and in a disarticulated pile (as if swept together) under larnax ΣΤ. The tomb was cut in LM IIIA but it continued in use into LM IIIB; all larnakes are LM IIIB types. High in the fill were found two LM IIIB stirrup jars.

Scattered on the floor in front of the larnakes was found two stirrup jars, a spouted vessel, large stirrup jar, three-handled amphora, pyxis and one-handled cup. An everted conical cup, apparently used as a lamp or incense burner, was located just inside the chamber itself on the east side. In addition, discrete piles of goods were located under different larnakes. Under larnax Δ were two one-handled cups, an LM IIIB spouted jar and stone weight. Under larnax E were two stirrup jars and a handleless semi-globular cup. Under larnax ΣΤ was a pile of bones representing at least two and probably more individuals (one a child), together with a one-handled and handleless cup, a bronze (hair?) pin and three rings, five stone weights, and 32 beads of bronze, copper and faience. In the back corner between larnakes ΣΤ and E was a large stamnos containing a child’s burial including a bronze bracelet and rock crystal weight. Beside it was a nipples ewer, a three-handled cup, an unpainted kylix and an imported? stone jar with (Minoan) lid. The jar (and apparently its lid) originally was used to cover the mouth of the stamnos.⁹⁷

⁹³ See DRIOTON 1957:13–14. See also scarab {219}. The practice of cryptographic writing generally is no longer accepted by Egyptologists.

⁹⁴ Identified as ‘glass paste’ by Pendlebury and ‘ivory’ in the *CMS*. Definitely not glass paste (see Chapter 5 ‘glass’) or even glass; possibly Pendlebury confused this with scarab {43} above.

⁹⁵ The “late XVIII–XIX dynasties” group illustrated on this page is now dated to Dynasty XX by ASTON 1997:62.

⁹⁶ ANDREADAKI-VLAZAKI 1983; CATLING 1984:67; FRENCH

1991:76; GODART and TZEDAKIS 1992:81–82; *CMS V Suppl.* 1B:205. GODART and TZEDAKIS 1992 give the excavation date as May 1990, when TOMLINSON 1995:71 notes the excavation of an LM III chamber tomb containing 10 larnakes and nine lids, some 31 complete and fragmentary pots, two copper spirals from a “Mainland-type” ring, dated to LM IIIA2 and mostly IIIB (early).

⁹⁷ GODART and TZEDAKIS 1992 also mention a stone amulet of a woman in an unusual costume, five stone seals, and a bronze jewellery fragment with a double-spiral.

Some material from this tomb is on display in wall cases 6 and 12 at the RM, but the following vessel is not amongst this material:

45. Jar ('spheroid jar'), RM A 173⁹⁸ (not seen)

Hornblende diorite (Type A or B) or gabbro, dimensions not stated, intact.

Spheroid jar with wide flat collar, high shoulder and flat base; the rim edge appears uneven and may be notched at the upper edge. Collar slightly undercut. No handles.

Egyptian, Dynasty I–IV, or Minoan, probably LM I(–IIIA1?).

Context: LM IIIA?–B.

Chronology: Dynasty I–IV (or LM I[–IIIA1?]) vessel, an 'heirloom' in its much later LM IIIA?–B tomb deposition (whether Egyptian or Minoan).

Comparanda: EL-KHOULI 1978:III:pl. 86.2364–2366, {143}; (for association with Minoan lid) {117}.

References: ANDREADAKI-VLASAKI 1983:371; GODART and TZEDAKIS 1992:pl. CXIII.1; PHILLIPS 2005b:457 n. 13.

Comments: This description is entirely based on the published photograph, including a tentative material identification. A Minoan loop-handled flat lid is photographed atop the jar, but it is of a different material and appears to be too small for it. Jar and lid were found and, apparently, accessioned together. Identification of this jar as Egyptian or Minoan depends on several factors not apparent in publication, especially scale and material. Apparent features favouring an Egyptian origin are the lack of both handles and raised base, and El-Khouli's examples (all Dynasty I in context) are very close. The lack of published suggestion of a foreign origin would support the Minoan side, assuming the excavator had considered the possibility of a foreign origin. Association of an imported Egyptian stone vessel with a Minoan lid of different material is also seen at Katsamba {117}.

Whether Egyptian or Minoan, it clearly was an heirloom at its interment. It is the only Egyptian/'egyptianising' stone vessel interred in this period on Crete.

Not included in CLINE 1994.

ARCHANES

Minoan remains have long been found at and near Archanes, a large town about 15 kilometres south of Herakleion and near both Knossos and Mount Juktas. In 1922, A. Evans discovered a large Minoan building and a large circular 'Reservoir'.⁹⁹ In 1948, N. Platon uncovered Minoan buildings,¹⁰⁰ as have others also.

Io. Sakellarakis began the most important exca-

vations in the area in 1964, and these now are continued by his wife, E. Sapouna-Sakellarakis. On Phourni hill, almost directly north of the modern town, they excavated an extensive and long-lived Minoan cemetery consisting of a variety of tomb and burial forms ranging in date between EM II and LM IIIC, many of which yielded evidence for foreign connections. Structures included five well-preserved tholoi with associated building structures, a large rectangular building, and a thick enclosure wall surrounding larnax burials, as well as more than 20 'burial buildings' and other funerary structures. They also have uncovered a large Neo-Palatial villa near Evans' 'Reservoir'¹⁰¹ within the town itself.

In 1979, on the nearby hill of Anemospilia to the north-west, they also excavated a temple which had been destroyed by earthquake at the end of MM III. Four human skeletons were found, one of which the excavators proposed had been sacrificed at the time of destruction.¹⁰²

A. Tourkoyeitionia, Palatial Building

Excavated piecemeal due to its location in the middle of modern Epano Archanes town, the first palatial building was constructed at the beginning of the Proto-Palatial period (MM IB) and destroyed by earthquake at its end (MM IIB). A new palace was constructed overtop (MM III) which continued in use, as with the other palaces elsewhere, throughout the Neo-Palatial period, when it, like the others, was destroyed at the end of LM IB; there also was evidence for an earlier destruction in LM IA. Occupation continued in Final Palatial times above the remains, the area having been levelled and some walls reused with a few additions. The upper levels were levelled again in LM IIIA2 and a new building erected above them in the End Palatial period. This too was destroyed in LM IIIB, but the area was reoccupied at the end of LM IIIB and early LM IIIC. Occupation in fact has continued until the present day.

The main excavations, in the Tourkoyeitionia suburb of the town, have revealed substantial walls, with

⁹⁸ GODART and TZEDAKIS 1992 provide the accession number A740, but this must be the jar and lid mentioned by ANDREADAKI-VLASAKI (1983:371) as A173 A–B. Presumably the jar is A and the lid B.

⁹⁹ EVANS 1922:319–329; *PM* I:623–624; II.1:64–68. See now SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:112–115.

¹⁰⁰ PLATON 1948:589.

¹⁰¹ SAKELLARAKIS 1965a; 1965b; 1966; SAKELLARAKIS and

SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1966; SAKELLARAKIS 1967a; 1967b; 1970; 1972. See also annual reports in *ADelt* 1965 and continuing; *Ergon* 1965 and continuing; *Praktika* 1965 and continuing, the 'tourist guide' (SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991) and the final report (SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997), the last with extensive bibliography.

¹⁰² SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1981.

evidence for at least two storeys and possibly more in places. Rooms revealed include staircases (6/8/9, 21?) with space and landing below (8, 9), courtyard(s?) (1, 11/12/15) separated by a ‘platform’ or ‘*excedra*’, entrance with antechamber (2) leading to inner rooms, corridors (5, 14?, 16?, 22?, 23?, 27, 28?), storage area (13?), rooms with a platform (4) and bench (4, 25), stoa (7 α – β), light-well (20), halls (3, 10) with ancillary areas (8, 9), shrine (17) and other rooms only partially excavated.

A.1. Room 4

Room 4, located at the north-eastern end of the excavation, is a small well-preserved room immediately north of Hall 3 and the entrance (2) from the courtyard (1), with timber-framed plastered mud-brick walls and plastered floor.¹⁰³ Roof-beam sockets also were preserved, and an upper storey with central stone-based wooden column and flagged floor is clearly indicated. Features of the ground-floor room include an off-centre entrance, a low gypsum-faced bench on the west wall, a higher stone platform in the north-west corner and a stepped plastered mud-brick and stone pedestal in the north-east corner. A small clay animal figurine was found on the pedestal.

An object or structure, presumably of wood, was located in the central part of the room, surrounded either side and in front by large jars and a variety of smaller vessels (globular two-handled spouted vessel, amphoriskoi, jugs, pyxides, bowl), all of LM IB date, and undescribed small ivory, faience and stone objects, with a large rectangular stone slab and spindle whorl nearby. Against the west bench and along the east wall lay other large vessels, including three amphorae and an incense burner just inside the entrance. The room appears to have had a religious function. All ground-floor plaster was white, although some red-painted plaster from the upper storey also was recovered.¹⁰⁴

46. Core and flakes, HM Λ 4964 (not seen)

Red jasper, with whitish streaks, core L: 18; W: 15; Th: 14 cm, complete as is, with small separate flakes/‘blades’.

Large raw lump, with multiple flakes.

Egyptian or Near Eastern origin, undateable, presumably New Kingdom or MB IIC/LB I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Generally contemporary raw material in LM IB destruction context.

Comparanda: DIMOPOULOU 1997:436; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:106–107 #84.

References: FRENCH 1990:71; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:35; WARREN 1994:81 Fig.; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:88, 350, II:614 fig. 649, 696.

Comments: No objects in red jasper are reported from Archanes, an observation that emphasises the rarity of this stone. Jasper seals from Archanes include a tiny blue-green jasper Final Palatial seal from Tholos Δ , and two of green jasper purchased at Archanes by Evans now in the Ashmolean Museum (one is a ring depicting a sphinx, the other is {63} below). The excavators suggest this core is indicative of a jewellery-making or seal-engraving workshop, although they do not suggest this was in the area of Room 4 or its upper storey. The core apparently was one of the small stone objects in the centre of the room.

A workshop with a variety of similarly worked stones, including red jasper, also was found in the recent Poros excavations.

A.2. Area 26

This incompletely excavated part of the palace building, located at the extreme eastern end of the main excavations, could not be defined.¹⁰⁵ It lies, as excavated, inaccessible to the rest of the building. However, it was at least two storeys in height. The upper storey was constructed in stone, the less common option to mud-brick (and so, presumably, also was the lower storey). The upper floor in this area was stone-flagged, and may have been, at least in part, a stonemason’s workshop, as various pieces of unworked stone were recovered in the excavation.¹⁰⁶ The following was recovered amongst the upper-storey material:

47. Alabastron, HM – or MA — (?) (not seen)

(Unstated) stone, “large” but no dimensions stated, condition not stated but “part of” vessel only.

Alabastron, no further description.

Egyptian?; if so, Dynasty XII–XVIII.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Presumably Dynasty XII–mid-XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in contemporary to later LM IB destruction context.

Comparanda: (working) {219?}.

Reference: SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:356.

Comments: Presumably part of the material of the suggested stonemason’s workshop. The stone from this workshop is unworked, suggesting that this vessel fragment too may have been considered raw material. It would be particularly interesting if the vessel had been sawn, as with the closed vessel {219} from the ‘Gypsum House’ at Knossos.

¹⁰³ SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:33–35; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:86–89.

¹⁰⁴ See also SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:810 for references to objects from this room.

¹⁰⁵ SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1989:325; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:91, 140, 143, 145. For its position, see the latter, I:79 Drg. 6.

¹⁰⁶ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:90.

A.3. Room 33

Room 33 is one of the more recently excavated rooms, a large storage room farther back from the light well and communicating with it via another large storage room (32).¹⁰⁷ It, like the rest of the building, was destroyed by earthquake and fire. Room 33 was constructed of ashlar masonry and contained 27 pithoi and 109 smaller vessels, chiefly small cylindrical amphorae that would have contained liquids. Many had been vitrified by the fire although the south-west corner was particularly well-preserved. A “faience” scarab also was reported from this room, apparently immediately at the room’s entrance:

48. Scarab, HM – or MA — (not seen)

Probably steatite, whitish-grey, “thumbnail size” but no dimensions stated, apparently intact.

Scarab with lunate or trapezoid head, distinguished between pronotum and elytra by short tick only, no distinction between elytra. Rear legs indicated by diagonal line, notching on forward legs only. String hole through length. *Face*: “hieroglyphic sealing motif,” no further description.

Canaanite, MB IIB–C or Egyptian, Dynasty XV.

Context: Unstated, but probably LM IB.

Chronology: MB IIB–C or Dynasty XV scarab, in unstated but probably LM IB destruction context.

Comparison: {215}.

Reference: *Athens News* 12782 (20/10/00); GEORGIOUDIS 2000:46, 47 fig:lower; BLACKMAN 2001:126.

Comments: All information is as stated in publication or taken from the one published photograph, which does not show the ‘face’. The *Athens News* noted that a “competent foreign Egyptologist” will be examining the scarab. As far as can be ascertained by the evidence available, the situation here is directly comparable to that of the *anra* scarab in the Stratigraphical Museum excavations at Knossos {215}.¹⁰⁸ If Canaanite, it *could* be generally contemporary with or only slightly older than its LM IB context but, if Egyptian, it can only be an heirloom at the time of the room’s destruction. It is unlikely to be made of faience, although this is the material stated in publication.

B. Burial Building 3

Burial Building 3, on Phourni hill, probably was constructed in MM IA.¹⁰⁹ It contained some six rooms, most of which continued through five separate building phases to LM IIIA. Two original large

rooms had other rooms added later on their east, including the staircase in the north-eastern corner leading to an upper storey added in the final phase. Two distinctive burial strata were uncovered in the north and west rooms. The upper stratum, disturbed by cultivation, consisted of larnakes that must have been placed in this upper storey. It was dated to LM IIIA2–B by the grave goods, which included pottery, a clay goat figurine, gold leaf and sheet fragments, bronze vases, a nail and knife, a seal and finely carved ivory plaques, inlays, comb and weapon handle, and fragments of four plaster offering tables.

The lower stratum contained a total of seven burials in two widely spaced periods, to judge from the final publication. Three burials, dated to MM IA, were placed on the floor in the two southern rooms, associated with obsidian blades, seashells, animal tooth, and a comb, amulet and three seals of ivory.¹¹⁰ A few LM IA sherds and some scattered Neo-Palatial gold beads apparently indicate continual use and clearance of the building before the north rooms were cleared and levelled with earth for the larnakes.

Four cist-shaped larnakes, two each in the north-west and north-central rooms, were placed above the floor on an artificial earth deposit. The two burials found next to each other in the north-western corner of the north-west room, were of children. Inside one was found a stone vase, gold hair-spiral and leaf fragment and a bronze lamp, whilst just beside the other was an imported stone bowl. The other two larnakes in the north-central room were even more richly furnished, with a pear-shaped rhyton made of Egyptian banded travertine,¹¹¹ gold sheet with figure-of-eight decoration, a silver cup, bronze sword, knife, spearhead and vase fragments. There are indications of some burial cult practice. Whilst no date is provided for these larnake burials in the final publication, they had been assigned to the LM II period in earlier reports.

49. Jar (‘high-shouldered jar’), HM A 3050

Hornblende diorite (Type A or B), black and white with green veins, H: 11.9; D (rim): 19.3; (max): 23.2; (base): 12.2 cm, intact with some rim chips.

¹⁰⁷ This area is shown on the most recently published plan, in *Ergon* 2000, 96–97 figs. 114, 115; BLACKMAN 2001:126 fig.185. Room 32 contained 11 pithoi and 87 other vessels.

¹⁰⁸ Does the published “hieroglyphic sealing motif” description indicate an *anra* motif here also? On the *anra* motif, see Chapter 7.

¹⁰⁹ SAKELLARAKIS 1967b:278; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKEL-

LARAKIS 1991:106–112; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:194–198. See also DAUX 1967:789, fig.17–20; MEGAW 1967:20, SOLES 1973:194–200, 205–206.

¹¹⁰ See SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:813 for references to objects from this tomb.

¹¹¹ This is the rhyton mentioned by WARREN 1969:87 Type 34B; he dated the vessel to “LM ?I.”

High-shouldered, having a wide mouth with small slightly undercut collar and small flat base.

Egyptian, Early Dynastic, Dynasty I–III, probably late in this period.

Context: LM II?

Chronology: Dynasty I–III vessel, an heirloom in LM II? tomb deposition.

Comparanda: (in general) EL-KHOULI 1978: pl. 86–89 Class VIII.

References: *Ergon* 1966:183, pl. 154:a; DAUX 1967:789, fig. 17; SAKELLARAKIS 1967b:278, fig. 8:top centre; WARREN 1969:111 Type 43:D3; LECLANT 1969:299; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:187 #12, pl. 65:12; PHILLIPS 1991:II:402 #44, III:998 fig. 44; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:110 fig. 85; CLINE 1994:190 #494; LILYQUIST 1996:159; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:197, 356–357 fig. 327.a–b; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:242 #241.

Comments: Lilyquist suggests, without explanation but presumably based on the green veining, that this jar (which she calls a ‘squat diorite jar’) may be a local product. Certainly, it differs from Warren’s other Type 43:D ‘high shouldered bowls’ (i.e., jars) in both scale and profile, none of which she considers indigenous. It may have been reworked by a Minoan artisan, but no clear evidence for this possibility is apparent on the vessel itself. The material is diorite, a stone Warren attributes to only one indigenous vessel {122}, an egyptianising ‘spheroid jar’ which, whilst having a vaguely similar profile, is half the scale of the Archanes bowl and in accordance with other egyptianising MM III–LM I bowls of this type.

C. Burial Building 6

Burial Building 6 consists of four long, narrow and parallel compartments oriented north-south, together with a further two less well-preserved rooms aligned east-west at the north end.¹¹² A staircase and pavement outside are associated with the building, although these are later constructions. The westernmost compartments apparently were devoid of finds, but numerous bones were deposited in the two easternmost rooms after removal from nearby tombs, so essentially this seems to have functioned (at least partially) as an ossuary. Its material generally dates between EM III and MM IB, the four continuous rooms being constructed as required and not as a unit, although most of the pottery is of MM IA date. The burials were on the earthen floor, and consisted of 196 skulls and some closely spaced bodies in the two easternmost rooms, and in clay larnakes, pithoi

or other vessels. In total, over 70 clay vessels of mainly small shapes (jugs, handleless conical cups, bowls, pyxides and one-handed cylindrical or globular cups) and two bell-shaped objects, two bronze scrapers, two stone vases, an ivory plaque (in Room 3), and a quantity of beads, amulets and 16 seals in various shapes, forms and designs were recovered.¹¹³ Their specific distribution within the building is not stated.

50. Scarab, HM (Faience) 464

Similar to ‘white piece’ material,¹¹⁴ L: 17.8; W: 13.1; H: 8.7; SH: 2.1 mm, cracked and corroded with about one-quarter of face missing, chipped on face edge and head.

Scarab with lunate head, single line between pronotum and elytra, double line between elytra, with outer framing line around pronotum, elytra and clypeus. Lunate tail. Legs indicated by undercutting. String-hole through length. *Face:* Pair of *tête-bêche* dogs or goats with tails raised over back, engraved in a linear style. Line border.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XI.

Context: EM III–early(?) MM IB, mostly MM IA.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XI scarab, in generally contemporary MM IA–early(?) IB (most likely MM IA) deposition.

Comparanda: WARD 1978:*passim*, pl. VI:174–176 (generally Back type II, Head type A3, Side type d1, Tail fig. 5:upper left); WARD and DEVER 1994:*passim* (Back type LN, side type d1, head type A3).

References: SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1966:32; SAKELLARAKIS 1967b:276; *CMS* II.1:#395; WARREN 1980:494–495 n. 114; CADOGAN 1983:513; YULE 1983:366 n. 22; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:129; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:186 #10, pl. 44:10;¹¹⁵ PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 15, 325 n. 36; 1991:II:397–398 #40, III:997 fig. 40; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:97 fig. 69.upper;¹¹⁶ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:205, 357 fig. 328.upper, II:676 fig. 751.upper right; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442.

Comments: Examples of *tête-bêche* animals in linear style are most common in later Dynasty XI, but the presentation of this example (lacking internal details on the animals themselves) retains earlier elements and suggests it should be dated very early in the Middle Kingdom. Thus it may be the earliest imported scarab on the island, in Egyptian terms, although not necessarily the first scarab to arrive or be interred on Crete.

In contrast, very few Minoan examples of *tête-bêche* animals are known.¹¹⁷

51. Seal, HM Σ–K 2251

Bone, L: 15.6; Max. W: 12.4; H: 10.8; *Face:* L: 6.0; W: 5.4; SH: 1.9 mm, chipped at edge of face and side, right wing repaired.

¹¹² SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1966:32; SAKELLARAKIS 1967b:276; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKIS 1991:98–104; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:302–303. See also SOLES 1973:128–132.

¹¹³ See SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997: II:813 for references to objects from this tomb. Note that the ivory plaque does not depict a griffin, as stated in

I:203. See II:402 for comments regarding ceramic material dating.

¹¹⁴ Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 08 May 2000). Despite the HM catalogue entry, it definitely is not faience.

¹¹⁵ The material is misidentified as faience.

¹¹⁶ Misidentified as coming from Burial Building 7.

¹¹⁷ One example is YULE 1981:129, pl. 7:Motif 8:B:9.

Seal, in the form of a fly, with wings closed. Head, eyes and nose are carved (not engraved). Row of short engraved lines behind head. Wings indicated by parallel lines within a border. *Face*: Almost circular, divided in half by two parallel lines along length of fly's body. On one side a triangle denoted by hatched lines, on the other two joined leaves, deeply cut.

Minoan, EM III–MM IA.

Context: EM III–MM IB, mostly MM IA.

Chronology: EM III–MM IA seal, in generally contemporary EM III–early MM IB (most likely MM IA) tomb deposition.

Comparanda: PHILIPPAKI, SYMEONOGLOU and FARAKLAS 1967:pl. 160:ε; (other fly on Minoan Crete) {272}.

References: SAKELLARAKIS 1965b:178; 1966:412; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1966:32; SAKELLARAKIS 1967b:276; HOOD 1978:117; *CMS* II.1:#379; YULE 1981:99–100 Class 33:I; PHILLIPS 1990:325 n. 33; 1991:II:398–399 #41, III:997 fig. 41; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:102 fig. 76; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:398 #389; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II: 688–689, figs. 786–787, 676 fig. 751.lower right; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:192 #187.

Comments: Sakellarakis suggests the form of this seal may have been influenced by the use of the fly in Egypt as a symbol of courage and bravery. The Pharaoh presented a gold medal in the form of a fly for military valour, according to Dynasty XVIII texts.¹¹⁸ Called 'The Order of the Golden Fly,' the decoration may have a Canaanite origin,¹¹⁹ and was introduced to Egypt in the very beginning of the New Kingdom.¹²⁰ This symbolism is not recorded earlier, and should not be associated with this Minoan seal of much earlier date.

Prior to this, however, smaller Egyptian amulets in gold, faience and carnelian were common necklace 'beads;' they may have represented the *b3* (*ba* or 'soul/essence' of the deceased), as flies commonly laid eggs on fresh corpses and newly-hatched flies would have been observed flying away within a few days of death. Alternatively, they may have been intended to ascribe the fly's fecundity to the wearer or protect them from its persistent annoyance.¹²¹ The most common periods for the type appear to be Naqada (the earliest known is from a Naqada II grave), and Dynasties XII and XVIII, although they are found in all Dynastic periods.¹²² An amulet in the form of a fly was found at Hemamieh,¹²³ and these apparently are typical of the FIP. The Archanes seal, however, is of Minoan manufacture and probably locally inspired. The face design certainly is Minoan.

D. Burial Building 7

Immediately west of Burial Building 6 another was

constructed and in use during early MM IA.¹²⁴ Burial Building 7 was a large well-constructed building, later almost totally destroyed by Tholos Tomb B, of which construction began later in MM IA and its southern end directly overlies the earlier building. Nonetheless, Burial Building 7 consisted of some six recognisable rooms, some of them having paved floors and generally rectangular in shape. Objects recovered include some clay vessels of chiefly MM IA date, clay larnakes, figurine and sealing, a bronze dagger, pin and figurine, gold sheet fragments, stone tools, figurine and vases, and a variety of beads, seals and amulets in different materials.¹²⁵

Two rooms second from the west, which lay below the later pillar room of Tholos B, were the most severely disturbed. The northern of the two contained only fragments of stone vases, obsidian blades, two small fragments of gold sheeting and an imported Egyptian scarab.¹²⁶ No ceramics are reported from this room.

52. Scarab, HM (Ivory) 378

'White piece,' L (pres.): 22.2; W (pres.): 14.4; H: 9.6; SH: (L): 2.8; (W): 2.0 mm, about half preserved.

Scarab with single line between pronotum and elytra and ladder bordered by double lines between elytra, single diagonal gouge/line on elytra, tail indicated by lunate, framing line around elytra. Legs indicated by deep undercutting and notching. String-hole through length, and another through width. *Face*: Simple linked C-scrolls around edge, with possible stem in centre of design at broken edge. Line border.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XI.

Context: MM IA (early).

Chronology: Late Dynasty XI scarab, in early MM IA tomb deposition.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1891: pl. VIII:73, 75, 87; WARD 1978: pl. IX:255, *passim* (generally Back type H).

References: SAKELLARAKIS 1967a:154, pl. 137:γ; WARREN 1980:495 n. 118; CADOGAN 1983:516; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:129; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:186 #9, pl. 44:9;¹²⁷ PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 15; 1991:II:400 #42, III:997 fig. 42; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:97 fig. 69.lower;¹²⁸ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:206, 357 fig. 328.lower; PHILLIPS 2005a:44.

¹¹⁸ BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:238.

¹¹⁹ ALDRED 1978:118.

¹²⁰ KRITSKY 1993:38. The earliest known are those of Queen Ah-hotep, presented by her son(s) Kamose and Ahmose, last king of Dynasty XVII and first of Dynasty XVIII.

¹²¹ ANDREWS 1994:63.

¹²² PETRIE 1914:12 #19; ANDREW 1994:62.

¹²³ BRUNTON 1927:16, pl. XLVIII:36:A:6.

¹²⁴ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1966:32–33; SAKELLARAKIS 1967b:276–278; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:97–98; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:169, 206–208. See also DAUX 1967:786, 789;

BRANIGAN 1970a:158–160; SOLES 1973:182–194. For a plan distinguishing the walls of Burial Building 7 and the later Tholos Tomb B, see SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:91 fig.66; in SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:fig. 40 the hatched walls belong to Burial Building 6.

¹²⁵ See SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II: 813 for references to objects from this tomb.

¹²⁶ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:206. Note that the scarab material is misidentified as 'faience.'

¹²⁷ The material again is misidentified as 'faience'.

¹²⁸ Misidentified as coming from Burial Building 6.

Comments: Both string-holes are original, prior to surface coating.

Given the MM IA (early) date published for this tomb, the scarab itself should be considered earlier rather than later in the range quoted. Warren and Hankey had noted the design is “at home in the First Intermediate Period–XIth Dynasty,” but this was before scarab typology dating was revised over the past decade.

E. Burial Building 9

Burial Building 9 lies immediately next to Tholos Γ, and actually abuts onto it.¹²⁹ Only three rooms were excavated, of which two lay east of the tholos and the third was added to its south-eastern side. They also served as buttresses for the tholos walls that had been constructed in EM III. All three rooms served as burial chambers, in use during MM IA–B. Both rooms to the east, the northern part of the building as excavated, revealed multiple burials in three successive layers, a mixture in larnakes, pithoi and the ground itself. Object types recovered from these rooms are similar: obsidian blade, flakes and core, seashells, clay human female figurine and bull figurines, two bull rhyta, seals and amulets in ivory and steatite, clay vessel, the repoussé rim of a gold vessel, and a bead. A stone vessel also was recovered, but its location not stated.¹³⁰

E.1. Specified layer in Southern Room

The southernmost room (3) contained five successive layers of 172 burials in total, mainly in the ground but children and infants in pithoi, jars and one larnax. The finds in this room, which sometimes are distinguished by layer in the publication, include a total of 155 clay vessels in a variety of shapes, bell-shaped objects, gold bands, steatite and ivory amulets, a necklace of steatite beads and several of seashells (one including a meteorite bead), further beads of bronze (1), rock crystal (1) and steatite (3), ivory handle, and 11 seals in bone and ivory. The clay vessels include small jugs, two-handed bridge-spouted tripod jars and other vessel forms, bowls and fruit-

bowls, ring-based and plain handleless conical cups, one-handed semi-globular cups, two-handed cups, cooking pots and amphoriskoi.

The following was recovered in the middlemost burial layer just beside a pithoid vase that contained a child’s burial having a sea-shell necklace, a small clay amphora and three one-handed semi-globular cups.

53. Sistrum, HM Π 27695 (not handled; replica in MA)

Clay, L: 18; W (max at ring) 6.9; H (ring): 10 cm, broken but repaired, wooden slats restored, three discs.

Sistrum, ‘arch’ type with long flat handle, oval ring with two holes either side of ring for two (lost, presumably wooden) slats, strung with three (separate) flat roughly circular perforated discs.

Minoan, MM IA.

Context: MM IA(–B?).

Chronology: MM IA object, in generally contemporary MM IA(–B?) tomb deposition.

Comparison: SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:353–354 figs. 325–326 (and numerous other illustrations elsewhere)

References: RAAB 1988; CATLING 1989:98, fig. 132; PHILLIPS 1991:II:405–406 #48, III:1000 fig. 48; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:118–121 fig. 99; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:325, 328–329, 351–356; YOUNGER 1998:38–39, 65 #24, pl. 22.2; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000: 267 #265.

Comments: The sistrum is of the ‘Egyptian’ rather than ‘Near Eastern’ type, having a frame closed (rather than open) at the top. Egyptian sistra (from the Greek *σειειν*, ‘to shake’) generally are of two kinds, one with the rattle squared in the form of a naos, the other arched like the Archanes sistrum. The ‘naos’ type is known as early as Dynasty VI, and most commonly is made of faience although also known in metal (usually bronze) and wood in Dynasty XVIII when the instrument first becomes popular; the discs and bars are of metal (usually bronze).¹³¹ The form is most popular after the Third Intermediate Period, and usually is identified as *sš.t*. This word is not, however, exclusively associated with the ‘naos’ form as distinct from the ‘arch’ form.¹³²

No evidence for the existence of the ‘arch’ type itself is found in Egypt prior to the New Kingdom,¹³³ although the word most commonly (but again not exclusively) associated with this form (*šym*) is mentioned in a few Middle Kingdom texts. This presents a serious chronological problem for these putative Egypt-

¹²⁹ SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:118–122; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:210–212.

¹³⁰ See SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II: 813 for references to objects from this tomb.

¹³¹ See ZIEGLER 1979:31–62, esp. 31, 34.

¹³² REYNDERS 1998.

¹³³ Two prototype examples for the ‘arch’ sistrum have been suggested by ZIEGLER 1979:34; 1984:959. See also MANNICHE 1991:62–65; REYNDERS 1998:946, 954. One of Ziegler’s suggested prototypes (WEGNER 1950:70 #42, pl. 15.b) is not Egyptian but *Minoan*, being the sistrum depicted on the ‘Harvester Vase’ from Aaghia Triadha. The

other (EDGAR 1915:59 fig. 5, pl. XXXV) is highly unlikely. It was illustrated in a scene in the tomb of *Hsw* the Elder at Kom el-Hisn in the Western Delta, but is now lost (compare the Edgar illustrations with SILVERMAN 1988:figs. 31 at left, 36a); the published photograph is unclear. This is the only possible example of an ‘arch’ sistrum in Egypt prior to the New Kingdom, as the tomb is dated by Silverman to the early Middle Kingdom (KIRBY, OREL and SMITH 1998:26 n. 13) and appears in the only published illustration to have a woven centre rather than loose discs on slats to produce noise; no actual ‘arch’ sistrum is known before the New Kingdom.

ian ‘prototypes’ on the Archanes sistrum – a point not emphasised by the excavators¹³⁴ – as it predates the Egyptian form. It is highly unlikely that the Egyptian ‘arch’ sistrum was the origin of its design. Its appearance on Crete at this early date is cause for speculation that the influence for this form of sistrum *may* in fact have been in the reverse direction.

A second Minoan ‘arch’ sistrum is seen later, on the MM III–LM I ‘Harvester Vase’ from Hagia Triadha, being carried by a member of the harvest procession. Younger also identifies another apparent ‘arch’ sistrum on a damaged three-prism steatite seal from the MM IIB ‘Malia Workshop’.¹³⁵ Later Egyptian ‘arch’ sistra tended to include thick horizontal projections at the top of the handle, thus forming the *ꜥnh* sign of life (S 34) in general shape and often decorated with the head of the goddess Hathor at the top of the handle. Neither are found on later Minoan sistra.

See now Chapter 18, Gerontomouri for further early Minoan sistra.

E.2. Unspecified, in Southern Room

The following were recovered in the southern room, but a specific association with a layer or burial is not stated.

54. Seal, HM Σ–K 3204 (not seen)

Ivory, hippopotamus tusk,¹³⁶ no dimensions stated, intact. Theriomorphic seal in the form of a squatting ape, seated as if on a (non-existent) base and forepaws resting on the ground between hind paws. Pointed nose/mouth, eyes and ears lightly depicted. Horizontal string-hole with wide diameter drilled through sides at upper arm level.¹³⁷ *Face*: Apical shape, with incised ribbed leaf at rounded end, remainder two alternating rows of horizontal curved line and band of five reverse J-hooks, each joined to horizontal line below, with vertical line border either side.

Minoan, MM IA(–B?).

Context: MM IA–B.

Chronology: MM IA(–B?) seal, in generally contemporary or slightly later MM IA–B tomb deposition.

Comparanda: (shape) {469}; {563}; {567}; {568}; {569}.

References: SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:687, 688 fig. 784.

Comments: Rather summarily executed figure, except for deep cutting to differentiate arms and lower legs, but otherwise similar to the comparanda quoted. The ape appears to be a *Cynocephalus* from the published illustration. There seems to be no good parallel for the face design.

55. Amulet or pendant, HM O–E 626 (not seen)

Bone, no dimensions stated, apparently intact.

Amulet in the form of a squatting(?) ape(?), apparently a monkey or possibly a baboon, with limbs somewhat twisted

but apparently with head sunk or hanging, high shoulders (or thick mane?) around neck, arms positioned in front between hind legs. Drilled eyes and apparently larger drilled hole on top of head (for suspension?). No published illustration or description of back or sides.

Minoan, MM IA–B.

Context: MM IA–B.

Chronology: MM IA–B object in MM IA–B tomb deposition.

References: SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:120 fig. 97; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:365, 401 #443; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:212, II:635 fig. 690.bottom right, 636 fig. 694.

Comments: This piece apparently is unique, and is stated to be a monkey by its excavators. I am unconvinced of this identification based on the published illustrations, but a tail might be evident at the back view (unpublished) to confirm their identification.

F. Burial Building 18

Burial Building 18 is located south of Tholos B, separated from it by Tholos Γ.¹³⁸ It was constructed directly overtop an earlier structure, Burial Building 24, and consists of some ten rooms constructed in two phases. The three southern rooms (# 1–3) date to EM III and continued in use until MM IA. The other seven (# 4–10) later added, probably in MM IB although perhaps in MM IA, on the north side were in use until MM II. Bodies were interred in different forms of larnax, in pithoi and in the ground.

The three original rooms to the south, contiguous east-west, contained numerous interments in three and four successive layers. Pottery of EM III (mainly)–MM IA date, was recovered together with ivory seals, obsidian blades, amulets and beads in a variety of materials (mainly steatite, some ivory) and shapes, a seal impression on a conical clay object, and necklaces of sea shells, steatite and faience beads.

The northern rooms had some 38 burials, again in up to four successive layers of all three burial types. One contained an adult couple, and two burials were of children. Pottery of mainly MM IB–II date were found, including some Kamares ware, although sherds of EM II grey ware also were found. Three stone vessels (one an EM III–MM IA kernos), seals of ivory, bone and hard semiprecious stones, and a bronze pin also are recorded from here. A ‘long rectangular marble object’ of indeterminate use but possibly a tool

¹³⁴ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:354–355

¹³⁵ *CMS* II.2 #134.c. See YOUNGER 1998:39, 76 #57. It is not included in OLIVIER and GODART 1996 (see YOUNGER 1998:79). This depiction is, to my mind, a very doubtful ‘arch’ sistrum representation, and is not included in the present catalogue. If it *is* an ‘arch’ sistrum, it too is dated earlier than the Egyptian instrument.

¹³⁶ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:687.

¹³⁷ No illustration or description of back is published; the only image is three-quarter view.

¹³⁸ SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:122–123; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:215–218.

also is reported from the building, but its location is not stated. Only two items are specifically identified as coming from one of the northern rooms (9), two sherds of EM IIA fine grey ware and a single seal.¹³⁹

56. Seal, HM Σ-K 3219 (not seen)

Ivory, hippopotamus tusk,¹⁴⁰ dimensions not stated, worn but well-preserved.

Oval 'stamp-cylinder' seal with oval section, having two decorated faces, nearly triangular string-hole through width. *Face 1*: Two rosettes of six radiating petals within a figure-8, with leaf splaying from either side of its crossover, one smaller and unembellished. *Face 2*: Ring of interlocking hooked Z-scrolls around edge, with two further Z-scrolls joining in centre. Face 1 is smaller than Face 2, having a rounded edge. All curved lines doubled. Minoan, EM III-MM IA, probably later in this date range.

Context: EM IIA-MM II, likely MM I(A?/B).

Chronology: Probably MM IA seal, in generally contemporary or somewhat later MM I(A?/B)-II tomb deposition.

Comparanda: (shape) YULE 1981:90 Class 32b; (Face 1) YULE 1981:pl. 12 Motif 19.10, pl. 26 Motif 46.5; MARANGOU 1992:212 #268; (Face 2) MARTIN 1971:pl. 48 base type 1.a-c; TUFNELL 1984:pl. XXVIII:2250, 2252; WARD and DEVER 1994:15 fig. 2:3; {72}.

References: CATLING 1989:98, fig. 131; PHILLIPS 1991:II:405 #47, III:999 fig. 47; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:682-683 figs. 771.bottom right, 775; PHILLIPS 2004:164-165, 165 fig. 4.

Comments: The 'stamp-cylinder' is a common indigenous Minoan seal form of EM II-MM IA date. Face 1 falls within the 'Border-Leaf Complex, although radiating petals usually number four or eight rather than six, of EM III-MM IA (-?) date; MARANGOU (1992) is another. Face 2 of this seal is quite unusual for a Minoan design.¹⁴¹ Use of formally-arranged multiple interlocking scrolls is characteristic of Egyptian Middle Kingdom, especially as 'scroll borders' for name and title inscriptions, and the type similar to the Archanes seal scrolls date generally to the late Middle Kingdom. The comparanda quoted here, however, are limited to interlocking Z- and S-scrolls, and bear no inscription.

This design *may* be an example of the artist trying out a variation of the Minoan motif on a clearly Minoan seal form. The seal's context, in the northern MM I(A?/B)-II rooms, suggests this may have been an heirloom piece, an intrusion like the two potsherds, or alternatively a late example of the type, since both its seal form and design of Face 1 are Pre-Palatial types.

G. Space between Burial Buildings 8 and 9

Burial Building 8 is located east of Burial Building 3 and north of Burial Building 9.¹⁴² An unstated num-

ber of sarcophagus burials were exposed in the small L-shaped space here, although they are barely discussed¹⁴³ and are only the upper burial levels in the area. Recovered from here were some amulets, necklaces and beads, MM IIIB pottery, sarcophagi, several seals and a stone vessel.¹⁴⁴

57. Pendant (HM?, MA?) (not seen)

Material and dimensions not stated, some chipping, otherwise intact.

Pendant possibly representing two apes back-to-back with heads hanging or 'drooping'. Only the heads are carved, with eyes drilled and possibly also at 'nose'. Slightly curving flattened unembellished body. String-hole through thickness at shoulder level, apparently drilled twice.

Minoan, EM III-MM IA.

Context: None, between two MM IA-B burial buildings.

Chronology: EM III-MM IA object, in loose context between generally contemporary MM IA-B tombs.

Comparanda: {395}; {511}.

Reference: SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:636-637, figs. 690:centre left, 693:left.

Comments: This form has been identified as a 'two-headed bird'.¹⁴⁵ Its formal similarity to the double ape figures, (e.g., {459}), is striking, especially in the shape of the drooping heads. This does not necessarily mean that the Archanes piece represents apes but, to judge from the head shape, they might represent *Cercopithec*i. Others listed by Yule for this shape show a different head type altogether, with the exception of those from Marathokephalo and Trapeza.

The excavators quote a parallel for this pendant at Kalathiana, but no similar object was excavated from the Kalathiana tholos or settlement and they must refer instead to that from Marathokephalo {395}, although less likely that from Platanos {475}, also published by XANTHOUIDES (1924) in the same volume as the Kalathiana site.

H. Tholos Tomb A

North of the ossuary and on the summit of Phourni hill Sakellarakis excavated Tholos A. It had been partially buried by debris over time, its main tholos area robbed possibly in Roman times or earlier and, in modern times, it had been converted for use as a small hut by local peasants.¹⁴⁶ The tomb itself for the most part was underground (up to the entrance lintel), and consisted of a very long dromos facing east, tall tholos of 4.31 m. diameter complete with keystone slab still in place some 5.04 m. above the floor, and a

¹³⁹ See SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:814 for references to objects from this building.

¹⁴⁰ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:683.

¹⁴¹ It is not paralleled in YULE 1981:160-161 Motif 46, pl. 26 Motif 46, although it may be a development of his Motifs 49-50, pp.163-155, pls. 27-28.

¹⁴² See Archanes B and E, above.

¹⁴³ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:232, fig. 181, 250 Drg. 65.

¹⁴⁴ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:814, figs. 693:left, 748, 766-768.

¹⁴⁵ XANTHOUIDES 1924:123; PENDLEBURY 1939:87; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:637.

¹⁴⁶ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1966:32-33; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:72-85; 1996:1113-1115; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:158-168.

sealed 3.67 m.² trapezoidal inner side chamber on the south side with collapsed roof; it is comparable to Mainland Mycenaean tholoi. The disarticulated skeleton of a sacrificed horse was recovered in the main chamber just west of the entrance to the inner chamber, and a pit directly but obliquely in front of this entrance contained a thoroughly robbed larnax burial. Although the tholos had been plundered in antiquity, the side chamber was intact. Its entrance blocking remained in place, including the skull of a bull with head facing into the sealed chamber, which was found when the blocking was removed in 1965.

Although the human bones were not well enough preserved to indicate either age or sex, Sakellarakis plausibly has identified the single larnax burial in the side chamber as a that of a woman of high social status, a priestess, queen or princess by the lack of weaponry and the type of grave goods found, chiefly jewellery. Her position at least could be recorded: in foetal position with head facing west. Tucked into the south-east corner space next to the painted larnax were seven bronze vessels including two different tripod cauldrons, two hydria, two two-handled krateroid vessels and a jug, and a serpentine cup at the north-east corner of the larnax. A bronze three-handled cup, ladle and lamp together with an ivory-handled bronze tool and three ivory plaque attachments from probably wooden vessels were found below the larnax, and an ivory-handled bronze mirror behind it. In the south-west corner were numerous glass beads and two beads and two signet-rings of gold, all apparently strung onto necklaces originally, of which five have been reconstructed. The ivory attachments of a wooden footstool remained *in situ* in front of the larnax, and along the west wall were three plain conical cups, a one-handled cup, two one-handled 'champagne cups' and a two-handled variation, and a low two-handled bowl, most dating to the beginning of LM IIIA2 and in use prior to the final destruction of Knossos.¹⁴⁷

Within the sealed larnax itself, 67 pieces of gold rosette (51, around the waist) and papyrus-shaped (16, along the hem) attachments to a long robe, three gold signet-rings and a hair-spiral, six reconstructed

necklaces with beads mainly of gold in a variety of shapes and techniques but some with further beads of sard, rock crystal, faience or steatite, five spindle whorls of rock crystal (2) and steatite (3), a plain gold ring and two iron beads (found on the breast) probably were worn at internment. A bronze lentoid and sard lentoid seal, two small boxes probably employed as amulets, fragments of a faience vase, and a glass pin also were recovered within the larnax. The specific findspot of a pair of bronze tweezers within the tomb is not stated.¹⁴⁸ It is one of the richest burials ever found on Crete.

58. Cornflower bead, HM –A 996 (not handled)

Gold, dimensions not stated, intact.

Cornflower bead, rounded, with horizontal string-hole near top.

Probably Egyptian, mid-Dynasty XVIII (Amonhotep III or slightly later), just possibly Minoan, LM IIIA1/early LM IIIA2.

Context: Beginning or early LM IIIA2.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XVIII (late reign of Amenhotep III or early reign of Akhenaten) bead, in contemporary beginning/early LM IIIA2 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:238 #314 (fig. 15); **{67}**; **{73}**; **{124}**; **{500}**.

References: SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1966:33 fig. 6; SAKELLARAKIS 1970:153 n. 82 #60–85; PHILLIPS 1991:II:403 #45, III:999 fig. 45; 1992b:499; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:610–611 figs. 642, 645, 639–640 fig. 700:top row, second from right; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:127 #108; PHILLIPS 2003; 2005a:45; 2005b:456 n. 4.

Comments: This is the only example in gold from Crete. It has been strung as the central pendant bead on a necklace of gold beads of various shapes, restrung in the order in which they were found *in situ* on the breast of the body. Most beads on this necklace are simple rounded shapes in assorted graded sizes and varying string-hole diameters, at least one almost a ring-shape, while four are the elongated fluted type similar to those found at the Isopata 'Royal Tomb'¹⁴⁹ and elsewhere. The motif of the central bead is not Minoan, but the bead itself *might* be as the fluted companion beads are Minoan types. Analysis of the gold itself *may* be of some help in identifying the probably Egyptian manufacture of this bead, although the gold itself must have been imported even if the bead is a Minoan product. Nonetheless, its colour appears to be more 'white' than its companion beads. The stringing, at least, must be considered Minoan.

The cornflower bead type is rare prior to the reign of Akhenaten in Egypt, this period barely overlapping with the context

¹⁴⁷ POPHAM 1974:253, 255, KANTA 1980:33, 322 and NIEMEIER 1985:48 all date the larnax and/or some elements of the pottery to either the beginning of, or early in, LM IIIA2, and preceding the destruction of Knossos. SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997, I:168, II:451, 480 (and earlier references) date it just slightly earlier, to late LM IIIA1.

¹⁴⁸ See SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:812 for references to objects from this tomb. Not listed are the glass pin (668 fig. 738) and iron beads (624 fig. 621). The lead horns listed there as being from Tholos A actually are from Tholos B.

¹⁴⁹ EVANS 1905:542 fig. 130.

date of beginning LM IIIA2. This overlap strongly suggests the dead woman, or one of her mourners, was able to acquire either new or unusual forms of jewellery items from abroad, and emphasises both her exalted position in society and her (family's?) international connections.¹⁵⁰

Not included in LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990 or CLINE 1994.

I. Tholos Tomb B

This building is an almost square complex centering around a tholos (B) itself, with a dromos facing south-east.¹⁵¹ Twelve rooms are identified. A staircase at the south side indicates at least a partial upper storey, also used for burials. A pillar room, crypt and several other side rooms surrounding the tholos indicate an arrangement that apparently remained substantially unchanged over some six centuries of use and at least five (possibly six) separate building phases between later MM IA and LM IIIB. During the last construction phase, the original tholos entrance and an interior doorway were blocked, a bench added along the interior tholos wall, its floor raised and a new, shorter entrance opened on the north-east side. The complex had been robbed extensively in Roman times, but some small fragments of plain white and painted plaster in a variety of colours were recovered, together with ceramic vessels, clay larnakes, figurines and bell-shaped objects, bronze belt, tweezers and vessels, gold sheeting and a signet ring, silver pin, stone vases and tools, ivory inlays and other fragments, and a variety of beads, amulets and seals.¹⁵²

The west side room (4) is the best preserved, with plastered interior walls preserved high enough to indicate an incline into a saddle roof. It was apparently constructed in the first (later MM IA) building phase, and continued in use at least to LM IIIA times where one or more robbed burials are found and the doorway leading to the tholos was blocked. No finds are reported for the lower levels, but the many bones recovered at this topmost level evidently were part of an important (possibly royal) and thoroughly robbed burial or burials placed there, either during or after the changes of the last construction phase, although it is unclear from the publication whether this

emplacement is original or secondary. Amongst a large quantity of human bone fragments were recovered two seals of LM IIIA1 date and many pieces of carved ivory.

59. Terminus, HM O-E 380 (not seen)

Ivory, L: 1.9; W (lowest point of neck): 0.7 cm, broken off on neck, possibly also at beak, much battered and pitted.

Terminus in the form of a *regardant* swan head, with 'kinked' neck, narrow elongated head and eye drilled through head. Lower part of neck appears straight, with nearly right-angled 'kink'.

Probably Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII, just possibly Minoan, LM IIIA1 or Mycenaean, LH IIIA.

Context: LM IIIA, probably LM IIIA1.

Chronology: Dynasty XVIII, possibly LM or LH IIIA object, in generally contemporary LM IIIA(?) tomb deposition.

Comparanda: HERMANN 1932:pl. X.d; VANDIER D'ABBADIE 1972:32–33 #78–81.

References: SAKELLARAKIS 1971:224, pl. 50:β; PHILLIPS 1991:II:400–401 #43, III:997 fig. 43; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1996:1116; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:741, 742 fig. 871; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:181 #168.

Comments: Possibly the handle end of a small 'cosmetic spoon' (see fig. 25).

Not included in LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990 or CLINE 1994.

J. Tholos Tomb E

Tholos E, at the southern end of the excavation area, is the usual circular shape with entrance facing east, having a monolithic lintel and doorposts.¹⁵³ It was set above ground, so had no dromos. This was probably the first burial building at Phourni, in EM IIA(?) as the lower of the two burial layers is dated to this period. The later, upper layer is dated to MM IA–IIB, with a definite gap in use of some two centuries.¹⁵⁴

The lower layer had numerous burials in larnakes and in the ground, together with 117 offerings. It was levelled to create the upper layer and the material was mixed with it so could not always be distinguished. A bronze finger-ring, limestone 'Koumasa' figurine fragment probably of local origin, three flint pieces, 27 obsidian blades, eight seals of shist (1), steatite (2), hippopotamus tusk (2), bone (2) and serpentine (1), 19 amulets of bone (16), boar tusk (2) and

¹⁵⁰ Other (carnelian) beads *may* have travelled beyond Egypt at this time, see full discussion in Chapter 8.

¹⁵¹ SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:90–96, plan fig.66; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:169–179.

¹⁵² See SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:812 for references to objects from this tomb complex.

¹⁵³ SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:126–127; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKIS 1997:I:186–188. This was the subject of Diamantis Panagiotopoulos Ph.D. thesis

(University of Heidelberg, 1996; see now PANAGIOTOPOULOS 2002). He kindly clarified some further unpublished details (personal communications, 16 February and 13 March 2000) incorporated into the present text, including the list of tomb contexts and his profile drawing of vessel {60}, and allowed me to include the information above.

¹⁵⁴ See SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:812–813 for references to objects from this tomb.

steatite (2), seven beads of steatite (6) and gold (1), fragments of two gold bands, a marble vase or lid and a miniature steatite vessel are specifically assigned to this level, together with a clay ‘Pyrgos-type’ incised pyxis of EM IIA date, 80 sherds from about 60 vessels (none clearly later in date), and other sherds, and about 45 other unnamed objects in clay, shist, stone, bone and antler.

The upper level, better preserved, had 56 burials in larnakes, pithoi and in the ground, probably including children, in a clearly developing and organised arrangement. The seals at least were assigned to two dated groups, MM IA and MM IB–II. Numerous grave goods were recovered, together with seashells (12) and animal bones. Finds specifically noted from this level are a necklace of amethyst (50), sard (3), steatite (1) and faience (1) beads, another of 14 faience beads only and a further seven loose beads of steatite (4), silver (1) and shell (2), bronze signet-ring, miniature ‘scraper’ and two pins, 13 obsidian blades and a core, a flint piece, and 11 seals of rock crystal (1), hippopotamus tusk (2), quartz (2), boar tusk (1), steatite (3), ophite (1) and meteorite? (1), bronze signet ring, three bone amulets, an ‘alabaster’ vase with lid, schist spouted bowl and an undescribed marble vessel, a clay bell-shaped object (idol?), spool, and about 20 further unnamed objects in clay, stone and shell, together with four complete/nearly complete clay vases and a further 560 sherds representing another 80 vessels nearly all MM IA date. The steatite bead recovered in the tholos is of Mycenaean date and presumably was intrusive. Some sherds could be dated within MM IB–IIA.

The following is assigned to the lower, EM IIA(?), level from the tholos.¹⁵⁵

60. Jar (‘miniature amphora’). HM Λ 3595 (not seen)

Olive-grey steatite with white mottling, H: 2.83; D: (rim) 2.0; (max) 2.45; (base) 1.45 cm, intact.

‘Miniature amphora’ with high slightly flattened shoulder, flat slightly raised base and short thickened rim. Interior cavity gouged, with vertical profile, rounded at bottom.

Minoan, EM II(A?).

Context: EM IIA(?).

Chronology: EM II, probably EM IIA, vessel, in generally contemporary EM IIA(?) tomb deposition.

Comparison: (general profile) {401}.

References: SAKELLARAKIS 1975:300, pl. 247.Ϸ; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:570, fig. 568:top row, fourth from left; PANAGIOTOPOULOS 2002:93, 153–154 #D 1, pls. 42.D1, 67.D1.

Comments: Described by Sakellarakis as belonging with either WARREN’s (1969) Type 28 (‘miniature amphora’) or 36A (‘small pot with globular or slightly flattened globular body with neck and/or out-turned rim’). Diamantis Panagiotopoulos prefers Type 28, comparing it to {401}, and indeed it is too elongated to fit within Type 36A and does belong to Type 28. It is, however, more squat than the usual ‘miniature amphora’ and is unusually angled at the shoulder, which might be considered an early feature in view of its context date.

K. Mycenaean Grave Enclosure

In 1972, Sakellarakis uncovered a rectangular Mycenaean grave enclosure just north of Tholos A.¹⁵⁶ The complex included seven rectangular shafts or pits, each originally surmounted by a rough stone stela of which three were recovered fallen into the pit itself. The entire group was surrounded by a stone enclosure wall, of which only the west wall and the angle to north and south are preserved; the entrance would have been along the missing eastern wall. All but one pit are oriented east-west, the last (# 3) north-south, on three levels descending as the ground sloped down eastwards. A circular *bothros* was found just outside the wall to the north-west, which contained only a large number of fragmentary clay vessels including cups, bowls, amphorae, hydriae and an unusual one-handed spouted cup with a plastic animal figurine on the interior of possibly LM IIIA2–B date. Each burial contained the remains of a rectangular painted larnax, all but one (# 2) devoid of bones, but here skull and teeth fragments indicate the head had been at the western end. The larnakes suggest a date range of LM IIIA1–B, of which the following are dated by the excavator: LM IIIA1: Pit 5; LM IIIA2: Pit 4, LM IIIA2–B: Pits 3 and 6. The enclosure as a whole, however, is dated to LM IIIA2.¹⁵⁷

Few objects were found with the larnakes, but rather in the shafts themselves. Reported from specific pits are ivory fragments (‘column’, pyxis and lid) from Pit 1, a one-handed clay ‘champagne’ cup and other unidentified sherds and some glass beads in

¹⁵⁵ I am assured by Diamantis Panagiotopoulos (personal communication, 16 February 2000) that the description by SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:686 of the shist seal of a “bird turning its head backwards” from this tomb is not intended to imply this is its zoomorphic form. It is not in fact a ‘duck *regardant*’ form.

¹⁵⁶ SAKELLARAKIS 1972:399–408, 415–417; KANTA 1980:33–34;

SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1996:1114–1115; KALLITSAKI 1997; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:189–193.

¹⁵⁷ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:I:189, II:480–483. KALLITSAKI 1997:220 dates the enclosure to early LM IIIA2.

Pit 3, four intact bronze vessels (a ladle, krateriskoid vase, large cup and cauldron) in Pit 4, fragments of a bronze vessel from Pit 5, and a variety of objects (described below) from Pits 2 and 6; nothing is reported from Pit 7. A talismanic lentoid seal in amethyst was found on the surface layer. Loose gold, sard, glass and faience beads were recovered in the larnakes, and were collected and arbitrarily strung together. Other objects reported from the enclosure and presumably from pits, but without specific published context, are two stone spindle whorls, two clay bell-shaped objects and an early LM clay human figurine.¹⁵⁸

K.1. Pit 2

Pit 2, the southern of the two middle-level pits, was described as the ‘pit of the stone vases’ from its main contents, a large cylindrical bucket-jar and lower portion of a jar, both in diorite. Also recovered were a clay hammer and fragments of two bronze vessels. This pit contained the skull and tooth fragments providing the body position of the burials. The grave stela, as the others found, was roughly-hewn.

61. Jar (‘spheroid jar’), HM Λ 3316 (not seen)

Diorite (or possibly gabbro?), H (pres.): 6.86; Dia. (base): 5 cm, shoulder to base only, one handle and rim profile missing.

Flat raised splaying base, tapering lower body, high sloping shoulder, solid horizontal lug handle on lower shoulder.

Minoan, LM I–IIIA.

Context: LM IIIA(2 early?).

Chronology: LM I–IIIA vessel, generally contemporary with/slightly later than, or an antique in, its LM IIIA(2 early?) tomb deposition.

Comparison: {85}.

References: SAKELLARAKIS 1972:404, 406 fig. 11, 416; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:573 fig. 576, centre left, 580–581 figs. 589; second from left,¹⁵⁹ 591; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:202 #197.

Comments: The material, stated to be diorite by the excavator, seems visually similar to the gabbro of which the smaller jar from Kalyvia {85} of similar shape and other details is made, rather than Egyptian (or even Minoan) diorite. The profile, solid handle and especially the splaying base and material (if gabbro) both argue that this is not an Egyptian product, and it is far more likely to be Minoan. The jar is only vaguely reminiscent of Warren’s imported ‘heart-shaped jar’ type, and probably was not derived from its form in any way. It seems better derived from the tall variety of the ‘spheroid jar’ form, with its raised base and horizontal lug handles.

K.2. Pit 6

Pit 6, second from the south at the eastern and lowest level, was devoid of bones but did have a stela. Its larnax was the only one found *in situ*, its bottom divided into six coffered sections, and the excavator suggests this imitation of wooden origin may provide a date of LM IIIA2–B. The main contents recovered are indicated by its identification as the ‘pit of the bronzes and ivories’. Material specifically reported from this pit are large fragments of five bronze vessels, fragments of a large ivory plaque (*not* a mirror handle) depicting a bull and calf, an ivory comb depicting crocodiles, dozens of small ivory inlay plaques (possibly for a large wooden object), and two lentoid seals in sardonyx and sard.

62. Comb, MA 312 (not handled)

Ivory, elephant,¹⁶⁰ H (with teeth): 4.02; (without) 3.45 cm, three joining and two non-joining fragments preserving almost half of design, and further fragment(s) of teeth.

Rectangular, with raised relief decoration on both faces of the handle, showing two registers of antithetical crocodiles on a ground line. Each faces to centre (‘confronted’) but with heads *regardant*. All have curled tails, long clawed feet, long snouts, and slit eyes but no ears. Scales indicated along the back by incised lines, and body scales by low circular depressions. Central rosette separating upper register crocodiles, rising to arc above top edge. Vertical border consisting of two rows of short horizontal notches flanking central raised ridge.

Minoan, LM IIIA1–early A2.

Context: Early LM IIIA2.

Chronology: LM IIIA1–early A2 object, in generally contemporary or slightly later LM IIIA2 early tomb deposition.

Comparanda: SYMEONOGLOU 1973:pl. 81:252–252.a; {102}.

References: SAKELLARAKIS 1972: 404, 416, fig. 13; POURSAT 1976:468 #III:1; 1977a:pl. VII.5; PHILLIPS 1991:II:404 #46, III:999 fig. 46; SAKELLARAKIS and SAKELLARAKIS 1991:69, 71 fig. 45 (drawing); 1996:1115; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:730–1 fig. 851 (drawing); PHILLIPS 1998:853–855, fig. 1.a; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:179–180 #166.

Comments: Separately-made teeth would be inserted into a prepared slot at the bottom edge of the handle. Enough is preserved to reconstruct the design, but note that the excavator’s published reconstruction drawing, and the subsequent restoration itself, do not correspond to the decoration seen on the published photograph of the object in Sakellarakis (1972);¹⁶¹ this restoration shows short rounded lizard-like heads with open mouth that are not *regardant* and are unparallelled elsewhere, and the one preserved rosette petal appears to have a radiating midrib not shown in the drawing.

¹⁵⁸ See SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:813 for references to objects from the enclosure. See also KALLITSAKI 1997:215–220 for a more complete identification of where specific objects were found.

¹⁵⁹ Note that the rim is restored incorrectly in this drawing. It should be similar to {85}.

¹⁶⁰ SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:730.

¹⁶¹ See also drawings in SAKELLARAKIS 1991 and SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997, and photograph in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000. All indicate the incorrect reconstruction.

L. No Find Context

The last object was ‘found near Archanes,’ either by Evans himself or by someone who sold it to him.

63. Seal, AM 1938.1084

Serpentine or chlorite? (soft very dark green stone, not jasper), L: 17.9; W: 18.8; H: 7.4; SH: 2.5 mm, scraped on back and chipped at SH ends, otherwise intact.

Lentoid, engraved on one face only and conoid profile on back. String-hole through length. *Face*: Cat with two dotted lines along body, and tail curled up behind, seizing a waterfowl by its long neck. Cat drawn up and contorted, facing left with neck twisted to face upwards. Bird indicated only by upraised wings and neck/head only. Two other waterfowl, apparently unaware of the central action, float to left above and below cat.

Minoan, LM IB?–IIIA1.

Context: None.

Chronology: Deposition LM IB? or later.

Comparanda: {319}; {530}; {572}.

References: EVANS *PM* IV.2:588, fig. 582; KENNA 1960:137 #344, pl. 13:344; HOOD 1971:90 fig. 52; YOUNGER 1983:127; MORGAN 1988:43, fig. 26; PHILLIPS 1991:II:407 #49, III:1000 fig. 49; SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:701 fig. 809; MILITELLO 2000:84 fig. 14; *CMS* VI:#367.

Comments: This, the only example of a cat having back markings on a seal, possibly was intended to represent the *Felis serval* with its regularly dotted coat, rather than the *Felis chaus*. Younger identifies this as one product of the “master of the berry-head waterbirds” within his “Cretan popular” stylistic group, that he dates to the late 16th–early 15th c. BC, or LM IA?–B. However, he also notes (YOUNGER 1973:II:155) that conoid backs first appear on Crete in LM IIIA1; as this does have a conoid back, it probably is later than the usual examples of his style.

ARKADES

The villages of Aphrati and Panagia lie on the extreme south-eastern edge of the Mesara plain where it meets the Diktaean mountain range. Between the two villages, on a hill called Profitis Ilias, is the site of ancient Arkades. The area was first explored by F. Halbherr in 1893–1894, who noted terrace walls, traces of Mycenaean remains and Geometric sherds on the hill.¹⁶² He also excavated small Sub-Minoan to Proto-Geometric tombs and collective burials on one of the hills sloping down from Ayios Ilias called ‘S tou Kofina to Kefali’.¹⁶³

D. Levi identified the site as Arkades in 1924, when he excavated fortifications and houses of the city. It is known chiefly as a classical city destroyed by the Romans, but there also is evidence for occupation from the Minoan period on. Additionally, Levi excavated numerous tombs, inhumation burials and cremation pithos burials on the western slopes of the hill. These dated chiefly to the Geometric and Early Orientalising periods, while four other Geometric tombs also were excavated nearby.¹⁶⁴

64. Seal, HM —¹⁶⁵ (not located)

Translucent coral-red and colourless sardonyx, L: 13.5; W: 13.0; H: 7 mm, one large chip on one side.

Lentoid seal, engraved on one face only. String-hole through length. *Face*: Minoan ‘genius’ standing in centre, facing left. Some ‘spikes’ at bottom of abdomen but no other indication of dorsal appendage. Dead deer or stag slung over far shoulder, supported by upraised arms of ‘genius’.

Minoan, LM IIIA.

Context: None.

Chronology: Deposition LM IIIA or later.

Comparanda: {266}; {557}; (“spectacle-eyes C”) {88}, {433}.

References: LEVI 1925–1926:191 fig. 241; GILL 1964:19 #33, pl. 5:1; *CMS* V.1:#209; YOUNGER 1986:135; PHILLIPS 1991:II:408–409 #50, III:1000 fig. 50; REHAK 1995:219.

Comments: Noted in publication as coming from Arkades, but is otherwise without provenance. Younger places this within his “spectacle eyes C” stylistic group, that he dates to LM IIIA.

ARVI

Whilst traveling through Crete in 1894, Evans noted a number of antiquities near the village of Arvi on the south-east coast. Although he mentioned that “Eg[yp]tian] scarabs often [are] found at Arvi,”¹⁶⁶ he made no purchases and none can be attributed to the area. Antiquarian sites too are mentioned, amongst them an early necropolis of cist-type graves having a number of stone and clay vessels dating to EM I/II–MM I,¹⁶⁷ including “steatite vases....going back to XII-dynasty egyptian models”. These too were not purchased.

He did purchase some contents of another tomb (not part of the necropolis) from a local peasant named Anastasi Christaki in the nearby town of

¹⁶² HALBHERR 1901a:283; 1901c:393–399.

¹⁶³ HALBHERR 1901a:283–287. See also KANTA 1980:74–75.

¹⁶⁴ LEVI 1927–1929. The later periods are discussed by SKON-JEDELE 1994:1699–1718, including discussion of the two scarabs published in PENDLEBURY 1930b:11 #12–13 (= SKON-JEDELE 1994:#2768–2769). One is since published by KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:#349, and both are dated to the Third Intermediate Period or later.

¹⁶⁵ Its present location is given as “D. Levi Collection, Athens”

by Gill both in GILL 1964 and the *CMS*. Doro Levi (personal communication, February 1989) notes that he presented it to the HM, and he has no “collection.” Neither it nor its catalogue number were identified in the HM, but Levi suggested it probably is there.

¹⁶⁶ EVANS *NB* C:36; BROWN and BENNETT 2001:92–93.

¹⁶⁷ EVANS 1894:285; 1895:112–113, 117–121; 1896:463. See also BOARDMAN 1961:168–169; HOOD, WARREN and CADOGAN 1964:91–92.

Amira.¹⁶⁸ Its contents included two amber beads,¹⁶⁹ three probably steatite studs, one rock crystal whorl, one amethyst and two yellow carnelian beads,¹⁷⁰ one red carnelian lentoid seal and fragments of a ribbed sword blade. A red carnelian bead now included with the finds may not have been from the same tomb.¹⁷¹ Evans originally dated the contents to LM I or II,¹⁷² but later amended his opinion to “possibly early LM I”.¹⁷³ However, the presence of a ribbed sword blade suggests the grave group should date no earlier than LM II, as this weapon did not appear in graves prior to this date.¹⁷⁴ Nonetheless, this dates only the sword, and the collection as a whole need not be the contents of a single tomb although it is consistent with a single grave group. Evans’ description suggests in fact several tombs were involved.

65. Bead. AM AE 313k

Amethyst, H: 13.4; D: 14.3; SH: 2.1 mm, intact, part of restrung group.

Globular, hole drilled through centre.

Probably Minoan, LM I–II, just possibly Egyptian, Dynasty XII(–XIII).

Context: None, possibly LM II or later.

Chronology: Probably LM I–II or Dynasty XII(–XIII) bead, in LM I or later deposition.

Comparanda: {3}; {505 (G)}.

References: EVANS 1896:463; 1914a: 43 n. 2; *PM* II.1:174 n. 2; PHILLIPS 1991:II:411–412 #51, III:1000 fig. 51; BROWN and BENNETT 2001:92:pl., 93, 412 #67, 413:fig. 67; WALKER and GALANAKIS 2007:#178.

Comments: Sources of amethyst are unknown on Crete and in the Aegean. The nearest source appears to be southern Egypt.¹⁷⁵ If for this reason alone, the bead must be considered Egyptian. But whether the bead itself actually was made in Egypt or the raw stone imported to Crete to be made into a bead, is open to question. Evans identifies this bead as Egyptian under much the same reasoning as those from Pyrgos {505}, but all are more likely to be Minoan work. Raw amethyst stone was imported into Crete, as a number of undoubtedly Minoan seals were made of this material.¹⁷⁶

ASPRI PETRA

The deposit found at Aspri Petra is associated with a grave so badly destroyed by the local inhabitants its type was impossible to ascertain, but is accepted as a probable tholos tomb. St. Xanthoudides excavated the deposit for two days in 1916, located between the villages of Platanos and Plora in the eastern Mesara plain at the foot of the Asterousia mountain range.¹⁷⁷

The deposit was small but entirely typical of tholos tomb assemblages, reportedly consisting of clay and stone vessels, a knife blade and a scarab seal together with a quantity of bones. The clay vessels included a handled bowl and Aghios Onouphrios ware jug or jar, and apparently all date to EM I–IIA.

66. Scarab. HM Σ–K 1227

Glazed ‘white piece’,¹⁷⁸ L: 15.2; W: 11.1; H: 7.1; SH: 2.1 mm, chipped and slightly worn at edges and face, ‘coating’ partially flaked off.

Scarab with open head, prominent eyes, single line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Elytra covered by cross-hatching, carved as a unit. Legs indicated by two parallel horizontal grooves around sides of body and one diagonal line each side. String-hole through length. *Face:* Chevron or ‘zig-zag’ pattern. Line border.

Minoan, MM IA.

Context: None.

Chronology: Deposition MM IA or later, without context.

Comparison: {41}.

References: XANTHOUIDES 1918:15, 21 fig. 7:bottom, second from left; PENDLEBURY 1930b:29 #49, pl. I:49;¹⁷⁹ 1939:89; *CMS* II.1:#1; WARD 1971:93–94, fig. 3:4;¹⁸⁰ YULE 1981:78 Class 29:a, 157 Motif 41, pl. 24 Motif 41.1; 1983:363, 364 fig. 25, 366 n. 22; KRZYSZKOWSKA 1989:120; PINI 1989:101 #1; 1990:116 #1; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:188–189 #15, pl. 45:15;¹⁸¹ PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 22; 1991:II:413–414 #60, III:1000 fig. 52; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; PINI 2000:108 #1, fig. 1.1; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:305 #299; PHILLIPS 2004:162 fig. 1.a.1.

Comments: Two features found on this scaraboid and the other example having a cross-hatched back {41}, namely the sepa-

¹⁶⁸ EVANS *NB* C:35–36; BROWN and BENNETT 2001:90–93. See also EVANS 1896:464–465; HOOD, WARREN and CADOGAN 1964:90 n. 52 and fig.19.

¹⁶⁹ For a discussion of the amber, see HOOD *et al.* 1958–1959: 238, 261–262, the latter misidentifying AM AE 313 as 316.

¹⁷⁰ Ann Brown (personal communication, October 1987) noted that the yellow ‘carnelian’ beads have been suggested to be glass. Helen Hughes-Brock (personal communication 07 September 2001) assures me that they are pale carnelian stone.

¹⁷¹ Although it is said to be from the same tomb and is listed under the same registration number in the AM, it was not included in Evans’ original inventory, *NB* C:35–36. The sword blade, illustrated by Evans in *NB* C, was not acquired by him. See also BROWN and BENNETT 2001:90–93, 412 #65, 413 fig. 65.

¹⁷² EVANS 1914:43 n. 2.

¹⁷³ EVANS *PM* II.1:174 n. 2.

¹⁷⁴ DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1984:56.

¹⁷⁵ YULE 1981:197. See also LUCAS and HARRIS 1962:389; WARD 1978:84–86; ASTON, HARRELL and SHAW 2000:51. MOOREY 1994:94 notes the possibility of early sources in Anatolia or Iran.

¹⁷⁶ YULE 1981:197, 204 n. 71. See also WARREN 1969:190 n. 1.

¹⁷⁷ XANTHOUIDES 1918:15.

¹⁷⁸ Identified as ‘ivory’ in the *CMS*, as ‘glazed steatite’ by Ward and ‘white steatite’ by Pendlebury. Pini’s analysis provides the correct identification.

¹⁷⁹ He misidentifies the find site as Marathokephalo, as XANTHOUIDES (1918) published the scarab together with objects from this site. His hand-written notes in his own copy, now in the Villa Ariadne Library at Knossos, corrects his error.

¹⁸⁰ The scarab is misidentified as HM 1207, p. 94 n. 382.

¹⁸¹ The scarab again is misidentified as HM 1207.

rate pronotum and the dividing line between elytra, are not found on either Egyptian or Canaanite scarabs with cross-hatched back, so both must be Minoan products. All other Minoan 'white piece' seals are dated to MM IA, so then should these. Moreover, as the cross-hatched back does not appear in Egypt until sometime later in Dynasty XII (= MM IB on Crete) and Canaanite scarabs are not earlier than late MB IIA (= sometime early Dynasty XIII), it seems that the cross-hatching on this and **{41}** must be an entirely indigenous Minoan feature of very limited popularity, earlier in date than the cross-hatched backs of both Egyptian and Canaanite scarabs and entirely separate from them. Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) incorrectly consider this Egyptian, of Dynasty XIII date.

Its material and stylistic date cannot be reconciled with its context based on the date of the clay vessels. The date of the knife and stone vessels, all unpublished, might help to lower the terminal date of the context as published. Nonetheless, the chronological discrepancy raised here suggests the scarab likely was not part of the original assemblage, although it must have come from the same general area.

EPISKOPI IERAPETRAS

The village of Episkopi lies on the main north-south road traversing the Isthmus of Ierapetra, about halfway between Ierapetra and the north coast. An extensive LM III cemetery sporadically has been excavated by a number of archaeologists since the beginning of the 20th century, but most are published quite inadequately. A settlement nearby has been inferred by the size of the cemetery, but has not yet been located.

R.B. Seager was the first to excavate in the cemetery in 1906, in addition to his work at Vasiliki and Pseira that same year. The grave(s?) are unpublished, apart from one very brief sentence. He notes only that he recovered some 60 vessels "of the type usually found in larnax burials," which date to LM IIIA-B.¹⁸²

A chamber tomb was found just north of the village during road construction in 1919, containing three larnakes and some vessels dated to LM IIIA2-B,¹⁸³ but no other finds are mentioned.

Two further chamber tombs have been excavated by N. Platon. One was discovered at 'Ayia Pangalos'

in 1940,¹⁸⁴ and the other in 1946.¹⁸⁵ The first contained one larnax and ceramics, the second three larnakes and over 50 vessels. The tombs date to LM IIIA-C, and also contained imported Mycenaean and Khaniote wares, now in the IM. No other objects were mentioned. A third tomb was recorded by Schachermeyr at 'Ayia Pankalos' in 1936.¹⁸⁶

In addition to the cemetery, Kanta has identified a number of LM IIIA2-B vessels given to the HM by G. Zarakinoudhakis, purportedly from a shrine.

67. Cornflower beads, HM 734

Carnelian, quantity: 3. (A) H: 12.0; W: 6.2; SH: 1.4 mm, intact; (B) H: 17.2; W: 6.9; SH: 1.4 mm, intact; (C) H (pres.): 15.1; W (pres.): 6.4; SH: 1.4 mm, bottom broken off.

Cornflower beads, rounded with horizontal string-hole near top.

Egyptian, most likely late-Dynasty XVIII (reign of Akhenaten) or later.

Context: None specified, likely LM IIIA-B.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XVIII (from reign of Akhenaten) or later, in probable LM IIIA2-B tomb deposition.

Comparanda: BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:238 #314 (fig. 15); **{73}**; **{124}**; **{500}**.

References: BOARDMAN 1961:71; PHILLIPS 1991:II:416 #53, III:1001 fig. 53; 1992b:499; 2005b:457.

Comments: According to the HM Inventory Book, these are from tomb(s) excavated by SEAGER in 1906.

Episkopi is the only site on Crete where more than one of these beads has been found. As the type is rare in Egypt prior to the reign of Akhenaten in Dynasty XVIII, these beads should not date any earlier. A more specific identification of their provenance within Seager's excavations (if this is possible) may provide a closer dating for these beads. If Kanta's singular tomb is correct, then these were recovered in the same tomb.

Not included in LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990 or CLINE 1994.

GERONTOMOURI

Gerontomouri is the name of a burial cave similar to that of Trapeza, accidentally discovered during bulldozing for a modern road north-west of the modern town of Aghios Charlambos, near Psychro cave on the south-western edge of the Lasithi Plain. Here C. Davaras reported a natural early ossuary in 1976, secondarily used for burials.¹⁸⁷ During two seasons of

¹⁸² SEAGER 1907:111. The ceramic finds are discussed in detail by KANTA 1980:147-148, who notes no LM IIIC vessels were amongst the thirty in the HM identified as being Seager's material from this site. Her description of Seager's excavation states 'Seager's Tomb,' suggesting he excavated only one tomb in the cemetery, although he mentions the "discovery of Late Minoan tombs" in the plural. He does not actually state how many were investigated.

¹⁸³ XANTHOUIDES 1920-1921:157-162. Again, the ceramics are discussed by KANTA 1980:148-150.

¹⁸⁴ WALTER 1942:198; PLATON 1941:273.

¹⁸⁵ PLATON 1947b:638; AMANDRY 1947-1948:441.

¹⁸⁶ SCHACHERMEYR 1938:471. Despite KANTA 1980:150 n. 1, this cannot be the same tomb as that excavated by Platon in 1940, as it was seen four years earlier and published two years before, and the two descriptions are dissimilar. KANTA 1980:150-158 discusses the ceramics and larnakes. The larnakes are discussed in MAVRIYANNAKIS 1972:*passim*; see p. 122.

¹⁸⁷ DAVARAS 1982; WATROUS 1982:65 #72; DAVARAS 1983; CATLING 1985:64; DAVARAS 1986; FRENCH 1991:70. See now also Chapter 18 for 'last minute' additions to the catalogue.

work, in 1976 and 1983, the entrance was located and the chamber, originally considered too dangerous to enter, was investigated. At first a natural cave, a formal entrance was constructed in MM II.

At the MM II entrance was recovered an intact footless Cycladic marble figure, whilst within one chamber was an undisturbed bone pile on a small horizontal platform and intact skeletons further inside the cave. At the far end of the chamber were found a greenish stone scarab figurine, three small stone vessels, mainly EM II–III pottery also including Kamares and barbotine wares, a sealstone, a bronze dagger, a miniature double axe, some gold sheeting and a gold ring with marine relief decoration. Finds in general range in date from Late Neolithic to MM III, although they may extend to the beginning of the LM period.

68. Figurine, HNM 11845 (not seen)

‘Greenish stone,’ L: 20 cm, condition excellent.¹⁸⁸

Figurine in the form of a beetle, with the hind part resembling “a Neolithic axe,” with single line between ‘elytra’. Hornless, but with two ridges or grooves on upper surface to indicate clypeus and distinction between pronotum and elytra. Highly polished. Uninscribed.

Minoan, presumably EM II–MM II(?).

Context: Late Neolithic–MM IIIB(–LM IA early?).

Chronology: EM II–MM II(?) object, in generally contemporary or somewhat later EM II–MM IIIB(–LM IA early?) deposition.

Comparison: {499}.

References: DAVARAS 1988:51, 54; PARIENTE 1990:824; PHILLIPS 1991:II:417 #54; LECLANT and CLERC 1992:318.

Comments: An early and large model representation of the hornless beetle. Found at the far end of the chamber, and apparently a grave offering. Pariente calls this “un gros scarabée en pierre verte,” but its scale precludes identification as a scarab seal in the usual sense. No mention is made of any face design, and presumably it has none.

69. Scarab, HNM 11871

‘White paste,’ L: 8.0; W: 6.0; H: 4.0; SH: 1.5 mm, worn but intact.

Scarab with open plain head, single line between head and clypeus, clypeus and pronotum, pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Legs indicated by diagonal lines at sides. String-hole through length. *Face:* Simple all-over cross-hatching.

Unknown.

Context: Late Neolithic–MM IIIB(–LM IA?).

Chronology: Scarab of unknown origin, in MM III(–LM IA?) deposition.

Comparanda: CMS II.5:#1–3; YULE 1981:147 Motif 25, pl.

16–17 Motif 25 (generally); {30}; {364}; {444}; {565} (all face design); {478} (leg markings); CMS V Suppl. 1B:#123 (specific), #118–125 (general).

References: DAVARAS 1986:14, fig. 3, pl. 2:στ–ι; PHILLIPS 1991:II:417–418 #55, III:1001 fig. 55; CMS V Suppl. 1A:XIX, 38–39 #38, V Suppl. 1B:XXXV n. 68; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:443.

Comments: The origins of this scarab are obscure. Davaras originally had dated it to MM II(?) on the basis of comparison with sealings from Phaestos. However, its material is not otherwise usual for indigenous scarabs during the Proto-Palatial period (when only hard stone normally was employed) and I had initially thought it dated earlier, probably MM IA–B due to its material, *if* Minoan. The face design is common during this period, as is the use of deeply incised lines on the back and sides of the scarab as well as its face. Its ‘white paste’ material is not known in the Aegean, and its very small size, cut vertical profile, rough worked surface and other features are quite different from other Minoan scarabs of this period, and my earlier attribution too is unlikely.¹⁸⁹

The scarab itself is unique on Crete. A number of similar scarabs were found in grave 1 in the *dromos* of tomb 15 at Aidonia on the Greek mainland, a context much later (LH II–IIIB) than the bulk of the excavated Gerontomouri material, including one scarab (CMS V Suppl. 1B:#123) virtually identical to the Gerontomouri scarab and a cylinder seal of similar material (CMS V Suppl. 1B:#126). Their material also apparently is the same. This would suggest that a similar origin and date should be assigned to the Gerontomouri scarab, although the latest cave contents are still earlier than the earliest Aidonia material. This would then suggest that it was deposited not earlier than MM at the very least, and probably late in that period; the context parameters make this possible. The Aidonia scarabs are suggested to have a possibly ‘Levantine’ origin in the CMS, on the basis of the cylinder seal, whilst Quirke and Fitton considered them to be “Aegean” (without question mark). The participants of the ‘Scarabs’ workshop in Vienna, on the other hand, reject this piece (and the Aidonia scarabs and cylinder seal) as either Levantine or Egyptian.¹⁹⁰ It seems that no one is willing or able to give it, and them, an origin. Nonetheless, the circumstances of their discoveries, both at Gerontomouri and at Aidonia, strongly argue against any possibility of modern forgery. Future finds and research may provide an attribution for them, but current knowledge cannot.

GOULAS

Goulas is the name originally given a site with well-preserved remains of an ancient city lying on and between two peninsular heights a few kilometres from the sea near Haghios Nikolaos and north of Kritsa. Spratt¹⁹¹ identified the site as ancient Olous, and Halbherr with ancient ‘inland’ Lato. Evans, who visited in 1894, 1895 (with J.L. Myres) and 1896, dis-

¹⁸⁸ Costis Davaras (letter of 02 July 1992).

¹⁸⁹ Costis Davaras (letter of 02 July 1992) agreed with my suggestion at that time of a Pre-Palatial dating. He made no mention of the possibility of a ‘Levantine’ import, so seems not to have known of the Aidonia scarabs at that time. It was the CMS editors who suggested this and, based

on their wide-ranging knowledge of Aegean seals, they have rejected an indigenous origin for both the Gerontomouri and Aidonia scarabs.

¹⁹⁰ By all participants, 12 January 2002.

¹⁹¹ SPRATT 1865:I:128–137.

puted both identifications.¹⁹² It lies about 12 kilometers west of modern Haghios Nikolaos.

The *École française d'Athènes* began excavation in 1899 under J. Demargne, who confirmed Halbherr's identification by inscriptions.¹⁹³ His and later work indicate the city was founded in the Sub-Minoan period and inhabited chiefly from Archaic to Hellenistic times. He records only four objects of 'Mycenaean' date after two seasons of excavation on the acropolis previously explored by Evans.¹⁹⁴

Evans' description indicates that he did not actually excavate but limited his work to surface survey and wall-tracing. He observed numerous above-ground remains of a 'prehistoric' city on two acropoleis, with many objects lying about; this description fits with the site of Lato which is on the slopes of both acropoleis. None of Evans' finds apparently were later than Bronze Age in date, and apparently are limited to LM III.¹⁹⁵ Among the several objects he recorded or mentioned in publication were numerous ceramics, stone vessels, bronzes and seals. Of the last he says that "I secured either the original or the impression of no less than seventeen examples,"¹⁹⁶ implying that they may have been purchased rather than personally found on the site.

The identification of the site with Lato is now accepted, but I use Evans' term of 'Goulas' as the object under discussion is Minoan, not Iron Age, in date, and may not have actually been recovered on the Lato site. Evans published it as from Goulas; it should not be associated with the Iron Age city of Lato.

70. Seal, AM 1910.281 (= 1938.938)

Pale green jasper, L: 10.5; W: 10.7; H: 9.0; SH: c. 2.0 mm, chipped along edge of face in two places, and loop of back broken off.

Signet (*Petschaft*) with faceted base and spiral grooving below loop. *Face*: Cat seated on its back legs, in profile facing left with head frontal, with curled tail and large pointed ears. Two X-shaped crosses in front, and an S-spiral behind its head. Engraved design, drilled at joints, eyes, shoulder, tail, haunch, feet and S-spiral.

Minoan, MM II(B?).

Context: None.

Chronology: MM II(B?) seal, deposited not earlier than MM II. *Comparanda*: {525}; {575}.

References: EVANS 1897:345, fig. 17; 1909:140, 156 #P.36, 209 #75:b, pl. II:P.36; KENNA 1960:105 #120, pl. 6:120; 1973:829; YULE 1981:86 Class 31:j, 130 Motif 9, 215, pl. 7 Motif 9.A:3; PHILLIPS 1991:II:420 #56, III:1001 fig. 56; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:364, 393 #283; BROWN and BENNETT 2001:460 #331, 461:fig. 331; *CMS* VI:#131.

Comments: Evans mentioned that he found an intaglio having a "seated lion" design, which must mean this seal as the initial publication¹⁹⁷ describes the cat as a "lion". KENNA (1973) dated this to MM II, and Yule places it with his 'Hieroglyphic Deposit Group,' now dated to MM II(B?).

GOURNES PEDIADHOS

The village of Gournes lies about 15 kilometres east of Herakleion, about three kilometres inland from the north coast on the road to Lasithi. A. Taramelli reported two larnakes from here at the end of the last century.¹⁹⁸ I. Hatzidakis excavated an MM I grave enclosure and LM IIIB tombs in separate locations near the village in 1915–1916.¹⁹⁹ An LM III settlement was located near the main road below the modern village,²⁰⁰ but is not yet excavated.

A. The House-Tomb

Three contiguous rooms of unequal size, identified as three graves, have recently been identified as a single tomb complex by J. Soles.²⁰¹ The eastern portion of the building is destroyed by construction of a threshing floor, and the western portion shows no indication of an entrance, but Soles suggested that it should be reconstructed similar to Archanes Burial Building 6, which overlaps in date.²⁰² Nearby, Hatzidakis also found a single rectangular grave partly destroyed by erosion. This was identified as Tomb A, and the three rooms (from the north) as B, Γ and Δ. Although the last contained but one burial, the other two were communal with the remains of some 20 (B) and 10 (Γ) burials found apparently with a small cup placed by each skull. A votive hole (ἱερὸς λάκκος) about 10 m. north of the tomb complex contained many hundreds of miniature clay jugs and cups corresponding to same date as the tomb material, but no burials.²⁰³

¹⁹² EVANS 1895–1896. See also EVANS *NB* C:58–59; 1894:277; BROWN and BENNETT 2001:343–345.

¹⁹³ DEMARGNE 1901; 1903.

¹⁹⁴ DEMARGNE 1901:306–307.

¹⁹⁵ EVANS 1894:177; 1895–1896:170. In one building, he records finding Mycenaean pottery in an interior wall (1895–1896:183, fig. 8). See also PICARD in MYERS, MYERS and CADOGAN 1992:154–159 who, interestingly, does not mention Evans' work here. KANTA 1980 also makes no mention of the site and any LM III material from there.

¹⁹⁶ EVANS 1894:277; in 1895–1896:192, the quantity is recorded as 15.

¹⁹⁷ EVANS 1897:345.

¹⁹⁸ TARAMELLI 1899:366–368.

¹⁹⁹ HATZIDAKIS 1915a; 1918b:45–58.

²⁰⁰ XANTHOUIDES 1948:535.

²⁰¹ SOLES 1973:157–161; 1992:149–150.

²⁰² SOLES 1992:149; see Archanes C.

²⁰³ HATZIDAKIS 1915:61 (see SOLES 1992:151) suggested the situation was "analagous to the shrines beside the Protodynastic tombs of Egypt that developed afterwards into great

The graves had been disturbed, but Hatzidakis was able to recover enough material to indicate restricted chronological parameters now identified as predominantly MM IA by Zois but with a few later (MM IB) pieces. Nothing earlier or later was found, although the finds earlier were incorrectly reported to include EM III. The remaining grave goods consisted for the most part of a large quantity of clay vessels dating to MM IA, a few wheel-made MM IB cups and some possibly later jugs to the end of MM IB.²⁰⁴

‘Tomb’ B is the northernmost and largest of the three rooms with some 20 bodies and a large number of clay vessels. The published vessels, an amphora and two cups, were all dated by Walberg to her ‘Phase I’ or MM I, a date which concurs with an earlier study by A. Zois of all the (published and unpublished) Gournes material.²⁰⁵ In addition, a ‘Petsofa’-type figurine, a seal and two scarabs were reported below the clay vessels.

71. Scarab, HM Σ-K 1184

Glazed ‘white piece,’²⁰⁶ L: 16.2; W: 10.8; H: 6.5; SH: 2.3 mm, chipped on head, and very large chip at back corner of tail including part of face design, deeply cracked.

Scarab with lunate head and prominent eyes, single line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Legs indicated by two horizontal grooves around body. String hole through length. *Face*: Divided into three panels by single lines. Centre panel filled with fine cross-hatching, outer panels with small triangle at end filled with diagonal lines. Line border.

Minoan, MM IA.

Context: MM IA, a little MM IB.

Chronology: MM IA scarab, in generally contemporary MM IA–early B context.

References: HATZIDAKIS 1918b:55, pl. IV:ξ; MATZ 1928:22–23 #268, pl. XIII:19; PENDLEBURY 1930b:15 #17, pl. I:17; KENNA 1960:31; CMS II.1:#402; WARD 1971:93–94, fig. 3:2; WARREN 1980:494; PINI 1981:427, pl. 127:514; YULE 1981:78 Class 29:a; CADOGAN 1983:513; WALBERG 1983:147; YULE 1983:363, 366 n. 22, fig. 21, 28; PINI 1989:102 #3, fig. 1.3; 1990:116 #4; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:253–254 #185, pl. 49:185;²⁰⁷ PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 22, 325 n. 36, 327; 1991:II:422–423 #57, III:1001 fig. 57; PINI 2000:109 #3, figs. 1.3, 5–6; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:316 #321; PHILLIPS 2004:162 fig. 1.a; 2005a:44.

Comments: Yule notes this face design is wholly typical of the ‘Border/Leaf Complex’. Warren and Hankey see it as an Egyptian scarab and date it to Dynasty XI, whilst Keel and

Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) consider it Minoan and “probably MM IA–B” in date. Its Minoan origin is confirmed by the ‘wedge-shaped’ cutting of the line border.²⁰⁸ Pini considers it to date within MM IA, together with other ‘white piece’ seals.

72. Scarab, HM Σ-K 3657²⁰⁹

‘White piece’ material, with overlayer,²¹⁰ L: 11.8; W: 7.8; H: 5.4, SH: 1.5 mm, chip on back edge of elytra, remains of overlayer on head.

Scarab with square head and clypeus, ladder double line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Eyes indicated. Double lunate tail indicated. Rear legs indicated by shallow undercutting, fringing and notching. All lightly incised. String hole through length. *Face*: Two C-scrolls divide the face in half through width. Each half contains a lotus bud flanked by Z-scrolls. The tail end of each lotus is a scroll, and the bud end of one is divided into two parallel lines. Slightly indented ‘border’ at edge. All lightly incised.

Egyptian, early/mid-Dynasty XII.

Context: MM IA, a little MM IB.

Chronology: Early/mid-Dynasty XII, in generally contemporary MM IA–early B context.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1925b:pl. VIII:203–204; WARD 1978:*passim* (generally Back type H, head type c1, side type d2, Tail type fig. 5:top row, centre); WARD and DEVER 1994:*passim* (generally Back type LS, head type C5, side type d13).

References: HATZIDAKIS 1918b:56, pl. V:i; MATZ 1928:22–23 #269; PENDLEBURY 1930b:15 #18, pl. I:18; CMS II.1:#405; WARD 1971:93–94, fig. 13:3; WARREN 1980:494; CADOGAN 1983:513; WALBERG 1983:147; YULE 1983:366 n. 22; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:129; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:253 #184, pl. 49:184;²¹¹ PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 15, 325 n. 36, 327; 1991:II:423 #58, III:1001 fig. 58; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:316 #320.

Comments: Fringing does not seem to appear on scarabs before Dynasty XII, but Quirke and Fitton note that the tendril terminal to the spiral motif suggests an early MK date. Its early/mid-Dynasty XII date would suggest it was interred quite late in MM IA, or even early in MM IB with the few vessels of that period. Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) suggest a more general MK date.

B. The LM IIIB Cemetery

The LM IIIB cemetery, as excavated to date on Kephala hill, consists of three chamber tombs and three shaft graves.²¹² Almost all were quite rich, with a considerable number of goods including stone and tin-plated vessels, bronze implements and accou-

temples.” However, by the date of this pit and deposit, these ‘great temples’ already had been constructed near their tombs by *all* the Old Kingdom Egyptian kings.

²⁰⁴ See ZOIS 1969:2–24; YULE 1981:12; WALBERG 1983:106–109; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:51; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:99.

²⁰⁵ WALBERG 1983:107, 147; ZOIS 1969.

²⁰⁶ See PINI 2000:112. Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 08 May 2000) describes it a ‘typical’ of this material.

²⁰⁷ The site is misidentified as Gournia, and the catalogue number misidentified as HM 1184bis, i.e., {72}.

²⁰⁸ See PINI 2000:111 fig. 4a.

²⁰⁹ Accession number was only recently assigned; previously identified as HM 1184bis, e.g. WARD 1971:94 n. 379.

²¹⁰ Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 08 May 2000).

²¹¹ The site is misidentified as Gournia.

²¹² The chamber tombs are numbered 1, 2 and 4, the shaft graves 3, 5 and 6 (HATZIDAKIS 1918b:63–87). See also FURUMARK 1941:105; KANTA 1980:47–49.

trements, seals, jewellery and sarcophagi in addition to apparently undisturbed skeletons.

B.1. Tomb 1

Tomb 1 is a small chamber tomb with an excessively long dromos having five steps.²¹³ One sarcophagus burial of a man was in a pit in the dromos near the entrance, together with two seals. In the dromos fill 1 m. above the pit, a dog skeleton and burnt sheep bones suggest a sacrificial offering. Three other sarcophagi were found in the tomb itself. It had been plundered, as the blocking stone had been holed. Apart from a large quantity of beads of various shapes and sizes in one of the sarcophagi, all other objects were found on the floor in the tomb or by the door. These consisted of a partially preserved offering table and a variety of clay vessels, all dating to LM IIIB and some possibly imported from western Crete.²¹⁴ The beads could be strung into several necklaces.

73. Cornflower bead, HM 1235 (not handled)

Faience, dimensions not estimated, intact.

Cornflower bead, rounded, with horizontal string-hole near top. Hollow through (most of?) length from bottom.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XVIII–XIX, possibly Minoan, LM IIIB.

Context: LM IIIB.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XVIII (reign of Akhenaten)–XIX (or possibly Minoan LM IIIB) object, in generally contemporary or later LM IIIB tomb context.

Comparanda: BROVARIKI *et al.* 1982:238 #314 (fig. 15); XENAKI-SAKELLARIOU 1985:261 #3192.9, pl. 125:3192.9; {58}; {68}; {124}; {500}.

References: HATZIDAKIS 1918b:68–69, fig. 12:4; COLDSTREAM 1973:163; PHILLIPS 1991:II:425 #60, III:1001 fig. 60; 1992b:499.

Comments: Presumably one of the beads recovered in the sarcophagus. It is the only faience example on Crete, although another found at Mycenae is of glazed clay. It is possible that the bead is of local manufacture.

Not included in LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990 or CLINE 1994.

B.2. Tomb 2

Tomb 2, a slightly smaller chamber tomb with an even longer dromos, contained three sarcophagus burials in one or possibly three separate pits.²¹⁵ It too had been robbed. One sarcophagus was empty, a second contained a seal and numerous beads of a neck-

lace, and a third, decorated, contained only a seal. A bronze hoard, including a spouted tankard, sword, two razors, ladle and knife, was found near the second sarcophagus. The clay vessels and other objects were found in three general groups, in the dromos, near the door, and in the chamber. They included two triton shells, stone bowls and a whetstone, clay offering table, brazier, kernos and stirrup jars. A clay kylix, bowl and ‘champagne cup’ apparently were tinned.²¹⁶ The stirrup jars may have been Khaniote imports.²¹⁷ The tomb dates to LM IIIB.

74. Jar (‘spheroid jar’), HM 2042

Mottled pink, maroon and grey limestone, H: 7.15 cm, intact. ‘Spheroid jar’ with high-shoulder, having a wide mouth with thick upright rim and raised base. Two raised horizontal flutes on shoulder, with two solid roll handles below.

Minoan, LM I(–IIIA1?).

Context: LM IIIB.

Chronology: LM I(–IIIA1?) vessel, an antique in its LM IIIB tomb deposition.

Comparanda: {5}; {16}.

References: HATZIDAKIS 1918b:78, fig. 22:7; WARREN 1969:74–75 Type 30:A, P399, D223; DICKERS 1990:fig. 1.5; PHILLIPS 1991:II:426 #61, III:1001 fig. 61.

Comments: Apparently a survival piece in context, as similarly grooved examples elsewhere date from LM IB.

C. No Find Context

Also found but without specific provenance given.

75. Beads, HM 1237 (not seen)

Faience, dimensions and quantity not estimated, intact.

Cylindrical and oval beads with string-hole.

Minoan, undateable without context, or possibly Egyptian, generally Middle Kingdom types.

Context: None, but presumably comes from the area of the MM IA tomb with some MM IB material, so presumably would be associated with it.

Chronology: Undateable, but presumably MM IA–early IB; if context range is accepted, beads should be MM IA–early IB or possibly late FIP–Dynasty XII.

References: PENDLEBURY 1930b:15 #16; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:254 #186;²¹⁸ PHILLIPS 1991:II:423–424 #59.

Comments: All information is from PENDLEBURY 1930b, including the possibility of an Egyptian origin and the Dynasty XII dating. All beads presumably are identified as Egyptian, as he does not specify otherwise. Based on his dating of the beads, I am presuming their association with the MM graves rather than the LM tombs. They are not illustrat-

²¹³ HATZIDAKIS 1918b:63–70.

²¹⁴ KANTA 1980:47–48.

²¹⁵ HATZIDAKIS 1918b:70–79.

²¹⁶ On this Mycenaean practice, see MOUNTJOY 1993:66, 75. Her latest use of tinning clay vessels is LH IIIA2. This

practice continues well into LM IIIB on Crete; see KANTA 1980:315, 327.

²¹⁷ KANTA 1980:48.

²¹⁸ The site is misidentified as Gournia.

ed by Hatzidakis. Pendlebury gives no reason for identifying these beads as Egyptian rather than of local origin; it is probable they are of Minoan manufacture.

GOURNIA

The town site of Gournia lies on a sharp hill less than a kilometre from the southern edge of the Bay of Mirabello on the north-eastern coast of Crete, about midway between the modern town of Haghios Nikolaos and the islands of Mochlos and Pseira. It is our best example of Minoan town planning and social infrastructure in the Neo-Palatial period, as a large portion of the town (about 15,000 sq. m.) was cleared in three seasons in 1901, 1903 and 1904 by Harriet Boyd Hawes. Understanding of the early excavations is hampered by an almost total lack of original records apart from the published material. The only exceptions are some records donated to the University Museum (Philadelphia) by Mrs. Hawes' son in 1973, and further notebooks and other archival material by her daughter that came to light in 1990 and subsequently donated to the same institution.²¹⁹ Recent cleaning and consolidation of the site by the Ephorate of Antiquities, which also excavated a number of ossuaries immediately to the south of the town, has helped considerably.

The site was first occupied at the end of the Late Neolithic period, indicated by a deposit and probable rock shelter at Sphoungaras hill immediately to the north. Occupational material (but no architecture) for the town begins in EM II, together with further burials in the immediate vicinity, and by EM III the entire Gournia hill was occupied, with ossuaries ('house-tombs') and further pithos and larnax burials on the hill.²²⁰

The main period of habitation is MM III–LM I, when a substantial villa and surrounding town flourished on the hill. As excavated, it is divided into eight 'Blocks,' identified by capital letters A–H, by narrow paved streets.²²¹ Each contained a varying number of houses, tightly compact and for the most part contiguous, almost all with entrances directly off the streets. Each house was identified by block followed by a small letter, while individual rooms were numbered consecutively within each block. The existing remains consist chiefly of basement rooms, but the

presence of stairways indicates higher levels. Block G was the villa (or 'palace'), a larger building than the others also distinguished by its location at the top of the hill; it also seems to have been modified and enlarged sometime late in LM I.²²² Unfortunately, it is the least well-preserved, and much of its plan is obscure. However, clearly it is patterned after the palaces, with an indented western facade and court, a pseudo-theatral area and 'central court' located to the south that must have been public spaces. A small bench-shrine lay just to the west.

It was an industrial town, with three metalworkers' shops, a pottery and carpenters' workshop, and an oil or wine pressing industry. The importance of the site lies also in its publication, for Hawes emphasised its industrial nature and illustrated items of everyday use.

The villa and much of the town were destroyed by earthquake and rebuilt at the end of MM III, to be destroyed again in the general conflagration on the island at the end of LM IB. Most of the houses date to this later period, although it is clear that all buildings were in use at the same time, those on the east slope seem to have been abandoned after LM IA, and some houses were remodeled and others subdivided into two before their LM IB destruction. Parts of Block E were re-occupied in LM III, when a 'Mycenaean' house also was constructed at the southern end of the town. Many of the cultic objects from the shrine also date from this period. It apparently was not reoccupied after the Bronze Age.

A. House Ad

Block A is located on the north-eastern corner of the site, with seven houses identified. House Ad (Rooms A22–A28) in the south-western corner of the block, is a small house of poor and intermittent construction, excavated in 1904. It is entered from the street, although it did boast a small staircase. It also was poor in finds. The back corner room (A23) may have been used as for storage. It and adjacent room A24 are considered to be cellars, although no real conclusions on the use of space within the house can be made. In the house Hawes records in print only a small hand lamp from Room A22 and, from A23, a small squat jug²²³ and alabastron.

²¹⁹ See FOTOU 1993:17–19.

²²⁰ See SOLES 1979.

²²¹ See now also the summary by DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:211–215.

²²² SOLES 1991:21–31.

²²³ HAWES *et al.* 1908:pl. II:58, 23.

One of the notebooks that came to light in 1990 lists a total 19 finds recorded from this house. Most are small stone or clay vases (including a “small Bull’s head” in A24), and two pithoi, almost all recorded as coming from A23 and A24. A stone basin also is recorded from A26.²²⁴

76. Alabastron (Type C form), HM 1882

(Grey) clay, H (pres): 9.3; Dia. (max): 8.2; (base): 6.5 cm, rim chipped but complete, paint flaked and worn.

Baggy, flat-bottomed alabastron. Black-painted horizontal wavy bands of varying thickness over entire body including base. Rim painted interior and exterior.

Minoan, LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM IB object, in contemporary deposition.

Comparanda: {8}; {176A}; {269}; {453}.

References: HAWES *et al.* 1908:51 #15, pl. VII:15;²²⁵ PHILLIPS 1991:II:429 #62, III:1002 fig. 62.

Comments: This was recovered in A23. It is a fairly obvious imitation of the Egyptian Type C alabastra of banded travertine. The profile is quite similar to that from Mavro Spelio Tomb VII {269}, whilst the basal banding also is seen on {176A}.

B. Exterior Space F21, North of House Fd

Space F21 is the eastern part of a large open area, apparently associated with a series of four steps at its north side, probably on a different elevation than the larger space F22 to its west. The space seems to count as the “space to N of House Fd,” and in fact sits between Fd and House Fe farther north, but is not accessible to the north-south road to its east and (as preserved) its western limit is unknown as it peters out in that direction.²²⁶ Little material is attributed to this space, only the cat’s head and a very large serpentine bowl,²²⁷ and two other objects unspecified in publication.²²⁸

77. Model, HM Π 3680

Clay, H (pres.): 4.7; W (pres.): 4.6; Th. (pres.): 3.6 cm, both ears battered and missing tips, worn surface.

Cat’s head model with realistically moulded features, large eyes and ears, double eyelids and whiskers. Hollow interior. Undecorated.

Minoan, MM III–LM I.

Context: Probably MM III–LM I.

Chronology: MM III–LM I object, in MM III–LM IB town deposition.

Comparanda: {113}; {377}; {397}.

References: HAWES *et al.* 1908:35; SILVERMAN 1974:13; FOSTER 1982:87 n. 43; PINI 1988:327 fig. 2.b, 328; PHILLIPS 1991:II:431 #64, III:1003 fig. 64; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:178 #164.

Comments: The original site report mentions that a “small cat’s head (from F 21) is doubly interesting for its excellent technique and also for being one of the few representations of this animal known thus early,” and it is suggested to be “a child’s toy, although it may have been used as a fetish, or even as a votive offering”. It is not illustrated. Presumably this model is the cat’s head mentioned there, although its material is not stated and it is described in the section devoted to ‘Stone Vessels’. A model cat’s head also is recorded but not illustrated in a Gournia record book donated in 1973 to the University Museum, Pennsylvania published by Silverman, as well as in Hawes’ notebook III described by Fotou, where it is noted to have been found in space F21. As Hawes *et al.* mention only a single cat’s head and cite its rarity at the time, presumably both the record book and the notebook refer to this same model head.

C. Grave? in House Ei

Block E, on the extreme west of the site on the lower slope, is separated from the villa by yet another road. Ten separate houses were identified straggling the edge of the road, of which the areas of three (Eh, Ei and Ej) were reoccupied in LM III. House Ei (Rooms E55–E60) consisted entirely of deep cellar rooms, probably reused older foundation walls.²²⁹ A new LM III building was constructed above rooms E55–56, at the northern end of the house.

The south-east corner of the original building is Room E58, one of two (with E59) connected rooms separated and apparently inaccessible from the rest, at least as cellars. The few finds reported from these rooms are a stone basin, the fragments of a larnax, a tall stirrup jar and a shallow decorated plate (all with octopus decoration), and two double-bowl kernoi (all from E59) and an anthropomorphic vessel in E58, which Hawes suggested were from an LM III grave dug into the room.²³⁰ The collection as a group appears to date to LM IIIA2–B.

78. Femiform parturient rhyton, HM Π 2841 (not handled)

Clay, H: 18.1 cm, left arm and nipple and right leg below knee missing and restored.

Anthropomorphic parturient rhyton in the form of a seated nude pregnant woman, with legs flexed and raised above ground level at front of body, vulva, fingers and toes incised, right arm raised to side of head below ear and left arm bent at

²²⁴ FOTOU 1993:61.

²²⁵ The rim restoration is incorrect.

²²⁶ House Fd is discussed by HAWES *et al.* 1908:22–23, but F21–22 are not mentioned.

²²⁷ HAWES *et al.* 1908:36, pl. V:11. This is WARREN’s (1969) Type 10.B.

²²⁸ HB/NB III:19, cited in FOTOU 1993:87, find nos. 59–62.

²²⁹ HAWES *et al.* 1908:23.

²³⁰ The recently available unpublished notebooks now in Philadelphia shed no further light on this part of House Ei, apart from a plan indicating a stone basin in E59 and another object obscured by an ink blot. Most new information relates to the northern end of the house. For what further information on the house is obtainable, see FOTOU 1993:83.

elbow out to side and hand just below (missing) breast. Ears, eyes, eyebrows and pubic hair added in clay. Pointed chin, round mouth and buttocks indicated. Hole at crown of head and at vulva. Painted decoration, including wide band down sides of body, legs and arms, horizontal band around waist and buttocks, large V-shaped line at back and cross-hatching on chest above waistband, three rows of dots around neck and upper body (representing necklaces), facial details highlighted, vertical lines from head hole to eyebrows and band encircling head (representing headgear?), and length of arms and legs ringed. Hollow body, legs solid.

Minoan, LM IIIA2–B.

Context: LM IIIA2–B.

Chronology: LM IIIA2–B object in contemporary and presumably funerary deposition.

Comparanda: ALON and AMIRAN 1976:117–120, pl. XXXIII, XXXVI:right; {35}; {123}.

References: HAWES *et al.* 1908:23, 46 #11, pl. X:11; BOSSERT 1923:23 #114, pl. 114; BETANCOURT 1985: 175, pl. 31:B; GESELL 1985:42, 50, 59, fig. 67:a–b; PHILLIPS 1991:II:430 #63, III:1003 fig. 63; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:263 #263; KOEHL 2006:18, 77 #36, fig. 3:36, pl. 6:36.

Comments: Hawes called this a “funerary figurine”. A clay vessel of similar pose was found in a Chalcolithic temple-room at Gilat in Israel.²³¹ The arm positions should be seen as a ritual gesture. Betancourt notes that this vessel has a small “cup-like” opening at the top of her head, that vessels of this complexity are extremely rare, and that this one is unique. Although the pose of the Gournia vessel is reminiscent of the ‘Gravidenflasche’ type, it appears unrelated to them.

KALO CHORIO MIRABELLOU

The modern village of Kalo Chorio (Mirabellou) lies just inland from the south east edge of the Bay of Mirabello, south of Haghios Nikolaos and west of Gournia. The ancient (Classical) city of Istron is immediately to the north, and the LM IIIC/Sub-Minoan refuge site of Vrokastro on the east side of the valley.²³² In 1931, a chamber tomb was found during cultivation of a field in the area of the ancient city, and Sp. Marinatos excavated several graves with Minoan vases in the area. Although destroyed by plowing, the chamber tomb yielded enough finds to provide a date of LM IIIA2, including a number of clay vessels and a ‘gem’.²³³

79. Oval plaque, HM 1453

Deep red stone, probably carnelian, L: 19.2; W: 13.8; H: 7.6;

SH: 2.0 mm, chipped on face edges and near string-holes.

‘Oval plaque’ with angular delineation between back and sides, slightly diagonal sides. In section, the face is flat and the back slightly curved. String-hole through length. *Face:* Undecorated.

Egyptian, Dynasty XII–XVIII, possibly TIP or later, or (more likely) Greek, 5th–4th c. BC.

Context: LM IIIA2, or without context.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–XVIII plaque, in much later LM IIIA2 context, or a TIP or 5th–4th c. piece, without context.

Comparanda: HORNUNG and STAEHELIN 1976:338–339 #748, 340 #755, 366 #903, 374 #1310, pl. 84:748, 755, 101:903, 108:1310; NFA 1991:#287, 291; KEEL 1995b:34 figs. 24–28, 86 #209, 289 #209; 1997:619 #249, 651 #14–16.

References: PHILLIPS 1991:II:432 #65, III:1004 fig. 65; CLINE 1994:144 #102.

Comments: This probably is the ‘gem’ found in the tomb in 1931. It was catalogued by the HM in that year, and is stated to be from Kalo Chorio on the case label. As a Minoan piece, it would be unique, but may be seen as a shaped ‘blank’ before actual transformation into a scarab without even the initial carving of the beetle form made.²³⁴ If so, it should be seen as an Egyptian import, although it might also have been a Canaanite product.

Its strikingly similar shape to Egyptian hard stone scaraboids, and lack of parallels on Bronze Age Crete strongly suggest it was an import. The lack of face design indicates it was unfinished or, far less likely, that it had been part of a necklace or other piece of jewellery. If correctly identified as coming from Marinatos’ tomb, this is the only such object found on Crete in a BA context. If so, its context would limit its date of manufacture to Dynasty XII to not later than Dynasty XVIII (or LB IIA) but virtually excluding the Second Intermediate Period when hard stone scarabs are extremely rare.

Nonetheless, it is possible that the Kalo Chorio piece is not Marinatos’ ‘gem’ and, if so, may instead have no context whatsoever. I have called this an ‘oval plaque,’ the term employed for oval-shaped seals of later date inscribed on one or both ‘faces’. The slight curvature on the ‘back’ of the Kalo Chorio piece suggests that only one face would have been provided with a ‘face design’.

If associated instead with post-Minoan period remains, nearby rather than in the tomb, it could be either a Greek or Egyptian product. If Egyptian, true ‘oval plaques’ can be arched on the non-inscribed ‘back’, although these are not produced before the Third Intermediate Period/early Iron Age. If Greek, it would fit within Boardman’s ‘Type B’ Classical “scaraboid” form, which he dates to the 5th or, more often, 4th century BC and notes that carnelian is usual for the type.²³⁵ It still would be unfinished, but could be inscribed on either or both the face and the ‘back’.

²³¹ No suggestion of any correlation is made here between the two, especially considering their wide chronological discrepancy, but their resemblance is striking.

²³² See LEEKLEY and NOYES 1975:58–59. WARREN 1984:41 fig. 2 #1 and 3 indicates evidence for MM III–LM I occupation here, as well as the site of Koprane slightly more than a mile away.

²³³ KARO 1932:176. See also KANTA 1980:140, which may refer to the same tomb.

²³⁴ Of the examples quoted by KEEL 1995b, see especially fig. 28=KEEL 1989c:298, 301 fig. 61. These are of Dynasty XIX date, and made of steatite, thus post-dating the Kalo Chorio piece (if from the tomb itself) and made of a different material.

²³⁵ See BOARDMAN 1970:191 fig. 200:B, 192, 203 Col. pl. 77:right.

This piece is included here on the possibility of a Bronze Age date, but a Greek origin and Classical date seem more likely.

KALOI LIMENES

Kaloi Limenes ('Fair Havens') is a small village on the south-central coast of Crete south of the western Mesara plain and Asterousia mountains, six kilometres east of Cape Lithinon and nine kilometres west of Lebena, said to be the landing place of the Apostle Paul on his way to Rome. Several excavations have taken place in the vicinity, including the discovery of three tholos tombs by Platon and Davaras in the 1960s.²³⁶ Tomb I was badly preserved, Tomb II well preserved to a maximum height of 2.3 m. with a southern entrance, and the early transitional Tomb III included a square antechamber at its eastern entrance. None of their contents have been published and no dating of their use has been proposed by the excavators, but Branigan²³⁷ suggests EM II vessels from a looted grave at Kaloi Limenes taken to the HM in 1964²³⁸ may have come from one of these three tholoi.

Nonetheless, all the following objects have no provenance beyond 'Kaloi Limenes'. They had been in the private collection of Dr. N. Metaxas (Herakleion) and are now housed in the Herakleion Museum. Branigan²³⁹ has suggested that this material may have been from the plundered tombs at Ayia Kyriaki, Megaloi Skinoi or Chrysostomos (Andiskari).

80. Seal, HM (Metaxas) 1174

Ivory, L: 17.5; W: 10.2; H: 19.5; SH: 2.2 mm, fractured and burnt, with parts missing and chipped at edges, restored in wax.

Theriomorphic seal in the form of a tall 'sleeping' goose or duck, with its head *regardant* and resting on its back, seated on a short oval base. Eyes drilled, and wings indicated by grooving. String-hole through width at neck. *Face*: 'Meander' pattern of short vertical and horizontal lines, some joined, others not.

Minoan, EM III–MM IA.

Context: None.

Chronology: Probably EM III–MM IA seal, without recorded context.

Comparison: {571}.

References: CMS IV:#5; YULE 1981:94 Class 33:e, 152 Motif 31; PHILLIPS 1990:325 n. 32; 1991:II:433–434 #66, III:1004 fig. 66.

Comments: This is an unusual form of the *regardant* bird, with a head too large for the body when compared with the others of its type and rather tall relative to width and length.

81. Ovoid, HM (Metaxas) 1203

'White piece' with surface coating, L: 12.1; W: 10.6; H: 4.3; SH: 1.8 mm, intact but worn, flaked at surface.

Low ovoid. Ovoid shape, gable-shaped in section. String-hole through length. *Face*: Cross with *Zwickelfüllung* or four hatched triangles joining in the centre. Line border. Tooling marks visible.

Minoan, MM IA.

Context: None.

Chronology: MM IA ovoid, without recorded context.

Comparison: {479}.

References: CMS IV:#106; YULE 1981:79 Class 30:a, 151–152 Motif 30, pl. 21 Motif 30:4; 1983:362–364 figs. 23, 31, 366; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 22, 325 n. 36; 1991:II:434 #67, III:1004 fig. 67; PINI 1990:117 #34; PHILLIPS 2004:163 fig. 1.b.left.

Comments: Yule considered the face design within the 'Border/Leaf Complex' (EM III–MM IA (–?). Pini dates use of the 'white piece' material to sometime in MM IA.²⁴⁰ However, following Pini's technical distinction between Egyptian and Minoan scarabs,²⁴¹ the line border of the face design is square-cut, suggesting this might possibly be an Egyptian piece, although no parallel face design is apparent.

82. Ovoid, HM (Metaxas) 1148

'White piece',²⁴² L: 10.2; W: 8.6; H: 6.3; SH: 1.8 mm, chipped at edges.

Ovoid. Roughly cowroid shape, half-moon-shaped in section. String-hole through length, with aborted secondary drilling at one end. *Face*: Trefoil of leaves in centre, with two other filled leaves attached to the line border. All very deeply gouged.

Minoan, MM IA.

Context: None.

Chronology: MM IA ovoid, without recorded context.

Comparison: CMS II.1:#115.

References: CMS IV:#108; YULE 1981:79 Class 30:a, 140 Motif 19; 1983:366; PINI 1990:117 #36; PHILLIPS 1991:II:434 #68, III:1004 fig. 68; PHILLIPS 2004:163 fig. 1.b.right.

Comments: As above, {81}.

83. Scarab, HM (Metaxas) 1226

'White piece,' L: 12.5; W: 8.4; H: 5.6; SH: 1.9 mm, chipped at edges of face, especially tail end.

Scarab with open head, single line between pronotum and elytra, double line between elytra. Legs indicated by two horizontal grooves around sides. String-hole through length. *Face*: Eight leaves arranged as a spray along the length. Badly-incised line border.

Minoan, MM IA.

Context: None.

Chronology: MM IA scarab, without recorded context.

References: CMS IV:#111; YULE 1981:78 Class 29:a; 1983:363 n. 12, 366 n. 22; PINI 1989:102 #5, fig. 1.5; 1990:117 #39; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 22, 325 n. 36; 1991:II:434–435 #69,

²³⁶ ALEXIOU 1967b:483; DAVARAS 1968:405.

²³⁷ BRANIGAN 1970a:8.

²³⁸ SAKELLARAKIS 1965c:562–564.

²³⁹ BRANIGAN 1984:31. See also {522}.

²⁴⁰ PINI 1992:203.

²⁴¹ PINI 2000:111 fig.4a.

²⁴² Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 15 August 2000).

III:1004 fig. 69; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:443; PINI 2000:109 #5, fig. 1:5; PHILLIPS 2004:162 fig. 1.a.5.

Comments: As above, {81}. The paired leaf arrangement is found only on Minoan seals, and seems to be a later rather than earlier design.

KALYVIA

The necropolis of Kalyvia lies on the east side of a low hill near the village of Kalyvia, north-east of Phaestos and on the northern edge of the Mesara plain. The discovery of numerous surface sherds led to a season of excavation by St. Xanthoudides in 1901. He uncovered 13 tombs, of which two were 'shaft graves' and the remainder chamber tombs, but published his finds only in local newspaper accounts.²⁴³ As the site was under Italian permit, publication rights were assigned to the Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene.

The Scuola undertook a second season of excavation the following year under the direction of L. Savignoni, finding one further chamber tomb to complete the total 14 here,²⁴⁴ numbered consecutively from south to north. The collective wealth of these tombs led to their identification as 'Tombe dei Nobili' by Savignoni, in contrast to the 'Tombe della Plebe' at nearby Liliانا cemetery, published jointly. Savignoni published all 14 tombs, but not all finds from Xanthoudides' excavations had been recorded by tomb context. The Kalyvia necropolis as a whole is limited in date to the LM IIIA period,²⁴⁵ and is strongly associated with contemporary post-palatial habitation at nearby Phaestos.

A. Tomb 2

Tomb 2 is a double-chambered chamber tomb having a long dromos.²⁴⁶ Three badly preserved skeletons of indeterminate sex were found, in addition to ceramics of LM IIIA1 date,²⁴⁷ a gold ring and a gold spiral-wire bracelet.

84. Ring, HM 44

Gold,²⁴⁸ bezel: L: 17.0; W: 10.2; Th. (max): 2.9; hoop: D: 15.4; W: 2.4; Th: 1.1 mm, intact but with considerably worn bezel surface.

²⁴³ XANTHOUIDES in *Patris*, 18, 22, 27 October and 03 November 1901.

²⁴⁴ SAVIGNONI 1904:501–627. Tombs 1–3 and 5–13 were chamber tombs, and tombs 4 and 14 of the 'shaft grave' type. Tomb 9 was excavated by Savignoni in 1902, the remainder by Xanthoudides.

²⁴⁵ According to FURUMARK 1941:104–105; PINI 1968:90; KANTA 1980:99; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:84. PENDLEBURY 1930b:16 extends the dating to include the entire LM period, but the published vessels all are LM IIIA. Kanta

Oval bezel with attached loop ring fluted on exterior. Interior hollow, *Face:* Cultic scene. Female figure in long flounced skirt standing at right facing left, with long hair and arms raised to face level. In front of her, an elongated ape facing left, with tail raised behind and arms raised in front. Both face a third figure on left side, probably a woman, in a semi-crouching position with arms raised. Behind this woman at the extreme left is a pillar capped at the top. In the upper field above the ape and third figure are several 'floating' objects and/or figures.

Minoan, LM II–III A1(?).

Context: LM IIIA1.

Chronology: LM II–III A1(?) ring, in generally contemporary or slightly later LM IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: {142}; {495}.

References: SAVIGNONI 1904:529, 578 fig. 51, 585–591 #F:a.2, pl. 40:7; EVANS *PM* II.2:764 fig. 492:c; McDERMOTT 1938:324 #603; PERSSON 1942:46–47, 174 fig. 9; NILSSON 1950:43, 257 fig. 125, 287, 346, 370; BIESANTZ 1954:67–68, 139 #1:P:6 pl. 7:41; ALEXIOU 1958b:231 pl. IB':2; KENNA 1960:75 n. 6; MATZ 1958:396 #2; KENNA 1963b:329–330, pl. IB':4; WESENBERG 1971:18 #54, fig. 62; MARINATOS and HIRMER 1973:45, 147, pl. 115:upper right; YOUNGER 1979:264–265, n. 25; PINI 1983:42 fig. 1, 43–44; YOUNGER 1984:85 Type IV, 86; *CMS* II.3:#103; MARINATOS 1987a:125–126, fig. 4:2; PHILLIPS 1991:II:437–438 #70, III:1005 fig. 70; XENAKI-SAKELLARIOU 1995:317 Type IV, nn. 14–15; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:365, 401 #446; KYRIAKIDES 2005:*passim*, 140 fig. 3.a, 141 table 1, n. a.

Comments: The 'floating objects' have been interpreted by Pini as a 'spike' and "chrysalis".

Despite the elongation of the body and lack of indicated legs, the ape illustrated here obviously is the same type as found elsewhere in a similar pose, best described as the *Cercopithecus* monkey. Both Younger and Xenaki-Sakellariou argue for a Final Palatial date, based on the ring technology (his Type IV with hoop type 1d; her Type IV), although Kenna had suggested LM IB and Pini LM I on stylistic grounds. Sakellariou notes its type is 'Mycenaean' in origin, with earlier Mainland examples, and relates it technologically to the ring from Archanes Tholos A,²⁴⁹ whose face design is similar except dragonflies seem to act as intermediaries. Its antiquity at interment can be supported by its noticeably worn condition, but its best technological comparanda appear to be LM II–III A1 and perhaps this is the better option.

B. Tomb 6

Tomb 6 has the usual oval single-chamber and long dromos.²⁵⁰ Three individuals were buried in this tomb, together with a clay bird-shaped oinochoe and presumably other clay vessels also, of LM IIIA date. Other finds included two stone jars, a gold-covered

notes one sherd from Xanthoudides excavation seems to be LM IIIB in stylistic date.

²⁴⁶ SAVIGNONI 1904:528–529, fig.17.

²⁴⁷ Apparently limited to this date by FURUMARK 1941:II:104.

²⁴⁸ KENNA 1963b:330 believed it to be solid gold; this was repudiated by YOUNGER 1979:265 n. 25. Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 15 August 2000) now confirms the lack of a bronze core, *contra* Younger.

²⁴⁹ See Archanes H.

²⁵⁰ SAVIGNONI 1904:532.

bronze pin, small bronze mirror, decorated ivory pieces and several necklaces of faience and steatite in varying states of preservation.

85. Jar ('spheroid jar'), HM A 178

Gabbro, H: 10.1; D (rim): 7.8; (max): 9.4; (base): 4.5 cm, two large chips on rim and upper body, otherwise intact.

Jar with a flat raised base, short neck having a slightly out-turned rim flat on top, high shoulder and two small horizontal lug handles on the lower shoulder. Roughly drilled interior.

Minoan, LM I–IIIA(1?).

Context: LM IIIA.

Chronology: LM I–IIIA(1?) vessel, generally contemporary or an antique in its LM IIIA tomb deposition.

Comparison: {61}.

References: SAVIGNONI 1904:552 #D:3, fig. 37:bottom left; WARREN 1969:75 Type 30:B, P406, D226; PHILLIPS 1991:II:438–439 #71, III:1005 fig. 71; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:212 #211.β.

Comments: Warren placed this as an 'imitation' of the 'heart-shaped jar' type, but it is only vaguely reminiscent and probably was not derived from this form. Rather, it seems better related to the tall variety of the 'spheroid jar' form, with its raised base, flat collar rim and horizontal lug handles on the shoulder.

86. Jar ('miniature amphora'), HM A 179

Grey and white mottled dolomitic limestone, H: 6.3; D (rim): 3.6; (max): 5.5; (base, rest.): 2.2 cm, cracked one side, with majority of rim chipped and large chip lower body and half of base.

'Miniature amphora' with flat raised base, high shoulder and thickened rim. A series of 16 horizontal grooves covers the exterior body from neck to lower body.

Separate flat lid with knob handle and horizontal grooves.

Minoan, EM III–MM I/II.

Context: LM IIIA.

Chronology: EM III–MM I/II object, an antique in its LM IIIA tomb deposition.

Comparanda: (additional lid) {45}, {117}.

References: SAVIGNONI 1904:552–553 #D:4, fig. 37:top left, second from left; WARREN 1969:72 Type 28, P359; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:439 #72, III:1005 fig. 72; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:212 #211.α.

Comments: Although found in an LM IIIA tomb, this vessel clearly is a type common in EM III–MM I/II and may have been removed from an earlier Mesara tholos.²⁵¹ Only one other example has been found in a 'survival' context, at Pyrgos (Khanli Kastelli) {506}, possibly also in LM IIIA. The overall horizontal grooving is unique. Savignoni thought it a container for a perfume or unguent. KARETSOU *et al.* consider this a 'miniature pithos' and date it to MM III–LM I.

The separate lid illustrated by Savignoni was not located in the HM. If it belongs with the vessel, as Savignoni notes, then this is one of only a handful of Minoan vessels provided with a separate lid, similar to the Egyptian model vessels with sep-

arate lid, and to those Egyptian vessels also provided with a separate (Minoan) lid at Angeliana and Katsamba.

C. Tomb 7

Tomb 7, another typical chamber tomb, contained further burials and rich grave goods.²⁵² Found objects included a gold ring and necklace, faience beads belonging to another necklace, and a seal. It is dated to LM IIIA2, although no ceramics are reported specifically from this tomb.

87. Seal, HM Σ-K 169

Bright orange-red carnelian, L: 18.2; W: 13.9; H: 6.6; SH: 2.4 mm, large chip on upper right corner of Face A, worn surface. 'Flattened cylinder' or 'cushion' seal with rounded edges. String-hole through length. *Face A:* Striding hippopotamus deity-type figure facing left, holding a captured and helpless deer fawn, on left side, in front with both front paws. Majority of head lost, but enough remains to indicate an open-jawed leonine head with sharp upper teeth. Thick body with leonine legs and paws. Large, thick dorsal appendage to knee level, with open curled attachments to outer edge over body. Vertical format. *Face B:* Standing bull, facing left with head *regardant* to attack man in foreground. Man half-kneeling in 'running' pose, with both arms raised to ward off bull. Horizontal format.

Minoan, MM III(–LM I?).

Context: LM IIIA(2?).

Chronology: MM III(–LM I?) object, an antique in its LM IIIA(2?) tomb deposition.

Comparanda: {159}; {372}; {448}; {449}.

References: SAVIGNONI 1904:533, 624–627 #F:d:14, fig. 97, pl. XL:5, 8; EVANS *PM* IV:2:434–435, fig. 358:a; NILSSON 1950:356–357, 380, fig. 167; BIESANTZ 1954:139 #1:P:7; ZERVOS 1956:fig. 663; KENNA 1960:53 n. 2; 1963b:329, 331 fig. HM 169, 333–334, pl. 14:15–16; GILL 1964:3, 20 #38, pl. 1:3; KENNA 1964:945, 949–950, fig. 30; YOUNGER 1973:1:85 #802, II:378; KAISER 1976:74 n. 168, pl. 7:4; YULE 1981:46 Class 8:c, 138 Motif 17:C, pl. 11 Motif 17:C:10; *CMS* II.3:#105; PHILLIPS 1991:II:439–440 #73, III:1005 fig. 73; REHAK 1995:219, 219 n. 33, 220 fig. 3; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:161–162 #139.β.

Comments: The standing hippopotamus figure seems halfway between the Egyptian hippopotamus deity figure and the Minoan 'genius'. The tactility of the dorsal appendage suggests a date later than the Knossos {159} and Phaestos {448; 449} seal impressions, a more developed form like those on the LM IA triton-shell rhyton from Malia {372}, as does the suggestion of movement in the figure itself.

Although the context of the seal is LM IIIA(2?), Yule and Younger date the seal itself to MM III based on the design style and shape of the seal itself. Evans had earlier considered the possibility. However, Gill noted its stylistic features betray a later date, especially the large drilled eyes of the deer and the design on Face B. It may be that it was 'modernised' to conform with contemporary (LM IIIA) taste before interment. Younger²⁵³ dated its context within LM IIIA2, probably on the basis of the seal itself.

²⁵¹ Possibly Aghia Triadha Tholos B, reused in LM IIIA (see Aghia Triadha D) or the Kamilari tholos, reused in LM IIIA2.

²⁵² SAVIGNONI 1904:532–533.

²⁵³ YOUNGER 1973:II:378.

D. Tomb 9

Tomb 9 was the only tomb excavated by Savignoni, and the only one fully published.²⁵⁴ It too was a typical chamber tomb with long dromos. Two earthen ‘benches’ lay along the walls, and two cist graves were dug into the chamber floor. One contained a skeleton possibly on a bier, with an unengraved gold ring nearby. The second grave was that of a child, and contained beads from a necklace. The remaining contents were scattered on the chamber floor above the top of the graves, including three skulls and other bones, numerous clay LM IIIA vessels and others of bronze and stone, necklaces and beads of stone and faience, and several seals.²⁵⁵

88. Seal, HM Σ-K 180

Agate,²⁵⁶ L: 15.5–16; W: 14.5–15.5; SH: 2.5 mm, intact.

Seal with three near-circular oval prisms. String-hole through length. *Face A*: Lion standing on all legs, facing right with head *regardant*, curled around to fit contour of the seal. *Face B*: Two standing Minoan ‘genii’ facing each other towards centre with arms to front, each with one paw raised in front of face as if holding an object but nothing indicated. Dorsal appendage indicated by a row of dots on upper back. Abdomen filled with parallel lines. Tall plant indicated by vertical line with attached diagonal lines behind each ‘genius’. *Face C*: Unengraved.

Minoan, LM IIIA.

Context: LM IIIA.

Chronology: LM IIIA object, in generally contemporary LM IIIA tomb deposition.

Comparanda: (“spectacle-eyes C”) {64}, {433}.

References: SAVIGNONI 1904:521, fig. 10:b–c, pl. 40:11–12; BOSSERT 1923:33 #317.b, pl. 317.b;1937:34, 228 fig. 391.a; NILSSON 1950:379 fig. 188; BIESANTZ 1954:50 n. 71, 141 #1:Q:4–5, pl. 5:29:b; KENNA 1963b:330–332, pl. IΓ:12–13; GILL 1964:17 #14, pl. 4:1; KENNA 1964:945, fig. 30:a–b; BUCHHOLZ and KARAGEORGHIS 1973:115 #1393, 117 #1393; YOUNGER 1973:I:84 #774: II:377; KAISER 1976:74, pl. 7:14; *CMS* II.3:#112; WEINGARTEN 1983:pl. 6:F; YOUNGER 2986:124 fig. 22, 125 fig. 33, 134, 135; PHILLIPS 1991:II:441 #74, III:1005 fig. 74; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:160–161 #139.a.

Comments: Younger places this within his “spectacle eyes C” group, which he dates to LM IIIA.

E. Tomb(s) in Cemetery

Many objects were not recorded as having been recovered in a specific tomb. They were not found in tomb 9, as all objects from here were recorded separately.

Nonetheless, they must be considered to have a context of LM IIIA, the date of the cemetery as a whole.

89. Flask, HM Y 270

Mottled greyish-black to bluish-white glass with white thread decoration, H (rest.): 15.6; D (rim): 3.0; (max): 10.0; (base): 4.4 cm, restored from numerous joining and non-joining fragments of lower base, body, neck and rim, and one handle. About one-third preserved but profile certain except height of pedestal base. Surface badly preserved, with small amount of glass thread decoration preserved.

Lentoid, having long straight neck with everted rim, flattened body front and back, and hollow pedestal base. Small vertical loop handle on each shoulder (as restored). Originally dark blue in colour, with body decoration of eight grooved threads in a single eight-pointed star pattern front and back, linked by single vertical line below handles and low wide “V” at bottom of neck, all filled with white glass thread. Horizontal groove around outer rim (original thread missing). Manufactured using the ‘sand-core’ technique.

Possibly Egyptian, late Dynasty XVIII (reigns of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten), perhaps Syrian or Cypriote, LB IIA.

Context: None recorded, presumably LM IIIA.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XVIII (not later than reign of Akhenaten) or LB IIA object, presumably in a generally contemporary LM IIIA tomb deposition.

Comparanda: HAYES 1953–1959:II:404 fig. 255:lower right; WEINBERG 1961–1962:pl. MΘ:2; NOLTE 1968:pl. VI:2, VII:5; GOLDSTEIN 1979:36, 55–56 #16, pl. III:18; (handle position) SCHLICK-NOLTE 1996:189 fig. 1.2; {101}.

References: SAVIGNONI 1904:556–557 #D:10–12, fig. 44:upper left; MARINATOS 1927–1928b:83–84, fig. 8–9; FOSSING 1940:26–28, fig. 16; WEINBERG 1961–1962:226–229, pl. MH:2, MΘ:1; NOLTE 1968:95–96 #28a, 165 Type IV:b, 184; HARDEN 1968:48, 49 n. 16, 70, pl. II:F; GOLDSTEIN 1979:36; HARDEN 1981:31 n. 6; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:240 #157, pl. 77:157; PHILLIPS 1991:II:442–443 #75, III:1006 fig. 75; CLINE 1994:196–197 #557; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:99 #74.

Comments: Marinatos²⁵⁷ concluded the flask was of Syrian manufacture, and associated it with a similar glass flask found at Karteros {101}. Fossing identified both flasks as local products influenced by Egyptian Dynasty XVIII prototypes. Weinberg sees both as Egyptian imports, basing her opinion on their decomposition features²⁵⁸ and her admittedly inexact parallels. Nolte²⁵⁹ accepts the Kalyvia flask as Egyptian, and dates two examples with similar star-pattern on the body to the reigns of Amenhotep III–IV, the latter being Akhenaten. Goldstein believes this flask to be a local product, due to its “rather ungainly and poorly preserved” appearance.

All the arguments are weakened by a lack of good parallels for either flask, although the Kalyvia flask certainly is closer to Egyptian and other possible parallels than the Karteros piece. The main points of difference are an excessively slim base and

²⁵⁴ SAVIGNONI 1904:508–526, fig. 4.

²⁵⁵ For their relative positions, see SAVIGNONI 1904:fig. 6–7.

²⁵⁶ Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 15 August 2000).

²⁵⁷ MARINATOS 1927–1928b:86–87.

²⁵⁸ She proposes that the original colour of the flasks was dark

blue, now decomposed to their present muddy colours. As virtually every vessel of this general type known is of dark blue, her conclusion is reasonable.

²⁵⁹ NOLTE 1968. Her lack of reference to the Karteros flask {101} infers her lack of acceptance of this vessel as Egyptian.

the position of the handles, low on the shoulder and not at the shoulder/neck junction characteristic of both Egyptian and Cypriote examples. In the case of the Kalyvia flask at least, this *may* be an incorrect restoration since the one surviving handle does not join onto any of the surviving body or neck fragments. Neither of Nolte's two Egyptian examples is footed. Only one parallel for the handle position on the shoulder only can be cited: a lentoid vessel fragment recovered in the 'Schatzhaus' at Kamid el-Loz.

The star design is known on several Egyptian and Cypriote vessels, as are examples of lentoid flasks having a pedestal foot. No evidence exists for an indigenous Minoan glass vessel industry. The additional presence of an almost certainly Egyptian glass krateriskos {92} at Kalyvia gives impetus to a probably similar non-Minoan origin for the flask that need not necessarily be Egypt.

Lambrou-Phillipson lists this vessel as from Phaestos.

90. Alabastron (Type B), HM A 175

Banded travertine, H: 46.6; D (rim): 13.8; (max): 26.6 cm, virtually intact, restored from numerous joining fragments.

Tall 'drop vase' alabastron with rounded bottom and flaring rim. Three deep horizontal grooves around exterior rim.

Egyptian, within Dynasty XII–early Dynasty XVII.

Context: None recorded, presumably LM IIIA.

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII–early Dynasty XVII vessel, an 'heirloom' or antique in its presumably LM IIIA tomb deposition.

Comparanda: VON BISSING 1904–1907:I:153 #18720; II:pl. C:18720; REISNER 1923:57–59, fig. 159, pl. 38:1.7, 4; PETRIE 1937:10, pl. XXIX:656–657, 659–660; BOURRIAU 1988:144–145 #150; {223}; (scale) MONTET 1928–1929:pl. CXXII:847–848.

References: SAVIGNONI 1904:554–555 #D:7, fig. 38; PENDLEBURY 1930a:73; 1930b:17 #19;²⁶⁰ SCHIERING 1960:22, fig. 11:left; WARREN in KENNA 1963b:337–338; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I, P607; HELCK 1979:93; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:207 #58, pl. 69:58; PHILLIPS 1991:II:443–444 #76, III:1007 fig. 76; CLINE 1994:165 #260; LILYQUIST 1996:145; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:235 #230.

Comments: Vessels at this extremely large scale are extremely rare. Its dating is limited by the neck grooves.

91. Alabastron (Type A), HM A 176

Banded travertine, H: 16.8; D (rim, rest.): 5.5; (max): 14.6 cm, majority of rim and lower body lost but entire profile preserved, restored from numerous joining fragments.

Globular body, with short cylindrical neck, slightly depressed shoulder and externally thickened rounded rim. Rounded bottom. Egyptian, late MK (from within Dynasty XII) (–SIP?).

Context: None recorded, presumably LM IIIA.

Chronology: Late Middle Kingdom (from within Dynasty XII?) (–Second Intermediate Period?) vessel, an antique in its presumably LM IIIA tomb deposition.

Comparanda: VON BISSING 1904–1907:I:153 #18719; II:pl. C:18719; PETRIE 1937:10, pl. XXIX:626–631; TBM 05.358; {146}, {210}.

References: SAVIGNONI 1904:555 #D:8, fig. 39; PENDLEBURY 1930b:17 #20;²⁶¹ SCHIERING 1960:22, fig. 11:right; WARREN in KENNA 1963b:337–338; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:H; HELCK 1979:93; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:206 #56–57, pl. 66:56; PHILLIPS 1991:II:444–445 #77, III:1008 fig. 77; CLINE 1994:165 #261; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:240–241 #240.α.

92. Krateriskos, HM 199

Mottled greyish-black to bluish-white glass with white and yellow decoration, H (pres.): 6.7; D (max): 5.6; (base): 3.4 cm, upper neck and rim, two handles and parts of base missing, surface badly preserved with some iridescence.

Krateriskos with flattened globular body, short wide cylindrical neck and splayed pedestal foot. Three horizontal loop handles on shoulder. Originally dark blue in colour, with marvered festoon decoration of yellow and white on body and on neck. Shoulder ribbed where threads have been dragged for festooning.

Egyptian, late or end Dynasty XVIII.

Context: None recorded, presumably LM IIIA.

Chronology: Late or end Dynasty XVIII object, presumably in a generally contemporary LM IIIA tomb deposition.

Comparanda: PHILIPPAKI, SYMEONGLOU and FARAKLAS 1967:pl. 160:a; NOLTE 1968:pl. IV:18, VIII:17; HARDEN 1981:31 n. 7; MMA 81.10.338; TBM 37.340E; {255} (without handles).

References: SAVIGNONI 1904:556 #D:10, fig. 44:upper left; FOSHING 1940:26; NOLTE 1969:17, 93 #16, 184, pl. VIII:16; HARDEN 1981:31 n. 7; PHILLIPS 1991:II:435 #78, III:1008 fig. 78; CLINE 1994:206 #650.

Comments: This form with three (rather than the usual two) handles is less common, and appears limited to late Dynasty XVIII. It therefore is fairly contemporary with the date of the cemetery, which in Egyptian terms lies within the reigns of Thutmose IV(?) through Horemhab.

KAMILARI

Three tholos tombs have been recorded near the village of Kamilari, about three kilometres south-west of Phaestos, at the eastern end of the Mesara plain. Tomb I was found on the hill known as 'Grigori Korifi,' 1.5 kilometres north of the village, and excavated by D. Levi in 1959.²⁶² Tomb II lay on another hill called 'Mylona Lakko' about two kilometres west of Phaestos. Levi also excavated its poorly preserved remains in 1959.²⁶³ Tomb III, also almost totally destroyed, was noted by K. Branigan in 1966 about 50 m. from Tomb I.²⁶⁴ Tombs II and III apparently

²⁶⁰ He places this and {91} below in Tomb 4 and dates the cemetery pottery to the entire LM period. His later handwritten notes (in his own copy now in the Villa Ariadne library, Knossos) add that "from the position of the vases they seem to have belonged to the first interment, i.e. Late Minoan I." He might either have had access to further data or mistaken this tomb for another. Indeed WARREN in

KENNA 1963b:338 and n. 38 points out these vessels are not listed as from Tomb 4 in the original publication. Nor is an LM I date mentioned elsewhere in publication.

²⁶¹ Misidentified as HM 46.

²⁶² LEVI 1960:434–436; 1961–1962a; 1976–1981:I.2:703–741.

²⁶³ LEVI 1961–1962a:107–108; 1976–1981:I.2:742–743.

²⁶⁴ BRANIGAN 1976.

date to MM II?–III and MM I–II respectively. Both employed well-cut regular stone blocks. Recent excavations at the foot of one of the hills have revealed a Middle Minoan building probably to be associated with the tholos above.²⁶⁵

The most famous of the tholoi, Tomb I, is very well preserved to a maximum height over two metres, its entrance lintel block and blocking stone still in place, and a large quantity of fallen stones indicative of stone roofing covering the chamber itself.²⁶⁶ Constructed in MM IB, it continued in use until LM IIIA2, to judge from its ceramic contents. No stratigraphy could be established, as it had been so robbed and churned over. It lies just north of the hilltop, surrounded on three sides by sloping ground and the fourth by a tall rocky ledge to which its five ante-rooms adjoined. The easternmost room, γ , is a later addition probably constructed in MM IIIA(?), as were annexe rooms δ – ϵ . A slab-paved and open ‘offertory precinct,’ with an altar where numerous overturned clay and stone vessels were recovered, was located immediately north of the antechambers.

A considerable number of finds were recorded from Tomb I and its antechambers. Over 1,000 ceramic vessels including more than 500 plain conical cups, about 70 stone vessels, 20 seals, bronze tools, toilet implements and rings, some fragments of worked gold, amulets, pendants and necklace beads of clay, metal and stone were recovered, together with an estimated 400–500 burials. An LM III larnax also was found at the entrance, together with LM IIIA1 and IIIA2 vessels. Further burials and grave goods were found in the annexes, which appear to have begun use for this purpose some time after the tholos. Almost all the conical cups were found concentrated in a single annexe room, as at other tombs. A number of quite detailed models of funerary rites apparently dating to either LM IB or IIIA were found in the antechamber rooms although not in the tholos, especially room α and the passage between rooms β and γ near the entrance.

A. Tomb I Tholos Chamber

The tholos chamber of Tomb I contained a considerable number of finds, including many clay bridge-

spouted jars, oinochoe, amphorae, jugs and juglets, goblets and cups (both handled and handleless), pitharaki, lids and alabastra, stamnoi and a kernos.²⁶⁷ Other finds included bronze bracelets, fish-hooks, razors and daggers. The contents had been destroyed by fire sometime after LM IIIA,²⁶⁸ and traces of burnt timbers were in evidence. The earlier interments had been pushed against the wall, likely to make room for subsequent interments or just possibly during looting. The following were found chiefly near the wall away from the entrance.

93. Amphora, HM Π 15082

Fine clay, H: 24.8; D (rim): 12.5; (max): 14.4; (base): 7.6 cm, restored from 11 joining fragments, with half of one handle and base and two-thirds of rim missing, paint/wash worn.

Amphora with everted high pedestal base, ovoid body, short wide cylindrical neck and everted rim. Two horizontal high loop handles on shoulder, set vertically raised ridge at base/body junction. Grooved at bottom of pedestal. Hollow underfoot. Red-painted/washed.

Minoan, Neo-Palatial, probably MM III, possibly LM IA.

Context: MM IB–LM IIIA2.

Chronology: MM III–LM IA object, probably in contemporary MM III–early LM I tomb deposition, or less likely as late as LM IIIA2.

Comparanda: {94–96}; {181}; {369}; (profile) {95}.

References: LEVI 1961–1962a:42–44, fig. 21:2877, 46:d; LEVI 1976–1981:1.2:726, fig. 1170:second from right; WALBERG 1983:93; PHILLIPS 1991:II:448 #79, III:1009 fig. 79; CUCUZZA 2000:103 type 2; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:228 #225.

Comments: Levi noted that the raised ring or collar at the body/base junction and high loop handles were derivative of Egyptian amphorae, exemplified on Crete by the travertine example from Katsamba {114}.²⁶⁹ Cucuzza includes it as one of her Type 2 amphorae.

The level of the horizontal collar of this one amphora is proportionately higher than the four other examples, {94–97} below, also found in the tholos; this suggests it is later in date, as those found in LM I contexts have the collar even higher.

94. Amphora, HM — (ex-PhSM F 2901) (not seen)

Clay, H: 14.0; D (rim): 10.0; (max): 10.4; (base): 6.0 cm, intact but colour well-worn.

Amphora with slightly flaring pedestal base, ovoid body, very short and wide cylindrical neck, and flaring rim. Two horizontal loop double-coil handles on shoulder, set at a diagonal. Slight raised ridge at base/body junction.

Minoan, Neo-Palatial, probably MM III.

Context: MM IB–LM IIIA2.

Chronology: Probably MM III object, probably in contempo-

²⁶⁵ BLACKMAN 1999:114. The specific hill is not stated, but presumably is Grigori Korifi.

²⁶⁶ LEVI 1961–1962a:18–19 figs. 11–12; BRANIGAN 1970a:pl. 6; FIANDRA 1995.

²⁶⁷ See comments by WALBERG 1983:93 on the pottery.

²⁶⁸ On the latest contents, see KANTA 1980:101–102.

²⁶⁹ A number of other vessel types with this basal ring were recovered at Kamilari, of which only the amphorae are included in the present catalogue. Others mainly are pitharaki with three or four handles (LEVI 1961–1962:50 fig.52.c, e, g–h, 51 fig.53) and bridge-spouted jars (LEVI 1961–1962:49 figs. 49.c–d, f–g, 50).

rary MM III tomb deposition, or less likely as late as LM IIIA2.

Comparanda: {93}; {95}–{97}; {288}; (double-coil handles) {97}.

References: LEVI 1961–1962a:42–44, fig. 21:2901, 46:a; 1976–1981:I.2:726, fig. 1170:left; WALBERG 1983:93; PHILLIPS 1991:II:448 #80, III:1010 fig. 80; CUCUZZA 2000:103 type 3(?).

Comments: As above, {93}. If Cucuzza has cited this as one of her Type 3 amphorae, its basal profile follows that of {97} below. She notes the presence of double-loop handles on these vessels. One of the three vessels of her Type 3 was recovered in the “recinto della offerte” (‘offerings enclosure’).

95. Amphora, HM — (ex-PhSM F 2917) (not seen)

Clay, H: 15.0; D (rim): 9.5; (max): 10.5; (base): 4.8 cm, intact but colour well-worn.

Amphora with short flaring pedestal base, ovoid body, very short and wide cylindrical neck and flaring rim. Two horizontal loop handles on shoulder, set vertically. Raised ridge at base/body junction. Hollow underfoot. Red painted/washed. Minoan, Neo-Palatial, probably MM III.

Context: MM IB–LM IIIA2.

Chronology: Probably MM III object, probably in contemporary MM III tomb deposition, or less likely as late as LM IIIA2.

Comparanda: {93}–{94}; {96}–{97}; (profile) {93}.

References: LEVI 1961–1962a:42–44, fig. 21:2917, 46:e; 1976–1981:I.2:726, fig. 1170:right; WALBERG 1983:93; PHILLIPS 1991:II:449 #81, III:1010 fig. 81; CUCUZZA 2000:103 type 2.

Comments: As above, {93}. Cucuzza notes that the base is “hollow” (underfoot), and includes it amongst her Type 2 amphorae.

96. Amphora, HM 15083 (not seen)

Clay, H: 37.5; D (rim): 15.5; (max): 25.5; (base): 10.5 cm, intact.

Amphora with short pedestal base, ovoid body, short and wide cylindrical neck and everted rim. Two vertical handles upper shoulder to mid-body. Raised ridge at base/body junction. Traces of paint on body.

Minoan, Neo-Palatial, probably MM III.

Context: MM IB–LM IIIA2.

Chronology: Probably MM III object, probably in contemporary MM III tomb deposition, or less likely as late as LM IIIA2.

Comparanda: {93}–{95}; {97}; {114}; (profile) {97?}.

References: LEVI 1961–1962a:42–44, fig. 21:2963, 46:c; 1976–1981:I.2:726, fig. 1170:centre; WALBERG 1983:93; PHILLIPS 1991:II:449 #81, III:1011 fig. 82; CUCUZZA 2000:103 type 3(?), 105.

Comments: As above, {93}. Unfortunately, this (the largest of the group) cannot be located at present in the HM. If Cucuzza has cited this as one of her Type 3 amphorae, its basal profile follows that of {97} below, but she notes the presence of double-loop handles on these vessels; if not this vessel, it is not included in her typology but clearly possesses a basal ridge. One of the three vessels of her Type 3 was recovered in the “recinto della offerte” (‘offerings enclosure’). Of the five

Kamilari amphorae {93–95}, this is nearest the Egyptian type as exemplified by the Katsamba import {114}, but nonetheless is much earlier in date. This is the only one of the five Kamilari amphorae with vertical loop handles.

97. Amphora, HM Π 15081

Fine clay, H: 15.7; D (rim): 10.5; (max): 10.9; (base): 6.4 cm, restored from numerous joining fragments, with large portions of body and part of rim missing, chipped at base and handles. Amphora with short flaring pedestal base, ovoid body, short and wide cylindrical neck and everted rim. Hollow stem and slightly concave base. Two horizontal loop double-coil handles at shoulder, set diagonally. Two horizontal grooves on stem, creating a slightly raised ridge. Loose horizontal black-painted band at neck/shoulder junction, dribbling between handles. Minoan, Neo-Palatial, probably MM III.

Context: MM IB–LM IIIA2.

Chronology: Probably MM III object, probably in contemporary MM III tomb deposition, or less likely as late as LM IIIA2.

Comparanda: {93}–{96}; {288}; (double-coil handles) {94}; (profile) {94}; {96?}.

References: LEVI 1961–1962a:42–44, 46 fig. 46:b; 1976–1981:I.2:726, fig. 1170:second from left; WALBERG 1983:93; PHILLIPS 1991:II:449 #83, III:1012 fig. 83; CUCUZZA 2000:103 type 3(?); KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:227 #224.

Comments: As above, {93}. Following her description, this seems to be one of the three vessels Cucuzza cites as her Type 3, the others being {94} and {96} above. She notes the presence of double-loop handles on these vessels. One of the three vessels of her Type 3 was recovered in the “recinto della offerte” (‘offerings enclosure’).

B. Annexe β

Annexe Room β is the second of the annexe rooms from the entrance of Tomb I, and presumably was the original entrance prior to the addition of room γ.²⁷⁰ A rectangular room, it leads immediately into the L-shaped room α and the burial chamber itself. Twenty-one stone vessels were found in this room together with a large quantity of bones and seven clay jugs/amphorae, a basin, four juglets, seven handled cups and a conical cup, two chalices, two plates, a conical cup, four seal stones and many of the clay funerary models including the most elaborate examples. It apparently went out of use before LM I.²⁷¹

98. Jar (‘cylinder jar’), Type A, HM unnumbered (Exc. # F59 2746) (not seen)

Chlorite, H: 5.1–5.3; D (rim): 4.2; (base): 2.9 cm, intact.

Medium-tall cylindrical jar with everted rim and base rounded at edges, body slightly convex and tapering to base. Interior profile unknown.

Minoan, MM IB, possibly earlier.

Context: MM IB–III.

Chronology: MM IB object, probably in contemporary MM IB tomb deposition but possibly as late as MM III.

²⁷⁰ LEVI 1961–1962a:61–67; 1976–1981:I.2:727–731.

²⁷¹ See WALBERG 1983:93–94 on the pottery.

Comparanda: {26}, {27}, {393}, {460}, {480}.

References: LEVI 1961–1962a:92 fig. 120:C:b, 94 n. 3; WARREN 1969:76 Type 30:D, P421; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23; 1991:II:450 #84, III:1012 fig. 84.

Comments: Egyptian ‘cylinder jar’ forms contemporary with EM II–MM I are tapering but tend to either be straight or slightly concave in profile. This example may be later than most, due to the MM IB construction date of the tholos, although it may have been reused from an earlier burial elsewhere (but not at Kamilari as no tombs here are earlier in date).²⁷² Convex forms almost exclusively are Predynastic and date not later than Dynasty I, and in any case do not have a defined base.²⁷³ Thus this vessel is somewhat removed from the Egyptian type, and thus is difficult to correlate with it; the footed base would at least place its model within the Dynastic period.

C. Annexe δ

Annexe room δ was published as a unit with room ε, from which it was divided by a short spur-wall, as a ‘small tholos’ although it is not.²⁷⁴ There is no entrance to this pair of rooms, which employ the rocky ledge as the eastern wall. Room δ, to the south, is ‘circular’ for purely practical reasons, as one wall abuts the tholos wall and another joins the tholos and the ledge, the third being only a spur-wall. This room too was filled with bones, interspersed with two stone vessels, a clay bridge-spouted jar, eight juglets, five plates, three small bowls and a hydria. This annexe, together with annexes γ and ε, was added in MM IIIA(?).²⁷⁵

99. Jar (‘spheroid jar’), HM — (ex-PhSM F 2964) (not seen)
Unidentified stone (limestone with irregular calcite veining?), H: 5.0; D (rim, int.): 4.8; (max): 12.4; (base): 5.0 mm, large chip on majority of rim and shoulder.

Spheroid jar with wide flat rim, undercut. High shoulder and tapering body to flat base.

Minoan, MM III or later.

Context: MM IIIA(?)–LM I.

Chronology: MM III or later vessel, probably in contemporary MM IIIA(?)–LM I tomb deposition.

Comparison: WARREN 1969:75–76 Type 30:A.

References: LEVI 1961–1962a:78, 94 n. 3, fig. 99; 1976–1981: I.2:735 n. 27; PHILLIPS 1991:II:451 #85, III:1012 fig. 85.

Comments: All information is taken from published text and photograph. Not listed in Warren 1969, but he agrees it is another example of his Type 30:A.²⁷⁶ The stone, to judge from

the photograph, is a limestone with irregular calcite veining commonly found on Crete, and therefore marks the jar as Minoan.

D. No Find Context

The following has no published find context.

100. Jar (‘miniature amphora’), HM – (ex-PhSM Kamilari unnumbered) (not seen)

Material (an unidentified stone), dimensions and condition unknown.

‘Miniature amphora’. No further details.

Minoan, MM I?

Context: None, but probably from the tholos and so within the MM IB–LM IIIA2 range.

Chronology: Probably MM I object, without find context but probably somewhat later in MM IB–LM IIIA2 tomb deposition.

References: WARREN 1969:229 Type 28; PHILLIPS 1991:II:451–452 #86.

Comments: This vessel is listed by Warren, but I have been unable to trace it. Comparanda cannot be cited without a description of the vessel itself.

KARTEROS

The Karteros Plain lies on the northern coast about six kilometres east of Herakleion. A number of sites have been excavated and investigated in the area, chiefly by Sp. Marinatos in 1926–1938,²⁷⁷ with later restoration work by N. PLATON in 1945²⁷⁸ and rescue excavations by St. Alexiou in 1963–1964 and 1967.²⁷⁹ At the northern edge of the plain lies the site of Amnisos, a harbour town of Knossos, excavated by Marinatos in 1932–1938 with later work by Platon and St. Alexiou. Ceramic evidence indicates the area was inhabited from the EM through LM IIIC periods,²⁸⁰ and the excavators have uncovered houses specifically dated within MM III–LM III. Harbour works were also reported. It was part of what must have been a rather densely populated area that encompassed known sites from Herakleion to Nirou Khani along the coast and inland beyond Knossos to Archanes. Alexiou’s later excavations showed the town of Amnisos extended beyond the plain edge to west of Palaeochora hill.

²⁷² Chlorite is popular as a vessel material to LM I, especially in the Mesara region; see WARREN 1969:129–130.

²⁷³ See B.G. ASTON 1994:99–105.

²⁷⁴ LEVI 1961–1962a:76–79; 1976–1981:I.2:733–735.

²⁷⁵ LA ROSA, in MYERS, MYERS and CADOGAN 1992:114.

²⁷⁶ Peter Warren (personal communication, September 1988).

²⁷⁷ MARINATOS 1927–1928b; 1928; 1930; preliminary reports continuing in *Praktika* almost annually to 1938.

²⁷⁸ COOK 1946:118.

²⁷⁹ ALEXIOU 1964:439–440; 1968b:402–403.

²⁸⁰ The representative quantity of material from the various periods are not equally represented in the excavated areas. Marinatos’s excavations apparently produced very little LM IIIA material, while Alexiou’s excavations find this period more than adequately represented. The reverse situation seems to be true for the LM IIIC period. See KANTA 1980:38–43.

Marinatos also excavated the cult cave of Eileithyia, south of Amnisos and above the Karteros stream.²⁸¹ It was in use from the Neolithic to the Venetian period,²⁸² but cultic activity is claimed for the MM to the Iron Age, and certainly occurred from the Classical through Roman period; Minoan period finds are limited to ceramics. Across the nearby gorge and opposite the cave entrance, Marinatos also found an EM burial cave continuing in limited use to LM IIIA1.

In 1926, Marinatos excavated a chamber tomb on the east side of the Karteros Plain.²⁸³ It had the usual long dromos and oval interior chamber. Only half the blocking wall was preserved, suggesting the tomb may have been looted. The chamber contained six larnakes, of which five were undecorated and the last had incised decoration only. A number of objects were found within the larnakes, but surprisingly few were clay vessels. The objects included a stone bowl, beads and necklaces, a gold ring, bronze knife and mirror, a glass flask and an ivory mirror handle. Ceramic finds included two miniature alabaster, jugs and a juglet, braziers, conical cups, bowls, and an incense burner (*themiatirion*), probably transitional LM IIIA2/B in date although perhaps continuing into LM IIIB.

The richest sarcophagus, although not the one with incised decoration, seems to have been #3. Its contents included two complete vases, bowls and a juglet, several beads in sard and rock crystal, the gold ring and fragments of others in silver and bronze, further fragments of pins, the bronze knife blade and mirror, the ivory comb, glass flask and an 'alabaster' pyxis lid.

101. Flask, HM Y 269

Brownish-grey glass with added yellow and white glass threads, H: 12.6–12.8; D (rim): 2.5; (max): 6.2; (base): 2.7 cm, restored almost complete from numerous fragments, missing majority of foot, tip of base and all handles, but base, strap handle and one loop handle restored.

Lentoid amphoriskoid flask with a long straight neck having everted rim and flattened body front and back on a high pedestal base. Small vertical loop handle on each shoulder.

One longer vertical strap handle at back, from upper neck to shoulder. All-over surface decoration, except base, consisting of horizontal threads of yellow and white glass, dragged into loops or festoons and marvered into the surface. Manufactured using the 'sand-core' technique.

Indeterminate origin, probably Levantine, LB IIA but possibly Egyptian, second half Dynasty XVIII.

Context: Transitional LM IIIA2/B–B.

Chronology: Probably imported LB IIA/late Dynasty XVIII object, in generally contemporary or slightly later tomb deposition.

Comparanda: (handles & lentoid) SCHLICK-NOLTE 1996:189 fig. 1.2; (not lentoid) SCHAEFFER 1949:154–155 fig. 59:11; HARDING 1981:pl. 1:11, fig. 1:11.

References: MARINATOS 1927–1928b:73–74, 81–87 #19, pl. 3:19; FOSSING 1940:26–28, fig. 17; WEINBERG 1961–1962:226–229, pl. MH'1; HARDEN 1968:49 n. 16; KANTA 1980:40; HARDEN 1981:31 n. 6; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:184 #7, pl. 77:7; PHILLIPS 1991:II:454–456 #87, III:1012 fig. 87; CLINE 1994:196 #556; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:100 #75.

Comments: The handle positions are based on breaks at the appropriate points on the vessel body. Marinatos concluded the flask was of Syrian manufacture, and associated it with another glass flask of different form and decoration found at Kalyvia {89}. Fossing disagreed, and identified both flasks as local products influenced by Egyptian Dynasty XVIII prototypes, especially the Karteros flask. Weinberg saw both as Egyptian imports, basing her opinion on features of decomposition on the vessels²⁸⁴ and her admittedly inexact parallels. Kanta suggested instead a Cypriote provenance is more plausible, but did not elaborate. Nolte²⁸⁵ rejected this flask as an Egyptian product. The closest and only good parallel, from Kamid el-Loz in the Lebanon, is extremely fragmentary, but features a similar combination of lentoid shape and handles on shoulder.

All the arguments are weak and problematic, including that of Weinberg. Based chiefly on similarities in shape, a Cypriote or Syrian importation is the most probable although a close parallel is lacking. Nonetheless, an Egyptian background is also possible.

Apart from the Khamid el-Loz fragments, there apparently is only one example of a similar glass vessel found in Syria,²⁸⁶ while several are known from Cyprus. The Karteros flask seems to be a hybrid of the Cypriote 'bilbil,' 'amphoriskos' and 'pilgrim flask' forms, all ceramic forms ubiquitous in LBA Syria, Cyprus and Egypt in the later 14th–early 13th c. They also occasionally appear in glass on Cyprus²⁸⁷ and are known in Egypt.²⁸⁸ However, none of these proposed places of origin

²⁸¹ MARINATOS 1929; 1930:91–99. Hatzidakis in 1886 and Faure in the 1950s also have investigated the cave. See also SKON-JEDELE 1994:1680–1698; WATROUS and WIDENOR 1996:61; RUTKOWSKI and NOWICKI 1996:21–24.

²⁸² MARINATOS 1930:98–99. See also KANTA 1980:39.

²⁸³ MARINATOS 1927–1928b:68–90. See also PINI 1968:82; KANTA 1980:39–40.

²⁸⁴ She proposes, almost certainly correctly, that the original colour of the flasks was dark blue, now decomposed to their present muddy colours.

²⁸⁵ NOLTE 1968, by exclusion; she includes the flask from Kalyvia {89}. She certainly knew of the existence of the

Karteros example as she refers to WEINBERG 1961–1962.

²⁸⁶ According to Weinberg. It is the tall footed 'bilbil' jug published by Schaeffer, also unusual but not a terribly convincing general parallel to the Karteros vessel. See also HARDING 1981:35 #11.

²⁸⁷ ÅSTRÖM and ÅSTRÖM 1972:530–531, 534 fig. 71:7 (jug/bilbil) and 71:8 (flask).

²⁸⁸ NOLTE 1968:162 Type II:f–g (bilbil), 170 Type VI:a, pl. VI:3, VII:6 (flask), also 164 Type III:d (amphoriskos); BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:167 #185 (flask) and 168 #191 (bilbil). The marvering technique is well known in later Dynasty XVIII Egypt.

can be isolated as the only possibility, indicative of the general lack of good parallels outside Crete. Fossing's suggestion that those examples from Cyprus and Syria are also Egyptian imports²⁸⁹ could not strengthen any argument, and indigenous glass-working industries are known in both regions. Although the native Egyptian glass-making industry developed late, its products soon acquired high technical merit and it certainly was in existence by this time, although the presence of equally good native Syrian and Cypriote glass-making industries cannot allow an Egyptian origin to be proposed with any certainty, despite Weinberg's technical arguments. It must be an amalgamation of at least two quite different forms. The complete lack of evidence for a Minoan glass *vessel* industry argues against a native origin, and the obvious affinities with Near Eastern and Egyptian vessel types also strongly suggests the vessel is an import. Its origin cannot be ascertained but both it and the Kalyvia flask may have the same origin due to the unusual placement of the loop handles, more likely the Levant than Egypt.

102. Comb, HM O-E 244

Ivory, L (pres.): 5.0; Th: 0.9 cm, middle third of handle only preserved, with both ends of handle and all teeth missing. Comb with raised relief decoration on the handle showing two registers of antithetical crocodiles. They face to centre but with heads *regardant*, and have long clawed feet and snouts, wide open eyes and no ears. Scales are indicated by lines along the body, the intervening spaces alternately blank and filled by short dash/dotted lines. The upper pair are separated by a large rosette in the centre, raised above the level of the crocodiles themselves.

Minoan, LM IIIA2/B, probably earlier rather than later in this range.

Context: Transitional LM IIIA2/B-B.

Chronology: Probably LM IIIA2 object, in generally contemporary or slightly later transitional LM IIIA2/B-B tomb deposition.

Comparanda: SYMEONOGLOU 1973:pl. 81:252-252.a; {62}.

References: MARINATOS 1927-1928b:73-74, 87-89, fig. 12, pl. 3; POURSAT 1976:468 #III:2; PHILLIPS 1991:II:456-457 #88, III:1013 fig. 88; 1998:853-855, fig. 1.b.

Comments: A very stylised representation of the 'confronted' format. The remainder of the design would be similar to that from Archanes, with the upper crocodiles compressed into a much smaller space than the lower figures.

KASTEELI PEDIADHOS

The large town of Kastelli is on the main north-south road west of the Lasithi plateau. Various rescue excavations were carried out by G. Rethemiotakis in 1987-1993 on several building plots in various areas of the town. These uncovered a variety of Minoan

buildings of mainly Neo-Palatial date, often with LM III and later constructions above, and in some cases earlier Proto-Palatial buildings below.²⁹⁰

Earlier levels only also were reported in some plots. In 1991, the corner (only) of an MM IB building was uncovered on the 'Stavroulakis plot,' named after the owner M. Stavroulakis, in the centre of town near the Plateia Meintani.²⁹¹ Little has been published of the Stavroulakis excavations, but the material remains included the gold sheet covering of a scarab, carinated and conical cups, a barbotine-ware jug and a 'fire-box' brazier.

103. Scarab (not located)

Gold, dimensions and condition not stated.

Sheet covering of an Egyptian scarab face, no further description.

Egyptian, later First Intermediate Period(?)–Dynasty XII (XIII?).

Context: MM IB(-II?).

Chronology: Probably imported late FIP(?)–Dynasty XII (XIII?) object, in generally contemporary to somewhat later MM IB(-II?) context.

Possible comparanda: WARD 1978:pl. XIII:341; *NFA* 1991: #190, col. pl.:9:190, pl. 190 (see also #9, pl. 9); BEN-TOR 1989:78 #6.

References: RETHEMIOTAKIS 1991/1993:287; PARIENTE 1994: 817; LECLANT and CLERC 1997:360.

Comments: Possible dating parameters are limited by the context date as published, but a more complete description of the scarab is needed to narrow these parameters. However, it is more likely to date from the Middle Kingdom on the basis of its material; see also an openwork gold scarab casing of Dynasty XII date also in the *NFA*, an early Dynasty XII 'gold foil on steatite' scarab published by Ward and another on green jasper published by Ben-Tor. Scarab coverings in gold are extremely rare survivals, and the openwork comparison cited dates to the New Kingdom, but the context date of the Kastelli piece precludes Egyptian manufacture later than mid-Dynasty XIII. No further description of the piece is published, and no mention is made of any embossed or otherwise embellished decoration on the face. If it is as stated, it is an extraordinary find, but we must await full publication of both the piece and its context.

KATO ZAKRO

The small coastal plain and bay of Kato Zakro, located on the extreme eastern coast of Crete, lies about three kilometres from the modern village of Epano Zakro. It chiefly consists of the plain and a series of

²⁸⁹ FOSSING 1940:28-31.

²⁹⁰ PARIENTE 1990:830; 1991:943; RETHEMIOTAKIS 1991; 1992; PARIENTE 1994:816-817; FRENCH 1994:74; TOMLINSON 1994:74; 1995:60; 1997:113; BLACKMAN 1998:114; 1999:114; see also later reports in both the *BCH* and *AR* for further work here. For a plan of the plots excavated, see

RETHEMIOTAKIS 1992:29 n. * (key to plan), 30 fig.1. The Stavroulakis plot is #4.

²⁹¹ PARIENTE 1994:817; TOMLINSON 1995:60; BLACKMAN 1997:113. Early reports quote a date of 'MM IB-II,' whilst later reports state only "MM IB;" presumably this is the result of as yet unpublished further research.

gorges, ringed and surrounded by an inhospitable landscape on which little grows. Spratt had noted some antiquities here in 1852,²⁹² and several early archaeologists and explorers also visited, including F. HALBHERR in 1892, L. Mariani in 1893,²⁹³ and A.J. Evans in 1894 and 1896.

D.G. Hogarth excavated in the area in 1901. In the Lenika gorge (now known as the ‘Gorge of the Dead’), he found evidence of EM III–MM IA habitation and EM burial caves,²⁹⁴ as well as some “late Mycenaean” and late Geometric burials and housing. In the area around Epano Zakro, further Geometric and earlier material also was noted.²⁹⁵ N. Platon found many other Minoan tombs in the area during the 1960s, especially in the ‘Gorge of the Dead’.

On the north-western of two hills or ‘spurs’ separated by a *wadi* north of the plain, Hogarth dug two ‘pits’ full of unstratified Minoan material dating chiefly to transitional MM III–LM I, near the modern church of Aghios Antonios.²⁹⁶ On the north-eastern hill or ‘spur,’ closer to the sea, he found a dozen houses of chiefly LM I date, including much pottery and evidence of a high living standard.²⁹⁷

Hogarth missed by only a few feet the edge of the palace later excavated by N. Platon beginning in 1961.²⁹⁸ Although the palace itself was uncovered in only a few years, excavation in the surrounding town and other areas of the gorge and plain still continues.²⁹⁹ This, the fourth Minoan palace excavated after Knossos, Phaestos and Malia, is the only one not re-occupied following the LM IB destructions general on the island. Located in the depression between the two ‘spurs,’ it is today so close to the water table that some areas are virtual swamps. Its construction seems to have been at a mature stage or the end of LM IA, and occupation seems confined to the LM IB period.³⁰⁰ It boasts several hundred rooms, the usual central court, and other typical palace features. Although the palace itself was not re-occupied, there is some evidence of LM IIIA and C occupation elsewhere in the surrounding area, found by Hogarth, N. Platon and others.³⁰¹

Although not excavated, an earlier palace proba-

bly was constructed after an MM IIA earthquake. The accumulated evidence indicates the major earthquakes (or at least destructions) date to during or at the end of MM IIA, and that this ‘first palace’ building was not destroyed until the end of LM IA, with no evidence for an intervening destruction. This building was encountered in test trenches in some areas;³⁰² its proximity to sea level probably precludes excavation at the present time.³⁰³

A. The Palace

N. Platon excavated the palace of Kato Zakro during the 1960s. He uncovered the entire extent of the Neo-Palatial building, which was constructed in early in LM IB and destroyed by fire at the end of LM IB. Although there are hints that an earlier palace (or at least large building[s]) lay beneath this structure at least in the East and South wings, they have not yet been investigated. Two phases can be recognised in the South, West and North wings, the West wing being enlarged in the latter. The East wing is barely preserved, due to modern cultivation.³⁰⁴

The fourth palace to be found on Crete, its arrangement confirmed the characteristic features of the Minoan palatial type, including central court, west wing cultic and storage use and east wing domestic use, apparent agglutinative architecture and ample evidence of upper storeys no longer preserved. The quantity and quality of the finds were extremely high, and this must have been the centre for the eastern part of the island.

A.1. The ‘Treasury’

The West wing of the palace consisted chiefly of rooms of cultic function in the southern half, and numerous storerooms to their north. Platon excavated Room XXV, a fairly large (3 by 3.5 m.) room that had been divided into eight compartments along the edge by thin brick partition walls no more than a metre high. He identified it as the ‘Treasury’ of the nearby ‘Central Shrine,’ Room XXIII. It was packed with numerous vessels, most of which were above the

²⁹² SPRATT 1865:I:234–236.

²⁹³ MARIANI 1895.

²⁹⁴ HOGARTH 1900–1901:142–145.

²⁹⁵ HOGARTH 1900–1901:147–149.

²⁹⁶ HOGARTH 1900–1901:123–129.

²⁹⁷ HOGARTH 1900–1901:129–142; 1902a; 1902b.

²⁹⁸ Annual reports in *Praktika* and *Ergon* 1961 and continuing; also N. PLATON 1971.

²⁹⁹ I am very grateful to Leftheris Platon for permitting me to include some unpublished material from his father’s excavations in the present study. The reader is referred to this

final report for the specific contexts and other further details of both unpublished and preliminarily published objects, when it is published.

³⁰⁰ L. PLATON 1999b:50.

³⁰¹ See KANTA 1980:194–197.

³⁰² See N. PLATON 1970:*passim*; for comments on dating, see WALBERG 1983:134.

³⁰³ See L. PLATON 1999a. He recently provided a synopsis of site development; see L. PLATON 2005.

³⁰⁴ N. PLATON 1971:*passim*; see also synopsis by DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:235–238.

level of the partially collapsed compartment walls. They probably had fallen from an upper room.³⁰⁵

The variety and quality of the vessels is remarkable. They included numerous rhyta (amongst them the famous rock crystal rhyton, and a lioness or cat head and two bull's head rhyta in faience), a veined marble amphora and libation jug, marble and 'alabaster' flasks, four kylikes/chalices, three stone lamps, and small basins. Other objects included an imitation nautilus shell in faience, three mace-heads, numerous ornament fragments in faience, ivory and crystal (possibly the remains of boxes), two bronze double axes decorated by incision, two bronze wreaths decorated in relief and two bronze hinges. The room was destroyed with the palace in LM IB.

104. Jar ('spheroid jar')/bridge-spouted jar, HM A 2695

Andesite porphyry (Type A),³⁰⁶ white crystals in an (originally black, now) brown matrix, H: 16.4; Dia. (rim): 13.3; (max): 23.2; (base): 12.2; Holes: Dia: 0.14, 2.1; Spout: L: 9.7; W. (max): 6.6; H: 4.0 cm., virtually intact in numerous fragments, but burnt. Attached handles lost. Separate spout in a fine-grained brown limestone, lacking inlays.

Bridge-spouted jar, spheroid shape with undercut flat collar, high shoulder and very small flat base. Four holes drilled into upper shoulder either side for attachment of missing handles. Horizontal drill depressions and other marks indicate the original handles, now lost. One large and two small holes drilled at front for attachment of separate spout. Separate bridge-spout of a different, unspecified stone material with irregularly-placed flat rectangular depressions, presumably to receive inlays in imitation of the scattered white crystals of jar. Attached by means of a dowel (restored in wood) at bottom.

Egyptian, Dynasty I, with alterations and attachments Minoan, probably LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Dynasty I vessel, probably reworked in LM IB and an antique in its LM IB context.

Comparanda: (shape) EL-KHOULI 1978:pl. 58:1473–1474, 59:1507; (spout) {280}; (spout hole) {590}.

References: N. PLATON 1964:352, fig. 9; WARREN 1965:32 #16; 1969:109 Type 43:A8, P593; N. PLATON 1971:137, 138 fig:upper; HOOD 1978:140, 148, 149 fig. 142; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:257 #197, pl. 71:197; PHILLIPS 1991:II:463–464 #92, III:936 fig. 1, 1015–1017 fig. 92; CLINE 1994:191–192 #509, pl. 5.16; LILYQUIST 1996:160; WARREN 1997:211–212 #3, 221–222, pl. LXXIX.c; LILYQUIST 1997:226; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:209–210 #208; BEVAN 2001:II:414 fig. 6.34.a.

Comments: Originally this was an Egyptian jar of typically Early Dynastic type; see fig. 8 for a reconstruction of the original profile. Minoan craftsmen removed the original horizontal-

ly perforated roll handles to adapt the jar for their own use. Most likely separate loop handles were added, either of metal as with jar {105} below, or of a stone similar to the spout by means of wires. The addition of the bridge-spout transformed the jar into a bridge-spouted jar, a typically Minoan vessel form.³⁰⁷

Lilyquist questions an Egyptian origin for this and the following vessel {105}, based partly on the material colour of both, not found for Egyptian vessels except when altered by fire, which is matched by the colour of the added spout for this vessel. The brownish colour of the spout suggests in fact that the brown colour of the jar itself was original rather than the result of fire, as the limestone would not have been altered by fire to its present brown colour. Alternatively, the brown colour was preferred by the artisan over, for example, greenish serpentine or steatite stone for the spout in relation to the stone of the jar itself.

105. Jar ('spheroid jar')/rhyton, HM A 2714

Andesite porphyry (Type A),³⁰⁸ white crystals in an (originally black, now) brown matrix, bronze handles, clay, H: 12.0; (including handles): 14.5; Dia. (rim): 15.5; (max): 14.0; Hole: 0.4; Base: H: 1.3; Dia. (ext.): 11.2; (int.): 8.9; Hole: 0.45 cm., virtually intact in numerous fragments. Base complete in five fragments and clay centre, one handle missing and restored.

Rhyton, spheroid shape with vertically fluted body, small raised collar having vertically ribbed decoration. Two horizontally perforated roll handles, each vertically ribbed and vertically drilled to facilitate addition of looped bronze wire handles. Rounded bottom. Separate base-ring filled with clay as potstand/trivet. Both rhyton bottom and base-ring have a small hole drilled off-centre.

Egyptian, Dynasty I, with alterations and attachments Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Dynasty I vessel, probably reworked in LM IB and an antique in its LM IB context.

Comparanda: ADAMS 1974:50 #72, pl. 37:272, with further references; EL-KHOULI 1978:pl. 60:1533–1534; LILYQUIST 1997:pl. LXXXVI.c; others noted by WARREN 1997:212–213. *References:* N. PLATON 1963:pl. 150:b; WARREN 1965:30 #3; 1969:109 Type 43:A3, P591; N. PLATON 1971:138 Fig:lower; HOOD 1978:148; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:257 #196, pl. 71:196; PHILLIPS 1991:II:464–465 #93, III:937 fig. 2. 1017 fig. 93; CLINE 1994:192 #510, pl. 5.15; LILYQUIST 1996:160; WARREN 1997:212–213 #4, 221–222, pl. LXXIX.d; LILYQUIST 1997:226–227; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:207–208 #207; KOEHL 2006:64, 237 #1334.

Comments: Originally, this was an Egyptian Early Dynastic jar with a wide flat collar and perforated roll handles; see fig. 9 for a proposed reconstruction of the original profile. A Minoan artisan adapted the vessel by cutting down the inner part of the collar rim to form a wider mouth. The mouth was vertically ribbed in a typically Minoan MM III–LM I form and the body fluted vertically.³⁰⁹ The inner part of the original collar was then re-carved and filled with clay as a flat pot-

³⁰⁵ N. PLATON 1971:133–148.

³⁰⁶ See Concordance XII.

³⁰⁷ Warren 1969:33–34 Type 13; Betancourt 1985:220.

³⁰⁸ See Concordance XII.

³⁰⁹ Handle and body fluting is almost unknown in Egypt at

the time the jar was made, but the few existing examples cannot entirely rule out the possibility that the fluting was Egyptian work. The comparanda listed all have vertical fluting on the body. Nonetheless, Warren's study of early Egyptian fluted vessels has led him to consider the Zakros

stand/base for the jar. Both the clay of the ‘base’ and the bottom of the jar were drilled just off-centre to turn the vessel into a rhyton. The roll handles were drilled vertically through the perforation, and typically Minoan loop handles were added in thick bronze wire.

Although not the only example of the Minoan adaptation of an Egyptian vessel, it is the most completely preserved yet found and its presence is a considerable aid in identifying other incomplete or fragmentary examples.

Lilyquist questions both this and the previous vessel {104} as Egyptian products, for reasons mentioned there.

106. Alabastron (Type C)/rhyton, HM 2736

‘Grey-banded’ travertine, H (pres.): 19.4; (rest.): 19.9; Dia. (rim, rest.): 7.0; (max): 14.5; Hole: 0.56 cm, restored from numerous joining fragments, entire profile preserved almost to rim.

Baggy globular rhyton, with flaring rim. Hole drilled off-centre at bottom.

Egyptian, within Dynasty XII–SIP, with alteration Minoan, probably LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII–Second Intermediate Period vessel, probably reworked in LM IB and an antique in its LM IB destruction context.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1937:10, pl. XXIX:658; HANKEY 1974:170 S3, fig. 1:S3, pl. XXXII:C; (colour): {4}; {109–110}; {179?}; {269}.

References: WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:H; N. PLATON 1971:136; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:257–258 #198;³¹⁰ PHILLIPS 1991:II:465–466 #94, III:1019 fig. 94; CLINE 1994:168 #292; WARREN 1997:219; KOEHL 2006:53, 203–204 #1070.

Comments: Another Egyptian vessel, this time a Type C alabastron, adapted by the Minoan craftsman into a rhyton by the addition of an off-centre hole at the bottom. Its wide, almost ‘drop-vase’ shape is indicative of an earlier date for the type range. The ‘grey-banded’ colouration may be the result of having been subjected to fire.

107. Rhyton (?) HM — (not handled)

Faience, mainly cream with black, white and dark red details, L: (rest.) 12.5; W: (rest.) 9.3 cm, numerous joining fragments of forehead with both eyes and upper cheeks, separate joining lower muzzle fragments; mostly restored.

Rhyton, in the form of a cat’s or lioness’ head. Eyes fully modelled, with ridge separating forehead and eyes/cheeks and two bosses on forehead representing whiskers. Cream fabric with details as follows: Eyes black outline with cream corneas and dark red pupils encircled in white, also white around eyes and part of cheeks. Red and black striations on cheeks, red striations on forehead, bosses black, fur patterning in black lines. Lower muzzle in cream and black with black-filled incised dots. Rhyton hole at mouth restored.

Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I object, in generally contemporary LM IB context.

Comparanda: WARREN 1969:90 Type E, P493; MARINATOS 1968–1975:V:35, pl. 80; METROPOLITAN MUSEUM 1979:78–79 #34; {113}; (white eye-‘patch’ & ears well back) {162}.

References: FOSTER 1979:69–71, fig. 9, pl. 6; VANSCHOONWINCKEL 1996:399 #412.

Comments: This vessel has been reconstructed on the basis of the famous travertine lioness-head rhyton from Knossos, but Foster (who calls this a “wild cat’s head”), notes the similarity of this Zakros piece to two clay rhyta with similar markings found at Akrotiri on Thera, as well as the model head from Zakros town {113}. The Akrotiri example with which Foster compares it also has small ears, fully preserved. The vessel therefore may have been more cat-like than its present restoration suggests. The ears are rather awkwardly placed as restored, and there is little room in the preserved portions of the forehead area for the cat’s large ears. Several features associate it with the cat’s head fresco fragment from Knossos {162}, namely the white ‘patch’ around the eyes and the high forehead between ears and eyes, and the small ears, although otherwise the decoration is dissimilar. It is not included in KOEHL (2006).

A.2. The ‘Hall of Ceremonies’

East of the shrine rooms and facing the western side of the Central Court was a large hall of 12 by 10 m., designated Room XXVIII or the ‘Hall of Ceremonies’ by Platon. It could be entered from the Central Court by a doorway having a massive stone threshold, and led directly to other rooms of the west wing by ‘pier-and-door’ partitioning and open colonnade. It was a massive and formal room, subdivided by rows of columns into smaller spaces including a light well. The ‘Treasury’ was directly accessible by a short corridor, as was the Central Shrine (Room XXIII), a lustral basin (XXIV), the shrine workshop (XXVI) and storeroom (XXVII) and other rooms. Originally it was decorated with fresco paintings (now badly burnt) and boasted panelled floors.³¹¹

Its function was chiefly ceremonial and cultic in nature. In it were found several magnificent stone rhyta including the ‘Peak Sanctuary’ rhyton and another in the form of a bull’s head, a fragmentary tripod altar, stone vessels, ostrich eggs, wooden boxes with applied ornaments in a variety of expensive materials, bronze hinges and several clay sealings, clay vessels including a rhyton and four-handled amphora. Also found were a number of bronze tools, probably fallen from an upper floor, including saws, chisels and other cutting tools.

jar body fluting as Minoan work – the fluting here is sharply delineated, whereas the Egyptian flutes are rounded or flattened; see WARREN 1997:213. My observations of relevant Egyptian vessels concur with his.

³¹⁰ Misidentified as HM 27.

³¹¹ N. PLATON 1971:155–160.

108. Eggshell fragments (not located)

Ostrich eggshell, dimensions unknown, fragments.

Body fragments of ostrich egg, convex profile.

Probably from Egypt, mid-Dynasty XVIII or earlier; just possibly Syro-Palestinian, LB(?).

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Undateable object(s) not later than mid-Dynasty XVIII, in generally contemporary or slightly later LM IB destruction context.

Comparanda: {153}; {425}.

References: N. PLATON 1963:186; 1971:136, 159; REESE 1985:373; SAKELLARAKIS 1990:289; PHILLIPS 1991:II:467 #95; CLINE 1994:238 #952–953; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:38.

Comments: Platon noted there were fragments of two eggs, suggesting that their quantity was sufficient to produce more than one egg. They are listed together under a single catalogue number here, as Platon continues by noting “only a few fragments were preserved,” strongly suggesting that the quantity in fact was insufficient for two separate eggs.³¹² His assertion that they probably were converted into rhyta is quite reasonable, as others were elsewhere in the Aegean (from Akrotiri on Thera and at Mycenae) at this same time.³¹³

Cline wrongly attributes one of his two ostrich eggshell entries to the ‘Treasury’, apparently by misreading N. PLATON 1971:136, who refers there instead to the travertine vessel {106}. Both clearly are stated to come from the ‘Hall of Ceremonies’ in PLATON 1971:159.

A.3. No Find Context

Two other alabastera were found within the palace, but remain unpublished and their find spot(s) unstated. It appears, however, that this area was subjected to a severe fire.

109. Alabastron (Type B), SM 3151 (ex-HM 3975)

‘Grey-banded’ travertine, H (rest.): 12.1; (pres.): 11.3; Dia. (rim, rest.): 3.5; (max): 7.4 cm, five joining fragments preserving majority of profile except bottom, burnt.

‘Drop vase’ alabastron with exterior thickened slightly flaring rim.

Egyptian, within Dynasty XII–SIP (–very early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: Unstated, but probably LM IB.

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII–Second Intermediate Period (–very early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, in unstated but probably LM IB destruction context.

Comparanda: (colour): {4}; {106}; {110}; {269}.

References: PHILLIPS 1991:II:467 #96, III:1020 fig. 96; CLINE 1994:168 #290.

Comments: The ‘grey-banded’ colour may be the result of having been subjected to fire.

110. Alabastron (Type C), SM 2813

Grey-banded travertine, H: 21.9; Dia. (rim, rest.): 10.9; (max): 17.5 cm, restored from numerous joining fragments,

entire profile preserved, much of outer rim missing and much damaged surface, badly burnt on lower half, with associated cracking.

Baggy almost flat-bottomed alabastron with wide flaring rim ‘shaved’ flat at top.

Egyptian, SIP (–very early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: Unstated, but probably LM IB.

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period (–very early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, in unstated but probably LM IB destruction context.

Comparanda: (colour): {4}; {106}; {109}; {269}.

References: PHILLIPS 1991:II:468 #97, III:1021 fig. 97; CLINE 1994:168 #291.

Comments: The discolouration may be the result of having been subjected to fire. The ‘shaved’ rim suggests a later rather than earlier date within the stated period of manufacture.

B. House A

Hogarth’s House A contained eight rooms built of cyclopean masonry, with only the ground or basement floor remaining, preserved to an average 1.63 m. high. Mariani originally had identified it as a temple,³¹⁴ and it also was re-examined by Platon. Rooms I and II, farthest to the right of the building entrance, were accessible only through trap doors from above; the others were entered through the outside entrance leading from a paved roadway. Several rooms served as shrines, while entrance Room IV contained a wine press *in situ* just right of the building entrance. Although preserved layers of ‘pure’ LM IA indicate destruction in that period, there seems also to have been a second destruction by fire in LM IB since two Knossian Marine Style rhyta also were recovered. Some evidence for LM IIIA2 occupation also was found.³¹⁵

One of the shrine rooms (Room VII), a large rectangular space located immediately left of the building entrance, had part of its floor laid out early in LM IA. About 45 cm. above the floor was recovered a collection of some 500 clay nodules, in addition to a Linear ‘A’ tablet and roundel.³¹⁶ These were in a large pile together with other material including painted plaster fragments, bronze tools and points including a large knife or sword, steatite lamp and LM I pottery, just beside the entranceway into the next and last room (VIII), possibly originally in a large container which has not survived and possibly from a cache under the floor of an upper storey.

The nodules are burnt, probably by the fire that

³¹² Perhaps they were in two different locations of the room.

³¹³ SAKELLARAKIS 1990:286, 289, 308. See also HELCK in *LÄ* VI.1:77, who notes another from Cyprus.

³¹⁴ MARIANI 1895.

³¹⁵ See DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:240; KANTA 1980:195.

³¹⁶ See especially HOGARTH 1902a; LEVI 1925–1926:157–201; *CMS* II.7:XV–XVIII.

destroyed the house. They were found in a roughly circular area, suggesting they originally had been kept together, perhaps in a basket, having fallen from a room in the upper storey that may have been an archives room. Many are of unusual and highly original design, and include numerous imaginary and daemonic animals and other figures. Recent studies of the nodules, especially by J. WEINGARTEN (1983), have revealed the hand of several ‘masters’ of glyptic art including ‘The Zakro Master’ and several ‘apprentice’ hands.

111. Nodule with seal impression. HMs 83

Clay, seal impression D: 14.0–15.0 mm, virtually complete in one impression, most edges and especially top edge not impressed.

Recumbent flat-based nodule with impression from a lentoid seal, showing a squatting ape facing left on the right half, with arms upraised in front of face and tail curled behind body. On the left half is a standing female figure facing right, with horizontally ‘pleated’ skirt and left arm raised in acknowledgement of the ape. She has only one leg depicted.

Minoan, LM I(A?–)B.

Context: Chiefly LM IA, with two LM IB vessels.

Chronology: LM I(A?–)B object, in generally contemporary early(?) LM IB context.

Comparison: {142}.

References: HOGARTH 1900–1901:133; 1902a:77 #5, 78, fig. 4, pl. VI:5; EVANS *PM* I:683 n. 1; II:2:764, fig. 492:a; McDERMOTT 1938:324 #605; YOUNGER 1983:123; MARINATOS 1987a:127, fig. 5.1; LANGDON 1990:417 n. 52; PHILLIPS 1991:II:461 #89, III:1014 fig. 89; HALLAGER 1996:II:239; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:401 #447; *CMS* II.7:32 #24.

Comments: The relative size of both figures suggests the woman is worshipping the ape, rather than the ape worshipping the woman. Younger places this within his ‘Cretan popular’ stylistic group, which he dates to the “late 16th–early 15th c. BC,” or LM IA?–B. The thickened upper body suggests a ‘hump’-back, and thus perhaps a *Cynocephalus* baboon type, but the pointed snout suggests the *Cercopithecus* monkey.

HALLAGER (1996) assigned no seal impression code reference to this nodule.

112. Nodules with seal impression, HM Σ-T 35/1–3, 3; Σ-T 95/1–6

Clay, (original seal) D: c. 19.0 cm, all but left and bottom edges preserved in nine impressions on two nodules.

Two flat-based nodules with impressions from two different seals.³¹⁷ One seal impression on each is from a lentoid seal, showing a bull and small ‘genius’ with a spear. Bull stands hunched over, his forepaws on a pile of rocks in centre as if attacking or repelling a ‘genius,’ who leans on the rocks with one rear paw. ‘Genius’ with leonine limbs and head. Dorsal

appendage has some cross-hatching on the back and short ‘spikes’ terminating in ‘balls’ along back edge.

Minoan, LM I(A?–)B.

Context: Chiefly LM IA, with two LM IB vessels.

Chronology: LM I(A?–)B objects, in generally contemporary early(?) LM IB context.

References: HOGARTH 1902a:87 #104, pl.IX:104; LEVI 1925–1926:162–163 #104, fig. 175:104, pl. XVII:104; GILL 1964:18 #27, pl. 5:7; KAISER 1976:pl. 7:5; WEINGARTEN 1983:78, 80; PHILLIPS 1991:II:461 #90, III:1014 fig. 90; REHAK 1995:221, 222 fig. 5, 222–223; HALLAGER 1996:II:235, 239; *CMS* II.7:39 #31, 274:35/1; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:157 #133.

Comments: This is the only Neo-Palatial example of a genius with another creature. The ‘genius’ is quite leonine, with a narrowed but not yet ‘wasp’-ish waist.

HALLAGER (1996) assigned no seal impression code reference to this nodule.

C. Aghios Antonios

On the Aghios Antonios or “Southwest” (Area NΔ) hill, N. Platon excavated at least eight houses (A, B, Γ, Δ, E, Z, Θ, and Δ–A).³¹⁸ Some may have been in use only in LM IA and destroyed in that period, whilst others continued into LM IB. Some rooms within houses were abandoned and used as dumping sites, whilst some houses show at least two phases.³¹⁹ House Z contained a workshop for steatite objects.

House B was a large house separated from House E, its neighbour to the south, by a stepped street. Well-constructed of dressed stone, its north façade was some 30 m. in length, and consisted of some 22 rooms, each identified by a letter of the Greek alphabet. It seems to have had two entrances, and clearly was a wealthy household. A well-preserved winepress and some 250 or more clay vessels were found, although very little bronze material was recovered. Room Σ contained stamnoi, Room Π amphorae with four handles, and Room I jugs, cups and cooking pots. As with many other houses and the palace, it was destroyed (by earthquake?) in LM IB.

In the “area of the houses on the south-west hill,” from House B, came the following:

113. Model, HM Π 18006

Clay, H: 5.8; W: 5.8; Th.: 4.9 cm, one large fragment preserving face and neck, bottom of both ears, worn at nose.

Model in the form of a cat’s head, moulded. Modeled features including large eyes, double eyelids. Hollow interior. Undecorated. Minoan, LM I.

³¹⁷ HMs 35 also is impressed with Hogarth’s #137, HMs 95 with his #119; for these impressions, see HOGARTH 1902a.

³¹⁸ See N. PLATON 1962; DAUX 1962:887; MEGAW 1962:33; DAUX 1963:833. Possibly more; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:240 also mention a ‘House of the Polythuron’ on the

hill. A recent overall plan of the area is found in L. PLATON 1999b:41 fig.1.

³¹⁹ N. PLATON 1986:263–281; 1987:299–313; 1988:236–243; see now also DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:239–240, fig.7.87.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I object, in unstated but presumably generally contemporary LM IB destruction context.

Comparanda: {77}; {377}; {496}.

References: N. PLATON 1962:154, pl. 147.β; 1971:262 Fig.; TE VELDE 1982:134; PINI 1988:327–328, fig. 2.a; PHILLIPS 1991:II:461–462 #91, III:1014 fig. 91; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:179 #165; KOEHL 2006:64, 237 #1335.

Comments: Although Platon calls this a rhyton, there is no evidence of the characteristic hole to justify this description. Koehl illustrated a photograph of {431} in error for this head. Its specific find location probably is indicated by an ink inscription on the interior: “ΖΓΒΒ / ΝΑδωΥ”.

KATSAMBA

Minoan remains have been found many times under the various suburbs of Herakleion, especially to its east near the sea. The three modern suburbs east of the city walls, Poros, Katsamba and Nea Halikarnassos, have revealed both habitation and cemetery sites. In what is now Katsamba or Nea Vrioula, the middle of the three suburbs, but was outside the city limits in his day, Evans conducted several excavations in 1922. He considered this the area of the “Minoan harbour town of Knossos” and found both habitation and burial areas.³²⁰ St. Alexiou excavated numerous tombs and houses chiefly of Neolithic, MM III and LM III date in 1951–1957 and 1963–1964,³²¹ and a number of illegal and inadvertent finds also have been made in this area of increasingly urban character. More recently, further excavations have revealed other substantial remains here, in an area verging on the Poros suburb.

A. Final Palatial Cemetery

In 1951, 1953 and 1963, St. Alexiou excavated in an LM II–III A1 cemetery of rock-cut chamber tombs on the southern edge of an MM–LM settlement, probably part of the harbour town.³²²

A.1. The ‘Tomb of the Blue Bier’ (Tomb B)

One of these tombs, subsequently called Tomb B or ‘The Tomb of the Blue Bier,’ was a horseshoe-shaped chamber tomb dated to LM III A1.³²³ It contained a blue-painted larnax, which provided the nickname for the tomb. In addition, two blue stucco tripod altars and seven incense burners were also found, the

latter mainly blue and one with a polychrome design. Other objects included three LM III A1 cups and a beaked ewer, a bronze knife and small cup/bowl, seal-stone, gold bead necklace and silver pin, in addition to several stone vessels. The wealth of its contents, and especially the number of imports, links this tomb with the continuing Final Palatial occupation of Knossos.

A.1.1.

Near the centre of the western wall of the tomb chamber, two stone vessels were found in a small group, together with a clay handled cup.

114. Amphora, HM A 2409

Banded travertine, H: 29.2; D (rim): 9.8; (max): 19.3; (base): 8.1 cm, intact with chips on base, rim and handles.

Amphora with ovoid body. Two vertical handles on upper body and short neck. Pedestal base concave underfoot, in imitation of a separate potstand but carved in one piece. On the upper body, an incised inscription: *ntr nfr s3 R^c (Mn-hpr-R^c) (Dhwtj-ms-nfr-hprw) di nḥ dt*, “The good god, son of Re, Menheper-re Djutymes-nefer-heperu, given life forever,” the prenomens, nomen and epithets of Pharaoh Thutmose III.

Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII, reign of Thutmose III.

Context: LM II–III A1.

Chronology: Dynasty XVIII (reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in somewhat later LM II–III A1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: VON BISSING 1904–1907:I:156–157, pl. IV:18734; ENGELBACH 1915:pl. XVI:1; WINLOCK 1948:pl. XXXVII:lower left; BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:127–128 #116; LILYQUIST 2003:212 fig. 135.a; TBM 37.248E.

References: ALEXIOU 1952:11, 14–20, figs. 1, 3; HUTCHINSON 1954a:184, fig. 1, pl. VIII, IX; VERCOUTTER 1956:413; SMITH 1965:69; ALEXIOU 1967a:7 fig. 4 #3, 10 fig. 6, 46 #3, fig. 33, 76–83, pl. 10; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J; BUCHHOLZ and KARAGEORGHIS 1973:91 #1140, 354 #1140; BUCHHOLZ 1974:440; SAKELLARAKIS 1978:52–53, 53 fig.:upper; HELCK 1979:93; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:137, 147–148; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:208–109 #63, pl. 67:63; PHILLIPS 1991:II:470–471 #98, III:1022 fig. 98; CLINE 1994:217 #742; LILYQUIST 1995:7, 41 #95, 103 figs. 90–91; 1996:148; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:220–221 #219.

Comments: LILYQUIST (1995:7) notes that this amphora is of ‘medium quality’ and suggests it may have been of Canaanite (not Egyptian) origin. It is also, as she notes, the “earliest dated example of a stone Canaanite amphora ... with integral stand”. I am not entirely convinced the piece is Canaanite, and an (uninscribed) definitely Egyptian example of similar proportions but better quality was interred in the tomb of Thutmose III’s ‘three foreign wives’ before Year 42 of his reign.

³²⁰ EVANS *PM* II.1:232–235, fig.131:a. See also HOOD and SMOLLETT 1959:24 #167.

³²¹ ALEXIOU 1952; 1955; 1957a; 1965; 1967a. See also HOOD and SMOLLETT 1959:24 #168; KANTA 1980:29–31.

³²² See also COURBIN *et al.* 1954:150–152; ALEXIOU 1976a.

³²³ ALEXIOU 1952; COOK 1952:108; DESHAYES 1952:236–237; HUTCHINSON 1954; ALEXIOU 1967a:6–11, 44–47. See also PINI 1968:80; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:83, 137, 147–148. The latter assigned an “LM III A 1 (perhaps into 2)” date for this tomb.

115. Jar ('spheroid jar'), HM A 2410

Diorite (probably hornblende diorite Type A), H: 18.4; D (rim): 24.0; (max): 29.7; (base): 11.0 cm, intact, with chips on body, handles, and base.

Spheroid jar with wide flat collar slightly undercut, two horizontal solid roll handles at the shoulder and a flat base. Internal profile roughly cut.

Egyptian, Dynasty II–IV.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Dynasty II–IV vessel, an antique in its II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparison: EL-KHOULI 1978:pl. 84:2253.

References: HUTCHINSON 1954a:184, pl. VIII; WARREN 1965:30 #4; ALEXIOU 1967a:7 fig. 4 #4, 10 fig. 6, 46 #4, pl. 11:α; WARREN 1969:109 Type 43:A4, D313; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:208 #60, pl. 66:60; PHILLIPS 1991:II:471 #99, III:1023 fig. 99; CLINE 1994:190 #496; LILYQUIST 1995:161; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:27 #1 drawing,³²⁴ 222 #220.

Comments: Lilyquist concurs with an Egyptian origin for this jar, which she calls a “diorite squat jar with lug handles”.

A.1.2.

Slightly north of the larnax, which lay along the southern wall, Alexiou found two footed clay braziers, a tripod hearth and an incense burner (*thimiatērion*) together with another stone bowl. A clay handled cup was found on the corner of the larnax.

116. Container, HM A 2411

Banded travertine, H: 11.0; D (rim): 11.4; (max): 16.8; (base): 8.9 cm, restored from numerous joining fragments with parts of body and handle missing. Separate lid lost.

Container with high shoulder, short upright rim, and base concave below. Two wedge-shaped handles of differing height at shoulder, both level with and extending from the rim. One handle has a drilled depression from the top, the other from the side.

Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Amenhotep III) vessel, in generally contemporary to later LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: VANDIER D'ABBADIE 1972:46 #125–127; HANKEY 1974:167–168, 174 #S40, fig. 3:S40; MMA 16.10.425; MMA 26.7.1291.

References: HUTCHINSON 1954a:184, pl. VIII; ALEXIOU 1967a:7 fig. 4 #5, 10 fig. 6, 46 #5, pl. 11:β–γ; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J; PHILLIPS 1991:II:471–472 #100, III:1024 fig. 100; CLINE 1994:189 #491; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:222–223 #221.

Comments: The bowl originally must have had a lid, secured to the body by a pivot in the top drilled depression on one handle whilst the other may have been for the addition of a knob

as is seen on the comparanda cited. Most but not all such holes are drilled through, and it may be that this example is unfinished or abandoned in the manufacture. Usually, both holes or depressions were drilled from the top only.³²⁵

A.2. Tomb H

During his 1963 excavations in the cemetery, Alexiou uncovered another rock-cut tomb north of the group of tombs investigated in the 1950s. Originally called ‘Tomb VII,’ now Tomb H, it was shaped like a flared rectangle and had a large central square pillar.³²⁶ It had been plundered, although a great deal remained in disorder.

Within the tomb were several loose crania and two larnakes, one of which was painted. Tomb furniture included several clay stirrup jars, incense burners, kylikes, an amphora, jug and cups dating to LM IIIA1 and 2.³²⁷ The most famous object was a carved ivory pyxis showing a bull-capture, but other ivories included a comb, knucklebone, figure-of-eight shield and seated animal figurine. Also found were a stone vase, bronze razors, stone weights, and faience rosettes.

Two open stone bowls were found outside the tomb chamber, just outside the doorway in the right hand corner, in the fill two metres above the floor. A skull and clay conical cup were in the left corner. Presumably, thieves had dropped them, possibly after their contents had been dumped.

117. Jar ('high-shouldered jar'), HM 2883 (not seen)

Granodiorite(?), H: 11.5 cm, intact.

High-shouldered, with undercut collar and flat base. No handles.

Egyptian, Dynasty I or later.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Dynasty I or later (Old Kingdom) vessel, an antique in its LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: EL-KHOULI 1978: pls. 78:1977, 79:2008–2023; (jar with Minoan lid) {45}.

References: *Ergon* 1963:183, fig. 192; DAUX 1964:846, fig. 4:lower right; ALEXIOU 1965:33; WARREN 1965:31–32 #15; ALEXIOU 1967a:54 #23, pl. E, F, 28:β:left; WARREN 1969:110 Type 43:D1, P596, D320; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:208 #61, pl. 67:61; PHILLIPS 1991:II:473 #101, III:1025 fig. 101; CLINE 1994:190 #497.

Comments: Found inside the tomb itself was a Minoan stone lid having a knobbed handle, which apparently fitted the jar but is not made of the same material.³²⁸ Warren³²⁹ illustrates

³²⁴ The drawing is of this vessel {115} from Katsamba, not that from Knossos {166} as indicated in the text.

³²⁵ E.g., VANDIER D'ABBADIE 1972:46–47 #123–127.

³²⁶ DAUX 1964:843–847; MEGAW 1964:26; ALEXIOU 1965; 1967a: 26–40, 51–58. See also PINI 1968:80; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:85. The latter assign an LM IIIA2 date to this tomb.

³²⁷ GESELL 1985:99 gives a date of LM IIIA2 only. Both periods are represented in the pottery.

³²⁸ ALEXIOU 1967a:54 #4:δ, pl. 28:a:lower middle.

³²⁹ WARREN 1969:P596. Lid not located.

the jar with the lid. The lid may have been made for the jar, happened to be the same size or perhaps was reduced to fit. Another, similar, vessel was recovered with a lid of different material at Angeliana {45}.

B. Votive Deposit

In 1957, Alexiou cleared a votive deposit in a small (2.8 by 2 m.) cave-like chamber that was entered via a stone staircase, of which five steps remained. It was filled almost to the level of the stairs with offerings of transitional MM IIIB–LM IA cups, jugs and bridge-spouted jars were found, together with a plastered offering table, a triton, a gypsum vessel and an imported marble jar.³³⁰

118. Jar ('high-shouldered jar'), HM unnumbered (Katsamba 1957) (not seen)

Marble, white, H: 6.7; Dia. (rim): 10.5; (max.): 15.2; (base): 6.5 cm; Th. (rim): 8 mm, intact.

Low jar with high shoulder and undercut collar.

Egyptian, Dynasty III–IV.

Context: Transitional MM IIIB–LM IA.

Chronology: Dynasty III–IV vessel, an antique in its transitional MM IIIB–LM IA tomb deposition.

References: PLATON 1957a:336; DAUX 1958:788–789, fig. 21; WARREN 1965:32 #17; 1969:110 Type 43:D2, P597, D321; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:208 #62, pl. 67:62; PHILLIPS 1991:II:473–474 #102, III:1026 fig. 102; CLINE 1994:190 #500; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:133; PHILLIPS 2001:79 #3.a.

C. No Find Context (Anemomylia Area)

The following is said to come from this general area, apparently obtained by Richard Seager. Evans³³¹ noted that “it was obtained through the good offices of” Seager, and that “from the information he received there seems to be no doubt that it was found on this part of the site,” i.e. Anemomylia (“Windmills”). Driessen and MacDonald note, without reference to their source, that it was found together with “small bronze double axes, stone vase maker debris, sealstones and sealings (some from Zakro),....an ashlar wall and perhaps an LM IB vase....but LM IA sherds may be said to predominate”.³³²

119. *Gravidenflasche*/rhyton, HM A 2171

Travertine, H: 13.6; Dia. (rim, rest.): 6.1; (hole): 0.8 cm, intact but for handle and majority of headdress, with chipped and worn surface.

Rhyton in the form of a kneeling pregnant woman. The rim/mouth is her flat headdress. A single vertical handle from her back to the back of her head, framed by unarticulated long hair. Hands rest on abdomen, breasts flattened. No base; balances on feet and knees. Fingers indicated by incised lines, corners of mouth drilled, remainder carved. Hole drilled off-centre at bottom between knees.

Egyptian, mid-Dynasty XVIII, likely not earlier than reign of Amenhotep II, with alteration Minoan, very end of LM IB–IIIA1.

Context: None.

Chronology: Mid-Dynasty XVIII, likely not earlier than reign of Amenhotep II, vessel, reworked not earlier than very end of LM IB–IIIA1 and in unknown deposition at this period or later.

Comparanda: VON BISSING 1904–1907:I:78–79 #18418, 80 #18421, pl. III:18418, 18421; EVANS *PM* II.1:256–257, 257 n. 1, fig. 151; BRUNNER-TRAUT 1970:*passim*; MUSCARELLA 1974:#192; BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:293 #404; (breasts) LEEDS 1922:pl. II:upper.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:255–256, fig. 150; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J; BRUNNER-TRAUT 1970:39 #11; FOSTER 1982:83;³³³ LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:209 #64, pl. 67:64; PHILLIPS 1991:II:474–475 #103, III:1027–1028 fig. 103; CLINE 1994:256 #1107; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:133; WARREN 1997:219; STAMPOLIDES, KARETSOU and KANTA 1998:35; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:262 #262; BEVAN 2001:I:281, II:434 fig. 7.17.a; PHILLIPS 2005a:41; KOEHL 2006:55–56, 208 #1092, fig. 39:1092, pl. 50:1092.

Comments: R. Seager purchased the vessel, with little information beyond its origin in the Katsamba region. He later showed it to Evans, who was digging in the area in 1922. Cline notes without explanation that it may have come from Poros (the neighbouring suburb of Herakleion).

The *Gravidenflasche* type is well known in Egypt, when it may have been used as a container for medicines pertaining to childbirth.³³⁴ This particular example was adapted for use by a Minoan artisan as a rhyton by the addition of the hole at the bottom, probably shortly after its arrival on the island. The Minoan alteration suggests that it should be dated not much later than the reign of Thutmose III at the latest. On the available evidence from Egypt, LM IB is too early a date for this vessel, or at least it sits at the very cusp of its earliest apparent Egyptian date in the reign of Amenhotep II.

Thus, if one would want to accept an association of the *Gravidenflasche* with the other finds quoted by Driessen and MacDonald, the date range of the type in Egypt itself precludes any association with the LM IA sherds, even if they do “predominate”. Its Egyptian date even leaves little chronological room for its importation to Crete and its Minoan conversion in LM IB, and more likely it is an LM II–IIIA1 conversion. However, another factor also must be considered.

Although there is no real parallel in other *Gravidenflaschen* for

³³⁰ PLATON 1957a:336; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:133.

³³¹ *PM* II.1:255 n. 1. Seager’s impression of an “Early Minoan fabric,” compared to its true date, is clear indication that it had no find context whatsoever. He probably was influenced by the femiform vessel he found in Tomb XIII at Mochlos (SEAGER 1912:64, fig.34, pl. XIII:g; *PM* II.1:258 n. 2, fig.153).

³³² DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:133. The material as a collection suggests a disparate group brought together in modern times, or at least after LM IB. Thus, it has no chronological value.

³³³ Incorrectly identified as HM 110 {19}.

³³⁴ See BRUNNER-TRAUT 1970; BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:293.

the headdress of this vessel, the variety of individual types shown in the known examples of the *Gravidenflasche* leaves considerable scope for acceptance of any unique features found. The headdress on this vessel resembles the profile of the bowl portion of the tazza, a vessel type also beginning to appear in Egypt (and, later, Syro-Palestine) during the reign of Thutmose III. Early (Thutmoside) tazzae do not possess a central horizontal rib on the dish, that has only a concave profile and thus exhibits only two 'ribs' at its top and bottom. The 'three-ribbed' tazza with central rib does not appear in Egypt before the reign of his successor Amenhotep II,³³⁵ and thus not earlier than sometime during the LM II period on Crete. Perhaps not coincidentally, a (Syro-Palestinian) three-ribbed tazza was recovered in the Temple Tomb at Knossos in the LM II–IIIA1 'Sepulchral Deposit'.³³⁶ It seems likely that the vessel itself should date not earlier than sometime during the reign of Amenhotep II at the earliest, and its importation therefore probably not earlier than LM II. It seems that, perhaps, at least one artisan in the Knossos area continued to convert imported vessels during the Final Palatial period.³³⁷

D. No Find Context (Katsamba/Trypete Area)

The following were recovered in the Katsamba and Trypete area. Trypete is a steep rocky slope near the shore in the Katsamba region, on the east side of the small stream west of the Kairitos River mouth, near the area excavated by Evans in 1922.³³⁸

Although the area has been subject to controlled excavation from time to time, many finds were recovered by accident without specific provenance. They may have belonged to the LM II–IIIA1 cemetery at Katsamba (A above) originally.

120. Jar ('spheroid jar'), HM A 2083

Gabbro, H: 8.1; D (rim): 5.0; (max): 12.0; (base): 5.4 cm, chipped at rim and on body.

Spheroid jar with high shoulder, rimless with flat base. Thick profile. No handles. Internal base ring.

Minoan, probably MM III–LM I.

Context: None.

Chronology: Probably MM III–LM I vessel, without context but of MM III or later deposition.

References: WARREN 1969:75 Type 30:A, P401; PHILLIPS 1991:II:475 #104, III:1029 fig. 104; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:214 #213.α.

Comments: Found in the Katsamba garden of Braimi Omeraki in November 1919, without context.

121. Jar ('spheroid jar'), HM A 2334

Grey and white mottled dolomitic marble, H: 7.9; D (rim): 7.5; (max): 11.3; (base): 5.5 cm, battered with chips at rim and on body.

Spheroid jar with slightly raised shoulder, short upright rim, flat slightly raised base. No handles.

Minoan, probably MM III–LM I.

Context: None.

Chronology: Probably MM III–LM I vessel, without context but of MM III or later deposition.

References: WARREN 1969:75 Type 30:A, P400; PHILLIPS 1991:II:476 #105, III:1029 fig. 105; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:215 #213.β.

Comments: Chance find in a Trypete tomb in 1933, without context.

122. Jar ('spheroid jar'), HM 2625

Diorite?, dark green/grey stone, speckled with grey/white, H: 5.9–6.1; D (rim): 7.3; (max): 9.9; (base): 4.9 cm, intact.

Spheroid jar with flat collar, not undercut. Flat base slightly raised. Two perforated roll handles on shoulder, with holes drilled diagonally into vessel body from side of handles.

Minoan, probably MM III–LM I.

Context: None.

Chronology: Probably MM III–LM I vessel, without context but of MM III or later deposition.

Comparison: {515}.

References: WARREN 1969:75 Type 30:A, P402, D224; PHILLIPS 1991:II:476 #106, III:1030 fig. 106.

Comments: Chance find without context in Katsamba, and given to the HM by K. Pitulaki in 1959.

KEPHALA KHONDROU

In 1955–1957, N. Platon excavated an important early LM IIIA–early IIIB Minoan settlement of closely packed individual houses, on the small hill of Kephala Khondrou about two kilometres north of the southern coast and nine kilometres south of Ano Viannos at the south-western edge of the Diktaean mountains.³³⁹ At least two phases of occupation were distinguished in an overall excavated area of some 60 by 17.5 m. The settlement itself was larger, but part had eroded down the hill and some had been destroyed in modern times. Platon divided the area into two 'complexes' (eastern and western), each room being identified by a letter of the Greek alphabet, the subscript number '1' being added for rooms in the western complex. He estimated about seven houses in the eastern complex and tentatively four in the western complex, although other interpretations are equally valid.

House A₁–A₁, in the western complex, was identified as possibly the house of the town governor; it is the largest on the site. The largest room (Δ₁) boasts a

³³⁵ BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:129 #120 says the reign of Amenhotep III. B.G. ASTON 1994:150 #170–171 notes an example from the reign of Amenhotep II.

³³⁶ See WARREN 1969:115 Types 44; Knossos RR.

³³⁷ In this respect, see also amphora/rhyton {144} at Knossos.

³³⁸ EVANS *PM* II.1:232–238:passim, fig.131:a. See also HOOD and SMOLLETT 1959:24 #167.

³³⁹ HOOD 1957:22; PLATON 1957b; DAUX 1958:780–783; PLATON 1959b. See also KANTA 1980:114–117; GESELL 1985:82–83 #31.

stepped dais. It contained at least one upper storey, as there is a staircase (Room Z₁). Additionally, several of the rooms are slab-paved, some in both phases and the upper not well made. Room A₁ had two successive layers of slab paving with some 30 cm. separating them in the south-west corner.

The concentration of ritual vessels and objects in the area of the staircase and surrounding rooms suggests a shrine was situated immediately above.³⁴⁰ Amongst the finds were a snake tube and rhyton, two stone offering table legs with standing lions in relief,³⁴¹ a triton shell, a small figurine head and conical cups. The related pottery and the objects themselves suggest the shrine belonged to the latest use and destruction of the settlement, in LM IIIB.³⁴²

123. Femiform parturient rhyton. HM — (not seen)

Clay, dimensions not stated, lower half only preserved in several joining fragments. Elbows preserved. Paint flaked and worn. Anthropomorphic parturient vessel in the form of a seated woman, with legs flexed to body and right arm bent. Seated on a short 'prop' at back. Open vagina. Coil-formed limbs attached to vessel body. Black-painted decoration outlines limbs, and indicates hair hanging in ringlets down back and laced dress between legs just above open vagina.

Minoan, LM IIIB.

Context: Not specified, but most likely LM IIIB.

Chronology: LM IIIB vessel, most likely in generally contemporary LM IIIB deposition.

Comparanda: ALON and AMIRAN 1976:117–120, pl. XXXIII, XXXVI:right; {35}; {78}.

References: PLATON 1957b:144, pl. 70:β:top row centre, 72:a; DAUX 1958:783, Fig:8:top row centre, 10; KANTA 1980:117; GESELL 1985:82 #31, 187 fig. 68; PHILLIPS 1991:II:478 #107, III:1030 fig. 107; KOEHL 2006:18, 77–78 #37.

Comments: Its presentation resembles that of the Egyptian 'Gravidenflaschen,' but appears much later than those Egyptian vessels. Its date is contemporary with the Ramesside (Dynasty XIX) period in Egypt.

The painted decoration is as described by Gesell, but the published photograph is insufficient to identify the painted decoration, so this is not indicated on the present catalogue illustration. The Alon and Amiran comparison is far removed chronologically, but is visually quite similar to this rhyton.

KHAMAIZI PHATSI

The site of Khamaizi Phatsi is located north of the modern town of Khamaizi, on the north-western

coast of Crete west of Siteia, and close to the cave of Liopetri.³⁴³ C. Davaras excavated five small square tombs here in 1971,³⁴⁴ together with another three some 500 m. to the east at Droggera. Recent plunderers had heavily robbed all the tombs, and destroyed the majority completely, before controlled excavation had begun.

M. Tsipopoulou recently has published the ceramics from these tombs in detail, dating these and one other tomb nearby at Droggera from the Sub-Minoan through Early Protogeometric (EPG) up to the Geometric period on that basis. She reported the following: Three vases, all EPG in date, are from Tomb I. Fourteen EPG vases are from Tomb II. Two lentoid seals in sardonyx and steatite and 36 vases ranging from Sub-Minoan through Geometric periods are in Tomb III.³⁴⁵ Tomb IV contained only four vases of EPG and Geometric date. Tomb V had 26 vases ranging between the Sub-Minoan and Geometric periods, together with a bronze dagger with ivory handle, several iron and bronze knives, and beads of clay, glass paste and rock crystal. Two Droggera tombs produced no objects, but in Tomb II the thieves had missed four EPG vases and an iron knife.

The following is not mentioned by Tsipopoulou, but is identified as from the Khamaizi Phatsi excavations on its label in the HNM. Its specific tomb is not identified, and it may have been a surface find since Tsipopoulou does not mention it.

124. Cornflower bead. HNM 8840 (not handled)

Carnelian, L: c. 14; W: c. 6; SH: c. 1 mm, large chip at bottom edge, with about two-thirds of bottom lost.

Cornflower bead, rounded, with horizontal string-hole near top.

Egyptian, almost certainly late Dynasty XVIII (reign of Akhenaten) or later.

Context: None.

Chronology: Probably late Dynasty XVIII (from the reign of Akhenaten)–XIX object, in unknown context.

Comparanda: BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:238 #314 (fig. 15); {67}; {500}.

Reference: PHILLIPS 1991:II:479–480 #108; 1992b:499.

Comments: The rarity of this bead type prior to the reign of Akhenaten in late Dynasty XVIII should date it no earlier.

³⁴⁰ The situation is paralleled at Myrtos Pyrgos.

³⁴¹ Despite FOSTER 1982:88, 111, 184, they probably are not sphingi but lions. They should not be 'genii,' as she implies by her description as 'lion-like demons,' as there is no (preserved) evidence for the dorsal appendage. See also PLATON 1957b:144–145, pl. 72:β.

³⁴² KANTA 1980:117.

³⁴³ See FAURE 1964:57.

³⁴⁴ DAVARAS 1972:650; CATLING 1978:67 ('Liopetri'); TSIPOPOULOU 1997a.

³⁴⁵ These seem to be the two published in *CMS* V.1:#22–23. The first is a 'talismanic' seal noted to be 'carnelian' from Tomb 3 (probably the 'sardonyx' of Tsipopoulou), and the second of 'serpentine' from Tomb 2. The latter is not mentioned by TSIPOPOULOU 1997a. The second ('steatite') seal from Tomb 3 was not published in the *CMS*; see *CMS* V.1:11.

The presence of a Final Palatial seal³⁴⁶ amongst the finds suggests that the cornflower bead too may have been an heirloom, especially as the few other examples of this bead type were found in generally contemporary contexts. It is known in Egypt during late Dynasty XXI–XXII, contemporary with the Sub-Minoan and Protogeometric periods on Crete, but its popularity had waned considerably even before that time. Despite the late context date or at least context association, this bead is included in the present work as an LM import. Nonetheless, it is possible that it is generally contemporary with these Iron Age tombs.

KHANIA

Khania, the second largest city on Crete, lies on the western edge of the isthmus joining the large rounded spit of land that forms Souda Bay on the north-western coast. Since 1964, excavations in the ‘Kastelli,’ the walled inner town of the modern city, have revealed almost continuous occupation from Neolithic to Graeco-Roman times. The site has been identified with Kydonia, a prominent Classical place name already mentioned centuries earlier on Amenhotep III’s ‘Aegean list’ at Kom el-Heitan. Originally begun by Io. Tzedakis in 1964,³⁴⁷ since 1969 the excavations have continued almost annually as a joint Greek-Swedish effort under Tzedakis and C.-G. Styrenius, and later E. Hallager;³⁴⁸ they remain ongoing. The joint team excavated a major area, in Aghia Aikaterini Square off Kanevaro Street and just downhill on Kanevaro Street, over a number of years. Other areas have been investigated as nearby buildings have been torn down and replaced.

Extensive and sophisticated Minoan buildings have been found below Mediaeval and modern buildings. Pottery dating from Neolithic through LM III has been found in abundance. Although much of the architecture had been cut through or removed by post-Minoan occupation levels, a large number of stratified levels were recognised in different portions of the excavated area, including two phases of LM IIIC, up to five construction phases within LM IIIB, and also in LM IIIA2–B, LM II–IIIA1, LM I and MM II/III levels. Not all phases were found in all areas excavated. Architecture prior to this date has not been recovered, although pottery was abundant and in many cases of excellent quality.

By MM times, the site was occupied by ordinary

housing, but the LM occupation was well-organised and substantial, possibly similar to the housing surrounding the palace at Knossos although no palace structure has yet been uncovered at Kastelli. The LM I buildings were destroyed by fire in LM IB. The site also is important for its caches of inscribed material, being the only site other than Knossos to produce both LM I Linear A and LM III Linear B inscriptions.

A. Kanevaro Street Megaron

Tzedakis excavated on the northern edge of Kanevaro Street, immediately west of Aghia Aikaterini Square in 1966.³⁴⁹ Disturbance from later structures was extensive here, and little was undisturbed. He found an LM IIIC stratum with traces of walls and a floor, below which was a deep LM IIIB layer with pits having LM IB–II sherds. Within this level, at a depth of 2.5 m., he recovered the foundations and lowest courses of an LM IIIB (early) megaron, but little could be associated specifically with the structure. In an associated storeroom he found fragments of seven stirrup jars with Linear B inscriptions, one containing some pumice, in a secure LM IIIB context. The megaron was aligned essentially NE-SW, and both rooms boasted polychrome plastered walls and a paved floor.

125. Scarab, KM Π 6182

Glazed faience, L: 39.7; W: 27.7; H: 17.1; SH: 4.0 mm, chipped on face edge, slightly battered back, worn surface, with glaze almost entirely worn off. Burnt.

Scarab with open head and notched clypeus, double line between pronotum and elytra, single line between elytra and framing line at outer edge of elytra. Humeral callosities indicated. Legs indicated by deep undercutting. Light turquoise glaze. String-hole through length. *Face*: Egyptian hieroglyphs: *Nb-m3ʿt-Rʿ my-Rʿ*, ‘Nebma’atre, whom Re loves,’ the pronominal and an epithet of the late Dynasty XVIII Pharaoh Amenhotep III.³⁵⁰ Horizontal format. Line border.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XVIII, reign of Amenhotep III.

Context: None, but not earlier than LM IIIA1 and presumably not later than LM IIIB.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XVIII (reign of Amenhotep III) object, in unstratified context ranging from contemporary LM IIIA1 to LM IIIB and post-dating his reign.

Comparanda: MATOUK 1972–1977:I:214 #505, 510.

References: TZEDAKIS 1967:503, pl. 377:d;³⁵¹ FRASER 1969:38;³⁵² CMS V.1:#237; HELCK 1979:95; KANTA 1980:315; YULE 1983:366 n. 22; CLINE 1987:11–12 fig. 10, 26; LAMBROU-

³⁴⁶ CMS V.1:XL, #23.

³⁴⁷ Annual reports in *ADelt* 20 (1965) and continuing.

³⁴⁸ STYRENIUS and TZEDAKIS 1970; HELLSTROM and STYRENIUS 1971; HALLAGER 1973a; TZEDAKIS and HALLAGER 1978; 1983; HALLAGER and TZEDAKIS 1982; 1984. See also *ADelt* 25 (1970) and continuing.

³⁴⁹ TZEDAKIS 1967:502–503; FRASER 1969:37–38.

³⁵⁰ See also comments to scarab {262}.

³⁵¹ Misidentified as inscribed with the name of “Tuthmosis (Amenophis) III” on the face.

³⁵² Misidentified as inscribed with the name of Thutmose III on the face.

PHILLIPSON 1990:183 #4, pl. 42:4; PHILLIPS 1991:II:483 #109, III:1030 fig. 109; CLINE 1994:147 #125, pl. 4.11; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:443; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:320 #329; PHILLIPS 2005b:459 n. 20, 461 n. 28.

Comments: Found in an unstratified context in the megaron area. The reign of Amenhotep III generally is equated with LM IIIA1, so it cannot have been imported earlier in any event.³⁵³ The *mry-r* epithet is squeezed into the small space behind the figure of the goddess, who holds an ankh sign (S 34).

B. 10 Karte Street

Just down from the Kanevaro Street excavations and around the corner on Karte Street, emergency excavations were conducted in 1973 under the direction of Io. Papapostolou, limited to the 10.5 by 6.47 m. of the property at #10.³⁵⁴ Here, he found a series of superimposed structures, at levels dated to LM IIIB, LM IIIA and MM III–LM IB. This lowest level contained the corner areas of three ‘buildings,’ the first two adjoined in one corner of the trench, and a third in the opposite corner. In the intervening space between two floors, in the eastern part of the excavated plot, he found a large archival deposit of inscribed Linear A documents scattered over a large area, in destruction debris with burnt soil. The upper floor (α) is now dated to LM II–IIIA, and in the lower floor (β) were MM III–LM IB sherds indicating a *terminus post quem* of LM IB. The documents are considered to belong with the destruction debris of LM IB, and were deposited at some time between the end of LM IB and the LM II(?) / IIIA period.³⁵⁵ Approximately 82 clay tablets, 112 complete or fragmentary roundels, 57 flat-based nodules and one nodule were recovered, together with MM III–LM I potsherds, preserved by the fire which destroyed the area. Many contain deeply incised Linear A inscriptions and/or ideogrammes, many also with seal impressions. The archival deposit seems to have been from a palatial-type building, and some of the tablets here were inscribed in the same hand as others from the Aghia Aikaterini/Kanevaro Street excavations.³⁵⁶

126. Roundel with seal impression. KM KH 2065 (KH Wc 2065) Clay, roundel: D: 20.6–22.4; Th.: 11.1; seal impression: H: 11.2; W: 8.8 mm, upper and lower edges lost on two fragmentary impressions on single roundel.

Round flat roundel inscribed with two Linear A signs on one face: L 88–unknown. Impression faintly stamped twice on the edge with same lentoid seal, showing a squatting ape facing left, with tail raised behind and paws raised inequally in front of body, with indication of an object between paws. Tail apparently tufted at end.

Minoan, LM I(B?).

Context: Between LM IB and LM IIIA1.

Chronology: LM I(B?) object, in slightly later intermediary context not later than LM IIIA1.

References: GODART and OLIVIER 1976–1985:3:138 #KH Wc 2065; PAPAPOSTOULOU 1977:50–51 #7, 163 #2065, pl. 18–19:7, *CMS V Suppl.* 1A:#159; PHILLIPS 1991:II:484 #110, III:1031 fig. 110; HALLAGER 1996:II:103 #KH Wc 2065, 299; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:365, 401 #445.

Comments: The ape represents a *Cercopithecus*, on the basis of its elongated body, defined neck, thin body and extremely long tail, despite what appears to be a tuft at the end of the last.

C. Aghia Aikaterini Square, House I

The major excavations in Aghia Aikaterini Square of Kanevaro Street between 1970 and 1987 and 1989 have produced a number of large and impressive buildings, essentially well-organised housing.³⁵⁷ Below Hellenistic to modern finds were the Bronze Age levels. The latest housing is a clearly dated LM IIIC room and other scattered walls of LM IIIB (late) and IIIC date. Below these was substantial housing dated LM IIIA2–B (early), with earlier stratified buildings of LM II–IIIA1 in certain areas and LM I housing below, destroyed by fire in LM IB with some walls reused for the later structures above. A sounding in one room indicated EM II habitation immediately below the LM I floor, consisting of a probable obsidian workshop and, in one corner, Final Neolithic sherds. MM structures were found elsewhere below the LM phases. Four separate structures (numbered I–IV) have been identified to date, but only the area of House I has been entirely exposed.³⁵⁸

House I is a large LM I ‘Type 2’ house³⁵⁹ with numerous rooms, including a typical Minoan hall having pier-and-door partitions and a light-well (rooms A and C), a separate industrial/storage area (rooms D–F and M), a drainage system and stairs indicating an upper storey. It was partly reused and superimposed by the later building levels, leading to

³⁵³ See {262}.

³⁵⁴ PAPAPOSTOULOU 1973; 1973–1974:926–927; 1977:1–10. See also CATLING 1974:40; 1982:59; *CMS V Suppl.* 1A:107.

³⁵⁵ It initially was dated to LM I; see PAPAPOSTOULOU 1973; 1977. See also HALLAGER 1975:62; CATLING 1982:59 and, most comprehensively HALLAGER 1996:I:50–51.

³⁵⁶ GODART and TZEDAKIS 1992:124; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:124.

³⁵⁷ HALLAGER 1973a; TZEDAKIS and HALLAGER 1978; 1983; 1985; HALLAGER and TZEDAKIS 1982; 1984; 1986; *CMS V Suppl.* 1A:106–107.

³⁵⁸ Phase plans for the period LM I–LM IIIC are in HALLAGER and TZEDAKIS 1986:figs. 2, 10, 13; HALLAGER 1997:figs. 1–5.

³⁵⁹ See McENROE 1982:7–10.

initial confusion of its nature and date. Only the residential area was superimposed; only pits were exposed above the industrial area, which already was at a lower level than the rest. Room F was partly slab-paved, room M was a kitchen and weaving area with a central hearth, and room E a storage area for some 50 vessels which also contained two Linear A tablets. It was destroyed in LM IB.

The old walls, especially the outer (ashlar) walls, of House I were reused by the inhabitants in their reconstruction of the settlement in LM II–IIIA1. A new feature seems to be the use of rubbish pits. The rooms in use again were destroyed by fire in LM IIIA1. During LM IIIA2–B (early), further walls were constructed above, sometimes but not always employing earlier walls, although by the end of this phase no LM IB walls were still in use and the houses were free-standing. Again, the settlement was destroyed by fire in early LM IIIB. The site was rebuilt yet again in late LM IIIB, partly employing old walls, again at least partly destroyed by fire, and yet again rebuilt in LM IIIC.

C.1. Room D

Room D, probably also a storage room, was linked to the others by a corridor. A wooden partition wall divided the room, creating two spaces considerably smaller than its entire area of 4.5 by 2.5 m. The walls were covered by red clay stucco, as was Room E, and had a hard-tamped clay floor. Two jars filled with the same stucco were found in the north corner. A cupboard in the south-east corner was originally thought to be a double-doorway to Room E. In the North-east corner of the partition wall were found a collection of three stone vases, a seal stone, amulet, beads from a necklace, several miniature cups, pyxides and other vases of different shapes, mostly decorated, while in the south-west part were other, unpainted cups.³⁶⁰ The following was recovered in the south-eastern corner cupboard, in the LM IB destruction level.

127. Nodule with seal impressions, KM KH 1559

Clay, nodule L: 114.2; W: 30.3; Th.: 24.2 mm, three joining pieces with some small chips missing.

Clay flat-based nodule,³⁶¹ hand-formed elongated roughly triangular form, with 12 seal impressions on two of three sur-

faces, and net-rope impressions on third. Only those relevant are described in detail, others are: *Face B*: skirted figure facing left; *Face C*: woman confronting agrimi(?); *Face E*: lion in profile; *Face F*: two men running right; *Face G*: as E; *Face H*: two lions or wingless griffins *tête-bêche*; *Face I*: man and lion fighting; *Face J*: as E, second stamping; *Face K*: lion attacking agrimi(?); *Face L*: four men milking(?) four sheep(?).

127.A. Face A: A Minoan ‘genius’ figure, facing right with arms positioned as if holding a *Schnabelkanne* although none is indicated. Nearly but not quite ‘wasp-waisted’ with an elongated figure. Dorsal appendage indicated only by ‘spikes’ terminating in balls up its arched back and possibly also its quite fat thighs (perhaps indicating legs and appendage). The head is indistinct, but with a long jaw and open mouth and blunted vaguely leonine profile. An amygdaloid seal was employed, the impression incomplete but indicating the seal was strung when used. The top of the head and legs below the ‘knee’ were not impressed. Seal impression: H: 14.5, W: 10.0 mm.

Comparanda: {112}, {208}.

References: CMS V *Suppl.* 1A:131 #128; REHAK 1995:231 #77.

127.B. Face D: Two apes face-to-face, both squatting with elbows on knees and hands in front of chin, tails wrapped around ankles. Probably a discoid seal was used, still strung as two string-marks emanate from either end where the string-hole would have been. Seal impression: H: 11.1; W: 9.3 mm.

References: PINI 1983:48 n. 31; CMS V *Suppl.* 1A:133 #131; PHILLIPS 1991:II:486 #111, III:1031 fig. 111.

Minoan, LM I, probably LM IB.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I(B?) object, in generally contemporary LM IB destruction context.

General references: HALLAGER 1985:pl. MΘ', fig. 6; 1996:II: 291; CMS V *Suppl.* 1A:131 #128–137.

Comments: Face A: Suggestively a development of the leonine type. Face D: *Cercopithecus* monkeys are represented. A unique representation similar to earlier Egyptian examples, except for the curled tail. Nonetheless, the seal used is undoubtedly of Minoan manufacture. The seals that produced these two impressions are not necessarily of the same date, and the amygdaloid appears to be later than the lentoid.

No seal impression code was assigned by HALLAGER (1996).

C.2. Rubbish Deposit, above Room A area

The rooms south-west of these storage areas constituted a typical Minoan hall mentioned above. Room A, the farthest interior room, appears to have been a light-well having a column in the centre, which provided light for a stone-flagged room to its east via pier-and-door partitions, initially identified as an LM IIIA level³⁶² and later as LM IB housing.³⁶³ The levels above

³⁶⁰ See HALLAGER 1985:146 n. 41 for a list of the complete vases recovered from this room, with further references.

³⁶¹ Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 28 April 2000) informs me this is *not* a ‘bar,’ despite its elongated appearance. The third surface, without seal impressions, was pressed against the document sealed by the nodule, hence the ‘triangular’ section. This document appears to

have been either of parchment or (less likely) leather (hence the ‘net-rope’ impressions), folded and then the nodule placed along its entire length to accommodate the dozen stamps necessary (in this case) to confirm its sealing.

³⁶² HALLAGER 1975:fig. 15.

³⁶³ HALLAGER and TZEDAKIS 1984:figs. 1–2.

this housing were disturbed, as was usual on the site. A rubbish deposit, dated to LM IIIB but containing pottery from EM through to LM IIIB, was isolated above Room A in 1971. Amongst the finds was a single roundel inscribed in Linear A and a clay sealing.

128. Roundel with seal impression. KM KH 2005 (KH Wc 2005) Clay, roundel: D: 34.8–35.3; H: 8.8–10.4; seal impression: H: 12.3; W: 9.3 mm, intact, design almost complete in seven impressions.

Round flat roundel, probably of disc shape, inscribed with four Linear A signs on one face: L29-L26-L60-L78, and impression stamped seven times around the edge with the same lentoid seal, giving it a septagonal appearance. Seal impression showing two standing apes facing each other with bent legs, tails hanging behind and arms more or less outstretched downwards in front. A third ape is sandwiched in-between, in the same position but upside-down. Other raised areas at his sides might be part of a fourth ape or, more likely, a filler design. Surfaces marked by fingerprints.

Minoan, LM I, probably LM IB.

Context: LM IIIB.

Chronology: LM I(B?) object, in later LM IIIB rubbish deposit context.

Comparison: {565}.

References: HALLAGER 1973b:24–25, pl. IV (KH W2); 1975:60, fig. 12, pl. IV:b.1–3; CMS V.1:#233; PHILLIPS 1991:II:487 #112, III:1031 fig. 112; GODART and OLIVIER 1976–1985:3:115 #KH Wc 2005; HALLAGER 1996:II:43 #KH Wc 2005; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:400 #434.

Comments: Probably the *Cercopithecus* is intended, although the figures are all rather chunky.

C.3. Pit 5-001, above Room G area

A large pit of LM IIIA1 date, labeled '5-001', cut into the northernmost wall of LM I House I room G, just east of room A and right next to a modern well.³⁶⁴

Material from this pit is of a homogenous early LM IIIA character, and included a fragment of an inscribed clay tablet, decorated and plain potsherds, and a half-preserved pyxis.³⁶⁵ During cleaning operations in the pit, the following also was recovered:

129. Seal, KM A 3187

Dark olive green serpentine, Dia.: 18.4–19.5; Th.: 7.4; SH: 2.8 mm, well-worn at upper string-hole opening, otherwise intact. Lentoid seal engraved on one face only. String-hole through length at vertical angle to face design. *Face:* Large goat with forelegs and head twisted to fit within seal shape. Space below body and between head and hind legs filled with an incised small 'genius' figure facing left. The 'genius' is depicted in

abbreviated form, having engraved body accented with single line for leg, foot, and arm, and outline for lower body, neck and eye, although cheek and lower jaw seem indicated by engraving. Row of small circles along back indicates 'balls' of 'spiked' back. Apparently thick waist. A leafy plant fills in space above goat's back.

Minoan, probably LM IB (–II?).

Context: Not later than LM IIIA1.

Chronology: Probably LM IB (–II?) seal, recovered in context not later than LM IIIA1.

References: CMS V Suppl. 1A:125 #122; REHAK 1995:231 #76.

Comments: Recovered in "Cleaning pit 5 - 001, 517.81/716.75/-2.42," a cleaning operation in the LM IIIA1 pit, and therefore considered unstratified. However, the date of the pit itself at least provides a *terminus post quem* for the deposition of the seal. The context is stated in the CMS.

Dated on the basis of face design and 'genius' depiction. This is the only example where the 'genius' is not the dominant or at least an equal figure in the composition, and the only example of the 'genius' and goat combination. The thick waist yet 'spiked' back of the 'genius' suggests an LM IB date, despite the LM IIIA1 pit context.

C.4. Deposit above Space G area

Room G continued in use into the next, LM IIIA2–B (early), period, at the end of which it was destroyed by fire, together with the rest of the settlement here.³⁶⁶ The room, as others in the same building, contained a slab-lidded pithos sunk into the floor, possibly as a grain storage container. A series of superimposed floors were excavated.

Recovered in a deposit above the earliest floor of LM IIIA2–B (early) building, Space G, in 'Scarp 3/14, Level 3, Basket 6, 511.35/710.84/1.58' (i.e., at the very edge of the excavation trench), was the following:

130. Seal, KM A 3185

Dark olive-green serpentine, Dia.: 21.5–22.5; SH: 2.5 mm, intact but worn.

Lentoid, engraved on one face only. String-hole through length. *Face:* Two very degraded Minoan 'genii' stand anti-thetically, with obscure drilled depressions and lines in centre between them. No arms or feet visible, but columnar bodies 'wrapped' by horizontal lines. Further band of looser horizontal lines behind each figure, bowed following seal edge

Minoan, LM IIIA2(–B [early]?).

Context: LM IIIA2(–B [early]?).

Chronology: LM IIIA2(–B [early]?) seal, in generally contemporary LM IIIA2(–B [early]?) deposit.

Comparanda: {556}; {559}.

References: CMS V Suppl. 1A:#125; PHILLIPS 2005b:456.

³⁶⁴ See HALLAGER 1997:177 fig. 2, location marked '5-001' on the plan, and compare with the same location in fig.1.

³⁶⁵ See HALLAGER 1985:147 n. 43, with references. The pit "around 518/716" mentioned there (and illustrated on pl. N:fig. 8) is Pit 5-001, so marked on a later plan, HALLAGER and TZEDAKIS 1986:18 fig.10. Note that HALLAGER 1985

refers to the (then-) forthcoming "HALLAGER and TZEDAKIS 1983," that actually was published the following year and is in the present bibliography as HALLAGER and TZEDAKIS 1984.

³⁶⁶ HALLAGER 1977:178–181, fig. 3.

Comments: Its iconography is not recognisable without reference to others of a more defined image, although that of {556} could be seen as an intermediary image. This is a very debased representation of 'genius' figures in heraldic arrangement, and its interest lies chiefly in the fact that it is the only one of these debased examples to have been recovered in a dateable context, and it thus provides an indication of the speed of its decline as a recognisable image.

D. Chamber Tomb, Mazali

In 1938, V. Theophanides excavated an LM III chamber tomb in the Mazali suburb of Khania, under Odos K. Manu between houses #14 and #19, south of the Khania Law Courts.³⁶⁷ It has the usual circular plan, with dromos entrance under #14. Theophanides text and accompanying photographs include no 'alabaster' vessel of any description, but he also states that only the best pieces are discussed; these include a collection of bronze tools and vessels, clay vessels, and beads and rings. According to Jantzen, he reported eight stirrup-jars, two bronze omphalos bowls, an 'alabaster' bowl/cup, two mirrors, two swords and two knives of bronze, an engraved crystal gem, and a necklace with amber and glass beads. Kanta, who discusses only the clay vessels, lists 12 stirrup jars, a globular flask, two jugs, a cup and a broken piriform jar ranging in date between LM IIIA1/2 and IIIB, all identified from Theophanides' published photographs. The only artefact now identifiable in the KM is the necklace of faience and glass beads.³⁶⁸ Warren suggested that this tomb is the probable source of the following alabastron.

131. Alabastron?. KM — (not located)

No information, presumably of 'alabaster' or travertine.

Alabastron?, no further description.

Egyptian?, MK–Dynasty XVIII(?)

Context: LM IIIA1/2–B.

Chronology: Middle Kingdom–Dynasty XVIII(?) object, in LM IIIA1/2–B tomb deposition.

References: JANTZEN in MATZ 1951:77; WARREN 1969:113; [LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:183–184 #5, pl. 65:5].

Comments: Evidence for this vessel is contradictory. It *may* be another imported Egyptian alabastron, but it is *not* KM A1009 as suggested by Warren, as this was accessioned in 1900. Theophanides' vessel may be in the KM, if it exists at all, but it was not located by Jantzen, nor by myself in 1989. The German text states the material is 'alabaster,' but not that the vessel shape is 'alabastron'. See also comments to {531}, the alternative identification of this vessel.

KNOSSOS

Knossos is the most important, well-known and visible site on Crete. Centred on a low hill named 'Kephala' in the middle of a small plain located now just outside the southern suburbs of Herakleion, it includes the palace, surrounding town and numerous cemeteries, tombs and other monuments. The site encompasses an area of some five kilometres from north to south, and three kilometres east to west.

The first person to excavate here was a local businessman and amateur antiquarian, Minos Kalokairinos, in 1878–1879. He dug into what later proved to be part of the palace storerooms in the west wing, and recovered numerous pithoi and other vessels. Several subsequent attempts were made by various scholars to purchase the land necessary to dig, including H. Schliemann, all of which failed. A.J. Evans finally succeeded in acquiring the *kephala* land under which he would find the palace, just after the Turks had been ousted and the island became autonomous, and he immediately began to dig.

D.G. Hogarth conducted a three-month campaign of excavations and test trenches in the surrounding area as a compliment to Evans' work on the palace site, begun in 1900. The majority of the palace was cleared within five years, but Evans continued to dig in the immediate area until about 1931. Others continued the complimentary work, and both palace and surrounding areas still are being investigated and excavated by the British School and others. Evans turned over control of the site and his concessions to the Greek government in 1924, but the School has priority of archaeological work there as part of the agreement. Evans' monumental *The Palace of Minos* (Evans *PM*) is basic to study of the Minoan period on Crete and the site itself, despite numerous errors, inconsistencies, insubstantialities and frustrating narrative style.

The *kephala* first was occupied during the Neolithic period, and was used continuously as a habitation site into the Roman period and later. Its history of occupation is long and complex, but suffice to say it was the major site on the island throughout most of its existence, especially after the EM period. The number of imported objects alone indicates the strength of its foreign connections, which were substantial. Egyptian imports number as many as are

³⁶⁷ THEOPHANIDES 1948–1949:12–16; JANTZEN in MATZ 1959:76–77; LEAKLEY 1975:112; KANTA 1980:226–227; ANDREADAKI-VLASAKI 1997:491.

³⁶⁸ ANDREADAKI-VLASAKI 1997:491 n. 16.

found elsewhere on the island as a whole. References to HOOD and TAYLOR (1981) and HOOD and SMYTH (1981) relate to all but the most recently published surveys of the palace and surrounding area, and help to indicate exact locations of the various excavations by the numerous scholars who have worked here over the past century.

Knossos was a large urban centre as early as EM III or early MM IA, although substantial housing is known even in the Neolithic period and had spread beyond the hill by early EM IIA. The ‘first,’ or ‘early,’ palace was constructed in late MM IA or early IB, following the destructions of succeeding earlier buildings of EM III and MM IA construction under the later West Court.³⁶⁹ The city also expanded considerably during MM I, and by MM II probably was the largest settlement on the island – a status it retained throughout the entire Bronze Age. Tombs and burials are known throughout the MM period, the earliest dating to MM IA, scattered on the outlying hills. The ‘first’ palace, and probably much of the town, was severely damaged by earthquake at the end of MM IIB, following two earlier (MM IB and MM IIA) destruction horizons.

The ‘second,’ or ‘later,’ palace, actually a substantial reconstruction of the ‘first’ with numerous changes to the original plan, soon replaced it. This Neo-Palatial palace and city probably reached its greatest extent in LM I. In contrast, few burials can be dated to LM I, and those chiefly reused earlier tombs. This ‘second’ palace was subjected to a ‘Great Destruction’ at the end of MM IIIB or MM IIIB/LM IA transition, and there is evidence of further destruction twice in LM IA (‘early’ and ‘mature’), each followed by some rebuilding. The second of these destructions probably relates to the Thera eruption. However, Knossos escaped the general palace destructions on the island at the end of LM IB. Parts of the town were subjected to destruction in LM IB and LM II, and the palace again in LM II.

The settlement apparently continued to shrink in population throughout Final Palatial and End Palatial times, while conversely the quantity and disbursement of tombs expanded in the immediate area.

Knossos became the only functioning palatial site on the island following the other palace destructions of LM IB. Knossos itself was destroyed by fire (again, probably due to an earthquake) at the end of the Final Palatial period, at a still-disputed date. A considerable number of tombs date to the End Palatial period, and the palace and town continued to be occupied at a much-reduced scale following this major destruction.³⁷⁰

A. Early Houses below the Central Court

A.J. Evans made soundings below the south-western part of the Central Court in 1923 and 1924,³⁷¹ directly in line with the ‘Room of the Chariot Tablets’³⁷² and extending to the centre of the court itself.³⁷³ Here he found the remains of two layers of ‘Late Neolithic’ housing, the dating of which remain problematical but apparently are two successive levels of EM I.³⁷⁴ The upper layer, β , lies about 25 cm. above the lower, α , and both are almost level with the Central Court. Identification of the origin of the objects listed below is as problematical as the contexts in which they were found, as some of the material may have come from the palace destruction level.³⁷⁵

A.1. The Lower Layer (α) Housing

The lower layer consisted of two houses, ‘A’ and ‘B’. Found in this layer were stone tools (possibly including two mace heads), a bone implement, copper axe-head, perforated shells, animal bones, an amulet and some beads, clay figurines, large vessels and sherds with incised decoration, and other assorted objects including numerous stone vessels. Unfortunately, Evans contradicted himself regarding the origin of some pieces such as the mace heads,³⁷⁶ so little can be

³⁶⁹ MACGILLIVRAY 1998:19–26.

³⁷⁰ This is an extremely abbreviated history of the site, which is far more complex than this short description implies; the reader is referred to HOOD and SMYTH 1981:6–29 and the various authors in EVELY, HUGHES-BROCK and MOMIGLIANO 1994 for far greater in-depth studies of its occupational development. See also Chapter 3 for discussion of the problematic history of the palace and site.

³⁷¹ EVANS *PM* II.1:5, 7–21, 30, fig. 8:A; HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16 #85.

³⁷² HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:15 #67.

³⁷³ Later soundings in 1958–1960 and 1969–1970 were con-

ducted by J.D. Evans. These greatly augmented our understanding of Neolithic Knossos but little more was said concerning A.J. Evans’ excavations that post-date the Neolithic. See EVANS 1964a; 1964b; WARREN *et al.* 1968; EVANS 1971.

³⁷⁴ EVANS 1964a:35 gives a date of “the latest stage of the Neolithic” but later analysis of specific vessels by BETANCOURT 1985:27 has indicated the presence of Pyrgos Ware, characteristic of EM I, in the fill.

³⁷⁵ See WARREN 1969:109 n. 1.

³⁷⁶ EVANS *PM* II.1:15 (“in stratum β ”) *contra* :11 fig. 3:k-l (“stratum α ”).

said with certainty. It appears to be ‘Late Neolithic,’ although it is similar in plan to the ‘Middle Neolithic’ buildings later excavated by J.D. Evans elsewhere in the court.³⁷⁷ An EM I Pyrgos Ware chalice was reported from this layer,³⁷⁸ providing its latest context.

Some objects were located within rooms of the houses in the plan published by A. Evans.³⁷⁹ From Room 15 in House ‘A’ came a jar fragment, but no other finds were specified from the same room.

132. Jar fragment (‘cylinder jar’) (not located)

‘Mottled limestone’ or travertine,³⁸⁰ H: c. 1.05; Dia. (base): 3.0 cm,³⁸¹ one base/lower body fragment.

Cylindrical jar(?) with flat base, cylindrical lower body.

Probably Egyptian, Predynastic (Naqada III)–Dynasty IV.

Context: Late Neolithic–EM I (and later?).

Chronology: Probably Predynastic–Dynasty IV vessel, in a Late Neolithic–EM I (and later?) context. If the EM I context date is accepted, not later than Dynasty I in date.

Comparanda: (in stone) DE MORGAN 1897: fig. 628; PETRIE 1901b:33, pl. IX:10; USSISHKIN 1980:21, 24–25, fig. 12; B.G. ASTON 1994:99, 101–102 #29; (in faience) {396}.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:15–16, fig. 6; REISNER 1931a:204 #8; WARREN 1965:34 #32; 1969:112 Type 43:G6, 182 n. 1; 1976a:207 n. 9; HOOD 1978:140; CADOGAN 1983:512; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:215 #81, pl. 69:81; PHILLIPS 1991:II:492–493 #113, III:1032 fig. 113.

Comments: Originally identified as ‘possibly Egyptian’ by Warren,³⁸² he now hesitates chiefly because it cannot be traced. He noted also that the doubtful position of this and the following two pieces {133–134} in a context before EM II. The material as identified by Evans is found on Crete, but travertine is not. It is possible that it is Egyptian, as the Minoans were not producing stone vessels at the time of its stated context, but the possibility of later intrusion and indigenous production cannot be discarded, at least until the fragment is located to ascertain its material.

If the fragment is Egyptian, this base form commonly is found in Naqada III through Dynasty IV Egyptian tomb contexts, and also is known at En-Gedi in Palestine. Clay versions also have been found, including several examples at Tel Erani and Arad in Palestine, and in Egypt. Thus an early context date of EM I or even Late Neolithic is not impossible on Egyptian typological grounds, if indeed this is an Egyptian import. Certainly it is a unique fragment on Crete, whether Egyptian or Minoan;³⁸³ one recovered in an EM cave burial at Maronia {396} is of faience and is also considered to be Egyptian.

³⁷⁷ EVANS 1971:113.

³⁷⁸ EVANS *PM* II.1:10–11 fig. 3:m, dated by BETANCOURT 1985:27.

³⁷⁹ EVANS *PM* II.1:fig. 8A.

³⁸⁰ EVANS *PM* II.1:15 originally identified the material as ‘mottled limestone,’ but WARREN 1969:112 suggests it instead may be ‘alabaster.’

³⁸¹ Dimensions estimated from 7:8 illustration in EVANS *PM* II.1: fig. 6, but see n. 389, below.

³⁸² WARREN 1965:34.

A.2. The Upper Layer (β) Housing

Finds from the upper layer consisted of essentially the same material as the lower layer, but in somewhat more developed form. The pottery found included a typical EM I Pyrgos Ware chalice³⁸⁴ and a bowl shape common to Aghios Onouphrios Ware, thus dating it to EM I when both forms were typical. Warren³⁸⁵ suggests some of the material from this layer may be (Late) Minoan, possibly from the destruction debris as the architecture was badly preserved and the remains almost level with the Central Court level itself.

Evans also specified the locations of some objects from this layer.³⁸⁶ He identified only one two-room house, overlying the earlier House ‘A’ on its eastern side. In Room 1 of this house he found a collection of stone vessel fragments, of which only some were published.

133. Jar fragment (‘spheroid? jar’) (not located)

Diorite (probably hornblende diorite Type A or B), H (pres.): 15.6; W (pres.): 19.0; Th.: 3.4–4.2 cm,³⁸⁷ one lower body fragment.

Large and thick-walled jar, probably of spheroid shape, widening considerably in thickness towards the bottom.

Probably Egyptian, Predynastic–Early Dynastic.

Context: EM I (and LM?).

Chronology: Predynastic–Early Dynastic vessel, in a generally contemporary to much later EM I (and LM?) context. If the EM I context date is accepted, not later than Dynasty I in date.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:16, fig. 7:a; WARREN 1965:29, 30 #5; 1969:109 Type 43:A5, 182 n. 1; 1976:207 n. 9; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:215 #82, pl. 69:82; PHILLIPS 1991:II:494 #114, III:1032 fig. 114.

Comments: Originally identified as “possibly Egyptian” by Warren,³⁸⁸ he now hesitates chiefly because it cannot be traced. Its scale, profile and physical appearance in Evans’ illustration all correspond to the Egyptian spheroid jar type, and this would suggest that it probably was an import. If actually of this context date (EM I), it would be the earliest import known, predating even the obsidian bowl rim fragment from the Royal Road {139}. However, Warren’s suggestion of intrusion from the Late Minoan destruction is far to be preferred, and he is, in any case, “doubtful” about its presence in a context before EM II. I concur. Such vessels and their fragments are found in some quantity in LM deposits.

³⁸³ The nearest Minoan parallel is WARREN 1969:Type 18, but this does not appear before MM I.

³⁸⁴ EVANS *PM* II.1:10–11, fig. 4, also dated by BETANCOURT 1985:27.

³⁸⁵ WARREN 1969:109 n. 1.

³⁸⁶ EVANS *PM* II.1: fig. 8:A. See also HOOD 1971:25 fig. 7.

³⁸⁷ Dimensions estimated from 1:2 illustration in EVANS *PM* II.1: fig. 7:a, but see n. 389, below.

³⁸⁸ WARREN 1965:34.

134. Jar fragment ('spheroid? jar'), AM 1938.653

Dark maroon marble?/Cretan serpentine with pale yellow/green veining, H: 2.22; W: 5.01; Th.: 1.18–1.33 cm,³⁸⁹ one lower? body fragment.

Thick-walled open jar, widening in thickness towards the bottom.

Unknown.

Context: EM I (and LM?). If the EM I context date is accepted, not later than Dynasty I in date.

Chronology: Unknown vessel, in an EM I (and LM?) context. If the EM I context date is accepted, not later than Dynasty I (or contemporary dating elsewhere) in date.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:16–17, fig. 7:c; REISNER 1931a:302 #7; WARREN 1965:31 #13; 1969:109–110 Type 43:A10, 182 n. 1; 1976:207 n. 9; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:214–215 #78, pl. 69:78; PHILLIPS 1991:II:494–495 #115, III:1033 fig. 115; LILYQUIST 1996:160.

Comments: As above, {133}. Warren notes that Egyptian parallels for the material do not exist, and it likewise is not used by the Minoans.³⁹⁰ Lilyquist states categorically that the stone is not dynastic Egyptian. It is unlikely to be “Egyptian, Late Predynastic–Early Dynastic” as Warren hesitantly suggests, and he also is “doubtful” about its presence in a context before EM II; thus it is possible that this too may be intrusive from later occupation. It is best to consider its origin as ‘unknown’ until the stone can be identified. If it is to be considered a ‘spheroid jar’ and non-Egyptian stone, it would best fit with the Neo-Palatial Minoan derivations of the Egyptian vessel type.

B. Early Houses near the South Corridor

On the palace’s southern slope, bordering the ‘South Corridor’ and immediately east of the ‘South House,’³⁹¹ Evans excavated below the palace level in 1908, uncovering some house-floors that he dated to EM II.³⁹² The houses contained many restorable vessels and sherds dating chiefly to EM II, but other sherds dating earlier and later are also reported. Warren³⁹³ considered that the houses do not appear to have been in use after EM II, and were in use chiefly during the middle part of that period.³⁹⁴ They apparently consist of large and small interconnecting rectangular rooms, without excavated entrance to the

building. Both the following objects were identified from context boxes by G. Cadogan years after their excavation, and the possibility remains that they are intrusions either to the context or the context box.

B.1. Room 1

Room 1 was one of several identified. Amongst the material found with fragments of a single stone bowl were one EM I sherd, and two or three others of EM IIB–MM I date,³⁹⁵ the remainder being more generally EM II.

135. Bowl fragment ('deep open bowl'), KSM Box H.I.2 788
‘Diorite’ (probably hornblende diorite type A or B),³⁹⁶ H: 4.4; W: 8.4; Dia. (rim): 15.6 cm, two joining rim/upper body fragments.

Deep open bowl with slightly convex body and straight rim, slightly thickened on interior near rim.

Egyptian, Early Dynastic.

Context: EM II(B?), perhaps to MM IA(–B?).

Chronology: Early Dynastic vessel, an antique in EM II(B?) possibly to MM IA(–B?) context box.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1937:pl. XVIII:266 (but oval), XX:309, 314; EMERY 1961:218 fig. 72; EL-KHOULI 1978: pl. 90:2566–2571, 97:3135–3138, 101:3591, and others.

References: WARREN 1969:110 Type 43:C1, D317; 1981b:633, fig. 3, pl. 205:b:right; CADOGAN 1983:512; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:216 #85, pl. 69:85; PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 16, 326; 1991:II:496 #116, III:1033 fig. 116.

B.2. No Find Context

Another fragment came from the same house, but its exact context is unknown. It too was identified by G. Cadogan in the context box, which contained chiefly EM II pottery but also three Neolithic sherds, some MM I, one MM II and some even MM III in date.³⁹⁷ Momigliano notes that this box contained mostly coarse and other undiagnostic sherds.³⁹⁸

136. Jar fragment ('cylinder jar'), KSM Box H.I.2 794

Travertine, H: 3.2; W: 2.2; Dia. (rim): 8.2 cm, one rim/upper body fragment.

³⁸⁹ Note that these dimensions, taken from the original fragment, do not correspond exactly with Evans’ illustration, leaving the estimated dimensions of {132–133} above even less accurately ‘estimated.’

³⁹⁰ WARREN 1965:31; 1969:109 n. 1.

³⁹¹ See Knossos X, below.

³⁹² HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:13 #2; DAWKINS 1908:326; EVANS *PM* I:71, 73–75, fig.40; WARREN 1972a:395–396. Later excavations included trials by Platon in 1957 and Hood and Cadogan in 1960 (HOOD 1958a:21; 1961:27; MOMIGLIANO and WILSON 1996:3–10). A plan of the houses is incorporated into Hood and Taylor’s comprehensive palace plan, and plans of the housing by MOMIGLIANO and WILSON (1996: 7–8 figs. 4–5), although individual room

numbers are not indicated. See also comments by CADOGAN *et al.* 1993:24, 26 Table 1 on the pottery groups from the upper and lower deposits of this area, that they place at EM III and EM IIB in Evans’ terms.

³⁹³ WARREN 1981b:633.

³⁹⁴ WARREN 1972a:395.

³⁹⁵ WARREN 1981b:633; see now also MOMIGLIANO 1991:200 n. 181, 203 #16 (an MM IA polychrome spouted jar rim fragment). MOMIGLIANO 1991:200 also notes David Wilson assigned the EM II ‘floor deposit’ to the EM IIB phase during his study of the material (1984).

³⁹⁶ Compare B.G. ASTON 1994:pl. 1.

³⁹⁷ EVANS *PM* I:73, fig. 40.

³⁹⁸ MOMIGLIANO 1991:200 n. 181.

Cylindrical jar with short everted rim and slightly tapering vertical body.

Egyptian, Early Dynastic–Middle Kingdom.

Context: EM II, with some Neolithic and others to MM III.

Chronology: Early Dynastic–Middle Kingdom vessel, in generally contemporary to somewhat later EM II(–MM III?) context box.

Comparanda: {311}; B.G. ASTON 1994:99–100, 103–104 #32–35.

References: WARREN 1981b:633–634, fig. 4, pl. 206:a; CADOGAN 1983:512; WARREN 1989:3 n. 3; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:219 #97, pl. 70:97; PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 16, 326; 1991:II:497 #117, III:1033 fig. 117.

Comments: Comparison with B.G. Aston’s Egyptian form provides a wide range of possible dates for this fragment. Her note that Old Kingdom/First Intermediate Period rims tend to be thin and projecting especially in Dynasty V–XI suggests this is the least likely period for this vessel, although parallels to the rim of this vessel are found. It seems best to give a wide-ranging possible period of manufacture. Whilst the context box material is said to be chiefly EM II, it is not inconceivable that this fragment belongs with the later (MM) material there. Momigliano’s comments (above) add further emphasis to this caution.

C. Early Houses below the West Court

The West Court of the palace lies immediately west of the storerooms that constitute much of its western wing.³⁹⁹ It is bordered on the west by an outer enceinte wall and now is the tourist’s initial introduction to the site.

C.1. Kouloura Houses

Evans and Pendlebury excavated below the paved stones of the court, resulting in the discovery of several early houses.⁴⁰⁰ Three of their ‘test-pits’ were in fact *koulourai*, ancient walled pits sunk into the court itself in a generally east-west line at the western end of the court.⁴⁰¹ Kouloura I, the farthest east, was excavated by Evans in 1907 and found to contain only ‘rubbish,’ which nonetheless could be divided into two periods of use. Koulourai II and III and some of the surrounding area were excavated by H.W. and J.D.S. Pendlebury in 1930, under the general direction of Evans.⁴⁰² They found house walls at the bottom of both pits, with two floor levels, the lower originally assigned an EM III date as it apparently lacked polychrome ware, and the upper ascribed to MM IA; both now are reassigned to MM

IA by Momigliano.⁴⁰³ Above the houses the pits apparently were used as rubbish dumps, chiefly for pottery. This rubbish is mainly of MM II date, with some MM IIIA as the latest assignable material. The MM IA material recently has been re-examined by MOMIGLIANO (1991) and the later kouloura fill levels by MACGILLIVRAY (1998).⁴⁰⁴

In January 1965, M.S.F. Hood was searching through the pottery boxes from Pendlebury’s excavations of Kouloura III, and came across the following object, later accessioned by the HM.

137. Knife blade, HM 2989 (ex-KSM Box B.II.6 392)

Brown flint with grey to white flecks and veins, L (pres.): 10.5; W (max): 4.2; Th. (max): 0.9 cm, perhaps one-third missing at tip end. Separately attached handle missing.

Convex face, with straight top edge and convex cutting edge at bottom. Tangless, one end with large section removed at top and two small notches at bottom edge of handle end, possibly to aid in binding separate handle.

Probably modern, just possibly Egyptian, Protodynastic–Middle Kingdom.

Context: None certain, found in box with MM IA–IIIA material.

Chronology: Probably modern (just possibly Protodynastic–Middle Kingdom) object, probably an intrusive piece or possibly an antique in generally contemporary or somewhat later MM IA–IIIA context box.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1891:52–53, pl. VII:7–8, XIII:6; ENGELBACH and GUNN 1923:pl. VII:8, 10.

References: CADOGAN 1966; BRANIGAN 1973:25; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:221 #101, pl. 78:101; PHILLIPS 1991:II:498–499 #118, III:1033 fig. 118; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:30.

Comments: The box in which the knife was found is labelled ‘West Kouloura (3). West of West Court. House at the bottom East side below top floor level to north’. An alternate label (for both Box 392 and Box 391) reads ‘House B. Room 1, below top floor level’.⁴⁰⁵ Together, these assign its contents to the lower of the two house floor levels of Room 1 in House B, in Kouloura III, dated to EM III. Two rooms are at the bottom of Kouloura III, divided in half by a wall with Room 1 the eastern half and Room 2 to the west, and further rooms excavated to the west and north. House A lies farther north and at a higher level.

Cadogan noted that MM IA and MM IIB sherds also were contained in the box and suggests it should instead be associated with a deposit from the bottom of the dump stratum, on top of the houses. Box 393 appears to be an MM IA ‘floor deposit’ from Room 2 ‘below top floor level,’ and Box 390 is ‘Room 1, above top floor level’ but, as Momigliano has shown, several boxes clearly contain pieces demonstrably from elsewhere.⁴⁰⁶

³⁹⁹ See HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:14 #40.

⁴⁰⁰ See HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:14 #42, #45–48, 16–17 #92–93.

⁴⁰¹ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16 #87–89. These were partly excavated by Evans and later completed by Pendlebury.

⁴⁰² PENDLEBURY and PENDLEBURY 1928–1930; EVANS *PM* IV.1:61–74.

⁴⁰³ MOMIGLIANO 1991:206–242: *passim*.

⁴⁰⁴ MACGILLIVRAY 1998:30, 33.

⁴⁰⁵ MOMIGLIANO 1991:209 fig. 18.

⁴⁰⁶ MOMIGLIANO 1991:206–216: *passim*.

Thus its context cannot be narrowed beyond EM III–MM IIB, if indeed it was excavated in the context recorded on the box in which it was found.⁴⁰⁷ A flint (or chert) fragment {156} from the Vat Room deposit is described as similar to the flint of this knife.⁴⁰⁸ The knife may instead be modern, as the excavation records indicate no knife amongst the Kouloura III finds. Cadogan did not exclude the possibility that the knife is a modern ‘import’ that may have fallen out of someone’s pocket or was mislaid in the KSM. Egyptian stone knives have the shaped extension for hafting the handle on the upper, thicker part of the blade rather than the thinner lower edge, and this usually has a curved side profile. Both the shaped extension below and double-notching are highly unusual if not unique in Egyptian knives.⁴⁰⁹ Thus, the possibility that it is modern is more likely.

C.2. West Facade Housing

In addition to his excavations below the Central Court,⁴¹⁰ J.D. Evans continued his search for the Neolithic origins of *kephala* habitation farther to the west in 1969–1970, below the West Court of the palace.⁴¹¹

J.D. Evans’ excavations were concentrated nearer the west facade of the palace, immediately south of the altar base at the north end of the court. He showed that the West Court area had been inhabited as early as the Early Neolithic I period, with subsequent substantial Middle Neolithic and later EM II building phases. The latest phase consisted of a major building of which four rooms were excavated, preserved to a metre in height.⁴¹² They apparently were basement cellars or storerooms, but probably did not have an upper storey above. Instead, he conjectured a terraced structure, the majority of which was later destroyed during levelling of the area prior to construction of the MM I palace.⁴¹³ Published finds from the EM IIA building were limited to ceramic vessels including several restorable shapes, some rouletted or incised. Others are painted, including Aghios Onouphrios II ware.

The following did not come from within the rooms of this building but from level BB2, just below the paving of the West Court. Nonetheless, it was a “pure EM IIA” context of building fill.⁴¹⁴

138. Canine. KSM (exc. West Court 1969 lvl BB2 #523)

Hippopotamus ivory, (pres.) L: 45; W: 45; Th.: 0.5–1 mm, one fragment.

Lower canine of a hippopotamus, partially worked with rough cutting marks on one side of outer edge with outer dentine entirely removed, and marked on other surface where the dentine is partly removed by abrasion. One edge cut or sawn to present shape.

Undateable, Egyptian, Early Dynastic.

Context: EM IIA.

Chronology: Undateable, Early Dynastic fragment, in EM IIA context.

References: KRZYSZKOWSKA 1983:166; 1984:123–124, pl. XIII:a:right; WILSON 1984:209, 1988:210, 214, 228; PHILLIPS 1991:II:500–501 #119.

Comments: The material was identified by Olga Krzyszkowska. Its shape suggests that it comes from a tusk imported whole, and therefore presumably worked at Knossos by Minoan artisans. The early context dating offers substantial proof of early contact with foreign lands, and at the least second-hand contact via possible intermediaries reaching probably as far as Egypt by the early EM II period,⁴¹⁵ and that raw goods were being imported over great distances by sea by that time. Although the hippopotamus is known to have existed in swampy areas of Syro-Palestine even into the beginning of the 1st millennium BC, hippopotamus ivory was not employed in this region between the Chalcolithic and Early Iron Age, and so this piece almost certainly originated in Egypt.⁴¹⁶ Its probable dates given above merely reflect its context date.

D. Royal Road, South Side (West End)

In 1971–1973, P. Warren excavated on the south side of the Royal Road,⁴¹⁷ about 13 m. south on the north side of the road, west of his south side excavations,⁴¹⁸ and just east of the modern major highway. Here he uncovered a north-south junction to the Royal Road, which runs east-west. His nine trenches revealed 14

⁴⁰⁷ See comments by MOMIGLIANO 1992:170 n. 17.

⁴⁰⁸ PANAGIOTAKI 1999:30. See Knossos I, below.

⁴⁰⁹ Neither was seen by the author (March 2000) in the extensive display of stone implements in the CM, Room U53, and no parallel for the Knossos knife can be cited from there. Occasionally, however, a single notch is found, e.g., NEEDLER 1984:277 #173. For the shaped extension, which has a ‘hooked’ shape at the bottom and to which the separate handle would be hafted, see, e.g., NEEDLER 1984:276–277 #172–174.

⁴¹⁰ See Knossos A, above.

⁴¹¹ EVANS 1971; 1972. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:17 #92.

⁴¹² For a section of the relevant area, see EVANS 1972:fig. 3.

⁴¹³ EVANS 1972:127.

⁴¹⁴ KRZYSZKOWSKA 1984:123–124.

⁴¹⁵ WILSON 1984:209 specifies “early in E.M.IIA” for this piece, and elsewhere (p. 302) notes that Warren’s Royal Road South EM IIA building (see Knossos D, below) is “slightly later.”

⁴¹⁶ Despite her initial hesitancy in assigning an Egyptian origin for this tooth (KRZYSZKOWSKA 1988:228), she now believes that the ivory used in Pre-Palatial Crete and probably also the Proto-Palatial period most likely originated from Egypt and not the Levant (Krzyszkowska 2001).

⁴¹⁷ WARREN 1972a; 1972b:627–629; CATLING 1972:20–21; WARREN 1973:574–576; CATLING 1973:26–29; 1974:34–35. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51 #216.

⁴¹⁸ See Knossos AA–BB, below.

phases of occupation, from the 4th c. AD., down to EM IIA levels. Apart from short preliminary reports, the excavations remain unpublished.⁴¹⁹

In the earliest level of Trench 'E,' in his 'Phase 14,' he found a house with pottery dated EM IIA, together with an imported EH IIA sauce boat spout. Other finds are not specified, but included at least one obsidian vessel fragment. At the same phase level in Trench 'F' he found fragments of at least four other EH IIA sauce boats associated with an obsidian workshop. The workshop consisted of a hearth in a hollow of the floor of a room, with a heavy concentration of hundreds of small obsidian flakes and chips adjacent to it.⁴²⁰

139. Open vessel fragment, KSM RRS/72/524 (E/RR /22\)
1139 (SMS 285)

Translucent grey obsidian with black streaks,⁴²¹ H: 1.05, W: 1.15, Th.: 0.21 cm, one rim fragment.

Bowl, beaker or chalice having a straight but diagonally oriented profile, and a slightly flaring rim.

Egyptian, Dynasty I.

Context: EM IIA.

Chronology: Dynasty I vessel, an antique in its EM IIA context.

Comparanda: (profile, but not material) EL-KHOULI 1978:659–666 Class XXVIII:c, g–h, l–m, pls. 119–120, 666 Class XXIX:c. pl. 157:5190.

References: WARREN 1972a:394 n. 3; HOOD 1978:262 n. 76; WARREN 1980:493; 1981b:630, 633–635, fig. 5, pl. 205:b:left; 1989:3, 3 n. 2; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:222 #105, pl. 70:105; PHILLIPS 1990:326–327; 1991:II:502–503 #120, III:1034 fig. 120; LILYQUIST 1996:156.

Comments: Warren does not connect the obsidian workshop with the obsidian vessel, as the material found in the workshop is implied to be Melian in origin,⁴²² the vessel fragment is not,⁴²³ and it was a distance from the workshop. He considers that, as the Minoans had only begun to manufacture stone vessels in EM II and were employing only soft stones such as chlorite,

they would hardly have been able to produce a vessel of such a hard stone as obsidian at this time.⁴²⁴ The workshop contained only flakes and chips of the material. He suggested that the vessel is Egyptian, based on other examples found there.

He originally suggested the vessel was a bowl, but his Dynasty I parallels are not similar in profile to the Knossos piece.⁴²⁵ He later (1989) suggested it was from a beaker or chalice, and quoted better parallels for the rim form but of different stones. It is evident nonetheless that this is a deep open shape, whatever its missing profile and, although shape parallels are known, none are found in obsidian. Obsidian was a stone rarely employed in Dynasty I, and its use is not correlated to vessel typology. According to Lucas, obsidian is a stone imported into Egypt, and is black, grey, green or brown in colour, which accords well with the colour of this piece.⁴²⁶ B.G. Aston notes that the only known Old Kingdom (and post-Dynasty I) obsidian vessels are a very few small Dynasty VI model 'Opening of the Mouth' vessel sets,⁴²⁷ representative of use in the ceremony to reanimate the dead. These, however, post-date the Minoan context of this fragment and are, like all such 'model' vessels, merely representative of the full-scale vessel shape.

E. Platon's Sounding North-West of the Palace

N. Platon conducted numerous soundings in and around the palace in 1955–1960. In one sounding, north-west of the palace, he recovered the following in an EM III (pre-polychrome Knossian MM IA) level.

140. Bowl, KSM — (not seen)

Siltstone,⁴²⁸ no dimensions provided, one rim/body fragment. Bowl, shallow open, with plain rounded rim and straight body profile.

Egyptian, Dynasty I(–II).

Context: EM III.

Chronology: Dynasty I(–II) vessel, an antique in its EM III context.

Comparanda: (profile) PETRIE 1937:pls. XVIII:248–249 (fig. 7.A), XX:304–305, 307; EL-KHOULI 1978:560–562 Class

⁴¹⁹ A short interpretive description of the MM III–LM IB period is made by DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:157.

⁴²⁰ WARREN 1972a:393; 1973:576; CATLING 1973:26.

⁴²¹ Although described in print as 'translucent purple' or 'lilac' in colour and 'clear, not streaky' by Warren, it is clearly grey with pockets of short black 'streaks' throughout. Warren (personal communication, September 1988) concurs.

⁴²² WARREN 1981b:630.

⁴²³ WARREN 1972a:394 n. 3. Melian obsidian is found at Knossos as early as the Early Neolithic I period (EVANS 1964a:233, 239).

⁴²⁴ WARREN 1981b:633–635.

⁴²⁵ WARREN (1981b) quotes Petrie 1901a: pl. XLVIII:X.106, a bowl with incurved rim. His other parallels are far removed from the Knossos vessel. DE MORGAN 1897:figs. 625–627 are tall, close-mouthed jars with thickened, rounded rims, and figs. 628–629 are cylindrical jars with everted rims in

travertine, not obsidian. A hand-shaped dish fragment was recovered recently in the Dynasty I tomb of Den; B.G. ASTON, HARRELL and SHAW 2000:79. Only PETRIE 1901a: pl. XLVIII:O.87 could be considered comparable, but it has a straight rim.

⁴²⁶ LUCAS and HARRIS 1962:415–416, 422. See also LUCAS 1942:271–275; 1947:113–123; B.G. ASTON 1994:23–26. This conclusion is *contra* PHILLIPS 1990:327, written prior to examination of the fragment itself.

⁴²⁷ B.G. ASTON 1994:25; clarified in B.G. ASTON, HARRELL and SHAW 2000:47. See HAYES 1953–1959:I:118 fig. 70; D'AURIA, LACOVARA and ROEHRIG 1988:80–81 #11 for examples of sets in other stones. Obsidian examples are in PETRIE 1900b:pl. XXI:upper right; FIRTH and GUNN 1926:II:pl. 15.A.4.

⁴²⁸ This is the geological term for 'greywacke,' the material identified by Warren; see B.G. ASTON 1994:28–32.

XVII.d-f, pl. 108:4329, 4333-4342; B.G. ASTON 1994:108 #44. Reference: WARREN 1989:1 n. 1.

Comments: All information is as stated in WARREN (1989), with additions and emendations from B.G. ASTON (1994) based on Warren's quoted comparanda. P. Warren identified the vessel and its material in 1987. It is being studied by A.A.D. Peatfield, but is as yet unpublished. The type is very shallow and, as described, a unique vessel on Crete. Fig. 7.A is a published comparison for this piece.

F. South-West Basement Deposit

Evans' second (1901) season of excavations began late in February in the area south of the Central Court. Here he found a number of basement rooms and corridors. Among them was a collection of rooms just off the first bend of the corridor leading to the Central Court, not all of which were accessible to each other or to the corridor.⁴²⁹ This area, as elsewhere, had been severely burnt in the destruction of the palace. The burnt debris apparently extended from close to the surface to floor level, where a pithos of burnt beans and a pile of carbonised cereal identified as wheat were found in two rooms.

In several of these rooms a number of clay sealings were recovered from various levels, many by sifting the fill, but above floor level and therefore almost certainly originating from an upper storey. The sealings were concentrated in the 'Room of the Seal Impressions', but others are known to come from the 'Room of the Egyptian Beans' and 'Room of the Clay Signet' nearby. Evans postulated a shrine in the upper storey above, which has been discounted by YOUNGER (1979) although the upper storey certainly existed.

Evans first identified the 'Room of the Egyptian Beans' erroneously as a 'Lapidary's Workshop' from a number of unfinished stone, bone and shell objects and unworked fragments of similar material.⁴³⁰ Younger's recent re-discovery of some of these objects in the KSM and subsequent re-analysis of the area indicates the workshop produced stone and gold seals, probably dating to LM IB. Few other finds are recorded from the area, but these included three col-

lections of cereals from two rooms, and a number of 'latish' LM IIIB vessels whose stratigraphical position is open to doubt as they apparently were not burnt.⁴³¹

Re-investigation of the entire South-West Basement area by Momigliano and Hood have assigned the seal impressions to a period after LM IB on stratigraphical grounds.⁴³² As they were burnt, and the 'latish' LM IIIB vessels were not, it seems that this material is associated with a widespread destruction in LM II and remodelling activity in LM II-III A. This apparently is not the same destruction as the 'final' one, assigned by Hood to late LM IIIA2 or IIIB.⁴³³

F.1. The 'Room of the Seal Impressions'

The 'Room of the Seal Impressions' or 'Room of the Clay Seals',⁴³⁴ contained the majority of the sealings. It is a small square room about half-way between the Central Court and the South Porch, entered from the east from the corridor through the 'Room of the Plaster Pits' and then 'Room of the Clay Signet'. Gill recently has identified 18 different seal types originating from this room, recovered above floor level and apparently fallen from an upper storey.⁴³⁵ These included chiefly animal figures, such as bulls, oxen, wild goats and dogs. No other finds were assigned specifically to this room.

Recent investigations by Momigliano have confirmed that the deposit was found above the floor, and thus the context of the sealings cannot be dated earlier than LM II, although it is noted that a large proportion of the impressions are attributable on stylistic grounds to LM IB seals.⁴³⁶

141. Nodule with seal impression, HM Σ-T 360

Clay, nodule: H: 19.5; W: 17.7; Th.: 6.9; seal impression: H: 13.7; W: 13.6 mm, one incomplete fragment.

Two-hole hanging nodule with thick twisted string impression on back, and impression probably from a lentoid seal. Impression shows a Minoan 'genius' striding to right in centre(?), with one arm extended holding(?) an elongated vessel (rhy-

⁴²⁹ EVANS 1900-1901:16-21; *PM* II.2:762-773; PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:151-156; BOARDMAN in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:9-12, 19-21; PALMER 1969:98-106. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:13-14 #22, #23-27.

⁴³⁰ Other areas also were designated with this name elsewhere, and the exact location of the 'workshop' is open to doubt. See YOUNGER 1979; HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:14 #25; MOMIGLIANO and HOOD 1994:134-139.

⁴³¹ POPHAM 1964:9.

⁴³² MOMIGLIANO and HOOD 1994:111, 112.

⁴³³ HOOD in MOMIGLIANO and HOOD 1994:128. Dating of the 'final' destruction of the palace remains controversial; see Chapter 3.

⁴³⁴ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:13 #23; see now also MOMIGLIANO and HOOD 1994:109-111, 129-132, fig. 2; POPHAM and GILL 1995:15-16, pl. 1 #25.

⁴³⁵ GILL 1965:75 #Q1-Q18; see now discussion in POPHAM and GILL 1995:15, and list in WEINGARTEN 1994:155.

⁴³⁶ MOMIGLIANO and HOOD 1994:128, 129-132; WEINGARTEN 1994:151.

ton/ewer/jug) in front. No vessel handle is shown. Ambiguous foliage(?) or figure(?) behind, with petals or leaves along two edges.

Minoan, seal impression LM I(-II?), nodule LM II-III.

Context: LM II-III A.

Chronology: LM IB(-II?) seal impression, on somewhat later LM II-III A nodule in generally contemporary context.

References: EVANS *PM* IV.2:601 #A:3; GILL 1964:15 #6, pl. 1:6; 1965:75 #Q16, pl. 6:Q16, 13:Q16; KAISER 1976:pl. 7:7; YOUNGER 1983:127; 1988a:216; PHILLIPS 1991:II:505 #121, III:1034 fig. 121; HALLAGER and WEINGARTEN 1992:178, 179 fig. 4; 1994:152 n. 8, 155; POPHAM and GILL 1995:15, 16, 31, pls. 7:Q16, 28:Q16, 39:Q16; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:159 #136.β; *CMS* II.8.1:#196.

Comments: The 'genius' is quite thin and elongated, with an almost donkey-like face and a goatlike 'horn' extending to rear of head. YOUNGER (1983) places this within his "Cretan popular" stylistic group, which he dates to the late 16th-early 15th c. BC, or LM IA?-B. Weingarten concurs with an LM I date for the seal that made this impression, and notes the shape as a "pseudo-V (grooved imprint)". As the hanging nodule type itself is not employed before the Final Palatial period, the lentoid seal used was old when it was impressed onto the nodule.

Not listed by HALLAGER (1996).

F.2. The 'Room of the Egyptian Beans'

'The Room of the Egyptian Beans,'⁴³⁷ as its name suggests, is where a small pithos of burnt beans was recovered, together with another pot containing smaller carbonised seeds; neither vase was recorded or identified, and their date(s) unknown. It is a rectangular room, larger than the 'Room of the Clay Seals'. The corridor, the northern part of which is identified as the 'Room of the Clay Signet,' separates this room from the 'Room of the Seal Impressions'. It is inaccessible to both the corridor and room to the west, with its only entrance at the south-east corner. The 'floor' is about 70 cm. above the bottom of its East-West wall foundations on the north side, yet some 5-10 cm. below the top of the earlier foundation blocks on the south side; the south wall may have supported an earlier (possibly MM IIIA) wall above it. At least seven sealings or fragments were found in this room, with impressions representing three different seals (but no Linear B tablets)⁴³⁸ but, apart from the vessels containing the beans and seeds, nothing else is recorded specifically from this room. Despite Evans' original identification, the 'workshop' is not

confined to this room, and may not have included it at all.

142. Nodules with seal impression, HMs 160 + s 161

Clay, brownish-black, HM 160: H: 20.5; W: 12.8; Th.: 6.3; HM 161: H: 19.9; W: 10.2; Th.: 9.1 mm, 2 fragments preserving about 60% of the design, on right half.

Two-hole hanging nodules having gable-shaped back with impressed thick twisted string marks, and seal impression from a lentoid seal. Impression shows a standing male(?) figure wearing a patterned robe on the left, facing right, one arm slightly lifted and remains of other from shoulder to above elbow in similar position, with a small filler of foliage behind his head. He faces an ape seated on a 'camp-stool' on the right, facing left, with upright tail behind and arm(s) bent with hand(s) in front of face. Clothing indicated by two rings around its waist. A possible 'rug' suggested by a fringe element in front of the stool. A tall floating tree with arrow-like roots and sprouting leaves at top fills the space between man and ape. The head and forepart of unidentifiable animal between the man and ape, the man's hand immediately above its head but its exact relationship to the man is lost. Minoan, seal impression LM I(B?), nodule LM II-III.

Context: LM II-III A.

Chronology: LM I(B?) seal impression, on somewhat later LM II-III nodules in generally contemporary context.

Comparison: *CMS* I:#377 (from Pylos, LH IIIB/C context).

References: EVANS 1900-1901:18 fig. 7:a; *PM* II.2:763 fig. 491; IV.2:387-388 fig. 321, 594, 601 #A:2; GILL 1965:76 #Q:19; YOUNGER 1979:261 n. 13; 1988a:345; PHILLIPS 1991:II:506 #122, III:1034 fig. 122; WEINGARTEN 1994:155, 155 n. 24; POPHAM and GILL 1995:15, 16, 29, 43.Q19, pls. 7:Q19, 28:Q19, 39:Q19; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:365, 401 #447; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:177 #162; *CMS* II.8.1:#262.

Comments: Evans identified the ape as a 'young Minotaur' but recognised its association with the ape pose. He was referring to the *Cynocephalus*; the head is particularly cynocephalic in profile and the tail short, despite the elongated body more suggestive of the *Cercopithecus*. Evans originally published this as an impression from an oval seal, and its circular shape was only recently recognised in the *CMS*. As the hanging nodule type with gable-shaped back itself is not employed before LM IIIA (or perhaps LM II), the lentoid seal used was old when it was impressed onto the nodule. Evans and Younger had both suggested it may be earlier in date than its context.

Not listed by HALLAGER (1996).

G. South Propylaeum

In the south-western wing of the palace, immediately south of the 'Central Court Sanctuary Complex,'⁴³⁹ lay an area excavated by Evans in 1900 which he identified

⁴³⁷ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:14 #26; see now also MOMIGLIANO and HOOD 1994:132-134; POPHAM and GILL 1995:15-16, pl. 1 #27.

⁴³⁸ GILL 1965:76 #Q:19-21. YOUNGER 1979:261 places these sealings in the 'Room of the Clay Signet' but, as he cites Gill as the source, this must be in error. See also

MOMIGLIANO and HOOD 1994:133, 141 for the lack of Linear B tablets, and the list provided by WEINGARTEN 1994:155. MOMIGLIANO and HOOD 1994:133 suggest the seal impression may have come from disturbed surface soil.

⁴³⁹ See GESELL 1985:85-8; also Knossos H-J, below.

originally as the 'Central Clay Area'.⁴⁴⁰ Testing also was conducted at various times between 1902 and 1905. This area lay below a 'Greek temple of later date,' in the immediate area of the 'South Propylaeum'.⁴⁴¹ The clay beneath was interpreted as bedding for the masonry. The finds were of mixed date, both LM I and LM IIIA–B material, and this area remains controversial. Evans' excavations led down through the Minoan era to the Neolithic underlay, for he found a Neolithic/Sub-Neolithic stratum below the palace level.

143. Jar ('spheroid jar'), HM A 56

'Syenite' (either granodiorite or porphyritic quartz monzodiorite),⁴⁴² H: 11.4; Dia. (rim): 12.4; (max): 16.0; (base): 6.4 cm, intact.

Spheroid, with a wide flat collar, high shoulder and flat base. Two solid roll handles on the shoulder, collar not undercut. Irregular interior profile at bottom.

Egyptian, Dynasty III–IV, more likely III.

Context: LM I, LM IIIA–B.

Chronology: Dynasty III–IV vessel, an antique in its LM I or LM IIIA–B context.

Comparison: EL-KHOULI 1978:pl. 84:2263.

References: EVANS 1902–1903:98–99, fig. 67; *PM* I:65, 67, fig. 28, 31; II.1:31 n. 1; PENDLEBURY 1930b:21 #26, pl. II:26;⁴⁴³ REISNER 1931a:203 #3; BOARDMAN in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:13 n. 2; WARREN 1965:30 #6, 36; 1969:109 Type 43:A7, P592, D314; 1976a:206–207 n. 9; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:214 #77, pl. 68:77; PHILLIPS 1991:II:507–509 #123, III:1035 fig. 123; CLINE 1994:192 #511; LILYQUIST 1996:159; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:242 #242.

Comments: Note that the profiles published by Evans and Warren do not match; that of Warren is preferred.

Evans states that the vessel was found "on the border of the Central Clay Area",⁴⁴⁴ "on the borders of the Neolithic and Sub-Neolithic clay deposit inside the South Propylaeum",⁴⁴⁵ and lying "in what we now know to have been made earth beneath the South Propylaeum".⁴⁴⁶ Its dating precludes association with any Neolithic deposit as its Egyptian date is equivalent at the earliest to the developed EM I period on Crete.⁴⁴⁷ It has in fact

no definable context whatsoever, but appears to have been found just inside the northern edge of the South Propylaeum. Warren⁴⁴⁸ supposes it probably had been part of the 'Central Shrine' deposit of vessels in the 'Room of the Stone Vases'.⁴⁴⁹ If so, it is a minimum of about 10 m. away from these vessels, a fair distance. Nonetheless, it is a reasonable suggestion especially as LM IIIA and B sherds appear also in the destruction level and in the foundations of the reoccupation level in this area.⁴⁵⁰ It may be that this vessel was separated from the others during the levelling-off of destruction debris preparatory to reoccupation. In suggesting this possibility, Warren accepts a context date far removed from its date of manufacture. Colin Macdonald (in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) suggests that the context of this vessel "may be that of the final destruction of the Palace in LM IIIA" and, sensibly, that it "once formed part of the collection of the 'Room of the Stone Vases'".⁴⁵¹ Lilyquist considers this vessel may be Minoan, without explanation.

H. The Room of the Stone Vases

The first area to be excavated by Evans in his first (1900) season proved to be the West wing of the palace; Minos Kalokairinos also dug this area in 1878. Just south of the Tripillar Shrine and its associated pillar crypts and north-east of the 'South Propylaeum,' Evans found a rectangular room opening to the south which he called the 'Room of the Stone Vases'.⁴⁵² He found a large deposit of stone vessels and other objects between 1.9 and 2.4 m. above the floor level of this room; a few others were found in the east-west passage immediately south-west of it.⁴⁵³ No ceramic vessels are associated with them.

Evans conjectured a palace treasury and associated this 'Central Treasury' with the room directly above the 'Room of the Stone Vases' itself.⁴⁵⁴ It now is assumed to have been above the 'Room of the Chariot Tablets',⁴⁵⁵ immediately to the east and separated from it only by a stairway that did not appear

⁴⁴⁰ EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900:17, pl. XIII; EVANS *PM* II.1:6–7; PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:63–68. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:15 #62.

⁴⁴¹ EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900:14–17; EVANS *PM* II.2:686–718. PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:223–226; BOARDMAN in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:13–19; PALMER 1969:71–83 thought it of LM III construction. POPHAM (with P. CALLAGHAN) 1978:186–187 has shown that "a sanctuary of some kind existed [here] from the fifth century at the latest." See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:14 #32.

⁴⁴² Compare B.G. ASTON 1994:15, 18, pl. 2.b.

⁴⁴³ Misidentified as HM 263 {163}.

⁴⁴⁴ EVANS 1902–1903:98.

⁴⁴⁵ EVANS *PM* I:65.

⁴⁴⁶ EVANS *PM* II.1:31 n. 1.

⁴⁴⁷ This had not been a problem to Evans, who had allocated a Predynastic dating to the vessel.

⁴⁴⁸ WARREN 1976a:207 n. 9.

⁴⁴⁹ Just north of the 'Central Clay Area.' A scattering of these stone vases extended as far south as the 'Room of the Clay Chest' farther to the east. See PALMER 1969:128; Knossos H, below.

⁴⁵⁰ PALMER 1969:75–78.

⁴⁵¹ See Knossos H, below.

⁴⁵² EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900:30–32; EVANS 1902–1903:36–37; *PM* II.2:820–826; PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:74–77; BOARDMAN in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:23. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16–17 #70. Note that their plan of this area is considerably different than that in the original publications and subsequent literature. See now also comments by DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:142.

⁴⁵³ BOARDMAN in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:23–24. Warren had suggested that an Egyptian stone jar {143} also may have been from this deposit originally.

⁴⁵⁴ EVANS *PM* III:4, fig. 1A; IV.2:777 n. 2.

⁴⁵⁵ See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16 #67.

on Evans' original plan. The vessels must have fallen from the upper storey when the palace was destroyed. It seems to have been part of the large 'Central Court Sanctuary Complex' which also included the two pillar crypts, the 'Tripillar Shrine,' 'Vat Room Deposit' and 'Temple Repositories' on the west side of the Central Court, and the 'Tri-Columnar Hall' on the upper floor, and other rooms.⁴⁵⁶

The considerable collection of material found in the 'Room of the Stone Vases' includes the 24 finely made stone vessels from which the room is named. Amongst these were an inordinate number of rhyta in various forms, including six piriform and fluted rhyta, three in the form of a lioness-head, a triton, and three in the familiar conical form. Other stone vessels included a large spouted bowl with two handles, triple-handled pedestal vessel with a long spout, stand, amphora, alabastra, separate 'pulley-shaped' necks and a foot. A libation table with carved base and a faience spouted jug were also found. The stone vases scattered as far south as the 'Room of the Clay Chest,' east of the South Propylaeum. Although Evans dated their context to LM II-III A1, stylistic and technical details of the vessels themselves, together with parallels elsewhere, date their manufacture to MM III-LM I.⁴⁵⁷ This context itself recently has been called into question, although one gypsum vessel *may* be LM III A⁴⁵⁸ and one converted vessel {144} can have been imported no earlier than LM II/III A1.

144. Amphora or amphoriskos/rhyton?, HM A 46

Travertine, H (pres.): 17.8; (rest.): 34.0; Dia. (rim/neck): 8.3; (max): 17.2 cm, 3 joining neck/upper body fragments, lower half and part of upper half restored, including one handle, neck removed by sawing, restored with hole at bottom.

Large, hole-mouthed amphora or amphoriskos with tapering body, high shoulder, thick body section. Two perforated vertical handles with 'pad' at junction to both points on upper body.

Egyptian, mid-late Dynasty XVIII (reigns of Amenhotep II through Akhenaten, possibly later), or Syro-Palestinian, LB IIA(-B), with alterations Minoan, apparently LM II/III A1, and thus not later than reign of Amenhotep III.

Context: LM II/III A1.

Chronology: Mid-late Dynasty XVIII (reigns of Amenhotep II

through III), or Syro-Palestinian, LB IIA vessel, reworked in LM (IB-)III A1 and in generally contemporary LM II/III A1 deposit.

Comparanda: RANDALL-MACIVER and MACE 1902:pl. XLVII:Tomb D.115; CARTER and MACE 1923-1933:III:146, pl. LXXVIII:A; WINLOCK 1948:pl. XXXVII.lower left; B.G. ASTON 1994:153 Type 182; LILYQUIST 1995:42 #93, figs. 94-95; 1996:pls. 14, 25.1-2.

References: EVANS *PM* II.2:821 fig. 537:M; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J, P617; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:222 #104, pl. 69:104; PHILLIPS 1991:II:511-512 #124, III:1036 fig. 124; CLINE 1994:201 #602; LILYQUIST 1996:147, 154, pl. 25.4;⁴⁵⁹ WARREN 1997:213-214, pl. LXXX.a; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:244 #244; MACDONALD 2001:529.

Comments: The form is strongly reminiscent of the so-called 'Canaanite commercial jar' form,⁴⁶⁰ found in Egypt and the Levant in clay. As the jar is travertine, an Egyptian origin is preferred and the profile, although a foreign type, was copied during the New Kingdom from the reign of Thutmose III. Nonetheless, an LB Syro-Palestinian origin is possible, and the form has been recovered in travertine at various Levantine sites. A similar example, used as an oil container, was found in the tomb of Tutankhamun. Note that the illustration presented here shows both the vessel with an excessively elongated lower body as presently restored, and the present author's preferred profile based on other Egyptian stone amphorae.

As the upper half only is preserved, we cannot say if the original amphora had a rounded or keeled bottom or an integral potstand (as does {114}); all are found on amphorae with 'padded' handles.⁴⁶¹ The lower half as restored is far too elongated, to judge from the interior profile of the remaining upper half,⁴⁶² as well as the comparanda quoted. The comparatively depressed position and small hollow of the handle and its articulated 'ridge' or 'pad' (including a slight 'tail' at the bottom) around both body junctions, are best compared with Syro-Palestinian examples, whilst the tapering handle profile is better paralleled in Egypt. Lilyquist notes that the particular handle/body junction, with flattened 'pads' is not attested in Egypt before the reign of Amenhotep II and continues at least until the reign of Amenhotep IV⁴⁶³ (Akhenaten) and, if so, its importation to Crete should not be earlier than LM II. Thus, its importation is generally contemporary with its LM II/III A1 context, unless this handle type developed earlier in the Levant and the Knossos example is an import from there.⁴⁶⁴

Minoan artisans have altered this particular example to convert it to a local form, possibly a rhyton, and it has been restored as such (although it is not included in KOEHL 2006). The neck, originally tall and almost cylindrical, was removed. It is possible that the other handle was removed entirely,⁴⁶⁵

⁴⁵⁶ See GESELL 1985:85-88; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:181; Knossos I-J, below.

⁴⁵⁷ WARREN 1969:84. He also equates the 'Treasury' with the similar 'Treasury' at Kato Zakro; see Kato Zakro C.I.

⁴⁵⁸ DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:142.

⁴⁵⁹ Lilyquist has conflated this vessel and HM 47 {145}. Her description on p. 147 is of the latter.

⁴⁶⁰ See AMIRAN 1970a:138-142, pl. 43.

⁴⁶¹ LILYQUIST 1995:104 figs. 94-95 (with rounded bottom), 117 fig. 146 and front cover (with integral stand); SPARKS

1998:II:180 #1381 (with tenon base for separate stand, observed in the Israel Museum, Jerusalem).

⁴⁶² The illustration shown indicates the lower profile as presently restored.

⁴⁶³ LILYQUIST 1995:19; 1996:154. The 'pads' are not found on {114}.

⁴⁶⁴ See discussion on the 'duck-head handles' in Chapter 14.

⁴⁶⁵ Note, however, that at least one Egyptian stone amphora has had one handle removed by an ancient Egyptian artisan; see EL-KHOULI *et al.* 1993:21 #41, fig. G:41.

and a hole possibly also drilled through the (missing) bottom, thus nearly producing a somewhat squat but nonetheless piri-form Minoan rhyton shape.⁴⁶⁶ The integral stand or tenon (if any existed originally) also would have been removed. There is no evidence for separate attachments in the area of the rim/mouth (e.g., as a pulley-shaped neck characteristic of this rhyton type) but, as over a quarter of the rim is missing, this possibility cannot be excluded.

As the Egyptian date of manufacture post-dates the LM IB period, after which Minoan vessel conversion generally has ceased, it seems we can assume one of two possibilities. Either this vessel should be seen as a Syro-Palestinian product rather than an Egyptian one, or Minoan artisans continued their practice of converting imported Egyptian vessels into the LM IIIA1 period, at least at Knossos and in the case of this vessel. Its material argues for an Egyptian origin, suggesting the second option as the more likely. If so, this is the latest example of a unique practice in the ancient world, paralleled in this respect only by the *gravidenflaschen* {119} from Katsamba.

145. Bottle/vessel, HM Λ 47

Banded travertine, H (pres.): 24.1; (rest.): 24.4; Dia. (rim): 6.8; (max): 15.0 cm, about one-third missing but almost entire profile preserved, restored from 10 joining fragments.

Bottle with high rounded shoulder, tapering to (missing) bottom. No rim and neck. Two tapering semi-circular deeply incised lines on shoulder at opposite sides of vessel, serving as *sfumato* handles. One drilled hole near rim, plugged by (original) bronze pin.

Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII–TIP, with alterations and additions Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM II/III A1.

Chronology: Early–mid-Dynasty XVIII (not later than reign of Amenhotep III) vessel, reworked in LM I–II/III A1 and probably an antique in somewhat later LM II/III A1 deposit.

Comparanda: BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:131–132 #126; see also 106 #91, 148–149 #150; PEET 1914:44 fig. 13 (alabaster), 125, pl. XXI:7 (clay); PETRIE 1937:pl. XXXIV:876; B.G. ASTON 1994:156 #191; (for base plugging) {551}.

References: EVANS *PM* II.2:821 fig. 537:J; GALLET DE SANTERRE 1949:5, fig. 4; KENNA 1963b:337; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:J, P608; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:221 #102, pl. 69:102; PHILLIPS 1991:II:512 #125, III:1037 fig. 125; CLINE 1994:167 #281; LILYQUIST 1996:147, pl. 8.3;⁴⁶⁷ WARREN 1997:214 #6, pl. LXXX.b; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:203 #200.

Comments: This originally seems to have been an Egyptian bottle (see fig. 10), with the (probably tapering to pointed or rounded) bottom and (probably tall and slender) neck and rim removed and the vessel converted into a different (Minoan) vessel. The incised shoulder ‘handles’ are characteristic of the Egyptian bottle form, although this particular example is both larger and squatter than most, and indicates a date likely not earlier than Dynasty XVIII; the context would provide a date

not later than the reign of Amenhotep III in any case. The hole and preserved pin at the bottom indicates it had been plugged at that end as part of the conversion, after removal of the original bottom. Probably there were four holes originally, but the vessel is restored in the other relevant areas. The profile as restored is almost complete, with a small aperture where the neck had been removed that has been (incorrectly) ‘restored’ as a rounded bottom. It must have been quite narrow in diameter, which fits the proposed original bottle form. This vessel has been treated differently from others converted into Minoan vessels, and it is difficult to judge the intended result.⁴⁶⁸ The originally rounded bottom has been cut off and the plug hole(s) indicates it was intended to have a flat base. This vessel probably would have been converted into an ‘ewer,’ ‘jar’ or ‘jug’ form. The bottle form was employed to pour spiced liquids or contain perfume in Egypt.⁴⁶⁹

146. Alabastron (Type A), HM Λ 48

Lightly banded travertine, H (pres.): 17.8; (rest.): 18.0; Dia. (rim): 5.9; (max): 16.2 cm, restored from 14 joining fragments, entire profile except bottom preserved, one rim fragment and about half of body missing.

Globular alabastron with short upright slightly flaring neck and outturned rim.

Egyptian, late MK (from within Dynasty XII) (–SIP?).

Context: LM II/III A1.

Chronology: Late Middle Kingdom (from within Dynasty XII) (–Second Intermediate Period?) vessel, an antique in its later LM II/III A1 deposit.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1937:pl. XXIX:627; {91}; {210}.

References: EVANS *PM* II.2:823–824, fig. 537:K; PENDLEBURY 1930b:22 #30:a;⁴⁷⁰ KENNA 1963b:337; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:H, P605; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:221–222 #103, pl. 69:103; PHILLIPS 1991:II:512–513 #126, III:1038 fig. 126; CLINE 1994:167 #282; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:240–242 #240.β.

Comments: As the bottom is missing, it is (theoretically, given its context) possible that this vessel was converted into a rhyton like that from the Unexplored Mansion {210}.

147. Closed vessel/footed bowl or ‘sea urchin-shaped vase’, HM Λ 49

Egyptian travertine or possibly Cretan banded tufa,⁴⁷¹ H: 13.1–14.2; Dia. (rim): 14.0–14.3; (max): 15.5–15.8; (base): 7.8 cm, restored from 10 joining fragments, some fragments missing but profile and base complete.

Bowl with globular body tapering to a pedestal-footed base. Uneven rim ‘tilting’ to one side.

Probably Minoan, MM III–LM I, just possibly Egyptian, Middle-New Kingdom.

Context: LM II/III A1.

Chronology: Probably MM III–LM I, in a somewhat later LM II/III A1 deposit.

Comparanda: VANDIER D’ABBADIE 1972:114–115 #467; DEVETSI 2000:137 #8, pl. 37.d, fig. 13; AM E 2409–2410.

⁴⁶⁶ WARREN 1969:87–88 Type 34:B:2.

⁴⁶⁷ Lilyquist has conflated this vessel and HM 46 {144}. Her description on p. 147 is, however, of HM 46 {145}.

⁴⁶⁸ WARREN 1997:214 suggests several possibilities, none entirely convincing.

⁴⁶⁹ BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:131–132.

⁴⁷⁰ Hand-written addition to his personal copy, now in the Villa Ariadne Library, Knossos.

⁴⁷¹ WARREN 1969:102. It might also be white marble.

References: EVANS *PM* II.2:821 fig. 537:L; WARREN 1969:102 Type 42:B, P580; PHILLIPS 1991:II:513–514 #127, III:1039 fig. 127; LILYQUIST 1996:147 n. 121; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:244 #245.

Comments: Warren initially suggested this may be another Egyptian alabastron converted into a Minoan vessel by local craftsmen. The suggestion is reasonable but inaccurate, as the base is not only complete but part of the original vessel and quite thick; it is not plugged. However, the unevenness of the rim suggests that the upper part of a taller vessel has been removed, and so this may also have been converted to its present appearance by removal of the upper body. If so, the original vessel must have been an open form, for the interior is smoothed. Care has been taken in the final appearance, with the exception of the tilt, for the rim has been smoothed and rounded on the exterior edge. Alternatively, the rim may have been accidentally chipped, and repaired by smoothing the rim to its present tilted appearance. The form is very rare, suggesting that it might have been converted, but whether of original Minoan or Egyptian type is dependent on the presently uncertain identification of the material as local or not.

Some comparanda listed are Egyptian footed bowls dated to Dynasty XVIII of shape similar to the Knossos vessel. Possible Minoan vessels with similar profile and scale and generally similar date are a bridge-spouted bowl and a jug.⁴⁷²

Nonetheless, it is more than likely the Knossos vessel may always have had its present shape, which is paralleled (with the exception of the uneven rim) in a ‘sea urchin-shaped’ vase of ‘white marble’ from Akrotiri on Thera and thus dated not later than LM IA (late). This seems to not be an example of a converted vessel.

148. Alabastron (Type C)/animal-head rhyton?, AM AE 1181(a)

Banded travertine, H: (pres.) 17.1, Dia.: (base) 5.9; W: (pres.) 8.15 cm, eight joining body and base, and one probable non-joining body fragments.

‘Drop-shaped’ alabastron with flat bottom, curved tapering lower to mid-body. One large and two misaligned small drilled holes at maximum diameter, one small hole apparently plugged with unidentified substance. Each small hole with two parallel roughly incised lines dragging towards large hole. Base with a large hole off-centre near one edge, possibly cutting into body bottom junction; this basal hole is aligned exactly opposite the large body hole.

Egyptian, Dynasty XII–SIP (–early Dynasty XVIII?), with alterations Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM II/IIIA1.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–SIP (–early Dynasty XVIII?), reworked in LM I and an antique or ‘heirloom’ found in a somewhat later LM II/IIIA1 deposit.

Comparanda: (hole at top) *PM* II.2:828 fig. 542.

References: *PM* II.2:827 (generally); WARREN 1969:90 Type 34.E; 1997:214–215 #7, pl. LXXX.c; BEVAN 2001:II:415 fig. 6.35.e.left; KOEHL 2006:37, 122–123 #331.

Comments: Apparently identified by Warren as being from the ‘Central Treasury,’ but not so cited in the AM register. Other

fragments included under the AM AE 1181 accession number represent at least four further separate vessels, judging from their diameters and differences in the stone material. Some probably are Minoan whilst others could be Egyptian. The stone itself mostly is banded travertine, although some (probably indigenous) calcite also is represented. One other vessel is likely to be Egyptian, from the available fragments, and {148} is distinguished from {149} below by adding the letters a–b; note that not all fragments are illustrated by Bevan.

Warren considered this to be an Egyptian alabastron converted to a lion/lioness rhyton. He discounts the possibility that this fragment may be part of {147} above after detailed study and comparison, and suggests without serious conviction that it might be interpreted as having been converted into an animal-head rhyton with the aid of several separately made attachments and the two holes still visible. Neither of the two preserved large holes are specifically indicative of a rhyton, and it may be that another vessel was intended. Conversion from an alabastron, as he says, is clear, but the final result is difficult to determine with any certainty. Its flat base would make it a Type C alabastron.

A circular fragment also found amongst the AM AE 1181 fragments appears initially to be the circular part of an alabastron base removed as part of the conversion process. It does not fit the body hole of this vessel, but does fit the diameter of the off-centre basal hole. Its section thickens dramatically to one side at one point along the cut edge, whilst the opposite ‘side’ is broken off in a manner that does not include the junction with the lowermost body. It may have been cut on the basal edge and continued around onto the lower body, hence producing the cut section as found. Whether this was intended to have been used on the final (Minoan) vessel is unknown, and would depend on what this final vessel shape would have been. The large body hole and associated attachment holes suggest that the alabastron would have been turned upside down and a spout of some kind attached at this point in a manner similar to {551}. The basal hole – actually at the rim position of the converted vessel – seems far too large and inconveniently placed for a handle. The original rim, i.e., the base of the converted vessel, is lost.

149. Closed vessel (amphora?), AM AE 1181(b)

Banded travertine, Dia.: (base) 6.4; H: (pres.) 8.3 cm, three joining lower body and one non-joining base fragments.

Closed vessel, large, with flattened base curving to diagonal lower body.

Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII (from reign of Amenhotep I).

Context: LM II/IIIA1.

Chronology: Dynasty XVIII (from reign of Amenhotep I) vessel, found in a somewhat later to generally contemporary LM II/IIIA1 deposit.

Comparanda: D’AURIA, LACOVARA and ROEHRIG 1988:129 #77; B.G. ASTON 1994:153–154 #182.

References: BEVAN 2001:II:415 fig. 6.35.ecentre (body), upper centre right (base).

Comments: See {148} above for general context background. The dating cited rests on the assumption that this is an amphora. This base is not a Minoan type, but does appear on

⁴⁷² WARREN 1969:33–34 Type 13.B, 47–48 Type 22.C.

Egyptian amphorae and other vessels. This vessel quite clearly is a closed shape. Amphorae are the only closed vessels with such a small basal diameter, although the angle of the lower body (as illustrated) is more squat than usual.

I. The Room of the Stone Vats

The 'Room of the Stone Vats,' a long narrow magazine excavated by Evans in 1900, lies immediately north of the East Pillar Crypt, west of the 'Temple Repositories,' and is considered to belong to the 'Central Court Sanctuary Complex'.⁴⁷³

Evans excavated below the paving at the entrance to this magazine in 1903. He found a plaster-lined pit about a metre deep containing a substantial deposit of early artefacts dug into the underlying Neolithic stratum, and concluded that it was part of the contents of a 'treasury' belonging to the sanctuary of a building prior to the later palace (possibly the first palace, possibly an even earlier structure); this generally is known as the 'Vat Room Deposit'.⁴⁷⁴ The contents included decorated and undecorated amphorae, jars, bowls and cups (including some Cycladic vessels), dating chiefly to MM IA but also including earlier and later material and in particular many MM IB wheel-made wares.⁴⁷⁵ MacGillivray suggests the deposit could have been formed at one time, and puts this at an early stage of MM IB, very early in the Proto-Palatial period.⁴⁷⁶ Panagiotaki prefers to leave the date of the deposit as "within the Old Palace Period" and connects their overall character with other deposits affected by the MM IB destruction fire.

The 'treasury' otherwise consists of obsidian blades, cores, flakes, a nodule and unworked fragments, a flint or chert fragment, a crystal core, bead and other fragments, pieces of gold sheeting, copper or bronze fragments, stone cups, lids, vase and bridge-spouted jar fragments mainly of banded tufa, many small faience and frit beads of various shapes, faience and shell inlays, hippopotamus ivory plaques, the forearm of a faience figurine, clay sealings, and worked ostrich eggshell inlay pieces and fragments of at least one ostrich eggshell imported from Egypt, Libya or the Levant.

150. Beads. AM AE 2305a-b + HM unnumbered (not seen) Bright green faience with core and string-hole surface white, quantity: 5–9. L: 9–10, D: 13–17, Th.: 5, SH: 10–11 mm, intact (2), half-preserved (4), quarter preserved (3), all worn and powdery.

Beads, large annular, with wide string-hole.

Probably Minoan, MM I, just possibly Egyptian, Dynasty VI. *Context:* MM IB (early).

Chronology: MM I or Dynasty VI objects, in a generally contemporary or somewhat later MM IB (early) deposit (if Minoan).

Comparison: ENGELBACH and GUNN 1923:pl. LIV:85.D.

References: EVANS 1902–1903:98; SCHMIDT 1905:360–361; EVANS *PM* I:169, 170, 487, 490, fig. 120:centre, above container; HOOD 1978:132; FOSTER 1979:77, 115, 153; PHILLIPS 1991:II:515 #128; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:36 fig. 14:115, 40, 66 #115–118, pl. 8:a, e.

Comments: Evans originally described bugle and globular beads with a very large perforation that possibly are Dynasty VI in date, a description which seems to fit the larger of the two types he illustrated later in his final report. Hood believed them to be Egyptian, although Foster classified them as local products and the recent thorough study by Panagiotaki came to the same conclusion (pending analyses in progress).

151. Bead. HM unnumbered (not seen)

Bright green faience with core and string-hole surface white, L: 21.2, Th.: 3.7–4 mm, broken off both ends, worn and powdery. Tubular bead, one end (as preserved) wider in diameter than the other, string-hole through length.

Probably Minoan, MM I, just possibly Egyptian, Dynasty VI–MK.

Context: MM IB (early).

Chronology: MM I or Dynasty VI–early Dynasty XII object, in a generally contemporary or somewhat later MM IB (early) deposit.

Comparanda: SEAGER 1912:pl. 20.IV.11, 55.VI.35; PENDLEBURY, PENDLEBURY and MONEY-COUTTS 1935–1936:123 fig. 26.e; ALDRED 1978:31 fig. upper; BROVARSKI *et al* 1982:234 #307; ANDREWS 1990:27 fig. 18, 67 fig. 50; {443?}.

References: EVANS 1902–1903:98; SCHMIDT 1905:360–361; EVANS *PM* I:169, 170, 487, 490, fig. 120:centre, above container; FOSTER 1979:77, 115, 153; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:36 fig. 14:119, 40, 66 #119, pl. 8:a.lower right.

Comments: Evans originally described bugle and globular beads, of which this must be the 'bugle' type. Whilst it resembles Egyptian faience tubular beads, especially those employed on 'broad-collar' (*wsh*) necklaces from the Old Kingdom on (as that of the Dynasty XI steward Wah), it is more likely to be a local product. Tubular faience beads are known elsewhere on Crete at this early period, including the Trapeza

⁴⁷³ EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900:34, pl. XIII; EVANS *PM* I:165–172; PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:80–82; BOARDMAN in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:26. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16 #77; GESELL 1985:86; PANAGIOTAKI 1999; Knossos H, above, and Knossos J, below.

⁴⁷⁴ See PANAGIOTAKI 1999:8–43 for a comprehensive reassessment of this pit and its contents.

⁴⁷⁵ EVANS 1902–1903:94–98; *PM* I:165–172. See also WARREN

1967b:200 n. 35; YULE 1981:12; BETANCOURT 1985:79; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:34–35; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:9–23, 41–43. Warren suggests the deposit may have been contaminated by LM II–IIIA material, and Panagiotaki notes the presence of two marble lids (otherwise not found prior to LM II–IIIA1) and an MM IIIB–LM IA pithos fragment amongst Evans' finds from here.

⁴⁷⁶ MACGILLIVRAY 1998:35.

cave (EM III–MM I) and Mochlos tombs IV and VI (EM II–MM III), but these are dissimilar to this bead and to Egyptian tubular beads in general, being tapering or badly made, short with a wide string-hole, or convex-sided.

152. Beads. AM AE 2304 + HM Σ–K 3659 (not seen)
‘Egyptian blue,’ Dia.: (average) 2–3, SH: 1 mm, 1,692 intact and 23 fragments, hard and well-preserved.

Small circular beads of varying thickness, unglazed, with string-hole.

Minoan, MM IA–early IB.

Context: Early MM IB.

Chronology: Minoan, MM IA–early IB objects, in a generally contemporary or somewhat later MM IB (early) deposit.

Comparison: (material) {443}.

References: EVANS 1902–1903, 98; *PM* I:170, fig. 120:container; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:40–41, 66 #120–121, pl. 8:c; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:114 #92.

Comments: A total of 1,611 whole and 22 fragmentary beads constitute the HM collection, whilst a further 81 whole and one fragment are in the AM. Their colour is a ‘deep cobalt blue’ throughout.⁴⁷⁷ They are quite tiny in scale and probably (as noted by Panagiotaki) were originally a complete necklace, or possibly another piece of beaded jewellery;⁴⁷⁸ they have been restrung as such. The large faience beads {150} would not have been part of this same necklace, if only due to their extremely large string-hole totally incompatible to the string-holes of these tiny beads. The ‘Egyptian blue’ beads are included here as they would have been considered imported objects, as they are the only objects of this material recovered on Crete prior to the Neo-Palatial period other than, probably, the cylindrical beads from Pezoules Kephales {443}. However, recent analysis by M. Tite and others have indicated conclusively that the Knossos beads in fact are indigenous Aegean products.⁴⁷⁹ As objects of ‘Egyptian blue’ generally survive better than those of faience, it is unlikely that their absence elsewhere at this period is the result of non-survival.

153. Eggshell fragments. HM Λ 4364 (not seen)

Ostrich eggshell, Th.: 1.9–2 mm, 24 fragments of various sizes, including joining groups of nine (9.37 × 6.8 mm), four (5.92 × 4.22 mm), three (4.26 × 2.6 mm), and two (2.5 × 1.7 mm), and six non-joining (2.94 × 2.33 mm).

Body fragments.

Probably from Libya or Egypt, or Syro-Palestine, undateable.

Context: Early MM IB.

Chronology: Undateable but early Dynasty XII or earlier object(s), in an early MM IB deposit. *Comparanda:* {108}, {425}.

References: EVANS *PM* I:169–170, fig. 120:lower right; SAKELARAKIS 1990:289, 290 fig. 22; PHILLIPS 1991:II:515–516 #129, III:1039 fig. 129; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:38, 65 #99.a–e, pl. 7.a, .c; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:30–31 #9.b.

Comments: Three of the nine joining fragments were identified as the “remains of a vase of marble-like material” by Evans; these and the remainder were relocated and recomposed by Panagiotaki. Panagiotaki makes no mention of the possibility of more than a single eggshell being represented by these 24 fragments, and indeed there is substantially less than enough for one amongst them. She notes many of these pieces are roughly of triangular shape, and may have been used as inlays, although she makes no mention of their being worked. She also notes that several have a circular form at the (unpolished) edge, reminiscent of the mouth of ostrich-eggshell rhyta.⁴⁸⁰ The early context date precludes any possibility of conversion into a rhyton,⁴⁸¹ however, although the religious association is certain; perhaps eventually the form derived in part from the use of such vessels on Crete, although there is no further direct evidence of ostrich-eggshell vessels in the Aegean prior to the late Proto-Palatial rhyta such as {236}.

154. Eggshell fragment. HM unnumbered (not seen)

Ostrich eggshell, H: 18.8, W: 1.3, Th.: 1.9 mm, one fragment.

Body fragment, triangular shape, slightly polished upper surface and matte underside.

Probably from Libya or Egypt, or Syro-Palestine, undateable.

Context: Early MM IB.

Chronology: Undateable but early Dynasty XII or earlier object, in an early MM IB deposit.

Comparanda: {108}, {425}.

Reference: PANAGIOTAKI 1999:38, 65 #98, pl. 7.a.top.

Comments: This fragment is distinguished from those of {153} above by Panagiotaki on two points: the edges are roughly cut (although unpolished) and the exterior surface has dark brown spots. Thus this *may* represent a second eggshell, and also may have been used as an inlay piece.

155. Inlays. AM AE 1941 + HM Λ 4359 (not seen)

Ostrich eggshell, quantity: 3, (A) L: (max.) 1.7, W: (max.) 7.2, Th.: 1.4–1.6 mm, chipped at edge; (B) L: 22.4, W: (max.) 8.6, Th.: 1.5–1.8 mm, chipped at pointed end; (C) L: 19.4, W: (max.) 8.6, Th.: 1.6–1.8 mm, intact.

Inlays, petaloid loop shape, slightly curving section, slightly bevelled and finely polished edges, matte underside and polished upper surface.

Probably from Libya or Egypt, or Syro-Palestine, undateable but not later than Dynasty XII, probably Minoan MM IA–early IB work.

Context: Early MM IB.

Chronology: Probably MM IA–early IB objects, in a generally contemporary or slightly later early MM IB sanctuary deposit.

References: EVANS *PM* I:169–170, fig. 120:middle right; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:36 fig. 14:96.A, 37–38, 64–65 #96–97,⁴⁸² pl. 7.b, .d.top; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:30–31 #9.a.

⁴⁷⁷ A few more beads of green (1) and white (3) colours (in frit or other materials?) are found in the HM group.

⁴⁷⁸ E.g., a girdle such as that from Mostagedda grave 592 of Badarian date; see ANDREWS 1990:51 fig. 37.

⁴⁷⁹ See PANAGIOTAKI *et al.* 2004:173–174.

⁴⁸⁰ The only good example of this seems to be the lower left edge of her pl. 7.c, judging only from the photographs published.

⁴⁸¹ Non-zoomorphic rhyta did not appear in Crete until MM II, with the single exception of an MM I piriform vessel at Khamaizi; see KOEHL 2000:94 (*contra* 1981:187).

⁴⁸² Note that her reference to BROWN 1986:63 fig. 31 is incorrect; all objects depicted are clay vessels.

Comments: All three petaloid loops are of slightly different scale, but all clearly were intended as inlay pieces. Their settings are unknown.

156. Fragment. KSM Box 751 (not seen)

Flint or chert, dark brown, L: 7.5, W: 2.3–3.6 cm, fragment with battered and chipped edges and surfaces, traces of weathering at pointed end.

Irregular shape, with one concave surface and the other “crest-like,” with thinly distributed patches of white substance. Shape “recalls a single axe-head”.

Possibly Egyptian, undateable.

Context: Early MM IB

Chronology: Undateable early Dynasty XII or earlier Egyptian object, in an early MM IB deposit.

Comparison: (material) {137}.

Reference: PANAGIOTAKI 1999:30, 62 #68.10.

Comments: All information from PANAGIOTAKI 1999. She compares the material to the possibly Egyptian knife blade {137}. If comparable, this would suggest the attribution of this fragment as possibly Egyptian is dependent on the attribution of the knife, although its dating is limited to not later than its context.⁴⁸³ This material comparison suggests the ‘white patches’ are material components rather than encrustation, although this is not stated.

J. The Temple Repositories

Immediately between the ‘Room of the Stone Vats’ and ‘Tripartite Shrine’⁴⁸⁴ Evans found in 1903 two rectangular rooms which he named the ‘Room of the Two Cists’⁴⁸⁵ (to the north) and the ‘Room of the Great (or Tall) Pithos’⁴⁸⁶ (to the south). Evans and later scholars consider them part of the ‘Central Court Sanctuary Complex,’⁴⁸⁷ as they directly relate to the tripartite shrine by the ‘Lobby of the Stone Seat’.⁴⁸⁸ The northern of these two rooms was found to have two small stone slab-lined rectangular but lidless cists incorporated below the gypsum-slab floor, at the centre and western sides of the room.⁴⁸⁹ Evans soon noted a depression in the floor on the eastern side, and discovered a large (1.94 by 1.46 by 1.64 m.) covered cist of dove-tailed stone slabs of earlier date, now called the ‘East Repository’. A second of slightly smaller dimensions (1.76 by 1.37 by 1.5 m.), the ‘West Depository,’ was found in the western half of

the room, surrounding and incorporating the later western cist. This and surrounding rooms were later used to store oil, and fire damage here was extensive. A pithos and sealings of a later date found on the floor of the room were connected with this use.

Both earlier cists seem to have contained two distinctly stratified layers of finds. The upper 1.1 m. of the ‘East Repository’ was packed with a total of about 40 clay vessels, chiefly oval-mouthed amphorae, jars and jugs of MM IIIB to LM IA date, mixed with rubble and gold foil. The space below was filled with a collection of cult objects, all grouped together and according to material within more compact and “fatter” earth. The ‘West Repository’ contained a mixed but lesser variety of cult objects, with proportionally more pots and gold foil, crystal etc. There is some confusion as to what was found in each cist, and this mostly cannot be determined. Fish vertebrae and a ‘weasel’ skull also were found, together with thousands of sea shells.

The ‘East Repository’ cult objects consisted of numerous faience vessels and objects including the three snake goddess figurines; the middle part of one was found in the ‘West Repository,’ the remainder being from the other. Other objects included plaques of a cow and a goat suckling their young, miniature bowls and baskets, two tall cups, a jug, and plaque components in the form of flowers, fruit, other animals, marine life and objects, figure-of-eight shields, and plain flat and ‘ring’ forms, together with around 2000 beads of various forms. A large number of seal impressions, estimated at 52, were also recovered on flat-based and hanging nodules, noduli, roundels and direct sealings, apparently all found in the ‘East Repository’.⁴⁹⁰

Other objects, probably from the ‘West Repository,’ were recorded as a crystal inlay with silver foil backing, bronze handles and a clamp, two stone (breccia and limestone) hammers, and a clay Linear A tablet. Also found were four small square stone libation tables, a large flat marble cross, ivory and

⁴⁸³ As it is found and recorded only from the KSM box and is the only non-obsidian piece there, its origins can be compared again with the knife blade.

⁴⁸⁴ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16 #85.

⁴⁸⁵ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16 #80; add DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:141. See now the detailed reassessment of this room and its deposits by PANAGIOTAKI 1999:71–179 and *passim*, which supercedes all earlier work; surrounding areas also are discussed in as much detail.

⁴⁸⁶ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16 #79.

⁴⁸⁷ GESELL 1985:85–88. See also Knossos H–I, above.

⁴⁸⁸ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16 #78.

⁴⁸⁹ EVANS 1902–1903:fig. 19.

⁴⁹⁰ POPHAM and GILL 1995:29–35 *passim* note many of these sealings, and suggest that two without provenance from Knossos ({308}; {317}) also may have been from this deposit. See, however, PANAGIOTAKI 1995; 1999:104–118, for a detailed reconstruction of the seal impressions from this deposit. Both sealings are catalogued amongst the unprovenanced palace finds in the present study.

bone handles and inlays, bone arrow plumes, faience tall cylindrical offering cups, faience beads and inlays, together with four deer antlers and the carbonised remains of wood and corn.

The two cist deposits are contemporary, shown by their similar situations and the joining fragments of the snake goddess. The gypsum floor laid over both suggests deliberate sealing of the contents, and subsequent lack of disturbance. They probably are cult objects (and offerings?) ritually buried together following destruction of the shrine in which they were used. The deposit of cult objects is connected to the later palace and their deposition must date to sometime in LM IA as the vessels above them are definitive of the final stage of MM III and the majority of seal impressions appear to date to Neo-Palatial; it is at any rate after the MM IIIB destruction.⁴⁹¹ The recently defined 'MM IIIB-LM IA transitional' is a likely possibility, although later in LM IA ('mature') probably is to be preferred.⁴⁹²

157. Figurine. HM 57 + 65 (not handled)

Glazed faience, H: 29.5, without head: H: 20 cm; cat figure: H: 3.5 cm, restored from numerous joining fragments, several fragments (including complete head, part of skirt, left arm and polis) missing and restored. Cat's tail missing but not restored.

Figurine in the form of a standing female figure with arms upraised and speckled snakes coiled around lower arms, wearing a long seven-flounced skirt with bare-breasted bodice and dropped overskirt. *Polis* head-dress with raised medallions identified as 'roses' around side. Dress highly decorated, multi-coloured and glazed. Long trailing hair front and back to hip level. Separate seated cat figurine, with head turned to left at right angle to body and small hole at bottom corresponding to small hole on 'polis,' reconstructed as sitting atop the *polis*. Cat glazed yellowish-brown with black dots.⁴⁹³

Minoan, MM IIIB-LM IA.

Context: LM IA (early-'mature').

Chronology: MM IIIB-LM IA object, in a generally contemporary or slightly later LM IA (early-'mature') deposit.

References: EVANS 1902-1903:figs. 56.a-b, 57; *PM* I:503-505, fig. 362; BOSSERT 1923:22-23 #103-104; pls. 13-104; EVANS *PM* III:440, 442 fig. 306; HOOD 1978:133, fig. 123; SAKELLARAKIS 1978:37 Fig.:left; FOSTER 1979:72, 74-75 pl. 10-11; MORGAN 1988:184 n. 15; PHILLIPS 1991:II:518 #130, III:1040 fig. 130; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:364, 393 #282; PANAGIOTAKI 1993:57-58; 1999:97, 99 fig. 25, 161 #211-211.a, pl. 17.middle right.

Comments: Despite Evans' identification as a "miniature lioness" or "spotted pard" and Hood's suggestion that it

might represent a leopard, the animal appears to represent a cat. Indications are the overly large ears and flattened facial profile, unlike the elongated profile and proportionately smaller ears of the larger felines. It probably is to be identified with the *Felis silvestris* species, due to its spotted coat. The goddess' head was never found, and the cat and *polis* later were attached onto the figure although, as Panagiotaki has pointed out, there is no evidence to indicate that they actually belong to the same figure. The cat was catalogued separately as HM 57 before its attachment.

K. The North-West Central Court

Evans excavated the north-west area of the palace in 1900, including that portion of the Central Court which he called the 'Eastern Court' at that time. He found a small remaining patch of pavement belonging to the original surface of the Central Court at its north-west corner, which he called the 'East Paved Area' when he excavated it that season.⁴⁹⁴ He also conducted a number of 'test pits' below the pavement level here in 1913, finding material below the court surface as late as LM IIIA2 and as early as Neolithic.⁴⁹⁵

158. Statuette. HM A 95

Anorthosite gneiss,⁴⁹⁶ H (pres.): 15.8; W (base): 7.3; D: 14.4 cm, lower half only preserved and damaged at edges and corners, both elbows, right hand and knee, and part of left hand, upper half from waist missing.

Male figure frontally seated on a block 'throne' with legs together, feet resting on projecting base, and hands and arms resting on thighs, left palm flat and right hand clenched on knees. Figure wearing a short unpleated kilt with low-slung plain wide waistband. Fingers, toes and kilt indicated by incised lines, fingernails, toenails and navel carved. Inscription crudely incised on back and both sides of throne: Back: *im3hy hr ntr 3^c nb pt wdh (?) nb ms w3dt wsr m3^c-hrw*, 'One who is honoured by the great god, Lord of Heaven, caster(?) of gold, born of the Wadjet-nome, Weser, justified'. Inscribed in two vertical columns. Right side: *im3h wdh (?) nb ms w3dt wsr m3^c-hrw*, 'The honoured one, caster(?) of gold, born of the Wadjet-nome, Weser, justified...'. Inscribed in one vertical column. Left side: *ms n im3ht s3t-Hwt-hr m3^ct-hrw*,⁴⁹⁷ '...who was born of/to the honoured one, Sat-Hathor, justified'. Inscribed in three horizontal lines.

Egyptian, Dynasty VI-Middle Kingdom.

Context: MM III-LM IIIA2 (generally).

Chronology: Dynasty VI-MK object, in a problematic context probably MM III-LM IIIA2.

References: EVANS *et al.* 1899-1900:27; EVANS 1899-1900:65-66, pl. opp. 65; *PM* I:286-290, fig. 220; II.1:219-220; II.2:800-801; FIMMEN 1924:171 fig. 166; EVERS 1929:II:96; PENDLEBURY 1930b:22 #29, pl. II:29; STEINDORFF 1936:173; PORTER and

⁴⁹¹ BETANCOURT 1985:103; PANAGIOTAKI 1993:88; 1999:256.

⁴⁹² On the history and definition of 'MM IIIB-LM IA transitional' see, most recently, WARREN 1999. On the vessels found and their dating, see PANAGIOTAKI 1999:131-148, 151.

⁴⁹³ For colouration of the rest of the figure, see PANAGIOTAKI 1993:57.

⁴⁹⁴ EVANS *et al.* 1899-1900:26-27, 63-64, pl. XIII. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:16 #85.

⁴⁹⁵ PALMER 1969:20-21, 57; WOTZKA 1990:452.

⁴⁹⁶ See B.G. ASTON 1994:62-64.

⁴⁹⁷ The final sign written in error for GARDINER 1957:541 (Aa 11).

MOSS 1927–1952:VII:405; WARD 1961:27–29; BOARDMAN in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:29, 30 n. 1; PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:x, xxiii–xxiv; PALMER 1965:221–223; 1969:19–20, 55, 117; WARD 1971:80–81 n. 221–223; POMERANCE 1973:25–26; BETANCOURT and WEINSTEIN 1976:336; WARD 1977:269–271; HELCK 1979:47–48; PALMER 1981:127 n. 27; CADOGAN 1983:516; UPHILL 1984; EDEL 1990; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:219–220 #99, pl. 18:99; PHILLIPS 1990:322 n. 18; WOTZKA 1990; PHILLIPS 1991:II:519–523 #131, III:1041–1042 fig. 131; LILYQUIST 1996:159 n. 214; PANAGIOTAKI 1999:254; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:61–62 #39.

Comments: As with the Khyan lid {163} deposition, Evans apparently erred in reading his notes. His original notebook stated it was found “on the south side of the paved court,” and D. MacKenzie’s daybook noted it was “just on the pavement about .70 m. down”. Evans’ preliminary published report⁴⁹⁸ correctly ascribed the find location as “70 cm. below the surface on the edge of a small remaining patch of pavement,” and his final report⁴⁹⁹ relocated the position to “70 cm. below” the pavement surface in a “clearly” MM IIB context in one of the test pits dug in 1913. Its apparent findspot above the pavement level suggests an association with the Throne Room Complex and a context date no earlier than MM III when the second palace was constructed,⁵⁰⁰ but it is clear from Evans’ original description that no pavement remained where the statuette was found. No other finds are published in association with it, but three days later two inscribed clay tablets were found “almost at the surface” in the north-west corner of the Central Court. Evans’ dating of the statuette to the Middle Kingdom clarified for him the relative dating for the MM IIB period, but the circumstances as known do not allow such clear-cut association. The stratigraphy is best described at present as unreliable, and the statuette’s date of deposition unclear. Wotzka, who has examined both Evans’ and his critics’ interpretation of the findspot in some detail, has concluded that neither in fact are entirely correct, and that the statuette was found without a pottery context and thus is useless for chronological purposes.

The major problem in dating the statuette itself is the lack of the upper torso and head, those parts of the body that best aid in dating. The general appearance seems to reflect the Middle Kingdom, but the statuette may be as early as Dynasty

VI. The kilt waistband, for example, is typical of those from Dynasty VI–early XII.⁵⁰¹ One of Weser’s titles, that of *wdh* (?) *nb*, is unique. A similar title, that of *imy-r^cwdh* (?) *nb*, ‘overseer of goldcasting,’ is known from the Dynasty VI stele of Taw found at Edfu, but is the only near-parallel example.⁵⁰² Whilst not conclusive evidence for a Dynasty VI dating, there is nothing about the statuette that would preclude such a date either but it may well in fact be later.

Another title, *ms w3dt*, has been linked to an early Dynasty V tomb inscription⁵⁰³ and a Dynasty XIII scarab.⁵⁰⁴ Although it had been suggested that the statuette and scarab belonged to the same individual due to the rarity of his title, this no longer is tenable.⁵⁰⁵ Griffith (in EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900) originally suggested the statue may have come from the Aphroditopolite (Wadjet-) nome (the 10th nome) of Upper Egypt, translating the inscription to indicate Weser was born there; this translation, although much discussed, usually is accepted.⁵⁰⁶

A number of theories have arisen concerning why the private statuette of an unremarkable, unimportant person should have been found at Knossos, including that of Ward⁵⁰⁷ who suggested at first that he was a “goldsmith who had left his native land to seek his fortunes abroad and that he was in Knossos in the capacity of a private individual” rather than an Egyptian court official. Alternative suggestions involved a political or diplomatic mission, or dominance of Egypt over the island, especially employing the Khyan lid {163} as evidence for a widespread Hyksos empire stretching as far as Babylon and Crete. Under any of these theories one also would have to assume either this unimportant private individual was a trained scribe, or that either the statuette or a scribe accompanied him to Knossos, in order to account for the text itself.

Weser himself almost certainly never set foot on Crete at all, and even may not have left his homeland. The statuette should be considered as another import like the scarabs inscribed with royal names and, indeed, the Khyan lid {163} itself. The final epithet, *m3^ct-hrw*, normally would suggest the statuette is a funerary object, as the term usually is applied only to the dead. This maxim is not universal, for several examples of the term are known in contexts where the individual clearly is amongst the living.⁵⁰⁸ However, these contexts are not on object inscriptions, and it is most likely the statuette original-

⁴⁹⁸ EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900:27, i.e., pl. XIII:Sq. K7.

⁴⁹⁹ EVANS *PM* I:286.

⁵⁰⁰ See GESELL 1985:88–89; she seems to be the latest to continue accepting Evans’ location of the statuette, p. 4, despite the growing acceptance of alternative evidence.

⁵⁰¹ EVERS 1929:II:34 #225.

⁵⁰² See WARD 1977. He suggests this man may have been an overseer of specialist metalworkers having the same title as Weser. See also ALLIOT 1935:29 #D:b, pl. XIV:3.

⁵⁰³ By WARD 1961:28. See MURRAY 1908:pl. XXV:middle row, 27 down; from LEPSIUS 1849–1858:II:pl. 23 and JUNKER 1934:184 fig.28, from Tomb G5150 of Sesephotep-Heti at Giza (PORTER and MOSS 1960–III.1:149–150). The *hm-k3* priest ‘Ankhem’akh, *ms.f dt*, is in the lower left corner of the composition.

⁵⁰⁴ Also by WARD 1961:28. STEINDORFF 1936:173–174 #117, pl. IV:117; MARTIN 1971:39 #429, pl. 13:Type I:ak:8. The latter dates the scarab type to Dynasty XIII. The inscrip-

tion reads *smsw h3yt Wsr-w3dyt*, ‘Elder of the Portal, Weser-wadjet.’

⁵⁰⁵ The man’s name is not Weser but Weser-wadjet, according to MARTIN 1971:39. Additionally, the writing of the (formerly-identified) title of *W3dt* is quite unusual for identification with the 10th Upper Egyptian nome of Wadjet and the remainder of the title, *ms*, is not present.

⁵⁰⁶ Two Upper Egyptian nomes are identified as ‘Aphroditopolis,’ the 10th and 22nd. The 22nd, however, is symbolised by the knife hieroglyph (T 30), whilst the 10th is represented by the snake (I 10) with ostrich feather (H 6) on its back. Its capital was at Antaeopolis and its nome-deity (like the 22nd) was Hathor; see WILSON 1997:xlii.

⁵⁰⁷ WARD 1961:29.

⁵⁰⁸ Two inscriptions from the Wadi Hammamat can be cited as examples: COUYAT and MONTET 1912:48 #43.12, pl. XIII and 91–92 #70, pl. XX.

ly came from a tomb or possibly was a temple/shrine donation in honour of the deceased. Its circumstances probably should be considered as similar to the Early Dynastic to Middle Kingdom vessels found in MM III–LM III contexts.

L. The Hieroglyphic Deposit

Evans excavated the so-called ‘Hieroglyphic Deposit’ or ‘Area of the Pictographic Tablets’ in 1900, in the west wing of the palace. It consisted of a large hoard of bars, labels and nodules found scattered in a space beneath the upper staircase at the north end of the ‘Long Gallery (or Corridor)’ and in the adjacent magazines 4, 12 and 13, west of the Throne Room complex.⁵⁰⁹ About 80% of the finds were stamped with motifs in the ‘Hieroglyphic B’ script, the remainder being ornamental, and many contained both. The total count is one tablet, 20 bars, 18 medallions, 26 crescents, one hanging nodule, 10 flat-based nodules, and two noduli. Unfortunately, little associated pottery with which to date the deposit was found, and none was published. Evans originally assigned it an MM III date and later MM IIB on the basis of stylistic comparison with other seals and seal impressions having associated pottery.⁵¹⁰ Although some later scholars such as Reich and others have reiterated the later dating, others like Yule, Olivier and Godart have countered and a date of MM II now more often is accepted for the deposit,⁵¹¹ although an MM III dating cannot be ruled out entirely and some pieces should be later still.

159. Nodule with seal impression and incised design. HM Σ-T 202 (not seen)

Clay, nodule: H: 22.4; W: 11.3; Th. 6.4 mm, approximately half remaining of impression on either face.

Complete crescent-shaped nodule, with hole of twisted string through length, impressed design apparently from cushion seal with convex face on one face, incised and punched design on other. *Face A*: Figure midway between the Egyptian standing hippopotamus deity and Minoan ‘genius’ facing left, holding *Schnabelkanne* at handle and bottom. Leonine body and face, with open jaws, pendant breasts and large protruding abdomen and belly-button. Large upright ribbed object resembling large leaf at back, only partially impressed but possibly part of a long mane. Vegetation rising above left in front of ‘genius,’ possibly tri-leafed plant or a palm tree type, and sinuous vegetation with papyrus-type ‘head’ below left in front of legs. Double horizontal line border at top and bottom. *Face B*: Two incised triangles(?), filled with punctated dots (possibly a hieroglyphic sign).

Minoan, MM II(B?).

Context: MM II (III?).

Chronology: MM II(B?) nodule, in a generally contemporary MM II (III?) deposit.

Comparanda: {448–449}.

References: GILL 1964:2, 15 #7, pl. 1:2; 1965:66, 93, 97; KENNA 1968:332; GILL 1970:404–405, Ill. 2.a–b; CADOGAN 1972:11; KAISER 1976:pl. 7.3; YULE 1981:138 Motif 17:C, pl. 11:Motif 17:C:7; BAURAIN and DARQUE 1983:441 fig. 31; SAMBIN 1989:78 fig. 2; PHILLIPS 1990:325 n. 26; WEINGARTEN 1991: 6–7, 22 fig. 1, pl. 1; PHILLIPS 1991:II:524 #132, III:1043 fig. 132; CLINE 1994:162 #233; REHAK 1995:217 n. 24; POPHAM and GILL 1995:30 #202; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:156 #132; *CMS* II.8.1:#195.

Comments: Although the context of this nodule is unrecorded,⁵¹² Gill argued on the basis of colour and condition of the clay, nodule shape and incised signs on the back that it probably was part of the ‘Hieroglyphic Deposit,’ and is now generally accepted as such. It was, at least, excavated sometime in 1900–1904 by Evans, who did not publish it.

The double border lines have suggested to some (Kenna [accepted by Cadogan], Cline) the cylinder-seal form and specifically a LCyp I date and origin for the original seal, but GILL (1970) persuasively argues for the cushion-seal format. The nodule shape itself dates no later than MM III, which immediately negates the possibility that an LCyp I cylinder seal was used to impress it.

Weingarten’s analysis shows the iconography of the proto-‘genius’ developed from early forms of the Egyptian standing hippopotamus deity, and the one depicted here probably is based on the image dated to “1800–1700, probably sometime just before mid-century”⁵¹³ [early Dynasty XIII].

160. Nodule with seal impression. HMs 140 (not seen)

Clay, nodule: H: 22.4; W: 11.3; Th. 6.4 mm, edges of lower part of sealing face lost, otherwise complete.

Two-hole hanging nodule with impression from a seal having a (slightly convex?) circular face.⁵¹⁴ Impression shows an apparently rocky landscape setting, with what may be a rectangular entryway lower right near center, and two squatting apes of different scale facing left near left edge, each having one arm and one leg indicated. Both are tailless, with arm bent in front and almost to face level and elbows resting on knees, hand upraised and turned forwards, an elongated face and raised ‘dot’ for eye. Upper and smaller ape has an emphasised humpback. Lower and larger figure have head *regardant* and appears also to have a humpback but an extended ‘growth’ seems to be part of the landscape.

Minoan, seal impression MM II(B?) or later (likely LM I), nodule should be LM II–III.

Context: MM II or later(?)

Chronology: MM IIB? or later seal impression, on a later LM II–III nodule in problematic context.

Comparanda: (style) {447}, (pose) {11}, {561}, {566}.

⁵⁰⁹ EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900:25, 59–63; EVANS *PM* I:271–285. See also EVANS 1909:19–22, 159–165; GILL 1965:66–67; REICH 1970; YULE 1978; 1981:16, 215–219; HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:19 #147.

⁵¹⁰ EVANS 1909:19–20 *contra PM* I:271–276.

⁵¹¹ YULE 180:215–219; OLIVIER and GODART 1996:28.

⁵¹² It is published neither by Evans nor by GILL 1965, although HM sealings with catalogue numbers both above and below HM 202 are listed by Gill from this deposit.

⁵¹³ WEINGARTEN 1991:7.

⁵¹⁴ PINI 1990:39 Table 3 states the impression is from a discoid or lentoid seal.

References: EVANS 1899–1900a:63; *PM* I:273, fig. 202.c; II:453 fig. 265; IV.1:116 fig. 81; KENNA 1960:40 n. 2, 74 n. 151; GILL 1965:67; PINI 1990a:38 Table 2, 39 Table 3, 43, 42 Table 4, pl. V:c; WEINGARTEN 1995:296 fig. 4.4:140; *CMS* II.8.1:#286.

Comments: This is a quite unusual image, as the bodies of both apes face its outer edge rather than towards a central or other figure. The apes actually seem to be part of the rocky landscape, rather than interacting with it. Their presence might indicate that this landscape should be seen as a sacred one.

Pini considers this to be ‘more advanced’ than the majority of the seals from this deposit, both in face design and in sealing type. Indeed, this appears to be the case, and its design suggests an LM I date. It is difficult to comment, as the design is quite worn and not very understandable – as it would be if impressed onto a Final Platial nodule – but it might also have been an early attempt at a more ‘realistic’ design that was common in LM I. The nodule format apparently dates to LM II–III A1, and it may have been a later sealing associated with the ‘Hieroglyphic Deposit’.

M. The Room of the Saffron-Gatherer

Evans excavated the north-western wing of the palace in 1901, his second season. Among the numerous rooms excavated at the corner of the Central Court in the area known as ‘The Prisons,’ was a squarish room entered from the Central Court via the ‘Room of the Lotus Lamp’ and leading into the ‘Room of the Stirrup-Jars’.⁵¹⁵ This room also was covered by the modern threshing floor centred over the ‘Room of the Stirrup Jars,’ under which Evans found ‘heaps’ of debris consisting of fresco fragments.⁵¹⁶ It was named the ‘Room of the Saffron-Gatherer’ or ‘Room of the Flower-Gatherer’ by Evans, following the discovery of fresco fragments depicting this scene.⁵¹⁷

The stratigraphy of the room itself is complex, and remains matter for debate partly due to its early excavation and disturbed context. There were at least two floors, one plastered about a metre below the surface and a second, also plastered and with a gypsum slab, another 40 cm. below this.⁵¹⁸ Both floors are of LM III date, the upper being LM IIIB.⁵¹⁹ Associated with the early floor was a black steatite jar with relief spirals of probable LM I date and a sur-

vival, and some Linear B tablets found in the fill above.⁵²⁰ Above the later floor level were more tablets and some fresco fragments, evidently fallen from an upper floor,⁵²¹ and more of the ‘miniature’ fresco fragments presumably part of the debris heap.

161. Fresco, HM unnumbered (not handled)

Painted plaster, dimensions not stated, partly burnt, composition restored from fragments, some joining.

Apes gathering crocuses from a bowl with flaring rim, surrounded by a rocky landscape with hanging crocuses above and below. Two blue apes with a white stomach and red waist-harness, wristband, armband and chest-band, and faces yellow and white. Two dark blue bowls, with white spots and horizontal red and white rim bands, with white-dotted garlands either side. Other bowls plain light blue, one trimmed in white. Yellow crocuses and white-bordered rocky pattern on a dark red background.

Minoan, MM IIIA.

Context: LM II–III A1.

Chronology: MM IIIA fragments, in a dump dating as late as LM II–III A1.

Comparanda: MARINATOS 1968–1976:V:pl. 92:b, 93, D; {180}.

References: EVANS 1900–1901:45; *PM* I:265–266, pl. IV; III: 21–22; PENDLEBURY 1939:131; PLATON 1947a; SMITH 1965:75–76, 79, figs. 102–103; EVANS, CAMERON and HOOD 1967: 27, pl. I; PALMER 1969:126–127; CAMERON 1975:260–263; HOOD 1978:48–49, figs. 27–28; SAKELLARAKIS 1978:129 fig. upper; RAISON 1988:51–59; IMMERWAHR 1990:21, 41–42, 162, 170 Kn No. 1, pls. 10–11; PHILLIPS 1991:II:526–527 #133, III:1043 fig. 133; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:365, 400 #432; EVELY and JONES 1999:50 figs. 119–121, 236–238 #78–81, figs; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:299;⁵²² HOOD 2005:62 #5, pl. 4.1.

Comments: Originally identified as a ‘blue boy’ by Evans, later re-examinations of the fragments resulted in the present identification and new arrangement of both original and newly-identified non-joining fragments as two apes. Although the date of its context remains disputed, the fresco itself usually is recognised as earlier, even by Evans who dated it in various publications anywhere from MM I to MM IIB (too early, according to more recent research). The use of red background colour and the bowl are the best criteria for an MM IIIA dating; decoration of the latter is typical of the period and probably should be taken as the best indicator of the date of the fresco itself. However, the fresco also has been assigned later dates, most recently by Immerwahr (MM IIIB–LM IA), Cameron (LM II) and Evely and Jones (LM II–III A1).⁵²³

⁵¹⁵ EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900:44–45; EVANS 1900–1901:35–36; *PM* I:265 n. 1; III:20–23; PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:115–117, 210–215; PALMER 1969:45–50, 126–127. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:19 #143, 141, 144. For location, see now also EVELY and JONES 1999:220 map:80.

⁵¹⁶ EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900:44. See also Knossos N, below.

⁵¹⁷ Further testing in this room was conducted in 1923 and 1928. See PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:*passim*.

⁵¹⁸ EVANS 1900–1901:35 n. 1.

⁵¹⁹ PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:116–117; PALMER 1969:45–46, 127.

⁵²⁰ HM 22. WARREN 1969:61 Type 25. See also PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:117, 127.

⁵²¹ Presumably those of the ‘Saffron-Gatherer.’ Mark Cameron’s copy of PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963, now in the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens library, indicates his interpretation of the evidence, p. 212, fig. 3.

⁵²² Illustrated with discussion on the ‘House of Frescoes’ landscape fresco with apes {180}, apparently as part of this group.

⁵²³ See HOOD 1978:246 n. 30; IMMERWAHR 1990:41, 170 #Kn No 1; EVELY and JONES 1999:237 #80.

Cameron's dating is on the basis of style, which seems to be followed by Evely and Jones together with its context and stratigraphy, but would raise the (unanswered) question of why a clay vessel of (presumably) deliberately archaizing shape and decoration would be included in the scene. The lack of other ape images in Final Palatial contexts at Knossos and on Crete generally also would argue against the date provided by Evely and Jones. It may be, given Evans' remark that the threshing floor area was above this room, that they were on the outskirts of the fresco heap,⁵²⁴ and may not have belonged to this room at all, although the quantity of sherds would argue against this possibility.

Cameron's later research suggested that some fragments, including pieces not used in earlier restorations, belong to further apes, rather than just the one as restored. This was based on differences in style and details of the crocii and rock paneling background, and resulted in his restoration (1974) of three separate figures on three separate panels in the room which, he stressed, was purely conjectural; his earlier (1967) restoration of the 'House of Frescoes' panels also must have been a strong influence.

The fragmentary nature of the ape(s) here precludes certain identification of the species portrayed. The restored portions are based partly on the apes in the House of Frescoes {180}, of later or generally contemporary date.⁵²⁵ It is a reasonably accurate portrayal of the *Cercopithecus*, except for the colour, as preserved. But the body is thinner and more elongated than the others, and might be a different sub-species of the animal. The waist and armbands indicate a tamed pet rather than a wild animal, and the model for the fresco probably was imported as such. It should be noted that other painted depictions of apes show no such accoutrements.

N. The North-West Fresco Heap

In 1900 and 1901, Evans excavated a large waste heap containing many frescoes below a modern threshing floor over the north-west corner of the palace, especially over the 'North-West Portico',⁵²⁶ although it also spread over the room to its north⁵²⁷ and possibly as far south as the 'Room of the Saffron Gatherer'.⁵²⁸ It contained numerous fresco fragments of various dates including some LM III patterns. The majority were found in the eastern part of the Portico at various levels as debris, and lay above the 'Re-

occupation' (i.e., LM III) wall stubs. Evans suggested that recent stone plundering had resulted in this heap, rather than an ancient gathering of debris.⁵²⁹

The collection of debris included a large number of 'miniature' frescoes belonging to women's dresses, dated by Evans to the end of MM III but now recognised as LM I.⁵³⁰ Fragments include olive leaves, spirals, rosettes, 'waves,' quatrefoil combinations as border elements, griffins, sphingi and bull's heads, and objects resembling quivers. Others included full-scale relief frescoes of human figures and border elements of bands, chevrons and dotted returning spirals,⁵³¹ nature scenes with grasses and olive leaves, and two other miniature fragments of scenes similar to the 'Grandstand Fresco' found about 15 m. to the south. Specifically mentioned from north of the 'North-West Portico' in the 1901 season were a cat-head fragment and a bird's plumage.

162. Fresco fragment, HM 29

Plaster, painted, H: 4.2; W: 5.1; Th. (max): 1.0 cm, one fragment, with surface well-preserved.

Fragment showing the upper head of a cat or leopard having yellow fur with white spots and a large white patch around the eye. Red/brown tufts frame the eye, white fur spots, and also on the interior of the ear. Blue pupil, rounded ears, and all details outlined in red/brown including central dot in pupil.⁵³² Minoan, LM I(A?) or ?LM II-III A1.

Context: LM I.

Chronology: LM I(A?) fragment, in a dump dating as late as LM II-III A1.

Comparanda: {397}; {438}; {517-518}.

References: EVANS 1900-1901:59; *PM* I:539-541, fig. 392:b; III:114; EVANS, CAMERON and HOOD 1967:23; CAMERON 1976:37 n. 22; MORGAN 1988:42, pl. 184:right; IMMERWAHR 1990:179 Kn No. 44:12; PHILLIPS 1991:II:529-530 #134, III:1043 fig. 134; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:364, 393 #278; EVELY and JONES 1999:219 #51; HOOD 2005:58-60 #3.

Comments: Evans identified the animal as a cat. He noted that another fragment found nearby was a bird's plumage, that both cat and bird were depicted in the same position as those in the Aghia Triadha fresco {9}, and supposed these were the remnants of a similar scene with, however, a different species

⁵²⁴ See Knossos N, below.

⁵²⁵ Depending on which date (MM IIIA or MM IIIB-LM IA) is accepted for the 'Saffron-Gatherer.' On the basis of design complexity for the relationship of the figures and their immediate surroundings (rather than the conjectured compositions as a whole), the 'Saffron-Gatherer' seems much simpler in execution. This does not imply it *should* be earlier, but that it *might* be. Both compositions have a red background. {180} only is partly red and partly white, whilst the 'Saffron-Gatherer' is too fragmentary for comment on the missing majority.

⁵²⁶ Excavated in 1900. EVANS *et al.* 1899-1900:44, 46-48, 68; EVANS *PM* I:374, 423-424; II:2:742; III:36-42, 59-60;

IV:2:875-876. See also EVANS, CAMERON and HOOD 1967:pl. C:4, D:4-6, E:2, 3:a, c-f, h, k, IV:12, 15; KAISER 1976:259, 267-270; HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:19 #153.

⁵²⁷ Excavated in 1901. EVANS 1900-1901:59, *PM* I:540-541; III:114.

⁵²⁸ EVANS *et al.* 1899-1900:44. Evans called it the 'North-West Fresco Heap' and the 'Threshing Floor Heap/Deposit.' See also Knossos M, above.

⁵²⁹ EVANS *et al.* 1899-1900:46, 68.

⁵³⁰ See HOOD 1978:62.

⁵³¹ See KAISER 1976:259, 267-270.

⁵³² The black hairs in the restored water-colour are incorrect.

of cat. However, as this was a rubbish heap and (according to Evans) the heap was full of frescoes, such a reconstruction of the scene must remain speculative however attractive it may be. Cameron objected to the association of cat and bird, as they are not in the same style or by the same hand, and he almost certainly is correct.

The eyes here are blue, the fur spotted and the ears rounded, in contrast to the pointed ears, solid colouring and lack of eye-patch of the Aghia Triadha cat. Evans noted also that the white eye-patch is characteristic of a wild cat common on Crete (*Felis agrilus*). Morgan noted that later scholars have disagreed with his identification, and it more likely is partly *Felis serval*, which has rounded ears and black spots on the body, and may be an interbred mixture if indeed it represents a cat. The head profile is rather elongated for a cat, with a long distance between ears and eye (although a similar profile can be seen on the Aghia Triada cat {9}), and the ears are abnormally small; it as easily could represent a larger feline such as a leopard.

There are few examples of a cat with rounded ears, but those from Mavrikiano {397} and Vathypetro {517–518} also are described as having this feature.

O. The Initiatory Area

Some parts of the palace's north-west wing were excavated by Evans in 1901, including the area of the 'North Lustral Basin' with its 'Initiatory Area'⁵³³ immediately north of the 'North Terrace Wall' of the palace. This was a separately enclosed area of the palace, accessible only from the 'North West Portico' to the east, via an anteroom that led directly to the lustral basin.

The open space called the 'Initiatory Area' in its latest level was located directly behind it, and had a clay floor, surrounded by the rubble masonry walls 60 cm. high. Its foundations were 30 cm. below floor level, resting on a 'well-marked... stratum' containing a large carbonised wood mass from a destruction level extending at least six metres westwards as far as the 'North Lustral Basin'. In the burnt destruction stratum three metres north of the 'North Terrace Wall,' some 10 cm. below the foundations of the eastern

rubble wall, Evans found the lid inscribed with the name of the 'Hyksos' king Khyan together with stone basketwork relief fragments and pottery.⁵³⁴ Although Evans indicated it was found directly below the eastern wall, Hood has suggested it may not have been found below the wall itself.⁵³⁵ In the open space, Evans found other late 'Mycenaean' walls at a lower level that only recently have been located on a plan.⁵³⁶ The 'North Lustral Basin' rested on an even lower, MM IIIA, level.

The exact sequence of events and location of much material remains matter for debate, not the least due to Evans' lack of publication of the associated pottery. Originally he published only the lid itself, dating it to a clear MM III context and later specifying MM IIIA.⁵³⁷ He later published one fragment of a stone vessel with basketwork relief decoration (later reconstructed as an ewer) from the 'South-West Lustral Basin'.⁵³⁸ The lid quickly became one of the most important chronological *terminus post quem* cornerstones of Minoan relative dating.

Recent reinvestigation by a number of scholars including Hood, Popham, Hallager and most specifically Palmer, have corrected some of Evans' errors and clarified his excavation records and their interpretation. Palmer⁵³⁹ notes the recently rediscovered late Mycenaean walls at the lower level, apparently not taken into consideration by Evans, would preclude dating the deposit above them to MM III, and suggests its final deposit should be related to the 'penultimate' destruction of the palace in LM IIIA, although both the dating of the associated finds and of the 'penultimate' destruction also remain matters for dispute.

Mackenzie's notebook entry for 03 April 1901 indicate that the lid was recovered in a burnt stratum probably contemporary with MM IIIA in the 'North Lustral Basin' immediately east of here.⁵⁴⁰ The associated finds, recently published, included "many

⁵³³ EVANS 1900–1901:63–68, *PM* I:405–422; III:8–15; IV.2:937; PALMER 1969:54–58, 142–143; PALMER 1981. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:19 #159–160, GESELL 1985:90.

⁵³⁴ PALMER 1969:142–143.

⁵³⁵ PALMER 1981:114.

⁵³⁶ See PALMER 1981:110–111 fig. 2a–2b.

⁵³⁷ EVANS 1900–1901:63–68; *PM* I:419.

⁵³⁸ EVANS *PM* IV.1:229 fig. 176. This probably is identified in error for the 'North-East Lustral Basin,' by this time his term for the 'North Lustral Basin' as clearly seen in his description of the Khyan lid being found here in *PM* IV.1:229. There is no other mention of the 'South-West Lustral Basin' in *PM* or elsewhere.

⁵³⁹ PALMER 1981:111–112.

⁵⁴⁰ As described by Colin Macdonald in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000. Whilst it is feasible that MacKenzie would have understood the complicated stratigraphy and ceramic dating of Knossos at this early point in the excavations, I am unconvinced that the lid can be associated with an MM IIIA level. Khyan's position in the Dynasty XV succession of kings remains not entirely certain but he is one of the middle two of six kings. Within this dynasty also must be sandwiched MM IIIB and at least some of LM IA. If Khyan reigned contemporary with MM IIIA, then both MM IIIB and some of LM IA can extend at maximum the length of the last two or three Dynasty XV kings, a very short time indeed.

fragments of stone vases in different colours of stone,” describing the basket work fragments, and a considerable amount of pottery ranging from Neolithic to at least LM IIIA1,⁵⁴¹ indicating that the specific context cannot be dated more closely than the Neolithic to LM IIIA1 periods. Pottery of MM, LM I and LM IIIA, and possibly two sherds of later date also were found nearby. As both the associated and nearby pottery thus contains an admixture of numerous periods, it suggests a leveling-off of the destruction debris preparatory to reconstruction, not the destruction material itself. Thus, the LM IIIA context dating is a *terminus post quem*, and the lid could have been discarded at any time following its manufacture and arrival on the island, and its *terminus* context.⁵⁴² Evans’ initial dating of the lid’s context to MM III may pre-date the reign of Khyan, and his specific dating of MM IIIA certainly does. Thus, the associated finds and the lid itself both indicate that the context is not closely dated, and Evans’ conclusions are incorrect.

163. Lid, HM A 263⁵⁴³

Travertine, H: 1.1; Dia. (max): 10.3 cm, restored from three joining fragments, some edge missing, remainder battered.

Flat circular lid with inset outer circumference underneath. Inscribed on upper surface in vertical line, enclosed within a cartouche: (*ntr nfr swsr-n-Rc s3 Rc hy-3n*), ‘(The good god, Seweserrenre, son of Re, Khyan),’ the name and title of the Dynasty XV ‘Hyksos’ Pharaoh Khyan who ruled in Lower Egypt. Otherwise undecorated.

Egyptian, Dynasty XV, reign of Khyan.

Context: Neolithic–LM IIIA1.

Chronology: Dynasty XV (reign of Khyan) vessel, deposited in a wide-ranging context in MM III/LM IA–IIIA1.

Comparanda: KAPLONY 1973:15 #40–41, pl. 10:40–41, 22:40, 23:41; {490}.

References: EVANS 1900–1901:65–67, fig. 20–21; GRIFFITH 1900–1901:37; EVANS *PM* I:291, 418–422, fig. 303, 304:b; II.1:303; III:9; FIMMEN 1924:172 fig. 167; PENDLEBURY 1930a:75; 1930b:22 #30, pl. II:30; EVANS *PM* IV.1:229; KANTOR 1947:74; PORTER and MOSS 1927–1951:VII:405; VERCOUTTER 1954:77–78; SMITH 1965:28; SCHACHERMEYER 1967:43; PALMER 1969:54–58; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J; BUCHHOLZ and KARAGEORGHIS 1973:92 #1142, 354 #1142; HANKEY and

WARREN 1974:145; PALMER 1976:35, 39–40; POMERANCE 1978:27–28; HELCK 1979:48–50; PALMER 1981; CADOGAN 1983:517; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:141; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:220–221 #100, pl. 68:100; PHILLIPS 1991:II:532–533 #135, III:1044 fig. 135; CLINE 1994:210 #680; VIENNA 1994:149 #124; LILYQUIST 1995:17, 22 #1, fig. 12; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:82–83 #62.

Comments: This piece has been the subject of much discussion and speculation, even to the supposition of a massive Hyksos empire stretching from Crete in the west to Baghdad in the east, where a large recumbant lion statue bearing Khyan’s name was found without context.⁵⁴⁴ The lid has the earliest inscribed royal name discovered on Crete, but almost certainly must have been imported onto Crete long after Khyan’s reign, and probably not before the New Kingdom.

P. Royal Pottery Stores

Evans excavated north-east of the Central Court in 1902, finding a number of palace storerooms and areas where the second palace had been almost entirely denuded, especially by a later lime kiln. In the north-eastern quarter, he discovered basement rooms beginning at a depth of about 0.5 m. which had been constructed earlier, and were part of the first palace.⁵⁴⁵ These consisted of a series of three small rectangular rooms (4–6) mostly linked by a passageway (7) from the south-east of this immediate area, a further but unconnected small rectangular room entered from the north-east, a long unconnected passageway (2) to the west linked to further rooms farther north-west, and a totally unconnected basement room to the southwest (1).

The South-West Room (1) and others in this area has been deduced by MacGillivray, and is followed here. This room was packed for the uppermost 0.5 m. with surface deposit, followed by a layer of ‘packed’ Kamares ware (including four clay bulls) between 0.5 and 1.0 m, whilst the Neolithic layer began at about 1.5 m from the surface. The intervening 1.5–1.0 m fill is unspecified. MacGillivray has reconstituted the Proto-Palatial material from this space, dating it to MM IB–II and including the following sherd of previously unpublished context:

⁵⁴¹ See PALMER 1981:113; PALMER in ÅSTRÖM, POMERANCE and PALMER 1984:15–25.

⁵⁴² Despite its discovery in a ‘burnt’ stratum, the lid itself shows no marks of burning. Considering its material, which would be affected by any fire, the described context itself may be questioned.

⁵⁴³ Evans had the lid cast in plaster.

⁵⁴⁴ MEYER 1928:43. See also VON BISSING 1936–1937; GARDINER 1961:158. For the lion, see PORTER and MOSS 1927–1951:VII:396.

⁵⁴⁵ EVANS 1901–1902:122. The ‘Early Store Rooms,’ also

called the ‘North-East Kamares Area,’ ‘North-East Insula’ and other titles, later were renamed the ‘Royal Pottery Stores,’ see HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:20 #178, with more complete bibliography. See now also MACGILLIVRAY 1998:35–39 for a reassessment of this area and its ceramic material; room numbers are those of MACGILLIVRAY 1998:36 fig. 1.8. Passageway 2 is his Group G (MM IB–IIA), Rooms 3–6 his Group H (MM IIA), Corridor 7 his Group I (MM IB). Otherwise unallocated pottery from this area constitutes his Group J (MM IB–IIA).

164. Bowl ('pedestalled bowl'), AM AE 942; + HM 5186 + 5189; + KSM L III 1 Box 996; + SMP 9712

Clay, fine buff, H (pres.): 7.0; Dia. (rim): 20.6; (base) 5.0 cm, one rim and several non-joining rim and body sherds, paint flaked and worn.

Pedestalled bowl with carinated rim, projecting little beyond the carinated shoulder. All-over semi-lustrous paint with thick horizontal added-white band at carination interior and exterior, and further bands on exterior and interior lower body and base, also thin band at edge of interior and exterior rim. Upper body exterior and interior covered with small added-white dots.

Minoan, MM IIA.

Context: MM IB–IIA.⁵⁴⁶

Chronology: MM IIA vessel, in contemporary MM IIA context.

Comparanda: PELON and STÜRMEYER 1989:108 n. 18 and *passim*; {172}; {175}; {294}.

References: EVANS *PM* I:178–179, 239, fig. 127:f; II.1:57; WARREN 1969:170 n. 11; PHILLIPS 1991:II:629–630 #257, III:1108 fig. 257; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:37, 153 #647, pls. 22:647, 107:647.

Comments: This vessel was noted by Evans as imitative of the Egyptian carinated bowl form and decoratively of “liparite” (white-spotted obsidian) used to imitate the anorthosite gneiss. The profile would appear to best imitate the shallow form of Dynasties IV–V, as the rim projects little beyond the shoulder carination and the carination itself is quite sharp.

MacGillivray’s recent restudy of the material from the ‘Royal Pottery Stores’ has resulted in the recovery of further non-joining fragments. These extend the profile, and indicate the vessel in fact is a ‘pedestalled bowl’ of Minoan type, apparently of ritual use, and that Evans’ ‘egyptianising’ sherd belongs with the material from the ‘South-West Room’. Evans noted other sherds of this vessel type at Knossos and further, more complete examples have been recovered at Malia, Phaestos and Palaikastro ranging in date between MM IB–II.⁵⁴⁷

Q. The North-West Corner of the Palace

Although Evans never published the finds from the ‘unstratified deposits’ surrounding the palace, with the exception of a few important pieces, he speculated that they were the remnants of the ‘levelling-off’ of the site in order to construct the palace building in MM I(B).⁵⁴⁸ This suggests that these deposits immediately surrounded the palace building, but their exact positions seem never to have been clarified, at

least in print. Hood, however, believes these deposits were located just north, north-west and west of the same corner wall, located at the north-west corner of the palace building, just east of the ‘North-West Buttress’ (or ‘Bastion’) and facing the ‘Theatral Area’.⁵⁴⁹

These deposits were found and excavated in separate years. Their dating remains uncertain, but Evans’ comments clearly identify his position: these were early finds. However, they equally could be accumulation from the palace itself at a later date, mixed with earlier material. Nearly all finds of such vessels as the following, when found in dateable context, are of MM III or later date. Warren, who believes these to be early deposits, himself has noted that the Minoan ‘imitations’ of this vessel type “were very probably made in MM III–LM IIIA1”.⁵⁵⁰ Since the pottery and any other finds from these deposits have never been published, the date of the deposits themselves must remain open to question.⁵⁵¹

Q.1. No Find Context, North of Palace

Evans identified a jar from one of these unstratified deposits, found in 1910, which he described as being north of the palace.

165. Jar ('spheroid jar'), AM 1910.201

Hornblende diorite (Type A or B)?,⁵⁵² H: 11.35; W: 21.1; Dia. (rim): 17.0; (base): 8.2 cm, complete but badly battered, worn and with flaking surface in some areas.

Spheroid jar with flat but not undercut collar and flat base. No handles.

Egyptian, probably Dynasty IV.

Context: Wide-ranging but unspecific.

Chronology: Probably Dynasty IV vessel, in wide-ranging unspecified context.

Comparanda: EL-KHOULI 1978: pl. 86:2340, 88:2432 (exterior profile); {235}.

References: EVANS *PM* I:65, fig. 32; PENDLEBURY 1930b:21 #25, pl. II:25; REISNER 1931a:203 #4; WARREN 1965:30 #2; 1969:109 Type 43:A2, P590; 1981b:632, pl. 204:b;⁵⁵³ LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:217 #88, pl. 68:88; PHILLIPS 1991:II:535 #136, III:1045 fig. 136; LILYQUIST 1996:148, 159, pl. 13.4; PHILLIPS 2001:79.

Comments: The jar is badly made, with an off-centre tilting rim and interior cavity. Its extremely battered condition lends

⁵⁴⁶ Note that CADOGAN *et al.* 1993:25 relate this deposit (presumably as a whole) to that on the upper floor of the Royal Road South (Knossos BB.1, below), and (p. 26 Table 1) place that deposit as MM IIA in Evans’ terms.

⁵⁴⁷ See PELON and STÜRMEYER 1989:108 n. 18 for references.

⁵⁴⁸ EVANS *PM* II.1:31, 58–59.

⁵⁴⁹ M.S.F. Hood (personal communication, 12 September 1990). For the ‘North-West Buttress’ and ‘Theatral Area,’ see HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:19 #148 and 162.

⁵⁵⁰ WARREN 1969:74.

⁵⁵¹ Evans’ dating cannot be entirely accepted, as he sometimes ignored later ‘intrusive’ material to state an early context date, as at Knossos G; see above. See also comments to {171}, and PALMER 1969:71–83.

⁵⁵² Possibly intergrading with gabbro; see discussion in B.G. ASTON 1994:12–13.

⁵⁵³ He incorrectly cites the find spot as “west of the palace.”

support to the suggestion that it was deposited much later than its date of manufacture. Its identification as ‘gabbro,’ which it appears to be, severely limits its Egyptian origin. B.G. Aston was able to identify only two vessels in that stone; both are from the Menkaure Valley Temple (Dynasty IV), limiting use of this stone to Dynasty IV.

Lilyquist suggests without explanation that it may be Minoan; however, she also notes it came from “northwest of the palace” so may have intended to refer to one of the vessels with that provenance {166–168} instead. Its profile is difficult to envisage as Minoan; if so, there are no parallels.

Q.2. No Find Context, North-west of the Palace

The largest of these ‘unstratified deposits’ lay “north-west of the palace”.⁵⁵⁴ Here, Evans found numerous stone vessels, amongst which several were identified as Egyptian although others are not described;⁵⁵⁵ nor was any associated pottery.

166. Jar fragment (‘spheroid jar’), HM A 2092

Andesite porphyry (Type B),⁵⁵⁶ H (pres.): 12.5; (rest.): 13.5; W (pres.): 18.2; Dia. (rim, rest.): 23.3; (max, rest.): 19.9 cm, one fragment preserving upper part of jar, majority of rim and beginning of one handle only.

Thick-walled spheroid jar with flat undercut collar and two perforated handles on the upper shoulder.

Egyptian, probably Dynasty I–II.

Context: Wide-ranging but unspecific.

Chronology: Probably Dynasty I–II vessel, in wide-ranging unspecified context.

Comparanda: EL-KHOULI 1978: pl. 85:2286–2292, 155:upper right.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:30, fig. 12; PENDLEBURY 1930b:21 #22; REISNER 1931a:203 #1; WARREN 1965:29–30 #1; 1969:108 Type 43:A1, P589, D312; 1981b:632, pl. 204:a;⁵⁵⁷ LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:213 #74, pl. 67:74; PHILLIPS 1991:II:536 #137, III:1046 fig. 137; LILYQUIST 1996:155 n. 187; WARREN 1997:216, pl. LXXXI.c; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:27 #1;⁵⁵⁸ PHILLIPS 2001:79.

Comments: Restored in error with a flat base.

167. Bowl or jar fragment (‘spheroid jar’ or ‘deep open bowl’) (not located)

Andesite porphyry (Type B)?, dimensions not stated, one lower body/base fragment.

Lower body fragment of a deep open bowl or spheroid jar having a raised flat base.

Egyptian, Predynastic–Dynasty I.

Context: Wide-ranging but unspecific.

Chronology: Predynastic–Dynasty I vessel, in wide-ranging unspecified context.

Comparison: {289?}.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:30; REISNER 1931a:203 #2; WARREN 1965:31 #14; 1969:110 Type 43:C5; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:216 #84; PHILLIPS 1991:II:536 #187; 2001:79.

Comments: The physical description is as given by Evans, who noted it was of an ‘identical material’ as {166}, which he called ‘porphyry’. Stated by Warren to be of ‘gabbro’ and Egyptian in origin, following his identification of {166} as ‘gabbro’. If so, it should be of Dynasty IV date as the material is rare in Egypt; B.G. Aston notes only two vessels, both from the Menkaure Valley Temple at Giza.⁵⁵⁹ As the fragment has never been illustrated and cannot be located, and Warren did not examine the piece himself, material identification remains open. If Egyptian, and corresponding to {166}, it more likely is B.G. Aston’s ‘andesite porphyry, Type B,’ very similar in appearance to gabbro, employed from Predynastic through Dynasty III. Following the limited date range of the raised base for these jars, however, it should not be later than Dynasty I.

168. Bowl fragment (‘deep open bowl’), AM 1938.408

Hornblende diorite (Type A?),⁵⁶⁰ H: 2.20; Dia. (base): 4.09 cm, one base fragment.

Deep open bowl with a slightly raised, flat base. Small internal base ring.

Egyptian, Dynasty I–II (Dynasty IV?).

Context: Wide-ranging but unspecific.

Chronology: Dynasty I–II (or IV?) vessel, in wide-ranging unspecified context.

Comparison: EMERY 1961:218 fig. 83.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:30–31, fig. 28; PENDLEBURY 1930b:21 #23;⁵⁶¹ REISNER 1931a:203 #5; EVANS *PM* IV.2:985 n. 1, fig. 942; WARREN 1965:31 #12; 1969:110 Type 43:C4, D319; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:216–217 #86, pl. 69:86; PHILLIPS 1991:II:536–537 #139, III:1046 fig. 139; 2001:79.

Comments: Warren dated this to the Early Dynastic, on the presence of the internal base-ring, although it is seen in both earlier and later examples and is not found in EL-KHOULI (1978) in combination with the slightly raised base. However, if gabbro, it should date to Dynasty IV as B.G. Aston notes the use of gabbro is restricted to that dynasty. It is more likely to be B.G. Aston’s ‘hornblende diorite Type A,’ very similar in appearance to gabbro. See also comments to {167} above.

169. Bowl fragment (‘deep open bowl’), AM AE 2303

Andesite porphyry (Type A),⁵⁶² H: 4.47; W: 5.51; Th.: 0.76–0.90 cm, one body fragment.

⁵⁵⁴ EVANS *PM* II.1:30–31.

⁵⁵⁵ There may have been yet another vessel; see jar {311}.

⁵⁵⁶ Compare B.G. ASTON 1994:pl. 3.b. KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:27 describe it as “gabbro.”

⁵⁵⁷ He incorrectly cites the find spot as “west of the palace.”

⁵⁵⁸ Note that the profile illustrated actually is that of {115} from Katsamba.

⁵⁵⁹ ASTON 1994:14.

⁵⁶⁰ Compare ASTON 1994:13, pl. 1.a. WARREN 1969:32 notes that his four non-Cretan and almost certainly Egyptian

gabbro vessels are “truly porphyritic rock with phenocrysts well-scattered,” and visually the material compares best with Aston’s hornblende diorite Type A (earlier called porphyry).

⁵⁶¹ Emended by hand from “not yet in Museum” to “in possession of Sir Arthur Evans” in Pendlebury’s own copy now in the Villa Ariadne, Knossos. Evans later presented it to the AM.

⁵⁶² Compare ASTON 1994:pl. 3.a.

Probably deep, open bowl.

Egyptian, Early Dynastic.

Context: Wide-ranging but unspecific.

Chronology: Early Dynastic vessel, in wide-ranging unspecified context.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:30; REISNER 1931a:203 #6; WARREN 1965:31 #11; 1969:110 Type 43:C3; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:219 #98; PHILLIPS 1991:II:537 #140, III:1047 fig. 140; LILYQUIST 1996:161; PHILLIPS 2001:79.

Comments: Given by Evans in 1937–1938. Lilyquist concurs with Warren’s identification of this fragment as an Egyptian vessel, presumably based on its material.

Q.3. No Find Context, West of the Palace

Evans’ third ‘unstratified deposit’ is described as being “west of the palace’ and excavated in 1922.⁵⁶³

It included fragments of a stone cup that he identified as Egyptian, but again no other finds are mentioned.

170. Cup or bowl fragments. HM Λ 2170

Anorthosite gneiss, white matrix with black crystals, H. (pres.): 6.7; (rest.): 9.3; W (pres.): 6.6 cm, three joining rim/ledge and upper body fragments, preserving about two-thirds of ledge.

Straight-walled cup or bowl, widening towards the top, with slightly tapering rim. Horizontal ledge either side of pouring ‘spout’ thus created. Restored flat base.

Egyptian, Dynasty III–IV.

Context: Wide-ranging but unspecific.

Chronology: Dynasty III–IV vessel, in wide-ranging unspecified context.

Comparanda: QUIBELL 1898: pl. X:20; EVANS *PM* II.1:58 fig. 27:a (AM E 380).⁵⁶⁴

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:57–58, fig. 27:b; PENDLEBURY 1930b: 21 #28, pl. II:28; REISNER 1931a:204 #9; WARREN 1965:33 #28; 1969:111 Type 43:C3, P603, D326; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:218 #93, pl. 68:93; PHILLIPS 1991:II:537 #141, III:1048 fig. 141; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:28 #4; PHILLIPS 2001:79.

Comments: Often called the ‘moustache cup,’ after Victorian and Edwardian handled cups with a related type of ledge at the rim. As Evans noted, this is a rare vessel form even in Egypt.

R. North of the Palace Front

In 1987, M.S.F. Hood conducted a series of five soundings, supervised by A.A.D. Peatfield, over a 16 m. length immediately south-west of the ‘North Lustral

Basin’ and near the ‘Initiatory Area,’ with the intention of tracing further a massive EM III wall running east-west uncovered in 1973.⁵⁶⁵ The wall, some 2.5 m. thick, lies behind stretches of the later palace-facade foundations exposed further west, and continued at least to just south-west of the ‘North Lustral Basin’. The soundings also revealed EM I–II occupation in the area and one revealed a possible entrance dating to the first phase of the early palace (MM IB, possibly extending into MM IIB).⁵⁶⁶

At this point and farther east an early wall of the first palace had replaced the EM III wall. The second palace facade wall lies immediately to its south. Between these two walls was uncovered an ambiguously dated fill, either part of the EM III wall fill or of the MM III fill, in which was recovered the following.

171. Vessel fragment (‘spheroid jar’?), KSM —

Unstated sstone, “enormous,” one fragment.

Shape not stated.

Egyptian, date not stated.

Context: Wide-ranging but unspecific, either EM III or MM III.

Chronology: Undated Egyptian vessel, an antique in its EM III or MM III fill context.

References: CATLING 1988:69; PEATFIELD 1988:223; TOUCHAIS 1988:685; LECLANT and CLERC 1990:437; PHILLIPS 1991:II: 538–540 #142, III:1049–1050 fig. 142; LECLANT and CLERC 1998:439 n. 51; PHILLIPS 2001:79 #2.a.

Comments: The deposition of this fragment might be compared to those of Evans’ deposits at the north-west corner immediately to the west,⁵⁶⁷ as Hood mentions a number of early deposits in his excavation area including those of EM IIA (and EM IIB and EM III farther east) and MM IIB date. The related context material is inconclusive between an EM III and MM III date for its deposition. The excavation is not yet fully published,⁵⁶⁸ but it highlights the ambiguous nature of Evans’ deposits and their dating.

Vessels of “enormous” scale are extremely rare. Only a few spheroid jars having a closed shape and wide flat collar and horizontal handles are known, chiefly from Hierakonpolis. The Knossos fragment most likely is of this vessel type.⁵⁶⁹ Its scale suggests cultic use in Egypt, as the other vessels of similar size are best known from the sacred temple area at Hierakonpolis.

It is difficult to imagine a vessel of “enormous” scale having been imported entire to Knossos. It may have been fragmentary upon arrival on Crete, perhaps imported as raw material for a Minoan artisan’s use together with other stone material

⁵⁶³ EVANS *PM* II.1:57.

⁵⁶⁴ For a later, more ornate, example suggested to function as a lamp, see JÉQUIER 1934:113 #1, fig.19:c.

⁵⁶⁵ CATLING 1974:34; 1988:69. The wall is mentioned by HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:18 #122.

⁵⁶⁶ CATLING 1988:69; TOUCHAIS 1988:685; HOOD 1994:101–102; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:34.

⁵⁶⁷ The Egyptian vessel fragments recovered by Evans were found just west of here (Hood, letter of 18 October 1999). See Knossos Q, above.

⁵⁶⁸ CATLING 1988:69 and Peatfield 1988:323 identify the fill as “apparently LM I” in date but Alan Peatfield, who excavated the area under Hood’s direction and is preparing it for publication, informed me that the mixed context in which it was found might be either EM III or MM III (personal communication, 15 May 1989).

⁵⁶⁹ See also PHILLIPS 1991:II:538–540 #142.

known to have been imported from Egypt such as travertine, possibly brought as ship's ballast. Indeed, it may even have been recovered in Egypt as a fragment rather than the complete vessel.

S. No Find Context, East Palace Slope

Evans' 1902 explorations in north-eastern area of the 'Royal Pottery Stores' also continued down the hill slope beyond the palace walls. In an area described as being "on the East slope, near the Early Store Rooms containing the 'Middle Minoan' pottery" he found a fill of "disturbed earth".⁵⁷⁰ The only recorded find was the following:

172. Bowl fragment ('shallow carinated bowl'), HM Λ 591

Black obsidian with white spots ('liparite'), H (pres.): 2.8; (rest.): 4.65; W. (pres.): 3.8; Dia. (rim): 16.4 cm, one rim/upper body fragment.

Open, shallow carinated bowl with flaring rim, projection nearly same diameter as shoulder carination, carination very sharp. Minoan, probably MM IB–II.

Context: Wide-ranging but unspecific.

Chronology: Probable MM IB–II vessel, without context.

Comparanda: EVANS *PM* I:86 fig. 54;⁵⁷¹ WARREN 1969:75, P408 (BM 4965); {175}; {213}; {294}; (shape) {164}.

References: EVANS 1901–1902:122–124, fig. 74; *PM* I:86–87, fig. 55:c, 178 fig. 127:e; II.1:57; PENDLEBURY 1930b:27;⁵⁷² REISNER 1931a:205; WARREN 1969:75 Type 30:C, 136, P409, D228; PHILLIPS 1991:II:540–541 #143, III:1051 fig. 143; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:66 #44.

Comments: Evans' identification of the Lipari islands north of Sicily as the source of the particular variety of obsidian from which it is made,⁵⁷³ and hence his use of the term "liparite" for its material, has since proven to be incorrect. The source now is identified as the islet of Gyalı off Nisyros in the Dodecanese⁵⁷⁴ and the material as a white-spotted obsidian.

Evans dated this fragment "as late as the beginning of the Middle Minoan Age,"⁵⁷⁵ implying its context, or at least the unpublished accompanying material, may have been as early as this date. Evans' implied date for this piece, i.e., MM IA, generally is too early for the production of a stone vessel of this high quality in such hard material on Crete, although the raw spotted obsidian is found in an MM I stonemaker's atelier at Malia and occasionally in contexts into the LM period.⁵⁷⁶ A clay vessel imitating both the material and apparently the form {164} of this vessel also are known at Knossos, and Warren suggests its date of manufacture almost certainly is contemporary with them. Bowl {164} in fact was recovered uphill and near this obsidian piece.

The profile on this bowl appears to best imitate the shallow form of Dynasties IV–V, as the rim projects little beyond the shoulder carination and the carination itself is quite sharp. Note that the profiles published by Evans and Warren do not match: Evans' profile is the more accurate.

T. The East Wing Stair Closet

By 1902, Evans had progressed to the eastern wing of the palace, where he excavated the 'Hall of the Double Axes' or 'King's Megaron,' 'Queen's Megaron' and the 'Grand Staircase' areas. Sandwiched inbetween these three areas was a 'Service Staircase' west of the light well associated with the 'Grand Staircase,' which led to the upper storey of this wing.

Below the upper flight or southern half of the staircase, Evans found a small closet. It was about 1.15 m. wide, opening at the corner of the passage and was shut from below by a low stone breastwork, with its top about 85 cm. above the passage floor.⁵⁷⁷ During the LM III period the lower part of the closet was choked with earth, and a second opening was traced about 70 cm. above the original. This contained several Mycenaean amphorae and a stirrup jar with octopus decoration.

Between the two floors was a stratum deposit about 30 cm. thick, covering the remains of LM I vessels, including at least one 'amphora' with two vertical handles. Immediately below this was a deposit of transitional MM III–LM I vessels, the remains of ivory figurines chiefly acrobatic in nature, and other objects, the so-called MM IIIB 'Ivory Deposit'.

173. 'Amphora,' AM AE 856

Clay, H: 36.6; Dia. (rim): 11.7; (max): 13.8; (base): 10.7; Hole: 1.2 cm, intact.

'Amphora' with high pedestal base, tall tapering body and flaring everted rim. Two horizontal coil loop handles on shoulder, small raised horizontal ring at lower neck, and thicker raised ring on lower body, large horizontal groove at top of base. Hollow profile throughout, tapering to hole at bottom. Slipped and undecorated.

Minoan, LM I, probably LM IB.

Context: LM I.

Chronology: LM I(B?) vessel, in generally contemporary LM I deposition.

Comparanda: {14–15}; {446}.

⁵⁷⁰ EVANS 1901–1902:122. The 'Early Store Rooms' later were renamed the 'Royal Pottery Stores,' see HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:20 #178 and Knossos P, above.

⁵⁷¹ Identified as from the tomb of Snefru by Evans, but in fact from El Kab and now AM E 401. BOARDMAN 1961:162 provides the correct identification.

⁵⁷² He mistakenly states the find spot as the same context as bowl {174}.

⁵⁷³ EVANS 1901–1902:123–124.

⁵⁷⁴ See RENFREW, CANN and DIXON 1965:240 n. 70; WARREN 1969:135–136.

⁵⁷⁵ EVANS *PM* I:87.

⁵⁷⁶ WARREN 1969:136.

⁵⁷⁷ EVANS 1901–1902:70; *PM* III:401–404. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:23 #244.

References: EVANS 1901–1902:70; *PM* III:402–403, fig. 267:E; IV.2:779, fig. 759:E; PHILLIPS 1991:II:542–543 #144, III:1053 fig. 144; CUCUZZA 2000:101 #1–3; WALKER and GALANAKIS 2007:#193.

Comments: Evans noted only a single vessel in his preliminary report, but the quantity increases to three – two intact – in the final volumes. As none have been published with the exception of this vessel and no other corresponding vessels from Knossos were found in the AM, HM or KSM, Evans' original publication may be correct, although possibly two others exist(ed). If so, one at least may have been a non-hollow companion to this 'amphora,' similar to others from Aghia Triadha {13} and Phaestos {445}. Evans believed that the form imitated the Egyptian amphora type having an integral potstand as one piece, although his dating varied from "closing MM IIIB"⁵⁷⁸ to later than the LM I date he gives the example from Phaestos {445}.⁵⁷⁹

U. The Area of the Daemon Seals/Wooden Staircase

Evans' habit of identifying certain areas and rooms in the Knossos palace through the important finds within them often is a help but occasionally a hindrance to later scholars. The 'Area,' 'Room,' 'Corridor' or 'Passage' of the Daemon Seals is a case in point. When he first excavated the area of the 'Domestic Quarters' in the south-east quarter of the palace in 1901, he defined it as the northern section of the Service (or 'Wooden') Staircase, originally believed to be a corridor but later recognised as the upper steps of the staircase,⁵⁸⁰ and later as an enclosed room immediately west of the stairs.⁵⁸¹ The area is accepted now as the northern section of the stairs,⁵⁸² located behind (south of) the 'Hall of the Colonnades'⁵⁸³ and linking the various floors of the 'Treasury'.⁵⁸⁴

Within this area Evans recorded painted stucco fragments of spirals and rosettes, and others representing a bull.⁵⁸⁵ About four metres down, together with fragments of fresco and stucco relief, he found a pottery deposit,⁵⁸⁶ a slab of porphyry-like limestone

with a grotesque rock work border, a bronze knife and clay nodules with numerous seal impressions including those which gave the area its name.⁵⁸⁷ Recent re-examination of the limestone slab⁵⁸⁸ and identification of the pottery⁵⁸⁹ suggests that its context is LM IIIA, part of the destruction debris of the palace.

174. Nodules with seal impression. AM 1938.1046 + HM Σ-T 256/13, Σ-T 257/1–5, Σ-T 261, Σ-T 262, Σ-T 269, Σ-T 273, Σ-T 275/1–6, Σ-T 1340, Σ-T 1365, Σ-T 1380

Clay, seal impression: Dia: c. 16 mm, impression reconstructed from 20 incomplete fragments.

Triangular two-hole hanging nodules with impression of twisted string on back, and impression from a lentoid seal, possibly of a soft stone. Impression shows a 'lion-man' walking right in centre, with Minoan 'genius' behind, also facing right and apparently walking. Both have arms reaching in front of body. 'Genius' has open mouth, striations on body and a spiked back; no waist is indicated. Two detached bull-limbs facing left in front of the 'lion-man'. A small space-filler foliage is positioned between the 'lion-man's' legs.

Minoan, impression LM II–IIIA, nodule LM II–III.⁵⁹⁰

Context: LM IIIA.

Chronology: LM II–IIIA seal impression, on generally contemporary or somewhat later LM II–III nodule in generally contemporary deposition.

Comparison: ('floating leg in front') {476}.

References: EVANS 1900–1901:108; 1901–1902:76, 77; *PM* IV.2:441, fig. 365; KENNA 1960:147 #46S, pl. 17:46S; GILL 1964:20 #45, pl. 4:3; 1965:77, 80 #R81; KENNA 1968:332–333, pl. 108:25; GILL 1970:405, Ill. 3; PINI 1980:107 n. 111; KAISER 1976:pl. 7:8; YOUNGER 1983:124; PHILLIPS 1991:II:545 #145, III:1052 fig. 145; CLINE 1994:253 #1086;⁵⁹¹ POPHAM and GILL 1995:21, 30, 34, 35, 49, 57, pls. 13:R81, 17:R81, 26:R81, 29:R81, 43:R81; POPHAM 1997:380 fig. 2.R81; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:158–159 #136.α; *CMS* II.8.1:60 figs. g, l, #200.

Comments: Evans named the area from this collection of sealings. Younger places this within his "Cretan popular" stylistic group, which he dates to the late 16th–early 15th c. BC, or LM IA?–B, on the basis of the central 'lion-man' figure. However, Olga Krzyszkowska informs me that the 'lion-man' and

⁵⁷⁸ EVANS *PM* II:403.

⁵⁷⁹ EVANS *PM* IV.2:779.

⁵⁸⁰ EVANS 1900–1901:108. See also PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:132 n. 2, pl. XXI. See now discussion in POPHAM and GILL 1995:16–19, pl. 1 #32.

⁵⁸¹ EVANS *PM* III:404; see also EVANS 1900–1901: pl. I. The *CMS* II.8.2:770–803 *passim* calls this room the 'Secretaries' Bureau' and notes that some nodules may have come from the "West Wall by Magazine 3."

⁵⁸² EVANS 1901–1902:75; *PM* III:301–302; IV.2:440–441, 451–452, 598; PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:132–133, 227; BOARDMAN in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:92; GILL 1965:77; POPHAM 1966:26; 1970:22–26. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:23 #243; POPHAM and GILL 1995:pl. 1 #32.

⁵⁸³ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:22 #226.

⁵⁸⁴ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:23 #249.

⁵⁸⁵ EVANS 1900–1901:108; KAISER 1976:260, 283.

⁵⁸⁶ Unpublished by Evans, but see POPHAM 1966:26; 1970:22–26.

⁵⁸⁷ See POPHAM 1997:380 fig. 2 for a selection of the sealings from this area.

⁵⁸⁸ KOEHL 1986:407–411.

⁵⁸⁹ POPHAM 1970:22–26. See also PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:132–133, 227, where he identified the pottery as LM IIIB. POPHAM 1997:378–379 and fig. 1 emphasises that the pottery definitely is not LM IIIB but rather "an early stage of LM IIIA" (i.e., LM IIIA1).

⁵⁹⁰ Dated by KENNA 1960:43 #13 as "LM II Early."

⁵⁹¹ Listed as Cypriote, but "possibly Minoan."

similar combination man/animal figures do not appear before LM II.⁵⁹² The hanging nodule type itself is not employed before the Final Palatial period. Note that Σ-T 261 is a cone-shaped object seal rather than a hanging nodule, according to the *CMS*. Not listed by HALLAGER (1996).

V. The Magazine of the False-Spouted Pithoi

In the second season at Knossos, Evans uncovered a magazine called, at various times, the ‘Magazine (or Room) of the False-Spouted Pithoi (or Jars),’⁵⁹³ the ‘Plaster Closet (or Chest),’⁵⁹⁴ or the ‘(Early) South-East Magazine.’⁵⁹⁵ It consists of a small square room at the end of a long narrow corridor, and is distinguished from a second storeroom to its west by a clay partition wall.

In the room, Evans identified three pithoi with ‘false’ spouts (an atrophied MM III version of the earlier spouted pithos) along the southern wall, and a jug in front of them.

Embedded into the southern wall of the store-room, Evans reported the fragment of an imported stone bowl.⁵⁹⁶ The room seems to have been destroyed in MM IIIB–LM IA transitional (or even LM IA),⁵⁹⁷ and the false-spouted pithoi provide a context date of that period. However, the point that this particular bowl fragment was embedded in the wall suggests it had been re-employed as chinking during construction of the wall, rather than being contemporary with the contents of the room itself. Thus, we can only say it dates prior to construction of the wall.

175. Bowl fragment (‘shallow carinated bowl’), HM Λ 590

Anorthosite gneiss, black crystals in a white matrix, H (pres.): 2.7; (rest.): 4.3; W: 6.5; Dia. (rim): 20.2 mm, one rim/upper body fragment.

Open, shallow carinated bowl with flaring rim, projecting beyond shoulder carination, carination rounded.

Egyptian, Dynasty VI.

Context: Not later than MM III, probably MM II.

Chronology: Dynasty VI vessel, an antique in its reuse as MM III or earlier wall chinking.

Comparanda: EVANS *PM* I:86 fig. 54;⁵⁹⁸ WARREN 1969:75, P408

(BM 4965); B.G. ASTON 1994:134 #117, (material) pl. 14.b; {172}; {294}; (shape) {213}; {164}.

References: EVANS 1901–1902:121–123, fig. 72; *PM* I: 85–86, fig. 55:b; II.1:31 n. 1; PENDLEBURY 1930b:21 #27, pl. II:27; REISNER 1931a:205 #10/11; WARREN 1965:32 #20; 1969:111 Type 43:E1, P599, D322; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:217–218 #90; pl. 68:90; PHILLIPS 1991:II:546–547 #146, III:1052 fig. 146; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:201 #194.

Comments: Note that the profiles published by Evans and Warren do not match and neither is entirely correct. Evans⁵⁹⁹ specifies the published profile as originating from this room, and describes its find circumstances in some detail. Boardman identifies this published profile as “probably” bowl {294},⁶⁰⁰ but the sharp shoulder carination of that fragment is in direct opposition to the very rounded shoulder of the published profile. However, that profile does not resemble this fragment either, and it may be questioned which of the two in fact was found in this room. It is assumed here that a fragment with provenanced context would more likely remain on Crete, as (obviously) did Warren who cited this fragment as from this room.

The projecting rim suggests this bowl most likely is the ‘late,’ Dynasty VI, variety.

W. South-West of the Palace, Sector S VII 6

Colin MacDonald opened multiple trenches in 1992–1994 to clarify the chronology and architectural history of several houses south-west of the palace. The trenches in S VII investigated the house west of the ‘South-West House,’ initially exposed by Evans.⁶⁰¹ He found a formal street formed by two LM II houses exposed again by MacDonald in the S V (north wing of South-West House) and S VII trenches. An earlier house partly was exposed in S VII below the western of the two houses, this being slightly farther to the west, which was destroyed in LM IA (‘classic’). LM IB and II layers lie beneath the later house paving here, but above the LM IA house. The two LM II houses both were destroyed by fire in LM IIIA2 (late), and above the western (S VII) house was recovered an imported faience vessel fragment amongst fragments of champagne cups and sherds of LM IIIB date, all undecorated, in ‘sector S VII 6’.⁶⁰² The champagne cups, kylikes and imported fragment

⁵⁹² Olga Krzyszkowska (personal communication, 10 May 2003).

⁵⁹³ EVANS *PM* I:581.

⁵⁹⁴ EVANS 1901–1902:87.

⁵⁹⁵ EVANS *PM* I:581–584. See also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:24 #266.

⁵⁹⁶ EVANS 1901–1902:121–122; *PM* I:31 n. 1. PENDLEBURY 1930b:21 specifies the south wall of the room.

⁵⁹⁷ WARREN and HANKEY 1989:55 Table 2.5, 62, 72. Colin MacDonald (in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) places the construction in this area “probably early in Late Minoan IA.”

⁵⁹⁸ Identified as from the tomb of Snefru by Evans, but in fact from El Kab and now AM E 401. BOARDMAN 1961:162 provides the correct identification.

⁵⁹⁹ EVANS 1901–1902:121–122.

⁶⁰⁰ BOARDMAN 1961:162. See also bowl {294}.

⁶⁰¹ For the South-West House, see HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:13 #14. Evans’ initial exposure is recorded in *PM* II.1:390. For a summary report of activities and results, see FRENCH 1993:68; 1994:75; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:148–149.

⁶⁰² HUBER and VARALIS 1995:1024 is the only mention of the imported fragment. The specific trench (6) is not mentioned in any other published report. Evans and MacKenzie’s partial clearing of this area is mentioned only in general.

presumably are within a post-destruction and abandonment debris or fill context dating to LM IIIB. Full publication has not yet appeared.

176. Vessel fragment, KSM — (not seen)

Faience, no dimensions stated, one fragment.

'Vessel,' no description stated.

Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII.

Context: None, but amongst LM IIIA2–B material.

Chronology: Dynasty XVIII vessel, without context but in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IIIA2–B post-occupation fill? deposition.

References: HUBER and VARALIS 1995:1024; LECLANT and CLERC 1998:439.

Comments: Vessel description is as published. Vessel dating is presumed from the associated material, but could be earlier.

X. The 'South House' and Area

This house, an entirely separate building immediately south of the western rooms of the palace, lies immediately west of the 'Early Houses near the South Corridor'.⁶⁰³ Some 19 m. long and 12 m. wide, it was constructed at the very end of MM IIIB.⁶⁰⁴ The building, now partly restored, is preserved to over 3 m. on its north side, but rapidly descends to complete lack of preservation on its south side. It includes a 'pillar basement' with a 'columnar hall' above, two separate staircases, a corner room with gypsum dado and flagged floor entered through 'pier and door' partitioning on two sides from one of the staircases and from what may have been a single-pillared light-well, a 'lavatory' and adjoining 'latrine' (from which a drain led out to the north and east), and a basement storeroom with badly preserved room above. A 'pillar crypt' on the west and second room to its south are later additions, together with the second staircase on the northern wall, as is a further 'bathroom' that replaced the earlier 'lustral basin' near one staircase sometime in LM IA. A hoard of silver vessels and a stand for a double axe were recovered in the 'pillar crypt,' and second hoard of bronze tools and weapons in the basement room.⁶⁰⁵

It seems the southern wall of the 'South Corridor' of the palace was removed at the western side, and a retaining wall constructed to support the palace building, in order to position the house where it is situated. This suggests, if nothing else, that its instigator (the occupier of the South House?) must have

had considerable social status or power, to have effected these changes to the palace. The building had no residential function, but "pay[s] a surprising attention to ritual and ceremony".⁶⁰⁶

Evans excavated the house in 1908, after clearance of the space south of the palace exposed numerous blocks of different construction than the palatial blocks, with further work in 1924 and some cleaning in 1930; further test excavations were made in 1969, 1989 and 1993. One of these recent tests revealed a 'foundation deposit' below the pillar room, broadly dated MM III/LM IA to mature LM IA. Originally, Evans (and Mackenzie) proposed that the building was demolished in 'mature' LM IA but, on the basis of the multiple and scattered joining fragments of the LM IB and later pottery, Popham later re-dated its destruction to LM IB. Whilst they lean as far as possible towards dating the building's destruction in late LM IA, Driessen and Macdonald finally hesitated to actually propose this due to the quantity of LM IB material recovered, but apparently nothing later than LM IA was recovered on the floor itself, and an LM IA date is generally accepted.⁶⁰⁷ In addition to this, a considerable quantity of LM II and some LM III ceramics also were recovered in the area, but their position(s) relative to the building is not stated.

A final report on Evans' 'South House' excavations and its material has recently been published by current members of the British School. Doniert EVELY (2003) published the stone vessels, and he kindly provided details of three stone vessel fragments apparently relevant to the present study, including their material identification, prior to publication. All were recovered outside the 'South House' building itself, in unstratified contexts to its north or south, but the fragments themselves by their types suggest most strongly use or deposition in the Neo-Palatial period. Thus, it is possible that they were associated with the use of the building itself although any conclusions must also relate to their relationship with the rest of the contents of the relevant KSM context boxes.

X.1. *Minoan Hall*.

The easternmost space is generally called the 'Minoan hall,' with pier and door partitioning from a

⁶⁰³ See Knossos B, above.

⁶⁰⁴ EVANS *PM* III:280; DRIESSEN in MOUNTJOY 2003:34.

⁶⁰⁵ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:13 #1; GESELL 1985:96–97 #52–54.

⁶⁰⁶ DRIESSEN in MOUNTJOY 2003:35. See large state plan of HOOD and TAYLOR 1981 for the relationship between this house and the palace. Note, however, that the details of

their plan do not coincide with that published by EVANS (*PM* II.1:375 fig. 208).

⁶⁰⁷ EVANS *PM* II.1:373–390; HOOD 1961:28, POPHAM 1967:341, n. 14; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:149–150; MOUNTJOY 2003:24–25.

stairs and ‘lustral basin’ in the northern part and a single column supporting what may have been a light well to the south. Its floor is flagged, with a gypsum dado on the walls. The pottery from this space was divided into three boxes, 1613 to the north (‘room within NE angle. ‘Megaron’.’) and 1614 south of the dividing ‘pier and door’ partition (‘NE Room ‘Megaron’.’), and 1615 within the northern space itself as well as the space immediately to its east (‘from outside and inside NE angle’). All were collected in 1908.

The sherds as a whole provided numerous joins with material from other boxes, and contained small quantities of Neolithic, EM and MM material but almost entirely was of LM I and LM II–III date. Box 1614 included 2 Neolithic, 126 LM I and 150 LM II–III sherds, together with a stone vase and architectural element.⁶⁰⁸ Amongst the material from this base is the following LM IB sherd:

176A. Alabastron fragment (Type C form), KSM Box 1614 (not seen)

Clay, pink, buff slip, black paint, H (pres.): 3.6; Dia. (base): 12 cm, one large base/lower body fragment only, paint flaked and worn.

Baggy, flat-bottomed alabastron. Black-painted horizontal wavy bands of varying thickness over entire body including base. Rim painted interior and exterior.

Minoan, LM IB.

Context: LM I–III, with 2 Neolithic sherds.

Chronology: LM IB object, in mixed probably LM II deposition.

Comparanda: {8}; {76}; {453}.

Reference: MOUNTJOY 2003:82 #195, 84 fig. 4.14.195.

Comments: This is a fairly obvious imitation of the Egyptian Type C alabastra of banded travertine.

X.2. North of the ‘South House’

North of the ‘South House’ is a 5 m. wide space separating its north wall from the ‘South Terrace Basements’ of the palace. In this area, Evans found multiple gypsum blocks that apparently had been thrown in from above, fresco fragments for the palace corridor, a lapis lazuli ringstone in a gold setting, a collection of ivories including an ivory relief fragment of a griffin, a small stone ‘box’ with mosaic cubes of different semi-precious stones, and multiple ceramic fragments, some of which came from a single Marine Style jar decorated with octopi, all seemingly at different levels of the fill. His plan indicates that the majority of these were found on the eastern side of this space.

Box 487 was collected about the middle of this ‘yard,’ and consisted of 32 Neolithic, 5 MM, 3 LM I and 6 LM II–III sherds, together with a painted plaster fragment, 3 pieces of obsidian, 7 stone vessels and 4 ‘Neolithic’ axes.⁶⁰⁹ One of the stone vessels is the following:

177. Jar fragment (‘spheroid jar’), KSM Box 487 (not seen)

White marble with grey patches, H (pres.): 5.4; Dia. (rim): c.11; W (pres.): 7.8 cm; hole (on shoulder) 6.5; Th.: 15 mm, one large rim/upper body fragment only, with shoulder hole partly preserved.

Spheroid jar with high shoulder, very low and narrow upright rim. Drilled hole on shoulder. Smooth exterior and interior, the latter with horizontal rotary abrasion marks.

Minoan, MM III–LM I.

Context: Mixed, not ascertainable.

Chronology: MM III–LM I vessel, without dateable context.

Comparanda: (profile) {121}; {274}; (hole) {104}; {274}.

Reference: EVELY 2003:176, 179 fig. 7.4.141, 186 #141.

Comments: This appears from its profile to be another example of the derivative ‘spheroid jar’ form. The colour is not uncommon amongst this vessel form.

X.3. South of the ‘South House’

The south side of the building was little preserved, and Evans mentions only the traces of an ‘ascending roadway’ at the eastern end of the excavated space. Very little material was recovered here, but Box 786 included 15 LM I and 10 LM II–III sherds, together with a painted plaster fragment, 3 obsidian pieces, 2 stone vessel fragments and another stone fragment. The lack of material earlier than LM I in this context box is suggestive of an LM date, but earlier material from one of the other two boxes nearby cannot provide a good dating for this box either. None of the material joined with anything from within the house itself.⁶¹⁰ Both of the stone vessels from Box 786 are of interest here.

178. Closed vessel fragment/potstand?, KSM Box 786 (not seen)

“Mudstone-related rock” or limestone(?), H (pres.): 1.35; Dia. (rim): c. 10 cm; Th. (rim.): 6 mm, one rim/upper neck fragment, badly burnt black-brown

Closed vessel with everted rim and cylindrical neck. Three flutes around upper rim surface. Neck edge rubbed smooth at bottom.

Likely Egyptian, early Dynasty XVIII.

Context: Mixed, not ascertainable.

Chronology: Most likely early Dynasty XVIII, without dateable context but conversion suggests it is not later than mid-Dynasty XVIII in date.

Comparanda: (profile) {248}; (rim fluting) {7}, {587}.

⁶⁰⁸ MOUNTJOY 2003:14.

⁶⁰⁹ MOUNTJOY 2003:17.

⁶¹⁰ EVANS, *PM* II.1:379; MOUNTJOY 2003:18.

Reference: EVELY 2003:176, 179 fig. 74.163, 187#163.

Comments: This rim fragment should be from a closed vessel with everted rim and neck, probably a jar or ewer of some kind. The eversion is characteristic of New Kingdom vessels, but also is found in the Levant at this time. Normally, Egyptian (and Levantine) vessels of this type are not fluted at the top, and this suggests that, like at least one converted spheroid jar recovered at Mycenae {587} and a similar Minoan vessel from Aghia Triadha {7}, the fluting is Minoan work. Thus it is another addition to the group of converted imports, suggesting importation not later than LM IB. The material is unusual for the vessel form, and in Egypt generally; it is not used in the Levant until post-Bronze Age times.⁶¹¹

The deliberately smoothed edge of the neck strongly suggests that this fragment itself later was employed for an unspecified use after the vessel had been broken. Perhaps the entire neck/rim was reversed and used as a ringed potstand with secure (flat) base, although the entire ring was not recovered. Another possibility is Evely's suggestion that it may have been intended as a detachable rim.

179. Alabastron? (Type C), KSM Box 786 (not seen)

'Grey-banded' white marble or limestone, H (pres.): 7.8; Dia. (max): 18; W (pres.): 6.5 cm; Th.: 7–12 mm, one large lower body fragment only.

Baggy alabastron? with baggy body, or (if reversed) another closed vessel of high shouldered form. Smooth polished exterior and smooth but pitted interior.

Egyptian?, probably late Dynasty XII–SIP (–early Dynasty XVIII?) if so.

Context: Mixed, not ascertainable.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XII–SIP (–early Dynasty XVIII?).vessel, without dateable context.

Comparanda: {249}; (grey banding) {4}; {106}; {109–110}; {269}.

Reference: EVELY 2003:176, 179 fig. 74.164, 187#164.

Comments: Not necessarily an alabastron but the form and banded stone seems to suggest this identification. If of marble and an imported vessel, is possibly made of a "white marble with grey veins" from Gebel Rokham in the Wadi Mah mentioned by B.G. ASTON (1994:55), although she identified only a single Egyptian vessel made of marble. Grey-banded vessels of travertine are known on Crete, and Evely's published identification of 'limestone' circumvents the question of whether this one has been 'burnt'.

Y. The 'House of the Frescoes'

In 1923, Evans excavated about 70 m. west of the north-west corner of the palace, finding a reasonably large and well-constructed house consisting of eight rooms on the ground floor.⁶¹² In the centre of the house he found a large collection of fresco fragments,

stacked diagonally some 3.65 (north-south) by 1.5 m. in area and a metre high, and promptly named it 'The House of the Frescoes'. The building entrance was from the west at its northern end, and a room with slab flooring was located at the other end. The remainder of the house was undistinguished, with but one set of 'pier-and-door' partitioning. On the basis of the dateable pottery found inside, it was constructed late in MM IIIB and destroyed by earthquake in LM I. Later excavations in 1926 revealed an earlier building dating to MM IIIB.⁶¹³

The majority of the frescoes were found in 'Room' E, essentially a 'closet' at the eastern end of Room D, the largest of the house, and distinguished from it only by a thin partition wall of plaster clay to the west.⁶¹⁴ Some fragments had spilled over into the north-eastern corner of Room F, south of D/E. Many of the fragments were of large size, and some joined. Repair work by N. Platon in 1959⁶¹⁵ recovered further fragments, and museum study by T. Phanouakis, A. Caravella and M.A.S. Cameron in the 1960s⁶¹⁶ has resulted in even further fragments and joins. The 'Captain of the Blacks' fragments were found at a much higher level, and recognised as not only of a different composition but also of later date.⁶¹⁷

Their positions suggested to Evans that the fresco stack had been placed there deliberately for storage purposes, but instead it probably had slid down from the upper storey, from the room above D/E, conventionally designated 'Room Q'.⁶¹⁸ He recognised that some fragments depicting crocuses and agrimi did not relate to the rest, and did not incorporate them in his restorations in this room. Cameron agreed, and placed this separate composition at the north end of the eastern wall of the room above F, conventionally designated 'Room T'.

180. Fresco, HM — (not handled)

Painted plaster, H (est.): 85 cm; L (est.): 5.5 m, fragmentary, conjecturally restored composition.

Fresco illustrating floral and faunal compositions, including at least six apes and eight birds (some possibly doves), flora including lilies, crocuses, myrtle, papyri, rushes and other wildflowers including some resembling roses, rocky landscape elements, and waterfalls originally identified as a 'jet d'eau' by Evans. Background dark red and/or white in areas. The composition as conjecturally restored essentially depicts a group of

⁶¹¹ Rachael Sparks (personal communication, 13 March 2002).

⁶¹² WOODWARD 1924:262; EVANS *PM* II.2:431–467. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51 #212. For its location, also see now EVELY and JONES 1999:221 map:3.

⁶¹³ EVANS *PM* II.2:435.

⁶¹⁴ This was supported by a wall of the earlier structure.

⁶¹⁵ PLATON 1959a:364, 385.

⁶¹⁶ CAMERON 1967; 1968; EVELY and JONES 1999:128–130.

⁶¹⁷ EVANS *PM* II.2:755–757, pl. XIII.

⁶¹⁸ CAMERON 1968:14–19, fig. 9. See EVELY and JONES 1999:128–130, 129 fig.

apes raiding the nests of several birds, within a rocky landscape peppered with flora and a stream originating from a rocky height. The features of the apes are detailed: painted blue with white stomach, having a yellow upper and blue lower muzzle, black pupils, white forehead band and red ears.

Minoan, late MM IIIB–early LM IA, probably later than earlier.

Context: Late MM IIIB–LM I.

Chronology: Late MM IIIB–early LM IA fresco, in LM IB secondary context.

Comparanda: MARINATOS 1968–1976:V:pl. 92:B, 93, D; {161}.

References: WOODWARD 1924:262; EVANS *PM* II.2:444–462; McDERMOTT 1938:23–24, 274–276 #472–473; SMITH 1965:75, figs. 100–101; CAMERON 1967:46–65; 1968; BUCHHOLZ and KARAGEORGHIS 1973:80 #1046, 332 #1046; IMMERWAHR 1990:42–46, 170 Kn No. 2, fig. 16; PHILLIPS 1991:II:548–550 #147, III:1054–1055 fig. 147; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:365, 401 #449; EVELY and JONES 1999:234–235 #73–76, 246–247 #90; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:298–299 #293; MORGAN 2005b:pls. 5–7.

Comments: Instead of the three separate panels originally restored by Evans,⁶¹⁹ Cameron has hypothesised a continuous frieze around the eastern end of the room above D/E, on the three walls between the two doorways above those found below. The separately conjectured overall length of his newly restored composition approximated the total length of this space, with 1.5 m. on the northern wall, 1 m. on the south, and 3 m. on the eastern wall. The composition is, however, highly conjectural, but apes appear both with a red background (Cameron - almost entirely on the north wall, left side of composition) and a white background (Cameron - east wall and centre of composition), whilst the doves dominate (without apes) on the south wall and right portion of the composition as he restored it.

Evans himself recognised similarities between the details of this composition and New Kingdom illustrations of domesticated apes.⁶²⁰ More closely related are those depicted seated in trees, eating/picking figs and generally playing.⁶²¹ Their specific facial features encouraged him to identify them as *Cercopithecus calitrichus* or ‘common green monkey’ from the Sudan, as they have a thin white band on the forehead, despite their blue (not green) colouring. McDermott in the main agreed, but instead identified them as *Lasiopyga chlorocebus*, probably *tantalus*, of the same general species of guenon apes as Evans thought; the specific sub-species quoted by Evans do not have the white forehead band. The apes depicted on the large wall fresco from Akrotiri on Thera have an identical white forehead band, as do the fragmentary head and other ape figures from this site.⁶²²

Despite all these identifications, the variant body shapes of

the different scenes indicate that the (probably live) models were not all of the same species. The combination of features in the ‘House of Frescoes’ apes differ from the ‘Saffron Gatherer’ and both differ from the Akrotiri apes. Features in the ‘House of Frescoes’ apes include the shorter tail, long squarish muzzle, red ears, chunkier and squatter body and heavier limbs (especially the arms) and neck. They in fact suggest the *papio anubis*, a *Cynocephalus* rather than *Cercopithecus* type, but are not specifically of this sub-species. The various apes depicted differ in their various characteristics, and the impression remains of a variety of model types or interpretative license on the part of the painter(s).

Z. The ‘North-West Houses’

Evans’ 1926 excavations north-west of the palace continued farther north-west of the ‘House of the Frescoes’. Some six metres past that building and some 12 m. south of the ‘Royal Road,’ he uncovered earlier domestic remains. In addition to an early MM drainage system, he found the remains of two small houses about five to six metres below the modern surface, which he named House A and House B.⁶²³

The north-west corner of House A⁶²⁴ abutted the south-east corner of House B; each had only two rooms as preserved. House A, about 6 by 5 m, had rooms oriented north-south, while House B, oriented east-west, was 6.5 by 4 m. in area. Both clearly were basement rooms whose upper storeys have not survived. At the floor level of both Evans found pottery deposits, which he grouped together without distinction. Published were a dark-painted jar much white-spotted on its upper body, a ‘proto-Vaphio’ cup, and a cup and amphora having a “brilliant vermilion glaze” surface. These and other vessels from this context have since been located and published by MacGillivray.⁶²⁵ Evans dated the houses and deposit to MM IIIA, and MacGillivray concurs.

181. Footed goblet (not located)⁶²⁶

Clay, dimensions not stated, base and lower side only preserved.

Footed goblet with a low flaring base, tall tapering body and

⁶¹⁹ EVANS *PM* II.2:fig. 264, pls. X–XI. See also fig. 272. The basic distinction of red and white background colour must have been the major factor in Evans’ restoration of two separate scenes representing apes. The ‘Blue Bird’ fresco depicting doves, however, combines both background colours and additionally the upper border stripes of both ape compositions are identical.

⁶²⁰ EVANS *PM* II.2:448.

⁶²¹ See VANDIER D’ABBADIE 1964:*passim*; 1965:*passim*; 1966:*passim*.

⁶²² 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 figs. 85–89. The head in the ‘monkey in the shrine’

fresco has a wavy, but clearly present, forehead band. That scene itself is a marvellous example of literal visual interpretation of a verbal description: one can almost hear the artist being told of temples supported by columns topped by papyrus blooms.

⁶²³ WOODWARD 1926:237; EVANS *PM* II.1:366–371. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51 #212.

⁶²⁴ Not the south-west corner of House A, as EVANS *PM* II.1:369 claims.

⁶²⁵ MACGILLIVRAY 1998:50–51 Group P, 171 Group P, pls. 154–156.

⁶²⁶ Not in AM, HM or KSM. MacGillivray also was unable to locate this vessel.

flaring everted rim. Two raised rings at base/body junction. Covered in a “brilliant vermilion glaze”.⁶²⁷

Minoan, MM IIIA.

Context: MM IIIA.

Chronology: MM IIIA vessel, in generally contemporary MM IIIA context.

Comparison: (profile) MACGILLIVRAY 1998:pl. 21.605.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:369, 371 fig. 206:a; III:402–403, fig. 267:c; IV.2:778–779, fig. 759:c; WALBERG 1976:142 Form 27, fig. 25:43;⁶²⁸ PHILLIPS 1991:II:551–552 #148, III:1056 fig. 148; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:50–51, 171 #1048, fig. 1.13.a; CUCUZZA 2000:103 type 5.

Comments: The initial publication drawing of this vessel fragment as an amphora, indicates virtually everything above the lowest part of the body is restored, including both neck and handles, and thus little if anything remains as justification for comparison. Evans restored the vessel to have two horizontal coil loop handles on shoulder (see fig. 2), and related this vessel to the Egyptian stone amphora type on potstand, carved in a single piece as indicated by a raised ring on the lower body, and to other similar clay vessels found at Knossos and Phaestos. If this was an amphora of Evans’ type, it appeared to be the earliest Minoan example. The double ring-ridge above the base does not correspond to either the ‘potstand’ in profile nor any other Minoan amphora. The original vessel has not been located, but it is not fragment {288} below, due to the flaring profile and double-ridged base.

MacGillivray advocates an alternative restoration, as a footed goblet similar to another of this date recovered elsewhere at Knossos (fig. 3). This would explain the otherwise unique feature of two raised foot rings on this example, and negate any relationship of this vessel with other amphorae discussed in the present study. His interpretation is far to be preferred, and is accepted for the present study (*contra* Cucuzza). This piece owes nothing to Egyptian influence.

AA. Royal Road Buildings, North Side

Between 1957 and 1961 M.S.F. Hood conducted a number of stratigraphic excavations in the Knossos area. On the north side of the Royal Road, the major paved road leading from the ‘Theatral Area’⁶²⁹ west towards the modern town of Knossos, he excavated a series of large trenches west of the ‘Armoury’ (or ‘Arsonal’) dug by Evans in 1904 and 1922,⁶³⁰ over all five seasons.⁶³¹ Beneath Roman housing, he uncovered an LM IB building which included an upper storey, and was destroyed by fire in LM IB. Debris

from an ivory workshop was found in its basement rooms, fallen from the LM IB floor above.

Substantial LM IA (mature) deposits were recovered below, above and on Floor 3. Below this was an earlier Floor 2B, with deposits on and above it dated to MM IIIB/LM IA transitional. Beneath this he found further floors dated to MM IA and, finally, traces of EM II housing at the bottom of the nearly seven metre deep trenches.

AA.1. The LM IB Building Deposit

A large LM IB deposit was found in a small (4.5 × 1 m.) basement room of the LM IB building at the western edge (trench A) of the excavation in 1960–1961, and partially on a plaster floor of the same date at a considerably higher level of the same building excavated the previous season. Presumably it had fallen from an upper storey of the building at the time of its destruction. Included in the deposit were a number of finished and incomplete ivory carvings and enormous quantities of waste pieces, which have been interpreted as the remains of an ivory-carver’s workshop in the building. The deposit consisted chiefly of numerous clay vessels with extremely fine LM IB decoration, including cups, strainers, jars, bowls, stirrup jars, bridge-spouted jars, and an unusual double vase. Other objects included seals of jasper and steatite, several rhyta, an ivory comb, two ‘offering tables’ and a small ‘horns of consecration,’ suggesting a household shrine or sanctuary may have been on the upper floor.⁶³² No faience was mentioned in the preliminary reports, but Cadogan notes their origin in this area.⁶³³

The faience and ‘Egyptian blue’ vessels from Hood’s 1957–1961 excavations here and at ‘Hogarth’s Houses’⁶³⁴ are being studied for publication by G. Cadogan and R.E. Jones.

182. Bowl fragment, KSM RR/60/319.

Faience, white glaze with black decoration, H: 2.5; W: 2.5; Dia. (rim): 9.1 cm, one rim fragment.

Low open bowl or cup with straight rim and concave body. Added black horizontal band at rim on interior and exterior.

⁶²⁷ But see comments to amphora(?) {288} below. This may be the same as the “thick lustrous red-brown and burnished” coating of his footed goblet with which he compares vessel {181}.

⁶²⁸ This form is based solely on Evans’ reconstruction of this one vessel as a tall amphora type with horizontal loop handles. MacGillivray’s analysis (see below) provides an entirely different reconstruction.

⁶²⁹ HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:19 #162. Material and context dates in this section are presented in collaboration with

Gerald Cadogan, Doniert Evely, Sinclair Hood and Peter Warren; full publication is forthcoming.

⁶³⁰ HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51 #213.

⁶³¹ HOOD 1958a:21; 1958b:229; 1959:20; 1960:23–24; 1961:26–27; 1961–1962:*passim*; 1962a:25–27, figs. 31–32; 1962b. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51 #215; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:156–157.

⁶³² GESELL 1985:101 #64.

⁶³³ CADOGAN 1976:18.

⁶³⁴ See Knossos II, below.

Worn interior decoration may be lotus petals⁶³⁵ or a series of upside-down 'V's' in a vertical line to the centre. No exterior decoration visible.

Egyptian, early Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in generally contemporary or slightly later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

References: SMITH 1969:280; CADOGAN 1976:18 Faience #1, 19; 1983:517; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:222–223 #106–107 (in general); PHILLIPS 1991:II:554–555 #150, III:1057 fig. 150; CLINE 1994:189 #485.

183. Vase fragment, KSM RR/60/136(a)

Faience, white glaze with black decoration, H: 2.5; W: 2.7; MDim: 7.1 cm, one body fragment.

Closed rilled vase, with horizontally-ribbed exterior surface painted in imitation of woven basket-work.

Egyptian, SIP–Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

Comparanda: REISNER 1923:II:155 fig. 182:13–16, 18, 160–161; DUNHAM 1967:111 fig. 3:29/1/63; ADAMS 1974:42–43 #217, 220–221, pl. 32:217, 220–221, 37:217; BROVARSKI *et al* 1982:142 #138; MMA 22.1.1134–1135 (from Lisht).

References: As above, {182}; PHILLIPS 1991:II:555–556 #151, III:1057 fig. 151; CLINE 1994:215 #731.

Comments: Although combined in the excavation under a single catalogue number, this and the following fragment do not come from the same vessel. Their profiles have different thicknesses and their ribbing appears to be of differing heights. The fragment is annotated (a) to distinguish it from the other fragment {184} below.

Rilled faience vessels in imitation of basketwork are rare, and known almost exclusively from Nubia. Examples of bowls ribbed and painted on the exterior in imitation of basketwork have been found in comparatively large numbers at Kerma, with examples from Uronarti, Hierakonpolis and Lisht, and one is without provenance. The particular shape here is known only from Kerma and Hierakonpolis (see fig. 11). The only dateable context for the rilled vessels is that from Kerma, at SIP–early Dynasty XVIII. However, other faience vessels imitating the form of baskets, with rilling but not painted in imitation of the basketweave, also are known.⁶³⁶

184. Vase fragment, KSM RR/60/136(b)

Faience, white glaze with black decoration, H: 2.1; W: 1.5; MDim: 2.2 cm, one body fragment with worn surface.

Closed rilled vase with horizontally-ribbed exterior surface painted in imitation of woven basket-work.

Egyptian, SIP–Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

Comparanda: As above, {183}.

References: As above, {182}; PHILLIPS 1991:II:556 #152, III:1057 fig. 152; CLINE 1994:215 #732.

Comments: See above, {183}. The fragment is annotated (b) to distinguish it from the other (a) above {183}.

185. Vase fragment, KSM RR/60/302

Faience, white glaze with black decoration, H: 1.5; W: 1.8; MDim: 1.8 cm, one upper or lower body fragment, possibly with rim.

Closed rilled vase, with horizontally-ribbed exterior surface painted with vertical stripes, possibly in imitation of woven basket-work.

Egyptian, SIP–Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

Comparanda: As above, {182}.

References: As above, {183}; PHILLIPS 1991:II:556 #153, III:1057 fig. 153; CLINE 1994:215 #733.

Comments: See above, {183}. This fragment appears to have one band thicker and wider than the others, which may indicate the rim. If so, it may be a small spherical vessel of some kind.

186. Open vessel fragments, KSM RR/61/265+134.

Faience, white glaze with black decoration, H: 3.5; W: 4.5; MDim: 5.1; Dia. (rim): 18.9 cm, five joining and one non-joining rim and upper body fragments.

Large open-mouthed vessel, possibly a rhyton, with rounded exterior rim, horizontal ribbing on body. Diagonal banding on exterior rim and horizontal bands on rib concavities. Some decorative dotting on uppermost rib between bands. Solid black interior.

Egyptian?, late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III)?, possibly Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III)? or LM I vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

References: As above, {182}; PHILLIPS 1991:II:557 #154, III:1058 fig. 154; CLINE 1994:221 #782.

Comments: See above, {183}. There is nothing particularly diagnostic about this fragment, but it might be Egyptian.

187. Closed vessel fragment, KSM RR/60/318

Faience, white glaze with black decoration, H: 0.8; W: 1.2; MDim: 1.2 cm, one body fragment.

Closed vessel fragment with three thin parallel horizontal lines on exterior. Solid black interior.

Egyptian?, late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III)?, possibly Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III)? or LM I vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

References: As above, {182}; PHILLIPS 1991:II:557 #155, III:1058 fig. 155; CLINE 1994:221 #780.

Comments: See above, {186}.

⁶³⁵ Gerald Cadogan (personal communication, December 1987).

⁶³⁶ See BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:151 #157; with the exception of REISNER 1923:II:155 fig.182:13 (fig.11) and the Hierakonpolis vessels, all the comparanda are open bowl forms. ADAMS

1974:42 #217 appears to have traces of black paint in imitation basket weave similar to the Knossos example on the best (but not well-) preserved surface area, when seen in the original. The Lisht fragments appear to be open forms.

188. Closed vessel fragment, KSM RR/61/210

Faïence, white glaze with black decoration, H: 2.0; W: 1.8; MDim: 2.2 cm, one upper? body fragment.

Closed vessel fragment with one (possibly two) horizontal bands and four vertical bands below. Solid black interior.

Egyptian?, late SIP–Dynasty XVIII to reign of Thutmose III)?, possibly Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III)? or LM I vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

References: As above, {182}; PHILLIPS 1991:II:557 #156, III:1058 fig. 156; CLINE 1994:221 #781.

Comments: See above, {186}. Possibly the shoulder.

189. Closed vessel fragment, KSM RR/60/14

Faïence, white glaze with black decoration, H: 2.9; W: 5.5; MDim: 5.7 cm, one body fragment.

Closed vessel fragment with indecipherable decoration on exterior, possibly including a large dot and part of a vertical line. Solid black interior.

Egyptian?, probably late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III)?.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Probably late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III)? vessel, if Egyptian, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

Comparison: PETRIE 1906b:145, fig. 150:14.

References: As above, {182}; PHILLIPS 1991:II:557 #157, III:1058 fig. 157; CLINE 1994:220 #779.

Comments: Possibly a potstand.

190. Potstand, KSM RR/60/16 + RR/59/440 + HM unnumbered (RR/58/480)

Faïence, white glaze with black decoration, (KSM): H: 5.85; W: 3.7; MDim: 6.3; Dia. (base): 10.2 cm, three joining base/lower body fragments (+ HM fragments).

Potstand with thick, essentially vertical walls and rounded foot. Thick horizontal band covers exterior base. Exterior decoration of large triangles dropped from thin horizontal line, filled by short vertical dashes. Solid black interior.

Egyptian?, late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III).

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, if Egyptian, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1906b:145 fig. 150:15; HAYES 1953–1959:II:207 fig. 122:right front.

References: CADOGAN 1976:18 Faïence #2, 19; 1983:517; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:229 unnumbered; PHILLIPS 1991:II:558 #158, III:1059 fig. 158; CLINE 1994:211 #697.

Comments: The profile suggests a potstand rather than the footed base of a large vessel or a tazza. Cadogan notes that the parallel at Serabit el-Khadim may well be contemporary with

LM IB, but the parallel at Kerma can hardly be dated after Thutmose I had conquered the site.

191. Potstand, KSM RR/61/264

Faïence, white glaze with black decoration, Dia. (base): 9.1 cm, (A) H: 2.5; W: 3.7; MDim: 4.0 cm; (B) H: 1.4; W: 2.3; MDim: 2.7 cm; (C) H: 1.0; W: 1.2; MDim: 1.3 cm, three non-joining base fragments:

Potstand with flaring angled base and straight walls. Thick horizontal band covers exterior base. Exterior decoration of two narrow parallel lines below series of vertical and diagonal lines, possibly filled triangles. Solid black interior.

Egyptian?, late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, if Egyptian, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

Comparanda: HAYES 1953–1959:II:207 fig. 122:second from right.

References: As above, {190}; PHILLIPS 1991:II:558 #159, III:1059 fig. 159; CLINE 1994:212 #698.

Comments: See above, {190}. This profile does not suggest the base of a large vessel, and it can only be a potstand.

192. Potstand fragment, KSM RR/60/13

Faïence, white glaze with black decoration, H: 3.2; W: 2.4; MDim: 3.4 cm, one lower? body fragment.

Potstand fragment with concave profile. Added decoration of petals with vertical line rising between them, possibly for a second larger row of petals. Solid black interior.

Egyptian?, late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Late SIP–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, if Egyptian, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

Comparanda: As above, {190}.

References: As above, {190}; PHILLIPS 1991:II:558 #160, III:1059 fig. 160; CLINE 1994:211 #696.

Comments: See above, {190}. The vessel thickness suggests it is a potstand; compare with {190}.

193. Closed vessel fragments, KSM RR/59/417 + RR/61/142

‘Egyptian blue,’ H: 7.1; W: 5.1; Dia. (max): 12.8; 10 joining body fragments preserving beginning of handle and neck.

Closed vessel, possibly a jug or jar, with globular body, and at least one vertical handle, wide and probably tall upright neck. Base not preserved but likely footed.⁶³⁷

Egyptian, probably early Dynasty XVIII (reigns of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III).

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Probably early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IB workshop and/or shrine context.

Comparanda: (general) BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:159 #170; CLINE 1994:216 #734, pl. 3:10.⁶³⁸

⁶³⁷ Stone vessels of similar profile having a tall wide neck and globular body, both with and without handle(s), virtually all are footed. See ASTON 1994:87 fig. 16:173–175.

⁶³⁸ This complete vessel was found at Mycenae in Chamber Tomb 49, inscribed [*mn*]-*htp* *hk3-w3st* ([Amon-]hotep, ruler

of Thebes), whom Cline identifies as Amonhotep III. Whilst this is the most likely identification, one use of this epithet is known for Amenhotep II, at Kalebsha. At 11.3 cm in height, it is smaller than the Knossos vessel, handleless and with a flat base.

Reference: CADOGAN 1976:18 Blue frit #1, 19;⁶³⁹ PHILLIPS 1991:II:559 #161, III:1060 fig. 161; CLINE 1994:221 #783.

Comments: This is an unusually large 'Egyptian blue' vessel. If this is a closed footed vessel with wide, tall upright neck, it may be possible to limit its manufacture date to within the reigns of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III.⁶⁴⁰ Its LM IB context places it not much later than this reign at most in any case.

AA.2. No Find Context

The following have no published context within the Royal Road (North) excavations.

194. Jar fragments ('spheroid jar')/scrap, KSM RR/61/22

Andesite porphyry (Type B), having a black matrix with grey-white crystals,⁶⁴¹ (A) H: 4.5; W: 4.0; Th.: 1.7 cm; (B) H: 1.1; W: 3.2; Th.: 1.7 cm, two non-joining body fragments.

Fragments of a spheroid jar, with a small hole drilled through the wall at one end of each. Each has a second hole at right angles to the first, on the interior surface of the larger piece, and the exterior surface of the smaller. Both fragments had been sawn through the profile through the drilled hole.

Egyptian, Naqada II–Dynasty III.

Context: LM IA.

Chronology: Naqada II–Dynasty III vessel, an antique when reworked in MM III–LM IA and then in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM IA context.

Comparanda: {219}; {278}; {416}.

References: WARREN 1969:109 Type 43:A9; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:215 #80; PHILLIPS 1991:II:559–560 #162, III:1060 fig. 162; CLINE 1994:191 #505; PHILLIPS 2001:79 #2.b.

Comments: The Egyptian date range cited is the widest possible, but limited to not later than Dynasty III by its material. Warren cites its origin as an LM IA context in Hood's Royal Road (North) excavations, where the LM IB ivory workshop was excavated.⁶⁴²

The two fragments must have been from the same vessel originally, and the vessel sawn apart and drilled by the Minoan craftsmen for unknown reasons. A similar working is seen elsewhere at Knossos {219}. The 'amulet' found at Myrtos Pyrgos {416}, obviously a reshaped vessel fragment, suggests one possible result.

195. Alabastron? fragment, KSM (1957–1961) RR/60/53 (not located)

Travertine (presumably), H: 3.0; W: 1.8 cm, one body fragment.

Alabastron body, no further description.

Egyptian?, Dynasty XII–XVIII.

Context: LM IB, with some LM II–IIIA sherds.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–XVIII vessel, if Egyptian, general-

ly contemporary with or slightly later than, or more probably an antique in, its LM II?–IIIB context.

References: WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:223 #108; PHILLIPS 1991:II:563 #169; CLINE 1994:166 #272.

Comments: As this fragment is accessioned within the 1960 season, it must be from the north side of the Royal Road excavations since no work was carried out on the south side that year. Its context date has been provided by Warren,⁶⁴³ probably debris or fill context after the LM IB building had been destroyed. A more precise date of manufacture or type cannot be proposed until the vessel and its context are properly published. Given more complete comparanda, however, it is most likely to be not later than the Second Intermediate Period or perhaps very early Dynasty XVIII in date.

196. Alabastron? fragment, KSM (1957–1961) RR/60/404 (not located)

Travertine (presumably), H: 3.5; W: 3.7 cm, one body fragment.

Alabastron body, no further description.

Egyptian?, Dynasty XII–XVIII.

Context: LM IIIB/C.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–XVIII vessel, if Egyptian, an antique in its LM IIIB/C context.

References: WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:223 #108; PHILLIPS 1991:II:563 #166; CLINE 1994:167–168 #286.

Comments: As this fragment is accessioned within the 1960 season, it must be from the north side of the Royal Road excavations since no work was carried out on the south side that year. Its context date has been provided by Warren,⁶⁴⁴ a debris or fill context since no housing or stratified levels of this date is mentioned in the preliminary report. A more precise date of manufacture or type cannot be proposed until the vessel and its context are properly published. Given more complete comparanda, however, it is most likely to be not later than the Second Intermediate Period or perhaps very early Dynasty XVIII in date.

BB. Royal Road Buildings, South Side

On the south side of the 'Royal Road,' Platon had found an MM building and MM II pottery when opening a drainage pit in 1955.⁶⁴⁵ Between 1957 and 1959 M.S.F. Hood excavated a large trench here,⁶⁴⁶ opposite the 'Armoury' (or 'Arsonal') excavated by Evans in 1904 and 1922.⁶⁴⁷ Hood's excavations revealed stratified deposits of Proto-Geometric, LM IIIA2–IIIB and LM II–IIIA1 pottery, the last including a number of

⁶³⁹ He noted fragments of two closed vessels in this reference, but later realised that the fragments joined (personal communication, December 1987).

⁶⁴⁰ BROVARIKI *et al.* 1982:159.

⁶⁴¹ WARREN 1969:109 notes that the material is the same as bowl {241}.

⁶⁴² HOOD 1961–1962:96. Compare context reference with {182–183}; {187}; {189}.

⁶⁴³ Peter Warren (letter of 04 February 1989).

⁶⁴⁴ Peter Warren (letter of 04 February 1989).

⁶⁴⁵ PLATON 1955:566. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51 #215. Material and context dates in this section are presented in collaboration with Doniert Evelyn, Sinclair Hood and Peter Warren; full publication is forthcoming.

⁶⁴⁶ HOOD 1958a:21–22; 1958b:299–300; 1959:19–20; 1960:22–23; 1961–1962:*passim*; 1962b:260; 1966. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51 #214.

⁶⁴⁷ HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51 #213.

large carved ivories including pieces of statuettes and several Linear B tablets related to those found by Evans in the 'Armoury'. Below this was an MM IIIB level, a large MM IIA deposit, MM IB and finally a very thick late? MM IA fill, in well-stratified sequence in narrow basement spaces. These important excavations are published only as preliminary reports.

BB.1. The MM IIA Deposit

The MM IIA deposit⁶⁴⁸ was found on the uppermost of a series of superimposed floor levels,⁶⁴⁹ evidently having fallen from an upper floor or shelf. It included numerous complete MM II vessels, of which only eggshell cups and a scarab were specified. MacGillivray notes 'Egg-shell Ware' and the first appearance of 'Crude Ware' in this sequence here. The scarab was recovered at the top of this floor deposit.

197. Scarab, HM Σ-K 1898

Unidentified glazed material similar but not identical to 'white piece,'⁶⁵⁰ L: 18.7; W: 12.7; H: 8.1; SH: 1.9 mm, intact. Scarab with ornate trapezoidal head, prominent eyes, single line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Legs indicated by diagonal lines and elaborate pattern of notching and fringing. String-hole through length. *Face*: Divided in half along the width by a bar. Inscribed with Egyptian hieroglyphs. Upper half: *w3h* (V 29) flanked by *m3ʿt*-feathers (H 6).⁶⁵¹ Lower half: *nfr* (F 35) flanked by *ʿnh*-signs (S 34). Line border. Egyptian, late Dynasty XII–XIII.⁶⁵²

Context: (late?) MM IIA.

Chronology: Dynasty XIII scarab, in generally contemporary (late?) MM IIA context.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1925b:pl. X:440; REISNER 1955: fig. 13:324, 327–333; DUNHAM 1967:36, 76 seal impressions 13:324, 327–333; MARTIN 1971:pl. 53:Back type 6, 54:Profile type 2e; MATOUK 1972–1977:II:410 fig. 2330; SLIWA 1989:50 #39, pl. XIII:39; TUFNELL 1984:*passim* (generally Back Type I, Head type D3, Side type d13); WARD and DEVER 1994:*passim* (Back type LN, head type D3, side type Di3).

References: HOOD 1959:19–20, fig. 32; 1960:22; ÅSTRÖM 1961–1962:145, 149 (Hood reply); HOOD 1961–1962:96, pl. A'; 1971:47, 218, pl. 12; WARD 1971:81 n. 334; *CMS* II.2: #34; WARREN 1980:497; CADOGAN 1983:510, 516; YULE 1983:366 n. 22; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:211–212 #69, pl. 46:69; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 15, 325 n. 36, 327; 1991:II:561–562 #163,

III:1061 fig. 163; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:51; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:313 #314.

Comments: The profile typology for this period⁶⁵³ does not indicate a closer dating. Quirke and Fitton suggest an even looser "late MK–SIP" range and Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) "Dynasty XIII–XV," but the context itself would not allow for a date later than sometime before late Dynasty XIII and the beginning of the Second Intermediate Period. As it is described as being at the top of the MM IIA floor deposit, it may be that the scarab actually is part of a deposition rather late in MM IIA. Clarification of the actual position and immediate context of this scarab will be crucial for the relative chronology of MM II with the Egyptian sequence, when the context is fully published.

It is one of the better correlations of context and typology available and, surprisingly enough, both the earliest dateable scarab and the earliest dateable context of a scarab at Knossos. This is quite remarkable, as scarabs are found in much earlier contexts elsewhere on Crete, and Knossos has Egyptian imports in contexts as early as EM IIA as well as earlier in the Proto-Palatial period. Equally surprising is the comparatively small number of scarabs recovered at Knossos in general.

BB.2. No Find Context

Other objects have no published specific find location within Hood's Royal Road (South) area, but Warren has specified their context dates.⁶⁵⁴

198. Alabastron? fragment, KSM (1957–1961) RR/59/8

Banded travertine, H: 6.5; W: 4.5; MDim: 7.2 cm, one body fragment.

Alabastron body with rough interior surface.

Egyptian?, Dynasty XII–very early XVIII.

Context: Proto-Geometric, with some residual LM I–III 'scraps'.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–very early XVIII vessel, if Egyptian, an antique in its Proto-Geometric deposition.

References: WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:223 #108; PHILLIPS 1991:II:562 #164, III:1061 fig. 164.

Comments: The sherd probably is another residual piece introduced together with the LM fragments. The curvature suggests a date of manufacture not later than very early Dynasty XVIII, if this is an alabastron. Not listed by Cline.

199. Alabastron (Type B), KSM (1957–1961) RR/59/55

Lightly banded travertine, H: 9.6; W: 6.2; MDim: 9.6 cm, two joining body fragments.

⁶⁴⁸ Originally identified by Hood as MM IIA, then MM IIB, and later emended to the present identification in HOOD 1971:218 #12. See now also MACGILLIVRAY 1998:51; CADOGAN *et al.* 1993:25 "Royal Road South, Basement, Upper Floor," where they note this deposit defines the second horizon of destructions in the Old Palace, relate it to the 'Royal Pottery Stores' deposit (Knossos P), and (p. 26 Table 1) date it to MM IIA in Evans' terms.

⁶⁴⁹ The earlier floor levels were dated to MM IB and MM IA respectively. See HOOD 1961–1962:94; CADOGAN *et al.* 1993:25, 26 Table 1.

⁶⁵⁰ It may be an atypical 'white piece.' (Ingo Pini, personal communication, 09 February 1989).

⁶⁵¹ Possibly to be read *šw*, 'Shw,' the god Shu.

⁶⁵² Previously dated to mid-Dynasty XII (WARD 1971:81 n. 334) and late Dynasty XII–early XIII and possibly SIP (HOOD 1961–1962:96; 1966:111; 1971:47, 218). However, back type parallels to Dynasty XIII by MARTIN 1971:5.

⁶⁵³ MARTIN 1971: pl. 54: Type 2.e.

⁶⁵⁴ Peter Warren (letter of 04 February 1989).

'Drop vase' alabastron with tall narrow body. Egyptian, Dynasty XII–SIP (–very early Dynasty XVIII?).
Context: LM IB–IIIA.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–Second Intermediate Period (–very early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, in later LM IB–IIIA context.

References: WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:223 #108; PHILLIPS 1991:II:562 #165, III:1061 fig. 165; CLINE 1994:166 #273.

Comments: Found in an undescribed context, presumably at or just above the level associated with the carved ivory pieces. The tall, only slightly baggy ('drop') profile suggests a date of manufacture not later than early Dynasty XVIII. Cline notes this is from the South side.

CC. Royal Road North/South, No Find Context

The following are noted to be from Hood's Royal Road excavations of 1957–1961,⁶⁵⁵ but are not specifically located north or south of the road. Both sides were excavated in 1957–1959, when these were registered. Although Warren⁶⁵⁶ has specified the context dates of the two fragments and Hughes-Brock that of the bead, the actual circumstances have not yet been published.

200. Alabastron? fragment. KSM (1957–1961) RR/59/589 (not located)

Travertine (presumably), H: 4.9; W: 2.5 cm, one body fragment.

Alabastron body, no further description.

Egyptian?, Dynasty XII–XVIII.

Context: LM II?–IIIB.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–XVIII vessel, if Egyptian, generally contemporary with or slightly earlier than, or more probably an antique in, its LM II?–IIIB context.

References: WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:223 #108; PHILLIPS 1991:II:563 #167, III:1062 fig. 167; CLINE 1994:167 #283.

Comments: A more precise date of manufacture or type cannot be proposed until the vessel and its context are properly published. Given more complete comparanda, however, it is most likely to be not later than the Second Intermediate Period or perhaps very early Dynasty XVIII in date.

201. Alabastron? fragment. KSM (1957–1961) RR/59/373 (not located)

Travertine (presumably), H: 4.6; W: 2.4 cm, one body fragment. Alabastron body, no further description.

Egyptian?, Dynasty XII–XVIII.

Context: LM IB, with some LM II–IIIA sherds.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–XVIII vessel, if Egyptian, general-

ly contemporary with or slightly earlier than, or more probably an antique in, its LM II?–IIIB context.

References: WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:223 #108; PHILLIPS 1991:II:563 #168, III:1062 fig. 168; CLINE 1994:166 #271.

Comments: A more precise date of manufacture or type cannot be proposed until the vessel and its context are properly published. Given more complete comparanda, however, it is most likely to be not later than the Second Intermediate Period or perhaps very early Dynasty XVIII in date. The mostly LM IB context material suggests it would not be later than the reign of Thutmose III.

202. Bead. KSM (1957–1961) RR/57/21 (not seen)

Faience, "relatively small," presumably intact but condition not stated.

'Ball bead' or "'sector globe,' with alternating blue and black sectors". Number of sectors not stated.

Egyptian, Middle–New Kingdom.

Context: MM IIA.

Chronology: Dynasty XI–XII bead, generally contemporary with or somewhat earlier than its MM IIA context.

Comparanda: BOURRIAU 1988:132–133 #128; LOYRETTE 1997:*passim*; FRIEDMAN 1998:212 #81; 259 #190; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:113 #90.β.

Reference: HUGHES-BROCK 2000:125.⁶⁵⁷

Comments: Egyptian examples are called 'ball beads,' whilst Hughes-Brock refers to this bead as a "sector globe". The context date precludes a date of manufacture later than that stated, although use of these beads continued well into the New Kingdom, the latest closely dateable example being from a foundation deposit of Thutmose III at Koptos.⁶⁵⁸ They are hollow, of various sizes that can be up to 4 cm in diameter. They seemed to have been worn by dancers as extra 'plaits' of hair, or as a weight at the end of a long plait of hair, to swing or allow the hair to swing more vigorously. Ball beads, not necessarily of faience, are depicted in this manner as early as the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, on a relief fragment from the tomb of Queen Neferu, wife of Mentuhotep II (Nebhepetra). They are strongly associated with the goddess Hathor, as they are frequent votive offerings at sites dedicated to her.

This bead suggestively is of Egyptian origin, due to its similarity with those recovered in some quantity in Egypt. Its KSM identification number indicates its find location in the 1957–1961 Royal Road stratigraphical excavations.

DD. Royal Road, South Side (West End)⁶⁵⁹

In 1971–1973, P. Warren excavated on the south side of the Royal Road,⁶⁶⁰ about 13 m. south on the north side of the road, west of his south side excavations,⁶⁶¹ and just east of the modern major highway. Here he

⁶⁵⁵ See Knossos AA–BB, above.

⁶⁵⁶ Peter Warren (letter of 04 February 1989).

⁶⁵⁷ Helen Hughes-Brock (letter of 03 December 2001) asks me to note that she had mentioned this object here with the kind permission of Sinclair Hood and the British School at Athens. She had expected it to be included in the accompanying exhibition, and her grateful acknowledgement would have appeared in the catalogue (KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) entry.

⁶⁵⁸ PINCH 1993:268.

⁶⁵⁹ See Knossos D, above, for the material found in the Pre-Palatial levels of these excavations.

⁶⁶⁰ WARREN 1972a; 1972b:627–629; CATLING 1972:20–21; WARREN 1973:574–576; CATLING 1973:26–29; 1974:34–35. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51 #216.

⁶⁶¹ See Knossos AA–BB, above. Material and context dates in this section are presented in collaboration with Doucret

uncovered a north-south junction to the Royal Road, which runs east-west. His nine trenches revealed 14 phases of occupation, from the 4th c. AD, down to EM IIA levels. Apart from short preliminary reports, the excavations remain unpublished.⁶⁶²

DD.1. Late Minoan I–III? Occupation

During the 1972 season, Warren exposed a number of structures in his ‘Phase II’ dated to LM I–II and possibly III.⁶⁶³ One was a large structure he tentatively suggested was a large stand or grandstand for observing processions along the road or activities on the open ground to the south, constructed in LM I and continuing in use into LM II and possibly also LM III.

Roughly contemporary with it was “the basal level reached in the south-east corner of trench G where the finds included a fragment of a stone bull’s head rhyton and of an Egyptian XVIIIth Dynasty alabastron”.⁶⁶⁴

203. Alabastron? fragment. KSM RRS/72/652 (not seen)

Travertine (presumably), no dimensions stated, one body fragment.

Alabastron body, no further description.

Egyptian?, within Dynasty XII–XVIII.

Context: LM I–II(–IIIA?).

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII–XVIII vessel, if Egyptian, in a generally contemporary or somewhat later LM I–II(–IIIA?) context.

References: WARREN 1973:576; 1989:3 fig. 1; CLINE 1994:167 #285.

Comments: A more precise date of manufacture or type cannot be proposed until the vessel and its context are properly published. Given more complete comparanda, however, it is most likely to be not later than the Second Intermediate Period or perhaps very early Dynasty XVIII in date, probably not within Dynasty XVIII. Its association with a bull’s head rhyton is suggestive of ritual association, but only complete publication would confirm this; the fragmentary nature would suggest a discard rather than ritual use in context. Presumably this is the alabastron from trench G mentioned by WARREN 1973. Cline, however, states it was recovered in an LM III(A?) context.

DD.2. No Find Context

No find contexts are described for the following objects.

204. Alabastron? fragment. KSM RRS/71/203 (not seen)

Travertine (presumably), no dimensions stated, one body fragment.

Alabastron body, no further description.

Egyptian?, within Dynasty XII–SIP (Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: LM IA (early?).

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII–Second Intermediate Period vessel, if Egyptian, in early? LM IA context.

References: WARREN 1989:3 fig. 1; CLINE 1994:166 #269; PHILLIPS 2001:79 #1.d.

Comments: A more precise date of manufacture or type cannot be proposed until the vessel and its context are properly published. Recorded in the 1971 season, and noted by Cline to have been recovered in an LM IA context. This may be from the “early LM IA building phase” described by Warren.⁶⁶⁵ If so, it would not be later than the later Second Intermediate Period in date.

205. Lid, KSM RRS/72/456 (not seen)

Travertine, no dimensions stated, fragment(s).

Lid with domed profile, no undercutting.

Egyptian?, MK–Dynasty XVIII.

Context: EM II–LM III.

Chronology: if Egyptian, MK–Dynasty XVIII vessel, in wide-ranging EM II–LM III context.

References: WARREN 1989:3 fig. 1; CLINE 1994:209 #679.

Comments: Cline notes its context is “EM II–LM III,” suggesting it was recovered in a mixed fill context having EM II–LM III material, presumably deposited sometime in LM III. It was recorded in the 1972 season.

EE. The Little Palace

Evans began work on the so-called ‘Little Palace,’ about 230 m. north-west of Knossos palace along the ‘Royal Road,’ in 1905.⁶⁶⁶ Although he had cleared the majority of it by the end of that season, he returned twice again, in 1908 and 1910, to complete the work.

The building he found was a large ‘villa,’ without the usual central court and other features definitive of a palace, but which seemed to consist almost entirely of large halls with ‘pier-and-door’ partitioning and rooms of a religious nature on the eastern side. The south-east corner largely was destroyed, and a basement room found below appears on the plans in lieu. The main focus of religious importance was the lustral basin (dated to MM IIIB–LM I) at the lower level, later raised and altered to an enclosed bench sanctuary (dated to LM IIIB) and, immediately south of this, a second room called the ‘Room of the (Fetish) Shrine’ (also dated to LM IIIB).⁶⁶⁷ Sealings were found widely scattered in this and sur-

Guely, Sinclair Hood and Peter Warren; full publication is forthcoming.

⁶⁶² A short interpretive description of the MM III–LM IB period is made by DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:157.

⁶⁶³ WARREN 1973:575–576.

⁶⁶⁴ WARREN 1973:576.

⁶⁶⁵ WARREN 1972b:628.

⁶⁶⁶ EVANS 1904–1905:2–16; 1914a:59–94; *PM* II.2:513–544; PALMER in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:164–167, 244; BOARDMAN in PALMER and BOARDMAN 1963:61–67; GILL 1965:85–91; GESELL 1985:93–94 #42. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:47 #185, and now HATZAKI 1994; 2005.

⁶⁶⁷ RUTKOWSKI 1986:131, 135, 151 #22.

rounding rooms,⁶⁶⁸ in what was described as a ‘loose tawny deposit’ at a height considerably above floor level and probably originating in an upper storey, together with a number of cult objects, including the ‘bronze corkscrew curls’ identified by Evans as locks of hair from a large statue, crystal discs and a faience vase with nautilus reliefs, a clay agrimi figure and fragments of others. The excavation notes are confusing, and little has been done to elucidate the situation or distinguish the material other than the sealings within this area since. The building seems to have been destroyed sometime during the second half of LM IIIB according to some, whilst Eleni Hatzaki argues for an LM IIIA2 main destruction and then extensive LM IIIB re-occupation.⁶⁶⁹

EE.1. ‘The Room North of the Shrine’

The ‘Room North of the Shrine’ (also called ‘Anteroom of the Shrine’ and ‘Anteroom of the Lustral Area’) is a long rectangular room measuring some 3.5 by 4.5 m, originally with two openings to a stairway and possible cult storage room on its west and a large open hall, the ‘Great Megaron’ to the east.⁶⁷⁰ Additionally, two other openings at the south lead into the ‘Lustral Basin’ and the ‘Corridor by Shrine’. It was only partly excavated.⁶⁷¹ Later alterations included blockage of one western and southern passageway and the eastern entrance, leaving only two of the original five openings still accessible.

Gill recently has identified 11 seal impressions found in this room, of which only four can now be located;⁶⁷² no other finds are specifically mentioned from here. The fill is dated both to LM I and LM III, and cannot be associated with either architectural phase. Sealings are reported from the ‘tawny deposit’ below the lustral basin ledge and later ‘fetish shrine’ level. This same ‘tawny deposit’ was reported to contain LM III sherds elsewhere in the Little Palace and in the main palace, and was attributed by MacKenzie to decay of the rubble walls and brick, and to the action of fire. Presumably, then, the sealings are from an LM III context.

206. Seal impression, HM — (not located)

Clay, dimensions unknown, lower part only preserved in one impression.

Seal impression, possibly from a lentoid seal, showing the lower part of a Minoan ‘genius’ standing at right, facing left in front of a large bull’s head lying on the ground and facing right. Only the legs and abdomen of ‘genius’ are preserved. Obscure lines above bull’s head may indicate other action in the upper left area of the design.

Minoan, LM III, probably LM IIIA.

Context: LM III.

Chronology: LM III(A?) object, in generally contemporary LM III context.

References: EVANS *PM* IV.2:605 #E.9; GILL 1964:8, 18 #28, fig. 3; 1965:90 #U.116, pl. 19:U116; PHILLIPS 1991:II:565–566 #170, III:1062 fig. 170; HATZAKI 1994:268 #U116, pl. 220:U116/E9; POPHAM and GILL 1995:24, 27, pl. 47:U116

Comments: The impression is known only from a sketch in Evans’ excavation notebook. As Gill notes, the bull’s head may represent a rhyton in that shape.

207. Seal impression, HM — (not located)

Clay, dimensions unknown, lower half preserved possibly in two impressions.

Seal impression, possibly from a lentoid seal, showing lower part of a standing ‘genius’ at right facing left. Raised above the suggested ground level are the fore?-legs of an animal, presumably being carried either from a pole or directly on the shoulders of the ‘genius’. Only legs of ‘genius’ are preserved.

Minoan, LM III, probably LM IIIA.

Context: LM III.

Chronology: LM III(A?) object, in generally contemporary LM III context.

Comparanda: {64}; {266}; {557}.

References: GILL 1964:20 #36, fig. 4; 1965:90 #U108, pl. 19:U108; PHILLIPS 1991:II:556 #171, III:1062 fig. 171; HATZAKIS 1994:268 #U108, pl. 219:U108; POPHAM and GILL 1995:27 #U108, pl. 47:U108.

Comments: The impression is known only from a sketch in Evans’ excavation notebook. Evans noted the number ‘2’ next to the sketch in his NB, taken to indicate that two impressions had been recovered. If so, neither can now be located.

*EE.2. The “Room West of Megaron. ? balustrade”*⁶⁷³

The “Room West of Megaron. ? balustrade” or ‘Corridor by Shrine’ is a short corridor flanked to the west by the ‘Lustral Area’ and to the west by the

⁶⁶⁸ See GILL 1965:85–91; also HALLAGER and HALLAGER 1999:316.

⁶⁶⁹ HATZAKI 1994:I:321–324; 2005:201–204.

⁶⁷⁰ HATZAKI 1994:I:84–87; POPHAM and GILL 1995:23–25, 24 fig. 1 #11; HALLAGER and HALLAGER 1999:pl. LXIII #14; HATZAKI 2005:48–49, plans 2, 39.

⁶⁷¹ See HATZAKI 1994:I:24:Room 12; 2005:13: Room 12.

⁶⁷² GILL 1965:90 #U108–U116; POPHAM and GILL 1995:27 #U108–116, pl. 16; HATZAKI 2005:184 table 5.4.

⁶⁷³ Note that I have altered the text of this title from “Room West of Megaron? balustrade” (as presented in POPHAM and GILL

1995) to ‘Room West of Megaron. ? balustrade’ as originally written in Evans’ NB text; see POPHAM and GILL 1995: pl. 47.top of recto page. The implication in Evans’ original text is his lack of certainty for the identification of the space as a *balustrade* rather than its location west of the the Megaron. This better reflects the situation of the ‘Corridor by Shrine,’ whereas Popham and Gill’s presentation of this location implies the balustrade identification is certain but its location west of the megaron, or that room’s identification as a megaron, is not. Note the reading employed here also is used by HATZAKIS 2005:184, where she identifies it as (her) Room 18.

large ‘Megaron’ hall, from which it is separated by a solid wall.⁶⁷⁴ It links the ‘Room of the Fetish’ and the ‘Room North of Shrine,’ and measures some 0.75 m wide and 2.25 m long. Apart from the ‘Room North of the Shrine’ (EE.1, above), the corridor is the only room west of the megaron, and the east ‘wall’ of the ‘Lustral Area’ is a series of three pillars on a plinth, later blocked, that was called a ‘balustrade’ during excavation of the area,⁶⁷⁵ so the ‘balustrade’ may refer only to the western portion of the corridor.⁶⁷⁶ The balustrade itself seems to have served as a bench in LM III.⁶⁷⁷ The fill here was consistently the same ‘tawny’ earth as elsewhere except that it contained more burnt wood.⁶⁷⁸ It too probably came from an upper storey, and the pottery again is LM III in date.

Gill recently has identified some eight seal impressions specifically from the “Room West of Megaron. ? balustrade,”⁶⁷⁹ of which none can now be located. From the ‘Corridor by Shrine,’ which Evans evidently also called this space,⁶⁸⁰ she has identified a further five seal impressions,⁶⁸¹ of which again none can be located, providing a total of 13 *if* the two names indeed refer to the same space. No other finds are reported specifically from this room.

208. Seal impression. HM — (not located)

Clay, dimensions unknown, almost complete in one impression.

Seal impression, probably from a lentoid seal, showing a standing ‘genius’ at left, facing right with hands raised in front of face. On right, an upright object described as ‘a grain of barley’. Dorsal appendage indicated only by a row of dots at back, abdomen filled with horizontal lines.

Minoan, LM III, probably LM IIIA.

Context: LM III.

Chronology: LM III(A?) object, in generally contemporary LM III context.

References: EVANS *PM* IV.2:605 #E.10, 626–627 fig. 614; GILL 1964:8, 16 #11; 1965:89 #U86; PHILLIPS 1991:II:567 #172,

III:1062 fig. 172; HATZAKI 1994:267 #U86, pl. 218:U86/E10; POPHAM and GILL 1995:17 #U86, 51#U86, pls. 31:U86, 47:U86.

Comments: The impression is known only from a sketch in Evans’ excavation notebook and a more detailed published drawing; the sealing itself now cannot be located. It is identified there as coming from the “Room West of Megaron. ? balustrade”.

Gill identifies the ‘grain of barley’ as a large stone altar, forerunner of the *omphalos*. Dated by Kenna on the basis of the sketch.

EE.3. No Find Context

The following was found in one of the boxes containing material from the ‘Little Palace’ in the Knossos Stratigraphical Museum.⁶⁸²

209. Jar (‘shoulder jar’) fragment. KSM unnumbered. (Evans box P.I. 8 #1437) (not seen)

Anorthosite gneiss, H (max.) 9.8 cm, one rim or body fragment.

Jar of ‘shouldered’ type; thick walled,⁶⁸³ very smoothly finished on exterior and interior, large and heavy, no evidence for handles.

Egyptian, Dynasty I–IV(?).

Context: None.

Chronology: Dynasty I–IV(?) vessel, without context amongst material from an MM IIIB–LM IIIB building.

References: HATZAKI 1994:1:281, 283 #SF13, II:pl. 226.d; BEVAN 2001:289–290 n. 162; HATZAKI 2005:185, 189 #SF13.

Comments: This seems to be the only example of this vessel type on Crete. Hatzaki, with some reservation, called this “part of a cylindrical stand”.

FF. The ‘Unexplored Manison’

Evans originally gave this building its name when he found it in 1908 just west of the ‘Little Palace,’ but he did not actually excavate it beyond two small test trenches. It seems to have been linked to the ‘Little Palace’ by a bridge. It may have served as an annexe to the other building, although it is on a different orientation than the ‘Little Palace’ itself. The Germans

⁶⁷⁴ HATZAKI 1994:94–95; POPHAM and GILL 1995:24, 24 fig. 1 #10; HALLAGER and HALLAGER 1999:pl. LXIII #12; HATZAKI 2005:525, plan 2.

⁶⁷⁵ HATZAKI 1994:I:21–23; 2005:11–13.

⁶⁷⁶ For this portion, effectively the east wall of the Shrine itself, see HATZAKI 1994:I:90–91; 2005:51.

⁶⁷⁷ RUTKOWSKI 1986:143.

⁶⁷⁸ GESSELL 1985:94, stated by MacKenzie.

⁶⁷⁹ GILL 1965:89 #U84–92; POPHAM and GILL 1995:24 #U84–92, 27 #84–92; HATZAKI 2005:184 table 5.4.

⁶⁸⁰ Other names are ‘North South Corridor’ and ‘Corridor E of Shrine.’

⁶⁸¹ GILL 1965:89 #U75–79; POPHAM and GILL 1995:24 #U75–79, 26 #75–79; HATZAKI 2005:184 table 5.4.

⁶⁸² I am grateful to Andrew Bevan and Eleni Hatzaki for allowing me to mention this vessel.

⁶⁸³ Andrew Bevan (personal communication, 10 December 2001), who handled the vessel, informs me that its type is that of his fig. 6.3, which is the type as described by B.G. ASTON 1994:121–122 #79/81 and cited here. She also notes that anorthosite gneiss is not used in vessel manufacture after the Old Kingdom. Those of his fig. 6.3 are inscribed with the names of a Middle Kingdom and ‘Hyksos’ king, and may either be reused vessels or late use of the stone. The vessel dates quoted here reflect Aston’s range of vessel and stone production.

attempted some minor exploration in 1940 and 1941 during their occupation of Knossos, but the building was not fully explored until M.R. Popham and H. Sackett's excavations in 1968, 1972–1973 and 1977.⁶⁸⁴

The 'Mansion' is a large (c. 24 × 14.5m) rectangular LM building cut partly into a large rock at the back. It was made of finely dressed ashlar masonry, with a flagged passageway separated from a raised platform/terrace to its north, and a large earthen ramp linking it with the 'Little Palace' and an intermediary platform to its south. A large 'pillar hall' separates a series of rooms to its north and south, each with its own staircase to an upper floor. Initially but incompletely constructed in LM IA, it was first occupied in LM II before a severe fire collapsed its upper floor. It seems partly to have been a workshop, for a bronzemaking establishment was located on the upper storey during LM II, but its use otherwise is unclear. The northern part only was cleared out, repaired and re-occupied until it was abandoned in LM IIIB, whilst the central and southern areas were not reused. The area later was extensively pitted, often removing some of the walls almost entirely, in post-Minoan times.

FF.1. The 'North Platform'

The North Platform is directly north of the 'Mansion,' where one test trench was dug to bedrock level. It is separated from the main rooms of the northern part of the building by the 'North Corridor,' which runs directly east-west and parallel to Corridor E. A poorly constructed stairway led up to it from near the western end of the North Corridor. The platform seems to have been levelled during the initial LM IA construction of the building, as it can be related to the foundation trenches of the building and LM IB pits were dug into it, as were one LM II (context /7\)) and two LM IIIB pits excavated in the trench. The platform extends both north and west beyond excavation limits. Again, post-Minoan pitting had destroyed much, so it seems unlikely that any LM structure was constructed on the platform itself. Some but not many signs of the LM II destruction are evident here.

The platform was paved with limestone slabs, and its fill contained a quantity of MM IIIB and LM IA pottery, mostly as sherds, and a serpentine lentoid

seal. The LM II pit and immediate LM II layer material apparently included numerous LM II sherds together with some fragments of one serpentine and two travertine rhyta, a faience vessel fragment, and two spherical clay loomweights. The later fill and LM IIIB pits material included a chlorite animal head rhyton, rock crystal bead, lapis lazuli pierced disc, two serpentine conical 'buttons,' ivory 'rod,' bone spatula, 'faience' spherical bead, and clay spherical loomweight and pendant.⁶⁸⁵ Other stone vessel fragments and eight pieces of obsidian also came from this area, their location unstated.

210. Alabastron (Type A)/rhyton, KSM UM/68/249 + UM/68/277 (NP 4) (not seen)

Banded travertine, creamy-white veined, H: 14.4, Dia. (max): 16, (hole) 0.6, Th.: 0.7–2.5 (at base) cm, base and lower body to shoulder in two fragments.

Globular alabastron, rounded body and bottom. Hole drilled at bottom centre or, more likely, near-centre, for conversion to a rhyton. Upper body presumably restored on the basis of {146}. Egyptian, late MK (from within Dynasty XII) (–SIP?), with alterations Minoan, MM III–LM I.

Context: LM IA(–II).

Chronology: Late Middle Kingdom (from within Dynasty XII) (–Second Intermediate Period?) vessel, reworked in MM III–LM I and generally contemporary to heirloom in its somewhat later LM IA(–II) deposition.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1937:pl. XXIX.627; {91}, {146}; (profile) {91}; {146}; {259}.

References: POPHAM *et al.* 1984:I:94, 234, II:pl. 229.1; WARREN 1989:2 fig. 1, 3; CLINE 1994:167 #280.

Comments: Found in a context 'to LM II but mostly LM IA,' and therefore presumably either immediately on or above the flagged platform surface, or possibly the LM II pit fill.

This vessel originally was a Type A alabastron, and was converted into a rhyton by drilling a hole at its bottom by Minoan craftsmen. Its conversion (as published) is unusual in that the hole is not off-centre, and the publication may be incorrect. The illustration in the present study is adapted to correct this, and also making the hole entirely vertical whilst retaining the vessel maximum diameter. The result is a vessel having a higher shoulder and slightly more elongated lower body. Similar Type A alabastra have been recovered at Kalyvia {91} and in the 'Room of the Stone Vases' at Knossos {146}, but only the 'Unexplored Mansion' example has been converted into a Minoan vessel. Its context suggests that it had been discarded, probably together with the other rhyta and faience vessel fragments, possibly after it was no longer needed for ritual use elsewhere. As the rim is missing, its profile is unknown, and it is possible this vessel may have been a Dynasty XVIII type with angular rim profile; here, however, the rounded profile is indicated, as on the other two vessels found on Crete.

⁶⁸⁴ POPHAM *et al.* 1984. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:47–48 #186 for earlier references.

⁶⁸⁵ The specific contexts of this material (apart from the pottery) are rarely stated, only the 'to' context dates.

FF.2. No Find Context

The following have no, or no published, context.

211. Lid, KSM [M]UM/72/147 (not seen)

Anorthosite gneiss, dimension estimated as Dia.: 8.5 cm, one rim/body fragment.

Circular lid, with inset underside.

Probably Egyptian, if so, probably Dynasty III–IV.

Context: Not stated.

Chronology: Probably Dynasty III–IV vessel, in an unstated context of an LM IA–LMIIIB building.

Comparanda: (material) {231}.

References: POPHAM *et al.* 1984:236, pl. 217.1.lower left; WARREN 1989:2 fig. 1; 3.

Comments: This fragment seems visually to be the only illustrated sherd in anorthosite gneiss shown in the plates quoted in Evely's discussion. Identification as a lid is made from the published photograph, and seems straightforward; presumably it is the flat type. Its material would date the lid to Dynasties I–IV, and its inset profile is more common from Dynasty IV. Although its level and context date are not stated, its much later context is not unique.

212. Vessel (not located)

Anorthosite gneiss, no further information.

No description except "individual".

Probably Egyptian.

Context: Not stated.

Chronology: Probably Early Dynastic–Old Kingdom vessel, in an unstated context of an LM IA–LMIIIB building.

Comparanda: (material) {231}.

Reference: WARREN 1989:2 fig. 1; 3.

Comments: Warren mentions a second vessel fragment of the same material as {211}.

213. Bowl ('shallow carinated bowl'), KSM — (not seen)

Quartz crystal, dimensions estimated as H: 4.8, Dia. (rim): 21.5, (carination): 20 cm, one rim to lower body fragment.

Open, shallow bowl with carinated shoulder, flaring rim projecting slightly farther than carination, carination sharp but rim edge squared, comparatively thick section.

Minoan, probably MM II.

Context: Not stated.

Chronology: Probably MM II vessel, in an unstated context of an LM IA–LM IIIB building.

Comparanda: {172}; {175}; {294}; (shape) {164}.

Reference: BEVAN 2001:I:225, II:4412 fig. 6.32.d.

Comments: Bevan notes the existence of this sherd from the 'Unexplored Mansion,' but does not provide further details; it is not mentioned in the site report and all description here is based on his illustration.⁶⁸⁶ This piece, in an extremely hard and brittle stone, is much thicker in section than its parallels at Knossos, both Egyptian and Minoan. As the earliest material from the recent 'Mansion' excavations is described as MM IIIB, it *may* have been from an earlier fill.

GG. The Stratigraphical Museum Area

A proposed extension to the KSM, about 350 m. north-west of the palace, made necessary investigations in the areas to its west. P. Warren conducted excavations in 1978–1982 on the west side, behind the KSM.⁶⁸⁷ Below Geometric to Roman levels, he found in succession LM IIIC/Sub–Minoan pits, an LM IIIB/C apsidal building, LM IIIA levels with three circular stone platforms, LM II housing and an LM I building and three kilns. An east-west road, continuing the line of the 'Royal Road' farther east, divided the building and the kiln. Below this was an MM building and debris dating as early as MM IA.

GG.1. Drain Area

In the extreme north-eastern corner of the excavation, sited north of the 'Room of the Frescoes' of the LM IB 'North House,' Warren exposed an east-west drain and its support wall to the north, both associated with the 'North House,' above a layer of red soil which extended farther north to the northern edge of the trench. Below this soil was encountered a massive, 2 m. wide fill of pottery slumping from the northern trench section (1.15m deep) southwards some 0.65 m. south. This rested above a wall tumble of MM III date. Further walls and floors of MM IA–II date underlay all this.⁶⁸⁸

WARREN (1991) has examined in detail the fill, originally thought to be the contents of a pit and identified as 'Pit VI'. The pottery dates this material to MM IIIB–LM IA transitional, and was considered by Warren to represent the debris of a major destruction at that date, cleared out and used as fill following the collapse of an unexcavated building farther north due to an earthquake rather than human agency. Whilst the vast majority of material is ceramic vessels, five stone vase fragments (three open bowls, a tankard and low lamp), the foot of a plaster tripod stand, bronze pin fragments, two loomweights and several pieces of obsidian also were recovered.

214. Bowl fragment ('high-shouldered jar'? type), KSM SEX/82/1779 (D /21\ 5344)

Mottled limestone, black matrix with white veins, H: 5.6; W: 10.6; Dia. (rim): 16.4; (max): 20.2 cm, one rim/body fragment. Open bowl with incurved upper body. Rim slightly raised by low horizontal groove just below rim. No evidence for handles. Minoan, probably MM IIIB–LM IA.

⁶⁸⁶ It is not mentioned by POPHAM *et al.* 1984, and may have been from Evans' trenches or the German investigations in the area.

⁶⁸⁷ CATLING 1979:36–37; 1980:48–50; WARREN 1981a; 1983;

BLACKMAN 1998:114–115. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:49 #188.

⁶⁸⁸ See plans and sections in WARREN 1991:figs. 2–4.

Context: MM IIIB–LM IA transitional.

Chronology: Probably MM IIIB vessel, in generally contemporary or slightly later MM IIIB–LM IA transitional debris context.

References: WARREN 1989:5, fig. 3:82/1779, pl. 12; PHILLIPS 1991:II:572 #177, III:1065 fig. 177; WARREN 1991:332.

Comments: The vessel should have been made in MM IIIB, as it was found in a debris context, yet above an MM IIIA wall tumble. It seems related to the ‘high-shouldered jar’ type, with its slightly raised rim.

GG.2. The ‘North House’

In the LM I building, called the ‘North House’ as it lies immediately north of the ‘Royal Road’ extension, Warren uncovered a series of basement rooms.⁶⁸⁹ The building had been destroyed in LM IB, and was built over in LM II with the construction of the ‘Gypsum House’. It consisted of several rooms, apparently facing onto a court (the ‘North Court’) at the north end of the trench. The largest room, on the east, was identified as the ‘Cult Room Basement,’ and contained a collapsed upper floor deposit of numerous LM I clay vessels and other objects. Immediately to the west, separated from the ‘Cult Room’ by a narrow corridor, is the ‘Room of the Children’s Bones,’ and another room of similar size immediately south of it and also accessible from the corridor. In the north-east area of the excavation, east of the ‘North Court,’ and entered from it, is another large room decorated with frescoes, having a large square feature apparently in the middle. North of its northern wall was revealed the earlier east-west drain, choked with pottery, described immediately above.

GG.2.1. ‘Room of the Children’s Bones’

This room, near the eastern end of the trench, is where the remains of several children were recovered. Markings on the bones were identified as knife cuts, and the excavators concluded that the children had been sacrificed and their flesh removed.⁶⁹⁰ All four layers of fill in the room were LM IB in date. On the preserved top of the west wall of the room was found a scarab.

215. Scarab, HM Σ-K 2816

‘White steatite’. L: 10.0; W: 7.0, H: 5.0, SH: 1.5 mm, chipped on head and tail.

Scarab with open head, prominent eyes, distinguished between pronotum and elytra by short tick only, no distinction between elytra. Lunate tail. Legs indicated by deep undercutting and notching. *Face:* Four Egyptian hieroglyphs in vertical format: ‘bread loaf’ *t* (X 1), water *n* (N 35), mouth *r* (D 21) and an arm and hand *ꜥ* (D 36) or alternatively where the hand holds incense *rdi* (D 37). Line border.

Canaanite, MB IIB–C or (less likely) Egyptian, very late Dynasty XIII–XV.

Context: LM IB (or LM II?).

Chronology: MB IIB–C scarab, slightly earlier than, or an heirloom or antique in, its LM IB (LM II?) context.

Comparanda: ROWE 1936: pl. VI:229, see also 215–220; MATOUK 1972–1977:II:412 #2394–2401; HORNING and STAEHELIN 1976:52 fig. 5; TUFNELL 1984:*passim* (generally Back type O, Head type B2, Side type d2, Design class 3C).

References: WARREN 1981a:88–89, fig. 47;⁶⁹¹ LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:211 #68, pl. 45:68; PHILLIPS 1991:II:568–569 #173, III:1062 fig. 173; CLINE 1994:147 #126; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:314 #317.

Comments: This is a common combination of signs found on scarabs almost exclusively of this date, in both Canaan and in northern Egypt. Multiple variants of the type are known, including this one. All are generally known as *anra* scarabs, after the single-sound hieroglyphs that generally appear as the ‘inscription’. Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) date this scarab to Dynasty XV.⁶⁹² In the Canaanite area, however, the *anra* face design continued in use until the incursions of Thutmose III that mark the end of the MB and the beginning of the LB period, and it is entirely possible that the scarab is from this region and date. Thus its latest possible date of manufacture is dependent on its origin and this as yet cannot be determined with certainty. This one likely is Canaanite rather than Egyptian, as the inscription is written opposite to the usual vertical presentation where the top of the face is at the tail end of the scarab; here, the inscription reads from the head end.

The published find spot of the scarab, on the preserved top of the wall, suggests that an LM IB dating for this piece corresponding to the LM IB finds in the room may not be secure, although this would need to be confirmed when the context is fully published. It may have been deposited there during the LM II rebuilding, as the tops of the LM IB basement walls probably had been used as foundations for the LM II building.⁶⁹³ Whether the deposition of the scarab was part of the LM IB debris leveled off or deposited in LM II itself during construction is open to question. As there is no break in habitation and the maximum time span concerned not great, the question is not chronologically important when dealing with an object that is either only slightly earlier or possibly even several generations old at the earliest possible date of its deposition.

⁶⁸⁹ CATLING 1980:49; WARREN 1981a:79–92; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:159–161. See WARREN 1991:320 fig. 1 for a plan of the building remains; WARREN 1981a:79 fig. 15 is an earlier, less complete plan. The area is that of Trench G in WARREN 1983:fig. 1.

⁶⁹⁰ WALL, MUSGRAVE and WARREN 1986. The room contents are described in detail.

⁶⁹¹ Illustrated upside-down.

⁶⁹² KEMP and MERRILLEES 1980:48–49 note that the *anra* motif is one of several that are “either new [in the Hyksos period], or had previously been uncommon.” The formula also is known on a scarab naming Senwosret I (Dynasty XII) that certainly is dated long after his reign and likely is of SIP date; see TUFNELL 1984:I:121.

⁶⁹³ WARREN 1983:65. Scarab {197} was recovered in a similar type of context.

GG.2.2. North Court & Corridor

The North Court is immediately north of the ‘Room of the Children’s Bones,’ and is linked to it by the north end of the narrow corridor. The court is at the basement level and may have been a light well; a few paving stones remained *in situ*. In the overlying fill of the court were found four cult vessels (two cup rhyta and two amphorae), possibly fallen from the cult room. The north end of the corridor also was paved, and could be closed off from the court by a door. Apart from some LM II cups from the later occupation which had cut into this area and some carbonised earth at the south end, few finds were recovered in the corridor. However, two small fragments of (one or two) ostrich eggshells were found, separated by some six metres; one was recovered on the east side of the court, the other at the south end of the corridor.

216. Ostrich eggshell, KSM SEX/80/2024 + SEX/81/408 (not seen)

“Only a few cm in size,” two non-joining fragments.

Fragments convex, undecorated.

Probably from Libya or Egypt, or Syro-Palestine, undateable but probably not earlier than early Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM IB, with some LM II sherds.

Chronology: Undateable possibly Egyptian object, probably in generally contemporary or slightly later LM IB cult or domestic fill context.

Comparanda: {108}, {153}, {261}, {425}.

References: REESE 1985:373; CLINE 1994:238 #951.

Comments: Presumably from the same eggshell, which Cline considers to be a rhyton. Reese mentions only one fragment.

GG.2.3. ‘Room of the Frescoes’

The ‘Room of the Frescoes’ is located in the north-eastern area of the ‘North House,’ immediately south of the earlier east-west drain.⁶⁹⁴ This room, the eastern wall of which was not excavated, boasts a floor of fine limestone and gypsum paving. The main recorded finds are the fresco fragments in multiple colours for which the room is named, recovered on the floor near the north wall but presumably from the upper part of the wall or an upper storey originally. These represent a series of different subjects, including miniature buildings, a river scene with bordering crocuses and other flowers, festooned columns and a life-size olive branch, and a series of garlands, each representing different flowers.⁶⁹⁵

217. Tridacna shell, KSM SEX/79/2025 (not seen)

Shell; L: (pres.) 15.2; W: (pres.) 10.0 cm, one(?) fragment.

Giant clam shell, valve.

Egyptian?, SIP? or later.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: Undateable imported object probably from Egypt, probably in generally contemporary or slightly later LM IB cult or domestic fill context.

References: WARREN 1985a:187–189; SHACKLETON, HOOD and MUSGRAVE 1987:286 n. 19; CLINE 1994:236–137 #937–938.

Comments: Cline lists two tridacna shells, which presumably are the same object. Tridacna (giant clam) shells are found only in the Red Sea and Persian Gulf, and therefore presumably were acquired from Egypt. The possibility exists, however, that this one was acquired via Mesopotamia and the Levant. It either is raw material, or was used as a cosmetic container, according to Cline. This seems to be the only such shell identified from Crete, and as such is indeed a rarity whatever its origin.⁶⁹⁶

GG.2.4. ‘North House,’ unspecified.

The following is noted to be from the ‘North House,’ but not its location within the building. It should however, be from the region of its ‘Cult-Room Basement,’ according to its labels.

218. Alabastron (Type B), KSM SEX/78/145 + SEX/80/1131 (L /19\ 37 + G/L /57\ 3036)

Banded travertine, (A) H: 10.9; W: 9.8; Dia. (max): 10.2 cm; (B) H: 8.1; W: 4.7; Dia. (max): 10.2 cm; (C) H: 5.5; W: 3.5; MDim: 5.5 cm; six joining and two non-joining body and lower body fragments, preserving majority of profile except rim and bottom: total H (pres):12.6; Dia 12.1 cm.

‘Drop vase’ alabastron with sloping profile, irregular body interior profile.

Egyptian, within Dynasty XII–SIP (–very early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: LM IB, with some MM IIIB–LM IA sherds, and LM I with some LM II sherds.

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII–Second Intermediate Period (–very early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, in a somewhat later LM IB context.

References: WARREN 1978:361; 1989:4 #6, fig. 2.6, pl. 5:left and centre; PHILLIPS 1991:II:573 #178, III:1066 fig. 178; CLINE 1994:166 #270.

Comments: Five joining fragments found in an LM IB context with a few MM IIIB/LM IA sherds (G/L /57\ 3036) in the region of the ‘Cult-Room Basement’ of the LM IB ‘North House,’ and three more in an LM I context with some LM II sherds (L /19\ 37) a little farther south of the others. These locations are calculated on the basis of their associated trench references. Warren notes this ‘almost certainly [is] a vessel in use in the LM IB North House’.

The Type B profile suggests a date of manufacture not later than very early Dynasty XVIII at the very latest.

GG.3. The ‘Gypsum House’

The north-west corner of the excavation site revealed

⁶⁹⁴ WARREN 1981:79 fig. 15:upper right, 80; 1991:320 fig. 1: upper right. See Knossos GG.1, above, for the drain area.

⁶⁹⁵ WARREN 1985a.

⁶⁹⁶ See SHACKLETON, HOOD and MUSGRAVE 1987 for discussion of other possible and misidentified objects of tridacna shell.

part of a large LM II structure termed the ‘Gypsum House’ from the large quantities of that material used in its construction and details.⁶⁹⁷ It lay north of the east-west road. The building as excavated consists of multiple rooms and two staircases, founded on sloping bedrock and constructed atop the western part of the LM IB ‘North House,’ where basement walls had partially been used as foundations in its construction. Gypsum was used for floors, staircases, cupboards and door-jamb bases. Walls were made of mud-brick, sometimes plastered. One floor was earthen. Most floors had pottery deposits, mostly of kylikes and small drinking and pouring vessels

219. Closed vessel fragment, KSM SEX/81/1322 (F /80\ 4505) Banded travertine, H: 16.7; W: 7.9; Dia. (base): 15.6 cm, one lower body/base fragment.

Probable jar with thick profile, slightly rounded flat base and tapering lower body, rough interior.

Egyptian, probably Dynasty XVIII, possibly SIP or earlier.

Context: LM II disturbed, with MM IIIB–LM I sherds.

Chronology: Probably Second Intermediate Period–mid-Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, reworked in LM (IB?–)II and in generally contemporary or slightly later LM II context.

Comparanda: PENDLEBURY 1932:148 #H8, pl. XIX:3; HAYES 1953–1959:I:fig. 211–212; II:fig. 39; LILYQUIST 1995:38 #72, 74, figs. 82.left, 83; (saw marks) {194}; {278}; {416}.

References: WARREN 1989:5 #18, 8 n. 5, fig. 3:18, pl. 9–10; PHILLIPS 1991:II:570–571 #174, III:1063 fig. 174; CLINE 1994:201 #601; LILYQUIST 1996:139 n. 44; BEVAN 2001:I:224, II:410 fig. 6.30.

Comments: Found in an LM II context, on an unspecified but disturbed gypsum slab floor of the house, with MM IIIB–LM I as well as LM II sherds. This is not the ‘disturbed gypsum slab floor’ mentioned in Trench A at the extreme north-west corner.⁶⁹⁸

It is possible this might be a Minoan vessel type, the ‘bucket-jar,’⁶⁹⁹ but its material is unknown in this form elsewhere and it is an open (not closed) vessel type. The fragment is far more likely to be Egyptian, and its profile and scale is identical to those of the comparisons quoted. The flat base is not common for vessels of this size in the New Kingdom, or indeed in Egypt at all except in the Predynastic and early Old Kingdom periods, but is known for several New Kingdom closed vessel types (‘tall lugged jar,’ ‘shoulder jar’) of roughly similar scale. Saw marks on one of the vertical edges indicate the vessel had been sawn down the profile to the point 5 cm. in from the base edge then broken in two, of which only this half is preserved. This corresponds to similar marks on the edges of two porphyritic jar fragments also from Knossos {194}, and probably

also the amulet from Myrtos Pyrgos {416}. The vessel probably was broken up into smaller pieces for use as raw material, to be carved into other (smaller) objects – but whether this was done in Egypt, Crete or elsewhere is impossible to say.

GG.4. No Find Context

The following objects were identified recently as Egyptian during Warren’s restudy of his material for publication. Individual contexts are not specified in publication⁷⁰⁰ although recorded in excavation records. Warren kindly allowed me to study the material prior to publication, including profiles. Three other vessels he has identified as Egyptianising pieces are not published there. The context dates with which he kindly has provided me fall into general periods, and the vessels are grouped in the present catalogue into these general periods. The general locations can be discerned from comparison of the trench identification on the label (Trenches A–W) and Warren’s publication of the site plan.⁷⁰¹

GG.4.1.

The following are found in contexts dated within MM III–LM I.

220. Ewer or jar fragment, KSM SEX/81/1381 (D /88\ 4536)

Banded travertine, H: 5.9; W: 8.2; Dia. (rim): 10.1; (neck): 4.9 cm, one rim/neck fragment preserving more than a quarter of the diameter.

Ewer or jar with flaring neck and slightly everted rim. Exterior edge of rim with grooved (concave) profile.

Probably Syro-Palestinian, LB I, or just possibly Egyptian, SIP–early Dynasty XVIII.

Context: MM IIIB–LM I, with two or three LM II sherds.

Chronology: Probably early LBA or Second Intermediate Period–early Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in generally contemporary or slightly later MM IIIB–LM I context.

Comparanda: XENAKI-SAKELLARIOU 1985:266 #3225, fig. 131:3225; LILYQUIST 1995:pl. 7.1; TBM 37.248; {281}.

References: WARREN 1989:5 #20, fig. 3:20, pl. 6:top right; PHILLIPS 1991:II:571–572 #175, III:1064 fig. 175; CLINE 1994:204 #630; PHILLIPS 2001:80 #4.a.

Comments: Recovered in the north-eastern corner of the excavation area, in Trench D (general region of the east-west drain) Warren calls this a typical Egyptian vessel rim form, certainly not Minoan,⁷⁰² and compares it to hydria {281} that is in fact an Egyptian imitation of a Syro-Palestinian form. The grooved rim profile is not an Egyptian type, however, and may be indicative of an alternative origin, most likely Syro-Pales-

⁶⁹⁷ WARREN 1983:63–65, figs. 2–3.

⁶⁹⁸ This is the only floor so described in the preliminary report (WARREN 1983:63–65). However, the fragment was recovered in Trench F according to its label, so should have come from one of the gypsum floors east of the staircase with a *sottoscala*.

⁶⁹⁹ WARREN 1969:34–35 Type 14.

⁷⁰⁰ WARREN 1989.

⁷⁰¹ WARREN 1983:63 fig. 1.

⁷⁰² Peter Warren (personal communication, September 1988).

tine. Xenaki-Sakellariou has published a much better preserved vessel (NMA 3225) of LH I–II date with similar grooved rim profile found by Tsountas at Mycenae in 1885. Lilyquist⁷⁰³ also illustrates the vessel, comparing it to another from Kāmid el-Lōz in the Lebanon (but note this latter vessel does not have a grooved rim).

221. Lid fragment, KSM SEX/80/1804 (F/G /43\ 3005)

Banded travertine, H: 0.5, W: 4.7; Dia. (rim): 11.1 cm, one rim fragment.

Flat lid, slightly thinning to the exterior edge.

Egyptian, Old Kingdom–Dynasty XVIII, probably the latter.

Context: MM IIIB–LM IA, with some LM I–II sherds.

Chronology: Old Kingdom–mid-Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in generally contemporary to much later MM IIIB–LM IA context.

References: WARREN 1989:5 #21; PHILLIPS 1991:II:572 #176, III:1064 fig. 176; CLINE 1994:210 #681; PHILLIPS 2001:80 #5.a.

Comments: Recovered in the general region of the ‘Cult-Room Basement’ and corridor to its west of the ‘North House,’ and of the area of the east-west road in Trench F/G, but not necessarily associated with building or road itself.

The flat lid with tapering edge is known throughout most of the pharaonic period, but is most common in Dynasty XVIII.

GG.4.2.

The following were found in contexts dated within LM I–II.⁷⁰⁴

222. Bowl? fragment, KSM SEX/82/1710 (D /17\ 5288)

Anorthosite gneiss, grey/white with multiple broken dark grey/black bands, H: 14.8; W: 9.3, one body fragment.

Thick-walled large open vessel, probably a bowl. Smooth interior and exterior, angle difficult to determine.

Egyptian, Old Kingdom, probably Dynasty III–IV.

Context: LM I–II, with a few earlier sherds.

Chronology: Old Kingdom (probably Dynasty III–IV) vessel, an antique in its LM I–II context.

Comparison: PETRIE 1937:pl. XXIII:382.

References: WARREN 1989:4 #5, fig. 2:5, pl. 4; PHILLIPS 1991:II:573 #179, III:1067 fig. 179; CLINE 1994:190 #498.

Comments: Recovered in the north-eastern corner of the excavation area, in Trench D (general region of the east-west drain).

The smooth interior surface suggests an open form.

223. Alabastron (Type B), KSM SEX/82/1653 (D /11\ 5243)

Banded travertine, H: 3.0; W: 3.7; Dia. (rim): 10.0 cm, one rim/neck fragment.

‘Drop vase’ alabastron with flaring rim, having four (preserved) horizontal grooves on exterior and a flat top.

Egyptian, within Dynasty XII–SIP.

Context: LM I–II, with a few earlier sherds.

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII–Second Intermediate Period vessel, in somewhat later LM I–II context.

Comparanda: REISNER 1923:57–59, fig. 159, pl. 38:1.7, 4; PETRIE 1937:10, pl. XXIX:656–657, 659–660; BOURRIAU 1988:144–145 #150–151.a; {90}.

References: WARREN 1989:4 #7, fig. 2:7, pl. 6:top, second from right; PHILLIPS 1991:II:573 #180, III:1066 fig. 180; CLINE 1994:166–167 #275.

Comments: Recovered in the north-eastern corner of the excavation area, in Trench D (general region of the east-west drain).

The multiple-grooved rim is found only on Type B alabaster.⁷⁰⁵

224. Alabastron (Type C), KSM SEX/79/444(a) (H /17\ 1278)

Banded travertine, H: 12.5; W: 9.1; Dia. (max): 25.8 cm, Th.: 20 cm, one body fragment.

Probable large baggy alabastron with sloping profile, irregular interior profile.

Egyptian, SIP–Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM I–II, with a few MM IIIB–LM IA sherds.

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period–mid-Dynasty XVIII vessel, in generally contemporary or slightly later LM I–II context.

References: WARREN 1989:4 #9, pl. 5:right; PHILLIPS 1991:II:574 #181, III:1068 fig. 181; CLINE 1994:221 #785.

Comments: Recovered in the north-north-eastern edge of the excavation area, in Trench H (general region south of the ‘Room of the Frescoes’ and east of the ‘Cult-Room Basement’). Two fragments were found here and listed under a single accession number, but do not appear to be from the same vessel. This fragment is identified as (a) to distinguish it from fragment {225} below. Its rim profile is unknown, so its date parameters can extend into Dynasty XVIII.

225. Alabastron (Type B–C), KSM SEX/79/444(b) (H /17\ 1278)

Banded travertine, H: 3.8; W: 4.0; MDim: 4.3 cm, one neck fragment.

Probable alabastron with constricted flaring/diagonal neck.

⁷⁰³ LILYQUIST 1995:pl. 7.1. It is possible that the grooved rim profile conflates the normally separate rim and lid into a single piece, as often occurs with the amphora and potstand such as {114}; see LILYQUIST 1995:pl. 16.2–3 for comparative rim profile with separate fitted lid, here on an alabastron.

⁷⁰⁴ Three other fragments of banded travertine were also found in contexts of this period but, although considered Egyptian imports by Warren, they have no distinguishing feature to identify them as such. The fourth is a pyxis form, which does not convince me as Egyptian. As Minoan vessels also were made of this material (see WARREN

1969:125–126), the following are not included in this catalogue:

- 1) KSM SEX/82/1636 (D /11\ 5239), LM I–II context; WARREN 1989:4 #8, pl. 16:top left; CLINE 1994:167 #276;
- 2) KSM SEX/81/1918 (W /42\ 2846), LM I–II context, *Ibid.*:4 #10, fig. 2:10, pl. 7; CLINE 1994:167 #277;
- 3) KSM SEX/79/1824 (H /60\ 2057), LM I context, *Ibid.*:4 #11, pl. 6: top, second from left; CLINE 1994:167 #278; and
- 4) KSM SEX/80/1163, LM IB context, *Ibid.*:5 #19, fig. 3:19, pl. 8:lower left; CLINE 1994:201 #600.

⁷⁰⁵ But see the footed base of a Dynasty XI miniature ‘brewer’s vat,’ METROPOLITAN MUSEUM 1999:454–455 #184.

Egyptian, within Dynasty XII–SIP (–very early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: LM I–II, with some MM IIIB–LM IA sherds.

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII–Second Intermediate Period (–very early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, in generally contemporary or slightly later LM I–II context.

References: PHILLIPS 1991:II:574 #182, III:1069 fig. 182; CLINE 1994:166 #274.

Comments: Recovered in the north-north-eastern edge of the excavation area, in Trench H (general region south of the ‘Room of the Frescoes’ and east of the ‘Cult-Room Basement’).

As above, {224}. This piece is identified as (b) to distinguish it from fragment {224} above, and was not included in WARREN 1989.

The angle of the junction from body to neck suggests a date of manufacture not later than very early Dynasty XVIII.

226. Lid fragment, KSM SEX/79/543 (T /37\ 1112)

Banded travertine (possibly calcite), H: 0.8; W: 3.0; Dia. (rim): 5.9 cm, one rim fragment to edge of undercut.

Flat lid, undercut at edge.

Egyptian, Old Kingdom–Dynasty XVIII, probably the latter.

Context: LM II.

Chronology: Old Kingdom–mid-Dynasty XVIII vessel, in generally contemporary to much later LM II context.

Comparanda: {163}, {490}.

References: WARREN 1989:4 #12; PHILLIPS 1991:II:574 #183, III:1069 fig. 183; CLINE 1994:167 #279.

Comments: Recovered in the south-eastern part of the excavation area, in Trench T (general region of the south-west excavated area of the ‘South House’).

It is just possible that this is a vessel rim fragment, either of a small open vessel such as the ‘cylinder jar’ {311} or a constricted neck/rim of a closed vessel such as the krateriskos {255}, small pot {253}, jug {248}, hydria {281}, or amphora {114}.

227. Lid fragment, KSM SEX/79/372 (P/Q /11\ 1518)

Banded travertine, H: 0.6, W: 2.6; Dia. (rim): 6.9 cm, one rim fragment.

Flat lid, undercut at edge.

Egyptian, Old Kingdom–Dynasty XVIII, probably the latter.

Context: LM I, with a few MM IIIB/LM IA and LM II sherds.

Chronology: Old Kingdom–early-Dynasty XVIII vessel, in generally contemporary to much later LM I(–II?) context.

Comparanda: {163}, {490}.

References: WARREN 1989:5 #22, fig. 3:22, pl. 8:lower right; PHILLIPS 1991:II:574–575 #184, III:1069 fig. 184; CLINE 1994:210 #682.

Comments: Recovered in the south-eastern part of the excavation area, in the Trench P/Q area (general region of the northern rooms of the ‘South House’).

228. Bowl fragments, KSM SEX/80/1162 (G/L /3\ 1162)

White marble (‘Cycladic?’), H: 6.7; W: 9.7; Dia. (rim): 1.6; (max): 16.2 cm, one rim/body fragment preserving two-thirds of handle.

Open bowl with incurving unarticulated rim and sharp shoulder. Horizontal lug/roll handle on shoulder.

Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB context.

References: WARREN 1989:5, fig. 3:80/1162, pl. 11; PHILLIPS 1991:II:575 #185, III:1070 fig. 185.

Comments: Recovered in the north-central part of the excavation area, in Trench G/L, in a context identified on the storage envelope as in the area of a ‘stairway’. This stairway seems to be in the region of the ‘Cult-Room Basement’ of the LM IB ‘North House,’ possibly that immediately east of the room and north of the road.

Possibly derived in part from the ‘high-shouldered jar’ and/or ‘spheroid jar’ forms in combination with the basic Minoan bowl having a carinated profile and lug/roll handles on the shoulder.⁷⁰⁶

229. Bowl fragment, KSM SEX/82/1736 (D /7\ 5299)

Gabbro, H: 3.8; W: 4.6; MDim: 4.9 cm, one body fragment.

Open bowl with incurving unarticulated sharply rounded shoulder, strongly tapering lower body.

Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM IB.

Chronology: LM I vessel, in generally contemporary LM IB context.

Comparanda: (generally) WARREN 1969:passim Types 3, 5, 7, 9.

References: WARREN 1989:5; PHILLIPS 1991:II:575 #186, III:1070 fig. 186.

Comments: Recovered in the north-eastern corner of the excavation area, in Trench D (general region of the east-west drain).

As above, {228}.

GG.4.3.

The following were found in contexts dated within LM III, or LM III at the latest.⁷⁰⁷

230. Jar fragment (‘spheroid jar’), KSM SEX/78/205 (M /13\ 222)

Porphyritic rock (possibly porphyritic quartz monzo-diorite?),⁷⁰⁸ dark grey matrix with black, pink and white phenocrysts, H: 6.8; W: 7.9; MDim: 8.3 cm, 1 lower body fragment. Thick-walled body fragment, probably of a large spheroid jar with flat collar and horizontal roll handles.

Egyptian, Naqada II–Dynasty V.

Context: LM IIIA–C.

⁷⁰⁶ WARREN 1969:20–21 Type 7. See also Types 5–6.

⁷⁰⁷ A small fragment of banded travertine also was found in an LM III context but, although listed as an Egyptian import by Warren, it has no distinguishing feature to identify it as such. As Minoan vessels also were made of this

material (see WARREN 1969:125–126), it is not included in this catalogue: KSM SEX/79/1972 (T /22\ 1061), WARREN 1989:4 #13; CLINE 1994:164 #284.

⁷⁰⁸ See ASTON 1994:18; WARREN 1989:4 #2.

Chronology: Naqada II–Dynasty V vessel, an heirloom or antique in much later LM IIIA–C context.

Comparanda: WARREN 1969:108–110 Type 43:A.

References: WARREN 1989:4 #2, fig. 2.2, pl. 3.left; PHILLIPS 1991:II:576 #187, III:1071 fig. 187; CLINE 1994:191 #506.

Comments: The Egyptian date range cited is the widest possible. Recovered in the eastern edge of the excavation area, in Trench M (general region of the east-west road).

Warren notes the material is ‘close to’ that from the Mons Porphyrites area in the Eastern desert of Egypt.

231. Lid fragment, KSM SEX/79/517 (O /14\ 1649)

Anorthosite gneiss, blue/grey with black mottling, H: 1.0; W: 3.2; Dia. (rim): 12.2 cm, one rim fragment.

Flat lid, thinning at bottom towards edge.

Egyptian, Dynasty I–IV, probably III–IV.

Context: Late LM III, with a few MM III/LM I and one or two Post-Minoan sherds.

Chronology: Dynasty I–IV, probably III–IV, an heirloom or antique in much later late LM III context.

Comparanda: B.G. ASTON 1994:132 Type 110; (material) {211}.

References: WARREN 1989:4 #4, fig. 2.4,⁷⁰⁹ pl. 3.right; PHILLIPS 1991:II:576 #188, III:1071 fig. 188; CLINE 1994:210 #683.

Comments: Recovered in the south-central part of the excavation area, in Trench O.

232. Alabastron (Type C), KSM SEX/80/915 (K /35\ 2380)

Banded travertine, H: 8.1; W: 7.5; Dia. (max): 17.2 cm, three joining lower body fragments.

Baggy alabastron, strongly curved.

Egyptian, SIP–Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM I–IIIA.⁷¹⁰

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period–Dynasty XVIII vessel, in generally contemporary to much later LM I–IIIA context.

References: WARREN 1989:4 #14, fig. 3.14, pl. 6.lower right; PHILLIPS 1991:II:576 #189, III:1072 fig. 189; CLINE 1994:168 #287.

Comments: Recovered in the north-central part of the excavation area, in Trench K, south of the east-west road (general region of the kiln).

233. Closed vessel fragment, KSM SEX/80/1184 (Y /33\ 3550)

Banded travertine, H: 4.6; W: 4.9; Dia. (rim): 6.6; (max): 7.1 cm, one rim/neck fragment.

Closed vessel with vertical neck, thickening to exterior carination just below flat rim top.

Possibly Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM I–IIIA.

Chronology: Possibly Dynasty XVIII vessel, if so in generally contemporary to much later LM I–IIIA context.

References: WARREN 1989:5 #17, fig. 3.17, pl. 8.top left; PHILLIPS 1991:II:576 #190, III:1072 fig. 190; CLINE 1994:201 #599.

Comments: Recovered in the south-eastern corner of the excavation area, in Trench Y.

Warren notes the section thickness suggests a large vessel, of which this fragment is the neck. It is not a Minoan shape, according to Warren, but not particularly an Egyptian one either. Warren’s suggested parallels all depend on the addition of an inset rim, for which no evidence is preserved on the fragment and no direct parallels can be cited.

GG.4.4.

The following were found in contexts dated to the post-Bronze Age but probably are survival pieces from that time.⁷¹¹

234. Closed vessel fragment, KSM SEX/79/427 (H /29\ 1264)

Diorite, white and black matrix, H: 3.7; W: 5.1; Dia. (rim): 13.2 cm, one rim fragment.

Closed vessel, probably a jar, with low thick rolled collar rim.

Probably Egyptian, Old Kingdom, probably Dynasty III–IV.

Context: Classical–later Hellenistic, with residual Minoan and Geometric sherds.

Chronology: Old Kingdom (probably Dynasty III–IV) vessel, an antique in its Classical–later Hellenistic pit context.

Comparanda: EL-KHOULI 1978:III:pl. 751725–1727.

References: WARREN 1989:4 #3, fig. 2.3, pl. 3centre; PHILLIPS 1991:II:577 #191, III:1072 fig. 191.

Comments: Found in Pit III, in the north-north-eastern edge of the excavation area, in Trench H (general region south of the ‘Room of the Frescoes’ and east of the ‘Cult-Room Basement’ of the LM IB ‘North House’).

235. Jar fragment (‘spheroid jar’), KSM SEX/80/1057 (Y /3\ 3507)

Porphyritic rock (possibly porphyritic quartz monzo-diorite?),⁷¹² black matrix with white and some pinkish and orange-brown phenocrysts, H: 10.3; Dia. (rim): 19.0; (max): 26.4 cm, one large but quite battered fragment preserving about one-fifth of vessel but almost entire profile except interior rim.

Thick-walled spheroid jar with flat collar not undercut, high shoulder and flat base. Irregular interior profile with pimple at bottom. No handle preserved

Egyptian, Dynasty I–IV.

Context: Modern.

Chronology: Dynasty I–IV vessel, an antique in its modern pit context.

Comparanda: WARREN 1969:108–110 Type 43:A; EMERY 1938:pl. 33:17; {165}.

⁷⁰⁹ Shown upside down, following his parallels with lids illustrated in PETRIE 1937.

⁷¹⁰ These are stated to be “probably LM IIIC” in WARREN 1989, who later emended this attribution by hand to ‘LM I–IIIA’ on the offprint kindly sent by him to me after further study of its context.

⁷¹¹ Two other travertine vessel fragments were found in contexts of post-Minoan date, but could not be identified as

probable Egyptian forms and are not included in this catalogue. These are:

1) KSM SEX/80/969 (F/FG /17\ 2947), WARREN 1989:4–5 #15, pl. 6.lower centre (where he suggests it may be a Minoan conical rhyton), not included in CLINE 1994; and
2) KSM SEX/82/1669 (D /13\ 5262), WARREN 1989:5 #16, fig. 3.16, pl. 6.lower left; not included in CLINE 1994.

⁷¹² See ASTON 1994:18; WARREN 1989:4 #2.

References: WARREN 1989:3–4 #1, fig. 2.1, pls. 1–2; PHILLIPS 1991:II:577 #192, III:1073 fig. 192.

Comments: Recovered in the south-eastern corner of the excavation area, in Trench Y.

Warren dates this piece to Dynasty II–III. Found in a modern pit in the course of excavation, but presumably arrived on Crete sometime during the Bronze Age when virtually all the comparable jars were imported.

HH. The ‘House of the Sacrificed Oxen’

In 1922, Evans excavated the area immediately south of the east (domestic) wing of the palace, on the hill slope. Here he uncovered a number of houses constructed in MM IIIA and destroyed by earthquake in MM IIIB/LM IA transitional, and not rebuilt. He named two of them the ‘House of the Fallen Blocks’ and the ‘House of the Sacrificed Oxen,’⁷¹³ the former due to the large blocks that had been found thrown inside by the earthquake, and the latter following the discovery of two ox skulls and horns together with tripod altars in opposite corners on its southern room. Both houses were small, with only four and five rooms respectively, separated by a north-south path and drain way. The ‘House of the Sacrificed Oxen’ was only partially revealed. Only the basement level of both remained.⁷¹⁴

Above the wall levels in the ‘House of the Sacrificed Oxen,’ Evans found an apparently deliberate earthen fill mixed with ceramics dating well within MM III.⁷¹⁵ The majority of vessels were of a domestic nature, including oval-mouthed amphorae, lamps, jugs and juglets, cups and bowls, pots, ewers and spouted vessels. Others included a bridge-spouted jar, rhyton and ‘fruit stand’. All are of MM IIIA, some possibly MM IIIB, date.⁷¹⁶

236. Rhyton, AM AE 916

Clay, H (pres.): 15.5; Dia. (max.): 12.5 cm; basal hole: 5.3 mm, several joining fragments, apparently entire profile except upper neck and rim, paint flaked and worn.

‘Globular’ ovoid rhyton with raised basal hole and stepped neck. Painted white, with wide orange ‘rock work’ border at

base and upper shoulder, and alternating black and red horizontal stripes on neck corresponding to stepped profile. Basal hole slightly off-centre.

Minoan, MM III(A?).

Context: MM IIIA(–B?).

Chronology: MM III(A?) vessel, in generally contemporary MM IIIA(–B?) context.

Comparanda: MINISTRY 1988:266–267 #301;⁷¹⁷ (form) LEVI 1965–1966:332 fig. 22:centre, pl. II:a; SHAW 1978:pl. 37:a; BETANCOURT 1985:108 fig. 8:B; 1990:fig. 32:656, 69:2014–2015.

References: EVANS *PM* I:594, fig. 436:A; II.1:224, 303, fig. 129:3; WALBERG 1976:144 Form 162.4, fig. 27:162; PHILLIPS 1991:II:578–579 #193, III:1074 fig. 193; KOEHL 2006:27, 94 #142.

Comments: Evans saw this as the earliest prototype of the ‘ostrich-eggshell rhyton’ form, imitating the ostrich eggshells converted into rhyta in the Aegean. If so, it is the only example painted in imitation of the surface decoration and attachments: Evans postulated the white imitated the egg surface and the orange its added gold plating.

Rhyta in ‘ostrich eggshell’ form are found in some quantity in MM III, where the upper aperture is fairly wide with a small thick lip and ‘pimpled’ lower aperture. This example exhibits a different upper aperture, suggesting perhaps an early or at least a variant detail. Nonetheless, it seems that this is but one of many examples of this form, albeit the only one directly imitating the appearance of the ostrich eggshell. It is difficult to see it as the ‘prototype’ for the clay form.⁷¹⁸ An added problem is chronological, as Egyptian ostrich-egg vessels are extremely rare finds in contexts or illustrations earlier than Dynasty XVIII, apart from the desert oases where such vessels would be utilised more readily. It may be that ostrich eggshells were imported and made into rhyta because of their similarity to the clay vessel form and this example, the only one of its kind on Crete, was painted to imitate the import.

An LH IIA (=LM IB) rhyton with integral flaring neck and rim, with sponged body decoration described as imitating the eggshell surface, was recovered at Kalkani (Mycenae), possibly in imitation of the LH I eggshell rhyta also recovered at Mycenae. It seems a poor imitation, however, and may simply be a sponged body pattern that was characteristic of the period.

II. ‘Hogarth’s Houses’ Area

Low on the eastern slope of Gypsades hill, about 600 m. south-west of the palace and just west of the modern road, D.G. Hogarth excavated two LM houses in March 1900, indicating the existence and extent of

⁷¹³ EVANS 1922:326–328; *PM* II.1:296–311; see also HOOD and TAYLOR 1981:25 #285–286.

⁷¹⁴ Below these was recovered even earlier material; see MACGILLIVRAY 1998:46–48.

⁷¹⁵ BETANCOURT 1985:104. He notes the deposit is “stylistically earlier than the Temple Repositories” (Knossos J, above).

⁷¹⁶ MACGILLIVRAY 1998:46–48 studied the earlier deposits below the post-destruction fill, where he concluded that some material (his #985, 989, 1002 and 1005) actually belonged to this fill. On the basis of the ‘intrusive’ material, he dated this fill to MM IIIA, noting no fragments of MM IIIB or later material and quoting Mackenzie that “no

LM I vases were found in these deposits,” and Mackenzie’s conclusion that the filling took place at the end of MM III. WALBERG 1992:13 notes the material has characteristics of both.

⁷¹⁷ The painted design is called ‘stippled’ here, but actually it is applied with a sponge dipped in paint.

⁷¹⁸ The earliest examples at Knossos (MACGILLIVRAY 1998:82) preserve only the lower portion. He notes that rhyton F.1036 from Phaestos may give the complete profile and dates it to MM IIIB (LEVI 1976–1981:Plates I:pl. 155:a, d); this has no articulated upper aperture. Thus, the origins of this form do not lie with Type A (‘flask’) alabastra either.

the town surrounding the palace. Trials nearby also revealed several earlier contexts, including a plastered pit closed in MM IB. In 1949, P. de Jong found more buildings in an adjoining field to the south, and M.S.F. Hood excavated in the adjoining field in 1953, finding a larnax.⁷¹⁹

During 1956–1958, Hood returned to excavate next to Hogarth's original House 'A'.⁷²⁰ He found a Geometric well, with some pottery of later date in its fill. Remains of houses and traces of occupation from MM IB–LM III were also uncovered, including a deposit of MM IB vessels in a 'kind of rock-cut basement'.

II.1. West of 'Hogarth's Houses,' MM IIIB context

A deposit or context in Hood's area D 5, excavated in 1956 contained at least one alabastron. Its registration in 1956 suggests this fragment was excavated during trial excavations in the autumn of that year, revealing "deep deposits dating from the early part of Late Minoan times".⁷²¹ No mention is made of MM III levels in Hood's preliminary report of the 1956–1957 excavations here, but Warren dates its context to MM IIIB.

No other 1956 finds were mentioned, and no real description of the 1956 trenches has been published, but in 1957 the topsoil of a 10 × 20 m. area was cleared around these trenches. This revealed an apparent 'house-shrine' apparently dating to the LM IA period, much disturbed by deep ploughing. It had a pebble floor, and contained a stone altar, a triton shell, and conical cups ritually placed upsided down. Also found were a stone weight and pithos rim, both inscribed with Linear A signs. No associated walls were found.

237. Alabastron (Type B), KSM HH/56/30

Banded travertine, H: 5.1; W: 3.9; MDim.: 5.1 cm, one body fragment.

Tall, almost ovoid 'drop vase' alabastron.

Egyptian, within Dynasty XII–SIP (–very early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: MM IIIB.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–earlier Second Intermediate Period vessel, in generally contemporary MM IIIB context.

References: WARREN 1969:112–113 Type 43:I; BETANCOURT and

WEINSTEIN 1976:337; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:223 #109; PHILLIPS 1991:II:580 #194, III:1075 fig. 194; 2001:78 #1.a.

Comments: Warren notes that this is the earliest dated find context of an Egyptian alabastron on Crete.⁷²² The Type B body profile also suggests a pre-Dynasty XVIII date of manufacture. Whether this fragment should be associated with the early LM house-shrine, or came from an earlier level, is unknown. If the former, it is the earliest instance of an alabastron in a ritual context, as well as the earliest dated find context for the vessel type.

II.2. West of 'Hogarth's Houses,' LM II context

The 1958 excavations were conducted south of the 1956–1957 excavation area. Just south of the earlier excavations was revealed a Geometric well, sunk through several Middle Minoan floors. At the bottom was a 'kind of rock-cut basement' with MM IB pottery.

South of this area was revealed further walls (possibly an extension to Hogarth's House 'A'), including a complex of rooms, corridor and stairway, built and destroyed during LM IA. Above this was a thick ash layer containing LM IB pottery above, then two 'small and flimsy' one-storeyed houses. Traces of subsequent houses lay above this, and continued in use into LM III.⁷²³

238. Potstand fragment, KSM (1957–1961) HH/58/91

'Egyptian blue,' H: 2.8; W: 3.7; Dia. (base): 10.1 cm, one base fragment, chipped on exterior.

Potstand with thickened splaying base, horizontally-ribbed lower body with grooving between ribs.

Egyptian, probably early to mid-Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II.

Chronology: Early–mid-Dynasty XVIII vessel, in generally contemporary to later LM II occupation? context.

References: CADOGAN 1976:18 Blue frit #1, 19; PHILLIPS 1991:II:580–581 #195, III:1075 fig. 195; CLINE 1994:212 #699.

Comments: Cadogan provides a provisional LM II context date for this fragment. This and the other 'Egyptian blue' and faience vessels from Hood's 1957–1961 Royal Road North excavations⁷²⁴ are in the process of being studied for publication by Cadogan and R.E. Jones.

JJ. The Sanctuary of Demeter

Just south of the palace and about 200 m. north of 'Hogarth's Houses,' M.S.F. Hood and J.N. Coldstream excavated areas that later were identified as part of

⁷¹⁹ EVANS *et al.* 1899–1900:70–81, pl. XII:points 6, 7; HOGARTH and WELSH 1901; EVANS *PM* II.2:547–550; COOK and BOARDMAN 1954:166–167. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:57 #297; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:52–53.

⁷²⁰ HOOD 1958a:22–23; 1958b:299 fig. 1; 1959:18–19; MACGILLIVRAY 1998:53. The last notes excavation was north rather than west of 'Hogarth's Houses'. Material and context dates in this section are presented in collaboration with Gerald Cadogan, Doniert Evely, Sinclair Hood and Peter Warren; full publication is forthcoming.

⁷²¹ HOOD 1958a:21, 22, fig.22; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:165.

⁷²² See also {426}.

⁷²³ HOOD 1959:19. HOOD 1961–1962:97 notes that LM II deposits were found on Gypsades. See also DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:163–164. Material and context dates in this section are presented in collaboration with Gerald Cadogan, Doniert Evely, Sinclair Hood and Peter Warren; full publication is forthcoming.

⁷²⁴ See Knossos AA, above.

an Iron Age temple dedicated to the goddess Demeter. It continued in use from the 8th c. BC–2nd c. AD.⁷²⁵ Although only a row of seven foundation blocks and possibly two Doric capital fragments remained of the building itself, the large number of votive deposits and dumps surrounding it were conclusive.⁷²⁶

Amongst these were a series of pit deposits. The largest was an enormous votive dump, 'Deposit H,' part of a pit complex about 10 m. in diameter.⁷²⁷ Lying south and south-east of the temple, it contained material as early as Geometric but chiefly Classical and Hellenistic in date. It had been thoroughly disturbed in Roman times. The pit is believed to have been in use from the 5th c. BC–2nd c. AD, dated chiefly by two undisturbed 'nuclei' of miniature clay vessels. Other material included enormous quantities of terracotta figurines, coins, beads, and other small objects in gold, silver, bronze, iron, stone, bone, clay and glass. Nonetheless, among the small finds were a number of objects clearly earlier and some Bronze Age in date.

239. Cornflower bead, HM Σ-K 1904

Carnelian, H: 17.0; W: 8.8; Dia.: 4.3; SH: 0.9–1.5 mm, slight chip at back on edge.

Cornflower bead with circular base and flat back. Horizontal string-hole through side at 'stem' near top.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XVIII (not earlier than reign of Akhenaten) or later.

Context: 5th c. BC–2nd c. AD.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XVIII (not earlier than reign of Akhenaten) or later object, an antique in its Classical-Roman pit context.

Comparanda: BLANCHARD 1909:pl. XLVII:277; BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:238 #314 (fig. 15).

References: COLDSTREAM 1973:163 #259, fig. 41:right, pl. 95:259; PHILLIPS 1991:II:582 #196, III:1075 fig. 196; 1992b:499; ADLER 1996:45 n. 69; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:190–191 #184.

Comments: Cornflower beads also have been found elsewhere on Crete, but this is the only example having a flat back. These beads date not earlier than the reign of Akhenaten (late Dynasty XVIII), but continue in use at least into Dynasty XXV, which ended in the mid-7th c. BC. Thus, this bead still would have been an antique at minimum two centuries earlier than its earliest possible context date, but is not necessarily a Bronze Age piece.

240. Amulet or pendant, HM Σ-K 1905

Rock-crystal, H: 16.6; W: 8.7; Th.: 7.2; SH: 1.7 mm, intact.

Amulet or pendant in the form of a squatting ape, with elbows on knees and hands at sides of head. Incised lines indicate details of face and hands, and two horizontal lines at wrists seem almost like bracelets. Horizontal string-hole through side at shoulder level. No ears indicated. Tail indicated by diagonal lines lower back to right leg. Baseless.

Minoan, MM IB–II.

Context: 5th c. BC–2nd c. AD.

Chronology: MM IB–II object, an antique in its Classical-Roman pit context.

Comparanda: {30}; {386}; {469}; {563}.

References: HOOD 1959:21 fig. 36; DAUX 1959:737–738 fig. 8; CANCIANI 1973; COLDSTREAM 1973:162–163 #258, fig. 41:left, pl. 95:258; LANGDON 1990:416, fig. 13; PHILLIPS 1991:II:582 #197, III:1075 fig. 197; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:400 #436; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:185 #173.

Comments: Evans casually has suggested the tailless figures might be the 'Barbary ape,'⁷²⁸ but its limited distribution in the extreme north-western Sahara does not warrant such an identification. This figure probably is derived from the *hamadryas* sub-species of the *Cynocephalus*, as suggested by the thick mane obscuring its neck and shoulders, but is of Minoan work.

Dated on the basis of its material. Evidence for earlier use of rock crystal is problematic.⁷²⁹

KK. Isopata 'Royal Tomb'

About five kilometres north of the palace of Knossos and four kilometres from the northern coast, A.J. Evans excavated a 'royal' tomb on the plateau of Isopata in 1904.⁷³⁰ Although architecturally much ruined by the removal of most of the upper courses for building material, the plan was complete. The tomb consisted of three areas: a long dromos leading from the north-east, a 'fore-hall' with a 'sepulchral niche' on either side wall, and a large rectangular 'inner chamber' with a deep 'cist grave' in the north corner. Essentially, this was a chamber tomb. It was later destroyed during the Second World War.

The tomb had been plundered prior to excavation, but much still remained. The recovered material dates to LM I–III A1, all the ceramics being LM II–III A1. The tomb itself was constructed in LM IA (early).⁷³¹ The southern niche of the fore-hall was

⁷²⁵ HOOD 1958a:23–24; 1959:19–21; 1960:24–25; 1961:25–26; COLDSTREAM 1973. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:56 #286. A 6th c. B.C. 'egyptianising' figurine from the sanctuary is discussed by SKON-JEDELE 1994:1845 #2901, 1860–1861 #2901.

⁷²⁶ A plan of the area is provided by HOOD 1958a:25 fig. 26.

⁷²⁷ COLDSTREAM 1973:4, 39, 188, and pit section fig. 2.

⁷²⁸ EVANS *PM* I:119.

⁷²⁹ See YULE 1981:198. Vanschoonwinkel accepted the originally published date of EM III–MM I.

⁷³⁰ EVANS 1903–1904:5–6; 1905:526–562; *PM* IV:2:771–776; PENDLEBURY 1939:195–196, fig. 35; POPHAM 1965:333, fig. 33; PINI 1968:82. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:34 #2.

⁷³¹ HOOD and SMYTH 1981:11; see also DRIESEN and MACDONALD 1997:170 for comparanda of stone vessels with LM I material elsewhere.

reused during LM IIIC.⁷³² Driessen and MacDonald note a number of parallels in both Aegean and Egyptian stone vessels between the Royal Tomb here and Chamber Tomb 102 at Mycenae, dated to LH IIA (=LM IB).⁷³³ The stone vessels seem generally to be of LM I types, and this (together with some other evidence) raises the possibility that they are remnants of an earlier interment.

Although the objects catalogued below were found in three separate locations within the tomb, in each case they were from the lower of two interments, and should be regarded as a single unit. This impression is reinforced by the similarity of the beads and pendants from the cist grave and the east end of the forehall, which probably were strung together originally.

This is the largest group of Egyptian artefacts from a single context on Crete. There seems to have been more Egyptian material than Minoan, but this does not mean to suggest that the owner was an Egyptian or an Egyptophile. The tomb had been heavily looted, not only of objects but also of its walls, and if anything we can say that the plunderers were uninterested in the imports. The fact that some were found at the entrance suggests that the missing objects were either lighter or more precious, or both. Nonetheless, it is notable that it was *not* the alabaster that were considered worthy of removal, for they were all found in the inner chamber. The bowls were removed at least as far as the entrance. Undoubtedly, the thieves were interested in the contents of the bowls but not of the alabaster. The vessels left in the chamber were closed vessels, suggesting liquid contents, while the open bowls would have held solid (and portable) material. The thieves would have carried these to the entrance to remove the contents, and then discarded the bowls.

The small size of the beads and pendants suggest these were accidentally dropped by the thieves, both in the cist grave and in the fore-hall, and probably were originally placed in the cist grave. A small gold pin also was found in the fore-hall, dropped by thieves. They may have been part of the original contents of the open bowls, lost in the transfer between containers. The thieves also left the two silver cups in the main chamber; depending on the date

of the robbery, they may not have been considered worth taking.

KK.1. Near Tomb Entrance

Above the east end of the fore-hall (i.e., near the tomb entrance), beginning about three metres below ground level and scattering below and around this point, were found all the bowls and some beads and pendants. Nearby were a dozen clay sealings, all employing an impression from same lentoid seal dating to LM I, although possibly employed in LM II.⁷³⁴ Their 'arrangement' suggests that a great deal of debris had accumulated at the entrance and in the forehall prior to plundering. All the bowls were broken.

241. Bowl ('spheroid jar'/?/bowl), HM Λ 611

Andesite porphyry (Type A), having large white crystals in an almost black matrix,⁷³⁵ H: 13.25, Dia. (rim): 22.7; (max): 28.3; (base): 11.7; (holes): 0.6 cm, restored intact in 13 joining fragments but for rim chips.

Open, strongly carinated, with slightly flaring rim and flat undercut base. Two small holes either side drilled vertically through the carination, those on one side partly filled in with an apparently similar stone.

Egyptian, Early Dynastic, with alterations Minoan, MM III–LM I.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Early Dynastic vessel, reworked LM I and even so still an antique in its LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: See comments by WARREN 1969:111 n. 1; 1997:215–216.

References: EVANS 1905:531, 536 #1, figs. 123/pl. XCVIII:S1, 124; *PM* I:87–88, fig. 56; II:270, fig. 182; WARREN 1965:33 #27; 1967b:199 n. 30; 1969:111 Type 43:G:2, P602, D325; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:202–203 #43, pl. 65:43; PHILLIPS 1991:II:585–586 #198, III:1076 fig. 198; CLINE 1994:191 #504; LILYQUIST 1996:157, 159, pl. 3:S1; WARREN 1997:215–216 #8, pl. LXXXI:a–b, d; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:240–241 #238.

Comments: The Egyptian origin and date of this bowl is identified by Warren, who postulates that it is a very heavily reworked spheroid jar with flat collar rim (with or without handles), including the cutting for its present raised base.⁷³⁶ In addition to reworking the profile, the small filled perforations and the present lack of handles suggest that the Minoans may have adapted this bowl by adding handles of a different material, possibly for suspension. These added handles later must have been removed and the holes filled, all probably within MM III–LM I. Another imported jar similarly adapted by the addition of bronze wire handles was found in the palace of Kato Zakro {105}. The profile, unparalleled both in Egypt and on Crete, also may have been re-worked, not necessarily by the Minoans.

⁷³² EVANS 1905:140–141, fig.122; POPHAM 1965:333 n. 33.

⁷³³ DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:170.

⁷³⁴ See POPHAM and GILL 1995:28 for these sealings; also DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:170.

⁷³⁵ WARREN 1969:109 notes that the material is the same as

{194} and 1997:215–216 that no direct parallel for it is known to him.

⁷³⁶ See WARREN 1997:216, and pl. LXXXI.d for comparative profiles.

Lilyquist suggests that this bowl may be an indigenous product, as she compares its material to *lapis laedaemonius* of which some indigenous vessels are made. The “three sets of holes [that] edge the rim, each pair side by side; gouges...visible on the inside of the mouth” in her description were not noted by either Warren nor the present author. The profile is un-Minoan, however, which suggests the alterations may have been made elsewhere than on Crete.

242. Bowl/closed vessel?, HM A 608

Banded travertine, H: 8.4–8.5, Dia. (rim): 20.5; (base): 8.1; (base hole): 3.5; (side holes): 0.95, 0.3 cm, restored almost intact from 22 joining fragments with five fragments missing. Open, with slightly moulded rim and flat slightly raised base. Base deliberately and almost entirely holed off-centre. Further, smaller drilled holes about halfway down the sides: on one side a single large hole; on the other, two small holes more or less horizontal to each other.

Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Early–mid-Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, reworked LM I and even so still an antique in its LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparison: CM 31736 (from Mahasna?).

References: EVANS 1905:531, 539 #11, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S11; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:25 #40; KANTOR 1947:38; DESHAYES and DESSENNE 1959:94–95 #6, pl. LVIII:2;⁷³⁷ WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J, P621; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:204 #50, pl. 66:50; PHILLIPS 1991:II:586–587 #199, III:1077 fig. 199; CLINE 1994:189 #489; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S11; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:240–241 #239.α.

Comments: The holes on the base and body of the bowl are puzzling. These might have been added by the Minoans, and the bowl turned upside down to form the upper half of a closed and possibly spouted vessel. In this case, the holes would be for attachment of an added spout and probably vertical handle. The other attachment for the handle would be either on an added neck or the lower portion of the vessel, both presumed here and, if so, lost. However, this seems unlikely as the bowl rim does not seem to be reworked for attachment of any presumed lower vessel half, and no method of actually attaching the spout. Conversion to a rhyton is negated by the size of the base hole. Egyptian vessels were also adapted to form typically Minoan types, sometimes completely different in type and function than their original form, as at Kato Zakro {104–105}, Malia {373} and elsewhere. Alternatively, Banou (in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) has suggested that a high base may have been added to the bowl base (which has a rougher surface) to convert it to a pedestalled cup, but this would not explain the smaller body holes that do not conform to the addition of one or two handles. The nearest parallel may be a vessel from Mycenae {590}.

Other possible explanations are difficult to envisage, except the possibility that the vessel had been repaired. Two clearly repaired Dynasty I bowls exhibit the same feature of a deliberately holed bottom.⁷³⁸ Perhaps the repair plug of the Isopata bowl was not found, and may in fact have been of a materi-

al other than stone. This does not, however, explain the other, smaller holes, which clearly were not made for repair purposes.

243. Bowl, HM A 609

Banded travertine, H: 9.9–10.3; Dia. (rim): 19.6–19.8; (base): 5.1 cm, restored intact in 19 joining fragments, some small fragments lost.

Open, with slightly thickened rim, and a small flattened base having small concavity in centre underfoot.

Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Early–mid-Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, reworked LM I and even so still an antique in its LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: (rim profile) LILYQUIST 1995:87 fig. 28.

References: EVANS 1905:531, 539:#13, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S13; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:25 #41; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J, P622; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:203 #46, pl. 65:46; PHILLIPS 1991:II:587 #200, III:1078 fig. 200; CLINE 1994:189 #490; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S13; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:240–241 #239.β.

Comments: Pendlebury calls this a ‘basin’.

244. Beads, HM Y 146(c) (not handled)

Lapis lazuli, dimensions not stated, quantity: 15 (with {244}), restrung but individually intact.

Simple and round, apparently in graduated scale.

Probably Minoan, Neo-Palatial; if Egyptian, probably Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Probably LM I or just possibly Dynasty XVIII (or earlier) objects, in an LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparison: BRUNTON and ENGELBACH 1927: pl. XLV:79:J.

References: EVANS 1905:531, 541–542 #25, fig. 130; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:25 #42; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:205–206 unnumbered; PHILLIPS 1991:II:587–588 #201, III:1079 fig. 201/214; CLINE 1994:138 #50; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:185–186 #174.

Comments: Evans identifies the material as ‘lapis lazuli,’ and Pendlebury as ‘faience;’ but it has not yet been analysed. Viewed in the museum case, and after recent cleaning for the 2000 Crete-Egypt exhibition, all seem to have a somewhat white-mottled surface suggestive of lapis lazuli.

Pendlebury considered these beads of Egyptian origin, of Dynasty XVIII date. As both he and Evans note, the more elaborate bead forms are not Egyptian. Other beads were found in the cist grave {257}, and the two groups may originally belonged to the same necklace, or two separate necklaces. This includes both ape pendant/amulets {245; 256}, the frog pendant {246} and more ornate beads, all combined under the same HM catalogue number. They are distinguished in the present work by the letters a–e. The original arrangement is lost, and that published by Evans and now on display in the HM is modern.

245. Amulet or pendant, HM Y 146(a) (not handled)

Lapis lazuli, H: 19 mm, intact.

Squatting ape with right elbow and left hand on knees, right

⁷³⁷ This Minoan bowl has similar holes through the lower profile although the base is not hollow.

⁷³⁸ See BAKRY 1962:17, pl. IV.

hand over right ear. Tail vertically up the back. Drilled eyes. Narrow horizontal drilled holes through side at neck and waist. Wide vertical drilled hole through body. Baseless.

Near Eastern, probably LB I–IIA or possibly Egyptian, (if so) probably Dynasty XVIII (not later than reign of Amenhotep III) cylindrical bead(?), possibly recarved by a Minoan artisan, Neo-Palatial.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Probably LB I–IIA or Dynasty XVIII (not later than reign of Amenhotep III), either converted(?) in or possibly MM III–LM I object, in generally contemporary or more likely later LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: BRUNTON and ENGELBACH 1927: pl. XLII:2.M; MMA 26.7.897; {240}; {562}.

References: EVANS 1905:531, 542–543 #26, fig. 131:a; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:25 #44; McDERMOTT 1938:213 #300; KANTOR 1947:38; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:201–202 #40, pl. 1:40; PHILLIPS 1991:II:588–589 #202, III:1079 fig. 202; 1992b:500, 504 fig. 4.middle; CLINE 1991:39; 1994:136 #34; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:185–186 #174.

Comments: As above, {244}. Pendlebury considered this ape to be Egyptian and of Dynasty XVIII date, whilst Evans and McDermott accepted them as local products. McDermott argued that, as they appear to be of the same material as some beads that clearly are Minoan types, the rounded beads {244, 257}, apes {245; 256} and frog {246} should all have been locally made. The style and form of this ape is entirely different to its companion {256}, and they should not be viewed as a pair. The generally cylindrical surface of this piece strongly suggests it may initially have been a cylindrical bead later carved to represent the ape. If so, this most likely was accomplished in the Levant or by a Minon artisan on Crete, rather than an Egyptian. See also comments to {244}, above.

246. Amulet or pendant, HM Y 146(e) (not handled)

Lapis lazuli, L: 16.8; W (pres.): 8.4; H: 10.7; SH: 2.4 mm, majority of the right leg and side of body missing, with adhering substance on tail end, and partly burnt.

Crouching frog with raised bulbous eyes. Wide horizontal hole through side between front and back legs. Flattened base with carved legs below.

Egyptian, probably Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Probably Dynasty XVIII, either generally contemporary or an heirloom in its LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1894:pl. XVII:328; 1914:pl. II:18:h; RIEFSTAHL 1968:26 #25, pl. II:25; BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:251–252 #353.

References: EVANS 1905:531, 543 #28, fig. 132; PENDLEBURY

1930a:83; 1930b:25 #43; KANTOR 1947:38; HELCK 1979:94; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:201 #39, pl. 1:39; PHILLIPS 1991:II:589 #203, III:1079 fig. 203; 1992b:500, 504 fig. 4.left; CLINE 1994:136 #33; VANSCHOONWINKEL 1996:397 #378; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:187 #176.⁷³⁹

Comments: The frog was the hieroglyphic sign *krr* (I 7) ('frog'), and also the zoomorphic manifestation of Hekat (*Hkt*), the goddess of childbirth. Beginning in the Middle Kingdom, it also was the ideogram for the epithet *whm ḥnh* ('living again' or 'repeating life'), following the name of the deceased. Although a number of Egyptian seals are found in the shape of a crouching frog (especially in the FIP when it was the second most popular stamp seal form, after the scarab), this piece has no face design and so is called a 'pendant' or 'amulet' here. Amulets also commonly appear from the Predynastic throughout the Dynastic period, chiefly as symbols of fertility and regeneration; the majority of them possess no string-hole. Amuletic beads also are known, with string-hole through the length.⁷⁴⁰ Their function usually was to protect the mother during childbirth. The 'popping' eyes are common, and its identification as a frog (rather than toad) here follows Petrie's observation that the frog is slender with 'outstanding' legs (1914:12), although the distinction between the two often is unclear.

There seem to be no (other) representations of frogs in the Minoan world⁷⁴¹ if this piece were to be considered a Minoan product. The implausible possibility is suggested only by its material similarity to the other beads {244; 257} found with it, and perhaps also the ape pendant/amulets {245; 256}, found together with other beads again of similar material in characteristic Minoan forms. See also comments to {244}, above.

247. Jar fragments ('high-shouldered jar'). HM unnumbered Hornblende diorite (Type A or B), H. (restored): 5, Dia. (restored): 11 cm, two fragments preserving entire profile almost to base.

Open, with high shoulder and slightly undercut collar. Body tapers to small base. Restored with a flat base.

Egyptian, Dynasty III–IV.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Dynasty III–IV vessel, an antique in its LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: QUIBELL 1898: pl. X:17, 30; EL-KHOULI 1978: pl. 88:2456.

References: EVANS 1905:541 #21, figs. 123/pl. XCVIII:lower left, 128; VON BISSING 1914:226; EVANS 1914b:228; PENDLEBURY 1938a:83; 1930b:23 #31; KANTOR 1947:38; WARREN 1965:32 #18; 1969:111 Type 43:D4; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:202 #42; PHILLIPS 1991:II:589–590 #204, III:1079 fig. 204; CLINE 1994:190 #495.

⁷³⁹ Identified as Y 146, actually the necklace consisting in part of spherical beads and ape pendants; see {244–245; 256–257} above and below.

⁷⁴⁰ For the use of the frog as an amuletic device; HORNUNG and STAEHELIN 1976:112–113; BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:241, 251–252, and ANDREWS 1994:63. See also PETRIE 1914:12 #18, pl. II:18. Frogs as seals are discussed by KEEL 1995b:69 §152.

⁷⁴¹ A Proto-Palatial painted design on an amphora from Phaistos is identified as a frog; see VANSCHOONWINKEL

1996:397 #379 (the Koumasa gold pendant #380 is entirely different from this amulet in presentation, and Vanschoonwinkel's identification as a frog is unlikely). A frog-shaped seal is identified from Burial Building 7 at Archanes (SAKELLARAKIS and SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKI 1997:II:687 fig. 781.left), but the illustration is not convincing; the building was in use in early MM IA. The unique gold pendant of a spotted frog (or toad?; frogs rarely are spotted) found at LH IIA Kakovatos (MINISTRY 1988:107 #38) is entirely different in presentation.

Comments: Evans provided no specific provenance for these fragments, but a number of indications suggest that they were found in the debris at the east end of the fore-hall.

KK.2. Main Chamber

All the closed vessels were found within the main chamber scattered with other material, including at least four 'late Palace Style' amphorae dating to LM II–III A1, two stone lamps, a bucket and a bridge-spouted jar, a bronze mirror with ivory handle, three crystal beads and a pommel, and parts of two silver cups on or near the floor from the centre towards the south wall of the chamber.

248. Jug, HM A 600

Coarse travertine or limestone(?), H: 25.3; Dia. (rim): 9.1; (max): 13.8; (base): 6.8 cm, restored from 10 joining fragments, with parts of rim, neck and handle missing.

Ovoid body, with splaying base. Tall, slightly flaring neck and thin outturned rim. Flat strap handle below neck to mid-shoulder, with two vertical incised grooves on exterior, terminating with two horizontal grooves at top and four at bottom. Raised double collar around neck at handle.

Egyptian, late SIP or Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II–III A1.

Chronology: Late Second Intermediate Period–Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Amenhotep III) vessel, in generally contemporary or later LM II–III A1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: RANDALL-MACIVER and MACE 1902: pl. L: Tomb D.11; WINLOCK 1948:pl. XXXVII:lower right; HAYES 1953–1959:II:207 fig. 122:center; MERRILLEES 1968:150 Type IAa(v); BUCHHOLZ and KARAGEORGHIS 1973:91–92 #1141:b, 354 #1141:right; HANKEY 1974:167, 172–173 #15–20, fig. 3:15–20; BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:128–129 #118; LILYQUIST 2003:212 fig. 135.b; CM 33778 (from Maherpra); CM 62143–62144 (from Thebes, Tombs of the Kings); MMA 26.8.18; TBM 34.1299; (from Mycenae) XENAKI-SAKELLARIOU 1985:#4923.

References: EVANS 1905:532, 536–537 #2, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S2; FIMMEN 1924:174 fig. 168:second from right; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:24 #32; KANTOR 1947:38; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J, P618; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:204–205 #51, pl. 66:51; PHILLIPS 1991:II:590–591 #205, III:1080 fig. 205; CLINE 1994:204 #629; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S2; DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:170; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:239 #237.

Comments: The vessel form and decoration is in obvious and distinctive imitation of Cypriote Base-Ring Ware. This ware was imported into Egypt throughout the late SIP to the reign of Tutankhamun, and was imitated in faience, glass and stone, most commonly travertine. Travertine imitations apparently were as common in Dynasty XVIII as the clay imports, and do not seem to actually appear before the reign of Amenhotep I.⁷⁴² Many survive complete with separate flat lids. A similar example also was found at Mycenae in Chamber Tomb 102

(NMA 4923), and numerous examples also imported to Syro-Palestine.⁷⁴³

Unlike all the other travertine vessels found in this tomb, the stone of this vessel is not opaque or banded, but rather has a dull, non-shiny surface that absorbs rather than reflects light. It appears, in its museum case, to be more limestone than 'alabaster'.

249. Alabastron (Type C), HM A 601

Banded travertine, H: 18.2–18.75; Dia. (rim): 9.6; (max): 16.0 cm, restored from 15 joining fragments, parts of rim and body lost.

Baggy, flat-bottomed body with sloping sides and flaring rim. Egyptian, SIP (–very early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: LM II–III A1.

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period (–very early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, an antique in its LM II–III A1 tomb deposition.

Comparison: PETRIE and BRUNTON 1924a: pl. XL:20, XLI:1. *References:* EVANS 1905:532, 537 #3, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S3; FIMMEN 1924:174 fig. 168:second from left; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:24 #33; KANTOR 1947:38; HELCK 1979:93; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I, P609; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:203 #44, pl. 65:44; PHILLIPS 1991:II:591 #206, III:1081 fig. 206; CLINE 1994:165 #262; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S3; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:236 #232.α.

250. Alabastron (Type C), HM A 602

Banded travertine, H: 10.2; Dia. (rim): 5.7; (max): 8.9–9.1 cm, two joining fragments, chip on rim.

Baggy, round-bottomed body with convex sides and flaring rim.

Egyptian, SIP (–very early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: LM II–III A1.

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period (–very early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, an antique in its LM II–III A1 tomb deposition.

Comparison: CARTER 1916: pl. XXII:4.

References: EVANS 1905:532, 537 #4, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S4; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:24 #34; KANTOR 1947:38; HELCK 1979:93; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I, P610; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:203 #45, pl. 65:45; PHILLIPS 1991:II:591 #207, III:1082 fig. 207; CLINE 1994:165 #263; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S4; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:236–237 #232.β.

251. Alabastron (Type C), HM A 603

Banded travertine, H: 7.4; Dia. (rest. rim): 4.4; (max): 7.4 cm, two joining fragments, majority of rim and part of upper body missing.

Baggy, with slightly convex base, convex sides and flaring rim. Egyptian, SIP (–early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: LM II–III A1.

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period (–early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, an antique in its LM II–III A1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: RANDALL-MACIVER and MACE 1902: pl. XLVI:Tomb D.116; BRUNTON and ENGELBACH 1927:pl. XXII:41; MERRILLEES 1968:119, pl. XXXIII:2:top left.

⁷⁴² BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:129; B.G. ASTON 1994:151 #174.

⁷⁴³ All those listed by SPARKS 1998:III:139–142 #1084–111 are imports; see also SPARKS 1998:I:103–105.

References: EVANS 1905:532, 537 #5, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S5; FIMMEN 1924:174 fig. 168:left; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:24 #35, PL. III:35; KANTOR 1947:38; HELCK 1979:93; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I, P611; BUCHHOLZ and KARAGEORGHIS 1973:91–92 #1141:a, 354 #1141:left; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:204 #49, pl. 65:49; PHILLIPS 1991:II:591–292 #208, III:1082 fig. 208; CLINE 1994:165 #264; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S5; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:237 #232.γ.

252. Alabastron (Type C variant), HM A 604

Banded travertine, H: 5.3; Dia. (rest. rim): 7.5; (max): 8.5 cm, most of rim and one side restored but profile complete in three joining fragments.

Squat baggy, flat-bottomed body with very wide (almost everted) flaring rim.

Egyptian, Dynasty XII–SIP.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Dynasty XII–Second Intermediate Period vessel, an antique in its LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: PETRIE and BRUNTON 1924a: pl. XL:2, 16, XLI:2, 3; HAYES 1953–1959:II:67 fig. 35:upper right; B.G. ASTON 1994:142 Type b; LILYQUIST 1995, fig. 2.middle.

References: EVANS 1905:532, 537–538 #6, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S6; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:24 #36, pl. III:36; KANTOR 1947:38; HELCK 1979:93; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I, P612; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:204 #48, pl. 65:48; PHILLIPS 1991:II:592 #209, III:1083 fig. 209; CLINE 1994:165–166 #265; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S6; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:237 #233.

253. Pot, HM A 605

Banded wavy-grain travertine, H. (rest.): 11.4; Dia. (rest. rim): 3.9; (max): 6.1; (base): 3.5 cm, intact in four joining fragments to top of neck, rim restored.

Piriform body with high-shoulder, flat base, and cylindrical neck with (restored) everted rim.

Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Early–mid-Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Amenhotep III) vessel, in generally contemporary or later LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: VANDIER D’ABBADIE 1972:70–71 #234; MMA 32.2.3.

References: EVANS 1905:532, 538 #9, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S9; PENDLEBURY 1930b:24 #37, pl. III:37; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J, P619; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:204 #47, pl. 65:47; PHILLIPS 1991:II:592 #210, III:1083 fig. 210; CLINE 1994:216 #740; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S9; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:238 #235.

Comments: Banou (in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) calls this an “unguentarium or lekythion”.

254. Alabastron(?) or pot, HM A 606

Banded travertine, H. (rest.): 9.8; Dia. (rest. rim): 4.2; (max): 6.0 cm, intact in four joining fragments to beginning of neck, mouth/rim restored.

Slightly baggy oval body with flattened base, (restored) short cylindrical neck and nearly everted rim. Leans to one side.

Egyptian, SIP–Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period–Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Amenhotep III) vessel, in generally contemporary or later LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparison: PETRIE 1937:13, 24, pl. XXXIV:869.

References: EVANS 1905:532, 538 #10, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S10; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:24 #38; KANTOR 1947:38; HELCK 1979:93; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I, P613; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:205 #53, pl. 66:53; PHILLIPS 1991:II:592–593 #211, III:1083 fig. 211; CLINE 1994:166 #266; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S10; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:238 #234. *Comments:* Banou (in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) calls this a “lekythio”.

255. Krateriskos, HM A 607

Lightly banded travertine, H: 9.5; Dia. (rim): 6.2; (max): 7.3; (base) 4.2 cm, intact but for large chip on rim and on base.

Flattened globular body with short wide cylindrical neck, everted rim and pedestal foot. Slightly concave underfoot. No handles.

Egyptian, SIP or Dynasty XVIII, not later than Thutmose III.⁷⁴⁴

Context: LM II–IIIA1.

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period–Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, in generally contemporary or somewhat later LM II–IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: RANDALL-MACIVER and MACE 1902: pl. XLVI: Tomb D.116; PEET and LOAT 1913:pl. XII:11:left; PETRIE and BRUNTON 1924b: pl. LVII:38; VANDIER D’ABBADIE 1972:112–113 #OT 456, OT 457; HANKEY 1974:167, 174 S35, fig. 3:S35; LILYQUIST 2003:217 fig. 140; (from Saqqara) CM 56401; MMA 22.3.299; (three handles) {92}.

References: EVANS 1905: 532, 538 #8, fig. 125/pl. XCIX:S8; FIMMEN 1924:174 fig. 168:right; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:24 #39, pl. III:39; KANTOR 1947:38; HELCK 1979:93; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J, P620; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:205 #52, pl. 66:52; PHILLIPS 1991:II:593 #212, III:1084 fig. 212; CLINE 1994:216 #741; LILYQUIST 1996:157, pl. 3:S8; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:238 #236.

Comments: Krateriskoi were made in stone, faience and glass, amongst other materials. Most examples were handleless, but glass vessels had two or three loop handles on the shoulder. Other examples of this form in stone are known outside of Egypt, found at Amman, Hazor and Tell Jemmeh. The form in stone apparently dates no later than the reign of Thutmose III.⁷⁴⁵

Lazzarini is quoted (in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) as suggesting this may not be from Egypt, due to the lack of veining on the stone, but such veining is not always apparent. See {248} for a problematic origin for another Isopata vessel.

KK.3. Cist Grave in Main Chamber

In the north-east quarter of the main chamber, Evans found a rectangular cist grave, almost totally devoid of contents. However, part of a human leg bone and some small objects were recovered near the bottom.

⁷⁴⁴ HANKEY 1974:167.

⁷⁴⁵ See HANKEY 1974:167.

256. Amulet or pendant, HM Y 146(b) (not handled)

Lapis lazuli, H: 19 mm, tip of head missing, corner of base damaged.

Seated ape with arms resting on upper legs and hands on knees. Tail curled to right side on base around legs and feet. Detailed facial features and ears. Single horizontal hole through side at shoulders and a narrow vertical hole through entire body. Short rectangular base.

Egyptian, probably Dynasty XVIII (not later than reign of Amenhotep III), or Minoan, Neo-Palatial.

Context: LM II–III A1.

Chronology: Probably Dynasty XVIII (not later than reign of Amenhotep III) or MM III–LM I object, in generally contemporary or later LM II–III A1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1914: pl. XXXVII:205; BRUNTON and ENGELBACH 1927: pl. XLII:2:M; BRUNTON 1928: pl. XCIV:14:D:3; (pose) ANDREWS 1994:67 fig. 71.a; (tail position) VALLOGGIA 1980:pl. XIV:A, C, XVII–XVIII.

References: EVANS 1905:534, 543 #27, fig. 131:b; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:25 #45; McDERMOTT 1938:213 #301; KANTOR 1947:38; HELCK 1979:94; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:202 #41, pl. 1:41; PHILLIPS 1991:II:592 #209, III:1084 fig. 213; 1992b:500, 504 fig. 4.right; CLINE 1991:39; 1994:136 #35; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:185–186 #174.

Comments: See above, {245}. See also comments to {244}, above. The style and form of this ape is entirely different to its companion {245}, and they should not be viewed as a pair. This piece is much more similar to Egyptian types than ape {245}. The tail position is common. Presumably these amulet/pendants and beads originally were interred in the grave.

257. Beads, HM Y 146(d) (not handled)

Lapis lazuli, dimensions not stated, quantity: 15 (with {244}), restrung but individually intact.

Simple and round, apparently in graduated scale.

Probably Minoan, Neo-Palatial; Egyptian, probably Dynasty XVIII.

Context: LM II–III A1.

Chronology: Probably MM III–LM I or or just possibly Dynasty XVIII (or earlier) objects, in LM II–III A1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: See above, {244}.

References: EVANS 1905:534, 541–542 #25, fig. 130; PENDLEBURY 1930a:83; 1930b:25 #42; PHILLIPS 1991:II:594 #214, III:1079 fig. 201/214; CLINE 1994:138 #50; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:185–186 #174.

Comments: See above, {244}.

LL. Isopata Deposit

A series of six chamber tombs and one rectangular built tomb were excavated by Evans in 1910, about a

quarter mile north of the Isopata ‘Royal Tomb,’ following the chance discovery of a small deposit of Minoan artefacts by a local peasant in 1909.⁷⁴⁶

The tombs were constructed along the foot of the plateau edge. They included the ‘Tomb of the Double Axes’ and the ‘Tomb of the Polychrome Vases,’ both chamber tombs. The peasant’s deposit could not be linked to a tomb, but likely was the unwanted remnant of a neighbouring tomb that had been robbed and has not yet been located. The deposit included a chlorite bridge-spouted jar of MM III type with shell inlays inserted into drilled depressions in the upper body and rim,⁷⁴⁷ a bowl, fragments of two alabaster, a bronze knife, spear, two swords, axes and a ‘talent’ weight, all fragmentary. The weapons all are MM III–LM I types, and the stone vessels too are earlier than those from the surrounding tombs. All known tombs in the area are dated to LM II–III A, but the deposit dates to MM III–LM I on the basis of the weaponry.⁷⁴⁸ If so, it would be a rare example of a Neo-Palatial funerary group.

258. Alabastron (Type C), KSM Box 1671 T I i + HM 1583

Banded travertine, H: 11.1; Dia. (rim): 7.2; (max): 9.8 cm, restored in two (HM) + seven (KSM) joining and non-joining fragments, except tip of rim and centre of base.

Baggy, flat-bottomed alabastron with a short neck and wide flaring rim, lightly shaved at top.

Egyptian, late SIP–very early Dynasty XVIII.

Context: None, with objects of MM III–LM I date.

Chronology: Late Second Intermediate Period–very early Dynasty XVIII vessel, without context but with generally contemporary or somewhat later MM III–LM I ‘deposit’ of objects.

Comparison: LILYQUIST 1995:87 fig. 31.

References: EVANS 1914a:3–4, fig. 3; PENDLEBURY 1930a:85; 1930b:25 #46;⁷⁴⁹ 1939:258; HELCK 1979:93; WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I, P614; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:205 #54, pl. 66:54; PHILLIPS 1991:II:595 #215, III:1084 fig. 215; CLINE 1994:166 #267; PHILLIPS 2001:78 #1.b.

Comments: Evans noted that the material was ‘somewhat coarse’. The form is unlikely to be of Middle Kingdom date and most likely is very early in Dynasty XVIII. Note the early development of the rim ‘shaved’ at the top, making it one of the latest examples of Egyptian alabastra on Crete and would not have arrived on Crete before the LM IA period. The nearest parallel is a vessel inscribed with the name of Ahmes Nefertari, sister of Ahmose and mother of Amenhotep I.

⁷⁴⁶ DAWKINS 1909:360–361; 1910:362; EVANS 1914a:1–59; *PM Index* 74–75; PINI 1968:84. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:34 #1.

⁷⁴⁷ WARREN 1969:33 Type 13:A. Another was found in or near the Khyan lid deposit; see Knossos O, above.

⁷⁴⁸ DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:170 suggest the deposit was a tomb clearance.

⁷⁴⁹ Also #46b, as listed in his hand-written emendation in his personal copy now in the Villa Ariadne, Knossos library. He apparently confused #46 with another fragment, or not realised Evans had already published the fragment when *Aegyptiaca* was published in 1930.

259. Alabastron (Type A?), (A) HM 1584 + **(B)** KSM Box 1671, T I i

Banded travertine, two non-joining fragments: **(A)** H: 10.5, W: 13.5 cm, one base fragment; **(B)** H: 5.3; W: 4.6; MDim: 6.8 cm, one lower body fragment.

Large ‘flask’ (or possibly Type B ‘drop-vase’) alabastron with rounded bottom. Internal depression at bottom. Interior not centre-hollowed.

Egyptian, late MK (from within Dynasty XII) (–SIP?).

Context: MM III–LM I.

Chronology: Late Middle Kingdom (from within Dynasty XII) (–Second Intermediate Period) vessel, without context but with generally contemporary or somewhat later MM III–LM I ‘deposit’ of objects.

Comparison: (profile) **{210}**.

References: EVANS 1914a:3–4, figs. 2, 4;⁷⁵⁰ PENDLEBURY 1930b:25 #46a, 46c;⁷⁵¹ WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:205 #55; PHILLIPS 1991:II:595–596 #216, III:1085 fig. 216; CLINE 1994:166 #268; PHILLIPS 2001:78 #1.c.

Comments: These fragments possibly are not from the same vessel. The KSM fragment certainly is not part of bowl **{241}** above, and appears to be of similar profile to the HM fragment, so has been included together here. Incurving at the top of the fragment suggests this more likely is a Type A alabastron, but it might be a Type B form instead.

MM. Kephala Ridge

This ridge runs essentially north-south for several miles west and south of the Isopata plateau. The majority of archaeological remains are tombs, mostly cut into the hillside.

MM.1. Disturbed Tomb

Near the southern edge of the Kephala ridge, ceramic hillwash from the winter rains indicated the presence of Geometric and Orientalising material farther uphill. A large but very ruined tomb chamber was discovered and excavated in August 1957, near tombs excavated by Hogarth in 1900.⁷⁵² Cremation debris and similar pottery sherds were found inside, mostly dating to Early Orientalising but also small quantities of earlier phases back to later Protogeometric or Protogeometric B. The tomb clearly had been in use for generations, at least between the mid-9th–early 7th c. BC, on the basis of the pottery recovered.

A small quantity of other ‘small’ finds were

reported, a small gold bead, iron short sword fragment, gilded iron pin and a ‘pale blue paste’ scarab.⁷⁵³

260. Scarab, HM Σ–K 1909

Probably white steatite, glazed,⁷⁵⁴ L: 14; W: 9.9; H: 6.8 mm, worn and abraded.

Scarab, with open head, single line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Legs indicated, meeting at mid-pronotum. String-hole through length. *Face:* Hieroglyphic inscription of the name of the god Amon (*Imn*) in horizontal format, with reed leaf ‘i’ (M 17) in mirror image at either end, and gaming board ‘m’ (Y 5) and water ‘n’ (N 35) in centre. Line border. Egyptian, Dynasty XIX–XX or later.

Context: Late Protogeometric–Early Orientalising.

Chronology: Dynasty XIX–XX or later scarab, an heirloom in, or perhaps even generally contemporary with, its Late Protogeometric–Early Orientalising tomb context.

Comparanda: BLINKENBERG and KINCH 1931:pl. 60:1393; (face design) KEEL 1990b:359 fig. 56.

References: COLDSTREAM 1963:42 fig. 15.4, 43 #4, pl. 14.e; *CMS* II.3:#76; SKON-JEDELE 1994:III.1863 #1905; HOFFMAN 1997:89 #135, pl. 115; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:323 #335.⁷⁵⁵

Comments: The god’s name can be read either right-to-left (the preferred direction in ancient Egyptian texts) or left-to-right, with the central ‘mn’ signs used for both readings. Hoffman dates its deposition at probably Early Orientalising (c. 700–680 BC). Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) incorrectly date this scarab to Dynasty XVIII–XX. This undoubtedly is a Ramesside or even later scarab, due to the rather crude cutting of the hieroglyphic signs and especially the central ‘n’ sign.

MM.2. No Find Context

A possible LM tomb may have been located on the east side of this ridge.⁷⁵⁶ Found here in 1939 were some fragments of an ostrich eggshell and of an undescribed ‘alabaster’ vessel.⁷⁵⁷ Trial trenches in this area were conducted by Hutchinson in 1938/1939, including one where he recovered a gold bull’s-head earring and LM IA pottery⁷⁵⁸ where the ‘alabaster’ vase had been found earlier, ‘some 100 yards north of the Kephala tholos’. This material might be from surrounding LM I occupation, and the eggshell and vessel may have been from either occupational or tomb debris.

261. Ostrich egg fragments, KSM unnumbered (KSM 33F.4) (not seen)

Ostrich eggshell, L: 3.8, W 3.7 cm, numerous fragments, preserving pieces of the body but neither end.

⁷⁵⁰ Both figures indicate a scale of 1:2, but they are vastly different in size: that of fig. 2 is correct. Evans obviously thought there were two different vessels involved, but the two figures clearly illustrate the same fragment.

⁷⁵¹ Added by hand to his own copy of the book, now in the Villa Ariadne, Knossos library.

⁷⁵² HOOD and SMYTH 1981:37 #39.

⁷⁵³ COLDSTREAM 1963:42–43.

⁷⁵⁴ It appears to be a glazed composition material of some description, on the basis of photographs.

⁷⁵⁵ Material described as “composite material, cream.”

⁷⁵⁶ See HOOD and SMYTH 1981:35 #11.

⁷⁵⁷ This cannot be located.

⁷⁵⁸ HUTCHINSON 1956b; see now also DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:169–170. The ‘Kephala tholos’ is the one also published in HUTCHINSON 1956b.

Fragments convex, possibly with some “red paint” blotches adhering in four lines down the body.

Probably from Libya or Egypt, or Syro-Palestine, undateable.
Context: None.

Chronology: Undateable object, without context.

Comparanda: {108}, {153}, {425}.

References: HOOD, HUXLEY and SANDARS 1958–1959:260; HOOD and SMYTH 1981:35 #11; REESE 1985:372.

Comments: HOOD initially stated (1958–1959) that Hutchinson had found this eggshell in trials on the ‘Isopata’ ridge, and later (1981) that it was found in 1939. It is not mentioned in Hutchinson’s report of his work on the Kephala ridge.⁷⁵⁹ No record of this survives in Hutchinson’s unpublished diaries for archaeological finds in the Knossos area, and the relevant pages from his logbook for that period have been cut out. Todd Whitelaw recently has relocated the pieces, in the main room of the KSM, bay 33, section F, shelf 4 down, in a box labeled ‘Knossos Area’ in a bag labeled “Squire’s ostrich egg with red paint” and (in Hutchinson’s hand) “From Kephala c. 100 yards N of tholos”.⁷⁶⁰ The shell has no chronological value whatsoever, although the blotches (which might be the remains of an adhesive) strongly suggest it had been converted to a decorated rhyton like those recovered on Thera and various sites on the Mainland.

NN. Sellopoulo

In 1957, two LM IIIA2–B chamber tombs were excavated by N. Platon and G. Huxley on the east side of a cottage about 500 m. north-east of Zapher Papoura, at a site called Sellopoulo.⁷⁶¹ In 1968, a rescue operation under M. Popham discovered two further tombs, slightly earlier in date, about 100 m. east of the 1957 tombs.⁷⁶²

Although the roof had collapsed, Chamber Tomb 4 was the only one found undisturbed. Three burials were found, two male and one female, dated to LM II–

early IIIA1. Most of the tomb furniture belonged with the two male skeletons, both of whom lay on their backs with their feet towards the chamber entrance. Their accoutrements included numerous clay and bronze vessels of LM II–early IIIA1 date, including a large LM IIIA1 stirrup jar and an imported LH IIIA1 (developed) high-spouted jar, swords and a spearhead, gold and faience necklaces, seal stones, mirrors and rings (including two of gold). The female, the latest burial, was positioned differently, on her side with her head towards the entrance. Directly associated with her were a bronze dish and mirror, a clay stirrup jar of early LM IIIA1 date, and a necklace found near her lower jaw.

262. Scarab, HM Y 489

Glazed material, possibly quartz,⁷⁶³ L: 17.2; W: 13.1; H: 7.8; SH: 2.2 mm, intact with small chips at edge, flaking glaze and worn stone(?) edges.

Scarab with open head and rayed clypeus, prominent eyes, single line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra, the last bifurcating to indicate tail. Humeral callosities indicated. Legs indicated by deep undercutting. String-hole through length. *Face:* Incised hieroglyphic inscription: (*Nb-m3ʿt-Rʿ*) *sb3 t3wy*, ‘Nebma’atre, Star of the Two Lands,’ the pronomen and epithet of Amenhotep III.⁷⁶⁴ Cartouche in vertical format, epithet as a second line of format. Line border.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XVIII, reign of Amenhotep III.⁷⁶⁵

Context: Early LM IIIA1.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XVIII (reign of Amenhotep III) scarab, in generally contemporary early LM IIIA1 tomb deposition.

References: FRASER 1969:33, fig. 44; POPHAM 1970:227, 228; 1973:273; HANKEY and WARREN 1974:147, 149; POPHAM and CATLING 1974:203 fig. 6:d, 216–218, fig. 14:F, 224 #J.14, pl. 38:g–i; HELCK 1979:95; KANTA 1980:315; CLINE 1987:12, 25, fig.

⁷⁵⁹ Actually descriptions of the same location, as Hood equates his original Knossos Survey #151 on the ‘Isopata ridge’ (HOOD, HUXLEY and SANDARS 1958–1959:260) with the new Knossos Survey #11 on the ‘east side of the Kephala ridge’ (HOOD and SMYTH 1981:35). I use the later description for the area in the present study. HOOD and SMYTH 1981:35 consider the material as possibly from a Late Minoan tomb rather than occupation.

⁷⁶⁰ Todd Whitelaw (letter of 18 January 2003). “Squire” is Hutchinson. Whitelaw thinks the first label is in Hood’s handwriting, and tells me he saw no traces of working on the fragments themselves. Laura Preston, who attempted to restore the shell as far as possible, informs me of the ‘blotch’ pattern described here, that may be compared to the arrangement of the four metal strips decorating the body of the ostrich eggshell recovered at Dendra (SAKELLARAKIS 1990:296 figs. 45, 47–49).

⁷⁶¹ HOOD 1958a:24–25; DAUX 1958:786–787. The following year, Hood excavated an LM IIIA shaft grave in the next field to the south, HOOD 1959:21. See also PINI 1968:85; POPHAM 1970:228; HOOD and SMYTH 1981:36 #28.

⁷⁶² FRASER 1969:33; POPHAM 1970:228; 1973; POPHAM and CATLING 1974. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:36 #29.

⁷⁶³ Wrongly described by POPHAM and CATLING 1974:211, as “a scarab of glass paste.” It is not faience as the inner material is visibly different from faience, nor is it glass. It resembles an opaque stone, and most closely quartz.

⁷⁶⁴ Nebma’atre also is the pronomen both of an obscure SIP king and Ramesses VI of Dynasty XX. The presence of the humeral callosities, characteristic of Dynasty XVIII scarabs in the reign of Amenhotep I and following (O’CONNOR 1985:9, 33) precludes an SIP dating, while the context of the scarab, about two centuries before the reign of Ramesses VI, precludes identification with this pharaoh. The translation of the inscription, and especially the unusual writing of *sb3*, is that of I.E.S. Edwards, in POPHAM and CATLING 1974:216–217.

⁷⁶⁵ It is possible that this is a commemorative scarab made after his reign, as demonstrably later examples of his name are well known. But the context date again gives little post-reign margin.

14; WARREN and HANKEY 1989:148, pl. 14.c; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:212 #70, pl. 46:70; PHILLIPS 1991:II:597–598 #217, III:1085 fig. 217; 1992b:498; CLINE 1994:147 #128, pl. 4.13; LILYQUIST 1996:146 n. 120;⁷⁶⁶ KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:321 #330; PHILLIPS 2005b:457, 459 n. 20, 460.

Comments: The scarab was part of the woman's necklace, found at her neck and therefore worn at the time of her burial. Other beads on the necklace include four 'snail' beads of faience or glass,⁷⁶⁷ two spherical beads of banded glass and a much decayed (probably amber) oval bead. The original arrangement is difficult to reconstruct, but the scarab may have been the central ornament.

The find circumstances may be paralleled to that of the scarab at Zapher Papoura {265}, although that is later in date. In both cases, the scarab was employed simply as another bead. If it was the central ornament, and we cannot be sure in either circumstance, it may have had some amuletic value to the wearer or simply have been the most unusual, valuable or elaborately worked element of the necklace.

The scarab provides an extremely good overlap of the latest date (early LM IIIA1) of the tomb, and the reign of this mid/late-Dynasty XVIII king. A similar overlap is seen in the gold cornflower bead {58} in Archanes Tholos Tomb A. On the evidence of this context association, by itself, LM IIIA1 must have begun not much earlier than the 38-year reign of Amenhotep III at the earliest. The LH IIIA1 (developed) jar in this tomb also suggests that the LH IIIA1 period began earlier than the LM IIIA1 period on Crete. Keel and Kyriakides's (in KARETSOU *et al.*) suggestion that the scarab may date to a period after the death of Amenhotep III is impossible due to its context dating.

OO. Zapher Papoura

In 1904, Evans discovered an LM III cemetery on the eastern slope of the hill called Zapher Papoura, about 600 m. north of the Knossos palace and west of the Kairitos river.⁷⁶⁸ One hundred chamber tombs, shaft graves and 'pit-caves' were excavated.

OO.1. 'Pit-cave' #7

'Pit-cave' #7⁷⁶⁹ was a single but badly preserved burial, lying on its back with its head to the west and wearing a necklace of gold beads and perhaps wear-

ing a gold-plated ring on its left hand. A bronze dagger was found near the right arm, an ivory pyxis near the left arm, and a bronze mirror near the left shoulder. A clay piriform jar of early LM IIIA2 date and an LM IIIA1 kylix,⁷⁷⁰ lay above the head.

263. Pyxis, HM 120 (not handled)

Hippopotamus ivory,⁷⁷¹ L (rest.): c. 25; W: 11–12; H: c. 10–15 cm, restored from numerous fragments, with majority of bottom, front, and separate lid lost. Surface badly degraded.

Pyxis in the form of a swan (or duck), with oval body narrowing sharply towards neck at head end, and interior cavity carved with flat rim on top. Two drilled holes either end, one for pivot of (missing) lid, the other as its closure catch. Hollow folded neck integral with body, curving to be raised high above it, without articulated terminus. A third drilled hole through body at junction to neck.

Probably Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII (reign of Amenhotep III), but possibly Levantine, LB IIA.

Context: LM IIIA2 early.

Chronology: Dynasty XVIII [reign of Amenhotep III] vessel, in generally contemporary LM IIIA2 early tomb deposition.

Comparanda: SAKELLARAKIS 1971:fig. 1–3, pl. 34–35, 39–40, etc.; LONG 1974:pl. 24:60; (integral neck) ADLER 1996:*passim*, esp. 106 #53–55, 110 #85.

References: EVANS 1905:416 #7:e, fig. 22; DUCHESNE-GULLEMIN 1968; SAKELLARAKIS 1971:193–198, *passim*, fig. 4, pl. 38; POURSAT 1977a:28, pl. IX:3–4; KRZYSZKOWSKA 1988:233–234; PHILLIPS 1991:II:599–600 #218, III:1086 fig. 218; CLINE 1994:212 #703; ADLER 1996:41–48 *passim*, figs. 5.12, 21–22.

Comments: Duchesne-Gullemin incorrectly reconstructed this pyxis as a small harp, a proposal at variance with contemporary harps and incompatible with details of the figure itself.⁷⁷² It undoubtedly is a pyxis, almost certainly for cosmetics. The rim arrangement is paralleled by numerous similar pyxides.

Sakellarakis reconstructs a similarly ill-preserved pyxis from Mycenae with a *regardant* 'duck's head' handle terminus on the basis of this pyxis. However, although his reconstruction of the Mycenae pyxis essentially is correct, the Zapher Papoura pyxis is unique in having the present rounded terminus edge of its neck carved rather than broken,⁷⁷³ and the open inner part of the neck itself, curving in from the outer rim of the pyxis and giving the appearance of a 'split' handle.⁷⁷⁴ A separately

⁷⁶⁶ She seems to imply, but does not actually suggest, that the scarab may be of Syro-Palestinian origin.

⁷⁶⁷ See POPHAM and CATLING 1974. The 'snail' beads are identified as faience pp. 210–211 and 214, and as "glass paste" p. 224.

⁷⁶⁸ EVANS 1905:391–482. See also PINI 1968:83; HOOD and SMYTH 1981:12, 36 #36.

⁷⁶⁹ EVANS 1905:415–417.

⁷⁷⁰ Dating of the vessels kindly provided by Eleni Hatzaki.

⁷⁷¹ From the lower canine; see KRZYSZKOWSKA 1988:233.

⁷⁷² Compare with HICKMANN 1949:pl. CIII–CXVI. Egyptian harps of this type, for example, are larger in scale, with an almost straight handle that does not curve near the junc-

tion to the sounding box, and a completely different arrangement for the sounding-hole. All Duchesne-Gullemin's comparanda are of later, post-Bronze Age date.

⁷⁷³ This is apparent through inspection in its museum case. The pyxis is too fragile for removal from the case.

⁷⁷⁴ This includes similar pyxides found in the Aegean, of which only four or five others are known; see KRZYSKOWSKA 1988:234; ADLER 1996:99 #1–4. Sakellarakis's reconstruction of the Mycenae pyxis handle should not be 'split,' but rather a rounded and probably solid neck; see also views in POURSAT 1977b:pl. XXXIII.316/9506. Otherwise the reconstruction seems correct.

attached swan (or duck) head terminus is difficult to envisage, but likely the head attachment would fit into the top. It may have been lost and the end smoothed, and the head may not have been there at the burial. Krzyszkowska has suggested, on the basis of other ‘duck’ *regardant* pyxides, that this too is an import; she likely is correct as she points out that “alternatively we would have to see them [i.e., this and the Mycenae pyxis] as local adaptations – but using the “correct” material – of a Near Eastern type”. She does not remark on the unique construction of the neck. Adler’s typological study includes only five pyxides having a neck integral with the body; the others all were recovered at Minet el-Beida (Ugarit), except one from Saqqara.⁷⁷⁵ Thus this pyxis may be a Near Eastern rather than Egyptian product, perhaps from Ugarit.

OO.2. ‘Pit-cave’ #66

‘Pit-cave’ #66⁷⁷⁶ was a single burial, lying on its back with head to the south and wearing a necklace of gold beads. A bronze mirror lay by the left hand, a glass bead necklace by the left foot, and a faience necklace and Mitanni ‘common style’ cylinder seal⁷⁷⁷ by the other. Seven clay vessels were positioned along the western (back) wall, including a spouted vase, two pedestalled cups and another plain, and two two-handled bowls and another plain, dating the grave to LM IIIA2. Near the left femur were a glass ‘bottle’ and a gold ring.

264. ‘Bottle’ (not located)⁷⁷⁸

Glass, ‘amber-coloured,’ H (pres.): 6.5 cm; badly degraded.

Bottle, globular, core-formed.

Probably Egyptian, Dynasty XVIII, or Cypriote, LBA.

Context: LM IIIA2.

Chronology: Late? Dynasty XVIII or LB I–IIA vessel, in somewhat later to generally contemporary LM IIIA2 tomb deposition.

References: EVANS 1905:461, 462 #66:e, 524; HARDEN 1981:165 n. 6; CLINE 1994:180 #398.

Comments: No drawing or photograph recorded this vessel, but it is suggested by Harden to be either a ‘pomegranate-bottle’ or one of the ‘high-necked’ types.⁷⁷⁹ He and Nolte both accept that ‘pomegranate-bottles’ were being produced on Cyprus in the LBA,⁷⁸⁰ so it is possible that this vessel is in fact Cypriote rather than Egyptian in origin. Harden’s catalogue includes a number of ‘clear brown’ pomegranate-bottles with

marvered trails. The glass flask found at nearby Karteros {101}, originally dark blue in colour, is now ‘brownish-grey’. If the Zapher Papoura ‘bottle’ was so badly degraded when excavated, the marvering may not have been evident. Alternatively, if Egyptian and indeed monochrome, it is likely not to be earlier than the reign of Tutankhamun when monochrome vessels became popular.⁷⁸¹

OO.3. Chamber tomb #99

Chamber tomb #99 contained three skeletons, one a child and the others probably but not certainly a male and female.⁷⁸² The child and the presumed woman were laid out on one side of the chamber, and the presumed man on the other side. The two sides were distinctly separated. Unusually, no weaponry was found in this tomb, which suggested to Evans that it had been taken when the two later skeletons had been interred.

The presumed man wore a necklace about his neck and two gold rings on his hand. The ‘woman’ wore a similar gold ring and the child a necklace of glass beads. Additionally, a stone basin and ‘blossom bowl,’ bronze bowl, jug and mirror (without handle), five clay stirrup jars, spouted bowl, miniature jug, jar with lid, and a pot were recovered with her. Those on the ‘man’s’ side included a stone basin, two bronze vessels and a mirror, clay cup, spouted bowl, miniature jug and covered jar. The ‘woman’s’ burial is dated to LM IIIA2 on the basis of the pottery associated with her, and is earlier than the ‘man’s’ interment.

The ‘male’ necklace was a collection of disparate beads, pendants and seals of various materials arranged in summary order. These included an Egyptian scarab, two Minoan seals, two crystal pendants, whorls of steatite and another stone, and beads of bronze, ivory, gold, crystal, carnelian and other materials in various shapes and sizes (see Fig. 14 for the excavator’s reconstruction). Eleni Hatzaki, who has been restudying the material from this tomb, describes his burial as having “both LM IIIA2 and LM IIIB pottery so we must be somewhere into an early phase of IIIB unless all the IIIA2 are heirlooms”.⁷⁸³

⁷⁷⁵ See ADLER 1996:pl. 40 feature 11. As some are not preserved in the relevant area, it is possible that others with integral neck exist.

⁷⁷⁶ EVANS 1905:461–462.

⁷⁷⁷ CMS II.3:#43.

⁷⁷⁸ CLINE 1994:180 notes it is in the HM. There seems to be no other indication that it survived.

⁷⁷⁹ A possible ‘high-necked type’ bottle or jar was recovered at Kommos {334}.

⁷⁸⁰ NOLTE 1968:122; HARDEN 1981:37. For examples of ‘pomegranate-bottles’ found on Cyprus, see JACOBSSON

1994:26–29 #122–143; some are described as ‘clear brown’ and the decoration of #127 is not preserved. Jacobsson accepts them as Egyptian imports on Cyprus; see p. 79.

⁷⁸¹ NOLTE 1969:127–134 (*Werkkreis* 6). Alternatively, it may be amongst the earliest Egyptian glass vessels, dating to the reign of Thutmose III when some monochrome vessels are known.

⁷⁸² EVANS 1905:477–480 gives this identification.

⁷⁸³ Eleni Hatzaki (personal communication, 19 May 2003). This tomb and its contents will be published in detail by her.

265. Scarab, HM Σ-K 687

'White steatite,' L: 16.0, W: 11.8, H: 6.7; SH: 2.0 mm, majority of back, all head and one side missing, slightly damaged edge of face.

Scarab with engraved lunate head, single line between elytra and pronotum, and at least two between elytra, with framing line at outer edge of pronotum and elytra. Humeral callosities marked. Legs indicated by deep undercutting. String-hole through length. *Face*: 'Horus' hawk (G 5) in centre, facing right, with *nfr* (F 35) ('good fortune') in front and winged *Nhbt* (Nekhbet, the cobra goddess of Lower Egypt) in reduced form behind. The cobra has only one wing. Horizontal format. Line border.

Egyptian, Dynasty XIX–XX.

Context: LM IIIB (early), with mostly LM IIIA2 pottery.

Chronology: Early Dynasty XIX scarab, in generally contemporary LM IIIB (early) deposition.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1894:pl. XV:145; PENDLEBURY 1930b:56 #95, pl. IV:95 (from Mycenae); TUFNELL 1958:II:pl. 37–38:319; MATOUK 1972–1977:I:pl. 390:883–886, 891, 906; KEEL 1997:269 #490; {43}; {545}; (cryptographic writing) DRIOTON 1957:13–14.

References: EVANS 1905:477, 479 #99:a:1, pl. XC/fig. 101:1;⁷⁸⁴ FIMMEN 1924:177 fig. 173; PENDLEBURY 1930a:85; 1930b:27 #47, pl. I:47; 1939:258;⁷⁸⁵ POPHAM 1970:227; HELCK 1979:95; WEINSTEIN 1989:25 n. 124; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:250 #179, pl. 45:179; PHILLIPS 1991:II:601–602 #219, III:1087 fig. 219; 1992b:498, 504 fig. 3; CLINE 1994:150 #153; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:322 #332; PHILLIPS 2005a:44; 2005b:458–459.

Comments: The scarab and the two Minoan seals probably had been employed simply as ornamental beads without regard for their design or original intended use, although their original arrangement is unknown. This situation is paralleled at Sellopoulo {262}, although in an earlier context.

This example is dated to the Ramesside period due to the characteristically deep cutting and relatively crude carving of both the face design and the beetle itself, and therefore generally contemporary with its context. The context itself apparently *just* extends into LM IIIB (early), on the basis of one vessel, and therefore this context and scarab is a very tight overlap that strongly suggests the transition from LM IIIA2 and IIIB (early) should be early placed in the 13th c. (and early Dynasty XIX, early in the Ramesside period) rather than late in the 14th c. BC and Dynasty XVIII.

Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) initially dated this scarab to Dynasty XVIII, but later dated it to the reign of Ramesses II (Dynasty XIX), generally contemporary with its context date. Nir Lalkin places it within his Phases 1–3 in Palestine, encompassing LB I–IIA or the entire Dynasty XVIII. This was cited as an apparent cryptographic writing of *Imn*, 'Amon,' the god Amon. However, the use of crypto-

graphic writing generally is no longer accepted by Egyptologists.

OO.4. No Find Context

Evans also found another seal, "over a Zapher Papoura grave" according to the description accompanying a rough sketch in his travel notebook of Crete for 1922.

266. Seal, AM 1938.1045

Grey, pink and white agate, L: 15.1; W: 15.9; H: 7.7; SH: 2.1 mm, intact.

Lentoid with engraved design on one face, conoid back. String-hole through length. *Face*: Minoan 'genius' carrying a dead stag over its far shoulder towards left. 'Genius' has prominent drilled eyes and spikes running along dorsal appendage/body. Minoan, LM IIIA.

Context: None.

Chronology: LM IIIA seal, without context but presumably within LM III date of cemetery.

Comparison: GILL 1964:19 #32, pl. 5:1; {64}.

References: KENNA 1960:132 #303, pl. 12:303; GILL 1964:19 #34, pl. 5:3; KAISER 1976:pl. 7:9; PHILLIPS 1991:II:602–603 #220, III:1087 fig. 220; CMS VI:#307.

Comments: Kenna notes that the engraving appears to be unfinished. He suggests the stone may have shown signs of fracture, or alternatively it may have been used as a votive stone.

PP. Mavro Spelio

About two kilometers north-east of the Knossos palace, Evans discovered an MM–LM cemetery about 400 m. up the hillside, by a dry gully near the 'Mavro Spelio' ('Black Cave'), an artificially augmented cave which was once a 'spring chamber' probably for cultic use.⁷⁸⁶ He excavated six chamber tombs cut into terraces in the hillside in 1926 and passed responsibility for excavating the remaining 17 tombs to E.J. Forsdyke, who did so the following year. Forsdyke also published the entire cemetery, including Evans' excavations.⁷⁸⁷

Both multi-chambered and single-chambered tombs were found, each having a dromos. They were used continuously between MM II/III and LM IIIC. Some were devoid of finds and most had been plundered extensively, but nonetheless a large and varied number of objects were recovered from many of the tombs.⁷⁸⁸

⁷⁸⁴ The back illustration is entirely incorrect: not only are the humeral callosities lacking, the scarab is shown almost intact with its head completely reconstructed.

⁷⁸⁵ He misidentifies its find spot as Tomb 100.

⁷⁸⁶ HOOD and SMYTH 1981:53–54 #252. See now also RUTKOWSKI and NOWICKI 1996:62–63 on the cave itself.

⁷⁸⁷ EVANS excavated Tombs I–VI, and Forsdyke VII–XXII; FORSDYKE 1926–1927; EVANS *PM* II.2:555–557. See also PINI 1968:84; HOOD and SMYTH 1981:53 #251.

⁷⁸⁸ I am most grateful to Lucia Alberti, who currently is studying the material from the Mavro Spelio tombs, for providing further information not found in FORSDYKE 1926–1927 or otherwise noted, including specific dates for the individual tombs and chambers (personal communication, 07 February 2002). See ALBERTI 2001 for MM tombs; a more complete study is in preparation.

PP.1. Tomb III

Tomb III, excavated by Evans in the midst of the cemetery, was single-chambered, with a 30 cm. deep cavity near the centre of the floor.⁷⁸⁹ The front of the chamber had collapsed, but the rest was in fairly good condition. Although no skeletal remains were recorded, the contents included a silver earring, bronze knife, razors, tweezers, mirror and scale pans, lead weights, ivory knife pommel, beads of gold, faience, carnelian, crystal, lapis lazuli and steatite, a sard seal, marble rhyton, nine stone bowls and cups, and clay figurine, brazier, cup and flask. One of the vessels may be LM II–IIIA1 in date,⁷⁹⁰ and Lucia Alberti dates the use of the tomb to within LM II–IIIC.

267. Jar ('spheroid jar'), HM A 2146

Gabbro, H: 9.1; Dia. (rim): 10.1; (max): 12.9; (base): 5.7; (hole): 1.2–1.3 cm, intact with chips at rim.

Closed, with flat collar slightly undercut, high shoulder and raised base. Large circular hole at shoulder on one side, incompletely bored.

Minoan, LM I.

Context: LM II–IIIC.

Chronology: MM III–LM I vessel, an heirloom in its much later LM II–IIIC deposition.

References: FORSDYKE 1926–1927:253 #III:17, pl. XX:III:17; EVANS *PM* II.2:Suppl. pl. XXI:A:a; WARREN 1969:75 Type 30:A, P403, D222;⁷⁹¹ DICKERS 1990:fig. 1:6;⁷⁹² PHILLIPS 1991:II:604 #221, III:1087 fig. 221; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:215 #214; PHILLIPS 2001:85 #E.3; BEVAN 2001:II:415 fig. 6.35.d; EVELY 2003:176 n. 13.

Comments: The large hole may have been for a spout, but there are no smaller holes either side to attach the suggested spout nor any indication of attached handles. Nonetheless, this may have been intended to be, or be converted into, a bridge-spouted jar, as was jar {104}, but the conversion was abandoned before the spout or handles were added, or indeed the hole completed and other attachment holes made.

PP.2. Tomb V

Tomb V, farther up the hill and separated from the others, was a three-chambered tomb,⁷⁹³ with material between MM IIIA and LM IIIB. Evans did not distinguish the material by chamber. The tomb contained one complete larnax and several fragments of at least one other. In addition, bronze and stone

weapons and small tools, some bronze and faience beads, and fragments of faience bowls were recovered. Many of the ceramics are fragmentary, with almost all periods represented within the range quoted, although apparently not LM IB and LM IIIA1. Vessels include braziers, alabastro, cups, kylikes, champagne cups, a jug, conical cup, stirrup jars, fruit-stand(?), an apparently unique rhyton, and a possibly imported LH IIA squat alabastron. Alberti notes a last 'reuse' of the tomb in LM IIIB.⁷⁹⁴

268. Bowl fragments, HM unnumbered

Faience, white or yellow ground on exterior and green on interior, with black design, having a light brown and/or brown/black core, from at least two different vessels but the fragments cannot be distinguished. Total of 23 non-joining fragments including one rim, one base, and the remainder body fragments. Very decayed and worn surfaces.

(A) Rim fragment, H. (pres.): 3.6; W. (pres.): 5.1; Dia. (est. rim): 15.3 cm. Low carinated bowl with flaring rim. Exterior decoration of interlocking horizontal S-scrolls above carination and interior large lotus(?) bud and other probable floral elements. Thin band at rim edge.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XVII–early Dynasty XVIII.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1906b:pl. 9–10, 12–14; REISNER 1923:pl. 46:2.3; STRAUB 1974:12 fig. 1.6 (profile), 50 fig. 52, pl. 11.1.b (decoration); Chicago Field Museum 31005.

References: FORSDYKE 1926–1927:257 #V.7, fig. 9:upper; CADOGAN 1976:18; PHILLIPS 1991:II:605 #222 (A), III:1088 fig. 222.A; CLINE 1994:189 #486.

(B) Six carinated bowl fragments, MDim: (1) 2.1, (2) 2.1, (3) 1.9, (4) 1.9, (5) 1.8, (6) 1.6 cm. Similar to (A) above, three with some exterior scrolling and four indeterminate interior design. See comments above.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XVII–early Dynasty XVIII.

References: FORSDYKE 1927–1928:257 #V.7; CADOGAN 1976:18; PHILLIPS 1991:II:605 #222 (B), III:1088 fig. 222.B; CLINE 1994:189 #486.

(C) Base fragment, H (pres.): 1.9; W (pres.): 5.4; Dia. (base): 3.9 cm. Low shallow bowl with low base, concave underfoot. All-over paint underfoot, beginning of lotus petal design on exterior having some petals filled with vertical dashes, and interior bowl base having a filled rectangle surrounded by a series of complete and incomplete lines probably in imitation of a pool. Almost certainly not from the same bowl as the rim fragment (A) and upper body fragments (B) above.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XVII–early Dynasty XVIII.

Comparanda: RIEFSTAHL 1968:18 #14, 95 #14, pl. III:14; STRAUB 1974:42 fig. 40–41, pl. 8.b; BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:143

⁷⁸⁹ FORSDYKE 1926–1927:252–254 and *passim*; EVANS *PM* II.2:555–556, fig. 351:b.

⁷⁹⁰ DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:169.

⁷⁹¹ Note that the illustrations of D222 and D225 are reversed in the text, pp. 74–75. D225 is the profile of jar P398 {457}, and D222 of P403 (this jar).

⁷⁹² Mistakenly identified as the vessel from Elounda (= Pinies) {457}.

⁷⁹³ FORSDYKE 1926–1927:256–259.

⁷⁹⁴ Lucia Alberti (personal communication 16 February 2002) tells me that Evans' excavation record for this tomb consists of a single page in his Notebook, with a sketch of the tomb, two vases and an LM fragment, and no written text.

#139; BOURRIAU 1988:128–129 #122.a, fig. 122.a; D'AURIA, LACOVARA and ROEHRIG 1988:138–139 #76 (fig. 12); GIDDY 1999:pl. 39.2996, 3021, 3040, 3133.

References: FORSDYKE 1927–1928:257 #V.7, fig. 9:lower;⁷⁹⁵ CADOGAN 1976:18; PHILLIPS 1991:II:605–606 #222 (C), III:1089 fig. 222.C; CLINE 1994:189 #486.

(D) Fifteen shallow bowl body fragments, MDim: (1) 5.5, (2) 4.7, (3) 4.3, (4) 3.6, (5) 3.5, (6) 3.2, (7) 3.2, (8) 3.1, (9) 3.0, (10) 2.25, (11) 2.1, (12) 2.1, (13) 2.1, (14) 1.55, (15) 1.0 cm. Mostly having indeterminate designs both interior and exterior, some clearly part of lotus-petal decoration on both sides of fragments, and others more obscure. Most individual lines appear to be straight or short dashes/dots.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XVII–Dynasty XVIII. Some fragments *may* be Minoan, LM IA.

Comparanda: VON BISSING 1902:25–26 #3686; GIDDY 1999:pl. 39.2996, 3021, 3040, 3133.

References: FORSDYKE 1927–1928:257 #V.7, fig. 47:V.7; CADOGAN 1976:18; PHILLIPS 1991:II:606 #222 (D), III:1089–1091 fig. 222.D; CLINE 1994:189 #486.

Egyptian, late Dynasty XVII–early Dynasty XVIII. Some fragments *may* be Minoan, LM IA.

Context: LM IA (mature)–LM IIIB.

Chronology: Late Dynasty XVII–Dynasty XVIII vessels, in slightly to much later LM IA (mature)–IIIB tomb deposition.

Comments: The fragments cannot be directly associated or restored, as the majority are too small, fragmentary and worn even to estimate their profile angle. The extant decoration, however, suggests a minimum of three vessels: (1) a low carinated bowl with running spirals (exterior rim) and lotus bud (interior) decoration; (2) an open vessel, probably a bowl, imitating an open lotus (low/mid exterior) and an overall pattern of thick, solid and dotted, lines in an unidentifiable pattern (interior); and (3) a footed pond-bowl, having a pool in the centre (interior) and imitating an open lotus flower (exterior). Rim fragment (A) and upper body fragments (B) above probably are from the same carinated bowl, but rim (A) and base (C) cannot be from the same vessel, and upper body fragments (B) and base (C) have such differentiation in profile thickness that their combination would produce a vessel of immense proportions. The various fragments of (D) might belong to any or all of them, or even a fourth vessel. As the vast majority are decorated both interior and exterior, a date earlier than Dynasty XVIII is unlikely but, nonetheless, possible since a few are known from Dynasty XIII. The black rim band of (A) places this piece at least within Dynasty XVIII.⁷⁹⁶

The pool as centre design is typical of the Egyptian so-called 'pond-bowls' characteristic of Dynasty XVIII and most popular in the earlier part of the dynasty. Although the central pond is a common motif especially in this period, this bowl base (C) nonetheless equally could be from the latter part of the dynasty.⁷⁹⁷

The running spirals of rim fragment (A) might suggest Minoan work, but its fabric is no different from the others and

the interior design instead suggests instead an Egyptian origin. The running spiral is known on other Egyptian faience vessels, dateable to late Dynasty XVII–early Dynasty XVIII. The use of lotus buds and flowers also is common in the so-called 'pond-bowls,' but these normally possess a rounded rim. Although clearly not of the same type, tall faience vessels commonly employ similar lotus-petal decoration, especially on the exterior emanating from the base.⁷⁹⁸

PP.3. Tomb VII

Tombs VI and VII were found in the area between Tomb V and the others, but still removed from the main body of tombs. Tomb VII, excavated by Forsdyke, was double-chambered and contained numerous larnakes.⁷⁹⁹

In chamber 'A' were found two gold earrings, bronze rings, knife and tweezers, beads of gold, bronze, faience, glass, steatite and carnelian, sard and limestone seals including a limestone cylinder seal, steatite pendants and bowls, and a clay piriform jar, conical cup and champagne cups, deep bowls, potstand and braziers. Ceramic material dates to MM III–LM III. Alberti notes that some MM and many LM I–II vessels were found intact in both chambers, and may have been reused in later depositions, whilst the LM IIIC material is fragmentary. The tomb was plundered.

269. Alabastron (Type C), HM Λ 2142

'Grey-banded alabaster' or 'veined white marble,' H: 16.25; Dia. (rim): 5.2; (max): 14.0; (base): 12.2 cm, intact with a large deep pick-mark on the base.

Tall, baggy almost tapering body rounding at bottom to flattened bottom, with a short collared neck with upright rounded rim.

Egyptian?, SIP–Dynasty XVIII, or Minoan, LM IB–IIIA1.

Context: None definite, but MM III–LM IIIC (middle) if from this tomb.

Chronology: Second Intermediate Period–Dynasty XVIII vessel, in questionable context possibly of somewhat to much later MM III–LM IIIC deposition.

Comparanda: (for material) PLATON 1971:141 Fig.; LILYQUIST 1996:pl. 9.3–5; {4}; {106}; {109–110}; {179?}.

References: WARREN 1969:112 Type 43:I, P615; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:238 #153, pl. 70:153; PHILLIPS 1991:II:607–608 #223, III:1092 fig. 223; CLINE 1994:168 #288; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:235 #231.

Comments: Not published in the original report but identified by Warren as coming from Chamber 'A'. This vessel was originally marked 'XIV,' which was crossed out and 'VII.A' added in a smaller but similar hand.⁸⁰⁰ Tomb XIV, according to the excavation report,⁸⁰¹ was found devoid of any contents, so it is

⁷⁹⁵ The design is over-restored.

⁷⁹⁶ GIDDY 1999:273 #1331.

⁷⁹⁷ See also STRAUB 1974; BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:141–142.

⁷⁹⁸ E.g., BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:149 #151, 154 #160. An example was found in the 'House of Shields' at Mycenae; see WACE and DESBOROUGH 1956:Pl 19:7515.

⁷⁹⁹ FORSDYKE 1926–1927:260–264, fig. 15.

⁸⁰⁰ Clearly seen in WARREN 1969:P615.

⁸⁰¹ FORSDYKE 1926–1927:294.

unlikely that the alabastron came from there. It was found in the HM, in a box containing material from these excavations and, whilst likely originating in chamber A of Tomb VII, uncertainty must remain. Its short upright rim might indicate a larger neck and rim was removed to produce the present profile, if Egyptian.

The stone material is 'grey-banded,' an unusual description for banded travertine, and it is possible that this vessel was a Minoan imitation in local stone; it is unlike the 'usual' banded travertine stone and may be another stone altogether. On the other hand, it may be the result of having been subjected to fire although it does not appear similar to other 'grey-banded' vessels and otherwise has not burning marks. Grey-banded 'alabaster' and 'veined white marble' were used for several clearly Minoan vessels, such as a pilgrim's flask, jug and conical rhyton from Kato Zakro.

QQ. Ailias

South of Mavro Spelio cemetery on the western face of Prophitis Ilias hill, directly east of Knossos palace and the Kairitos river, is the ridge called Ailias. It runs along a north-south axis. A number of finds have been recovered here.

M.S.F. Hood excavated a Middle Minoan cemetery here in 1950–1955. A total of six rock-cut chamber tombs were uncovered, the first by Hood and St. Alexiou in 1950, and the remainder by Hood in 1951, 1953 and 1955. Others were found in the surrounding area also. Those from the cemetery are numbered Tombs IV–IX. They are not fully published as yet.

All tombs contained multiple burials. Tomb IV had nine pithos burials and five earlier burials swept to the back, with a few grave goods of MM date.⁸⁰² Tomb V was divided into two main compartments, of which the farther contained MM larnakes piled two to three deep and blocked by a large stone slab.⁸⁰³ Tomb VI, also with two compartments, contained more than 50 burials, most of them in pithoi. Its pottery and seals date within MM II.⁸⁰⁴ Tomb VIII contained 18 larnakes and a pithos burial, and Tomb IX three larnakes, a pithos burial and some cremated remains. Both date chiefly to MM III, and certainly no later.⁸⁰⁵ A rock-cut stairway near Tombs V–VII apparently led up to the cemetery area.

Tomb VII was sub-divided into three compartments by stone walls. It contained several larnax

burials. Both near and in the larnakes was much MM III pottery and a quantity of jewellery, including six seals, a scarab and locally-made cylinder seal, silver anthropomorphic pendant, two gold rings, many bronze rings, earrings, pins and bracelets, and beads of amethyst, rock crystal, lapis lazuli and carnelian. The tomb is dated to MM III.

270. Scarab, HM Σ-K 1715

"Smoky quartz,"⁸⁰⁶ L: 10.0; W: 8.2; H: 5.1; SH: 1.7 mm, chipped on back.

Scarab with three horizontal lines separating head, pronotum and elytra, and two lines between elytra. Legs indicated by two loosely diagonal lines each side, from front to back on the left and back to front on the right. One irregular shallow drill-mark on left elytrum. *Face*: Linear design consisting of horizontal, vertical and diagonal lines in a vaguely formal arrangement.

Minoan, MM III.

Context: MM III.

Chronology: Late MB IIA–B or MM III scarab, in generally contemporary MM III tomb deposition.

Comparanda: (face design) KEEL 1989b:224–225 #27–28, 226–227 #30–31.

References: COOK and BOARDMAN 1954:166; *CMS* II.2:#56; YULE 1981:79 Class 29:b, 146 Motif 24; 1983:366, 366 n. 22, fig. 30; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:228–229 unnumbered; PHILLIPS 1991:II:609–610 #224, III:1092 fig. 224; QUIRKE and FITTON 1997:442; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:323 #334; PHILLIPS 2004:166 fig. 5.middle.

Comments: Yule classified this face design as an unusual example of the 'tectonic ornament' motif; however, it would fit within his 'T-composition' schema if it is viewed with the head at the top. Quirke and Fitton, on the other hand, suggest the motif is "derived from FIP examples with plant motif?". Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) have identified this scarab as one of the small number of scarabs produced by the 17th c. BC 'Green Jasper Workshop' group at Byblos or possibly Megiddo and, as such, an import to Crete.⁸⁰⁷ They see the face design as a series of stylised plants, similar to some face designs in the Jasper Group. However, they also comment that the scarab's back and sides "are in no way comparable" to others in the group, so their association with it is limited to the material (as identified by them) and face design. Its small scale also is incompatible with those of the 'Jasper Group,' as published. It is much better seen as an indigenous product, by an artisan who had little if any understanding of what he was attempting to depict. The disparity in rendering the legs strongly suggests the artisan was quite unsure of, or removed from, the original intention of depicting a scarab beetle.⁸⁰⁸ This appears to be the last indigenous scarab(oid) produced on Crete.

⁸⁰² COOK 1951:252. Material and context dates in this section are presented in collaboration with Doniert Evely and Sinclair Hood; full publication is forthcoming.

⁸⁰³ COOK 1952:108.

⁸⁰⁴ COOK and BOARDMAN 1954:166.

⁸⁰⁵ HOOD and BOARDMAN 1956:32–33.

⁸⁰⁶ The *CMS* lists its material as 'smoky quartz,' and all other references follow this identification. The exception is Keel

and Kyriakides in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:323, who call it "jasper, greenish brown." It appears at least partly translucent, in strong disagreement with 'jasper,' and their identification likely is the result of their association of this scarab with the 'Green Jasper Workshop.'

⁸⁰⁷ See also the cylinder seal {488} from Poros.

⁸⁰⁸ Compare YULE's 1981 drawing and *CMS* photograph with the photograph in KARETSOU *et al.*

271. Pendant, HM –A 1721 (not handled)

Silver, H: 21.4; W: 9.9; Th.: 6.5; SH: 1.8 mm, intact.

Pendant in the form of a dancing boy or pygmy with arms at waist, hands meeting in centre, and legs drawn up, knees splayed and feet together. Head overly large, with flattened nose and roughly indicated features. String-hole through wide loop attached to top of head.

Egyptian, probably Dynasty XII, or Minoan, MM II–III.

Context: MM III.

Chronology: Probably Dynasty XII object, in somewhat later MM III tomb deposition.

References: COOK and BOARDMAN 1954:166; HOOD 1971:225, pl. 65; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:229 unnumbered; PHILLIPS 1991:II:610–611 #225, III:1092 fig. 225; 1992b:500; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:190 #183.

Comments: Bichta (in KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) notes this is from Compartment 2 of the tomb. Hood considers the figure to be reminiscent of the Egyptian god Bes. The dating of its context would negate this, as it would need to have been inspired by Middle Kingdom examples of the god, then quite leonine in appearance.⁸⁰⁹ It strongly resembles the Egyptian figures of pygmies, the so-called “dwarfs of the divine dances” from ‘the Land of the Spirits’ in Central Africa.⁸¹⁰ It also strongly resembles Dynasty XVIII amuletic representations of the Egyptian deity Ptah-Sokar,⁸¹¹ but the MM III context date of the tomb is again too early for that identification. No comparable contemporary Egyptian representation can be cited; it may simply represent a child.

Alternatively, it may be another example of the ‘squatting pregnant woman’ type, although the side view of the figure does not suggest a swollen abdomen. Nonetheless, if this is the case, then the context dating is not a problem as it is more or less contemporary with the date of the rock crystal pendant **{312}** and not much later than the other images of this type.

272. Amulet, HM Σ–K 1722 (not handled)

Carnelian, L: 8; W: 5; SH: 1 mm, intact.

Amulet in the form of a fly, naturalistically carved with rounded wingtips. String-hole through width of centre body just below wings, with trace of an initial aborted drilling on left side. Very finely carved.

Probably Egyptian, probably Middle Kingdom.

Context: MM III.

Chronology: Probably Middle Kingdom object, without context but undoubtedly in slightly to somewhat later MM III tomb deposition.

Comparanda: PETRIE 1914:12 #19; BRUNTON 1927:16, pl. XLVIII:36:A:6 (from Hemamieh); 1928:pl. XCVII:36; ANDREWS 1981:66 #438; MFA 11.2565; 12.1320.

References: PHILLIPS 1991:II:611–612 #226, III:1092 fig. 226; 1992b:500, 501 n. 23; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:192 #188.

Comments: Bichta (in KARETSOU *et al.*) notes this is from Compartment 2 of the tomb, as is the silver pendant **{371}**, above. The fly is quite small and displayed in a case; details are not visible under these conditions but the rounded wingtips are recognisable; it appears much like an Egyptian fly amulet. Bichta dates it to MM III, suggesting it is a Minoan piece.

The Pharaoh presented a gold medal in the form of a fly for military valour, according to Dynasty XVIII texts.⁸¹² It symbolised courage and bravery in battle. Called ‘The Order of the Golden Fly,’ this decoration may have a Canaanite origin,⁸¹³ and was introduced to Egypt at the very beginning of the New Kingdom.⁸¹⁴ This dating is too late for an MM III deposition in the tomb, however, and this piece should not be associated with this New Kingdom royal award.

Prior to this, however, smaller fly amulets also are known in materials other than gold, including silver, glass, carnelian, red jasper, lapis lazuli and variously coloured glazed material and stones, and were fairly common necklace ‘beads’ without face design. Carnelian examples are known at least from the end of the Old Kingdom on, although they are not common. Gold examples most often are found strung in multiple on necklaces separated by several simple round beads, but others are found as one of many different amulet forms on necklaces and bracelets.⁸¹⁵ They may have represented the *b3* (*ba*), as flies commonly laid eggs on fresh corpses and newly-hatched flies would have been observed flying away within a few days of death. Alternatively, they may have been intended to ascribe the fly’s fecundity to the wearer or protect them from its persistent annoyance.⁸¹⁶ The most common periods for the type appear to be Naqada (the earliest known is from a Naqada II grave), and Dynasties XII and XVIII, although they are found in all Dynastic periods.⁸¹⁷ An amulet in the form of a fly was found at Hemamieh,⁸¹⁸ and these apparently are typical of the FIP.

Petrie distinguishes two types, one with rounded wing tips and the other pointed, but he does not distinguish them chronologically and later authorities have not followed his distinction. The presence of this single example might indicate a dismantled Egyptian necklace, the individual beads reused in Minoan arrangements, but if so must be earlier than the New Kingdom, as Dynasty XVIII postdates the MM III dating of the tomb. Given its material, this amulet probably should be ascribed to the Middle Kingdom, although this is uncertain. The fly is known as a Minoan motif only once, as a seal from Archanes **{51}**, of EM III–MM IA date.

RR. Gypsades

A number of tombs have been excavated over the years by the British School on Gypsades hill, south of

⁸⁰⁹ On the early Bes figure, see ROMANO 1980.

⁸¹⁰ See HAYES 1953–1959:I:222–223, fig. 139; BARNETT 1982: pl. 7:a.

⁸¹¹ See PETRIE 1914:38 #176.A, pl. XXXI:176:c–e; DOTHAN 1979:24, figs. 49, 57.

⁸¹² BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:238.

⁸¹³ ALDRED 1978:118.

⁸¹⁴ KRITSKY 1993:38. The earliest known are those of Queen

Ah-hotep, presented by her son(s) Kamose and Ahmose, last king of Dynasty XVII and first of Dynasty XVIII.

⁸¹⁵ E.g., BROVARSKI *et al.* 1982:238 #315; also KRITSKY 1993: 38–39.

⁸¹⁶ ANDREWS 1994:63.

⁸¹⁷ PETRIE 1914:12 #19; ANDREWS 1994:62.

⁸¹⁸ BRUNTON 1927:16, pl. XLVIII:36:A:6.

Knossos palace, in addition to numerous chance finds.

RR.1. Tholos Tomb I

In the 1957 season, Hood interrupted his excavations in the area west of ‘Hogarth’s Houses’⁸¹⁹ following the chance discovery and robbing of a tholos tomb some 300 m. away.⁸²⁰ A second grave of possible shaft grave type was found nearby, dated to the MM period.⁸²¹

The tholos is small, only about four metres in diameter. It was constructed probably in MM IIA–IIIA, and continued in use through into the LM period. At least two distinct layers of deposits were isolated, the later one raised some 30 cm. above the earlier sometime in MM IIIB. The upper layer included two skeletons, one found inside a ‘bathtub’-type larnax, with no grave goods mentioned but presumably of MM IIIB–LM IA date. A third burial, in a second similar larnax but again without grave goods, was found at a higher level near the blocking slab.

Even later, a large ossuary with two compartments was built in front of its entrance on the east side. It was filled with bones and skulls, together with LM IA pottery, which apparently had spilled out into the open and into the tholos chamber. The tholos had been plundered, and no beads, seals, gold or silver or other small ‘rich’ finds were recovered. It awaits final publication.

RR.1.1.

In the lower layer some clay vessels and figurines were found, the vessels dating to MM II/IIIA. Some sherds of MM IIIB date were recovered in the 30 cm. of fill above, below the upper layer. Thus the lower layer presumably dates to MM II/IIIA(–IIIB). Also found in this layer was at least one stone vessel, to judge from the context dating cited by Warren.⁸²²

273. Jar fragment (‘spheroid jar’), KSM (1957–1961) C 8 (not located)

Dolomitic marble, H: (est.) 6.5; Dia. (rim): 8.5; (max.): 13.5; (base): 8.2 cm,⁸²³ one fragment preserving almost entire profile and about half of vessel, worn on handle edges.

Spheroid jar with narrow flat collar rim, raised base, high shoulder and two horizontal roll handles on the shoulder. Multiple fluting on entire shoulder to rim. Alternating thick and thin vertical gouges on handles.

Minoan, MM (IIB?–)IIIA.

Context: MM II/IIIA.

Chronology: (MM IIB?–)IIIA vessel, in generally contemporary or slightly later MM IIB/IIIA tomb deposition.

References: WARREN 1969:74, 75 Type 30:A; PHILLIPS 1990:323 n. 23, 327; 1991:II:613 #227, III:1093 fig. 227; 2001:85 #E.1.

Comments: Warren dates this piece to MM IIB; thus, it must have been recovered in the lower layer. He also notes that this is the earliest Minoan example of the later (i.e., MM III–LM IIIA1) penchant for imitating Early Dynastic Egyptian stone vessels. He does not provide reasons for dating it this early, and presumably it may be associated with the MM IIIA material of this lower layer instead.

RR.1.2.

Another stone vessel also seems to have been found in a later context, presumably in the ossuary or the upper fill of the tholos, again according to Warren’s context dating of the piece to LM IA.

274. Jar fragment (‘spheroid jar’), KSM (1957–1961) E 9 A (not located)

“Probably antico rosso,” H: (pres., est.) 4.5; Dia. (rim): 6.5; (max.): 13 cm, one rim/upper body fragment.

Spheroid jar fragment with slightly raised narrow flat collar rim and high shoulder, no indication of handles.

Minoan, LM IA.

Context: Presumably LM IA.

Chronology: LM IA vessel, in generally contemporary LM IA tomb deposition.

References: WARREN 1969:75 Type 30:A; PHILLIPS 1991:II:613 #228, III:1093 fig. 228; 2001:85 #E.2.

RR.2. LM IIIA1 Chamber Tomb

In 1979, Mervyn Popham excavated a chamber tomb accidentally exposed by plowing on the lower Gypsades hill.⁸²⁴ It was of the usual type, with long dromos and blocked trapezoidal chamber constructed of stone, although the front part of the roof had collapsed. It had only been used once, and despite roof collapse was intact and undisturbed. Nonetheless, no burial was found, and the excavator suggests it may have been that of a very young person, “presumably a girl”. Apart from some LM IA and a few LM II/early IIIA sherds, finds were limited to a single small LM IIIA1 piriform jar and a number of beads belonging to one or more necklaces, chiefly carnelian and faience but also one gold and another of amber, found on the right side of the room from the door.

⁸¹⁹ See Knossos II, above.

⁸²⁰ HOOD 1958a:22–23; 1958b:229, 230–231. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:57 #308 (code LG I/57); DRIESSEN and MACDONALD 1997:169.

⁸²¹ See SOLES 1973:257–259; HOOD and SMYTH 1981:57 #307 (code LG II/57).

⁸²² WARREN 1969:75.

⁸²³ I am extremely grateful to Prof. Warren for allowing me to copy and include his unpublished drawings of **{273}** and **{274}** here. Dimensions quoted here for both vessels are estimated from these 1:1 scale drawings.

⁸²⁴ POPHAM 1980.

The string(s) had been disturbed but the beads have been re-strung by the excavators based on surviving evidence. The beads included two scaraboids.

275. Scaraboid, HM — (not located)⁸²⁵

Carnelian, L: 12; W: 9.5 mm, intact.

Scaraboid with single line between clypeus and elytra, and double line between elytra. Head indicated by three horizontal lines. 'Legs' indicated by horizontal groove around sides. String-hole through length. Ovoid shape intapering to head. *Face*: Three lines crossing in a six-pointed star pattern.

Minoan, MM (IB?–)II.

Context: LM IIIA1.

Chronology: MM (IB?–)II scaraboid, an indigenous antique in its LM IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: (Minoan) *CMS* II.1:#448; YULE 1981:148–149 Motif 26, pl. 18:Motif 26:16; BLACKMAN 1999:5–6, fig. 6; {276}; (Egyptian) NFA 1991:#192, pl.#192.

References: POPHAM 1980:171, fig. 5, pl. 16:d:upper right, 17:d–f:right; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:199–200 unnumbered; PHILLIPS 1991:II:615 #229, III:1093 fig. 229; 1992b:499; PHILLIPS 2004:168 fig. 8.bottom.

Comments: There are a few Egyptian examples of the face design, dated to the New Kingdom, also slightly tapering ovoid in shape, used mainly as necklace elements rather than as seals. However, they have an entirely different profile and are not as crudely made. It is highly unlikely that the two Gypsades scaraboids are anything but Minoan, as almost certainly is the parallel found in an LH IIIA tomb at Athens. If Minoan, parallels for the face design date this (and {276} below) to MM I–II, whilst the material makes it almost certainly not earlier than MM II; the design is entirely unknown in the LM period.⁸²⁶ Thus they must have been heirlooms when deposited in the tomb, but perhaps used in lieu of an imported scarab. The multiple horizontal lines of the head give the suggestion of a 'horn' at the front, but this probably is fortuitous. The 'parallel' at Peristeria (Messinia) quoted by Popham⁸²⁷ is not at all similar, and is rejected here.

Restrung onto one of two necklaces, and must have belonged to a necklace originally, probably together with {276}, which is identical except for the single rather than double line between elytra.

276. Scaraboid, HM — (not located)

Carnelian, L: 12; W: 9.5 mm, intact.

As above, {275}, except only single line between elytra. *Face*: As above, {275}.

Minoan, MM (IB?–)II.

Context: LM IIIA1.

Chronology: MM (IB?–)II scaraboid, an indigenous antique in its LM IIIA1 tomb deposition.

Comparanda: As above, {275}.

References: POPHAM 1980:171, pl. 16:d:upper middle, 17:d–f:left;

PHILLIPS 1991:II:615 #230, III:1093 fig. 230; 1992b:499; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:199–200 unnumbered; PHILLIPS 2004:168 fig. 5.top.

Comments: As above, {275}.

RR.3. Overlying MM Tomb

In 1955, M.S.F. Hood, G. Huxley and N.K. Sandars excavated a Minoan cemetery on Upper Gypsades hill, with a total of 18–20 LM III tombs and one MM tomb.⁸²⁸ The one MM tomb (#XVIII) was a large oval antechamber and kidney-shaped burial chamber, separated by a large stone wall blocking. No floor deposit was found in the antechamber. The burial chamber contained at least nine burials, apparently not all contemporary but all somewhat disturbed and few original grave goods were found. These included four small vases, a bowl, juglet and two miniature cups, a bronze or haematite bead, two plain silver earrings, a silver or meteoritic sealstone, and a small bronze link. These indicate a date of late MM II–IIIA for the tomb.

The overlying fill, on the other hand, seems to have been domestic occupation rubbish, dumped there after the chamber had collapsed, rather than having any votive significance. This consisted of a large quantity of MM IIIA pottery (oval-mouthed amphora, handled cups, bowls, vase and jar), together with some clay human and bull figurines and stone bowl fragments (jugs, vases, lids and a lamp, of white marble, steatite and limestone?), scraps of red-painted (wall?) plaster, an ostrich egg fragment, and a clay crucible fragment with bronze traces.

277. Ostrich egg fragment, KSM — (not located)

Ostrich eggshell, L: 3.8, W 3.7 cm, fragment only.

Fragment convex, undecorated.

Probably from Libya or Egypt, or Syro-Palestine, undateable but not later than Dynasty XIII/MB IIB.

Context: MM IIIA.

Chronology: Undateable object not later than Dynasty XIII or MB IIB, in late MM IIIA 'domestic rubbish' deposition.

Comparanda: {108}, {153}, {425}.

References: HOOD, HUXLEY and SANDARS 1958–1959:223, 260 #XVIII.35, fig. 35:XVIII:35, pl. 60.d; REESE 1985:372.

Comments: The location of the eggshell fragment within the fill is not stated, but it is part of Hood's 'domestic rubbish' and therefore is associated with the MM IIIA pottery. No MM domestic remains are reported from anywhere nearby,

⁸²⁵ This and scaraboid {276} below are not listed in the KSM objects register from this excavation. Material from this excavation not held in the KSM was transferred to the HM, but the two scaraboids could not be located there either.

⁸²⁶ See YOUNGER 1973:387 for a few examples having much more elaborate forms of this type.

⁸²⁷ POPHAM 1980:173.

⁸²⁸ HOOD 1955:33–34; HOOD, HUXLEY and SANDARS 1958–1959. See also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:59 #331. One other possible MM tomb (#VIII) in this cemetery was found completely devoid of contents.

although a considerable amount of MM II–III sherd deposition and some possible MM limestone blocks also are noted farther down the hill.⁸²⁹ The date given above reflects its context date.

RR.4. No Find Context Stated

Bevan notes the existence of an unpublished stone vessel from ‘Lower Gypsades’.

278. Closed vessel fragment. KSM LG/57/8 (not seen)

Travertine?, dimensions not stated, one shoulder? fragment. Lower shoulder? fragment of apparently closed vessel, convex, undecorated, ‘sawn-up’.

Egyptian, not dateable as shown.

Context: Not stated.

Chronology: Undateable object in unknown deposition.

Comparison: (‘sawn’), {194; 219; 416}.

Reference: BEVAN 2001:I:224, II:410 fig. 6.30:LG/57/8.

Comments: All information is as kindly provided by Bevan 2001. The accession code provides its origin at Lower Gypsades and its excavation or at least accession in 1957 but, as ‘Hogarth’s Houses’ material is coded ‘HH,’ it is not from here. Bevan’s text suggests it is of travertine stone and Egyptian in origin, and his illustration suggests its shape and profile.

Bevan notes it has saw marks, suggesting it was part of a stone vessel reduced to scrap.

SS. The ‘Temple Tomb’

Almost immediately west of the modern highway some 550 m. south of Knossos towards Archanes, two rocky ‘headlands’ of land with fallen debris on their lower slopes were chosen by Evans for investigation in 1931, following the accidental discovery here of the gold ‘Ring of Minos’⁸³⁰ by a local boy.

About 30 paces north-west of its find spot, Evans discovered what proved to be the west wall of the upper chamber of a very large structure he nicknamed the ‘Temple Tomb’.⁸³¹ It was built partially into the northern headland on a generally east-west axis. Originally two storeys in height, the structure was remarkably well preserved but later partially restored by Evans. The twisted rock-cut entrance passage and staircase led down to a covered ‘Pavilion’⁸³² supported by two columns *in antis* facing an open paved court. Opposite the court was the recessed entrance to an ‘Inner Hall’ leading in turn to a ‘Pillar Crypt’ supported by two square pillars. At the north-west corner of the crypt a short passage

led to the ‘Sepulchral Chamber’ or ‘Inner Pillar Crypt’. This room, about four metres square, was supported by another square pillar in the centre in a slightly depressed square of pavement. The entire room had been carved out of living rock in the hill-side, but the walls and floor were lined with gypsum slabs and the exposed ceiling painted blue. The upper storey was located above the ‘Pillar Crypt,’ entered via an inner staircase east of the ‘Inner Hall’.

Despite generalisations to the contrary, the Temple Tomb bears no specific resemblance to Egyptian religious or funerary architecture, with which it often is compared.⁸³³ Certainly it served a religious function as a place of worship.⁸³⁴ The building was constructed in MM IIB, and destroyed by earthquake late in LM IA. A small collection of glass beads imitating amethyst was found in the Sepulchral Chamber vault. The building subsequently was rebuilt, and continued in use at least through LM IIIA and possibly later. An LM II–IIIA1 deposit (the ‘Sepulchral Deposit’) was found in the pit immediately beside the ‘Inner Pillar Crypt’ entrance, including a gold ring, bronze knife and razor, an ivory comb, stone alabastra and a bowl, an imported gypsum tazza of Syro-Palestinian type, a variety of clay vessels and a few fragments of human bones possibly separated from those in the outer room.

SS.1. The ‘Pillar Crypt’

The ‘Pillar Crypt’ partially was blocked probably following the earthquake, sealing off rubble together with the bones of about 20 people and LM IA sherds. Essentially the south-western quarter of the room was blocked, employing both pillars. The ‘Inner Pillar Crypt’ or ‘Sepulchral Chamber’ remained accessible via this room, which had become little more than an entrance passageway. Bones of an old man and child were found in the north end of the ‘Pillar Crypt’ at the entrance to the ‘Inner Pillar Crypt’. The ‘Pillar Crypt’ was decorated with double axes incised on the walls, the east pillar in red. In addition to the blocked rubble contents, the LM II–IIIA deposit, a large ‘horns of consecration’ and a stone kernos were found in the room itself, presumably in the passage space remaining.

⁸²⁹ See HOOD and SMYTH 1981:51–51#332(2), 337–338, 356.

⁸³⁰ EVANS *PM* IV.2:947–956. This ring has recently been re-‘found’ and is now on display in the HM.

⁸³¹ EVANS 1930–1931:191–192; PAYNE 1931:205–208; EVANS *PM* IV.2:964–978, 988–1018. See also PINI 1968:84; SOLES 1973:269–275; HOOD and SMYTH 1981:58–59 #323; GESELL 1985:99.

⁸³² The names of the various areas in the tomb are those designated by Evans.

⁸³³ JARKIEWICZ 1982:491.

⁸³⁴ See JARKIEWICZ 1982:446–452; GESELL 1985:99.

279. Kernos ('block vase'), HM A 2276

Soft heavy stone, either serpentine or chlorite(?), H: 6.8–7.6; L (rest.): 24.4; W (max): 9.4; Cups (Dia.): 3.6–4.1; (depth): 4.3–4.7 cm, large fragments missing, chiefly large chips from edges including half of cup at either end and majority of base surface, now restored.

Rough kernos ('block vase') of elongated oval shape of irregular height and width, sloping to one side, having uneven base somewhat smaller in surface area than top. Five cylindrical cups in rough line along length, hollowed out by drilling.

Probably Egyptian, probably Predynastic if so.

Context: MM IIIB–LM IIIA, presumably LM II–IIIA.

Chronology: Predynastic(?) vessel, an antique in its LM II–IIIA deposition.

Comparanda: QUIBELL 1900:10, pl. XXXI:3; VON BISSING 1904–1907:II:69 #18377, pl. VI:18377; EL-KHOULI 1978:pl. 133:5576, 158:5576.

References: EVANS 1930–1931:192; PAYNE 1931:208; EVANS *PM* IV.2:978–983, fig. 939, 953; WARREN 1965:33 #26; 1969:12, 111 Type 43:G1, P60; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:214 #76, pl. 67:76; PHILLIPS 1991:II:618–619 #231, III:1094 fig. 231; CLINE 1994:217 #745; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:245 #246.

Comments: The kernos or 'block vase' is found both in Predynastic Egypt and on Minoan Crete, but the nearest parallels to this example are found in Egypt. The Minoan kernoi are not closely related.⁸³⁵ Minoan examples with a unified exterior (i.e., with the exterior appearance of a single long vessel, not attached multiple vessels) all have drilled holes possibly for suspension but more likely for attachment of a lid, at various places on the vessel, most commonly at the edges set between the cups in the centre of the block, at the top. The Egyptian parallel has these holes at the upper corners although another with but three cups, rounded at the four 'corners' following the interior curve, does exhibit holes at the centre edge between the cups themselves. The Temple Tomb example unfortunately is broken off at all corners, but it is possible that it might have had holes at the corners; no evidence for or against this is apparent. None are at the centre edge. Minoan examples also tend to have carved decoration on the long sides. This piece is so roughly carved that it might be unfinished, as may be the Egyptian parallel. Its identification as Egyptian is probable but unprovable, but its presence in a context much later than its presumed date of manufacture is paralleled on Crete numerous times, and is not an argument against importation.

SS.2. No Find Context

Evans also explored the area immediately surrounding the building. He also found at least one other object on the surface near the north-western corner of the 'Temple Tomb'.

280. Spout, HM 2280

Banded tufa, H: 5.9; L: 8.1; W: 4.5 cm, majority of spout end missing, and large areas of attachment end including one drill hole remain.

Triangular spout tapering towards the pouring end, with raised flat bridge at other. Three drilled holes (two preserved, with base ring) for attachment below bridge, where surface carved to fit the (missing) vessel.

Minoan, MM IIIB–LM IIIA.

Context: None.

Chronology: MM IIIB–LM IIIA vessel, without context.

Comparanda: {104}; {306}; {307}.

References: EVANS *PM* IV.2:976, Suppl. pl. LXVI:a; WARREN 1969:33, 34; PHILLIPS 1991:II:619–620 #232, III:1095 fig. 232.

Comments: Although this is a Minoan piece, it is made in a local stone clearly chosen to match Egyptian travertine, suggesting a similar function to another spout of Minoan manufacture at Kato Zakro {104}. The vessel to which it once was attached must have been of the same or similar material, to judge from the careful matching demonstrated in the Kato Zakro jar {104}. A banded tufa bridge-spouted jar, carved in a single piece and of Minoan origin, was found in the Isopata Royal Tomb together with imported Egyptian alabastra,⁸³⁶ and an Egyptian alabastron converted into a Minoan jar with evidence for a separate spout originally attached was found at Mycenae {590}. While we cannot be sure that this spout originally was attached to a (now lost) imported travertine Egyptian vessel, it is a reasonable possibility. In addition to the spout, Warren lists a jar, two chalices, five ewers, two jugs, 13 rhyta, an imitation triton and 14 other Minoan vessels of this material.⁸³⁷

TT. The 'Silver and Gold Cup Tomb'

Whilst laying out a new vineyard about 90 m. south of the 'Temple Tomb' but on the opposite side of the modern highway, Kostis Psilakis, a local landowner, uncovered several stone and clay vessels. He reported the finds, and R.W. Hutchinson excavated the remains of a very small transitional LM II–IIIA1 chamber tomb in 1940.⁸³⁸

It contained two burials. The earlier, virtually intact, was a male. The later, found in the entrance by the dromos, was so obliterated that identification was impossible. In addition to the silver and gold cup which gave the tomb its nickname, Hutchinson found stone bowls and a lid, clay bowls, jugs, jars, alabastra, an amphora and kylix, and a bronze sword and silver pin. Two clay jugs, and a stone anthropoid jar, hydria and bowl were recovered in the landowner's initial find.

281. Hydria/rhyton, HM A 2403

Banded travertine, H: 17.3; Dia. (rim): 8.6; (max): 15.2; (base): 10.2 cm, part of shoulder and majority of handle and rim restored, and chip on base.

Rhyton with wide body with sharp shoulder angle, slightly splayed base concave below. Narrow cylindrical neck with raised ridge at join to shoulder and wide everted rim. Strap handle on upper shoulder, with raised ridge having diagonal

⁸³⁵ See WARREN 1969:11–14 Type 4.

⁸³⁶ HM 598. See WARREN 1969:34 Type 13:B.

⁸³⁷ WARREN 1969:143–156.

⁸³⁸ DUNBABIN 1944:83–84, fig. 1; HUTCHINSON 1956a. See also PINI 1968:84; HOOD and SMYTH 1981:59 #324.

slashes along length and a short tail. Hole drilled through base opposite the handle side.

Probably Egyptian, late SIP–Dynasty XVIII, alteration certainly Minoan, probably MM III–LM I.

Context: LM II–III A transitional.

Chronology: Late Second Intermediate Period or early–mid–Dynasty XVIII (to reign of Thutmose III) vessel, without certain context but reworked in MM III–LM I and an heirloom in somewhat later presumed transitional LM IIB–III A tomb deposition.

Comparanda: GUY and ENGBERG 1938:pl. 39:10, 46:5, 14, 16. (clay); AMIRAN 1970a:159 photo 153 (clay, from Megiddo).

References: DUNBABIN 1944:83–83, fig. 1:centre; HUTCHINSON 1956a:68, 71, 73 #18, fig. 1:18, pl. 7:e; WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:J, P623; POPHAM 1970:227; HANKEY 1974:165; WARREN 1979:106–107 n. 2; CADOGAN 1983:517; LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON 1990:225 #118; PHILLIPS 1991:II:621–622 #233, III:1096 fig. 233; CLINE 1994:197 #561; LILYQUIST 1996:147, 152, pl. 7.4; WARREN 1997:219; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:210–211 #210; BEVAN 2001:II:389 fig. 6.9.c; KOEHL 2006:58, 214 #1192.

Comments: The hydria was not found within the tomb itself, but rather was uncovered by the field owner. Nonetheless, it must have come from the tomb originally.

Although of banded travertine, the hydria has a clearly Syro-Palestinian MB IIA/LB I shape.⁸³⁹ Nonetheless, its Egyptian origin is ascertained by its material and on technical grounds, as “no closed vessels found in Palestine can be described as made by Palestinian craftsmen using imported Egyptian material,”⁸⁴⁰ and the complete lack of any stone vessels in this shape in Levant,⁸⁴¹ despite its excavator’s acceptance of a Syrian origin⁸⁴² and the varied opinions of others, including Amiran who considered it “almost certainly” of Canaanite origin,⁸⁴³ and the uncertainty of Popham and Warren.

A Minoan artisan drilled the basal hole, in order to adapt it for use as a rhyton.

UU. Fortetsa

Fortetsa is the name of a modern town west of Knossos village and the palace, immediately south of the larger town of Ambelokipi through which the main road from Herakleion leads to Knossos.

UU.1. Fortetsa Cemetery

About 500 m. southeast of Fortetsa town is a series of some 17 early Iron Age tombs, excavated by Nikolaos Platon, Ian Blakeway and Humfry Payne in 1933 and 1935 in a series of different campaigns. Nine are located west of a North-South cart track, and the other eight to its east. The cemetery was published by J.K. Brock some 20 years later, after

the British excavators had died and including much of the material from Platon’s excavations.⁸⁴⁴

Tomb II, the middle of the nine western tombs, was the richest of the group, with some 18 burials inside and a further 10 outside the tomb, all in large pithoi. Pithos burial #8, a polychrome Late Orientalising vessel, is one of three on the topmost level of the tightly packed chamber. It contained an oinochoe, an aryballos, beads of glass (1) and dark steatite (1, conoid), pendants of carnelian (1) dark steatite (1) and blue-grey steatite (1), seals of red steatite (1) and jasper (1), three glass scarabs, two silver pins, and a pin and human head in bronze.⁸⁴⁵ The burial is described as ‘rich’ and is dated to the ‘Late Orientalising’ period (c. 680–620 BC).

282. Scarab, HM Σ-K 3026 (not seen)

‘White steatite,’ L: 11.6; W: 8.6; H: 5.8 mm, worn.

Scarab, with trapezoidal head, single line between pronotum and elytra, and between elytra. Legs indicated and deeply undercut, meeting just forward of elytra-pronotum junction. String-hole through length. *Face:* Hieroglyphic inscription of a personal name, Amonhotep (*Imn-htp*) in vertical format. An extraneous horizontal line below the bread-loaf ‘t’ (X 1) may be a *nb*-basket (V 30). Line border.

Egyptian, Dynasty XXVI.

Context: Protocorinthian/Late Orientalising.

Chronology: Early Dynasty XXVI scarab, in Protocorinthian/Late Orientalising tomb deposition.

References: BROCK 1957:97 #1077, 208, pl. 75, 173; SKONJEDELE 1994:III.1862 #1904; HOFFMAN 1997:89 #T; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:328 #345.

Comments: I.E.S. Edwards dated all three scarabs from Fortetsa for Brock as Dynasty XXVI, of which this example was ‘certain’ and the other two could be as early as Dynasty XXII. I concur. Hoffman also considers it a Dynasty XXVI type but a Phoenician product. Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) published only this scarab from Fortetsa. They dated this scarab to the reign of Amenhotep I, although noting it is from a ‘Protocorinthian’ context. It therefore has been included in the present catalogue, although the other two do not concern the present study. Dynasty XXVI is the first for which the chronology is precisely known in absolute modern terms: 664–525 BC. Thus its Egyptian dating fits perfectly into the majority of the Late Orientalising date range of the tomb and pithos in which it was recovered with the other two scarabs. Keel and Kyriakides are the only dissenters.

Four Dynasty XVIII pharaohs are named Amonhotep; the last changed his to Akhenaten. Amenhotep I and III both enjoyed an extended posthumous cult worship, with attendant scarab production, at least as late as Dynasty XXVI. Additionally, this is a common personal name throughout the New

⁸³⁹ POPHAM 1970:227; HANKEY 1974:165.

⁸⁴⁰ HANKEY 1974:165.

⁸⁴¹ The form is not found in SPARKS 1998.

⁸⁴² HUTCHINSON 1956a:68. His original inclination was to accept it as Cretan work, DUNBABIN 1944:83.

⁸⁴³ POPHAM 1970:227 n. 4.

⁸⁴⁴ BROCK 1957; see also HOOD and SMYTH 1981:46 #151, with references to earlier, preliminary reports.

⁸⁴⁵ BROCK 1957:84–97, #956–958, 1069–1082.

Kingdom and later periods. Thus it need not even be a royal name, much less that of a Dynasty XVIII pharaoh. The crude quality of the carving alone is indicative of a post-Dynasty XVIII date.

UU.2. No Find Context

The following is said to have been found in the area of Fortetsa. It was purchased by R.W. Hutchinson and presented to the HM.

283. Scarab, HM Σ-K 1555 (not seen)

'Unidentified white material,' L: 14; W: 12.9; H: 9.4 mm, slightly chipped edge of face.

Scarab, with unindicated head, single line between pronotum and elytra, and a second on elytra. Elytra not distinguished, but both are striated vertically and undercut at tail. Legs indicated, mainly by undercutting, meeting at division between pronotum and elytra. Very high base. String-hole through length. *Face*: Undecorated, slightly concave.

Unknown.

Context: None.

Chronology: Unknown scarab, without context.

Comparison: {316}.

Reference: KARETSOU *et al.* 2000:314 #316.

Comments: Purchased by Hutchinson and presented to the HM, said to have been found in the area of Fortetsa. Keel and Kyriakides (in KARETSOU *et al.*) incorrectly date this scarab and its parallel to MM III-LM I. The material is as described by Keel and Kyriakides, and appears to be unlike all other scarabs found on the island. It certainly is not Egyptian, nor is it Minoan, but it might be Phoenician. See also comments to {316}.

VV. No Find Context

A considerable number of objects at Knossos either have no recorded context or are surface finds. When known, they are grouped in the present study by the name of their excavator.

VV.1. Evans' Excavations

The following were found at Knossos by A.J. Evans but without recorded find context or provenance.

284. Alabastron (Type C), KSM Box 1891

Very lightly banded travertine, H: 8.15; W: 5.4; MDim: 9.1 cm, one fragment preserving upper body profile to neck.

Baggy alabastron with sloping shoulder and flaring rim.

Egyptian, Within Dynasty XII-SIP (-very early Dynasty XVIII?).

Context: None.

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII-Second Intermediate Period (-very early Dynasty XVIII?) vessel, without context.

References: WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:I; PHILLIPS 1991:II:626-627 #245, III:1101 fig. 245.

285. Alabastron (Type C), KSM Box 1893

Banded travertine, H: 8.5; W: 5.4; MDim: 8.9 cm, one fragment preserving majority of body profile from lower body to beginning of rim.

Baggy alabastron with sloping shoulder and thick flaring rim, rounded lower body.

Egyptian, within Dynasty XII-SIP.

Context: None.

Chronology: Within Dynasty XII-Second Intermediate Period vessel, without context.

Comparison: BOURRIAU 1988:145 #151.a.

References: WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:I; PHILLIPS 1991:II:627 #246, III:1102 fig. 246.

Comments: As the bottom is missing, it is possible that this vessel had a raised base; see comparison.

286. Alabastron (Type B) or deep vase fragments, KSM Boxes O+E 4 + 9

Banded travertine, H: 12.5; W: 11.8; MDim: 12.4 cm, four joining fragments preserving lower body almost to base.

'Drop vase' alabastron or deep vase with lower body tapering to rounded bottom. Bottom with depressed interior profile. Upper body thickens.

Egyptian, within Dynasty XII-XVIII.

Context: None.

Chronology: Dynasty XII-XVIII vessel, without context.

References: WARREN 1969:113 Type 43:I; PHILLIPS 1991:II:627 #248, III:1103 fig. 248.

Comments: Perhaps this should be associated rather with Warren's Type 43:J. If it is an alabastron, it is of the 'drop' type and dates not later than the Second Intermediate Period or possibly very early Dynasty XVIII. Alternatively, if it is another vessel form, it could date to Dynasty XVIII.

287. Amphora(?) fragment, KSM Box 1900.

Banded travertine, H: 8.2; W: 2.9; MDim: 8.3 cm, one fragment preserving lower body profile.

Amphora(?), with thick-walled lower body, thickening to (either a keeled or rounded) bottom.

Egyptian, (SIP-)Dynasty XVIII.

Context: None.

Chronology: (Second Intermediate Period-)Dynasty XVIII vessel, without context.

References: WARREN 1969:112-113 Type 43:I; PHILLIPS 1991:II:627 #247, III:1102 fig. 247.

Comments: Most likely an amphora fragment having either a keeled or rounded bottom, judging from the surviving profile and vessel thickness. It is unlikely to have been an alabastron as suggested by Warren, or a tenon base for insertion into a separate 'potstand' base.

288. Closed vessel (amphora?) fragment, AM 1938.452

Clay, H (pres.): 3.9; D (base): 4.5, base/lower body fragment, chipped around base, paint chipped and worn.

Closed vessel with short splaying base and deep lower body, raised ridge at base/lower body junction, slightly concave underfoot. Bottom added separately to base, with joining clear on interior. All exterior including underfoot covered with thick red glaze.

Minoan, MM III(A?).

Context: None known.

Chronology: MM (III A?) vessel, with no known context.

Comparison: {97}.

References: EVANS *PM* II.1:369; BOARDMAN 1961:164 (p. 369); PHILLIPS 1991:II:552-553 #149, III:1057 fig. 149.

Comments: The raised ridge suggests restoration of this vessel as an amphora with sagging lower body similar to the comparison from Kamilari quoted; it has a similar underfoot, although is not mentioned by Cucuzza as another example of